APPENDIX

Data, Methods, and Findings

For readers concerned about methodological issues, this appendix provides details on the sources of our data—two waves of the Baylor Religion Survey and a series of qualitative interviews—and the statistical analyses that lie behind our presentation.

The Baylor Religion Survey

Funded by the Templeton Foundation, the Baylor Religion Survey (BRS) is an in-depth survey of religious beliefs and attitudes administered to the U.S. general population. Most other national surveys, such as the General Social Survey and National Election Study, include limited questions on religion.[1] That is not to say that the developers of these surveys do not feel religion is important. Rather, it is a question of focus. The Baylor Religion Survey was designed to try to fill this gap with the inclusion of dozens of new religion questions. Most important for the purposes of this book, the BRS includes more than two dozen questions that ask respondents to characterize God's personality.

This book utilizes data from the first two waves of the Baylor Religion Survey. Wave 1, collected in the fall of 2005, consists of a random sample of 1,721 Americans. Wave 2, collected in the fall of 2007, provides responses from a random sample of 1,648 Americans. In the interests of space, we have not reproduced the full survey booklets for each wave in this volume. Interested readers can view the questionnaires at the Web site for Baylor's Institute for Studies of Religion (ISR): http://www.isreligion.org/research/surveysofreligion/. Researchers can also download the Baylor Religion Survey at http://thearda.com.

Data Collection

The Gallup Organization administered the Baylor Religion Survey. Of course, many items on the BRS are similar or identical to those on existing surveys, such as the General Social Survey, the National Election Study, and the many surveys conducted by the Pew Forum. But new questions, such as the image of God module, had never before appeared on a national survey and were field-tested by both Baylor University and the Gallup Organization.

Even though the BRS includes many religion questions, it was *not* administered only to highly religious people or to a certain type of religious person. The Gallup Organization called a random sample of people around the country to solicit their participation in the survey. Every person in the United States with a phone had an equal chance of being selected for the survey. While Americans are overwhelmingly Christian, people of non-Christian religions and atheists completed the survey as well.[2]

For both waves, Gallup used a mixed-mode sampling design (telephone and self-administered mailed surveys). The recruitment and administration of the BRS can be broken down into three distinct phases: (1) initial recruitment through random-digit dialing, (2) phone interviews on a randomly selected subsample of participants to determine bias in initial refusals; and (3) the mailed survey. Given the number of different stages in the process, we will focus on Wave 1 in our description here and present a table to summarize both waves.

The Gallup Organization conducted phone recruitment requesting participation in a survey project designed to "investigate the values and beliefs of Americans." The Gallup Organization did not indicate that the BRS was specifically about religion or that Baylor University was involved in the study, for fear that this might bias the response rate. The random-digit telephone sample was drawn from telephone exchanges serving the continental United States. To avoid various other sources of bias, a random-digit procedure designed to provide representation of both listed and unlisted (including not-yet-listed) telephone numbers was used. The design of the sample ensures representation of all telephone numbers by randomly generating the last two digits of numbers selected on the basis of their area code, telephone exchange, and bank order.

The mailed survey was a sixteen-page booklet with a cover page titled "The Values and Beliefs of the American Public—A National Study."[3] Questionnaires included a cover letter explaining the study's objectives and a number to call if participants had any questions or comments. In appreciation of their participation, potential mail survey respondents were offered a $5 incentive to complete the self-administered questionnaire and return it to the Gallup Organization. A follow-up reminder postcard was sent to all those who did not respond to the initial survey mailing.

For Wave 1, the Gallup Organization contacted 7,041 households by phone, and 3,002 people agreed to participate in the study. The response rate for the initial recruiting phase is calculated according to the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) RR1 definition: RR1 = 3,002 / 7,041 = 42.6 percent. Of the 2,603 surveys mailed, 1,721 were completed and returned. Consequently, the return rate for the mailed surveys is 66.1 percent (1,721 / 2,603). When these three phases of data collection (initial recruitment, phone interviews, and mailed surveys) are pooled to calculate the response rate for the mixed-mode method per AAPOR RR1, it becomes 24.4 percent (1,721 / 7,041 = 24.4 percent).[4] Using the same formula, the response rate for the mixed-mode method per AAPOR RR1 for Wave 2 is 24.94 percent (1,648 / 6,604).

$$RR1 = \frac{I}{(I + P) + (R + NC + O) + (UH + UO)}$$

I = complete interviews; P = partial interviews; R = refusals and break-offs; NC = noncontact; O = other; UH = unknown if household occupied; UO = unknown, other. This response rate for multimethod surveys accounts for nonresponse at all levels of data collection.

The Gallup Organization asserts that these response rates fit within the normal parameters for reliable national survey data. In addition, all demographic variables compare favorably with other national surveys. To search for such bias, we compared our respondents to those of the 2004 General Social Survey on key religious indicators such as attendance and denomination. The respondents to the two surveys were quite similar. For example, there was no evidence of a systematic bias toward

more conservative denominations in the BRS. For the thirty-seven groups for which comparisons are possible between the BRS and GSS, the two surveys differ by less than 1 percent.[5] The largest differences were for Catholics (the GSS had 4 percent more), Baptists (5 percent more in the GSS), and those with no religion (14.8 percent in the GSS, 11 percent in the BRS). Other religion indicators were equally comparable. Respondents to both surveys attend at about the same rate, with BRS data having a slightly higher number that never attend.

With the exception of being slightly more educated on average than GSS respondents (16 percent of BRS respondents have had some graduate study, compared with 10 percent in the GSS), our sample also looked very similar to the GSS with regard to employment status, marital status, and education. In sum, for the most part, differences between the BRS and GSS were small and certainly not sufficiently worrisome to suggest we have an overly religious sample that does not represent the general population.[6] We are confident that the BRS data can be used to present a portrait of current religious beliefs in the United States.

The Gallup Organization created weights for each wave using a ratio estimation program. By using a statistical algorithm, the overall (marginal) distributions, as well as the interrelationships among several variables, are simultaneously adjusted by assigning weights to individual respondents in order to bring all of the distributions into alignment with population parameters, or "true distributions" of these variables and their relationships with one another. The Gallup Organization used the most recent national data available from the Bureau of the Census Current Population Survey for gender, race, region, age, and education. In the first step of the weighting, a full weighting matrix of region by gender by age by education is derived from the CPS information. The second step involved a full weighting matrix of region by gender by race. All of our analyses are weighted using these constructed weight variables.

The God Interviews

Examining the results of the BRS provided us with some fascinating insights into American religion in general and American beliefs about

God in particular. It should be noted here that our conclusions about national trends are based on our quantitative data. But at the same time we realized that answers on a questionnaire do not tell a complete story about how people imagine God. Opinions about God are often vague, abstract, and highly personal, and survey data alone cannot adequately capture the many nuances of American beliefs. Therefore, we supplemented our national survey data with a series of in-depth one-on-one interviews that helped us clarify and expand on our theories about why certain statistical relationships exist.

There were two types of interviews completed: individual interviews and focus groups. With regard to the former, the authors and a team of three trained graduate students conducted the interviews. The authors attempted to have as much geographic, racial, and religious diversity in the interviews as possible. In most cases, we used convenience sampling. We selected cities or regions to conduct interviews where we had a contact person who was a starting point for soliciting interviews. Through snowball sampling, we collected other interviews as needed. In some cases, we used an alternate method of soliciting interviews. For example, we did not have any contacts along the coast of Washington that we could use to solicit interviews. One of the authors gave an interview to a coastal newspaper that described the project and requested that those interested in being interviewed contact him. We also did not have existing contacts in Boston, Pasadena, or Kansas City, and we cold-called churches to seek interviews in those locations. As interviews were completed, we continually reevaluated our basic demographic distributions and regional distribution and determined new locations and interviewee characteristics as needed. For example, if we noted that we had few interviews with Roman Catholics, we specifically looked for Catholics in a targeted region.

When including both individual and focus group interviewees, the total number of respondents for this project was 106. Seventy of these interviews were conducted one-on-one in the following states and cities: Massachusetts (Boston, Newport, 2), Rhode Island (Providence, 5), Texas (Dallas, Houston, Waco, 18), Arkansas (Lake Village, 1), Florida (Bradenton, Holmes Beach, Orlando, St. Augustine, Tampa, 14), California (Glendale, Pasadena, San Fernando, Woodland Hills, 12), Kansas (Kansas City, 14), and Washington (Copalis Beach, Moclips, Ocean Shores,

Lynnwood, 4). Those respondents were of the following races: Caucasian (60; 86 percent), Hispanic (2), Asian (3; 4 percent), and African American (7; 10 percent), split between males (32; 46 percent) and females (38; 54 percent). Interviewees ranged in age from 19 to 79, with an average age of 47.

Respondents were from a wide array of religious traditions and denominations. Forty-three percent (30) of the interview subjects identified with an evangelical denomination (for example: Pentecostal, nondenominational, Southern Baptist, and Seventh-Day Adventist). Seventeen percent (12) of our subjects identified as Catholic, and 29 percent (20) identified with a Mainline denomination (including the United Church of Christ, Disciples of Christ, Presbyterian Church [U.S.A.], Anglicans, and Episcopalians). The remaining respondents were Jewish (2, 3 percent) and of other religions (6, 9 percent), which included Buddhists, Greek Orthodox, and a respondent who identified himself as a "mystic."

The interviews themselves were semistructured. We asked the respondents broad questions about the nature of God and allowed them to elaborate as desired. Although we added or deleted items when we desired reflection on a specific issue, our common interview schedule consisted of the following eight topics:

> Do you believe in God? [If not, do you believe that something exists beyond the physical world?]
>
> Please describe God as best you can. [Is God a "he" or a "she"? What does God look like? Can you describe God's personality?]
>
> Is God active in your daily life? In what ways?
>
> Are there specific things that you have experienced that you believe were acts of God?
>
> Are there world events that you believe were acts of God?
>
> How does God deal with sinners?
>
> Is there divine justice? What is it and how it is accomplished?
>
> Does God have an opinion about moral issues? [Abortion, homosexuality, the death penalty]

These items were used a guide for the interviewers, who were free to ask them in a different order if doing so helped the flow of conversation.

Interviewers were instructed to prompt for examples or personal experiences and were free to ask follow-up questions for clarification. All interviews were tape-recorded. On average, the interviews lasted for forty-five minutes.

Each interviewee was also given a survey containing the same block of questions about God that were included on the BRS. The interviewers did not mention the God typology or four God types during the interviews, and in no case did interviewees appear familiar with the God typology mentioned in media coverage. Once interviews were complete, the tapes were transcribed and questionnaire data entered, allowing us to determine the God type for each respondent who completed the survey. During interviews, the subjects were allowed to expand upon each topic as much as possible and correct or clarify themselves as desired. We did not, however, send final transcripts to each subject for approval.

In addition to these one-on-one interviews, we selected two groups to visit that would be used as illustrations in particular chapters. Twenty one-on-one interviews were conducted at the Westboro Baptist Church in Topeka, Kansas (see chapter 3). Another sixteen interviews were conducted at the Greater Exodus Baptist Church in Philadelphia (see chapter 5).

Although we attempted to interview a variety of different people, we must be clear that such interviews do not constitute a random sample. Consequently, we cannot use them to draw inferences about the beliefs of the general population. Thankfully, the Baylor Religion Surveys allow us to determine how the average American answers questions about God. Our work is not one of grounded theory. Yet we used the interviews to test hypotheses generated from our analysis of the BRS; in sum, this qualitative data indicate the mechanisms and internal logic that connect the opinions and attitudes about various conceptually disparate issues. And the interviews fully confirmed our assertions that a wide range of Americans think deeply about God and that their images of God influence how they think about a host of other topics.

The Analyses

Throughout the book, we do not present full regression tables, nor do we make a point of discussing the effects of control variables. But the

reader can be assured that we do not claim a connection between God images and a particular outcome if that relationship disappears with the addition of key control measures. After all, there is little point in focusing on images of God if their effects can be accounted for by other variables.

In most models, we focused on two perceived qualities of God's character—God's perceived level of judgment/anger and God's level of engagement with the world. In our analyses, we refer to the first measure as "God's Judgment" and the latter as "God's Engagement." If we were more interested in *how* an outcome varied by God type, we performed analyses using dichotomous variables representing the four God types.[7]

In Wave 1, God's Engagement is a simple additive scale of eight items tapping the respondent's belief about God's interest and involvement in the world. Six of those items ask respondents their level of agreement (on a 5-point, Likert-type scale) with the following descriptions of God: "removed from worldly affairs," "removed from my personal affairs," "concerned with the well-being of the world," "concerned with my personal well-being," "directly involved in worldly affairs," and "directly involved in my affairs." Two additional items ask respondents how well the adjectives "Distant" and "Ever-present" describe God: "not at all," "not very well," "undecided," "somewhat well," or "very well." Items were flipped as necessary, such that higher scores equal higher levels of perceived engagement. The resulting scale ranged from 8 to 40 with a mean of 30.64 (alpha = .91).

We measured God's Judgment by summing six items. Respondents are asked if they agree that God is "angered by human sins" and "angered by my sins." They are also asked how well the adjectives "critical," "punishing," "severe," and "wrathful" describe God. As with the items regarding God's Engagement, all are on 5-point, Likert-type scales. The final scale has an alpha of .85. Scores range from 6 to 30, with a mean of 17.04.

Not all items from Wave 1 were reproduced in Wave 2; therefore, the God's Engagement measure differs slightly. Our measure of God's Engagement in Wave 2 consists of six items: God is "concerned with the well-being of the world," "concerned with my personal well-being," "directly involved in worldly affairs," and "directly involved in my

affairs" and responses to the adjectives "Distant" and "Ever-present." Again, items were flipped as necessary, such that higher scores equal higher levels of perceived engagement. The Wave 2 God's Engagement scale ranges from 7 to 35, with an alpha of .88. God's Judgment was created in an identical manner in both waves. The alpha score for God's Judgment in Wave 2 remained at .85.

We created the typology of four different God types used throughout the book by splitting variables at their mean. Those who were above the mean on God's Judgment were considered "high" on God's judgment. Those with scores above the mean on God's Engagement were considered to have "high" values. The four God types correspond to the four possible combinations of these two split variables. Some readers may wonder why we did not simply focus on the two variables of God's Judgment and Engagement in the text. We did so for several reasons. First, the four God types line up nicely with the way in which God is discussed in popular discourse and therefore provide a useful heuristic tool. As we discussed in chapter 6, some public figures have spoken of a God that causes tsunamis and hurricanes to punish humans for their sins. An image of God as *Authoritative* captures such a worldview quite well. Clearly, the *Distant God* captures the God of Benjamin Franklin and the deists quite well. Our interviews supported the notion that these two characteristics of God's perceived personality tend to coalesce into a unified image of God in the minds of believers rather than acting as separate variables. In other words, people talked very differently about God if they see "him" as angry but disengaged than if they see him as engaged but not angry. Finally, we desire our work to be accessible to readers who are not trained in the use of statistics in the social sciences. In our opinion, it is easier to grasp the concept of different personality profiles of God than it is the interaction of two conceptually distinct but related measures. Table A.1 provides the frequencies for each God type in Waves 1 and 2.

It was also important to ensure that images of God are not simply a proxy for other religion measures such as church attendance, denomination, or biblical literalism. Therefore, we included key demographic and religious controls in our models. Biblical literalism is included as a dichotomous variable comparing those who believe that the Bible should be "taken literally, word-for-word, on all subjects" with all

Table A.1 Images of God in Baylor Religion Survey, Waves 1 and 2

	Wave 1	Wave 2
Atheist	71 (5.2%)	68 (4.8%)
Authoritative God	429 (31.4%)	401 (28.2%)
Benevolent God	315 (23.0%)	317 (22.3%)
Critical God	219 (16.0%)	297 (20.9%)
Distant God	333 (24.4%)	340 (23.9%)
Missing	354	225
Total	1,721	1,648

others. Attendance is included as a simple frequency ranging from "Never" to "Several times a week." To control for religious family, we utilized the RELTRAD classification system developed by Steensland and colleagues (2000).[8] The RELTRAD system places denominations into the groupings Evangelical Protestant, Mainline Protestant, Black Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Other religion, and None/no religion. In our analyses, we entered RELTRAD as a series of dummy variables, with Evangelical as the contrast category.

We also include controls for age, race, education, income, gender (0 = female), and marital status. Marital status is a dichotomous variable comparing people who are married (1) to all others. Race compares whites (1) to other races. Education has six categories—eight years or less of schooling, some high school, high school diploma, some college or vocational school, college degree, postgraduate degree. Family income has seven categories: $10,000 or less, $10,000–$20,000, $20,000–$35,000, $35,000–$50,000, $50,000–$100,000, $100,000–$150,000, and $150,000 and over. Family income was logged in our analyses.

We also include a control for political ideology. For analyses using Wave 2, we utilize a seven-category variable with responses ranging from "Extremely conservative" to "Extremely liberal." Unfortunately, this item does not exist in Wave 1; therefore, for Wave 1 analyses, we use a seven-category variable with the responses "Strong Democrat," "Moderate Democrat," "Leaning Democrat," "Independent," "Leaning Republican," "Moderate Republican," and "Strong Republican."

Before conducting our analyses, we took several steps to recover missing data. First, we examined our race variables and found that a

large amount of missing data was created by individuals neglecting to check "no" on individual race items. In other words, a person who checked that "yes" they were white but failed to check "no" to all of the other race categories was being counted as missing. By considering a nonresponse a "no" we recovered 144 cases in Wave 2. Further, we used predicted values to replace missing values for income based on a regression using other demographic characteristics (gender, age, education, race, and marital status). This recovered an additional seventy-six cases in Wave 2. We ran each model with and without these altered variables, and their inclusion does not change the pattern of results. We could have recovered more cases if we had attempted to use predicted values for biblical literalism, church attendance, or images of God. We were concerned, however, about using predicted values for the key religion measures central to our arguments, and we elected not to do so.

The introduction and chapters 1 and 7 primarily present simple frequencies. In the following sections, we provide the key analyses that informed the major conclusions of chapters 2–6.

Chapter 2: God, Self, and Society

In chapter 2, we examined several sources of conceptions of God: child-rearing, personality types, religious identity, and personal identity. Hence, table A.2 presents our analysis of how demographic factors, religious background, and personality characteristics relate to one's image of God.

Immediately clear is that a complicated set of factors are associated with different conceptions of God. If you are very conservative, you are more likely to conceive of an Authoritative God; those with very liberal leanings tend toward a Distant God. Yet politics tell us nothing about those with Benevolent and Critical Gods. Females and younger people tend toward a Benevolent God. Religious background, parenting practices, and personality also have significant effects on different ways of imagining God, as outlined in chapter 2.

Chapter 3: God and Morals

The Baylor Religion Survey Wave 2 includes two questions related to the perceived source of homosexuality. First we ask respondents their

Table A.2 Predicting God (Baylor Religion Survey, Wave 2)

	Authoritative God	Benevolent God	Critical God	Distant God
Demographics				
Gender (0 = Female)	1.129 (.159)	**.585 (.157)****	**1.527 (.160)****	.921 (.160)
Age	**1.008 (.005)***	**.990 (.005)***	1.002 (.005)	1.002 (.005)
Married	**1.066 (.179)**	**.940 (.176)**	**.890 (.171)**	**.940 (.176)**
Income	.724 (.188)*	1.668 (.198)**	.519 (.181)**	2.096 (.230)**
Education	.954 (.076)	.954 (.075)	**.875 (.077)***	**1.157 (.076)***
Race (0 = Nonwhite)	.671 (.250)	**.563 (.241)****	.955 (.253)	**2.159 (.291)****
Political Conservatism	**1.239 (.058)****	.999 (.056)	.984 (.054)	**.853 (.055)****
Religion†				
Catholic	**.345 (.209)****	**1.980 (.211)****	1.318 (.215)	**1.581 (.225)***
Black Protestant	.785 (.388)	1.149 (.405)	1.260 (.465)	.229 (1.263)
Mainline Protestant	**.488 (.206)****	**1.815 (.217)****	**1.518 (.219)***	1.150 (.233)
Jewish	**.377 (.713)**	.430 (.829)	1.635 (.512)	1.267 (.480)
Other Religions	**.232 (.354)****	**2.405 (.295)****	.558 (.419)	**2.339 (.322)****
No Religion	**.045 (.947)****	.884 (.445)	**.501 (.306)***	.820 (.287)
How Religious?	**1.824 (.132)****	**1.609 (.134)****	.828 (.121)	.862 (.120)
Biblical Literalist? (0 = No)	**1.455 (.183)***	.903 (.202)	**.583 (.244)***	**.370 (.349)****
Church Attendance	**1.128 (.034)****	**1.138 (.037)****	**.870 (.037)****	**.795 (.041)****

Table A.2 continued

	Authoritative God	Benevolent God	Critical God	Distant God
Parenting				
Church Attendance at 12	**1.069** **(.036)***	1.022 (.035)	1.031 (.034)	**.935** **(.034)***
Parents Spanked	**1.487** **(.153)****	.865 (.157)	1.077 (.163)	**.593** **(.173)****
Parents Praised	**0.595** **(.265)***	.781 (.245)	**1.637** **(.244)***	1.415 (.251)
Personality				
Extraversion	1.045 (.037)	1.026 (.036)	**.913** **(.038)****	1.052 (.037)
Agreeableness	.946 (.053)	**1.176** **(.054)****	.919 (.052)	.940 (.053)
Conscientiousness	.980 (.052)	1.073 (.051)	.952 (.052)	1.015 (.053)
Emotional Stability	1.003 (.045)	1.048 (.045)	**.906** **(.045)***	1.016 (.045)
Openness	1.015 (.055)	1.009 (.055)	**.910** **(.053)***	1.047 (.056)
Constant	**−3.076** **(.820)****	**−4.750** **(.814)****	**3.403** **(.841)****	**−2.018** **(.862)****
N	1,253	1,253	1,253	1,253

* = p < .05; ** = p < .01.
† Contrast category for religious tradition = Evangelical Protestant.
Logistic regression analyses. Odds ratios presented with standard errors in parentheses.

level of agreement with the statements "People are born as either homosexual or heterosexual" and "People choose to be homosexuals." We find that people with more active and judgmental views of God are less likely to believe that people are homosexual by nature. However, God's perceived level of judgment does not have a direct effect on the belief that homosexuality is a choice (see table A.3).

Both God's Judgment and God's Engagement lead to more absolutist attitudes toward gay marriage (see table A.4). A question on the BRS Wave 1 asks respondents if gay marriage is "not wrong at all," "only

Table A.3 Images of God and the Origins of Homosexuality (Baylor Religion
Survey, Wave 2)

	People are born as either homosexual or heterosexual	People choose to be homosexuals
Demographics		
Gender (0 = Female)	**-.160 (.068)****	**.206 (.072)****
Age	**.071 (.002)****	**-.063 (.002)***
Married	-.008 (.075)	**.073 (.079)****
Income	.044 (.081)	-.029 (.086)
Education	.022 (.032)	**-.071 (.034)****
Race (0 = Nonwhite)	-.002 (.108)	-.042 (.115)
Political Conservatism	**-.232 (.024)****	**.246 (.025)****
Religion Controls†		
Catholic	**.126 (.093)****	**-.073 (.098)***
Black Protestant	**.116 (.192)****	.034 (.203)
Mainline Protestant	**.134 (.094)****	**-.102 (.100)****
Jewish	.046 (.237)	-.024 (.255)
Other Religions	**.062 (.141)***	-.036 (.149)
No Religion	**.082 (.139)****	-.036 (.147)
Biblical Literalist? (0 = No)	**-.175 (.092)****	**.072 (.097)***
Church Attendance	**-.126 (.015)****	**.100 (.015)****
Images of God		
God's Judgment	**-.066 (.006)***	.035 (.006)
God's Engagement	**-.068 (.007)***	**.109 (.007)****
Constant	4.265 (1.131)	1.573 (1.199)
N	1,254	1,255
R^2	.335	.290

* = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$.
† Contrast category = Evangelical Protestant.
OLS regression analysis with standardized coefficients presented. Standard errors are
in parentheses. Responses to each item were on a standard Likert-type scale, "strongly
disagree," "disagree," "undecided," "agree," "strongly agree."

wrong sometimes," "almost always wrong," and "always wrong." Respondents clumped at "not wrong at all" (30 percent) and "always wrong" (59 percent); therefore, we dichotomized this item, comparing those who believe gay marriage is always wrong with all others. The results of a logistic regression are presented in table A.4.

Table A.4 Images of God and Belief That Gay Marriage Is "Always Wrong" (Baylor Religion Survey, Wave 1)

	Gay marriage is "always wrong"
Demographics	
Gender (0 = Female)	1.997 (.167)**
Age	1.024 (.005)**
Married	.933 (.176)
Income	.959 (.206)
Education	.790 (.075)**
Race (0 = Nonwhite)	.909 (.269)
Political Conservatism	1.555 (.045)**
Religion Controls†	
Catholic	.463 (.221)**
Black Protestant	2.411 (.551)
Mainline Protestant	.401 (.218)**
Jewish	.341 (.477)*
Other Religions	.384 (.375)**
No Religion	.151 (.370)**
Biblical Literalist? (0 = No)	4.337 (.310)**
Church Attendance	1.141 (.035)**
Image of God	
God's Judgment	1.061 (.014)**
God's Engagement	1.046 (.014)**
Constant	−4.457 (.726)**
N	1,296

* = p < .05; ** = p < .01.
† Contrast category = Evangelical Protestant.
Logistic regression analyses. Odds ratios presented with standard errors in parentheses.

God's Judgment will view gay marriage as always wrong, as does God's Engagement.

In the following analyses, we examine how God's perceived judgment and engagement relate to belief that abortion is "always wrong" in particular circumstances using logistic regression. In each model, we contrast people who believe that abortion is "always wrong" in the given situation with those who believe that it is "almost always wrong," "only wrong sometimes," or "not wrong at all." As we discuss in chapter 3, images of God are related to attitudes toward abortion differently, depending on the circumstances (see table A.5).

Chapter 4: God and Science

In chapter 4, we note that the most salient feature of God's perceived character with regard to science is Engagement. Those with an engaged God imagine a creator who is distinct from nature and able to shape the world directly. Those with a less engaged God imagine a creator who is, perhaps, part of nature itself. To capture these two conceptions of God, we combine respondents with a highly engaged God (Authoritative or Benevolent). Those with less active Gods (Critical or Distant) are also combined. In the following analyses, we search for differences in views regarding science by God type by entering a dichotomous variable that contrast those with an engaged God with all others. All of the following analyses use data from the Baylor Religion Survey, Wave 2.

We use OLS regression to predict several attitudes about the intersection of faith and science. First, respondents are asked their level of agreement with the statements "Science will eventually provide solutions to most of our problems" and "We rely too much on science and not enough on faith." Those with engaged Gods (Authoritative or Benevolent) exhibit considerably more skepticism regarding science (see table A.6).

We further asked respondents their level of agreement with the statements that "Science and religion are incompatible" and "Science helps to reveal God's glory." Those with Authoritative or Benevolent God types are most likely to believe that science is a window into God's plans yet see an incompatibility between scientific and religious worldviews.

Table A.5 Images of God and Belief That Abortion Is "Always Wrong" under Particular Circumstances (Baylor Religion Survey, Wave 1)

	The baby may have a serious defect	The woman's health may be in danger	The pregnancy is a result of rape	The family cannot afford the child	The woman does not want the child
Demographics					
Gender (0 = Female)	1.052 (.169)	.714 (.206)	.935 (.177)	1.285 (.158)	1.277 (.156)
Age	**.991 (.005)***	.994 (.007)	.996 (.006)	.995 (.005)	**.989 (.005)***
Married	1.344 (.191)	1.408 (.237)	1.151 (.200)	1.224 (.170)	1.133 (.167)
Income	**.704 (.200)***	.735 (.235)	**.669 (.206)***	**.621 (.194)****	**.599 (.193)****
Education	.951 (.077)	.867 (.095)	**.851 (.081)***	**.832 (.072)****	**.799 (.071)****
Race (0 = Nonwhite)	.851 (.299)	.758 (.365)	.781 (.307)	1.193 (.261)	**1.544 (.258)***
Political Conservatism	**1.305 (.046)****	**1.178 (.058)****	**1.139 (.049)****	**1.276 (.041)****	**1.236 (.041)****
Religion Controls†					
Catholic	**1.790 (.216)****	**2.116 (.263)****	**1.591 (.227)***	1.074 (.213)	1.167 (.212)
Black Protestant	.974 (.490)	.777 (.615)	1.317 (.488)	.973 (.455)	1.008 (.456)
Mainline Protestant	**.489 (.239)****	**.528 (.324)***	**.435 (.263)****	**.515 (.205)****	**.588 (.205)****
Jewish[1]	—	—	1.116 (.673)	.605 (.472)	.562 (.474)
Other Religions	.663 (.453)	**.208 (.911)***	**.200 (.631)****	.599 (.372)	.659 (.369)
No Religion	**2.233 (.481)***	1.223 (.868)	**2.476 (.498)***	**.529 (.361)***	.673 (.336)
Biblical Literalist? (0 = No)	**1.835 (.195)****	**3.598 (.227)****	**3.337 (.194)****	**2.012 (.245)****	**2.947 (.262)****

Table A.5 continued

	The baby may have a serious defect	The woman's health may be in danger	The pregnancy is a result of rape	The family cannot afford the child	The woman does not want the child
Church Attendance	1.336 (.039)**	1.303 (.051)**	1.244 (.039)**	1.168 (.033)**	1.174 (.033)**
Images of God					
God's Judgment	1.037 (.014)**	.993 (.017)	1.001 (.015)	1.039 (.014)**	1.050 (.014)**
God's Engagement	1.096 (.017)**	1.091 (.024)**	1.133 (.019)**	1.134 (.014)**	1.111 (.014)**
Constant	−6.658 (.821)**	−6.100 (1.060)**	−6.002 (.881)**	−4.677 (.700)**	−3.826 (.679)**
N	1,291	1,288	1,288	1,295	1,296

[1] Jewish respondents could not be included in the first two models as convergence was not achieved. There are forty-one Jewish respondents. All forty-one disagree that abortion is "Always Wrong" when the baby may have a serious defect or when the woman's health may be in danger. There is disagreement among Jewish respondents with regard to the last three circumstances, allowing their inclusion in the models.

* = p < .05; ** = p < .01.

† Contrast category = Evangelical Protestant; convergence not achieved if Jewish respondents in model.

Logistic regression analyses. Odds ratios presented with standard errors in parentheses.

Two items ask respondents about the debate over the theory of evolution. We find that those with Authoritative or Benevolent God images are less convinced by evolution and more likely to believe that creationism should be taught in public schools (see table A.7).

We also use logistic regression to examine who supports scientific research. People who believe in Authoritative or Benevolent Gods are more likely to believe that embryonic stem-cell research is "always wrong." People with Authoritative and Benevolent Gods are also less likely to believe that the government is spending "too little" supporting scientific research (see table A.8).

Table A.6 Faith and Science & Faith in Science (Baylor Religion Survey, Wave 2)

	We rely too much on science and not enough on faith	Science will eventually provide solutions to most of our problems	Science and religion are incompatible	Science helps to reveal God's glory
Demographics				
Gender (0 = Female)	−.040 (.058)	.041 (.060)	.005 (.058)	.025 (.066)
Age	.002 (.002)	−.034 (.002)	.045 (.002)	.018 (.002)
Married	.009 (.065)	**−.075 (.066)****	.011 (.065)	−.052 (.073)
Income	**−.139 (.070)****	**.057 (.072)***	**−.133 (.070)****	.022 (.079)
Education	**−.075 (.028)****	−.036 (.028)	**−.157 (.028)****	**.121 (.031)****
Race (0 = Nonwhite)	**−.065 (.095)****	.035 (.097)	**−.073 (.095)***	−.033 (.106)
Political Conservatism	**.138 (.021)****	**−.136 (.021)****	−.027 (.021)	**.097 (.023)****
Religion Controls†				
Catholic	−.002 (.082)	**.086 (.083)****	.011 (.082)	**−.073 (.092)***
Black Protestant	−.022 (.171)	**.069 (.174)***	**.071 (.171)***	**−.063 (.192)***
Mainline Protestant	−.019 (.084)	**.085 (.085)****	−.011 (.083)	−.035 (.094)
Jewish	**−.070 (.201)****	.042 (.205)	.032 (.201)	**−.094 (.226)****
Other Religions	−.036 (.125)	**.058 (.126)***	−.027 (.126)	−.042 (.139)
No Religion	**−.126 (.109)****	**.138 (.111)****	**.066 (.109)***	**−.242 (.122)****

Table A.6 continued

	We rely too much on science and not enough on faith	Science will eventually provide solutions to most of our problems	Science and religion are incompatible	Science helps to reveal God's glory
Biblical Literalist? (0 = No)	.188 (.082)**	−.109 (.083)**	.039 (.081)	−.024 (.092)
Church Attendance	.205 (.013)**	−.177 (.013)**	−.070 (.013)*	.088 (.014)**
Images of God				
(Authoritative/ Benevolent)	.175 (.071)**	−.111 (.073)**	−.161 (.071)**	.248 (.080)**
Constant	2.782 (1.015)	3.696 (1.036)	3.640 (1.012)	1.934 (1.138)
N	1,316	1,319	1,312	1,315
R²	.424	.251	.127	.245

* = p < .05; ** = p < .01.
† Contrast category = Evangelical Protestant.
OLS regression analyses with standardized coefficients presented. Standard errors are in parentheses. Responses to each item were on a standard Likert-type scale, "strongly disagree," "disagree," "undecided," "agree," "strongly agree."

Chapter 5: God and Mammon

In chapter 5, we examine how images of God are related to views on economic issues. An item on BRS Wave 2 asks respondents how important it is to care for the sick and needy if one is to be a good person. Two further items from BRS Wave 1 ask level of agreement with the statement "The federal government should distribute wealth more evenly" and whether the government should fund faith-based initiatives. Using logistic regression, we examine how various factors influence these views on how economic and social problems are best addressed (see table A.9). A final model examines how different conceptions of God and our control variables influence whether a person identifies himself or herself as a Republican.

Table A.7 Images of God and Human Origins (Baylor Religion Survey, Wave 2)

	Humans evolved from primates over millions of years	Creationism should be taught in public schools
Demographics		
Gender (0 = Female)	.020 (.060)	.001 (.068)
Age	−.020 (.002)	−.050 (.002)*
Married	−.037 (.067)	.011 (.076)
Income	.032 (.072)	.019 (.082)
Education	.108 (.029)**	−.072 (.033)**
Race (0 = Nonwhite)	.015 (.097)	−.035 (.111)
Political Conservatism	−.218 (.021)**	.248 (.024)**
Religion Controls†		
Catholic	.165 (.084)**	−.073 (.096)*
Black Protestant	.039 (.175)	.008 (.199)
Mainline Protestant	.121 (.086)**	−.092 (.098)**
Jewish	.086 (.216)**	−.059 (.237)*
Other Religions	.044 (.127)*	−.081 (.146)**
No Religion	.151 (.111)**	−.174 (.127)**
Biblical Literalist? (0 = No)	−.132 (.084)**	.064 (.095)*
Church Attendance	−.209 (.013)**	.108 (.015)**
Images of God		
(Authoritative/Benevolent)	−.238 (.073)**	.121 (.083)**
Constant	3.659 (1.040)**	2.525 (1.184)**
N	1,312	1,312
R²	.528	.284

* = p < .05; ** = p < .01.
† Contrast category for religious tradition = Evangelical Protestant.
OLS regression analyses with standardized coefficients presented. Standard errors are in parentheses. Responses to each item were on a standard Likert-type scale, "strongly disagree," "disagree," "undecided," "agree," "strongly agree."

Table A.8 Images of God and Support for Science (Baylor Religion Survey, Wave 2)

	Embryonic stem-cell research is "always wrong"	The government is spending "too little" on science
Demographics		
Gender (0 = Female)	.929 (.173)	1.079 (.132)
Age	**.985 (.005)****	1.005 (.004)
Married	.935 (.196)	.876 (.145)
Income	**.628 (.195)****	.960 (.161)
Education	.900 (.084)	**1.261 (.062)****
Race (0 = Nonwhite)	.822 (.277)	.898 (.213)
Political Conservatism	**1.686 (.069)****	**.751 (.046)****
Religion Controls†		
Catholic	1.208 (.221)	1.154 (.186)
Black Protestant	.696 (.431)	1.517 (.376)
Mainline Protestant	.704 (.243)	**1.363 (.187)***
Jewish	.680 (.753)	**2.852 (.459)***
Other Religions	**.141 (.522)****	1.389 (.273)
No Religion	.515 (.544)	**2.488 (.238)****
Biblical Literalist? (0 = No)	**2.740 (.190)****	.896 (.198)
Church Attendance	**1.252 (.037)****	**.932 (.029)****
Image of God		
(Authoritative/Benevolent)	**1.717 (.212)****	**.601 (.156)****
Constant	−3.315 (.574)**	−.043 (.419)
N	1,287	1,310

* = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$.
Logistic regression analyses. Odds ratios presented with standard errors in parentheses.

Conceptions of God are related to these issues in different ways. Those with more engaged Gods (Authoritative or Benevolent) are more likely to believe that caring for the sick and needy is very important than are those with Critical or Distant Gods. They are also more likely to identify as Republican, controlling for other factors. Those with

Table A.9 Images of God and Economic Policy (Baylor Religion Survey, Waves 1 & 2)

	Caring for the sick and needy is "very important"	The government should distribute wealth more evenly	The government should fund faith-based initiatives	Identifies as Republican
Demographics				
Gender (0 = Female)	.786 (.128)*	.859 (.134)	1.222 (.150)	**1.411 (.134)****
Age	**1.022 (.004)****	**.988 (.004)****	**.980 (.005)****	1.006 (.004)
Married	1.163 (.147)	**1.604 (.156)****	1.064 (.168)	1.267 (.155)
Income	**.753 (.161)***	**.306 (.182)****	**.458 (.175)****	**3.232 (.188)****
Education	**.898 (.061)***	**.792 (.065)****	.973 (.069)	**.850 (.064)****
Race (0 = Nonwhite)	.825 (.211)	1.279 (.218)	**.465 (.249)****	**2.090 (.241)****
Political Preference	**.787 (.047)****	**.543 (.052)****	**1.211 (.041)****	—
Religion Controls†				
Catholic	**2.013 (.186)****	**1.763 (.190)****	.942 (.200)	**.486 (.184)****
Black Protestant	1.110 (.407)	**6.080 (.463)****	**2.564 (.437)***	**.156 (.490)****
Mainline Protestant	1.078 (.182)	1.034 (.191)	1.054 (.198)	**.595 (.184)****
Jewish	1.305 (.434)	1.494 (.436)	**.191 (.825)***	**.417 (.460)***
Other Religions	**1.674 (.275)***	.857 (.285)	**.477 (.419)***	.635 (.276)
No Religion	.895 (.231)	**1.597 (.250)***	**.200 (.432)****	**.203 (.299)****

Table A.9 continued

	Caring for the sick and needy is "very important"	The government should distribute wealth more evenly	The government should fund faith-based initiatives	Identifies as Republican
Biblical Literalist? (0 = No)	1.508 (.186)*	1.575 (.192)**	1.978 (.183)**	2.478 (.187)**
Church Attendance	1.125 (.028)**	.972 (.029)	1.124 (.032)**	1.135 (.028)**
Images of God††				
Benevolent God	.789 (.179)	1.472 (.184)*	.616 (.186)**	.947 (.180)
Critical God	.523 (.185)**	1.030 (.198)	1.093 (.209)	.709 (.197)*
Distant God	.465 (.185)**	.974 (.197)	.497 (.235)**	.605 (.198)**
Constant	1.136 (.438)**	5.092 (.506)**	.481 (.471)	−2.624 (.454)**
N	1,262	1,267	1,267	1,275

* = p < .05; ** = p < .01.

† Contrast category for religious tradition = Evangelical Protestant; †† Contrast category = Authoritative God.

Logistic regression analyses are used. Odds ratios are presented with standard errors in parentheses. Models 1, 2, and 4 use data from the Baylor Religion Survey, Wave 2. The question about faith-based initiatives was not asked in Wave 2, therefore model 3 utilizes date from Wave 1. Political preference is the only variable that is not directly comparable between Waves 1 and 2. In Wave 1 political preference ranges from strong Democrat (low) to strong Republican (higher values). In Wave 2, political preference ranges from extremely liberal (low) to extremely conservative (high). Political preference is not used as a predictor in the final model that predicts Republican identification.

Benevolent Gods show a special propensity to believe that the government should distribute wealth more evenly. Those with more judgmental Gods (Critical and Authoritative), however, prefer the use of faith-based initiatives for solving social problems.

Next we examine how images of God are related to beliefs about God's hand in one's personal fortunes. Two questions from BRS Wave

2 ask respondents their level of agreement with the statements "God rewards the faithful with major successes" and "God punishes sinners with terrible ways." Some people disagreed with both statements, suggesting that they believe God does not play a role in their personal fortunes and misfortunes. Others believe that God may reward the faithful but disagree that God might punish with misfortune. Finally, a third group agrees with both statements, suggesting that God is an architect of one's fortunes and misfortunes. A very small group of respondents (3.2 percent) believe that God only punishes and never blesses. This group was combined with the third group. A series of logistic regression analyses demonstrate that a person's God type impacts how people conceive of their personal fortunes (see table A.10).

In particular, those with less engaged Gods (Critical and Distant) tend to believe that their fortunes are their personal business—God does not bless or curse them. Authoritative God believers stand apart, with all other God types being significantly less likely to imagine a God who would personally punish a sinner with misfortune.

Chapter 6: God and Evil

In chapter 6, we shift our focus to a different aspect of God's perceived character. Two questions on Wave 2 of the Baylor Religion Survey ask respondents their level of agreement with the statements "God some-times *allows* major tragedies to occur as a warning to sinners" and "God *causes* major tragedies to occur as a warning to sinners." We created a variable that indicates whether the respondent agrees or strongly agrees with either statement. In other words, we compare respondents who believe that God either causes tragedies, allows tragedies, or both, with people who do not think that God plays a role in tragic events. It is immediately clear that those with an Authoritative God are the most likely to believe that God plays *some* role in tragedy (see table A.11).

An item in Wave 2 of the Baylor Religion Survey asks respondents their level of agreement with the statement "Going to war in Iraq was the right decision" using a standard Likert-type scale. In addition to asking about party affiliation, the Wave 2 survey also asks respondents to describe themselves politically on a scale ranging from "extremely liberal" to "extremely conservative." We use this liberal-conservative

Table A.10 Images of God and Our Fortunes (Baylor Religion Survey, Wave 2)

	God does not bless with fortune or curse with misfortune	God only blesses with fortune, never curses with misfortune	God may bless with fortune and/or curse with misfortune
Demographics			
Gender (0 = Female)	.802 (.145)	1.069 (.158)	1.299 (.186)
Age	**1.011 (.004)****	.999 (.005)	**.986 (.006)****
Married	1.090 (.160)	1.224 (.182)	**.676 (.203)***
Income	1.087 (.172)	.918 (.193)	.975 (.199)
Education	**1.214 (.068)****	**.842 (.076)***	.901 (.090)
Race (0 = Nonwhite)	**1.488 (.227)***	1.179 (.260)	**.471 (.267)****
Political Conservatism	1.007 (.051)	.912 (.056)	**1.132 (.068)***
Religion Controls†			
Catholic	1.013 (.191)	1.201 (.216)	.787 (.251)
Black Protestant	**.395 (.438)***	1.760 (.412)	1.173 (.411)
Mainline Protestant	1.005 (.196)	**1.452 (.217)***	**.536 (.280)***
Jewish	1.331 (.585)	.672 (.749)	.935 (.701)
Other Religions	.927 (.288)	1.240 (.314)	.943 (.399)
No Religion	**3.016 (.411)****	**.322 (.566)***	.435 (.549)
Biblical Literalist? (0 = No)	**.502 (.182)****	**2.071 (.194)****	1.090 (.215)
Church Attendance	**.920 (.030)****	**1.106 (.033)****	1.014 (.038)
Images of God††			
Benevolent God	1.029 (.179)	**2.603 (.189)****	**.214 (.264)****
Critical God	**2.600 (.206)****	**.455 (.263)****	**.531 (.241)****
Distant God	**5.217 (.244)****	**.559 (.274)***	**.071 (.450)****
Constant	−1.296 (.484)**	−1.043 (5.45)*	.479 (.599)
N	1,179	1,179	1,179

* = p < .05; ** = p < .01.
† Contrast category = Evangelical Protestant; †† Contrast category = Authoritative God.
Logistic regression analyses with standard errors in parentheses.

Table A.11 Image of God and God's Role in Tragic Events (Baylor Religion
Survey, Wave 2)

	God allows tragedies to occur as a warning to sinners	God causes tragedies to occur as a warning to sinners
Demographics		
Gender (0 = Female)	−.019 (.065)	.017 (.062)
Age	−.029 (.002)	−.006 (.002)
Married	−.031 (.073)	.013 (.069)
Income	**−.095 (.079)****	**−.126 (.075)****
Education	.018 (.031)	−.029 (.030)
Race (0 = Nonwhite)	−.047 (.106)	**−.072 (.101)***
Political Conservatism	**.190 (.023)****	**.078 (.022)***
Religion Controls†		
Catholic	.008 (.091)	−.013 (.086)
Black Protestant	−.036 (.186)	−.033 (.178)
Mainline Protestant	−.033 (.092)	−.025 (.088)
Jewish	−.022 (.230)	−.008 (.220)
Other Religions	.010 (.137)	−.031 (.130)
No Religion	**−.098 (.132)****	**−.073 (.126)***
Biblical Literalist? (0 = No)	**.145 (.089)****	.026 (.085)
Church Attendance	.041 (.014)	−.015 (.013)
Image of God		
Benevolent God	**−.253 (.090)****	**−.213 (.086)****
Critical God	**−.129 (.099)****	−.004 (.095)
Distant God	**−.386 (.104)****	**−.274 (.099)****
Constant	3.249 (1.098)	3.088 (1.050)
N	1,243	1,247
R^2	.352	.165

* = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$.
† Contrast category = Evangelical Protestant.
OLS regression analyses with standardized coefficients presented. Standard errors are
in parentheses. Responses to each item were on a standard Likert-type scale, "strongly
disagree," "disagree," "undecided," "agree," "strongly agree."

Table A.12 Images of God and Support for the War in Iraq (Baylor Religion
Survey, Wave 2)

	Going to war in Iraq was the right decision
Demographics	
Gender (0 = Female)	−.002 (.071)
Age	**−.086 (.002)**
Married	.042 (.079)
Income	**.091 (.085)**
Education	.016 (.033)
Race (0 = Nonwhite)	.024 (.114)
Political Conservatism	**.499 (.025)**
Religion Controls†	
Catholic	**−.092 (.097)**
Black Protestant	**−.099 (.202)**
Mainline Protestant	**−.116 (.099)**
Jewish	−.022 (.250)
Other Religions	−.028 (.148)
No Religion	**−.135 (.146)**
Biblical Literalist? (0 = No)	.030 (.096)
Church Attendance	−.011 (.015)
Image of God	
God's Judgment	.017 (.006)
God's Engagement	**.083 (.007)**
Constant	
N	1,256
R²	.402

* = p < .05; ** = p < .01.
† Contrast category = Evangelical Protestant.
OLS regression analyses with standardized coefficients presented. Standard errors are in
parentheses.

continuum as our measure of political conservatism when performing
analyses with Wave 2 data. We find that people who have a more engaged
view of God were significantly more supportive of the war in Iraq, but
views of God's anger do not have a significant effect (see table A.12).

Table A.13 Images of God and Nationalism (Baylor Religion Survey, Wave 2)

	The United States should declare itself a Christian nation	The success of the United States is part of God's plan	People should be made to show respect for American traditions	The U.S. government should advocate Christian values
Demographics				
Gender (0 = Female)	−.073 (.066)**	−.017 (.061)	−.074 (.065)**	−.038 (.064)
Age	.092 (.002)**	−.055 (.002)*	.076 (.002)**	.074 (.002)**
Married	.009 (.073)	.003 (.067)	−.003 (.071)	.022 (.071)
Income	−.105 (.079)**	−.089 (.073)**	−.001 (.077)	−.060 (.077)*
Education	−.051 (.031)*	−.045 (.028)	−.164 (.030)**	−.050 (.030)*
Race (0 = Nonwhite)	−.042 (.106)	.022 (.097)	−.014 (.103)	−.059 (.103)*
Political Conservatism	.224 (.023)**	.201 (.021)**	.265 (.023)**	.230 (.023)**
Religion Controls†				
Catholic	−.045 (.091)	−.022 (.083)	.073 (.088)*	−.035 (.088)
Black Protestant	−.023 (.187)	.055 (.172)*	.016 (.183)	−.023 (.182)
Mainline Protestant	.022 (.092)	−.028 (.084)	.058 (.090)	−.042 (.089)
Jewish	−.030 (.232)	−.021 (.212)	−.057 (.232)*	−.073 (.225)**
Other Religions	−.035 (.137)	−.030 (.126)	−.057 (.134)*	−.107 (.133)**
No Religion	−.081 (.136)**	−.099 (.124)**	−.099 (.133)**	−.134 (.132)**
Biblical Literalist? (0 = No)	.148 (.090)**	.132 (.082)**	.019 (.088)	.072 (.087)**
Church Attendance	.054 (.014)	.040 (.013)	−.007 (.014)	.114 (.014)**

Table A.13 continued

	The United States should declare itself a Christian nation	The success of the United States is part of God's plan	People should be made to show respect for American traditions	The U.S. government should advocate Christian values
Images of God				
God's Judgment	.088 (.006)**	.058 (.005)*	.098 (.006)**	.082 (.006)**
God's Engagement	.185 (.007)**	.345 (.006)**	.030 (.006)	.257 (.006)**
Constant	.623 (1.104)	.507 (1.012)	2.708 (1.081)	.843 (1.072)
N	1,250	1,254	1,253	1,251
R^2	.359	.443	.225	.454

* = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$.
† Contrast category = Evangelical Protestant.
OLS regression analyses with standardized coefficients presented. Standard errors are in parentheses. Responses to each item were on a standard Likert-type scale, "strongly disagree," "disagree," "undecided," "agree," "strongly agree."

Our final series of analyses in chapter 5 examines the relationship between images of God and beliefs about the nature of the United States. Using standard Likert-type scales, respondents to BRS Wave 2 were asked if we should "declare the United States a Christian nation." Both God's Judgment and God's Engagement are significant predictors of this belief. God's Engagement is also the strongest, significant predictor of belief that the "success of the United States is part of God's plan" (see table A.13).

With regard to images of God, it appears that the belief that "people should be made to show respect for American traditions" is driven by views of God's judgment. Those who imagine God in more judgmental terms show more agreement with this statement, regardless of how engaged they believe God to be. However, both images of God are, once again, significant predictors of the belief that the "government should advocate Christian values."

Further Resources

For those who wish to further examine how images of God impact behaviors and attitudes, there are several resources available.

First, the Baylor Religion Survey, Wave 1, is now a public data source. You can download the full data set and view supporting materials and methodological information at the Web site of the Association of Religion Data Archives (www.thearda.com). The ARDA archives a host of quality religion surveys, all available for free download and analysis.

Second, the Baylor Institute for Studies of Religion maintains its own Web site on the Baylor Religion Survey. For announcements, research reports, and other material related to this ongoing project, visit http://www.isreligion.org/research/surveysofreligion.

Finally, we have developed a Web site related to this book project. Users can complete the God Questionnaire online (see postscript). As we collect responses and comments on the questionnaire, we will post results, feedback, and announcements on www.Americasfourgods.com.