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**1. Issue salience and church attendance in the 2004 presidential election**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Issue salience and church attendance in the 2004 presidential election** | | | | | | |
| **Independent variable** | **Same-sex marriage model** | **Abortion model** | **Moral values model** | **Same sex marriage with interaction** | **Abortion with interaction** | **Moral values with interaction** |
| **Party Identification** | 2.52\*\* | 2.5\*\* | 2.45\*\* | 2.27\*\* | 2.23\*\* | 2.22\*\* |
| **Church Attendance** | .293\*\* | .329\*\* | .244\*\* | .174\* | .227\*\* | .166\* |
| **Same-sex Marriage** | .061 | -- | -- | -1.00\* | -- | -- |
| **Abortion** | -- | -.156 | -- | -- | -.31 | -- |
| **Moral values** | -- | -- | .298\* | -- | -- | .703 |
| **Ideology** | -- | -- | -- | .53\* | 1.03\*\* | 1.45\*\* |
| **Ideology\*Same-sex** | -- | -- | -- | .306\* | -- | -- |
| **Ideology\* Abortion** | -- | -- | -- | -- | .017 | -- |
| **Ideology\* Moral values** | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -.187 |
| **Constant** | -6.2 | -5.89 | -6.53 | -6.94 | -8.17 | -9.981 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Nagelkerke r-square** | .628 | .622 | .624 | .68 | .673 | .667 |
| **% Predicted Correctly** | 82.2% | 82.7% | 82.7% | 85.7% | 86.3% | 85.7% |
| Above: All entries are logit coefficients. Dependent variable is vote choice (excluding undecided and minor party voters), where higher scores indicate a preference for Bush over Kerry. Independent variables are a three-point party identification measure where higher scores are Republicans, a six-point church attendance measure where higher scores are frequent attendees, and four-point issue “salience” items, where higher scores indicate issue importance. I also interact the salience items with a five-point ideology measure, since the salience items alone do not capture the direction of cultural issue preference. In no case do the cultural issue salience items severely impact the strength of church attendance as a predictor. This suggests that the substantial religion gap in 2004 was not driven by cultural issues. \*p<.05, \*\*p<.001 | | | | | | |

**2. Rhetoric variables measurement details**

*Civil religion identity rhetoric: Civil religion identity rhetoric*, constructed from the group identity measure described in the appendix to chapter three,is a measure of the frequency of references to American identity (such as “national soul” or “American dream”) and ambiguous references to the audience as an inclusive group. Scores range from .3333 to .7867. Mean = .56, s.d. = .11.

*Subgroup:* Subgroup is the frequency of all references to Christianity, Protestantism, Catholicism, and specific Christian denominations. Because sectarian references occur infrequently, this measure was computed as the frequency with which these groups were mentioned across all speeches in the sample. Scores range from .0000 to .4680. Mean = .1, s.d. = .13.

*Emotion indicators:* I use measures available in the software programs Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC; Pennebaker et al. 2001) and the Dictionary of Affect in Language (WDAL; Whissell 1994) to gauge the emotive content of rhetoric. LIWC contains measures of *anxiety* and *anger*, which correspond to the number of angry or anxious words in a religious passage as a percentage of the total number of words. Because neither of the content analytic tools used contain a measure of “enthusiasm,” I factor analyzed all available measures of emotions as guidance for constructing an *enthusiasm* scale. Accordingly, enthusiasm is the sum of LIWC’s “positive feeling” variable and WDAL’s “fun” measure. For anger, scores range from .00040 to .00880. Mean = .0041, s.d = .0025. For anxiety, scores range from .00017 to .00261. Mean = .00119,s.d.= .00086. For enthusiasm, scores range from .0561 to .1003. Mean = .07157, s.d. = .01354.

*Opponent:* Opponent rhetoric measures the proportion of religious rhetoric whereby a candidate makes reference to his opponent. Scores range from 0 to .1867. Mean = .080000, s.d. = .06. This variable had 95% intercoder agreement (kappa = .696).

**3. Dependent variable measurement details**

The dependent variable used in chapter 5 is *post-election candidate evaluation*, which is a candidate “feeling thermometer” (0 – 100) score obtained after the election. By using this dependent variable and controlling for the same measure administered in the pre-election period, it is possible to approximate a “campaign effect” – changes that have occurred over the course of the campaign. This model, which Finkel (1995) terms a “static score” or “conditional change” model, has numerous advantages for making causal inferences. Statistically, this model is appropriate because it corrects for regression to the mean, which is often present when analyzing panel data (Finkel 1995, 8). This model is also a good fit theoretically, given that the ultimate aim is to capture campaign effects. That is to say, a pre-election feeling thermometer does not necessarily provide much information about what effects an electoral campaign has had on the survey respondent. The static score model, in contrast, is predicting change in candidate evaluation controlling for pre-election candidate evaluation – change which could theoretically be due to religious rhetoric. Thus, this model is justifiable on both statistical and theoretic grounds.

Finkel (1995) demonstrates that this model has an equivalence with a model that uses a change score as a dependent variable. In simple form, the model specified above is Yt = β0 + B1Xt +B2Yt-1 + εt. Subtracting Yt-1 from each side of the equation to get a change score on the left yields ΔY = β0 + B1Xt + (B2 – 1) B2Yt-1 + Δε. However, change scores as dependent variables are problematic because of autocorrelation in the residuals of the dependent variable and the lag. In contrast, a relatively straightforward test exists for examining serial correlation in the residuals when the dependent variable is just the post (not the change) measure. Pindyck and Rubinfeld (1998) recommend Durbin’s h statistic for this, since the Durbin-Watson statistic is often biased against finding serial correlation in the errors in the case of a lagged dependent variable. Pindyck and Rubinfeld define Durbin’s test statistic h as: h = ρ√T/[1-T(Var (β))] where: ρ is the estimated first-order serial-correlation coefficient, T is the sample size, and Var(β) is is the estimated square of the standard error of the coefficient of the lagged endogenous variable, which in this case is pre-election evaluation. ρ can be calculated from the Durbin Watson statistic, which I calculated using SPSS. Comparing the resulting statistic against a normal distribution, it is possible to reject the null hypothesis that autocorrelation exists in the first lag of the residuals.

**4. Independent variables measurement details**

All individual level variables are from the American Nation Election Study (ANES), 1980 – 2004. Detailed sampling and survey development information available at [www.electionstudies.org](http://www.electionstudies.org).

**Individual-level variables**

*Candidate evaluation*: This question was administered on the ANES pre- and postelection questionnaire. The post-election item is the dependent variable for all analyses in chapter 5. The pre-election item is the lagged for all analyses in chapter 5.

● “I'll read the name of a person and I'd like you to rate that person using something we call the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorable and warm toward the person. Ratings between 0 degrees and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorable toward the person and that you don't care too much for that person*.”*

For the post-election variable, n = 11373, mean = 57.41, s.d. = 26.2.

For the pre-election variable, n = 12789, mean = 56.63, s.d. = 26.74

*Party Identification (PID):* 7-point summary measure of the NES party-ID instrument.

● “Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an independent, or what?”

0 = strong Democrat, 6 = strong Republican

n = 12958, mean = 3.34, s.d. = 1.97.

*Date of interview:* This measure was created by calculating the number of days before the

general election the pre-election interview was completed, and reverse-coding it so that

larger scores indicate more campaign exposure.

n = 13084, mean = 31.42, s.d. = 18.06, minimum = 1.00, maximum = 64.00

*Race:* 0 indicates the respondent is African American, 1 corresponds to all other racial groups.

n = 13129 (11.3% of the sample is African American)

*Gender*: 0 indicates the respondent is male, 1 indicates the respondent is female

n = 13129 (55.5% of the sample is female)

*Media Exposure:* Available ANES media exposure questions change over the seven election studies pooled in this analysis, reflecting both advances in survey methodology and the changing media environment. In order to obtain the most precise measure of media exposure in a given year, I computed a separate 0 – 1 scaled media exposure summary for each election year. All questions are reported below.

n = 11228, mean = .44, s.d. = .24

**1980:**

6 questions

alpha = .762

● “Some people don't pay much attention to campaigns. How about you? Would you say that you were very much interested, somewhat interested, or not much interested in…”

● “Would you say you listened to a good many, several, or just one or two?” (if “yes” to did you listen to any speeches or discussions about the campaign on the radio?)

● “How many magazine articles about the campaign would you say you read?”

● “Would you say you watched -- a good many, several, or just one or two?” (television programs about the campaign?

● “Did you (watch/listen to) the entire debate, or just part of it?”

● “How many newspaper articles did you read about the campaign -- would you say you read a good many, several, or just one or two?”

**1984:**

7 questions

alpha = .787

● “Some people don't pay much attention to campaigns. How about you? Would you say that you were very much interested, somewhat interested, or not much interested in following the political campaigns this year?

● “Would you say you listened to a good many, several, or just one or two?” (if “yes” to did you listen to any speeches or discussions about the campaign on the radio?)

● “How many magazine articles about the campaign would you say you read -- a good many, several, or just one or two?”

● “How many newspaper articles did you read about the campaign -- a good many, several or just one or two?”

● “Would you say you watched -- a good many, several, or just one or two?” (television programs about the campaign)

● “Did you (watch/listen to) the entire debate (1) or just part of it?”

● “Did you (watch/listen to) the entire debate (2) or just part of it?”

**1988:**

6 questions

alpha = .763

● “Some people don't pay much attention to political campaigns. How about you? Would

you say that you have been very much interested, somewhat interested, or not much

interested in the political campaigns so far this year?”

● “How much attention did you pay to news on tv about the campaign for president – a great deal, quite a bit, some, very little, or none?”

● “How much attention did you pay to newspaper articles about the campaign for president -- a great deal, quite a bit, some, very little, or none?”

● “How much attention did you pay to magazine articles about the campaign for president -- a deal, quite a bit, some, very little, or none?”

● “Would you say you listened to a good many, several, or just one or two?” (if “yes” to did

you listen to any speeches or discussions about the campaign on the radio?)

● “Some people don't pay much attention to political campaigns. How about you? Would

you say that you were very much interested, somewhat interested, or not much interested in following the political campaigns this year?” (On post-election survey)

**1992:**

6 questions

alpha = .727

● “How much attention did you pay to news on TV about the campaign for President – a great deal, quite a bit, some, very little, or none?”

● “How much attention did you pay to newspaper articles about the campaign for President -- a great deal, quite a bit, some, very little, or none?

● “How much attention did you pay to magazine articles about the campaign for President -- a great deal, quite a bit, some very little, or none?”

● “Would you say you listened to a good many, several, or just one or two?” (discussions or speeches about the campaign on the radio)

● “Some people don't pay much attention to political campaigns. How about you? Would you say that you were very much interested, somewhat interested, or not much interested following the political campaigns this year? (on post-election survey)

● “Would you say you watched a good many, several, or just one or two?” (programs about the campaigns on television on post-election survey)

**1996:**

7 questions

alpha = .782

● “Some people don't pay much attention to political campaigns. How about you? Would you say that you were very much interested, somewhat interested, or not much interested in following the political campaigns this year?”

● “Would you say you watched a good many, several, or just one or two?” (programs about the campaign on television?)

● If R watched first presidential debate: “Did you watch the entire debate or just part of it?”

● “If R watched second presidential debate: Did you watch the entire debate or just part of it?”

● “How much attention did you pay to magazine articles about the campaign for President --

a great deal, quite a bit, some, very little, or none?”

● “If R listened to any speeches or discussion about the campaign on the radio: Would you say you listened to a good many, several, or just one or two?”

● “In general, how much attention did you pay to news about the campaign for President -- a great deal, quite a bit, some, very little, or none?”

**2000:**

5 questions

alpha = .788

● “Some people don't pay much attention to political campaigns. How about you? Would you say that you were very much interested, somewhat interested, or not much interested in following the political campaigns this year?”

● If R watched programs about campaign: Would you say you watched a good many, several, or just one or two?”

● If R watched presidential debate: Did you watch an entire debate or just part of it?

● If R listened to radio campaign programs: Would you say you listened to a good many,

several, or just one or two?

● FTF: “Looking at page 12 in the booklet: In general, how much attention did you pay to news about the campaign for President -- a great deal, quite a bit, some, very little, or none?”

TELEPHONE: “In general, how much attention did you pay to news about the campaign for President -- a great deal, quite a bit, some, very little, or none?”

**2004:**

6 questions

alpha = .773

● “Would you say that you have been very much interested, somewhat interested or not much interested in the political campaigns so far this year?”

● “If R watched programs about campaign: Would you say you watched a good many, several, or just one or two?”

● “How much attention did you pay to magazine articles about the campaign for President -- a great deal, quite a bit, some, very little, or none?”

● “How much attention did you pay to news on TV about the campaign for President – a great deal, quite a bit, some, very little, or none?”

● “If R listened to radio campaign programs: Would you say you listened to a good many, several, or just one or two?”

● “In general, how much attention did you pay to news about the campaign for President -- a

great deal, quite a bit, some, very little, or none?”

*Religious commitment:* This measure is a composite of two NES items. Each item was first rescaled (0 to 1) and then scaled, and then summed, so that the variable has a minimum score of 0 and a maximum score of 2.

● “Do you go to religious services every week, almost every week, once or twice a month, a few times a year, or never?”

● “If R says that religion is important: Would you say your religion provides some guidance in your day-to-day living, quite a bit of guidance, or a great deal of guidance in your day-to-day life?”

n = 12877, mean = 1.01, s.d. = .69

*Religious orthodoxy*: The ANES is somewhat limited in its ability to consistently measure religious orthodoxy spanning 1980 – 2004. Thus, I replicate a measure of religious orthodoxy developed by Layman (2001) that involves using religious tradition to rank individuals’ denominational orthodoxy, and then further differentiates respondents based on church attendance. This strategy is described in Layman (2001), pp. 78 – 87.

**5. Using multilevel models to understand campaign effects**

Social phenomena can often be thought of as having a nested structure. For example, imagine you are a researcher interested in raising students’ test scores at particular school. You might be interested in characteristics of those students – their income, or the number of books they have at home, et cetera. You also might be interested in what’s going on in the classrooms in which the students are “nested.” Each student in a given classroom shares certain features unique to that classroom, like the teacher’s teaching style or the class size. These contextual features might interact with student characteristics in important ways. For example, perhaps in the aggregate there is a positive relationship between the number of books at home and students’ reading scores, but this relationship might vary according to classroom context. The relationship might be greatest, for example, when class sizes are large and teachers can devote less time to each pupil. As this example suggests, it is important to fully theorize how contextual factors are related to individual-level processes.

Similarly, individuals can be thought of as being nested within varied campaign climates. Features of the campaign can have broad and varied effects on individual level processes – in particular, individuals’ attitudes toward the candidates. These effects might be rather direct: Individuals might be persuaded that one candidate is better suited for the job. However, research on identity priming and affect suggest that indirect effects might also hold. For example, as hypothesized earlier, religious commitment might only become an important part of candidate evaluation in contexts that prime religious identity. Thus, the “slope” of the relationship between religious identity and candidate evaluation might vary by the rhetorical context. In other words, we should expect the slope of identity on evaluation to change according to the context.

In order to examine the effects of individuals “nested” within varied rhetorical contexts, I first randomly assign individual ANES respondents to a given campaign. This step adds a degree of artificiality, of course, because survey respondent’s preferences are actually subject to the rhetorical forces of two simultaneous campaigns. Nevertheless, since the dependent variable of interest is the evaluation of a single candidate, it is necessary to assign individual respondents to a single campaign.

Next, I use Hierarchical Linear Models (HLM; Raudenbush and Byrk 2002) to model attitude change as a function of both the individual- and campaign-level factors discussed above, as the figure below illustrates. As the arrows indicate, religious campaign rhetoric can have three potential effects. First, campaign-level rhetoric can predict the level-1 intercept, β0.  This specification (γ01) is important to test for the possibility that religious rhetoric influences opinion change directly, as opposed to priming religious considerations. Second, I test the extent to which level-2 rhetoric predicts the relationship between media exposure and change in evaluation. This specification (γ61)is motivated by Zaller’s (1992) premise that we should expect little opinion change over the course of a campaign in those who are inattentive throughout. Like γ01, a significant coefficient here suggests that religious rhetoric does not persuade by priming religious considerations. In other words, this variable captures the possibility that rhetoric has an effect on all individuals interested in the campaign, without regard to their religious predispositions. Finally, this equation models the relationship between some measure of religiosity and change in candidate evaluation as a function of religious rhetoric (either “religious commitment” or “religious orthodoxy,” as described above). These specifications (γ71 and γ81 respectively)specifically test the possibility that affect-inducing language and identity priming activate a religious basis of political judgment.

**Modeling candidate evaluation as a function of individual- and campaign-level factors**

**Individual level effects:**

**Post election**

**candidate evaluation =**

**β0 + β1(PID) + β2(Days before election) + β3(Lagged DV) + β4(Race) + β5(Gender) + β6(Media Exposure) +**

**β7(Religious Commitment) + β8 (Religious Orthodoxy)**

**Campaign level effects:**

β0 = γ00 + γ01(Rhetoric variable) + γ02(Party of Candidate) + γ03(Honeymoon effect) + u0

β1 = γ10 + γ11(Party of candidate) + u1

β2 = γ20 + u2

β3 = γ30 + u3

β4 = γ40 + u4

β5 = γ50 + u5

β6 = γ60 + γ61(Rhetoric variable) + u6

β7 = γ70 + γ71(Rhetoric variable) + u7

β8 = γ81 + γ81(Rhetoric variable) + u8

The equation contains several other important controls for opinion change. It is, of course, important to keep in mind that by including a lagged dependent variable, this model is essentially predicting opinion change. Thus, the “standard” control variables that would typically predict raw candidate evaluation with great consistency are not necessarily relevant in this model. I do include controls for individual-level race and gender, since these are both related to identities that could theoretically be activated over the course of a campaign, just as I am explicitly testing how religious identities become activated. I include a control variable for party identification (PID), and, since survey respondents were randomly assigned to either a Republican or Democratic candidate. I interact individual-level party identification with the party of the candidate whom the respondent is evaluating (γ11). I also include a control for the timing of the survey, since pre- and post-election surveys in closer proximity are theoretically subject to less campaign manipulation. Since the ANES is administered both before and after the presidential election and the election winner generally experiences a “honeymoon effect” – a boost in voter confidence following the election – I include a dummy variable designating the election winner predicting the level-1 intercept.

One significant limitation of this model is the small number of level-2 units (n=14). I am limited to 14 level-2 units because the ANES data necessary to test the hypotheses was not collected before 1980. For example, the NES began asking both pre- and post-election feeling thermometer questions on the 1980 survey, and did not obtain this information in 2008. In addition, the 1980 survey features an expanded battery of religiosity questions. This small n severely limits the number of level-2 predictors the model can calculate. For this reason, my strategy is to use this fairly simple model to test different combinations of level-2 predictors interacting with level-1 religiosity.

**6. Religious identity rhetoric and change in candidate evaluation (to accompany Figure 5.2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Religious identity rhetoric and change in candidate evaluation** | | | | | |
|  |  | **Civil religion model** | | **Subgroup model** | |
| **Individual-level variable** | **Campaign-level variable** | **Coefficient** | **Std. Error** | **Coefficient** | **Std. Error** |
|  | Intercept | 11.85\*\*\* | 2.23 | 15.98\*\*\* | 2.46 |
|  | Party | 3.59\*\* | 1.29 | 1.14 | 1.39 |
|  | Honeymoon effect | 8.23\*\*\* | 1.28 | 7.29\*\*\* | 1.07 |
|  | Civil religion rhetoric | -7.03 | 5.68 |  |  |
|  | Subgroup rhetoric |  |  | -0.76 | 4.63 |
| PID | Intercept | -4.91\*\*\* | 0.62 | -5.73\*\*\* | 0.68 |
|  | Party | 3.26\*\*\* | 0.37 | 3.8\*\*\* | 0.42 |
| Days before election | Intercept | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.01 |
| Pre-election (Lag) | Intercept | 0.62\*\*\* | 0.02 | 0.62\*\*\* | 0.02 |
| Race | Intercept | -0.63 | 1.7 | -0.64 | 1.68 |
| Gender | Intercept | 0.64 | 0.64 | 0.64 | 0.63 |
| Media exposure | Intercept | 3.74\*\* | 1.14 | 3.76\*\* | 1.18 |
|  | Civil religion rhetoric | -6.35 | 9.12 |  |  |
|  | Subgroup rhetoric |  |  | 13.1 | 7.28 |
| Religious commitment | Intercept | 0.87 | 0.45 | 0.83 | 0.44 |
|  | Civil religion rhetoric | 12.33\*\* | 3.63 |  |  |
|  | Subgroup rhetoric |  |  | -6.4 | 3.29 |
| Orthodoxy | Intercept | -0.076 | 0.14 | -0.06 | 0.17 |
|  | Civil religion rhetoric | -4.22\*\*\* | 0.96 |  |  |
|  | Subgroup rhetoric |  |  | 1.27 | 0.94 |
| Above: Table displays separate multilevel regression models for civil religion rhetoric and subgroup rhetoric. Dependent variable is post-election feeling thermometer scores. Table entries are unstandardized regression coefficients. “Lag” is pre-election feeling thermometer scores. “PID,” “Date of interview,” “Lag,” “Media exposure,” “Religious commitment,” and “Religious orthodoxy” are all centered on their group mean. Rhetoric variables are all grand-mean centered. \*\*\*p<.001, \*\*p<.01, \*p<.05. | | | | | |

**7. Angry and opponent-directed religious rhetoric (to accompany Figure 5.3)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Angry and opponent-directed religious rhetoric** | | | |
| **Individual-level variable** | **Campaign-level variable** | **Coefficient** | **Std. Error** |
|  | Intercept | 18.57\*\* | 2.27 |
|  | Opponent | 16.76 | 7.81 |
|  | Party | 0.06 | 1.33 |
|  | Honeymoon | 4.93\*\* | 0.88 |
|  | Anger | -1031.01\*\* | 191.9 |
| PID | Intercept | -4.07\*\* | 0.6 |
|  | Party | 2.69\*\* | 0.37 |
| Days before election | Intercept | 0.03\* | 0.01 |
| Pre-election (Lag) | Intercept | 0.62\*\* | 0.02 |
| Race | Intercept | -0.6 | 1.68 |
| Gender | Intercept | 0.48 | 0.58 |
| Media exposure | Intercept | 4.2\*\* | 1.12 |
|  | Opponent | 20.23 | 14.92 |
|  | Anger | 95.05 | 373.35 |
| Religious commitment | Intercept | 0.77 | 0.51 |
|  | Opponent | -14.15\*\* | 4.51 |
|  | Anger | 93.21 | 110.68 |
| Above: Table displays multilevel regression model for angry and opponent rhetoric. Dependent variable is post-election feeling thermometer scores. Table entries are unstandardized regression coefficients. “Lag” is pre-election feeling thermometer scores. “PID,” “Date of interview,” “Lag,” “Media exposure,” and “Religious commitment” are all centered on their group mean. Rhetoric variables are all grand-mean centered. \*\*\*p<.001, \*\*p<.01, \*p<.05. | | | |

**8. Anxious and opponent-directed religious rhetoric (to accompany Figure 5.4)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Anxious and opponent-directed religious rhetoric** | | | |
| **Individual-level variable** | **Campaign-level variable** | **Coefficient** | **Std. Error** |
|  | Intercept | 16.62\*\* | 2.23 |
|  | Opponent | 12.51 | 11.05 |
|  | Party | 1.21 | 1.23 |
|  | Honeymoon | 5.29\*\* | 1.17 |
|  | Anxiety | -441.56 | 797.76 |
| PID | Intercept | -4.57\*\*\* | 0.63 |
|  | Party | 3.01\*\*\* | 0.38 |
| Days before election | Intercept | 0.03\* | 0.01 |
| Pre-election (Lag) | Intercept | 0.62\*\*\* | 0.02 |
| Race | Intercept | -0.64 | 1.67 |
| Gender | Intercept | 0.46 | 0.59 |
| Media exposure | Intercept | 4.26\*\* | 1.06 |
|  | Opponent | 18.85 | 15.72 |
|  | Anxiety | 1000.88 | 1164.79 |
| Religious commitment | Intercept | 0.75 | 0.49 |
|  | Opponent | -13.17\* | 4.98 |
|  | Anxiety | -241.21 | 349.02 |
| Above: Table displays multilevel regression model for anxiety and opponent rhetoric. Dependent variable is post-election feeling thermometer scores. Table entries are unstandardized regression coefficients. “Lag” is pre-election feeling thermometer scores. “PID,” “Date of interview,” “Lag,” “Media exposure,” and “Religious commitment” are all centered on their group mean. Rhetoric variables are all grand-mean centered. \*\*\*p<.001, \*\*p<.01, \*p<.05. | | | |

**9. Enthusiastic religious rhetoric (to accompany Figure 5.5)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Enthusiastic religious rhetoric** | | | |
| **Individual-level variable** | **Campaign-level variable** | **Coefficient** | **Std. Error** |
|  | Intercept | 13.37\*\*\* | 2.02 |
|  | Party | 3.22\* | 1.08 |
|  | Honeymoon | 5.72\*\*\* | 1.20 |
|  | Enthusiasm | -98.04 | 47.17 |
| PID | Intercept | -5.32\*\*\* | 0.67 |
|  | Party | 3.50\*\*\* | 0.42 |
| Days before election | Intercept | 0.03\* | 0.01 |
| Pre-election (Lag) | Intercept | 0.62\*\*\* | 0.02 |
| Race | Intercept | -0.70 | 1.68 |
| Gender | Intercept | 0.46 | 0.60 |
| Media exposure | Intercept | 4.27\*\* | 1.06 |
|  | Enthusiasm | -132.26 | 66.86 |
| Religious commitment | Intercept | 0.76 | 0.43 |
|  | Enthusiasm | 48.24\* | 20.93 |
| Above: Table displays multilevel regression model for enthusiastic religious rhetoric. Dependent variable is post-election feeling thermometer scores. Table entries are unstandardized regression coefficients. “Lag” is pre-election feeling thermometer scores. “PID,” “Date of interview,” “Lag,” “Media exposure,” and “Religious commitment” are all centered on their group mean. Rhetoric variables are all grand-mean centered. \*\*\*p<.001, \*\*p<.01, \*p<.05. | | | |

**10. Making inferences about rhetorical effects over the arc of a campaign**

Given that the multilevel models in chapter five aspire to reach conclusions about candidate rhetoric using data, two objections immediately arise: First, if candidates’ religious rhetorical style changes substantially over the course of a campaign, it could lead to biased estimates. Second, individuals exposed to more campaign rhetoric should, on the balance, exhibit larger effects (there is a greater probability that they will both receive the candidate’s religious message, and that this message will be accessible at the time of the survey interview. See Zaller (1992)). These concerns could be phrased in quasi-experimental terms as “individuals may have been exposed to different treatments depending on the date of interview,” and “some respondents were exposed to more treatment than others.” Addressing these objections both strengthens the empirical findings from chapter 5, and generates new insights.

First, the evidence suggests that candidates are extremely consistent in how they use religious language over the course of a campaign. To text this, I performed several analyses, looking at rhetoric drawn from different stages of the campaign. I examined the data for 10 of the campaigns in the sample, splitting the sample of religious rhetoric passages for each candidate in half according to when the speech was delivered, and analyzing the variance between “early in the campaign” and “late in the campaign” rhetoric. I examine these religious rhetoric passages along 3 dimensions consistent with rhetorical strategies discussed in chapters 3 and 4: the “we” voice (which is highly correlated with civil religion rhetoric), as well as WDAL’s “fun” and “nasty.” Thus, I am testing to see whether campaigns systematically change their rhetorical style over the course of a campaign. I also compare the variance between the candidates (as opposed to between “early” and “late” rhetoric), to ensure that these measures are, indeed, capturing meaningful rhetorical differences. If my method of using averages is appropriate, there will be no differences between early and late campaigning, but significant differences between candidates. Results support the approach of averaging across an entire campaign. There is no significant relationship between the timing of the passage and a given rhetorical dimension. However, there is significant variation between candidates along these dimensions. In short, while candidates significantly differ from one another along these key dimensions, they do not systematically vary by stage of the campaign.

Since I rely on survey data measured over the two months before the election, several timing related factors could be influencing change in candidate evaluation. On the one hand, individuals measured two months before the campaign are subject to more campaign forces, and their opinions would have the potential to shift much more. On the other hand, individuals interviewed just a day or two before the election have already been exposed to religious campaign rhetoric and therefore any opinion change we observe in them could be a product of something other than religious rhetoric. In this case, any effect of religious rhetoric has already been built into the lagged dependent variable.

While I do control for the date of interview in the multilevel model, there is still some concern as to the extent to which we can draw conclusions about opinion change, when the interval of time between the pre- and post-election survey is inconsistent. This concern can be addressed by observing that, theoretically, individuals initially surveyed a full two months before the election should exhibit more pronounced campaign effects than those individuals measured immediately before the election. If civil religion rhetoric is priming religious identity in the manner theorized, then the rhetoric\*religiosity interaction should be the largest for those initially surveyed early on in the campaign. As figure below illustrates, when comparing hypothetical respondents measured four and thirty days before an election, individuals measured early in the campaign have had a chance to “soak in” more of the campaign, and if the campaign is, in fact, responsible for the observed effects, these individuals should change more as a result.

**Hypothetical campaign effects vary in magnitude as a function of survey timing**

Greater theorized evidence of

campaign effects

Pre-election survey Pre-election survey

thirty days before four days before General Post-election

election election election interview

Minimal evidence of religious

identity priming

In order to test this, it is necessary to develop a way to compare how individuals interviewed early in the campaign differ from individuals interviewed late in the campaign, as a function of the rhetorical constructs identified in chapter five. While a cross-level interaction using “religious rhetoric” to predict “religiosity” \* “days before the election” is one candidate for testing this hypothesis, this assumes a linear campaign effect that is probably unrealistic. In other words, this interaction would assume that the additive effect of campaigning of the religious basis of candidate evaluation is equivalent for individuals interviewed at t - 59 and t - 60, versus those interviewed at t - 3 and t - 4. In all likelihood, whether one was interviewed at t - 59 or t - 60 days before the election probably doesn’t matter much. However, individuals could be exposed to substantially more campaigning on day t - 3 as opposed to day t - 4. In other words, the effect of a campaign on the religious basis of candidate evaluation is probably curvilinear, though I have no theoretic expectations about the exact shape of this curve.

Given this, I simply split the NES sample into respondents interviewed 1 – 30 days before the election and those interviewed 31 – 64 days prior, and rerun the analysis civil religion rhetoric model displayed above (“Religious identity rhetoric and change in candidate evaluation). If the campaign is having the theorized effects, I should observe larger effects for those individuals in the 31-64 day sample. In addition, the “days before the election variable,” which is significant in the whole sample analysis, should exhibit diminished effects. This analysis is displayed below.

Results are consistent with expectations. The cross-level interaction between religious commitment and civil religion rhetoric is only significant for those respondents exposed to considerable campaign communication following the initial interview. Moreover, the date of interview variable drops to insignificant in both models. This result supports the argument that campaign rhetoric is responsible for driving the effects observed in chapter five.
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