JCR (July 2010) 1-32

ARTICLES

A Quantitative Analysis of Political Affiliation, Religiosity, and Religious-based Communication

Narissra M. Punyanunt-Carter, Michael W. Corrigan, Jason S. Wrench, James C. McCroskey*

While considerable polling and research suggests that religious differences exist between Democrats and Republicans, little research has quantitatively examined such specific hypothesized differences in relation to religious ideology, political affiliation, and communication. Our research (a part of a series of quantitative based investigations into religious-based communication) examines the relationship between political affiliation, biological sex, several measures of religiosity, and four variables previously shown to be associated with communication: (1) tolerance for disagreement, (2) the willingness to communicate, (3) communication apprehension, and (4) receiver apprehension. Results of a MANOVA and confirmatory ANOVAs suggest that numerous statistically significant differences in religiosity and communication do exist between and within the political affiliations. Keywords: religiosity, communication apprehension, tolerance for disagreement, politics

Little research has quantitatively examined the relationships between religious fundamentalism, religious maturity, religious attitude, political affiliation, and more specifically how such viewpoints impact human communication. For this reason, the current study (a part of a series of quantitative based investigations into religious-based

* Narissra M. Punyanunt-Carter ,Texas Tech University Department of Communication Studies P.O. BOX 43083 Lubbock, TX 79409-3083 n.punyanunt@ttu.edu 806-742-3273, Michael W. Corrigan, Marshall University College of Education and Human Services Center for Research and Policy211 Jenkins Hall Huntington, WV 25755 304-696-2961 corrigan@marshall.edu; Jason Wrench, SUNY New Paltz Department of Communication and Media Coykendall Science Building 51 New Paltz, NY 12561 JasonSWrench@aol.com 845- 257-3450; James C. McCroskey, Dept. of Communication Studies University of Alabama-Birmingham Birmingham, AL 35294 email@JamesCMcCroskey.com 205-934-3877

communication) was designed to examine the relationship between political affiliation, biological sex, religiosity and four variables previously shown to be associated with communication: (1) tolerance for disagreement, (2) the willingness to communicate, as well as (3) communication apprehension and (4) receiver apprehension. These four communication variables were utilized to examine interpersonal interactions related to religious communication.

Whether one believes that religion should or should not play a part in politics, one cannot deny that they have often shared a forum during the short lifespan of the United States (U. S.) government (Coe & Domke, 2006). From the omnipresent questioned topics of abortion, homosexuality, the abolition of slavery, the women's and civil rights movements, the death penalty, and the seemingly endless debates over separation of church and state (e.g., prayer in public schools) it would appear that religion has and will continue to play a pertinent role in contemporary U.S. political communication (Brewer, Rogan, & Petersen, 2003). Coe and Domke (2006) found connections between presidential religious discourse and political activities.

In the discipline of communication studies, religion has a rich historical place in rhetoric, however, in the last 30 years such research has been embraced primarily by the Religious Communication Association (Schultze, 2005). While limited empirical research investigating religion and communication exists (Baesler, 1994; Stewart, 1994; Stewart & Roach, 1993), the impact that religious beliefs and perspectives has on human communication is clear (Lessl, 1993; Schultze, 2005). Thus, we focus on the role of religion within politics by quantitatively examining more specifically the constructs of religious fundamentalism, religious maturity, religious attitudes, tolerance for religious disagreement, the willingness to communicate about religion, and the possibility of communication-related apprehension resulting when differing political and possibly religious views collide.

Furthermore, both sides (Republicans and Democrats) have utilized the Bible to offer reasons for their sometimes-differing agendas, interpretations, and opinion (Moloney, 2004). Our study investigates the hypothesized religious differences between the U. S. political affiliations by more closely examining the relationships between political

affiliation, religious beliefs, religiously-based speech acts, and communicative predispositions. In other words, we would like to more specifically determine what (if any) are the religious differences between the individuals within the political affiliations and how such differences might affect the political communication process.

The Situation

From the ongoing polling by organizations such as the *Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life* and *Gallup,* it would appear that the religious beliefs of Democrats, Republicans, and Independents are quite divisive. According to *Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life* (2005, August 30):

> Both major political parties have a problem with their approach toward religion, in the eyes of many Americans. More than four-in-ten say that liberals who are not religious have too much control over the Democratic Party, while an almost identical percentage says that religious conservatives have too much influence over the Republican Party. (http://pewforum.org)

From an assortment of politically-related questions, the *Pew* poll (2005, August 30, http://pewforum.org) found that Democrats, Republicans, and Independents differ on views relating to: acceptance of gays, faith-based federal funding, religious views of politicians, religion in schools, and numerous other religiously-related contrasting party views. Another *Pew* poll (2004, August 24) found that "more Americans see the Republican Party than the Democratic Party as friendly toward religion… And most express comfort with President George W. Bush's reliance on his religious beliefs in making policy decisions" (http://pewforum.org). A vast majority consisting of 55% see Republicans compared to 29% that perceive Democrats as friendly toward religion.

With polls suggesting that the political parties differ in religious views and/or orientation, and with a media willing to cover stories that suggest that such a religious divide exists in the political landscape of America, given the influential role of media in the agenda setting and cultivation process one might be lead to believe such views to be true. However, a classic study on the shortcomings of religious research methods by Ploch (as cited in Eister, 1974) highlights *historically* "that differences [identified] between religious

groups are [often] exaggerated" (p. 275) and that many times the distinctions made are not significantly statistically different. Additionally, with religion being such a complex construct, one might question if a poll assessing whether one party is *more religious*, by measuring self reported church attendance, trust in organized religion, and religious beliefs with individual questions (not scales), can actually capture a reliable and valid assessment of one's religiosity or spirituality. Further questions of validity surface when one considers that such polls seem to be measuring if one party is *more* supportive of *organized religion* rather than *religion* in general.

For many individuals, there is a distinction between religion and spirituality (Carr, 2000). One may view spirituality as a belief in feelings of religious significance (such as God, one's Soul, or Heaven), but not necessarily feel connected to the bureaucratic structure and creeds of a particular organized religion. Therefore, assuming that a good number of members from each political party in this Christian-based society attend organized religion services and also hold spiritual or religious beliefs not necessarily related to organized religion, one might question if such current differences being reported are real or somewhat misleading due to the promotion of possibly unreliable and invalid measurements of religiosity by a pervasive and sometimes politically-influenced media (Bach, 2004).

Religious Perspectives

In Allport's (1954) perspective on religion, there exist two differing types of religious individuals whom he labels "devout" and "institutional," which are commonly referred to by modern religious scholars as "intrinsically religious" and "extrinsically religious" (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992). An individual with an intrinsic religious orientation is someone who sees religion as serving as the master motive within one's life; whereas, an individual with an extrinsic religious orientation perceives religion as serving as a means to other ends in life. Allport (1954) and Allport and Ross (1967) found that people who were intrinsically religious were less likely to harbor prejudicial perceptions of other people, and extrinsically religious people were more likely to harbor prejudicial perceptions of other people. Based on this early research Altemeyer and Hunsberger (1992) believed that religious orientation was only part of the equation for understanding

prejudicial beliefs of religious people. One variable that Altemeyer and Hunsberger believed accounted for prejudicial beliefs was *religious fundamentalism*, which they defined as:

> The belief that there is one set of religious teachings that clearly contains the fundamental, basic, intrinsic, essential, inerrant truth about humanity and deity; that this essential truth is fundamentally opposed by forces of evil which must be vigorously fought; that this truth must be followed today according to the fundamental, unchangeable practices of the past; and that those who believe and follow these teachings have a special relationship with the deity. (p. 118)

This construct of fundamentalism is a variable (or behavior) that helps to identify those in today's society that hold such definitive, intrinsic and/or extrinsic, and sometimes extreme religious beliefs.

In 1992, Altemeyer and Hunsberger studied the relationships among religious fundamentalism, authoritarianism, prejudice, quest, and attitudes toward homosexuals. They discovered significant relationships among all the variables. Later in 1996, they analyzed the associations between religious fundamentalism and culture. Again, they found similar results to their first study. These studies were interesting because they suggested that religious fundamentalism can be associated with other variables such as authoritarianism, quest for spirituality, doubt about religion, and intrinsic religious beliefs. Kirkpatrick (1993) also noted that "fundamentalism generally has been characterized in terms of something rather than belief content" (p. 257).

Utilizing one of presidential candidate Barry Goldwater's 1964 speeches, Haiman (1999) highlights that while moderation is normally considered a virtue; such extremist views (possibly related to fundamental perceptions) are not necessarily a vice. As Goldwater pointed out, "Extremism in defense of liberty is no vice…Moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue." However, Haiman goes on to clarify that extreme dogmatic views often associated with the religiously orthodoxy have served as the catalyst for many unfortunate events and wars in the name of God. Haiman also takes a position that

extremism is not a stranger to democracy, leadership, political correctness, and the ongoing debate of the separation of church and state.

In U.S. politics, religion is evident from the political influence that contemporary evangelical Christian leaders such as Jerry Falwell, Pat Robertson, and James Dobson have experienced in recent years (Hunsberger, 1995). The 1988 presidential campaign efforts of evangelist Pat Robertson provide further evidence of the evangelical Christianity's effort to become a part of the political process (O'Leary & McFarland, 1989). More recently, however, Robertson's call for U.S. agents to assassinate Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez and Robertson's theory that Israel's Prime Minister Sharon's stroke was the divine act of God punishing Sharon for dividing God's land (Associated Press, 2006, January 5), provides a good amount of cognitive dissonance in considering religion's role in politics for the not so fundamental Christians (and even the secular) who previously thought Jesus was a prophet of peace delivering good news.

Wilcox (1986) noted that many writing on religion have connected fundamentalism with evangelicalism. Young (1992) mentioned that the definitions between fundamentalism and evangelicalism are often mixed among scholars and the general public. Moreover, these terms are used interchangeably. Even though, evangelicals and fundamentalists believe in similar core values and principles there are some differences (Haskell, 2007). According to Haskell (2007), *evangelicals* believe in the major historical principles of the Christian church. Moreover, they tend to follow a more conservative and conventional practice of Christianity. Haskell further states that evangelicals view the Bible in high regard and predominately follow literal interpretations of the scripture. Thus, evangelicals are more likely to be opposed to topics such as gay marriage, adultery, pornography, and alcohol abuse (Haskell, 2007). Young also stated that that fundamentalism is linked closely with core beliefs and evangelism is more an attempt to convert people to the religion. According to Young, fundamentalists tend to deny moral relativity. He wrote, "Such absolutism, whether a cause or a consequence of fundamentalists beliefs is likely to be associated with the perception of considerable evil in the world, for the morality of human action is not to be judged relative to social context (p. 78)." At the same time, he noted that evangelicals are more inclined to ensure their own

salvation through Biblical directives. Young noted, "the evangelic desire to convert...could be interpreted as an expression of compassion and concern for the souls of others...such compassion might exert pressure in a more liberal direction with regard to certain social issues" (pg. 79).

At the same time, Lundberg (2007) noted that there was a troubled relationship between evangelicalism and fundamentalism that occurred from disagreement about the translations of the Bible. He stated that modern evangelicals took basic belief regarding the doctrines of the church and translations of scripture. He also noted that "evangelicals formed an uneasy alliance with fundamentals, who continue to harbor doubts about whether the evangelical compromise can make the gospel relevant to the secular world without compromising the purity of the witness" (p. 108). Today, one tends to consider evangelicalism to be associated with the supposedly more *conservative* Republican Party. These religious evangelical *conservatives* also are often considered to be highly religiously fundamental (Lundberg).

It is apparent that the popular media and news influence our perceptions of religion (Clark, 2006; Haskell, 2007). Assuming that some of the most powerful religious leaders hold strong religious fundamental views (intrinsic or extrinsic), support of fundamentalism existence in the political forum is apparent when one also considers the Catholic and evangelical alliance in regard to overthrowing Roe vs. Wade and more recent issues such as the Terry Shiavo case (Goodstein, 2005). The *Washington Post* (Edsall, 2006) further clarifies this religious-political dynamic between the hypothesized more religious conservatives and secular based liberals by stating, "Conservative religious leaders have sought to capitalize on their successes in the elections of 2002 and 2004 by winning a fight over a Supreme Court nominee and defeating their Democratic and liberal adversaries" (www.washingtonpost.com).

Although the apparent existence of religiously fundamental politics at work and the sometimes preconceived stereotypes regarding the religiosity of Democrats and Republicans would suggest that the *right* (e.g., Republican Party) is more likely to hold higher fundamental attitudes, it is still empirically unknown whether or not the two sides of the political arena differ in religious fundamentalism. One must not forget that the left also

have a strong contingency of religious leaders that hold strong religious beliefs but do not necessarily agree with their more outspoken counterparts nor agree with the strict interpretations of the Bible being lobbied for within the nation's capital (Falkowski, 1996). Groups like *Sojourners* (www.sojo.net) are progressive Christians who might not support abortion, but feel equally adamant about putting an end to war, the death penalty, hunger, and poverty. Therefore, they do not necessarily support a party or president based solely on abortion issues or separation of church and state, but also consider issues such as war, corporal punishment, feeding the hungry, and ending poverty to be of paramount consideration.

Past polls have thoroughly addressed the viewpoints of Americans on the perceptions of the religiosity of the parties, but few have used reliable and valid scales for constructs like religious fundamentalism to address the impact and existence of differences in religiosity between the parties. Given that religious fundamental views are hypothesized to influence more prejudicial perspectives (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992), this study seeks to better understand if there are significant differences in fundamentalism between political affiliations and how religious fundamental views impact the communication of the party supporters.

Studies concerning both religion and politics have found that they often are significantly related (Brewer, Kersh, and Peterson, 2003). Brewer et al. noted that "Americans routinely get more than spiritual guidance when they attend worship services: they are exposed to political messages at well" (p. 134). Moreover, Coe and Domke (2006) noted similarities in American presidential religious language on political movements over the past years. Looking at presidential inaugural addresses, they discovered that religion was frequently present when discussing freedom and the country.

To more thoroughly study the hypothesized religious differences between political affiliations, this research will employ two additional measures of religiosity. A measurement of religious maturity was created by Marthai (1980) to measure an individual's ego identity and self-concept as they relate to one's religious ideology. This construct of religious maturity helps to better understand the extent to which one's ego identity and self-concept is intertwined with her or his religious ideology. Additionally, this

study will utilize the construct of religious attitude. According to Ausubel and Schpoont (1957), religious attitude measures the intensity of extremeness of an individual's religious attitude. To determine if one political affiliation is "more religious", we feel that it is important to provide constructs such as religious fundamentalism, religious maturity, and religious attitude to better conceptualize what such a phrase truly implies.

Mathur and Salmi (2006) noted that "The chronic under-representation of women in politics everywhere, long after women secured justifiably equal rights in many democracies, intrigues scholars" (p. 81). Mathur and Salmi noted that there are several gender differences regarding politics and religion. These gender differences influence political participation, exclusion, representation, and inclusion. Pastorino, Dunham, Kidwell, Bacho, and Lamborn (1997) also noted gender differences among college youth toward religion and politics. Specifically, they found that males were more likely to explore and commit in politics than females and females were more likely to commit in religion than males. Nonetheless, given that much of the political interest of the religiously fundamental revolve around the right for a woman to have a choice in regard to the issue of abortion, and that some religious sects (more specifically Christian) take a more traditional approach to the role of women in today's society, we feel it is also important to consider how the sex of the participant relates to religious ideology and political affiliation.

Tolerance for (Religious) Disagreement

The first study to examine tolerance for disagreement was conducted by Knutson, McCroskey, Knutson, and Hurt (1979). The basic argument put forth by Knutson, et al. (1979) was that disagreements about substantive and procedural issues were disagreements and not conflicts as had been suggested in previous research (Burgoon, Heston, & McCroskey, 1974). However, disagreements can become conflicts when personal issues become involved in the disagreements. Yet, when a disagreement becomes a conflict, the ability to disagree exists at different threshold levels for different people, which Knutson, McCroskey, Knutson, and Hurt (1979) labeled an individual's tolerance for disagreement. McCroskey, Richmond, and McCroskey (2006) defined tolerance for disagreement as "the degree to which we can deal with disagreement from another person before we take it personally" (p. 125).

One of the objectives of this study is to analyze how much tolerance for disagreement will people who hold more extreme religious views have for religious disagreements. The definition given by Altemeyer and Hunsberger (1992) for "religious fundamentalism" states that religious individuals with more extreme fundamentalist views believe in a single truth; therefore, theoretically there would be no room for discussion of any other possible religious truths. Furthermore, theoretically the more extreme one's religious views are the lower the tolerance for religious disagreements. This variable will be used to assess if one's political affiliation and religiosity has a relationship with one's tolerance for disagreement.

Willingness to Communicate (about religion)

McCroskey and Richmond (1987) described the construct of willingness to communicate as a reference to an individual's general personality orientation towards initiating communication. Even though one's willingness is observed as relatively constant across contexts, situational variables may impact a person's willingness to communicate within a given time or context. Barraclough, Christophel, and McCroskey (1988) stated that differences in an individual's day-to-day communication behaviors may be accounted for more by context than by cultural variations. Therefore, the construct of willingness to communicate could serve to help better understand an individual's willingness to initiate communication with people about religion and to better understand the relationship that one's political affiliation shares with communication related to religion.

(Religious) Communication Apprehension

The manner in which individuals choose to communicate is related to their communication apprehension. Communication Apprehension (CA) is defined as "an individual's level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons" (McCroskey, 1984, p.14). Previous research has shown that people who experience high amounts of anxiety or fear regarding communication will often withdraw from and/or avoid communication situations (Daly & McCroskey, 1984). The causes of CA vary from culture modeling (Daly & Stafford, 1984, Richmond & McCroskey, 1998), personality characteristics (Butler, 1986; McCroskey, Daly & Sorenson, 1976), and genetically inherited behaviors (Beatty & McCroskey, 2001). Also,

individuals with high levels of CA are less likely to engage in social situations, because it makes them feel inadequate (Watson, Monroe, & Atterstrom, 1984). Numerous studies on communication apprehension have shown how influential it is according to socially relevant variables, thus this study will utilize this construct by relating the measure of CA to apprehension experienced to communicating with people who have differing political and religious beliefs.

Punyanunt-Carter, Wrench, Corrigan, and McCroskey (2008) conceptualized religious communication apprehension as "the anxiety or fear associated with either real or anticipated interaction about religion with people of other religions" (p. 1). Punyanunt-Carter et al. found a significant relationship between religious communication apprehension and religious receiver apprehension. At the same time, there was a negative relationship among willingness to communicate about religion religious communication apprehension, and tolerance for religious disagreement.

(Religious) Receiver apprehension

Wheeless (1975) defined receiver apprehension as "the fear of misinterpreting, inadequately processing, and/or not being able to adjust psychologically to messages sent by others" (p. 263). Thus, there is a different type of apprehension that occurs when someone communicates information (i.e., communication apprehension) than when someone receives information (i.e., receiver apprehension). Roberts and Vinson (1998) found that people who were less likely to listen had higher receiver apprehension than people who were willing to listen to the topic. Moreover, Wolvin and Coakley (1994) found that listeners' attitudes toward a topic are related to receiver apprehension. For that reason, one may assume that if religion is a topic that one does not want to listen to then there may be a relationship to one's receiver apprehension.

Research Questions

Based on the previous research, the following research questions were posed:

RQ1: Does one's political affiliation and biological sex predict one's religious fundamentalism, religious maturity, and religious attitude?

RQ2: Does one's political affiliation and biological sex predict one's tolerance for religious disagreement, the willingness to communicate about religion, religious communication apprehension, and religious receiver apprehension?

Method

Participants

Participants for this study were recruited from four different university and college settings in an attempt to attain a fairly diverse population. A convenience sample was used for this study. Each of the participants were students from each of the authors' communication classes. The participants were offered extra credit as an incentive for completing the survey. The first school utilized in this study was a large Mid-Atlantic University. From this university, 206 participants were recruited. The demographic characteristics of this portion of the sample included 111 (53.9 %) males and 94 (45.6 %) females with 1 person not identifying her or his biological sex. This portion of the sample also included 1 (.5%) first year student, 33 (16%) sophomores, 115 (55.8%) juniors, 53 (25.7%) seniors, and 2 (1%) individuals who did not specify their university standing. The mean age for this portion of this sample was 21.54 ($SD = 3.81$) with a range from 19 to 56.

The second school utilized in this study was a small regional campus part of a larger university system in the Midwest. From this university, 38 participants were recruited. The demographic characteristics of this portion of the sample included 13 (34.2 %) males and 24 (63.2 %) females with 1 person not identifying her or his biological sex. This portion of the sample also included 26 (68.4%) first year students, 3 (7.9%) sophomores, 5 (13.2%) juniors, 2 (5.3%) seniors, and 2 (5.3%) individuals who did not specify their university standing. The mean age for this portion of this sample was 21.08 ($SD = 6.13$) with a range from 18 to 46.

The third school utilized in this study was a small liberal arts college in the Great Lakes region of the United States. From this college, 53 participants were recruited. The demographic characteristics of this portion of the sample included 13 (24.5 %) males and 39 (73.6 %) females with 1 person not identifying her or his biological sex. This portion of the sample also included 10 (18.9%) first year students, 17 (32.1%) sophomores, 11

(20.8%) juniors, 9 (17%) seniors, and 6 (11.3%) individuals who did not specify their university standing. The mean age for this portion of this sample was 22.83 (*SD* = 6.43) with a range from 18 to 44.

The final school utilized in this study was a large Southwestern University, which resides in a town that was listed as the second most conservative town in the United States during the time when this study was conducted (Bay Area Center for Voting Research, 2005). From this university, 129 participants were recruited. The demographic characteristics of this portion of the sample included 48 (37.2 %) males and 75 (58.1 %) females with 6 (4.7%) people not identifying her or his biological sex. This portion of the sample also included 28 (21.7%) first year students, 23 (17.8%) sophomores, 34 (26.4%) juniors, 43 (33.3%) seniors, and 1 individual who did not specify her or his university standing. The mean age for this portion of this sample was 21.11 (*SD* = 3.14) with a range from 18 to 42.

Overall, the sample contained 426 participants 185 (43.4%) of whom were male, 232 (54.5%) of whom were female, and 9 (2.1%) not indicating her or his biological sex. The mean age for the entire sample was 21.53 (*SD* = 4.30) with a range from 18 to 56. Furthermore, information was collected on the participants' personal religious affiliations: 209 (49.1%) were Protestant, 145 (34%) were Roman Catholics, 19 (4.5%) were undecided, 12 (2.8%) were agnostic, 10 (2.0%) atheists, 7 (1.6%) were Eastern Orthodox Catholics, 6 (1.4%) were Jewish, 2 (.5%) were Pagan, and a number of religious bodies (Islam, Mormonism, Satanism, and Spiritualism) were represented by only one participant representing .8% of the sample. 12 (2.8%) participants did not reveal their current religious affiliation. Additionally, the political affiliation consisted of: 134 (32%) Democrats, 203 (48%) Republicans, 83 (20%) other party affiliations and 6 (1.4%) non-reports (Note: Independents, Greens, and other parties were collapsed into the other category to create a large enough cell size to analyze).

Instrumentation

Participants completed a multiple scale questionnaire that contained a number of demographic questions as described above. The following are the scales utilized in this

study (Note: Means, standard deviations, possible scale ranges, obtained scale ranges, and alpha reliabilities can be found in Table 1):

Religious Fundamentalism Scale. The Religious Fundamentalism Scale was created by Altemeyer and Hunsberger (1992) to measure the degree to which an individual believes that there is a true and fundamental way of holding and expressing one's religious ideology. The scale consists of 20 Likert-type items ranging from (1) *strongly disagree* to (5) *strongly agree*. Cronbach alpha for this scale was .92 ($M = 54.85$, $SD = 14.59$).

Religious Maturity Index. The Religious Index of Maturity survey was created by Marthai (1980) to measure an individual's ego identity and self-concept as they relate to one's religious ideology. The scale consists of 25 Likert-type items ranging from (1) *strongly disagree* to (5) *strongly agree*. Higher scores on this instrument indicate that an individual's ego identity and self-concept are highly intertwined with her or his religious ideology. Cronbach alpha for this scale was .95 ($M = 44.36$, $SD = 12.30$).

Religious Attitude Inventory. The Religious Attitude Inventory was created by Ausubel and Schpoont (1957) to measure the intensity of extremeness of an individual's religious attitude. The original scale consisted of 50 Likert-type items ranging from (1) *strongly disagree* to (5) *strongly agree*. In this study, items indicating clear Judaic Christian beliefs were either re-written to measure religion in a more general sense or were thrown out if they were unable to be re-written. Ultimately, the final scale used in this study consisted of 40 questions. Higher scores on this instrument indicate higher ego-involvement. Cronbach alpha for this scale was .97 ($M = 122.98$, $SD = 25.62$).

Tolerance for Religious Disagreement. The Tolerance for Disagreement scale was created by Teven, Richmond, and McCroskey (1998) to measure the degree to which an individual can tolerate other people disagreeing with what the individual believes to be true. This measure was adapted to measure tolerance for disagreement about religious messages. The scale consists of 20 Likert-type items ranging from (1) *strongly disagree* to (5) *strongly agree*. Higher scores indicated that a participant has a higher degree of tolerance for discussions of religious disagreement. Cronbach alpha for this scale was .86 ($M = 58.83$, $SD = 10.96$).

Willingness to Communicate about Religion. The Willingness to Communication instrument was devised by McCroskey (1992) to measure a person's willingness to initiate communication with another person or persons. In this study, the Willingness to Communicate instrument was re-tooled to examine an individual's willingness to initiate communication with people about religion. The scale consists of 20 items. Each of the items was designed to measure whether an individual would initiate communication in a specific situation or with a specific individual. Eight of the items are fillers and twelve are scored as part of the scale. Using a 100-point range from 0 (never) to 100 (always), participants are asked to indicate the percentage of time they would choose to communicate in each type of situation. Ultimately, the scores on the twelve items are added together to created a composite score with higher scores indicating a higher willingness to communicate. Cronbach alpha for this scale is .95 (M = 28.23, SD =22.90). This scale was used because the researchers wanted to see if there might be a difference between willingness to communicate about religion and religious communication apprehension.

Religious Communication Apprehension. The Religious Communication Apprehension scale was derived from Punyanunt-Carter et al.'s (2008) study. The Religious Apprehension Scale describes behaviors about communicating about religion to people of different religions and then ask participants to respond to 10 semantic differential items with a seven-step answer possibility. Higher scores are designed to indicate higher degrees of apprehension about the context in question. Cronbach alpha for this scale was .88 (M = 31.97, SD = 10.18).

Religious Receiver Apprehension. The Receiver Apprehension Test (RAT) is a self-report measure that examines an individual's apprehension towards receiving messages developed by Wheeless (1975). This measure was re-written to measure apprehension towards receiving religious messages from people with differing religious ideas. The scale consists of 20 Likert items ranging from (1) *strongly disagree* to (5) *strongly agree*. Higher scores indicated that a receiver perceived her or himself as highly anxious while receiving religious oriented messages. Cronbach alpha for this scale was .89 (M = 52.99, SD = 11.61).

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Study Measures

Measures	*M*	*SD*	Range Expected	Range Obtained	Alpha Reliability
Religious Fundamentalist	54.85	14.59	20-100	20-96	.92
Religious Maturity	44.36	12.30	25-125	25-70	.95
Religious Attitude	122.98	25.62	50-250	50-166	.97
Tolerance for Religious Disagreement	58.83	10.96	20-100	28-93	.86
Willingness to Communicate	28.23	22.90	20-1200	20-1200	.95
Religious Communication Apprehension	31.97	10.17	10-70	10-52	.88
Religious Receiver Apprehension	52.99	11.61	20-100	20-100	.89

Results

Research question one looked at the predictive power between one's political affiliation and biological sex upon one's religious fundamentalism, religious maturity, and religious attitude. Research question two looked at the predictive power between one's political affiliation and biological sex upon one's tolerance for religious disagreement, the willingness to communicate about religion, religious communication apprehension, and religious receiver apprehension. To test these two research questions while minimizing Type I error, a 3 x 2 Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was computed to

assess the impact of one's political affiliation (Democrat, Republican, or other) and biological sex (female or male) on all of the dependent variables. The results show that at the multivariate level, the main effect of political affiliation is significant, Hotelling's (F (14, 644) = 3.16) = .14, $p < .001$, $h_p^2 = .07$; the main effect for biological sex is significant, Hotelling's (F (7, 323) = 5.93) = .13, $p < .001$, $h_p^2 = .11$; and that a significant interaction is present between political affiliation and biological sex, Hotelling's (F (14, 644) = 1.92) = .08, $p < .02$, $h_p^2 = .04$.

Results for Research Question One

The significant between-subjects effects (significant differences between means) identified by the MANOVA and further supported through post-hoc analyses. Results revealed that political affiliation and religious fundamentalism, F (2,334) = 19.85, $p < .001$, $h_p^2 = .11$; with the Republican participants (M = 60.37, SD = 14.26) reporting significantly higher levels of religious fundamentalism than the Democrat participants (M = 49.44, SD = 13.03) and the other affiliations (M = 50.71, SD = 14.09). Also, political affiliation and religious maturity, F (2,334) = 9.55, $p < .001$, $h_p^2 = .06$; with the Republican participants (M = 47.93, SD = 11.89) reporting significantly higher levels of religious maturity than the Democrat participants (M = 40.79, SD = 11.50) and the other affiliations (M = 42.16, SD = 13.06). Moreover, political affiliation and religious attitude, F (2,334) = 8.46, $p < .001$, $h_p^2 = .05$; with the Republican participants (M = 130.27, SD = 24.70) reporting significantly higher levels of religious attitude than the Democrat participants (M = 118.10, SD = 21.67) and the other affiliations (M = 118.04, SD = 25.80).

Biological sex. Results revealed some interesting findings with biological sex. For instance, biological sex and religious maturity, F (1,334) = 5.20, $p < .023$, $h_p^2 = .02$; with the female participants (M = 46.26, SD = 12.35) reporting significantly higher levels of religious maturity than the male participants (M = 42.19, SD = 12.22). Also, biological sex and religious attitude, F (1,334) = 15.75, $p < .001$, $h_p^2 = .05$; with the female participants (M = 129.30, SD = 22.73) reporting significantly higher levels of religious attitude than the male participants (M = 116.99, SD = 25.44).

Political affiliation and biological sex. Results also revealed some interesting findings with political affiliation and biological sex. For instance, political affiliation,

biological sex, and religious fundamentalism, F (2,334) = 7.62, $p < .001$, $h_p^2 = .04$; with the Republican female participants (M = 63.05, SD = 14.45) reporting significantly higher levels of religious fundamentalism than all others (Note: religious fundamentalism accounted for 17% of the variance). Political affiliation, biological sex, and religious maturity, F (2,334) = 6.35, $p < .002$, $h_p^2 = .04$; with the Republican female participants (M = 51.52, SD = 10.63) reporting significantly higher levels of religious maturity than all others (Note: religious maturity accounted for 13% of the variance). Political affiliation, biological sex, and religious attitude, F (2,334) = 3.06, $p < .048$, $h_p^2 = .02$; with the Republican female participants (M = 137.98, SD = 21.51) reporting significantly higher levels of religious attitude than all others (Note: religious attitude accounted for 14% of the variance). See Table 2 for a complete breakdown on all of the between subject effects. See Table 3 for a breakdown of the mean scores relating to the independent variables (political affiliation and biological sex) and the three religiosity construct dependent variables.

Results for Research Question Two

The following results were the only significant findings among the variables. Biological sex and religious receiver apprehension; F (1,334) = 3.94, $p < .048$, $h_p^2 = .01$; with the male participants (M = 54.17, SD = 10.71) reporting significantly higher levels of religious receiver apprehension than the female participants (M = 51.25, SD = 11.56). Political affiliation, biological sex, and willingness to communicate, F (2,334) = 2.83, $p <$ .061, $h_p^2 = .02$; with the Republican female participants (M = 406.33, SD = 257.21) reporting significantly higher levels of religious attitude than all others (Note: willingness to communicate accounted for 3% of the variance). See Table 4 for a breakdown of the mean scores relating to the independent variables (political affiliation and biological sex) and all of the religious-based communication dependent variables.

Table 2: Between-Subjects Effect

Source	Dependent Variable	df	F	Sig.	ηp2
Political Affiliation					
	Religious Fundamentalism	2	19.85	.001	.12
	Religious Maturity	2	9.55	.001	.06
	Religious Attitude	2	8.46	.001	.05
	Tolerance For Disagreement	2	1.10	.336	.01
	Willingness to Communicate	2	.99	.374	.01
	Religious Communication Apprehension	2	1.29	.276	.01
	Religious Receiver Apprehension	2	.22	.804	.00
Biological Sex					
	Religious Fundamentalism	1	.66	.418	.00
	Religious Maturity	1	5.20	.023	.02
	Religious Attitude	1	15.75	.000	.05
	Tolerance For Disagreement	1	2.17	.142	.01
	Willingness to Communicate	1	.07	.794	.00
	Religious Communication Apprehension	1	.78	.377	.00
	Religious Receiver Apprehension	1	3.94	.048	.01
Political Affiliation* Biological Sex					
	Religious Fundamentalism	2	7.62	.001	.04
	Religious Maturity	2	6.35	.002	.04
	Religious Attitude	2	3.06	.048	.02
	Tolerance For Disagreement	2	.50	.606	.00
	Willingness to Communicate	2	2.83	.061	.02
	Religious Communication Apprehension	2	1.49	.228	.01
	Religious Receiver Apprehension	2	.82	.440	.01

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for Religious Variables and Biological Sex

Dependent Variable	Politics	Sex	M	SD	N
Religious Fundamentalism					
	Democrats	Male	53.46	13.81	39
		Female	47.13	12.07	68
		Total	49.44	13.03	107
	Republicans	Male	56.69	13.22	67
		Female	63.05	14.45	92
		Total	60.37	14.26	159
	Other	Male	52.26	14.72	42
		Female	48.30	12.96	27
		Total	50.71	14.09	69
	Total	Male	54.58	13.86	148
		Female	55.13	15.47	187
		Total	54.89	14.76	335
Religious Maturity					
	Democrats	Male	42.13	12.30	39
		Female	40.01	11.04	68
		Total	40.79	11.50	107
	Republicans	Male	43.00	11.84	67
		Female	51.52	10.63	92
		Total	47.93	11.89	159
	Other	Male	40.95	12.93	42
		Female	44.04	13.28	27
		Total	42.16	13.06	69

Table 3 continued: Descriptive Statistics for Religious Variables and Biological Sex

Dependent Variable	Politics	Sex	M	SD	N
	Total	Male	42.19	12.22	148
		Female	46.26	12.35	187
		Total	44.46	12.44	335
Religious Attitude					
	Democrats	Male	115.77	25.07	39
		Female	119.44	19.53	68
		Total	118.10	21.67	107
	Republicans	Male	119.69	25.01	67
		Female	137.98	21.51	92
		Total	130.27	24.70	159
	Other	Male	113.83	26.60	42
		Female	124.59	23.48	27
		Total	118.04	25.80	69
	Total	Male	116.99	25.44	148
		Female	129.30	22.73	187
		Total	123.87	24.70	335

It is important to note that all of the multivariate test results showed the Hotelling's trace statistic and Pillai's trace statistic to be rather small and nearly equal, which would suggest that the effect probably does not contribute much to the model. Additionally, multivariate test results showed the Hotelling's trace statistic and the Roy's Largest Root statistic to be nearly identical, therefore also suggesting that the effect does not contribute much to the model or that the effect is predominantly associated with just one of the dependent variables.

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics for Religious-based Communication Variables

Dependent Variable	Politics	Sex	M	SD	N
Tolerance For Disagreement					
	Democrats	Male	60.87	60.87	39
		Female	57.04	12.18	68
		Total	58.44	11.52	107
	Republicans	Male	58.78	10.88	67
		Female	57.41	11.39	92
		Total	57.99	11.16	159
	Other	Male	60.88	10.33	42
		Female	60.19	11.96	27
		Total	60.61	10.92	69
	Total	Male	59.93	10.47	148
		Female	57.68	11.75	187
		Total	58.67	11.24	335
Willingness to Communicate					
	Democrats	Male	309.41	287.68	39
		Female	304.71	256.93	68
		Total	306.42	267.21	107
	Republicans	Male	303.81	255.83	67
		Female	406.33	257.21	92
		Total	363.13	260.81	159
	Other	Male	365.74	319.52	42
		Female	292.93	244.93	27

Table 4 continued: Descriptive Statistics for Religious-based Communication Variables

Dependent Variable	Politics	Sex	M	SD	N
		Total	337.25	292.88	69
	Total	Male	322.86	282.83	148
		Female	353.00	259.45	187
		Total	339.68	270.03	335
Religious Communication Apprehension					
	Democrats	Male	32.95	8.79	39
		Female	33.60	11.71	68
		Total	33.36	10.70	107
	Republicans	Male	32.03	8.78	67
		Female	30.75	10.03	92
		Total	31.29	9.52	159
	Other	Male	31.17	8.92	42
		Female	34.96	11.85	27
		Total	32.65	10.25	69
	Total	Male	32.03	8.79	148
		Female	32.40	11.00	187
		Total	32.23	10.07	335
Religious Receiver Apprehension					
	Democrats	Male	53.18	10.22	39
		Female	52.03	13.12	68
		Total	52.45	12.11	107

Table 4 continued: Descriptive Statistics for Religious-based Communication Variables

Dependent Variable	Politics	Sex	M	SD	N
	Republicans	Male	55.43	11.46	67
		Female	50.75	10.17	92
		Total	52.72	10.94	159
	Other	Male	53.07	9.93	42
		Female	50.96	12.19	27
		Total	52.25	10.83	69
	Total	Male	54.17	10.71	148
		Female	51.25	11.56	187
		Total	52.54	11.27	335

Discussion

Considering that the main effects and interaction effect identified between the independent and dependent variables of this study were not necessarily what one would term *robust*, and given a few research limitations that will be addressed shortly, the results of this study (like many social scientific and political polling endeavours) can be considered neither definitive nor generalizable. However, the results do suggest a few findings that help to possibly better understand the political polls reporting that Republicans are *more religious* than Democrats. The results of this study show that there are significant differences between the religious views of the two party's constituents.

The Republicans sampled in this study were found to hold *more* extreme fundamental religious views resulting in stronger ego-involvement and self-concepts intertwined with religious ideology than the Democrats that participated. Table 3 illuminates that these fundamental differences not only exist between the party's participants themselves (the Republican religious fundamental mean = 60.37 and the

Democratic religious fundamental mean = 49.44), but also between the different biological sexes of these party's participants (the Republican religious fundamental male mean = 56.69 and the Democratic religious fundamental male mean = 53.46, and more significantly where the Republican religious fundamental female mean = 63.05 and the Democratic religious fundamental female mean = 47.13). Furthermore, the means for religious maturity and religious attitude reflect a similar pattern.

Roth and Kroll (2007) noted that women are more religious than men. Stark (2002) found that females were more likely to perceive themselves as religious, attend church often, pray, participate in church activities, and communicate about the existence of God. We find the significantly large difference between the religious fundamental perspectives for the women of the parties to be particularly interesting and somewhat hard to fully explain with the data collected. Why were the Republican women more religiously fundamental? Is it because the Republicans have dominated the South in most recent elections and that the South has a higher level of church attendance (i.e., dedication to organized religion)? The possibility exists, however, that such findings are reflective of the Republicans anti-abortion reputation and the Democrats pro-choice position. Considering that "On any given Sunday there are 13 million fewer men than women in U.S. pews" (Murrow, 2005, www.pastors.com), one would think that the women in both political parties would have been more religious than the men, yet for this sample this was not the case.

Marthur and Salmi (2006) argued that historically women have been ostracized from politics due to patriarchy, discrimination, domination, and oppression. Moreover, they noted that age, race, religion, and culture may all influence political participation, but their variables do not account for gender differences. Results from this study revealed that there were significant differences between men and women. Specifically, males were significantly higher on religious receiver apprehension than females. This suggests that college males do not like to listen to religious topics compared to females. These findings support Freese and Montgomery (2007)'s and Pastorino et al.'s (1997) studies that revealed males did not engage and commit in religion as often as females. Results from the current study also supported previous research looking at biological sex and religious attitude.

As for differences in religious-based communication, these same highly religious Republican women participants reported the highest willingness to communicate about religion amongst all of the participants. However, when excluding the role of one's biological sex from the equation, the results suggest that we have three groups (Democrats, Republicans, and a group of assorted other political affiliations) that hold significantly different fundamental religious perspectives, yet all of the political affiliations as a whole do not differ significantly in one's willingness to communicate about their religious beliefs, they are similar in being tolerant of others who might disagree with such religious beliefs, and that neither are significantly different in levels of anxiety and apprehension relating to the sending and receiving of religious-based communication. Such findings might help to explain why the topics relating to differences in religious views have become popular subjects of political debate, because it would appear that each side is equally apprehensive yet willing to listen and then dispute why the other is wrong. Findings from this study support Wrench et al.'s (2006) and Punyanunt-Carter et al.'s (2008) studies that revealed certain religious beliefs have influences on perceptions of communication behavior. Results from this study are noteworthy to researchers, because it shows how both politics and religion influence perceptions of communication.

The current study does contain a few limitations that should be noted. First, it is possible that given the younger age of the sample, the participants had not yet internalized the level of religious fundamentalism that might develop as one reaches a more mature age. In other words, if we had surveyed a broader age range of churchgoers, the results from this study could be different. Because traditional college students compromise the average age of the respondents in this study, it is possible that they have very different viewpoints concerning religion and politics compared to an older population. Moreover, different life position and socioeconomic status may affect religious communication (Pastorino et al., 1997). Future research into religious political communication should attempt to garner a broader range of participants.

A second limitation to the validity of this study relates to the possible influence of history on this project. The data for this study was collected shortly before the 2005 Presidential election in the United States. The 2005 Presidential election was highly

divisive, and routinely pitted religiously fundamental people against non-religiously fundamental. Furthermore, the Republican Party used issues like gay marriage and abortion as party platforms that effectively increased anxiety and mobilized its religious base during the election.

Lastly, religion is still one of those topics that is conversationally taboo, which could have led participants to respond in socially desirable patterns. In essence, people at both the upper and lower religiously fundamental extremes could have regressed towards the mean, which would skew the impact of religious extremism and fundamentalism in the current study. The possibility also existed that much of what we do hear with regard to this religious political debate does come from the far left and the far right and that those in the middle are less likely to be heard. The lack of a middle voice might explain how those in the middle in this study may have leveled out the differences between the two parties. Also, the survey does not ask about specific issues that encourage and/or limit communication. Regardless, future research might look more closely at the intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions of religious fundamentalism as well as a large enough sample that supports a *SD* split that looks more closely at those who are one *SD* above or below the norm. Furthermore, a more specific scale for measuring political ideology beyond the nominal categories utilized in this study could help differentiate people at the extremes from those in the middle.

Conclusion

The current study provides insight into the political-religious communicative dynamics at work in America today, which hopefully will encourage others to build upon our efforts. The question is not whether one political party is *more religious* than the other, but rather how such religious views differ and effect barriers or pathways to communication more conducive to social development reliant upon political process. This study further demonstrated how religion and politics is a factor that can influence perceptions of communication behavior. Hopefully, more communication scholars will see the need to examine how religion, politics, and biological sex are related from an empirical standpoint.

Works Cited

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice* (25th Anniversary ed.). Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books.

Allport, G. W., & Ross, J. M (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5*, 432-443.

Altemeyer, B., & Hunsberger, B. (1992). Authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, quest, and prejudice. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 2*, 113-133.

American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language: Fourth Edition (2000). *Evangelical*. Retrieved January 15, 2006, from http://www.bartleby.com/61/65/E0246500.html

Ausubel, D. P., & Schpoont, S. H. (1957). Prediction of group opinion as a function of extremeness of predictor attitudes. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 46*, 19-29.

Bach, A. (2004). *Religion, Politics, Media in the Broadband Era.* Sheffield Pheonix Press Ltd: Sheffield, UK.

Baesler, E. J. (1994). Religious orientation, persuasion, and communicator style. *Journal of Communication and Religion, 17,* 61-72.

Barraclough, R. A., Christophel, D. M., & McCroskey, J. C. (1988).Willingness to communicate: A cross-cultural investigation. *Communication research Reports, 5(2)*, 187-192.

Beatty, M., Valensic, K., & McCroskey, J. C. (2001). *The biology of communication: A communibiological perspective.* Cresskill, New Jersey: Hampton Press, Inc.

Brewer, M. D., Kersh, R., Petersen, R. E. (2003). Assessing conventional wisdom about religion and politics: A preliminary view from the pews. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 42*(1), 125-136.

Burgoon, M., Heston, J. K., & McCroskey, J. C. (1974). *Small group communication: A functional approach.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Butler, J. (1986). Personality characteristics in subjects high and low in communication apprehension about communication. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 62,* 895-898.

Carr, W. (2000). Some reflections on spirituality, religion, and mental health. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 3*(1), 1-12.

Clark, L.S. (2006). Religion, American style: Critical cultural analyses of religion, media, and popular culture. *American Quarterly, 58*(2), 523-533.

Coe, K., & Domke, D. (2006). Petitioners or prophets? Presidential discourse, god, and the ascendancy of religious conservatives. *Journal of Communication, 56*(2), 309-330.

Daly, J. A., & McCroskey, J. C. (Eds.). (1984). *Avoiding communication: Shyness, reticence, and communication apprehension.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Daly, J. A., & Stafford, L. (1984). Correlates and consequences of social communicative anxiety. In J. Daly & J.C. McCroskey (Eds.), *Avoiding communication: shyness, reticence, and communication apprehension.* B everly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Eckstrom, K. (2004, March 2). Gallup: Republicans more `religious' than democrats. *Religious News Service*. Retrieved January 14, 2006, from http://www.beliefnet.com/story/141/story_14140_1.html.

Edsall, T. B. (2006). Christian right mobilizes for judge: Conservative tilt sought on bench. *Washington Post*. Retrieved January 15, 2006, from http://www.washingtonpost.com/wpdyn/content/article/2006/01/08/AR200601080 1069.html

Falkowski, L. (1996). Religion and politics. *The Center for Progressive Christianity.* Retrieved January 15, 2006, from http://www.tcpc.org/resources/articles/religion_and.htm

Freese, J. & Montgomery, J. (2007). The devil made her do it: Evaluating risk preference as an explanation of sex differences in religiousness. (pp. 187-230) In Shelley J. Correll (ed.) *Advances in Group Processes: The Social Psychology of Gender.* Oxford, Elsevier.

Goodstein, L. (2005, March 24). Schiavo case highlights Catholic-evangelical alliance. *New York Times*. Retrieved January 15, 2006, from http://www.nytimes.com/2005/03/24/national/24relig.html?ex=1137474000&en= e262d0cc2c8d51c9&ei=5070.

GOP the religion-friendly party: But stem cell issue may help democrats (2004, August 24). *The Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life*. Retrieved January 15, 2006, from http://pewforum.org/docs/index.php?DocID=51.

Haiman, F. S. (1999). The voices of extremism revisited. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication, 16*, 119-135.

Haskell, D. M. (2007). Evangical Christians in Canadian national television news, 1994-2004: A Frame analysis. *Journal of Communication and Religion, 30*(1), 118-152.

Hunsberger, B. (1995). Religion and prejudice: The role of religious fundamentalism, quest, and right wing authoritarianism. *Journal of Social Issues, 51*(2), 113-129.

Kirkpatrick, L. A. (1993). Fundamentalism, Christian Orthodoxy, and intrinsic religious orientation as predictors of discriminatory attitudes. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 32*(3), 256-268.

Knutson, P. K., McCroskey, J. C., Knutson, T., & Hurt, H. (1979) *Tolerance for disagreement: Interpersonal conflict reconceptualized.* Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Western Speech Communication Association, Los Angeles.

Lessl, T. M. (1993). Toward a definition of religious communication: Scientific and religious uses of evolution. *Journal of Communication and Religion, 16*, 127-138.

Lundberg, C.O. (2007). Dueling fundamentalisms. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies, 4*(1), 106-110.

Mathur, A. N., Salmi, A. (2006). The politics of disharmony in management of gender differences. *Vikalpa:The Journal for Decision Makers, 31*(3), 81-93.

Marthai, R. (1980). Construction and validation of a measure of phenomenal process and religious maturity. (Doctoral dissertation, Southern Mississippi University, Hattiesburg, MS). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 41-05B, 1893.

McCroskey, J. C. (1984). The communication apprehension perspective. In J. Daly & J.C. McCroskey (Eds.), *Avoiding communication: shyness, reticence and communication apprehension.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

McCroskey, J. C. (1992). Reliability and validity of the willingness to communicate scale. *Communication Quarterly, 40*, 16-25.

McCroskey, J. C., Daly, J., & Sorenson, G. (1976). Personality correlates of communication apprehension: A research note. *Human Communication Research, 2*, 376-380.

McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1987). Willingness to communicate and interpersonal communication. In J. C. McCroskey and J. A. Daly (Eds.) *Personality and interpersonal communication,* (129-156), Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

McCroskey, J. C., Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, L. L. (2006). *An introduction to communication in the classroom: The role of communication in teaching and training.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Moloney, K. (2004). Democracy and public relations. *Journal of Communication Managements, 9*, 89-92.

Murrow, D. (2005, June 8). In spiritual matters, kids take their cues from dad. *Pastors. Com*. Retrieved January 16, 2006, from http://www.pastors.com/RWMT/?id=210&artid=8352&expand=1

O'leary, S., & McFarland, M. (1989). The political use of mythic discourse: Prophetic interpretation in Pat Robertson's presidential campaign. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 75*, 433-452.

Pastorino, E., Dunham, R. M., Kidwell, J., Bacho, R., & Lamborn, S. D. (1997). Domain-specific gender comparison in identity development among college youth: Idealogy and relationships. *Adolescence, 32*(127), 559-577.

Pat Robertson criticized for his comments linking Sharon's stroke to divine wrath (2006, January 5). *Associated Press*. Retrieved January 15, 2006, from http://www.dailypress.com/news/local/virginia/dp-asap-spotnews-roberst0105jan05,0,4190037.story?coll=dp-headlines-Virginia.

Ploch, D. R. (1974). Religion as an independent variable: A critique of some major research. As cited in A. W. Eister (Ed.) *Changing perspectives in the scientific study of religion* (pp.275-294). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Public Divided on Origins of Life: Religion A Strength And Weakness For Both Parties (2005, August 30). *The Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life*. Retrieved January 14, 2006, from http://pewforum.org/surveys/origins/.

Punyanunt-Carter, N.M., Wrench, J. S., Corrigan, M., & McCroskey, J.C. (2008). An examination of the reliability and validity of the religious communication apprehension scale. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 37,* 1-15.

Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C.(1998). *Communication apprehension, avoidance, and effectiveness (5th. ed.)*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Roberts, C. V., & Vinson, L. (1998). Relationships among willingness to listen, receiver apprehension, communication apprehension, communication competence, and dogmatism. *International Journal of Listening, 12*, 40-56.

Roth, L. M., & Kroll, J. C. (2007). Risky business: Assessing risk preference explanations for gender differences. *American Sociological Review, 72*, 205-220.

Schmalzbauer, J. A., & Wheeler, C. G. (1996). Between Fundamentalism and Secularization: Secularizing and sacralizing currents in the evangelical debate on campus lifestyle codes. *Sociology of Religion, 57*(3), 241-257.

Schultze, Q. J. (2005). The "God-Problem" in communication studies. *Journal of Communication and Religion, 28*, 1-22.

Shepard, S. (2004, November 25). Falwell says evangelical GOP party, Bush's fate. *Cox News Service*. Retrieved January 15, 2006, from http://www.signonsandiego.com/uniontrib/20040925/news_1n25christ.html.

Stark, R. (2002). Physiology and faith: Addressing the 'universal' gender differenc in religious commitment. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 41,* 495-507.

Stewart, R. A., & Roach, K. D. (1993). Argumentativeness, religious orientations, and reactions to argument situations involving religious versus nonreligious views. *Communication Quarterly, 41*, 26-39.

Stewart, R. A. (1994). Perceptions of an initial speaker's credibility as a foundation of religious involvement and religious disclosiveness. *Communication Research Reports, 11*, 169-176.

Teven, J. J., McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1998). Measurement of tolerance for disagreement. *Communication Research Reports, 15,* 209-217.

Watson, A.K., Monroe, E.E., & Atterstrom, H. (1984). American and Swedish children's apprehension about communication: A comparative study. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 59,* 917-918.

Wheeless, L. (1975). An investigation of receiver apprehension and social context dimensions of communication apprehension. *The Speech Teacher, 24*, 261-268.

Wilcox, C. (1986). Evangelicals and fundamentalists in the new Christian right: Religious differences in the Ohio Moral Majority, *Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, 25* (3), 355-363.

Wolvin, A. D., & Coakley, G. G. (1994). Listening competency. *Journal of International Listening Association, 8*, 148-160.

Wrench, J. S., Corrigan, M., McCroskey, J.C., & Punyanunt-Carter, N.M. (2006). Religious fundamentalism and intercultural communication: The relationships among ethnocentrism, intercultural communication apprehension, religious fundamentalism, homonegativity, and tolerance for religious disagreements. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 35*(1), 23-44.

Young, R. L. (1992). Religious orientation, race, and support for the death penalty. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 31*(1), 76-87.