Part I

1. Y(Hat) = 0.395 + .0001Xblk +.001XP65 - .0008XHighSch +.006Xpfem +.00002Xpurban

a. The model appears to be properly specified. The evidence for this statement can be found in the error term as it has a standard deviation of 1.0004 and a mean of 0.02. The skewness of the error term is 0.261 and is not correlated with the other independent variables in the model.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Table 1 - Regression of Gini Coefficient on County Demographic Variables | | |
| Variables | Unstandardized Coefficient | Standardized Coefficient |
| Percent Black | 0.0001\*\* | 0.00004 |
| Percent Over 65 | 0.0012\*\*\* | 0.0001 |
| Percent Over High School Education | -0.0009\*\*\* | 0.00005 |
| Percent Female Headed Household | 0.0064\*\*\* | 0.0003 |
| Percent Urban | 0.00002 | 0.00001 |
| Intercept = 0.395 |  |  |
| R2 = 0.4408 |  |  |
| Data Source: 2000 Census; \*P<.05, \*\*P<.01, \*\*\*P<.001 | | |

b.

* + 1. Intercept: Ho:Intercept=0, H­­a:Intercept≠0, this hypothesis test is testing if the intercept is equal to zero or if it is not equal to zero. With a high t-value of 90.60 we reject the null hypothesis.
    2. Percent Black: Ho:Bblk=0, H­­a:Bblk≠0, this hypothesis test is checking if the unstandardized coefficient is equal to zero or if is a value other than zero. We reject the null hypothesis for this hypothesis test. For every percent increase in county population black there is a 0.0001 increase in the Gini score.
    3. Percent Over 65: Ho:Bp65=0, H­­a:Bp65≠0, this hypothesis test is checking if the unstandardized coefficient is equal to zero or if is a value other than zero. We reject the null hypothesis for this hypothesis test. For every percent increase in county population 65 and older there is a 0.0012 increase in the Gini score.
    4. Percent Over High School Education: Ho:Bhighsch=0, H­­a:Bhighsch≠0, this hypothesis test is checking if the unstandardized coefficient is equal to zero or if is a value other than zero. We reject the null hypothesis for this hypothesis test. For every percent increase in county population with a greater than high school education there is a 0.0009 decrease in the Gini score.
    5. Percent Female headed Household: Ho:Bpfem=0, H­­a:Bpfem≠0, this hypothesis test is checking if the unstandardized coefficient is equal to zero or if is a value other than zero. We reject the null hypothesis for this hypothesis test. For every percent increase in county population in female headed households there is a 0.0064 increase in the Gini score.
    6. Percent Urban: Ho:Bpurban=0, H­­a:Bpurban≠0, this hypothesis test is checking if the unstandardized coefficient is equal to zero or if is a value other than zero. We fail reject the null hypothesis for this hypothesis test. Since we fail to reject the null hypothesis, our interpretations of the unstandardized coefficient are effectively zero or no statistically significant effect.

c. The r2 of 0.4408 as seen in Table 1, means that 44.08 percent of the variation in the Gini Coefficient is explained by our model and variables.

e. The average predicted Gini score when all independent variables are at their mean is 0.4047. Y(Hat) = 0.395 + .0001(8.12)blk +.001(15.69)P65 - .0008(58.45)HighSch +.006(6.57)pfem +.00002(29.26)purban

d. There appears to be multicollinearity present in this model. Looking at variance inflation scores, there are two variables that are above 2.4 which are percent black and percent female headed households. Looking at the Eigenvalues, there are two variables with Eigenvalues above 1 which are percent black and percent older than 65 in 2000. Looking at the proportion of variation between these two variables, none of them are above 0.5. Looking at other proportion of variation scores though, percent female headed households have scores greater than 0.5 for percent of county population with greater than high school education and for percent urban. The proportion of variation for percent urban and percent black and percent female headed households is greater than 0.8. Examining the variables’ correlation, percent female and percent black are highly correlated with a correlation above 0.7. After looking at all of the evidence, it appears that percent black and percent female headed households are causing the most issues.

e. After running two separate models one taking out percent black and another taking out percent female headed households, looking at Eigenvalues, variation inflation scores, and correlations, it appears that the model taking out percent female headed households cleans up multicollinearity the best so I will be using this model for the rest of the analysis. I am choosing to not combine the two variables into a factor because there are only two variables and not three or more. The new model is displayed below:

Y(Hat) = 0.443 + .00074Xblk +.00077XP65 - .0009XHighSch +.00009Xpurban

f. According to the model with ‘govdep’ included, there is a statistically significant difference in means between government dependent counties and non-government dependent counties in predicting level of income inequality in rural America. For counties that are government dependent, they have Gini scores 0.0081 higher than non-government dependent counties.

g. The processes of income inequality seem to be the same for both metropolitan and non-metropolitan counties. All of the variables are statistically significant in both models and have the same relationships for each corresponding variable. Looking at Table 2.1 and Table 2.2, variables like, ‘percent over 65’, ‘percent over high school education’, and ‘percent urban’ seem to matter more in metropolitan areas than they do in rural ones. The question then becomes why these variables have greater impact on income inequality. It could be possible that more resources and skills are required to live in metropolitan areas so that if a county lacks those like higher education where jobs require higher skill levels, then this could explain the difference in percent over high school education. If a county has a higher percent of over high school education then they will reduce their income inequality more than a rural county because the skills and resources that come along with an education greater than high school matter more in metropolitan areas than they do in rural ones. The same idea can be used to explain the difference in ‘percent over 65’. If a county in a metropolitan area has x percent over 65 then this will have a greater impact in the area as opposed to in a rural area with x percent over 65 because individuals over 65 may lack the necessary skills to acquire jobs to make a living that are present in metropolitan areas but not in rural ones.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Table 2.1 - Regression of Gini Coefficient on Metropolitan County Demographic Variables | | |
| Variables | Unstandardized Coefficient | Standardized Coefficient |
| Percent Black | 0.0008\*\*\* | 0.33685 |
| Percent Over 65 | 0.00257\*\*\* | 0.30671 |
| Percent Over High School Education | -0.001\*\*\* | -0.31256 |
| Percent Urban | 0.0004\*\*\* | 0.3545 |
| Intercept = 0.398 |  |  |
| R2 = 0.3886 |  |  |
| Data Source: 2000 Census; \*P<.05, \*\*P<.01, \*\*\*P<.001 | | |
|  | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Table 2.2 - Regression of Gini Coefficient on Rural County Demographic Variables | | |
| Variables | Unstandardized Coefficient | Standardized Coefficient |
| Percent Black | 0.0007\*\*\* | 0.40617 |
| Percent Over 65 | 0.0007\*\*\* | 0.11315 |
| Percent Over High School Education | -0.0009\*\*\* | -0.32175 |
| Percent Urban | 0.00009\*\*\* | 0.08461 |
| Intercept = 0.443 |  |  |
| R2 = 0.3485 |  |  |
| Data Source: 2000 Census; \*P<.05, \*\*P<.01, \*\*\*P<.001 | | |

Part II

1.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Table 1 - Regression of Abortion Attitudes on Demographic Variables | | |
| Variables | Unstandardized Coefficient | Standardized Coefficient |
| Sex (Male=1) | -0.05371 | -0.01098 |
| Region (South=1) | -0.58703\*\*\* | -0.1145 |
| Religion (Catholic=1) | -0.3688\* | -0.06605 |
| Race (White=1) | -0.31896 | -0.04929 |
| Age | 0.01076\* | 0.07665 |
| Number of Siblings | -0.05379 | -0.06741 |
| Number of Children | -0.04885 | -0.03533 |
| Religious Attendance | -0.33456\*\*\* | -0.36933 |
| Highest Year of School Completed | 0.11947\*\*\* | 0.15264 |
| Total Family Income | 0.03324\* | 0.07342 |
| Size of Place Reside | 0.0000167 | 0.0083 |
| Intercept = 3.653 |  |  |
| R2 = 0.1998 |  |  |
| Data Source: 2002 GSS; \*P<.05, \*\*P<.01, \*\*\*P<.001 | | |

a.

For this model regressing abortion attitudes on certain demographic variables, there are six variables that are statistically significant: ‘region’, ‘religion’, ‘age’, ‘religious attendance’, ‘highest year of school completed’, and ‘total family income’. Region is a dummy variable with ‘South’ equaling one. For those who live in the South, there is a difference in means between non-south dwellers concerning abortion attitudes. For these attitudes towards abortion, residents in the South are 0.587 units less liberal than residents in the non-south when controlling for sex, religion, race, age, number of siblings, number of children, religious attendance, highest year of school completed, total family income, and size of place reside. Religion is also a dummy variable in this model with ‘Catholics’ equaling ‘1’. There is a statistically significant difference in means between Catholics and non-Catholics as Catholics are 0.3688 units less liberal towards abortion than non-Catholics when controlling for the other variables in the model. For every unit increase in age, respondents’ attitudes towards abortion becomes 0.01076 units more liberal. Religious attendance also significantly impacts attitudes towards abortion as for every unit increase in religious attendance leads to a 0.33456 unit decrease in liberal attitudes towards abortion when controlling for the variables in the model. Years of school completed has a positive relationship on liberal attitudes towards abortion as every year of school completed leads to a 0.11947 unit increase in these liberal attitudes. The last variable that is significant in this model is total family income. For every unit increase in total family income there is a 0.03324 unit increase on liberal attitudes towards abortion when controlling for sex, religion, race, age, number of siblings, number of children, religious attendance, highest year of school completed, and size of place reside .

b. Looking at Table 1, the most important effect in this model is religious attendance because it has the largest absolute value standardized coefficient of 0.36933.

c. There are no values above three in the variance inflation scores and there is only one variable above 0.5 in the proportion of variance when the eigenvalue is above one. This variable of ‘number of siblings’ with an eigenvalue of 1.036 has a proportion of variation of 0.6483 with the variable ‘male’. This does not seem to be a problem as there are no variables which are highly correlated with each other in the correlation matrix. The multicollinearity in the model is acceptable.

d.

e. Y(hat) = 3.57064 – 0.32204Xattend – 0.16766XCath­ + -0.05403Xcathattend

Catholics

Y(hat) = 3.57064 – 0.32204Xattend – 0.16766(1)Cath­ + -0.05403Xcathattend­

= 3.51661 + (-0.32204 – 0.05403)X

Y(hat)= 3.51661 - 0.37607X

Non-Catholics

Y(hat) = 3.57064 – 0.32204Xattend

2. a.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 2 - Regression of Abortion Attitudes on Demographic Variables for Males and Females | | | | | |
|  | Males | |  | Females | |
| Variables | *b* | Standardized Coefficient |  | *b* | Standardized Coefficient |
| Region (South=1) | -0.664\*\* | -0.132 |  | -0.499 | -0.094 |
| Religion (Catholic=1) | -0.257 | -0.047 |  | -0.532 | -0.092 |
| Race (White=1) | -0.124 | -0.018 |  | -0.518 | -0.083 |
| Age | 0.015\* | 0.108 |  | 0.007 | 0.051 |
| Number of Siblings | -0.063 | -0.081 |  | -0.052 | -0.064 |
| Number of Children | -0.067 | -0.049 |  | -0.038 | -0.027 |
| Religious Attendance | -0.332\*\*\* | -0.363 |  | -0.347\*\*\* | -0.384 |
| Highest Year of School Completed | 0.128\*\*\* | 0.172 |  | 0.103\* | 0.125 |
| Total Family Income | 0.018 | 0.039 |  | 0.051\* | 0.113 |
| Size of Place Reside | 0.0001 | 0.067 |  | -0.0001 | -0.060 |
| Intercept | 3.3884 |  |  | 3.9917 |  |
| *n* | 427 |  |  | 362 |  |
| R2 | 0.2078 |  |  | 0.2043 |  |
| Data Source: 2002 GSS; \*P<.05, \*\*P<.01, \*\*\*P<.001 | | | | | |

b. Table 2 shows two separate models for abortion attitudes regressed on region, religion, race, age, number of siblings, number of children, religious attendance, highest year of school completed, total family income, and size of place reside. The two models are broken down into males and females in order to compare the two groups on abortion attitudes regressing the same variables in each model. For males, the significant variables are region, age, religious attendance, and highest year of school completed. The non-significant variables are religion, race, number of siblings, number of children, total family income, and size of place reside. For females, the significant variables are religious attendance, highest year of school completed, and total family income. The non-significant variables are region, religion, race, age, number of siblings, number of children, and size of place reside. Males and females both have religious attendance and highest year of school completed as significant variables but differ in region, age, and total family income which are significant in one model but not in the other. Based off of this information I will attempt to explain this disparity and how males and females arrive at their attitudes towards abortion.

For males, respondents in the South have a difference in means with respondents in the Non-South. Males in the South are 0.664 less liberal on abortion attitudes than males in the Non-South when controlling for religion, race, age, number of siblings, number of children, religious attendance, highest year of school completed, total family income, and size of place reside. Also for males, for every year increase in age causes a 0.015 unit change towards liberal attitudes on abortion when controlling for these the other variables in the model. Highest year of school completed also has a positive relationship with liberal attitudes on abortion for every unit increase in school completion leads to a 0.128 unit increase on liberal attitudes towards abortion when controlling for the variables in the model. Religious attendance has a negative effect on liberal attitudes towards abortion as a single unit change in religious attendance leads to a 0.332 decrease in liberal attitudes abortion when controlling for region, religion, race, age, number of siblings, number of children, highest year of school completed, total family income, and size of place reside.

It appears for males that religious attendance goes a long way in determining their attitudes towards abortion as this variable has the strong effect in the model. The next strongest effect is of highest year of school completed followed by region and age. If a male is in the south and attends religious services a lot, he will more than likely be conservative on abortion attitudes since both of these variables have a negative relationship with abortion attitudes. It also appears that the more education a male has and the older they become, they have more liberal attitudes on this subject. So the most liberal males should be expected to reside in the Non-South, attend religious services the least, be older and educated. On the flip side, the most conservative males on abortion reside in the South, attend religious services a lot, are younger and have less education.

For females, highest year of school completed and total family income has a positive relationship with liberal attitudes on abortion. For every unit increase in highest year of school completed, there is a 0.103 unit increase in liberal attitudes towards abortion when controlling for region, religion, race, age, number of siblings, number of children, religious attendance, total family income, and size of place reside. For every unit increase in total family income, there is a 0.051 unit increase in these same attitudes when controlling for the other variables in the model. Religious attendance once again has a negative effect on liberal attitudes towards abortion as a one unit increase in religious attendance leads to a 0.347 decrease on liberal attitudes towards abortion when controlling for region, religion, race, age, number of siblings, number of children, highest year of school completed, total family income, and size of place reside.

It appears that for females, religious attendance is also the strongest effect on attitudes towards abortion followed by highest year of school completed and then total family income. Females that come from families with higher total family incomes will be more liberal on abortion attitudes. This may be due in part to the fact that these families will probably be more educated and the effect of higher education will have its effect on abortion attitudes in this case as well. Just like males, females with higher education will be more liberal on abortion attitudes than females with lower levels of education. For females attending religious services more, their attitudes on abortion become less liberal probably due to hearing these views expressed from the pulpit more and due to trying to fit in with their social surroundings by being accepted by others who would likely have similar conservative views on abortion if they attend religious services the same amount.

The interaction between region of the country and sex, age and sex, total family income and sex, religious attendance and sex, and education and sex are not statistically significant. Since these interaction terms are not statistically significant I do not know how to justify showing graphs with the different slopes and interpretations of these slopes.

3. a.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 3 - Regression of Abortion Attitudes on Demographic Variables for South and Non-South Residents | | | | | |
|  | South Residents | |  | Non-South Residents | |
| Variables | *b* | Standardized Coefficient |  | *b* | Standardized Coefficient |
| Sex (Male=1) | -0.260 | -0.054 |  | 0.072 | 0.014 |
| Religion (Catholic=1) | -0.454 | -0.069 |  | -0.291 | -0.055 |
| Race (White=1) | -1.022\*\* | -0.178 |  | 0.186 | 0.027 |
| Age | 0.005 | 0.038 |  | 0.016\* | 0.114 |
| Number of Siblings | -0.053 | -0.075 |  | -0.041 | -0.049 |
| Number of Children | -0.031 | -0.02 |  | -0.055 | -0.040 |
| Religious Attendance | -0.294\*\*\* | -0.340 |  | -0.368\*\*\* | -0.402 |
| Highest Year of School Completed | 0.093 | 0.134 |  | 0.14\*\*\* | 0.169 |
| Total Family Income | 0.084\*\* | 0.200 |  | 0.007 | 0.016 |
| Size of Place Reside | -0.00005 | -0.005 |  | 0.00004 | 0.026 |
| Intercept | 3.3373 |  |  | 3.096 |  |
| *n* | 272 |  |  | 517 |  |
| R2 | 0.1599 |  |  | 0.2145 |  |
| Data Source: 2002 GSS; \*P<.05, \*\*P<.01, \*\*\*P<.001 | | | | | |

b. Table 3 shows two separate models for abortion attitudes regressed on sex, religion, race, age, number of siblings, number of children, religious attendance, highest year of school completed, total family income, and size of place reside. The two models are broken down into South and Non-South residents in order to compare the two groups on abortion attitudes regressing the same variables in each model. For South residents, the significant variables are race, religious attendance, and total family income. The non-significant variables are sex, religion, number of siblings, number of children, highest year of school completed, and size of place reside. For Non-South residents, the significant variables are age, religious attendance, and highest year of school completed. The non-significant variables are sex, religion, race, number of siblings, number of children, size of place reside, and total family income. South and Non-South residents both have religious attendance as significant variables but differ on race, age, highest year of school completed, and total family income which are significant in one model but not in the other. Based off of this information I will attempt to explain this disparity and how South and Non-South residents arrive at their attitudes towards abortion.

For residents in the South, religious attendance has the strongest effect in this model followed by total family income and then race with religious attendance and race having a negative relationship on abortion attitudes. When controlling for sex, religion, age, number of siblings, number of children, religious attendance, highest year of school completed, total family income, and size of place reside, Whites are 1.022 units less liberal on these attitudes than non-Whites for residents in the South. For every unit increase in religious attendance, there is a 0.294 decrease in liberal attitudes towards abortion and for every unit increase in family income there is a 0.084 unit increase in these attitudes when controlling for the variables in the model. A White Southerner with lower total family income and who attends religious services more often will be more conservative on abortion attitudes and a non-White Southerner with higher family income who attends religious services less frequently will be more liberal on abortion attitudes.

For residents in the Non-South, religious attendance also has the strongest effect on attitudes towards abortion followed by highest year of school completed and age. For every unit increase in religious attendance, there is a 0.368 decrease in liberal attitudes towards abortion when controlling for sex, religion, race, age, number of siblings, number of children, highest year of school completed, total family income, and size of place reside. The two variables with positive relationships with liberal attitudes towards abortion show that for every unit increase in highest year of school completed there is a 0.14 unit increase in liberal attitudes towards abortion and for every year increase in age leads to a 0.016 unit increase in these same attitudes when controlling for other variables in the model. A resident in the Non-South who is more educated, older, and attends religious services less often will be more liberal than a Non-South resident who is less educated, younger and attends religious services more often as they will be more conservative.

The interaction between age and region of the country, total family income and region of the country, religious attendance and region of the country, and education and region of the country are not statistically significant. Since these interaction terms are not statistically significant I do not know how to justify showing graphs with the different slopes and interpretations of these slopes. There was one interaction which had a statistically significant interaction term which was race and region of the country. Graph 1 shows this interaction and the difference in slopes between South and Non-South.

Y(hat) = 3.0535 + 0.404Xsouth + 0.18573Xrace­ + -1.205Xsouthrace

South - Y(hat) = 3.0535 + 0.404Xsouth + 0.18573Xrace­ + -1.205Xsouthrace = 3.4575 – 1.01927X

Non-South - Y(hat) = 3.0535 – 0.18573Xrace

Part III

The Baylor Religion Survey Wave I has a multitude of questions concerning religious attitudes and beliefs including religious paranormal experiences. For my investigation, I wanted to predict the number of religious paranormal experiences for the respondents. In the survey there were six questions which dealt with this topic and a scale was created called ‘religious paranormal experiences’ that ranges from 0-6 with zero being no religious paranormal experiences and six being a respondent affirming all six different religious paranormal experiences[[1]](#footnote-1). Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics for these variables and all variables used in the model.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 1 - Descriptive Statistics for Variables Used in Religious Paranormal Experience Analysis | | | | | |
| Variable | Mean | Median | Min | Max | N |
| Education | 5.059 | 5 | 1 | 7 | 1690 |
| Income | 4.401 | 5 | 1 | 7 | 1611 |
| Biblical Literalism | 2.427 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1581 |
| Religious Attendance | 4.936 | 5 | 1 | 9 | 1699 |
| Region (South=1) | 0.266 |  | 0 | 1 | 1721 |
| Religious Paranormal Experiencea | 0.953 |  | 0 | 6 | 1721 |
| Catholicb | 0.217 |  | 0 | 1 | 1721 |
| Black Protestantb | 0.024 |  | 0 | 1 | 1721 |
| Evangelical Protestantb | 0.293 |  | 0 | 1 | 1721 |
| Mainline Protestantb | 0.252 |  | 0 | 1 | 1721 |
| Jewishb | 0.027 |  | 0 | 1 | 1721 |
| Otherb | 0.048 |  | 0 | 1 | 1721 |
| Note: a = Scale created with six related variables with α=0.66; b = Dummy Variable with 'None' religious tradition being reference category. Data Source: Baylor Religion Survey Wave 1 | | | | | |

The biblical literalism variable is coded such that the higher the number the more likely a person is to believe that the Bible is the literal word of god. Dummy variables were also created for region of the country with South being set equal to one and Non-South being set equal to zero. This dummy variable was created due to prior analysis which has shown a difference in responses with residents in the South compared to residents in other regions of the country. Table 1 also shows a set of dummy variables created to compare responses from different religious traditions with individuals without a religious tradition. After recoding these variables and creating the ‘religious paranormal experience’ scale, the regression model in Table 2 was created and following it will be an analysis of the results.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 2 - Regression of Religious Paranormal Experiences on Demographic and Religious Variables | | | |
| Variables | *b* | T-Value | Standardized Coefficient |
| Education | 0.042 | 1.89 | 0.050 |
| Income | -0.123\*\*\* | -5.37 | -0.141 |
| Biblical Literalism | -0.236\*\*\* | -6.1 | -0.193 |
| Religious Attendance | 0.073\*\*\* | 5.39 | 0.159 |
| Region (South=1) | 0.059 | 0.82 | 0.020 |
| Catholica | -0.219 | -1.84 | -0.068 |
| Black Protestanta | 0.843\*\*\* | 3.71 | 0.099 |
| Evangelical Protestanta | 0.242\* | 2 | 0.084 |
| Mainline Protestanta | -0.047 | -0.41 | -0.016 |
| Jewisha | -0.325 | -1.47 | -0.038 |
| Othera | 0.253 | 1.51 | 0.042 |
| Intercept | 1.4897 |  |  |
| *n* | 1472 |  |  |
|  | R2 = 0.1828 |  |  |
| Note: a = Dummy Variable with 'None' religious tradition being reference category. Data Source: Baylor Religion Survey Wave 1; \*P<.05, \*\*P<.01, \*\*\*P<.001 | | | |

The model above was examined for multicollinearity and after viewing variation inflation scores, eigenvalues, and the correlation matrix, the multicollinearity present in the model is acceptable. The model explains 18.28% of the variation in religious paranormal experience. There are five statistically significant variables in the model being income, biblical literalism, religious attendance, Black Protestant, and Evangelical Protestant. The model shown in Table 2 shows that for every unit increase in income there is a 0.123 unit decrease in having experienced religious paranormal experiences when controlling for education, biblical literalism, religious attendance, region, and the religious tradition variables in the model. What this means is that individuals with more income are less likely to have religious paranormal experiences and this could be explained by the fact that people with higher income are likely to be from higher education backgrounds and attend church less frequently than poorer individuals. This could also be due to the types of religious traditions that higher income individuals are more likely to be from or to attend.

The model also shows an interesting finding in the biblical literalism variable, which has the strongest effect in the model, because it seems counter-intuitive at first. The model shown in Table 2 shows that for every unit increase in biblical literalism, that for every unit increase towards believing the Bible is the literal word of god, there is a 0.236 unit decrease in religious paranormal experience when controlling for the variables in the model. This can be explained possibly in the types of people that believe the Bible is the literal word of god. I would imagine that these individuals are more black and white dichotomous type of thinkers and see the world with little room for variation or new types of experiences whereas individuals on the opposite end see the world a set of grey proposition and leave room for new experiences or are more open to spiritual things.

Religious attendance is another variable that is significant in this model, but this fact is not as profound as it was for the biblical literalism variable. For every unit increase in religious attendance, there is a corresponding 0.073 unit increase in religious paranormal experience when controlling for other variables in the model. This seems to make sense intuitively because as a person attends religious services more they have more opportunities to experience a religious experience while at the service. These individuals probably value religion more in their lives if they are attending more and thus are more open to encountering some sort of religious paranormal experience.

The two religious tradition variables that are significant are Black Protestant and Evangelical Protestants compared to the reference category of no religious tradition. For Black Protestants, there is a difference in means with those with no religious tradition and they are 0.843 times more likely to experience a religious paranormal experience than those with no religious tradition when controlling for the other variables in the model. For Evangelical Protestants, there is also a difference in means with those of no religious tradition and they are 0.242 times more likely to have such an experience when controlling for the variables in the model. For these two traditions, the explanation may lie in the type of worship styles they conduct at their religious services which makes them more likely to have such a religious paranormal experience. The other traditions that were not significantly different than no religious tradition tend to be more contemplative and ordered in their worship styles and would not likely have room (structurally) for there to be an opportunity to experience such an event. With the Black Protestant and Evangelical Protestant traditions stressing more of an emotional atmosphere in their services and outside of them, individuals from these traditions would be more inclined to have religious paranormal experiences than individuals from other traditions or no tradition at all.

The conclusion to this regression model is that we can predict who will be more likely to have religious paranormal experiences and they are individuals who attend religious services more frequently, have lower incomes, have lower belief in biblical literalism and come from either a Black protestant or Evangelical Protestant background. Of course, this only accounts for 18.28% of the variation so other variables are needed to completely explain and predict who has religious experiences but as a cursory glance into this topic this model will suffice.

1. For a list of all seven religious paranormal experience questions and all variable questions listed in this model please visit: <http://www.thearda.com/qbshow.asp?id=392>. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)