

A short scale for measuring political secularism

Kai Arzheimer*

1 Introduction

Social scientists have long been aware that religion is a powerful political force and that by implication, significant changes to the religious makeup of a society will have far-reaching political repercussions. The growing number of people who identify as Muslims is one such change that has become a hot button issue in Europe. However, Muslims currently make up just five per cent of Europe's population, and even under a high immigration/high fertility scenario, their share will rise to less than 15 per cent over the next three decades (Pew Research Center, 2017). At least numerically, *secularisation* is a much more important development in Europe.

This is the author's version of the paper. Please cite as Kai Arzheimer (2022). 'A short scale for measuring political secularism'. In: *Politics and Religion* forthcoming

Secularisation is a multi-faceted term that denotes both social and intrapersonal processes (Sommerville, 1998) that diminish the role of religion at the societal, group, and individual level (Stolz and Tanner, 2019, p. 2). At the micro-level, applied research usefully distinguishes between a decline in membership and practice on the one hand and a decline in individual beliefs on the other. The former may outpace the latter, creating "un-churched" segments of the population that still believe but no longer belong (Davie, 1990). However, in their global survey of religious life, Norris and Inglehart (2011) demonstrate that in some parts of the world and most notably in Western Europe, *both* membership and belief have been on the retreat for decades. These trends continue to the present day, making Western Europe "one of the world's most secular regions" where "many do not describe themselves as Christian" (Pew Research Center, 2018, p. 6).

For many of these citizens (in Europe and elsewhere), being secular is not just the absence of religion: they embrace *secularism* as a non-religious world-view. In the broadest possible sense, secularism is an idea that "seeks to restrict religious elements" (Stolz and Tanner, 2019). While such an outlook has multiple dimensions, one particularly interesting one is political secularism, a preference to limit religion's role in politics (Beard et al., 2013).

One prominent account (Voas, 2009) of religious change in Europe that is well supported by empirical data holds that long-running societal secularisation brings about individual secularism, via a mechanism of changing socialisation patterns and generational replacement. At the same time, individual (political) secularism may lead to demand for policy changes (e.g. full legal recognition of same-sex partnerships) that in turn drive further societal secularisation. Somewhat paradoxically, secularisation

*Department of Political Science, University of Mainz, Germany

in Europe is also contributing to a re-politicisation of religion: it makes societies more culturally diverse and results in polarisation between religious organisations and citizens on the one hand and their political secular opponents on the other (Pickel, 2017).

To gauge the importance of these issues on the micro-level, a survey measure for political secularism is required. Yet, although there is a plethora of scales for measuring religiousness, secularism as such is rarely studied, and not a single psychometrically evaluated instrument for measuring *politically secular* attitudes exists.

In this research note, I briefly review the concept of political secularism and present a cluster of items which target it. Using data from four large population representative samples, I show that these items form a short internally consistent scale, and that this scale also displays convergent and discriminant validity.

2 What is political secularism, and how can it be measured?

Rates of religious membership and participation have been a concern for social scientists since the inception of sociology in the 19th century. Attempts to complement them by instruments that capture more private religious practice as well as the structure of religious beliefs and attitudes hark back to at least the 1950s. Allport and Ross's distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic orientations (Allport and Ross, 1967) is perhaps the most famous example of this early research. Less than two decades later, Gorsuch (1984) reviewed the many instruments already existing at the time and strongly argued against their further proliferation. Yet after another quarter-century, Cutting and Walsh (2008) counted nearly 180 scales for measuring religiousness, and their number is still growing.

Almost all of these scales implicitly follow Sommerville's classic notion that secular attitudes represent a "*shift of attention* from ultimate (religious) concerns to proximate concerns" (Sommerville, 1998, p. 250), i.e. a lapse from or a neglect of religion. While such "passive secularism" is an important phenomenon in itself, "active secularism", i.e. "the affirmation of secular identity and beliefs" (Campbell et al., 2018, p. 553) is arguably a more interesting cluster of attitudes. While passively secular citizens are by definition indifferent towards religion but may still accept its traditional role in society and politics, actively secular citizens are positively opposed to religious arguments and authority, which may spur them into political activity and lead them to adopt more extreme positions (see, e.g. Brockway, 2018; Layman, Campbell et al., 2021; Layman and Weaver, 2016).

Just like religion, secularism has several "dimensions" (Campbell et al., 2018) or "facets" (Beard et al., 2013). These include philosophical convictions, social values, secular identities, and negative emotions towards religious authority and doctrine, all of which can have political consequences.

In a narrower sense, *political secularism* refers to one's attitudes on "the proper role of religious beliefs in political life" (Beard et al., 2013, p. 758). More succinctly political secularism holds that religious beliefs should not be used to justify curbing individual freedoms, and should play little, if any role in political debates.

As a political and legal idea, political secularism is well-researched (Bhargava, 2008; Cliteur and Ellian, 2020). But there is not one validated scale for political secularism at the micro-level. This is problematic, because politically secular views are believed

to become more and more widespread in Europe and even in the US, and because they represent a particularly disruptive type of active secularism. This is because they are conceptually linked to a host of polarising “morality policies”, which pit religious views and actors against notions of individual freedom (Mourão Permoser, 2019). If one wants to assess the alleged spread of politically secular views as well as their impact on politics, it is therefore desirable to have an instrument that is both reliable and valid and preferably comprises multiple indicators.

But even single-item questions or short batteries that tap into politically secular views are rare in the extant literature. Beard et al. (2013), who prominently make the case for researching political secularism at the micro-level, propose only two items that fit their own definition: “Do you worry the government is getting too involved in the issue of morality?” and “Should churches and other houses of worship keep out of political matters” (Beard et al., 2013, p. 760).¹

Brockway (2018), in his useful study of “committed seculars”, relies on a single item that refers to one important but very specific aspect of political secularism, namely the separation of church and state. Similarly, Castle (2015) measures opinions on “religious establishment” using an index comprising four items that refer to government institutions and officials engaging in and supporting religious activities.

Finally, Ribberink, Achterberg and Houtman (2018) measure “anti-religiosity” by combining four items that were included in the 1998 and 2008 waves of the ISSP survey. Two of these items refer to respondents’ views of believers and their creeds as intolerant and belligerent. Such opinions may be secular, but they are not *politically secular* in the aforementioned sense. The two other items tap into attitudes on the role of religious leaders in politics. These items are a better fit for the concept of political secularism but again address a single, rather narrow and specific aspect of it.

Conversely, a valid and reliable scale for measuring political secularism should consist of several items that cover the breadth of the relationship between religion and politics. While developing such a scale from scratch would have its own obvious benefits, re-using existing items from large-scale surveys has at least three important advantages. First, it is already clear that these items “work” in surveys of the general public. Second, replicating single items or group of items opens up the possibility of meaningful comparisons between new and existing surveys. Third, if a whole set of items is replicated that form a scale, its reliability and validity can be assessed across different settings.

The questionnaire of an older survey (“Church and Religion in an enlarged Europe” (CREE)), which ran in 2006 in various European countries and targeted attitudes on “religion, society, and life in general” (Pollack, Pickel and Müller, 2007, p. 20), provides a useful starting point. Its large pool of questions contains five items that closely fit Beard et al.’s (2013) definition of political secularism.

One of these items (*Symbols*, see below) was taken from the earlier “Religious and Moral Pluralism” survey. Another one (*Debates*) came from the ISSP survey series and is one of the two that were also used by Ribberink, Achterberg and Houtman (2018). The remaining three were written by members of the CREE team.²

These five (and also some of the other) items were then subsequently included in the 2012 iteration of Germany’s biannual General Social Survey (ALLBUS) in somewhat modified form:

1. “The EU treaties should contain a reference to the Christian god” (*God EU*) (reversed)

2. “Religious symbols such as crucifixes should be banned from state schools” (*Symbols*)
3. “Education in state schools should be free of religious elements” (*Education*)
4. “Scientific research on humans should not be limited by religious norms and values” (*Science*)
5. “Religious norms and values have no place in public debates on political issues” (*Debates*)

When the “Problems of Representation in the Domain of Biopolitics” (PRDB) project set out in 2016 to measure political secularism and its effects at the micro-level, it adopted these five items for its nationally representative survey. For comparability with the ALLBUS and because the rewritten items are even better suited for measuring political secularism,³ the PRDB project also used the new wording.

The PRDB project chose these items because collectively, they capture different aspects of political secularism as defined by Beard et al. The first question was highly controversial in European Union politics in the 2000s and is still useful as a supranational variation of the classic question about the separation of church and state. The second and third items relate to the role of religion in state schools, which is another contentious issue for secularists in many societies. The fourth item alludes to the role of religious authority in one specific domain of regulatory politics where appeals to religious doctrine are frequent. More generally, it also taps into secular support for science and rationality. Finally, the fifth item spells out the core tenet of political secularism: that religion should play no role in politics.

3 Data

The analyses presented in the remainder of this research note are based on data from the 2012 ALLBUS round (GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften, 2019) and the 2016 PRDB survey (Arzheimer, 2016). Both datasets are available in their entirety from Germany’s national data archive, where they can be located by following their respective DOIs.

Because of the persistent political, social, and economic east-west differences within Germany, both studies drew separate and disproportionately large samples of respondents from Germany’s eastern states. For the present research question, this is particularly apt because West German politics was dominated for decades by a Christian Democratic party, whereas Eastern Germany was a self-avowed irreligious state. As a consequence of this research design, the analyses are effectively based on four large ($n = 740\text{--}2538$), independent samples.

While the ALLBUS usually uses an odd (five, seven, or eleven) number of categories for measuring agreement, they retained the CREE’s original four-point format. Conversely, the PRDB survey employed five categories with a neutral mid-point for almost all items and adjusted the items’ response options accordingly. Otherwise, the wording of the items is identical across the samples.

4 Reliability and Dimensionality

4.1 Methods

Any presumptive scale must be internally consistent, i.e. its items should tap into a single common dimension. Internal consistency is one important type of reliability, which in turn is a necessary but insufficient condition for validity. Traditionally, internal consistency is assessed by calculating Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach, 1951), which can be interpreted as the mean of all possible split-half reliabilities across a given set of items.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) provides a complementary perspective that is more nuanced and can also help mitigate some of the well-known problems⁴ linked to the exclusive reliance on alpha (Viladrich, Angulo-Brunet and Doval, 2017). However, the common practice of establishing unidimensionality mechanically by assessing the fit of a single-factor model may also be misleading, because established fit indices as well as newer measures may be too sensitive to trivial violations under some circumstances while failing to identify clearly multidimensional structures in others (Reise et al., 2013). Therefore, a detailed inspection of the measurement model that takes into account not just various fit indices and newer variations of alpha but also the factor loadings and possibly alternative specifications of the measurement model is required.

One final complexity arises from the ordinal nature of the survey responses. While items with as few as five categories are sometimes treated as if they were continuous (Viladrich, Angulo-Brunet and Doval, 2017), the WLSMV estimator, which was specifically developed for large samples of ordinal measurements, was employed for both surveys. Therefore, the factor loadings are probit coefficients, and variants of alpha that account for the ordinal nature of the data (Green and Yang, 2009) were calculated. Threshold parameters are omitted from the main tables but documented in the appendix.

4.2 Findings

[Table 1 about here.]

Table 1 shows the estimates for a preliminary measurement model for political secularism. All five items display substantial factor loadings in the correct direction. (Ordinal) alpha varies between 0.7 and 0.83, a range that is usually seen as acceptable to good. Because the measurement model assumes that the items are congeneric whereas alpha presupposes tau-equivalent items, (ordinal) omega is a more appropriate measure of internal consistency (Viladrich, Angulo-Brunet and Doval, 2017). The respective row in Table 1 shows that values for omega are indeed slightly higher, but the differences are minuscule.

The evidence from the fit indices, however, is more mixed. The CFI and the SRMR show an acceptable fit in all four samples. Conversely, the TLI and the RMSEA indicate that model fit is unsatisfactory for all respondents but those interviewed in the east in 2012.

[Table 2 about here.]

A closer look at the bivariate correlations reveals that there is a particularly close relationship between the two items referring to the role of religion in state schools,

which can be explained by their very similar content. This in turn suggests that allowing their error variances to correlate could improve the model fit substantially.

From a substantive point of view, however, it is preferable to remove the *Symbols* item from the scale. First, having two items that refer to public education gives disproportionate weight to this specific aspect of political secularism. Second, while both items are similar, “religious elements” is more general and already encompasses “religious symbols”. Third, the meaning of the former item is also clearer, because almost all federal states provide some form of religious education in state schools, whereas crucifixes in schools (and other public buildings) are closely linked to the Bavarian Christian Democrats (CSU) and their representation of Bavarian identity. Moreover, because “religious symbols” also include the hijab, this item may also tap into anti-Muslim sentiment. And finally, short(er) scales have clear advantages: they often provide a more realistic assessment of reliability, increase the motivation of and decrease the burden on respondents, and are cheaper to administer (Gogol et al., 2014).

Table 2 shows the estimates for the four-item measurement model. The factor loadings remain high and their direction is still correct. Omega and alpha are somewhat lower, which is expected because they partly depend on the number of items, but still acceptable. Finally, the CFI, TLI, and SRMR indicate near perfect fit in all four samples. The RMSEA indicates a very good fit for all samples but the eastern one in 2016.

Taken together, these findings suggest that the four items form a consistent scale that works reasonably well across slightly different formats (four vs five scale points) and cultural settings (Germany’s staunchly secular eastern states vs the more religiously diverse states in the west). The next section will assess the question whether the scale is also valid.

5 Validity

Many different types of validity have been proposed in the literature. However, they all relate to the same underlying question: to what degree does an instrument tap into what it is supposed to measure? Thus, they should be seen as “tests” that provide (sometimes conflicting) evidence on the question of validity, which “can never be answered with absolute certainty” (Bollen, 1989, p. 185).

This uncertainty is fundamental: in an ideal world, validity could be quantified simply by the correlation of a scale with some universally accepted external criterion, but in reality, there is usually no such gold standard. Like reliability, validity is therefore best investigated making use of CFA, which opens up many sophisticated possibilities (see e.g. O’Leary-Kelly and Vokurka, 1998).

In this section, I follow a comparatively simple approach (see e.g. Hayes, Glynn and Shanahan, 2005, p. 309): I demonstrate that scores on the secularism scale are highly correlated with measurements that they should correlate with (convergent validity), yet remain distinguishable from them (discriminant validity). This provides a more rounded view of the scale’s validity than the relationship with a single criterion and is a first step towards a full nomological validation, which would test a whole network of theoretical propositions and auxiliary assumptions (see, e.g., Hagger, Gucciardi and Chatzisarantis, 2017). There are two constructs available across the four samples that can be used for validation, one rather specific, the other more general.

Attitudes on a specific policy, namely *legal access to abortion*, form the first of these constructs. The regulation of abortion is widely seen as one of the most prominent “morality issues” (Mooney and Schuldt, 2008; Studlar, Cagossi and Duval,

2013) worldwide. Efforts to limit legal access to abortions are almost universally spearheaded by religious organisations, who explicitly claim that they act on of their beliefs. This suggests that political secularism should be positively associated with more permissive views on abortion. But because this is a single specific policy, because many other factors may shape one's views on abortion, and because the items used in the surveys make no reference to religious doctrine, this correlation should be far from perfect.

All surveys include four identical or very similar items on the regulation of abortion (see appendix A.2). A preliminary analysis shows that all items display substantial loadings on the common factor. Ordinal alpha is high and ordinal omega is acceptable across all four samples (see Table 7 in the appendix) so that the construct may be used for validation.

The second, more general construct is a composite measure of religiousness that encompasses individual and collective religious practice on the one hand (prayer and attendance) and self-conception as more or less religious on the other (see appendix A.3). All three items display substantial loadings on the common factor. Alpha is high, and omega is acceptable across all four samples (see Table 8 in the appendix).

Following Beard et al., I have argued in section 2 that political secularism should not be understood as the absence of religiousness but rather as an attitude on the proper role of religion in political life. For the validity of the political secularism scale, its correlation with religiousness is therefore crucial. Overall, a strong negative relationship is to be expected: non-religious citizens should be opposed to religious interference in the public sphere, whereas believers should support institutional arrangements that make outcomes which align with their beliefs more likely. Having said that, many religious citizens (particularly in some protestant traditions) may still favour a clear separation of church and state. Conversely, lukewarm believers and even non-believers may see a societal value in religion.

[Table 3 about here.]

To investigate the validity of the secularism scale, a joint model of secularism and attitudes on abortion was estimated (see the tables in appendix A.4.1 for the full results). Table 3 shows that the two-factor models, which treat secularism and abortion attitudes as separate constructs, fit the data very well. In line with expectations, the correlation is clearly positive (more secular respondents do indeed have more permissive views on legal access to abortion) but far from perfect, with values between 0.35 and 0.53. Conversely, assuming that all items measure a single common factor results in a dramatic decline of model fit to values that would be unacceptable by common standards. This provides some initial evidence for the validity of the secularism scale.

[Table 4 about here.]

In the next step, a joint model for secularism and religiousness was estimated (see the tables in appendix A.4.2 for the full results). Table 4 shows that a two-factor solution again achieves an acceptable fit across all four samples.⁵ In line with expectations, the estimated correlation between secularism and religiousness is negative and quite substantial, with values ranging from -0.56 to -0.70. To ascertain that political secularism and religiousness are indeed closely related but not identical, again all items were forced to load on a single common factor. Once more this results in a

dramatic increase in χ^2 and a decline in all measures of model fit to values that would be unacceptable by common standards.

Taken together, these findings already provide strong evidence for the convergent and discriminant validity of the political secularism scale. Ideally, they would be complemented by a full nomological validation in future research.

6 Conclusion

Recent research highlights the importance of political secularism as an individual attitude that affects political behaviour. While secularism as a political and philosophical concept has existed for centuries, and while there is a plethora of measures for individual religiousness, there is no established instrument for measuring political secularism at the micro-level.

In this research note, I introduce a cluster of items which tap into individual political secularism. Applying CFA, I show that these items form an internally consistent scale. Importantly, good internal consistency can be achieved with just four items. Such short scales are becoming increasingly popular, because they reduce both surveys costs and the burden on respondents.

The secularism scale also displays a moderate to strong positive correlation with permissive views on abortion and a strongly negative correlation with religiousness, yet it remains clearly distinguishable from both. This suggests that the scale is not just a reliable but also a valid instrument for measuring political secularism.

However, there are some limitations. First, the analyses presented in this note rely on surveys that were carried out in Germany only, albeit both in the territory of the former Federal Republic of Germany and the former German Democratic Republic. In future research, they should be complemented by comparative survey data to ascertain that measurements are invariant (Davidov, 2009) across cultural, political and linguistic borders. Ideally, they would be included in large-scale project such as the European Social Survey.

Second, and relatedly, the item referencing the EU treaties should obviously be confined to the EU's 27 member states. In an even broader context, it would have to be adapted, e.g. by instead referring to the national constitution.⁶

Third, while internal consistency is a central aspect of the scale's reliability, it is unrelated to test-retest reliability (McCrae et al., 2011). Political secularism itself should be a relatively stable attitude. If the scale is reliable, measurements of secularism should be relatively stable, too, at least in the short and medium term. Ideally, future surveys should therefore administer the items repeatedly so that we may learn more about the scale's properties.

But ultimately, the usefulness of the scale can only be gauged in applied research: including the scale in rich and substantively interesting models of political attitudes and behaviour will yield the true test of nomological validation.

References

- Allport, Gordon W. and J. Michael Ross (1967). 'Personal Religious Orientation and Prejudice'. In: *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 5, pp. 432–443.
- Arzheimer, Kai (2016). *Problems of Representation in the Domain of Biopolitics (PRDB) – Einstellungen zur Präimplantationsdiagnostik*. DOI: 10.7802/2028.

- Arzheimer, Kai (2022). 'A short scale for measuring political secularism'. In: *Politics and Religion* forthcoming.
- Beard, T. Randolph et al. (2013). 'Secularism, Religion, and Political Choice in the United States'. In: *Politics and Religion* 6.4, pp. 753–777. doi: 10.1017/S1755048313000047.
- Bhargava, Rajeev (2008). 'Political Secularism'. In: *The Oxford Handbook of Political Theory*. Ed. by John S. Dryzek, Bonnie Honig and Anne Phillips. Oxford University Press, nil. doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199548439.003.0035.
- Bollen, Kenneth A. (1989). *Structural Equations with Latent Variables*. New York: Wiley.
- Brockway, Mark (2018). 'Home on Sunday, Home on Tuesday? Secular Political Participation in the United States'. In: *Politics and Religion* 11.2, pp. 334–363. doi: 10.1017/S175504831700061X.
- Bumpass, Larry L. (1997). 'The Measurement of Public Opinion on Abortion: the Effects of Survey Design'. In: *Family Planning Perspectives* 29.4. Nur interessant als Beleg für die Herkunft der Abortion-Items (GSS -> Allbus), p. 177. doi: 10.2307/2953382.
- Campbell, David E. et al. (2018). 'Putting Politics First: The Impact of Politics on American Religious and Secular Orientations'. In: *American Journal of Political Science* 62.3, pp. 551–565. doi: 10.1111/ajps.12365.
- Castle, Jeremiah J. (2015). 'The Electoral Impact of Public Opinion on Religious Establishment'. In: *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 54.4, pp. 814–832. doi: 10.1111/jssr.12228.
- Cliteur, Paul and Afshin Ellian (2020). 'The Five Models for State and Religion: Atheism, Theocracy, State Church, Multiculturalism, and Secularism'. In: *ICL Journal* 14.1, pp. 103–132. doi: 10.1515/icl-2018-0056.
- Cronbach, Lee J. (1951). 'Coefficient Alpha and the Internal Structure of Tests'. In: *Psychometrika* 16, pp. 297–334.
- Cutting, Marsha and Michelle Walsh (2008). 'Religiosity Scales: What Are We Measuring in Whom?' In: *Archive for the Psychology of Religion/Archiv Für Religionspsychologie* 30. Review of scales, pp. 137–154.
- Davidov, Eldad (2009). 'Measurement Equivalence of Nationalism and Constructive Patriotism in the ISSP: 34 Countries in a Comparative Perspective'. In: *Political Analysis* 17.1, pp. 64–82. doi: 10.1093/pan/mpn014.
- Davie, Grace (1990). 'Believing without Belonging: Is This the Future of Religion in Britain?' In: *Social Compass* 37.4, pp. 455–469.
- GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften (2019). *German General Social Survey - ALLBUS 2012 / German General Social Survey - ALLBUS 2012*. doi: 10.4232/1.13418.
- Gogol, Katarzyna et al. (2014). "'My Questionnaire Is Too Long!' The Assessments of Motivational-affective Constructs With Three-item and Single-item Measures'. In: *Contemporary Educational Psychology* 39.3, pp. 188–205. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2014.04.002>.
- Gorsuch, Richard L. (1984). 'Measurement: the Boon and Bane of Investigating Religion.' In: *American Psychologist* 39.3, pp. 228–236. doi: 10.1037/0003-066x.39.3.228.
- Green, Samuel B. and Yanyun Yang (2009). 'Reliability of Summed Item Scores Using Structural Equation Modeling: An Alternative to Coefficient Alpha'. In: *Psychometrika* 74.1, pp. 155–167. doi: 10.1007/s11336-008-9099-3.
- Hagger, Martin S., Daniel F. Gucciardi and Nikos L. D. Chatzisarantis (2017). 'On Nomological Validity and Auxiliary Assumptions: The Importance of Simultaneously Testing Effects in Social Cognitive Theories Applied to Health Behavior and Some Guidelines'. In: *Frontiers in Psychology* 8, p. 1933. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01933.

- Hayes, Andrew F., Carroll J. Glynn and James Shanahan (2005). 'Willingness to Self-Censor: A Construct and Measurement Tool for Public Opinion Research'. In: *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 17.3, pp. 298–323. DOI: 10.1093/ijpor/edh073.
- Layman, Geoffrey C., David E. Campbell et al. (2021). 'Secularism and American Political Behavior'. In: *Public Opinion Quarterly* 85.1, pp. 79–100. DOI: 10.1093/poq/nfab011.
- Layman, Geoffrey C. and Christopher L. Weaver (2016). 'Religion and Secularism among American Party Activists'. In: *Politics and Religion* 9.2, pp. 271–295. DOI: 10.1017/S1755048316000079.
- McCrae, Robert R. et al. (2011). 'Internal Consistency, Retest Reliability, and Their Implications For Personality Scale Validity'. In: *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 15.1, pp. 28–50.
- Mooney, Christopher Z. and Richard G. Schuldt (2008). 'Does Morality Policy Exist? Testing a Basic Assumption'. In: *Policy Studies Journal* 36.2, pp. 199–218. DOI: 10.1111/j.1541-0072.2008.00262.x.
- Mourão Permoser, Julia (2019). 'What are Morality Policies? The Politics of Values in a Post-Secular World'. In: *Political Studies Review* 17.3, pp. 310–325. DOI: 10.1177/1478929918816538.
- Norris, Pippa and Ronald Inglehart (2011). *Sacred and secular. Religion and politics worldwide*. 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press.
- O'Leary-Kelly, Scott W. and Robert J. Vokurka (1998). 'The Empirical Assessment of Construct Validity'. In: *Journal of Operations Management* 16.4, pp. 387–405. DOI: 10.1016/S0272-6963(98)00020-5.
- Pew Research Center (2017). *Europe's Growing Muslim Population*. Pew Research Center. URL: <https://www.pewforum.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/7/2017/11/FULL-REPORT-FOR-WEB-POSTING.pdf>.
- (2018). *Being Christian in Western Europe*. Pew Research Center. URL: <https://www.pewforum.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/7/2018/05/Being-Christian-in-Western-Europe-FOR-WEB1.pdf>.
- Pickel, Gert (2017). 'Secularization - An Empirically Consolidated Narrative in the Face of an Increasing Influence of Religion on Politics'. In: *Política & Sociedade* 16.36, pp. 259–294. DOI: 10.5007/2175-7984.2017v16n36p259.
- Pollack, Detlef, Gert Pickel and Olaf Müller (2007). *Church and Religion in an Enlarged Europe (C&R 2006). Cumulated Codebook*. Frankfurt/Oder: European University Viadrina / Chair for Comparative Sociology of Culture. URL: https://www.uni-muenster.de/imperia/md/content/soziologie/personen/pollack/church_religion_codebuch.pdf.
- Reise, Steven P. et al. (2013). 'Multidimensionality and Structural Coefficient Bias in Structural Equation Modeling'. In: *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 73.1, pp. 5–26. DOI: 10.1177/0013164412449831.
- Ribberink, Egbert, Peter Achterberg and Dick Houtman (2018). 'Religious Polarization: Contesting Religion in Secularized Western European Countries'. In: *Journal of Contemporary Religion* 33.2, pp. 209–227. DOI: 10.1080/13537903.2018.1469262.
- Sommerville, C. John (1998). 'Secular Society/Religious Population: Our Tacit Rules for Using the Term "Secularization"'. In: *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 37.2, pp. 249–253. DOI: 10.2307/1387524.
- Stolz, Jörg and Pascal Tanner (2019). 'Secularization, Secularity, and Secularism in the New Millennium: Macro-theories and Research'. In: *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*. Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics. Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.013.792.

- Studlar, Donley T., Alessandro Cagossi and Robert D. Duval (2013). 'Is Morality Policy Different? Institutional Explanations for Post-War Western Europe'. In: *Journal of European Public Policy* 20.3, pp. 353–371. DOI: 10.1080/13501763.2013.761503.
- Viladrich, Carme, Ariadna Angulo-Brunet and Eduardo Doval (2017). 'A Journey Around Alpha and Omega To Estimate Internal Consistency Reliability'. In: *Anales de Psicologia* 33.3, pp. 755–782. DOI: 10.6018/analesps.33.3.268401.
- Voas, David (2009). 'The Rise and Fall of Fuzzy Fidelity in Europe'. In: *European Sociological Review* 25.2, pp. 155–168. DOI: 10.1093/esr/jcn044.

Notes

¹A third item (“Do religious beliefs most influence your thinking about government and public affairs?”) is more a matter of self-perception than a statement about the desired role of religion in public life.

²Personal communication with Olaf Müller, one of the former CREE project members.

³The *Debates* item originally more specifically referred to “religious leaders” trying to influence public debate. Because the new wording is more general, it better captures political secularism. Other modifications are very minor.

⁴Alpha can be misleading if the items are not tau-equivalent or if the structure of the underlying measurement model is not simple. In its original formulation, it is also not adequate if measurements are ordinal. Finally, striving for a particularly high value of alpha during scale development may lead to the inclusion of redundant indicators, because alpha is also a function of the number of items.

⁵For the West German sample from 2012, the TLI is below the usual cut-off value of 0.95, but the other indices still suggest a reasonable fit.

⁶The CREE project used this variation of the item in Russia.

A Appendix

A.1 Thresholds for the measurement models from section 4.2

[Table 5 about here.]

[Table 6 about here.]

A.2 Measurement model for attitudes on abortion

The ALLBUS 2012 included an item battery – first developed in the 1970s for the American General Social Survey (Bumpass, 1997) – that taps into attitudes on abortion. Respondents were presented with a set of vignettes and asked whether abortion should be legal under these circumstances. Four of these questions were replicated in the PRDB study. They read as follows:

Should abortion be legal ...

1. ... if there was a high probability that the baby would suffer from a serious birth defect (*Birth Defect*)
2. ... if the pregnancy posed a serious health risk to the mother (*Health*)
3. ... if the pregnancy was the result of rape (*Rape*)
4. ... if the woman wanted an abortion, whatever her reasons (*Choice*)

A slight complication arises from a split-half experiment in the 2012 ALLBUS that varied the situations. As a result, about 50 per cent of the respondents were not presented with the *Rape* item. Because their answers are missing completely at random (MCAR) and the estimator handles missing values transparently, this poses no special problem. In the same experimental group, respondents were given the opportunity to qualify their affirmative answer so that they had three options instead of two: “yes”, “yes, but only during the first three months of pregnancy”, and “no”. For the analysis, this was recoded as just “yes” versus “no”. Compared to the respondents who only had a binary choice in the first place, this does not change the marginal distribution.

[Table 7 about here.]

A.3 Measurement model for religiousness

Religiousness was measured by three items from the ALLBUS study :

1. Would you describe yourself as (*Intensity*: 1 extremely non-religious ... 10 extremely religious)
2. About how often do you pray (*Prayer*: 1 never, 2 less than several times a year, 3 several times a year, 4 between one and three times a month, 5 once a week, 6 more than once a week, 7 daily)
3. As a rule, how often do you go to church - or to the mosque, synagogue or other house of God? (*Church Attendance*: 1 never, 2 less than several times a year, 3 several times a year, 4 between one and three times a month, 5 once a week, 6 more than once a week)

The PRDB study used the same wording but a slightly different answer format. For *Church Attendance*, there was an additional category “daily”. Because this was chosen by just 5 respondents, it was recoded to “more than once per week”, which brings the variable in line with the ALLBUS. For *Intensity*, the PRDB used a scale with the same labels for the endpoints, but eleven instead of ten steps. Because of this slightly greater spread, factor loadings for this item are not strictly comparable across time.

[Table 8 about here.]

A.4 Convergent and discriminant validity: full models

A.4.1 Attitudes on abortion

[Table 9 about here.]

[Table 10 about here.]

A.4.2 Religiousness

[Table 11 about here.]

[Table 12 about here.]

List of Tables

1	Measurement of political secularism by five items (factor loadings only)	16
2	Measurement of political secularism by four items (factor loadings only)	17
3	Secularism and abortion	18
4	Secularism and religiousness	19
5	Threshold parameters for the measurement of political secularism by five items	20
6	Threshold parameters for the measurement of political secularism by four items	21
7	Measurement of abortion attitude	22
8	Measurement of religiosity	23
9	Political secularism and abortion: two-factor model	25
10	Political secularism and abortion: one-factor model	27
11	Political secularism and religiousness: two-factor model	29
12	Political secularism and religiousness: one-factor model model	31

	West 2016	East 2016	West 2012	East 2012
Loading: Symbols	0.68*** (0.02)	0.77*** (0.02)	0.63*** (0.02)	0.71*** (0.02)
Loading: Science	0.60*** (0.02)	0.52*** (0.03)	0.51*** (0.02)	0.64*** (0.02)
Loading: Education	0.75*** (0.02)	0.83*** (0.02)	0.76*** (0.02)	0.81*** (0.02)
Loading: Debates	0.67*** (0.02)	0.76*** (0.02)	0.55*** (0.02)	0.66*** (0.02)
Loading: God EU	0.59*** (0.03)	0.66*** (0.03)	0.43*** (0.02)	0.49*** (0.03)
Observations	1269	739	2334	1121
CFI	0.92	0.97	0.95	0.99
TLI	0.84	0.94	0.89	0.99
RMSEA_Estimate	0.18	0.14	0.11	0.05
SRMR	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.01
Parameters	25	25	20	20
Ordinal α	0.78	0.83	0.70	0.79
Ordinal ω_3 (ρ_{NL})	0.81	0.85	0.73	0.81

*** $p < 0.001$; ** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$. Threshold parameters are omitted from the table for better legibility. Full set of parameters in Table 5 in the appendix

Table 1: Measurement of political secularism by five items (factor loadings only)

	West 2016	East 2016	West 2012	East 2012
Loading: Science	0.67*** (0.02)	0.56*** (0.03)	0.54*** (0.02)	0.64*** (0.03)
Loading: Education	0.59*** (0.02)	0.72*** (0.03)	0.63*** (0.02)	0.76*** (0.03)
Loading: Debates	0.75*** (0.02)	0.84*** (0.02)	0.67*** (0.02)	0.70*** (0.02)
Loading: God EU	0.59*** (0.03)	0.66*** (0.03)	0.42*** (0.02)	0.50*** (0.03)
Observations	1269	739	2330	1121
CFI	1.00	0.99	0.99	1.00
TLI	1.00	0.96	0.96	1.00
RMSEA_Estimate	0.02	0.11	0.07	0.00
SRMR	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.00
Parameters	20	20	16	16
Ordinal α	0.74	0.79	0.65	0.74
Ordinal ω_3 (ρ_{NL})	0.74	0.84	0.66	0.75

*** $p < 0.001$; ** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$. Threshold parameters are omitted from the table for better legibility. Full set of parameters in Table 6 in the appendix

Table 2: Measurement of political secularism by four items (factor loadings only)

	West 2016		East 2016		West 2012		East 2012	
	two factors	one factor	two factors	one factor	two factors	one factor	two factors	one factor
ϕ	0.46*** (0.04)		0.53*** (0.06)		0.45*** (0.03)		0.35*** (0.05)	
Observations	1269	1269	740	740	2354	2354	1122	1122
CFI	0.98	0.85	0.97	0.83	0.96	0.82	0.99	0.85
TLI	0.97	0.79	0.96	0.76	0.95	0.74	0.99	0.79
RMSEA_Estimate	0.05	0.13	0.05	0.12	0.05	0.11	0.03	0.11
SRMR	0.04	0.12	0.05	0.12	0.05	0.11	0.05	0.16
ChiSqM_Value	71.93	473.07	52.67	240.40	128.39	574.54	34.07	274.75
Parameters	29	28	29	28	25	24	25	24

*** $p < 0.001$; ** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$

Table 3: Secularism and abortion

	West 2016		East 2016		West 2012		East 2012	
	two factors	one factor	two factors	one factor	two factors	one factor	two factors	one factor
ϕ	-0.70*** (0.02)		-0.67*** (0.03)		-0.70*** (0.02)		-0.56*** (0.03)	
Observations	1269	1269	740	740	2357	2357	1122	1122
CFI	0.96	0.85	0.97	0.79	0.92	0.80	0.95	0.71
TLI	0.94	0.77	0.94	0.68	0.86	0.71	0.92	0.56
RMSEA_Estimate	0.07	0.13	0.07	0.17	0.08	0.12	0.07	0.17
SRMR	0.03	0.06	0.02	0.08	0.03	0.06	0.03	0.10
ChiSqM_Value	86.19	310.44	59.70	305.69	228.41	515.70	90.60	472.31
Parameters	30	29	30	29	26	25	26	25

*** $p < 0.001$; ** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$

Table 4: Secularism and religiousness

	West 2016	East 2016	West 2012	East 2012
Threshold 1: Symbols	-0.23*** (0.04)	-1.12*** (0.06)	-0.36*** (0.03)	-1.13*** (0.05)
Threshold 2: Symbols	0.34*** (0.04)	-0.63*** (0.05)	0.52*** (0.03)	-0.36*** (0.04)
Threshold 3: Symbols	0.70*** (0.04)	-0.18*** (0.05)	1.06*** (0.03)	0.17*** (0.04)
Threshold 4: Symbols	1.12*** (0.04)	0.30*** (0.05)		
Threshold 1: Science	-1.19*** (0.05)	-1.47*** (0.07)	-1.09*** (0.03)	-1.39*** (0.05)
Threshold 2: Science	-0.52*** (0.04)	-0.94*** (0.06)	-0.17*** (0.03)	-0.56*** (0.04)
Threshold 3: Science	-0.19*** (0.04)	-0.60*** (0.05)	0.65*** (0.03)	0.19*** (0.04)
Threshold 4: Science	0.53*** (0.04)	0.13** (0.05)		
Threshold 1: Education	-0.57*** (0.04)	-1.28*** (0.06)	-0.82*** (0.03)	-1.50*** (0.06)
Threshold 2: Education	0.13*** (0.04)	-0.65*** (0.05)	0.14*** (0.03)	-0.59*** (0.04)
Threshold 3: Education	0.40*** (0.04)	-0.30*** (0.05)	0.76*** (0.03)	-0.02 (0.04)
Threshold 4: Education	0.87*** (0.04)	0.17*** (0.05)		
Threshold 1: Debates	-1.03*** (0.04)	-1.22*** (0.06)	-1.12*** (0.03)	-1.29*** (0.05)
Threshold 2: Debates	-0.25*** (0.04)	-0.50*** (0.05)	0.01 (0.03)	-0.19*** (0.04)
Threshold 3: Debates	0.12** (0.04)	-0.15** (0.05)	0.79*** (0.03)	0.49*** (0.04)
Threshold 4: Debates	0.68*** (0.04)	0.40*** (0.05)		
Threshold 1: God EU	-1.53*** (0.06)	-1.40*** (0.07)	-1.38*** (0.04)	-1.59*** (0.06)
Threshold 2: God EU	-0.91*** (0.04)	-1.06*** (0.06)	-0.79*** (0.03)	-1.10*** (0.05)
Threshold 3: God EU	-0.47*** (0.04)	-0.62*** (0.05)	0.15*** (0.03)	-0.29*** (0.04)
Threshold 4: God EU	0.16*** (0.04)	-0.14** (0.05)		
Observations	1269	739	2334	1121

*** $p < 0.001$; ** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$. This table shows the threshold parameters that were omitted from Table 1

Table 5: Treshold parameters for the measurement of political secularism by five items

	West 2016	East 2016	West 2012	East 2012
Threshold 1: Science	-1.19*** (0.05)	-1.47*** (0.07)	-1.09*** (0.03)	-1.39*** (0.05)
Threshold 2: Science	-0.52*** (0.04)	-0.94*** (0.06)	-0.17*** (0.03)	-0.56*** (0.04)
Threshold 3: Science	-0.19*** (0.04)	-0.60*** (0.05)	0.65*** (0.03)	0.19*** (0.04)
Threshold 4: Science	0.53*** (0.04)	0.13** (0.05)		
Threshold 1: Education	-0.57*** (0.04)	-1.28*** (0.06)	-0.82*** (0.03)	-1.50*** (0.06)
Threshold 2: Education	0.13*** (0.04)	-0.65*** (0.05)	0.14*** (0.03)	-0.59*** (0.04)
Threshold 3: Education	0.40*** (0.04)	-0.30*** (0.05)	0.76*** (0.03)	-0.02 (0.04)
Threshold 4: Education	0.87*** (0.04)	0.17*** (0.05)		
Threshold 1: Debates	-1.03*** (0.04)	-1.22*** (0.06)	-1.12*** (0.03)	-1.29*** (0.05)
Threshold 2: Debates	-0.25*** (0.04)	-0.50*** (0.05)	0.01 (0.03)	-0.19*** (0.04)
Threshold 3: Debates	0.12** (0.04)	-0.15** (0.05)	0.79*** (0.03)	0.49*** (0.04)
Threshold 4: Debates	0.68*** (0.04)	0.40*** (0.05)		
Threshold 1: God EU	-1.53*** (0.06)	-1.40*** (0.07)	-1.38*** (0.04)	-1.59*** (0.06)
Threshold 2: God EU	-0.91*** (0.04)	-1.06*** (0.06)	-0.79*** (0.03)	-1.10*** (0.05)
Threshold 3: God EU	-0.47*** (0.04)	-0.62*** (0.05)	0.15*** (0.03)	-0.29*** (0.04)
Threshold 4: God EU	0.16*** (0.04)	-0.14** (0.05)		
Observations	1269	739	2330	1121

*** $p < 0.001$; ** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$. This table shows the threshold parameters that were omitted from Table 2

Table 6: Treshold parameters for the measurement of political secularism by four items

	West 2016	East 2016	West 2012	East 2012
Loading: Birth Defect	0.86*** (0.03)	0.80*** (0.06)	0.88*** (0.03)	0.86*** (0.05)
Loading: Health	0.91*** (0.03)	0.74*** (0.11)	0.84*** (0.04)	0.91*** (0.05)
Loading: Rape	0.90*** (0.03)	1.00*** (0.06)	0.85*** (0.04)	0.84*** (0.06)
Loading: Choice	0.65*** (0.04)	0.67*** (0.06)	0.59*** (0.04)	0.68*** (0.06)
Threshold: Birth Defect	-1.05*** (0.04)	-1.67*** (0.08)	-1.14*** (0.03)	-1.61*** (0.06)
Threshold: Health	-1.55*** (0.06)	-2.10*** (0.11)	-1.62*** (0.04)	-1.86*** (0.07)
Threshold: Rape	-1.35*** (0.05)	-1.70*** (0.08)	-1.20*** (0.05)	-1.70*** (0.09)
Threshold: Choice	-0.01 (0.04)	-0.55*** (0.05)	0.33*** (0.03)	-0.16*** (0.04)
Observations	1259	740	2339	1117
CFI	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99
TLI	0.99	1.00	0.99	0.98
RMSEA_Estimate	0.05	0.00	0.03	0.04
SRMR	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.05
ChiSqM_Value	7.84	1.56	7.09	5.35
Parameters	8	8	8	8
Ordinal α	0.89	0.88	0.87	0.87
Ordinal $\omega_3 (\rho_{NL})$	0.75	0.63	0.71	0.63

*** $p < 0.001$; ** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$.

Table 7: Measurement of abortion attitude

	West 2016	East 2016	West 2012	East 2012
Loading: Intensity	2.26*** (0.07)	2.45*** (0.09)	2.35*** (0.06)	2.46*** (0.07)
Loading: Prayer	1.76*** (0.06)	1.61*** (0.06)	2.02*** (0.04)	1.63*** (0.05)
Loading: Church Attendance	1.02*** (0.04)	1.01*** (0.04)	1.01*** (0.02)	0.90*** (0.03)
Intercept: Intensity	5.06*** (0.08)	3.20*** (0.10)	5.28*** (0.06)	3.08*** (0.08)
Intercept: Prayer	3.34*** (0.06)	2.07*** (0.07)	3.40*** (0.05)	1.98*** (0.06)
Intercept: Church Attendance	2.55*** (0.04)	1.76*** (0.04)	2.48*** (0.03)	1.75*** (0.03)
Variance: Intensity	2.59*** (0.19)	2.05*** (0.17)	3.19*** (0.14)	2.11*** (0.15)
Variance: Prayer	2.06*** (0.13)	0.81*** (0.07)	1.46*** (0.09)	0.72*** (0.06)
Variance: Church Attendance	0.69*** (0.04)	0.36*** (0.03)	0.65*** (0.03)	0.42*** (0.02)
Observations	1262	736	2356	1122
CFI	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
TLI	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
RMSEA_Estimate	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SRMR	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
ChiSqM_Value	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Parameters	9	9	9	9
α	0.79	0.83	0.80	0.82
ω	0.64	0.68	0.71	0.69

*** $p < 0.001$; ** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$.

Table 8: Measurement of religiosity

	West 2016	East 2016	West 2012	East 2012
Loading: Science	0.69*** (0.02)	0.59*** (0.03)	0.54*** (0.02)	0.65*** (0.03)
Loading: Education	0.58*** (0.02)	0.72*** (0.03)	0.62*** (0.02)	0.76*** (0.03)
Loading: Debates	0.71*** (0.02)	0.81*** (0.02)	0.62*** (0.02)	0.68*** (0.02)
Loading: God EU	0.62*** (0.03)	0.67*** (0.03)	0.50*** (0.02)	0.51*** (0.03)
Loading: Birth Defect	0.83*** (0.03)	0.83*** (0.06)	0.87*** (0.03)	0.91*** (0.05)
Loading: Health	0.89*** (0.03)	0.73*** (0.12)	0.85*** (0.04)	0.88*** (0.05)
Loading: Rape	0.93*** (0.03)	0.98*** (0.06)	0.84*** (0.04)	0.86*** (0.07)
Loading: Choice	0.70*** (0.04)	0.65*** (0.05)	0.60*** (0.04)	0.64*** (0.05)
ϕ Abortion, Secularism	0.46*** (0.04)	0.53*** (0.06)	0.45*** (0.03)	0.35*** (0.05)
Threshold 1: Science	-1.19*** (0.05)	-1.47*** (0.07)	-1.09*** (0.03)	-1.39*** (0.05)
Threshold 2: Science	-0.52*** (0.04)	-0.94*** (0.06)	-0.17*** (0.03)	-0.56*** (0.04)
Threshold 3: Science	-0.19*** (0.04)	-0.60*** (0.05)	0.65*** (0.03)	0.19*** (0.04)
Threshold 4: Science	0.53*** (0.04)	0.13** (0.05)		
Threshold 1: Education	-0.57*** (0.04)	-1.28*** (0.06)	-0.82*** (0.03)	-1.50*** (0.06)
Threshold 2: Education	0.13*** (0.04)	-0.65*** (0.05)	0.14*** (0.03)	-0.59*** (0.04)
Threshold 3: Education	0.40*** (0.04)	-0.30*** (0.05)	0.76*** (0.03)	-0.02 (0.04)
Threshold 4: Education	0.87*** (0.04)	0.17*** (0.05)		
Threshold 1: Debates	-1.03*** (0.04)	-1.22*** (0.06)	-1.12*** (0.03)	-1.29*** (0.05)
Threshold 2: Debates	-0.25*** (0.04)	-0.50*** (0.05)	0.01 (0.03)	-0.19*** (0.04)
Threshold 3: Debates	0.12** (0.04)	-0.15** (0.05)	0.79*** (0.03)	0.49*** (0.04)
Threshold 4: Debates	0.68*** (0.04)	0.40*** (0.05)		
Threshold 1: God EU	-1.53*** (0.06)	-1.40*** (0.07)	-1.38*** (0.04)	-1.59*** (0.06)
Threshold 2: God EU	-0.91*** (0.04)	-1.06*** (0.06)	-0.79*** (0.03)	-1.10*** (0.05)
Threshold 3: God EU	-0.47***	-0.62***	0.15***	-0.29***

	West 2016	East 2016	West 2012	East 2012
	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.03)	(0.04)
Threshold 4: God EU	0.16***	-0.14**		
	(0.04)	(0.05)		
Threshold: Birth Defect	-1.05***	-1.67***	-1.14***	-1.61***
	(0.04)	(0.08)	(0.03)	(0.06)
Threshold: Health	-1.55***	-2.10***	-1.62***	-1.86***
	(0.06)	(0.11)	(0.04)	(0.07)
Threshold: Rape	-1.35***	-1.70***	-1.20***	-1.70***
	(0.05)	(0.08)	(0.05)	(0.09)
Threshold: Choice	-0.01	-0.55***	0.33***	-0.16***
	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.03)	(0.04)
Observations	1269	740	2354	1122
CFI	0.98	0.97	0.96	0.99
TLI	0.97	0.96	0.95	0.99
RMSEA_Estimate	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.03
SRMR	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.05
Parameters	29	29	25	25

*** $p < 0.001$; ** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$

Table 9: Political secularism and abortion: two-factor model

	West 2016	East 2016	West 2012	East 2012
Loading: Science	0.63*** (0.02)	0.58*** (0.03)	0.48*** (0.02)	0.62*** (0.03)
Loading: Education	0.52*** (0.03)	0.70*** (0.03)	0.55*** (0.02)	0.73*** (0.03)
Loading: Debates	0.62*** (0.02)	0.77*** (0.02)	0.53*** (0.02)	0.65*** (0.02)
Loading: God EU	0.58*** (0.03)	0.66*** (0.03)	0.49*** (0.02)	0.50*** (0.03)
Loading: Birth Defect	0.70*** (0.03)	0.70*** (0.06)	0.73*** (0.03)	0.67*** (0.05)
Loading: Health	0.82*** (0.03)	0.58*** (0.12)	0.77*** (0.03)	0.71*** (0.05)
Loading: Rape	0.85*** (0.03)	0.78*** (0.07)	0.74*** (0.04)	0.76*** (0.07)
Loading: Choice	0.56*** (0.03)	0.45*** (0.04)	0.45*** (0.03)	0.34*** (0.04)
Threshold 1: Science	-1.19*** (0.05)	-1.47*** (0.07)	-1.09*** (0.03)	-1.39*** (0.05)
Threshold 2: Science	-0.52*** (0.04)	-0.94*** (0.06)	-0.17*** (0.03)	-0.56*** (0.04)
Threshold 3: Science	-0.19*** (0.04)	-0.60*** (0.05)	0.65*** (0.03)	0.19*** (0.04)
Threshold 4: Science	0.53*** (0.04)	0.13** (0.05)		
Threshold 1: Education	-0.57*** (0.04)	-1.28*** (0.06)	-0.82*** (0.03)	-1.50*** (0.06)
Threshold 2: Education	0.13*** (0.04)	-0.65*** (0.05)	0.14*** (0.03)	-0.59*** (0.04)
Threshold 3: Education	0.40*** (0.04)	-0.30*** (0.05)	0.76*** (0.03)	-0.02 (0.04)
Threshold 4: Education	0.87*** (0.04)	0.17*** (0.05)		
Threshold 1: Debates	-1.03*** (0.04)	-1.22*** (0.06)	-1.12*** (0.03)	-1.29*** (0.05)
Threshold 2: Debates	-0.25*** (0.04)	-0.50*** (0.05)	0.01 (0.03)	-0.19*** (0.04)
Threshold 3: Debates	0.12** (0.04)	-0.15** (0.05)	0.79*** (0.03)	0.49*** (0.04)
Threshold 4: Debates	0.68*** (0.04)	0.40*** (0.05)		
Threshold 1: God EU	-1.53*** (0.06)	-1.40*** (0.07)	-1.38*** (0.04)	-1.59*** (0.06)
Threshold 2: God EU	-0.91*** (0.04)	-1.06*** (0.06)	-0.79*** (0.03)	-1.10*** (0.05)
Threshold 3: God EU	-0.47*** (0.04)	-0.62*** (0.05)	0.15*** (0.03)	-0.29*** (0.04)
Threshold 4: God EU	0.16***	-0.14**		

	West 2016	East 2016	West 2012	East 2012
	(0.04)	(0.05)		
Threshold: Birth Defect	-1.05***	-1.67***	-1.14***	-1.61***
	(0.04)	(0.08)	(0.03)	(0.06)
Threshold: Health	-1.55***	-2.10***	-1.62***	-1.86***
	(0.06)	(0.11)	(0.04)	(0.07)
Threshold: Rape	-1.35***	-1.70***	-1.20***	-1.70***
	(0.05)	(0.08)	(0.05)	(0.09)
Threshold: Choice	-0.01	-0.55***	0.33***	-0.16***
	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.03)	(0.04)
Observations	1269	740	2354	1122
CFI	0.85	0.83	0.82	0.85
TLI	0.79	0.76	0.74	0.79
RMSEA_Estimate	0.13	0.12	0.11	0.11
SRMR	0.12	0.12	0.11	0.16
Parameters	28	28	24	24

*** $p < 0.001$; ** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$

Table 10: Political secularism and abortion: one-factor model

	West 2016	East 2016	West 2012	East 2012
Loading: Science	0.64*** (0.02)	0.54*** (0.03)	0.49*** (0.02)	0.60*** (0.03)
Loading: Education	0.61*** (0.02)	0.75*** (0.03)	0.65*** (0.02)	0.77*** (0.02)
Loading: Debates	0.71*** (0.02)	0.80*** (0.02)	0.59*** (0.02)	0.67*** (0.02)
Loading: God EU	0.65*** (0.02)	0.69*** (0.03)	0.54*** (0.02)	0.57*** (0.03)
Loading: Intensity	2.22*** (0.09)	2.42*** (0.14)	2.36*** (0.09)	2.54*** (0.15)
Loading: Prayer	1.70*** (0.12)	1.54*** (0.11)	1.88*** (0.10)	1.53*** (0.09)
Loading: Church Attendance	1.06*** (0.04)	1.05*** (0.05)	1.06*** (0.03)	0.92*** (0.03)
ϕ Religiousness, Secularism	-0.70*** (0.02)	-0.67*** (0.03)	-0.70*** (0.02)	-0.56*** (0.03)
Intercept: Intensity	5.07*** (0.08)	3.20*** (0.16)	5.28*** (0.06)	3.08*** (0.15)
Intercept: Church Attendance	2.54*** (0.04)	1.76*** (0.08)	2.45*** (0.03)	1.75*** (0.05)
Intercept: Prayer	3.34*** (0.08)	2.05*** (0.16)	3.39*** (0.06)	1.97*** (0.14)
Threshold 1: Science	-1.19*** (0.05)	-1.47*** (0.07)	-1.09*** (0.03)	-1.39*** (0.05)
Threshold 2: Science	-0.52*** (0.04)	-0.94*** (0.06)	-0.17*** (0.03)	-0.56*** (0.04)
Threshold 3: Science	-0.19*** (0.04)	-0.60*** (0.05)	0.65*** (0.03)	0.19*** (0.04)
Threshold 4: Science	0.53*** (0.04)	0.13** (0.05)		
Threshold 1: Education	-0.57*** (0.04)	-1.28*** (0.06)	-0.82*** (0.03)	-1.50*** (0.06)
Threshold 2: Education	0.13*** (0.04)	-0.65*** (0.05)	0.14*** (0.03)	-0.59*** (0.04)
Threshold 3: Education	0.40*** (0.04)	-0.30*** (0.05)	0.76*** (0.03)	-0.02 (0.04)
Threshold 4: Education	0.87*** (0.04)	0.17*** (0.05)		
Threshold 1: Debates	-1.03*** (0.04)	-1.22*** (0.06)	-1.12*** (0.03)	-1.29*** (0.05)
Threshold 2: Debates	-0.25*** (0.04)	-0.50*** (0.05)	0.01 (0.03)	-0.19*** (0.04)
Threshold 3: Debates	0.12** (0.04)	-0.15** (0.05)	0.79*** (0.03)	0.49*** (0.04)
Threshold 4: Debates	0.68*** (0.04)	0.40*** (0.05)		
Threshold 1: God EU	-1.53***	-1.40***	-1.38***	-1.59***

	West 2016	East 2016	West 2012	East 2012
	(0.06)	(0.07)	(0.04)	(0.06)
Threshold 2: God EU	-0.91***	-1.06***	-0.79***	-1.10***
	(0.04)	(0.06)	(0.03)	(0.05)
Threshold 3: God EU	-0.47***	-0.62***	0.15***	-0.29***
	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.03)	(0.04)
Threshold 4: God EU	0.16***	-0.14**		
	(0.04)	(0.05)		
Variance: Intensity	2.77***	2.15***	3.17***	1.71***
	(0.19)	(0.26)	(0.17)	(0.23)
Variance: Church Attendance	0.59***	0.27***	0.54***	0.38***
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.03)
Variance: Prayer	2.29***	1.01***	1.99***	1.03***
	(0.14)	(0.09)	(0.10)	(0.08)
Observations	1269	740	2357	1122
CFI	0.96	0.97	0.92	0.95
TLI	0.94	0.94	0.86	0.92
RMSEA_Estimate	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.07
SRMR	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.03
Parameters	30	30	26	26

*** $p < 0.001$; ** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$

Table 11: Political secularism and religiousness: two-factor model

	West 2016	East 2016	West 2012	East 2012
Loading: Science	0.62*** (0.02)	0.52*** (0.03)	0.46*** (0.02)	0.56*** (0.03)
Loading: Education	0.59*** (0.02)	0.73*** (0.02)	0.62*** (0.02)	0.73*** (0.02)
Loading: Debates	0.69*** (0.02)	0.78*** (0.02)	0.55*** (0.02)	0.63*** (0.02)
Loading: God EU	0.64*** (0.02)	0.67*** (0.03)	0.52*** (0.02)	0.56*** (0.03)
Loading: Intensity	-1.80*** (0.09)	-1.92*** (0.14)	-2.01*** (0.09)	-1.88*** (0.14)
Loading: Prayer	-1.41*** (0.11)	-1.23*** (0.10)	-1.59*** (0.10)	-1.10*** (0.08)
Loading: Church Attendance	-0.86*** (0.04)	-0.83*** (0.05)	-0.89*** (0.03)	-0.66*** (0.04)
Intercept: Intensity	5.07*** (0.08)	3.20*** (0.16)	5.28*** (0.06)	3.08*** (0.15)
Intercept: Church Attendance	2.54*** (0.04)	1.76*** (0.08)	2.45*** (0.03)	1.75*** (0.05)
Intercept: Prayer	3.34*** (0.08)	2.05*** (0.16)	3.39*** (0.06)	1.97*** (0.14)
Threshold 1: Science	-1.19*** (0.05)	-1.47*** (0.07)	-1.09*** (0.03)	-1.39*** (0.05)
Threshold 2: Science	-0.52*** (0.04)	-0.94*** (0.06)	-0.17*** (0.03)	-0.56*** (0.04)
Threshold 3: Science	-0.19*** (0.04)	-0.60*** (0.05)	0.65*** (0.03)	0.19*** (0.04)
Threshold 4: Science	0.53*** (0.04)	0.13** (0.05)		
Threshold 1: Education	-0.57*** (0.04)	-1.28*** (0.06)	-0.82*** (0.03)	-1.50*** (0.06)
Threshold 2: Education	0.13*** (0.04)	-0.65*** (0.05)	0.14*** (0.03)	-0.59*** (0.04)
Threshold 3: Education	0.40*** (0.04)	-0.30*** (0.05)	0.76*** (0.03)	-0.02 (0.04)
Threshold 4: Education	0.87*** (0.04)	0.17*** (0.05)		
Threshold 1: Debates	-1.03*** (0.04)	-1.22*** (0.06)	-1.12*** (0.03)	-1.29*** (0.05)
Threshold 2: Debates	-0.25*** (0.04)	-0.50*** (0.05)	0.01 (0.03)	-0.19*** (0.04)
Threshold 3: Debates	0.12** (0.04)	-0.15** (0.05)	0.79*** (0.03)	0.49*** (0.04)
Threshold 4: Debates	0.68*** (0.04)	0.40*** (0.05)		
Threshold 1: God EU	-1.53*** (0.06)	-1.40*** (0.07)	-1.38*** (0.04)	-1.59*** (0.06)
Threshold 2: God EU	-0.91*** (0.06)	-1.06*** (0.07)	-0.79*** (0.04)	-1.10*** (0.06)

	West 2016	East 2016	West 2012	East 2012
	(0.04)	(0.06)	(0.03)	(0.05)
Threshold 3: God EU	-0.47***	-0.62***	0.15***	-0.29***
	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.03)	(0.04)
Threshold 4: God EU	0.16***	-0.14**		
	(0.04)	(0.05)		
Variance: Intensity	4.45***	4.33***	4.67***	4.62***
	(0.22)	(0.30)	(0.18)	(0.27)
Variance: Church Attendance	0.98***	0.68***	0.87***	0.78***
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.04)
Variance: Prayer	3.21***	1.86***	3.01***	2.15***
	(0.20)	(0.12)	(0.13)	(0.12)
Observations	1269	740	2357	1122
CFI	0.85	0.79	0.80	0.71
TLI	0.77	0.68	0.71	0.56
RMSEA_Estimate	0.13	0.17	0.12	0.17
SRMR	0.06	0.08	0.06	0.10
Parameters	29	29	25	25

*** $p < 0.001$; ** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$

Table 12: Political secularism and religiousness: one-factor model model