

The Contribution of Religiosity to Ideology: Empirical Evidences From Five Continents

Cross-Cultural Research
2018, Vol. 52(5) 524–541
© 2018 SAGE Publications
Article reuse guidelines:
sagepub.com/journals-permissions
DOI: 10.1177/1069397118774233
journals.sagepub.com/home/ccr



**Gian Vittorio Caprara¹, Michele Vecchione¹,
Shalom H. Schwartz^{2,3}, Harald Schoen⁴,
Paul G. Bain⁵, Jo Silvester⁶, Jan Cieciuch^{7,8},
Vassilis Pavlopoulos⁹, Gabriel Bianchi¹⁰,
Hasan Kirmanoglu¹¹, Cem Baslevant¹¹,
Catalin Mamali¹², Jorge Manzi¹³,
Miyuki Katayama¹⁴, Tetyana Posnova¹⁵,
Carmen Tabernero¹⁶, Claudio Torres¹⁷,
Markku Verkasalo¹⁸, Jan-Erik Lönqvist¹⁸,
Eva Vondráková¹⁹, and
Maria Giovanna Caprara²⁰**

¹Sapienza University of Rome, Italy

²The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel

³National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia

⁴University of Mannheim, Germany

⁵Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia

⁶City University London, UK

⁷University of Zurich, Switzerland

⁸Cardinal Wyszyński University, Warsaw, Poland

⁹National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece

¹⁰Slovak Academy of Sciences, Bratislava, Slovak Republic

¹¹Istanbul Bilgi University, Turkey

¹²University of Wisconsin–Platteville, USA

¹³Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile

¹⁴Toyo University, Tokyo, Japan

¹⁵Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University, Ukraine

¹⁶University of Salamanca, Spain

¹⁷University of Brasília, Brazil

¹⁸University of Helsinki, Finland

¹⁹Constantine the Philosopher University, Nitra, Slovak Republic

²⁰Universidad a Distancia de Madrid, Collado Villalba, Spain

Corresponding Author:

Michele Vecchione, Department of Social and Developmental Psychology, Stanza: 17 (III piano),
Via dei Marsi 78, 00185 Roma, Italy.

Email: michele.vecchione@uniroma1.it

Abstract

The current study examines the extent to which religiosity account for ideological orientations in 16 countries from five continents (Australia, Brazil, Chile, Germany, Greece, Finland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Poland, Slovakia, Spain, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom, and the United States). Results showed that religiosity was consistently related to right and conservative ideologies in all countries, except Australia. This relation held across different religions, and did not vary across participant's demographic conditions (i.e., gender, age, income, and education). After controlling for basic personal values, the contribution of religiosity on ideology was still significant. However, the effect was substantial only in countries where religion has played a prominent role in the public sphere, such as Spain, Poland, Greece, Italy, Slovakia, and Turkey. In the other countries, the unique contribution of religiosity was marginal or small.

Keywords

religiosity, political ideology, values

Introduction

Religion and politics have taken quite different routes in the transition to modernity and democracy through the gradual emancipation of political authority from religious legitimation (Witte, 2006). However, this transition did not carry the estrangement of religion from public affairs. Religion, indeed, continues to play a major role in several societies, although to different degrees and in different forms, across countries and generations (Casanova, 1994).

Research has shown that religiosity still represents a valid predictor of electoral behavior and political alignment in most Western democracies (Bruce, 2003; Dalton, 1990, 1996; Inglehart, 1997; Knutsen, 2004; Norris & Inglehart, 2004; Putnam & Campbell, 2010; Van der Brug, Hobolt, & De Vreese, 2009). A common finding is that religious individuals are more likely to hold conservative views on a wide range of policy issues and are, therefore, more inclined to vote for conservative or right-wing parties (e.g., Cohen et al., 2009; Duriez, Luyten, Snauwaert, & Hutsebaut, 2002; Malka, Lelkes, Srivastava, Cohen, & Miller, 2012). Most religions, indeed, still hold in great consideration values such as authority and tradition, which are at the core of conservative platforms. In addition, most religions have difficulty in facing how liberal platforms handle sensitive issues such as sex, marriage, and abortion.

The relation between religiosity and political orientation appears to hold across cultural and political contexts. For example, using data from the European Social Survey (ESS), Piurko, Schwartz and Davidov (2011) found that religious individuals from different countries tend to locate themselves more on the right of the political spectrum than nonreligious individuals. This association was stronger in countries with a major national religion, and where religious practices are still widespread, such as Greece, Israel, Italy, Poland, and Spain, than in more secular countries, such as Denmark and the United Kingdom.

The general picture one may draw from available records, however, is that of a fluid situation whose direction and end points are difficult to capture. Whereas secularization has pervasively expanded through northern and center European Protestant countries, in traditional Catholic countries such as Italy and Spain, and in the Orthodox Greece, the decline of church attendance has been less rapid and profound.

As religious practice has generally declined among the youth, one cannot predict the extent to which previous associations between religiosity and political orientation will continue to hold in the future. Among postcommunist countries, one cannot assess the health status of Polish Catholicism, where religion is still credited with responsibility for resisting and dismantling the communist authoritarian regime. The secularization of Israeli society has been counteracted by the growing influence of orthodox Jewish, whereas the secularization of Turkey has been relented by the new vitality of Islamism. A special reference needs to be made for the United States, where different religions make different offers that appeal for different forms of religiosity (Putnam & Campbell, 2010).

The present contribution examines the extent to which religiosity accounts for ideological self-placement in 16 countries from five continents. It involves secondary analysis of data from a cross-national project on the role of values in orienting political preference. With respect to other, published manuscripts that used the same set of data (Caprara & Vecchione, 2015; Caprara et al., 2017; Schwartz et al., 2014; Vecchione et al., 2015), this is the only study that includes religiosity.

The study extends the literature by including countries such as Australia, Brazil, Chile, Japan, and Turkey, which were not considered in previous studies (Cohen et al., 2009; Duriez et al., 2002; Malka et al., 2012; Piurko et al., 2011). Moreover, the study is novel in addressing the distinctive influence that religiosity may exert on ideology after basic values were taken into account. Earlier studies have indeed shown systematic associations of value priorities with both religiosity (Roccas & Schwartz, 1997; Saroglou, Delpierre, & Dernelle, 2004) and political preferences (e.g., Rokeach, 1973;

Schwartz, Caprara, & Vecchione, 2010). Specifically, meta-analytic evidence has shown that conservation values (e.g., conformity, tradition, and security), namely, values which express order, self-restriction, and commitment to the customs and ideas of traditional culture, are positively related to religious commitment (Schwartz & Huismans, 1995). This finding is consistent across countries with different economic, cultural, and religious characteristics (Fontaine, Luyten, & Corveleyn, 2000; Roccas & Schwartz, 1997; Saroglou et al., 2004). Conservation values are also related to a preference for right-wing and conservative ideologies, across different cultural contexts and political systems (Aspelund, Lindeman, & Verkasalo, 2013; Barnea & Schwartz, 1998; Caprara, Schwartz, Capanna, Vecchione, & Barbaranelli, 2006; Caprara, Vecchione, & Schwartz, 2012; Caprara et al., 2017; Piurko et al., 2011; Thorisdottir, Jost, Liviatan, & Shrout, 2007). Thus, the observed link between religiosity and political ideology might depend, at least in part, on individual's value priorities. We aimed to disentangle unique and shared effects of religiosity on ideological self-placement.

In accordance with previous findings (e.g., Malka et al., 2012; Piurko et al., 2011), we hypothesized that religiosity would be associated with a preference for right-wing and conservative ideologies, due to the importance assigned by most religions to authority and traditional values, and in contrast with the emphasis of left-wing and liberal ideologies on individual's freedom of expression (Haidt, 2012). We also expected the association between religiosity and political ideology to be stronger in countries with an established religious majority, such as Italy, Spain, Greece, Israel, and Poland. In such countries, the dominant religion has received special recognition from political authorities, and religious institutions have historically exerted considerable influence in shaping citizens' views of society and politics.

Material and Method

Participants and Procedures

This study involved 16 countries: Australia ($n = 285$), Brazil ($n = 995$), Chile ($n = 415$), Finland ($n = 428$), Germany ($n = 1,066$), Greece ($n = 374$), Israel ($n = 478$), Italy ($n = 557$), Japan ($n = 364$), Poland ($n = 699$), Slovakia ($n = 485$), Spain ($n = 420$), Turkey ($n = 512$), Ukraine ($n = 735$), the United Kingdom ($n = 469$), and the United States ($n = 543$). Overall, the sample comprised 8,825 individuals (53% female), with a mean age of 40.60 years ($SD = 14.74$). Details about sample composition in each country are reported in earlier studies (Caprara et al., 2017, Table 1; Schwartz et al., 2014, Table 2).

Table 1. Importance of Religiosity and Correlations With Ideological Self-Placement.

	Importance of religion		Correlations with ideological self-placement	
	Mean rating of religiousness (present study) ^a	Is religion important? Percentage of "yes" (2009 Gallup survey) ^b	Left-right	Liberal-conservative
Australia	2.44 (<i>SD</i> = 1.90)	32%	.06	.01
Brazil	3.91 (<i>SD</i> = 2.02)	87%	.21**	.27**
Chile	3.53 (<i>SD</i> = 1.96)	70%	.24**	.33**
Finland	2.63 (<i>SD</i> = 2.23)	28%	.30**	.29**
Germany	3.13 (<i>SD</i> = 2.14)	40%	.23**	.20**
Greece	3.56 (<i>SD</i> = 1.88)	71%	.45**	.38**
Israel	2.09 (<i>SD</i> = 2.18)	51%	.46**	.53**
Italy	3.22 (<i>SD</i> = 2.14)	72%	.39**	.45**
Japan	1.71 (<i>SD</i> = 1.92)	24%	.20**	.02
Poland	3.60 (<i>SD</i> = 1.75)	75%	.42**	.43**
Slovakia	3.56 (<i>SD</i> = 2.11)	47%	.25**	.34**
Spain	2.86 (<i>SD</i> = 2.09)	49%	.46**	.48**
Turkey	4.17 (<i>SD</i> = 1.66)	82%	.34**	.38**
Ukraine	4.02 (<i>SD</i> = 1.61)	46%	.15*	.05
The United Kingdom	2.95 (<i>SD</i> = 1.98)	27%	.26**	.31**
The United States	3.02 (<i>SD</i> = 1.90)	69%	.25**	.28**

^a"How religious, if at all, do you consider yourself to be?" (from 0 = *not at all religious* to 7 = *very religious*).

^b"Is religion important in your daily life?" ("yes" or "no").

p* < .05. *p* < .01.

As described in Schwartz et al. (2014; see also Caprara et al., 2017), a representative sample was obtained in Germany and Turkey. In the other 14 countries, researchers enlisted university students to gather the data. Questionnaires were administered online in Australia and Finland and by telephone in Germany. In the other 14 countries, written self-reports were obtained. The same instructions were used for administering the instruments in all countries.

Table 2. Correlations of Basic Values With Religiosity.

	SE	CO	TR	BE	UN	SD	ST	HE	AC	PO
Australia	.03	.12	.41**	-.03	-.07	-.17**	-.19**	-.17**	-.05	.08
Brazil	.11**	.16**	.44**	.09**	-.07	-.20**	-.20**	-.25**	-.08	-.06
Chile	.15**	.22**	.46**	.12	-.05	-.31**	-.20**	-.29**	-.10	-.14**
Finland	.22**	.17**	.41**	.03	.00	-.21**	-.15**	-.31**	-.18**	-.08
Germany	.04	.08**	.48**	.14**	.03	-.15**	-.22**	-.23**	-.12**	-.04
Greece	.44**	.19**	.56**	-.12	-.23**	-.34**	-.28**	-.26**	-.12	-.06
Israel	.09	.14**	.60**	.03	-.14**	-.18**	-.17**	.21**	.13**	.14**
Italy	.21**	.22**	.44**	.03	-.08	-.27**	-.23**	-.24**	-.09	-.09
Japan	.13**	.07	.20**	.01	-.01	-.10	-.03	-.04	-.13**	-.06
Poland	.15**	.24**	.44**	.15**	.13**	-.15**	-.19**	-.29**	-.29**	-.28**
Slovakia	.03	.27**	.52**	.18**	.05	-.21**	-.26**	-.27**	-.25**	-.14**
Spain	.19**	.31**	.46**	-.02	-.23**	-.31**	-.15**	-.24**	-.09	.02
Turkey	.21**	.23**	.42**	.12**	.03	-.31**	-.19**	-.19**	-.15**	-.17**
Ukraine	.04	.01	.29**	.12**	.12**	-.14**	-.09	-.17**	-.09	-.13**
The United Kingdom	.15**	.19**	.56**	.07	-.10	-.25**	-.21**	-.34**	-.10	-.07
The United States	.17**	.23**	.34**	.08	.10	-.17**	-.19**	-.25**	-.20**	-.19**

Note. Before calculating correlation coefficients, persons' responses were centered on their own mean rating of the 40 PVQ items. SE = security; CO = conformity; TR = tradition; BE = benevolence; UN = universalism; SD = self-direction; ST = stimulation; HE = hedonism; AC = achievement; PO = power; PVQ = Portrait Values Questionnaire.

** $p < .01$.

Measures

Ideology. Ideology was measured through two indicators. The first was a self-placement item on the left–right (L/R) scale: “In political matters, people sometimes talk about ‘the left’ and ‘the right’ How would you place your views on this scale, generally speaking?” Alternatives ranged from 1 (left) to 10 (right), without intermediate labels. The second was a self-placement item on the liberal–conservative (L/C) scale: “In political matters, people sometimes talk about *conservatives* and *liberals*. How would you place your views on this scale, generally speaking?” Alternatives ranged from 1 (extremely liberal) to 7 (extremely conservative).

Religiosity. Participants rated their religiosity in response to the question “How religious, if at all, do you consider yourself to be?” using an 8-point scale ranging from 0 (*not at all religious*) to 7 (*very religious*). We adopted this unidimensional approach to assessing religiosity because it is most appropriate when studying heterogeneous groups from different countries with different religious affiliations (Roccas & Schwartz, 1997; Schwartz & Huismans, 1995).

Values. The Portrait Values Questionnaire (PVQ; Schwartz, 2006) was used to measure 10 domains of values, as operationalized in Schwartz’s (1992) theory. The PVQ includes 40 short verbal portraits of different people matched to the respondents’ gender, each describing a person’s goals, aspirations, or wishes that point implicitly to the importance of a value. For each portrait, respondents indicate how similar the person is to themselves on a scale ranging from *not like me at all* to *very much like me*. Respondents’ values were inferred from the implicit values of the people they consider similar to themselves. In the current study, Cronbach’s alpha reliabilities, averaged across countries, ranged from .56 (tradition) to .80 (achievement). Details on the psychometric characteristics properties of the PVQ scales in the present samples were reported in a previous study by Vecchione et al. (2015; see also Schwartz et al., 2014).

Results

Preliminary data

Table 1 (first column) reports the mean ratings of religiosity in each country. As these results cannot be regarded as representative of the respective countries, we also reported the results of a worldwide survey conducted in 2009

(Table 1, second column). Respondents were asked whether religion is important in their daily life, and percentages for “yes” and “no” answers were reported (we downloaded the scores from <http://news.gallup.com/poll/142727/religiosity-highest-world-poorest-nations.aspx>). Highest percentages were observed in Brazil, Turkey, Poland, Italy, and Greece. Lowest percentages were observed in Japan, the United Kingdom, Finland, and Australia. Spearman rank-order correlation between percentage of “yes” in this survey and mean ratings of religiosity observed in the present study across the 16 countries was .68 ($p < .01$).

Religiosity and Ideological Self-Placement

Table 1 (third and fourth column) reports the correlations of religiosity with the L/R and the L/C scales. Results showed that religiosity was significantly associated with at least one indicator of ideological self-placement in all countries except Australia. The same pattern was observed in each country: More religious individuals located themselves more to the right and conservative side of the political spectrum than less religious individuals. This association was stronger in Israel ($r = .46$ with L/R, $.53$ with L/C), Spain ($r = .46$ with L/R, $.48$ with L/C), Greece ($r = .45$ with L/R, $.38$ with L/C), Poland ($r = .42$ with L/R, $.43$ with L/C), and Italy ($r = .39$ with L/R, $.45$ with L/C).

Religiosity and Basic Values

Table 2 reports the pattern of correlations observed in each country between religiosity and the whole set of 10 values. Results showed that individuals more committed to a religion attributed relatively high importance to the conservation values of security, tradition, conformity. Tradition values, in particular, showed the highest positive correlation in most countries, with Pearson's r ranging from .20 (Japan) to .60 (Israel). Religiosity, by contrast, was associated with low importance attributed to hedonism, stimulation, and self-direction.

The Unique Contribution of Religiosity

A multiple regression was used to assess the unique contribution of religiosity to ideological self-placement, controlling for basic values and demographic variables. In this analysis, we used the L/C scale as outcome in the United Kingdom and the United States, and the L/R scale in all other countries, in accordance with the ideological labels that are most commonly used in each country.

Table 3. The Unique Contribution of Religiosity to Ideology, Controlling for Basic Values and Demographic Variables.

	Step 1: Demographics		Step 2: Basic values		Step 3: Religiosity	
	<i>F</i> (df)	<i>R</i> ²	ΔF (df)	ΔR^2	ΔF (df)	ΔR^2
Australia	1.73 (4, 232)	.03	6.82 (10, 222)**	.23	1.37 (1, 221)	.00
Brazil	0.50 (4, 878)	.00	16.84 (10, 868)**	.16	13.12 (1, 867)**	.01
Chile	7.23 (4, 387)**	.07	5.97 (10, 377)**	.13	7.65 (1, 376)*	.02
Finland	6.52 (4, 424)**	.06	16.12 (10, 414)**	.26	19.84 (1, 413)**	.03
Germany	8.14 (4, 938)**	.03	16.71 (10, 928)**	.15	14.70 (1, 927)**	.01
Greece	3.67 (4, 350)**	.04	11.94 (10, 340)**	.25	39.96 (1, 339)**	.08
Israel	7.67 (4, 439)**	.07	15.35 (10, 429)**	.25	23.73 (1, 428)**	.04
Italy	2.25 (4, 496)	.02	17.18 (10, 486)**	.26	60.61 (1, 485)**	.08
Japan	0.47 (4, 290)	.01	3.36 (10, 280)**	.11	6.03 (1, 279)*	.02
Poland	2.06 (4, 666)	.01	7.51 (10, 656)**	.10	88.01 (1, 655)**	.11
Slovakia	1.65 (4, 448)	.01	1.87 (10, 438)*	.04	37.20 (1, 437)**	.07
Spain	3.36 (4, 352)**	.04	8.00 (10, 342)**	.18	58.29 (1, 341)**	.11
Turkey	6.07 (4, 464)**	.05	4.28 (10, 454)**	.08	30.82 (1, 453)**	.06
Ukraine	2.67 (4, 733)*	.01	3.28 (10, 723)**	.04	15.60 (1, 722)**	.02
The United Kingdom	5.42 (4, 391)**	.05	11.18 (10, 381)**	.22	5.89 (1, 380)*	.01
The United States	9.10 (4, 433)**	.08	7.19 (10, 423)**	.13	16.19 (1, 422)**	.03

Note. The outcome variable in the regression analyses is the liberal-conservative scale in the United Kingdom and in the United States, and the left-right scale in all other countries.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

We first controlled for demographic variables, entering gender, age, income, and education in the first step as a single block of predictors. We then entered the 10 values in the second step, and religiosity at the third step.

The contribution of demographic variables at the first step was significant in 10 countries (first column of Table 3), accounting for a proportion of variance in those countries between .01 (Ukraine) and .08 (the United States). Basic values made an incrementally significant contribution in all countries at the second step (second column, Table 3). The proportion of variance uniquely accounted for by values ranged between .04 (Slovakia, Ukraine) and .26 (Finland, Italy). In most countries, universalism and, to a lesser extent, self-direction values predicted a preference for left and liberal ideologies. Security and tradition values predicted a preference for right and conservative ideologies.¹ In the third step, religiosity accounted for significant

additional variance in all countries, except for Australia (third column, Table 3). A substantial increment in *R*-squared was observed in Spain, Poland, Greece, Italy, Slovakia, and Turkey. In these countries, religiosity added from 6% to 11% of explained variance, after basic values were taken into account. In the other countries, the unique contribution of religiosity was marginal or small (i.e., from 1% to 4% of explained variance).

We linked cross-national variations in the strength of the relation between religiosity and ideology to the importance assigned to religion in each country, operationalized as the percentage of inhabitants who affirm that religion is an important part of their daily lives. We found an overall tendency for this relation to be stronger in countries where religion is more important (Spearman rank-order correlation between the increment in *R*-squared reported in the last column of Table 3 and the percentage of citizens affirming that religion is important, Table 1, second column, was .45, $p < .10$).

Moderation Analysis

We investigated whether the relation of religiosity with ideological self-placement is moderated by gender, age, and income. To this aim, a moderated regression analysis was performed in each of the examined countries. In this analysis, religiosity and the demographics were entered in the first step. Three interaction terms, representing the cross-product of religiosity with gender, age, and income were entered in the second step. All predictors were centered around their means prior to computing the interaction terms. Results showed no significant moderating effects. We can, therefore, conclude that the contribution of religiosity to ideological self-placement did not vary across participant's demographic conditions.

Discussion

Religion is a potent psychological and social force. History attests to the power of religion in supplying the worldview that is needed to cope with life and death for ordinary people, and the moral legitimacy to claim obedience for their rulers. Recent literature documents the associations of religion with subjective health and well-being (Diener, Tay, & Myers, 2011; McCullough & Willoughby, 2009; Reed & Neville, 2014). Likewise, a vast literature points to the contribution that religiosity still exerts on the functioning of communities and society by fostering moral and prosocial behavior, by strengthening individual compliance with group norms and by promoting civic engagement (see Galen, 2012, for a critical review).

The aim of the present study was to examine the pattern of relations between religiosity and ideological self-placement across 16 countries that differ significantly in the nature, history, and role of religion. As expected, religiosity was associated with right-wing and conservative ideologies in the vast majority of examined countries, despite the diversities of political offerings and of the dominant religion. This association was consistent across predominantly Roman Catholic (e.g., Italy, Poland, Spain), orthodox (Greece), protestant (the United Kingdom, Finland), Jewish (Israel), and Islamic (Turkey) populations. It is also worthy of note that age, gender, education, and income did not exert any moderating effect on the association between religiosity and political preference, further attesting the robustness and generality of this result. As stated earlier, we believe that the association between religiosity and ideology is due to the importance given by different religions to traditional values about authority, family, life, and sex in shaping people's world views, and thus in dictating their choices in the public sphere (Haidt, 2012).

There were, however, important differences across countries in the strength of this relationship. Specifically, the association was stronger in countries such as Greece, Italy, Israel, Poland, and Spain, where the majority religion had significantly influenced the moral education and socialization of children and the national identity of people. This occurred despite the different role religion might have played to sustain or to contrast the political regimes in power. In Spain, for example, religion has been a strong supporter of an authoritarian regime for over three decades during Franco's dictatorship. In Poland, religion has played a significant role in building the national identity and in fostering the transition toward democracy after the demise of real socialism.

Whereas the effect that religiosity exert on ideological self-placement tend to be stronger in countries where religion is more important, many other relevant, contextual variables may contribute to explain the variability observed across countries. For example, religiosity is likely to exert a major influence on political preference to the extent that it reflects deeply hold values about life and the government of society that accord or conflict with contingent political offerings.

This study also examined how religiosity relates to basic personal values. In accordance with earlier studies (e.g., Fontaine et al., 2000; Roccas & Schwartz, 1997; Saroglou et al., 2004), a consistent relationship was found between religiosity and value priorities, placing religion among the major allies of conservation. Specifically, religious people tended to assign high priority to self-restraining values, which encourage preserving traditions, avoiding uncertainty, and submitting to others' expectations (tradition, security, conformity), and low priority to values emphasizing independence in

thought and action, receptiveness to change, and gratification of the senses (self-direction, stimulation, hedonism).

Most importantly for our purposes, we found that religiosity exhibits incremental validity for predicting ideology over basic values in most of the traditionally religious countries. In such countries, the impact of religion may have been strengthened and prolonged by socialization experiences in family and the school, which predispose to worldview and moral values conducive to political ideologies that are most congenial to the dominant religion. In this regard, one should keep in mind the special influence that religious authorities and hierarchies have exerted in people's life within and beyond the religious domain. It is a topic for further investigation to examine the extent to which religiosity predisposes toward authority and hierarchy through beliefs and practices that are more congenial to a right ideology, or whether both religiosity and right-wing ideology rest upon common predispositions to obey authorities and trust into hierarchies.

The unique contribution of religiosity to ideology, by contrast, was weaker in several secular countries (e.g., Australia, Finland, Japan, The United Kingdom), where modernization has led to a significant decline of religious practice, where political institutions have long been independent of religious authority, and where moral education in schools is not committed to a special faith. In these countries, the choices people make in politics mostly reflect the values they cherish.

Our data do not allow us to disentangle the reciprocal influences between values and religiosity. Clarifying the extent to which religions influence people's value priorities versus the extent to which people's personal values influence their commitment to the religion they profess is a topic worthy of in-depth study. Likewise, the extent to which basic traits, needs, and attitudes are associated with religiosity and ideology, and moderate their relationship, is worth of further investigation. Extending the study to broader samples representative of various constituencies of population is a further goal to be achieved by future studies.

A potential limitation of the study is the use of a single-item to assess religiosity. Although this approach has been extensively applied in cross-cultural investigations of religiosity (Roccas & Schwartz, 1997; Schwartz & Huisman, 1995), it may fail to capture the complex ways in which religion and politics are related (Malka, 2013). The fact that most results are based on samples of convenience represent a further limitation of this study that warns against the premature generalization of its findings. Yet, above findings converge in pointing to the current importance of religion in people's political views. Although the practice of religion in church attendance and religious marriages has diminished in most Western countries, one

should not underestimate the influence that religiosity may still exert in orienting citizens' political choices. Religious institutions, in fact, may still play an important role in established democracies either directly through their explicit or implicit support for certain parties or indirectly through emphasizing values that suggest giving priority and preference to particular political issues and platforms.

Authors' Note

Two of the authors have changed universities. Paul G. Bain is now affiliated to Department of Psychology, University of Bath, UK and Jo Silvester is affiliated to University of Exeter Business School, UK.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: The work of Jan Cieciuch was supported by Grant 2014/14/M/HS6/00919 from the National Science Centre, Poland.

Note

1. Details on the association between values and ideological self-placement are reported in Caprara et al. (2017). Authors used the same set of data but focused on values and ideology, without considering religiosity.

References

- Aspelund, A., Lindeman, M., & Verkasalo, M. (2013). Political conservatism and left-right orientation in 28 eastern and western European countries. *Political Psychology, 34*, 409-417. doi:10.1111/pops.12000
- Barnea, M., & Schwartz, S. H. (1998). Values and voting. *Political Psychology, 19*, 17-40. doi:10.1111/0162-895X.00090
- Bruce, S. (2003). *Politics and religion*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Polity Press.
- Caprara, G. V., Schwartz, S., Capanna, C., Vecchione, M., & Barbaranelli, C. (2006). Personality and politics: Values, traits and political choice. *Political Psychology, 1*, 1-28. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2006.00457.x
- Caprara, G. V., & Vecchione, M. (2015). Democracy through ideology and beyond: The values that are common to the right and the left. *Ceskoslovenska Psychologie, 59*(Suppl. 1), 2-13.
- Caprara, G. V., Vecchione, M., & Schwartz, S. H. (2012). Why people do not vote: The role of personal values. *European Psychologist, 17*, 266-278. doi:10.1027/1016-9040/a000099

- Caprara, G. V., Vecchione, M., Schwartz, S. H., Schoen, H., Bain, P. G., Silvester, J., . . . Caprara, M. G. (2017). Basic values, ideological self-placement, and voting: A cross-cultural study. *Cross-Cultural Research, 51*, 388-411. doi:10.1177/1069397117712194
- Casanova, J. (1994). *Public religions in the modern world*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Cohen, A. B., Malka, A., Hill, E. C., Thoemmes, F., Hill, P. C., & Sundie, J. M. (2009). Race as a moderator of the relationship between religiosity and political alignment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*, 271-282. doi:10.1177/0146167208328064
- Dalton, R. J. (1990). Religion and party alignment. In R. Sankiaho, V. Yhdistys, & P. Pesonen (Eds.), *People and their politics* (pp. 66-88). Jyväskylä: Finnish Political Science Association.
- Dalton, R. J. (1996). *Citizen politics: Public opinion and political parties in advanced Western democracies* (2nd ed.). London, England: Chatham House.
- Diener, E., Tay, L., & Myers, D. G. (2011). The religion paradox: If religion makes people happy, why are so many dropping out? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 106*, 1278-1290. doi:10.1037/a0024402
- Duriez, B., Luyten, P., Snauwaert, B., & Hutsebaut, D. (2002). The importance of religiosity and values in predicting political attitudes: Evidence for the continuing importance of religion in Flanders (Belgium). *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 5*, 35-54. doi:10.1080/13674670110066831
- Fontaine, J. R. J., Luyten, P., & Corveleyn, J. (2000). Tell me what you believe and I'll tell you what you want: Empirical evidence for discriminating value patterns of five types of religiosity. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 10*, 65-84. doi:10.1207/S15327582IJPR1002_01
- Galen, L. W. (2012). Does religious belief promote prosociality? A critical examination. *Psychological Bulletin, 138*, 876-890. doi:10.1037/a0028251
- Haidt, J. (2012). *The righteous mind: Why good people are divided by politics and religion*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Inglehart, R. (1997). *Modernization and post-modernization: Cultural, economic and political change in 43 societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Knutsen, O. (2004). Religious denomination and party choice in Western Europe: A comparative longitudinal study from eight countries, 1970-1997. *International Political Science Review, 25*, 97-128. doi:10.1177/0192512104038169
- Malka, A. (2013). Religion and domestic political attitudes around the world. In V. Saroglou (Ed.), *Religion, personality, and social behavior* (pp. 230-254). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Malka, A., Lelkes, Y., Srivastava, S., Cohen, A. B., & Miller, D. T. (2012). Association of religiosity and political conservatism: The role of engagement with political discourse. *Political Psychology, 33*, 275-295. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2012.00875.x
- McCullough, M. E., & Willoughby, B. L. B. (2009). Religion, self-regulation, and self-control: Associations, explanations, and implications. *Psychological Bulletin, 135*, 69-93. doi:10.1037/a0014213

- Norris, P., & Inglehart, R. (2004). *Sacred and secular*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Piurko, Y., Schwartz, S. H., & Davidov, E. (2011). Basic personal values and the meaning of left–right political orientations in 20 countries. *Political Psychology*, 32, 537-561. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2011.00828.x
- Putnam, R. D., & Campbell, D. E. (2010). *American grace: How religion divides and unites us*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Reed, T. D., & Neville, H. A. (2014). The influence of religiosity and spirituality on psychological well-being among Black women. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 40, 384-401. doi:10.1177/0095798413490956
- Roccas, S., & Schwartz, S. H. (1997). Church-state relations and the association of religiosity with values: A study of Catholics in six countries. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 31, 356-375. doi:10.1177/106939719703100404
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Saroglou, V., Delpierre, V., & Dernelle, R. (2004). Values and religiosity: A meta-analysis of studies using Schwartz's model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37, 721-734. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2003.10.005
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 1-65). New York, NY: Academic Press. doi:10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60281-6
- Schwartz, S. H. (2006). Les valeurs de base de la personne: Théorie, mesures et applications [Basic human values: Theory, measurement, and applications]. *Revue Française De Sociologie*, 42, 249-288.
- Schwartz, S. H., Caprara, G. V., & Vecchione, M. (2010). Basic personal values, core political values and voting: A longitudinal analysis. *Political Psychology*, 31, 421-452. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2010.00764.x
- Schwartz, S. H., Caprara, G. V., Vecchione, M., Bain, P., Bianchi, G., Caprara, M. G., . . . Zaleski, Z. (2014). Basic personal values underlie and give coherence to political values: A cross national study in 15 countries. *Political Behavior*, 36, 899-930. doi:10.1007/s11109-013-9255-z
- Schwartz, S. H., & Huismans, S. (1995). Value priorities and religiosity in four Western religions. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 58, 88-107. doi:10.2307/2787148
- Thorisdottir, H., Jost, J. T., Liviatan, I., & Shrout, P. E. (2007). Psychological needs and values underlying the left–right political orientation: Cross-national evidence from Eastern and Western Europe. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 71, 175-203. doi:10.1093/poq/nfm008
- Van der Brug, W., Hobolt, S., & De Vreese, C. (2009). Religion and party choice in Europe. *West European Politics*, 32, 1266-1283. doi:10.1080/01402380903230694
- Vecchione, M., Schwartz, S. H., Caprara, G. V., Schoen, H., Cieciuch, J., Silvester, J., . . . Alessandri, G. (2015). Personal values and political activism: A cross-national study. *British Journal of Psychology*, 106, 84-106. doi:10.1111/bjop.12067
- Witte, J., Jr. (2006). Facts and fictions about the history of separation of church and state. *Journal of Church and State*, 48, 15-45.

Author Biographies

Gian Vittorio Caprara holds a Laurea degree in political science and a specialization degree in psychology, both from the Catholic University of Milan. He is full-time professor of personality psychology at Sapienza University of Rome, where he served as chair of Department of Psychology; dean of faculty of psychology; and president of Federate Faculties of Arts, Law, and Economics; and Director of the Inter-University Center for the Research on the origin of prosocial and antisocial motivations. His primary research interests focus on personality development and assessment and psychosocial adjustment.

Michele Vecchione holds a Laurea degree in psychology from Sapienza University of Rome and a PhD in personality and social psychology from the University of Padua. He is associate professor of psychometrics at the Department of Social and Developmental Psychology, Sapienza University of Rome. His research interests focus on psychological assessment and multivariate statistics in the field of personality and social psychology.

Shalom H. Schwartz is professor emeritus of psychology at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and scientific supervisor of the Socio-Cultural Research Laboratory of the Higher School of Economics in Moscow. He holds a PhD in social psychology (University of Michigan), is a past president of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology, is an Israel prize laureate in psychology, and recipient of a distinguished Career Award from the American Sociological Association. He has been a member of the European Social Survey scientific board since 1997 and authored its human values scale. His individual and culture-level value theories have been used in research in more than 80 countries. He has written or edited nine books and published over 220 articles in international journals in social, cross-cultural and developmental psychology, political science, sociology, education, management, law and economics. His publications have been cited in the literature over 50,000 times.

Harald Schoen is professor of political psychology at the University of Mannheim. His research interests include political psychology, political behavior, public opinion, online communication, and political methodology. His recent publications include *Old Friends in Troubled Waters: Policy Principles, Elites, and U.S.-German Relations at the Citizen Level after the Cold War*, Nomos, 2016 (co-authored with Hans Rattinger, Fabian Endres, Sebastian Jungkunz, Matthias Mader, and Jana Pötzschke).

Paul G. Bain is a senior lecturer at QUT in Brisbane, Australia. His research interests include human values, lay theories and beliefs (e.g., about human nature and how societies change over time), psychological essentialism, dehumanization, and cross-cultural psychology.

Jo Silvester is an organizational psychologist who specializes in the assessment and development of leaders in public, private, and political organizations.

Jan Cieciuch is a professor of psychology at the Cardinal Wyszyński University in Warsaw (Poland) and a project leader of the University Research Priority Program on

Social Networks at the University of Zurich (Switzerland). His interests are psychology of personality and values. Inspiring by the circle of values he codeveloped together with his team a Circumplex of Personality Metatraits and a Circumplex of Identity Formation Modes. His recent publications appeared in the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *Journal of Research on Personality*, *Self and Identity*, *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *Annual Review of Sociology*.

Vassilis Pavlopoulos is associate professor of cross-cultural psychology in the Department of Psychology, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece. His research interests and published work focus on acculturation and adaptation of immigrants, resilience processes of immigrant youth, perceived discrimination and beliefs about justice, cross-cultural study of personal and political values, and the cultural processes of behavioral intentions.

Gabriel Bianchi, senior research fellow at Slovak Academy of Sciences, Institute for Research in Social Communication, has several intertwined research and teaching focuses: public participation and deliberative democracy, values, intimate citizenship, sexual and reproductive rights and health. Recently, his research covers also issues of societal and ethical responses to science and technology innovations.

Hasan Kirmanoglu is a former professor of economics in Istanbul Bilgi University (Department of Economics). He has got his PhD from Paris West University Nanterre La Defense. He has published extensively in journals such as the *European Journal of Political Research*, *Party Politics*, *Socio-Economic Review*, and *Social Indicators Research*.

Cem Baslevant has a BA degree in economics and mathematics from Franklin & Marshall College, Lancaster, PA (1994), and MA and PhD degrees in economics from Bogazici University in Turkey (1996 and 2001). He has published applied studies in journals such as *World Development*, *Urban Studies*, *Social Indicators Research*, and *Party Politics*. Since 2000, Baslevant has been a faculty member in the Department of Economics at Istanbul Bilgi University.

Catalin Mamali, PhD (University of Bucharest, 1976), present at Department of Social Sciences NICC-Iowa, The United States. Published research on motivation, interpersonal cognitive behavior, interpersonal relationships within totalitarian societies, interrogative orientations of scientists, social iconic metaphors, interpersonal crucial experiences, the interface diary-correspondence, on participatory methods and political genealogies. He published a few books such as *Interknowledge* (1974); *Motivational balance and coevolution* (1981); *The Gandhian mode of becoming* (1998).

Studies on social representations on Armenian genocide ("Accuracy of Basic Knowledge of Traumatic Historical Events: The Armenian Genocide," *Journal of Loss and Trauma*, Published online: May 11, 2016). He received a Fulbright award (1990-1991) at University of Iowa.

Jorge Manzi is director of MIDE, Research Center for the Assessment of Educational and Organizational Systems.

Miyuki Katayama is professor of social psychology in the Faculty of Sociology, Department of Social Psychology, Toyo University in Tokyo, Japan. Her basic research interests are the process of maintenance of public order even in a state of emergency, and the origins of cognition filled in good will like Japanese even in conflicting situations.

Tetyana Posnova is affiliated to Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University, Ukraine.

Carmen Tabernero is professor of social psychology at the University of Salamanca, Spain. From a social-cognitive perspective, her main research interest is focus on the analysis of motivational processes at individual and collective level (e.g., self-efficacy beliefs, goals, emotional states, positivity, values. . .) related to behavioral intentions and behaviors (decision making; acculturation processes; prosocial behaviors, pro-environmental behaviors, organizational and political behaviors).

Claudio Torres is a full-time professor at the Department of Social and Work Psychology at the University of Brazilia—Brazil, and head of the Institute of Psychology at the same university. He is affiliated with International Association for Cross-cultural Psychology, where was a representative for Latin America. He lectures and has research interests in cross-cultural psychology, human values, and political psychology.

Markku Verkasalo, is at the Department of Psychology and Logopedics, University of Helsinki.

Jan-Erik Lönnqvist, professor of social psychology at the University of Helsinki, has primarily focused on personality traits and personal values. More recent research interests are moral and political psychology.

Eva Vondráková (1952), assistant professor at the legal department of the Department of Social Work and Social Sciences at Faculty of Social Sciences and Health Care, University of Constantine the Philosopher, teaches legal disciplines and is co-author of publications dealing with social problems and human rights. Full list of publications is available at www.ukf.sk.

Maria Giovanna Caprara is professor of psychology at the Open University of Madrid (UDIMA), Spain, and she is director of the master's program in social gerontology (2013-2016). Her research interests focus on psychogerontology and social gerontology promoting active aging, determinants of well-being in older people.