

Municipal Spending and Religious Preferences

Jannett Highfill and Kevin M. O'Brien

Bradley University

Abstract: This paper investigates the question of whether religious affiliation is related to municipal spending, revenue, taxes, property taxes, debt, employment, and spending on several specific municipal services: education, roads, police, health, and welfare. It is found that the proportion of religious adherents was negatively associated with property taxes and spending on education and welfare. When divided into religious groups, an increase in the proportion of Protestants was negatively associated with property taxes and education and welfare spending but positively associated with debt. The proportion of Catholics was positively associated with taxes and spending on roads. The proportion of Orthodox Christians was positively associated with education and police spending. When the Protestant group was subdivided, the proportion of evangelicals was negatively associated with property taxes, spending on education, roads, and welfare but positively associated with debt. The proportion of black Protestants was negatively associated with health spending, while the proportion of mainline Protestants was positively associated with welfare spending. Generally, the results for the proportion of Protestants as a whole were similar to the results for evangelicals when Protestants were divided into groups. JEL Codes: H7, N32

With the advances in institutional economics of the last few decades, many observers would agree that moral attitudes are related to economic behavior. It is a short step from there to the main idea of this paper, that religious affiliation might also be related to economic outcomes with regard to municipal expenditure, revenue, taxes, debt, employment, and spending on specific services like education, roads, police, health, and welfare. The primary result of the paper is that religious adherents as a proportion of a metro-area population were negatively correlated with property taxes and spending on education and welfare. When all adherents were divided into religious groups some other relationships were found. For example, the proportion of the population that was Catholic was positively associated with taxes and

spending on roads. The proportion of Protestants was positively associated with debt but negatively associated with property taxes and education and welfare spending. When Protestants were subdivided into the groups evangelicals, black Protestants, and mainline Protestants, the results for evangelicals were similar to those for Protestants as a whole.

One particularly clear statement of the general idea that religious views have economic consequences comes from Benjamin Friedman. While he is sympathetic to Max Weber's ideas about "the protestant ethic" as related to "hard work, diligence, patience, and a sense of obligation to fulfill our commitments" (2005, 17), he also extends the argument to other groups: "Weber overlooked other religious and ethnic groups (Jews and overseas Chinese, to cite just two) who share many of the attitudes toward personal behavior, and much of the economic success, that he associated with northern European Protestants" (2005, 17). Friedman points out that certain Christian groups have seen themselves as being agents of reform for both religion and society. The Puritans, for example, "took it as their collective duty to reform society and thereby create the new Christian Commonwealth" (2005, 42). The latter would presumably have had many dimensions, but he cites in particular Puritanism as a major reason for early free public education in the U.S. (2005, 45).

Fischer and Schneider (2007) relate Weber's ideas about the Protestant ethic directly to municipal spending. Taking an "ascetic Protestantism" point of view, they posit that, as compared to Catholics, Protestants should "prefer relatively low tax levels" and "have a taste for less welfare spending"; a larger "share of Protestants exerts a lowering impact on government spending" (2007, 7–8). They empirically test the last hypothesis for Swiss cantons and find support. Although they believe that religion should affect taxes and welfare spending, they did not test either proposition. It might also be mentioned that Wisman and Davis (2013) find evidence of a weakening of the connection between the Protestant ethic and asceticism in the U.S.; they argue that the Protestant ethic became transformed over time into an emphasis on hard work and consumerism.

Reda (2010), starting from a "Cultural Wars" thesis, investigates whether religious preferences and affiliations affect government decision-making regarding tax rates and spending at the state level in the U.S. The question is whether governments, in their economic and fiscal plans, take "into consideration the demands and prescriptions of religious institutions and religious doctrines" (2010, 300). Framed slightly

differently, “are the choices of political leaders and parties influenced by the religious inclinations of their constituencies?”

His basic strategy in addressing these questions was to add a religion variable to a standard set of explanatory variables for tax rates and two types of state spending, welfare and education. The religion variable was the proportion of a state’s population which belonged to eight “conservative” Protestant denominations (Reda 2010, 304). He sometimes included Catholics in his measure of conservatism, and sometimes did not. He found that conservative Protestants had a positive effect on education spending and a negative effect on welfare spending; none of his religion variables had an effect on taxes. This result parallels that of Kannianen and Paeaekkoenen (2010), who found no relationship between “tax morale” or tax compliance and European religious affiliations—“Catholic countries” versus “Protestant countries.”

Finally, it should be noted that the present paper is exploratory in nature, examining correlation rather than causation. As far as we are aware, U.S. municipalities have not been studied in this context. We also include among the dependent variables several that have not been studied in the literature. Among the specific services, these variables are spending on roads, police, and health; for the municipal-wide variables, these are employment and debt. In general, our empirical model for these variables is similar to our model for overall expenditure, except perhaps for our model of debt.¹

1 Data and Basic Empirical Model

The data represent a national cross-sectional sample of 366 U.S. metropolitan areas; the data were collected by county and summed into metro areas. The dependent variables were collected from the 2007 Survey of Governments and were based on fiscal measures for the metro area. The sources for all variables appear in the data appendix; descriptive statistics for all variables are presented in Table 1. The metro-wide dependent variables are total spending per capita (all spending by a metro area divided by the metro area population), total revenue (including inter-governmental transfers) per capita, taxes per capita, property taxes per capita, debt per capita, and employment per capita (number of full-time-equivalent employees divided by metro area population). We also analyzed spending on five specific functions provided for the metro

area: education, roads, police, health, and welfare. All spending variables are on a per-capita basis except education, which was analyzed on a per pupil basis.

The source for the religion independent variables is the U.S. Religion Census: Religious Congregations and Membership Study, 2010 (Metro Area File). This study, designed and carried out by the Association of Statisticians of American Religious Bodies (ASARB), compiled data on the number of adherents for 236 religious groups in each metro area of the United States. Participants included 217 Christian denominations, associations, or communions (including Latter-Day Saints, Messianic Jews, and Unitarian / Universalist groups), counts of Jain, Shinto, Sikh, Tao and National Spiritualist Association congregations, and counts of adherents from Baha'i, three Buddhist groupings, four Hindu groupings, four Jewish groupings, Islam, and Zoroastrianism. The 236 groups reported a total of 344,894 congregations with 150,686,156 adherents, comprising 48.8 percent of the U.S. population in 2010.

We estimate three regressions for all of the dependent variables, specifying the measures of religion differently in each case. The first specification includes all religious adherents as a proportion of the metro area population. The second divided adherents into the religious groups Protestant, Catholic, Orthodox, and Other. The third sub-divided the Protestant group, resulting in the categories evangelical, black Protestant, mainline Protestant, Catholic, Orthodox, and Other.

The regression equation for the first specification (to which the other specifications are similar), with total spending as the dependent variable, takes this form:

$$\begin{aligned} \log(\text{Total spending per capita}) = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 \log(\text{Population density}) \\ & + \beta_2 \log(\text{Median income}) + \beta_3 \log(\text{Poverty rate}) + \beta_4 \log(\text{Bachelors}) \\ & + \beta_5 \log(\text{Owner - occupied housing}) + \beta_6 \log(\text{Age 65 and over}) \\ & + \sum_{i=7}^{10} \beta_i \text{Ethnic variable}_i + \beta_{11} \text{Religious Adherents} \end{aligned}$$

All regressions are estimated with ordinary least squares, and all variables except ethnicity and religion are in natural logs.

The independent variable population density is a purely demographic variable for which we hypothesize no particular expected coefficient sign. There are two ability-to-pay variables: median income and the pov-

erty rate. We generally expect median income to have a positive relationship to municipal spending and taxes. We have no expectation for coefficient on poverty rate; higher levels may put extra pressure on public services but also represent lower ability to pay. An increase in the percentage of housing which is owner-occupied should be associated with lower municipal spending and taxes in that home owners, as opposed to renters, tend to be more sensitive to increases in spending because they believe this will increase taxes (Poterba 1997).

The rest of the demographic variables reflect preferences to some degree. These are the percentage of the population with a bachelor's degree, the percentage of the population age 65 and over, the proportion of the population in various ethnic groups, and the religion variables (defined above and discussed further below). The sign of these is *a priori* ambiguous, but the comparison literature does provide some empirical guidance. Fischer and Schneider (2007) sometimes found a positive relationship between age and expenditure per capita for Swiss cantons. Reda (2010) sometimes found a positive relationship between the percent college educated and taxes at the state level in the U.S. For the specific spending category of education, Poterba (1997) found a negative relationship between age 65 and older and education spending, and the result was compounded by issues of ethnicity.

Recall that Friedman suggests that ethnicity might matter in a way similar to the way that religion matters. Also, one of the religion variables is black Protestants, which suggests that the ethnicity variables are needed. (Ethnicity variables were included by Reda (2010) but not by Fischer and Schneider (2007).) In the census data, individuals self-report in ethnic categories: non-Hispanic white or white, black, Asian, and Hispanic. (The omitted category in the regressions is the sum of "Native American" and "Other" ethnic groups, which together make up 4.5% of the sample.) The effect of each of these variables is *a priori* ambiguous, but Reda (2010) found a negative coefficient for the black and Hispanic variables as compared to his omitted category (white).

The proportions of the population in the various religious groups are the remaining explanatory variables. (Non-adherents are the omitted category in the regressions; 48.8% of the population are adherents, 51.2% non-adherents.) Recall that Fischer and Schneider (2007) argue that there should be a negative relationship between Protestants and taxes, overall expenditure, and welfare expenditure, but these authors only

consider the Catholic and Protestant categories. (They also do not divide the latter into its constituent groups.) Their empirical results showed a negative relationship between Protestants and taxes for Swiss cantons. Reda (2010) identified “conservative Protestants” and Catholics, but no other groups. He found that conservative Protestants had a positive relationship to state education spending and a negative relationship to state welfare spending, but that there was no relationship between U.S. state taxes and any of his religion variables.

2 Basic Empirical Results

Table 2 contains the results of the regressions in which those who identified themselves as members of a religious group are aggregated into one variable: religious adherents as a proportion of the total metro area population. Before discussing the results for this religion variable, the other explanatory variables will be addressed briefly. In the first pane of Table 2, metro-wide total spending, total revenue, taxes, property taxes, debt, and employment are the dependent variables. All are measured on a per capita basis. When significant, these results generally conformed to expectations, with the understanding that our methodology only allows us to comment on correlation and its direction. Greater population density was positively associated with all the dependent variables but employment, where the relationship was negative. As expected, higher median income was associated with an increase in all the dependent variables but employment, for which there was no relationship. An elevated poverty rate was positively associated with total revenue, debt, and employment, perhaps reflecting a higher demand for government services.

The coefficients for the proportion of a metro population with bachelor’s degrees were mixed—negative for total spending and revenue, positive otherwise. Noting the change in sign between revenue and taxes, recall that revenue includes intergovernmental transfers as well as taxes. A higher proportion of owner-occupied housing was negatively associated with spending, revenue, taxes, and employment, but there was no relationship to property taxes and debt. A larger 65-and-older population was positively related to spending, revenue, taxes, and property taxes. The ethnic variables were generally insignificant except for the proportion white (negatively associated with taxes) and the proportion Asian (negatively associated with spending, revenue, taxes, and property tax-

es). The effect of the key religion variable, the percentage of religious adherents, was only significant twice: negatively for property taxes and positively for debt.

The second pane of Table 2 examines several specific functions of metro governments—spending on education, roads, police, health, and welfare. Population density was positively associated with education, health, and welfare spending, but negatively associated with spending on roads. It may be that dense cities are more compact and require less road spending per capita. An increase in median income was positively correlated with all the specific service functions except health spending. Higher poverty rates only affected road spending, where the coefficient was positive. The reason for this effect is not readily apparent.

Bachelor's degrees had mixed effects, the coefficient being negative for education and welfare but positive for police spending. A higher rate of owner-occupied housing was negatively associated with education, police, and welfare spending as predicted, with no relationship for the other two categories. A larger population over 65 was positively associated with education, road, police, and welfare spending. It is especially worth noting the first coefficient, since education mainly benefits children, and because the result is contrary to Poterba (1997). The ethnic variables, where significant, were generally negative, with most of the results affecting police spending. For the religious adherents variable, a greater proportion of religious adherents in a metro area was negatively associated with education spending and welfare spending. Although the effects are relatively small, a greater proportion of religious adherents was associated with a decrease in spending on the specific function concerned with human capital acquisition and one of the two redistributive functions.

In Table 3 and Table 4 the dependent variables are the same as in Table 2. The explanatory variables were also the same, except for the religion variables. Looking at the non-religion variables, the qualitative results in Tables 3 and 4 were generally consistent with those in Table 2. Population density and median income were somewhat less often significant, but when they were the qualitative results were the same. The poverty rate had a positive coefficient for total spending in Tables 3 and 4, but no effect in Table 2, and the other qualitative results of poverty were the same in Tables 2–4. The qualitative results for a bachelor's degree were the same in Tables 2–4.

The results for owner-occupied housing were the same for the total

70 FAITH & ECONOMICS

spending through employment regressions. For the specific functions, the relationship was negative for police spending in Tables 2–4. It was negative for education and welfare spending in Table 2, and positive for road spending in Table 3.

Age 65 and older had similar effects through Tables 2–4, noting the negative coefficient on employment and insignificant effect of education in Tables 3–4. The qualitative results for the ethnic variables were the same in Tables 2–4, except for the black variable's negative association with debt in Table 4, the insignificance of the black variable on police spending in Table 3, and the lack of an effect of the Asian variable on education in Tables 3–4.

Considering the religion variables now, in Table 3 the religious adherents were divided into four groups: Protestant, Catholic, Orthodox, and Other religious adherents. Although the effects were relatively small for all the religion variables, a greater proportion of Protestants was negatively related to total spending, revenue, and property taxes. Conversely, a relatively larger Protestant population was associated with increased debt. A greater proportion of Catholics had a positive relationship to revenue, taxes, and employment. A greater proportion of Orthodox Christians had no effect on any of the variables. Lastly, an increase in the proportion of adherents in the Other category had a negative relationship to total spending, property taxes, and employment.

The second pane of Table 3 contains the regression results for spending on specific government functions. A relatively larger Protestant population was negatively associated with spending on all specific functions except health. A relatively larger Catholic population was associated with increased education and road spending. While the Orthodox variable had no effect on the previous dependent variables, here the coefficients on both education and police spending were positive. For the Other-adherents variable, a negative coefficient was found for education and welfare spending. To sum up, in Table 3, except for the health category, a greater relative Protestant population was always associated with decreased spending. A greater proportion of Catholics or Orthodox Christians, when significant, was associated with increased spending. A greater proportion of Other adherents was associated with decreased spending.

In Table 4, the Protestant variable was divided into three parts: evangelical, black Protestant, and mainline Protestant. In the first set of regressions, a greater proportion of evangelicals was associated with de-

creased total spending, revenue, and property taxes, but increased debt. The black Protestant and mainline Protestant variables were not related to any of dependent variables in the first set of regressions, except that black Protestants and debt were positively related. From these regressions, it appears that the Protestant results in Table 3 were largely driven by evangelicals.

For the specific-service regressions in the second pane of Table 4, the evangelical variable was negatively associated with education, road, and welfare spending, but positively associated with health spending. The black Protestant variable was positively associated with road and police spending, but negatively associated with health spending. A greater proportion of mainline Protestants was negatively associated with police spending, but positively associated with welfare spending. Comparing Tables 3 and 4, the coefficients were qualitatively the same for all Protestants and evangelicals for education, road, health, and welfare spending. On the other hand, the coefficients were qualitatively the same for all Protestants and mainline Protestants for police spending, but notice the coefficient for black Protestants was positive while the others were negative. Similarly, notice that the coefficient for all Protestants and evangelicals was negative for welfare spending, but the coefficient between mainline Protestants and welfare spending was positive. The other significant religion variable coefficients were qualitatively the same in Tables 3 and 4, except that the coefficient for Other adherents was significant (and negative) for road spending.

3 Re-estimation with Geographic Controls

In this final section of the paper we include state-level dummies in the regressions to provide for geographic controls. The constitutions of the states vary, and this may play a role in the relationships between religious adherence and the municipal variables. In only five of the 366 metro areas do the state and the metro-area coincide, so the geographical controls should not raise issues in the estimation. The results of the regressions with geographic controls are reported in Tables 5–7, where we have omitted the state fixed-effect coefficients. In the interest of brevity, we will compare the overall patterns of the results to those of the previous section, and then concentrate on the religion variables.

Comparing the equivalent regression in Tables 2 and 5, Tables 3 and

72 FAITH & ECONOMICS

6, and Tables 4 and 7, all significant coefficients were of the same sign, with two exceptions which we will discuss below. The evidence from the two analyses (without and with geographic controls) is, we judge, most consistent when an independent variable bears a significant coefficient with the same sign across all six regressions—that is, across all of the dependent variables. Median income, for example, had a positive coefficient in all six regressions for total spending, revenue, taxes, property taxes, and police spending, with no significant negative coefficient in any regression. Owner occupied housing had a negative coefficient in all six regressions for total spending, revenue, employment, and police spending, and no significant positive coefficients. Age 65 and over had a positive coefficient for all six regressions for total spending, revenue, taxes, property taxes, road and police spending, and only two significant negative coefficients (for employment in both cases).

The bachelor's degree variable had a positive coefficient for all six regressions for taxes, property taxes, debt, employment, and police. But the other coefficients, when significant, varied considerably. In the regressions without state dummies, there were nearly as many negative coefficients as positive, while in the regressions with state dummies there were none with negative coefficients. In two cases, for education with religious adherents (comparing Tables 2 and 5) and religious groups (comparing Tables 3 and 6), the bachelor's degree coefficient switched from negative to positive. Population density had a positive coefficient for all six regressions for debt, and negative coefficients for employment and roads; the other significant coefficients were somewhat more positive than negative. The poverty rate was not often significant in the regressions with state-level controls; when it was, the signs were about evenly divided. The only dependent variable for which the poverty rate coefficient was the same in all six regressions was for employment, where the relationship was positive.

The ethnic variables were much more often significant in the regressions with state-level controls than in the regressions without them, and with one lone exception the coefficients were all negative. The cases for which all six regressions return significant coefficients are police spending for whites, Asians, and Hispanics; taxes for whites and Asians; and property taxes for Asians.

Looking now at the religious adherents variables, in Table 5 the only significant results are for property taxes, education, and welfare spend-

ing. These coefficients are negative, as they were in Table 2. However, the coefficient for debt, statistically significant in Table 2 without state-level controls, is no longer significant in Table 5.

In the regressions with religious groups (Table 6), the proportion Protestant had a negative coefficient for property taxes, education, and welfare spending, and a positive coefficient for debt. These results are qualitatively the same as in Table 3, but notice that several coefficients for Protestants that were significant in Table 3 are not significant in Table 6 (total spending, revenue, roads, police, and health spending). In Table 6 the proportion Catholic had a positive correlation with taxes, property taxes, and road spending. In Table 3, the coefficients for taxes and road spending were also positive and significant. Catholics and property taxes were not significantly related in Table 3 but were in Table 6, while on the other hand revenue and employment were related in Table 3 but not in Table 6. The Orthodox variable bore a positive coefficient for education and police spending in both Tables 3 and 6. The Other group had a negative correlation in both Tables 3 and 6 for property taxes, education, and welfare spending. This group's coefficients for total spending and employment were significant in Table 3 but not in Table 6.

In the regressions with religious Protestant groups in Table 7, the proportion of evangelical Protestants had a negative coefficient for property taxes, education, and welfare spending, and a positive coefficient for debt; these are unchanged from Table 4. These results were qualitatively similar to those for all Protestants in Tables 3 and 6. In addition, there was a negative relationship between evangelicals and spending on roads in both Tables 4 and 7. In Table 7 the proportion Catholic had a positive correlation with taxes, property taxes, and road spending, as it did in Table 6. The proportion Catholic is not related to property taxes in Table 4, but is related to taxes and road spending. The qualitative results for the Other category were similar in Tables 3, 4, 6, and 7. For the Orthodox group, the coefficients were qualitatively similar for Tables 7 and 6, with the differences from Tables 3 and 4 noted above.

4 Conclusion

The strategy of this paper was to add religious adherence variables to a standard set of explanatory variables for several metro-area measures of spending, taxing, debt, and employment. While there is some precedent

74 FAITH & ECONOMICS

for the inclusion of religion variables in examinations of local government spending, as far as we are aware, this is the first paper to use them to examine metro-area spending and taxing. Future work will be needed to investigate the theoretical and empirical mechanisms by which these stylized facts arose. Focusing on the religion variables, we may summarize the primary relationships, consistent across the regressions both without and with geographic controls, as follows: Property taxes and spending on education and welfare were negatively correlated with the proportion of overall religious adherents, the proportion of Protestants, the proportion of evangelical Protestants, and sometimes the Other category of religious adherents. Debt was positively correlated with the proportion of Protestants and the proportion of evangelical Protestants. Taxes and spending on roads were positively correlated with the proportion of Catholics. Spending on roads was negatively correlated with the proportion of evangelical Protestants. Health spending was negatively correlated with the proportion of black Protestants. Education and police spending were positively correlated with the proportion of Orthodox adherents. Finally, welfare spending was positively correlated with the proportion of mainline Protestants.

Endnotes

- 1 Coming from a Christian perspective, Anderson (2013) has argued that government debt should generally be avoided—although he was thinking of national rather than municipal debt.

References

- Anderson, J. E.** (2013). Government debt and deficits. *Faith and Economics*, 61–62, 1–31.
- Fischer, J. A.V. & Schneider, F.** (2007). Protestantism and government spending: A negative relationship? An empirical application to Swiss cantons. *SSE/EFI Working Paper Series in Economics and Finance*, No. 685.
- Friedman, B. M.** (2005). *The Moral Consequences of Economic Growth*. New York: Alfred A Knopf.
- Kannianen, V. & Paeaekkoenen, J.** (2010). Do the Catholic and Protestant countries differ by their tax morale? *Empirica*, 37(3), 271–290.

- Poterba, J. M.** (1997). Demographic structure and the political economy of public education. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 16(1), 48–66.
- Reda, A.** (2010). Religious and economic preferences: An empirical analysis of state tax rates and public spending. *International Economic Journal*, 24(3), 297–316.
- Wisman, J. D. and Davis, M. E.** (2013). Degraded work, declining community, rising inequality, and the transformation of the Protestant ethic in America: 1870–1930. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 72(5), 1075–1105. ■

Tables

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Total spending per capita	3913.54	1050.28	1550.00	8618.31
Total revenue per capita	3813.63	1040.19	1576.89	7539.09
Taxes per capita	1380.64	507.25	537.00	3861.68
Property taxes per capita	1023.45	463.70	174.00	3705.12
Debt per capita	4525.03	4626.30	527.00	69603.87
Employment per capita	71.15	30.39	7.53	290.25
Education spending per student	9891.02	2083.81	5796.00	18768.45
Road spending per capita	174.17	89.70	20.19	567.53
Police spending per capita	195.43	69.53	66.39	480.89
Health spending per capita	354.97	563.33	0.00	5787.13
Welfare spending per capita	122.785	163.28	0.00	884.20
Population density	111.51	126.18	2.80	1091.10
Median income	47014.50	8142.34	31736.00	84523.00
Poverty rate	16.24	4.33	6.80	36.30
Bachelor's degree	25.52	8.04	10.90	57.50
Owner-occupied housing	66.53	5.77	48.20	81.50
Age 65 and over	13.47	3.37	6.40	34.10
White	73.18	17.44	3.40	97.30
Black	11.30	10.84	0.20	52.60
Native American	1.46	2.76	0.10	37.10
Asian	3.49	5.20	0.60	79.70

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Hispanic	10.57	15.47	0.70	95.70
Religious adherents	48.22	11.97	22.34	90.80
Evangelical	18.86	12.54	0.48	61.58
Black Protestant	1.54	2.25	0.00	13.49
Mainline Protestant	8.34	4.99	0.08	30.84
Catholic	15.31	11.70	1.22	53.29
Orthodox	0.18	0.24	0.00	1.32
Other	3.96	9.42	0.14	88.87
N	366			

Table 2: Regressions with religious adherents

	Total spending per capita	Total revenue per capita	Taxes per capita	Property taxes per capita	Debt per capita	Employment per capita
Population density	.040** (2.529)	.037** (2.231)	.059*** (3.366)	.102*** (4.130)	.122*** (3.152)	-.118*** (-5.507)
Median Income	1.063*** (6.055)	1.117*** (6.184)	1.132*** (5.869)	1.018*** (3.749)	.930** (2.200)	.283 (1.208)
Poverty rate	.153 (1.637)	.162* (1.684)	-.009 (-.086)	-.210 (-1.450)	.427* (1.895)	.399*** (3.195)
Bachelor's degree	-.131** (-2.436)	-.152*** (-2.732)	.287*** (4.840)	.345*** (4.137)	.459*** (3.538)	.433*** (6.017)
Owner- occupied housing	-.524*** (-2.723)	-.608*** (-3.068)	-.595*** (-2.813)	-.293 (-.985)	.456 (.984)	-.832*** (-3.242)
Age 65 and over	.317*** (4.708)	.375*** (5.409)	.662*** (8.926)	.588*** (5.640)	.123 (.757)	-.119 (-1.328)
White	-.006 (-1.210)	-.008 (-1.504)	-.012** (-2.146)	-.003 (-.466)	-.015 (-1.269)	.008 (1.255)
Black	-.004 (-.718)	-.005 (-.969)	-.006 (-1.081)	-.003 (-.440)	-.016 (-1.347)	.009 (1.365)
Asian	-.016*** (-3.391)	-.016*** (-3.415)	-.020*** (-3.877)	-.017** (-2.301)	-.010 (-.899)	.004 (.683)

78 FAITH & ECONOMICS

	Total spending per capita	Total revenue per capita	Taxes per capita	Property taxes per capita	Debt per capita	Employment per capita
Hispanic	-.002 (-.335)	-.003 (-.693)	-.006 (-1.109)	.003 (.437)	-.008 (-.709)	.005 (.771)
Religious adherents	-.001 (-1.426)	-.001 (-.929)	.0003 (.285)	-.005*** (-2.961)	.005** (2.187)	.0003 (.194)
Constant	-1.356 (-.568)	-1.571 (-.640)	-4.307 (-1.641)	-4.812 (-1.303)	-6.008 (-1.045)	-4.720 (-1.483)
Adj. R ²	.299	.294	.514	.461	.201	.322
N	366	366	366	366	366	366

*, **, and *** indicate significance at the 10 percent, 5 percent, and 1 percent levels, respectively.

Table 2 (cont.): Regressions with religious adherents

	Education spending per pupil	Road spending per capita	Police spending per capita	Health spending per capita	Welfare spending per capita
Population density	.040*** (3.311)	-.154*** (-4.339)	-.004 (-.187)	.167* (1.782)	.271** (2.404)
Median Income	.489*** (3.677)	1.650*** (4.235)	1.009*** (4.635)	.985 (.955)	3.048** (2.433)
Poverty rate	-.053 (-.749)	.498** (2.397)	.145 (1.250)	.491 (.894)	-.140 (-.213)
Bachelor's degree	-.077* (-1.886)	.101 (.847)	.155** (2.320)	-.283 (-.893)	-1.203*** (-3.298)
Owner- occupied housing	-.386*** (-2.649)	.517 (1.210)	-.567** (-2.379)	-1.251 (-1.108)	-2.726** (-1.990)
Age 65 and over	.186*** (3.641)	.588*** (3.932)	.786*** (9.405)	-.210 (-.531)	.815* (1.777)
White	-.001 (-.189)	-.002 (-.172)	-.023*** (-3.762)	.016 (.568)	.015 (.451)
Black	-.001 (-.169)	-.010 (-.936)	-.011* (-1.854)	.020 (.690)	-.012 (-.371)
Asian	-.006* (-1.674)	.003 (.280)	-.015*** (-2.607)	.003 (.115)	.048 (1.065)

	Education spending per pupil	Road spending per capita	Police spending per capita	Health spending per capita	Welfare spending per capita
Hispanic	-.002 (-.685)	-.005 (-.445)	-.014** (-2.353)	.021 (.713)	.012 (.354)
Religious adherents	-.002*** (-3.267)	-.001 (-.444)	-.001 (-.578)	.002 (.397)	-.024*** (-3.379)
Constant	5.521*** (3.053)	-17.060*** (-3.220)	-4.068 (-1.375)	-2.713 (-.194)	-16.486 (-.991)
Adj. R ²	.256	.196	.391	.022	.211
N	366	366	366	365	331

*, **, and *** indicate significance at the 10 percent, 5 percent, and 1 percent levels, respectively.

Table 3: Regressions with religious groups

	Total spending per capita	Total revenue per capita	Taxes per capita	Property taxes per capita	Debt per capita	Employment per capita
Population density	.027 (1.533)	.021 (1.156)	.039** (2.058)	.077*** (2.930)	.121*** (2.858)	-.130*** (-5.528)
Median Income	.955*** (5.388)	.982*** (5.392)	.982*** (5.113)	.725*** (2.712)	1.165*** (2.704)	.260 (1.094)
Poverty rate	.169* (1.833)	.175* (1.845)	.015 (.151)	-.190 (-1.360)	.466** (2.074)	.428*** (3.446)
Bachelor's degree	-.124** (-2.339)	-.148*** (-2.706)	.297*** (5.147)	.352*** (4.377)	.486*** (3.753)	.449*** (6.284)
Owner- occupied housing	-.444** (-2.314)	-.530*** (-2.685)	-.478** (-2.297)	-.162 (-.559)	.537 (1.150)	-.730*** (-2.829)
Age 65 and over	.247*** (3.543)	.303*** (4.227)	.560*** (7.411)	.451*** (4.294)	.110 (.646)	-.191** (-2.038)
White	-.005 (-1.066)	-.007 (-1.319)	-.010** (-1.981)	-.002 (-.291)	-.015 (-1.298)	.009 (1.322)
Black	-.002 (-.387)	-.003 (-.546)	-.003 (-.662)	.0008 (.108)	-.019 (-1.616)	.009 (1.406)
Asian	-.014*** (-2.961)	-.014*** (-2.941)	-.017*** (-3.353)	-.013* (-1.820)	-.010 (-.900)	.006 (.938)

80 FAITH & ECONOMICS

	Total spending per capita	Total revenue per capita	Taxes per capita	Property taxes per capita	Debt per capita	Employment per capita
Hispanic	-.002 (-.486)	-.004 (-.810)	-.007 (-1.307)	.001 (.1585)	-.007 (-.622)	.004 (.671)
Protestant	-.003** (-2.169)	-.002** (-1.996)	-.001 (-.933)	-.008*** (-4.627)	.009*** (3.216)	.0004 (.285)
Catholic	.002 (1.508)	.003* (1.836)	.005*** (3.523)	.003 (1.558)	.004 (1.122)	.003* (1.799)
Orthodox	.014 (.236)	.040 (.653)	.028 (.449)	.008 (.095)	-.025 (-.178)	-.017 (-.222)
Other	-.003** (-2.281)	-.002 (-1.489)	-.002 (-1.513)	-.007*** (-3.131)	-.00008 (-.024)	-.003* (-1.823)
Constant	-.445 (-1.186)	-.355 (-1.144)	-3.065 (-1.182)	-1.988 (-.549)	-9.041 (-1.554)	-4.874 (-1.516)
Adj. R ²	.322	.319	.544	.503	.213	.335
N	366	366	366	366	366	366

*, **, and *** indicate significance at the 10 percent, 5 percent, and 1 percent levels, respectively.

Table 3 (cont.): Regressions with religious groups

	Education spending per pupil	Road spending per capita	Police spending per capita	Health spending per capita	Welfare spending per capita
Population density	.003 (.247)	-.187*** (-4.955)	-.020 (-.916)	.227** (2.211)	.144 (1.175)
Median Income	.271** (2.424)	1.266*** (3.295)	.860*** (3.899)	1.732* (1.653)	1.908 (1.521)
Poverty rate	-.011 (-.185)	.532*** (2.658)	.135 (1.171)	.501 (.917)	-.046 (-.071)
Bachelor's degree	-.061* (-1.814)	.117 (1.012)	.141** (2.124)	-.253 (-.803)	-1.162*** (-3.252)
Owner-occupied housing	-.183 (-1.510)	.712* (1.711)	-.552** (-2.312)	-1.406 (-1.240)	-1.995 (-1.461)
Age 65 and over	.020 (.457)	.391*** (2.589)	.758*** (8.740)	.007 (.018)	.274 (.570)

	Education spending per pupil	Road spending per capita	Police spending per capita	Health spending per capita	Welfare spending per capita
White	.002 (.509)	-.0003 (-.027)	-.021*** (-3.528)	.012 (.407)	.024 (.742)
Black	.003 (1.028)	-.005 (-.477)	-.008 (-1.365)	.008 (.268)	.007 (.222)
Asian	-.001 (-.266)	.008 (.775)	-.013** (-2.239)	-.005 (-.192)	.072 (1.625)
Hispanic	-.003 (-1.043)	-.008 (-.791)	-.013** (-2.201)	.022 (.769)	.010 (.295)
Protestant	-.004*** (-5.824)	-.006** (-2.259)	-.002* (-1.655)	.012* (1.712)	-.036*** (-4.395)
Catholic	.005*** (5.353)	.011*** (3.533)	.00004 (.022)	-.010 (-1.217)	-.00006 (-.006)
Orthodox	.095** (2.574)	-.032 (-.255)	.145** (1.994)	-.276 (-.799)	.429 (1.082)
Other	-.007*** (-7.791)	-.005 (-1.645)	.002 (.938)	-.002 (-.200)	-.029*** (-2.862)
Constant	7.155*** (4.747)	-13.412** (-2.586)	-2.483 (-.834)	-10.561 (-.747)	-6.813 (-.413)
Adj. R ²	.502	.260	.407	.041	.249
N	366	366	366	365	331

*, **, and *** indicate significance at the 10 percent, 5 percent, and 1 percent levels, respectively.

Table 4: Regressions with religious groupings, Protestants subdivided

	Total spending per capita	Total revenue per capita	Taxes per capita	Property taxes per capita	Debt per capita	Employment per capita
Population density	.026 (1.506)	.020 (1.129)	.040** (2.101)	.077*** (2.932)	.132*** (3.101)	-.129*** (-5.477)
Median Income	.961*** (5.400)	.982*** (5.364)	.982*** (5.094)	.771*** (2.911)	1.163*** (2.705)	.277 (1.162)
Poverty rate	.176* (1.889)	.175* (1.824)	.012 (.115)	-.140 (-1.008)	.431* (1.909)	.445*** (3.556)

82 FAITH & ECONOMICS

	Total spending per capita	Total revenue per capita	Taxes per capita	Property taxes per capita	Debt per capita	Employment per capita
Bachelor's degree	-.129** (-2.378)	-.147*** (-2.633)	.294*** (5.014)	.314*** (3.898)	.467*** (3.564)	.435*** (5.989)
Owner-occupied housing	-.446** (-2.312)	-.528*** (-2.663)	-.484** (-2.317)	-.182 (-.633)	.481 (1.032)	-.738*** (-2.856)
Age 65 and over	.251*** (3.580)	.303*** (4.190)	.558*** (7.335)	.484*** (4.630)	.094 (.551)	-.179* (-1.904)
White	-.005 (-1.110)	-.006 (-1.300)	-.010** (-1.978)	-.004 (-.566)	-.016 (-1.325)	.008 (1.203)
Black	-.002 (-.325)	-.003 (-.485)	-.004 (-.785)	.002 (.202)	-.027** (-2.176)	.009 (1.352)
Asian	-.014*** (-2.948)	-.014*** (-2.928)	-.017*** (-3.358)	-.013* (-1.828)	-.011 (-.965)	.006 (.939)
Hispanic	-.002 (-.498)	-.004 (-.805)	-.007 (-1.307)	.001 (.087)	-.008 (-.636)	.004 (.640)
Evangelical	-.003** (-2.088)	-.002* (-1.736)	-.001 (-1.001)	-.010*** (-5.067)	.007** (2.317)	-.0001 (-1.11)
Black Protestant	-.005 (-.514)	-.003 (-.371)	.004 (.394)	-.018 (-1.349)	.055** (2.547)	-.002 (-1.53)
Mainline Protestant	-.001 (-.369)	-.003 (-.923)	-.001 (-.377)	.004 (.896)	.009 (1.280)	.005 (1.282)
Catholic	.002 (1.443)	.003* (1.819)	.005*** (3.332)	.003 (1.310)	.002 (.706)	.003 (1.644)
Orthodox	.013 (.215)	.040 (.660)	.027 (.421)	-.003 (-.031)	-.039 (-2.277)	-.022 (-2.278)
Other	-.003** (-2.069)	-.002 (-1.450)	-.002 (-1.519)	-.005** (-2.366)	-.001 (-.268)	-.001 (-1.493)
Constant	-.507 (-2.211)	-.360 (-1.146)	-3.010 (-1.157)	-2.399 (-.671)	-8.516 (-1.467)	-5.011 (-1.556)
Adj. R ²	.319	.314	.541	.515	.218	.334
N	366	366	366	366	366	366

*, **, and *** indicate significance at the 10 percent, 5 percent, and 1 percent levels, respectively.

Table 4 (cont.): Regressions with religious groupings, Protestants subdivided

	Education spending per pupil	Road spending per capita	Police spending per capita	Health spending per capita	Welfare spending per capita
Population density	.003 (.284)	-.175*** (-4.642)	-.016 (-.769)	.216** (2.085)	.190* (1.684)
Median Income	.293*** (2.664)	1.250*** (3.280)	.817*** (3.775)	1.659 (1.580)	1.996* (1.741)
Poverty rate	.012 (.209)	.478** (2.391)	.078 (.686)	.464 (.841)	.419 (.706)
Bachelor's degree	-.080** (-2.392)	.106 (.915)	.170** (2.580)	-.174 (-.542)	-1.535*** (-4.637)
Owner-occupied housing	-.195 (-1.636)	.655 (1.584)	-.550** (-2.347)	-1.307 (-1.150)	-1.857 (-1.486)
Age 65 and over	.035 (.816)	.364** (2.418)	.723*** (8.464)	-.024 (-.058)	.680 (1.537)
White	.001 (.186)	-.0001 (-.008)	-.020*** (-3.290)	.015 (.511)	.004 (.134)
Black	.003 (.999)	-.014 (-1.273)	-.011* (-1.806)	.016 (.511)	.008 (.257)
Asian	-.001 (-.268)	.007 (.700)	-.013** (-2.335)	-.005 (-.171)	.091** (2.260)
Hispanic	-.003 (-1.149)	-.008 (-.799)	-.013** (-2.170)	.023 (.797)	.006 (.198)
Evangelical	-.005*** (-6.456)	-.007*** (-2.652)	-.001 (-.919)	.017** (2.130)	-.057*** (-6.758)
Black Protestant	-.007 (-1.257)	.049** (2.524)	.020* (1.832)	-.027* (-.504)	-.084 (-1.441)
Mainline Protestant	.002 (.893)	-.010 (-1.641)	-.014*** (-4.041)	-.005 (-.285)	.091*** (5.177)
Catholic	.004*** (4.971)	.009*** (3.030)	.0001 (.057)	-.008 (-.926)	-.006 (-.691)
Orthodox	.089** (2.442)	-.045 (-.356)	.152** (2.118)	-.244 (-.703)	.271 (.746)
Other	-.006*** (-6.903)	-.006** (-2.068)	-.00005 (-.027)	-.003 (-.340)	-.012 (-1.215)

84 FAITH & ECONOMICS

	Education spending per pupil	Road spending per capita	Police spending per capita	Health spending per capita	Welfare spending per capita
Constant	6.976*** (4.701)	-12.702** (-2.469)	-1.943 (-.665)	-10.454 (-.738)	-8.810 (-.583)
Adj. R ²	.519	.272	.431	.041	.373
N	366	366	366	365	331

*, **, and *** indicate significance at the 10 percent, 5 percent, and 1 percent levels, respectively.

Table 5: Regressions with states and religious adherents

	Total spending per capita	Total revenue per capita	Taxes per capita	Property taxes per capita	Debt per capita	Employment per capita
Population density	.008 (.452)	.013 (.735)	.024 (1.483)	.038* (1.967)	.130*** (2.874)	-.187*** (-7.299)
Median Income	.604*** (3.376)	.554*** (2.994)	.703*** (4.161)	.753*** (3.747)	.525 (1.119)	.456* (1.725)
Poverty rate	-.006 (-.071)	-.047 (-.524)	-.126 (-1.545)	-.164* (-1.684)	.151 (.664)	.414*** (3.231)
Bachelor's degree	-.028 (-.515)	-.044 (-.776)	.356*** (6.943)	.363*** (5.953)	.506*** (3.553)	.482*** (6.008)
Owner- occupied housing	-.418** (-1.985)	-.521** (-2.397)	-.257 (-1.294)	-.179 (-.758)	.847 (1.536)	-1.328*** (-4.268)
Age 65 and over	.329*** (4.577)	.371*** (5.000)	.578*** (8.524)	.558*** (6.922)	-.100 (-.531)	.016 (.147)
White	-.015*** (-2.864)	-.016*** (-3.000)	-.020*** (-4.206)	-.022*** (-3.793)	-.021 (-1.595)	.002 (.310)
Black	-.012** (-2.426)	-.014** (-2.567)	-.015*** (-3.037)	-.017*** (-2.968)	-.016 (-1.193)	.004 (.468)
Asian	-.012* (-1.860)	-.012* (-1.773)	-.015** (-2.429)	-.024*** (-3.226)	-.013 (-.721)	-.003 (-.317)
Hispanic	-.009* (-1.804)	-.010** (-2.036)	-.015*** (-3.185)	-.017*** (-3.025)	-.016 (-1.212)	.003 (.369)
Religious adherents	-.001 (-1.306)	-.001 (-1.021)	-.001 (-.752)	-.003** (-2.355)	.004 (1.401)	-.002 (-1.118)

	Total spending per capita	Total revenue per capita	Taxes per capita	Property taxes per capita	Debt per capita	Employment per capita
Constant	4.148* (1.818)	5.243** (2.222)	.240 (.112)	-.647 (-.252)	-1.627 (-.272)	-4.020 (-1.191)
Adj. R ²	.531	.523	.760	.810	.368	.443
N	366	366	366	366	366	366

*, **, and *** indicate significance at the 10 percent, 5 percent, and 1 percent levels, respectively.

Table 5 (cont.): Regressions with states and religious adherents

	Education spending per pupil	Road spending per capita	Police spending per capita	Health spending per capita	Welfare spending per capita
Population density	-.009 (-1.155)	-.065** (-1.991)	.066*** (.3.347)	.121 (1.165)	.223 (.866)
Median Income	.075 (.969)	.487 (1.439)	.362* (1.770)	2.385** (2.231)	-.190 (-2.220)
Poverty rate	-.126*** (-3.361)	.125 (.763)	-.074 (-.750)	.289 (.556)	-.221 (-.515)
Bachelor's degree	.055** (2.320)	.142 (1.378)	.192*** (3.084)	-.241 (-.743)	-.040 (-1.151)
Owner-occupied housing	-.375*** (-4.108)	.541 (1.359)	-.452* (-1.846)	-2.531** (-2.018)	-.894 (-1.868)
Age 65 and over	.194*** (6.233)	.407*** (2.994)	.633*** (7.703)	.692 (1.616)	.839** (2.365)
White	-.011*** (-5.172)	-.004 (-.442)	-.025*** (-4.186)	-.011 (-.358)	-.023 (-.962)
Black	-.010*** (-4.368)	-.004 (-.434)	-.011* (-1.920)	-.029 (-.945)	-.022 (-1.888)
Asian	-.014*** (-4.905)	.005 (.360)	-.021*** (-2.725)	-.026 (-.641)	-.008 (-2.250)
Hispanic	-.009*** (-4.254)	-.007 (-.709)	-.019*** (-3.318)	-.007 (-.246)	-.014 (-.588)
Religious adherents	-.003*** (-5.675)	-.001 (-.623)	.002 (1.417)	-.001 (-.144)	-.012** (-2.075)

86 FAITH & ECONOMICS

	Education spending per pupil	Road spending per capita	Police spending per capita	Health spending per capita	Welfare spending per capita
Constant	10.915*** (11.033)	-3.560 (-.824)	3.036 (1.162)	-10.970 (-.805)	9.824 (.886)
Adj. R ²	.837	.609	.653	.323	.739
N	366	366	366	365	331

*, **, and *** indicate significance at the 10 percent, 5 percent, and 1 percent levels, respectively.

Table 6: Regressions with states and religious groups

	Total spending per capita	Total revenue per capita	Taxes per capita	Property taxes per capita	Debt per capita	Employment per capita
Population density	.0005 (.030)	.003 (.186)	.019 (1.115)	.032 (1.565)	.139*** (2.912)	-.184*** (-6.771)
Median Income	.610*** (3.397)	.558*** (3.019)	.697*** (4.195)	.746*** (3.770)	.530 (1.138)	.456* (1.719)
Poverty rate	.008 (.092)	-.029 (-.324)	-.103 (-1.272)	-.133 (-1.380)	.147 (.652)	.422*** (3.280)
Bachelor's degree	-.037 (-.676)	-.058 (-1.019)	.351*** (6.854)	.353*** (5.795)	.567*** (3.953)	.493*** (6.040)
Owner-occupied housing	-.446** (-2.136)	-.552** (-2.561)	-.291 (-1.504)	-.240 (-1.040)	.916* (1.690)	-1.354*** (-4.385)
Age 65 and over	.310*** (4.121)	.349*** (4.499)	.528*** (7.562)	.503*** (6.059)	-.207 (-1.060)	-.122 (-.110)
White	-.014*** (-2.707)	-.015** (-2.799)	-.020*** (-4.120)	-.021*** (-3.679)	-.023* (-1.747)	.002 (.253)
Black	-.012** (-2.294)	-.013** (-2.385)	-.014*** (-2.967)	-.016*** (-2.853)	-.019 (-1.437)	.003 (.389)
Asian	-.012* (-1.729)	-.011 (-1.612)	-.014** (-2.266)	-.023*** (-3.043)	-.014 (-.803)	-.003 (-.299)
Hispanic	-.009* (-1.836)	-.011** (-2.082)	-.017*** (-3.597)	-.019*** (-3.460)	-.018 (-1.340)	.001 (.191)
Protestant	-.001 (-1.054)	-.001 (-1.050)	-.001 (-.738)	-.004** (-2.343)	.009** (2.516)	-.001 (-.504)

	Total spending per capita	Total revenue per capita	Taxes per capita	Property taxes per capita	Debt per capita	Employment per capita
Catholic	.0004 (.252)	.001 (.739)	.004*** (2.772)	.003* (1.772)	.006 (1.508)	.0004 (.192)
Orthodox	.040 (.728)	.054 (.946)	-.020 (-.400)	-.027 (-.439)	-.099 (-.689)	-.058 (-.711)
Other	-.282 (-.809)	-.166 (-.462)	-.464 (-1.435)	-.940** (-2.444)	-.878 (-.970)	-.795 (-1.543)
Constant	4.181* (1.825)	5.29** (2.240)	.462 (.218)	-.308 (-.122)	-1.789 (-.301)	-3.881 (-1.146)
Adj. R ²	.528	.523	.768	.816	.377	.440
N	366	366	366	366	366	.366

*, **, and *** indicate significance at the 10 percent, 5 percent, and 1 percent levels, respectively.

Table 6 (cont.): Regressions with states and religious groups

	Education spending per pupil	Road spending per capita	Police spending per capita	Health spending per capita	Welfare spending per capita
Population density	-.020** (-2.458)	-.076** (-2.198)	.048** (2.318)	.115 (1.048)	.179** (2.015)
Median Income	.092 (1.180)	.466 (1.388)	.365* (1.791)	2.443** (2.277)	-.202 (-.237)
Poverty rate	-.103*** (-2.712)	.160 (.979)	-.061 (-.615)	.282 (.541)	-.134 (-.316)
Bachelor's degree	.043* (1.772)	.128 (1.240)	.171*** (2.730)	-.241 (-.730)	-.096 (-.363)
Owner-occupied housing	-.439*** (-4.815)	.525 (1.344)	-.415* (-1.751)	-2.604** (-2.088)	-.953 (-.941)
Age 65 and over	.167*** (5.093)	.326** (2.316)	.599*** (7.014)	.746* (1.659)	.728** (1.979)
White	-.011*** (-4.722)	-.003 (-.293)	-.023*** (-3.890)	-.011 (.371)	-.018 (-.767)
Black	-.009*** (-4.057)	-.003 (-.289)	-.010* (-1.662)	-.030 (-.970)	-.017 (-.695)

88 FAITH & ECONOMICS

	Education spending per pupil	Road spending per capita	Police spending per capita	Health spending per capita	Welfare spending per capita
Asian	-.013*** (-4.437)	.007 (.521)	-.020*** (-2.599)	-.026 (-.654)	-.004 (-.132)
Hispanic	-(.010)*** (-4.391)	-.009 (-.968)	-.018*** (-3.131)	-.005 (-.162)	-.015 (-.651)
Protestant	-.002*** (-3.050)	-.003 (-1.265)	.001 (.488)	.004 (.429)	-.018*** (-2.683)
Catholic	.0005 (.671)	.005* (1.710)	.002 (1.199)	-.004 (-.390)	-.004 (-.553)
Orthodox	.058** (2.415)	-.002 (-.019)	.154** (2.471)	.102 (.311)	.277 (1.089)
Other	-.467*** (-3.073)	-.928 (-1.422)	.343 (.868)	.835 (.401)	-3.494** (-2.133)
Constant	10.930*** (10.939)	-3.174 (-.740)	2.883 (1.109)	-11.506 (-.840)	10.248 (.932)
Adj. R ²	.834	.616	.657	.318	.743
N	366	366	366	365	331

*, **, and *** indicate significance at the 10 percent, 5 percent, and 1 percent levels, respectively.

Table 7: Regressions with states and religious groupings, Protestants subdivided

	Total spending per capita	Total revenue per capita	Taxes per capita	Property taxes per capita	Debt per capita	Employment per capita
Population density	.001 (.048)	.004 (.198)	.022 (1.275)	.038* (1.878)	.146*** (3.038)	-.185*** (-6.747)
Median Income	.607*** (3.380)	.556*** (3.008)	.686*** (4.127)	.721*** (3.701)	.503 (1.080)	.459* (1.725)
Poverty rate	.012 (.134)	-.024 (-.264)	-.109 (-1.353)	-.141 (-1.488)	.129 (.568)	.426*** (3.291)
Bachelor's degree	-.040 (-.709)	-.060 (-1.038)	.334*** (6.382)	.316*** (5.161)	.526*** (3.583)	.499*** (5.956)

	Total spending per capita	Total revenue per capita	Taxes per capita	Property taxes per capita	Debt per capita	Employment per capita
Owner-occupied housing	-.438** (-2.094)	-.540** (-2.508)	-.306 (-1.581)	-.260 (-1.144)	.873 (1.608)	-1.345*** (-4.336)
Age 65 and over	.310*** (4.105)	.350*** (4.498)	.519*** (7.415)	.486*** (5.926)	-.229 (-1.170)	-.009 (-.080)
White	-.014*** (-2.789)	-.015*** (-2.907)	-.020*** (-4.173)	-.022*** (-3.932)	-.024* (-1.777)	.002 (.246)
Black	-.010* (-1.938)	-.011* (-1.941)	-.015*** (-3.091)	-.017*** (-2.885)	-.023* (-1.651)	.004 (.487)
Asian	-.012* (-1.796)	-.012* (-1.706)	-.014** (-2.194)	-.022*** (-3.055)	-.013 (-.725)	-.003 (-.329)
Hispanic	-.010* (-1.912)	-.011** (-2.180)	-.017*** (-3.646)	-.020*** (-3.690)	-.018 (-1.367)	.001 (.185)
Evangelical	-.002 (-1.107)	-.002 (-1.101)	-.002 (-1.340)	-.006*** (-3.452)	.007* (1.715)	-.001 (-.332)
Black Protestant	-1.091 (-1.224)	-1.428 (-1.559)	.426 (.517)	-.526 (-.545)	2.745 (1.188)	-.612 (-.463)
Mainline Protestant	.002 (.648)	.003 (.852)	.003 (.945)	.010** (2.351)	.018* (1.789)	-.001 (-.240)
Catholic	.001 (.452)	.002 (.990)	.004*** (2.732)	.003** (1.997)	.006 (1.437)	.001 (.237)
Orthodox	.036 (.661)	.049 (.869)	-.026 (-.503)	-.041 (-.694)	-.111 (-.774)	-.057 (-.697)
Other	-.230 (-.656)	-.101 (-.280)	-.425 (-1.309)	-.800** (-2.101)	-.810 (-889)	-.792 (-1.523)
Constant	4.185* (1.820)	5.276** (2.230)	.739 (.347)	.237 (.095)	-1.097 (-1.184)	-3.984 (-1.169)
Adj. R ²	.528	.525	.768	.822	.376	.437
N	366	366	366	366	366	366

*, **, and *** indicate significance at the 10 percent, 5 percent, and 1 percent levels, respectively.

90 FAITH & ECONOMICS

Table 7 (cont.): Regressions with states and religious groupings, Protestants subdivided

	Education spending per pupil	Road spending per capita	Police spending per capita	Health spending per capita	Welfare spending per capita
Population density	-.018** (2.237)	-.069** (-2.004)	.049** (2.335)	.096 (.874)	.219** (2.508)
Median Income	.084 (1.087)	.441 (1.314)	.363* (1.778)	2.509** (2.344)	-.371 (-.444)
Poverty rate	-.105*** (-2.794)	.143 (.879)	-.066 (-.667)	.353 (.677)	-.159 (-.383)
Bachelor's degree	.031 (1.262)	.089 (.847)	.167*** (2.606)	-.126 (-.373)	-.283 (-1.075)
Owner-occupied housing	-.443*** (-4.924)	.488 (1.248)	-.427* (-1.794)	-2.439* (-1.958)	-.973 (-.984)
Age 65 and over	.162*** (4.975)	.306** (2.167)	.596*** (6.943)	.813* (1.807)	.629* (1.748)
White	-.011*** (-4.970)	-.003 (-.349)	-.023*** (-3.828)	-.012 (-.394)	-.023 (.974)
Black	-.009*** (-3.914)	-.006 (-.589)	-.011* (-1.849)	-.012 (-.384)	-.022 (-.888)
Asian	-.013*** (-4.491)	.008 (.606)	-.019** (-2.515)	-.033 (-.808)	-.002 (-.057)
Hispanic	-.010*** (-4.617)	-.010 (-1.018)	-.018*** (-3.078)	-.005 (-.182)	-.019 (-.846)
Evangelical	-.003*** (-3.886)	-.005* (-1.896)	.001 (.359)	.009 (1.031)	-.029*** (-4.099)
Black Protestant	-.409 (-1.068)	1.092 (.657)	1.034 (1.022)	-9.268* (-1.749)	-.561 (-.129)
Mainline Protestant	.003* (1.846)	.006 (.796)	-.001 (-.221)	-.005 (-.241)	.045*** (2.604)
Catholic	.001 (.928)	.005* (1.656)	.002 (1.035)	-.002 (-.171)	-.002 (-.279)
Orthodox	.052** (2.218)	-.013 (-.130)	.155** (2.479)	.121 (.370)	.211 (.849)
Other	-.414*** (-2.742)	-.851 (-1.299)	.314 (.788)	.852 (.408)	-2.712* (-1.683)

	Education spending per pupil	Road spending per capita	Police spending per capita	Health spending per capita	Welfare spending per capita
Constant	11.101*** (11.221)	-2.536 (-.591)	2.977 (1.139)	-13.553 (-.989)	12.923 (1.200)
Adj. R ²	.839	.617	.656	.323	.756
N	366	366	366	365	331

*, **, and *** indicate significance at the 10 percent, 5 percent, and 1 percent levels, respectively.

Data Appendix

Variable	Source
Municipal Expenditures (Total Spending)	U.S. Bureau of the Census-Survey of Governments, 2007
Municipal Revenue	U.S. Bureau of the Census-Survey of Governments, 2007
Taxes	U.S. Bureau of the Census-Survey of Governments, 2007
Property Taxes	U.S. Bureau of the Census-Survey of Governments, 2007
Debt	U.S. Bureau of the Census-Survey of Governments, 2007
Employment	U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis-Regional Economic Accounts, 2009
Education Spending	U.S. Department of Education-National Center for Education Statistics, 2008–2009
Specific Services Spending (Road, Police, Health, Welfare)	U.S. Bureau of the Census-Survey of Governments, 2007
Population	U.S. Bureau of the Census-Census Bureau Estimates, 2010
Population Density	U.S. Bureau of the Census-Census Bureau Estimates, 2010
Median Income	U.S. Bureau of the Census-Census of Population and Housing, 2010
Poverty rate	U.S. Bureau of the Census-Census of Population and Housing, 2010
Bachelor's Degree	U.S. Bureau of the Census-Census of Population and Housing, 2010

92 FAITH & ECONOMICS

Variable	Source
Owner-occupied housing	U.S. Bureau of the Census-Census of Population and Housing, 2010
Age 65 and Older Population	U.S. Bureau of the Census-Census of Population and Housing, 2010
Ethnic Populations	U.S. Bureau of the Census-Census of Population and Housing, 2010
Religious adherents (evangelical, black Protestant, mainline Protestant, Catholic, Orthodox, other)	ARDA (http://www.thearda.com/Archive/Files/Descriptions/RCMSMT10.asp)