ECONSTOR
Make Your Publications Visible.

A Service of

ZBW Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft
Leibniz Information Centre for Economics

Roman, Monica; Zimmermann, Klaus F.; Plopeanu, Aurelian-Petrus

Working Paper

Religiosity, Smoking and Other Addictive Behaviors

GLO Discussion Paper, No. 859

Provided in Cooperation with:
Global Labor Organization (GLO)

Suggested Citation: Roman, Monica; Zimmermann, Klaus F.; Plopeanu, Aurelian-Petrus (2021) : Religiosity, Smoking and Other Addictive Behaviors, GLO Discussion Paper, No. 859, Global Labor Organization (GLO), Essen

This Version is available at:
https://hdl.handle.net/10419/234561

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

WWW.ECONSTOR.EU

Mitglied der Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

Religiosity, Smoking and Other Addictive Behaviors*

Monica Roman
Klaus F. Zimmermann
Aurelian-Petruș Plopeanu

Draft: June 6, 2021

Abstract

While under communism, identity-providing religion was suppressed, religiosity is strong today even among the youth in post-communist countries. This provides an appropriate background to investigate how external and internal religiosity relates to addictive behaviors like smoking, drinking and drugs among the young. This study shows that not religion as such or internal religiosity, but largely observable (external) religiosity prevents them from wallowing those vices.

JEL Codes: I12, N34, Z12

Keywords: addictive behavior, Orthodox, external and internal religiosity, youth, smoking, drinking, drugs, Romania.

Acknowledgments

The Appendix contains a more detailed description and documentation of data, as well as a descriptive and robustness analysis supporting the major findings in this paper. Declarations of interest: none.

*Corresponding author: **Klaus F. Zimmermann** (klaus.f.zimmermann@gmail.com), UNU-MERIT & Maastricht University, Global Labor Organization (GLO), and Centre for Economic Policy Research (CEPR). **Monica Roman** (monica.roman@csie.ase.ro), Bucharest University of Economic Studies; and **Aurelian-Petruș Plopeanu** (aplopeanu@gmail.com), Social Sciences and Humanities Research Department, Institute of Interdisciplinary Research, Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi.

1. Introduction


While it has been established that religion associates negatively with risky health behaviors such as smoking, drinking and drug use (Arani et al., 2019; Russell et al., 2020; Yonker et al., 2012; Brown et al., 2014), we study the role of religiosity, the intensive margin. We therefore focus on the two main facets of the multidimensional concept of religious behavior: external and internal religiosity (Minton et al., 2016), separated by intrinsic beliefs and external practices or experiences. “Internal religiosity or faith is defined as belief in God and a trusting acceptance of God’s will. External religiosity refers to all observable activities that are undertaken in a religious context, most conspicuously when going to church.” Frey (2018, p. 60). Is it religious denominations, internal or external religiosity? With non-believers as reference group, we aim at decomposing the behavioral contributions of the diverse facets of religiosity.

Post-communist Orthodox Romania is a natural basis for such an analysis. After several decades of forced secularization under an oppressive communist regime with a powerful persecution of external religiosity almost until its extinction (Stan and Turcescu, 2007), Romanians again freely expressed their religiosity. Romania reported the highest level of church construction in Europe (Andreescu, 2007), a sign of revival of visible religiosity, the strongest among all Orthodox countries in the region (Voicu, 2019). Young Romanians show a very high Orthodox affiliation and they are found to be highly spiritual (Vincett et al., 2014). Both types of religiosity play an important role in Orthodoxy, being the core of a rich, sincere, and active religious life (Fontaine, 2017).

Transition placed a high pressure on young people's lifestyle with a strong rise of risky health behaviors (Roberts et al., 2012; Appendix), and the paper studies how the facets of religiosity deal with it in Romania. A stronger participation in religious services or at least a regular church attendance was a protective factor against tobacco use among high school students or other young adults (Atkins et al., 2002; Albert-Lorincz et al., 2019). Complementary research among US adolescents by Longest and Vaisey (2008) found that external religiosity has a safety effect on previous bad habits only when internal religiosity is high enough or sufficiently internalized.

The Graphical Abstract exhibits the raw data concerning addictive behaviors (smoking, drinking and drug-openness) comparing the full sample with important subgroups. Individuals with external religiosity are substantially less affected than those refusing religion.

Graphical Abstract: Religiosity and addictive behaviors



2. Data and Methodology

The data set used ("FES Youth Studies in East Europe"; Umbreș et al., 2014) provides a representative sample of 1,302 respondents from the Romanian population of age 15-29. The *religious denomination* of young Romanians is similar to that of the general population: they are mainly Orthodox (85.3%), followed by Catholics (7.1%), Protestants and neo-Protestants (5.8%), and 0.3% other religions. Only a small share (1.5%) is atheist or without religion. Religiosity is measured by external and internal indicator variables: We use "frequency of going to church/mosque/synagogue to attend a religious service" with responses "regularly", "often", "sometimes" or "never" to measure *external religiosity*. *Internal religiosity* is captured by the belief of the respondents that "there is God" with alternatives "believe", "doubt" or "do not believe".

The external/internal cross-tabulation has entries X_{ij} (see Appendix). Similar to Voicu and Constantin (2012), we find that Romanian youth is largely engaged in religion: the vast majority believes in God and Christian values and attend church services. Only 12.2% "doubt or do not believe" *and* "never go to church" ($X_{32}+X_{33}$), *the refusers.* About 79.7% "believe in god" ($X_{11}+X_{21}+X_{31}$), which we decompose in "never go to church *and* believe" as *internal* (X_{31}, 17.8%), "sometimes go to church *and* believe" as *reflecting* (weak internal, X_{21}, 37.7%) and "often or very often go to church *and* believe" as *external* ($X_{11,}$ 24.2%). Those remaining ($X_{12}+X_{13}+X_{22}+X_{23}$, 8.0%) go to church, but are *doubting*. This classification enables us to

decompose the association of those variants with the risky behaviors under study, in particular the conjecture that mainly external religiosity drives the reduction.

Addictive behaviors: *Smoking* is measured with a dummy for regular or occasional smoking (with value 1) versus non-smoking (and value 0). 43.2 % of the respondents are smokers. Similarly we use *alcohol consumption* ("alcohol") with those reporting "no, almost never" = 0 and 1 "else" or yes (65.5%), and *drug openness* (agreement on "it is fashionable to use drugs"), with "disagree"=0 and "agree" or "partly agree" = 1 (55.8%). Control variables used are *gender* ("male"), *age*, *age squared*, *education* ("medium", "high", with reference "low"), *social class* ("working", "middle", "upper", with reference "low"), *family* (dummy variables for "married" and "child", if children), and *trust* (an index of the number of positive responses to respective questions).[1]

We analyze variables smoking, alcohol and drugs through:

$$y_i = \mu + \alpha R_i + \gamma X_i + \varepsilon_i \qquad (1)$$

y_i covers risky behaviors, R_i represents the religiosity variables, X_i denotes the controls, and ε_i is the error term. The estimation method is OLS with robust standard errors. We focus on smoking using the other addictive behaviors as robustness checks. We further include only those who are of age (18-29), employing the younger (15-17) as controls.

3. Results

The Table measures religiosity association effects referring to those who clearly refuse a religious affiliation. Column 1 for smoking including only those variables finds that the internal religiosity effect is negative, but not statistically different while external religiosity substantially is. Visibility together with true belief matters a lot in avoiding the vice. This is already the core observation the data reveal. Those reflecting have a marginally more negative association, also than those doubting (but attending church). All in all: External religiosity stands out negatively, while all other types of religiosity have a similar size and only small effect in comparison with the refusers.

These findings remain robust when including variables male, age, age-squared and education (column 2) and respondent's social class (column 3). Alcohol and drug openness are expected substitutes to smoking; hence the basic story prevails with those dependent variables in columns (4) and (5). However, the size of the coefficients are somewhat smaller for alcohol,

[1] The Online Appendix contains a descriptive data analysis.

and religiosity has a much stronger and more equal negative association for drug openness than for the refusers. The somewhat different results for drugs may have to do with the different respective survey question or with differences in the visibility of actual drug use.

While age does not play a role in any of the regressions for the studied risky behaviors in columns (1)-(5), it drives external religiosity (see column (6)) U-shaped together with gender (males are less religious) and education, whereas the educated youth exhibit it with higher probability. Social class has no role. A further robustness check adds to the smoking regression of column (3) as controls alcohol and drug openness, and extra variables married, child and trust. This (see column (7)) does not affect the basic story, although the religiosity coefficients are smaller in size. Alcohol and drug openness have positive and strongly significant associations, revealing that there are positive interactions between addictive risky behaviors. The other extra variables do not matter. We further examine the smoking regression of column (3) for the younger (15-17 years) cohort, confirming again the basic story: external religiosity reduces smoking, while all other religiosity variants are not different from the refusers. The Appendix replicates columns (3)-(5) robust with a broader set of religiosity variables.

4. Conclusion

Data for the deeply religious Orthodox country Romania reveals that in fact active and engaged (external) religiosity and not religion as such nor internal religiosity is what prevents Romanian youngsters from unhealthy, addictive risky behaviors.

References

Albert-Lorincz, E., Paulik, E., Szabo, B., Foley, K., Gasparik, A.I. (2019). Adolescent smoking and the social capital of local communities in three counties in Romania, **Gaceta Sanitaria**, 33(6), 547-553.

Andreescu, L. (2007). The construction of orthodox churches in post-communist Romania. **Europe-Asia Studies**, 59(3), 451-480.

Arani, A.Z., Biderafsh, A., Salmani, S. (2019). The relationship of spirituality development and addiction potential among students of Qom University of Medical Sciences. **Journal of Religion and Health**, 58(4), 1107-1114.

Atkins L.A., Oman R.F., Vesely S. K. (2002). Adolescent tobacco use: the protective effects of developmental assets. **American Journal of Health Promotion**, 16(4), 198-205.

Brown, Q.L., Linton, S.L., Harrell, P.T., Mancha, B.E., Alexandre, P.K., Chen, K.F., Eaton, W. W. (2014). The influence of religious attendance on smoking. **Substance Use and Misuse**, 49(11), 1392–1399.

Fontaine, G. (2017). Five lessons about Orthodoxy. Cluj-Napoca: Renașterea.

Frey, B.S. (2018). Economics of happiness, Cham: Springer.

Longest, K.C., Vaisey, S. (2008). Control or conviction: religion and adolescent initiation of marijuana use. **Journal of Drug Issues**, 38(3), 689-715.

Minton, E.A., Kahle, L.R., Jiuan, T.S., Tambyah, S.K. (2016). Addressing criticisms of global religion research: a consumption-based exploration of status and materialism, sustainability, and volunteering behavior. **Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion**, 55(2), 365-383.

Roberts B., Gilmore A., Stickley A., Rotman D., Prohoda V., Haerpfer C., McKee M. (2012), Changes in smoking prevalence in 8 countries of the former Soviet Union between 2001 and 2010. **American Journal of Public Health**, 102(7), 1320-1328.

Russell, A.M, Yu, B., Thompson, C.G., Sussman, S.Y., Barry, A.E. (2020). Assessing the relationship between youth religiosity and their alcohol use: A meta-analysis from 2008 to 2018. **Addictive Behaviors**, 106:106361.

Stan, L., Turcescu, L. (2007). Religion and politics in post-communist Romania. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Umbreș, R, Sandu, D., Stoica, C. A. (2014). *Romanian Youth: concerns, aspirations, attitudes and life style [SPSS dataset]*. Bucharest: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES), Bucharest.

Vincett, G., Dunlop, S., Sammet, K., Yendell, A. (2014). Young People and Religion and Spirituality in Europe: A Complex Picture. Handbook of Children and Youth Studies, 1-11.

Voicu, M. (2019), Religious supply, existential insecurity and Church attendance in post-communist Romania. **Review of Religious Research**, 61, 365-388.

Voicu, M., Constantin, A. (2012). Religious revival in Romania: between cohort replacement and contextual changes. In G. Pickel, K. Sammet (Eds.), Transformations of religiosity: religion and religiosity in Eastern Europe 1989-2010. Wiesbaden: Springer, 155-174.

Yonker, J.E., Schnabelrauch, C.A., DeHaan, L.G. (2012). The relationship between spirituality and religiosity on psychological outcomes in adolescents and emerging adults: A meta-analytic review. **Journal of Adolescence**, 35(2), 299-314.

Table.

VARIABLES	(1) Smoke1	(2) Smoke2	(3) Smoke3	(4) Alcohol	(5) Drugs	(6) Religiosity	(7) Smoke 4	(8) Smoke<18
External Religion	-0.406***	-0.346***	-0.355***	-0.184***	-0.252***		-0.262***	-0.205**
	(0.0493)	(0.0514)	(0.0523)	(0.0456)	(0.0554)		(0.0786)	(0.0920)
Internal Religion	-0.0668	-0.0789	-0.0891	-0.0582	-0.259***		-0.00217	-0.154
	(0.0539)	(0.0543)	(0.0547)	(0.0437)	(0.0582)		(0.0746)	(0.104)
Weak Internal Religion/Reflect	-0.152***	-0.129***	-0.137***	-0.109***	-0.189***		-0.117*	-0.0624
	(0.0479)	(0.0487)	(0.0496)	(0.0389)	(0.0504)		(0.0705)	(0.0941)
Doubt	-0.129*	-0.101	-0.142**	-0.0596	-0.191***		-0.0240	-0.0746
	(0.0675)	(0.0668)	(0.0683)	(0.0551)	(0.0692)		(0.0920)	(0.137)
Male		0.171***	0.174***	0.252***	-0.0188	-0.152***	0.122**	0.169***
		(0.0320)	(0.0324)	(0.0289)	(0.0349)	(0.0268)	(0.0544)	(0.0461)
Age		0.0310	0.0237	-0.0200	0.0445	-0.142**	0.0216	-0.767
		(0.0709)	(0.0725)	(0.0662)	(0.0820)	(0.0626)	(0.123)	(1.616)
Age^2		-0.000309	-0.000198	0.000414	-0.000990	0.00293**	-7.27e-05	0.0284
		(0.00150)	(0.00153)	(0.00140)	(0.00173)	(0.00133)	(0.00255)	(0.0507)
Medium Education		-0.0887**	-0.0585	0.103**	0.0546	0.0988***	-0.192***	0.0840
		(0.0450)	(0.0478)	(0.0463)	(0.0536)	(0.0378)	(0.0706)	(0.0856)
Higher Education		-0.147***	-0.0949	0.169***	0.0154	0.105**	-0.251***	
		(0.0549)	(0.0596)	(0.0547)	(0.0667)	(0.0486)	(0.0841)	
Working class			-0.112*	0.0369	-0.0193	-0.00476	-0.160*	0.0195
			(0.0631)	(0.0630)	(0.0658)	(0.0599)	(0.0868)	(0.0807)
Medium class			-0.0437	0.0584	-0.0386	-0.0481	-0.119	-0.0625
			(0.0649)	(0.0642)	(0.0684)	(0.0609)	(0.0908)	(0.0829)
Upper class			0.0345	0.00420	0.130	0.0390	0.0320	0.0568
			(0.0796)	(0.0778)	(0.0828)	(0.0728)	(0.107)	(0.102)
Alcohol							0.198***	
							(0.0566)	
Drugs							0.111**	
							(0.0465)	
Married							-0.0707	
							(0.0530)	
Child							-0.0555	
							(0.0631)	
Trust							0.00175	
							(0.00186)	
Constant	0.671***	0.102	0.251	0.773	0.246	1.923***	0.179	5.238
	(0.0394)	(0.814)	(0.828)	(0.760)	(0.936)	(0.717)	(1.455)	(12.84)
Observations	964	963	935	948	850	953	425	304
R-squared	0.077	0.119	0.129	0.124	0.034	0.049	0.207	0.189

Notes: Column (1)-(6): 18-29 years old; (7):15-17 years old. Robust standard errors in parentheses. Statistical significance at level 10% (*), 5% (**), and 1% (***). Reference groups in parenthesis: Religiosity (those who never go to church and doubt or do not believe in god); education (low); parents social class (lower). Alcohol, drugs=drug openess, married, child are all 0,1 dummies. Trust is an index of the size of trust measured according to variables.

Appendix

Appendix A1. Smoking as Risky Health Behavior and Religion

The transition to market economies in ex-communist countries was accompanied by a strong rise of risky health behaviors. For instance, smoking among Romanian youngsters reached alarming levels and raised concerns among public health authorities. Romanian authorities managed to contain the process through measures to reduce advertising and sponsorship of tobacco products (Law no. 457/2004), but youth smoking behavior got out of control after 2014. This is indicated by the 2016 adoption of Law no. 15 by the Romanian Parliament which banned smoking in any enclosed public spaces.

The association of religion with smoking habits has been reflected in numerous studies (Karlsen and Nazroo 2010; Ford and Hill 2012; Garrusi and Nakhaee 2012; Anthony et al. 2013). Regardless of country of origin, culture or dominant religion, young people smoke less when religious (Alexander et al., 2016). Religious attitudes and activities prevent harmful behaviors to health, namely smoking, use of drugs and alcohol dependence, while improving the quality of life and self-esteem (Turiano et al., 2012)

References

Alexander, A. C., Robinson, L. A., Ward, K. D., Farrell, A. S., & Ferkin, A. C. (2016). Religious beliefs against smoking among black and white urban youth. Journal of Religion and Health, 55(6), 1907-1916.

Anthony, D., Chowdary, Q., Dyson, P., & Thankappan, K. (2013). Does ethnicity or religion affect and/or explain the relationship between knowledge, attitudes and beliefs, and smoking behaviour? Journal of Diversity and Equality in Health and Care, 10(1), 31-40.

Ford, J., & Hill, T. (2012). Religiosity and adolescent substance use: Evidence from the national survey on drug use and health. Journal of Substance Use and Misuse, 47, 787-798.

Garrusi, B., & Nakhaee, N. (2012). Religion and smoking: a review of recent literature. International Journal of Psychiatry in Medicine, 43(3), 279-292.

Karlsen, S., & Nazroo, J. Y. (2010). Religious and ethnic differences in health: evidence from the Health Surveys for England 1999 and 2004. Ethnicity and Health, 15(6), 549-568.

Turiano, N. A., Whiteman, S. D., Hampson, S. E., Roberts, B. W., & Mroczek, D. K. (2012). Personality and substance use in midlife: Conscientiousness as a moderator and the effects of trait change. Journal of Research in Personality, 46(3), 295-305.

Appendix A2. Internal and External Religiosity

Table A2 provides the external/internal cross-tabulation for 1,285 available observations with entries X_{ij}. Romanian youth is largely engaged in religion: the vast majority believes in God and Christian values and attend church services. Only 12.2% "doubt or do not believe" *and* "never go to church" ($X_{32}+X_{33}$), *the refusers.* About 79.7% "believe in god" (the first column $X_{11}+X_{21}+X_{31}$), which we decompose in "never go to church *and* believe" as *internal* (X_{31}, 17.8%), "sometimes go to church *and* believe" as *reflecting* (weak internal, X_{21}, 37.7%) and "often or very often go to church *and* believe" as *external* ($X_{11,}$ 24.2%). Those remaining ($X_{12}+X_{13}+X_{22}+X_{23}$, 8.0%) go to church, but are *doubting*.

Table A1. Cross-tabulation of internal and external religiosity

Go to church/ Believe in God	I believe	I doubt	I do not believe	Total
Often or very often	310	10	0	320
Sometimes	485	84	9	578
Never	229	101	57	387
Total	**1,024**	**195**	**66**	**1,285**

Note: "believe in god" (internal); "go to church" (external)

Appendix A3. Data

Descriptive statistics for all used variables are provided in Table A2 for the two distinct age groups young adults (18-29, our main data set) and teenagers (15-17, comparison group). Trust is a variable that sums the values of the responses to the following questions: How much trust do you have in the following: Parliament, Political Parties, Government, Mayor, General attorney, Police, Judges, Media, Trade Unions, NGOs, Church. The answers were coded from 1 (very much) to 4 (not at all). Education counts for the highest education level by the respondent. Low education level corresponds to primary education, medium education covers lower and upper secondary education, as well as vocational studies, while higher education level includes graduate and post graduate studies. Social class refers to the self-assessed parent's social class on a scale ranging from 1 (lower class) to 4 (upper class).

The religiosity structure between both age groups is not very different, and the same holds for drug openness. Young adults smoke and drink more, while most of the other

differences result implicitly from age: they are better educated, more married, with kids, and have a somewhat lower level of trust.

Table A2. Descriptive Statistics

	Young adults (18-29)					Teenagers (15-17)				
Variable	Obs.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min.	Max.	Obs.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min.	Max.
Smoke	964	.501	.5	0	1	318	.223	.417	0	1
ALCO	978	.707	.456	0	1	318	.497	.501	0	1
DRUGS	878	.563	.496	0	1	288	.545	.499	0	1
RELIGIOSITY										
External	983	.228	.42	0	1	319	.27	.444	0	1
Internal	983	.183	.387	0	1	319	.154	.361	0	1
Weak external	983	.354	.478	0	1	319	.429	.496	0	1
Doubts	983	.086	.281	0	1	319	.056	.231	0	1
Male	983	.505	.5	0	1	319	.476	.5	0	1
Age	983	23.308	3.386	18	29	319	16.034	.837	15	17
EDUCATION										
Low Education	982	.152	.359	0	1	318	.884	.321	0	1
Medium Education	982	.624	.485	0	1	318	.116	.321	0	1
Higher Education	982	.224	.417	0	1	318	0	0	0	0
SOCIAL CLASS										
Low social class	954	.063	.243	0	1	306	.092	.289	0	1
Working class	954	.494	.5	0	1	306	.503	.501	0	1
Medium Social class	954	.345	.476	0	1	306	.301	.459	0	1
Upper social class	954	.099	.298	0	1	306	.105	.307	0	1
Married	978	.422	.494	0	1	319	.056	.231	0	1
Child	981	.173	.379	0	1	319	.003	.056	0	1
Trust	983	48.141	13.90	23	135	319	51.9	23.841	24	135

Appendix A4. Robustness Analysis

The data set provides a broader set of variables to measure external and internal religiosity, namely

1. External religiosity is captured by the following ordinal variables: (i) "frequency of going to church/mosque/synagogue to attend a religious service", (ii) "frequency of praying", (iii) "frequency of celebrating religious holidays", and (iv) "frequency of fasting". All these variables have responses "regularly", "often", "sometimes", or "never", which were categorized (1) "regularly" or "often", (2) "sometimes" and (3) "never".

2. Internal religiosity is measured by the following ordinal set of beliefs of the respondents: (i) "there is God", (ii) "there is heaven and hell", (iii) "God created the world", and (iv) "God is the source of moral prescriptions and duties". These variables have the values (1) "true", (2) "doubt" or (3) "do not believe".

The paper uses 1. (i) to measure external religiosity and 2. (i) to cover internal religiosity on the judgment that those two variables proxy best the respective sentiments. To check the robustness of the analysis, we first calculate the sum of the four external and internal measures of religiosity, E_s and I_s. Calculating the correlation coefficients between the variables used in the paper and those others available reveal: The correlation coefficient of the frequency of "going to religious service" is 0.600 for (1.ii) "praying", 0.486 for (1.iii) "religious holidays", 0.594 for (1.iv) "fasting", and 0.834 for E_s. The correlation coefficient of the "belief in God" is 0.752 for (2.ii) "there is heaven and hell", 0.816 for (2.iii) "God created the world", 0.559 for (2.iv) "God is the source of moral prescriptions and duties", and 0.882 for I_s.

All variables show a substantial degree of correlation. After classification of each individual into the two-way typology with respect to external or internal based on the maximum of answers given one obtains Table A3. Note that in cases of draws among the four observations for internal and external for each variable, the decision rule was: draw between "1" and "2": "1", "1" and "3": "2", and "2" and "3": "3". This makes the distribution a bit broader which likely reduces the observed association for external religiosity, which is an additional robustness check. The distribution in Table A3 is broadly similar to Table A1 with the major difference in X_{21} as expected.

Table A3. Tabulation of ERS x IRS

ERS	IRS			
	1	2	3	Total
1	573	36	6	615
2	269	81	18	368
3	144	100	75	319
Total	986	217	99	1302

Note: ERS: External religiosity; IRS: Internal religiosity
both based the complete set of the 8 base variables.

A replication of the three core regressions in the paper table (see columns 3-5) have findings provided in Table A4. The results, in particular for the religiosity variables, are very similar. Only the (crucial) coefficient for the external religiosity group for smoking is less negative (-0.254 against -0.355), but still dominant and highly significant. We conclude that our findings are robust against other use of the available data.

Table A4. Risky Health Behaviors with Extended Religiosity ERS x IRS

VARIABLES	(1) Smoke3	(2) Alcohol	(3) Drugs
External Religion New	-0.254***	-0.165***	-0.252***
	(0.0482)	(0.0386)	(0.0479)
Internal Religion New	-0.0686	-0.0413	-0.294***
	(0.0614)	(0.0503)	(0.0658)
Weak Internal Religion New	-0.114**	-0.0637	-0.212***
	(0.0534)	(0.0414)	(0.0543)
Doubt New	-0.155**	-0.101**	-0.240***
	(0.0620)	(0.0506)	(0.0635)
Male	0.185***	0.254***	-0.0187
	(0.0326)	(0.0288)	(0.0348)
Age	0.0535	-0.0106	0.0657
	(0.0733)	(0.0653)	(0.0817)
Age2	-0.000796	0.000228	-0.00143
	(0.00155)	(0.00138)	(0.00172)
Education (Low education as reference)			
Medium Education	-0.0663	0.106**	0.0422
	(0.0484)	(0.0460)	(0.0536)
Higher Education	-0.107*	0.172***	0.00709
	(0.0602)	(0.0544)	(0.0664)
Social Class (Low class as reference)			
Working class	-0.109	0.0329	-0.0352
	(0.0671)	(0.0645)	(0.0685)
Medium social class	-0.0429	0.0524	-0.0529
	(0.0687)	(0.0658)	(0.0708)
Upper social class	0.0135	-0.00924	0.106
	(0.0820)	(0.0789)	(0.0852)
Constant	-0.111	0.659	0.0457
	(0.838)	(0.749)	(0.934)
Observations	935	948	850
R-squared	0.112	0.126	0.039