

NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES

DEATH, TRAUMA AND GOD:
THE EFFECT OF MILITARY DEPLOYMENTS ON RELIGIOSITY

Resul Cesur
Travis Freidman
Joseph J. Sabia

Working Paper 24954
<http://www.nber.org/papers/w24954>

NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH
1050 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138
August 2018

We are grateful to Laurence R. Iannaccone, Rohit Ticku, Ryan Abman, and Aaron Yelowitz as well as seminar participants at the Association for the Study of Religion, Economics, and Culture (ASREC) 2017 Annual Conference in Boston, MA, Society of Economics of the Household (SEHO) 2017 Meeting in San Diego, CA, and Southern Economic Association 2017 Meeting in Tampa, FL for invaluable comments and suggestions. We thank Thanh Tam Nguyen and Alex Vornsand for excellent editorial assistance. Sabia acknowledges research support from the Charles Koch Foundation while a faculty member at both San Diego State University and the University of New Hampshire. The views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Bureau of Economic Research.

NBER working papers are circulated for discussion and comment purposes. They have not been peer-reviewed or been subject to the review by the NBER Board of Directors that accompanies official NBER publications.

© 2018 by Resul Cesur, Travis Freidman, and Joseph J. Sabia. All rights reserved. Short sections of text, not to exceed two paragraphs, may be quoted without explicit permission provided that full credit, including © notice, is given to the source.

Death, Trauma and God: The Effect of Military Deployments on Religiosity
Resul Ceur, Travis Freidman, and Joseph J. Sabia
NBER Working Paper No. 24954
August 2018
JEL No. I10,J24,Z12

ABSTRACT

Learning to cope with man's mortality is central to the teachings of the world's major religions. However, very little is known about the impact of life-and-death trauma on religiosity. This study exploits a natural experiment in military deployments to estimate the causal effect of traumatic shocks on religiosity. We find that combat assignment is associated with a substantial increase in the probability that a serviceman subsequently attends religious services regularly and engages in private prayer. Combat-induced increases in religiosity are largest for enlisted servicemen, those under age 25, and servicemen wounded in combat. The physical and psychological burdens of war, as well as the presence of military chaplains in combat zones, emerge as possible mechanisms.

Resul Ceur
University of Connecticut
School of Business
2100 Hillside Road
Storrs, CT 06269
and NBER
cesur@uconn.edu

Travis Freidman
Peter T. Paul College of Business
and Economics
10 Garrison Avenue
Durham, NH 03824 -234
United States
dtf1000@wildcats.unh.edu

Joseph J. Sabia
San Diego State University
Department of Economics
Center for Health Economics & Policy Studies
5500 Campanile Drive
San Diego, CA 92182
and University of New Hampshire,
and IZA & ESSPRI
jsabia@mail.sdsu.edu

1. Introduction

“[F]or many trauma survivors, spirituality may be a resource that can be associated with resilience and recovery. However, for some, the circumstances of the trauma may lead to the questioning of important and previously sustaining beliefs. This can lead to spiritual struggle or even loss of faith.” – U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (2012)

The United States is the most religious developed nation in the world, with nearly 90 percent of adults claiming a belief in God, 44 percent attending religious services at least once per month, and 73 percent asserting a belief in life-after-death (Smith et al. 2016). Doctrinal promises of an afterlife for those who practice good works, obey religious law, and are faithful to God provide an important psychological framework for coping with mortality (Pargament and Brant 1998) and may inform believers’ resource allocation decisions (Iyer 2016). While religious fundamentalism may breed intolerance toward and conflict with those who hold differing beliefs (Hunsberger and Jackson 2005; Kossowska and Sekerdej 2015), religion also generates important social benefits, documented in the burgeoning “new economics of religion” literature (Iyer 2016; Iannaccone and Berman 2008; Gruber 2005).¹ These benefits have been attributed to religious institutions’ facilitation of social capital accumulation, provision of within-network public goods that insure against financial and emotional shocks, and espousal of doctrines that encourage development of soft skills to cope with trauma and improve mental health (Iannaccone 1992b; Berman 2000; Gruber 2005; Fruehwirth, Iyer and Zhang 2016).²

¹ Religious participation among Americans is associated with increased educational attainment and earnings (Gruber 2005), improved physical and mental health (Deaton 2009; Mellor and Freeborn 2011; Fruehwirth, Iyer, and Zhang 2016), lower crime rates (Gruber and Hungerman 2008), reduced welfare receipt (Gruber 2005), and greater trust among citizens (Smidt 1999; Daniels and von der Ruhr 2010).

² Economists have also studied how religiosity is impacted by the level of competition in the market for religion (Bisin and Verdier 2000; Iannaccone and Berman 2008), secular forces (Gruber and Hungerman 2008; Cesur and Mocan 2018; Hungerman 2014; Becker et al. 2017), genetic diversity (Cesur and Yildirim 2017), income (Chen, 2010; Buser 2015), and public welfare generosity (Hungerman 2005).

War is a life-and-death struggle that generates substantial trauma to servicemembers and their families (Tanielian and Jaycox 2008). Servicemen deployed to combat face imminent threat of injury and death (Shen et al. 2009), and may witness or participate in causing the deaths of enemy combatants, civilians, and comrades-in-arms (Fontana and Rosenheck 2004; Drescher et al. 2011; Steenkamp et al. 2011). These traumatic war experiences, and the risk such experiences will materialize, have been linked to Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), which is estimated to cost \$2 to \$3 billion dollars per year (Zarembo 2014; Sabia and Skimmyhorn 2018).

The U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs has identified the provision of mental health services to combat veterans as a top policy priority (Litz and Schlenger 2009; Marx 2009). In January 2018, President Donald Trump issued Executive Order 13822, which mandated the Secretaries of Homeland Security, Defense, and Veterans Affairs develop a Joint Action Plan to more effectively provide psychological services to combat veterans.

As part of a strategy to aid servicemembers at risk of exposure to war-related trauma, the U.S. Department of Defense funds religiously-based counseling services for servicemembers via the military chaplaincy. While the First Amendment's Establishment Clause prohibits Congress from enacting laws "respecting an establishment of religion," chaplains are defended by advocates as indispensable in protecting servicemembers' mental health and healing invisible wounds of war (Litz et al. 2009; Drescher et al. 2011; Worthington and Langberg 2012). The Armed Forces Chaplains Board appoints chaplains to each service branch with the charge of tending to the religious, spiritual, and overall personal wellbeing of servicemembers and their families. The primary focus of the chaplaincy is "religious ritual, instruction, and counseling: for example, 'religious services, rites, sacraments, ordinances, and religious ministrations,' as well as religious pastoral care and teaching" (Waggoner 2014, p. 14). A 2006 Congressional report

concluded that there were 2,859 regular duty chaplains and 1,740 reserve chaplains serving as members of the Armed Forces (Jindal 2006). Each chaplain may have over 1,500 servicemembers entrusted to his care (Johns 2017).

The effect of life-threatening trauma on religiosity is theoretically ambiguous.³ Fear of death or war-related psychological trauma may cause combat veterans to question, or even abandon, religious faith, as life-and-death experiences challenge religious doctrines of good and evil (Fontana and Rosenheck 2004; Falsetti et al. 2003; Ogden 2011). This may cause combat veterans to substitute away from religion and toward secular counseling or even toward risky health behaviors, such as illicit drug use, to numb emotional pain (Cesur et al. 2016). Alternatively, fear of death and the adverse psychological effects of war could increase religiosity by increasing the demand for social support networks or doctrinal philosophies that promise life-after-death. In addition, combat could create tighter bonds among servicemembers that generate religious peer effects. Combat deployments may also provide opportunities for military chaplains stationed in combat zones to proselytize in environments where competition from secular counselors is more limited.

This study is the first to estimate the causal impact of life-and-death traumatic shocks on religiosity. We exploit a natural experiment in military deployments to estimate the impact of combat service on religious participation, private prayer, and spiritual salience, outcomes that measure both public and private dimensions of religious ritualism (Glock and Stark 1965). First, using data from the military module of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent and Adult Health (NLSA AH), we find that servicemen deployed to combat zones are 9 percentage-points

³For example, in a mental health production framework (Grossman 1972), life-and-death trauma may affect the marginal product of religiosity, the marginal rate of technological substitution between religiosity and other mental health-generating inputs (such as secular counseling) and the marginal utility of religiosity.

more likely to attend religious services weekly and 9 percentage-points more likely to engage in private prayer than their counterparts assigned to non-combat overseas deployments. Further, we find that combat deployments where enemy firefights could, but does not, materialize also generate increases in religiosity.

Next, using data from the Department of Defense Survey of Health and Related Behaviors Among Active Duty Personnel (HRB), we find that exposure to enemy firefights during combat deployments increases the probability of both public and private expressions of religion. The magnitudes of the impacts are largest for enlisted servicemen as compared to officers, junior servicemen under age 25, and those physically injured in combat. Descriptive evidence suggests that the psychological and physical burdens of war deployments as well as the presence of military chaplains in war zones help to explain combat-induced increases in religiosity.

2. Background

2.1 The Global War on Terrorism

The Global War on Terrorism, or GWOT, was launched by the United States in response to the September 11th terrorist attacks and included major combat operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, chiefly Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) and Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF), respectively. More than two million U.S. servicemen were deployed in OEF and OIF, with peak deployments at over 100,000 in Afghanistan and nearly 60,000 in Iraq (Marx 2009; Epstein and Williams 2016). In contrast to prior wars, multiple deployments for longer durations were more common in both OEF and OIF (Marx 2009). Thirty-seven percent of servicemembers deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan were deployed on multiple occasions (Litz and Schlenger 2009), and duration of combat tours was, on average, 28 percent higher relative to prior conflicts (Baiochi

2013). As of February 2018, OEF and OIF had resulted in 5,390 servicemembers killed in action and over 52,000 wounded (Defense Manpower Data Centers Defense Casualty Analysis System 2016).

In addition to deaths and physical injuries, there is evidence that war experiences in GWOT have generated substantial invisible wounds of war for combat veterans (Tanielian and Jaycox 2008). Such wounds have taken the form of increased risk of PTSD (Tanielian and Jaycox 2008), suicide ideation (Cesur et al. 2013), substance use (McFall, Mackay, and Donovan 1992; Price et al. 2004), and traumatic brain injury, sometimes diagnosed as migraine headache (Cesur et al. 2015).⁴ Technological advances in arms and medicine have resulted in servicemembers surviving combat at much higher rates than in prior wars (Marx 2009), but also have resulted in a substantial number of physically and emotionally wounded combat veterans.

2.2 Life-and Death Trauma and Religion

Both economic and socio-psychological theories inform the expected impact of life-and-death trauma on religiosity. Negative traumatic shocks may induce greater religiosity as a response to fear of death or wounding in battle. This may come from newly induced demand for services provided by religious institutions or via “withdrawals” on prior investments in religious capital (Berman 2000; Chen 2010; Hungerman 2005). Such religious investments could increase

⁴ The source of war-related psychological trauma has been studied extensively by both military health researchers (McFarlane 2010) and health economists (Cesur et al. 2013). Combat experiences such as (i) witnessing deaths of unit members, coalition members, or civilians, (ii) engaging the enemy in firefight (including rocket or mortar fire), (iii) killing another human being, and (iv) witnessing injuries to those with whom a servicemember has a personal relationship, are associated with substantially increased levels of trauma (Litz and Schlenger 2009; Steenkamp et al. 2011), often manifest in the form of PTSD (Fontana and Rosenheck 2004; Litz and Schlenger 2009; Cesur et al 2013; Gubkin 2016). In addition, even if such traumatic events do not materialize, there is evidence that the fear and guilt associated with potentially enduring these events may generate symptoms of PTSD (Steenkamp et al. 2011; Cesur et al. 2013).

combat veterans' net present discounted utility, which may include the afterlife. Such investments could be transitory, passing after imminent threat of death has receded.

Religious adherence may also rise following combat if increased religiosity dampens the adverse mental health effects of war-related trauma (De Castella and Simmonds 2013; Harris et al. 2015).⁵ This could occur, for example, through the provision of social support networks (Iannaccone 1992a; Stark et al. 1996; Barro and McCleary 2003; Iyer 2016) such as the Knights of Columbus or informal weekly prayer groups. Moreover, doctrinal philosophies may provide meaning in the wake of trauma (De Castella and Simmonds 2013), leading to a strengthening of personal faith. Combat veterans may also turn to religion because of the adverse impacts of combat on family life, including increased risk of divorce (Negrusa, Negrusa, and Hosek 2014) and domestic violence (Cesur and Sabia 2016).

On the other hand, some psychological theories, including the “shattered assumptions hypothesis” suggest that trauma could reduce religiosity. Life-and-death shocks may lead some to abandon religious faith because it has shattered their notions of how their lives were promised to unfold (Overcash et al. 1996; De Castella and Simmonds 2013; ter Kuile and Ehring 2014; Harris et al 2015). That is, individuals may turn away from religion because of perceived doctrinal promises of delivering just life outcomes (Lyons 1991; McLaughlin 1994; Falsetti et al. 2003; Fontana and Rosenheck 2004).⁶

In addition, the effects of trauma on religion could differ by dimensions of religiosity, including public and private spheres (Glock 1962; Glock and Stark 1965).⁷ This sociological

⁵ See also Overcash et al. 1996; Shaw et al. 2005; Peres et al. 2007; and Koenig 2009.

⁶ Along these lines, Falsetti et al. (2003) argue that combat veterans with wartime trauma may substitute away from religion and toward secular mental health services to achieve mental health needs.

⁷ Glock (1962) and Glock and Stark (1965) classify religiosity into five dimensions: belief, ritual, experience, knowledge, and consequence.

framework suggests that the public and private natures of religious practices could signal different mechanisms at work (see also Koenig et al. 1997 for a discussion of the public/organizational measures of religiosity).⁸ For instance, if participation in religious services, but not private religious belief is affected by life-and-death shocks, this could suggest insurance and social networks are important channels. On the other hand, if combat trauma impacts strength of belief, but not religious-based social interactions, this could suggest that doctrinal philosophies drive increased demand for religion.

2.3 Alternative Mechanisms

War service could also affect religiosity through channels unrelated to fear of death or trauma, at least directly. Peer effects have been documented to be quite important among those serving in the military (Lyle 2007; Carrell et al. 2009; 2011). Those who select into military service have, at least historically, been more likely to identify with religion than their non-serving counterparts (Burdette et al. 2009). Combat experiences could intensify bonds among comrades-in-arms and the increase the likelihood that religious doctrines are transmitted through peers (Fontana and Rosenheck 2004).⁹ Furthermore, buildup of spiritual capital in combat may incentivize servicemen to seek connections with religious communities when they transition to civilian life and therefore increase religiosity. Alternatively, time away from former peers in servicemembers' stateside religious communities could lead to a loosening of religious ties, leading to less engagement upon return.

⁸For a detailed overview of the literature see Koenig et al. (2001). See also Egbert et al. (2004), Bjarnson (2007) and Berry (2005) for a discussion of several differing measures of religiosity.

⁹ For instance, a widely popular theory among theologians is that religion may have emerged as a solution to a cooperation problem (Durkheim and Swain 2008; Norenzayan and Shariff 2008).

In addition to peers, there may also be other “supply-side” channels at work, including military chaplain availability. In 2012, there were over 1,400 military chaplains mobilized or deployed to combat zones. Military chaplains are employed as staff officers and are considered non-combatants. They do not possess the duties and responsibilities of military command and are prohibited from bearing arms. Their roles include ensuring the freedom of religion for servicemembers, facilitating dialog with civilian organizations pertaining to religious issues, and promoting joint military endeavors.¹⁰ While the Armed Forces Uniform Code of Conduct and the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution prohibit military chaplains from promoting or establishing religion, military chaplains are encouraged to form close relationships with servicemembers and to provide psychological support to as needed.¹¹ Despite prohibitions against proselytizing, the presence of chaplains could encourage such behaviors (Astore 2010), including among soldiers with prior religious exposure, which could increase religious adherence.¹² Moreover, servicemembers may be more likely to approach chaplains than secular mental health counselors to treat the psychological impacts of war because there is less social stigma attached to such services (Besterman-Dahan et al. 2012).

A final pathway through which combat deployments could affect religiosity is via income effects. Combat deployments are accompanied by increased income in the form of hostile fire pay (HFP) or imminent danger pay (IDP). Religious engagement has been found to be positively related to income, consistent with religious organizations serving as club goods (Iannaccone 1992a; Stark, Iannaccone, and Finke 1996; Barro and McCleary 2003; Iyer 2016).

¹⁰ A description of the role of military chaplains in the Armed Forces is provided by the U.S. Department of Defense here: <http://prhome.defense.gov/M-RA/MPP/AFCB/>.

¹¹ Historically, the military chaplaincy has been viewed as strategic asset that aids in the successful prosecution of military operations (Waggoner 2012).

¹² This issue is of some concern to civil libertarians, who worry that government-sanctioned zealous proselytizing could violate the First Amendment’s Establishment Clause. Supporters of chaplains argue that they are indispensable to servicemembers’ mental health and to the achievement of military objectives.

2.4 Existing Literature on War and Religiosity

The literature on the relationship between war service and religiosity is thin and largely descriptive. One set of studies describes the characteristics of those who select into the all-volunteer U.S. Armed Forces.¹³ While military personnel are more religious, on the whole, than the civilian population (Burdette et al. 2009), there is evidence of increasing diversity in religions in recent years, mirroring diminished religiosity in the millennium generation (Military Leadership Diversity Commission 2010). However, given the self-selection of military personnel into the Armed Forces, it is unclear whether this association is causal in nature.

Descriptive evidence suggests that servicemembers with mental health problems frequently turn to clergy, often military chaplains, for mental health services. Besterman-Dahan et al. (2012) find that nearly one-third of active duty servicemembers utilize mental health services offered by military chaplains compared to 44 percent who seek support from non-religious healthcare professionals. Along the same lines, Kopacz et al. (2017) find that about one-third of suicide attempt survivors received chaplaincy services in the 30 days following their suicide attempt. Moreover, there is evidence that those who seek out chaplain services are often most in need of psychological services (Morgan et al. 2016).

A number of other studies have explored the relationship between symptoms of war trauma and religiosity, with mixed findings.¹⁴ A study of 120 Bosnian-Herzegovinian veterans of the Bosnian war, finds that PTSD is negatively related to religiosity (Hasanović and Pajević 2015). On the other hand, Tran et al. (2012) evaluated a sample of 449 U.S. war veterans from

¹³ US Draft was abolished on January 27th 1973.

¹⁴ See also Chen and Koenig (2006) for a review of the broader literature on trauma, including exposure to domestic violence, and religiosity.

Veterans Administration (VA) hospitals who had experienced military-related trauma and sought mental health treatment. The authors find that veterans who turned to religion for “socially motivated reasons” were less likely to suffer severe symptoms of PTSD or depressive symptomatology. They conclude that “evaluating religiosity in patients may be an important area to address in PTSD and depression treatment” (Tran et al. 2012, p. 313).

Finally, Harris et al. (2011) examine a small sample (54) of veterans who had suffered from psychological trauma. They estimate the impact of a group intervention therapy designed to utilize veterans’ pre-existing religious beliefs to manage combat related trauma and find that religiosity mitigates the adverse psychological consequences of war.

3. Data and Measures

Our analysis uses data drawn from two national datasets, each of which include data on military servicemen, their combat assignments, and religiosity.

3.1 The National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (NLSAAH)

The NLSAAH is a nationally representative longitudinal survey that began by collecting information on high school students in the 1994-1995 academic year. Three follow-up surveys were conducted and the last to date, collected in 2007-2008, contains information on respondents ages 24 to 34. These data are useful for our purposes because, at Wave IV, the NLSAAH includes a military module with a wide set of military characteristics and war experiences from current active duty personnel and prior service veterans. Servicemembers’ war experiences largely include post-9/11 GWOT deployments to Iraq and Afghanistan.

Our NLSAAH analysis sample focuses on 482 active duty overseas deployed male servicemen who, at the time of the Wave IV survey, provided information on their current religiosity, and reported that their military service began after the Wave I survey interview.¹⁵ Among these 482 deployed servicemen, 298 (59.3 percent) completed their military service prior to the Wave IV survey interview, while 196 (40.7 percent) were currently serving in the military.

Our primary measure of combat, *Combat Assignment*, is a dichotomous variable generated from self-reports of combat deployments.¹⁶ *Combat Assignment* is set equal to 1 if the respondent reported being deployed overseas to a combat zone, and set equal to 0 for deployments to non-combat zones.

We also exploit additional information collected in the NLSAAH military module to capture war theatre experiences among those deployed to combat zones. We generate the variable *Enemy Engagement*, set equal to 1 if the respondent reported “engaging the enemy in firefight” while in a combat zone and set equal to 0 otherwise.¹⁷ This allows us to estimate the independent effect of combat exposure.

We generate three measures of religiosity at the time of the Wave IV interview that capture both public and private expression of religion. First, respondents are asked:

"How often have you attended church, synagogue, temple, mosque, or religious services in the past 12 months?"

¹⁵ Because the NLSAAH does not provide information on the age of high school completion, we exclude survey respondents for whom the start of military service precedes the Wave I interview. Including these 13 individuals in the analysis does not affect our estimates.

¹⁶ This variable is constructed using the following survey questions in the Wave IV of NLSAAH.

"Was your military service in the US, outside the US, or both?"
"What is the total amount of time you (have) served in a combat zone?"

¹⁷ The following questionnaire item from the Wave IV NLSAAH is used to construct *Enemy Engaged*.

"During your combat deployment, how many times did you engage the enemy in a firefight?"

We generate a dichotomous variable, *Weekly Religious Attendance*, set equal to 1 if the respondent reported attending his place of worship or religious services at least once per week in the last year, and set equal to 0 otherwise.¹⁸ In addition, servicemen are asked:

“How often do you pray privately, that is, when you're alone, in places other than a church, synagogue, temple, mosque, or religious assembly?”

The variable *Prayer* is coded as 1 if the respondent reports praying outside of a religious service and 0 otherwise. Finally, respondents are asked:

“How important (if at all) is your religious faith to you?”

Religious Importance is set equal to 1 if the respondent reported that his faith was “very important” or “more important than anything else,” and set equal to 0 otherwise.

A key advantage of the NLSAAH data is its inclusion of information on a wide set of military characteristics (e.g., military rank, branch of service, timing of military service, occupation), which is important for the “conditional random assignment” identification strategy described in *Section 4* below.¹⁹ In addition, because the data are longitudinal, we will be able to test the robustness of findings to controls for pre-enlistment religiosity.

Despite these important advantages, the NLSAAH also has some shortcomings. Small sample sizes limit both the power of our research design and our ability to examine heterogeneous impacts of combat, such as by branch of service or specific combat experiences.

3.2 Department of Defense (DOD) Health and Related Behaviors (HRB) Survey, 2008

¹⁸ We also experimented with alternative measures of frequency of church attendance, including whether the respondent had ever attended religious services to gage the extensive margin of behavior. The results from this definition of religious service attendance appear in Appendix Table 1.

¹⁹ In fact, the NLSAAH contain each of the military observables available to Human Resources Command when making unit assignments.

To compensate for limitations with the NLSAAH data, we next turn to the HRB survey. Collected by RTI International, the HRB survey collects information on health and well-being of active duty military personnel, measured at nearly the same time as Wave IV of the NLSAAH. The survey, which is designed to be representative of active duty servicemembers in all branches and pay grades of the U.S. Armed Forces. Individuals who were absent without official leave (AWOL), incarcerated at the time of data collection, or attending a service academy were excluded from the interview.

Our analysis sample is comprised of 11,598 active duty servicemen between the ages of 18 and 50 who were deployed overseas and provided non-missing information on religiosity. Included are 2,563 soldiers, 2,563 marines, 3,374 sailors, and 3,098 airmen. While the HRB survey does not include information on lifetime combat and non-combat zone deployments that would allow us to construct a measure analogous to *Combat Service*, we can use information available in the survey to construct an analogous measure of *Enemy Engagement*. Respondents were asked:

“Thinking about all of your deployments, [have you] or members of [your] unit, received incoming fire from small arms, artillery, rockets, or mortars...or [has your] unit fired on the enemy?”

Enemy Engagement is set equal to 1 for those who reported exposure to enemy firefight while they were deployed, either through incoming fire or firing on the enemy, and 0 otherwise.

To capture the intensity of war experiences that may explain the potential mechanisms between combat and religion in the HRB survey, we take advantage of more detailed measures of combat experiences, which may, in fact, be important mechanisms through which combat exposure affects religiosity. These measures include *Combat Injury* and *Witness Death*,

dichotomous variables that capture whether the respondent were injured in combat and witnessed deaths in war, respectively.²⁰

Outcomes in the HRB survey are measured analogously to the NLSAAH military module. Religious attendance is measured using responses to the following survey item:

“During the past 12 months, how many times did you attend religious/spiritual services? (Please do not include special occasions, such as weddings, christenings, funerals, or other special events in your answer.)”

Frequent Religious Attendance is set equal to 1 if the respondent attends services 25 or more weeks per year and is set equal to 0 otherwise.²¹

While the HRB data does not ask whether the respondents pray on their own in an identical fashion to the NLSAAH, it asks the following survey question to measure if the respondents pray under stressful circumstances:

“When you feel pressured, stressed, depressed, or anxious, how often do you engage in each of the following activities: Say a prayer”

Prayer is set equal to 1 for those who pray frequently when they are stressed, depressed or anxious and 0 if they do so only sometimes, rarely or never. Finally, servicemen were asked to agree or disagree along a Likert scale with the following statement:

²⁰ These measures were generated using servicemen’s responses to the following questionnaire items:

“Thinking about all of your deployments, how many times have you had each of the following experiences? I was wounded in combat.”

“Thinking about all of your deployments, how many times have you had each of the following experiences? I saw dead bodies or human remains.”

²¹ Responses to this survey item do not allow us to distinguish between biweekly and weekly church attendance as each are contained in the same category of possible responses. Therefore, our measure of religious attendance in the HRB survey is slightly different than in the NLSAAH. Analyses using alternate measures of religious service attendance, including ever attending services or attending services more than weekly, produced a qualitatively similar pattern of results.

“My religious/spiritual beliefs are a very important part of my life.”

We generate an indicator, *Religious Importance*, set equal to 1 if the respondent agrees or strongly agrees that religious beliefs are a very important part of his life and 0 otherwise.

As with the NLSAAH data, the HRB data has strengths and weaknesses. The relatively larger sample allows us to more precisely estimate branch-specific effects of combat. In addition, because the HRB survey is a representative sample of the active duty military personnel, the estimates obtained from the sample are more generalizable to all active duty service members, including those older and younger than surveyed in the NLSAAH. On the other hand, if previous combat exposure influences the likelihood of remaining in the military, estimates using only those who are currently on active duty may suffer from sample selection bias. An additional limitation of the HRB data is the lack of information on religious denomination affiliation either prior to or after deployment; thus we cannot conduct heterogeneity analysis by religious sect. Finally, due to confidentiality requirements, the HRB survey lacks data on some important military observables (such as primary military occupation), though it does include other reasonable proxies, which we discuss below.²²

4. Identification

4.1 Natural Experiment

A wide body of literature estimating the impact of military service on labor market outcomes (Angrist, 1990, 1998; Angrist et al., 2011; Angrist and Chen 2011) or other measures

²² These covariates include branch of service, rank, timing of service, detailed measures of educational attainment, and installation level Major Command (MAJCOM), a subdivision for a particular military installation responsible for a specific combat/support mission. MAJCOMs include US Army Training and Doctrine Command, US Army Europe, US Army Pacific, 8th Army, US Fleet Forces Command, Commander Pacific Forces, Naval Medical Command, Commander Naval Installations Command, Marine Corps Installations East, Marine Corps Installations West, Air Combat Command, Air Education and Training Command, Air Force Materiel Command, Air Force Space Command, Air Mobility Command, Pacific Air Forces, and US Air Forces Europe.

of socioeconomic wellbeing (Angrist et al. 2010; Angrist and Johnson, 2000; Price et al., 2004; McFall et al., 1992a,b; Rohlfs, 2010) has relied on the draft lottery as a natural experiment to identify the causal impact of war. The absence of conscription in the U.S. following the abolition of the draft in 1973 makes such an identification strategy impossible for service during GWOT. Instead, we rely on an alternate natural experiment that identifies a different local average treatment effect. We rely on the process by which the U.S. Armed Forces Human Resources Command assigns active duty servicemen to deployment duties to generate variation in combat assignment that is plausibly exogenous to religiosity.

The United States Armed Forces generally deploys military units to combat rather than individuals (Lyle 2006; Engel et al. 2010). Human Resources Command (HRC), the agency that assigns servicemen to their units and then assigns those units to deployment duties, treats branch-specific servicemen of identical military rank and primary military occupation specialty as essentially perfect substitutes for the purposes of assignments.²³ Senior commanders decide when, where (combat versus non-combat operations), and for how long to deploy units based on largely exogenous factors such as (i) the state of operational environment, which is dictated by world events, and (ii) the readiness and availability of suitable units, determined by equipment availability, timing of training completion, and the occupational composition of unit members (Army Regulation 220-1; Lyle 2006; Engel et al. 2010). HRC does not consider personal preferences, religious practices, or family background in assigning servicemen to units or deploying units overseas (Engel et al. 2010). Thus, conditional on military rank and occupation

²³ Lyle (2006) and Engel et al. (2010) test for so-called “stayback selection” bias by using unit-level deployment orders as an instrumental variable (IV) for an individual deployment. A comparison of IV and ordinary least squares (OLS) estimates suggests that stayback selection is an unimportant source of bias.

(within service branch), deployment assignments among active duty personnel are made orthogonally to religiosity.

The conditional random assignment of deployed units creates the conditions for a natural experiment that we exploit across the NLSAAH and HRB surveys. This natural experiment has been exploited by previous scholars examining the impacts of deployments on servicemembers' children (Lyle 2006; Engel et al. 2010), servicemen's risk of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (Cesur et al. 2013), as well as domestic violence (Cesur and Sabia 2016).

Data from the NLSAAH are particularly valuable for carrying out this natural experiment because they include information on the military observables available to HRC when making deployment decisions. Therefore, we are able to provide descriptive tests of whether, conditional on these observables, deployment assignment is orthogonal to a wide set of personal and family background characteristics, including pre-enlistment religiosity. While the HRB data do not include information on military occupation, there is prior evidence that these missing data do not contaminate the natural experiment described above in the presence of controls for branch of service, military rank, timing of service, educational attainment and installation-level Major Command.²⁴ We explore similar tests below.

4.2 Estimating Equations

We begin with data on active duty overseas deployed servicemen from the NLSAAH and estimate the following estimating equation to test whether combat assignment is related to pre-enlistment observables after controlling for military observables available to HRC:

$$\text{Combat Assignment}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \mathbf{M}_i + \beta_2 \mathbf{X}_i + \epsilon_i \quad (1)$$

²⁴ Cesur and Sabia (2016) show that estimates from the NLSAAH, where the natural experiment is clean, remain largely unchanged when HRB controls are included in NLSAAH regressions and occupation is omitted.

where $Combat Assignment_i$ measures whether serviceman i was deployed to a combat or non-combat zone, \mathbf{M}_i is a vector of military controls for serviceman i , including military rank, branch of service, timing of service, and occupation, and \mathbf{X}_i is set of covariates capturing pre-enlistment (Wave I) individual- and family-level characteristics: age, race, cognitive ability, height, weight, parental income, parental marital status, parental religiosity, as well as the respondent's own pre-enlistment religiosity. Also included in the vector \mathbf{X}_i are controls for maternal educational attainment and the respondent's own educational attainment. If, conditional on \mathbf{M}_i , combat assignment should be orthogonal to individual and family background characteristics, we hypothesize that the estimate of β_2 should be 0.

Next, we estimate the impact of combat assignment on religiosity in equation (2):

$$R_i = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 Combat Assignment_i + \gamma_2 \mathbf{M}_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (2)$$

where R_i measures the religiosity of serviceman i . In alternate specifications, we add $Enemy Engagement_i$ as an additional right-hand-side variable to isolate the effects of combat exposure and combat zone assignment without exposure. If the assumptions underlying the natural experiment described above hold, then γ_1 will be an unbiased estimate of the impact of combat zone assignment on religiosity. As another descriptive test of this assumption, we add the vector \mathbf{X}_i to the right-hand side of equation (2):

$$R_i = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 Combat Assignment_i + \gamma_2 \mathbf{M}_i + \gamma_3 \mathbf{X}_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (3)$$

If the estimate of γ_1 remains unchanged in equations (2) and (3), this is evidence consistent with the hypothesis that $Combat Assignment$ is orthogonal to religiosity.

A similar estimating equation is used for the HRB survey:

$$R_i = \theta_0 + \theta_1 Enemy Engagement_i + \theta_2 \mathbf{M}_i + \theta_3 \mathbf{X}_i + \mu_i \quad (4)$$

where *Enemy Engagement* indicates if respondent i was deployed to a combat zone with enemy firefight, \mathbf{M}_i includes a set of military variables available in the HRB survey, including military rank, branch of service, Major Command (MAJCOM), and frequency of deployments. In addition, the vector \mathbf{X}_i includes controls for age, race, marital status, and educational attainment, which are present in all models. While we do not have specific controls for military occupation in the HRB survey, the set of controls available in the DOD data appear to be sufficient to not contaminate the natural experiment described above.²⁵ Finally, we note that the effects of war obtained from equation (4) may be biased downward to the extent that some who are not exposed to enemy engagement, but are assigned to combat zones may have their religiosity affected by their deployment assignment.

5. Results

5.1 NLSAAH Results

Descriptive statistics for the NLSAAH in Table 1 show that 15.4 percent of active duty deployed servicemen attend religious services weekly. Approximately three-quarters (75.1 percent) report praying outside of their house of worship, and just over half (51.1 percent) report that religion is an important aspect of their lives. With regard to deployment assignments, two-thirds (76 percent) of servicemen were assigned to combat zones and 37 percent reported engaging the enemy in firefight.

²⁵ To descriptively test the validity of this assumption, we estimated the effect of combat on our outcomes in the NLSAAH sample (where the natural experiment is “clean”) by only controlling for the covariates that are available in the DOD data. As shown in Appendix Table 2, results obtained from this exercise are very similar to the clean natural experiment from the NLSAAH sample. These results lend support to the hypothesis that estimates from the DOD data are unbiased.

In Table 2, we present estimates from equation (1) to test if predetermined covariates in the vector \mathbf{X}_i predict combat assignment.²⁶ Specifically, we examine whether deployment assignment is related to pre-deployment religiosity, height and weight, age and race, educational attainment, cognitive ability, and parental household income, marital status, educational attainment, and religiosity.²⁷ Our results show little evidence that these characteristics predict whether servicemen are deployed to combat zones as compared to non-combat zones (column 1), to combat zones with enemy firefight as compared to combat zones without enemy firefight (column 2), or to combat zones with enemy firefight versus non-combat zones (column 3). Out of 78 coefficients estimated, only three are statistically distinguishable from zero at conventional levels, and no single category of related variables (e.g. income) is jointly statistically different from zero. This descriptive evidence supports the assumption that deployment assignment is orthogonal to religiosity.

Table 3 shows estimates of γ_1 from equation (2). In Panel I, we find that servicemen assigned to combat zones are 8.9 percentage-points more likely to attend weekly religious services in the past year than their counterparts deployed to non-combat zones (Panel I, column 1). Those assigned to combat are also 8.9 percentage-points more likely to engage in private prayer (Panel I, column 2), and 4.3 percentage-points more likely to report religion is important to them (Panel I, column 3), though this latter estimate is not statistically different from zero at conventional levels. These estimates, which are economically substantial (relative to their

²⁶ While we estimate equations (1) through (4) via linear probability models, marginal effects obtained from probit specifications are very similar to the results presented below.

²⁷ Each coefficient and standard error combination is obtained from a separate regression; p-values pertain to the joint significance of mutually exclusive categories providing information on pre-existing characteristics, such as race, income, and maternal schooling. We also estimate regression models including all of these right-hand side variables in a single model. Results are qualitatively similar. For example, in column (1), a test of the joint significance of the variables in the vector \mathbf{X} yields an F-statistic of 0.97 and a p-value of 0.52.

respective means), are consistent with the hypothesis that life-and-death shocks induce increases in both public religious expression as well as private religious practices.

In Panels II and III of Table 3, we explore whether the effects differ by whether the combat serviceman had separated from the military at the time of the Wave IV survey. We find that the impact of combat assignment on religious attendance and private prayer is statistically equivalent for those whose active duty service was ongoing at the time of the Wave IV survey (Panel II) and those who had separated from the military (Panel III). This could suggest that the impact of combat on religious practices persists over time. Interestingly, however, the impact of combat on self-reported religious salience (column 3) is much larger for those whose service is current as compared to veterans who had previously separated from the U.S. Armed Forces. This finding could suggest that combat generates transitory increases in the importance of religion in one's life, but that this salience dissipates as faith serves its purpose in helping servicemen to cope with immediate trauma. However, these findings could be explained by heterogeneity in soldier characteristics or in the nature of combat across periods.²⁸

In the final two panels of Table 3, we examine whether religiosity effects of combat differ across pre-enlistment religious affiliation. In Panel IV, we restrict the sample to those who reported a Christian affiliation (e.g., Catholics, Protestants and Other Christians) at the time of

²⁸ For example, those serving in the Armed Forces at the time of the Wave IV survey are younger than those who had separated from the military. Younger individuals may have fewer alternative means to cope with life-threatening stress, be more susceptible to proselytizing, or be more likely to be impacted by peers. Moreover, the observed differential impact could represent a cohort effect, whereby current active duty servicemen may have been involved in more recent intense combat during the time of the so-called surge in Iraq in 2007 during which more than 20,000 additional servicemembers were deployed to Baghdad and Al Anbar Province. However, it is important to note that whatever the source of the differential impact of combat assignment on the importance with which servicemen place on religion, this difference does not translate into religious behavior differences. Combat veterans who have separated are also more likely to attend religious services regularly and pray than their non-combat veteran counterparts. We also explore whether the religious effects differ by the prior religiosity of servicemen, which we have documented is orthogonal to deployment assignment. The results show that combat has the largest impact on weekly religious service attendance for those who reported some degree of religiosity prior to deployment.

the Wave I interview, while Panel V examines all other affiliations, or a non-affiliation. We find that our findings in Panel II are driven by the effect of combat on those with a Christian affiliation prior to deployment.

Next, in Table 4, we explore whether combat exposure, measured by engaging the enemy in firefight, has an independent effect on religiosity. We find that servicemen deployed to combat zones where they engaged the enemy in firefight were significantly more likely to attend religious services and engage in private prayer than those deployed to non-combat zones. However, the magnitude of this effect was not significantly different from the estimated effect of combat deployments without such exposure. This results could suggest that fear of combat exposure, whether or not enemy engagement materializes, may have important effects on religiosity. This result is also consistent with supply-side mechanism such as combat-zone specific, unit-level peer effects in religiosity or increased presence of military chaplains in combat zones. In the HRB data below, we empirically explore channels that might be at work.

Finally, in Table 5, we examine the sensitivity of estimates to the addition of controls for individual and personal background characteristics (columns 2, 5, 8), and pre-deployment religiosity (columns 3, 6, 9), following equation (3). The stability of estimates of γ_l are consistent with findings of Table 2 and suggest that deployment assignment is exogenous to religiosity.

5.2 HRB Results

Given the above-discussed limitations with the NLSAAH survey, we next turn to the HRB sample. Descriptive statistics, shown in Table 6, reflect that 18.9 percent of active duty servicemen in our sample reported frequent religious attendance in the prior year, 22.0 percent

reported that they turned to prayer in stressful situations, and approximately two-thirds (69.5 percent) indicated that religion was important to them.

Table 7 presents results from equation (4). In Panel I, we find that engaging the enemy in firefight is associated with a 1.9 percentage-point increase in the probability of frequent religious attendance (column 1), a 1.4 percentage-point increase in the likelihood of prayer at times of stress or depression (column 2), and a 1.9 percentage-point increase in the probability that a serviceman reports that religion is important (column 3). The magnitudes of these estimates are smaller than those obtained from the NLSAAH, which may be explained, in part, by an increase in religiosity for those deployed to combat zones who are not exposed to enemy firefight (see Table 4).²⁹

In Panels II through V, we examine heterogeneous impacts of combat exposure, by branch of service. In general, we find that the effect of combat on religiosity is generally larger for soldiers, marines, and sailors as compared to airmen. This is consistent with evidence that the psychological costs of combat are largest for those in the Army and Marines, for whom the nature of combat is quite different as compared to the Air Force (Cesur et al. 2013). However, we do find that combat exposure is associated with a 2.4 percentage-point increase in the probability that airmen turn to prayer in stressful situations.

Next, we attempt to disentangle the effects of combat exposure from the effects of time spent deployed. In Table 8, we use data from the HRB survey on number of post-9/11 combat deployments and average deployment length and add constructed measures of these variables to right-hand-side of equation (4). The results in Table 8 suggest that length of deployments and number of deployments are *negatively* related to weekly religious attendance (Panel I), which

²⁹Recall that those deployed to non-combat zones without enemy engagement are included in the 0s when *Enemy Engagement* is defined in the HRB survey.

may be due to reduced opportunities to attend religious services while deployed overseas. However, in our fully specified model (column 4), we confirm that, conditional on number and length of combat deployments, combat exposure leads to substantial increases in religiosity, suggesting that life-and-death trauma rather than simply length of possible exposure to such trauma is important. This pattern of results on the impact of combat exposure persists for private religious prayer (Panel II) and religious salience (Panel III).

5.3 Heterogeneous Impacts of Combat

Next, we examine whether the effects of combat differ across enlisted servicemen and officers. Our results in the first two panels of Table 9 show that religious effects are concentrated among enlisted servicemen. We find that for enlisted servicemen (Panel I), enemy engagement is associated with a 2 to 3 percentage-point increase in public and private expressions of religiosity. However, for officers (Panel II), there is no such impact. This result is consistent with prior evidence showing that the adverse psychological impacts of war, including effects on Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder, are larger for enlisted servicemen as compared to officers (Lyle 2006; Engel et al. 2010; Cesur and Sabia 2016). This finding may also be due to differences across enlisted servicemen and officers in social support networks, socioeconomic wellbeing, and occupation role.

In Panels III through V of Table 9, we explore heterogeneity in the effects of war by age. Again, consistent with prior work on the adverse psychological effects of war (Cesur and Sabia 2016), we find that the largest religiosity effects of combat are observed for young servicemen under the age of 25. Estimated religiosity effects of combat for younger servicemen are around 6 percentage-points, while estimates are smaller for those ages 25-to-34, a comparably aged

sample as that examined in the NLSAAH, and smaller still for those ages 35-to-55. Thus, junior enlisted servicemen are differentially impacted relative to junior or senior NCOs.

Next, in Panel VI of Table 9, we explore whether religious effects of combat extend to women. At the time of the 2008 DOD Survey, women were prevented from serving in many front-line combat roles, a regulation changed by the Department of Defense in 2013 (Burelli 2013; Kamarck 2015). However, during this period, women could still be exposed to combat via enemy fires on military bases overseas, ambush of their units, as well as witnessing war casualties experienced by their comrades. The results in Panel VI show that combat has comparably-sized religiosity effects for women, though these effects are imprecisely estimated.

In the final two panels of Table 9 (Panels VII and VIII), we examine impact of particular combat experiences: whether the serviceman was wounded in combat (Panel VII) or witnessed deaths in battle (VIII). Our findings suggest that being wounded in combat has the largest positive impact on religiosity. Injury in war is associated with a 7.9 percentage-point increase in weekly religious service attendance, and a 5.4 percentage-point increase in the probability of turning to prayer in stressful situations, effect sizes that are substantially larger than the average impact of enemy engagement. We find less evidence, at least in the HRB survey, that witnessing deaths or injuries of others impacts religiosity. These findings suggest that personal physical trauma and the consequences that flow from such trauma, may be a particularly important reason why servicemen turn to religiosity.

5.3 Mechanisms

The results presented above provide strong and consistent evidence that combat service increases religiosity. In the final section of this study, we empirically explore the channels that may be at work. The adverse psychological effects of war deployments have been well-

documented (Taneilian and Jaycox 2008; Cesur et al. 2013). In Appendix Table 3, we confirm that assignment to combat zones with enemy firefight is associated with substantial increases in the risk of PTSD (column 1), suicide ideation (column 2), psychological distress (column 3), and wounded in combat (column 4).

In addition to these channels, as noted above, supply-side channels related to chaplains and peers could also be at work. Unfortunately, the HRB survey do not permit us to identify specific combat zones to which servicemembers were deployed, nor are we able to identify supply-side shocks to the number of chaplains available in these combat zones. However, we can measure the extent to which servicemen turned to military chaplains to treat the mental health effects of combat, though this may certainly be due to demand-side reasons. In Table 10, we estimate the impact of combat on the probability of seeking counseling services from secular and religious sources, including military chaplains (Panel I).³⁰

In column (1) of Panel I, we find that combat exposure is associated with a 7.2 percentage-point increase in the likelihood of receipt of some type of counseling services. When we examine whether there is a heterogeneous response by type of counseling (columns 2 through 4), we find that combat exposure increases the probability of receiving counseling from secular

³⁰ Respondents to the DOD HRB Survey are asked:

“In the past 12 months, did you receive counseling or therapy for mental health or substance abuse from the following?”

- *Military chaplain*
- *Civilian pastor, rabbi, or other pastoral counselor*
- *Mental health professional at a military facility (e.g., psychologist, psychiatrist, clinical social worker or other mental health counselor).*
- *General medical doctor at a military facility*
- *General medical doctor at a civilian facility*
- *Civilian mental health professional (e.g., psychologist, psychiatrist, clinical social worker or other mental health counselor)”*

sources (e.g. medical or psychological professionals) (column 2), civilian clergy (column 3), and military chaplains (column 4). However, we find little evidence that combat increases use of military chaplain or civilian clergy by a greater degree than secular sources. This finding is generally confirmed in Panel II, where we condition the sample on those who sought counseling. We find that chaplains are no more likely to be used than other sources, though civilian clergy are 5.6 percentage-points more likely to be used than secular sources, consistent with less social stigma associated with seeking religious counseling.³¹

Finally, in Table 11, we descriptively explore the relative importance of psychological, physical, and chaplain-related channels. In odd-numbered columns, we show estimates of the effect of combat exposure on religiosity, while in even-numbered columns, we add (imperfect and admittedly endogenous) measures of psychological wellbeing, wounding in battle, and use of chaplain services to the right-hand side of equation (4).³² This descriptive exercise shows that the physical and psychological consequences of war, as well as chaplain interactions, may explain up to one-third to about 40 percent of the impact of war on religiosity. These channels appear more important in explaining religious attendance and prayer relative to religious importance. Residual channels could include fear of death as well as unit-level peer influences.

6. Conclusions

Coping with life-and-death trauma, including man's mortality, is widely believed to be an important stimulant for the demand for religion. However, relatively little research has examined the causal impact of life-and-death shocks on religiosity. The current study fills this

³¹ Results from a multinomial logit model, shown in Appendix Table 4, show a qualitatively similar pattern of results. However, given that categories of counseling are not independent, the IIA assumption is unlikely to be met.

³² For instance, because chaplain use is endogenous, it may be that their use is positively related to religiosity due to religious individuals being more likely to use chaplain services.

important gap by exploiting a natural experiment in military deployment assignments at a time of war. Across two national datasets, we find that combat service is associated with substantial increases in religious attendance and prayer. The strongest and largest religious effects of combat exposure are found among younger enlisted servicemen and among those who are physically injured in combat. There is also some descriptive evidence that these effects may not be entirely transitory.

Together, our findings suggest that life-and-death combat trauma has important effects on spiritual capital development. We find several mechanisms at work, including (i) servicemen seeking out religious organizations and doctrines to cope with fear of death, adverse psychological effects of war, or physical wounding in war, (ii) peer effects on religiosity forged by bonds created among combat veterans, and/or (iii) the role the U.S. military itself, wittingly or unwittingly, in nudging servicemen toward religiosity via chaplains or social stigma for seeking out secular psychological services.

There is a vigorous policy debate about how well the U.S. Armed Forces has achieved a proper balance in making spiritual services available for those who demand them, which may be necessary for mission success, while not using publicly funded resources to proselytize for a particular religion. Some advocates argue that the presence of chaplains in combat has led to unconstitutional proselytizing and endangered combat veterans' mental health. In a letter written to Secretary of Defense Robert Gates in 2010, the Military Religious Freedom Foundation wrote:

“Perhaps the most alarming...[is]...the widespread practice of ‘battlefield Christian proselytizing.’ When, on active duty, our service members sought urgently needed mental health counseling while on the battlefield and with the gun smoke practically still in their faces, they were instead sent to evangelizing chaplains, who are apparently being used with increasing frequency to provide mental health care due to the acute shortage of mental health professionals.” (Astore 2010)

On the other hand, columnists at the more conservative *National Review* have defended chaplains as indispensable not only to servicemembers' emotional well-being, but also to the success of military operations:

“The more dangerous the mission, the more vital chaplains are to its success. The nearly 1,400 chaplains in the U.S. armed forces...must be on-the-spot counselors to men and women living through a kind of trauma that few civilians will ever experience. They prepare soldiers to kill and to die without losing their souls. They help soldiers re-integrate into the lives of their families. Chaplains ministering stateside help military families left behind get through months of emotional and sometimes financial hardship.”
(Dreher, *National Review*, 2003)

While our findings suggest that combat-induced religiosity is not solely, or even largely, attributable to chaplain-induced demand, the role of chaplains in providing counseling services — particularly in war theatres where there is limited secular competition and a high degree of social stigma associated with seeking secular psychological counseling — remains a controversial military policy issue worthy of continued study.

References

- Angrist, Joshua D. "Lifetime earnings and the Vietnam era draft lottery: evidence from social security administrative records." *The American Economic Review* (1990): 313-336.
- Angrist, Joshua D. "Estimating the Labor Market Impact of Voluntary Military Service Using Social Security Data on Military Applicants." *Econometrica* 66, no. 2 (1998): 249-288.
- Angrist, Joshua D., and John H. Johnson IV. "Effects of work-related absences on families: Evidence from the Gulf War." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 54, no. 1 (2000): 41-58.
- Angrist, Joshua D., Stacey H. Chen, and Brigham R. Frandsen. "Did Vietnam veterans get sicker in the 1990s? The complicated effects of military service on self-reported health." *Journal of Public Economics* 94, no. 11-12 (2010): 824-837.
- Angrist, Joshua D., and Stacey H. Chen. "Schooling and the Vietnam-era GI Bill: Evidence from the draft lottery." *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 3, no. 2 (2011): 96-118.
- Angrist, Joshua D., Stacey H. Chen, and Jae Song. "Long-term consequences of Vietnam-era conscription: New estimates using social security data." *American Economic Review* 101, no. 3 (2011): 334-38.
- Army Regulation 220-1, 2010. Army Unit Status Reporting and Force Registration—Consolidated Policies. Headquarters of the Department of the Army, Washington DC, http://www.apd.army.mil/pdffiles/r220_1.pdf
- Astore, William. 2010. "In Place Of Mental Health Care, Are Some Troops Being Evangelized?" *Huffington Post*. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/william-astore/in-place-of-mental-health_b_677602.html.
- Baiocchi, Dave, *Measuring Army Deployments to Iraq and Afghanistan*, Rand Corporation, 2013.
- Barro, Robert J., and Rachel McCleary. *Religion and economic growth*. No. w9682. National Bureau of Economic Research, 2003.
- Becker, Sascha O., Markus Nagler, and Ludger Woessmann. "Education and religious participation: city-level evidence from Germany's secularization period 1890–1930." *Journal of Economic Growth* 22, no. 3 (2017): 273-311.
- Berman, Eli. "Sect, subsidy, and sacrifice: an economist's view of ultra-orthodox Jews." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 115, no. 3 (2000): 905-953.
- Berry, Devon. "Methodological pitfalls in the study of religiosity and spirituality." *Western Journal of Nursing Research* 27, no. 5 (2005): 628-647.
- Besterman-Dahan, Karen, Susanne W. Gibbons, Scott D. Barnett, and Edward J. Hickling. "The role of military chaplains in mental health care of the deployed service member." *Military Medicine* 177, no. 9 (2012): 1028-1033.

- Bisin, Alberto, and Thierry Verdier. "'Beyond the melting pot': cultural transmission, marriage, and the evolution of ethnic and religious traits." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 115, no. 3 (2000): 955-988.
- Bjarnason, Dana. "Concept analysis of religiosity." *Home Health Care Management & Practice* 19, no. 5 (2007): 350-355.
- Burdette, Amy M., Victor Wang, Glen H. Elder, Terrence D. Hill, and Janel Benson. "Serving God and Country? Religious involvement and military service among young adult men." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 48, no. 4 (2009): 794-804.
- Burrelli, David F. "Women in combat: Issues for Congress." LIBRARY OF CONGRESS WASHINGTON DC CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE, 2013.
- Buser, Thomas. "The effect of income on religiousness." *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 7, no. 3 (2015): 178-95.
- Carrell, Scott E., Richard L. Fullerton, and James E. West. "Does your cohort matter? Measuring peer effects in college achievement." *Journal of Labor Economics* 27, no. 3 (2009): 439-464.
- Carrell, Scott E., Mark Hoekstra, and James E. West. "Is poor fitness contagious?: Evidence from randomly assigned friends." *Journal of Public Economics* 95, no. 7-8 (2011): 657-663.
- Cesur, Resul, Joseph J. Sabia, and Erdal Tekin. "The psychological costs of war: military combat and mental health." *Journal of Health Economics* 32, no. 1 (2013): 51-65.
- Cesur, Resul, Joseph J. Sabia, and Erdal Tekin. "Combat exposure and migraine headache: evidence from exogenous deployment assignment." *Economics & Human Biology* 16 (2015): 81-99.
- Cesur, Resul, and Joseph J. Sabia. "When war comes home: The effect of combat service on domestic violence." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 98, no. 2 (2016): 209-225.
- Cesur, Resul, Alexander Chesney, and Joseph J. Sabia. "Combat Exposure, Cigarette Consumption, and Substance Use." *Economic Inquiry* 54, no. 3 (2016): 1705-1726.
- Cesur, Resul, and Sadullah Yildirim. "Macrogenetic Structure and Religion: Evidence from the Recent African Origin Hypothesis" University of Connecticut Working Paper (2017)
- Cesur, Resul, and Naci Mocan. "Education, religion, and voter preference in a Muslim country." *Journal of Population Economics* 31, no. 1 (2018): 1-44.
- Chen, Yung Y., and Harold G. Koenig. "Traumatic stress and religion: Is there a relationship? A review of empirical findings." *Journal of Religion and Health* 45, no. 3 (2006): 371-381.
- Chen, Daniel L. "Club goods and group identity: Evidence from Islamic resurgence during the Indonesian financial crisis." *Journal of Political Economy* 118, no. 2 (2010): 300-354.
- Daniels, Joseph P., and Marc Von Der Ruhr. "Trust in others: Does religion matter?." *Review of Social Economy* 68, no. 2 (2010): 163-186.
- Deaton, Angus S. *Aging, religion, and health*. No. w15271. National Bureau of Economic Research, 2009.

- De Castella, Rosemary, and Janette Graetz Simmonds. "There's a deeper level of meaning as to what suffering's all about": experiences of religious and spiritual growth following trauma." *Mental Health, Religion & Culture* 16, no. 5 (2013): 536-556.
- Department of Veterans Affairs. "Analysis of VA health care utilization among operation enduring freedom (OEF), Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF), and Operation New Dawn (OND) veterans." *Washington, DC: Department of Veterans Affairs* (2012).
- Department of Defense. *Defense Casualty Analysis System*. Defense Manpower Data Centers. Washington D.C.: US Department of Defense, https://www.dmdc.osd.mil/dcaspages/report_by_year_manner.xhtml (2016).
- Dreher, Rod. "Ministers Of War". *National Review*. <http://www.nationalreview.com/article/210615/ministers-war-rod-dreher> (2003).
- Drescher, K.D., Foy, D.W., Kelly, C., Leshner, A., Schutz, K. and Litz, B., 2011. An exploration of the viability and usefulness of the construct of moral injury in war veterans. *Traumatology*, 17(1), p.8.
- Durkheim, Emile, and Joseph Ward Swain. *The elementary forms of the religious life*. Courier Corporation, 2008.
- Egbert, Nichole, Jacqueline Mickley, and Harriet Coeling. "A review and application of social scientific measures of religiosity and spirituality: Assessing a missing component in health communication research." *Health Communication* 16, no. 1 (2004): 7-27.
- Epstein, Susan B., and Lynn M. Williams. *Overseas Contingency Operations Funding: Background and Status*. Congressional Research Service Washington United States, 2016.
- Engel, Rozlyn C., Luke B. Gallagher, and David S. Lyle. "Military deployments and children's academic achievement: Evidence from Department of Defense Education Activity Schools." *Economics of Education Review* 29, no. 1 (2010): 73-82.
- Falsetti, Sherry A., Patricia A. Resick, and Joanne L. Davis. "Changes in religious beliefs following trauma." *Journal of Traumatic Stress* 16, no. 4 (2003): 391-398.
- Fontana, Alan, and Robert Rosenheck. "Trauma, change in strength of religious faith, and mental health service use among veterans treated for PTSD." *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease* 192, no. 9 (2004): 579-584.
- Fruehwirth, Cooley, Jane, Sriya Iyer, and Anwen Zhang. *Religion and Depression in Adolescence*. No. 9652. IZA Discussion Papers, 2016.
- Glock, Charles Y. "On the study of religious commitment." (1962): 98-110.
- Glock, Charles Young, and Rodney Stark. *Religion and society in tension*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.
- Grossman, Michael. "On the concept of health capital and the demand for health." *Journal of Political Economy* 80, no. 2 (1972): 223-255.

- Gruber, Jonathan H. "Religious market structure, religious participation, and outcomes: Is religion good for you?" *The BE Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy* 5, no. 1 (2005).
- Gruber, Jonathan, and Daniel M. Hungerman. "The church versus the mall: What happens when religion faces increased secular competition?" *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 123, no. 2 (2008): 831-862.
- Gubkin, Rut. "An Exploration of Spirituality and the Traumatizing Experiences of Combat." *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* 56, no. 4 (2016): 311-330.
- Harris, J. Irene, Christopher R. Erbes, Brian E. Engdahl, Paul Thuras, Nichole Murray-Swank, Dixie Grace, Henry Ogden et al. "The effectiveness of a trauma focused spiritually integrated intervention for veterans exposed to trauma." *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 67, no. 4 (2011): 425-438.
- Harris, J. Irene, Gary K. Leak, Rachel Dubke, and Cory Voecks. "Religious strain and postconventional religiousness in trauma survivors." *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality* 7, no. 2 (2015): 173.
- Hasanović, Mevludin, and Izet Pajević. "Religious moral beliefs inversely related to trauma experiences severity and presented posttraumatic stress disorder among Bosnia and Herzegovina war veterans." *Journal of Religion and Health* 54, no. 4 (2015): 1403-1415.
- Hungerman, Daniel M. "Are church and state substitutes? Evidence from the 1996 welfare reform." *Journal of Public Economics* 89, no. 11 (2005): 2245-2267.
- Hungerman, Daniel M. "The effect of education on religion: Evidence from compulsory schooling laws." *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 104 (2014): 52-63.
- Hunsberger, Bruce, and Lynne M. Jackson. "Religion, meaning, and prejudice." *Journal of social issues* 61, no. 4 (2005): 807-826.
- Iannaccone, Laurence R. "Sacrifice and stigma: reducing free-riding in cults, communes, and other collectives." *Journal of Political Economy* 100, no. 2 (1992): 271-291.
- Iannaccone, Laurence R. "Religious Markets and the Economics of Religion." *Social Compass* 39, no. 1 (1992): 123-131.
- Iannaccone, Laurence R. and Eli Berman. "Economics of Religion" In *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics*, edited by Stephen Durlauf and Lawrence Blume. Baisingsoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan. (2008)
- Iyer, Sriya. "The New Economics of Religion." *Journal of Economic Literature* 54, no. 2 (June 2016): 395-441.
- Jindal, Congressman Bobby. 2006. Report on Chaplaincy. Obtained on September 28, 2006.
- Johns, Jay (Executive Director, Armed Forces Chaplains Board), interviewed by Travis Freidman, September 2017.
- Kamarck, Kristy N. "Women in Combat: Issues for Congress." *Congressional Research Service: Report* (August 18, 2015): 1.
- Koenig, Harold, George R. Parkerson Jr, and Keith G. Meador. "Religion index for psychiatric research." (1997).

- Koenig, Harold G., Michael E. McCullough, and David B. Larson. *Handbook of religion and health*. n.p.: Oxford ; New York : Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Koenig, Harold G. "Research on religion, spirituality, and mental health: a review." *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*. 54, no. 5 (2009): 283-291.
- Kopacz, Marek S., Cathleen P. Kane, Wilfred R. Pigeon, and Jason A. Nieuwsma. "Chaplaincy encounters following a suicide attempt." *Journal of Health Care Chaplaincy* 23, no. 4 (2017): 167-173.
- Kossowska, Małgorzata, and Maciej Sekerdej. "Searching for certainty: Religious beliefs and intolerance toward value-violating groups." *Personality and Individual Differences* 83 (2015): 72-76.
- Litz, Brett T., Nathan Stein, Eileen Delaney, Leslie Lebowitz, William P. Nash, Caroline Silva, and Shira Maguen. "Moral injury and moral repair in war veterans: A preliminary model and intervention strategy." *Clinical Psychology Review* 29, no. 8 (2009): 695-706.
- Litz, Brett T., and William E. Schlenger. "PTSD in service members and new veterans of the Iraq and Afghanistan wars: A bibliography and critique." *PTSD Research Quarterly* 20, no. 1 (2009): 1-7.
- Lyle, David S. "Using military deployments and job assignments to estimate the effect of parental absences and household relocations on children's academic achievement." *Journal of Labor Economics* 24, no. 2 (2006): 319-350.
- Lyle, David S. "Estimating and interpreting peer and role model effects from randomly assigned social groups at West Point." *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 89, no. 2 (2007): 289-299.
- Lyons, J A. "Self-mutilation by a man with posttraumatic stress disorder." *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease* 179, no. 8 (1991): 505-507.
- Marx, Brian P. "Posttraumatic stress disorder and Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom: Progress in a time of controversy." (2009): 671-673.
- McFarlane, Alexander C. "The long-term costs of traumatic stress: intertwined physical and psychological consequences." *World Psychiatry* 9, no. 1 (2010): 3-10.
- McFall, Miles E., Priscilla W. Mackay, and Dennis M. Donovan. "Combat-related posttraumatic stress disorder and severity of substance abuse in Vietnam veterans." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 53, no. 4 (1992): 357-363.
- McFall, Miles E., Richard C. Veith, and M. Michele Murburg. "Basal sympathoadrenal function in posttraumatic distress disorder." *Biological Psychiatry* 31, no. 10 (1992): 1050-1056.
- McLaughlin, Barbara R. "Devastated Spirituality: The Impact of Clergy Sexual Abuse on the Survivor's Relationship with God and the Church." *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity* 1, no. 2 (1994): 145.
- Mellor, Jennifer M., and Beth A. Freeborn. "Religious participation and risky health behaviors among adolescents." *Health Economics* 20, no. 10 (2011): 1226-1240.
- Military Leadership Diversity Commission. "Religious diversity in the US Military." *Military Leadership Diversity Commission* (2010).

- Morgan, Jessica Kelley, Laurel Hourani, Marian E. Lane, and Stephen Tueller. "Help-seeking behaviors among active-duty military personnel: Utilization of chaplains and other mental health service providers." *Journal of Health Care Chaplaincy* 22, no. 3 (2016): 102-117.
- Negrusa, Sebastian, Brighita Negrusa, and James Hosek. "Gone to war: have deployments increased divorces?" *Journal of Population Economics* 27, no. 2 (2014): 473-496.
- Norenzayan, Ara, and Azim F. Shariff. "The Origin and Evolution of Religious Prosociality." *Science* 322, no. 5898 (2008): 58-62.
- Ogden, Henry, J. Irene Harris, Christopher R. Erbes, Brian E. Engdahl, Raymond HA Olson, Ann Marie Winskowski, and Joelle McMahill. "Religious functioning and trauma outcomes among combat veterans." *Counselling and Spirituality* (2011): 71-89.
- Overcash, Wendy S., Lawrence G. Calhoun, Arnie Cann, and Richard G. Tedeschi. "Coping with crises: An examination of the impact of traumatic events on religious beliefs." *The Journal of Genetic Psychology* 157, no. 4 (1996): 455-464.
- Pargament, Kenneth I., and Curtis R. Brant. "Religion and coping." In *Handbook of Religion and Mental Health*, (1998): 111-128.
- Peres, Julio FP, Alexander Moreira-Almeida, Antonia Gladys Nasello, and Harold G. Koenig. "Spirituality and Resilience in Trauma Victims." *Journal of Religion and Health* 46, no. 3 (2007): 343-350.
- Price, Rumi Kato, Nathan K. Risk, Ashley H. Haden, Collins E. Lewis, and Edward L. Spitznagel. "Post-traumatic stress disorder, drug dependence, and suicidality among male Vietnam veterans with a history of heavy drug use." *Drug & Alcohol Dependence* 76 (2004): S31-S43.
- Rohlf, Chris. "Does combat exposure make you a more violent or criminal person? Evidence from the Vietnam draft." *Journal of Human Resources* 45, no. 2 (2010): 271-300.
- Sabia, Joseph J. and William Skimmyhorn. "War! What is it Good For? The Effect of Combat Service on Economic Transitions of Veterans." *Economic Self-Sufficiency Policy Research Institute Working Paper* (2018).
- Shaw, Annick, Stephen Joseph, and P. Alex Linley. "Religion, spirituality, and posttraumatic growth: A systematic review." *Mental Health, Religion & Culture* 8, no. 1 (2005): 1-11.
- Shen, Yu-Chu, Jeremy Arkes, and John Pilgrim. "The effects of deployment intensity on post-traumatic stress disorder: 2002–2006." *Military medicine* 174, no. 3 (2009): 217-223.
- Smidt, Corwin. "Religion and civic engagement: A comparative analysis." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 565, no. 1 (1999): 176-192.
- Smith, Tom W, Peter Marsden, Michael Hout, and Jibum Kim. *General Social Surveys, 1972-2012: Cumulative Codebook / Principal Investigator, Tom W. Smith; Co-Principal Investigator, Peter V. Marsden; Co-Principal Investigator, Michael Hout. -- Chicago: NORC at the University of Chicago, 2016*
- Stark, Rodney, Laurence R. Iannaccone, and Roger Finke. "Religion, science, and rationality." *The American Economic Review* 86, no. 2 (1996): 433-437.

- Steenkamp, Maria M., Brett T. Litz, Matt J. Gray, Leslie Lebowitz, William Nash, Lauren Conoscenti, Amy Amidon, and Ariel Lang. "A Brief Exposure-Based Intervention for Service Members with PTSD." *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice* 18, no. 1 (2011): 98-107.
- Tanielian, Terri and Lisa H. Jaycox, eds., *Invisible Wounds of War: Psychological and Cognitive Injuries, Their Consequences, and Services to Assist Recovery*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2008.
- ter Kuile, Hagar, and Thomas Ehring. "Predictors of changes in religiosity after trauma: Trauma, religiosity, and posttraumatic stress disorder." *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy* 6, no. 4 (2014): 353.
- Tran, Christy T., Eric Kuhn, Robyn D. Walser, and Kent D. Drescher. "The Relationship Between Religiosity, PTSD, and depressive symptoms in veterans in PTSD residential treatment." *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 40, no. 4 (2012): 313-322.
- Waggoner, Ed. "Taking Religion Seriously in the US Military: The Chaplaincy as a National Strategic Asset." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 82, no. 3 (2014): 702-735.
- Worthington Jr, Everett L., and Diane Langberg. "Religious considerations and self-forgiveness in treating complex trauma and moral injury in present and former soldiers." *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 40, no. 4 (2012): 274-288.
- Zarembo, Alan. "As disability awards grow, so do concerns with veracity of PTSD claims." *Los Angeles Times* (2014).

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics, NLSAAH

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Standard Deviation</i>
	(1)	(2)
<i>Dependent Variables</i>		
Weekly Religious Attendance	0.154	(0.361)
Prayer	0.751	(0.433)
Religious Importance	0.511	(0.500)
<i>Combat Measures</i>		
Combat Assignment	0.755	(0.430)
Enemy Engagement	0.367	(0.483)
Combat Service without Engagement	0.388	(0.488)
<i>Military Controls</i>		
Army	0.41	(0.49)
Marine	0.20	(0.40)
Navy	0.25	(0.43)
Air Force	0.16	(0.37)
Rank E1-E3	0.06	(0.24)
Rank E4-E6	0.85	(0.36)
Rank E7-E9	0.02	(0.14)
Rank W1-W5	0.01	(0.08)
Rank O1-O3	0.06	(0.25)
Rank 04-O10	0.00	(0.00)
<i>Selected Background Characteristics</i>		
Age	28.68	(1.70)
Some College	0.66	(0.47)
College Education	0.16	(0.37)
White	0.70	(0.50)
Black	0.22	(0.42)
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.08	(0.26)
Hispanic	0.16	(0.37)
Observations	482	

Notes: Standard deviations in parentheses. The means are generated using data for males drawn from wave IV of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. Branch of service is not mutually exclusive. The sample is composed of male servicemembers only. The indicators for rank are further disaggregated in the regression analysis (Rank E1–E2, Rank E3, Rank E4, Rank E5, Rank E6, Rank E7–E8, Rank O1–O2, Rank O3, Rank W1–W2).

Table 2. Descriptive Checks of Exogeneity of Deployment, NLSAAH

	<i>Combat Assignment</i> vs <i>No Combat</i> <i>Assignment</i>	<i>Enemy Engagement</i> vs <i>No Enemy</i> <i>Engagement</i>	<i>Enemy Engagement</i> vs <i>No Combat</i> <i>Assignment</i>
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Weekly Religious Attendance	0.047 (0.041)	0.026 (0.050)	0.046 (0.060)
Prayer	-0.057 (0.043)	0.037 (0.058)	-0.014 (0.067)
Religious Importance	0.060 (0.041)	0.012 (0.052)	0.099 (0.065)
F-test (p-value)	1.279 (0.285)	0.406 (0.749)	1.313 (0.274)
Wave 1 Mother Religion is Very Important	0.012 (0.048)	-0.007 (0.052)	0.036 (0.061)
Wave 1 Mother Attended Service	0.005 (0.045)	-0.041 (0.044)	-0.012 (0.054)
Wave 1 Weight	-0.001 (0.001)	-0.000 (0.001)	-0.001 (0.001)
Wave 1 Height	-0.003 (0.005)	0.003 (0.006)	0.000 (0.007)
Wave 1 Protestant	-0.009 (0.067)	0.009 (0.087)	-0.013 (0.097)
Wave 1 Catholic	0.065 (0.072)	0.012 (0.087)	0.016 (0.104)
Wave 1 Other Religion	0.036 (0.125)	-0.004 (0.151)	0.085 (0.206)
F-test (p-value)	0.888 (0.450)	0.0134 (0.998)	0.169 (0.917)
Age in Years	0.173 (0.403)	0.111 (0.398)	0.302 (0.555)
Age in Years Squared	-0.003 (0.007)	-0.002 (0.007)	-0.006 (0.010)
F-test (p-value)	0.354 (0.702)	0.286 (0.752)	0.566 (0.570)
Race: Black	-0.010 (0.050)	-0.085 (0.059)	-0.062 (0.073)
Race: Other	0.098 (0.061)	-0.053 (0.067)	0.049 (0.119)

	<i>Combat Assignment</i> vs <i>No Combat</i> <i>Assignment</i>	<i>Enemy Engagement</i> vs <i>No Enemy</i> <i>Engagement</i>	<i>Enemy Engagement</i> vs <i>No Combat</i> <i>Assignment</i>
	(1)	(2)	(3)
F-test (p-value)	1.381 (0.255)	1.093 (0.339)	0.543 (0.583)
Ethnicity: Hispanic	-0.005 (0.049)	-0.158*** (0.053)	-0.080 (0.079)
Some College	0.032 (0.053)	-0.000 (0.055)	0.043 (0.069)
College	0.106 (0.081)	-0.008 (0.087)	0.068 (0.117)
F-test (p-value)	0.915 (0.403)	0.00531 (0.995)	0.228 (0.796)
Wave 1 PPVT	-0.001 (0.001)	0.000 (0.002)	-0.001 (0.002)
\$19K=<Parental Income <\$28K	-0.014 (0.087)	0.016 (0.093)	-0.028 (0.129)
\$28K=<Parental Income <\$36K	0.076 (0.072)	0.086 (0.097)	0.098 (0.110)
\$36K=<Parental Income <\$45K	0.062 (0.081)	0.036 (0.083)	0.076 (0.120)
\$45K=<Parental Income <\$56K	0.087 (0.073)	0.066 (0.079)	0.121 (0.099)
\$56K=<Parental Income <\$83K	0.165* (0.089)	0.106 (0.104)	0.195 (0.120)
\$83K=<Parental Income	0.117 (0.096)	0.184 (0.128)	0.257* (0.150)
F-test (p-value)	1.078 (0.380)	0.589 (0.739)	1.335 (0.249)
Parents: Married	-0.107 (0.070)	0.043 (0.129)	-0.127 (0.132)
Parents: Divorced, Separated or Widowed	-0.138 (0.087)	0.046 (0.145)	-0.172 (0.153)
F-test (p-value)	1.342 (0.265)	0.0568 (0.945)	0.638 (0.530)
Mothers Education: High School	0.035 (0.093)	0.020 (0.071)	0.039 (0.109)
Mothers Education: Above High School	0.033	0.057	0.090

	<i>Combat Assignment</i>	<i>Enemy Engagement</i>	<i>Enemy Engagement</i>
	vs	vs	vs
	<i>No Combat</i>	<i>No Enemy</i>	<i>No Combat</i>
	<i>Assignment</i>	<i>Engagement</i>	<i>Assignment</i>
	(1)	(2)	(3)
	(0.082)	(0.074)	(0.107)
F-test (p-value)	0.0832 (0.920)	0.421 (0.658)	0.581 (0.561)

Notes: Standard errors clustered on the school are in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1 Each model includes controls for military-specific variables, including binary indicators for current active-duty military service status, total service length, military rank, branch of service, timing of service, and occupation. Each specification also includes missing dummy categories for each of the control variables with missing information. Estimates are obtained from a separate regression for each independent variable (or mutually exclusive independent variable category). P-values represent the joint significance of mutually exclusive categorical variables, e.g., race, income, and maternal schooling. The sample is comprised of male servicemembers only.

Table 3. The Effect of Combat on Religiosity, NLSAAH

	<i>Weekly Religious Attendance</i>	<i>Prayer</i>	<i>Religious Importance</i>
	(1)	(2)	(3)
<i>Panel I: All</i>			
Combat Assignment	0.079**	0.086*	0.045
	(0.033)	(0.050)	(0.052)
N	482	481	481
<i>Panel II: Current Active Duty</i>			
Combat Assignment	0.124**	0.090	0.198**
	(0.051)	(0.090)	(0.088)
N	196	196	195
<i>Panel III: Prior Service</i>			
Combat Assignment	0.083*	0.117*	0.019
	(0.042)	(0.064)	(0.062)
N	286	285	286
<i>Panel IV: Pre-Enlistment Christian Identification</i>			
Combat Assignment	0.111**	0.059	0.014
	(0.045)	(0.042)	(0.064)
N	349	348	348
<i>Panel V: Pre-Enlistment Non-Christian Identification</i>			
Combat Assignment	-0.048	-0.014	-0.024
	(0.043)	(0.112)	(0.071)
N	133	133	133

Notes: Standard errors clustered on the school are in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1 Military controls include binary variables for current active-duty military service status, total service length, military rank, branch of service, timing of service, and occupation. Each regression also includes missing dummy categories for each of the control variables with missing information. The sample includes male servicemembers only.

Table 4. The Effect of Enemy Engagement on Religiosity, NLSAAH

	<i>Weekly Religious Attendance</i>	<i>Prayer</i>	<i>Religious Importance</i>
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Enemy Engagement	0.079* (0.043)	0.075 (0.051)	0.011 (0.059)
Combat Assignment without Engagement	0.079** (0.034)	0.095 (0.059)	0.075 (0.064)
N	482	481	481

Notes: Standard errors clustered on the school are in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1 Military controls include binary variables for current active-duty military service status, total service length, military rank, branch of service, timing of service, and occupation. Each regression also includes missing dummy categories for each of the control variables with missing information. The sample includes male servicemembers only.

Table 5. Sensitivity of Estimated Combat Effects to Background Characteristics and Pre-Deployment Religiosity, NLSAAH

	<i>Weekly Religious Attendance</i>			<i>Prayer</i>			<i>Religious Importance</i>		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
<i>Panel I: Combat Service</i>									
Combat Assignment	0.079**	0.088**	0.072*	0.086*	0.086*	0.067	0.045	0.052	0.034
	(0.033)	(0.042)	(0.041)	(0.050)	(0.051)	(0.049)	(0.052)	(0.054)	(0.055)
N	482	482	482	481	481	481	481	481	481
<i>Panel II: Enemy Engagement</i>									
Enemy Engagement	0.079*	0.085	0.067	0.075	0.088*	0.058	0.011	0.021	-0.009
	(0.043)	(0.053)	(0.052)	(0.051)	(0.052)	(0.050)	(0.059)	(0.057)	(0.057)
Combat Assignment without Engagement	0.079**	0.092**	0.077*	0.095	0.085	0.075	0.075	0.082	0.075
	(0.034)	(0.040)	(0.040)	(0.059)	(0.060)	(0.057)	(0.064)	(0.066)	(0.066)
N	482	482	482	481	481	481	481	481	481
Military Variables & Occupation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Individual and Family Covariates	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Pre-Deployment Religiosity	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes

Notes: Standard errors clustered on the school are in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1 Military controls include dichotomous indicators for current active-duty military service status, total service length, military rank, branch of service, timing of service, and occupation. Each specification also includes missing dummy categories for each of the control variables with missing information. The sample is comprised of male servicemembers only. Full Controls include height, weight, religion indicators at Wave 1, age, age squared, race/ethnicity indicators, education dummies, Picture Vocabulary Test Score, parental income dummies, parental marital status indicators, and maternal education indicators. Pre-deployment religiosity measures include religious attendance weekly, private prayer, and religious importance.

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics, HRB Survey

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Standard Deviation</i>
	(1)	(2)
<i>Dependent Variables</i>		
Frequent Religious Attendance	0.189	(0.390)
Prayer	0.220	(0.414)
Religious Importance	0.695	(0.460)
<i>Combat Measures</i>		
Enemy Engagement	0.515	(0.500)
Combat Injury	0.050	(0.218)
Witness Death	0.322	(0.467)
<i>Selected Military Controls</i>		
Army	0.222	(0.416)
Marine	0.217	(0.412)
Navy	0.292	(0.455)
Air Force	0.268	(0.443)
Rank E1-E3	0.074	(0.262)
Rank E4-E6	0.526	(0.499)
Rank E7-E9	0.167	(0.373)
Rank W1-W5	0.040	(0.195)
Rank O1-O3	0.098	(0.297)
Rank O4-O10	0.096	(0.294)
<i>Selected Background Characteristics</i>		
Age	31.609	(7.626)
Some College	0.475	(0.499)
College Education	0.268	(0.442)
White	0.744	(0.443)
Black	0.153	(0.360)
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.115	(0.319)
Hispanic	0.125	(0.331)
N	11,542	

Standard deviations in parentheses. Summary statistics are generated using data for male servicemembers from the 2008 Department of Defense Health and Related Behaviors Survey.

Table 7. The Effect of Combat on Religiosity, HRB Survey

	<i>Frequent Religious Attendance</i>	<i>Prayer</i>	<i>Religious Importance</i>
	(1)	(2)	(3)
<i>Panel I: All</i>			
Enemy Engagement	0.019** (0.008)	0.014** (0.006)	0.019* (0.010)
N	11,307	11,340	11,278
<i>Panel II: Army</i>			
Enemy Engagement	0.029 (0.021)	0.016 (0.021)	0.039 (0.031)
N	2,517	2,518	2,513
<i>Panel III: Marines</i>			
Enemy Engagement	0.039* (0.014)	0.005 (0.012)	0.033 (0.024)
N	2,449	2,460	2,444
<i>Panel IV: Navy</i>			
Enemy Engagement	0.031 (0.022)	0.013 (0.013)	0.016 (0.013)
N	3,293	3,313	3,280
<i>Panel V: Air Force</i>			
Enemy Engagement	0.002 (0.008)	0.024*** (0.006)	0.013 (0.024)
N	3,048	3,049	3,041

Notes: Standard errors clustered on the stratum are in parentheses. Statistically significant at *10%, **5%, ***1%. Regressions control for military rank, branch-specific major command indicators, number of combat deployments since September 11, education indicators, age, age squared, and race/ethnicity dummies. In the full sample (Panel A) we also control for branch of service. The sample includes male servicemembers only.

Table 8. The Effect of Deployment Assignment, Number of Deployments, and Deployment Length on Religiosity, HRB Survey

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
<i>Panel I: Frequent Religious Attendance</i>				
Enemy Engagement			0.014*	0.018**
			(0.008)	(0.008)
Number of Post-9/11 Deployments	-0.005**			-0.006***
	(0.002)			(0.002)
Deployed 3-6 Months in Last Year		0.005	0.003	0.007
		(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.007)
Deployed 7+ Months in Last Year		-0.033***	-0.036***	-0.032***
		(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)
N	11,307	11,278	11,278	11,250
<i>Panel II: Prayer</i>				
Enemy Engagement			0.015**	0.014**
			(0.006)	(0.006)
Number of Post-9/11 Deployments	0.002			0.001
	(0.003)			(0.003)
Deployed 3-6 Months in Last Year		0.009	0.008	0.007
		(0.013)	(0.012)	(0.012)
Deployed 7+ Months in Last Year		0.007	0.004	0.004
		(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.010)
N	11,340	11,311	11,311	11,282
<i>Panel III: Religious Importance</i>				
Enemy Engagement			0.016*	0.018*
			(0.009)	(0.010)
Number of Post-9/11 Deployments	0.001			-0.002
	(0.003)			(0.003)
Deployed 3-6 Months in Last Year		0.030*	0.028*	0.029*
		(0.015)	(0.016)	(0.015)
Deployed 7+ Months in Last Year		0.010	0.007	0.008
		(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.012)
N	11,278	11,251	11,251	11,222

Notes: Standard errors clustered on the stratum are in parentheses. Statistically significant at *10%, **5%, ***1%. Regressions control for military rank, branch of service, branch-specific major command indicators, number of combat deployments since September 11, education indicators, age, age squared, and race/ethnicity dummies. The sample includes male servicemembers only.

Table 9. Exploring Heterogeneity in Effect of Combat on Religiosity, HRB Survey

	<i>Frequent Religious Attendance</i>	<i>Prayer</i>	<i>Religious Importance</i>
	(1)	(2)	(3)
<i>Panel I: Enlisted</i>			
Enemy Engagement	0.033** (0.012)	0.018** (0.008)	0.033** (0.012)
N	8,644	8,677	8,615
<i>Panel II: Officer</i>			
Enemy Engagement	-0.020 (0.016)	0.004 (0.017)	-0.018 (0.017)
N	2,663	2,663	2,663
<i>Panel III: Ages 18 to 24</i>			
Enemy Engagement	0.057** (0.026)	0.010 (0.024)	0.062** (0.028)
N	2,486	2,500	2,476
<i>Panel IV: Ages 25 to 32</i>			
Enemy Engagement	0.025 (0.015)	0.020 (0.013)	0.018 (0.024)
N	3,820	3,825	3,808
<i>Panel V: Ages 33 to 50</i>			
Enemy Engagement	-0.002 (0.013)	0.015 (0.011)	0.004 (0.017)
N	5,001	5,015	4,994
<i>Panel VI: Females</i>			
Enemy Engagement	0.035* (0.019)	0.016 (0.020)	0.025 (0.019)
N	3,137	3,132	3,123
<i>Panel VII: Wounding</i>			
Combat Injury	0.073** (0.029)	0.054*** (0.018)	0.033 (0.020)
N	11,182	11,212	11,152
<i>Panel VIII: Witnessing Death</i>			
Combat Witness Death	-0.007 (0.010)	-0.000 (0.008)	0.004 (0.007)
N	11,213	11,245	11,185

Notes: Standard errors clustered on the stratum are in parentheses. Statistically significant at *10%, **5%, ***1%. Regressions control for military rank, branch of service, branch-specific major command indicators, number of combat deployments since September 11, education indicators, age, age squared, and race/ethnicity dummies. Panels I to V includes male servicemembers, who are enlisted, officers, ages 18 to 24, ages 25 to 32, and ages 33 to 50, respectively. Panel VI is comprised of female servicemembers.

Table 10. The Effect of Combat on Religious and Secular Counseling Receipt, HRB Survey

	(1) <i>Any Counseling</i>	(2) <i>Secular Counseling</i>	(3) <i>Civilian Clergy Counseling</i>	(4) <i>Military Chaplain Counseling</i>
Panel I: Full Sample				
Enemy Engagement	0.072*** (0.011)	0.069*** (0.011)	0.034*** (0.006)	0.040*** (0.008)
Observations	11,361	11,361	11,361	11,361
Panel II: Sample Receiving Counseling				
Enemy Engagement	--	0.038** (0.016)	0.056** (0.026)	0.025 (0.031)
		1,952	1,952	1,952

Notes: Standard errors clustered on the stratum are in parentheses. Statistically significant at *10%, **5%, ***1%. Models control for military rank, branch of service, branch-specific major command indicators, number of combat deployments since September 11, education indicators, age, age squared, and race/ethnicity dummies. In Panels I to IV, the sample is comprised of male servicemembers only. In Panel V, the sample includes male servicemembers who received at least one form of secular and/or religious counseling.

Table 11. Descriptive Analysis of Mechanisms to Explain Effect of Combat on Religiosity

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	<i>Frequent Religious Attendance</i>		<i>Prayer</i>		<i>Religious Importance</i>	
Enemy Engagement	0.019** (0.008)	0.012 (0.008)	0.014** (0.006)	0.008 (0.006)	0.019* (0.010)	0.017* (0.010)
PTSD		0.010 (0.021)		0.004 (0.017)		-0.010 (0.022)
Suicide		-0.006 (0.020)		-0.027 (0.021)		-0.034 (0.021)
Psychological Distress		0.005 (0.014)		0.028* (0.014)		-0.022 (0.016)
Wounding		0.057** (0.025)		0.039* (0.019)		0.027 (0.022)
Military Chaplain		0.060*** (0.016)		0.060*** (0.015)		0.052*** (0.015)
N	11,307	11,307	11,340	11,340	11,278	11,278

Notes: Standard errors clustered on the stratum are in parentheses. Statistically significant at *10%, **5%, ***1%. Models control for military rank, branch of service, branch-specific major command indicators, number of combat deployments since September 11, education indicators, age, age squared, and race/ethnicity dummies. In Panels I to IV, the sample is comprised of male servicemembers only. In Panel V, the sample includes male servicemembers who received at least one form of secular and/or religious counseling. Models also control for missing observations indicators for PTSD, Suicide, Psychological Distress, Wounding, and Military Chaplain.

Appendix Table 1. The Effect of Combat on Any Religious Service Attendance

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	<i>NLSAAH</i>		<i>HRB Survey</i>				
	<i>All</i>	<i>All</i>	<i>All</i>	<i>Army</i>	<i>Marines</i>	<i>Navy</i>	<i>Air Force</i>
Combat Assignment	0.094*						
	(0.052)						
Enemy Engagement		0.076	0.028**	0.045	0.051	0.037	0.010
		(0.063)	(0.011)	(0.034)	(0.032)	(0.023)	(0.010)
Combat Assignment without Engagement		0.109*					
		(0.058)					
N	482	482	11,307	2,517	2,449	3,293	3,048

Notes for *columns (1) and (2)*: Standard errors clustered on the stratum are in parentheses. Statistically significant at *10%, **5%, ***1%. Models control for military rank, branch-specific major command indicators, number of combat deployments since September 11, education indicators, age, age squared, and race/ethnicity dummies. In the full sample (Panel A) we also control for branch of service. The sample includes male servicemembers only.

Notes for *columns (3)-(7)*: Standard errors clustered on the school are in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1 Number of observations in brackets. Military controls include dichotomous indicators for current active-duty military service status, total service length, military rank, branch of service, timing of service, and occupation. Regressions also includes missing dummy categories for each of the control variables with missing information. The sample includes male servicemembers only. Full Controls include height, weight, religion indicators at Wave 1, age, age squared, race/ethnicity indicators, education dummies, Picture Vocabulary Test Score, parental income dummies, parental marital status indicators, and maternal education indicators. Pre-deployment religiosity measures include religious attendance weekly, private prayer, and religious importance.

**Appendix Table 2. Estimating the Impact of Combat on Religiosity in the NLSAAH,
Using the Available Control Variables in HRB Survey**

	<i>Weekly Religious Attendance</i>	<i>Prayer</i>	<i>Religious Importance</i>
	(1)	(2)	(3)
<i>Panel I: Combat Assignment</i>			
Combat Assignment	0.093** (0.037)	0.084* (0.050)	0.046 (0.050)
	482	481	481
<i>Panel II: Enemy Engagement</i>			
Enemy Engagement	0.101** (0.044)	0.080 (0.053)	0.019 (0.058)
Combat Assignment without Engagement	0.085** (0.040)	0.088 (0.056)	0.070 (0.059)
N	482	481	481
<i>Panel III: Wounding</i>			
Combat Injury	0.127* (0.073)	0.165** (0.076)	0.053 (0.084)
Combat Assignment without Injury	0.088** (0.037)	0.074 (0.051)	0.045 (0.051)
N	482	481	481
<i>Panel IV: Witnessing Death</i>			
Witness Death	0.101** (0.045)	0.095* (0.055)	0.023 (0.054)
Combat Assignment without Witness Death	0.074* (0.038)	0.060 (0.054)	0.080 (0.064)
N	480	479	479

Notes: Standard errors clustered on the school are in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. All models control for age, age squared, race/ethnicity indicators, education indicators, military rank, timing of military service, and branch of service. Each regression also includes missing dummy categories for each of the control variables with missing information. The sample includes male servicemembers only.

Appendix Table 3. Marginal Effects from Multinomial Logit Estimates of the Effect of Enemy Engagement on Types of Counseling

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
<i>Military Chaplain Counseling Only</i>	<i>Civilian Religious Counseling Only</i>	<i>Secular Counseling (Civilian or Military)</i>	<i>Counseling from Multiple Sources (Secular and Religious)</i>
Panel I: Enemy Engagement			
-0.0005 (0.0022) [11,381]	-0.0001 (0.0012) [11,381]	0.0276*** (0.0066) [11,381]	0.0473*** (0.0063) [11,381]
Panel II: Wounding			
(0.0057) (-0.0020) [11,252]	-0.0010 (0.0033) [11,252]	0.0553*** (0.0085) [11,252]	0.0850*** (.0082) [11,252]
Panel III: Witnessing Death			
0.0021 0.0027 [11,286]	0.0023* 0.00139 [11,286]	0.0309*** 0.0050 [11,286]	0.0431*** 0.0057 [11,286]

Notes: Standard errors clustered on the stratum are in parentheses. Number of observations is in brackets. Statistically significant at *10%, **5%, ***1%. Regressions control for military rank, branch of service, branch-specific major command indicators, number of combat deployments since September 11, education indicators, age, age squared, and race/ethnicity dummies. The sample includes male servicemembers only. The comparison group includes those with no reported counseling.

Appendix Table 4. The Effect of Combat Exposure on Selected Mechanisms through which Combat May Impact Religion, HRB Survey

	(1) <i>PTSD</i>	(2) <i>Suicide</i>	(3) <i>Psychological Distress</i>	(4) <i>Wounding</i>	(5) <i>Military Chaplain Counseling</i>
Combat Exposure	0.065*** (0.009)	0.013** (0.005)	0.040*** (0.008)	0.078*** (0.012)	0.039*** (0.008)
Observations	11,366	10,796	11,370	11,338	11,380

Notes: Standard errors clustered on the stratum are in parentheses. Statistically significant at *10%, **5%, ***1%. Models control for military rank, branch-specific major command indicators, number of combat deployments since September 11, education indicators, age, age squared, and race/ethnicity dummies. In the full sample (Panel A) we also control for branch of service. The sample includes male servicemembers only.