State Networks Codebook

Institute for Public Policy and Social Research (IPPSR)
Michigan State University

Updated: May 12, 2020.
For comments or questions, contact Shayla Olson: sfolson@msu.edu

Variable	Description	Citation
State1	Name of first state in dyad.	
State2	Name of second state in dyad.	
State2Abbr	State 1 Abbreviation	
State2Abbr	State 2 Abbreviation	
dyadid	Unique, directional identification of each state pair.	
S1region	State 1 Census region.	U.S. Census
S2region	State 2 Census region.	U.S. Census
S1division	State 1 Census division.	U.S. Census
S2division	State 2 Census division.	U.S. Census
Border	Binary variable. 0 if no border shared border between State 1 and State 2. 1 if State 1 and State 2 share a border. (http://users.econ.umn.edu~holmes/data/BORDLIST.html)	Holmes, Thomas J. 1998. "The Effect of State Policies on the Location of Manufacturing: Evidence from State Borders." Journal of Political Economy 106(4):667–705. URL: https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/10.1086/250026
Distance	Haversine distance between State 1 and State 2 Capitals in kilometers. Calculated using the "geosphere" package ftp://cran.r-project.org/pub/R/web/packages/geosphere/geosphere.pdf.	
State1_Lat	Latitude of State 1 Capital.	http://www.xfront.com/us_states/
State1_Long	Longitude of State 1 Capital.	http://www.xfront.com/us_states/
State2_Lat	Latitude of State 2 Capital.	http://www.xfront.com/us_states/
State2_Long	Longitude of State 2 Capital.	http://www.xfront.com/us_states/
ACS_Migration	People migrating from State 2 to State 1 in one year, 2017.	U.S. Census American Community Survey. https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/geographic-mobility/state-to-state-migration.html
PopDif	Difference in State 1 and State 2 population. Negative values indicate State 2 population is higher.	U.S. Census American Community Survey. https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/geographic-mobility/state-to-state-migration.html

State1_Pop	Population of State 1 in 2017.	U.S. Census American Community Survey. https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/geographic-mobility/state-to-state-migration.html
State2_Pop	Population of State 2 in 2017.	U.S. Census American Community Survey. https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/geographic-mobility/state-to-state-migration.html
IncomingFlights	Flights from State 2 with destination in State 1. From Bureau of Transportation Statistics (BTS) Origin and Destination Survey, DB1B Coupon (10% sample of airline tickets from reporting carriers). 2019.	https://www.transtats.bts.gov/Fields.asp
IRS_migration	Counts the number of exemptions on returns that were filed in State 2 the previous year and in State 1 the following year. Total from 1993-2010.	https://interactive.taxfoundation.org/migration/.
Income	Total income moved on tax returns from State 2 to State 1, in thousands of dollars, from years 1993-2010. More information from FAQ: “AG” stands for “Adjusted Gross Income” - this is the income reported on thetaxreturnthatisthebaselineformosttaxcalculations,andisusuallythe same as total income. The AGI figures are in thousands of dollars, so a figure of $1,200 between two states would mean that migrants...had a collective income of $1,200,000.	https://interactive.taxfoundation.org/migration/.
IRS_migration_2010	Total exemptions on returns that were filed in State 2 in 2009 and in State 1 in 2010.	https://interactive.taxfoundation.org/migration/.
Income_2010	Total income moved on tax returns form State 2 to State 1, in thousands of dollars, from 2009 to 2010.	https://interactive.taxfoundation.org/migration/.
Imports	Aggregated value of trade from State 2 to State 1 in one year. 2017 BTS Commodity Flow Survey. More info from BTS: “The CFS is a shipper survey of	https://www.bts.gov/cfs

	approximately 100,000 establishments from the industries of mining, manufacturing, wholesale trade, auxiliaries (i.e. warehouses and distribution centers), and select retail and service trade industries that ship commodities. Data requested by the CFS includes the type of commodities shipped, their origin and destination, their value and 3 weight, and mode(s) of transport. The CFS provides a comprehensive multimodal picture of national freight flows and represents the only publicly available source of data for the highway mode."	
GSPDif	Difference between State 1 and State 2 GSP (in millions of current dollars). Negative values indicate State 2 has a higher GSP.	
S1GSP	State 1 Gross State Product (in millions of current dollars). 2016.	From Correlates of State Policy Project and US Department of Commerce Bureau of Economic Analysis. http://www.bea.gov/regional/downloadzip.cfm
S2GSP	State 2 Gross State Product (in millions of current dollars). 2016.	From Correlates of State Policy Project and US Department of Commerce Bureau of Economic Analysis. http://www.bea.gov/regional/downloadzip.cfm
DemDif	Difference in the average proportion of Democratic state legislators in State 1 and State 2. Negative values indicate State 2 has a higher proportion of Democratic legislators.	
S1AvgDem	Average proportion of Democrats in State senate and House in State 1.	
S2AvgDem	Average proportion of Democrats in State Senate and House in State 2.	
S1SenDemProp	Proportion of Democratic State Senators in State 1. 2016.	From Correlates of State Policy and Ranney, Austin. 1976. "Parties in State Politics." In Politics in the American States, 3rd ed., edited by

		Herbert Jacob and Kenneth Vines. Boston, MA: Little, Brown Co.
S1HSDemProp	Proportion of Democratic State House members in State 1. 2016.	From Correlates of State Policy and Ranney, Austin. 1976. "Parties in State Politics." In Politics in the American States, 3rd ed., edited by Herbert Jacob and Kenneth Vines. Boston, MA: Little, Brown Co.
S2SenDemProp	Proportion of Democratic State Senators in State 2. 2016.	From Correlates of State Policy and Ranney, Austin. 1976. "Parties in State Politics." In Politics in the American States, 3rd ed., edited by Herbert Jacob and Kenneth Vines. Boston, MA: Little, Brown Co.
S2HSDemProp	Proportion of Democratic State House members in State 2. 2016.	From Correlates of State Policy and Ranney, Austin. 1976. "Parties in State Politics." In Politics in the American States, 3rd ed., edited by Herbert Jacob and Kenneth Vines. Boston, MA: Little, Brown Co.
IdeologyDif	Difference between State 1 and State 2 ideology. Negative values indicate State 2 is more liberal than State 1.	
PIDDif	Difference between State 1 and State 2 party ID. Negative values indicate State 2 is more Democratic than State 1.	
S1Ideology	State 1 ideology. 2016. "Yearly measure, giving the proportion of liberal identifiers minus the proportion of conservative identifiers in each state. A positive score indicates a more liberal state citizenry."	From Correlates of State Policy Project and: Erikson, Robert S., Gerald C. Wright and John P. McIver. 1993. Statehouse democracy: public opinion and policy in the American states. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
S1PID	State 1 party ID. "Yearly measure, giving the proportion of Democratic identifiers minus the proportion of Republican identifiers in each state. A positive score indicates a more Democratic state citizenry."	From Correlates of State Policy Project and: Erikson, Robert S., Gerald C. Wright and John P. McIver. 1993. Statehouse democracy: public opinion and policy in the American states. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
S2Ideology	State 2 ideology. 2016. "Yearly measure, giving the proportion of liberal identifiers minus the proportion of conservative identifiers in each state. A positive score indicates a more liberal state citizenry."	From Correlates of State Policy Project and: Erikson, Robert S., Gerald C. Wright and John P. McIver. 1993. Statehouse democracy: public opinion and policy in the American states. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

S2PID	State 2 party ID. "Yearly measure, giving the proportion of Democratic identifiers minus the proportion of Republican identifiers in each state. A positive score indicates a more Democratic state citizenry."	From Correlates of State Policy Project and: Erikson, Robert S., Gerald C. Wright and John P. McIver. 1993. Statehouse democracy: public opinion and policy in the American states. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
policy_diffusion_tie	Aggregated latent diffusion ties from State 2 to State 1, from 1960-2015. Total in the data counts the total years from the 55 year period where State 2 sent a directed policy diffusion tie to State 1. In other words, the total indicates the total years in the 55 year period where State 1 uses State 2 as a policy source. "Estimates are generated using the NetworkInference R package developed by Linder and Desmarais (2016), which is an R implementation of the netinf algorithm of Gomez Rodriguez, Leskovec, and Krause (2010)."	Boehmke, Frederick, Mark Brockway, Bruce Desmarais, Jeffrey J. Harden, Scott LaCombe, Fridolin Linder and Hanna Wallach. 2019. "State Diffusion Networks - Latent Network Ties from SPID v1.0.". type: dataset. URL: https://dataverse.harvard.edu/citation?persistentId=doi:10.7910/
policy_diffusion_2015	Latent diffusion ties from State 2 to State 1. Takes the value of 1 if State 2 sent a directed policy diffusion tie to State 1 in 2015, and takes the value of 0 if no policy diffusion tie was sent.	Boehmke, Frederick, Mark Brockway, Bruce Desmarais, Jeffrey J. Harden, Scott LaCombe, Fridolin Linder and Hanna Wallach. 2019. "State Diffusion Networks - Latent Network Ties from SPID v1.0.". type: dataset. URL: https://dataverse.harvard.edu/citation?persistentId=doi:10.7910/
policy_diffusion_2000.2015	Aggregated latent diffusion ties from State 2 to State 1, from 2000-2015. Total in the data counts the total years from the 15 year period where State 2 sent a directed policy diffusion tie to State 1. In other words, the total indicates the total years in the 15 year period where State 1 uses State 2 as a policy source.	Boehmke, Frederick, Mark Brockway, Bruce Desmarais, Jeffrey J. Harden, Scott LaCombe, Fridolin Linder and Hanna Wallach. 2019. "State Diffusion Networks - Latent Network Ties from SPID v1.0.". type: dataset. URL: https://dataverse.harvard.edu/citation?persistentId=doi:10.7910/
LibDif	Total absolute value of differences in social and economic liberalism between State 1 and State 2. Lower values indicate more similarity between State 1 and State 2.	

ELibDif	Difference between State 1 and State 2 economic liberalism. Negative values indicate State 2 has a higher score.	
SLibDif	Difference between State 1 and State 2 social liberalism. Negative values indicate State 2 has a higher score.	
S1EconomicLiberalism	State 1 economic liberalism score. 2000.	Correlates of State Policy Project and: Rigby, Elizabeth and Gerald C. Wright. 2013. "Political Parties and Representation of the Poor in the American States: POLITICAL PARTIES AND REPRESENTATION OF THE POOR." American Journal of Political Science 57(3):552–565. URL: http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/ajps.12007
S1SocialLiberalism	State 1 social liberalism score. 2000.	Correlates of State Policy Project and: Rigby, Elizabeth and Gerald C. Wright. 2013. "Political Parties and Representation of the Poor in the American States: POLITICAL PARTIES AND REPRESENTATION OF THE POOR." American Journal of Political Science 57(3):552–565. URL: http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/ajps.12007
S2EconomicLiberalism	State 2 economic liberalism score. 2000.	Correlates of State Policy Project and: Rigby, Elizabeth and Gerald C. Wright. 2013. "Political Parties and Representation of the Poor in the American States: POLITICAL PARTIES AND REPRESENTATION OF THE POOR." American Journal of Political Science 57(3):552–565. URL: http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/ajps.12007
S2SocialLiberalism	State 2 social liberalism score. 2000.	Correlates of State Policy Project and: Rigby, Elizabeth and Gerald C. Wright. 2013. "Political Parties and Representation of the Poor in the American States: POLITICAL PARTIES AND REPRESENTATION OF THE POOR." American Journal of Political Science 57(3):552–565. URL: http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/ajps.12007
MassSocLibDif	Difference between State 1 and State 2 mass social liberalism. Negative values indicate State 2 has a higher score.	
MassEconLibDif	Difference between State 1 and State 2 mass economic liberalism. Negative values indicate State 2 has a higher score.	
PolSocLibDif	Difference between State 1 and State 2 policy social liberalism.	

	Negative values indicate State 2 has a higher score.	
PolEconLibDif	Difference between State 1 and State 2 policy economic liberalism. Negative values indicate State 2 has a higher score.	
State1PolSocLib	State 1 social policy liberalism score	Caughey, Devin and Christopher Warshaw. 2018. "Policy Preferences and Policy Change: Dynamic Responsiveness in the American States, 1936â˘AS¸2014." American Political Science Review 112(2):249–266. URL:https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S0003055417000533/type/journalarticle
State1PolEconLib	State 1 economic policy liberalism score	Caughey, Devin and Christopher Warshaw. 2018. "Policy Preferences and Policy Change: Dynamic Responsiveness in the American States, 1936â˘AS¸2014." American Political Science Review 112(2):249–266. URL:https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S0003055417000533/type/journalarticle
State1MassSocLib	State 1 mass social liberalism score	Caughey, Devin and Christopher Warshaw. 2018. "Policy Preferences and Policy Change: Dynamic Responsiveness in the American States, 1936â˘AS¸2014." American Political Science Review 112(2):249–266. URL:https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S0003055417000533/type/journalarticle
State1MassEconLib	State 1 mass economic liberalism score	Caughey, Devin and Christopher Warshaw. 2018. "Policy Preferences and Policy Change: Dynamic Responsiveness in the American States, 1936â˘AS¸2014." American Political Science Review 112(2):249–266. URL:https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S0003055417000533/type/journalarticle
State2PolSocLib	State 2 social policy liberalism score	Caughey, Devin and Christopher Warshaw. 2018. "Policy Preferences and Policy Change: Dynamic Responsiveness in the American States, 1936â˘AS¸2014." American Political Science Review 112(2):249–266. URL:https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S0003055417000533/type/journalarticle

State2PolEconLib	State 2 economic policy liberalism score	Caughey, Devin and Christopher Warshaw. 2018. "Policy Preferences and Policy Change: Dynamic Responsiveness in the American States, 1936â˘AS¸2014." American Political Science Review 112(2):249–266. URL:https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S0003055417000533/type/journalarticle
State2MassSocLib	State 2 mass social liberalism score	Caughey, Devin and Christopher Warshaw. 2018. "Policy Preferences and Policy Change: Dynamic Responsiveness in the American States, 1936â˘AS¸2014." American Political Science Review 112(2):249–266. URL:https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S0003055417000533/type/journalarticle
State2MassEconLib	State 1 mass economic liberalism score	Caughey, Devin and Christopher Warshaw. 2018. "Policy Preferences and Policy Change: Dynamic Responsiveness in the American States, 1936â˘AS¸2014." American Political Science Review 112(2):249–266. URL:https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S0003055417000533/type/journalarticle
perceived_similarity	Score reflects the degree to which respondents in State 2 feel State 1 is similar to their state.	Bricker, Christine, and Scott LaCombe. 2020. "The Ties That Bind Us: The Influence of Perceived State Similarity on Policy Diffusion." *Political Research Quarterly*: 106591292090661.
fb_friend_index	State level relative probability of a Facebook friendship link between users in State 1 and State 2.	Bailey, M., Cao, R., Kuchler, T., Stroebel, J., & Wong, A. (2018). Social connectedness: Measurement, determinants, and effects. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 32(3), 259-80.
RaceDif	Total absolute value of differences in each racial group. Lower values indicate more similarity between State 1 and State 2.	
LatinoDif	Difference between State 1 and State 2 proportions of Latino population. Negative values indicate State 2 has a larger proportion of Latinx citizens.	
WhiteDif	Difference between State 1 and State 2 proportions of white population. Negative values indicate State 2 has a larger proportion of white citizens.	

BlackDif	Difference between State 1 and State 2 proportions of Black population. Negative values indicate State 2 has a larger proportion of Black citizens.	
AsianDif	Difference between State 1 and State 2 proportions of Asian population. Negative values indicate State 2 has a larger proportion of Asian citizens.	
NativeDif	Difference between State 1 and State 2 proportions of Latinx population. Negative values indicate State 2 has a larger proportion of Native citizens.	
S1Latino	Proportion of State 1 population identifying as Latino.	2017 U.S. Census American Community Survey
S1White	Proportion of State 1 population identifying as non-Hispanic white.	2017 U.S. Census American Community Survey
S1Black	Proportion of State 1 population identifying as Black.	2017 U.S. Census American Community Survey
S1Asian	Proportion of State 1 population identifying as Asian.	2017 U.S. Census American Community Survey
S1Native	Proportion of State 1 population identifying as Native.	2017 U.S. Census American Community Survey
S2Latino	Proportion of State 2 population identifying as Latino.	2017 U.S. Census American Community Survey
S2White	Proportion of State 2 population identifying as non-Hispanic white.	2017 U.S. Census American Community Survey
S2Black	Proportion of State 2 population identifying as Black.	2017 U.S. Census American Community Survey
S2Asian	Proportion of State 2 population identifying as Asian.	2017 U.S. Census American Community Survey
S2Native	Proportion of State 2 population identifying as Native.	2017 U.S. Census American Community Survey
ReligDif	Total absolute value of differences in each of the following religious groups: Evangelicals, Mainline Protestants, Black Protestants, Catholics, Mormons, Jews, Muslims, Buddhists, Hindus, and "Nones." Lower values indicate more similarity between State 1 and State 2.	
ChristianDif	Difference between State 1 and State 2 proportions of Christians. Includes Evangelicals, Mainline Protestants, Black Protestants, Catholics, and Mormons (also	

	includes Orthodox Christians, Jehovah's Witnesses, and Other Christians not listed in dataset). Negative values indicate State 2 has a larger proportion of Christians.	
EvangelicalDif	Difference between State 1 and State 2 proportions of Evangelicals. Negative values indicate State 2 has a larger proportion of Evangelicals.	
MainlineDif	Difference between State 1 and State 2 proportions of mainline protestants. Negative values indicate State 2 has a larger proportion of Mainline Protestants.	
BPDif	Difference between State 1 and State 2 proportions of Black Protestants. Negative values indicate State 2 has a larger proportion of Black Protestants.	
CatholicDif	Difference between State 1 and State 2 proportions of Catholics. Negative values indicate State 2 has a larger proportion of Catholics.	
MormonDif	Difference between State 1 and State 2 proportions of Mormons. Negative values indicate State 2 has a larger proportion of Mormons.	
JewishDif	Difference between State 1 and State 2 proportions of Jewish population. Negative values indicate State 2 has a larger proportion of Jewish citizens.	
MuslimDif	Difference between State 1 and State 2 proportions of Muslims. Negative values indicate State 2 has a larger proportion of Muslims.	
BuddhistDif	Difference between State 1 and State 2 proportions of Buddhists. Negative values indicate State 2 has a larger proportion of Buddhists.	
HinduDif	Difference between State 1 and State 2 proportions of Hindus. Negative values indicate State 2 has a larger proportion of Hindus.	

NonesDif	Difference between State 1 and State 2 proportions of religious "nones." Nones include unaffiliated (atheist or agnostic), those identify with "nothing in particular" and those who say they "don't know." Negative values indicate State 2 has a larger proportion of "nones."	
NPDif	Difference between State 1 and State 2 proportions of those identifying as "nothing in particular." Negative values indicate State 2 has a larger proportion of those identified as "nothing in particular."	
ReligiosityDif	Difference between State 1 and State 2 proportions of highly religious people from the highlyreligious variables. Negative values indicate State 2 has a larger proportion of highly religious people.	
S1Christian	Proportion of State 1 identifying as Christian, all traditions and denominations.	2014 Pew Religious Landscape Study (RLS). More information: https://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/
S1Evangelical	Proportion of State 1 identifying as Evangelical.	2014 Pew Religious Landscape Study (RLS). More information: https://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/
S1Mainline	Proportion of State 1 identifying as Mainline Protestant.	2014 Pew Religious Landscape Study (RLS). More information: https://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/
S1BlackProt	Proportion of State 1 identifying as Black Protestant.	2014 Pew Religious Landscape Study (RLS). More information: https://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/
S1Catholic	Proportion of State 1 identifying as Catholic.	2014 Pew Religious Landscape Study (RLS). More information: https://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/
S1Mormon	Proportion of State 1 identifying as Mormon.	2014 Pew Religious Landscape Study (RLS). More information: https://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/

S1Jewish	Proportion of State 1 identifying as Jewish.	2014 Pew Religious Landscape Study (RLS). More information: https://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/
S1Muslim	Proportion of State 1 identifying as Muslim.	2014 Pew Religious Landscape Study (RLS). More information: https://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/
S1Buddhist	Proportion of State 1 identifying as Buddhist.	2014 Pew Religious Landscape Study (RLS). More information: https://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/
S1Hindu	Proportion of State 1 identifying as Hindu.	2014 Pew Religious Landscape Study (RLS). More information: https://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/
S1Nones	Proportion of State 1 identifying as “Nones.” Includes atheists, agnostics, and those who are “nothing in particular.”	2014 Pew Religious Landscape Study (RLS). More information: https://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/
S1NothingParticular	Proportion of State 1 identifying as “nothing in particular” in regards to religion.	2014 Pew Religious Landscape Study (RLS). More information: https://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/
S1HighlyReligious	Proportion of State 1 population identifying as “Highly Religious” on religious observance index. “The index is created by combining four individual measures of religious observance - self-assessment of religion's importance in one's life, religious attendance, frequency of prayer, and belief in God. Respondents are assigned a score of 1 on each of the four measures on which they exhibit a high level of religious observance, a score of 0 on each of the measures on which they exhibit a medium level of religious observance, and a score of -1 on each measure on which they exhibit a low level of religious observance.”	2014 Pew Religious Landscape Study (RLS). More information: https://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/
S2Christian	Proportion of State 2 identifying as Christian, all traditions and denominations.	2014 Pew Religious Landscape Study (RLS). More information:

		https://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/
S2Evangelical	Proportion of State 2 identifying as Evangelical.	2014 Pew Religious Landscape Study (RLS). More information: https://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/
S2Mainline	Proportion of State 2 identifying as Mainline Protestant.	2014 Pew Religious Landscape Study (RLS). More information: https://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/
S2BlackProt	Proportion of State 2 identifying as Black Protestant.	2014 Pew Religious Landscape Study (RLS). More information: https://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/
S2Catholic	Proportion of State 2 identifying as Catholic.	2014 Pew Religious Landscape Study (RLS). More information: https://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/
S2Mormon	Proportion of State 2 identifying as Mormon.	2014 Pew Religious Landscape Study (RLS). More information: https://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/
S2Jewish	Proportion of State 2 identifying as Jewish.	2014 Pew Religious Landscape Study (RLS). More information: https://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/
S2Muslim	Proportion of State 2 identifying as Muslim.	2014 Pew Religious Landscape Study (RLS). More information: https://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/
S2Buddhist	Proportion of State 2 identifying as Buddhist.	2014 Pew Religious Landscape Study (RLS). More information: https://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/
S2Hindu	Proportion of State 2 identifying as Hindu.	2014 Pew Religious Landscape Study (RLS). More information: https://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/
S2Nones	Proportion of State 2 identifying as “Nones.” Includes atheists, agnostics, and those who are “nothing in particular.”	2014 Pew Religious Landscape Study (RLS). More information: https://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/
S2NothingParticular	Proportion of State 1 identifying as “nothing in particular” in regards to religion.	2014 Pew Religious Landscape Study (RLS). More information: https://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/

S2HighlyReligious	Proportion of State 2 population identifying as “Highly Religious” on religious observance index. “The index is created by combining four individual measures of religious observance - self-assessment of religion's importance in one's life, religious attendance, frequency of prayer, and belief in God. Respondents are assigned a score of 1 on each of the four measures on which they exhibit a high level of religious observance, a score of 0 on each of the measures on which they exhibit a medium level of religious observance, and a score of -1 on each measure on which they exhibit a low level of religious observance.”	2014 Pew Religious Landscape Study (RLS). More information: https://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/