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We reviewed data from approximately 80 published and unpublished studies that examined the association of religious affiliation or involvement with depressive symptoms or depressive disorder. In these studies, religion was measured as religious affiliation; general religious involvement; organizational religious involvement; prayer or private religious involvement; religious salience and motivation; or religious beliefs. People from some religious affiliations appear to have an elevated risk for depressive symptoms and depressive disorder, and people with no religious affiliation are at an elevated risk in comparison with people who are religiously affiliated. People with high levels of general religious involvement, organizational religious involvement, religious salience, and intrinsic religious motivation are at increased risk for depressive symptoms and depressive disorders. Private religious activity and particular religious beliefs appear to bear no reliable relationship with depression. People with high levels of extrinsic religious motivation are at increased risk for depressive symptoms. Although these associations tend to be consistent, they are modest and are substantially reduced in multivariate research. Longitudinal research is sparse, but suggests that some forms of religious involvement might exert a protective effect against the incidence and persistence of depressive symptoms or disorders. The existing research is sufficient to encourage further investigation of the associations of religion with depressive symptoms and disorder. Religion should be measured with higher methodological standards than those that have been accepted in survey research to date.
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Depression is one of the most common mental disorders. Within their lifetime, between 10 and 25% of women and 5–12% of men will meet the criteria for major depressive disorder, while at any given point in time between 5 and 12% of women and 2–3% of men meet the criteria for major depressive disorder.1

Depression is expensive financially and in terms of human life. It appears that medical care for depression is on the rise. Pincus et al2 review evidence indicating that visits to physicians for depression increased from 11 million in 1985 to 20.4 million in 1993–1994, and visits that included treatment with an antidepressant medication increased from 5.3 million to 12.4 million in the same time frame. In addition, people with major depression have a substantially increased risk for use of hospital and medical services, suicide attempts, and early death.3

Religion is a variable that is not commonly discussed in standard epidemiological conceptualizations of depression. This is not terribly surprising given the traditional difficulty of quantifying religious phenomena, and admittedly, the uncertain epidemiological value of such information today. Nevertheless, clinical observations and structured investigations since at least Knepley4 have suggested that depression coincides with various aspects of religion. The cumulative weight of 100 years of structured and unstructured appraisals of the religion–depression relationship has yet to be fully summarized and reviewed.

In the present paper, we try to accomplish this task. Our discussion is divided into three sections. First, we review the existing research on the prevalence of depression and depressive symptoms among people of various religious affiliations (eg Jews, Catholics, Protestants, and Pentecostals). Second, we examine the relationship on the between ordinal and interval-level measurements of religious involvement (including measures of organizational religious involvement, religious salience and motivations, private religious activity, and specific religious beliefs). Third, we summarize what findings might imply for the future study of religion in psychiatric epidemiology.

Religious affiliation and depression
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disorders. In such studies - at least those conducted in the United States - the incidence or prevalence of depression and depressive symptoms among members of particular religious groups are typically compared with those of the general population. Because the US population is approximately 60% Protestant and 26% Catholic, Christian populations usually become a sort of de facto comparison group in such epidemiological studies (at least those conducted in the US). The religious constitution of the hidden comparison group will differ in culture to culture. In cultures where the general population is mostly Muslim, or Hindu, or Buddhist, the conclusions that we draw here probably would not apply.

Jews

In the United States, Jews represent approximately 2–3% of the population. Studies since the 1880s from across the world have suggested that Jews have an elevated risk for depressive disorders. Sanu reviewed a large group of epidemiological and clinical studies related to the prevalence of mental disorders - including depression - among Jews and concluded, citing a variety of cross-sectional studies, that people of Jewish descent appear to be at an elevated risk of depressive disorders. Even when examining the psychiatric symptoms of admissions to psychiatric hospitals, Jews tend to have higher rates of depressive disorders than non-Jewish admissions. As Levav et al. pointed out, however, most of these studies use clinical populations, and thus might be subject to a variety of biases that could cast doubt on the validity of such findings.

However, more recent studies using community samples and more rigorous research methods also corroborate this general conclusion. In high-quality, community-based epidemiological studies, Jews appear to have approximately a twofold risk for major depression in comparison with members of other religious groups. Using DSM-III diagnoses of major depression as a measure of depression, Levav et al. found the lifetime and period prevalence of major depression to be 1.5 to 2 times that of non-Jews (especially Catholics and Protestants) in two large, random regional samples, even after controlling for relevant covariates.

Is the association of Jewishness and depression causal? Longitudinal studies disagree. One prospective study followed 1855 older community-dwelling adults in the Bronx for 24 months. Kennedy et al. found that over a 24-month period, Jews were nearly 1.4 times as likely as Catholics and over 4 times as likely as people from other faiths to develop high scores on the Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression (CES-D) scale. Among the adults who were not depressed at baseline but became depressed by the 24-month follow-up, Jews were significantly over-represented. Being Jewish remained a risk factor even after controlling for six other covariates of depression. In contrast, Idler and Kasl found that in a sample of 2812 older adults from New Haven, CT, being Jewish at baseline actually appeared to lead to lower risk of developing depression over a 3-year follow-up period relative to Catholics (even after controlling for baseline levels of depression and a variety of covariates). Among Jews, risk for depression appears to be associated with many of the standard risk factors for depression (including poor subjective and functional health, lack of social support, and gender). In addition, Jews of Eastern European descent appear particularly vulnerable to depression. It is also important to acknowledge the fact that Jews - especially Jews of Eastern European descent - may be more willing to admit to negative affects, creating a potential response bias in depression research. Elevated prevalence rates of depression in Jews might also be a trade-off for their reduced rates of alcohol abuse and dependence. Levav et al. compared data on the prevalence of depression and alcohol use/dependence among Jewish and non-Jewish men and women from the Epidemiological Catchment Area Study (using data from the New Haven, CT, and Los Angeles, CA, sites). These researchers found that (a) excess depression among Jews was attributable only to Jewish men (not Jewish women), and (b) lower alcohol use/dependence among Jews was attributable only to Jewish men (not Jewish women). Jewish and non-Jewish women had roughly equal prevalences of both depression and alcohol abuse/dependence. Further, combined prevalences of both depression and alcohol abuse/dependence together were not significantly different for Jewish men than for non-Jewish men. Furthermore, alcohol use among Jewish men was higher in Los Angeles (the less traditional Jewish community) than in New Haven (the more traditional Jewish community). The observed 2.1 female–male ratio of prevalence rates for depression was obtained in the more secular Jewish community of Los Angeles (where alcohol abuse/dependence among Jewish men was fairly high), whereas the female–male ratio of prevalence rates for depression was approximately 1:1 in the more conservative Jewish communities of New Haven (where alcohol abuse/dependence among Jewish men was fairly low).

Since more conservative Jews tend to avoid the use of alcohol, Jewish men who have a disposition toward psychopathology might be at a significantly higher risk for experiencing depression instead of alcohol abuse or dependence. This might suggest that in the absence of a proclivity for alcohol abuse/dependence, Jewish men could be substantially
more likely to 'express' their latent psychopathology through depressive symptoms.

Catholics

Catholics constitute approximately 26% of the American population. Existing studies are quite inconsistent regarding the relationship between Catholicism and depression. Miller et al. reported the results of a 10-year prospective study of 60 mothers and 151 of their children. At the 10-year follow-up, the mothers' religious affiliation was determined. Miller et al. found that Catholic mothers were at significantly lower risk of being diagnosed with depression at baseline and at follow-up and were significantly less likely than other mothers to have children who were diagnosed with major depressive disorder at baseline and follow-up. In contrast, Ross examined denominational differences in scores on an 8-item self-report measure of depressive symptoms. Even when controlling for a variety of potential covariates (including several single-item measures of religious involvement, age, gender, race, marital status, education, income, and willingness to express feelings), Ross found that Catholics had slightly higher depression scores than those of Protestants. Sorsonen et al. found higher depression scores among unwed Catholic mothers than among unwed Protestant mothers. Park et al. found Catholic women to score lower than Protestant women on measures of depression in one study, but found no such differences in another study. Still other studies using small samples of recently bereaved adults, nursing home residents, and undergraduate students find Catholicism to have no effect on depression scores.

Pentecostals/Fundamentalists

Pentecostals constitute approximately 2% of the US population. Some evidence suggests that members of Pentecostal faiths are at an elevated risk for major depression. Meador et al. examined cross-sectional data from 2850 adults in North Carolina who were involved in the Epidemiological Catchment Area (ECA) study. In their ECA sample, Meador et al. found that members of Pentecostal churches had rates of major depression that were three times higher than those of the non-Pentecostals. These differences in the rates of major depression held after controlling for a variety of covariates, including gender, age, race, socio-economic status, unexpected life events, and social support.

Another cross-sectional study using the same data set compared the prevalence rates of depression among Pentecostals to the prevalence rates of depression among members of other Christian faiths. The sample was split into ‘baby boomers’ (those born between 1945 and 1966) and middle-aged and older adults (those born between 1889 and 1944). Compared with members of other conservative denominations or mainline Christian denominations, the 6-month and lifetime risk of depressive disorders for Pentecostal ‘baby boomers’ was considerably higher than the 6-month and lifetime risk for ‘baby boomers’ from other conservative denominations or from mainline Christian denominations. These differences in prevalence held even after controlling for sex, race, physical health, and socio-economic status. Pentecostalism was not associated, however, with differential prevalence rates of depression in the older age group.

Koenig et al. speculated as to whether the association of Pentecostalism with depression among ‘baby boomers’ was a causal effect, but is unclear whether (a) Pentecostalism leads to higher rates of depression; (b) Pentecostalism attracts members who are more likely to be depressed; or (c) some third variable controls for Pentecostalism.
third variable that was uncontrolled or poorly controlled is responsible for the apparent association of Pentecostal membership with depression. Meador et al.\textsuperscript{26} speculated that Pentecostals might have, like Jews, higher levels of emotional expression. If this were the case, then their differential rates might be explainable, in part, as a response bias (cf. Koenig,\textsuperscript{30} who found that Pentecostal affiliation was associated with fewer depressive symptoms among older men in prison).

No affiliation

A final group of people whose depressive symptoms have been studied in the context of religion is those who claim to have no religious affiliation at all. Currently, approximately 8\% of the US population claim to have no religious affiliation.\textsuperscript{6} People with no religious affiliation at all appear to be at an elevated risk for depressive symptoms compared with people who are affiliated with a religion. In a sample of 841 medically ill men, Koenig et al.\textsuperscript{31} examined whether religious affiliation predicted depression after controlling for demographics, medical status, and a measure of religious coping. They found that when relevant covariates were controlled for, men who indicated that they had "no religious affiliation" had higher scores on the Hamilton depression rating scale (an observer-administered rating scale) than men who identified themselves as moderate Protestants, Catholics, or non-traditional Christians. Interestingly, the men with "no religious affiliation" did not score differently from men who were affiliated with various religions on a self-report measure of depression (the Geriatric Depression Scale).

The association of religious disaffiliation with higher degrees of depressive symptoms might be particularly strong among African-Americans. In a sample of 537 African-American males, Brown and Cary\textsuperscript{32} explored the association of scores on the CES-D to religious affiliation. They found that men who were not affiliated with a religion had depression scores (mean = 16.95) that were on average 0.60 standard deviation units higher than those of men who were affiliated with a religion (mean = 11.76). This effect for religious affiliation persisted even after controlling for church attendance, age, income, education, marital status, and employment status. Ellison\textsuperscript{33} also reported the results of a study involving a random sample of 2956 adults from the North Carolina site of the Epidemiological Catchment Area (ECA) survey. In this sample, depressive symptoms were assessed using the Diagnostic Interview Schedule. Among white respondents, whether one was affiliated with a religion did not predict degree of depressive symptoms. Among black respondents, however, people who were not affiliated with a religion scored, on average, 0.58 standard deviation units higher on the measure of depressive symptoms. This relationship remained significant (although weaker) after controlling for a number of covariates.

Religious affiliation effects in depression: explanations

Aside from the many methodological explanations that could explain the findings on religious affiliation and depression (e.g., selection biases, response biases, and differential test validity for certain religious or ethnic groups), a large variety of substantive explanations exist as well. These include genetic explanations, sociological explanations, substantive lifestyle differences, differential exposure to life-changing historical events (e.g., the Holocaust of World War II), substantive differences in religious and spiritual practices (see also Kennedy\textsuperscript{34}), and trade-offs in the expression of latent predispositions for psychopathology that lead some groups (e.g., Jews) to have increased rates of depression, but lower rates of other disorders (e.g., alcohol abuse/dependence). Although all of these explanations are plausible and should be ruled out formally, we review two potential explanations here that deal specifically with aspects of religion per se.

Religious marginalization The first of these explanations is a sociological one, and relates to the effects of religious marginalization on mental health. Some researchers have theorized that the elevated risk of depression among Jews – at least in the US – might be related to the marginality of Jewish people in the US. Some research evidence supports the hypothesis that religious marginalization – being religiously different from one’s cultural surround – creates social conditions that foster depression. For example, Rosenberg\textsuperscript{34} conducted a cross-sectional survey with a sample of high school juniors and seniors (495 Catholics, 405 Protestants, and 121 Jews). He found that children reared in neighborhoods that were similar to them in terms of religious affiliation (e.g., Jewish adolescents raised in traditionally Jewish neighborhoods) had significantly lower levels of depressed affect than adolescents raised in religiously dissimilar neighborhoods. Similarly, Williams and Hunt\textsuperscript{35} found that Muslims living in Scotland experience nearly four times the likelihood of depressive symptoms as do non-Muslims living in Scotland. Whilst approximately 50\% of the elevated risk could be explained as a function of differences in the social and psychological conditions between Muslims and non-Muslims (e.g., greater stress, lower standard of living, and lack of social support), even
after controlling for such factors Muslims still had
twice the odds of experiencing depressive symptoms
as non-Muslims. Similar findings are reported for
Ashkenazi Jews in various Israeli neighborhoods.36

Differences in religious involvement Another pos-
sible explanation for the observed differences in
rates of depressive symptoms of various religious
affiliations is that differences in the religious prac-
tices among these groups are responsible for the
differences between religious groups. After all, non-
religious people are not simply “not Jewish, Protes-
tant, or Catholic”; they do not possess many religious
attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors that are held by
many religious people. Could it be that these
differences in religious involvement explain the
effects of religious affiliation on depression? It is to
an intensive look at how such measures of beliefs
and behavior predict depression and depressive
symptoms that we now turn.

Religious involvement and depression

The number of studies that have examined the cross-
sectional association of at least some measure of
religious involvement with some measure of depres-
sion is likely to be quite large. We have retrieved
over 50 published studies that have examined the
religion–depression association in some fashion. In
general, it would be safe to conclude that these
studies find measures of religiousness to be asso-
ciated with measures of depression. However, the
results across studies are not as consistent as one
would like.

Aside from the most likely methodological expla-
nation for lack of consistency in results – sampling
error,38 perhaps the second most plausible explana-
tion for lack of consistency in results is that the
religiousness–depression relationship changes as a
function of how religiousness is operationalized. In
the section that follows, we attempt to find consis-
tency in the religiousness–depression literature
by examining results obtained when measuring
specific aspects of religious involvement.

Measures of general religious involvement

Many cross-sectional studies have examined the
association of multi-item measures of religious
beliefs and behavior with measures of depressive
symptoms. We refer to these measures as measures of
‘general religious involvement’, because they tend to
combine indicators of public religious involvement
(eg frequency of church attendance), private reli-
gious involvement (eg measures of the frequency of
private prayer), and religious salience and motiva-
tion (eg self-rated importance of one’s faith) in a
single index. Such measures tend to be quite reli-
able, since the measurement errors associated with
each individual item tend to cancel each other out
when the items are aggregated.39

Perhaps due to the measurement stability that is
obtained when such multi-item measures are used,
we see that they are uniformly and negatively
related to measures of depressive symptoms and
affect.32,40–49 The zero-order correlations
between such measures and measures of depression
appear to be in the range of $r = -0.07$ to $-0.40$, with
a central tendency in the neighborhood of
$r = -0.20$.

When a variety of potential causes of spurious
associations are controlled statistically, the associa-
tions between general measures of religious involve-
ment and depression are adjusted downward dra-
matically, although not completely. For example,
after controlling for age, marital status, geography,
race, obesity, religious salience, and strength and
comfort that people derived from their religion,
Ferraro45 found that scores on a three-item measure
of general religiousness were still negatively asso-
ciated with depressive symptoms, but at a low
magnitude ($\beta = 0.08$). Other studies find that when
other measures of religious involvement are con-
trolled simultaneously (eg measures of religious
affiliation and public religious involvement), the
association of general religiousness with depression
typically falls to trivial levels.32,44

There is an important lesson to be learned here.
Allowing various measures of religiousness (which
share a large amount of common variance) to ‘fight’
for common variance in a measure of depression is
not the most theoretically sophisticated way to
illuminate the association of religious involvement
and depression. Such purely empirical approaches
do not yield fundamental insights into the various
paths through which religious involvement
might obtain its association with measures of
depression. Rather, they capitalize on chance and
non-substantive differences in measurement reliabil-
ity. If researchers truly want to determine whether
several measures of religious involvement are differ-
entially associated with depression, they should first
confirm that the measures that they intend to pit
against one another are indeed factorially distinct. If
they are (and the researchers still insist on using
them as simultaneous predictors of depression), then
their covariances with each other and other variables
of interest should be corrected for attenuation due to
measurement unreliability prior to examining their
unique contributions to the prediction of depres-
sion.39 Only then will the research on depression
and religion yield a hard core of findings upon
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Organizational religious involvement

Another common way to measure religiousness has
been to assess people's involvement in public religi-
ous activities. By far the most common measures
used to assess the relationship of religious involve-
ment and depression have been single-item mea-
sures of attendance at religious services, membership
in religious organizations, or short scales that com-
bine two or more single-item measures of organiza-
tional religious involvement. Such measures are
convenient to include in large survey databases;
however, they are likely to contain remarkably little
true score variance.\textsuperscript{39} Also, such measures are
problematic because they might not accurately
assess the religiosity of highly religious people
who are not able to be involved in their religious
congregations because of physical health
limitations.\textsuperscript{30}

Despite the psychometric limitations inherent in
such measures of religious involvement, most studies
that have assessed the relationship between
organizational religious involvement and depression
have found a small negative association. Of 29 studies
that examined the cross-sectional association of a
measure of organizational religious involvement
(usually single-item measures assessing frequency of
church attendance), 24 of them\textsuperscript{14,17,21,23,25,30,32,37,51--56
find people involved in a religious organization to
have lower levels of depressive symptoms. They also
are less likely to be diagnosed with depressive
disorders or score in the clinical range on dichoto-
mized measures of depression.\textsuperscript{14,51,53,57,64} The
balance of the 29 studies found associations between
organizational religious involvement and depression
so small as to be nearly zero.\textsuperscript{7,26,66--68}

After stringent control of demographic, psychoso-
cial, and health-related variables, the association
between organizational religious involvement and
depression drops substantially, usually yielding
standardized regression coefficients in the range of
$\beta = 0.10$.\textsuperscript{24,25,51,53,55,60,63,64,67} Although estimates have
extended as high as $\beta = -0.18$.\textsuperscript{58} Well-controlled
multivariate studies using depressive diagnoses as the
dependent variable suggest that lack of organiza-
tional religious involvement leads to a 20--60%
increase in the odds of experiencing a major depres-
sive episode.\textsuperscript{51,63} The largest decreases in the magni-
tude of the organizational religious involvement--depression
relationship appear to occur when measures of social support, health status, and func-
tional disability are added into multivariate equa-
tions, and it is possible that the unique association of

religious involvement and depression is larger for
women rather than for men.\textsuperscript{17}

The longitudinal research on the effects of organiza-
tional religious involvement on depression pre-
sents a somewhat mixed picture. Much of the
available longitudinal data suggests that the extent of
one's organizational religious involvement at baseline
does not strongly predict later depression when
reasonable care is exerted to rule out potential
demographic, psychosocial, or biomedical explana-
tions.\textsuperscript{14,17,50,69} There are exceptions, however.\textsuperscript{37,70}
Indeed, the best prospective study on the topic\textsuperscript{37}
suggests that organizational religious involvement
might be differentially related to later depressive
symptoms as a function of one's religious affiliation.
Using 7-year follow-up data from a random sample
of 8866 American adults, Musick and Strulowitz\textsuperscript{37}
estimated the prospective associations of attendance
at formal religious activities and involvement in
informal religious groups on two scales, measuring
(a) the somatic retardation symptoms of depression
($\alpha = 0.87$), and (b) depressed affect ($\alpha = 0.87$). They
assessed religious involvement with a two-item
measure of involvement in two organized religious
social events: (a) attendance at religious services and
(b) church or synagogue-related social events. These
two items were conceptually related and yielded an
internal consistency estimate of $\alpha = 0.59$. A second
measure of organizational religious involvement
assessed how often respondents participated in
other religious groups.

Zero-order correlations of the depression variables
and organizational religious involvement variables
at baseline were small ($-0.04$ to $-0.06$; although
these estimates would be in the $-0.06$ to $-0.08$ range if
adjusted for attenuation due to unreliability in the
dependent variables). Despite the small magnitude
of these cross-sectional correlations, the longitudinal
effects appeared to be considerable. When simulta-
neously controlling for sociodemographic variables
and baseline levels of (a) somatic-retarded depressive
symptoms, (b) physical health, and (c) several
measures of social support, involvement in formal
religious activities was negatively associated with
somatic-retarded depressive symptoms at the 7-year
follow-up for most groups of Christians. Similar
findings were found when depressed affect was used
as a criterion variable. Among Jews ($n = 192$), how-
ever, formal religious involvement at baseline had a
positive net association with somatic-retarded
depressive symptoms and with depressed affect at
the 7-year follow-up. In contrast, participation in
informal church groups was associated with lower
levels of depressive symptoms for Jews on both
measures of depression, whereas informal partici-
pation in church groups was associated with higher
levels of depressive symptoms among Christians.
Summary The data on organizational religious involvement and depression supports two conclusions. First, it seems clear that depression is indeed less prevalent among people who are involved in public religious activities. Second, for Americans and Europeans of Christian denominations, the best longitudinal research indicates that formal organizational religious involvement is related to a lower risk of depression over time; the converse is true for American Jews. Conversely, informal religious involvement appears to be associated prospectively with less depression for Jews, but with more depression for Christians. These differences could result from the different psychosocial resources provided by the two respective kinds of organizational activities for Christians and Jews in modern culture. Thus, although organizational religious activity does, in general, appear to deter depression, by no means does it do so in a ‘one size fits all’ fashion.

Religious salience and motivation

Following Alport, social scientists typically distinguish between extrinsic religious motivation (a strictly utilitarian motivation for being religious) and intrinsic religious motivation (which regards religion as valuable in and of itself). Intrinsic religious motivation is typically associated with multi-item scales, such as those by Alport and Ross, Hoge, and Feagin. Several studies have also used single-item measures to assess people’s impressions of their own degree of religiosity and the importance of religion to their identity. In general, these studies have found that such single-item measures have rather small zero-order associations with measures of depressive symptoms (e.g., on the order of $r = 0.00$ to 0.05). These weak relationships are not terribly surprising, since such single-item measures are likely to contain low amounts of reliable variance. There are, of course, exceptions to this trend—some studies using single-item measures of religious salience do find such measures inversely related to depression. Ross, found, for example, that a single-item measure of strength of religious belief was associated, after controlling for potential sociodemographic confounds and other religious measures, with reduced depressive symptoms in a sample of Illinois residents ($\beta = -0.12$). However, such findings are exceptions when using single-item measures of religious salience. Measures of religious salience that aggregate multiple items produce zero-order correlations with depression that are considerably higher. When we rely on studies that have used multi-item measures of intrinsic and extrinsic religious motivation, however, a different pattern emerges. Across several studies using the Alport-Ross, Hoge, and Feagin measures of intrinsic and extrinsic religious motivation, multi-item measures of extrinsic religious motivation have tended to be positively associated with self-report measures of depressive symptoms. The correlations of extrinsicness and depressive symptoms have typically been in the range of 0.03 to 0.25, with a central tendency that appears to center around 0.15 or so. Thus, it would appear that people who are motivated to be religious because of the benefits that religion brings (e.g., comfort, security, affirmation of one’s lifestyle) are actually disposed to slightly higher levels of depressive symptoms.

In contrast, multi-item measures of intrinsic religious motivation have tended to be negatively correlated with self-report measures of depressive symptoms. These correlations have typically been in the range of −0.05 to −0.36, with a central tendency that appears to be centered around −0.20. Thus, it appears that people who are motivated by an intrinsic religious conviction and of itself to be religiously motivated with high slightly les...
people who are motivated to be religious by virtue of their conviction that being religious is worthwhile in and of itself are predisposed to slightly lower levels of depressive symptoms. Also, medically ill adults with high degrees of intrinsic religiousness are slightly less likely to be diagnosed with major depression. Further, it appears that people who are classified as intrinsically religious (based on established cut-off scores) have significantly lower scores on measures of depressive symptoms than people who are classified as extrinsically religious, and are only approximately 55% as likely as extrinsically religious people to receive a diagnosis of major depression, (even though the odds ratio becomes nearly 1.0 when health, income, education, and marital well-being are controlled).

Longitudinal research on religious salience, motivation, and depression is limited. One relevant longitudinal study suggests that intrinsic religiousness may indeed predict later depressive symptoms, even after controlling for baseline depressive symptoms (although this intrinsicness--depression effect was not replicated in a second sample). A more comprehensive study with a one-year follow-up found that people who indicated that ‘a strong religious faith’ was among the three most important things in life had only 38% of the odds of becoming depressed in comparison with those who did not ascribe such importance to their religious faith. Among those who were depressed at baseline, (n = 48) people who indicated that having a strong religious faith was among the most important things in life had only 17% of the odds of remaining depressed at the one-year follow-up as those individuals who did not ascribe such importance to their religious faith. Similarly, Koenig et al. found that among 87 depressed older adults who were hospitalized for medical illness, scores on a ten-item measure of intrinsic religious motivation predicted length of time until patients were no longer depressed. Even after controlling for over 30 sociodemographic, medical, and psychosocial variables (including single-item measures of church attendance and private religious activities), a 10-point increase on the intrinsic religious motivation measure (approximately one standard deviation) was associated with 70% increase in speed of remission.

Summary The available data on religious salience, religious motivation, and depression lead to several conclusions. First, extrinsic religious motivation — that is, being involved in religion for its potential to confer temporal benefits upon the individual — is associated with greater risk of depressive disorder and higher degrees of depressive symptomatology. Second, intrinsic religious motivation (as measured with single-item measures of religious salience, or with multi-item measures) tends to be negatively related to depressive symptoms. Third, in studies that examine whether early levels of intrinsic religious motivation predict longitudinal change in depressive symptoms after controlling for potential confounding variables, the hypothesis that intrinsic religious motivation actually helps to prevent depression fares well. However, large-scale replications of these longitudinal findings are sorely needed.

Religious beliefs

Do religious beliefs per se have any causal association with depression? This question is difficult to answer based on the existing research because so little of it exists, and what little does exist is cross-sectional in nature. Hallstrom and Persson, Koenig, and Shafer all found that single-item measures of belief in God (or in a personal God) and belief that Jesus was God’s divine son were associated with lower levels of depressive symptoms (and in the case of Hallstrom and Persson, lower rates of depressive disorder). However, Mosher and Handal failed to find such an association of belief in God and depression.

Other specific religious beliefs fare poorly as predictors of depression. Mosher and Handal, Musick and Strulowitz, and Schafer found that conservative beliefs about the Bible, belief in Heaven and Hell, and belief in life after death were virtually uncorrelated with measures of depressive symptoms. In addition, using a factor score that was represented best by four items assessing conservative religious belief (e.g., belief in God, belief that God rewards and punishes, and literal belief in the Bible), Kendler, Gardner, Prescott found that conservative religious belief bore almost zero relationship with depressive diagnoses in a sample of 1800 female twins sampled from the state of Virginia.

Conclusions

This review of the existing research on religion and depression supports a few conclusions that should be of import for researchers examining religion from the perspective of psychiatric epidemiology.

Substantive conclusions

First, the data on religious affiliation and depression suggests that two religious groups — Jews and people who are not affiliated with a religion — are at an
elevated risk of depression and depressive symptoms. These particular findings appear to be quite robust and well replicated across many data sets. Whilst such effects could indeed be causal, it appears most likely that these apparent effects are (at least in the case of Jews) a result of trade-offs in how latent predispositions for psychopathology are expressed in certain religious cultures.\cite{7}

Second, it appears that some measures of religious involvement are indeed associated with depression. People who are involved frequently in organized religion and who highly value their religious faith for intrinsic reasons are at substantially reduced risk of depressive disorder and depressive symptoms. They also appear to recover more quickly from depressive episodes and are less likely to become depressed over time. Conversely, people who are involved in religion for reasons of self-interest are at a decidedly higher risk for depressive symptoms. Whilst the longitudinal data at present is limited, it does give tremendous incentive for further inquiry into the possibly causal nature of the religious involvement–depression relationship.

Third, there appear to be certain manifestations of religious involvement – particularly private religious activities and religious beliefs – that bear no lawful association with measures of depression and depressive symptoms. The fact that some measures are reliably associated with depression, whilst others are not, should be particularly useful as researchers attempt to build more sophisticated theories to explain the religion–depression relationship. Such findings might also be useful in the future in designing strategies for epidemiological surveillance, depression screening, and primary prevention.

A methodological note

We close with a methodological note. Future research on religion and psychiatric epidemiology must deal with the fact that self-report measures of religious involvement are typically correlated moderately with one another. For example, a measure of (a) the frequency of one’s church attendance, (b) self-rated religiousness, and (c) frequency of private prayer are likely to be correlated on the order of 0.30 or better. Musick and Strulowitz,\cite{27} for example, found frequency of formal church attendance and informal organizational religious involvement to be correlated at $r = 0.70$, and they were correlated with conservative beliefs about the Bible at $r = 0.38$ and 0.32, respectively. These associations would not be considered trivial by psychometricians; they suggest that various self-report measures of religious involvement could very well be assessing the same underlying construct(s) over and over again.

Prior to conducting statistical analyses on data from epidemiological investigations of religion, we recommend that researchers examine the construct validity of the religious measures beforehand to determine that they are indeed assessing distinct constructs. Even better, researchers might use measures of religious involvement whose psychometric properties are well known and whose construct validity are well established. Many measures of religious involvement with well-known psychometric properties are available, and researchers who wish to take the measurement of religion in psychiatric epidemiology seriously should become acquainted with these measures.\cite{30} Steps taken to improve the reliability (and construct validity) of measures of religion used in epidemiological investigations in particular (and in social scientific research in general) will help the field to build a body of highly replicable findings about the nature of the religion–depression relationship in particular, and the role of religion in psychiatric epidemiology in general.
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