

interests, questions, and standards of knowledge with regard to sometimes the same objects of study (religion, in our case)” (19, note 33).

Overall, I find Smith’s discussion of the nature of religion, how it works, and why it matters to be engaging, illuminating, and generally convincing. Yet, I would also acknowledge that, though Smith provides explanatory material related to the theoretical perspectives that undergird his argument (specifically, the philosophy of critical realism and the social theory of personalism), I would be far better equipped to critique his perspective if I was more familiar with these particular perspectives and some of their competing viewpoints. But, if I do understand Smith correctly, then I think that there may be certain aspects of religious life that his definition of religion does not adequately capture. Here, I am thinking of those instances in religious life when one simply chooses to worship and praise one’s “God” simply because of one’s understanding of who this “God” is. (e.g. as Creator of the universe). Certainly, it may be the case that this attribution of God being the Creator of the universe is linked to other attributions given to this God (e.g. power and dominion) and that these other attributions have relevance for one’s need to overcome personal limitations and to meet the challenges one faces. Yet, even though this may be the case, there are times in which certain acts of worship are simply that—religious acts done without any pretext of “ultimate ends” in mind. But, perhaps this particular contention simply reflects Smith’s recognition that, though the effort to understand “the subjective motives of religious people is entirely valid,” to do so shifts “attention away from defining *religion* analytically... and toward studying *religiousness* empirically (34–35).”

***Faithful Measures: New Methods in the Measurement of Religion.* Edited by Roger Finke and Christopher D. Bader. New York: New York University Press, 2017. vii + 399 pp. \$99.00 cloth, \$35.00 paper.**

doi:10.1017/S1755048318000111

Jacob R. Neiheisel  
*University at Buffalo*

Louis Pasteur is oft-quoted as saying that “A science is as mature as its measurement tools” (qtd. in *Transforming Performance Measurement:*

*Rethinking the Way We Measure and Drive Organizational Success*, New York, 2007). By this benchmark, the essays contained in *Faithful Measures* detail a variety of different tools—some of which are quite new—that firmly place the social scientific study of religion in the “mature” category. The diverse chapters featured in this new volume by Roger Finke and Christopher Bader collectively cover a wide range of measurement strategies, review some of the larger controversies in the literature on the measurement of core concepts, and introduce readers to an array of tools that can be employed in the scientific study of religion. Creative readers, however, will no doubt see that the utility of these tools is not limited to the study of religion. Some examples of innovative new data-gathering or analysis tools that may not be familiar to even seasoned researchers in the field include Google Ngrams (Chapter 10, Finke and McClure), Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (Chapter 4, Baker, Hill, and Porter), Smartphone-Based Experience Sampling Methods (Chapter 12, Wright and colleagues), and ARDA’s Measurement Wizard (Chapter 5, Bader and Finke). While many chapters in the volume cover survey-based approach, others involve the use of mixed methods or can, in principle at least, be applied to laboratory settings. The implicit measures detailed in a contribution from Jong, Zahl, and Sharp falls into this latter category, as the employ of such items often requires the use of specialized software that is perhaps best suited to the laboratory.

Much to this volume’s credit is the fact that several of its entries cover historical approaches to the scientific study of religion (Chapter 8, Bainbridge) or detail methods for culling data from government documents, newspapers, and web pages (Chapter 7, Scheitle). Bainbridge’s chapter on historical research, rather than describing more traditional methods of retrieving historical materials from archives, takes advantage of the fact that massive quantities of information that were formerly locked away in various document repositories have been digitized and are now more widely available to researchers through the web. This “updated” look on how social scientists might incorporate historical materials into their work is insightful, and Bainbridge’s frank treatment of the various perils and pitfalls of this type of research, as revealed through his investigation of the Oneida community, serves as a useful guide for the field.

Students of religion and politics will find several chapters to be of particular interest or utility. For instance, Brenner’s contribution detailing the ways in which religious identity helps to shape survey respondents’ answers to questions about various religious behaviors (such as church

attendance) stands as a cautionary tale for those of us who employ such measures in our own work. Although this chapter is more of an overview of existing work on measurement bias induced by a strong sense of religious identity than it is an original investigation of the phenomenon, the lessons contained therein are ones that researchers going forward would be wise to heed. Many scholars have long treated religious belonging or identity as distinct from religious behavior. Similarly, those who have largely eschewed the “three b’s” framework still employ measures of church attendance as proxies for exposure to messages from the pulpit or access to church-based networks, even as most will readily admit that self-reports of religious behavior hardly constitute a wholly accurate or complete census. The findings detailed in Brenner’s overview should, therefore, give many of us pause, particularly as the debate over the causes and consequences of the recent rise of the religious “nones” continues to heat up. A silver lining does emerge from the chapter, however, as Brenner notes that church attendance measures “may still be valid if used as a general control for religiosity” (40) (Chapter 1, Brenner, 40).

Also worthy of special note is a chapter by Baker, Hill, and Porter on crowdsourced surveys delivered through Amazon’s Mechanical Turk. Recent studies have found that “MTurkers” are, on balance, less religious than the general population. Rather than being stymied by this fact, however, the authors of this chapter capitalize on it in order to study the causes of religious nonaffiliation. Their chapter reports the results of original research in which they administered a fascinating series of question-wording experiments to an MTurk sample that collectively help to illuminate some of the factors that can influence the proportion of sample respondents who identify as religiously nonaffiliated.

Finally, Evelyn Bush’s contribution on the difficulties inherent in studying, or even defining, religious nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) is likely to be of interest to many students of religion and politics—comparativists and Americanists alike. Her chapter provides an excellent look under the hood of her investigation into religious NGOs and affords readers with a number of useful suggestions for studying such groups. After all, putting one’s finger on what, precisely, makes a group religious is frustratingly difficult to do. As the author points out, many groups may be nominally religious, but comport themselves in much the same way as more secular organizations. The question follows: if the group in question is simply affiliated with a religious body, does that make it a religious NGO, or do its motivations and policy aims have to be religiously inspired as well? The author’s answer to this, and many other definitional

quandaries is to use “multiple measures, and more detailed categorization for each measure, which in turn allows for more precision and flexibility in later analyses” (283) (Chapter 9, Bush, 283). This is sage advice no matter the object of inquiry.

In short, this volume should be essential reading for those interested in the scientific study of religion. Students of religion and politics, in particular, are almost certain to find a great deal to like, and I can easily see the edited volume that Finke and Bader put together rapidly becoming a “go to” citation for many researchers in the field. I, therefore, have little doubt that *Faithful Measures* will find a place on many reading lists going forward.

***Religion, Politics and Values in Poland: Continuity and Change Since 1989.* Edited by Sabrina P. Ramet and Irena Borowik. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017\*. 341 pp. \$129.00 Cloth**

doi:10.1017/S1755048317000712

Ben Stanley

*SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities*

It is not that no understanding of Polish politics and society is complete without an understanding of the role played by the Catholic Church; rather, no such understanding is possible. As Sabrina Ramet observes in her introduction to this edited volume, the Church has a strong claim to be considered the fourth estate in Poland. This is the influence it wields not only over the private lives of the faithful, but in the public spheres of politics, education, and the media itself.

While the Church by no means occupies as powerful a position as it had envisaged for itself at the beginning of Poland’s transition from communism, it has nevertheless succeeded in parlaying its historical status as the majority faith in Poland, and the immense moral authority it accrued during the communist era, into a privileged position in the new order, with a Concordat regulating the relationship between the Church and the Polish state and securing significant expenditures from the state budget, provision of catechism-based religious education in public

\* The year of publication was omitted in the original version of this review published online. A corrigendum has been published.