UC Riverside

UC Riverside Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

The Effect of Non-Affiliation With Religion on Religiosity and Pro-Social Ties

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/43v6x69q

Author

Suh, Daniel Hyun

Publication Date

2014

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
RIVERSIDE

The Effect of Non-Affiliation With Religion on Religiosity and Pro-Social Ties

A Dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Sociology

by

Daniel Hyun Suh

June 2014

Dissertation Committee:
Dr. Raymond Russell, Chairperson
Dr. Tanya Nieri
Dr. Alexandra Maryanski

The Dissertation of Daniel Hyun Suh is approved:

_____

_____

_____

Committee Chairperson

University of California, Riverside

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to acknowledge the contributions made by my committee members: Professors Raymond Russell (chair), Tanya Nieri, Alexandra Maryanski, Katja Guenther, and Amanda Huffer. Their efforts and patience are greatly appreciated well beyond what can be stated here. I would like to mention my appreciation for Professors Raymond Russell, Tanya Nieri, and Alexandra Maryanski, who were instrumental on all phases of the research project. I would like to express my gratitude for Professor Raymond Russell for his sage advice and mentorship throughout the dissertation project. His mentorship throughout graduate school has been invaluable. I have had the good fortune to work with and learn from his pedagogical and research approach, which helped in my professional development. Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends for their continued support and encouragement.

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

The Effect of Non-Affiliation With Religion on Religiosity and Pro-Social Ties

by

Daniel Hyun Suh

Doctor of Philosophy, Graduate Program in Sociology
University of California, Riverside, June 2014
Dr. Raymond Russell, Chairperson

This dissertation examines the effect of non-affiliation with religion on religiosity and pro-social ties. Using panel data from the General Social Survey from 2006 to 2010, longitudinal analyses confirm the negative effect of non-affiliation with religion on religiosity.

A major development in the sociology of religion has found that an increasing proportion of the American population identifies as religious non-affiliates (i.e., they claim no affiliation with a religion, but are still religious) or affiliation with no denomination (i.e., they are affiliated with a religion but claim no specific denomination within that religion). Research indicates that non-affiliation and affiliation with no denomination are associated with lower levels of religious beliefs and participation. This study systematically differentiates religious non-affiliation from affiliation with no denomination, with the latter being similar to their denominational counterparts. Implicit in these findings regarding the variation across a spectrum of religious affiliation is the importance of affiliation for beliefs and participation. The importance of collective representation or social group regarding religious phenomena is grounded in a Durkheimian theory of religion. Individuals are religious, yet their lack of affiliation or

strong adherence to a particular socio-religious group appears to be a significant indicator of individual religiosity.

The larger picture that emerges is that methodological consideration and treatment of religious affiliation and non-affiliation require systematic attention and detail. The current religious landscape reflects a pluralistic dynamic in regards to affiliation and religiosity. Furthermore, the absence of a socio-religious group, affiliation, or "moral community", is critical in the outcomes of religious phenomena.

Table of Contents

Abstract of Dissertation iv

CHAPTER ONE - Introduction

A Note on Religious Non-Affiliation, Non-Denominationalism, Religion Switching, and Denomination Switching 1

CHAPTER TWO - Religion and Crime

Background 7

Hirschi and Stark's Hellfire and Delinquency 9

The Inverse Relationship of Religion and Crime (Anti-Asceticism) 11

Moral Communities Hypothesis 16

Reference Group Theory 21

Spuriousness 22

Religion and Pro-Social Ties 27

CHAPTER THREE - Theory

Durkheimian Perspective and the Moral Communities Thesis 31

Durkheimian Paradigm 32

Social Bonds and Contextual Moral Communities 36

CHAPTER FOUR – Methodology

Incidence of Non-Affiliation, Non-Denominationalism, Switching of Religions and Denominations, Religiosity, and Pro-social Ties 40

Dependent Variables of Religious Beliefs and Participation and Pro-Social Ties 48

Specific Aims 59

Incidence of Non-Affiliation, Non-Denominationalism, Switching of Religions and Denominations, and Drug Use 64

Specific Aims 74

CHAPTER FIVE - Results

Findings on the Effects of Switching and Non-Affiliation on Religious Beliefs and Participation 76

Findings on the Effects of Switching and Non-Affiliation on Pro-Social Ties 89

Findings on the Effects of Switching and Non-Affiliation on Drug Use 97

CHAPTER SIX – Discussion 103

REFERENCES 115

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Respondent's Demographics and Independent Variables of Switching and Non-Adherence in 2006…….46

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of Dependent Variables of Religious Beliefs and Participation and Pro-Social Ties for Full and Subsamples, 2006 and 2010…….50

Table 3: Correlation Matrix of Respondent's Religion Switching, Non-Affiliation, and Religiosity……..54

Table 4: Correlation Matrix of Respondent's Denomination Switching, Non-Denominationalism, and Religiosity……..……....56

Table 5: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Switching and Adherence……...58

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics of Respondent's Demographics, Independent Variables of Switching and Non-Adherence, and Drug Use…….....68

Table 7: Correlation Matrix of Respondent's Religion Switching, Non-Affiliation, and Religiosity……..……....71

Table 8: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Switching and Adherence…….73

Table 9: Unstandardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors, and Odds Ratios for Regression of Religiosity on Denomination Switching and Non-Denominational Protestants……...77

Table 10: Unstandardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors, and Odds Ratios for Regression of Religiosity on Switching and Non-Adherence……..…79

Table 11: Unstandardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors, and Odds Ratios for Regression of Religiosity on Denomination Switching and Non-Denominational Protestants…….……....82

Table 12: Unstandardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors, and Odds Ratios for Regression of Religiosity on Switching and Non-Adherence……...…….....84

Table 13: Unstandardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors, and Odds Ratios for Regression of Religiosity on Apostasy and Always None……...…87

Table 14: Unstandardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors, and Odds Ratios for Regression of Religiosity on Apostasy and Always None…….....88

Table 15: Unstandardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors, and Odds Ratios for Regression of Pro-Social Ties on Ever Switch Denominations and Non-Denominational Protestants…….89

Table 16: Unstandardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors, and Odds Ratios for Regression of Pro-Social Ties on Ever Switch Religions and Non-Affiliation……..91

Table 17: Unstandardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors, and Odds Ratios for Regression of Pro-Social Ties on Denomination Switching and Non-Denominational Protestants…….93

Table 18: Unstandardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors, and Odds Ratios for Regression of Pro-Social Ties on Religion Switching and Non-Affiliation……94

Table 19: Unstandardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors, and Odds Ratios for Regression of Pro-Social Ties on Apostasy and Always None……...……96

Table 20: Unstandardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors, and Odds Ratios for Regression of Pro-Social Ties on Apostasy and Always None……...……97

Table 21. ZINB Regression of Drug Use on Denomination Switching……...……98

Table 22. ZINB Regression of Drug Use on Religion Switching…….99

Table 23. ZINB Regression of Drug Use on Non-Denominationalism…….....100

Table 24. ZINB Regression of Drug Use on Non-Affiliation……..101

Table 25. ZINB Regression of Drug Use on Apostates and Always None…….....102

CHAPTER ONE

A NOTE ON RELIGIOUS NON-AFFILIATION, NON-DENOMINATIONALISM, RELIGION SWITCHING, AND DENOMINATION SWITCHING

In recent decades, researchers have been calling attention to major changes in religious adherence across American society. Religiously unaffiliated individuals, formerly rare, have emerged to comprise a substantial proportion of the population (Stark and Bainbridge, 1985, 1987; Wuthnow, 1988; Hout and Fischer, 2002; Ammerman, 2006; Bellah, Sullivan, Tipton, Madsen, and Swindler, 2007; Pond, Smith, and Clement, 2010). These non-affiliates have no religious preference and are not tied to any particular religion, although they may nevertheless consider themselves to be religious (Hout and Fischer, 2002; Dougherty, Johnson, and Polson, 2007; Baker and Smith, 2009; Lim, MacGregor, and Putnam, 2010; Schwadel, 2010; Eagle, 2011; Scheitle and Smith, 2011).

While the growth of this religiously unattached population is widely documented in the recent literature, most studies do not differentiate between non-affiliation and non-denominationalism. Distinct from non-affiliation, non-denominationalism refers to individuals who report no denominational preference, but who nevertheless report that they are affiliated with a religion. Common examples include non-denominational Protestants, or Jewish respondents who report that they are "just Jewish" when asked which denomination (Orthodox, Conservative, or Reform) they identify most closely with (Sands, Marcus, and Danzig, 2006). The conceptualization and operationalization of non-denominationalism specifically refers to no denominational preference. This is not to be confused with individuals who belong to explicitly independent Protestant denominations. This is categorized as "other" in the GSS and specified as independent

denominations in other data sets such as the Baylor Religion Survey and the Pew Research Studies.

Growth in the numbers of Americans who report "no denomination" has been noted for several decades by researchers who study denomination "switching" (Stark and Glock, 1968; Roof and Hadaway, 1979; Sherkat, 1995; Hoge, Johnson, and Luidens, 1995; Hoge and O'Connor, 2004). The utility of many past studies of switching, however, is limited by a failure to differentiate between acts of conversion from one religion to another and changes in denominational attachments that leave an individual's religious affiliation (Protestant) unchanged. Many past studies of denomination and religion switching (Roof and Hadaway, 1979; Newport, 1979; Sherkat and Wilson, 1995; Loveland, 2003) have treated these two forms of switching as equivalent.

By systematically distinguishing denomination switching from religion switching, and non-denominationalism from non-affiliation, this study seeks to document the continued growth of all four of these phenomena in the contemporary United States, and to provide estimates of their effects on religious beliefs and participation. The efforts to explore the implications of these phenomena for religious beliefs and participation are informed by previous studies. The literature on switching often reports higher levels of beliefs and participation among individuals who have changed religions or denominations than among those who have not. Hadaway (1980), for example, found that "switchers" reported higher levels of religiosity than those who stayed within a particular denomination, while Hoge, Johnson, and Luidens (1995) found that switchers were more involved in religious organizational participation. Insofar as the research addresses

changes in the United States, it must be noted that most American Protestants who have changed denominations in recent decades have been leaving denominations with less involving forms of worship and daily practice in favor of more charismatic and evangelical alternatives (Hadaway, 1980; Wuthnow, 1988; Chavez, 2011; Schwadel, 2013). Tracking denomination switching among Protestants the past several decades, the majority of denomination switching among Protestants occurs from mainline denominations to more "strict", conservative, and charismatic denominations (Roof & McKinney, 1987; Iannaccone, 1994; Sherkat, 2001; Hout, Greeley, Wilde, 2001; Chavez, 2011). For this reason, denomination switching is typically associated with systematically higher levels of beliefs and participation. While switching, in and of itself, is generally associated with increased religious beliefs and participation, because many previous studies (e.g., Roof and Hadaway, 1979; Newport, 1979; Sherkat and Wilson, 1995; Loveland, 2003) have treated denomination switching and religion switching as interchangeable equivalents, there exists a gap in the literature on identifying the systematic differences between the types of switching.

Again by following the precedent set by previous studies, while still religious, religious non-affiliates will exhibit lower levels of religious beliefs and participation. Extending Hout and Fischer's (2002) analysis, the lack of religious preference and affiliation will correspond with lower levels of religious beliefs and participation. Subsequent studies (Dougherty et al., 2007; Vanidyanathan, 2011; Eagle, 2011) also find lower levels of religious beliefs and participation among the non-affiliated. Insofar as non-affiliation and non-denominationalism differ in their association with religiosity, we

expect non-affiliation to be associated with lower levels of beliefs and religious behavior. The non-affiliated or religious nones include respondents who are irreligious or are anti-religious, whereas the non-denominational Protestant category explicitly excludes such respondents. Approximately 13 percent of religious nones are atheists and another 18 percent are agnostics in 2006 (Sherkat, 2008; Stark, 2008). However, the majority of religious nones report belief in God and pray. Research suggests that the "nones" are not entirely irreligious, but rather primarily consist of those who are not currently attached to major religious traditions. Distinct from atheists and agnostics, the religious non-affiliates still exhibit a certain degree of religiosity (Hout and Fischer, 2002). Research shows that the growth in religious non-affiliates is partially due to religiously unaffiliated parents, having a spouse or peer group that are non-affiliated, attending religious services less as a child, and political ideologies that strongly oppose institutionalized religion in the public sphere (Baker and Smith, 2009; Hout and Fischer, 2002). Again, the growth in the numbers of Americans who report "no denomination" has been noted for several decades by researchers (Stark and Glock, 1968; Roof and Hadaway, 1979; Sherkat, 1995; Hoge, Johnson, and Luidens, 1995; Hoge and O'Connor, 2004), but the attention to its relation to religiosity is absent in the extant research. The current body of research fails to emphasize the differences in outcomes of religiosity for non-denominational Protestants compared to their denominational counterparts.

A growing proportion of the religious non-affiliates are composed of respondents who are raised and stay as religious non-affiliates (Schwadel, 2010). This is coupled with the growth in the proportion of the religious population disaffiliating with organized

religion, or what the literature refers to as apostasy (Sherkat and Ellison, 1991; Sherkat and Wilson, 1995; Scwadel, 2010; Vargas, 2012). The limited research on apostasy and "always nones" suggests that many of these individuals are skeptical of religious doctrine and may experience conflict with organized religion (Altemeyer and Hunsberger 1997; Krause and Wulff, 2004; Lim et al., 2010; Schwadel, 2010; Vargas, 2012). Religious disaffiliation, or apostasy, has been found to be more likely among younger people, men, whites, political liberals, skeptics of religious doctrine or theology, the highly educated, and those raised in non-religious homes (Baker and Smith, 2009; Schwadel, 2010; Vargas, 2012; Hout and Fischer, 2002). Conversely, marriage and parenthood may often illicit a return to religion after periods of non-affiliation (Sherkat and Wilson, 1995). In addition, few apostates reject theism and turn to agnosticism or atheism (Altemeyer and Hunsberger, 1997; Hunsberger and Altemeyer, 2006; Smith, 2011). In further unpacking the religious non-affiliate group, research shows the heterogeneity among religious non-affiliates as either stable nones compared to unstable, or liminal, nones who are halfway in and out of their religious identity (Lim et al., 2010). Research suggests that while stable nones report significantly lower levels of religiosity, unstable or liminal nones bear no significant difference to their affiliated counterparts. Again, using Durkheim's theory of religion as inherently a social phenomenon, as apostates and always nones lack the social attachments to a religious community such phenomena are expected to be associated with lower levels of beliefs and participation.

This study systematically distinguishes between all four of these often-conflated phenomena. I differentiate between individuals who express no religious preference and

those who report religious affiliations but are otherwise non-denominational, and differentiate between switching of religions and switching of denominations. With the help of panel data taken from the General Social Survey for the years 2006 to 2010, these distinctions are used to make two main points. First, the absence of or changes in religious attachments have very different implications for religious beliefs and participation, depending on which form of attachment (religious affiliation or denomination) has been severed or switched. Second, using both cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses, this study differentiates between the association of switching and non-adherence with religious beliefs and participation at 2006, with the effects of switching and non-adherence on religious beliefs and participation over time at 2010. Together, this study attempts to provide conceptual clarity and empirical support for significant trends in the current religious landscape.

CHAPTER TWO
RELIGION AND CRIME

BACKGROUND

As contemporary criminology continues to advance approaches and methods to understand the criminogenic indicators across society, a particular area of study within criminology experiencing significant progress and potential is religion and crime. The role of religion has often been overlooked, underdeveloped, and even trivialized in earlier historical theoretical paradigms and approaches, such as social control (i.e., Hirschi's social bond theory) or institutional analysis (i.e., Messner institutional anomie). Hirschi's notion of social bond theory, which involves attachment, commitment, involvement, and beliefs, can incorporate religion as a mechanism that serves to provide "social bonds". Messner and Rosenfeld proposed institutional analysis (i.e. institutional anomie – "American dream"), but emphasis on the institution of the economy has led to the lack of attention on religion as a relevant and pertinent variable (Rosenfeld, Quinet, Garcia, 2010). Seemingly, throughout the historical development of criminological theories and paradigms, the role of religion has been diminished due to the larger prevailing assumptions that religiosity and religious participation are simply inversely related to delinquency and criminality (Durkheim, 1897). Not until several studies suggesting otherwise did the responses to these studies build the growing literature on religion and crime.

Rooted in two earlier seminal works by Kvaraceus (1944) and Hirschi and Stark (1969), the development of research regarding religion and crime reflects the growing attention to the phenomenon of religion and its relationship to delinquency and

criminality. Kvaraceus's study of church attendance and delinquency found that church attendance had no effect on rates of delinquency (Kvarceus, 1944). This was a particularly distinct and novel proposition at the time. After an extensive period of irrelevancy in the field for many years, Travis Hirschi and Rodney Stark's prominent work, "*Hellfire and Delinquency*" (1969), also found that religious beliefs and church attendance had no effect on delinquency. Astonishingly, this was accepted for nearly a decade, until subsequent research began to reexamine the effects of religion on crime. Thus, while an immediate response to Hirschi and Stark did not occur, the unsupported "hellfire thesis" laid the foundation for the current body of literature regarding religion and crime.

Hirschi and Stark's work is important in finding the null effect, but more important because it challenged a simplified notion of religion and crime – this comes to fruition when Stark (1996) acknowledges in a later work that measurement and methodology are critical to the research outcomes. That is, the individual measures of religious beliefs and participation would be explored in its social context (i.e. moral communities hypothesis). Along with measuring individual religiosity, the religiosity of the surrounding community should be accounted for. In addition, the distinction between religiosity and religious participation, along with the variation in types of delinquency, become important details for analysis. The research on religion and crime over time has gained clarity in scope, but has also increased in complexity and vigor, as the scientific means to understand this relationship become more rigorous. Since Hirschi and Stark's study a series of notable subsequent developments include: measurement of religiosity,

religious participation, and types of offenses, the moral communities hypothesis, anti-ascetic hypothesis, reference group theory, spuriousness argument, methodological advances – multi-level analysis, models including moderating or mediating effects (i.e. family, neighborhood), and life-course analysis.

Emphasizing the developments over the course of forty years of a particularly focused body of research on religion and crime, Akers (2010) acknowledges and calls for attention to the social nature of religion and its effects on criminality. Rodney Stark, after presenting his foundational work in 1969, has reiterated that religion and crime must be given careful "sociological" attention to realize the effects of religion on delinquency and crime (Stark, 1996). An overwhelming majority of the research to date on religion and crime suggests that an inverse relationship exists (Johnson & Jang, 2010). However, this relationship must be understood as a complex one, which depends on a multitude of variables (religiosity, religious participation, types of offenses, context, etc.). From the following discussion, it appears we have come full circle to an old, but vital premonition, that is, that religion is a social phenomenon (Durkheim, 1912).

HIRSCHI AND STARK'S HELLFIRE AND DELINQUENCY

The consensual origin for the literature on religion and crime is Hirschi and Stark's article, "*Hellfire and Delinquency*" (1969). The authors use a sample of 4,077 junior and high school students from California to empirically test the link between the "hellfire" thesis and individual-level criminal behavior. The "hellfire" thesis states that religion will deter criminal behavior because of sanctions and rewards based on religious normative standards. The concept of 'hellfire' is measured through several dimensions

including: internalization and acceptance of moral values, acceptance of legal authority, belief in existence of supernatural world, and church attendance. Delinquency is measured through a self-report index of items ranging from "stealing things less than $2" to "fighting or physically harming another person" (Hirschi & Stark, 1969). Controlling for race and gender (i.e. white/black, male/female dichotomy), a serious of cross-tabulations present the findings of the lack of relationship between measures of religiosity and delinquency. Individuals' level of religiosity and church attendance has no bearing distinction on delinquency compared to their counterparts. Thus, challenging the simplified notion that delinquency coincides with a lack of religiosity, the authors suggest that it may be possible that varying components of religiosity, religious participation, and delinquency, may attribute to the varying levels of delinquency. The hellfire thesis is grounded in social control theory. Social control theories posit that crime is uniformly distributed across society and that individuals will engage in delinquency because of a lack of social control (i.e. Hirschi's social control theory including bonds, commitment, attachment, and beliefs). According to this theory, delinquent acts occur when an individual's social bonds to society are weak or absent. Therefore, a lack of control, in this instance a religious bond, explains why an individual will engage in delinquent behavior. However, Hirschi and Stark fail to find support for this claim regarding religion as a source of social control. Subsequent studies skeptical of the results critique the series of bivariate cross-tabulations used in the study for lacking statistical rigor by contemporary standards.

THE INVERSE RELATIONSHIP OF RELIGION AND CRIME AND TYPES OF OFFENSES (ANTI-ASCETICISM)

In response to "*Hellfire and Delinquency*", two initial developments appeared to account for the majority of research reexamining the relationship between religion and crime: measurements of types of offenses and the inclusion of parental bonds as a variable (Burkett and White, 1974; Burkett, 1977; Albrecht et. al, 1977; Cochran, 1988; Evans et. al, 1995; Benda, 1995; Benda, 1997; Pearce and Haynie; 2001, Regnerus, 2003). The first has become an especially important contribution to the progression of the literature on religion and crime. That is, religion appears to have the strongest effect on minor delinquency and crime, rather than major types of offenses. For example, a minor offense might be alcohol use, whereas a major offense might be assault. The typical criteria for this distinction is based on whether or not the act involves a victim and/or if it is secularly condemned. Establishing this is critical for the relevancy of the domain of religion in criminology. For the most part, the research incorporating parental bonds and parent's religiosity have produced mixed results, while the research on various types of offenses have predominantly found an inverse relationship between religion and crime.

For several years after Hirschi and Stark's findings, the assumption that religion affects all types of delinquent acts seemed steadfast. Burkett and White challenged this assumption in their article, "*Hellfire and Delinquency: Another Look*" (1974), by hypothesizing that religion would only be relevant to minor delinquency and offenses that are condemned by churches, yet condoned by larger society. The authors replicated Hirschi and Stark's study with a sample of 855 high school students across the Pacific

Northwest (Burkett and White, 1974). Several scales were constructed to measure three independent variables including religiosity (church attendance), morality, and supernatural beliefs. The effect of these variables on delinquency (larceny, vandalism, and assault), marijuana use, and alcohol use was assessed. The findings revealed that religiosity was not significantly related to delinquency but did influence alcohol and marijuana use. The measure of religiosity influenced "victimless" crimes, or minor offenses, that are clearly religiously condemned. The study showed that religion serves as a means of social control for particular forms of delinquency. That is, when there is no secular base for social control and condemnation of particular deviant acts, religiosity becomes a significant source of social control. For more serious offenses, religion is insignificant due to the prevailing secular societal condemning.

Subsequently, Albrecht et. al (1977) reinforced the importance of variation by offense though their study of religiosity and adolescents' participation in victim and victimless deviance by examining a sample of 240 Mormon teenagers. Like Burkett and White (1974), the study examines a variety of delinquent offenses. The authors initially use a ten-item index with delinquent acts ranging from smoking cigarettes to starting fights. However, the acts are then separated by victimless and victim induced crimes. Religious participation is measured by church attendance, while religious attitudes are measured by questions of morality and life after death. Using correlations among the variables and constructs, the results from their study show that religiosity (attitudes and behavior) had a greater impact on victimless crimes than victim involved offenses. In addition, variables of the family are introduced into the analysis of religiosity and

deviance. The results show varying effects of the family and parental bond variables. That is, family and parental bonds are important for victim deviance, but not significantly related to victimless crimes. Introducing the family as a potential variable is an intriguing addition to the research on religion and crime. An important implication following this study is the emphasis of studies on the impact of religion on ascetic behaviors versus non-ascetic, or secular behaviors. Ascetic behaviors are religiously condemned behaviors that may not be secularly condemned to the same degree (i.e. sex before marriage, drug use, etc.).

In further support of the anti-ascetic thesis and methodological advancement, Cochran and Akers (1989) found a moderately weak inverse relationship between religion and deviance, with the exception of personal religiosity on vandalism and use of wine and religious participation on assault. The authors then combined measures of religion into one composite index and categorized respondents as either strongly or weakly religious. Regressing anti-ascetic measures of deviance (alcohol and marijuana use), the combined effect of the multi-dimensional religious construct had a greater effect on self-reported delinquency than independent effects (personal religiosity, religious participation, and personal asceticism). The findings provide clear support for the anti-ascetic hypothesis as all measures of religion had a statistically significant inverse effect on the self-reported frequency of alcohol and drug use.

In more recent studies, Brent B. Benda conducted two studies in which the first he found no support for a relationship between religiosity and ascetic behaviors (Benda, 1995), while finding some support in a later study (Benda, 1997). In "*The Effect of*

Religion on Adolescent Delinquency Revisited", Benda studies a sample of 1,093 high school students from Arkansas. A variety of measures are used for offenses that capture both secular forms of deviance and anti-ascetic behaviors. Secular forms of offense (both secularly and religiously sanctioned) are measured by crimes against property and persons. The anti-ascetic (behaviors less secularly sanctioned, but against religious norms) behaviors include status offenses, alcohol use, and other drug use. Religiosity is measured with eight variables, which include church attendance, prayer, reading the bible, etc. In addition, elements of bonding, specifically attachment to parents, are incorporated in the analysis. The results of the hierarchical regression model[1] reveal that there is no support for a clear pattern or distinction based on type of offense. In addition, the hypothesis that religion is an antecedent factor that is mediated by social control only finds support in the case of marijuana use. In sum, the article does not seem to support the clear distinction supported by Burkett and White (1977), but support Cochran's study of the skepticism regarding religion's effect on ascetic/secular offenses.

In his later article, Benda (1997) finds through a factor analysis that the various forms of delinquency load on three distinct factors (alcohol, drug, and crime). Using the same sample, but a different methodology (two-stage least squares regression), Benda finds mixed support for the effect of religion on crime. Religion is inversely related to alcohol use and criminal behavior, but no relationship existed for drug use. In addition, reciprocal or feedback effects were observed in alcohol use and religiosity, meaning, that alcohol use had some impact on levels of religiosity as well. This later study by Benda

[1] Note the advancements in statistical methodology relative to previous studies.

provides empirical support for the anti-ascetic hypothesis, that religiosity is significantly related to "ascetic behaviors", rather than secular criminal behaviors. The study critically acknowledges both that religion is inversely related to crime and that the type of offense appears to matter. Benda concludes that "*religiosity affects behavior that is uniquely proscribed within a religious context*" (Benda, 1995). Socio-demographic contexts where the controls of a religious community do not also exist in the larger community provide the context in which religiosity has the strongest effect on crime.

An important comprehensive work that considers both the types of offense and the social-ecological context is Evans et. al's (1995) article, "*Religion and Crime Reexamined: The Impact of Religion, Secular Controls, and Social Ecology on Adult Criminality*". The researchers examined survey responses from a sample of 477 white respondents from Midwest urban neighborhoods. A total of 43 possible criminal acts were included as measurements of offenses. Religion was measured with religiosity, denominational conservatism, and interpersonal religious networks. A scale was created to measure religiosity, which included religious activity, religious salience, and beliefs. Distinct from other works in the literature, the authors include measures of secular constraints, religious networks, and social ecology. Secular constraints include legal deterrents and social constraints. Religious networks include networks with friends, family, and neighbors. Social ecology is measured by two variables of social integration: subjective perceptions of social integration in their neighborhoods and objective census measures of community-level social disorganization (Evans et al., 1995). The results of the regression analyses indicate that religiosity impacted on all forms of adult crime,

which failed to support the anti-ascetic hypothesis. In addition, only *participation in religious activities* had a direct effect on adult criminality (Evans et. al, 1995). That is, controlling for secular controls, religious networks, and social ecology, religious participation remained significant, while beliefs and salience failed to have a significant effect on general crime. An important implication of the findings is that behaviors, and less so beliefs, are critical to inhibiting criminal propensities. Individuals involved in church or religious group participation are subject to religious group controls. This general conclusion is supported by later studies (Johnson et al., 2000). Again, in the Durkheimian tradition, religion holds an essentially social character, which for the purposes of criminological studies holds value in its inhibiting effervescence. This particular research study not only further informs the anti-ascetic thesis, but adopts the moral communities hypothesis (although not supported because of the lack of joint effects between religiosity, social ecology, and religious networks), which was introduced and popularized in religion and crime shortly before (Stark et.al, 1982).

MORAL COMMUNITIES HYPOTHESIS

A highly sociological theoretical development is the "*moral communities*" hypothesis established by Stark et al. (1982) in their article, "*Religion and Delinquency: The Ecology of a 'Lost' Relationship*". The moral communities hypothesis posits that in communities where religious commitment is the norm and individuals are religious, it is less likely that community members will engage in delinquent or criminal behavior. In contrast, in secularized communities, the individual's religiosity has no distinct bearing on delinquency or criminality from their irreligious counterparts. A moral community

with higher normative religious commitment is measured through levels of religiosity across schools. Thus, the effect of religion on delinquency is highly ecological and social in nature. Using a national sample, the authors capture moral communities through the use of a Religious Value Index (Bachman, 1970) that asks contextual questions regarding the individuals' religious experience (i.e., "is it good or bad to be religious in these ways"). Also, religious geography is taken into account in this study. For example, the ecology and demographics of the West Coast United States involves much more secularized communities than the Southern United States. Thus, the results of the study show that variation in the moral climate explains the inhibiting nature of religion on crime. Religion is not necessarily meant to make the individual afraid of deviance, or sin, but rather, to bind adherents to a "moral community" (Stark et. al, 1982). The moral communities hypothesis represents a significant paradigm shift in the studies of religion and crime. For the most part, the moral communities hypothesis has generally received support in other empirical research (Tittle and Welch, 1983; Bainbridge, 1989; Olson, 1990; Pettersson, 1991; Welch, Tittle, Petee, 1991; Richard et al, 2000). However, several studies find mixed or no support for the moral communities hypothesis (Chadwick and Top, 1993; Evans et. al, 1995; Benda, 1995).

Shortly after Stark et al.'s study on moral communities, Tittle and Welch (1983), using a sample of adults across Oregon, Iowa, and New Jersey, examined the link between contextual variables of the community and criminality. For community context, the authors use variables including normative dissent, social integration, perceived peer conformity, aggregate religiosity, and status inequality. Individual religiosity is

measured by frequency of church attendance. The results of the study contradict the moral communities hypothesis, as individual religiosity is found to be most effective in communities where general normative ambiguity, low social integration, low peer-conformity, and a high proportion of religious non-affiliates exist (Tittle and Welch, 1983). While the authors begin the article by critiquing previous studies for weak methods (i.e., bivariate associations, neglect of causal ordering, measurement of context) and imprecise theory, they also acknowledge the limitation of their data set and the measurement of context (pseudo-contextual effects with assumption that all ecological units within a given size are similar). The authors acknowledge that the methodology may be the reason for the lack of statistical support for the moral communities hypothesis.

In a later study, Welch et al. (1991) change their methodological approach and find some general support for the moral communities hypothesis. Two important methodological advances are made in this research: multi-level analysis of individual and parish-level religiosity on adult deviance and measures of deviance (DV) were questions regarding self-projected behaviors (not retrospective) to protect against false causal ordering. The independent variable is a four-item scale of private religiosity, which is then aggregated for each parish to capture community religiosity. The dependent variables are tax evasion, drinking, and unauthorized use of employer equipment. The multi-level regression analysis reveals support for two of three hypotheses. Religiously active individuals are less likely to commit deviant acts and individuals in parish communities with high religiosity levels are less likely to be deviant. The third

hypothesis regarding the interaction of personal and community religiosity was not found to be significant, however the authors mention this may be due to methodological reasons.

Other studies have also looked at the moral communities hypothesis while taking into account the variation in types of deviance, an important methodological concern as mentioned above. William Bainbridge (1989) continues with the ecological approach to religion and crime to find support for the notion that religion changes with social context (Bainbridge, 1989). Bainbridge uses a unified ecological dataset of 75 cities from 1980 to test the relationships among a variety of variables regarding religiosity, crime and deviance, and social context. The major findings from the results of correlations and multiple regression analyses are that many forms of crime (burglary, rape, assault, etc.) and cultism were deterred by religion, regardless of the presence of moral communities. However, the influence on suicide and homosexuality was found to be indirect. For example, the church membership rate has significant negative correlations with homosexuality, but introducing the social instability variable (measured by change of housing) renders the relationship non-significant (Bainbridge 1989). This particular finding shows that the moral community or strength of the social context of social stability can help explain the significant impact of religion as an inhibiting variable. Therefore, an important contribution of this study is that while support for the moral communities thesis is mixed, it is supported for particular types of deviance and demonstrates the importance of social context in the relationship between religiosity and crime.

The methodological approach to test the moral communities hypothesis has developed to include several approaches to examining the impact of religious moral communities on inhibiting criminal behavior. A study by Richard et. al (2000) investigates the moral communities hypothesis by comparing the effects of religiosity across two types of institutional rather than geographic communities: the church community and a self-help drug recovery group. Religiosity is measured by asking respondents about the salience of religion in their lives. Drug use is measured by the use of crack cocaine, alcohol, and marijuana. The results show that individual church attendance is a significant predictor of reducing drug and alcohol use. Attendance in the drug recovery group reduced alcohol use, independent of church attendance. Thus, the impact of religion on drug use varies with the social context.

While empirical research regarding the moral communities hypothesis used varied samples and methodologies to test the strength of the relationship between religion and crime, important works along the way also branched the analyses in varying directions. In J. K. Olson's article, "*Crime and Religion: A Denominational and Community Analysis*", the findings support the moral communities thesis, while at the same time finding that variation may be attributed to denominational affiliation. From a Weberian tradition, religious denomination should have varying effects on individual behavior. Olson extends this assumption and applies it to an analysis on religion and crime (Olson, 1990). Interestingly, Olson finds that church membership is negatively associated with crime. However, the data revealed that the inverse relationship is more applicable to Protestantism than Catholicism. In addition, the results do not support any difference

between liberal and conservative Protestant groups (Olson, 1990). With such complex findings, the author emphasizes the need for continued research to understand relationship between religion and crime through an analysis including denominational affiliation.

Examining conservative Protestants from the National Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health (NLSAH), Regnerus (2003) finds support for the moral communities hypothesis as conservative Protestant homogeneity in county and schools is found to be associated with lower levels of delinquency. The independent variables included identity and attendance, while the dependent variables were theft and minor delinquency[2]. In addition, it is important to note that the sample examines adolescents, which has implications for longitudinal and life-course analysis later and the study also uses a sophisticated statistical method in hierarchical level modeling.

Overall, the majority of the research to date testing the moral communities hypothesis seems to support the thesis. Contextual effects of the community on the relationship between an individual's religiosity and deviance must be considered.

REFERENCE GROUP THEORY

Another theoretical development in the past few decades is the reference group theory, which is grounded in the social learning theory. Reference group theory states that an individual involved in a group that has similar status, similar beliefs, clear group values and beliefs, sustained interaction, and significant others, will learn differential

[2] Important to note that studies roughly in the past decade seem to acknowledge and accept the anti-asceticism hypothesis and use minor/victimless offenses as dependent variables for statistically significant findings

reinforcement of rewards and punishments through this group. Thus, as a reference group becomes religiously centered, it can be inferred that religion deters crime at the group-level. Generally speaking, the research testing the reference group theory in religion and deviance finds support for the relationship of greater religious group involvement and lower patterns of deviance. The research on reference group theory examines reference group on alcohol use (Bock et al., 1987; Beeghley et al., 1988; Beeghley et al., 1990). Thus, individuals involved in religious denominations that proscribe alcohol consumption are less likely to consume alcohol. Bock et al. (1987) find support for reference group theory in their regression analysis of Protestant denominations, religiosity, and alcohol use. However, the study also revealed that alcohol misuse was not statistically significant. Beeghley et al. (1988) use two separate dependent variables of self-reported alcohol use and perceived misuse. The results from this study show that all four religiosity measures (attendance, belief in life after death, strength of commitment, and membership in various organizations) were significant for alcohol use, while three were significant for perceived misuse. The measures for perceived misuse however were all weak. Following the anti-ascetic hypothesis, religion has less of an effect on alcohol misuse because this is secularly condemned as well. While fewer studies have applied the reference group theory, it is nonetheless, an important contribution as it explores the relationship between religion and crime.

SPURIOUSNESS

In discussing the important methodological advances throughout the literature, a body of research examines the possible spurious relationship between religion and crime.

That is, researchers were skeptical that the variables used to study the effects of religion on crime might be spurious with non-religious variables, such as, family attachment, school attachment, individual arousal, etc. Several studies examine non-religious variables to test if the relationship between crime and religion is spurious (Burkett, 1977; Hadaway et al., 1983; Hadaway et al., 1984; Ellis and Thompson, 1989; Cochran et al., 1994; Johnson and Jang, 2001; Welch et al., 2006; Kerley, 2010). The results of these studies have been mixed, further implicating the importance of methodological approaches in conceptualization, operationalization, and measurement.

One of the first studies to examine the possible spurious relationship between individual religiosity and delinquency was Burkett's (1977) study on parental religious involvement as it related to marijuana and alcohol use. The sample of high school students were asked to categorize their parents' religious attendance and parental family bonds. The study did not find empirical support for parental bonds as an important component of religiosity and delinquency.

Other studies have found that the religion and delinquency relationship may be spurious when controlling for other variables. In their study of 600 students from Atlanta, Georgia, Hadaway et al. (1983) use regression models to examine religiosity, religious participation, and religious salience on delinquency. Delinquency is measured on a 20-item scale of various offenses. In addition, the models include control variables of parental bonds, peer relationships, morality, and denomination. The results show that students with no friends who use marijuana, obey all parental rules, and report that religion is important, are less likely to engage in delinquent acts. However, the authors

do find that of the three independent variables, religious salience is the strongest predictor and that when controls are introduced religious salience becomes an unimportant predictor. Thus, religious salience is highly correlated with the non-religious predictors. This suggests that parental bonds, peer relationships, and morality may explain levels of religious salience and delinquency. Overall, it seemed that peer group dynamics was the most significant predictor followed by religious salience.

Interestingly, the same authors conduct a subsequent study in which they find the relationship between religion and delinquency to be non-spurious. Hadaway et al. (1984) use the same sample, but a methodological change in introducing the social context, or normative consensus regarding ascetic acts is used. The authors separate non-ascetic and ascetic acts (marijuana and alcohol use). The regression analyses show that the relationship between religiosity and drug use to remain significant when non-religious influences (parents, peer, moral values, school) are controlled for. The authors find that other than marijuana use by friends, religion is the most significant source of social control. Religious adolescents are less likely to commit deviant acts than less religious adolescents.

Consistent with the tests of spuriousness of religiosity-delinquency, several studies use measures of arousal and social control (grounded in arousal and social control theories) as a means to examine possible confounding variables. Ellis and Thompson (1989) empirically test a theory of religion and crime by surveying college students on their religious beliefs, involvement, and levels of boredom and thrill seeking (arousal). Religiosity was measured by beliefs and involvement (e.g. belief in God, prayer,

attendance, etc.). Respondents were also asked about levels of boredom experienced, if church services were comforting, and if church services were boring. The results showed that boredom with church was positively associated with delinquency. When boredom with church services is removed from the model, religion and criminal behavior are not associated. The authors conclude that the relationship between religion and crime is spurious.

Another study by Cochran et al. (1994) also finds the relationship between religion and crime to be spurious. In a study of 1600 high school students in Oklahoma, the authors include measures of both arousal and social control theories to test for spuriousness. Measures of arousal include levels of thrill seeking, impulsivity, and physicality. Social control was measured self-concept, self-esteem, socialization, parental control, and attachment to schools. Religiosity is assessed by attendance and salience, while three scales are created for delinquency based on interpersonal, theft, and property offenses. Using a sophisticated method in structural equation modeling, the authors find general support for both claims of spuriousness in arousal and social control. That is, when controlling for both measures of arousal and social control, the effect of religiosity is reduced to insignificance. The only measures that remain significant are legalized substances of tobacco and alcohol use (further support for anti-asceticism thesis). The authors conclude that the relationship between religion and crime to be spurious on the basis of arousal and social control.

Several studies on the other hand, find the relationship between religion and crime to be non-spurious. Johnson et al. (2001) consider important methodological changes to

examine spuriousness in their study of adolescent religious commitment and delinquency, using three waves of NYS data. The authors control for structural effects by using latent variable modeling and also use a longitudinal approach to assess the relationship between religion and delinquency. The authors use several indicators of religiosity, three items for beliefs, four items of delinquent association, and 35 items for delinquency in their structural equation model. The results indicate that the effects of religiosity, while partially mediated by nonreligious variables of social control and socialization, remain significant independent of controls. This suggests that the relationship between religiosity and delinquency is non-spurious. There is however support for bidirectional causal relationships between religiosity and other predictors of delinquency. The belief variable is not a significant predictor of delinquency. Finally, the lagged effect of delinquent association on beliefs receives partial support.

Welch et al. (2006) conduct a subsequent study in which a survey of a sample of Oklahoma City adults is used to assess the relationship between religiosity, criminality, and self-control. Self-control is measured through a 10-item scale (e.g. do you always wear a seatbelt). Using OLS regression, the study finds that both religiosity and self-control display statistically significant, independent negative effects on criminal behaviors. Therefore, concluding that self-control does not account for the effects of religiosity on criminality.

The continual research agenda on the spuriousness debate is illustrated in Kerley et al.'s (2010) recent work on religiosity and self-control on prison deviance. The authors use prayer, religious television, and attending religious class as independent variables,

while prison deviance is the dependent variable. Control variables include criminal history, demographics, and self-control. The results of the multivariate regression models show decreased levels of self-control to be predictive of prison deviance, net the effect of the control variables and religion. Two of the three measures of religiosity, prayer and religious television, may be spurious predictors of prison deviance. Only participation in religious services significantly reduces deviance when controlling for the other factors. The organized form of religious participation, or the social nature of religion, is more significant than the individualized measures of religiosity.

RELIGION AND PRO-SOCIAL TIES

At the current state of the literature on religion and crime, several remarks can be made regarding established findings and future directions. First, religiosity seems to be a significant predictor of minor, victimless, anti-ascetic offenses such as drug and alcohol use. Many of the current studies use measures of drug use as the dependent variable of deviance due to the established findings that religiosity has a greater effect on such offenses, rather than serious offenses (anti-ascetic thesis). In a systematic review of the literature, 99 of 105 publications find that at least one or more measures of religiosity reduce the risk of substance abuse (Chitwood et al., 2008).

Secondly, a majority of the research is cross-sectional (Chitwood et al., 2008) predominantly with samples of adolescents, which inspires the application of life-course criminology, longitudinal methods, and adult samples. In a review of 40 prominent articles in the literature, Johnson et al. (2000) contend that the research is particularly robust, but that there are few obvious and necessary methodological advancements

needed. The authors find that in 85% of the studies there is no ambiguity about causal inference, 93% use multivariate statistics, 67% of the articles use the role of religion as a central measure (not peripheral or covariate), and that 75% of the articles find a negative effect of religion on delinquency. However, the review also indicates that nearly 90% of the studies do not use longitudinal data (Jang et al., 2008; Giordano et al., 2008), 50% do not test the reliability of measures, and that almost all the studies had a mono-method bias. There is also a lack of research examining the role of religion as an influential variable of pro-social behavior (Johnson et al., 2010).

Based on the extant research on the relationship between religion and crime, a potentially insightful scope of analysis is to examine the longitudinal effects of religious non-affiliation on pro-social ties. Pro-social ties including family ties, partnerships, employment, and education, deter crime by establishing social control through bonds to conventional institutions (Hirschi, 1969; Sampson and Laub, 1990; Wright et al., 2001; Giordano et al., 2008). Strongly socialized individuals are the most sensitive to the social disapproval associated with criminal behavior, and so they are most deterred by strong, conventional social ties (Wright et al., 2001). Desistance is likely influenced by stability of marital unions and opportunities for meaningful employment (Booth et al., 1999; Giordano et al., 2002; Giordano et al., 2007; Giordano et al., 2008). Structural disadvantages and the lack of pro-social ties positively influence the likelihood of adult criminality. In longitudinal analysis, pro-social ties positively affect the likelihood of pro-social behavior. In their study of high-risk children raised in group homes, Rutter et al. (1990) found that these children experienced high levels of adult problems including

crime, but some of them also formed pro-social ties, such as positive school experiences and supportive marriages. Likewise, Sampson and Laub (1990) found that persistent delinquents developed many family, educational, and economic troubles later in life, but some of them also acquired stable jobs and strong marriages that turned them from their life-course trajectories of crime. The majority of analyses on pro-social ties exists in the literature on life-course criminology and take longitudinal approaches.

A less developed research agenda is the relationship between religion and pro-social ties. Religion provides one of the few sources of pro-social capital (Giordano et al., 2008). Religion exerts pro-social influences as an outcome of theological, moral, and spiritual commitments. In other words, religion promotes substantive normative directives that foster forms of self-control and behaviors conducive to pro-sociality (Wuthnow, 1995; Smith, 2003). However, the impact of individual religiousness on pro-sociality is limited and pro-sociality is more epiphenomenal of religious social attachments (Saroglou et al., 2005). For example, a significant relationship between individual religiosity and sustained desistance is not supported in longitudinal analyses, but empirical support is found for network forms of deviance (Giordano et al., 2008). Religious affiliation may not be protective in and of itself, but rather religious involvement and culture which cultivate norms may protect against criminal proclivity by providing opportunities for pro-social activities (Marisglia et al., 2005).

The body of research on attachment and religion suggests that people who are religious at a given point in time and who have been successfully socialized in the context of religion may be more likely to report secure attachments (Kirkpatrick, 1999).

Pro-sociality, then, is a function of religiousness at least partially due to security in attachment. That is, religious people not only perceive themselves as behaving pro-socially, but that others accept their behaviors as well. Frequent churchgoers report larger social networks, more contact with network members, more types of social support, and more favorable perceptions of the quality of their social relationships (Ellison and George, 1994). Individuals see themselves as "good" spouses, parents, and citizens. Collective participation in religious rituals also may build interpersonal trust and feelings of mutuality, and may therefore enhance perceptions of the quality of social relationships. The more collective events individuals participate in, the greater the ties of those participants to the community. There is evidence that higher levels of church attendance and religiosity are also associated with more pro-family attitudes and values (Brody et al., 1996; Smith, 2003). In addition, church attendance has been found to have a positive, albeit mild, influence on academic achievement and school attitudes and behaviors (Muller and Ellison, 2001; Regnerus, 2000). Pro-social ties and influences can counteract and reduce the exposure to influences on criminogenic propensities.

CHAPTER THREE

DURKHEIMIAN PERSPECTIVE AND THE MORAL COMMUNITIES THESIS

According to Durkheim, religion[3] is essentially a social phenomenon that arises out of the collective, social sentiments in society. This sociability is at the very core of the religious sentiment and construction of religion. Religious ideas, then, result from the interpretation of pre-existing sentiments. Rather than understanding religion as epiphenomenal of efforts of social organization, Durkheim theorized that efforts of social organization caused religion. That is, as members of society organize together, religion is a mechanism to explain the collective social sentiments and representations of the group. Implicit within this theory is that social interaction and the construction of a "moral community" is essential to religious phenomena. An individualized notion of religion fails to consider the social foundation of religion. In his most developed conceptualization of religion, Durkheim (1915) states that, "*religion is a unified system of beliefs and practices relative to sacred things, that is to say, things set apart and forbidden – beliefs and practices which unite into one single moral community called a Church, all those who adhere to them*" (p. 62).

The socio-religious group is a collective representation of the shared collective sentiments (Durkheim, 1898; Durkheim, 1902). In more contemporary societies, this may serve as a conceptual distinction between churched and non-churched representations. Individual and collective representations are dialectic in fashion, as

[3] An organized, systematized whole composed of phenomena held to be religious in obligatory beliefs, connected with clearly defined practices which are related to given objects of those beliefs (Durkheim, 1899, Concerning the definition of religious phenomena, 93)

collective life occurs from individual representations becoming social and in turn the collective representations cause social reality. Collective life is composed of representations and therefore individual and collective representations are comparable (Pocock and Peristiany, 2009). What Durkheim had in mind is that any property expresses itself by manifestations which are grounded in behavior and collective representations. From a Durkheimian approach, collective representations can be of any kind and religious phenomena is simply one such social reality. Society is a mass of associated individuals and the system by which they form by uniting together groups can be of a religious kind. The collective representations which form the network of social life arise from the relations between individuals. It is this synthesis of individual and collective representations manifest in religious phenomena that create social reality. As such, religious affiliation and the socio-religious group constitute the collective representations of religious ideation.

DURKHEIMIAN PARADIGM

Durkheim's theory on the origin, nature, and function of religion pursues a sociological definition of religious phenomena. Religion is not a priori and must find its roots in society. The cause of religion is the social, collective conscience deriving from a collective effervescence, or mana. It arises as an interpretation of pre-existing sentiments in society. For Durkheim to suggest that religion is social and inherent to the collective conscience, the core of religion cannot rest upon a mystification. Religion expresses something real and its idealism is a general characteristic of the collective mentality. Religion is not a function of the idea of a God or deity (Durkheim, 1899). With the

evolution and growth of societies, religion becomes abstract and religious symbols are attributed to a deity. Thus, the separation of God and religion is necessary to analyze the origin and nature of religion as an institution. The function of religion is to reinforce social solidarity and subsequently legitimate the social organization efforts of society. As an institution, religion provides rules and guidelines, by which adherents abide.

Religious organization is based upon the distinction between the sacred and profane[4]. To Durkheim, the sacred is that which is defined as holy, protective, and isolate. The profane[5] is the ordinary and must be separate from the sacred. The sacred and profane distinction is the first criteria for religion (Durkheim, 1912). It is necessary for the social, collective group to determine what is sacred and profane in order to construct rites and beliefs. The sacred is the symbolization and collective representation of the collective sentiments. This is essentially the foundation for a religious system. Essentially, religion begins with the separation of the holy, sacred from the ordinary, profane. Religious representations are thus expressions of the nature of sacred and profane things. This distinction between the sacred and profane is fundamental to a conceptualization of a religious system and religion rests upon the dialectic forces of these two phenomena.

---

[4] "This explains why there is this division of things into sacred and profane, which is fundamental to all religious organization" (Durkheim, Concerning the definition of religious phenomena, 90)

[5] "All known religious beliefs, whether simple or complex, present one common characteristic: they presuppose a classification of all things, real and ideal, of which men think, into two classes or opposed groups, generally designated by two distinct terms which are translated well enough by the words profane and sacred. This division of the world into two domains, the one containing all that is sacred, the other all that is profane, is the distinctive trait of religious thought; the beliefs, myths, dogmas and legends are either representations or systems of representations which express the nature of sacred things, the virtues and powers which are attributed to them, or their relations with each other and with profane things" (Durkheim, Elementary Forms, 53).

A religious system is comprised of both religious practices and beliefs. Religious rites precede beliefs (beliefs not a priori) and the two are highly interdependent on one another to solidify a belief system (Durkheim, 1899). Practices and beliefs function in cyclical fashion and reinforce one another to construct a religious system. Beliefs are representations of the sacred and religious rites are rules of conduct relative to the sacred (Durkheim, 1912). Therefore, with this basis of religion, Durkheim's theory can be applied to the examination of the origin of religion in sociality and collectivity, the sacred and profane, and rites and beliefs. Religion reflects a synthesis of human consciousness, which is at the core of society itself.

The idea of the nature of religion as reflective of social organization is illustrated in Durkheim's separation of magic and religion. Due to the similar characteristics and properties between magic and religion, it was necessary for Durkheim to create a distinction across the two phenomena. Magic and religion both include beliefs and rites. Durkheim (1912) mentions that, "*magic is full of religion just as religion is full of magic*" (p. 58). The two are highly similar in nature and scope. However, the function of the two is not the same. Religion is a public, social institution, while magic reflects a more private, individual phenomenon. How does a social institution of religion arise from non-institutional means? Why is religion, apart from magic, bounded in an institution? The origin and nature of religion are tied to the collective sentiments of a group or society. Religious beliefs are determined by a group and bind together those who adhere to the beliefs and rites. Magic, on the other hand, does not unite to a group or have a common conscience of any sort. Durkheim (1912) writes, "*Here is how a line of demarcation can*

be traced between these two domains. The really religious beliefs are always common to a determined group, which makes profession of adhering to them and of practicing the rites connected with them" (p. 59). Durkheim refers to the translation of common ideas into common practices as the process of the institutionalization of the Church. Here lies the critical difference between magic and religion. Durkheim (1912) states, "*It is quite another matter with magic. To be sure, the belief in magic is always more or less general; it is very frequently diffused in large masses of the population, and there are even peoples where it has as many adherents as the real religion. But it does not result in binding together those who adhere to it, nor in uniting them into a group leading a common life. There is no Church of magic*" (p. 60).

The church is an embodiment of a moral community. As a sociological import of religion, the idea of a moral community reflects the process by which an object becomes sacred as the community invests it with that meaning. Religion functions to uphold the collective sentiments of the sacred and reinforce social solidarity. Magic has an odd way of profaning sacred, holy things, while religion seeks to separate the two. Again, this is an important implication for Durkheim's theory of religion and essentially any sociological theory of religion or religious phenomena in the future. This leads to a concrete definition of religion[6] for Durkheim.

[6] A religion is a unified system of beliefs and practices relative to sacred things, that is to say, things set apart and forbidden – beliefs and practices which unite into one single moral community called a Church, all those who adhere to them. The second element which thus finds a place in our definition is no less essential than the first; for by showing that the idea of religion is inseparable from that of the Church, it makes it clear that religion should be an eminently collective thing (Durkheim, Elementary Forms, 62-63)

In illustrating the social nature of religion, the degree of social integration to religion results in variations of empirical outcomes (Durkheim, 1897). In his study of suicide, Durkheim (1897) finds that it is epiphenomenal of the degree of social integration to religion. Thus, suicide is not an individual phenomenon, but rather a social, collective pattern. By showing that religious differences exist in comparing Protestant and Catholic groups, empirical support is provided for his thesis on suicide. Both Protestants and Catholics are embedded in religious ties, but to varying degrees. Durkheim finds that Catholics are more socially integrated with stronger social ties and structure. Protestant groups on the other hand, have a less structured religious system, which involves greater expression of free inquiry and altogether weaker ties. Thus, the suicidal tendency within each society is collectively afflicted (Durkheim, 1897). This difference leads to the greater aggregate rates of suicide among Protestant groups (Durkheim, 1897). The variation in aggregate suicide rates explained by the collectivity of religious groups is indicative of the nature of religion as the degree of embedded religious ties and collective representation.

SOCIAL BONDS AND CONTEXTUAL MORAL COMMUNITIES

Social control explanations (Hirschi, 1969) suggest that the extent and strength of social ties between the individual and conventional society serve to reduce both the opportunities to engage in criminal behavior as well as increasing social attachment and adherence to moral codes (Pearce and Haynie, 2004). Religious institutions, similar to other important institutions such as family and schools, deter proscribed behavior (Baier and Wright, 2001). Social integration is fundamental to increasing the social control

function of religious groups (Ellison, 1991; Hoffmann, 2000). Religion serves as a social control mechanism by embedding the person in organized sanctioning networks, increasing sensitivity to what constitutes moral and appropriate behaviors, offering the deity as the supreme source of wrath and punishment, and creating an obedience orientation through encouraging devoutness (Rohrbaugh and Jessor, 1975; Rostosky et al., 2004). Religiosity has been integrated into social bonding theory (Cochran et al., 1994; Cretacci, 2003). Religiosity represents an additional element of the social bond (Cretacci, 2003). Religiosity affects family dynamics such as increasing parental attachment (Smith and Denton, 2005). Commitment can be reinforced by meanings and goals acquired from religious institutions as well as through the acquisition of a cognitive orientation toward the future, which many religious groups promote (Free, 1994). Involvement in religious activities including church attendance and religious youth groups absorbs time that might otherwise be used for delinquent behavior (Ellis, 1985). Finally, belief in rules is enhanced by religion as many religions have stronger proscriptions against delinquent behavior than secular society (Evans et al., 1996). Religiosity strengthens moral beliefs about the wrongfulness of delinquent behaviors.

One of Durkheim's (1897) central propositions was that geographic areas holding high levels of religious ritual or social integration would have lower rates of deviance. Building on Durkheim's notion of "moral communities", Stark et al. (1982) proposed that individual religiosity deters delinquency only in communities where the majority of people are actively religious. The moral communities hypothesis (Stark, Doyle, and Kent, 1980; Stark, Kent, and Doyle, 1982) explains how religion reduces proscribed

behaviors. As it was originally conceptualized, the moral communities thesis suggests that the strength of religious institutions in the larger context engender a moral ecology that conditions the individual-level association between religiosity and proscribed behavior. That is, in communities where the majority of constituents are involved in a shared religion, the individual-level effect of religiosity on proscribed behavior should be greatest (Stark and Bainbridge, 1997; Regenerus. 2006). Only when a religious individual is in a community with a critical mass of others who share their beliefs and practices will that individual's religious beliefs significantly affect their behavior. The religiousness needs to be ratified by the social environment. Conversely, communities that have relatively fewer members involved in religion are expected to have a weaker association between individual religion and deviant behavior. People surrounded by the non-religious will learn to use non-religious reasons or justifications for engaging in or avoiding certain behaviors.

The matter of context in applying the moral communities thesis has been a key issue in the extant research (Stark et al., 1982; Evans et al., 1996; Regenerus, 2003; Bader and Finke, 2010). While some works examine a larger context of national differences (Junger and Polder, 1993), a body of existing research argues for a more proximal measure of religious context of moral community (Stark et al., 1982; Evans et al., 1996; Adamcyk, 2008). In its original theoretical development, Stark et al. (1982) argue that the state is not a moral community, for the religious climates of states are too remote for the everyday experience of individuals. Therefore, focusing on local religious composition and immediate social networks are a more focused conceptualization of a

moral community. Although Durkheim's macro-level arguments assuming a unified society with a shared collective conscience applies to collective representations of society out of similarity and association, with organic solidarity as the basis for collectivity with the development of society, the notion of moral communities at the meso level of groups and organizations appears more applicable (Fisher and Chon, 1989; Regenerus, 2003). Using this level of analysis, this study examines the variation in denominational and religious affiliation as outcomes on religiosity and pro-social ties. Due to the body of research on the anti-ascetic hypothesis (Burkett and White, 1974; Benda, 1995; Cochran and Akers, 1989), which argues that only when secular values are vague should one expect to see ascetic-based standards to have an effect (when secular rules proscribe a behavior, anti-ascetic values merely reinforce such proscriptions), the study views an appropriate mechanism of deviance and crime in examining pro-social ties.

CHAPTER FOUR

METHODOLOGY

STUDY 1: THE INCIDENCE OF NON-AFFILIATION, NON-DENOMINATIONALISM, SWITCHING OF RELIGIONS AND DENOMINATIONS, RELIGIOSITY, AND PROSOCIAL TIES

To measure the incidence of religion switching, denomination switching, non-affiliation, non-denominationalism, and their effects on religious beliefs and participation, panel data from the 2006 to 2010 General Social Survey (GSS) including 1,276 respondents across both waves is examined. The Protestant only sub-sample includes 712 respondents across both waves. Key variables include the control variables of age, gender, race, class, education, number of children, and geographic mobility. The data also includes measures of pro-social ties (i.e. family, partnerships, work, and education). Cases must have non-missing data on all key variables. The GSS data is collected through the administration of interviews to complete standardized questionnaires. A full-probability sampling method is employed across households to give each household equal probability of being selected. Only one adult per household is interviewed. The data include English-speaking persons over 18 years of age and non-English speaking adults are excluded from the data collection process.

Using STATA 10 (StataCorp, 2007), multivariate logistic and ordered logistic regression were employed to assess the association of religion switching, denomination switching, non-affiliation, and non-denominationalism with religious beliefs, participation, and pro-social ties. Models testing religion switching and non-affiliation will be run with the full sample. Models examining denomination switching and non-

denominationalism were confined to the Protestant sub-sample. The analyses include both cross-sectional analysis for 2006 and longitudinal analysis for the years 2006 to 2010, which allows for comparative and causal analysis among the independent and dependent variables.

To begin, patterns of non-affiliation in the total population and of non-denominationalism among Protestants are identified. **Religious affiliation** and **denomination** from 2006 are used for analysis. First, *religious affiliation* asks respondents, "*What is your religious preference*? *Is it Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, some other religion, or no religion*?" There are fourteen categorical responses in the question with other religions such as Buddhism, Islam, Hinduism, etc. In addition, there are "other" and "none" responses. Of the categorical responses, the response "none" is used to represent non-affiliation. A dummy coded variable where all affiliates receive a "0" and religious nones receive "1" is created for **non-affiliation**. Second, the variable *denomination* asks respondents, "*If Protestant: What specific denomination is that, if any*?" For denomination, respondents can choose from all the major Protestant denominations (Baptist, Methodist, etc.) and no denominational affiliation as well. Another dummy coded variable where all denominations receive a "0" and no denomination receives "1" is created to represent **non-denominationalism**. This measure of non-denominationalism is only representative of people affiliated with Protestantism. Both non-affiliation and non-denominationalism for Protestants are thus operationalized as binary variables.

To identify instances of **"*religion switching*"**, the respondents' religious affiliation in 2006 is compared to 2010. Respondents with the same religious affiliation in 2006 and 2010 were dummy coded as "0", while respondents with different religious affiliation were coded as "1" indicating a switch. Respondents with a religious affiliation in 2006 and no religious affiliation, or "none", in 2010 were coded as "0" indicating no switch. Respondents with no religious affiliation in 2006 and a reported affiliation in 2010 were coded as "1" indicating a switch. We also create a dichotomous variable **"ever switch religions"** for cross-sectional analysis by comparing the religion in which respondents were raised in to their religious affiliation at 2006. Respondents with the same religious affiliation than they were raised in were coded as "0" indicating no switch, while respondents with a different religious affiliation than they were raised in received a "1" indicating a switch. Respondents who were raised in a religion, but do not report a religious affiliation in 2006 were coded as "0" indicating no switch. This phenomenon would reflect **"apostasy"** or disaffiliation (Schwadel, 2010). Respondents who were not raised in any religion, but indicated a religious affiliation in 2006 were coded as "1" indicating a switch. Finally, respondents who were not raised in any religion and do not report a religious affiliation in 2006 were coded as "0". This phenomenon would reflect **"always none"** (Lim et al., 2010).

Similarly, to identify Protestants who have switched denominations, a **"*denomination switching*"** variable is created as a binary variable with "no" and "yes". The dichotomous variable is dummy coded "0" for no switch and "1" for respondents who have switched. Respondents with the same denominational affiliation in 2006 and

2010 or with no denominational affiliation across these years were dummy coded as "0", indicating no switch. The few in the sample that indicated a denomination in 2006, but had indicated no response for current affiliation in 2010 were not coded as denomination switching (this phenomenon would pertain to religion switching or apostasy). Respondents with a reported denominational affiliation in 2006, but non-denominational response in 2010 were coded as "0" indicating no switch. Conversely, respondents with "no denomination" in 2006 and a reported denomination in 2010 were coded as "1" indicating a switch. In addition, a dichotomous variable **"ever switch denominations"** was created for cross-sectional analysis by comparing the Protestant denomination respondents were raised in to their denominational affiliation at 2006. Respondents with the same denominational affiliation than they were raised in were coded as "0" indicating no switch, while respondents with a different denominational affiliation than they were raised in received a "1" indicating a switch. Respondents who were raised in a specific denomination, but do not report a denominational affiliation in 2006 were coded as "0" indicating no switch. Respondents who were not raised in a specific denomination, or non-denominational, but indicated a specific denominational affiliation in 2006 were coded as "1" indicating a switch.

Table 1 below presents the descriptive statistics for 2006 for the independent variables of denomination switching, religion switching, non-denominationalism, and non-affiliation for both the full sample and Protestant subsample. In addition, the descriptive statistics for the control variables of respondent's age, gender, race, education, socioeconomic class, marital status, number of children, and geographic

mobility are included. The composition of the full sample is generally similar to the composition of the Protestant subsample, with the exception that the proportion of respondents who are Black is substantially higher for the Protestant subsample (.20) than for the full sample. Consistent with empirical findings in prior research, African Americans exhibit higher levels of religiosity compared to their white counterparts (Du Bois, 1903; Ellison and Sherkat, 1990; Hunt and Hunt, 2001; Sherkat, 2002). The majority of African Americans hold affiliations in Baptist and other conservative denominations that have the highest rates of religious participation of any subgroup in America.

Religious research has found that young adults are more likely to consider themselves to be spiritual, but less likely to participate in organized religious services or activities (Shahabi et al., 2002; Glover, 1996; Becker and Hofmeister, 2001). When young adults have children, however, they are more likely to participate in religious services or activities. Religiosity increases from middle adulthood to older adulthood (Moberg, 2001; Schlehofer et al., 2008).

Gender is also controlled for as research shows that women generally exhibit higher levels of religious beliefs and participation than men (Azzi and Ehrenberg, 1975; Iannaccone, 1990; Davis and Smith, 1991; Miller and Hoffman, 1995). Women are more likely than men to pray, read the Bible, and attend religious services regularly (Azzi and Ehrenberg, 1975; Davis and Smith, 1991; Miller and Hoffman, 1995). One particular explanation for this difference is that religion is seen as an extension of the patriarchal division of labor of the family in larger society (Iannaccone, 1990; Miller and Hoffman,

1995). Gender is also found to be a significant indicator in religious affiliation, as men are more likely to be religiously unaffiliated than women (Hayes, 2000; Baker and Smith, 2009)

Social class and education levels are associated with levels of religiosity. The majority of research shows that individuals from lower social classes and education levels exhibit higher levels of religiosity (Niebuhr, 1929; Evans et al., 1996; Schwadel, 2008). Religion may offer resources to compensate for the frustrations of socio-economic stressors (Stark and Bainbridge, 1980; Ellison, 1991). Other studies have found that lower class Americans are more likely to claim no religious preference or to be religious nones, but at the same time more likely to affiliate with conservative denominations if affiliated (Demerath, 1965; Roof and McKinney, 1987; Wuthnow, 1998). Lower class Americans are more likely to pray and read religious scriptures but less likely to be involved in organized religion (Demerath, 1965; Stark 1972; Schwadel, 2008). However, when affiliated, Americans from lower social classes are more likely to emphasize the communal features of religion. Other studies have argued that religious participation is positively associated with occupational success and overall socio-economic status (Estus and Overington, 1970; Muller and Johnson, 1975; Caplow et al., 1983).

Research indicates that higher levels of education are associated with less religious participation and may determine apostasy, as college students are exposed to ideas that question fundamental religious beliefs, depart from the family, and are influenced by peer culture (Caplovitz and Sherrow, 1977; Albrecht and Heaton, 1984; Roof and McKinney, 1987; Wuthnow, 1988). The majority of the research on education

and religiosity rests on the notion of the secularizing effects of higher education. More recently, studies argue that people with higher education levels are no more likely, and sometimes less likely, to experience a decline in religious beliefs and participation (Cohen, 1983; Cornwall, 1989; Muller and Ellison, 2001; Uecker et al., 2007). Few studies have found a positive correlation between educational attainment and frequency of religious services (Hoge et al., 1993). Other studies show that religious participation, in the form of attendance of religious services, suffers during years of higher education, but that this outcome appears to be temporary and short-term for young adults (Bryant et al., 2003; Uecker et al., 2007).

Finally, geographic mobility is included as a control variable because moving away from one's family of origin is associated with increased religion switching and denomination switching (Stark and Bainbridge, 1985; Hout and Fischer, 2002).

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Respondent's Demographics and Independent Variables of Switching and Non-Adherence in 2006

Variable	*N*	*Mean*	*Proportion*	*Std. Deviation*	*Min*	*Max*	*Coding*
Age in Years in 2006	1276	47.05		16.45	18	89	
Age in Years in 2006 (Protestant Sub-Sample)	712	43.9		16.41	18	89	
Female 2006	1276		0 = .41 1 = .59	.49	0	1	0=male, 1=female
Female 2006 (Protestant Sub-Sample)	712		0=.39 1=.61	.49	0	1	0=male, 1=female
Black 2006	1276		0 = .86 1 = .14	.35	0	1	0=white and other, 1=black
Black 2006 (Protestant Sub-Sample)	712		0=.80 1=.20	.40	0	1	0=white and other, 1=black
Highest Year of Education	1276	13.7		2.97	0	20	

in 2006							
Highest Year of Education in 2006 (Protestant Sub-Sample)	712	13.5		2.93	0	20	
Socioeconomic Class in 2006	1276		1=.06 2=.45 3=.46 4=.03	.66	1	4	1=lower class, 2=working class, 3=middle class, 4=upper class
Socioeconomic Class in 2006 (Protestant Sub-Sample)	712		1=.06 2=.47 3=.44 4=.03	.65	1	4	1=lower class, 2=working class, 3=middle class, 4=upper class
Married in 2006	1276		0= .49 1= .51	.50	0	1	0=not married, 1=married
Married in 2006 (Protestant Sub-Sample)	712		0=.47 1=.53	.50	0	1	0=not married, 1=married
Number of Children in 2006	1276	1.97		1.70	0	8	
Number of Children in 2006 (Protestant Sub-Sample)	712	1.98		1.61	0	8	
Geographic Mobility since age 16	1276		0= .40 1= .24 2= .36	0.87	0	2	0=same city, 1=same state, diff city, 2 = diff state
Geographic Mobility since age 16 (Protestant Sub-Sample)	712		0= .42 1= .26 2= .32	.86	0	2	0=same city, 1=same state, diff city, 2 = diff state
Ever Switched Denominations since age 16 at 2006	712		0=.60 1=.30	.37	0	1	0=no switch, 1=switch
Switched Denominations from 2006 to 2010	712		0= .86 1= .14	.33	0	1	0=no switch, 1=switch
Ever Switched Religions since age 16 at 2006	1276		0=.90 1=.10	.30	0	1	0=no switch, 1=switch
Switched Religions from 2006 to 2010	1276		0= .92 1= .08	.27	0	1	0=no switch, 1=switch
Non-Denominational Protestant in 2006	712		0= .93 1= .07	.26	0	1	0= denominational Protestant 1= non-denominational Protestant
Non-Affiliation in 2006	1276		0= .85 1= .15	.36	0	1	0= religious affiliates 1= non-affiliates

Apostate in 2006	1276	0= .95 1= .05	.22	0	1	0= non-apostates 1= apostates
Always None in 2006	1276	0= .91 1= .09	.28	0	1	0= affiliated or switchers 1= always none

DEPENDENT VARIABLES OF RELIGIOUS BELIEFS AND PARTICIPATION AND PRO-SOCIAL TIES

To assess the association of religion switching, denomination switching, non-affiliation, and non-denominationalism with religious beliefs and participation, each of five dependent variables (confidence in god, belief in life after death, prayer, attendance, and religious activities outside the church) is regressed on the independent variables of switching and non-affiliation at 2006 and 2006 to 2010. Religious beliefs include confidence in god and belief in life after death. The variable "**confidence in God**", asks respondents, "*which of the following expressions most closely represents your confidence in God: don't believe in God; don't know and no way to find out; believe in higher power; believe in God sometimes; some doubts, but believe in God; no doubts about God*." The variable "**belief in life after death**" measures respondents' beliefs in life after death. Responses include *no or yes*. For religious participation, prayer, attendance, and religious activities outside the church are used. The variable "**frequency of prayer**" asks respondents, "*How often do you pray*?" Responses range from *more than once a day, daily, several times a week, weekly, less than once a week, to never*. Another measure of participation is **"attendance"**. Respondents were asked, "*How often do you attend religious services*?" The responses ranged from *"never", "less than once a year", "once or twice a year", "several times a year", "once a month", "several times a month",*

"weekly", to "several times a week". Finally, **"religious activity"**, asks respondents, "*How often do you take part in the activities and organizations of a church or place of worship other than attending services?"* This question is asked later in the survey after accounting for the level of attendance from participants. Responses ranged from *"Never", "Less than once a year", "About once or twice a year", "Several times a year", "About once a month", "2-3 times a month", "Nearly every week", "Every week", "Several times a week", "Once a day", to "Several times a day."*

One item is used to measure employment as a pro-social tie: employment status (0= not full-time, 1=full-time). While pro-social ties are commonly conceptualized including family, partnership, employment, and education (Sampson and Laub, 1990; Wright et al., 2001; Giordano et al., 2008), employment status is the only measure that is deemed to potentially change in the span of four years. With the average of age of respondents in the panel data at 47 years of age, the likelihood of additional years of education, children, and partnership are less likely among the sample. **Table 2** below presents the descriptive statistics for all of these measures in 2010 and 2006 for both the full sample and Protestant subsample.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Dependent Variables of Religious Beliefs and Participation and Pro-Social Ties for Full and Subsamples, 2006 and 2010

Variable	*N*	*Mean*	*Proportion*	*Std. Deviation*	*Min*	*Max*	*Coding*
Confidence in God in 2006	1276		0=.37 1=.63	.48	0	1	0=don't believe or doubts, 1=know god exists
Confidence in God in 2006 (Protestant Sub-sample)	712		0=.26 1=.74	.44	0	1	0=don't believe or doubts, 1=know god exists
Confidence in God in 2010	1276		0=.37 1=.63	.48	0	1	0=don't believe or doubts, 1=know god exists
Confidence in God in 2010 (Protestant Sub-sample)	712		0=.26 1=.74	.44	0	1	0=don't believe or doubts, 1=know god exists
Belief in Life After Death in 2006	1276		0=.18 1=.82	.38	0	1	0=no, 1=yes
Belief in Life After Death in 2006 (Protestant Sub-sample)	712		0=.12 1=.88	.33	0	1	0=no, 1=yes
Belief in Life After Death in 2010	1276		0=.22 1=.78	.41	0	1	0=no, 1=yes
Belief in Life After Death in 2010 (Protestant Sub-sample)	712		0=.15 1=.85	.36	0	1	0=no, 1=yes
Frequency of Prayer in 2006	1276	2.62	1=.33 2=.29 3=.11 4=.06 5=.12 6=.09	1.68	1	6	1=never, 2=less than once a week, 3=once a week, 4=several times a week, 5=once a day, 6=several times a day
Frequency of Prayer in 2006 (Protestant Sub-sample)	712	2.22	1=.41 2=.31 3=.11 4=.05 5=.09 6=.03	1.43	1	6	1=never, 2=less than once a week, 3=once a week, 4=several times a week, 5=once a day, 6=several times a day
Frequency of Prayer in 2010	1276	2.63	1=.32 2=.30 3=.12 4=.05 5=.11 6=.10	1.69	1	6	1=never, 2=less than once a week, 3=once a week, 4=several times a week, 5=once a day, 6=several times a day
Frequency of Prayer in 2010 (Protestant Sub-sample)	712	2.15	1=.43 2=.29 3=.11	1.39	1	6	1=never, 2=less than once a week, 3=once a week,

			4=.06 5=.08 6=.03				4=several times a week, 5=once a day, 6=several times a day
Attendance in Religious Services in 2006	1276	3.75	0=.21 1=.06 2=.13 3=.10 4=.06 5=.09 6=.05 7=.21 8=.09	2.83	0	8	0=never, 1=less than once a year, 2=once a year, 3=several times a year, 4=once a month, 5=several times a month, 6=nearly every week, 7=every week, 8=more than once a week
Attendance in Religious Services in 2006 (Protestant Sub-sample)	712	4.60	0=.10 1=.05 2=.11 3=.11 4=.09 5=.09 6=.07 7=.24 8=.14	2.66	0	8	0=never, 1=less than once a year, 2=once a year, 3=several times a year, 4=once a month, 5=several times a month, 6=nearly every week, 7=every week, 8=more than once a week
Attendance in Religious Services in 2010	1276	3.78	0=.21 1=.06 2=.13 3=.10 4=.06 5=.09 6=.05 7=.21 8=.09	2.81	0	8	0=never, 1=less than once a year, 2=once a year, 3=several times a year, 4=once a month, 5=several times a month, 6=nearly every week, 7=every week, 8=more than once a week
Attendance in Religious Services in 2010 (Protestant Sub-sample)	712	4.59	0=.11 1=.06 2=.11 3=.10 4=.08 5=.10 6=.06 7=.25 8=.13	2.67	0	8	0=never, 1=less than once a year, 2=once a year, 3=several times a year, 4=once a month, 5=several times a month, 6=nearly every week, 7=every week, 8=more than once a week
Religious Activities Other Than Attendance in 2006	1276	3.24	1=.39 2=.07 3=.15 4=.12 5=.07 6=.07 7=.02 8=.10 9=.01 10=.00	2.45	1	10	1=never, 2=less than once a year, 3=once or twice a year, 4=several times a year, 5=once a month, 6=several times a month, 7=nearly every week, 8=every week, 9=several times a week, 10=once a day
Religious Activities Other Than Attendance in 2006 (Protestant Sub-Sample)	712	3.89	1=.28 2=.08 3=.14 4=.12 5=.10	2.55	1	10	1=never, 2=less than once a year, 3=once or twice a year, 4=several times a year, 5=once a month, 6=several times a month, 7=nearly every

			6=.08 7=.05 8=.13 9=.01 10=.01				week, 8=every week, 9=several times a week, 10=once a day
Religious Activities Other Than Attendance in 2010	1276	3.29	1=.39 2=.07 3=.15 4=.12 5=.07 6=.07 7=.02 8=.10 9=.01 10=.00	2.43	1	10	1=never, 2=less than once a year, 3=once or twice a year, 4=several times a year, 5=once a month, 6=several times a month, 7=nearly every week, 8=every week, 9=several times a week, 10=once a day
Religious Activities Other Than Attendance in 2010 (Protestant Sub-Sample)	712	3.92	1=.28 2=.06 3=.15 4=.13 5=.09 6=.09 7=.04 8=.14 9=.01 10=.01	2.54	1	10	1=never, 2=less than once a year, 3=once or twice a year, 4=several times a year, 5=once a month, 6=several times a month, 7=nearly every week, 8=every week, 9=several times a week, 10=once a day
Married in 2010	1276		0 =.50 1= .50	.50	0	1	0=not married, 1=married
Married in 2010 (Protestant Sub-sample)	712		0=.48 1=.52	.50	0	1	0=not married, 1=married
Number of Children in 2010	1276	1.99		1.66	0	8	
Number of Children in 2010 (Protestant Sub-sample)	712	2.09		1.62	0	8	
Employment Status in 2010	1276		0 =.52 1= .48	.49	0	1	0=not fulltime, 1=fulltime
Employment Status in 2010 (Protestant Sub-sample)	712		0=.53 1=.47	.50	0	1	0=not fulltime, 1=fulltime
Highest Year of Education in 2010	1276	13.74		2.95	0	20	
Highest Year of Education in 2010 (Protestant Sub-sample)	712	13.47		2.89	0	20	

Next, **Table 3** below presents the correlation matrix of respondents' demographics, religion switching, non-affiliation, and measures of religious beliefs and participation for the full sample in 2006. The correlation matrix is presented to illustrate the significant relationships among the control, independent, and dependent variables included in the analysis. As expected, age, gender, race, marital status, and having children are positively correlated with religious beliefs and participation. That is, being older, female, African American, married, and having children is positively correlated with religious beliefs and participation. Religion switching is positively correlated with non-affiliation and apostasy, meaning that much of the religion switching involves non-affiliation and disaffiliation. Religion switching is significantly negatively correlated with attendance. Non-affiliation is negatively correlated with all measures of religious beliefs and participation.

Table 3. Correlation Matrix of Respondent's Religion Switching, Non-Affiliation, and Religiosity. N=1276

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	1.00							
2	.04	1.00						
3	-.13***	.39***	1.00					
4	-.01	-.04	-.39***	1.00				
5	.02	.03	-.21***	.41***	1.00			
6	-.01	.03	-.33***	.61***	.40***	1.00		
7	-.07**	-.05**	-.32***	.46***	.24***	.50***	1.00	
8	-.02	.01	-.22***	.34***	.19***	.43***	.68***	1.00

(1) Ever Switched Religions Prior to 2006 [a]
(2) Switched Religions from 2006-2010 [a]
(3) Non-Affiliation 2006 [b]
(4) Confidence in God 2010
(5) Belief in Life After Death 2010
(6) Frequency of Prayer 2010
(7) Attendance 2010
(8) Religious Activities 2010

***p<.01, **p< .05, *p< 0.10
[a] Never switched is the reference category
[b] Religious Affiliate is the reference category

Table 4 below presents the correlation matrix of respondents' demographics, denomination switching, non-denominationalism, and measures of religious beliefs and participation for the Protestant subsample. Denomination switching from 2006 to 2010 is not significantly correlated with any of the measures of religious beliefs and participation. Being non-denominational Protestant negatively correlates with attendance. Non-denominationalism is negatively correlated with denomination switching, indicating that most denomination switching occurs from one Protestant denomination to another. This supports the established research that most denomination switching occurs away from mainline denominations to strict, conservative, and charismatic denominations (Roof & McKinney, 1987; Iannaccone, 1994; Sherkat, 2001; Hout, Greeley, Wilde, 2001; Chavez, 2011).

Table 4. Correlation Matrix of Respondent's Denomination Switching, Non-Denominationalism, and Religiosity. N=712

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	1.00							
2	-.00	1.00						
3	-.12***	-.14***	1.00					
4	.12***	.02	.02	1.00				
5	.07**	-.03	.02	.41***	1.00			
6	.18***	.00	-.00	.62***	.41***	1.00		
7	.20***	.01	-.09***	.46***	.24***	.50***	1.0000	
8	.22***	-.00	-.06	.34***	.19***	.42***	.68***	1.00

(1) Ever Switched Denominations Prior to 2006 [a]
(2) Switched Denominations from 2006-2010 [a]
(3) Non-Denominational Protestant 2006 [b]
(4) Confidence in God 2010
(5) Belief in Life After Death 2010
(6) Frequency of Prayer 2010
(7) Attendance 2010
(8) Religious Activities 2010

***p<.01, **p< .05, *p< 0.10
[a] Never switched is the reference category
[b] Denominational Protestant is the reference category

Table 5 reports the incidence of denomination switching, religion switching, non-denominationalism, and non-affiliation from 2006 to 2010. Respondents reporting "ever switching denominations" at 2006 include 30.6% of the Protestant sub-sample. Another 14% of Protestants responding in 2006 switched denominations during the four years from 2006 to 2010. Respondents reporting "ever switching religions" at 2006 include 10.4% of the full sample, and another 8.1% of respondents switched religions during the four years from 2006 to 2010. Non-denominational Protestants accounted for 13.2% of all Protestants in 2006. About 14.7% of respondents in 2006 were non-affiliates, a slight increase from the 14% for 1998 reported by Hout and Fischer (2002). Among the non-affiliates, about 3.8% of the population had always been non-affiliated, while approximately 10.9% were apostates (Schwadel, 2010). As a result of the combined effect of these trends, the percent of the Americans in 2006 who were stable adherents of religion included approximately two-thirds (66.8%) of the total population. That is, approximately 33.2% of the population in 2006 had already switched religions, was about to engage in switching from 2006 to 2010, or reported non-affiliation with religions. The percent of Protestants in 2006 who were stable adherents of denominations included approximately 42.2% of all Protestants. About 57.8% of Protestants in 2006 had already switched denominations, was about to engage in switching from 2006 to 2010, or reported non-denominational affiliation.

Table 5A

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Switching and Adherence (U.S. Adults, 2006-10, GSS Panel Data)

Switching and Non-Affiliation	*Full Sample*
Switched Religions before 2006	133 (10.4%)
Switched Religions from 2006 to 2010	103 (8.1%)
Non-Affiliated (2006)	188 (14.7%)
Always None in 2006	*49 (3.8)*
Apostate in 2006	*139 (10.9)*
None of the Above	852 (66.8%)
Total	1,276 (100%)

Table 5B

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Switching and Adherence (U.S. Adults, 2006-10, GSS Panel Data)

Switching and Non-Affiliation	*Protestant Sub-Sample*
Switched Denominations before 2006	218 (30.6%)
Switched Denominations from 2006 to 2010	100 (14%)
Non-Denominational Protestants (2006)	94 (13.2%)
None of the Above	300 (42.2%)
Total	712 (100%)

SPECIFIC AIMS

By systematically distinguishing denomination switching from religion switching, and non-denominationalism from non-affiliation, this study seeks to document the continued growth of all four of these phenomena in the contemporary United States, and to provide estimates of their effects on religious beliefs and participation. The efforts to explore the implications of these phenomena for religious beliefs and participation and pro-social ties involve testing two sets of seven hypotheses that are informed by previous studies, a Durkheimian theoretical framework, and the moral communities thesis.

The literature on switching often reports higher levels of beliefs and participation among people who have changed religions or denominations than among those who have not. Hadaway (1980), for example, found that "switchers" reported higher levels of religiosity than those who stayed within a particular denomination, while Hoge, Johnson, and Luidens (1995) found that switchers were more involved in religious organizational participation. Following a Durkheimian approach to the social nature of religion, switching leads to increased socio-religious ideation and ritualistic involvement. Because many previous studies (e.g., Roof and Hadaway, 1979; Newport, 1979; Sherkat and Wilson, 1995; Loveland, 2003) have treated denomination switching and religion switching as interchangeable equivalents, I begin by hypothesizing that they are equivalent in their association with religiosity. The first two hypotheses, therefore, state that denomination switching and religion switching are associated with higher levels of religiosity.

> *H1: Protestant respondents who have switched denominations exhibit higher levels of religious beliefs and participation than other Protestants.*

H2: Among all respondents, those who have switched religions exhibit higher levels of religious beliefs and participation than others.

Next, I consider whether the two forms of switching differ in their association with religiosity. Since a change in religion is ostensibly a greater change in beliefs and religious norms than a change in denomination, religion switching can on these grounds alone be expected to have a stronger association with religiosity than denomination switching. But because this study addresses changes in the United States, it is important to note that most American Protestants who have changed denominations in recent decades have been leaving denominations with less involving forms of worship and daily practice in favor of more charismatic and evangelical alternatives (Hadaway, 1980; Wuthnow, 1988; Chavez, 2011; Schwadel, 2013). Tracking denomination switching among Protestants in the past several decades, the majority of denomination switching among Protestants occurs from mainline denominations to more "strict", conservative, and charismatic denominations (Roof & McKinney, 1987; Iannaccone, 1994; Sherkat, 2001; Hout, Greeley, Wilde, 2001; Chavez, 2011). For this reason, I expect changes in denomination to be associated with systematically higher levels of beliefs and participation.

H3: Protestant individuals who have switched denominations exhibit higher levels of beliefs and participation than Protestant individuals who have switched religions.

Turning to non-affiliation and non-denominationalism, although the ultimate goal is to differentiate them, I again start by following the precedent set by previous studies, and hypothesize that they have similar association with religious beliefs and participation. Extending Hout and Fischer's (2002) analysis, the lack of religious preference and

affiliation will correspond with lower levels of religious beliefs and participation. Subsequent studies (Dougherty et al., 2007; Vanidyanathan, 2011; Eagle, 2011) also find lower levels of religious beliefs and participation among the non-affiliated. Durkheim (1912) defined religion as a unified system of beliefs and practices which serves to bind adherents into a moral community. Based on a Durkheimian notion of religion, the lack of an immediate community of religious and moral adherents will be associated with lower levels of individual-level religious beliefs and participation.

> *H4: Non-denominational Protestants exhibit lower levels of religious beliefs and participation than other Protestants.*
> *H5: Among all respondents, religious non-affiliates exhibit lower levels of religious beliefs and participation than religious affiliates.*

In so far as non-affiliation and non-denominationalism differ in their association with religiosity, I expect non-affiliation to be associated with lower levels of beliefs and religious behavior. The non-affiliated or religious nones include respondents who are irreligious or are anti-religious, whereas the non-denominational Protestant category explicitly excludes such respondents. Approximately 13 percent of religious nones are atheists and another 18 percent are agnostics (Sherkat, 2008; Stark, 2008). However, the majority of religious nones report belief in God and pray. Research suggests that the "nones" are not entirely irreligious, but rather primarily consist of those who are not currently attached to major denominations or traditions. I propose that non-affiliation will be associated with lower scores on religiosity.

> *H6: Non-affiliated individuals will exhibit lower levels of beliefs and participation than non-denominational Protestants.*

A growing proportion of the religious non-affiliates are composed of respondents who are raised and stay as religious non-affiliates (Schwadel, 2010). The limited research on apostasy and always nones suggests that many of these individuals are skeptical of religious doctrine and may experience conflict with organized religion (Altemeyer and Hunsberger 1997; Krause and Wulff, 2004; Lim et al., 2010; Schwadel, 2010; Vargas, 2012). Again, using Durkheim's theory of religion as inherently a social phenomenon, as apostates and always nones lack the social attachments to a religious community, I expect such phenomena to be associated with lower levels of beliefs and participation.

H7: People who are apostates and always nones have lower levels of beliefs and participation than other people.

One of Durkheim's (1897) central propositions was that areas holding high levels of religious ritual or social integration would have lower rates of deviance. Building on Durkheim's notion of "moral communities", Stark et al. (1982) proposed that individual religiosity deters delinquency only in communities where the majority of people are actively religious. The moral communities hypothesis (Stark, Doyle, and Kent, 1980; Stark, Kent, and Doyle, 1982) explains how religion reduces proscribed behaviors through a collective moral climate functioning as a source of social control. As it was originally conceptualized, the moral communities thesis suggests that the strength of religious institutions in the larger context engender a moral ecology that conditions the individual-level association between religiosity and proscribed behavior. That is, in communities where the majority of constituents are involved in religion, the individual-

level effect of religiosity on proscribed behavior should be greatest (Stark and Bainbridge, 1997; Regenerus. 2006).

Since empirical findings show that denomination and religion switching increase religious beliefs and participation (Hadaway, 1980; Hoge, Johnson, and Luidens, 1995), individuals are likely engendered into stronger moral communities that discourage proscribed behaviors. In turn, as individuals are part of a strong moral community, the greater the likelihood to establish pro-social ties to other conventional institutions (Brody et al., 1996; Muller and Ellison, 2001; Regenerus, 2000; Smith, 2003).

H8: Protestant respondents who have switched denominations exhibit higher levels of pro-social ties than other Protestants.
H9: Among all respondents, those who have switched religions exhibit higher levels of pro-social ties than others.

Following the research on the tendency for denomination switching to take place towards conservative, evangelical, strict denominations (Roof & McKinney, 1987; Iannaccone, 1994; Sherkat, 2001; Hout, Greeley, Wilde, 2001; Chavez, 2011), I again hypothesize that denomination switching will lead to stronger moral communities and thus higher levels of pro-social ties (or in other words lower levels of criminal propensity). Denomination switching involves an increase in religious beliefs and participation. In turn, increased religiosity from denomination switching will be associated with increased pro-social ties (Ellison and George, 1994; Brody et al., 1996; Smith, 2003; Muller and Ellison, 2001; Regnerus, 2000).

H10: Protestants who have switched denominations exhibit higher levels of pro-social ties than individuals who have switched religions.

Religious affiliations appear to constitute important normative climates which impact the religiosity-crime relationship. As such, as non-denominational Protestants and religious non-affiliates lack the immediate moral community, these respondents will likely experience lower levels of pro-social ties than their affiliated counterparts. Consistent with the Durkheimian tradition, these religiously unattached persons are void of the rudimentary sociality of religion. Religious social attachments can be a significant source of pro-sociality (Wuthnow, 1995; Smith, 2003; Saroglou et al., 2005).

H11: Non-denominational Protestants exhibit lower levels of pro-social ties than other Protestants.
H12: Among all respondents, religious non-affiliates exhibit lower levels of pro-social ties than religious affiliates.

Consistent with hypothesis 6 above, I expect that non-affiliation will have a comparatively stronger association with pro-social ties than non-denominationalism.

H13: Religious non-affiliates exhibit lower levels of pro-social ties than non-denominational Protestants.

Finally, of the non-affiliates, I again expect apostates and always nones to have lower levels of pro-social ties as their socio-religious ties to the community have been severed or absent.

H14: People who are apostates and always nones are associated with lower levels of pro-social ties than people who are affiliated with a religion.

STUDY 2: THE INCIDENCE OF NON-AFFILIATION, NON-DENOMINATIONALISM, SWITCHING OF RELIGIONS AND DENOMINATIONS, AND DRUG USE

To measure the incidence of religion switching, denomination switching, non-affiliation, non-denominationalism, and their association with drug use, data from the 2008 General Social Survey (GSS) including 2,023 respondents is examined. The

Protestant only sub-sample includes 1,100 respondents. The 2008 GSS data is used because the measures of drug use are absent from the panel data from 2006 to 2010. Key variables include the control variables of age, gender, race, class, education, number of children, and geographic mobility. The GSS data is collected through the administration of interviews to complete standardized questionnaires. A full-probability sampling method is employed across households to give each household equal probability of being selected. Only one adult per household is interviewed. The data include English-speaking persons over 18 years of age. Non-English speaking adults are excluded from the data collection process.

Multiple imputation is used as a method to impute missing data. Multiple imputations use information from all variables in a single model based on a single multivariate distribution to estimate values for missing data. Unlike single imputation which tends to overestimate the level of precision and underestimate the standard errors, multiple imputation incorporates uncertainty into the standard errors. That is, using multiple imputation, five imputed data sets are generated recording the parameter estimates and standard errors separately, which are then used for pooled estimates of the parameters and standard errors using the five solutions. For the current study, missing values for each dependent variable in each model are imputed based on the control variables in each model (age, sex, race, class, and geographic mobility). This creates a sample size of 2,023 cases with complete data. Post-imputation analyses include the control and independent variables to estimate the relationship to the dependent variables.

Using STATA 10 (StataCorp, 2007), zero-inflated negative binomial (ZINB) regression was employed to assess the association of religion switching, denomination switching, non-affiliation, and no denomination with drug use. Drug use includes "ever use crack" and "ever inject drugs". Due to the significantly low count for both measures of drug use, the ZINB regression models are necessary for estimation. Models testing religion switching and non-affiliation will be run with the full sample. Models examining denomination switching and no denomination will be confined to the Protestant sub-sample. One particular limitation to the proposed study is that the analysis of cross-sectional data does not allow for an examination of causality among the independent and dependent variables.

Table 6 below includes descriptive statistics on all measures of respondents' demographics, non-affiliation, and switching. First, **religious affiliation** and **denomination** from 2008 are used for analysis. *Religious affiliation* asks respondents, "*What is your religious preference*? *Is it Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, some other religion, or no religion*?" There are fourteen categorical responses in the question with other religions such as Buddhism, Islam, Hinduism, etc. In addition, there are "other" and "none" responses. Of the categorical responses, the response "none" is used to represent non-affiliation. A dummy coded variable where all affiliates receive a "0" and religious nones receive "1" is created for **non-affiliation**. Likewise, the variable *denomination* asks respondents, "*If Protestant: What specific denomination is that, if any*?" For denomination, respondents can choose from all the major Protestant denominations (Baptist, Methodist, etc.) and no denominational affiliation as well.

Another dummy coded variable where all denominations receive a "0" and no denomination receives "1" is created to represent **non-denominationalism**. This measure of non-denominationalism is only representative of people affiliated with Protestantism. Both non-affiliation and non-denominationalism for Protestants are thus operationalized as binary variables.

A dichotomous variable **"ever switch religions"** is created for cross-sectional analysis by comparing the religion in which respondents were raised in to their religious affiliation at 2008. Respondents with the same religious affiliation than they were raised in were coded as "0" indicating no switch, while respondents with a different religious affiliation than they were raised in received a "1" indicating a switch. Respondents who were raised in a religion, but do not report a religious affiliation in 2008 were coded as "0" indicating no switch. This phenomenon would reflect **"apostasy"** or disaffiliation (Schwadel, 2010). Respondents who were not raised in any religion, but indicated a religious affiliation in 2008 were coded as "1" indicating a switch. Finally, respondents who were not raised in any religion and do not report a religious affiliation in 2008 were coded as "0". This phenomenon would reflect **"always none"** (Lim et al., 2010).

Similarly, a dichotomous variable **"ever switch denominations"** is created for cross-sectional analysis by comparing the Protestant denomination respondents were raised in to their denominational affiliation at 2008. Respondents with the same denominational affiliation than they were raised in were coded as "0" indicating no switch, while respondents with a different denominational affiliation than they were raised in received a "1" indicating a switch. Respondents who were raised in a specific

denomination, but do not report a denominational affiliation in 2008 were coded as "0" indicating no switch. Respondents who were not raised in a specific denomination, or non-denominational, but indicated a specific denominational affiliation in 2008 were coded as "1" indicating a switch.

Two items are included as measures of criminal drug use: ever use crack cocaine in lifetime (0=no, 1=yes), ever injected drugs in lifetime (0=no, 1=yes). A limitation of the dataset is the absence of behavioral measures of crime.

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics of Respondent's Demographics, Independent Variables of Switching and Non-Adherence, and Drug Use

Variable	*N*	*Mean*	*Proportion*	*Std. Deviation*	*Min*	*Max*	
Age in Decades in 2008	2023	47.71		17.35	18	89	
Female 2008	2023	.54		.49	0	1	0=male, 1=female
Black 2008	2023	.14	0 = .86 1 = .14	.34	0	1	0=white and other, 1=black
Highest Year of Education in 2008	2023	13.4		3.07	0	20	
Socioeconomic Class in 2008	2023	2.41	1=.09 2=.45 3=.42 4=.04	.70	1	4	1=lower class, 2=working class, 3=middle class, 4=upper class
Married in 2008	2023	.48	0= .49 1= .51	.50	0	1	0=not married, 1=married
Number of Children in 2008	2023	1.94		1.70	0	8	
Geographic Mobility since age 16 2008	2023	1.97	0= .40 1= .24 2= .36	.87	0	2	0=same city, 1=same state, diff city, 2 = diff state
Ever Switched Denominations since age 16 at 2008	1100	.26	0=.74 1=.26	.44	0	1	0=no switch, 1=switch
Ever Switched Religions since age 16 at 2008	2023	.09	0=.91 1=.09	.29	0	1	0=no switch, 1=switch

Non-Denominational Protestant in 2008	1100	.17	0= .83 1= .17	.38	0	1	0= denominational Protestant 1 = non-denominational Protestant
Non-Affiliation in 2008	2023	.16	0= .84 1= .16	.37	0	1	0= religious affiliates 1= non-affiliates
Apostate in 2008	2023	.11	0= .89 1= .11	.32	0	1	0= non-apostates 1= apostates
Always None in 2008	2023	.05	0= .95 1= .05	.21	0	1	0= affiliated or switchers 1= always none
Ever Used Crack 2008	2023	.05	0=.95 1=.05	.23	0	1	0=no, 1=yes
Ever Injected Drugs 2008	2023	.03	0=.97 1=.03	.18	0	1	0=no, 1=yes

Table 7 below presents the correlation matrix of respondents' demographics, denomination switching, non-denominationalism, and measures of drug use. As expected, drug use is negatively correlated with older respondents, female respondents, middle and upper socioeconomic classes, and higher levels of education. Religion switching and non-affiliation are positively correlated with ever using crack.

Table 7. Correlation Matrix of Respondent's Switching, Non-Affiliation, Non-Denominationalism, and Drug Use. N=2013

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	1.00					
2	-.20***	1.00				
3	.20***	.10***	1.00			
4	-.01	-.14***	-.14***	1.00		
5	-.03	.05**	.01	.07***	1.00	
6	-.00	.02	.01	.02	.26***	1.00

(1) Ever Switched Denominations [a]
(2) Ever Switched Religions [a]
(3) Non-Denominational Protestant 2008 [b]
(4) Non-Affiliation 2008 [c]
(5) Ever Use Crack 2008
(6) Ever Inject Drugs 2008

***p<.01, **p< .05, *p< 0.10
[a] Never switched is the reference category
[b] Denominational Protestant is the reference category
[c] Religious Affiliate is the reference category

Table 8 reports the incidence of denomination switching, religion switching, non-denominationalism, and non-affiliation for 2008. Respondents reporting "ever switching denominations" at 2008 include 26.3% of the Protestant sub-sample. Respondents reporting "ever switching religions" at 2008 include 9.5% of the sample. Non-denominational Protestants accounted for 17.4% of all Protestants in 2008. About 16.4% of respondents in 2008 were non-affiliates, a slight increase from the 14% for 1998 reported by Hout and Fischer (2002). Among the non-affiliates, about 5.1% of the population had always been non-affiliated, while approximately 11.3% were apostates (Schwadel, 2010). As a result of the combined effect of these trends, the percent of the Americans in 2008 who were stable adherents of the religion and denomination that they had been raised in includes approximately 75% of the population and 56% of the Protestant subsample. That is, approximately 25% of the population in 2008 had already switched religions or reported non-affiliation with religions. Approximately 44% of Protestants in 2008 had already switched denominations or reported non-denominational affiliation.

Table 8A

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Switching and Adherence (2008, GSS)

Switching and Non-Affiliation	***Full Sample***
Switched Religions before 2008	192 (9.5%)
Non-Affiliated 2008	332 (16.4%)
Always None in 2008	*104 (5.1)*
Apostate in 2008	*228 (11.3)*
None of the Above	1,499 (74.1%)
Total	2,023 (100%)

Table 8B

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Switching and Adherence (2008, GSS)

Switching and Non-Affiliation	***Protestant Sub-Sample***
Switched Denominations before 2008	289 (26.3%)
Non-Denominational Protestants 2008	191 (17.4%)
None of the Above	620 (56.3%)
Total	1,100 (100%)

SPECIFIC AIMS

In support of the moral communities thesis, previous studies have found that conservative Protestant homogeneity in communities is associated with lower levels of deviance (Regenerus, 2003; Richard et al., 2000) and that variation in levels of crime can be associated with variation in denominational affiliation (Olson, 1990). As denomination switching increases religious participation, such as attendance, such experiences have been found to be negatively associated with drug use (Nelson and Rooney, 1982; Richard et al., 2000). Research also shows that individuals involved in denominations that proscribe alcohol and drug use are less likely to use (Bock et al., 1987; Beeghley et al., 1988; Beeghley et al., 1990). Based on the moral communities thesis and that denomination switching is associated with higher levels of religious beliefs and participation (Hadaway, 1980; Hoge et al., 1995), I hypothesize that switching is associated with lower levels of drug use.

> *H15: Protestant respondents who have switched denominations exhibit lower levels of drug use than other Protestants.*
> *H16: Among all respondents, those who have switched religions exhibit lower levels of drug use than others.*

Since denomination switching is associated with higher levels of religiosity, as most switching occurs away from mainline to conservative denominations (Iannaccone, 1994; Sherkat, 2001; Hout, Greeley, Wilde, 2001; Chavez, 2011), Protestants who have switched denominations may report lower levels of drug use than those who have switched religions.

> *H17: Protestants who have switched denominations exhibit lower levels of drug use than individuals who have switched religions.*

While some research finds that non-affiliation is not related to drug use (Marsiglia et al., 2005), other studies find empirical support for the moral communities thesis on drug use (Richard et al., 2000; Regenerus, 2003). Further, other studies have found that religiosity simply protects against substance use (Burkett and White, 1974; Hadaway et al., 1983; Cochran and Akers, 1989; Marsiglia et al., 2005). Being that religious non-affiliates and non-denominational Protestants exhibit lower levels of religiosity, it is likely that there is a greater propensity for drug use compared to the affiliated.

H18: Non-denominational Protestants exhibit higher levels of drug use than other Protestants.
H19: Among all respondents, religious non-affiliates exhibit higher levels of drug use than religious affiliates.

In so far as non-affiliation and non-denominationalism differ in their association with religiosity, I expect non-affiliation to be associated with lower levels of beliefs and religious behavior. The non-affiliated or religious nones include respondents who are irreligious or are anti-religious, whereas the non-denominational Protestant category explicitly excludes such respondents. Approximately 13 percent of religious nones are atheists and another 18 percent are agnostics (Sherkat, 2008; Stark, 2008).

H20: Non-affiliation is associated with higher levels of drug use than non-denominationalism.

Finally, of the non-affiliates, apostates and always nones will exhibit higher levels of drug use as their socio-religious ties to the community have been severed or absent. The absence of a moral community to proscribe such behaviors is one mechanism of control unavailable to individuals.

H21: Apostates and always nones are associated with higher levels of drug use than religious affiliates.

CHAPTER FIVE

FINDINGS ON THE EFFECTS OF SWITCHING AND NON-AFFILIATION ON RELIGIOUS BELIEFS AND PARTICIPATION

CROSS-SECTIONAL ANALYSES

Table 9 presents the cross-sectional results of the multivariate regression of beliefs and participation on denomination switching and non-denominationalism for the Protestant subsample in 2006 (N=712). Logistic regression is used for dichotomous dependent variables "confidence in God" and "belief in life after death". Ordered logistic regression is used for scaled dependent variables including prayer, attendance, and religious activities. Consistent with Hypothesis 1, individuals who have switched denominations in the past report higher levels of religious participation than other Protestants. Denomination switchers pray (OR=1.84) and attend religious services (OR=1.86) nearly twice as much as non-switchers. The odds for those who have switched denominations engaged in religious activities are 45% higher than non-switchers (OR=1.45). Contrary to Hypotheses 1, however, there is no significant association between past denomination switching and religious beliefs (confidence in God and belief in life after death).

Table 9. Unstandardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors, and Odds Ratios for Regression of Religiosity on Denomination Switching and Non-Denominational Protestants

	Confidence in God 2006			Belief in Life After Death 2006			Frequency of Prayer 2006		
	B	SE	Exp (B)	B	SE	Exp (B)	B	SE	Exp(B)
Age in Decades 2006	.01**	.00	.99	.01**	.00	1.01	.01**	.00	1.01
Female 2006	1.10***	.18	3.02	.16	.25	1.18	.87***	.14	2.39
Black [a] 2006	1.15***	.30	3.16	.91***	.28	2.5	1.23***	.19	3.43
Socioeconomic Class 2006	-.41***	.15	.66	-.06	.19	.92	-.02	.11	.98
Married [b] 2006	.44**	.19	1.55	.03	.26	1.03	.38***	.15	1.47
Number of Children 2006	.12*	.07	1.12	.08	.08	1.08	.00	.05	1.01
Highest Year Education Completed 2006	-.06**	.03	.93	-.07*	.04	.93	.01	.02	1.01
Geographic mobility 2006	.03	.10	1.03	-.07	.15	.92	.01	.08	1.01
Ever Switched Denominations [c] 2006	.26	.21	1.30	.19	.26	1.32	.61***	.16	1.84
Non-Denominational Protestant [d] 2006	-.01	.26	.98	.68	.49	1.97	.48**	.22	1.62
R^2	.07			.04			0.05		
N	712			712			712		

	Attendance 2006			Religious Activities 2006		
	B	SE	Exp (B)	B	SE	Exp (B)
Age in Decades 2006	.01*	.00	1.00	-.00	.00	.99
Female 2006	.63***	.14.	1.87	.50***	.14	1.65
Black [a] 2006	.80***	.17	2.21	.59***	.17	1.80
Socioeconomic Class 2006	.22**	.10	1.25	.22**	.11	1.25
Married [b] 2006	.51***	.14	1.67	.52***	.14	1.68
Number of Children 2006	.01	.05	1.01	.08*	.05	1.08
Highest Year Education Completed 2006	.04*	.02	1.05	.09***	.02	1.09
Geographic mobility 2006	.10	.08	1.10	.09	.08	1.10
Ever Switched Denominations [c] 2006	.62***	.15	1.86	.38***	.15	1.45
Non-Denominational Protestant [d] 2006	-.32	.21	.72	-.10	.21	.90
R^2	.03			.03		
N	712			712		

Standard errors in parentheses. ***p< .01, **p< .05, *p< 0.10

[a] White and other are the reference categories

[b] Non-married is the reference category

[c] Never switched is the reference category

[d] Denominational Protestant is the reference category

Table 9 does not support Hypothesis 4, which predicts that non-denominationalism is associated with lower levels of religious beliefs and participation. Non-denominational Protestants are pray about 62% more than their denominational Protestant counterparts (OR=1.62).

Table 10 presents the cross-sectional results of the multivariate regression of beliefs and participation on religion switching and non-affiliation for 2006 with the full sample. Consistent with Hypothesis 2, individuals who have switched religions in the past exhibit higher levels of confidence in God (OR=1.69), frequency of prayer (OR=1.25), attendance (OR=2.15), and religious activities (OR=1.74) compared to non-switchers. In comparing denomination switching to religion switching, the results do not support Hypothesis 3, that denomination switching is associated with higher levels of beliefs and participation than religion switching. The associations of denomination switching and religion switching with religious participation are comparable, and in fact religion switching in the past is associated with higher levels of confidence in God.

Table 10. Unstandardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors, and Odds Ratios for Regression of Religiosity on Switching and Non-Adherence

	Confidence in God 2006			Belief in Life After Death 2006			Frequency of Prayer 2006		
	B	SE	Exp (B)	B	SE	Exp (B)	B	SE	
Age in Decades 2006	-.01**	.00	.99	.01**	.00	1.01	.01***	.00	1.01
Female 2006	.78***	.12	2.19	.27*	.17	1.31	.89***	.11	2.43
Black [a] 2006	1.14***	.23	3.13	.44**	.23	1.64	1.19***	.17	3.31
Socioeconomic Class 2006	-.29***	.10	.75	-.04	.13	.96	-.03	.08	.96
Married [b] 2006	.50***	.13	1.65	-.05	.17	.93	.21**	.11	1.24
Number of Children 2006	.20***	.04	1.23	.09	.06	1.09	.12***	.04	1.13
Highest Year Education Completed 2006	-.09***	.02	.91	.04	.03	1.04	-.01	.02	.98
Geographic mobility 2006	-.03	.07	.97	-.12	.09	.89	-.02	.06	.96
Ever Switched Religions [c] 2006	.41**	.19	1.69	.12	.23	1.12	.27*	.16	1.25
Non-Affiliation [d] in 2006	-2.08***	.16	.12	-1.46***	.20	.23	-1.81***	.16	.16
R^2	.12			.06			.08		
N	1276			1276			1276		

	Attendance 2006			Religious Activities 2006		
	B	SE	Exp (B)	B	SE	Exp (B)
Age in Decades 2006	.00	.00	1.00	-.00	.00	.99
Female 2006	.38***	.10	1.46	.32***	.11	1.35
Black [a] 2006	.69***	.15	1.99	.71***	.15	2.04
Socioeconomic Class 2006	.28***	.08	1.32	.21**	.08	1.23
Married [b] 2006	.44***	.11	1.54	.41***	.11	1.52
Number of Children 2006	.07*	.04	1.07	.11***	.04	1.11
Highest Year Education Completed 2006	.03*	.02	1.03	.05***	.03	1.05
Geographic mobility 2006	-.02	.06	.98	-.00	.06	.99
Ever Switched Religions [c] 2006	.45***	.16	2.15	.29***	.17	1.74
Non-Affiliation [d] in 2006	-2.49***	.17	.08	-1.76***	.18	.17
R^2	.07			.06		
N	1276			1276		

Standard errors in parentheses. ***p< .01, **p< .05, *p< 0.10

[a] White and other are the reference categories

[b] Non-married is the reference category

[c] Never switched is the reference category

[d] Religious Affiliates is the reference category

For Hypothesis 5, Table 10 provides strong support for the predicted association of non-affiliation with lower levels of beliefs and participation. All measures of religious beliefs and participation for non-affiliation are significantly lower compared to religious affiliates. Finally, the results from the cross-sectional data support Hypothesis 6, that non-affiliation is associated with lower levels of religious beliefs and participation than non-denominationalism.

CHANGES IN RELIGIOSITY FROM 2006 TO 2010

While the data in Table 9 and Table 10 are suggestive, they bear the limitation of relying on independent and dependent measures that have all been collected at the same point in time. When all measures are simultaneous, causal relationships among them become difficult to sort out. The availability of GSS panel data for 2006 and 2010, however, permits us to see how characteristics of respondents in 2006 are related to changes in levels of religiosity reported by these respondents in 2006 and 2010.

In the longitudinal analyses presented in **Table 11** and **Table 12**, we regress measures of religiosity in 2010 on independent variables as measured in 2006. This approach is used over a fixed effects model or change score method for two reasons. First, the summary statistics indicate that the standard deviations between individuals are substantially higher than the standard deviations within cases, suggesting that there is not enough variation within individual cases from Y1 to Y2. That is, due to the four-year span from wave 1 to wave 3 of the GSS panel data, the change score method is not the most ideal, adequate method due to insufficient variation or difference from Y1 to Y2 (Allison, 1990). Second, because the models are not nested hierarchically in any way, the

fixed effects method is not ideal. Including responses to the same question about religiosity that was given in 2006 among the independent variables in each model allows us to interpret the dependent variable as the a measure of the amount of change that occurred in each respondent's answer to that question between 2006 and 2010.

Table 11 presents the longitudinal results of the multivariate regression of beliefs and participation on denomination switching and non-denominationalism for the Protestant subsample from 2006 to 2010. As predicted by Hypotheses 1, Protestants who had switched denominations prior to 2006 report significant increases in the frequency of prayer (OR=1.28) and religious activities outside the church (OR=1.45). If we look instead at Protestants who switched their denomination between 2006 and 2010, however, these respondents show a statistically significant change only for attendance (OR=1.54). Using this more sharply focused longitudinal approach, we thus find minimal support for Hypothesis 1, that denomination switching is associated with higher levels of religious beliefs and participation over time.

Table 11. Unstandardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors, and Odds Ratios for Regression of Religiosity on Denomination Switching and Non-Denominational Protestants

	Confidence in God 2010			Belief in Life After Death 2010			Frequency of Prayer 2010		
	B	SE	Exp (B)	B	SE	Exp (B)	B	SE	Exp (B)
Age in Decades 2006	.00	.00	1.00	.00	.00	1.00	.00	.00	1.00
Female 2006	.28	.19	1.33	.17	.28	1.18	.39***	.15	1.48
Black [a] 2006	1.05***	.32	2.87	.24	.34	1.27	.78***	.21	2.18
Socioeconomic Class 2006	-.05	.16	.93	-.08	.22	.92	-.05	.12	.95
Married [b] 2006	.38*	.20	1.46	.04	.29	1.04	.25	.16	1.29
Number of Children 2006	.05	.07	1.04	-.08	.10	.92	.05	.05	1.05
Highest Year Education Completed 2006	-.11***	.03	.89	-.08	.05	.92	-.02	.03	.97
Geographic mobility 2006	.11	.11	1.12	-.15	.16	.86	.13	.08	1.13
Ever Switched Denominations [c] 2006	.09	.22	1.09	.46	.33	1.59	.25*	.17	1.28
Denomination Switching [d] (2006-2010)	.36	.30	1.43	-.06	.42	.95	.17	.22	1.19
Non-Denominational Protestant [e] 2006	.36	.30	1.43	.13	.47	1.13	-.04	.23	.96
Confidence in God 2006	1.02***	.09	2.77						
Belief in Life After Death 2006				3.53***	.32	34.2			
Frequency of Prayer 2006							1.17***	.07	3.22
Attendance 2006									
Religious Activities 2006									
R^2	.16			.29			.21		
N	712			712			712		

	Attendance 2010			Religious Activities 2010		
	B	SE	Exp (B)	B	SE	Exp (B)
Age in Decades 2006	.00*	.00	1.00	.00*	.00	1.00
Female 2006	.23*	.14	1.23	.23*	.14	1.25
Black [a] 2006	.25*	.17	1.78	.25*	.18	1.29
Socioeconomic Class 2006	-.08	.11	1.05	-.08	.11	.92
Married [b] 2006	.43***	.14	1.60	.43**'	.14	1.53
Number of Children 2006	.02	.05	1.03	.02	.05	1.02
Highest Year Education Completed 2006	.02	.02	1.01	.02	.05	1.01
Geographic mobility 2006	-.02	.08	.92	-.02	.08	.97
Ever Switched Denominations [c] 2006	.37**	.15	.95	.37**'	.13	1.45
Denomination Switching [d] (2006-2010)	.18	.20	1.54	.18	.19	1.20
Non-Denominational Protestant [e] 2006	.01	.21	.89	.01	.21	1.01
Confidence in God 2006						
Belief in Life After Death 2006						
Frequency of Prayer 2006						
Attendance 2006	.72***	.03	2.06			
Religious Activities 2006				.46**	.03	1.59
R^2	.19			.10		
N	712			712		

Standard errors in parentheses. ***p< .01, **p< .05, *p< 0.10

[a] White and other are the reference categories [c] Never switched is the reference category

[b] Non-married is the reference category [e] Denominational Protestant is the reference category

As in Table 6 and Table 7, the results in Table 8 are inconsistent with Hypothesis 4. Once again, non-denominational Protestants are no different from their denominational Protestant counterparts across all measures of religiosity.

Next, **Table 12** presents the longitudinal results of the multivariate regression of beliefs and participation on religion switching and non-affiliation from 2006 to 2010 with the full sample. The results shown in the table provide adequate support for Hypothesis 2, as individuals who switched religions between 2006 and 2010 exhibit statistically significant positive effects across all five measures of religiosity. Whereas Hypothesis 3 predicted that switching denominations has more strongly positive effects on religiosity than does switching religions, the longitudinal results in Table 9 indicate that these two influences have qualitatively different effects: switching of religion from 2006 to 2010 is associated with higher levels of religiosity across all five variables, whereas switching of denominations is only associated with higher levels of attendance.

Table 12. Unstandardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors, and Odds Ratios for Regression of Religiosity on Switching and Non-Adherence

	Confidence in God 2010			Belief in Life After Death 2010			Frequency of Prayer 2010		
	B	SE	Exp (B)	B	SE	Exp (B)	B	SE	Exp (B)
Age in Decades 2006	.00	.00	1.00	.00	.00	1.00	.00	.00	1.00
Female 2006	.31**	.13	1.36	.35*	.21	1.41	.44***	.11	1.54
Black [a] 2006	1.11***	.25	3.03	.21	.31	1.22	.88***	.18	2.42
Socioeconomic Class 2006	-.05	.10	.94	.09	.17	1.10	-.12	.09	.88
Married [b] 2006	.20	.13	1.23	.11	.22	1.12	.25**	.11	1.28
Number of Children 2006	.08*	.05	1.09	.00	.08	1.00	.03	.03	1.0 3
Highest Year Education Completed 2006	-.08***	.03	.92	-.05	.04	.95	-.02	.02	.98
Geographic mobility 2006	.02	.07	1.02	-.24*	.12	.78	.03	.06	1.03
Ever Switched Religions [c] 2006	-.23	.21	.79	-.23	.35	.79	-.12	.18	.88
Religion Switching [d] (2006-2010)	.77***	.26	2.15	1.16**	.48	3.20	.98***	.24	2.66
Non-Affiliation [c] in 2006	-1.09***	.20	.33	-.66**	.32	.51	-.87***	.20	.42
Confidence in God 2006	1.02***	.06	2.77						
Belief in Life After Death 2006				3.57***	.22	35.4			
Frequency of Prayer 2006							1.10***	.05	3.01
Attendance 2006									
Religious Activities 2006									
R^2	.23			.38			.25		
N	1276			1276			1276		

	Attendance 2010			Religious Activities 2010		
	B	SE	Exp (B)	B	SE	Exp (B)
Age in Decades 2006	.00**	.00	1.01	.00*	.00	1.01
Female 2006	.24**	.10	1.27	.34***	.11	1.40
Black [a] 2006	.77***	.15	2.16	.58***	.15	1.79
Socioeconomic Class 2006	.02	.08	1.03	-.04	.08	.96
Married [b] 2006	.40***	.11	1.50	.46***	.11	1.58
Number of Children 2006	.02	.04	1.02	-.03	.03	.97
Highest Year Education Completed 2006	-.02	.02	.98	-.00	.02	.99
Geographic mobility 2006	-.01	.06	.98	-.05	.06	.95
Ever Switched Religions [c] 2006	-.35**	.17	.70	-.15	.18	.86
Religion Switching [d] (2006-2010)	.92***	.22	2.52	.70***	.23	2.01
Non-Affiliation [c] in 2006	-.55***	.19	.37	-.95***	.20	.39
Confidence in God 2006						
Belief in Life After Death 2006						
Frequency of Prayer 2006						
Attendance 2006	.67***	.03	1.96			
Religious Activities 2006				.47**[3]	.02	1.60
R^2	.20			.12		
N	1276			1276		

Standard errors in parentheses. ***p< .01, **p< .05, *p< 0.10

[a] White and other are the reference categories

[b] Non-married is the reference category

[c] Never switched is the reference category

[d] Never switched is the reference category

[e] Religious Affiliates is the reference category

Table 12 indicates that non-affiliation is negatively associated with all measures of religious beliefs and participation. Non-affiliates are roughly one-third as likely to have growing confidence in God (OR=.33), half as likely to believe in life after death (OR=.51), pray (OR=.42), attend religious services (OR=.57), and participate in religious activities (OR=.39). The results are consistent with Hypothesis 5, which states that non-affiliation is associated with lower levels of religious beliefs and participation, and become less religious over time.

Once again, the data also provide support for Hypothesis 6, which predicts that these two ostensibly similar phenomena have different associations with religiosity. While non-affiliation is associated with lower scores on measures of beliefs and participation, non-denominational Protestants appear similar to their fellow Protestants across all measures of religiosity. Hypothesis 6, that non-affiliation is associated with lower levels of religiosity than non-denominationalism is thus supported. This is an important empirical distinction that is lacking in the extant research. With the exception of Hypotheses 3 and 4, we find at least some support for the other four hypotheses.

Finally, **Table 13** presents the estimates of the association of apostasy and always none on the five measures of religious beliefs and participation. Cross-sectional models are only suggestive in that both apostates and always none show similar negative associations across all five measures of religiosity. The longitudinal models in **Table 14**, however, show that apostates exhibit lower religious beliefs and participation compared to always nones. Apostates are roughly half as likely to have confidence in God (OR=.41), pray (OR=.49), and participate in religious activities (OR=.46) than the rest of

the population. Apostates are about three-fourths as likely to attend religious services (OR=.73). Always nones score lower on belief in life after death (OR=.40) and participation in religious activities (OR=.59). The results support Hypothesis 7, which states that apostates and always nones are associated with lower levels of religious beliefs and participation. In addition, longitudinal analyses show that apostasy has stronger immediate effects on religiosity compared to the always nones.

Table 13. Unstandardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors, and Odds Ratios for Regression of Religiosity on Apostasy and Always None

	Confidence in God 2006			Belief in Life After Death 2006			Frequency of Prayer 2006		
	B	SE	Exp (B)	B	SE	Exp (B)	B	SE	
Age in Decades 2006	-.01**	.00	.99	-.01**	.00	.99	.01***	.00	1.00
Female 2006	.78***	.12	2.19	.27*	.16	1.32	.86***	.11	2.37
Black [a] 2006	1.16***	.23	3.19	-.44*	.23	.64	1.18***	.17	3.27
Socioeconomic Class 2006	-.28***	.10	.75	-.03	.13	.97	-.04	.08	.96
Married [b] 2006	.49***	.13	1.64	-.08	.17	.92	.18*	.11	1.19
Number of Children 2006	.21***	.04	1.23	.09	.06	1.09	.13***	.04	1.14
Highest Year Education Completed 2006	-.09***	.03	.91	.04	.03	1.03	-.01	.02	.98
Geographic mobility 2006	-.05	.07	.95	-.13	.09	.88	-.03	.06	.97
Apostate [c] 2006	-2.00***	.18	.14	-1.42***	.23	.24	-1.84***	.18	.16
Always None [d] 2006	-2.02***	.29	.13	-1.65***	.36	.19	-1.54***	.30	.21
R^2	.12			.07			.08		
N	1276			1276			1276		

	Attendance 2006			Religious Activities 2006		
	B	SE	Exp (B)	B	SE	Exp (B)
Age in Decades 2006	.00	.00	1.00	-.01	.00	.99
Female 2006	.38***	.11	1.45	.30***	.11	1.35
Black [a] 2006	.74***	.15	2.00	.75***	.15	2.12
Socioeconomic Class 2006	.29***	.08	1.32	.22***	.08	1.24
Married [b] 2006	.43***	.11	1.53	.42***	.11	1.52
Number of Children 2006	.07**	.04	1.07	.11***	.04	1.11
Highest Year Education Completed 2006	.03*	.02	1.03	.05***	.02	1.05
Geographic mobility 2006	-.04	.06	.96	-.01	.20	.98
Apostate [c] 2006	-2.24***	.19	.11	-1.55***	.20	.21
Always None [d] 2006	-2.98***	.34	.05	-2.24***	.18	.10
R^2	.07			.04		
N	1276			1276		

Standard errors in parentheses. ***p< .01, **p< .05, *p< 0.10

[a] White and other are the reference categories

[b] Non-married is the reference category

[c] Religious affiliate and always none are the reference categories

[d] Apostate and religious affiliate are the reference categories

Table 14. Unstandardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors, and Odds Ratios for Regression of Religiosity on Apostasy and Always None

	Confidence in God 2010			Belief in Life After Death 2010			Frequency of Prayer 2010		
	B	SE	Exp (B)	B	SE	Exp (B)	B	SE	Exp(B)
Age in Decades 2006	.00	.00	1.00	.00	.00	1.00	.00	.00	1.00
Female 2006	.31***	.13	1.37	.40*	.21	1.49	.44*	.11	1.55
Black [a] 2006	1.13***	.25	3.09	.27	.31	1.31	.86*	.17	2.37
Socioeconomic Class 2006	-.07	.10	.93	.11	.17	1.12	-.14	.08	.87
Married [b] 2006	.19	.13	1.20	.09	.22	1.10	.22	.11	1.25
Number of Children 2006	.09*	.04	1.09	.01	.07	1.01	.03	.04	1.03
Highest Year Education Completed 2006	-.08***	.03	.92	-.06	.03	.94	-.02	.02	.98
Geographic mobility 2006	.02	.07	1.02	-.26**	.12	.76	.03	.06	1.03
Apostate [c] 2006	-.88***	.18	.41	-.14	.32	.87	-.71*	.19	.49
Always None [d] 2006	-.51	.29	.60	-.92*	.52	.40	-.00	.30	.99
Confidence in God 2006	1.03	.06	2.79						
Belief in life after death 2006				3.60***	.22	36.7			
Frequency of prayer in 2006							1.10*	.05	3.02
Attendance 2006									
Religious Activities in 2006									
R^2	.23			.38			.25		
N	1276			1276			1276		

	Attendance 2010			Religious Activities 2010		
	B	SE	Exp (B)	B	SE	Exp (B)
Age in Decades 2006	.00**	.00	1.01	.00*	.00	1.00
Female 2006	.25**	.11	1.28	.34***	.11	1.41
Black [a] 2006	.75***	.15	2.11	.57***	.15	1.77
Socioeconomic Class 2006	.00	.08	1.00	-.05	.08	.95
Married [b] 2006	.36***	.11	1.44	.44***	.11	1.54
Number of Children 2006	.02	.04	1.02	-.03	.04	.97
Highest Year Education Completed 2006	-.02	.02	.98	-.00	.02	.99
Geographic mobility 2006	-.02	.06	.98	-.04	.06	.95
Apostate [c] 2006	-.31*	.19	.73	-.76***	.19	.46
Always None [d] 2006	.20	.31	1.22	-.53*	.33	.59
Confidence in God 2006						
Belief in life after death 2006						
Frequency of prayer in 2006						
Attendance 2006	.68***	.03	1.97			
Religious Activities in 2006				.48***	.02	1.61
R^2	.19			.12		
N	1276			1276		

Standard errors in parentheses. ***p< .01, **p< .05, *p< 0.10

[a] White and other are the reference categories [b] Non-married is the reference category

[c] Religious affiliate and always none are the reference categories [d] Apostate and religious affiliate are the reference categories

FINDINGS ON THE EFFECTS OF SWITCHING AND NON-AFFILIATION ON PRO-SOCIAL TIES

CROSS-SECTIONAL ANALYSES

For comparative purposes, we utilize both cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses. **Table 15** below presents the cross-sectional results of the multivariate regression of full-time employment on denomination switching and non-denominationalism for the Protestant subsample in 2006 (N=712). Logistic regression is used for dichotomous dependent variable "work full-time". Inconsistent with Hypothesis 8, individuals who have switched denominations in the past are roughly two-thirds as likely to be working full-time (OR=.69) Protestant respondents who do not switch.

Table 15. Unstandardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors, and Odds Ratios for Regression of Pro-Social Ties on Ever Switch Denominations and Non-Denominational Protestants

	Work Full-Time 2006		
	B	SE	Exp (B)
Age in Decades 2006	-.04***	.00	.95
Female 2006	-1.13***	.17	.32
Black [a] 2006	.22	.20	1.25
Socioeconomic Class 2006	-.25**	.12	.77
Married [b] 2006	.32*	.18	1.37
Number of Children 2006	-.08	.06	.92
Highest Year Education Completed 2006	.13***	.03	1.14
Geographic mobility 2006	-.01	.10	.99
Ever Switched Denominations [c] 2006	-.36*	.19	.69
Non-Denominational Protestant [d] 2006	-.28	.26	.75
R^2		.15	
N		712	

Standard errors in parentheses. ***p< .01, **p< .05, *p< 0.10

[a] White and other are the reference categories

[b] Non-married is the reference category

[c] Never switched is the reference category

[d] Denominational Protestant is the reference category

Table 15 does not fully support Hypothesis 11, which predicts that non-denominationalism is associated with lower levels of pro-social ties. Non-denominational Protestants are about three-fourths as likely to work full-time (OR=.75) than their denominational Protestant counterparts, but these findings are statistically insignificant.

Table 16 presents the cross-sectional results of the multivariate regression of pro-social ties on religion switching and non-affiliation for 2006 with the full sample. Inconsistent with Hypothesis 9, individuals who have switched religions in the past are no different from respondents who have not switched in relation to pro-social ties. In comparing denomination switching to religion switching, the results do not support Hypothesis 10, that denomination switching is associated with higher levels of beliefs and participation than religion switching.

Table 16. Unstandardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors, and Odds Ratios for Regression of Pro-Social Ties on Ever Switch Religions and Non-Affiliation

	Work Full-Time 2006		
	B	SE	Exp (B)
Age in Decades 2006	-.04***	.00	.96
Female 2006	-1.01***	.13	.36
Black [a] 2006	.33*	.18	1.39
Socioeconomic Class 2006	-.30***	.10	.74
Married [b] 2006	.52***	.13	1.69
Number of Children 2006	-.13***	.04	.87
Highest Year Education Completed 2006	.11***	.02	1.12
Geographic mobility 2006	-.04	.07	.96
Ever Switched Religions [c] 2006	-.07	.20	.92
Non-Affiliation [d] 2006	-.18	.18	.83
R^2		.14	
N		1276	

Standard errors in parentheses. ***p< .01, **p< .05, *p< 0.10

[a] White and other are the reference categories

[b] Non-married is the reference category

[c] Never switched is the reference category

[d] Religious Affiliates is the reference category

For Hypothesis 12, Table 16 does not support the predicted association of non-affiliation with lower levels of pro-social ties. Non-affiliated respondents are slightly less likely to work full-time (OR=.83) but the relationship is statistically insignificant. Finally, the results from the cross-sectional data do not support Hypothesis 13, that non-affiliation is associated with lower levels of pro-social ties than non-denominationalism.

CHANGES IN PRO-SOCIAL TIES FROM 2006 TO 2010

While the data in Table 15 and Table 16 are suggestive, they bear the limitation of relying on independent and dependent measures that have all been collected at the same point in time. When all measures are simultaneous, causal relationships among them

become difficult to sort out. The availability of GSS panel data for 2006 and 2010, however, permits us to see how characteristics of respondents in 2006 are related to changes in pro-social ties reported by these respondents in 2006 and 2010. In the longitudinal analyses presented in **Table 17** and **Table 18**, full-time employment in 2010 is regressed on the independent variables in 2006.

Table 17 presents the longitudinal results of the multivariate regression of full-time work on denomination switching and non-denominationalism for the Protestant subsample from 2006 to 2010. Using this more sharply focused longitudinal approach, we do not find support for Hypothesis 8, that denomination switching is associated with higher levels of pro-social ties over time. Across all measures, those that switched denominations prior to 2006 and that switch from 2006 to 2010 do not bear any statistically significant association with pro-social ties.

Table 17. Unstandardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors, and Odds Ratios for Regression of Pro-Social Ties on Denomination Switching and Non-Denominational Protestants

	Work Full-Time 2010		
	B	SE	Exp (B)
Age in Decades 2006	-.04***	.00	.95
Female 2006	.27	.21	1.31
Black [a] 2006	.12	.26	.88
Socioeconomic Class 2006	-.04	.16	.96
Married [b] 2006	-.22	.21	.79
Number of Children 2006	-.04	.07	.95
Highest Year Education Completed 2006	.10***	.03	1.10
Geographic mobility 2006	.12	.11	1.13
Denomination Switching[c] (2006-2010)	-.09	.22	.91
Non-Denominational Protestant [d] 2006	.13	.29	1.14
Work Full-Time 2006	2.52	.21	12.49
R^2		.32	
N		712	

Standard errors in parentheses. ***p< .01, **p< .05, *p< 0.10
[a] White and other are the reference categories
[b] Never switched is the reference category
[c] Never switched is the reference category
[d] Denominational Protestant is the reference category

The results in Table 17 are again inconsistent with Hypothesis 11. Non-denominational Protestants do not bear any statistically significant difference with full-time work from their denominational Protestant counterparts. The effect of non-denominationalism on work is statistically insignificant.

Next, **Table 18** presents the longitudinal results of the multivariate regression of pro-social ties on religion switching and non-affiliation from 2006 to 2010 with the full sample. Table 18 does not support Hypothesis 9, as individuals who switched religions between 2006 and 2010 do not exhibit a statistically significant effect on working full-

time. Whereas Hypothesis 10 predicted that switching denominations has more strongly positive effects on pro-social ties than does switching religions, the longitudinal results in Table 15 do not support this claim.

Table 18. Unstandardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors, and Odds Ratios for Regression of Pro-Social Ties on Religion Switching and Non-Affiliation

	Work Full-Time 2010		
	B	SE	Exp (B)
Age in Decades 2006	-.04***	.00	.95
Female 2006	.16	.15	1.17
Black [a] 2006	.05	.21	1.05
Socioeconomic Class 2006	-.10	.11	.90
Married [b] 2006	-.17	.15	.84
Number of Children 2006	-.03	.05	.96
Highest Year Education Completed 2006	.13***	.03	1.14
Geographic mobility 2006	-.02	.08	.97
Religion Switching [c] (2006-2010)	-.01	.23	.98
Non-Affiliation [d] 2006	-.13	.20	.87
Work Full-Time 2006	2.28	.15	9.83
R^2		.29	
N		1276	

Standard errors in parentheses. ***p< .01, **p< .05, *p< 0.10
[a] White and other are the reference categories
[b] Non-married is the reference category
[c] Never switched is the reference category
[d] Religious Affiliates is the reference category

Unlike previous models that find strong support for the inverse relationship between non-affiliation and religiosity and a moderate inverse relationship between non-affiliation and pro-social ties, Table 18 indicates that non-affiliation in 2006 does not bear any statistically significant immediate effect on pro-social ties in 2010. The results are

inconsistent with Hypothesis 12, which states that non-affiliation is associated with lower levels of pro-social ties.

Longitudinal analysis of non-affiliation on pro-social ties does not support Hypothesis 13, which predicts that non-affiliation will have a stronger negative effect on pro-social ties than non-denominationalism. While non-denominational Protestants seem to have a positive association with working full-time and non-affiliation a negative association with working full-time, neither results are statistically significant. The results of the longitudinal analyses fail to find support for hypotheses 8-13. There is inadequate support for the effects of switching and non-adherence on pro-social ties. The control variables including marital status, children, and education, which are considered to be pro-social ties, are significantly associated with switching and non-adherence, but due to issues of time order these aren't included as dependent variables.

Finally, **Table 19** presents the estimates of the association of apostasy and always none on the pro-social tie of full-time employment. The cross-sectional models show that apostates and always nones are negatively associated with full-time work, but neither finding are statistically significant. The longitudinal model in **Table 20**, illustrates that the more proximal effects of apostasy and always none are absent. The results from do not support Hypothesis 14, which states that apostates and always nones are associated with lower levels of pro-social ties. Again, the relationship between apostasy and always nones with the control variables of socioeconomic class, marital status, children, and education behave as expected, but the phenomena of apostasy and always none do not

have an effect on full-time employment. The longitudinal models do not support the immediate effects of apostasy and always none on pro-social ties.

Table 19. Unstandardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors, and Odds Ratios for Regression of Pro-Social Ties on Apostasy and Always None

	Work Full-Time 2006		
	B	SE	Exp (B)
Age in Decades 2006	-.03***	.00	.96
Female 2006	-1.01***	.13	.36
Black [a] 2006	.35*	.18	1.41
Socioeconomic Class 2006	-.30***	.10	.74
Married [b] 2006	.53***	.13	1.70
Number of Children 2006	-.13***	.04	.87
Highest Year Education Completed 2006	.11***	.02	1.11
Geographic mobility 2006	-.04	.07	.96
Apostate [b] 2006	-.08	.20	.92
Always None [c] 2006	-.26	.32	.77
R^2		.14	
N		1276	

Standard errors in parentheses. ***p< .01, **p< .05, *p< 0.10

[a] White and other are the reference categories

[b] Religious affiliate and always none are the reference categories

[c] Apostate and religious affiliate are the reference categories

Table 20. Unstandardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors, and Odds Ratios for Regression of Pro-Social Ties on Apostasy and Always None

Work Full-Time 2010

	B	SE	Exp (B)
Age in Decades 2006	-.04***	.00	.96
Female 2006	.14	.15	1.15
Black [a] 2006	.05	.21	1.05
Socioeconomic Class 2006	-.10	.11	.90
Married [b] 2006	-.19	.15	.82
Number of Children 2006	-.02	.15	.97
Highest Year Education Completed 2006	.13***	.02	1.14
Geographic mobility 2006	-.01	.08	.98
Apostate [b] 2006	-.16	.23	.84
Always None [c] 2006	-.26	.35	.77
Work Full-Time 2006	2.28***	.15	9.82
R^2		.29	
N		1276	

Standard errors in parentheses. ***p< .01, **p< .05, *p< 0.10

[a] White and other are the reference categories

[b] Religious affiliate and always none are the reference categories

[c] Apostate and religious affiliate are the reference categories

STUDY 2: FINDINGS ON THE EFFECTS OF SWITCHING AND NON-AFFILIATION ON DRUG USE

Table 21 below presents the results from the zero-inflated negative binomial regression of drug use on denomination switching. Protestants who have switched denominations are no different from other Protestants who have not switched denominations in reported use of crack cocaine or injecting drugs. The results do not support Hypothesis 15, which states that Protestant respondents who have switched denominations exhibit lower levels of drug use than other Protestants.

Table 21. ZINB Regression of Drug Use on Denomination Switching

	Crack Cocaine	Inject Drugs
Age	-.02***	-.01
	(.00)	(.00)
Female	-.73***	-.95***
	(.19)	(.27)
Black [a]	.63***	.36
	(.30)	(.23)
Socioeconomic Class	-.24*	-.17
	(.15)	(.20)
Married [b]	-.51**	-.41
	(.21)	(.28)
Number of Children	.06	.02
	(.06)	(.08)
Highest Year Education Completed	-.12***	-.11**
	(.03)	(.04)
Geographic Mobility	.08	.10
	(.10)	(.14)
Ever Switch Denominations [c]	-.06	.00
	(.25)	(.32)
R^2	.08	0.05
N	1100	1100

Standard errors in parentheses. ***p< .01, **p< .05, *p< 0.10

[a] White and other are the reference categories

[b] Non-married is the reference category

[c] Non-switcher is the reference category

Table 22 below presents the results from the zero-inflated negative binomial regression of drug use on religion switching. Those respondents that have ever switched religions have a positive association with crack cocaine use. Contrary to Hypothesis 16, respondents who have switched religions exhibit higher levels of crack cocaine use than others.

Table 22. ZINB Regression of Drug Use on Religion Switching

	Crack Cocaine	Inject Drugs
Age	-.02***	-.01
	(.00)	(.00)
Female	-.77***	-.97***
	(.19)	(.27)
Black [a]	.64***	.37*
	(.19)	(.23)
Socioeconomic Class	-.24*	-.17
	(.15)	(.20)
Married [b]	-.55***	-.43
	(.21)	(.28)
Number of Children	.06	.02
	(.06)	(.08)
Highest Year Education Completed	-.12***	-.11***
	(.03)	(.04)
Geographic Mobility	.07	.09
	(.10)	(.14)
Ever Switch Religions [c]	.68***	.54
	(.26)	(.36)
R^2	.08	0.05
N	2013	2013

Standard errors in parentheses. ***p< .01, **p< .05, *p< 0.10

[a] White and other are the reference categories

[b] Non-married is the reference category

[c] Non-switcher is the reference category

Providing moderate support to Hypothesis 17, individuals who have switched denominations are less likely to have used crack cocaine than individuals who have switched religions.

Next, **Table 23** below indicates that non-denominationalism is not significantly associated with drug use. Contrary to Hypothesis 18, non-denominational Protestants are no more likely to use drugs than their denominational Protestant counterparts.

Table 23. ZINB Regression of Drug Use on Non-Denominationalism

	Crack Cocaine	Inject Drugs
Age	-.02***	-.01
	(.00)	(.00)
Female	-.74***	-.95***
	(.19)	(.27)
Black [a]	.63***	.36*
	(.19)	(.23)
Socioeconomic Class	-.24*	-.17
	(.15)	(.20)
Married [b]	-.52**	-.42
	(.21)	(.28)
Number of Children	.06	.02
	(.06)	(.08)
Highest Year Education Completed	-.13***	-.11***
	(.03)	(.04)
Geographic Mobility	.08	.10
	(.10)	(.14)
Non-Denominational Protestant[c]	.25	.31
	(.30)	(.40)
R^2	.08	0.05
N	1100	1100

Standard errors in parentheses. ***p< .01, **p< .05, *p< 0.10

[a] White and other are the reference categories

[b] Non-married is the reference category

[c] Denominational Protestant and non-Protestants are the reference categories

Table 24 below presents the results of non-affiliation and drug use. Non-affiliation is positively associated with the use of crack cocaine, but not injecting drugs. In support of Hypothesis 19, religious non-affiliates exhibit higher levels of cocaine use than religious affiliates.

Table 24. ZINB Regression of Drug Use on Non-Affiliation

	Crack Cocaine	Inject Drugs
Age	-.02***	-.01
	(.00)	(.00)
Female	-.69***	-.93***
	(.19)	(.27)
Black [a]	.62***	.36*
	(.19)	(.23)
Socioeconomic Class	-.22*	-.17
	(.15)	(.20)
Married [b]	-.48**	-.40
	(.21)	(.28)
Number of Children	.07	.02
	(.06)	(.08)
Highest Year Education Completed	-.13***	-.11***
	(.03)	(.04)
Geographic Mobility	.09	.10
	(.10)	(.14)
Non-Affiliation [c]	.37*	.12
	(.22)	(.31)
R^2	.08	0.05
N	2013	2013

Standard errors in parentheses. ***p< .01, **p< .05, *p< 0.10

[a] White and other are the reference categories

[b] Non-married is the reference category

[c] Religious Affiliates is the reference category

For cocaine use, the results support Hypothesis 20 that non-affiliation is associated with higher levels of drug use than non-denominationalism.

Finally, **Table 25** below presents the results of drug use regressed on apostasy and always none. Apostasy is positively associated with crack cocaine use, but not statistically significantly related to injecting drugs. Always nones are not significantly associated with drug use. In support of Hypothesis 21, apostates are associated with higher levels of cocaine use than the religiously affiliated.

Table 25. ZINB Regression of Drug Use on Apostates and Always None

	Crack Cocaine	Inject Drugs
Age	-.02***	-.01
	(.00)	(.00)
Female	-.70***	-.93***
	(.19)	(.27)
Black [a]	.62***	.36*
	(.19)	(.23)
Socioeconomic Class	-.22*	-.17
	(.15)	(.20)
Married [b]	-.49**	-.41
	(.21)	(.28)
Number of Children	.07	.02
	(.06)	(.08)
Highest Year Education Completed	-.13***	-.11***
	(.03)	(.04)
Geographic Mobility	.09	.10
	(.10)	(.14)
Apostates	.36*	.18
	(.25)	(.35)
Always None	.30	-30
	(.34)	(.60)
R^2	.08	0.05
N	2013	2013

Standard errors in parentheses. ***p< .01, **p< .05, *p< 0.10

[a] White and other are the reference categories

[b] Non-married is the reference category

CHAPTER SIX

DISCUSSION

This study adds to previous research by systematically differentiating religion switching from denomination switching and non-affiliation from non-denominationalism and demonstrating that these are empirically distinct phenomena. Among contemporary Americans, past denomination switching has a stronger association with religious beliefs and behavior than past religion switching. This is consistent with previous reports that the majority of denomination switching among Protestants occurs from mainline denominations to more "strict", conservative, and charismatic denominations (Roof & McKinney, 1987; Iannaccone, 1994; Sherkat, 2001; Hout, Greeley, Wilde, 2001; Chavez, 2011). These results support the moral communities thesis rooted in a Durkheimian perspective that individual religious outcomes reflect the strength of the surrounding moral community. The strict denominations provide a stronger moral community which significantly influences its constituents. If we focus on the short-term consequences of changes that have occurred within a period of only four years, however, longitudinal analyses disclose few statistically significant effects of denomination switching (i.e. attendance), while religion switching has a positive effect across all measures of religiosity. This in turn leads us to reconsider the results of numerous previous studies in which denomination switching was associated with higher levels of beliefs and participation (Roof and Hadaway, 1979; Iannaccone, 1994; Sherkat, 1995; Hoge, Johnson, and Luidens, 1995).

People who have switched religions in the past exhibit higher levels of religious beliefs and participation. In the short-term, religion switching has a positive effect on religious beliefs and participation. Consistent with Durkheim's theory of the social nature of religion, religion switching in the short-term has positive effects on religiosity as individuals are presumably more engaged in religion.

As in previous studies, non-affiliation is associated with lower levels of beliefs and participation (Hout and Fischer, 2002; Ammerman, 2006; Dougherty, Johnson, and Polson, 2007; Baker and Smith, 2009; Eagle, 2011; Scheitle and Smith, 2011) and become less religious over time. In comparison, non-denominationalism does not have a significant negative effect on religious beliefs and participation. Non-denominational Protestants exhibit very minimal difference from their denominational counterparts. This lends further support to the denominationalism decline perspective (Wuthnow, 1998). That is, denominational identities are no longer as salient as they once were. Since the 1960s, denominational differences in status, region, and ethnicity have decreased (Wuthnow, 1988). The influences of the decline in denominationalism include ecumenical cooperation, increased interfaith and interdenominational switching, and de-emphasis in distinctive denominational teachings and memberships (Wuthnow, 1988; 1993). Denominational boundaries are more permeable and less distinctive than historically before. Assuming that affiliation is representative of the degree of social integration to religion this empirical distinction supports Durkheim's theory of religion as a social phenomenon.

Prior research has established the growing number of religious non-affiliates who are raised and stay non-affiliated, as well as disaffiliate (Sherkat and Wilson, 1995; Hout and Fischer, 2002; Schwadel, 2010). In support of the heterogeneity found among the religious nones (Lim, MacGregor, Putnam, 2010), the results indicate that apostates and always none are empirically distinct in their levels of religiosity. Apostates and always nones are similarly negatively associated across all measures of religious beliefs and participation. In the short-term, however, apostasy show stronger negative effects on religiosity than being always none. As apostates disaffiliate from religion, they are void of the social integration to the socio-religious group which has significant negative effects on religiosity. Again, this supports Durkheim's theory of religion emphasizing the importance of the sociality of religious experience.

Taken as a whole, the findings suggest that the degree of social integration to religion, represented via types of switching and affiliation, significantly influence individual religiosity. The results in this study show the variation in these outcomes based on the complexity of religion and denomination switching and adherence.

The various religious groups and collectivities employed in this study can each serve as a form of reference group. Nearly all religions are concerned with moral issues and strive to promote moral behavior, and because deviant behavior equates to immoral behavior, the inverse relationship between religiosity and deviant behavior is expected. More so than religion in general, one's denomination and religious group are more proximate to the individual and are able to more clearly articulate their values and beliefs regarding moral issues. Because there is variability across these groups in their

normative standards on moral issues, what constitutes conformity also varies. Conformity to these various religious norms should be greatest when these religious groups are most utilized as a frame of reference. The notion of moral community represents a means through which religion can serve as a frame of reference. Moral communities serve as an additional source of religious reference by exposing individuals to an excess of conformity messages consistent with those present in the religious realm. Moral communities hypothesis has generally received support in other empirical research (Stark et al., 1982; Tittle and Welch, 1983; Bainbridge, 1989; Olson, 1990; Pettersson, 1991; Welch, Tittle, Petee, 1991; Richard et al, 2000). However, several studies find mixed or no support for the moral communities hypothesis (Chadwick and Top, 1993; Evans et. al, 1995; Benda, 1995).

In communities where the majority of constituents are involved in religion, the individual-level effect of religiosity on proscribed behavior should be greatest (Stark et al., 1982; Stark and Bainbridge, 1997). A direct association between the strength of the pro-religious climate at a larger contextual level and rates of crime has been supported in criminological research (Regnerus, 2006; Lee, 2006; Eitle, 2011). Religious communities promote conformity in a number of ways, including increasing social organization, promoting collective efficacy, and reducing nonconforming behavioral options. Based on theorizing and scholarship examining the association between religion and crime, the present study examined whether the strength of the religious context, represented by switching and affiliation, has an association with pro-social ties, or one's criminal propensity. Among young adults, pro-social ties that deter crime, such as

education, employment, marriage, and family, link criminal propensity to crime (Wright et al., 2001; Giordano et al., 2008) Sociological criminology explains crime with reference to social environment that social relationships can provide opportunity, motivation, and knowledge for criminal behavior. However, social relationships of education, employment, marriage, family, can influence the decreased likelihood of individual propensity towards crime (Wright et al., 1999; Wright et al., 2001). Research also indicates that conventional social ties act as turning points for desistance from crime and drug use (Giordano et al., 2008). Particularly, among young adults, marriage and employment function as protective social ties influencing desistance from crime and drug use.

An underdeveloped analysis of religion and crime includes the relationship of religion and pro-social ties (Wright et al., 2001; Giordano et al., 2008). Few studies do not find support for the relationship between pro-social ties and criminal disposition (Cochran and Akers, 1989) and emphasize the significance of low self-control, aggressiveness, and negative emotionality (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990; Caspi et al., 1994). Extant research on religiosity and pro-social ties is grounded in social control theory, more specifically social bonds and self-control (Hirschi, 1969; Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990). In an attempt to further focus on the social nature of religion, religious integration as a catalyst to stronger pro-social ties and thus lower individual criminal propensity is examined (Giordano et al., 2008). Theoretically, moral communities exhibit greater levels of religiosity surrounding the individual, which lower criminal propensity at the individual-level. Informed by the moral communities thesis, patterns of

switching and affiliation on pro-social ties, however, bear minimal to no support for our hypotheses.

Among the Protestant sub-sample, Protestants who have ever switched denominations have no significant association with pro-social ties. While denomination switching is positively associated with religiosity, denomination switching does not influence pro-social ties, or criminal propensity. In the short-term, no relationship exists between denomination switching and pro-social ties. That is, individuals switching denominations do not show any significant difference in ties to other conventional institutions, thus criminal propensity. The results do not support the moral communities thesis for denomination switching.

The analyses show no association of religion switching in the past with pro-social ties. Research on adult social bonds, such as employment, shows that employment can serve as a protective agent against criminal propensity (Sampson and Laub, 1990; Laub and Sampson, 2003). Religion switching in longitudinal analysis does not reveal a positive effect on employment or working full-time.

Next, non-denominationalism has no significant association with the pro-social tie of full-time employment. Non-denominationalism has a negative relationship with the marital status and number of children. Non-denominational Protestants are less likely to marry and have children. This finding supports the moral communities thesis in that non-denominational Protestants lack the surrounding denominational affiliates and socio-religious group, which leads to the lack of pro-social ties, or higher propensity for crime.

Non-affiliation is negatively associated with marital status and number of children (Niebuhr, 1929; Evans et al., 1996; Schwadel, 2008). That is, religious non-affiliates are less likely to be married and have children, which are significant pro-social ties. However, non-affiliation is not associated with more years of education completed. This counters the majority of research that suggests Americans in higher education are less likely to participate in organized religion or disaffiliate from religion for various reasons – secularizing effect of higher education, depart from family of origin, or the influence of peer culture (Stark, 1972; Caplovitz and Sherrow, 1977; Albrecht and Heaton, 1984; Roof and McKinney, 1987; Wuthnow, 1988; Schwadel, 2008). Although education and socio-economic class are strong correlates, this is not to be confused with some research that shows that Americans from lower socio-economic classes are more likely to pray and read religious scriptures, but possibly less likely to be involved in organized religion (Demerath, 1965; Stark 1972; Schwadel, 2008). However, when affiliated, Americans from lower social classes are more likely to emphasize the communal features of religion. In the short-term non-affiliation does not have any statistically significant effect on full-time employment. Thus, religious non-affiliation supports the moral communities thesis insofar that there is an association between non-affiliation and lack of pro-social ties. However, we cannot conclude causality among the relationship between non-affiliation and pro-social ties, further suggesting that there must be other more powerful explanations for criminal propensity.

For apostasy and always none, the analyses show that these have empirically distinct influences on pro-social ties. Apostasy is negatively associated with marital

status and number of children, but positively associated with more years of education completed. Always nones are less likely to be married and less likely to have more education. Comparative analyses indicate that apostasy is related to more years of education, but that those that have been always nones are less likely to have completed more years of education. These disparate findings suggest that education may be a strong indicator for apostasy. Being that always none are less likely to have completed more year of education, religion in a more Weberian sense seems to be positively correlated with educational achievement. However, at some point with more years of education completed, individuals are more likely to disaffiliate from religion. Traditionally, research indicates that higher levels of education is associated with lower levels of religious participation and a possible determinant of apostasy as college students are exposed to ideas that seriously question fundamental religious beliefs, depart from the family, and influenced by peer culture (Caplovitz and Sherrow, 1977; Albrecht and Heaton, 1984; Roof and McKinney, 1987; Wuthnow, 1988). The majority of the research on education and religiosity is comprised of the longstanding notion of the secularizing effects of higher education. Part of the limitation of cross-sectional analysis is the lack of clarity on causal ordering or directional influence. In fact, in the short-term, apostasy has no effect on pro-social ties. The results from apostasy and always none and its relationship to pro-social ties support the moral communities thesis insofar as there is some evidence for an association with lower likelihood to be married and having children. There is only minimal support that apostates and always none, who are void of

a religious moral community, lack pro-social ties that serve as protective agents against criminal propensity.

Overall, the analyses on pro-social ties suggest that religion matters minimally in instances of switching and non-affiliation. Denomination switching has a negative association with full-time employment. In the short term, denomination switching has no effect on employment. Non-denominationalism and non-affiliation are inversely related to marriage and number of children, but bears no relationship to full-time employment. Finally, apostasy and always none aren't associated with pro-social ties, thereby lacking the influence on likelihood of criminality. The present research illustrates the importance of the influence of the religious context in understanding the link between religion and pro-social ties. The individual controlled by external forces is predominant not only in general treatments religion (Durkheim, 1912) but also in studies focused on the connections between religion and crime. Overall, the impact of religious context and collectivities appear to have moderate influence on individual religious and pro-social disposition.

Finally, juxtaposed to pro-social ties as indicative of criminal propensity, an examination of switching and non-affiliation on drug use moderately support the moral communities thesis. First, denomination switching is not significantly associated with ever using crack cocaine or injecting drugs. While denomination switching is associated with higher levels of religious participation, it is not associated with pro-social ties or drug use. Second, religion switching exhibits a positive association with more crack cocaine use. Consistent with previous analyses show that religion switching in the past is

associated with lower levels of religious beliefs and participation. This finding is somewhat inconsistent with previous models showing that religion switching has no association with pro-social ties and religion switching in the short-term has positive effects on religiosity. Third, consistent with the majority of previous analyses, non-denominationalism is not significantly associated with drug use. Non-denominational Protestants are no more likely to use drugs than their denominational Protestant counterpart. Fourth, consistent with the moral communities thesis, non-affiliation is positively associated with ever using crack cocaine. Finally, comparing apostates and the always none, apostasy is associated with crack use, while always none do not exhibit any significant difference in terms of drug use compared to the religiously affiliated.

The limitations of the present research study should be addressed. First, the available GSS panel data examines two points in time that are relatively close. The utility of such analysis allows us to assess the short-term effects of switching and non-affiliation, but longitudinal models over a longer period and several points in time may be more instructive in unpacking the relationships between religious and denominational affiliation, religiosity, and pro-social ties. In addition to pointing to the need for greater specificity about the nature of the tie (to a religion or a denomination) that is being switched or reported absent, our results also demonstrate a need for greater specificity about the time periods over which these changes are alleged to exert their effects. Do events like religious conversion and denomination switching exert their full effects immediately, or should they be seen as lifestyle changes whose effects continue to unfold over time? Second, it is imperative that a wide range of variables for religiosity, pro-

social ties, and drug use are examined to tap into the full dimensionality of each phenomenon. This study utilizes measures of religious beliefs and participation and patterns of affiliation consistent with extant research (Hout and Fischer, 2002; Dougherty, Johnson, and Polson, 2007; Baker and Smith, 2009; Lim, MacGregor, and Putnam, 2010; Schwadel, 2010; Eagle, 2011; Scheitle and Smith, 2011; Stark and Glock, 1968; Roof and Hadaway, 1979; Sherkat, 1995; Hoge, Johnson, and Luidens, 1995; Hoge and O'Connor, 2004) Newport, 1979; Sherkat and Wilson, 1995; Loveland, 2003). This research agenda also uses measures of pro-social ties conceptually consistent with research on religion and crime (Wright et al., 2001; Giordano et al., 2008). Consistent with the anti-ascetic thesis, crack cocaine and injecting drugs are examined as drug use (Burkett and White, 1974; Burkett, 1977; Albrecht et. al, 1977; Cochran, 1988; Evans et. al, 1995; Benda, 1995; Benda, 1997; Pearce and Haynie; 2001, Regnerus, 2003). However, subsequent studies utilizing various measures of each dimension may support the statistical power in explaining the relationships between religion, pro-social ties, and drug use. Third, sufficient statistical controls are used in this study including age (Shahabi et al., 2002; Glover, 1996; Becker and Hofmeister, 2001; Moberg, 2001; Schlehofer et al., 2008), gender (Azzi and Ehrenberg, 1975; Iannaccone, 1990; Davis and Smith, 1991; Miller and Hoffman, 1995; Hayes, 2000; Baker and Smith, 2009), race (Du Bois, 1903; Ellison and Sherkat, 1990; Hunt and Hunt, 2001; Sherkat, 2002), class (Niebuhr, 1929; Evans et al., 1996; Schwadel, 2008), education (Caplovitz and Sherrow, 1977; Albrecht and Heaton, 1984; Roof and McKinney, 1987; Wuthnow, 1988), and geographic mobility (Stark and Bainbridge, 1985; Hout and Fischer, 2002). However,

further analyses examining theoretically appropriate measures to understand both the mechanism and process of switching and non-affiliation across various groups are needed.

An agenda for future research would examine other empirical relationships and outcomes epiphenomenal of switching and non-affiliation. Research might address religious experience, individual social-psychological outcomes such as self-identity or happiness, or the impact on personal relationships. In addition, in a pluralistic society, it is likely that religious groups do not serve as the only source of normative structure or is the most salient. Different theoretical perspectives may inform an assessment of various social groups and its influence on religiosity, crime, and drug use. Variation in individual level characteristics and self-selection criteria may also be informative in developing explanations for the dynamics of the current religious landscape and its related outcomes. However, this study adds to the extant research by providing conceptual clarity and empirical distinctions across the types of switching and non-affiliation and its influence on religiosity, pro-social ties, and drug use.

REFERENCES

Albrecht, Stan, and Tim Heaton. 1984. Secularization, Higher Education, and Religiosity, *Review of Religious Research*, 26, 1: 43-58.

Altemeyer, Bob, and Bruce Hunsberger. 1997. Amazing Conversions: Why Some Turn to Faith and Others Abandon Religion. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.

Ammerman, Nancy. 2006. Religious Identities in Contemporary American Life: Lessons from the NJPS. *Sociology of Religion*, 67, 4: 359-364.

Akers, R. L. 2010. Religion and Crime. *The Criminologist*, 35, 6:1-6.

Albrecht, S. L., & Chadwick, B. A., Alcorn, D. 1977. Religiosity and Deviance: Application of an Attitude-Behavior Contingent. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *16*, 3:263-273.

Baker, Joseph O'Brian and Buster Smith. 2009. None Too Simple: Examining Issues of Religious Nonbelief and Nonbelonging in the United States. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 48, 4: 719-733

Baker, Joseph O'Brian and Buster Smith. 2009. The Nones: Social Characteristics of the Religiously Unaffiliated. Social Forces, 87, 3: 1251-1264.

Bainbridge, William Sims. 1989. The Religious Ecology of Deviance. *ASR*, 54, 2: 288 -295.

Beeghley, L. E., Bock, W., Cochran, J. 1987. Moral Messages: The Relative Influence of Denomination on the Religiosity-Alcohol Relationship. *The Sociological Quarterly* 28:89-103.

Beeghley, L. E., Bock, W., Cochran, J. 1988. Religiosity and Alcohol Behavior: An Exploration of Reference Group Theory. *Sociological Forum,* 3:256-276.

Beeghley, L. E., Bock, W., Cochran, J. 1990. Religious Change and Alcohol Use: An Application of Reference Group and Socialization Theory. *Sociological Forum, 5*(1), 261-278.

Bellah, Robert, Sullivan, William, Tipton, Steven, Madsen, Richard, Swindler, Ann. 2007. Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life. University of California Press.

Benda, B. 1994. Testing Competing Theoretical Concepts: Adolescent Alcohol Consumption. *Deviant Behavior*, 15:235-57.

Benda, B. 1995. The Effect of Religion on Adolescent Delinquency revisited. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, pp. 446-467.

Benda, B. & Corwyn, R. F. 1997. Religion and Delinquency: The Relationship After Considering Family and Peer Influences. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 36, 1: 81-92.

Benda, B. 1997. An Examination of a Reciprocal Relationship Between Religiosity and Different Forms of Delinquency Within a Theoretical Model. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 34, 2: 163-187.

Benda, B. 2002. Religion and Violent Offenders in Boot Camp: A Structural Equation Model. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 39, 1: 91-121.

Berger, Peter L.. 1967. The Sacred Canopy: Elements of A Sociological Theory of Religion. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Berger, Peter L., 1979. The Heretical Imperative. New York Anchor Press/Doubleday

Berger, Peter. 2001. Reflections on the Sociology of Religion Today. *Sociology of Religion*, 62, 4: 443-454

Besecke, Kelly. 2005. Seeing Invisible Religion: Religion as a Societal Conversation about Transcendent Meaning. *Sociological Theory*, Vol. 23, No. 2, pp. 179-196.

Breault, Kevin D. 1989. New Evidence on Religious Pluralism, Urbanism, and Religious Participation. *American Sociological Review*, 54, pp. 1048-1053.

Brody, Gene, Zolinda Stoneman, and Douglas Flor. 1996. Parental Religiosity, Family Processes, and Youth Competence in Rural, Two-Parent African American Families. *Developmental Psychology*, 32, 4: 696-706.

Bryant, Alyssa N., Jeung Yun Choi and Maiko Yasuno. 2003. "Understanding the Religious and Spiritual Dimensions of Students' Lives in the First Year of College." *Joumal of College Student Development* 44:723-45.

Burkett, Steven R. and Mervin White. 1974. Hellfire and Delinquency: Another look. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 13:455-462.

Burkett, S. 1977. Religion, Parental Influence, and Adolescent Alcohol and Marijuana Use. *Journal of Drug Issues, 7,* 263-73.

Burkett, Steven R. and Bruce 0.Warren. 1987. Religiosity, Peer Associations, and Marijuana Use: A Panel Study of Underlying Causal Structures. *Criminology,*

25:109-131.

Caplovitz, David, and Fred Sherrow. 1977. *The Religious Drop-Outs: Apostasy among College Graduates.* Sage Publications.

Chaves, M & Gorski, P. 2001. Religious Pluralism and Religious Participation. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27, pp. 261-281

Chitwood, D., Weiss, M., and Leukefeld, C. 2008. A Systematic Review of Recent Literature on Religiosity and Substance Use. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 38, 3: 653-688.

Cochran, John K. 1988. The Effect of Religiosity on Secular and Ascetic Deviance. *Sociological Focus*, 21:293-306.

Cochran, John K. 1989. Another Look at Delinquency and Religiosity. *Sociological Spectrum*, 9:147-162.

Cochran, John K. and Ronald L. Akers. 1989. Beyond Hellfire: An Exploration of the Variable Effects of Religiosity on Adolescent Marijuana and Alcohol Use. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency,* 26:198-225.

Cochran, John K., Peter B. Wood, and Bruce J. Arneklev. 1994. Is the Religiosity Delinquency Relationship Spurious?: A Test of Arousal and Social Control Theories. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 31:92-123.

Cretacci, Michael. 2003. Religion and Social Control: An Application of a Modified Social Bond on Violence. *Criminal Justice Review*, 28, 2:254-277.

Dougherty, Kevin, Johnson, Bryon, and Edward Polson. 2007. Recovering the Lost. Remeasuring U.S. Religious Affiliation. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 46, 4: 483-499

Durkheim, Emile. 1886. "*Review of Herbert Spencer - Ecclesiastical Institutions: being Part IV of the Principles of Sociology*". Revue philosophique de la France et de l'etranger, XXII, pp. 61-9.

Durkheim, Emile. 1887. "*Review Guyau – L'Irreligion de l'avenir, etude de sociologie*". Revue philosophique de la France et de l'etranger, XXIII, pp. 299-311.

Durkheim, Emile. 1897. *Incest The Nature and Origin of the Taboo*. Lyle Stuart, Inc., New York.

Durkheim, Emile. 1893. *The Division of Labor in Society*. The Free Press

Durkheim, Emile. 1895. *Rules of the Sociological Method*. The Free Press

Durkheim, Emile. 1897. *Suicide*. The Free Press

Durkheim, Emile. 1899. "*Concerning the definition of religious phenomena*". L'Annee sociologique, II, pp.1-28.

Durkheim, Emile. 1902. "*On Totemism*". L'Annee sociologique, V, pp.82-121.

Durkheim, Emile. 1912. *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. The Free Press

Du Bois, W.E.B. 1903. The Souls of Black Folk. New York: Bantam Classic.

Eagle, David. 2011. Changing Patterns of Attendance at Religious Services in Canada, 1986-2008. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 50, 1: 187-200. 1986-2009.

Eitle, David. 2011. Religion and Gambling Among Young Adults in the United States: Moral Communities and the Deterrence Hypothesis. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion,* 50, 1: 61-81.

Ellis, Lee. 1985. Religiosity and Criminality: Evidence and Explanations of Complex Relationships. *Sociological Perspectives*, 28, 4: 501-520.

Ellis, Lee. 2002. Denominational Differences in Self-Reported Delinquency. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 35, 3: 179-192.

Ellison, C. & D. Sherkat. 1990. Patterns of Religious Mobility Among Black Americans, *The Sociological Quarterly*, 31, 4: 551-568.

Ellison, C. & L.K. George. 1994. Religious Involvement, Social Ties, and Social Support in a Southeastern Community. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 33, 1: 46-61.

Ellison, C., Bradshaw, M., Rote, S., Storch, J., and Trevino, M. 2008. Religion and Alcohol Use Among College Students: Exploring the Role of Domain-Specific Religious Salience. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 38, 3: 821-846.

Evans, T., Cullen, F., Dunaway, G., and Burton, V. 1995. Religion and Crime Reexamined: The Impact of Religion, Secular Controls, and Social Ecology on Adult Criminality. *Criminology*, 33, 2: 195-224.

Evans, David, Francis Cullen, Velmer Burton, R. Gregory Dunaway Gary Payne, and

Sesha Kethineni. 1996. Religion, Social Bonds, and Delinquency. *Deviant Behavior* 17, 1:43-70.

Evans, D. T., & Cullen, F. T., Burton, V, & Benson, M. 1997. The Social Consequences of Self-Control: Testing the General Theory of Crime. *Criminology, 35*, 3:475-504.

Finke R. and Stark R. 1988. Religious Economies and Sacred Canopies: Religious Mobilization in American Cities, 1906. *American Sociological Review*, 53: 41-49.

Finke and Stark. The Churching of America, 1776-1990: Winners and Losers in our Religious Economy. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Free, M. D. 1994. Religiosity, Religious Conservatism, Bonds to School, and Juvenile Delinquency Among Three Categories of Drug Users. *Deviant Behavior: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 15: 141-170.

Giordano, Peggy, Longmore, Monica, Schroeder, Ryan, and Seffrin, Patrick. 2008. A Life Course Perspective on Spirituality and Desistance from Crime. *Criminology*, 46, 1: 99-132.

Grasmick, Harold G.,Karyl Kinsey, and John K. Cochran. 1991. Denomination, Religiosity, and Compliance With the Law: A Study of Adults. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 30, 1:99-107.

Hadaway, Kirk. 1980. Denominational Switching and Religiosity. *Review of Religious Research*, 21, 451-461.

Hadaway, C. Kirk, Kirk W. Elifson, and David M. Petersen 1983. Religiosity and Delinquency: A Contextual Analysis. *Criminology*, 21: 505-527.

Hadaway, C. Kirk, Kirk W. Elifson, and David M. Petersen. 1984. Religious Involvement and Drug Use Among Urban Adolescents. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 23:109-128.

Hirchi, Travis. 1969. *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hirschi, Travis, & Stark, Rodney. 1969. Hellfire and Delinquency. *Social Problems*, 17, 2: 202-213

Higgins, Paul C. and Gary L. Albrecht. 1977. Hellfire and Delinquency revisited. *Social Forces*, 55:952-958.

Hoge, Dean, Johnson, Benton, & Luidens, Donald. 1995. Types of Denominational Switching Among Protestant Young Adults. *Journal for the Scientific Study of*

Religion, 34, 253-256

Hout, Michael & Fischer, Claude S. 2002. Why More Americans Have No Religious Preference: Politics and Generations. *American Sociological Review*, 67, 165 190.

Jang, Sung J., and Byron R. Johnson. 2001. Neighborhood Disorder, Individual Religiosity, and Adolescent Use of Illicit Drugs: A Test of Multilevel Hypotheses, *Criminology*, 39, 1:109-144.

Jang, Sung J. and B.R. Johnson. 2008. The Cumulative Advantage of Religiosity in Preventing Drug Use. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 38: 771-798.

Johnson, B. R., & Jang, S., De Li, S., Larson, D. 2000. The 'Invisible Institution' and Black Youth Crime: The Church as an Agency of Local Social Control. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 29, 4: 479-498.

Johnson, B. R., & Larson, D. B., De Li, S., Jang, S. 2000. Escaping From the Crime of the Inner Cities: Church Attendance and Religious Salience Among Disadvantaged Youth. *Justice Quarterly*, 17:377-391.

Johnson, B., De Li, S., Larson, D., and McCullough, M. 2000. A Systematic Review of the Religiosity, Justice, and Delinquency Literature: A Research Note, *Journal of Contemporary Criminal*, 16, 1: 32-52, Sage Publications, Incorporated.

Johnson, B. R., Jang, S., Larson, D., De Li, S. 2001. Does Adolescent Religious Commitment Matter? A Reexamination of the Effects of Religiosity on Delinquency. *Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquency*, 38, 1: 22-44.

Johnson, B. R. & S.J. Jang. 2010. Crime and Religion: Assessing the Role of the Faith Factor. Pp. 117-161 in *Criminological Theory and Research: The Role of Social Institutions*, edited by Rosenfeld, Quinet, and Garcia. Cengage Learning.

Kerley, K., Allison, M., & Graham, R. 2006. Investigating the Impact of Religiosity on Emotional and Behavioral Coping in Prison. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 29: 71-96.

Kirkpatrick, LA. 1999. Attachment and Religious Representations and Behavior in *Handbook of Attachment: Theory, Research, and Clinical Applications*. New York, NY, US: Guliford Press.

Krause, Neal, and Keith Wulff. 2004. Religious Doubt and Health: Exploring the Potential Dark Side of Religion. *Sociology of Religion*, 65, 1: 35-56.

Kvarceus, William C. 1944. Delinquent Behavior and Church Attendance. *Sociology and Social Research*, 28:418-434.

Lee, M. & Bartkowski, J. 2004. Love Thy Neighbor? Moral Communities, Civic Engagement, and Juvenile Homicide in Rural Areas. *Social Forces*, 82: 1001-1035.

Lim, Chaeyoon, Carol Ann MacGregor, and Robert Putnam. 2010. Secular and Liminal: Discovering Heterogeneity Among Religious Nones. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 49, 4: 596-618.

Lim, Chaeyoon an Robert Putnam. 2010. Religion, Social Networks, and Life Satisfaction. *American Sociological Review*, 75, 6: 914-933

Loveland, Matthew. 2003. Religious Switching: Preference Development, Maintenance, and Change. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 42, 1: 147-157

Maimon, D., Kuhl, D. 2008. Social Control and Youth Suicidality: Situating Durkheim's Ideas in a Multilevel Framework. *American Sociological Review*, 73, 6: 921-943.

Marsiglia, F., Kulis, S., Nieri, T., Parsai, M. 2005. God Forbid! Substance Use Among Religious and Nonreligious Youth. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 75, 4: 585-598.

Miller, Alan S and John P. Hoffmann. 1995. "Risk and Religion: An Explanation of Gender Differences in Religiosity." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 34:63-75.

Muller, C. & CG Ellison. 2001. Religious Involvement, Social Capital, and Adolescents' Academic Progress: Evidence from the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988. *Sociological Focus*, 34, 2: 155-183.

Newport, Frank. 1979. Religious Switcher in the United States. *American Sociological Review*, 44, 4: 528-552.

Niebuhr, Richard. 1929. The Social Sources of Denominationalism. Kessinger Publishing.

Olson, Daniel. 1990. Religious Pluralism and US Church Membership: A Reassessment. *Sociology of Religion*, 60, 149-173.

Olson, J. K. 1990. Crime and Religion: A Denominational and Community Analysis. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 29, 3:395-403.

Pargament, K. 2008. The Sacred Character of Community Life. American Journal of Community Psychology, 41: 22-34

Pettersson, T. 1991. Religion and Criminality: Structural Relationships. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 30, 3: 279-291.

Pond, Allison, Smith, Gregory, & Clement, Scott. 2010. Religion Among the Millennials. Washington D.C. Pew Research Center, The Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life.

Regnerus, M. D. 2000. Moral Communities and Adolescent Delinquency: Subcultural Aspects of Social Disorganization. Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Sociology of Religion. Washington, D.C.

Regnerus, M. D. 2003. Moral Communities and Adolescent Delinquency: Religious Contexts and Community Social Control. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 44, 4: 523 -554.

Regnerus, M. D. 2003. Linked Lives, Faith and Behavior: Intergenerational Religious Influence on Adolescent Delinquency. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *42*, 2: 189-203.

Rohrbaugh, J. & R. Jessor. 1975. Religiosity in Youth: A Personal Control Against Deviant Behavior. *Journal of Personality*, 43, 1: 136-155.

Rostosky, S., B. Wilcox, M. Wright, & B. Randall. 2004. The Impact of Religiosity on Adolescent Sexual Behavior: A Review of the Evidence. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 19, 6: 677-697.

Roof, Wade Clark & C.K. Hadaway. 1979. Denominational Switching in the Seventies: Going Beyond Stark and Glock. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 18, 4:363-377

Rutter, M., Quinton, D., & Hill, J. 1990. "Adult Outcome of Institution-Reared Children: Males and Females Compared" in Straight and Devious Pathways from Childhood to Adulthood. Cambridge University Press.

Sampson, RJ, and JH Laub. 1990. Crime and Deviance Over the Life Course: The Salience of Adult Social Bonds. *American Sociological Review*, 55, 5: 609-627.

Sands, Roberta G, Marcus, Steven, and Rivka A. Danzig. 2006. The Direction of Denominational Switching in Judaism. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 45, 3: 437-447

Saroglou, V., Pichon, I., Trompette, L, Verschueren, M., & Dernelle, R. 2005. Prosocial Behavior and Religion: New Evidence Based on Projective Measures and Peer Ratings. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 44, 3: 323-348.

Scheitle, Christopher and Buster Smith. 2011. A Note on the Frequency and Sources of Close Interreligious Ties. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 50, 2: 410-421.

Schroeder, R & Frana, J. 2009. Spirituality and Religion, Emotional Coping, and Criminal Desistance: A Qualitative Study of Men Undergoing Change. *Sociological Spectrum*, 29, 6: 718-741.

Schwadel, Philip. 2008. Poor Teenagers' Religion, *Sociology of Religion*, 69, 2: 125 149.

Schwadel, Philip. 2010. Nonaffiliation and Religious Disaffiliation: A Research Note. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 49, 2: 311-319

Shahabi, L., L.H. Powell, and M.A. Musick. 2002. Correlates of Self-Perceptions of Spirituality in American Adults. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 24, 1: 59-68

Sherkat, Darren E. & Wilson, J. 1995. Preferences, Constraints, and Choices in Religious Markets: An Examination of Religious Switching and Apostasy. *Social Forces*, 73, 993-1026

Sherkat, Darren. 2002. African-American Religious Affiliation in the Late 20th Century: Cohort Variations and Patterns of Switching, 1973-1998. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 41, 3: 485-493.

Sinha, J., Cnaan, R., Gelles, R. 2007. Adolescent Risk Behaviors and Religion: Findings From a National Study. *Journal of Adolescence*, 30, 2: 231-249.

Smith, Christian. 2003. Theorizing Religious Effects Among American Adolescents. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 42, 1: 17-30

Smith, Christian & Melina Denton. 2005. Soul Searching: The Religious and Spiritual Lives of American Teenagers. Oxford University Press.

Smith, Jesse M. 2011. Becoming an Atheist in America: Constructing Identity and Meaning from the Rejection of Theism. *Sociology of Religion*, 82, 2: 215-237

Spencer, Herbert. 1885. Ecclesiastical Institutions. Principles of Sociology, Chapter 1.

Stack, S., Kanavy, M.J. 1983. The Effect of Religion on Forcible Rape: A Structural Analysis. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 22,* 1:67-74.

Stark, Rodney, and Bainbridge, William S. 1985. The Future of Religion. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Stark, Rodney, and Bainbridge, William S. 1987. A Theory of Religion. Peter Lang, New York.

Stark, Rodney, and Glock, Charles. 1968. American Piety: The Nature of Religious Commitment. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Stark, Rodney, Lori Kent, and Daniel P. Doyle. 1982. Religion and Delinquency: The Ecology of a ‘‘Lost’’ Relationship. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 19:4-24.

Stark, R. 1984. Religion and Conformity: Reaffirming a Sociology of Religion. Sociological Analysis, 45, 4: 273-282

Stark, Rodney. 1987. Religion and Deviance: A New Look. In James A. Day and William S. Laufer (eds.), Crime, Values, and Religion. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Stark, Rodney, Daniel P. Doyle, and Lori Kent. 1980. Rediscovering Moral Communities: Church Membership and Crime. In Travis Hirschi and Michael Gottfredson (eds.), Understanding Crime: Current Theory and Research. B.H, CA: Sage.

Stark, Rodney, Lori Kent, and Daniel P. Doyle. 1982. Religion and Delinquency: The Ecology of a ‘‘Lost’’ Relationship. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 19:4-24.

Stark, R. 1996. Religion as Context: Hellfire and Delinquency One More Time. *Sociology of Religion, 57,* 2:163-73.

Suh, D. and R. Russell. 2014. Forthcoming (working paper). A Note on Religion and Denomination Switching, Non-Affiliation, and Non-Denominationalism

Tittle, Charles R. and Michael R. Welch. 1983. Religiosity and Deviance: Toward a Contingency Theory of Constraining Effects. *Social Forces,* 61:653-682.

Uecker, J.E., M.D. Regnerus, and M.L. Vaaler. 2007. Losing My Religion: The Social Sources of Religious Decline in Early Adulthood, *Social Forces,* 85, 4: 1667-1692.

Vanidyanathan, Brandon. 2011. Religious Resources or Differential Returns? Early Religious Socialization and Declining Attendance in Emerging Adulthood. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 50, 2: 366-387.

Vargas, Nicholas. 2012. Retrospective Accounts of Religious Disaffiliation in the United States: Stressors, Skepticism, and Political Factors. *Sociology of Religion*, 73, 2: 200-223.

Welch, Michael R., Charles R. Tittle, and Thomas Petee. 1991. Religion and Deviance Among Adult Catholics: A Test of the "Moral Communities" Hypothesis. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 3: 159-172.

Welch, Michael R., Charles R. Tittle, and Harold Grasmick. 2006. Christian Religiosity, Self-Control, and Social Conformity. Social Forces, 84, 3: 1605-1623.

Wright, B., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T., & Silva, P. 2001. The Effects of Social Ties on Crime Vary By Criminal Propensity: A Life-Course Model of Interdependence. *Criminology*, 39, 2: 321-346.

Wuthnow, Robert. 1988. The Restructuring of American Religion: Society and Faith Since WWII. Princeton University Press.