Sociology of Religion 2014, 0:0 1-23
doi:10.1093/socrel/sru012

Workplace-Bridging Religious Capital: Connecting Congregations to Work Outcomes

Jerry Z. Park*
Department of Sociology, Baylor University

Jenna Griebel Rogers
Department of Sociology, Baylor University

Mitchell J. Neubert
Hankamer School of Business, Baylor University

Kevin D. Dougherty
Department of Sociology, Baylor University

Research in the sociology of work has long considered the importance of individual worker values but has not considered one of the central sources of those values: the congregation. In this study, we examine this understudied relationship and propose greater theoretical specification on religious capital. We argue that religious capital, like social capital, may have bridging characteristics. We introduce the concept of workplace-bridging religious capital (WBRC) and describe its cultivation within congregations. Using data from a survey of 1,000 fulltime workers, we test the relationship of WBRC (measured with a 15-item Congregational Faith at Work Scale, CFWS) to workplace commitment, job satisfaction, and entrepreneurial behavior. While CFWS alone is not significantly related to workplace commitment or job satisfaction, the interaction of CFWS and church attendance is significant for all three workplace outcomes. Thus, the influence of congregational beliefs on work attitudes and practices is contingent upon an individual's level of involvement in the congregation. This study builds on the growing body of literature that identifies religious influences in nonreligious domains of everyday life.

Key words: religion; cultural capital; work; religious capital; congregations; church attendance.

**Direct correspondence to Jerry Z. Park, Department of Sociology, Baylor University, One Bear Place #97326, Waco, TX 76798, USA. E-mail: jerry_park@baylor.edu.*

Though paid labor is a core area of sociological research, little attention has considered the ways in which religion might affect particular work-related outcomes (Tracey 2012). This is surprising given Weber's classic treatise on the development of capitalism via a religiously inspired work ethic, and Marx's understanding of religion as an opiate of the proletariat. This absence may be accounted for by a prevailing view through much of the twentieth century that secularization processes negated the influence and authority of religion in public life including the domain of paid labor (Davidson and Caddell 1994; Hadden 1987; King 2008). But just as the fields of paid labor have transformed over the century, the predicted obsolescence of religion gave way to recurrent evidence of religion's resilience in the modern and postmodern eras (Warner 1996; Wuthnow 1988).

Evidence of religion's persistence in the modern world steadily increased from the mid-1990s onward, and research has emphasized the resilience of traditional religion in modernizing contexts as well as the transformation of religion in view of changing contexts. Put together, religion is an adaptive institution that functions as a significant cultural resource for individuals and groups as evident in political mobilization, civic participation, and immigrant incorporation (Ebaugh 2002, 2003; Putnam 2000; Putnam and Campbell 2010; Regnerus and Smith 1998; Verba et al. 1995).

In our review of the sociological and business research literatures, interest in the relationship between work and religion on work has grown dramatically within the past few years. Nevertheless, still relatively few studies apply concepts in the sociology of religion (e.g., religious organizations, institutions and cultures, individual belief, behavior, and affiliation) to the world of work. We affirm the conclusions made by Tracey (2012) and Steffy (2013) that this absence is due in part to a lack of theorizing the potential relationships between these substantive areas. To that end, we propose in the following that religious capital provides a useful frame in which to examine the effect of religious belief and practice on workplace outcomes.

WORK AND RELIGION IN THE SOCIOLOGY OF RELIGION AND BUSINESS RESEARCH

Paid labor is a central domain to the majority of American adults. Consequently, attitudes toward work represent a foundational area of research (Kalleberg 1977; Seashore 1974). Much of the research historically focused on explaining job satisfaction and workplace commitment; it emphasized intrinsic and extrinsic rewards such as workplace conditions and the psychological aims of the worker in his or her career development (Kalleberg 1977). In the sociological literature on nonworkplace-related factors that affect employee outcomes, little research has considered the independent impact of religion.

Although religious belief and practice are a significant matter for millions of workers, through much of the twentieth century, sociology as a discipline anticipated a significant demise in religion's institutional influence. Scholarship throughout the 1980s and onward cast doubt on the decline of religion in modern capitalist societies (Casanova 1994; Warner 1993), but the specific relationship of religion to the workplace received scant consideration. A handful of sociological studies explored the potential relationships between the institution of religion and individual worker outcomes, none of which appear prior to 1994. Wuthnow (1994, 1996) and Davidson and Caddell (1994) suggested that religion has little bearing on workplace outcomes save for its therapeutic function allowing workers to derive meaning in their work and psychological release from its stresses (see also Neal 2000). Over a decade later, Lindsay (2007) further demonstrated that the beliefs of some elite evangelical entrepreneurs influence the way they structure the values of the workplace they create. Further, Steffy (2013) recently found that personal religious orthodoxy was associated with greater altruistic decision-making at work, lower workplace deviation, and greater intrinsic and extrinsic workplace orientation. All told, individual religious beliefs seem to hold some influence on worker and entrepreneur attitudes regarding the workplace.

In two sociological studies, institutional religion had effects for individual worker outcomes. Sherkat (2012) showed that conservative Protestant culture's lower emphasis on educational attainment and women's paid-labor force participation resulted in persistent lower prestige occupations and downward mobility across generations. This comports with Becker and Hofmeister's (2001) finding of gendered employment effects on religion. Working fulltime was a significant determinant for men's additional church participation, but less so for women due to the male breadwinner ideology reinforced in many U.S. churches. Taken together, religion's institutional effects on workplace outcomes are often indirect and drawn to some degree from the cultural messages found in religious communities.

These brief findings are dwarfed by the work of business researchers on the topic of religious effects on workplace organizations.[1] Notably, Tracey's (2012) recent review of 21 management journals covering over 50 years of research identified 86 papers, most of which appear after 2000. Using 11 different categories, Tracey summarized how religion (as an organization, a set of beliefs, subculture, etc.) bore on business culture, organizations, and individual outcomes. Most of these papers, like the sociological studies of religion and employment, addressed the substantive relevance of religion in the workplace, and less than a handful illustrated these arguments through empirical examination. A few of these

[1]One particular line of research in the business literature we describe generally as "workplace as spirituality" emerged during the turn of the century (Ashforth and Vaidyanath 2002; Krishnakumar and Neck 2002; Milliman et al. 2003). Given space limitations we will not explore these studies in great detail here.

studies have direct bearing on our research given their focus on religious effects on individual-level job-related outcomes. Chusmir and Koberg's (1988) review of the literature through the 1980s found ameliorative effects of religious belief and job satisfaction and involvement for individual workers. But Weaver and Agle's (2002:85) review of the literature on workplace ethical behavior suggested that findings on religious effects are more mixed; they recommended "when-dealing with religion's impact on behavior, fine-grained analyses are important." Indeed, this conclusion is drawn from their observation—shared by both Steffy (2013) and Tracey (2012)—that most studies of religion and work lack sufficient specificity in theorizing *and* measuring religion's influence on work. In response, Weaver and Agle employed a symbolic interactionist framework involving religious identity salience and expectations to demonstrate the "religious factor" in explaining individual business ethical behavior. Following this point, Walker et al. (2012) found that intrinsic religious motivation orientation (RMO) and a loving view of God were negatively associated with endorsing ethically questionable situations presented in experimental vignettes, whereas extrinsic RMO and job sanctification were linked to endorsing those same vignettes. Recently, Walker (2013) employed the "Faith at Work" scale developed by Lynn et al. (2009) (which we describe later) to demonstrate that employed adults who integrated their religious beliefs toward their work were more likely to report intentions to leave one's job, lower job performance, but also greater affective commitment to one's job, and greater continuance commitment.

In sum, research on religious influences in the workplace suggests that the former has effects on the latter. Much of this research has appeared only since the turn of the twenty-first century and more prominently in business research journals. We join Weaver and Agle's (2002) call for greater specificity in identifying religious effects on workplace outcomes. We focus our attention to congregational cultural values emerging from religion that are relevant to the workplace.

WORKPLACE-BRIDGING RELIGIOUS CAPITAL

Sociologists of culture and religion have specified numerous ways in which religion can motivate action. For the purposes of our study, we turned to Bourdieu's cultural capital model which theorizes the linkages between cultural goods and ideas with economic outcomes (Bourdieu 1983, 1984). We look specifically to one form of cultural capital: religious capital, referring to the "mastery" of the beliefs and practices of a religious culture (Stark and Finke 2000). Within a religious context, greater familiarity with the beliefs and practices of the tradition and the community of like-minded believers implies greater investment in that religious culture. In this way, religious cultural capital connotes increased social bonds among co-religionists.

But religious cultural capital is not necessarily limited to ingroup bonding. Mastery of beliefs and practices can be significant to the individual outside of the

religious community in which those beliefs and practices were first cultivated in at least two ways. Some religious capital can simply be utilized in nonreligious contexts. Rote prayers learned in a church, for example, can be recited in public environments or nonreligious private spaces such as a restaurant or other commercial business. Second, religious capital can contain thisworldly propositions or beliefs applied to nonreligious contexts. Religious belief regarding one's labor at home or in the workplace can both be forms of religious capital.

The latter example is particularly relevant for our study. It reframes Weber's example of work as a religious calling. Weber noted in his overview of Calvinist Puritans in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that religious beliefs regarding work imbue secular labor with sacred meaning. A believer feels "called" to a line of work which may in turn affect her performance of the tasks involved in that occupation. For religious capital to be effective in nonreligious contexts, it must be specified to that field of production. The Faith at Work Scale is a recent empirical examination of religious capital bridging onto a nonreligious domain. Lynn et al. (2009) developed a 15-item Faith at Work Scale (FWS) that measures individually based faith–work integration beliefs. These include concepts such as feeling the presence of God at work, viewing one's work as a mission from God, and using one's faith to guide work decisions and practices. The FWS is an attempt to quantify the religious significance individuals place upon their paid labor. As such, it represents a useful metric for capturing what we term "bridging religious capital" in the field of paid labor.

We suggest that religious capital may have complex capacities that not only enhance institutional commitment to religion but also to other domains as well. Religious capital, we argue, can bridge into nonreligious domains and perhaps influence nonreligious outcomes when it is specified to a particular field. From this, we theorize that to the extent that certain forms of religious capital are associated with political and civic outcomes, so too might some forms of religious capital be associated with workplace outcomes.

PRODUCING WORKPLACE-BRIDGING RELIGIOUS CAPITAL

Religious capital like other forms of cultural capital is often produced via social organizations, namely the religious congregation. Approximately 60 percent of American adults are affiliated with a religious congregation (Chaves 2004; Dougherty et al. 2007), and Putnam (2000) described congregations as the "largest repository of social capital." As such, they represent a prominent site for the organized production and mass transmission of religious capital. Congregations serve multiple functions and convey a wide range of religiously imbued ideologies that have effects on gender relations, family dynamics, political, and civic participation to name a few. As suggested earlier, sociological investigations on the import of congregational effects on the domain of paid labor are limited until very recently (Steffy 2013).

Business researchers have paid significantly more attention to the relationship between religious institutional effects and the workplace. In a follow-up study of 372 currently working alumni from five higher education institutions, Lynn et al. found that church attendance, denominational strictness, and individual faith maturity were predictive of faith–work integration beliefs (2010). Drawing this finding together with our concept of bridging religious capital, we argue that embeddedness in a religious community makes bridging religious capital salient. If bridging religious capital is present, it is functionally inert unless it is cultivated and activated from an institutional source to the individuals in the pews. This point helps explain Walker's (2013) recent analysis of workplace outcomes using the FWS. Walker's study revealed few intuitive relationships among adherence to beliefs that stress the sacred significance of work, job satisfaction, and workplace commitment. We suggest that part of the reason for these findings is the failure to account for the source of religious capital production, the congregation.

HYPOTHESES

We propose that workers' participation in religious congregations is related to workplace outcomes. Unlike previous research, we account not only for religious capital directed at the workplace but also for congregations as a source of that capital. For bridging to occur, religious capital must be specifically identified to a particular nonreligious social domain such as the workplace. We argue that bridging religious capital finds its main source in congregations. Individuals in congregations that cultivate an integration of faith and work will more likely infuse their religious convictions into their workplace. We develop hypotheses to connect bridging religious capital to three prominent workplace outcomes: affective organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and entrepreneurial behavior.

Affective Organizational Commitment

The commitment of a worker to his or her place of employment is beneficial for the employee and the employer. Affective organizational commitment is a bond or attachment to an organization that is grounded in desire in contrast to other forms of commitment based on obligation or assessments of cost (Allen and Meyer 1990; Meyer and Allen 1991, 1997). As might be expected, a bond of commitment rooted in desire is stronger than bonds of obligation or concerns about costs (Meyer 2009). Affective commitment has a positive association with individual performance, attendance, and organizational citizenship behavior; it has negative associations with turnover and turnover intentions (Cooper-Hakim and Viswesvaran 2005; Meyer 2009). Further, affective commitment can buffer the effects of stress and strain in the work environment (Meyer 2009). Affective organizational commitment stems from beliefs that the organization serves valued or important purposes or the sense that the organization meets needs or

provides a context for demonstrating values that are central to a person's self-concept (Meyer et al. 2004).

Religious belief specifically can enhance an individual's affective commitment to their place of employment by providing a religious endorsement for the value of work. For example, the school custodian who hears from the pulpit of his church that no task is insignificant to God and that God desires faithfulness even in secular employment likely will view his employer more favorably than the fellow custodian who feels demeaned by the position. A religious endorsement for work yields legitimacy to the workplace. Thus, we arrive at our first hypothesis.

H1a: Congregational emphasis on faith–work integration will be positively associated with affective organizational commitment.

The effect of religious capital on domains outside of congregations is likely to be enhanced to the extent it is inculcated in a member. As such, for this hypothesis and each following hypothesis, we argue that being affiliated with a congregation that cultivates bridging religious capital may be insufficient for effectively identifying the actual mechanism linking religious beliefs with nonreligious domains and outcomes. Much like a religious liturgy cannot be mastered by merely visiting a church intermittently, workplace-bridging religious capital (WBRC) is developed through deeper integration into the life of the congregation that emphasizes WBRC. In effect, one's stock of religious capital grows in accordance with an individual's participation in the congregation. Thus, we expect that the effects of WBRC should be stronger for those who attend such congregations regularly.

H1b: Frequency of church attendance will moderate the relationship between congregational emphasis on faith–work integration and affective organizational commitment.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is an attitude that an individual holds toward his or her specific job. It is a valued sentiment by individuals as well as by organizations (Crede et al. 2007). Meta-analytic evidence of a positive association between job satisfaction and job performance supports the adage that a happy worker is a productive worker (Judge et al. 2001). High levels of job satisfaction positively relate to discretionary pro-social behaviors and negatively relate to counterproductive behavior and job withdrawal (Crede et al. 2007). As suggested in regard to work environments, religion is a source of legitimacy for secular employment.

According to Weber, ascetic Protestants such as the Calvinists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries understood their secular employment as service to God. Hence, religion added salience to the value of one's productive labor. Those that see their work as important to God might reasonably be expected to express more pleasure in their work. A job, whatever the job, perceived as a divine calling has even greater potential for meaning (Elangovan

et al. 2010). In a definition that draws upon religious foundations, a calling is a "transcendent summons, experienced as originating beyond the self, to approach a particular life role (in this case work) in a manner oriented toward demonstrating or deriving a sense of purpose or meaningfulness and that holds other-centered values and goals as primary sources of motivation" (Dik and Duffy 2009:427). A sense of being able to live out one's calling in a job provides a sense of meaning that increases job satisfaction (Duffy et al. 2012). Thus, to the extent that the congregation affirms the value of work and promotes jobs as legitimate contexts for living out a calling, these inculcation and socialization processes should influence job attitudes. This leads to our second hypothesis.

H2a: Congregational emphasis on faith–work integration will be positively associated with job satisfaction.

In a study of attitudes toward work among 1,869 Catholics and Protestants, Davidson and Caddell (1994:145) found "simply being a church member and being exposed to religious influences is [*sic*] not enough". It was more religiously involved individuals who defined work as a calling rather than a career. We return to our contention that the cultivation of bridging religious capital requires involvement. Consistent with our moderation proposition regarding attendance and affective commitment, we hypothesize that WBRC and attendance will positively interact to raise levels of job satisfaction:

H2b: Frequency of church attendance will moderate the relationship between congregational emphasis on faith–work integration and job satisfaction.

Entrepreneurial Behavior

Entrepreneurial behavior is another workplace outcome with relevance to bridging religious capital. Business research literature describes entrepreneurship generally as the "examination of how, by whom, and with what effects opportunities to create future goods and services are discovered, evaluated, and exploited" (Shane and Venkataraman 2000; Venkataraman 1997). By extension, entrepreneurial behavior as we use it in this study refers to an individual's capacity to discover, evaluate, and exploit opportunities that create future goods and services. An entrepreneurial orientation can be expressed through the behaviors of individuals in existing organizations and is essential to the success and viability of the organization (Monsen and Boss 2009; Pearce et al. 1997; Wales et al. 2011). We use this individually situated definition because we are interested in this capacity as it relates to workers regardless of whether they are currently forming new organizations.

Theorizing about the relationship between religion and entrepreneurship returns us to Weber. The rationalized, inner-worldly asceticism of Calvinists led them to prize entrepreneurial activity; after all, earthly success in a person's vocational call was understood as confirmation of salvation (Weber [1904–1905]). Calvinists also introduced the idea of individual agency in the sense that one's vocational context

is corrupted and, thus, can be actively improved through individual action (Elangovan et al. 2010). Contemporary scholars continue to draw connections between religious values and entrepreneurship (Dana 2009; Drakopoulou Dodd and Gotsis 2007). Drakopoulou Dodd and Gotsis (2007) acknowledged the potential for religious communities to serve as entrepreneurial networks. Consequently, we propose that congregations that emphasize the integration of faith and work may also elicit entrepreneurial behavior for congregants in the workplace:

H3a: Congregational emphasis on faith–work integration will be positively associated with entrepreneurial behavior.

Once again, we believe that the extent of exposure to WBRC is influential to entrepreneurial behavior. Consistent with our previous moderation hypotheses, we test for an interaction effect of bridging religious capital and attendance:

H3b: Frequency of church attendance will moderate the relationship between congregational emphasis on faith–work integration and entrepreneurial behavior.

In view of these theoretically nuanced relationships we conducted a nationally representative survey of working adults to test these and other potential behavioral and cognitive interconnections between religion and work. This survey is part of the National Study of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Religion, which seeks to shed new light on the relevance of religion to innovative economic activity.

METHODS

The National Survey of Work, Entrepreneurship and Religion is a web-based survey of 1,022 fulltime workers, ages 18 and older, in the United States. Data collection was completed by Knowledge Networks using a probability-based web panel over two points in time from October to November 2010. Prerecruited probability web panels are composed of respondents who have been selected with some kind of probability method. Knowledge Networks utilizes a random sample of U.S. addresses to recruit respondents for its web panel. Respondents without internet access are provided access through a netbook and instructions on completing a survey. From the larger web panel, Knowledge Networks uses a probability proportional to size-weighted sampling approach to draw study-specific samples that are representative of the U.S. population.[2] For the purposes of our study, the sample was limited to current fulltime workers in the paid labor force. Currently, there is no set terminology or standard for determining the response rates for online panel surveys since the techniques used to recruit, profile, and

[2]For further explanation of the Knowledge Networks sampling strategy and response rate, see their online summary: http://www.knowledgenetworks.com/knpanel/docs/knowledgePanel(R)-design-summary-description.pdf.

survey the active members varies considerably from telephone and paper surveys.[3] Sixty percent of individuals selected for our sample completed both waves of the survey. Information about respondents' religious beliefs, behavior, and features of their place of worship (if they had one) was collected at Time 1. Approximately two weeks later, respondents were contacted again to gather information about work attitudes and practices. By separating in time data collection for independent and dependent variables, we minimize the problem of common method bias which is rampant in cross-sectional survey data (Podsakoff et al. 2003).

Dependent Variables

From the Time 2 survey, we employ three workplace outcomes: affective commitment, job satisfaction, and entrepreneurial behavior. *Affective commitment* is a recognized measure of workplace belonging developed by Meyer and Allen (1991). Six items comprise the scale: "I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization," "I really feel as though this organizations problems are my own," "I do not feel like 'part of the family' at my organization" (reverse coded), "I do not feel emotionally attached to this organization" (reverse coded), "this organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me," and "I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization" (reverse coded). All items were coded with higher scores reflecting increased affective commitment, so that 1, "strongly disagree," to 5, "strongly agree." The α-value for this scale was 0.89.

Job satisfaction was measured with two items from a scale developed by Cammann et al. (1979). The job satisfaction scale items were "In general I am satisfied with my job" and "All in all I dislike my job." Again coding reflected increasing job satisfaction, from 1, "strongly disagree," to 5, "strongly agree." The job satisfaction scale had an α-value of 0.82.

The *entrepreneurial behavior scale* was created from Pearce et al. (1997). The scale is made up of 11 items: "I efficiently get proposed actions through 'bureaucratic red tape' and into practice"; "I display an enthusiasm for acquiring skills"; I quickly change my course of action when results aren't being achieved"; "I encourage others to take the initiative for their own ideas"; "I inspire others to think about their work in new and stimulating ways"; "I devote time to helping others find ways to improve our products and services"; "I 'go to bat' for the good ideas of others"; "I boldly move ahead with a promising new approach when

[3]Callegaro and DiSogra (2008) state that the final response rate for web-based panels is a mathematical product of multiple response rates (recruitment, profiling, and completion) reflecting the different stages of building the panel for the study; thus, the range of the cumulative response rate is more limited, and a comparison to cumulative response rates for other survey techniques is not appropriate. For further discussion on the reliability and validity of web-based surveys, see Farrell and Petersen (2010). The popularity of web-based surveys is increasing in social science research as evidenced by its highly visible journals in medicine (e.g., Niederdeppe et al. 2011), political science (e.g., Perez 2010), and sociology (Polletta and Lee 2006).

others might be more cautious"; "I vividly describe how things could be in the future and what is needed to get us there"; I get people to rally together to meet a challenge"; and "I create an environment where people get excited about making improvements." All were coded to reflect higher levels of entrepreneurial behavior on the same five-point Likert scale noted previously. The entrepreneurial behavior scale had an *a*-value of 0.89.

Independent Variables

Our main independent variable is derived from Lynn et al.'s (2009) Faith at Work Scale. The original scale is derived from 15 Likert items, each ranging from 1, "strongly disagree," to 5, "strongly agree." Lynn et al. developed the questions to identify individual beliefs. Given our interest in congregations as a source of religious capital, we modified the question prompt to ask individuals about the transmission of work-related beliefs *from their place of worship*. We follow a common practice in business literature by asking individuals to report on aspects of an organization to which they belong.[4] Six items were asked per screen and rotated per respondent. A skip pattern in the survey meant that individuals who never attended religious services did not answer these questions. For our analysis, we coded respondents who never attended religious services as 0 on our Congregational Faith at Work Scale (CFWS). This decision allows us to retain nonattending respondents in our study and adds valuable variation to CFWS. After all, exposure to bridging religious capital spans a continuum. Some individuals in congregations promoting faith–work integration have high exposure. Other congregations provide less exposure to faith–work integration. Individuals not in congregations have little to no exposure to *congregational* faith–work integration. We believe our coding captures meaningful variation.[5] The Cronbach's *a* for CFWS was 0.97. Table 1 displays the items that comprise the CFWS measure.

We tested our argument further by interacting CFWS with church attendance. Respondents reported their frequency of attendance at a church, synagogue, temple, or mosque on a scale where 1, "never"; 2, "Less than once a year"; 3, "once or twice a year"; 4, "several times a year"; 5, "once a month"; 6, "2–3 times a month"; 7, "about weekly"; 8, weekly; and 9, "several times a week." The interaction variable tests hypotheses 1b, 2b, and 3b, which propose that the effect of WBRC on work outcomes is a function of greater involvement with the religious organization that primarily cultivates it. CFWS and church attendance were centered at their means in order to adjust for collinearity and allow for easier interpretation of the coefficients.

[4]Examples of organizational characteristics gathered from individuals include entrepreneurial orientation (Pearce et al. 2010) and ethical climate (Neubert et al. 2009).

[5]To ensure that our coding of CFWS did not bias results, we ran regression models for the full sample (as shown) and for a restricted sample of respondents who attended religious services more than "Never." Results pertaining to our hypotheses did not change.

TABLE 1 Congregational Faith at Work Scale

Does your place of worship emphasize the following concerning your full-time employment? (1, strongly disagree, 5, strongly agree)
a. Sensing God's presence while I work
b. Viewing my work as a partnership with God
c. Thinking of my work as having eternal significance
d. Seeing connections between my worship and my work
e. Drawing on my faith to help me deal with difficult work relationships
f. Viewing my work as a mission from God
g. Sensing that God empowers me to do good things at work
h. Pursuing excellence in my work because of my faith
i. Believing God wants me to develop my abilities and talents at work
j. Viewing my coworkers as being made in the image of God
k. Letting my coworkers know I am a person of faith
l. Demonstrating sacrificial love toward the people I work with
m. Practicing purity in my work habits
n. Viewing my work as part of God's plan to care for the needs of people
o. Viewing myself as a caretaker not an owner of my money, time, and resources

$\alpha = 0.972$.

Controls

We control for hours worked per week, organizational firm size, and white collar professional occupational status. "Weekly work hours" measured number of hours worked in the previous week, ranging from 0 to 120. Respondents were asked for the overall number of workers in the organization where they are primarily employed. Responses ranged from 1, "1–49," to 4, "more than 2,000." Respondents were also asked about their occupation status and provided with six categories including two white collar (professional/managerial/owner and sales/clerical), two blue collar (craftsman/foreman and semiskilled/unskilled), service workers, and a residual other category. We created a dichotomous variable where 1, "white collar professional," and all other occupations are coded as 0. We selected "white collar professional" as the focal group since this category of workers exhibit some of the highest workplace outcomes.

In addition to the focal variable of church attendance, we control for two other forms of religiosity: religious tradition and religious salience. We use the Steensland et al. (2000) scheme for classifying religious affiliations into one of the several religious traditions. We employed the modified coding strategy of Dougherty et al. (2007) that takes into consideration the name of a respondent's congregation along with more general information on religion and denomination. Our religious tradition classifications are Evangelical Protestant, Mainline Protestant, Black Protestant, Catholics, Other Religions, and No Religious Affiliation. Nonaffiliated serve as our contrast group. Following Weaver and Agle's study (2002), we account

for religious salience along with church attendance to identify the potential independent effects of internal motivation and group participation influences. Religious salience asked of the respondent's self-rated religiosity with responses ranging from 1, "not at all religious," to 4, "very religious." Controlling for religious salience allows us to distinguish personal religiosity from the potential influence of participating in a religious group. Religious salience serves as a proxy for personal religiosity, whereas church attendance represents a more public or social form of religious engagement. The focus of our research is the latter.

Analytic Plan

Our analytical presentation begins with descriptive statistics for the variables used in our study (table 2). To test our hypotheses, we estimate OLS regression models for each of our three dependent variables. The first model for each dependent variable displays the results accounting for workplace characteristics and our three religion variables. The second model for each dependent variable adds the interaction term of CFWS□ attendance. Due to the limited ranges of the dependent variables, we also ran models using Tobit regression. There were no significant changes in the results. The results below are reported from the OLS models.

RESULTS

In our sample of fulltime workers, we find moderate levels of affective commitment to one's place of employment, job satisfaction, and entrepreneurial behavior (3.34, 3.77, and 3.48, respectively, on scales ranging from 1 to 5). Table 2 presents these descriptive statistics and their correlations. Average hours worked in the last week was 43. Firm size on our four-point scale averaged 2.47 reflecting organizations between 50 and 1,999 workers. Sixty-three percent of respondents reported a white-collar occupation. The distribution of religious tradition affiliation resembles other contemporary surveys where about 5 percent affiliate with the Black Protestant tradition, 17 percent in Mainline Protestant denominations, 25 percent in Evangelical Protestant denominations, 24 percent Catholic, 11 percent in other religions, and 14 percent nonaffiliated. The mean for religious salience was 2.71 on a four-point scale (between "not very religious" and "somewhat religious") and the mean for attendance was 4.51 on a nine-point scale (between "once a month" and "2–3 times a month"). The mean for CFWS was 2.66 on a five-point scale. We include a correlation matrix of all of our independent and dependent variables along with means and standard deviations in table 2.

Table 3 presents results of OLS analyses that model the effects WBRC on our three workplace outcomes. The first models are for affective commitment. Model 1 accounts for work characteristics, religious tradition, religious salience, church attendance, and CFWS. CFWS shows no independent relationship to affective commitment in this model. Consequently, hypothesis 1a is unsupported. In fact, none of the religion variables (religious traditions, religious salience, attendance,

TABLE 2 Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Outcome variables																
1. Affective organizational commitment	3.34	0.87														
2. Job satisfaction	3.77	0.91	0.65***													
3. Entrepreneurial behavior	3.48	0.54	0.31***	0.29***												
Workplace controls																
4. Hours work/week	42.96	11.40	0.03	2 0.02	0.07*											
5. # workers in firm	2.47	1.21	2 0.22***	2 0.11**	2 0.06	0.04										
6. White collar professional[a]	0.63	0.48	0.11**	0.13***	0.15***	0.05	0.09**									
Religious controls																
7. Black Protestant [a]	0.05	0.21	2 0.01	2 0.01	0.01	2 0.05	2 0.05	2 0.03								
8. Mainline Protestant [a]	0.17	0.38	0.04	0.04	2 0.00	0.03	0.06	0.08**	2 0.10**							
9. Evangelical Protestant [a]	0.25	0.44	0.01	2 0.00	0.01	2 0.02	0.00	2 0.04**	2 0.13***	2 0.27***						
10. Catholic[a]	0.24	0.43	2 0.02	2 0.03	2 0.02	0.01	2 0.01	2 0.04	2 0.12***	2 0.26***	2 0.33***					
11. Other religion[a]	0.11	0.31	2 0.01	2 0.01	0.04	2 0.03	2 0.02	0.06	2 0.08*	2 0.16***	2 0.20***	2 0.19***				
12. Nonaffiliated[a]	0.14	0.34	2 0.00	0.01	0.02	2 0.01	0.01	0.07	2 0.09**	2 0.18***	2 0.23***	2 0.22***	2 0.14***			
13. Religious salience	2.71	0.97	0.04	0.03	0.01	2 0.05	2 0.01	2 0.06	0.19***	0.09**	0.23***	0.07*	0.02	2 0.54***		
Predictor variables																
14. Church attendance	4.51	2.79	0.08**	0.09**	0.02	2 0.01	2 0.06	0.01	0.20***	0.05	0.26***	0.05	2 0.01	2 0.46***	0.70***	
15. Congregational faith at work scale (CFWS)	2.66	1.55	0.06	0.06*	0.07*	2 0.03	2 0.04	2 0.01	0.16***	0.09**	0.29***	0.11***	2 0.09	2 0.57***	0.64***	0.74***

[a]0, no; 1, yes.
*p , .05; **p , .01; ***p , .001.

TABLE 3 Predictors of Affective Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, and Entrepreneurial Behavior, National Survey of Work, Entrepreneurship and Religion 2011

Work characteristics	Affective commitment[a]				Job satisfaction[a]				Entrepreneurial behavior[a]			
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6	
	b	se	*b*	se	*b*	se	*b*	se	*b*	se	*b*	se
Hrs. worked/week	0.002	0.002	0.003	0.002	2 0.002	0.003	2 0.002	0.003	0.004**	0.002	0.005**	0.002
# Workers in firm	2 0.180***	0.023	2 0.179***	0.023	2 0.088***	0.024	2 0.086***	0.024	2 0.034*	0.015	2 0.032*	0.014
White collar professional	0.228***	0.057	0.223***	0.057	0.253***	0.061	0.248***	0.060	0.170***	0.036	0.164***	0.036
Religious tradition												
Black Protestant[b]	2 0.198	0.161	2 0.171	0.162	2 0.024	0.171	0.010	0.171	0.056	0.101	0.092	0.101
Mainline Protestant[b]	0.026	0.108	0.093	0.114	0.060	0.114	0.145	0.120	2 0.009	0.068	0.084	0.070
Evangelical Protestant[b]	2 0.063	0.108	2 0.025	0.110	2 0.041	0.114	0.007	0.116	0.028	0.067	0.079	0.068
Catholic[b]	2 0.082	0.102	2 0.017	0.107	2 0.070	0.108	0.013	0.113	2 0.017	0.064	0.073	0.066
Other religions[b]	2 0.133	0.117	2 0.083	0.119	2 0.085	0.123	2 0.021	0.126	0.065	0.072	0.133	0.073
Religious salience	0.029	0.041	0.021	0.042	2 0.025	0.044	2 0.036	0.044	2 0.009	0.026	2 0.020	0.026
Church attendance[c]	0.024	0.016	0.013	0.017	0.039*	0.017	0.025	0.018	2 0.015	0.010	2 0.031**	0.012
Cong. faith at work[c]	2 0.006	0.029	0.025	0.033	2 0.006	0.031	0.033	0.035	0.046*	0.018	0.089***	0.021
Attendance[c] × CFWS[c]			0.016*	0.009			0.021*	0.099			0.023***	0.005
Intercept	3.510***	0.176	3.419***	0.182	4.02***	0.186	3.906***	0.193	3.299***	0.110	3.172***	0.113
Adjusted R^2	0.073		0.076		0.033		0.064		0.033		0.050	
N	954		954		955		955		960		960	

[a]Models were also run with the controls of age, gender, race, marital status, household income, and education level with no significant changes to our variables of interest. Tables available upon request.

[b]Contrast group is nonaffiliated.

[c]Variable centered at mean.

*p , .05; **p , .01; ***p , .001

or CFWS) are associated with affective commitment in Model 1. Model 2 adds the interaction of CFWS and church attendance. In this model, we see that religion does have bearing on affective commitment. The interaction term of CFWS attendance is statistically significant, supporting hypothesis 1b. Simply belonging to a congregation that promotes faith at work is not sufficient to elevate affective commitment. The association of bridging religious capital and affective commitment is contingent upon an individual's participation in the congregation. Workplace characteristics such as firm size, and white collar worker status are other correlates to affective commitment evidenced in models 1 and 2.

Models 3 and 4 repeat the analysis for job satisfaction. Again, CFWS is not significant by itself (model 3). Thus, hypothesis 2a is not supported. Attendance is positively associated with affective commitment however. Attending religious services, net of workplace characteristics and religious attendance and personal salience, is associated with greater job satisfaction. In model 4, we also see that attendance and CFWS have a joint effect on job satisfaction. Frequent attendance in a congregation promoting faith–work integration is related to more job satisfaction. This supports hypothesis 2b. As seen with affective commitment, firm size and white collar work status are significantly related to job satisfaction.

The final two models in table 3 are the OLS regression results for entrepreneurial behavior. In model 5, the coefficient for CFWS is significant and positive, as hypothesized in H3a. Individuals in congregations that promote faith–work integration are more likely to describe themselves as entrepreneurial. Interestingly, attendance seems to be an impediment to entrepreneurial behavior. The coefficient for church attendance is significant but negative in model 5. Given that entrepreneurial behavior reflects a tendency to seek improvements in the workplace, we might expect that it would be unrelated to church attendance. Alternatively, it may perhaps indicate that fulltime workers who seek such changes at work are less inclined to participate in another organization. This corresponds to the significant effect of work hours on this dependent measure, and is the only dependent measure in which it is significant. The time and energy invested in entrepreneurial endeavors may leave less discretionary time for church attendance. Despite this negative independent effect, model 6 displays the same positive, significant interaction term that we have seen for all three dependent variables. For the individuals that do regularly attend a congregation in which faith and work integration is emphasized, it appears that entrepreneurial behavior increases. This interactional religious effect holds even when controlling for other significant workplace characteristics, such as occupational status, hours worked, and firm size. We find support for hypothesis 3b.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Overall, results from this study support the contention that religious congregations can and often do inform workplace outcomes for millions of workers. Our

analyses focused on three fundamental workplace variables: affective organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and entrepreneurial behavior. As we have argued, workplace experiences are not only affected by internal facets of a firm, but also by influences that are external to the workplace. In particular, we identified that religious capital in the form of congregationally informed beliefs about the role of faith at work can promote work entrepreneurial behavior directly and affective commitment and job satisfaction when coupled with *active attendance* at these congregations. Mere religious participation does not sufficiently capture the influence of religion in the work domain of an individual's life (save for job satisfaction). Rather, by specifying WBRC, we find that those who actively participate in congregations that emphasize application of their religious worldview to their workplace exhibit greater affective commitment, greater job satisfaction, and entrepreneurial behavior.

We acknowledge some important limitations which call for further research. Our effect sizes for the direct association of CFWS and entrepreneurial behavior and the interactions between CFWS and church attendance in explaining affective commitment and job satisfaction are relatively small, given the relatively large sample. Further, this suggests that although we have found significant effects, there are other variables such as organizational leaders that are likely more efficacious in explaining workplace attitudes and behaviors. Yet, given that characteristics of the workplace and characteristics of an employee's congregation are presumably distinct, future research could explore the relative influence of these characteristics. In addition, high correlations between religiosity variables, namely attendance and salience with CFWS suggest that perhaps an underlying construct may better capture what these results suggest. Religious capital, for example, may have effects in nonreligious settings without direct linkages to that domain. Internalized messages of stewardship learned in a congregation may affect pro-environmental attitudes even if those messages do not specifically direct attention to the environment.[6] Perhaps other conceptualizations or measures of religious capital may better explain the relationship between participation in a religious setting and nonreligious outcomes. At present, we are not aware of a more effective measure that captures the relationship of congregational emphasis of faith integration at work. Our findings give credibility to workplace bridging religious capital as a construct, but we recognize that CFWS may not be an ideal measure of the construct. Careful scale development is warranted to generate a better measure. In addition, we note that while our analyses are based on responses from two different time points, it is plausible that the direction of the relationship between congregational participation and nonreligious outcomes works the other way around. Perhaps more committed and satisfied workers self-select into congregations that promote work–faith integration and are more motivated to participate more actively relative to others. In addition, those who

[6]We are grateful to the anonymous reviewer who noted this possibility to us.

are not involved in a congregation might similarly be motivated by nonwork-related external (nonreligious) factors. Future research should account for and perhaps oversample different kinds of nonreligious fulltime workers (e.g., atheists, agnostics) and examine nonreligious external factors that may also influence workplace attitudes.[7]

Our analysis also reveals some results that warrant further theoretical consideration. With the exception of a significant association between church attendance and job satisfaction, the regression findings indicate that church attendance and religious salience have no association with workplace outcomes. This may lead to the erroneous conclusion that religion plays almost no role in these fundamental workplace outcomes. Rather the significant influence of the interaction of church attendance with CFWS suggests that these broader and conventional measures of religion underspecify the influence of religion.[8] Stated differently, congregations vary in the degree to which they mention or articulate teachings regarding work; therefore, we should not be surprised that attendance by itself yields little or no relationship to certain workplace outcomes. Further, individual religious salience does not indicate the way in which that faith manifests in other fields such as the workplace. It appears that faith integration at work is most consistently developed in certain congregations and regular exposure to such messages or teachings appear to have some impact for religious workers. Given the findings of individual-level faith integration on workplace outcomes, future research should consider examining whether *personal* faith–work integration is more prevalent and more effective in promoting workplace commitment and job satisfaction than a *congregationally based* work–faith integration as we show here. In addition, accounting for intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity or assessing more specific measures of faith–work integration may help disentangle and more clearly specify the relationship between workplace outcomes and religion (see Weaver and Agle 2002).

We suggest several other avenues of research that will further enhance our understanding of religious effects on the workplace. Our analyses are based on survey data which cannot identify the interpretive dimension of religion. Qualitative research may reveal how workers understand the meaning of integrating their faith with their work, and the particular role that their local faith community serves to enhance that integration. In addition, future research should consider how religious majority and minority status might play a significant role in how congregational participation fosters different kinds of WBRC (Moore 2008, 2010; Yang and Ebaugh 2001). As the religious landscape continues to shift, acknowledging diverse

[7]We are grateful to our anonymous reviewer who provided these important insights.

[8]It is notable that religious salience was not significantly related to any of our dependent variables. Building on Weaver and Agle (2002), we ran additional models to test for interactions between religious salience and CFWS. Only for entrepreneurial behavior was this interaction significant. Given the focus of our study and the consistency of our results, we limit the presentation of our findings to the interaction of CFWS attendance.

means by which work is meaningful and integrated in the lives of religious adherents of various backgrounds will grow more pertinent. Future research should also consider multilevel indicators that are related to workplace commitment such as GDP, cross-national comparisons, or job market characteristics, which may also interact with the individual-level bridging effects of religious capital.

Participation in religious organizations matters a great deal for nonreligious outcomes such as life satisfaction to many Americans. Such participation is characterized by a combination of individual behavior in a religious organization and specified bridging religious capital that is relevant for nonreligious outcomes. Rather than treating work experience and religious experience as nonoverlapping features of workers' lives, our study suggests that participation in religious congregations and the messages that are promoted matters for many fulltime workers. Put differently, the significance of social institutions in individual lives involves not only understanding the type of institution in question but also the kind of cultural capital that is developed and converted into other forms of capital across institutions. Our study illustrates that religion has bridging as well as bonding characteristics identified in previous research. Specifically with respect to labor, fulltime workers who are actively involved in congregations that emphasize faith–work integration are more committed, more satisfied, and entrepreneurial in their employment. Our findings generated from a new national survey highlight the need for more careful measurement. Religious participation is an active part of life for millions of Americans and it is relevant in other domains. A cultural lens can illuminate new ways that religion can and often does foster nonreligious outcomes. Understanding these links is a task worthy of further research.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

An early version of this research was presented at the 2012 Society for the Scientific Study of Religion Annual Meeting.

FUNDING

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 0925907. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

REFERENCES

Allen, Natalie J., and John P. Meyer. 1990. "The Measurement and Antecedents of Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment to the Organization." *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 63:1–18.

Ashforth, Blake E., and Deepa Vaidyanath. 2002. "Work Organizations as Secular Religions." *Journal of Management Inquiry* 11:359–70.
Becker, Penny E., and Heather Hofmeister. 2001. "Work, Family, and Religious Involvement for Men and Women." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 40:707–22.
Bourdieu, Pierre. 1983. "Forms of Capital." In *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, edited by John G. Richardson, 241–58. New York: Greenwood Press.
———. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*, translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Callegaro, Mario, and Charles DiSogra. 2008. "Computing Response Metrics for Online Panels." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 72:1008–32.
Cammann, Cortlandt, Mark Fichman, G. Douglas Jenkins, and J. Klesh. 1979. *The Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire*. Unpublished manuscript. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
Casanova, Jose. 1994. *Public Religions in the Modern World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Chaves, Mark. 2004. *Congregations in America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Chusmir, Leonard H., and Christine S. Koberg. 1988. "Religion and Attitudes toward Work: A New Look at an Old Question." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 9, no. 3:251–62.
Cooper-Hakim, Amy, and Chockalingam Viswesvaran. 2005. "The Construct of Work Commitment: Testing an Integrative Framework." *Psychological Bulletin* 131:241–59.
Crede, Marcus, Oleksandr S. Chernyshenko, Stephen Stark, Reeshad S. Dalal, and Michael Bashshur. 2007. "Job Satisfaction as Mediator: An Assessment of Job Satisfaction's Position within the Nomological Network." *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 80:515–38.
Dana, Leo P. 2009. "Religion as an Explanatory Variable for Entrepreneurship." *Entrepreneurship and Innovation* 10:87–99.
Davidson, James D., and David P. Caddell. 1994. "Religion and the Meaning of Work." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 33, no. 2:135–47.
Dik, Bryan J., and Ryan D. Duffy. 2009. "Calling and Vocation at Work: Definitions and Prospects for Research and Practice." *The Counseling Psychologist* 37:424–50.
Dougherty, Kevin D., Byron R. Johnson, and Edward C. Polson. 2007. "Restoring the Lost: Re-Measuring US Religious Affiliation." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 46:483–99.
Drakopoulou Dodd, Sarah, and George Gotsis. 2007. "The Interrelationships between Entrepreneurship and Religion." *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation* 8:93–104.
Duffy, Ryan D., Elizabeth M. Bott, Blake A. Allan, Carrie L. Torrey, and Bryan J. Dik. 2012. "Perceiving a Calling, Living a Calling, and Job Satisfaction: Testing a Moderated, Multiple Mediator Model." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 59:50–59.
Ebaugh, Helen R. 2002. "Return of the Sacred: Reintegrating Religion in the Social Sciences." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 41:385–96.
Ebaugh, Helen R. 2003. "Religion and the New Immigrants." In *Handbook of the Sociology of Religion*, edited by Michele Dillon, 225–39. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Elangovan, A. R., Craig C. Pinder, and Murdith McLean. 2010. "Callings and Organizational Behavior." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 76:428–40.
Farrell, Dan, and James C. Petersen. 2010. "The Growth of Internet Research Methods and the Reluctant Sociologist." *Sociological Inquiry* 80:114–25.
Hadden, Jeffrey K. 1987. "Toward Desacralizing Secularization Theory." *Social Forces* 65:587–611.

Judge, Timothy A., Carl J. Thoresen, Joyce E. Bono, and Gregory K. Patton. 2001. "The Job Satisfaction–Job Performance Relationship: A Qualitative and Quantitative Review." *Psychological Bulletin* 127:376–407.

Kalleberg, Arne L. 1977. "Work Values and Job Rewards: A Theory of Job Satisfaction." *American Sociological Review* 42:124–43.

King, James E., Jr. 2008. "(Dis)Missing the Obvious: Will Mainstream Management Research Ever Take Religion Seriously?" *Journal of Management Inquiry* 17:214–28.

Krishnakumar, Sukumarakurup, and Christopher P. Neck. 2002. "The 'What,' 'Why' and 'How' of Spirituality in the Workplace." *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 17:153–64.

Lindsay, D. Michael. 2007. *Faith in the Halls of Power: How Evangelicals Joined the American Elite*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lynn, Monty L., Michael J. Naughton, and Steve Vander Veen. 2009. "Faith at Work Scale (FWS): Justification, Development, and Validation of a Measure of Judaeo-Christian Religion in the Workplace." *Journal of Business Ethics* 85:227–43.

Lynn, Monty L., Michael J. Naughton, and Steve Vander Veen. 2010. "Connecting Religion and Work: Patterns and Influences of Work–Faith Integration." *Human Relations* 64:675–701.

Meyer, John P. 2009. "Commitment in a Changing World of Work." In *Commitment in Organizations: Accumulated Wisdom and New Directions*, edited by Howard J. Klein, Thomas E. Becker, and John P. Meyer, 37–68. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence-Erlbaum Associated.

Meyer, John P., and Natalie J. Allen. 1991. "A Three-Component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment." *Human Resource Management Review* 1:61–89.

———. 1997. *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research, and Application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Meyer, John. P., Tom. E. Becker, and Christian Vandeberghe. 2004. "Employee Commitment and Motivation: A Conceptual Analysis and Integrative Model." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 89:991–1007.

Monsen, Erik Willard, and R. Wayne Boss 2009. "The Impact of Strategic Entrepreneurship Inside the Organization: Examining Job Stress and Employee Retention." *Journal of Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 33:71–104.

Moore, T. Winters. 2008. "Do Perceived Differences in Religion Matter at Work?" *Culture and Religion* 9:267–86.

———. 2010. "You Believe What? An Examination of Religious Differences in the Workplace." *The Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship* 15:43–63.

Neal, Judi. 2000. "Work as Service to the Divine: Giving our Gifts Selflessly and with Joy." *The American Behavioral Scientist* 43:1316–33.

Neubert, Mitchell. J., Dawn S. Carlson, K. Micki Kacmar, James A. Roberts, and Larry B. Chonko. 2009. "The Virtuous Influence of Ethical Leadership Behavior: Evidence from the Field." *Journal of Business Ethics* 90:157–70.

Niederdeppe, Jeff, Matthew C. Farrelly, James Nonnemaker, Kevin C. Davis, and Lauren Wagner. 2011. "Socioeconomic Variation in Recall and Perceived Effectiveness of Campaign Advertisements to Promote Smoking Cessation." *Social Science & Medicine* 72:773–80.

Pearce, John A., Tracy R. Kramer, and D. K. Robbins. 1997. "Effects of Managers' Entrepreneurial Behavior on Subordinates." *Journal of Business Venturing* 12:147–60.

Pearce, John. A., David A. Fritz, and Peter S. Davis. 2010. "Entrepreneurial Orientation and the Performance of Religious Congregations as Predicted by Rational Choice Theory." *Journal of Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 34:219–48.

Perez, Efren O. 2010. "Explicit Evidence on the Import of Implicit Attitudes: The IAT and Immigration Policy Judgments." *Political Behavior* 32:517–45.
Podsakoff, Philip M., Scott B. MacKenzie, Jeong-Yeon Lee, and Nathan P. Podsakoff. 2003. "Common Method Biases in Behavioral Research: A Critical Review of the Literature and Recommended Remedies." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 88:879–903.
Polletta, Francesca, and John Lee. 2006. "Is Telling Stories Good for Democracy? Rhetoric in Public Deliberation After 9/11." *American Sociological Review* 71:699–723.
Putnam, Robert D. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
Putnam, Robert D., and David E. Campbell. 2010. *American Grace: How Religion Divides and Unites Us*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
Regnerus, Mark D., and Christian Smith. 1998. "Selective Deprivatization among American Religious Traditions: The Reversal of the Great Reversal." *Social Forces* 76:1347–72.
Seashore, Stanley E. 1974. "Job Satisfaction as an Indicator of the Quality of Employment." *Social Indicators Research* 1:135–68.
Shane, Scott, and S. Venkataraman. 2000. "The Promise of Entrepreneurship as a Field of Research." *Academy of Management Review* 25:217–26.
Sherkat, Darren E. 2012. "Religion and the American Occupational Structure." In *Religion, Work and Inequality*, edited by Lisa A. Keister, John D. McCarthy, and Roger Finke, 75–102. UK: Emerald Group Publishing.
Stark, Rodney, and Roger Finke. 2000. *Acts of Faith: Explaining the Human Side of Religion*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press.
Steensland, Brian, Jerry Z. Park, Mark D. Regnerus, Lynn D. Robinson, W. Bradford Wilcox, and Robert D. Woodberry. 2000. "The Measure of American Religion: Toward Improving the State of the Art." *Social Forces* 79, no. 1:291–318.
Steffy, Kody. 2013. "Religious Orthodoxy and the American Worker." *Sociology of Religion* 74:1–29.
Tracey, Paul. 2012. "Religion and Organization: A Critical Review of Current Trends and Future Directions." *The Academy of Management Annals* 6:87–134.
Venkataraman, S. 1997. "The Distinctive Domain of Entrepreneurship Research: An Editor's Perspective." In *Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence, and Growth*, vol. 3, edited by J. Katz, and R. Brockhaus, 119–38. Greenwish, CT: JAI Press.
Verba, Sidney, Kay L. Schlozman, and Henry E. Brady. 1995. *Voice and Equality: Civic Volunteerism in American Politics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Wales, William, Erik Monsen, and Alexander McKelvie. 2011. "The Organizational Pervasiveness of Entrepreneurial Orientation." *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice* 35:895–923.
Walker, Alan G. 2013. "The Relationship between Integration of Faith and Work with Life and Job Outcomes." *Journal of Business Ethics* 112:453–61.
Walker, Alan G., James W. Smither, and Jason DeBode. 2012. "The Effects of Religiosity on Ethical Judgments." *Journal of Business Ethics* 106, no. 4:437–52.
Warner, R. Stephen. 1993. "Work in Progress Toward a New Paradigm for the Sociological Study of Religion in the United States." *American Journal of Sociology* 98:1044–94.
Warner, R. Stephen. 1996. "Convergence toward the New Paradigm." In *Rational Choice Theories of Religion*, edited by Lawrence A. Young. London: Routledge.
Weaver, Gary R., and Bradley R. Agle. 2002. "Religiosity and Ethical Behavior in Organizations: A Symbolic Interactionist Perspective." *Academy of Management Review* 27:77–97.
Weber, Max. [1904–1905] 1992. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, translated by T. Parsons. London: Routledge.

Wuthnow, Robert. 1988. *The Restructuring of American Religion*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
———. 1994. *God and Mammon in America*. New York: Free Press.
———. 1996. *Poor Richards Principle: Recovering the American Dream through the Moral Dimension of Work, Business, and Money*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Yang, Fenggang, and Helen R. Ebaugh. 2001. "Religion and Ethnicity among New Immigrants: The Impact of Majority/Minority Status in Home and Host Countries." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 40:367–78.