

Religious Identity, Religious Attendance, and Parental Control

Young-Il Kim · W. Bradford Wilcox

Received: 11 September 2013 / Accepted: 14 March 2014
© Religious Research Association, Inc. 2014

Abstract Using a national sample of adolescents aged 10–18 years and their parents ($N = 5,117$), this article examines whether parental religious identity and religious participation are associated with the ways in which parents control their children. We hypothesize that both religious orthodoxy and weekly religious attendance are related to heightened levels of three elements of parental control: monitoring activities, normative regulations, and network closure. Results indicate that an orthodox religious identity for Catholic and Protestant parents and higher levels of religious attendance for parents as a whole are associated with increases in monitoring activities and normative regulations of American adolescents.

Keywords Religious identity · Religious attendance · Parenting · Parental control

Introduction

The last two decades have witnessed renewed scholarly interest in the relationship between religion and parenting (for a recent review, see Mahoney 2010). One of the questions that has emerged out of this growing literature is whether religion is related to parenting in a uniform way or whether a particular religious culture is linked to distinctive patterns in parental values and practices (Wilcox et al. 2004). Previous research has largely yielded evidence for the relative importance of generic

Y. Kim (✉)

Institute for Studies of Religion, Baylor University, One Bear Place #97236, Waco, TX 76798-7236,
USA

e-mail: Young-Il_Kim@baylor.edu

W. B. Wilcox

Department of Sociology, University of Virginia, P.O. Box 400766, Charlottesville,
VA 22904-4766, USA

religiosity over religious culture in determining a variety of parenting outcomes, including parental values (Alwin 1986), parental involvement (Clydesdale 1997), father involvement (Wilcox 2002), mother–child relationship quality (Pearce and Axinn 1998), physical discipline (Ellison et al. 1996), and positive parental emotion work (Wilcox 1998). By contrast, the relative magnitude of religious culture was mostly modest, partially explained by generic religiosity such as religious beliefs (Ellison et al. 1996), religious salience (Pearce and Axinn 1998), and religious attendance (Bartkowski and Xu 2000), or by other family-related mediators (King 2003).

Among these parenting outcomes, no subject has been investigated with more thoroughness than parental valuation of obedience versus autonomy related to religious factors (Alwin 1984, 1986, 1988, 1990, 1996; Ellison and Sherkat 1993; Lenski 1963; Rossi and Rossi 1990; Starks and Robinson 2005, 2007). Despite steady interest in parental values from religion and family scholars, less is known about whether religion is related to the ways in which parents manage their children’s behavior, which we term “parental control” or “parental monitoring.” Although it is plausible to assume that parents who value obedience as a desired trait in children are more likely to closely monitor their children than those who value autonomy over obedience, few studies have explored the role of religion in various elements of parental control, such as monitoring of children’s activities. Moreover, family scholarship has generally treated parental monitoring as the factor that can protect against adolescents’ risky behaviors (e.g., Bersamin et al. 2008; Longest and Shanahan 2007; Longmore et al. 2001), but there has been little research to determine how religion is related to parental monitoring.

One exception is the study by Bartkowski and Xu (2000), which found that religious attendance and a conservative Protestant affiliation are associated with high levels of paternal supervision, in this case, summed restrictions on the amount and types of television shows that can be viewed and paternal monitoring of child chores. Nevertheless, this study’s focus on a limited set of outcomes—television viewing and chores—does not provide us with a comprehensive portrait of the association between religion and parental control. Indeed, one recent study suggests that television-related monitoring constructs are distinct from other general parenting constructs (Bersamin et al. 2008). In light of the limited set of outcomes in this study and its focus on fathers, we believe that a more comprehensive look at the association between religion and parental control is warranted (for a similar approach, see Snider et al. 2004).

The present study also differs from past research regarding the measure of a religious culture. Previous studies have almost always used denominational affiliation to measure the *culture* of particular religious traditions, given that denominational affiliation largely reflects one’s religious identity. However, some scholars have questioned this assumption because religious individuals do not always agree with the teachings of the denomination with which they are affiliated (Wuthnow 1988, 2004; for a recent review and analysis, see Alwin et al. 2006). Alternatively, scholars have employed religious self-identification, which asks respondents to identify themselves as being part of one of several religious traditions (e.g., Denton 2004; Smith 1998). If denominational affiliations are only

loosely connected to religious identity, then religious self-identification may represent an alternative way of categorizing religious groups. The present study adopts this latter approach to determine if religious culture assessed through self-identification is related to parental control.

In addition, the present study recognizes that parenting values and behaviors are significantly associated with religious culture, net of the generic religiosity variables. For example, Ellison and Sherkat (1993:321) found that Catholics value obedience more than other Americans, even after controlling for religious beliefs and attendance. Starks and Robinson (2007) go one step further and argue that religious culture is a stronger predictor of adult values for children than religious attendance. We believe that parenting values and behaviors often reflect parents' worldviews in ways that are likely to be distinctively affected by particular religious traditions. Given that parental monitoring practices are motivated by parenting beliefs and values (Dishion and McMahon 1998), we expect religious identity to be significantly associated with parental control as much as religious attendance.

Accordingly, this study aims to answer the following research questions: (a) Is religious identity associated with parental control, net of religious service attendance, or does religious attendance account for the relationship between religious identity and parental control? (b) Does the relationship between religious factors and parental control vary by supervision domains? Using data from the first wave of the Survey of Adults and Youth (SAY), we aim to determine which religious factor—generic religiosity or a particular subculture of religious tradition—has stronger implications for a variety of parental control practices, from TV viewing to overseeing the social networks of adolescent children.

Religion and Parenting

Because little research has focused on the association between religion and parental control, we frame our hypotheses relying on the broader literature on religion and parental values and practices. The literature suggests that two religious factors are related to various parental outcomes: generic religiosity and religious culture.

Generic Religiosity and Parenting

Generic religiosity is defined as any kind of religious beliefs and practices that can reflect one's religiousness (Wilcox 2004:99). It is generic in the sense that these kinds of beliefs and practices can be found in a range of religious traditions. As Durkheim (1951[1897]:170) argues in *Suicide*, religion in and of itself promotes a collective orientation by instilling “a certain number of beliefs and practices common to *all* the faithful... The details of dogmas and rites are secondary. The essential thing is that they be capable of supporting a sufficiently intense collective life” (emphasis added). Here, Durkheim stresses the integrative force of religion, which binds individuals into the normative structure of moral order—including the behaviors and beliefs associated with the family.

Scholars have developed at least three explanations for the generic association between religion and parenting. First, religious institutions promote a belief system that endows family life with transcendent significance, thereby motivating parents to make the considerable sacrifices of time, willpower, and energy that are required to form good character in their children (Ammerman 1997; Wilcox 2002). This belief system incorporates specific parent-related moral norms (e.g., the Golden Rule) that often guide parental behavior. Second, religious institutions imbue family roles with religious significance through family-centered rituals (e.g., bar and bat mitzvahs, baptism) (Wilcox 2002). Worship services also provide families with regular opportunities to spend meaningful time together. Third, religious institutions foster “intergenerational closure” (Coleman 1988:S106). Churches promote family-centered social ties between children, parents and other adults in the community (Smith 2003b). These ties define norms about parenting, reinforce the value of family life, and allow parents to monitor their children through other adults who share their religious and normative commitments (Mahoney et al. 2001).

Among indicators of generic religiosity, religious service attendance has been the most consistent determinant of parenting outcomes (for an exception, see King 2003). In his replication of Lenski’s (1963) study, Alwin (1984) found that the differences that once distinguished Catholic and Protestant childrearing orientation have disappeared since the 1960s, while religious service attendance was associated with higher expectations of obedience. He concluded that the link between religion and childrearing orientations revolved around generic religiosity rather than religious culture. Since then, several studies have provided evidence in support of this argument, suggesting that generic religiosity is more important than religious culture in determining a wide range of parenting practices. Clydesdale (1997) found that parents who attended church frequently were more likely to be involved in their children’s education. This result was consistently seen in studies of maternal and paternal involvement. Pearce and Axinn (1998) and Wilcox (2002) found positive effects of mother’s and father’s religious service attendance on mothers’ reports of the relationship with children and father’s involvement in youth-related activities, respectively. Finally, studies on parental supervision showed similar patterns. Bartkowski and Xu (2000) found fathers’ religious service attendance to be associated with high levels of paternal supervision. Similarly, Smith (2003a, b) showed that parental religious attendance is positively associated with moral expectations and supervision of adolescent children. Taken together, this literature suggests that what mattered for parents was not where they attended religious services but how often they attended. Thus, the generic religiosity literature suggests the following hypothesis: Generic religiosity—operationalized here as weekly religious attendance—will be associated with higher levels of parental control.

Religious Identity and Parenting

Although religious institutions may exert a uniform influence on parental control, it is possible that distinct cultures of particular religious traditions may be associated with different approaches to monitoring children. That is, parents can construct their religious identity in an institutional context in which religious elites provide the

concepts, the language, and the logic of their religious identity (Ammerman 2003; Hunter 1991), thereby adopting different strategies for parental control according to the teachings of the religious tradition with which they identify.

Scholars have observed that American religious traditions have been internally divided between religious orthodoxy and religious progressivism (Hunter 1991; Wuthnow 1988). Although it is still debatable as to whether this division has also occurred at the layperson's level and not just an elite level (e.g., Davis and Robinson 1996), research using public polls provides evidence that ordinary religious subgroups have different approaches to family life influenced by their specific religious tradition (Gay et al. 1996; Pearce and Thornton 2007).

Notably, orthodox expressions of religion may be particularly salient in shaping parenting beliefs and practices for three reasons. First, orthodox parents tend to have more intense devotional lives, which may make them more likely to embrace notions of divine and filial obedience, especially compared to non-orthodox parents. Second, the moral framework of orthodox expressions of religion often prioritizes the responsibilities and obligations of parenthood, namely the importance of teaching self-control. Finally, recent changes in American society have challenged many age-old religious and family-related beliefs that are associated with religious orthodoxy, which have in turn motivated conservative Protestants, traditional Catholics, and orthodox Jews to place even greater importance on parenting (Wilcox 2008). Thus, we expect orthodox religionists to monitor their children's behavior more strictly than parents with no religious identification.

Empirical literature provides some evidence in support of this religious culture argument. Using the 1988 General Social Survey, Ellison and Sherkat (1993:321) found that religious attendance is positively associated with valuation of obedience and negatively associated with valuation of autonomy, but religious attendance does not reduce denominational differences: Catholics tend to value obedience more than other Americans. More recently, Starks and Robinson (2005) provided robust evidence in support of the influence of religious culture on adult valuation of autonomy. They found that evangelical Protestants, black Protestants, and other religious subgroups value autonomy less than mainline Protestants, and that Jews tend to value autonomy more than mainline Protestants. Religious service attendance was also related to greater emphasis on obedience, but it did not attenuate the denominational differences. Starks and Robinson (2007) further provided stronger evidence in support of the religious culture argument, showing no relationship between religious service attendance and parental values for children. Denominational differences remain significant: For example, the odds of mainline Protestants valuing "think for self" over "obey" were 95 % higher than those of evangelical Protestants. While Starks and Robinson (2005, 2007) provided robust findings on the influence of religious culture on adult values for children, their empirical investigation on within-faith traditions was limited to Protestantism and primarily focused on the differences between evangelical and mainline Protestantism (for an exception, see Starks 2009). This is unfortunate, because the theoretical underpinnings that the studies relied upon were more comprehensive than operational strategy. Here, we expand their operational strategy to examine variations within Jews and Catholics, as well as Protestants. The religious culture

model suggests the following hypotheses: Net of generic religiosity, religious orthodoxy (which, in this instance, includes traditional Catholics and orthodox Jews in addition to fundamentalist and evangelical Protestants) will be associated with higher levels of parental monitoring. Conversely, religious progressivism (which includes mainline/liberal Protestants, liberal Catholics, and Reform/secular Jews) will be associated with lower levels of parental monitoring.

Data, Measures, and Methods

Data

We used data from the SAY, a repeated cross-sectional national survey of 13,852 adults and 6,675 adolescents aged 10–18 years, which was fielded during the 1998–1999 school year (Weitzman 2009). The survey was also conducted during the 2001–2002 and 2004–2005 school years, but we analyzed the first wave of data because religious identification variables—our key independent variable—were only available in the first wave.¹ To our knowledge, SAY is one of few data that includes a rich set of questions about parents' religious identity, which allows us to examine intra-faith differences not only among Protestants, but also among Jews and Catholics.

SAY interviewed 13,852 adults living in three types of households—households without children ($n = 4,151$ [30 %]), households with children aged 0–9 years ($n = 2,090$ [15 %]), and households with children aged 10–18 years ($n = 7,611$ [55 %]) in 14 geographic areas in the United States. For our purposes, we restricted our analytic sample to adults living with a focal child aged 10–18. Further, we restricted our sample to 6,965 parents, which is defined here as father, mother, stepfather, stepmother of focal child. Nonparent respondents ($n = 646$) such as grandmothers, aunts, or other guardians were excluded from the analysis. We then drew a sample of adolescents from this parent sample. Among 6,965 parents, 5,117 (73 %) of parents gave consent for their children to be interviewed (1,848 [27 %] parents whose child was not interviewed were thus excluded from the study). Of the 5,117 parent respondents, 3,914 (77 %) had one child interviewed and 1,203 (23 %) had two children interviewed. Regarding the latter, following Gager et al. (2009), we randomly selected only one of the children to include in our analytic sample. Thus, our analytic sample consisted of 5,117 adolescents and parents for same data point each row.

Because missing data for independent variables range from 0.2 to 1.9 %, missing cases were deleted list-wise, except family income (5.5 %). Missing values on family income were imputed using regression-equation imputation, with an equation including covariates for gender, race, education, and marital status. After imputation, we were left with our final sample of 4,895, which include data on

¹ Religious identification variables were restricted; we were able to access them through the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR).

all variables in the analysis. However, the analytic sample size varies lightly because of missing data for dependent variables (0.2–4 %).

Dependent Variables

We used adolescent reports of three distinct types of parental control—monitoring, moral expectations, and network closure. To measure *parental monitoring*, we used adolescents' reports on how decisions were made for three different domains: (1) what kinds of TV shows and movies adolescents could watch, (2) bedtime, and (3) who adolescents could hang out with. Responses for each topic included 1 = parent makes the rules, 2 = decide for myself, 3 = both parent and respondent jointly make the rules. We recoded these response categories in the following way: 1 = decide for myself, 2 = joint decision, 3 = parent makes the rules. In this way, high scores indicate stricter monitoring. Because parents can apply different approaches depending on domains, we analyze them separately.

The second type of parental control was *moral expectations*. Adolescents were asked how upset their parent would be if their parent discovered they were engaged in three different forms of deviant behavior: (1) drinking alcohol, (2) skipping school, and (3) having sex. Responses for each domain were 1 = very upset, 2 = somewhat upset, 3 = not upset. These measures of moral expectations had highly skewed distributions; the majority of adolescents reported that their parents would be very upset if they drank alcohol (85.2 %), skipped school (87.4 %), and had sex (73.7 %). Therefore, these variables were dichotomized so that 1 indicates very upset and 0 means not very upset.

Our last measure of parental control was *network closure*, for which we considered three items of control through social networks. Adolescents were asked about a parent's knowledge of (1) their children's friends' names (Range: 1 = all of your friends, 2 = most of your friends, 3 = some of your friends, 4 = none of your friends); (2) close friends' parents (Range: 1 = most of them, 2 = some of them, 3 = very few of them, 4 = no close friends); and (3) school teachers' names (Range: 1 = all of your teachers, 2 = most of them, 3 = some of them, 4 = none of them). The response categories for "all of your friends" and "most of your friends" were combined for (1); the response categories for "very few of them" and "no close friends" were combined for (2); and the response categories for "most of them" and "some of them" were combined for (3) in order to contain enough cases to perform regression analyses. All items were reverse coded so that higher values indicate greater network closure.

Independent Variables

To measure *religious identity*, we relied on parent reports of religious self-identification. 5,117 parents were first asked about their religious identity as follows: Protestant (45.4 %, $n = 2,324$); Catholic (24.8 %, $n = 1,269$); Jew (2.2 %, $n = 111$); just a Christian (6.3 %, $n = 322$); nothing in particular (14.8 %, $n = 754$); Mormon (0.3 %, $n = 17$); Jehovah's Witness (1.0 %, $n = 51$); Muslim

(1.1 %, $n = 56$); other, specify (2.2 %, $n = 114$), and missing cases (1.9 %, $n = 99$). Additionally, those who indicated their religious identity as “Protestant,” “Catholic,” or “Jewish” were asked follow-up questions to see if they identify with a particular religious tradition.

First, 2,324 Protestants were asked: “Would you describe yourself as a Fundamentalist, Evangelical, Mainline Protestant, or Liberal Protestant?” 11.8 % of Protestants identified themselves as fundamentalist ($n = 273$), 10.4 % as evangelical ($n = 242$), 15.2 % as mainline ($n = 352$), 26.7 % as liberal ($n = 621$), 4.7 % as other ($n = 108$), and 31.3 % as missing cases ($n = 728$). While 64.1 % of the Protestant respondents identified themselves as either fundamentalist, evangelical, mainline Protestant, or liberal Protestant, 36 % of the respondents were not able to identify themselves with these traditions, which we labeled as “other Protestant.” While we left the original classification unchanged, we created black Protestants for African Americans who consider themselves as either fundamentalist, evangelical, mainline Protestant, or liberal Protestant. Thus, fundamentalist, evangelical, mainline Protestant, and liberal Protestant are nonblack groups. Separating black Protestants is important given that black Protestantism is markedly different from other white Protestant traditions in terms of its theological influences on freedom and the quest for justice (Steensland et al. 2000).

Second, 1,269 Catholics were asked: “Would you describe yourself as a traditional, charismatic, liberal or just Catholic?” Of those asked, the categories were as follows: traditional Catholic ($n = 304$; 24.0 %), charismatic Catholic ($n = 40$; 3.1 %), liberal Catholic ($n = 232$; 18.2 %), just Catholic ($n = 667$; 52.6 %), other ($n = 6$; 0.5 %), and missing ($n = 20$; 1.6 %). We recoded charismatic Catholic into traditional Catholic, while other and missing cases were recoded as just Catholic.

Third, 111 Jews were asked: “Would you describe yourself as an ...orthodox, conservative, Reform, or secular Jew?” The categories were as follows: orthodox Jew ($n = 12$; 10.8 %), conservative Jew ($n = 27$; 24.0 %), Reform Jew ($n = 48$; 43 %), secular Jew ($n = 15$; 13.5 %), other ($n = 3$; 2.7 %), and missing ($n = 6$; 8.1 %). We combined orthodox and conservative Jew, while we combined reform, secular, other, and missing cases into the same group, Reform/secular Jews.

Given its significant increase as well as conceptual ambiguity, we left “just a Christian” unchanged. This category may represent a group of people who grow up in mixed Protestant and Catholic traditions or belong to a congregation that does not emphasize a particular religious tradition (Wuthnow 2004:208). Finally, we combined all of the remaining religious groups, such as Mormons, and labeled them as other religion. Because of the small sample size for these groups, we collapsed some ordered response categories, which limits valid comparisons.

Thus, our religious identity scheme was classified as follows: fundamental Protestant ($n = 105$; 2.1 %), evangelical Protestant ($n = 156$; 3.1 %), mainline Protestant ($n = 232$; 4.5 %), liberal Protestant ($n = 298$; 5.8 %), black Protestant ($n = 697$, 13.6 %), other Protestant ($n = 836$, 16.3 %), traditional Catholic ($n = 344$; 6.7 %), liberal Catholic ($n = 232$; 4.5 %), just Catholic ($n = 693$;

13.5 %), orthodox/conservative Jew ($n = 39$, 0.8 %), Reform/secular Jew ($n = 72$, 1.4 %), other religion ($n = 238$, 4.6 %), and no religion ($n = 754$; 14.7 %).

To measure *weekly religious attendance*, we relied on the following question: “How often do you attend church or synagogue? Once a week, two or three times a month, once a month, a few times a year, or never?” We dichotomized the response categories into 1 = once a week (41.0 %) and 0 = at most two or three times a month (59.0 %).

We used a number of control variables that might otherwise confound the relationship between religious identity and parenting outcomes. Demographic controls included *youth's age* ($M = 13.9$, $SD = 2.5$), *youth religiosity* measured in youth membership in religious youth group (1 = yes, 34.2 %), *parent's gender* (1 = female, 69 %), *age* ($M = 41.3$, $SD = 8.0$), *race/ethnicity* (Black, Hispanic, other race, reference category = white), *education* (dummy variables for some college, a college degree, graduate, reference category = at most high school), *family income* ($M = 3.7$, $SD = 1.3$), *marital status* (1 = married), *number of adolescents in the household* ($M = 1.63$, $SD = 0.86$), and *number of children under age 10 in the household* ($M = 0.66$, $SD = 0.94$). Descriptive statistics for all variables used in the analysis are shown in Table 1.

Analytic Approach

Because our dependent variables have ordered categories, we used ordered logistic regression. For items on parental moral expectations, we used binary logistic regression as noted above. In the regressions, parents who reported any of 13 religious identities were compared to those who reported “nothing in particular (no religion).” The analyses controlled for a range of factors that might otherwise confound the relationship between religion and parenting. Because of space constraints, results for the key independent variables are reported in the tables; results for the full set of control variables are available in the “Appendix”.

In a preliminary analysis, we examined the proportional odds assumption of using Stata's *omodel* command (Long and Freese 2006). The proportional odds model assumes that the odds ratio is the same for all response categories, which is frequently violated in multivariate analyses because the chance of all of the independent variables in the model having a constant odds ratio is rare. A likelihood ratio test revealed that the proportional odds assumption does not hold for all multivariate models. Thus, we presented generalized ordered logit estimates from partial proportional odds models using Stata's *gologit2* (Williams 2006).

The models are organized into two nested regression models: The odd-numbered model includes religious identity variables and control variables. The even-numbered model adds the measure of weekly religious attendance. To detect model fit increase, we report the results of a likelihood ratio test for model change.

Table 1 Descriptive statistics ($N = 5,117$)

	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Dependent variables				
Television viewing	1.80	0.93	1	3
Bedtime	1.96	0.97	1	3
Friends	1.59	0.85	1	3
Drinking alcohol	0.86	0.35	0	1
Skiping school	0.88	0.33	0	1
Having sex	0.77	0.42	0	1
Knowing children's friends	2.49	0.66	1	3
Knowing children's friends' parents	2.31	0.82	1	3
Knowing children's schoolteachers	2.23	0.59	1	3
Control variables				
Youth age	13.92	2.47	10	18
Youth religiosity	0.34	0.47	0	1
Female	0.69	0.46	0	1
Age	41.18	7.20	18	97
Black	0.39	0.49	0	1
Hispanic	0.08	0.27	0	1
Other race	0.06	0.23	0	1
Some college	0.29	0.46	0	1
College degree	0.19	0.39	0	1
Graduate education	0.12	0.32	0	1
Family income	3.71	1.29	1	5.36
Married	0.63	0.48	0	1
Number of child 10–18	1.63	0.85	1	7
Number of child 0–9	0.66	0.94	0	7
Religious identity				
Fundamental Protestant	0.02	0.14	0	1
Evangelical Protestant	0.03	0.17	0	1
Mainline Protestant	0.05	0.21	0	1
Liberal Protestant	0.06	0.24	0	1
Black Protestant	0.14	0.35	0	1
Other Protestant	0.17	0.37	0	1
Traditional Catholic	0.07	0.25	0	1
Liberal Catholic	0.05	0.21	0	1
Just Catholic	0.14	0.35	0	1
Orthodox/conservative Jew	0.01	0.09	0	1
Reform/secular Jew	0.01	0.12	0	1
Just a Christian	0.06	0.25	0	1
Other religion	0.05	0.21	0	1
Generic religiosity				
Weekly religious attendance	0.41	0.49	0	1

Results

Setting Rules

Table 2 shows results of the multivariate ordered logistic regression models estimating associations between religious identity, religious attendance, and the likelihood of parents making the rules related to watching TV shows/movies, bedtime, and who their children can hang out with. The response categories are coded as 1 = decide for myself, 2 = joint decision, 3 = parents make the rules. Thus, two equations are estimated: (1) decide for myself versus joint decision and parents make the rules and (2) decide for myself and joint decision versus parents make the rules.² For the sake of brevity, we present results for the odds ratios of the combined categories of decide for myself and joint decision versus parents make the rules.

The first set of models estimates the odds ratios of parental control over television viewing. Model 1 shows marked differences between the religiously orthodox and the progressive. Specifically, fundamental and evangelical Protestant parents are more likely to set the rules about TV shows/movies ($OR = 2.40$, $p < .001$, $OR = 1.92$, $p < .01$, respectively) than parents with no religious identification, whereas Reform/secular Jews are less likely than people with no religion to set those rules ($OR = 0.39$, $p < .01$). In Model 2, we added weekly religious attendance to see if generic religiosity mediates the relationship between religious identity and parental control over television viewing. Despite a slight reduction in magnitude, adding a control for the generic religiosity variable does not eliminate differences between fundamental and evangelical Protestant parents and parents with no religious identification. Interestingly, weekly religious attendance turns out to be a suppressor variable; adding weekly attendance in Model 2 renders the coefficient for liberal Catholic significant ($OR = 0.70$, $p < .05$). Regarding the generic religiosity effect per se, the odds of weekly church attenders making the rules for TV shows are 1.51 times that of nonweekly church attenders, holding all other variables constant. The likelihood ratio test for change in model fit between Models 1 and 2 indicates that the addition of the generic religiosity measure significantly improves the model fit for setting TV rules.

The second set of models estimates the odds ratios of parental control over bedtime. Model 3 shows that parents who identify themselves as fundamental Protestant are more likely to set rules about bedtime ($OR = 2.21$, $p < .01$) than parents who do not identify with any religion. In addition, parents who identify themselves as just Catholic are more likely than parents with no religion to set rules about bedtime ($OR = 1.40$, $p < .05$). When it comes to bedtime rules, self-identified “just Catholics” appear to be stricter than traditional Catholics. It may be that Catholics who hold a traditional view prefer to be treated as just plain Catholics rather than being labeled as “traditional” (Starks 2009). Unlike the results for

² Preliminary analyses show that most decisions were made relatively equally either by adolescents or parents. Thus, we decided to use the ordered model rather than to dichotomize these items.

Table 2 Generalized ordered logit models predicting parental control over setting rules

	TV shows/movies						Bedtime						Who you can hang out with					
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6		Model 5		Model 6			
	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE		
Religious identity^a																		
Fundamental Protestant	2.40***	0.60	2.05***	0.51	2.21**	0.56	2.12**	0.54	0.85	0.21	0.76	0.19	0.85	0.21	0.76	0.19		
Evangelical Protestant	1.92**	0.39	1.57*	0.32	1.18	0.25	1.12	0.24	1.37	0.27	1.19	0.24	1.37	0.27	1.19	0.24		
Mainline Protestant	1.11	0.20	1.00	0.18	1.36	0.25	1.32	0.24	0.88	0.17	0.82	0.16	0.88	0.17	0.82	0.16		
Liberal Protestant	1.09	0.18	1.03	0.17	1.38	0.23	1.36	0.23	1.12	0.18	1.08	0.18	1.12	0.18	1.08	0.18		
Black Protestant	0.94	0.12	0.88	0.12	1.06	0.14	1.04	0.14	1.07	0.13	1.02	0.13	1.07	0.13	1.02	0.13		
Other Protestant	1.17	0.14	1.07	0.13	1.19	0.15	1.16	0.14	1.14	0.13	1.07	0.12	1.14	0.13	1.07	0.12		
Traditional Catholic	1.05	0.16	0.88	0.14	0.99	0.16	0.95	0.15	1.21	0.18	1.08	0.17	1.21	0.18	1.08	0.17		
Liberal Catholic	0.73	0.13	0.70*	0.13	0.90	0.16	0.89	0.16	0.99	0.17	0.97	0.17	0.99	0.17	0.97	0.17		
Just Catholic	1.27	0.17	1.15	0.15	1.40*	0.18	1.36*	0.18	1.23	0.15	1.15	0.14	1.23	0.15	1.15	0.14		
Orthodox/conservative Jew	0.75	0.28	0.69	0.27	1.03	0.40	1.02	0.40	1.08	0.42	1.02	0.40	1.08	0.42	1.02	0.40		
Reform/secular Jew	0.39**	0.13	0.41**	0.14	0.73	0.20	0.74	0.21	0.26*	0.16	0.27*	0.17	0.26*	0.16	0.27*	0.17		
Just a Christian	0.90	0.14	0.77	0.12	0.89	0.14	0.86	0.14	1.12	0.16	1.01	0.15	1.12	0.16	1.01	0.15		
Other religion	1.34	0.25	1.17	0.22	0.95	0.17	0.92	0.17	1.06	0.18	0.96	0.16	1.06	0.18	0.96	0.16		
Generic religiosity^b																		
Weekly religious attendance			1.51***	0.11			1.10	0.08			1.33***	0.09			1.33***	0.09		
Number of cases	4,882		4,882		4,889		4,889		4,873		4,873		4,873		4,873			
Log-likelihood	-3,573.65		-3,558.26		-3,356.03		-3,355.17		-3,836.13		-3,828.05		-3,836.13		-3,828.05			
Pseudo R ²	0.19		0.20		0.22		0.22		0.08		0.08		0.08		0.08			
Likelihood ratio test			30.78				1.72				16.16				16.16			

Table 2 continued

TV shows/movies			Bedtime			Who you can hang out with		
Model 1	Model 2		Model 3	Model 4		Model 5	Model 6	
<i>OR</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>OR</i>	<i>OR</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>OR</i>	<i>OR</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>SE</i>
								0.00
								0.19
								0.00

Prob > χ^2

All models control for youth age, youth membership in religious group, parent’s gender, age, race/ethnicity, education, family income, marital status, the number of adolescents in the household, the number of children under age 10 in the household. Because of space constraints, the full set of control variables of the full model is listed in the “Appendix”

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests)

^a Omitted category is no religious identification

^b Omitted category is nonweekly attendance

television viewing, however, Model 4 shows that generic religiosity is not associated with setting rules about bedtime.

The third set of models estimates the odds ratios of parental control over making friends. Model 5 shows that virtually none of the religious identity measures are associated with parental monitoring of their children's friend. The only exception is Reform/secular Jews, who are more lenient than parents who report no religious identity ($OR = 0.26, p < .05$). However, Model 6 shows that weekly religious attendance is associated with a greater likelihood of monitoring friends ($OR = 1.33, p < .001$). The likelihood ratio test for change in model fit between Models 5 and 6 indicates that adding a generic religiosity measure significantly improves the model fit for setting rules regarding friends.

Moral Expectations

Table 3 presents results of models estimating the likelihood of parents being very upset concerning adolescents' deviant behaviors. The first set of models estimates the odds of parents being very upset about adolescents drinking alcohol. Model 1 shows that none of the religious identity measures are associated with moral expectations for drinking alcohol, whereas Model 2 shows that weekly religious attendance is significantly associated with stricter moral expectations for drinking alcohol ($OR = 1.24, p < .05$).

The second set of models estimates the odds of parents being very upset over skipping school. Model 3 shows that mainline Protestants and traditional and just Catholics reported higher expectations for their children regarding school attendance. Model 4, however, shows that differences between mainline Protestant and unaffiliated parents and between "just Catholic" and unaffiliated parents disappear when religious attendance is taken into account. For traditional Catholics, the result remains significant, showing higher expectations on school attendance ($OR = 1.72, p < .05$). However, there is no significant relationship between weekly religious attendance and skipping school.

The third set of models estimates the odds of parents being very upset over adolescents having sex. Model 5 shows a striking difference in moral expectations regarding premarital sex between religiously orthodox parents and progressive parents. Adolescents with evangelical Protestant and traditional Catholic parents report that their parents would be more likely than parents with no religion to be very upset if they had sex. Specifically, the odds of evangelical Protestant and traditional Catholic parents becoming very upset are 2.29 times ($p < .01$) and 1.56 times ($p < .05$) greater than the odds of parents with no religious identification becoming very upset. Liberal Catholics are more lenient about having sex than parents with no religion ($OR = 0.57, p < .01$). Model 6 shows that weekly religious attendance is significantly associated with stricter moral expectations pertaining to sexual activity ($OR = 1.40, p < .001$). We also see that the introduction of the generic religiosity variable renders the coefficient for traditional Catholics nonsignificant, whereas the coefficient for evangelical Protestants and liberal Catholics remains significant. The introduction of the likelihood ratio test for change in model fit between Models 5 and 6 indicates that adding the generic

Table 3 Logistic regression models predicting parents getting very upset over adolescent behaviors

	Drinking alcohol			Skipping school			Having sex					
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6	
	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE	OR	SE
Religious identity^a												
Fundamental Protestant	1.44	0.46	1.29	0.42	1.31	0.43	1.24	0.41	1.31	0.40	1.11	0.34
Evangelical Protestant	1.16	0.32	1.03	0.29	1.08	0.29	1.02	0.28	2.29**	0.72	1.91*	0.60
Mainline Protestant	1.24	0.29	1.17	0.27	1.68*	0.44	1.64	0.43	1.45	0.35	1.33	0.32
Liberal Protestant	1.20	0.25	1.17	0.24	1.50	0.34	1.48	0.33	0.91	0.18	0.86	0.17
Black Protestant	1.16	0.23	1.11	0.22	0.98	0.19	0.96	0.19	1.27	0.20	1.19	0.19
Other Protestant	1.38	0.24	1.31	0.23	1.13	0.19	1.09	0.19	0.89	0.12	0.81	0.12
Traditional Catholic	1.10	0.22	0.99	0.21	1.81**	0.41	1.72*	0.40	1.56*	0.32	1.34	0.28
Liberal Catholic	0.82	0.18	0.80	0.17	1.05	0.24	1.04	0.24	0.57**	0.11	0.55**	0.11
Just Catholic	1.14	0.19	1.07	0.18	1.41*	0.25	1.37	0.24	1.10	0.17	1.01	0.16
Orthodox/conservative Jew	0.99	0.48	0.99	0.47	0.77	0.36	0.76	0.35	2.61	1.71	2.65	1.74
Reform/secular Jew	0.76	0.26	0.77	0.26	1.40	0.58	1.40	0.58	0.66	0.24	0.67	0.24
Just a Christian	1.08	0.24	0.99	0.23	1.17	0.27	1.12	0.26	1.01	0.19	0.89	0.17
Other religion	1.48	0.38	1.38	0.36	0.91	0.21	0.87	0.21	1.41	0.31	1.26	0.28
Generic religiosity^b												
Weekly religious attendance			1.24*	0.13			1.11	0.12			1.40***	0.13
Number of cases	4,851		4,851		4,836		4,836		4,708		4,708	
Log-likelihood	-1,656.7		-1,654.61		-1,610.18		-1,609.67		-1,961.35		-1,954.5	
Pseudo R ²	0.17		0.18		0.10		0.10		0.23		0.24	
Likelihood ratio test			4.18				1.02				13.70	

Table 3 continued

Drinking alcohol		Skipping school		Having sex	
Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
<i>OR</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>OR</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>OR</i>	<i>SE</i>
0.04		0.31		0.00	
Prob > χ^2					

All models control for youth age, youth membership in religious group, parent's gender, age, race/ethnicity, education, family income, marital status, the number of adolescents in the household, the number of children under age 10 in the household. Because of space constraints, the full set of control variables of the full model are listed in the "Appendix"

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests)

^a Omitted category is no religious identification

^b Omitted category is nonweekly attendance

religiosity measure significantly improved the model fit for parental expectations regarding sex. Overall, these results suggest that compared to skipping school, generic religiosity plays a more significant role in moral expectations regarding alcohol consumption and sexual activity, which have been identified as “ascetic deviance” in the criminology literature (Baier and Wright 2001).

Network Closure

Table 4 presents the results from multivariate ordered logistic regression analyses predicting the likelihood of parental network closure. The first set of models estimates the odds ratios of parental closure on friendship networks. Model 1 shows that parents who identify themselves as traditional Catholics have a greater likelihood of knowing their children’s friends than parents with no religion. However, when religious attendance is taken into account in Model 2, this identity becomes nonsignificant.

Regarding relationships with the parents of children’s friends, neither generic nor identity effects are found. Results (see “Appendix”) indicate that education and youth religiosity account for most of this relationship: Parents with a graduate education ($OR = 1.58, p < .001$) and those whose children belong to a religious youth group ($OR = 1.55, p < .001$) are more likely to know the parents of their children’s friends than parents with at most a high school degree and parents whose children do not belong to a religious youth group, respectively.

The last set of models estimates the odds ratios of parental closure on school networks. Model 5 shows some significant religious identity effects for school networks even after controlling for generic religiosity: Traditional Catholics and self-identified just Catholics are more likely to know school teachers’ names than parents with no religion ($OR = 1.42, p < .01, OR = 1.30, p < .01$, respectively). Model 6 shows that weekly religious attendance is significantly associated with knowledge of school teachers’ names ($OR = 1.19, p < .01$). However, religious identity variables remain robust even after controlling for generic religiosity.

Discussion and Conclusion

A large body of research has focused on the connection between religion and parental values, but much less is known about whether religion is associated with actual parental control practices. Using data from a national survey of adolescents aged 10–18 years and their parents, we have examined how parents’ religion is related to adolescent reports of parental control. Specifically, we assessed the relative influence of religious attendance and religious identity on three elements of parental control: monitoring activities, normative regulations, and network closure. The results are mixed, depending on which domain is investigated, which points to the importance of distinguishing a variety of parental control domains. Nevertheless, three patterns emerged from the data.

Table 4 Generalized ordered logit models predicting parental network closure

	Know friends' names				Know close friends' parents				Know teachers' names			
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6	
	<i>OR</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>OR</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>OR</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>OR</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>OR</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>OR</i>	<i>SE</i>
Religious identity ^a												
Fundamental Protestant	0.69	0.15	0.66	0.15	0.69	0.15	0.68	0.15	1.21	0.27	1.12	0.26
Evangelical Protestant	1.43	0.29	1.36	0.28	1.08	0.20	1.04	0.20	1.32	0.26	1.20	0.24
Mainline Protestant	1.29	0.22	1.26	0.22	1.07	0.17	1.05	0.17	1.29	0.22	1.24	0.21
Liberal Protestant	1.33	0.20	1.31	0.20	1.09	0.16	1.08	0.15	1.27	0.19	1.24	0.19
Black Protestant	1.12	0.13	1.11	0.13	0.98	0.11	0.97	0.11	0.88	0.11	0.85	0.10
Other Protestant	1.05	0.11	1.02	0.11	0.93	0.09	0.92	0.09	1.10	0.12	1.05	0.12
Traditional Catholic	1.34*	0.19	1.28	0.19	1.15	0.16	1.11	0.15	1.53**	0.23	1.42*	0.22
Liberal Catholic	1.18	0.19	1.17	0.19	1.08	0.16	1.07	0.16	1.32	0.21	1.30	0.21
Just Catholic	1.15	0.13	1.12	0.13	1.01	0.11	0.99	0.11	1.35*	0.17	1.30*	0.16
Orthodox/conservative Jew	1.34	0.51	1.32	0.50	1.56	0.62	1.55	0.61	1.98	0.70	1.93	0.69
Reform/secular Jew	1.22	0.34	1.23	0.35	1.18	0.33	1.19	0.33	1.32	0.34	1.35	0.35
Just a Christian	0.89	0.12	0.85	0.12	0.84	0.11	0.82	0.11	0.93	0.14	0.87	0.13
Other religion	0.94	0.14	0.91	0.14	0.93	0.14	0.91	0.14	0.86	0.14	0.81	0.14
Generic religiosity ^b												
Weekly religious attendance			1.11	0.07			1.07	0.07			1.19*	0.08
Number of cases	4,880		4,880		4,873		4,873		4,628		4,628	
Log-likelihood	-4,182.65		-4,181.4		-4,724.73		-4,724.24		-3,783.27		-3,779.97	
Pseudo <i>R</i> ²	0.05		0.05		0.04		0.04		0.07		0.07	
Likelihood ratio test			2.51				0.97				6.60	
Prob > χ^2			0.11				0.32				0.01	

All models control for youth age, youth membership in religious group, parent's gender, age, race/ethnicity, education, family income, marital status, the number of adolescents in the household, the number of children under age 10 in the household. Because of space constraints, the full set of control variables of the full model are listed in the "Appendix"

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests)

^a Omitted category is no religious identification

^b Omitted category is nonweekly attendance

First, consistent with most research on religion and parenting, we find evidence that generic religiosity is more influential than religious culture for the domains of making friends and drinking alcohol (see Smith 2003a). Parents who attend religious services weekly are more likely to monitor whom their children associate with and to expect their children not to drink alcohol. However, religious identity was relatively insignificant for these domains of parental control.

Second, the results show that both generic religiosity and religious culture are significantly associated with parental monitoring of adolescent television viewing and normative regulations on having sex. On the one hand, parents who attend religious services weekly are more likely to establish rules about which television shows can be viewed and to impose higher expectations about sexual morality. On the other hand, the results also point to the importance of religious identity in predicting parental monitoring in these areas. Consistent with our expectations, orthodox parents, particularly evangelicals, are more likely to keep a close eye on what TV shows/movies their adolescent children are watching and to impose higher expectations about sexual morality. Conversely, progressive parents, particularly liberal Catholics, are more lenient about sexual morality and what TV shows/movies their children watch. Given that religious parents are more aware of adolescents' exposure to sexual content on TV, which is known to affect adolescent initiation of intercourse (Collins et al. 2004), it is not surprising that we see a similar pattern in these two domains between religious orthodoxy and progressivism. This is consistent with the finding that evangelical Protestants tend to be more opposed to premarital sex (Pearce and Thornton 2007). Recent changes in family life appear to motivate orthodox religionists to adopt a stricter approach to parenting in an effort to safeguard their children from secular influences. Taken together, these results suggest that when it comes to more sensitive issues which parents and adolescents are wrestling with, parents rely on religious teachings and norms to which they subscribe.

Third, the results in this study provide evidence that religious culture is more influential than generic religiosity for influencing authority over bedtimes, expectations for children not to skip school, and network closure through teachers. Specifically, self-identified fundamental Protestant and "just Catholic" parents are more likely to set rules about bedtimes. Parents who identified with traditional Catholics impose higher moral expectations about skipping school. Parents who identified with traditional Catholics and "just Catholics" are more likely to know school teachers' names than people with no religion. These results suggest that the religious culture of orthodox religions has an independent effect on these particular domains, net of religious attendance. When it comes to rules about bedtimes and normative controls related to skipping school, what mattered for parents was not how often they went to church, but where they went to church.

Although we find evidence for the religious culture argument, associations between religious culture and parental control may be the result of measurement differences in religious culture rather than parental control per se. What if religious culture was measured by denominational affiliation? Would it yield a

similar result? Although we believe so, future research should employ both denominational and subjective identity measures to determine whether the classification scheme of religious traditions makes any difference, particularly given that our religious identity measures are limited. First, our measures on Jewish groups have a smaller sample size than other religious groups. To minimize the potential bias due to small cell size, we combined some Jewish groups, but it should be noted that significant results may be due to the effects of small cell size. Thus, results regarding Jewish groups should be interpreted with this limitation in mind.

Second, as we have shown, about 36 % of the Protestant respondents did not identify themselves as either fundamentalist, evangelical, mainline Protestant, or liberal Protestant. This lends credence to Sikkink's (1998:55) finding that a substantial minority of Americans cannot clearly identify which specific tradition to which they belong. Because we did not see any differences between this group ("other Protestant") and parents with no religion, it may be that "other Protestant" is a less distinctive group.³ However, it is still an open question whether religious self-identification serves better to assess religious tradition than denominational affiliation. As religious identity becomes more voluntary and fluid (Wuthnow 1998), we see that religious identification clearly captures nuances of religious classification, but future research should continue to explore whether different classifications of religious identity yield different results.

Another limitation is that although generic religiosity is a multidimensional concept, studies using single-item measures of generic religiosity are prevalent, including our own. In her recent review, Mahoney (2010) criticizes this tendency, because research shows more benefits from studies using multiple measures of generic religiosity. For example, previous studies demonstrate that more subjective dimensions of religiosity (e.g., religious salience) have stronger effects on parent-child relationships (e.g., Pearce and Axinn 1998). Future research might include the importance of religion to determine if that is the case for the outcome of parenting control. Alternatively, parental religious beliefs on moral issues can be useful because we see significant variations in terms of strictness or leniency regarding television viewing and moral expectations about sex. We expect that we would have observed a similar pattern had there been a predictor that measures specific religious beliefs. Future work should continue to improve the domain-specific measurement of parental monitoring.

³ In ancillary analyses, we reran regressions using "other Protestant" as a reference category. Results indicated that this residual category is somewhat more liberal than other Protestant groups regarding sex. Adolescents having parents of evangelical, mainline, and black Protestant groups reported that their parents would be more likely than parents with "other Protestant" to be very upset if they had sex. However, we do not see consistent patterns for other parental control items. Results are available upon request.

Given that our results are based on cross-sectional data, we cannot rule out the possibility of reverse causality. That is, more family-oriented parents could be attracted to religious institutions in general and religious orthodoxy in particular. Future research using longitudinal data should address selection bias to determine whether a particular parenting style influences religious involvement or the appeal of a particular religious group (Alwin 1986:436).

Finally, we should note that adolescent reports of parental control may reflect parental-adolescent trust or relationship quality. Adolescents who feel close to their parents are more likely to disclose information about their activities, which may aid parental control efforts (Stattin and Kerr 2000). Since religious salience affects parent-child relationship quality (Pearce and Axinn 1998; Stokes and Regnerus 2009), it is possible that child-parent affective bonds may mediate the relationship between religion and parental control. With this possible mediator, future research should seek to determine the precise mechanisms that explain why religion affects parental control.

In conclusion, the present study adds to a large body of literature on religion and parenting by demonstrating the ways in which religious identity and religious participation are both connected to patterns of parental supervision of American adolescents. Although most studies have shown that generic religiosity is a significant predictor of parenting investments, this study indicates that religious identity as well as religious service attendance plays an important role in shaping the ways in which parents monitor the lives of their adolescents. We find that orthodox Catholic and Protestant parents are more likely to set clear norms about matters such as television viewing, to express emotions about teenage sex, or to establish connections with their teenagers' school teachers, when compared to their unaffiliated peers. In general, then, this study suggests that parents who attend religious services regularly or who identify with an orthodox religious tradition in the United States are more likely to keep tabs on their adolescents, and to be emotionally invested in their children's ability to steer clear of risky behaviors such as teen sex and drinking. However, future research is needed to determine if parents' strategies and their emotional commitments have the desired effect on their adolescents (Manlove et al. 2006).

Appendix

See Table 5.

Table 5 Odds ratios from generalized ordered and binary logit models of parental control (full model)

	Setting rules				Moral expectations				Network closure			
	TV	Bedtime	Friend	Skip	Drink	Skip	Sex	Friend	Parent	Teacher		
Control variables^a												
Youth age	0.59***	0.57***	0.75***	0.63***	0.72***	0.56***	0.95***	0.90***	0.81***			
Youth religiosity	1.28**	1.09	1.08	1.52***	1.32*	1.47***	1.24**	1.55***	1.32***			
Female	1.04	0.92	1.05	0.93	1.00	1.33**	1.04	1.24***	1.01			
Age	1.00	0.98**	1.00	1.00	0.99	1.01*	1.01**	1.01**	1.00			
Black	0.94	1.32**	1.52***	1.98***	1.69***	0.61***	0.51***	0.75**	0.88			
Hispanic	1.24	1.02	1.51***	1.04	0.76	0.93	0.43***	0.49***	0.44***			
Other race	0.86	1.22	1.52**	1.59*	1.44	1.27	0.51***	0.61***	0.60***			
Some college	1.12	1.01	0.91	0.95	0.95	1.01	1.00	1.15	1.09			
College degree	1.20	0.89	0.80*	0.90	0.91	1.07	1.02	1.24*	1.36***			
Graduate education	1.33*	0.89	0.65***	0.67*	0.95	1.22	1.23	1.58***	1.78***			
Family income	0.93*	0.91*	0.81***	0.97	0.98	1.02	1.02	1.04	1.03			
Married	1.31**	1.21*	1.19*	1.13	1.15	1.53***	1.07	1.08	1.08			
Number of child 10–18	1.08	1.08*	0.98	1.10	0.88*	1.05	0.98	0.97	0.97			
Number of child 0–9	1.08*	1.00	1.08*	0.97	0.99	1.00	1.02	0.99	0.96			
Religious identity^b												
Fundamental Protestant	2.05**	2.12**	0.76	1.29	1.24	1.11	0.66	0.68	1.12			
Evangelical Protestant	1.57*	1.12	1.19	1.03	1.02	1.91*	1.36	1.04	1.20			
Mainline Protestant	1.00	1.32	0.82	1.17	1.64	1.33	1.26	1.05	1.24			
Liberal Protestant	1.03	1.36	1.08	1.17	1.48	0.86	1.31	1.08	1.24			
Black Protestant	0.88	1.04	1.02	1.11	0.96	1.19	1.11	0.97	0.85			
Other Protestant	1.07	1.16	1.07	1.31	1.09	0.81	1.02	0.92	1.05			
Traditional Catholic	0.88	0.95	1.08	0.99	1.72*	1.34	1.28	1.11	1.42*			

Table 5 continued

	Setting rules			Moral expectations			Network closure		
	TV	Bedtime	Friend	Drink	Skip	Sex	Friend	Parent	Teacher
Liberal Catholic	0.70*	0.89	0.97	0.80	1.04	0.55**	1.17	1.07	1.30
Just Catholic	1.15	1.36*	1.15	1.07	1.37	1.01	1.12	0.99	1.30*
Orthodox/conservative Jew	0.69	1.02	1.02	0.99	0.76	2.65	1.32	1.55	1.93
Reform/secular Jew	0.41**	0.74	0.27*	0.77	1.40	0.67	1.23	1.19	1.35
Just a Christian	0.77	0.86	1.01	0.99	1.12	0.89	0.85	0.82	0.87
Other religion	1.17	0.92	0.96	1.38	0.87	1.26	0.91	0.91	0.81
Generic religiosity ^c									
Weekly attendance	1.51***	1.10	1.33***	1.24*	1.11	1.40***	1.11	1.07	1.19*
Number of cases	4,882	4,889	4,873	4,851	4,836	4,708	4,880	4,873	4,628
Log-likelihood	-3,558.3	-3,355.2	-3,828.1	-1,654.6	-1,609.7	-1,954.5	-4,181.4	-4,724.2	-3,779.9
Pseudo R ²	0.20	0.22	0.08	0.18	0.10	0.24	0.05	0.04	0.07
Likelihood ratio test	30.78	1.72	16.16	4.18	1.02	13.70	2.51	0.97	6.60
Prob > χ^2	0.00	0.19	0.00	0.04	0.31	0.00	0.11	0.32	0.01

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests)

^a Omitted categories are no membership in youth religious group, male, white, at most high school graduate, and not married

^b Omitted category is no religious identification

^c Omitted category is nonweekly attendance

References

- Alwin, Duane F. 1984. Trends in parental socialization values: Detroit, 1958–1983. *American Journal of Sociology* 90(2): 359–382.
- Alwin, Duane F. 1986. Religion and parental child-rearing orientations: Evidence of a Catholic-Protestant convergence. *American Journal of Sociology* 92(2): 412–440.
- Alwin, Duane F. 1988. From obedience to autonomy: Changes in traits desired in children, 1924–1978. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 52(1): 33–52.
- Alwin, Duane F. 1990. Cohort replacement and changes in parental socialization values. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 52(2): 347–360.
- Alwin, Duane F. 1996. From childbearing to childrearing: The link between declines in fertility and changes in the socialization of children. *Population and Development Review* 22(S):176–196.
- Alwin, Duane F., Jacob L. Felson, Edward T. Walker, and Paula A. Tufiş. 2006. Measuring religious identities in surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 70(4): 530–564.
- Ammerman, Nancy T. 1997. Golden rule Christianity: Lived religion in the American mainstream. In *Lived religion in America: Toward a history of practice*, ed. David D. Hall, 196–216. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ammerman, Nancy T. 2003. Religious identities and religious institutions. In *Handbook of the sociology of religion*, ed. M. Dillon, 207–224. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Baier, Colin J., and Bradley R. E. Wright. 2001. If you love me, keep my commandments: A meta-analysis of the effect of religion on crime. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 38(1): 3–21.
- Bartkowski, John P., and Xiaohe Xu. 2000. Distant patriarchs or expressive dads? The discourse and practice of fathering in conservative Protestant families. *The Sociological Quarterly* 41(3): 465–485.
- Bersamin, Melina, Michael Todd, Deborah A. Fisher, Douglas L. Hill, Joel W. Grube, and Samantha Walker. 2008. Parenting practices and adolescent sexual behavior: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 70(1): 97–112.
- Clydesdale, Timothy T. 1997. Family behaviors among early U.S. baby boomers: Exploring the effects of religion and income change, 1965–1982. *Social Forces* 76(2):605–635.
- Coleman, James S. 1988. Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology* 94(S):S95–S120.
- Collins, Rebecca L., Marc N. Elliott, Sandra H. Berry, David E. Kanouse, Dale Kunkel, Sarah B. Hunter, and Angela Miu. 2004. Watching sex on television predicts adolescent initiation of sexual behavior. *Pediatrics* 114(3): 280–289.
- Davis, Nancy J., and Robert V. Robinson. 1996. Are the rumors of war exaggerated? Religious orthodoxy and moral progressivism in America. *American Journal of Sociology* 102(3): 756–787.
- Denton, Melinda Lundquist. 2004. Gender and marital decision making: Negotiating religious ideology and practice. *Social Forces* 82(3): 1151–1180.
- Dishion, Thomas J., and Robert J. McMahon. 1998. Parental monitoring and the prevention of child and adolescent problem behavior: A conceptual and empirical formulation. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review* 1(1): 61–75.
- Durkheim, Emile. 1951[1897]. *Suicide: A study in sociology*. New York: Free Press.
- Ellison, Christopher G., and Darren E. Sherkat. 1993. Obedience and autonomy: Religion and parental values reconsidered. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 32(4): 313–329.
- Ellison, Christopher G., John P. Bartkowski, and Michelle L. Segal. 1996. Conservative Protestantism and the parental use of corporal punishment. *Social Forces* 74(3): 1003–1028.
- Gager, Constance T., Laura A. Sanchez, and Alfred Demaris. 2009. Whose time is it? The effect of employment and work/family stress on children’s housework. *Journal of Family Issues* 30(11): 1459–1485.
- Gay, David A., Christopher G. Ellison, and Daniel A. Powers. 1996. In search of denominational subcultures: Religious affiliation and ‘pro-family’ issues revisited. *Review of Religious Research* 38(1): 3–17.
- Hunter, James Davison. 1991. *Culture wars: The struggle to define America*. New York: Basic Books.
- King, Valarie. 2003. The influence of religion on fathers’ relationships with their children. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 65(2): 382–395.
- Lenski, Gerhard. 1963. *The religious factor*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.

- Long, J. Scott, and Jeremy Freese. 2006. *Regression models for categorical dependent variables using Stata*, 2nd ed. College Station, TX: Stata Press.
- Longest, Kyle C., and Michael J. Shanahan. 2007. Adolescent work intensity and substance use: The mediational and moderational roles of parenting. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 69(3): 703–720.
- Longmore, Monica A., Wendy D. Manning, and Peggy C. Giordano. 2001. Preadolescent parenting strategies and teens' dating and sexual initiation: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 63(2): 322–335.
- Mahoney, Annette. 2010. Religion in families, 1999–2009: A relational spirituality framework. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 72(4): 805–827.
- Mahoney, Annette, Kenneth I. Pargament, Nalini Tarakeshwar, and Aaron B. Swank. 2001. Religion in the home in the 1980s and 1990s: A meta-analytic review and conceptual analysis of links between religion, marriage, and parenting. *Journal of Family Psychology* 15(4): 559–596.
- Manlove, Jennifer S., Elizabeth Terry-Humen, Erum N. Ikramullah, and Kristin A. Moore. 2006. The role of parent religiosity in teens' transitions to sex and contraception. *Journal of Adolescent Health* 39(4): 578–587.
- Pearce, Lisa D., and William G. Axinn. 1998. The impact of family religious life on the quality of mother-child relations. *American Sociological Review* 63(6): 810–828.
- Pearce, Lisa D., and Arland Thornton. 2007. Religious identity and family ideologies in the transition to adulthood. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 69(5): 1227–1243.
- Rossi, Peter H., and Alice Rossi. 1990. *Of human bonding: Parent-child relations across the life course*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Sikkink, David. 1998. 'I just say I'm a Christian: Symbolic boundaries and identity formation among church-going Protestants. In *Reforming the center: American Protestantism, 1900 to the present*, ed. D. Jacobsen, and V. Trollinger, 49–71. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Smith, Christian. 1998. *American evangelicalism: Embattled and thriving*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Smith, Christian. 2003a. Religious participation and network closure among American adolescents. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 42(2): 259–267.
- Smith, Christian. 2003b. Religious participation and parental moral expectations and supervision of American youth. *Review of Religious Research* 44(4): 414–424.
- Snider, J. Blake, Andrea Clements, and Alexander T. Vazsonyi. 2004. Late adolescent perceptions of parent religiosity and parenting processes. *Family Process* 43(4): 489–502.
- Starks, Brian. 2009. Self-identified traditional, moderate, and liberal Catholics: Movement-based identities or something else? *Qualitative Sociology* 32(1): 1–32.
- Starks, Brian, and Robert V. Robinson. 2005. Who values the obedient child now? The religious factor in adult values for children, 1986–2002. *Social Forces* 84(1): 343–359.
- Starks, Brian, and Robert V. Robinson. 2007. Moral cosmology, religion, and adult values for children. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 46(1): 17–35.
- Stattin, Håkan, and Margaret Kerr. 2000. Parental monitoring: A reinterpretation. *Child Development* 71(4): 1072–1085.
- Steenland, 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(1):291–318.
- Stokes, Charles E., and Mark D. Regnerus. 2009. When faith divides family: Religious discord and adolescent reports of parent-child relations. *Social Science Research* 38(1): 155–167.
- Weitzman, Beth C. 2009. *National evaluation of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation's Urban Health Initiative (UHI): Survey of Adults and Youth (SAY), Waves 1–3, 1998–2005* [Computer file]. ICPSR23241-v1. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2009-07-13. doi:[10.3886/ICPSR23241](https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR23241).
- Wilcox, W. Bradford. 1998. Conservative Protestant childrearing: Authoritarian or authoritative? *American Sociological Review* 63(6): 796–809.
- Wilcox, W. Bradford. 2002. Religion, convention, and paternal involvement. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 64(3): 780–792.
- Wilcox, W. Bradford. 2004. *Soft patriarchy, new men: How Christianity shapes fathers and husbands*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wilcox, W. Bradford. 2008. Focused on their families: Religion, parenting, and child well-being. In *Authoritative communities: The scientific case for nurturing the whole child*, ed. K. Kline, 227–244. New York: Springer.

-
- Wilcox, W. Bradford, Mark Chaves, and David Franz. 2004. Focused on the family? Religious traditions, family discourse, and pastoral practice. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 43(4): 491–504.
- Williams, Richard. 2006. Generalized ordered logit/partial proportional odds models for ordinal dependent variables. *The Stata Journal* 6(1): 58–82.
- Wuthnow, Robert. 1988. *The restructuring of American religion*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Wuthnow, Robert. 1998. *After heaven: Spirituality in America since the 1950s*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wuthnow, Robert. 2004. The religious factor revisited. *Sociological Theory* 22(2): 205–218.