

ABSTRACT

The Effects of Negative Peer and Media Influences on Adolescent Religiosity

Philip P. Davignon, M.A.

Thesis Chairperson: Christopher Bader, Ph.D.

Many researchers have demonstrated how peer influences can lead to increases in adolescent religiosity, but none have endeavored to examine the effects of media and peer influences that might lead to decreases in adolescent religiosity. Using the nationally representative and longitudinal National Studies of Youth and Religion, this research demonstrates that peer and media influences do indeed have significant effects that lead to decreases in the religiosity of religious adolescents, and often times these effects negate the peer influences that other researchers have found to increase religiosity. This paper concludes by discussing the implications of these findings for various theories and perspectives in religious transmission and adolescent religiosity.

The Effects of Negative Peer and Media Influences on Adolescent Religiosity

by

Philip P. Davignon, B.A.

A Thesis

Approved by the Department of Sociology

Charles M. Tolbert II, Ph.D, Chairperson

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Baylor University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
of
Master of Arts

Approved by the Thesis Committee

Christopher Bader, Ph.D., Chairperson

Martha G. Sherman, Ph.D.

Wade C. Rowatt, Ph.D.

Accepted by the Graduate School
May 2011

J. Larry Lyon, Ph.D., Dean

Copyright © 2011 by Philip P. Davignon

All rights reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	List of Tables.....	v
II.	Acknowledgments.....	vi
III.	Chapter One: Introduction.....	2
	Previous Findings on Religious Transmission.....	3
	Apostasy.....	4
	Transmission and Family Influence.....	5
	Peers and Social Influences.....	7
	Other Environmental Influences.....	8
	Theories and Perspectives on Religious Transmission.....	8
	Social Learning Theory.....	8
	Life Cycle Theory.....	10
	Cultural Broadening Theory.....	11
	Other Theories of Social Influence.....	12
	Goals of Present Research.....	13
IV.	Chapter Two: Data and Methods.....	14
	Data.....	14
	Dependent Measures.....	15
	Key Independent Measures.....	17
	Control Variables.....	19
	Population.....	21
	Analytical Model.....	21
V.	Chapter Three: Results.....	23
	Importance of Faith.....	24
	Church Attendance.....	27
VI.	Chapter Four: Discussion.....	30
	Limitations.....	34
	Conclusion.....	35
VII.	Appendix: Effects of Peers and Media on Religiosity of All Respondents....	37
VIII.	Bibliography.....	42

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Descriptive Means of Adolescent Religiosity (2007).....	17
Table 2: Effects of Rel. Friends (2005) on Rel. Adolescents' Faith (2007).....	25
Table 3: Effects of Rel. Talk (2005) on Rel. Adolescents' Faith (2007).....	26
Table 4: Effects of Rel. Friends (2005) on Rel. Adolescents' Church Att. (2007).....	28
Table 5: Effects of Rel. Talk (2005) on Rel. Adolescents' Church Att. (2007).....	29
Table A.1: Effects of Rel. Friends (2005) on All Adolescents' Faith (2007).....	38
Table A.2: Effects of Rel. Talk (2005) on All Adolescents' Faith (2007).....	39
Table A.3: Effects of Rel. Friends (2005) on All Adolescents' Church Att. (2007).....	40
Table A.4: Effects of Rel. Talk (2005) on All Adolescents' Church Att. (2007).....	41

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my thesis chairperson, Dr. Chris Bader, as well the members of my thesis committee, Dr. Martha Sherman and Dr. Wade Rowatt, for guiding me through this process.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Religious transmission and adolescent religiosity have always been important topics in the sociology of religion, especially since research has suggested that declines in religion are not the result of adults leaving congregations, but rather a decline in church participation by young adults (Hoge and Roozen, 1979). Therefore, the study of the transmission of religious ideas and practices from adults to their children, as well as the study of the social factors that influence adolescent religiosity are important topics for both religious groups and those who study religion.

The study of the social effects of adolescent religious choices often falls into three categories: family influence, religious influence, and social environmental influence. As is to be expected, the religious influences that surround adolescents, such as the effects of pastors, denominations, and religious education tend to have a strong influence on the religiosity of adolescents (Gunnore and Moore, 2002; Dudley and Laurent, 1989; Smith and Sikkink, 2003). Similarly, families play an important role in religious transmission, and unsurprisingly, stable families where parents emanate acceptance of their children are more likely to transmit religious views to adolescents (Hoge and Petrillo, 1982; Bao et al, 1999; Myers, 1996; Hayes and Pittelkow, 1993). Researchers have also examined the effects of social environmental influences, such as how peer groups influence religious transmission and adolescent religiosity (King, 2002; Gunnore and Moore, 2002; Regnerus and Smith, 2004). This research has demonstrated how adolescents tend to be more

religious when they are surrounded by peers who are more religious (Renerus and Smith, 2004; Gunnoe and Moore, 2002), however, there has been little research done on how negative peer influences might lead to decreases in adolescent religiosity. Most of the research done on negative peer influences demonstrates how adolescents who take part in certain behaviors are less like to adopt their parent's religious views (Regnerus and Uecker, 2007; Dudley et al, 1987). However, these findings do not directly address how peer influence may lead to decreases in adolescent religiosity. Previous research has not directly studied whether seemingly negative peer influences have a similar magnitude of impact on adolescent religiosity as positive peer influences, and whether negative peer influences or positive peer influences has a stronger effect when both of these type of influences are included together in the same mode.

In order to clarify this study of the interplay between social influences and adolescent religiosity, several hypotheses will be set forth.

Hypothesis 1: Adolescents will be religious to the extent that religion is successfully modeled to them.

Hypothesis 2: When family, friends, and societal influences model religion as being a desirable and integral part of life, then adolescents will be more likely to be religious.

Hypothesis 3: When family, friends, and societal influences model religion as being undesirable and inessential to life, then adolescents will be less likely to be religious.

Previous Findings on Religious Transmission

The literature review that follows will set the foundation for these hypotheses. For the most part, the mechanisms of these hypotheses have already been studied by previous researchers. This literature review will consolidate the previous research into an

understandable whole, and then identify how previous research created the need for a study of how peer and media may also lead to decreases in religiosity.

Apostasy

One religious choice that is pertinent to study of changes in adolescent religiosity is the decision to apostatize. Apostasy represents the most extreme form of religious change, and the social influences that lead to apostasy will almost certainly be important for the study of changes in adolescent religiosity. The choice to disaffiliate from religion is an active choice to distance oneself from the faith of upbringing, which is in itself a religious choice: against religion. In religious apostasy, the religious identity in which one was raised has been completely rejected. The decision for children to reject the religious beliefs and practices of their parents is more extreme than just the absence of religious transmission, rather it signifies a total separation from the religious community in which they were raised (Caplovitz and Sherrow, 1977).

Research has shown that those who disaffiliate from religion are more likely to be young, male, highly educated, liberal, and mobile (Hadaway and Roof, 1988). It has also been shown that apostates are also closer to their friends than their families, suggesting that the effects of peers may sometimes be stronger than those of the family in the process of religious transmission (Hadaway and Roof, 1988; Hoge, 1988). The decision of apostates to disaffiliate from their parent's religion may be because they "have not structured their lives within the context of traditional institutions (family, church, political parties) but rather have adopted the prototypical contemporary individualistic lifestyle" (Bromley, 1988). Some have also disaffiliated from religion because they felt that the

church no longer helped them, or that their current views and lifestyle were not compatible with the church in which they were raised (Hadaway and Roof, 1988).

Transmission and Family Influences

Despite the fact that peers may sometimes have stronger effects on adolescent religiosity than families, research has still demonstrated the importance of parents and families in religious transmission. It has been shown that religiosity is largely determined by the parental religiosity (Myers, 1996; Hoge, Petrillo, and Smith, 1982), and that a variety of factors, such as parents being younger, lead to increases in religious transmission (Hoge, Petrillo, and Smith, 1982). It has also been shown that the religious beliefs of the parents themselves are important to religious transmission. When both parents agree on their religious views, they are more likely to successfully transmit these views to their children (Hoge, Petrillo, and Smith, 1982).

Agreement and accord in other areas of life is also important for successful parental religious transmission. Parental divorce leads to decreases in religious transmission (Copen and Silverstein, 2007), and when children learn from their parents that having dissenting views on religion is a normal part of life (Hoge, Petrillo, and Smith, 1982), then they become more likely to disagree with their parent's views when they are older. Similarly, if a child learns from their parents that having similar religious beliefs is important, then it seems that they would be more likely to adopt the same religious views as their parents.

Not only is parental agreement about religion important for religious transmission, but the way that parents relate the importance of religion is also vital. Research has examined how relationships between children and parents affect religious

transmission, and it has been demonstrated that good parent-child relationships enhance religious transmission (Hoge, Petrillo, and Smith, 1982). Further research has shown that when children feel accepted by their parents, they are more likely to adopt the religious views of their parents (Bao, Whitbeck, Hoyt, and Conger, 1999; Kandel and Lesser, 1972).

The way in which children and adults talk about religion is also important in facilitating the transmission of religious ideas. When conversations about religion are focused on children, and parents don't take an authoritative approach to the conversation, then both children and parents report these conversations as being more effective (Dollahite and Thatcher, 2008). This research reaffirms the importance of the role that parents play in transmitting religious values to their children. It cannot be taken for granted that parents will automatically transmit their religious views to their children.

The specific types of relationships between children and each of their parents is also a key influence for religious transmission, and many articles have sought to see if there is a difference in the effectiveness of transmission by the gender of the parent (Hayes and Pittelkow, 1993; Clark, Worthington, and Danser, 1988). Research has shown that children often inherit their religious beliefs from their mothers, and that they inherit the concepts of moral supervision and religious commitment from their fathers (Hayes and Pittelkow, 1993). These ideas are reiterated in other research which shows that mothers influence the day to day aspects of religion, while fathers influence church attendance (Clark, Worthington, and Danser, 1988). Not only are parents important, but grandparents also play an important role in religious transmission, with grandmothers exerting half of the influence of mothers (Copen and Silverstein, 2007). The effects of

grandparents is the strongest when the grandparents and parents are in agreement over religious views, although grandparents still have influence even when there is not complete agreement (Copen and Silverstein, 2007). Research describing the importance of mother's, father's, and grandparent's relationships to children and how it affects religious transmission affirm the perspective of Social Learning Theory, by demonstrating that family members who model religion to children are very important for the process of religious transmission.

Peers and other Social Influences

Peers are also an important influence on the religiosity of adolescents because they communicate group norms regarding whether religious faith is acceptable, as well as demonstrate through their actions how religious behavior should be appropriately lived out (Erickson, 1992). The concrete impact that religious peers can have on adolescent religiosity is demonstrated by research that indicates that the number of friends one has who attend church is strong predictor of adolescent religiosity (Gunnoe and Moore, 2002; Regnerus, Smith, and Smith, 2004). Levels of religious importance among students in one's school are also a strong predictor of adolescent religious importance, and close friends have a significant impact on the church attendance of adolescents (Regnerus, Smith, and Smith, 2004). Finally, research has shown that when peers engage in religious conversations and activities with each other, it leads to increases in their views of the importance of religion (King et al, 2002).

When it comes to studies of how peers may be an influence that leads to decreases in adolescent religious, there has been very little research. One study has suggested that peers may have a negative influence on adolescent religiosity, but the measures of peer

influence were so vague and ambiguous that few claims can be made as to the potential strength and mechanisms of negative peer influence (Dudley and Laurent, 1989).

Overall, the literature on the effects of peers on adolescent religiosity has demonstrated that there is certainly a positive effect, but little meaningful work has been done to test the potential effects of peers that may lead to decreases in adolescent religiosity.

Other Environmental Influences

Another type of influence that has received little attention is the effect that media and other social environmental influences have on adolescent religiosity. Research has demonstrated that pre-teens who watch R rated movies and listen to hard rock are more likely to use drugs (Dudley et al, 1987), however no direct link has been made between this type of media exposure and religiosity itself. Delinquency of teens is another environmental influence that may affect religiosity. When delinquency of peers themselves has been shown to lead to decreases in views of the importance of religion and in church attendance (Regnerus and Uecker, 2007), but no substantial research has been done on how delinquency of peers may affect adolescent religiosity.

Theories and Perspectives of Religious Transmission

Social Learning Theory

Many different perspectives can offer insight to the process of religious transmission, but Social Learning Theory is by far the most utilized and most comprehensive explanation of religious transmission (Dollahite and Thatcher, 2008; Hunsberger, 1983; Hoge, Petrillo, and Smith, 1983). Social Learning Theory has frequently been utilized to demonstrate that parents and families are the primary ways

that children socially learn about religion (Dollahite and Thatcher, 2008). When families view religion as important (Hunsberger, 1983), agree about the importance of religion in life (Hoge, Petrillo, and Smith, 1983), and when parents successfully and effectively convey this to children through good communication (Dollahite and Thatcher, 2008), children learn through observation about the importance of religion and are more likely to model these outlooks in their own lives.

Social Learning Theory is pertinent for studies of religious transmission because it states that children observe how their parents act, and learn to model their actions and beliefs after their parents (Bandura, 1977). Studies of religious transmission have suggested that children are more likely to adopt the religious views of their parents when they are being taught beliefs and practices that visible, concrete, and lasting in their family life, as opposed to other values and beliefs that are more abstract, and less pertinent to the daily lives of the family (Hoge, Petrillo, and Smith, 1982). This finding supports the Social Learning perspective, by showing that the modeling of religion to children is important if children are to adopt these religious practices and beliefs later in life.

Other theories of religious transmission have borrowed heavily from Social Learning Theory, in order to create a social learning theory that is specific to religion. Spiritual Modeling Theory asserts that people learn spiritual behaviors and beliefs through observing other the spirituality and behavior of other people who are close to them (Oman and Thoresen, 2003).

Life Cycle Theory

Social Learning Theory provides the most developmental and direct explanation for how children adopt religious views, but there are also other theories and perspectives that examine how outside influences influence adolescent religiosity. Life Cycle Theory is one such perspective that examines how religious choices are influenced by how religious needs and participation change at different stages in life (Chaves, 1991; Albrecht, 1988). Life Cycle Theory is important for the study of adolescent religiosity because it provides a structural explanation for why adolescents may have decreased religiosity. Life Cycle Theory claims that family, marriage, and children are important influences that lead people to practice religion (Chaves, 1991), and because adolescents do not have any of these traditional commitments, they may be less likely to practice religion. Adolescents are also at a stage in life where they are seeking to solidify their own self identity, which may lead them to distinguish and assert their unique identity by making religious choices that differ from their parents (Gallup and Bezilla, 1992; Smith, Denton, Faris, and Regnerus, 2002).

Other outside forces also play a role in whether children adopt the religious views of their parents. For instance, research has shown that tough family situations, difficult life events, and emotional distress can lead children to become more likely to doubt the religious views in which they were raised (Kooistra and Pargament, 1999). The effects of these outside influences, however, are better explained through Social Learning Theory. Family situations can mediate how children view religion, and if children learn negative views of religion through life events or family situations, then Social Learning Theory suggests that they will be less likely to be religious themselves. Other family situations

such as divorce or abuse may lead them to distrust their parents, which would also lead them to be less likely to adopt the religious views as their parents (Copen and Silverstein, 2007). Family circumstances and life events may be outside influences, but their effects on religious transmission are best understood through Social Learning Theory, which suggests that these events model to children ways to view the importance and function of religion.

Cultural Broadening Theory

Another pertinent theory that examines religious choice is Cultural Broadening Theory, which suggests that when people attend college, they are exposed to a many contradictory views, which leads them to become more likely to question their own views and change their religious views (Wuthnow and Glock, 1973; Hoge, Johnson, and Luidens, 1993). Cultural Broadening Theory has been critiqued because many college students are exposed to differing worldviews and ways of thinking long before college, and also many people do not attend traditional 4 year universities, which is where most of the “cultural broadening” was supposed to have taken place (Hoge, 1994). Research has also shown that even though attending college may lead to more liberal religious views, it has little influence on church attendance for college students when they become older (Hoge, Johnson, and Luidens, 1993).

These critiques of Cultural Broadening Theory are certainly valid, but they also create the possibility for research to be done using the Cultural Broadening perspective, but looking at whether cultural broadening occurs before college. The idea that cultural broadening occurs before college has been suggested (Hoge, 1994), but not tested.

Cultural Broadening Theory's suggestion that conflicting worldviews may lead to decreases in religiosity is similar to the idea that the consistency of religious influence is important for religious transmission. Research has shown that children are aided by a consistent message; when they see their parents acting in a contrary way to their own values, then children are less likely to adopt the religious views of their parents (Bader and Desmond, 2006). Perhaps this concept is also true for other influences in children's lives. For instance, if children are influenced by a certain set of religious values by their parents, yet they are exposed to other outside influences such as peers and the media that conflict with their parent's views, how will this affect religious transmission? Research has shown that apostates are more likely to be closer to their friends than to their family (Hadaway and Roof, 1988), which may be because apostate's friends have influenced them to accept religious worldviews that are not compatible with their family's religious worldviews.

Other Theories of Social Influence

Other theories of religious transmission and adolescent religiosity are based off of social capital theories. Spiritual capital theories suggest that how often religion is shared with other people is important, and that when parents have religious conversations with their children or pray with their children, shared meaning and understanding is created between them, which is best explained as spiritual capital (King et al, 2003). Adolescent religiosity is affected by the amount of religious interaction and spiritual capital that exists in a relationship (King et al, 2003). It has also been suggested that the mere presence of religious family members and peers has an effect on the religiosity of

adolescents, because the beliefs and practices of close relationships eventually become norms and expectations, which in turn influence adolescent religiosity (King et al, 2002).

Goal of Present Research

This study will examine how factors such as peer influence and media can lead to decreases in the religiosity of religious adolescents. Previous studies have demonstrated how peer groups lead to increases in religiosity (Gunnoe and Moore, 2002; Regnerus and Smith, 2004; King et al, 2003), but no research has been done to examine how negative peer influences affect adolescent religiosity. This present study will replicate the findings of previous researchers by demonstrating how peer influences can lead to increased levels of adolescent religiosity. Then peer and media influences that would be expected to lead to decreases in religiosity will be introduced to the model, to see how these measures affect adolescent religiosity. Finally, the findings will be discussed within the context of previous theories of adolescent religiosity and religious transmission.

CHAPTER TWO

Data and Methods

Data

The data for this study comes from the National Studies of Youth and Religion, which is a series of nationally representative telephone surveys that began with 3,290 American teenagers who were between the ages of 13 and 17 in 2003. Second and third waves of the survey were conducted in 2005 and 2007. Each year of the survey contains many of the same questions as previous years, in order to allow longitudinal comparison. New questions were also introduced each year to discover pertinent information about the respondents as they entered young adulthood.

Part of the self-proclaimed purpose of the National Studies of Youth and Religion is to “research the shape and influence of religion and spirituality in the lives of America youth; to identify effective practices in the religious, moral, and social formation in the lives of youth; to describe the extent and perceived effectiveness of the programs and opportunities that religious communities are offering to their youth”

(<http://www.thearda.com/Archive/NSYR.asp>). In order to achieve this purpose the National Studies of Youth and Religion interviewed the respondents, as well as their parents during the first wave only, in order to paint a clearest possibly picture of the social environment of each respondent during their adolescent years.

The survey was conducted using random-digit-dialing, and is representative of the population of the United States. It includes proportional amounts of listed, unlisted, and

not-yet-listed household telephone numbers. Some studies have used lists of students who attend public schools in order to contact respondents (Regnerus and Smith, 2004), but the random-digit-dial approach is the most representative because schools are often not representative of the United States. The random-digit-dial method is also able to interview adolescents who have either dropped out of school, are homeschooled, or who receive some other non-traditional form of education. The survey also contains an oversample of Jewish households, and the survey was also available in Spanish, so as to ensure that the sample would be as representative as possible.

Other studies of religious transmission and adolescent religiosity have utilized nationally representative surveys such as the Adolescent Health survey (Regnerus, Smith, and Smith, 2004; Bader and Desmond, 2006), however this surveys does not focus exclusively on religion, and the breadth of analyses of religiosity that can be performed are limited. Other studies of religious transmission and adolescent religiosity have drawn from convenience samples from churches (King, 2002). While these types of surveys often focus almost exclusively on religion, they are limited by a small sample size that is not nationally representative, not completely random, and not longitudinal. The National Studies of Youth and Religion is the ideal survey to use for studies of religious transmission and changes in adolescent religiosity, because it is a large, nationally representative, and longitudinal dataset that focuses on religion.

Dependent Measures

Consistent with previous studies of religious transmission and changes in adolescent religiosity, the main dependent variables are self-proclaimed levels of faith and church attendance (Bader and Desmond, 2006). Both dependent variables are from

the third wave (2007) of the study, when the respondents were between the ages of 17 and 21 years old. Respondents were asked, “How important or unimportant is religious faith in shaping how you live your daily life?” The possible responses are extremely important, very important, somewhat important, not very important, and not important at all. These responses were coded on a scale from 1 to 5, with 5 corresponding to faith being extremely important in shaping how the respondent lives their daily life.

Levels of personal church attendance were measured by asking respondents who attend religious services, “About how often do you usually attend religious services there?” The possible responses are: a few times a year, many times a year, once a month, 2-3 times a month, once a week, and more than once a week. The responses are coded on a scale from 0 to 6, with 0 corresponding to those who claimed no church attendance, and 6 corresponding to those respondents who attend church “more than once a week.” This measure of church attendance was also combined with another measure of church attendance, which asked each respondent if they also attended church somewhere else, in order to create a measure of total church attendance. Table 1 shows the frequencies for each of the dependent variables.

Key Independent Variables

Previous research in the areas of religious transmission and changes in adolescent religiosity has focused on the effects of family context (Meyers, 1996; Kooistra and Pargament, 1999), religious context (Hoge, Petrillo, and Smith, 1983; Hunsberger, 1983; Dollahite and Thatcher, 2008), and social context (King, 2003; Gunnoe and Moore, 2002; Regnerus and Smith, 2004). The effects of social context have demonstrated that peers with similar religious views lead to increased levels of adolescent religiosity

Table 1: Descriptive Means of Adolescent Religiosity (2007)

Faith (2007)

Q. How important or unimportant is religious faith in shaping how you live your da

	Percentage
Extremely Important	21.59
Very Important	27.44
Somewhat Important	31.89
Not very important	12.11
Not important at all	6.96

N=2154, Missing data: 15

Church Attendance (2007)

Q. About how often do you usually attend religious services?

	Percentage
More than once a week	12.00
Once a week	13.62
2-3 times a month	10.84
Once a month	7.83
Many times a year	8.80
A few times a year	18.86
Don't attend	28.04

N=2154, Missing data: 11

Moore, 2002; Regnerus and Smith, 2004), but fewer studies have looked at how peers might lead to decreases in adolescent religiosity. No studies have examined how peers with vastly dissimilar religious views affect adolescent religiosity. In order to study these potential effects, a measure of the number of friends who claim no religion will be used. In the third wave of the study, respondents are asked how many friends they have (up to 5), and then they are asked how many of these friends “are not religious?” Another measure of potential negative peer influence will be added to the model by asking the respondents how many of their friends “have been in trouble for cheating, fighting, and skipping classes.”

To measure positive peer influences in accord with previous studies (Regnerus, Smith, and Smith, 2004; King and Mueller, 2003) this study uses a variable that asks how many of the respondent's 5 closest friends "are similar to you in their beliefs about religion?" The influence of peers was also measured by asking how many of the respondent's 5 closest friends they "talk with about matters of religious belief and experience." Each of these key independent variables was measured in the 2005 wave of the study. Some of the respondents have less than 5 friends (6.2%), but this should not affect these dependent variables because respondents with fewer friends should be less likely to be influenced by their peers.

One problem with these measures of positive and negative peer influence is that they have the potential to exhibit multicollinearity, because these measures seem to be direct opposites of each other. However, none of these measures of peer influence have a correlation higher than .25, or a variance inflation factor higher than 1.4, indicating that multicollinearity probably does not affect any of these independent measures.

Another influence that may lead to decreases in adolescent religiosity is media influence. To determine if media influence can lead to decreases in adolescent religiosity, the respondents were asked in the 2005 wave of the survey "about how many, if any, of the movies and videos that you watch are rated R?" The possible responses are all, most, some, a few, and none, and these response categories are coded on a scale from 1 to 5, with 5 corresponding to the response category "all".

Control Variables

Standard demographic controls such as age (measured in years), race (white=1), gender (female=1), and if they are from the South (=1) were included in the model.

Other controls for various measures of family context were included, such as if their biological parents were married to each other (=1), their father's level of education, and if their parents are of the same faith (=1). The strength of their parent's religious beliefs was also included, and is measured by asking the parent who took part in the survey on the first wave, "How important is your religious faith in providing guidance in your own day-to-day living?" Possible responses are extremely important, very important, fairly important, somewhat important, not very important, or not important at all. These responses are coded on a scale from 1 to 6, with 6 being extremely important. The education of each respondent's mother and father figure is also taken into account, by asking the parent taking the first wave of the survey to indicate their spouses (if they have one) and their level of education. No schooling and elementary schooling only were coded as 0, some high school, a GED, and high school graduates were coded as 1, a vocational-technical degree was coded as 2, some college education was coded as three, an associates or bachelors degree was coded as 4, some graduate school was coded as 5, and having obtained a graduate or professional degree was coded as 6.

Previous literature also suggests that several other measures may have significant effects on levels of adolescent religiosity. For instance, previous literature has shown that the closer children are to their parents, the more likely they are to adopt the religious views of the parents (Myers, 1996). In order to control for these effects, a measure of parental closeness was created from two questions asking "How close or not close do you feel to [Father/Mother]?" The possible responses for these two questions are extremely close, very close, fairly close, somewhat close, not very close, or not close at all. These responses were coded on a scale from 1 to 6, with 6 being extremely close. These

measures for both mother and father were added together to create a total measure of parental closeness. If the respondent was from a single-parent household, then the level of closeness of their parent was doubled. This technique for creating a measure of parental closeness was used by Bader and Desmond in their study (2006).

Studies of religious transmission have also sought to see whether attending college has an effect on religiosity, so a control was included to measure if the respondent was attending college (=1) at the time of the third wave. Research has also shown that levels of personal autonomy can lead to decreases in adolescent religiosity (Potvin and Sloane, 1985), so a measure of personal autonomy will be introduced by asking, “How much freedom do your parents give you to develop and openly express your own views on important issues?” The possible responses are too little freedom, the right amount of freedom, and too much freedom. These responses are coded on a scale from 1 to 3, with 3 being too much freedom. Finally, the RELTRAD scale is used as a control for religious affiliation (Steensland et al, 2000).

Previous levels of faith and church attendance from the 2005 wave of the survey have also been included in the model as controls, because the data is being used longitudinally to measure the effects of certain key independent variables on dependent variables such as self-reported faith and levels of church attendance. Without holding these measures constant, the effects of peers and media on adolescent religiosity could not be properly studied.

Population

This study intends to examine the effects of peer and media influences that lead to decreases in religiosity. However, some of the respondents are not religious, and therefore

they would not experience a decrease in religiosity because of the influences of peers and media. These respondents who are not religious have been removed from the sample. A respondent is considered to be not religious if they reported on the 2005 wave that they don't attend church and claim that faith is either "not very" or "not important at all" to them. When respondents with all initial levels of religiosity are included in the analysis the results are not substantially different, and these findings that include all respondents are included in the appendix.

Analytical Model

The dependent variables measuring faith and church attendance have enough response categories to warrant Ordinary Least Squares regression analysis. Even though the data is a longitudinal panel study, the data will not be analyzed using longitudinal methods such as using fixed-effects and random-effects models. These types of models would be appropriate if the analysis were examining how changes in the measures of peer and media influence affected changes in the dependent measures of faith and church attendance. However, it is not the change in these key independent variables that is of interest, but rather it is how the presence of these influences that is of interest. Therefore, I will use Ordinary Least Squares and regression analysis in a longitudinal manner, to see how peer and media influences that were measured during the 2005 wave affect levels of faith and church attendance from the 2007 wave of the survey.

The longitudinal aspect of this analysis is important because the effects of peers are transmitted through relationships, which as they develop over time should have more influence on adolescent religiosity. By measuring peer and media influences in the 2005

wave of the survey, the true impact that these influences have on future levels of faith and church attendance can be measured.

CHAPTER THREE

Results

The results have been divided into four tables, each with two separate models. The first model in each table examines the effects that one of the positive peer influences has on adolescent religiosity, and the second model from each table examines the effects of the negative peer and media influences, as well as the positive peer influence measure from the first model. The first model from each table attempts to replicate the findings from previous research that have demonstrated the positive effects that peers can have on adolescent religiosity, while the second model from each table explores what will happen when potential negative influences are also included in the model. The effects of each measure of positive peer influence are examined independently from each other, because a low Cronbach's alpha measure (.31) prevented them from being combined, and when they were included in the same models they cancelled out each other's effects.

Tables two examines the effects of the number of friends who are similar religiously on levels of faith, while table three looks at the how the number of friends that one talks to about religion influences levels of faith. Similarly, table four examines the effects the number of friends who are similar religiously on church attendance, while table five examines the effects on the number of friends one talks to about religion on church attendance. All of these analyses were also replicated using all respondents, not just respondents who exhibit some religiosity, and these results are found in the appendix.

Importance of Faith

Table two, model one, corroborates previous studies that suggest peer influence can lead to increased levels of adolescent religiosity (Gunnoe and Moore, 2002; Regnerus and Smith, 2004). The number of friends who are similar religiously has significant, positive effect on levels of faith in 2007 (.039**). When the negative effects of peers and media are included in model two, the number of friends who are similar religiously is still significant, but it loses some of its power (.028*), while the number of friends who are not religious (-.096***), and the frequency of watching R rated movies (-.094***) become significant. When using the standardized coefficients to compare the positive and negative peer and media influences, the effects of R rated movies is twice as strong as the number of friends who are similar religiously, while the standardized coefficient for the number of friends who are not religious is almost three times stronger.

Table three, model one, also demonstrates how peers can lead to increases in religiosity, by showing the number of friends who one talks to about religion (.030**) leads to increases in faith. However, when the negative influences of peers and media are included in model two, the number of friends who one talks about religion loses its significance, while the number of friends who are not religious (-.105***) and the frequency of watching R rated movies (-.091***) become strong, negative predictors. In both tables two and three, the presence of the negative effects of peers and media reduced the power and significance of the positive effects of the number of friends who are similar religiously, and the number of friends who the respondent talks to about religion.

Table 2: Effects of Rel. Friends (2005) on Rel. Adolescents' Faith (2007)

Key variables	Model One		Model Two	
	Estimate	Sig. Stan. Est.	Estimate	Sig. Stan. Est.
Friends similar religiously (2005)	0.039	** 0.056	0.028	* 0.039
R rated movies (2005)			-0.094	*** -0.077
Friends not religious (2007)			-0.096	*** -0.118
Friends in trouble (2005)			-0.024	-0.033
Controls				
Faith (2005)	0.587	*** 0.511	0.557	*** 0.481
Attendance (2005)	0.071	*** 0.056	0.058	*** 0.106
Age	0.017	0.020	0.026	0.031
Race (white=1)	-0.050	-0.020	-0.096	-0.039
Gender (female=1)	0.133	** 0.058	0.055	0.024
In college? (2007)	-0.072	-0.032	-0.058	-0.025
Personal Autonomy (2005)	0.087	0.030	0.074	0.025
Closeness to parents (2005)	0.015	0.024	0.015	0.023
Parents' faith importance (2003)	0.108	*** 0.108	0.099	*** 0.099
Parents of the same faith? (2003)	0.065	0.027	0.047	0.020
Parents married? (2003)	-0.075	-0.032	-0.068	-0.029
Father's education (2003)	-0.019	-0.031	-0.023	-0.038
Southern (2003)	0.051	0.022	0.052	0.022
Mainline Protestant (2003)	-0.180	* -0.051	-0.170	* -0.049
Black Protestant (2003)	0.156	0.043	0.095	0.025
Catholic (2003)	-0.108	-0.042	-0.104	-0.041
Jewish (2003)	0.058	0.006	-0.063	-0.006
Other (2003)	-0.038	-0.009	-0.095	-0.023
Not religious (2003)	-0.019	-0.004	-0.058	-0.012

Source: National Studies of Youth and Religion

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

RELTRAD comparison category: Evangelical Protestant

Model 1: N=1739, missing: 430, r sq. =.46

Model 2: N=1691, missing: 478, r sq. =.49

Table 3: Effects of Rel. Talk (2005) on Rel. Adolescents' Faith (2007)

Key variables	Model One		Model Two			
	Estimate	Sig.	Stan. Est.	Estimate	Sig.	Stan. Est.
Friends talk about religion (2005)	0.030	**	0.051	0.021		0.036
R rated movies (2005)				-0.091	***	-0.073
Friends not religious (2007)				-0.105	***	-0.129
Friends in trouble (2005)				-0.020		-0.027
Controls						
Faith (2005)	0.591	***	0.513	0.560	***	0.483
Attendance (2005)	0.066	***	0.051	0.052	***	0.096
Age	0.015		0.018	0.025		0.030
Race (white=1)	-0.024		-0.107	-0.069		-0.028
Gender (female=1)	0.134	**	0.058	0.059		0.026
In college? (2007)	-0.073		-0.032	-0.058		-0.025
Personal Autonomy (2005)	0.065		0.022	0.046		0.016
Closeness to parents (2005)	0.014		0.022	0.014		0.022
Parents' faith importance (2003)	0.105	***	0.104	0.094	***	0.093
Parents of the same faith? (2003)	0.061		0.026	0.052		0.022
Parents married? (2003)	-0.068		-0.029	-0.065		-0.028
Father's education (2003)	-0.019		-0.032	-0.023		-0.038
Southern (2003)	0.065		0.028	0.065		0.027
Mainline Protestant (2003)	-0.192	**	-0.054	-0.177	*	-0.051
Black Protestant (2003)	0.157		0.043	0.095		0.025
Catholic (2003)	-0.090		-0.035	-0.090		-0.035
Jewish (2003)	0.009		0.001	-0.100		-0.010
Other (2003)	-0.059		-0.014	-0.102		-0.024
Not religious (2003)	-0.008		-0.002	-0.047		-0.009

Source: National Studies of Youth and Religion

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

RELTRAD comparison category: Evangelical Protestant

Model 1: N=1794, missing: 375 r sq. =.46

Model 2: N=1720, missing: 449, r sq.=.49

Church Attendance

Table four, model one, also lends support to the idea that peer influence can lead to increases in adolescent religiosity, by showing that the number of friends who are similar religiously has significant, positive effect on levels of faith in 2007 (.066**). However, when the negative effects of peers and media are included in model two, the number of friends who are similar religiously loses its significance, while the number of friends who are not religious (-.096***), the number of friends who get in trouble (-.083**), and the frequency of watching R rated movies (-.094***) become significant predictors.

Similarly, table five, model one, demonstrates how the number of friends who one talks to about religion (.071**) leads to increases in faith. When the negative influences of peers and media are included in model two, the number of friends who one talks about religion remains significant, while the number of friends who are not religious (-.174***), the frequency of watching R rated movies (-.225***), and the number of friends who get in trouble (-.078) become significant, negative predictors. When using the standardized coefficients to compare the strength of the positive and negative effects, the effects of watching R rated movies is more than twice as strong as the number of friends who are similar religiously, while the number of friends who are not religious is almost three times stronger. Again, both tables four and five demonstrate how the presence of the negative effects of peers and media reduce the power and significance of the positive effects of peers.

Table 4: Effects of Rel. Friends (2005) on Rel. Adolescents' Church Att. (2007)

Key variables	Model One		Model Two			
	Estimate	Sig.	Stan. Est	Estimate	Sig.	Stan. Est.
Friends similar religiously (2005)	0.066	**	0.050	0.043		0.032
R rated movies (2005)				-0.229	***	-0.098
Friends not religious (2007)				-0.173	***	-0.112
Friends in trouble (2005)				-0.083	**	-0.059
Controls						
Faith (2005)	0.530	***	0.243	0.473	***	0.215
Attendance (2005)	0.447	***	0.432	0.419	***	0.404
Age	-0.106	***	-0.067	-0.084	**	-0.053
Race (white=1)	-0.028		-0.006	-0.171		-0.036
Gender (female=1)	-0.133		-0.030	-0.302	***	-0.069
In college? (2007)	0.082		0.019	0.073		0.017
Personal Autonomy (2005)	0.251	*	0.042	0.224	*	0.039
Closeness to parents (2005)	0.025		0.021	0.004		0.003
Parents' faith importance (2003)	0.065		0.034	0.035	*	0.019
Parents of the same faith? (2003)	0.236	*	0.053	0.221	*	0.049
Parents married? (2003)	-0.022		-0.005	-0.024		-0.005
Father's education (2003)	0.048		0.041	0.033		0.029
Southern (2003)	-0.032		-0.007	-0.038		-0.009
Mainline Protestant (2003)	-0.401	**	-0.059	-0.402	**	-0.061
Black Protestant (2003)	0.122		0.018	0.048		-0.009
Catholic (2003)	-0.187		-0.038	-0.196		-0.040
Jewish (2003)	-0.142		-0.008	-0.416		-0.022
Other (2003)	0.253	***	0.032	0.083		0.011
Not religious (2003)	-0.027		-0.003	0.040		0.004

Source: National Studies of Youth and Religion

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

RELTRAD comparison category: Evangelical Protestant

Model 1: N=1741, missing: 428, r sq. =.40

Model 2: N=1673, missing: 496, r sq. =.43

Table 5: Effects of Rel. Talk (2005) on Rel. Adolescents' Church Att. (2007)

Key variables	Model One		Model Two			
	Estimate	Sig.	Stan. Est.	Estimate	Sig.	Stan. Est.
Friends talk about religion (2005)	0.071	**	0.064	0.047	*	0.042
R rated movies (2005)				-0.225	***	-0.096
Friends not religious (2007)				-0.174	***	-0.113
Friends in trouble (2005)				-0.078	**	-0.055
Controls						
Faith (2005)	0.519	***	0.238	0.472	***	0.215
Attendance (2005)	0.443	***	0.428	0.415	***	0.400
Age	-0.106	***	-0.067	-0.079	**	-0.050
Race (white=1)	0.013		0.003	-0.121		-0.026
Gender (female=1)	-0.190	*	-0.043	-0.350	***	-0.080
In college? (2007)	0.067		0.015	0.057		0.013
Personal Autonomy (2005)	0.183		0.033	0.149		0.026
Closeness to parents (2005)	0.027		0.023	0.008		0.007
Parents' faith importance (2003)	0.069		0.036	0.036		0.055
Parents of the same faith? (2003)	0.231		0.051	0.247	*	0.055
Parents married? (2003)	-0.041		-0.009	-0.056		-0.013
Father's education (2003)	0.050		0.043	0.035		0.031
Southern (2003)	-0.008		-0.002	-0.015		-0.003
Mainline Protestant (2003)	-0.385		-0.057	-0.368	**	-0.055
Black Protestant (2003)	0.137		0.020	0.070		0.010
Catholic (2003)	-0.156		-0.032	-0.166		-0.034
Jewish (2003)	-0.217		-0.012	-0.461		-0.024
Other (2003)	0.205		0.026	0.064		0.008
Not religious (2003)	-0.003		0.000	0.064		0.007

Source: National Studies of Youth and Religion

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

RELTRAD comparison category: Evangelical Protestant

Model 1: N=1796, missing: 373, r sq. =.40

Model 2: N=1722, missing: 447, r sq. =.43

CHAPTER FOUR

Discussion and Conclusion

After undertaking this study of the effects of peer and media influences on the religiosity of religious adolescents, it becomes apparent that both positive and negative peer and media influences have significant effects. Previous research had already demonstrated that peer influences such as the number of friends who attend church, the number of peers from one's school who attend church and who view faith as important, and the number of friends who one talks to about religion all lead to increases in religiosity (Gunnoe and Moore, 2002; Regnerus and Smith, 2004). In accord with this previous research, I have shown that number of religious friends that respondents had in 2005 had significant, positive effects on their 2007 levels of faith and church attendance. Even though none of the previous studies used the number of friends who are similar religiously as a measure of positive peer influence, this variable does indeed measure positive peer influence, because friends who are similar religiously would either explicitly or implicitly encourage norms and behaviors that are consistent with the respondent's current religious views.

Another measure of positive peer influence that I included in the analysis was a how many of the respondent's close friends they talk to about religion. Previous research has studied the effects of religious conversation, and has shown that religious conversation does indeed have a significant, positive influence on adolescent religiosity (King et al, 2003). My research corroborates these previous findings by demonstrating

that the number who respondents talked to about religion in 2005 has a significant, positive effect on their levels of faith and church attendance in 2007.

While these findings match previous findings in the literature, the intent of this study was to attempt to introduce new variables that had been overlooked in previous studies of religious transmission and adolescent religiosity. Therefore, each of these significant, positive effects of peers were also examined in the presence of negative peer and media influences, to see how these additional variables would affect the previous models. When the number of friends who are similar religiously was studied in the context of the negative peer and media influences, its positive effects became weaker when the dependent variable was faith levels, and it became insignificant when the dependent variable was church attendance.

A similar result occurred when the number of close friends who the respondent talks to about religion was examined in the presence of these negative peer and media influences. By itself the number of close religious friends was a significant positive predictor of levels of faith and church attendance in 2007, but when the negative influences were introduced to the model, it no longer significantly predicted levels of faith, and the strength of its effects on church attendance were weakened.

These findings about the negative effects that peers and media can have adolescent religiosity are important for the sociological study of adolescent religiosity because previous studies did not include measures of peer and media influences that could lead to decreases in religiosity (Gunnoe and Moore, 2002; Regnerus and Smith, 2004; King et al, 2003). The inclusion of these measures is of the utmost importance because these new measures have negated many of the previous findings, which showed

the positive effects of peer influence on adolescent religiosity. My study still demonstrated that peer influences can have positive effects on adolescent religiosity, but only when potential negative effects are not present in the model. These findings suggest that the negative effects of peer and media influences are more salient than the positive effects that have thus far been demonstrated in the literature. Future studies of adolescent religiosity should strive to include measures of negative peer influences when examining the social factors that affect adolescent religiosity.

These findings not only demonstrate that variables measuring negative peer influences should be considered in future studies of adolescent religiosity, but they also add understanding to various theories that have been used to explain variations in adolescent religiosity. The theory that has been most widely used to explain adolescent religiosity and religious transmission is the theory of Social Learning Theory. These findings do indeed corroborate Social Learning Theory, because peer influences can be attributed to the fact that adolescents observe their peer's behaviors and beliefs, and then they model their own behaviors and beliefs after their peers. Social Learning Theory suggests that adolescents are more likely to become religious if their peers have positive attitudes towards religion, and less likely to become religiously if their peers don't model religious behavior and attitudes in their daily lives.

Another theory that is often used to explain the effects of peer groups and networks is a theory involving religious human capital (King et al, 2003). This theory states that the mere presence of other people helps to create certain norms and explanations of belief and practice, which in turn influence those who are surrounded by these social networks (King et al, 2003). The theory of religious human capital receives

some support from my study, because I examine of the number of close friends who are similar religiously, have religious conversations, get in trouble, or have no religion. However, my findings do not offer conclusive support for this theory, because there are no measures included in the model that control for the extent of power and depth of these relationships. The researcher who suggested the religious human capital theory has suggested that it is more than just the presence of these relationships that affect adolescent religiosity, but rather it is specific attributes of these relationships, such as the quality of communication, that activate the effects of peer influences on adolescent religiosity (King, 2004).

Ideas from Cultural Broadening Theory also help to make sense of the present findings. Cultural Broadening Theory initially claimed that young adults lose their faith or have decreased levels of religiosity when they attend college because of the exposure to worldviews that contradict the faith of their upbringing (Wuthnow and Glock, 1973). For the most part, this theory has not found support for its initial claims. However, some have suggested that Cultural Broadening Theory has not been supported by research because college students are exposed to worldviews that contradict the faith of their upbringing long before they attend college (Hoge, Johnson, and Luidens, 1993). These same researchers suggest that perhaps the ideas behind Cultural Broadening Theory should be used as a framework to study whether these 'broadening' effects exist and play a role in religiosity before students attend college (Hoge, Johnson, and Luidens, 1993).

My research has looked at the potential broadening effects of watching R rated movies, and has found that watching R rated movies leads to decreased levels of faith and church attendance. These findings seem to support some of the ideas contained within

the original formulation of Cultural Broadening Theory, even if this ‘cultural broadening’ occurs before college. Watching R rated movies could lead to cultural broadening, because many of the themes and concepts in R rated movies are contrary to the ideals of mainstream religion. The finding that R rated movies lead to decreases in adolescent religious supports the idea that cultural broadening occurs before college, and is a viable explanation for adolescent religiosity.

Finally, Life Cycles Theory has helped to frame an understanding of why positive peer influences have a relatively small influence on adolescent religiosity, while the negative effects of peers and media have much larger effects on adolescent religiosity. According to Life Cycles Theory, adolescents attempt to create their own identity by forming a religious and philosophical identity that is independent from their parents (Gallup and Bezilla, 1992; Smith, Denton, Faris, and Regnerus, 2002). In this light, it makes sense that peer influences that lead to homogeneity with their parents would have smaller effects, while the presence of peer and media influences that facilitate the creation of a unique personal identity that is independent from one’s parents would have larger effects.

Limitations

Future studies of adolescent religiosity could further improve upon this study by developing questions that delve deeper into the peer influences of religiosity, especially negative peer influences that may suggest that it is normative to adopt beliefs and practices that are contrary to religion. Another way that future research could improve upon understandings of adolescent religiosity is by finding a way to account for compulsory church attendance. Church attendance has widely been used as a measure for

adolescent religiosity (Regnerus, Smith, and Smith, 2004), yet many adolescents probably attend church because of pressure from their parents, and not because of their own desire.

It is also important to remember that not only do peers affect religiosity, but religiosity also affects the types of peers with whom respondents associate. While this study has suggested that peer and media influence lead to changes in religiosity in 2007, it is also true that adolescents who are experiencing changes in religiosity will choose to associate with peers who are accepting of their new beliefs and behaviors.

Conclusion

Previous research has suggested that peers can positively influence adolescent religiosity, but most of this research has focused exclusively on the positive influences of peer groups, and not the potentially negative effects of influences such as peer groups and media. This present research demonstrates that when these negative influences are added to the model, they often negate the positive findings that have been so widely documented (King, 2002; Gunnoe and Moore, 2002; Regnerus, Smith, and Smith, 2004). This research suggests that negative peer influences are an important and salient component for understanding the social effects of adolescent religiosity, and that they often outweigh and mask any positive effects from peer influences. This research also suggests that media plays an important role in creating norms and expectations that influence religiosity. When these norms are contrary to the ideals of religion, which is often the case in many R rated movies, the result is often a decrease in religiosity.

Adolescent religiosity is an important topic in the sociology of religion, because it studies people's first opportunity to make their own religious choices. By studying the

social influences that affect adolescent's religious choices, researchers will be able to better understand the foundations of religious beliefs, norms and practices that people carry with them for the rest of their lives.

APPENDIX

Effects of Peers and Media on Religiosity of All Respondents

Table A.1 Effects of Rel. Friends (2005) on All Adolescents' Faith (2007)

Key variables	Model One		Model Two	
	Estimate	Sig. Stan. Est.	Estimate	Sig. Stan. Est.
Friends similar religiously (2005)	0.030 *	0.038	0.024 *	0.031
R rated movies (2005)			-0.098 ***	-0.071
Friends not religious (2007)			-0.098 ***	-0.117
Friends in trouble (2005)			-0.023	-0.028
Controls				
Faith (2005)	0.579 ***	0.555	0.537 ***	0.514
Attendance (2005)	0.066 ***	0.118	0.051 ***	0.092
Age	0.019	0.021	0.029 *	0.031
Race (white=1)	-0.130 **	-0.047	-0.164 **	-0.059
Gender (female=1)	0.129 ***	0.051	0.055	0.022
In college? (2007)	-0.058	-0.023	-0.054	-0.021
Personal Autonomy (2005)	0.066	0.021	0.050	0.016
Closeness to parents (2005)	0.013 *	0.018	0.014	0.020
Parents' faith importance (2003)	0.104 ***	0.105	0.096 ***	0.097
Parents of the same faith? (2003)	0.084	0.032	0.064	0.025
Parents married? (2003)	-0.095 *	-0.037	0.093 *	-0.036
Father's education (2003)	-0.011	-0.016	-0.014	-0.021
Southern (2003)	0.070	0.023	0.069	0.026
Mainline Protestant (2003)	0.082	-0.051	-0.192 **	-0.050
Black Protestant (2003)	0.070	0.019	0.032	0.007
Catholic (2003)	-0.133 *	-0.046	-0.128 *	-0.044
Jewish (2003)	-0.047	-0.005	-0.119	-0.012
Other (2003)	-0.086	-0.019	-0.133	-0.030
Not religious (2003)	-0.039	-0.009	-0.066	-0.016

Source: National Studies of Youth and Religion

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

RELTRAD comparison category: Evangelical Protestant

Model 1: N=2054, missing=550, r sq. =.55

Model 2: N=1973, missing=631, r sq. =.57

Table A.2 Effects of Rel. Talk (2005) on all Adolescents' Faith (2007)

Key variables	Model One		Model Two	
	Estimate	Sig. Stan. Est.	Estimate	Sig. Stan. Est.
Friends talk about religion (2005)	0.022 *	0.035	0.017	0.026
R rated movies (2005)			-0.088 ***	-0.063
Friends not religious (2007)			-0.108 ***	-0.128
Friends in trouble (2005)			-0.020	-0.024
Controls				
Faith (2005)	0.582 ***	0.557	0.540 ***	0.515
Attendance (2005)	0.062 ***	0.112	0.049 ***	0.087
Age	0.018	0.019	0.028	0.030
Race (white=1)	-0.102 *	-0.037	-0.134 **	-0.048
Gender (female=1)	0.140 ***	0.055	0.070	0.028
In college? (2007)	-0.062	-0.024	-0.062	-0.024
Personal Autonomy (2005)	0.055	0.017	0.015	0.010
Closeness to parents (2005)	0.013	0.019	0.015	0.021
Parents' faith importance (2003)	0.102 ***	0.105	0.093 ***	0.093
Parents of the same faith? (2003)	0.079	0.030	0.067	0.026
Parents married? (2003)	-0.089	-0.034	-0.089	-0.034
Father's education (2003)	-0.011	-0.016	-0.012	-0.018
Southern (2003)	0.078	0.029	0.075	0.026
Mainline Protestant (2003)	-0.229 ***	-0.058	-0.216 ***	-0.056
Black Protestant (2003)	0.084	0.019	0.031	0.007
Catholic (2003)	-0.133 *	-0.043	0.122 *	-0.042
Jewish (2003)	-0.071	-0.007	-0.134	-0.014
Other (2003)	0.095	-0.021	-0.131	-0.029
Not religious (2003)	-0.022	-0.005	-0.047	-0.011

Source: National Studies of Youth and Religion

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

RELTRAD comparison category: Evangelical Protestant

Model 1: N=2134, missing=470, r sq. =.55

Model 2: N=2044, missing=560, r sq. =.56

Table A.3 Effects of Rel. Friends (2005) on All Adolescents' Church Att. (2007)

Key variables	Model One		Model Two			
	Estimate	Sig.	Stan. Est.	Estimate	Sig.	Stan. Est.
Friends talk about religion (2005)	0.065	***	-0.059	0.051	*	0.038
R rated movies (2005)				-0.220	***	-0.092
Friends not religious (2007)				-0.152	***	-0.104
Friends in trouble (2005)				-0.066	***	-0.047
Controls						
Faith (2005)	0.410	***	0.228	0.362	***	0.201
Attendance (2005)	0.423	***	0.440	0.397	***	0.413
Age	-0.097	***	-0.060	-0.073	**	-0.045
Race (white=1)	-0.013		-0.003	-0.173		-0.036
Gender (female=1)	-0.140		-0.032	-0.240	**	-0.055
In college? (2007)	0.070		0.158	0.062		0.014
Personal Autonomy (2005)	0.152		0.028	0.175		0.031
Closeness to parents (2005)	0.021		0.017	0.000		0.000
Parents' faith importance (2003)	0.070	*	0.041	0.048		0.028
Parents of the same faith? (2003)	0.251	**	0.056	0.233	**	0.052
Parents married? (2003)	-0.067		-0.015	-0.048		-0.011
Father's education (2003)	0.048	*	0.041	0.035		0.031
Southern (2003)	-0.007		-0.002	-0.027		-0.006
Mainline Protestant (2003)	-0.380	**	-0.056	-0.384	**	-0.057
Black Protestant (2003)	0.078		0.010	0.007		0.001
Catholic (2003)	-0.191		-0.038	-0.227	*	-0.046
Jewish (2003)	-0.332		-0.020	-0.431		-0.026
Other (2003)	0.178		0.023	0.085		0.011
Not religious (2003)	0.060		0.008	0.062		0.008

Source: National Studies of Youth and Religion

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

RELTRAD comparison category: Evangelical Protestant

Model 1: N=2137, missing=467, r sq. =.45

Model 2: N=1976, missing=628, r sq. =.47

Table A.4 Effects of Rel. Talk (2005) on All Adolescents' Church Att. (2007)

Key variables	Model One		Model Two			
	Estimate	Sig.	Stan. Est.	Estimate	Sig.	Stan. Est.
Friends talk to about religion (2005)	0.061	**	0.045	0.048	*	0.043
R rated movies (2005)				-0.213	***	-0.089
Friends not religious (2007)				-0.151	***	-0.104
Friends in trouble (2005)				-0.061	*	-0.044
Controls						
Faith (2005)	0.418	***	0.233	0.363	***	0.202
Attendance (2005)	0.425	***	0.442	0.396	***	0.412
Age	-0.097	***	-0.060	-0.070	**	-0.044
Race (white=1)	-0.058		-0.012	-0.013		-0.026
Gender (female=1)	-0.095		-0.022	-0.274	***	-0.062
In college? (2007)	0.086		0.019	0.044		0.010
Personal Autonomy (2005)	0.206	*	0.038	0.119		0.021
Closeness to parents (2005)	0.013	*	0.016	0.004		0.003
Parents' faith importance (2003)	0.069	*	0.041	0.047		0.027
Parents of the same faith? (2003)	0.253	**	0.057	0.259	**	0.058
Parents married? (2003)	-0.049	*	-0.011	-0.077		-0.017
Father's education (2003)	0.048	*	0.041	0.037		0.032
Southern (2003)	-0.021		-0.005	-0.011		-0.002
Mainline Protestant (2003)	-0.392		-0.058	-0.357	**	-0.054
Black Protestant (2003)	0.057		0.008	0.033		0.004
Catholic (2003)	-0.133	*	-0.044	-0.197		-0.040
Jewish (2003)	-0.293		-0.018	-0.451		-0.027
Other (2003)	0.222		0.029	0.062		0.008
Not religious (2003)	0.034		0.005	0.090		0.012

Source: National Studies of Youth and Religion

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

RELTRAD comparison category: Evangelical Protestant

Model 1: N=2057, missing=547, r sq. =.45

Model 2: N=2047, missing=557, r sq. =.48

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albrecht, S. L., Cornwall, M., & Perry H. Cunningham. (1988). Religious leave-taking, disengagement and disaffiliation among Mormons. In D.G. Bromley (Ed.), *Falling from the faith: Causes and consequences of religious apostasy* (pp. 62-80). Newbury Park, CA, SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Bader, C.D., & Desmond, S.A. (2006). Do as I say and as I do: The effects of consistent parental beliefs and behaviors upon religious transmission, *Sociology of Religion*, 67, 313-329.
- Bao, W., Whitbeck, L. B., Hoyt, D. R., & Conger, R. D. (1999). Perceived parental acceptance as a mediator and moderator of religious transmission among adolescents boys and girls, *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61, 362-374.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory. New York, General Learning Press.
- Brinkerhoff, M.B., & Mackie, M.M. (1993). Casting off the bonds of organized religion: A religious careers approach to the study of apostasy. *Review of Religious Research*, 34, 235-258.
- Bromley, D.G. (1988). Religious disaffiliation: A neglected social process. In D.G. Bromley (Ed.), *Falling from the Faith, Causes and Consequences of Religious Apostasy* (pp. 9-28). Newbury Park, CA, SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Caplovitz, D., & Sherrow, F. (1977). The religious drop-outs, apostasy among college graduates. Beverly Hills, Sage.
- Chaves, M. (1991). Family structure and Protestant church attendance: The sociological basis of cohort and age effects. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 30, 501-514.
- Clark, C. A., Worthington Jr., E., & Danser, D.B. (1988). The transmission of religious beliefs and practices from parents to firstborn early adolescent sons. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 50, 463-472.
- Copen, C., & Silverstein, M. (2007). The transmission of religious beliefs across generations, do grandparents matter? *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 38, 497-510.
- Dollahite, D.C., & Thatcher, J.Y. (2008). Talking about religion: How highly religious youth and parents discuss their faith. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 23, 611-641.

- Dudley, R.L., & Laurent, C.R. (1989). Alienation from religion in church-related adolescents. *Sociological Analysis*, 49, 408-420.
- Erickson, J. (1992). Adolescent religious development and commitment. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 31, 131-152.
- Gallup, G., & Bezilla, R. (1992). The religious life of young Americans. Princeton, NJ, The George Gallup International Institute.
- Gunnoe, M. L., & Moore, K.A. (2002). Predictors of religiosity among youth aged 17-22: A longitudinal study of the National Survey of Children. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 41, 613-622.
- Hadaway, C. K., & Roof, W.C. (1988). Apostasy in American churches: Evidence from National Survey Data. In D.G. Bromley (Ed.), *Falling from the faith: Causes and consequences of religious apostasy* (pp. 29-46). Newbury Park, CA, SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Hayes, B.C., & Pittelkow, Y. (1993). Religious belief, transmission, and the family: An Australian study. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 55,755-766.
- Hoge, D.R. (1988). Why Catholics drop out. In D.G. Bromley (Ed.), *Falling from the Faith: Causes and consequences of religious apostasy* (pp. 81-99). Newbury Park, CA, SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Hoge, D.R., & Roozen, D.A. (1979). Understanding church growth and decline: 1950-1978. New York, Pilgrim Press.
- Hoge, D. R., Johnson, B., & Luidens, D.A. (1993). Determinants of church involvement of young adults who grew up in Presbyterian churches. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 32,242-255.
- Hoge, D.R., Petrillo, G.H., & Smith, E.I. (1982). Transmission of religious and social values from parents To teenage children. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 44,569-580.
- Hunsberger, B. (1983). Apostasy, A social learning perspective. *Review of Religious Research*, 25, 21-38.
- Kandel, D.B., & Lesser, G.S. (1972). Youth in two worlds. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- King, Pamela Ebstyn, James L. Furrow, Natalie Roth, and Ross A. Mueller. (2003). Parental influence on adolescent religiousness: Exploring the roles of spiritual modeling and spiritual capital. *Marriage and Family, A Christian Journal* 6, 401-413.

- King, P. E., Furrow, J.L., & Roth, N. (2002). The influence of families and peers on adolescent religiousness. *Journal for Psychology and Christianity*, 21, 109-120.
- Kooistra, W.P., & Pargament, K. (1999). Religious doubting in parochial school adolescents. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 27, 33-42.
- National Studies of Youth and Religion. (2011). *Association of Religion Data Archives*. Retrieved February 7, 2011, from <http://www.thearda.com/Archive/NSYR.asp>
- Oman, D., & Thoresen, C.E. (2003). Spiritual modeling: A key to spiritual and religious growth? *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 13, 149-65.
- Regnerus, M.D., Smith, C., & Smith, B. (2004). Social context in the development of adolescent religiosity. *Applied Developmental Science*, 8, 27-38.
- Smith, C., Denton, M.L., Faris, R. & Regnerus, M. (2002). Mapping American adolescent religious participation. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 41, 497-612.
- Stark, R., & Finke, R. 2000. Acts of faith: Explaining the human side of religion. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Stark, R., Iannaccone, L.R., & Finke, R. (1996). Religion, science, and rationality. *American Economic Review*, 86, 433-437.
- Stolzenberg, R.M., Blair-Loy, M., & Waite, L.J. (1995). Religious participation in early adulthood: age and family life cycle effects on church membership. *American Sociological Review*, 60, 84-103.
- Uecker, J., Regnerus, M.D., & Vaaler, M. (2007). Losing my religion: The social sources of religious decline in early adulthood. *Social Forces*, 85, 1667-1692.
- Wuthnow, R., & Glock, C. (1973). Religious loyalty, defection, and experimentation among college youth. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 12, 157-180.