Macalester College
DigitalCommons@Macalester College

Sociology Honors Projects   Sociology Department

Spring 5-6-2014

How does a Believer Become Evangelical?: Using Habitus to Track the Transfer of Religious Meaning Across Social Contexts

Ethan W. Johnson
Macalester College, ejohns13@macalester.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/soci_honors

Part of the Sociology Commons

Recommended Citation

How does a Believer Become Evangelical?:

Using Habitus to Track the Transfer of Religious Meaning Across Social Contexts

Ethan Johnson

Advisor: Erik Larson

Department of Sociology

Macalester College

May 2014

How does a Believer Become Evangelical?:

Using Habitus to Track the Transfer of Religious Meaning Across Social Contexts

Ethan Johnson
Macalester College

Abstract: Recent research on religion's influence on civic life in the United States has focused predominantly on either studying the civic consequences of the rise of Evangelical Protestantism or focused on religion's ability to promote civic engagement and social capital generally. These two lines of study run the risk of assuming the salience of particular theological beliefs across social contexts while also neglecting an attempt to understand how religious communities and belief can promote explicitly religious civic orientations. I build on Bourdieu's concept of habitus to propose a theoretical remedy for these shortcomings in the research. Using original survey data collected in Mainline Protestant congregations in a Midwest metropolitan area, I use binary logistic regression to test hypotheses which posit how the religious practices, non religious practices, and identities of Mainline Protestants may influence the likelihood of forming a religious civic orientation. Results show early support for the Bourdieuian theoretical framework, and suggest that prayer frequency and employment in the private sector may have a strong ability to influence Mainline Protestants' civic orientations. I end by suggesting implications the findings have for the future of research on religious meaning's ability to transfer across contexts into individuals' orientations towards the civic sphere.

A predominant trend in recent sociological study of religion in the United States has been how religious values and affiliations affect civic and political life (Smith et al. 1998; Starks and Robinson 2009; Hunter 1991; Wuthnow 1988; Regnerus et al. 1998; Barnes 2005; Brown and Brown 2003; Beyerlein and Hipp 2006). Driving this academic trend are two specific developments in American social life: the apparent rise of

conservative Protestantism as a social movement (Hunter 1991; Smith et al. 1998; Gold and Russell 2007; Regnerus and Smith 1998) and widespread concern that Americans are becoming less civically engaged (Putnam 2000).

The research collected following these lines of inquiry has certainly uncovered some important insights about religion's role in American public life. Both threads of research, however, have their respective problems if we desire to understand how religious beliefs and affiliation translate into civic attitudes and behavior. Research on conservative Protestantism is especially problematic in this regard because it often assumes the civic ideas and behaviors of conservative Protestants reflect individually held theological beliefs consistent with those of congregational doctrine. We have little reason to believe such an assumption would frequently bear out in empirical research (Chaves 2010).

Research on religion's general relationship with active participation in the civic sphere largely avoids the problems present in the literature on Conservative Protestantism. In focusing largely on the quantity of civic engagement religious sources of capital create, however, the literature often loses focus on determining how religious sources of civic engagement may lead to or reflect particularly religious orientations to the civic world. Ironically, then, research motivated by the desire to explain how religion provides unique opportunities to build social capital may overlook if and how such religious sources of civic engagement produce religiously civic individuals.

Consequently, we face a problem when trying to understand the influence religion has on individuals' understandings of civic life. How can we maintain religion as a

potentially causal variable in predicting individual's civic orientations while avoiding unwarranted assumptions about the salience of theological beliefs outside of explicitly religious social contexts?

In this paper, I develop an answer to this question, offering Pierre Bourdieu's theoretical tool of habitus as a potential solution. A habitus is a precognitive, individual level, orientation to the social world. Repeated exposure to particular social conditions, ideas, and practices forms the habitus. We can then understand the habitus as both a singular theoretical object, possible to measure empirically, as well as a device that takes into account subjective social histories and positions. If we use the habitus in empirical study, we avoid assuming unidirectional, unchecked religious influence while at the same time keeping open the possibility that religion influences an individual's particular orientation to the social world.

I derive empirical hypotheses about the relationship between individual religious practice and individual civic orientations. Then I use original survey data collected from Mainline Protestant congregations in a major Midwest metropolitan area to test the hypotheses using binary logistic regression. Although I do not find conclusive support for my hypotheses, perhaps due to the small size of my sample, the overall results encourage the use of a Bourdieuian framework for future study of individual level religious characteristics and the civic sphere.

Review

In recent years, one of the primary foci of the academic study of religion in the United States has been study of the effects of individuals holding conservative or

orthodox religious beliefs. Among the purported consequences of holding such beliefs are effects on voting behavior (Denton 2005), wealth accumulation (Keister 2008), evaluations of free market capitalism (Steensland and Schrank 2011), and charitable behavior (Regnerus et al. 1998). Scholars have also explored to what extent such unique characteristics of conservative Protestants reflect an embattled subculture at odds with secular society (Smith et al. 1998) or an inclusive worldview that views the entirety of humanity as subject to discernible mandates from God revealed through religious scripture (Starks and Robinson 2009). Additionally, scholars have debated whether differences between conservative Protestants and the rest of American society are emblematic of a culture war between moral modernists and religious fundamentalists (Hunter 1991), or whether such a dramatic binary depiction of theological differences in the United States exaggerates actual empirical distinctions (Williams 1997; DiMaggio et al. 1996).

While such studies and debates certainly illuminate potentially salient associations between religion and social life, they have a couple shortcomings. First, they run the risk of committing what Mark Chaves (2010) calls the religious congruence fallacy. People commit the religious congruence fallacy when they assume religious beliefs cause associations between religious identity and behavior without thorough proof that such religious beliefs inform the particular behaviors under study. Chaves (2010:5-6) explains why such a high standard of proof is necessary in such instances:

> A very common finding in the scientific study of religion is that
> theological beliefs relate to other beliefs and actions in different,
> sometimes opposite, ways for African Americans than for whites.
> Controlling for other things, theologically conservative whites are more

politically conservative than theologically liberal whites, but the opposite is true for African Americans (Greeley and Hout 2006:ch. 4). White conservative Protestants are more individualistic when they think about inequality, but the opposite is true for African Americans (Emerson and Smith 2000:97). Theologically conservative white congregations are less socially engaged than theologically liberal white congregations, but the opposite is true among African-American congregations (Tsitsos 2007).

If the truly salient casual variable in each of the three phenomena were religious beliefs held by individuals, then one would expect congruent attitudes between white Protestants and black Protestants. Instead, some kind of mechanism appears to be mediating the causal influence (if such an influence even exists in the first place) of religious beliefs on the attitudes mentioned. We should then conclude that any meaningful interpretation of the associations between conservative religious beliefs and individual attitudes and behaviors need to be based on extensive proof. After all, religious beliefs and behaviors may never have been intended to have an influence beyond specific social contexts. Also possible, even likely, is that individuals may simply not think to consider religious beliefs in contexts where non-religiously informed behaviors and thoughts have already been routinized (Chaves 2010). In short, there are simply too many reasons to believe religious beliefs *do not* have an influence across social contexts to assume that they do (Chaves 2010).

Research on conservative Protestants' particular civic orientations and the theoretical pitfalls caught up in such research does not, however, represent the totality of recent research on the relationship between religion and the civic world. Perhaps motivated by Robert Putnam's (2000) warning that overall civic behavior and social

capital in the United States is declining, sociologists of religion have developed another thrust in the study of religion in the United States. The research in this movement mostly concerns the relationship between religion and voluntarism. Such work often avoids the religious congruence fallacy by focusing not on the effects of particular theological perspectives, but rather on the effects of religiosity generally. It often situates actors within actual social contexts in which non theological considerations, such as reinforcing social ties in which actors are accountable to each other (Brown and Brown 2003; Schawdel 2005), as well as the reality of scarce time resources and potential substitution effects between congregational and non congregational volunteering, assume causal significance (Becker and Dhringa 2001; Uslaner 2002; Lam 2002; Schwadel 2005).

Such studies have their own shortcomings, however. The greatest one being that they fail to evaluate how a specifically religious perspective can inform civic engagement arising from religious contexts. In following Putnam's (2000) concern with civic engagement's generally positive effects on individual and societal well-being, the studies listed in the previous paragraph have mostly gleaned how religious identities and institutions affect the *quantity* of civic engagement. The *quality* of such civic engagement, to what degree a specifically religious perspective informs such action, remains largely unknown. Such an insight is integral if we are to fully understand any novel contribution religious adherence and belief makes to civic life.

Recent trends in the sociology of religion, then, leave us with a puzzle. On the one hand, we have a trend of literature relying too much on the likely fallacious assumption that the theological beliefs of a particular religious tradition have an effect on individuals across social contexts. On the other hand, we have a trend of literature which avoids that

pitfall, but largely fails to evaluate how religion may uniquely inform certain civic behaviors and orientations.

In the past half decade, a small trend has developed in the sociology of religion, one moving in a direction that almost addresses this puzzle. Taken as a whole, these works are subjective evaluations of religion in the civic sphere (Lichterman 2008; 2012; Madsen 2009; Beyerlin et al. 2011; Read and Eagle 2011; Honganeu-Sotelo 2008). For example, Madsen (2009) expands investigation of individual religious beliefs beyond measurements of cross- sectional, institutional affiliation into a more longitudinal, boundary crossing perspective. The study details how individuals often transition in and out of more than one faith community over a lifetime and shows how people often use past experiences to define themselves relative to other religious beliefs and communities. Although the exact methods and findings of the rest of the studies vary, what they have in common is a concern with religion in the concrete social world. In these studies, religion is not a stable variable, but a dynamic one, subjectively modified by the influence of specific social experiences and identities.

The subjective, dynamic treatment of religious belief and experience in these studies is certainly welcome. Nevertheless, these studies lack a coherent theoretical framework with which to understand how religious meaning transfers across contexts. Lichterman (2012) comes the closest to offering such a framework. He proposes we move toward a "cultural interactionalist" model informed by the work of Erving Goffman to understand how individuals express religious identity and belief in social settings. This suggestion, while certainly useful in some respects, usually neglects evaluating *why* individual actors may find explicitly religious action in the civic sphere legitimate or

desirable. Like Chaves (2010:10), I am simultaneously extremely hesitant to assign across context significance to religious beliefs and identities and also unwilling to give up the attempt to ascertain religion's independent influence on individuals' perspectives on civic life.

In trying to develop a coherent theory of how religious belief and practices transfer their effects across contexts, however, we arrive at another puzzle. How can we ascribe significance and stability to individual-level religious characteristics without succumbing to the religious congruence fallacy? We need a theoretical perspective that both treats the individuals seriously as actors in a subjective social world with many, often conflicting forces surrounding them, but also allows for a certain degree of stability of individual social orientation. Extending Pierre Bourdieu's theory of habitus into the realm of religion provides such a theoretical perspective.

A Bourdieuian Perspective on Religion in the Civic World

A habitus is a sort of mental filter that gives structure and order to an individual's lived social experiences (Bourdieu 1991). Repeated exposure to particular social experiences, ideas or routines construct this filter. The habitus is not synonymous with the conscious evaluation of preferences or appropriate behaviors in certain contexts. If it were, citizens of modern societies would likely grow exhausted having to consciously remember the last time they performed routine actions in order to remember how to correctly perform them again. The habitus' structuring of social life extends to more abstract situations as well. For example, an individual may have a conservative political habitus, automatically structuring every social problem reported on the news as the

accumulated product of the failures of individuals without consideration that systemic social problems may be at work.

Explaining with a more topical example, weekly church attendance may internalize into an individual a particular religious perspective on the non-congregational civic world. The same person, however, may enter a workplace for several hours multiple times per week, exposing himself to a different perspective on the civic world and internalizing a different kind of understanding of the civic world into the same habitus.

A Bourdieuian perspective on the association between individuals' religion and their civic orientation offers many advantages. First, it allows us to avoid falling prey to the religious congruence fallacy. It does so by focusing not on affiliation to particular religious institutions as the cause of particular individual orientations, but instead on how the effects of religious beliefs and practices may transfer into the civic realm through their internalization into the habitus. Indeed, a habitus is not an isolated structure formed by exposure to one particular perspective on social life, but is instead formed from many perspectives. It is a singular object and as such is measurable empirically, but the habitus is also a synthesis of many differing experiences and ideas which may have no inherent connection. By focusing on the habitus, we can thus both realistically conduct empirical studies and respect the subjective realities of the religious individuals we study. (Bourdieu 1991)

Potential implications and empirical hypotheses

Armed with the theoretical tool of the habitus to make sense of religion's influence in American civic life, empirical questions arise. What combination or

combinations of religious experiences and non religious experiences increase the likelihood of holding a religious orientation in the civic sphere? What types of experiences have a comparatively greater influence on this likelihood? In the section below, I outline some plausible answers to these questions, hypotheses I test later on in the paper.

Hypothesis One: Unidirectional Religious Accumulation

The first hypothesis is simple: the more individuals expose themselves to religious social contexts and practices, the more likely it is the individual will develop a civic religious habitus. Such contexts and practices would include the following: religious service attendance, scripture reading, prayer, volunteering within a congregation, participation or membership in religious organizations, and participation in friend groups in which members met each other in religious settings. Note that despite its simplicity and unidirectional nature, this hypothesis does not assume associations between an individual's religious tradition and his or her particular perspectives on civic life. The hypothesis focuses not on theological identity, but instead on the quantity of exposure to religious contexts and understandings of the world. Such a move keeps the empirical focus on actual social contexts. It also allows for the evaluation of what specific types of religious practices may exert a comparatively higher influence on the development of a civic religious habitus than other types.

Hypothesis Two: Unidirectional Non-Religious Accumulation

This hypothesis follows a logic similar to the previous hypothesis; the more individuals expose themselves to non religious social contexts the less likely they are to

develop a civic religious habitus. Although the logic of this hypothesis does not specify what exact types of religious contexts would be most important to focus on, I think it prudent to focus on the occupational practices and identity. Academic work on the relationship between individual religious characteristics and the workplace has been surprisingly scant (Steffy 2013). Nevertheless, within the past few decades, Americans have come to see the workplace, relative to other social settings, as more and more of a place to make lasting relationships and have meaningful experiences (Hochschild 1997). This trend in the structure of American life suggests that by examining occupational characteristics of individuals we may gain fruitful insights concerning the internalization of forms of non-religious systems of meaning.

Hypothesis Three: High Commitment Institutional and Cultural Closure

The third hypothesis is almost the opposite of the first hypothesis. It posits that high degrees of exposure and commitment to religious practices lead to increasing disengagement with the non-inherently religious civic sphere and an increasing commitment to otherworldly concerns. In other words, this hypothesis proposes that the pious may actually be *less* likely to understand the civic sphere in religious terms. Perhaps the spiritual beliefs of the highly religious individual may exist on a cosmological plane beyond the profanities of the material world. Literature on the effects of high degrees of commitment to congregational voluntarism on the quantity of non-congregational voluntarism (Becker and Dhringra 2001; McPherson and Rotolo 1996), parallel the logic behind this hypothesis (although the focus of this paper is on civic orientation rather than civic engagement).

If this hypothesis bore out in empirical research, we would conclude that high degrees of religious commitment lead to the cognitive separation of religion and civic life. This hypothesis may also accurately describe the effects of high degrees of certain religious practices, but not others. For example, it is possible that frequent prayer may lead to the elevation of religion to a cognitive plane above civic life, but frequent scripture reading would not lead to such an elevation.

Hypothesis Four: Interaction between Religious and Non Religious Internalizations

The last hypothesis is the most dynamic I will outline. It is inspired by studies asserting the importance of the interaction between individual level religious characteristics and other forms of individual capital in predicting levels of civic engagement (Brown and Brown 2003), as well as Putnam's (2000) differentiation between bonding and bridging social capital and each's respective consequences for social life. This hypothesis posits that religious and non-religious accumulated social experiences may not necessarily compete for predominance over an individual's civic habitus. Instead, both types of accumulated social experience may interact within individuals, producing civic orientations that would have been impossible if an individual had accumulated only one type of social experience. What might be necessary for an individual to develop a civic religious habitus is regular exposure to religious practices as well as the holding of particular types of non religious capital, such as advanced education. Such cultural capital may allow an individual to more readily translate religious experiences and ideas across social contexts. Consequently, for some individuals a strong presence outside of an explicitly religious context, whether in an

identity, time spent in an environment, or a combination of both, may serve not as a threat to the likelihood of them developing a religious civic habitus. Instead, it may amplify such a likelihood by providing them with the necessary experience and context to make religious ideas and socialization mean something outside a particular context.

Data and Methods

To test the hypotheses above, I wrote and distributed a survey, both in a pen and paper and an online format, to individuals who were either members of a Mainline Protestant church within a major Midwest metropolitan area or who had attended a church service the Sunday I was at the church. I collected data from four separate congregations.[1]

In the three congregations in which I collected data in the pen and paper format, I went to a church service in the congregation on a Sunday morning. During the service, a pastor announced my presence and my desire to collect surveys from members of the congregation. After the service, I stationed myself at a table with the surveys where a pastor told me people generally congregated after the church service and waited for respondents to volunteer to take the survey. They returned it to me either by their expense in the mail or the same day within the church. In the two congregations in which I collected data through an online survey (I collected surveys in one congregation through two means), I emailed a link to the survey to the pastor of the congregation who then distributed the link to the congregation member email list. In neither case did I use

---

[1] Due to an oversight in the construction of the online version of the survey, I cannot be sure from which congregation each individual survey came. Unfortunately, this means I cannot test whether particular congregational contexts are important in influencing the development of the civic habituses of Mainline Protestants. Future studies should make sure to investigate such a possibility.

scientific sampling techniques, nor can I calculate a response rate among those who had access to the survey. The theoretical project of this study does not depend on a representative sample per se, and as such I determined the significant costs of ensuring such a sample were not worth incurring.

I chose survey collection as my research method for two reasons. First, a survey can pull data efficiently from multiple contexts of individuals' lives. Second, the data collected from each context can be readily compared with data from other contexts. Through such an approach, I can determine which repeated practices or lived contexts have a higher or lower relative association with an individual's civic habitus through the use of logistic regression.

I identified Mainline Protestant churches as a desirable population for a few reasons. Firstly, I needed to make sure religion factored into the lives of those sampled in some way. Secondly, sampling Mainline Protestants breaks with the academic trend of focusing disproportionately on Evangelical Protestants. Thirdly, Mainline Protestants hold a comparatively high level of human and economic capital relative to other major religious traditions in the country (Keister 2008; Wuthnow 2007), meaning they are an appropriate population for testing the plausibility of the capital interactions hypothesized in hypothesis four.

I measure the civic habitus of an individual in the first question of the survey. I ask the respondent to name up to three charities, membership organizations, or organizations that advocate for social causes that the respondent believes best reflect their

personal values. I coded the respondents as having religious civic habitus if they listed at

least one non-congregational religious organization in their answer to the first question.[2]

I believe the first question of my survey measures a habitus for the following

reasons. First, the position of the question at the beginning of the survey ensures that, to

the extent possible, respondents will offer organizations that come to them naturally

when thinking about the civic sphere. I assume these organizations represent the types of

civic activity respondents are attracted to without prior priming in other questions.

Second, the focus on the respondent's civic values allows respondents to pick

organizations they are not personally involved in. This lessens the likelihood that the

organizations the respondent lists merely reflect the amount of an individual's exposure

to certain organizations.

I do not deny that such a strategy for measuring a religious habitus may

overestimate the importance of religious ideas and understandings within peoples' civic

habituses. After all, an atheist may think a religious charity deeply reflects her personal

values due to widely agreed upon standards what constitutes a good deed. Nevertheless,

what we should remember when considering habituses is that we should not necessarily

---

[2] I determined whether or not an organization was religious by searching the organization's name on an internet search engine. Almost all organizations respondents listed had websites. On those websites, I sought out sections named "About us," or "Our Mission," or something to that effect. If the organization claimed an explicitly religious rationale for their work, I coded such organizations as religious. I also coded organizations as religious if they had blatantly religious language in their name (for example, Catholic Charities) without further consideration unless such blatantly religious language was embedded within an acronym used to commonly refer to the organization (such as the YMCA). Respondents described some organizations too vaguely to be identified (for example, some people simply listed a "food shelf"). I decided to code such organizations as non religious, assuming that any religious aspect of such organizations were not particularly important to respondents if they neglected to point them out in their response. Additionally, because this study is particularly concerned with the effects of religious socialization and identity across contexts into non inherently religious realms, I did not count the respondent's church congregation as a religious organization that counted towards coding an individual's habitus as religious.

understand them to reflect active support for certain perspectives and actions. Rather, it is more accurate to understand them as reflecting an orientation that perceives certain perspectives and actions in a field of social activity as *legitimate*. Consequently, when I assert that an individual has a civic religious habitus in this study, I am merely indicating that I can be close to certain that the individual accepts some kind of religious expression in the civic sphere. I suspect that explicitly religious calls to action by public organizations and figures could motivate civic behavior in the future for such religious habitus individuals if certain conditions were met. Even if people with civic religious habituses only offer tacit support to religious civic action, however, that still constitutes *some* degree of support for religious voices in the civic sphere. A religious habitus as defined by this study represents, at the very least, a perspective of consequence for the future legitimacy of religious action in civic life.

In order to test hypotheses one, three, and four, I included questions on the survey designed to measure the extent respondents engaged in particular religious practices. I asked respondents how often they attend church, how often they pray and study scripture, how often they volunteer inside the church congregation, in how many congregational membership organizations they claim membership, and where they have met the greatest amount of their friends.

To test hypotheses two and four, I also included questions on the survey designed to measure the extent and type of engagement the respondent had in non-religious contexts. I asked respondents how often they volunteer outside the church congregation, how many non congregational organizations they claimed membership, in what sector of the economy (private, public, nonprofit, not/never in the workforce) they had worked at

the longest, how many hours they work (or worked) per week on average, and what their

highest achieved level of formal education is.[3]

To aid in data analysis, I recoded many of the variables into dichotomous

variables. I made the following recodings to the religious practice variables designed to

test hypotheses one, two and four: those who pray at least once daily and those who do

not; those who read scripture at least once a week and those who do not; those who

volunteer more within the church than outside the church; those who claim membership

in more congregational organizations than non congregational organizations;[4] and those

who self-report that they attended church service at least once per week and those who do

not.

Amongst the non-religious variables designed to test hypotheses two and four, I

coded the following dichotomous variables: those who work or worked more than 45

hours a week and those who do or did not[5]; those are or were self-employed or work at a

private business and those who do not fit that description, those who indicate work as the

---

[3] Since for the purposes of this study I am mainly concerned with the internalization of certain social
perspectives and not cross sectional representations of the current life situations of respondents, I asked
retired individuals to answer the occupational questions based on past experiences.

[4] For the questions concerning the extent and type of volunteering, respondents often indicated a non
definite number of volunteer occasions. Consequently, I decided to code responses to these questions into a
single dichotomous variable aimed at communicating if respondents volunteered within congregations or
outside congregations more. A similar problem plagued respondents' answers to the questions measuring
participation in membership organizations. Respondents often neglected to list each individual organization
separately or gave similarly esoteric responses. I thus coded the answers to these questions into a
dichotomous variable designed to communicate whether or not the respondent participated in more
congregational organizations or non congregational organizations. There may be error in my recodings, but
there is no evidence to suggest that it systematically biases responses in one direction.

[5] I chose 45 hours per week rather than 40 hours per week as the cutoff point because those people who
work or worked more than 45 hours per week would almost certainly work or have worked more than what
is usually expected of a full time employee. Employees who usually work about 42 hours a week may
consistently round down to 40 when asked by someone, even though they technically work more hours than
a prototypical full time employee.

place they have met the greatest number of their friends and that those who have met them in some other social setting; and, because of the extraordinary level of average education in my sample, those who have completed a graduate or professional degree and those who have not.

Results

216 congregants responded to my survey. Of those, 203 answered the first question on the survey measuring the dependant variable. Table 1 lists univariate data on the dichotomous variables listed above, as well as two additional dummy control variables measuring the retirement status and the gender of a respondent. All percentages reflect affirmative responses to the questions listed.

The univariate data show fairly even splits for most of the dichotomous variables. Encouragingly, almost exactly half of respondents (48 percent) have a religious habitus, a sign that merely being a Mainline Protestant does not cause an individual to have a religious habitus.

Exceptions to the general trend of evenly divided responses occur in the variables measuring relative organization membership and friend circles. A surprisingly low number of respondents (14.1 percent) claimed membership in more congregational organizations than non congregational organizations. It may simply be that there are significantly more opportunities for organizational membership outside of the church than opportunities inside of it. It may also be that membership in church organizations requires comparatively more commitment than membership in most non church

organizations. Neither interpretation of the data, however, mounts a serious challenge to the assumed theoretical significance of the variable.

Only around a fifth of respondents (21.0 percent) indicated that they met the greatest proportion of their current friends at work. This finding seems appropriate. With four other options for settings in which to make friends, we should not be surprised that a quarter to a fifth of respondents to choose work as their answer to the question.

The only potentially troubling univariate finding is the high percentage of respondents with graduate or professional degrees. The population I desired to sample was merely Mainline Protestants, not highly-educated Mainline Protestants. I did not plan that more than half of my sample (62.1 percent) would have a graduate or professional degree. I either accidently self-selected churches to survey in well-educated neighborhoods, or churches with highly educated members were more likely to respond to my request that I be allowed to survey their congregations. Whatever the case, my accidental sampling of such an extraordinarily educated population introduces some unanticipated problems with data interpretation. I will explain such problems in more detail later on in the paper.

The Model

Table 2 summarizes the nested binary logistic models I used to test the four hypotheses. A positive value for a variable indicates that those who have that characteristic have an increased likelihood of holding a civic religious habitus. Model 1 reflects the association between personal, not necessarily institutional religious practices and the dependent variable. Model 2 adds variables measuring religious practices within

a congregational context, as well as the variable measuring the source of the individual's friends. Model 3 adds variables measuring occupational and educational characteristics. Model 4 adds the two dummy demographic control variables, and Model 5 adds in two interaction terms to test the validity of hypothesis four.

The models reveal a few conspicuous trends. First, the most persistent association between independent variables and the dependent variable is the association between praying at least once per day and the presence of a religious habitus. Prayer is positively and significantly associated with having a religious habitus in every model. Second, with the exception of the congregational volunteering variable in Model 5, in no model do any of the measurements of congregational religious practice have a statistically provable association with the dependent variable. Third, much the same as the variable measuring prayer, working in the private sector the longest of any sector has a durable, negative association with the presence of a civic religious habitus.

If we use the models to evaluate the four hypotheses, we find mixed or inconclusive support. The positive association between daily prayer and the presence of a civic religious habitus is consistent with hypothesis one's assumption that repetition of religious practices lead to the internalization of religious understandings that can carry across social contexts. No other variables measuring the degree and frequency of particular types of religious practice were statistically significant in the models. Nevertheless, with the exception of the variable indicating relatively more congregational volunteering, all of the religious practice variables have encouraging positive coefficients. With a larger sample, those variables may have become significant. Based

on the data, then, I affirm the plausibility of a confirmation of hypothesis one fairly strongly.

The data offers less conclusive support for hypothesis two. The most straightforward measurement of commitment and exposure to non-inherently religious spheres, the amount of time an individual spends at work, was not statistically significant in any of the models. This may tempt us to reject hypothesis two outright. However, one type of non-religious characteristic, an individual's employment within the private sector of the economy, had a steady, negative effect on the likelihood of an individual holding a religious civic habitus. Based on the data, then, it seems prudent to refine hypothesis two. At least in these preliminary findings, the quality of exposure to non-religious contexts seems to matter more than quantity of exposure in predicting the likelihood of an individual holding a civic religious habitus. As such, the internalization of non-religious understandings of the civic world may depend more on considerations such as occupational identity and access to secular altruistic networks than on the raw number of hours spent in non-religious context. It is also still possible that there is an association between hours spent in non religious contexts and the internalization of non religious understandings of the civic world, but the relationship is non-linear. Perhaps if an individual works more than 30 hours per week, each successive hour ceases to have an additional impact on the habitus. Whatever the case, the models do not offer strong support to hypothesis two in the form I outlined it earlier in the paper, but they also do not reject its basic assumptions outright.

Regarding hypothesis three, the models are inconclusive, leaning toward rejection of the hypothesis. With exception of the congregational volunteering variable in the final

model, none of the variables indicating a high degree of religious commitment have a negative coefficient consistent with the assumptions of hypothesis three. With a larger sample, it is possible that the church volunteering variable could become significant in a direction supporting hypothesis three. Also possible, however, is that other variables would become significant in a direction consistent with hypothesis one. Additionally, the positive relationship between at least once daily prayer and the holding of a religious habitus directly contradicts the assumption of hypothesis three. Thus, I conclude that there is no evidence to support the idea that high levels of individual religiosity cause a cognitive barrier between individuals' religion and their orientation toward the civic world.

The models appear to support the assumptions of hypothesis four. Two interactions between a variable that measures a religious practice and a variable that measures a non religious characteristic are significant in the final model. I found no other statistically significant interaction terms, but finding two significant interaction in such a small sample is certainly more encouraging than discouraging in evaluating whether a confirmation of hypothesis four is plausible.

Interpreting the significant interaction terms theoretically is a steeper challenge. The highly educated nature of the sample makes interpreting the interaction between those who both hold a graduate degree and read scripture at least once per week difficult. The significance of the interaction term might mean that highly educated people have greater amounts educational cultural capital, capital which might direct them to approach religious scripture critically. Rather than understanding scripture to be filled with straightforward imperatives for humanity, highly educated people may have been

socialized to understand scripture to be similar to other human produced, historically situated texts. Consequently, the highly educated may have developed a habitus in which scripture reading is less of an objective information gathering exercise and more of a subjective, dynamic process whose exact civic consequences are unclear.

We can just as easily, however, interpret the interaction between education level and scripture differently. Because my recoded variable only draws a distinction between those with a graduate degree and those without, the variable may be acting as a proxy for the degree of occupational identity and employment status of an individual. If this is true, however, it is not clear why a strong internalized occupational identity or high amounts of occupational status would only interact with scripture reading rather than religious practices generally. To know this, we would need to know more about the mechanism which might connect regular scripture reading to the likelihood of developing a civic religious habitus. Whatever the case, the uncertainty as to what the education variable in the models measures makes me wary of asserting any interpretation of the scripture reading/level of education interaction term too strongly.

The interaction between the congregational volunteering variable and the employment sector variable does not appear to suffer from the same complications. It is not without its own puzzling aspects, however. It makes intuitive sense that if a private sector job internalizes a secular civic orientation that relatively higher amounts of voluntaristic exposure in a religious environment may counteract such a secular orientation. What is not clear, however, is why congregational volunteering would have a particular ability among religious practices to have such an effect. It may be that while the development of a secular civic orientation is not dependent on the raw amount of time

spent in a workplace, the ability to counteract such an orientation is dependent upon raw exposure to religious contexts. Such an interpretation is speculation, however, until it is tested by more intensive research into the lives of religious individuals.

Conclusions and Implications for Future Research

I believe that my empirical findings legitimate and encourage the use of a habitus-based approach for the study of religion's effect on civic life. Even with a limited number of cases, my data indicate a strong association between two independent variables (at least once daily prayer and employment in the private sector of the economy) and the holding of a civic religious habitus. I cannot explain either association as originating from a single causal source. Christian prayer is an inherently religious practice, and, as defined by the survey, usually personal and private. Private sector employment is almost never inherently religious, and is almost inherently a variable whose influence includes the effects of interpersonal and institutional level phenomena. Yet, despite the disparateness of both variables, they both help predict the likelihood of a person having a civic religious habitus. Without the multi-contextual, empirical focus of the Bourdieuian perspective I use in this study, such findings would have been impossible.

With respect to the content of my findings, the apparent high importance of prayer in predicting the holding of a civic religious habitus raises some questions. Why does prayer have a strong independent influence on civic orientation while evidence of the influence of other religious practices, such as service attendance, remains less conclusive? Could it be that praying represents an intensely personal form of religiosity

that more readily transfers into the deep consciousness of individuals? Or, is prayer especially able to transfer meaning across contexts because it is the religious practice most readily practiced in many social contexts?

What do we make of the finding that employment in the private sector lowers the likelihood of holding a religious habitus? Is there an alternative civic ethic promoted within the private sector hostile to religious civic understandings? Or, are employees of the private sector simply embedded in networks less likely to expose workers to explicitly religious civic activity? Moreover, why do the hours a person spends or spent in the workplace not magnify the influence on the civic habitus the private sector employment variable has in the models?

These questions pose an empirical puzzle for future research. While this study suggests that we need to consider variables from multiple social contexts when determining religion's role in individuals' civic orientations, what remains unclear is *how* these disparate variables influence civic orientations. We do not know the empirical mechanisms which connect the salient independent variables in the dependent variable. How does immersion in particular social contexts translate into orientations towards the civic world? How might that process vary depending on the repeated practice or social context under question?

Subsequent research can answer the above questions by using more intensive, qualitative research methods. We need to know how individuals conceptualize different religious practices and what role they imagine those practices to have in their life. For example, say we were to know through journal collection or interview data that

Christians most often use prayer as a means to focus on societal concerns while using scripture reading most often to focus on personal dilemmas. We would then have reason to conclude that the mindset of a person practicing a religious activity is the salient concern when predicting whether or not the repetition of the activity increases the likelihood of holding a civic religious habitus. Whatever the case, the overall objective in further study should be to ascertain the content and significance of particular religious practices for individuals.

With respect to variables pertaining to non-religious contexts, future research should begin gathering intensive qualitative data on religious individuals in the workplace. The field is not completely lacking study of how religion may inform an individual's work (Steffy 2013; Tracy 2012; Davidson and Cadell 1994). Indeed, one of the classical ideas in the field, Max Weber's theory of the Protestant work ethic (Weber 1958), relates to the topic. Nevertheless, these studies and theories almost entirely try to explain how an individual's religion influences occupational orientation and meaning, not the other way around. My findings in this study would suggest that it is important to take meaning systems and civic networks the workplace exposes people to as important in their own right. After all, if we do as Chaves (2010) suggests and do not assume the preeminence of religion as a source of meaning for individuals, we need to approach the workplace with as much reverence as a source for social meaning as religion, perhaps even investigating how people may "practice" their work in multiple contexts. Such an orientation toward future research would allow us to understand why certain workplace practices and ideas may lend themselves to more thorough internalization than certain religious ideas and practices.

The data collected in the proposed studies would also ease interpretation of the interaction terms I found significant in this study. Only if we understand more about how systems of meaning internalize into the civic habitus can we fully understand the processes described in hypothesis four. Since the conversion of and interaction between various types of capital is integral to the habitus theory, such insights are critical if we are to comprehend how the version of the habitus framework described in this paper translates into empirical reality.

I would also advise further research to take a fresh look at the differences between religious traditions using the theory of this paper. The first step in such research would be to take the general methods, theory, and interpretive strategies of this study and apply them to samples taken from different faith traditions. If we find that different independent variables influence the holding of a civic religious habitus for Evangelical Protestants than those I found among Mainline Protestants, we would have reason to believe that religious affiliation does matter in how individuals carry systems of meaning across contexts.

We would not assume, however, that the dominance of a particular theological world view in the psychologies of religious individuals caused such difference between faith traditions. Rather, we would likely hypothesize that members of different faith traditions have different understandings of particular religious practices. For example, as per Starks and Robinson (2006), if an Evangelical Protestant is truly more likely to approach scripture reading as a revelation of divine imperatives than Mainline Protestants, then it seems reasonable to assume that repeated scripture reading may more

readily internalize a civic understanding of Christianity for Evangelicals than for Mainliners.

Note that in the above hypothetical differences in religious belief would matter not in how they inform *every* context of an individual's life. Instead, they would matter in establishing particular orientations to religious practices, orientations that may increase or decrease the likelihood of carrying the effects of those practices across contexts relative to orientations to religious practices promoted by other faith traditions. Making sense of differences between traditions in the effects of non inherently religious variables, like sector of employment, would be more difficult. Nevertheless, the findings of the intensive qualitative work proposed above focused on Mainline Protestants would likely provide a good place to start in that regard.

Reusing the methods of this study in future studies would also help address some problems I had in interpreting results relating to the educational variable in this study. As I mentioned in the findings section, the sample in this study was so highly educated it became difficult to separate the potential effects of high educational attainment with the potential effects of strong occupational identity and status. The mere effort of including congregations situated within regions less educated than the region of my sample would likely alleviate this problem. By increasing the variation in the education variable, further research can begin to learn more about what role educational cultural capital plays in translating meaning across social contexts.

Whatever subsequent empirical findings arise from the research proposed above, what is clear is that in order to ascertain the effects of religion on individuals across

social contexts, sociologists will need to further understand the subjectivities of religious individuals' lives. This includes a commitment to not only understanding the religious characteristics of individuals but also a commitment to understanding the social contexts in which exposure to non-inherently religious ideas and experiences takes place. After all, unless someone is a monk, even the most devout modern religious individuals pass through varying social environments on a daily basis, each environment having the potential to affect a deep seeded orientation to the social world. We need to take such dynamic lived experiences seriously when studying the across context effects of any sort of ethical system, religious beliefs included.

References

Barnes, Sandra L. 2005. "Black Church Culture and Community Action." *Sof Social Forces* 84(2):967-994.

Becker, Penny Edgell and Pawan Dhingra. 2001. "Religious Involvement and Volunteering: Implications for Civil Society." *Sociology of Religion* 62(3).

Beyerlein, K., J. Trinitapoli, and G. Adler. 2011. "The Effect of Religious Short-Term Mission Trips on Youth Civic Engagement. "*Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 50(4):780-795.

Beyerlein, Kraig and John R. Hipp. 2006. "From Pews to Participation: The Effect of Congregation Activity and Context on Bridging Civic Engagement." *Social Problems Social Problems* 53(1):97-117.

Bourdieu, Pierre and John B. Thompson. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power.*Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Brown, R. Khari and Ronald E. Brown. 2003. "Faith and Works: Church-Based Social Capital Resources and African American Political Activism." *Social Forces* 82(2):617-641.

Chaves, Mark. 2010. "Rain Dances in the Dry Season: Overcoming the Religious Congruence Fallacy." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 49(1):1-14.

Davidson, James C., and David P. Caddell. 1994. "Religion and the Meaning of Work." *The Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 33(2).

Denton, Robert. 2005. "Religion and the 2004 Presidential Campaign." *American Behavioral Scientist* 49(1):11-31.

DiMaggio, P., J. Evans, and B. Bryson. 1996. "Have Americans' Social Attitudes Become More Polarized?" *American Journal of Sociology* 102(3):690-755.

Driskell, Robyn, Elizabeth Embry, and Larry Lyon. 2008. "Faith and Politics: The Influence of Religious Beliefs on Political Participation[*]." *SSQU Social Science Quarterly* 89(2):294-314.

Edgell, Penny. 2012. "A Cultural Sociology of Religion: New Directions."*Annual Review of Sociology"* 38:247-265.

Emerson, Michael O. and Christian Smith. 2000. *Divided by Faith: Evangelical Religion and the Problem of Race in America.*Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Finke, Roger and Rodney Stark. 1992. *The Churching of America, 1776-1990: Winners and Losers in our Religious Economy .*New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

Gold, Howard J and Gina E. Russell. 2007. "The Rising Influence of Evangelicalism in American Political Behavior, 1980-2004." *The Social Science Journal* 44(3):554-562.

Greeley, Andrew M. and Michael Hout. 2006. *The Truth about Conservative Christians : What they Think and what they Believe.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hochschild, Arlie Russel. 1997. *The Time Bind: When Work Becomes Home and Home Becomes Work*. New York: Metropolitan Books.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette. 2008. *God's Heart has no Borders: How Religious Activists are Working for Immigrant Rights.*Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hunter, James Davison. 1991. *Culture Wars: The Struggle to Define America.* New York: Basic Books.

Keister, Lisa A. 2008. "Conservative Protestants and Wealth: How Religion Perpetuates Asset Poverty." *The American Journal of Sociology* 113(5):1237-1271.

Lam, Pui-Yan. 2002. "As the Flocks Gather: How Religion Affects Voluntary Association Participation." *JSSR Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 41(3):405-422.

Lichterman, Paul. 2008. "Religion and the Construction of Civic Identity." *American Sociological Review* 73(1):83-104.

------------------ 2012. "Religion in Public Action: From Actors to Settings." *Sociological Theory* 30(1):15-36.

Madsen, Richard. 2009. "The Archipelago of Faith: Religious Individualism and Faith Community in America Today." *The American Journal of Sociology* 114(5):1263-1301.

McPherson, J. M., and T. Rotolo. 1996. "Testing a Dynamic Model of Social

    Composition: Diversity and Change in Voluntary Groups." *American Sociological*

    Review 61(2):179-202.

Putnam, Robert D. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American*

    Community. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Read, Jen'nan G. and David E. Eagle. 2011. "Intersecting Identities as a Source of

    Religious Incongruence." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 50(1):116-132.

Regnerus, Mark D. and Christian Smith. 1998. "Selective Deprivatization among

    American Religious Traditions: The Reversal of the Great Reversal." *Social Forces.*

    76(4):1347.

Regnerus, Mark D., David Sikkink, and Christian Smith. 1999. "Voting with the

    Christian Right: Contextual and Individual Patterns of Electoral Influence." *Social*

    Forces 77(4):1375-1401.

Schwadel, Philip. 2005. "Individual, Congregational, and Denominational Effects on

    Church Members' Civic Participation." *The Journal for the Scientific Study of*

    Religion 44(2):159-172.

Sherkat, Darren E., and Christopher Ellison. 1999. "Recent Developments and Current

    Controversies in the Sociology of Religion." *Annual Review of Sociology* 25:363-

    394.

Smith, Christian, and Michael Emerson. 1998. *American Evangelicalism: Embattled and Thriving.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Starks, Brian and Robert Robinson. 2009. "Two Approaches to Religion and Politics: Moral Cosmology and Subcultural Identity." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 48(4):650-669.

Steensland B. and Z. Schrank. 2011. "Is the Market Moral? Protestant Assessments of Market Society." *Rev.Relig.Res.Review of Religious Research* 53(3):257-277.

Steffy, K. 2013. "Religious Orthodoxy and the American Worker."*Sociology of Religion: A Quarterly Review* 74(1):1-29.

Tracey, Paul. 2012. "Religion and Organization: A Critical Review of Current Trends and Future Directions." *The Academy of Management Annals* 6: 1-48.

Tsitsos, William. 2007 "The Interaction of Race & Theological Orientation in Congregational Social Service Provision." Tucson: University of Arizona.

Uslaner, Eric M. 2002. "Religion and Civic Engagement in Canada and the United States." *JSSR Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 41(2):239-254.

Weber, Max. 1958. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism.* New York: Scribner.

Williams, Rhys H. 1997. *Cultural Wars in American Politics : Critical Reviews of a Popular Myth.* New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Woodberry, Robert D., Jerry Park, Lyman Kellstedt, Mark Regnerus, and Brian
    Steensland. 2012. "The Measure of American Religious Traditions: Theoretical and
    Measurement Considerations." *Social Forces* 91(1):65-73.

Wuthnow, Robert. 1988. *The Restructuring of American Religion: Society and Faith*
    since World War II. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

------------------. 2007. *After the Baby Boomers: How Twenty- and Thirty-Somethings are*
    Shaping the Future of American Religion. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Table 1: Univariate percentages of relevant variables

	Percent Yes
Did the respondent congregational church organization?	48.0
Does the respondent pray at least once per day?	48.5
Does the respondent read religious or theological scripture at least once per week?	41.6
Does the respondent attend religious services at least once per week?	61.1
Is the respondent part of more congregational organizations than non congregational organizations?	14.1
Does the respondent volunteer more often inside the congregation or outside?	57.0
Did the respondent indicate that they met the greatest amount of their current friends at work?	21.0
Has the respondent been self-employed or worked in private business more than in any other employment setting during his or her life?	45.9
Does/did the respondent work more than 45 hours a week on average?	42.3

Does the respondent hold a graduate or professional degree?	62.1
Is the respondent retired or semi-retired?	42.6
Is the respondent female?	62.4

N=184

Table 2: Estimated Effects of Independent Variables on an Individual Having a Civic Religious Habitus

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Once a day or more prayer	.798**	.762**	.964**	.954**	1.084***
	(.350)	(.356)	(.377)	(.396)	(.416)
Once a week or more scripture reading	.060	-.042	-.056	-.139	.799
	(.354)	(.370)	(.376)	(.346)	(.606)
Attend services at least once per week		.383	.379	.322	.299
		(.505)	(.341)	(.346)	(.362)
More membership in congregational orgs.		.695	.629	.662	.792
		(.505)	(.511)	(.517)	(.533)
More congregational volunteering		-.003	-.030	-.054	-.878*
		(.336)	(.350)	(.356)	(.469)
Work as primary source of friends		-.359	-.544	-.452	-.499
		(.389)	(.403)	(.411)	(.442)
Self employed or work for private business			-.768**	-.688*	-1.787***
			(.355)	(.374)	(.583)
Work more than 45 hours a week			.304	.324	.359
			(.342)	(.346)	(.359)
Hold a graduate or professional degree			.109	.094	.882*
			(.356)	(.363)	(.493)
Retired or semi-retired				.530	.564
				(.345)	(.358)
Gender				-.260	-.246
				(.353)	(.369)
Interaction: scripture reading and grad/prof degree					-1.624**
					(.742)
Interaction: more cong. volunteering and self-emp. or private busin.					1.865***
					(.717)
Constant	-.326	-.499	-.357	-.417	-.408
Chi squared	7.057	11.612	18.371	21.525	33.613

N=184. *Notes variables significant at p=0.1 **Notes variables significant at p=0.05 ***Notes variables significant at p=0.