

"A Century of Difference" Working Paper
THE SURVEY RESEARCH CENTER
University of California, Berkeley
2538 Channing Way
Berkeley, CA 94720-5100

<http://ucdata.berkeley.edu/rsfcensus>

510-643-6874

510-643-8292

Time Bind and God's Time

(Draft: March 2001)

by

Michael Hout

(MikeHout@uclink4.berkeley.edu)

Claude Fischer

(fischer1@uclink4.berkeley.edu)

Nancy Latham

(nlatham@socrates.berkeley.edu)

Survey Research Center
University of California, Berkeley

Notes:

(1) This draft working paper will be developed into a chapter of a book in progress commissioned by the Russell Sage Foundation. *Please do not quote or cite before consulting with the authors.* But comments are certainly welcome.

(2) The research reported here is supported by a grant from the Russell Sage Foundation to the "Century of Difference" project. Other working papers can be found at the web site above.

(3) *American Sociological Association Disclaimer:* Copyright 2001 Michael Hout and Claude S. Fischer. All rights reserved. This paper is for the reader's personal use only. This paper may not be quoted, reproduced, distributed, transmitted or retransmitted, performed, displayed, downloaded, or adapted in any medium for any purpose, including, without limitation, teaching purposes, without the Authors' express written permission. Permission requests should be directed to mikehout@uclink.berkeley.edu

The Time Bind and God's Time

Claude S. Fischer

Michael Hout

Nancy Latham

University of California, Berkeley

March 2001

Note

This work was funded by the Center for Working Families, University of California, Berkeley, and by the "USA: A Century of Difference" Project, sponsored by the Russell Sage Foundation. Fischer also acknowledges support from the Centre d'Études Nord-Américaines, École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Paris. Comments on an earlier draft by Arlie Hochschild and reviewer for *JMF* were especially useful.

Abstract

Did family time constraints lead Americans in the 1990s to cut back on their religious activities? Using the 1988-1998 GSS, we compared respondents by class, by whether or not they had children at home, and by how many hours spouses worked each week (and we controlled for several other factors, including religion of origin). Generally, Americans sustained their religious involvements - - affiliation, membership, attendance, and devotion -- despite high work and family commitments. Two exceptions: One, full-time employment for wives depressed middle-class couples' church attendance. Two, long work hours reduced a couple of devotional activities for wives. Overall, however, religious activity was relatively inelastic to family time pressures.

Key words: religion, time pressure, class, parenting, gender

The Time Bind and God's Time

Students of the contemporary family have by now become familiar with what Hochschild (1997) has termed the "time bind," the clashing demands of expanding work hours and family responsibilities. Research indicates that parents, especially mothers in middle-class families, have worked increasingly many hours. Jacobs and Gerson (1998) estimate an increase in employed work of 10 hours a week per *couple* between 1990 and 1997 (although there is some controversy about this question -- Scott 1999; Robinson and Godbey 1996). Adults have been forced to cut back leisure, personal care, housework, and sleep (Bianchi 2000; Families and Work Institute 1999; O'Neill 1993; Stewart et al. 1998). Our purpose here is to see whether and how the time bind may be cutting into the time Americans give to religious involvement, to "God's time." Is religion like other "elastic" activities that Americans condense in response to the time bind? Or does religion have, indeed, a sacred quality such that harried Americans continue to find time for it?

The issue is socially important because of the widespread concern about time pressures and because religion is important to Americans. At the end of the twentieth century, almost all Americans professed belief in God, seven of ten said they never doubted God's existence, two of three reported a church affiliation, half said that "prayer is an important part of my daily life," and over 40% claimed to attend church weekly or almost weekly (Pew Center 1997; Gallup 2000; Greeley 1989). These levels of adherence are among the very highest in the

developed world and are among the highest recorded in American history. (For overviews on American religious history, see, Caplow et al 1983; Marty 1984; Wuthnow 1988; Greeley 1989; and Finke and Stark 1992.) Has -- and, if so, how has -- the time bind affected Americans' unusually strong commitments to religion?

The theoretical issue concerns the "elasticity" of religious "demand" in a home economics model of the family. As couples find their joint non-work time shrinking, they cut back on some time outlays more than others. For example, employed mothers report having about thirty percent less leisure time and ten percent fewer sleep hours than nonemployed mothers, but children of employed mothers enjoy about as much direct attention from their parents as do children of nonemployed mothers (Bianchi 2000). Where does religion fall in the spectrum of Americans couples' time preferences? This question brings in another entire sociological debate, that on the fate of religion in contemporary society. (For overviews, see, e.g., Bruce 1992; Swatos and Christiano 1999.) Is religion a minor concern, sacrificed in the face of time pressures? Or, is it of such high value that time-pressed couples still try to maintain their religious commitments?

We focus on commitment in the form of affiliation, church membership, and attendance at services, but look also at contributions of time and money. We draw for our evidence on the National Opinion Research Center's General Social Surveys (GSS) conducted from 1988 through 1998.

To preview our results, we found that the most time-bound American couples in the 1990s -- those who jointly worked more than 80 hours a week and

had children -- were not, in general, less active religiously than those Americans who were less time constrained. This broad conclusion must be qualified in a few specific respects: On average, individuals who worked many hours reported measurably less time spent in personal religious practice, but families' religious commitments were not strongly affected. Also, husbands in middle-class couples who jointly worked over 80 hours were unusually likely to report depressed church attendance and contributions. Generally, however, American families appear to have protected their religious time in the face of the time bind.

After quickly reviewing the limited literature on this topic, we explain our methodology, present the results, and discuss them. The Appendix to this paper displays the statistical material in greater detail.

What We Know About Time Pressures and Religious Practice

Indirect evidence on this question is provided by the regular Gallup polls on religious practice, which show remarkable stability in Americans' religiosity since the 1960s (Gallup 2000). Reported church membership was about 70% between 1965 and 1979; it averaged 68% through the 1980s and the 1990s. Reported weekly church attendance averaged about 42% between 1962 and 1979, 41% in the 1980s, and 40% in the 1990s. (There has been major debate about the validity of respondents' church attendance reports, as in the American Sociological Review of February, 1998. People probably exaggerate when they report that they attended church in the last week, but that the level of exaggeration

has changed over the last 40 years is much harder to establish.) Given the major changes in American family structure and American culture, as well as the rise in mothers' employment, these numbers imply that religious practice has been notably inelastic. An early study of domestic schedules and religious activity is a quarter-century-old Gary Becker-like analysis of "Household Allocation of Time and Church Attendance" (Azzi and Ehrenberg 1975) in which households allocate members' time to religious activities so as to most efficiently "purchase" salvation. Besides conceptualizing both religion and family crudely, the article does not yield much evidence on our question since the authors focus on modeling attendance as a function of opportunity costs (imputed wages).

The closest precedent to our study is Hertel's (1995). He examined how work patterns affected church membership and church attendance among working white adults, using the 1972 through 1990 GSS. Restricting his analysis to whites aged 21 to 65, "who are not widowed, retired or temporarily unemployed," Hertel found that *full-time* employment of married women depressed their own religious activity, particularly church attendance, *and* depressed their husbands' activity, as well. Part-time employed women, however, were actually *more* active than nonemployed women. Hertel concluded that declines in religious activity since 1972 were due to the increasing numbers of women who worked full-time. Putnam (2000:176, 200, 476 n. 26), in his widely noted book, *Bowling Alone*, contests the claim that women's employment explains declines in associational activity, but does report, from a few different data sets, that full-time employment of wives tended to reduce their and their husbands' church attendance. This paper

is, in a few ways, an extension of the Hertel's work -- lengthening the period covered into the 1990s, adding measures both of religious activity and control variables, and reconceptualizing the time bind. Both the Hertel and Putnam findings direct our attention to gender-specific patterns. That is, gender may affect *whose* work has shortened free time and *whose* behavior is most affected.

Data and Methods

We employed the General Social Survey – a representative, national survey of the adult American population which has been conducted by the National Opinion Research Center virtually every year since 1972. Each year interviewers asked about fifteen hundred respondents a few questions germane to our topic such as religious affiliation and frequency of church attendance. Some years the survey posed more extensive questions about religion. We combined all the surveys from 1988 through 1998. (The 1988, 1991, and 1998 surveys included more religion questions, and this set allows us to focus on the contemporary period.)

To explicitly study the quandaries faced by families, we restricted our attention to those respondents who were married, aged 55 or younger, and in a couple with at least one employed spouse. We then categorized these respondents according to three critical attributes: (1) whether they had a child under age 18 at home or not, which we loosely refer to as being parents or not -- a measure of at-home time pressures; (2) their class or status position; and (3) their work-based

time bind.

We defined a family's status class on the basis of the *couple's education*: If both partners had at least one year of college education, the couple is coded middle class; if at least one partner had no college education, the couple is coded working class. We use the couple's joint education for a few reasons. Educational attainment is a more stable marker of lifetime social standing than is any year's income. For example, new Ph.D.s have lower incomes than many blue-collar workers, but both their lifetime earnings and social standing are higher. (We do control for income in our regression models.) Education is the precursor and often prerequisite of occupational standing. More important, education is typically the strongest determinant of lifestyle choices (e.g., the character of people's friendship networks -- Fischer 1982), which is what we are looking at here -- how people distribute their time. And, we will see that empirically, this measure is a powerful predictor of religious participation.

The measure of work-based time bind involves three categories: (a) only one spouse worked -- defining work for present purposes as being employed in the labor force for pay (the GSS has no information on housework hours); (b) both spouses worked, but the total work time they reported summed to less than 80 hours a week; and (c) both spouses worked and their hours summed to 80 or more. (Respondents in the first category reported an average of 45 hours of work a week jointly for the couple, respondents in the second category reported an average of 65 hours, and those in the last reported a combined average of 93 hours. We later discuss evidence suggesting that some of these counts may involve

underestimates.)

These distinctions gave us ($2 \times 2 \times 3 =$) 12 combinations, such as working-class couples with no children in which only one spouse worked and middle-class couples with children in which both spouses worked a joint total of at least 80 hours, which allows us to *describe* the time bind patterns for different sorts of couples. Do, for example, those respondents with children and an 80-plus-hour workweek show a reduced pattern of religiosity compared to such respondents without children? Does class make a difference in the time bind effect? The statistical tool that allows us to estimate both "main effects" (how religious practice varies by parenthood, class, and work hours) and the "interaction effects" (how religious practice varies by *combinations* of parenthood, class, and work hours) is the *analysis of variance* (ANOVA). We then try to look beyond these descriptive results to *explain* the time bind patterns by using *regression analysis* to control for other factors, such as age, household income, race, and childhood religious background. In particular, we see to what extent respondents' religious behaviors responded to their own, *individual* work hours and to what extent they responded to a *family* work pattern (i.e., their spouses' employment hours). Our language assumes that, if there is any causal association, class, parental status, and work hours determine religious behavior rather than vice versa. Although some reverse causality may exist, this assumption seems reasonable. In the regression analyses, we control also for religious origins, which should help take into account most self-selection effects (e.g., that religious respondents may prefer being or marrying stay-at-home mothers).

Findings

Religious Affiliation

The first question is: Did time constraints affect whether respondents claimed a religious affiliation at all? The answer is: No. The GSS probe is: "What is your religious preference? Is it Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, some other religion, or no religion?" Overall, about 92% of about fifty-two hundred respondents gave a religious affiliation, and there was no statistically or substantively significant difference by couples' work hours. Parents were likelier than nonparents to declare an affiliation, even after taking account of other factors like age, gender, and religious origin. From this point on in the analysis, we examine *only respondents who reported a religious affiliation* (as well as meeting our earlier eligibility criteria).

Membership in a Church Group

The GSS did not ask respondents if they were members of churches, but the standard GSS question on organizational affiliations allows us to assess whether respondents reported membership in a church-affiliated group such as a Bible study circle or sisterhood. Again, work time status made no statistically significant difference. Thirty-nine percent of the respondents in one-earner families were members; 43% of those in two-earner, under-80-hour couples were; and 37% of those in two-earner, 80-plus-hour couples were members. Parents more often reported membership than did nonparents, repeating the familiar pattern that people intensify religious practice when they have children, the time demands of parenting notwithstanding. Also, middle-class respondents more

often reported a membership than did working-class respondents. Although wives were likelier to belong than were husbands, there were no significant time bind "interaction effects." That is, men and women were similarly affected by the joint-work situation and by parenthood. (See Appendix 2, table A1.)

Attendance at Religious Services

Whether and how often respondents go to services is a critical issue. In America, regular attendance is probably the main expression of religious adherence and the main investment of time. It is the key indicator American sociologists have used to assess religiosity. It is also a controversial indicator among scholars because survey respondents surely exaggerate to some extent their frequency of attendance. (See Hadaway et al. 1993 and debate in February, 1998, issue of the *American Sociological Review*). Couples pressed by their weekday commitments may well look to Sunday (or Saturday) mornings to fulfill unmet practical or leisure needs -- if they can avoid working during even those hours. The GSS interviewers asked, "How often do you attend religious services?" We converted the response categories into a scale indicating the probability that a respondent would attend in any particular week.

We do find an association of attendance with work hours, albeit a nonlinear one. Respondents in dual-earner couples working less than a combined 80 hours had the highest average probability of attending, .48, followed by respondents in single-earner couples at .45; dual-earners with a combined 80-plus hours of work reported the least average probability of attending, .42. To complicate matters, however, there are two statistically significant interaction

effects. First, there is an interaction effect between class and work hours, as displayed in Table 1. Among the working-class couples, joint work hours made no difference. But middle-class respondents in two-earner/80-plus-hour couples were notably less likely to attend than were other middle-class respondents. Put another way, among couples with fewer than 80 joint hours, middle-class respondents reported attendance probabilities about .15 higher than did working-class respondents; but among couples with 80-plus hours, middle-class respondents reported probabilities only .06 higher than did the working-class respondents.

Table 1. Probability of Attending Weekly Services by Class and by Joint Work Hours*

Social Class	One-Earner Couple	Two Earners, < 80 Hrs.	Two Earners, 80 Hrs.
Working class	.40	.42	.39
Middle class	.55	.56	.45

* Parental status did not affect the pattern of these results.

How might we explain the pattern in Table 1? Perhaps it is something else about middle-class, 80-plus-hour couples besides class and work, such as their ages. In the regression analyses (reported in Appendix 2, Tables A2 and A3), we controlled for several factors. But respondents who were in that intersecting category of middle class and 80-plus hours, all else equal, still attended at a lower

probability, about .08 lower, than one would have expected given their class position. (The strength of the interaction effect varied somewhat by year. The beta for the interaction term ranges from -.01 in 1991 to -.16 in 1990, for an unweighted mean of beta = -.08.) Perhaps the middle-class respondents worked significantly more hours than did the working-class respondents in the same joint-work-hours category. But the GSS data do not support that hunch (details available from authors).

Another possible explanation for the distinctive drop in attendance noted among the middle-class, 80-plus-hour couples is that they were, in contrast to the other five categories of respondents, more likely to be immersed in a work-based social world, one that displaces church-based affiliations. The data in hand did not allow us to adequately test this hypothesis. Yet a third possibility is that respondents in this single category were less likely than others to exaggerate how often they attended church, but why that should be so is unclear. This puzzling interaction effect is elaborated, however, if not explained, by the second notable interaction effect we found -- with gender.

The negative effect of long work hours on middle-class church attendance appears to be specific to men, largely because middle-class men's attendance dropped as a function of how many hours their *wives* worked. To see this a little better, we reran the regression analysis, replacing our joint work time variable with straightforward counts of how many hours respondents and their spouses worked and running the analyses for husbands and wives separately (see Appendix 2, Table A3). One way to see the results is in Table 2, below. It

displays the estimated probability of attending services as a function of work hours, estimated for parents, age 40, who were white, had average income, and were raised as nonfundamentalist Protestants.

Table 2. Probability of Attending Weekly Services by Class, Gender, and Individual Work Hours, Controlling for Several Covariates.*

Respondents	Husb. Hrs. = 40	Husb. Hrs. = 40	Husb. Hrs. = 40	Husb. Hrs. = 60
	Wife Hours = 0	Wife Hours = 20	Wife Hours = 40	Wife Hours = 40
Working-class wives	.35	.32	.30	.33
Working-class husbands	.27	.29	.30	.30
Middle-class wives	.50	.48	.45	.45
Middle-class husbands	.47	.42	.36	.36

* These estimates are drawn from Appendix 2, Table A3, and assume that respondents were parents, age 40, white, had average income, and were raised as non-fundamentalist Protestants. There were no significant non-linear effects of hours.

Table 2 shows that, other things being equal, middle-class respondents were likelier to attend than working-class respondents and that women were likelier to attend than men. But what interests us most here are the effects of work hours. For both working-class and middle-class women, the more hours they worked, the less they attended, by modest amounts (cf. .35 to .30 and .50 to .45 in columns one to three). But working-class women attended *more* often the more their *husbands* worked (.30 vs. .33 in columns three and four). Husbands, however, were *not* affected by their *own* work hours. The most notable pattern is

the sharp drop in middle-class husbands' reported attendance by the number of hours their *wives* worked (last row, .47 to .36). Hertel (1995) and Putnam (2000) also found that wives' work hours affected men's participation, but we see here that the effect is specific to the middle class. Perhaps working-class men's attendance is generally so low to start with that it cannot be influenced. Or perhaps what is special is the middle-class family with the nonemployed wife, the one situation in which middle-class men attended at nearly the same high rate that women attended. Absent that context, a context in which perhaps at-home wives can maximize the spiritual side of the family, men's attendance drops. But this is speculative.

Stepping back from the complexities, we find that in the 1990s, time pressures per se had, at best, a modest effect on families' church attendance. Parents attended more often than did nonparents (by .07). Working-class couples' attendance rates were not affected by their joint work hours. Men's attendance was not affected by their own hours. We did find, however, that more hours wives worked, the modestly lower their reported attendance. (Each ten hours a week reduced wives' probability of attending by .01.) And we found that middle-class men's attendance dropped the more hours that their *wives* worked.

It is worth considering whether the causality of middle-class men's attendance may run the other way -- that a couple's religiosity shaped work patterns, rather than vice versa. Perhaps, wives most devoted to religion chose to work fewer hours or middle-class men most devoted to religion chose wives who preferred to stay at home (or frequently-attending men pressed their wives to stay at home). We used measures of the respondents' childhood religious affiliations in

our regressions as an effort to hold constant prior religiosity, but they may have been weak controls. To explore this issue further, we modeled wives' employment and their hours of employment on measures of their religious backgrounds, holding constant other factors. Women from more fundamentalist backgrounds were no more likely to work than were other women and they were actually likely to work more hours, not fewer (tables available from authors). So, it is likely that the causality runs from work experiences to religious behavior. Also, Hertel (1995) reminds us that, even if employment does shape religiosity, it might do so for reasons other than a time bind. Participation in the labor force may expose wives to secular influences or to new friends or to new interests that compete with the church for their leisure time. In sum, wives' full-time employment was associated with lower attendance rates for middle-class couples, but whether this is a time bind effect or some other dynamic is unclear.

Devotional Time

The next few analyses are based, unfortunately, on smaller sample sizes, so we are cautious about our conclusions, especially conclusions that there are no differences among respondents. The first set of items address "God's time" directly. In 1998, the GSS asked about four hundred of the eligible respondents, "In the past month, about how many hours have you spent doing religious activities in your home (such as time spent praying, meditating, reading religious books, listening to religious broadcasts, etc.)?" Interviewers also asked, "In the past month, about how many hours have you spent doing religious activities outside your home (such as attending religious services, prayer groups, Bible studies,

fellowship meetings, church leadership meetings, etc.)?" We would surely expect work hours to constrict the amount of time respondents could give to these activities. It did, but perhaps not as much as we might have expected.

Whether a respondent reported giving any time at all in answer to the first question did not differ by joint work hours or by personal work hours or, for that matter, by parental status. (Nor were work hours significant for either husbands or wives separately.) We then looked only at those who gave *some* time to religion, assessing how many hours they devoted to religious practice at home. Again, there was no clear difference by joint work hours. (Differences were statistically marginal, and the lowest category was the middle one -- two-job couples working under 80 hours.) Regression analysis shows, however, that *personal* work hours *did* make a difference. Respondents who reported more work hours themselves reported fewer devotional hours at home. Roughly, a doubling from 20 to 40 hours of work a week was accompanied by a half-hour less of religious time at home, all else being equal. (See Appendix 2, Table A5; in this case, personal work hours depressed religious time more for husbands than wives.) Analysis of the number of hours respondents gave to religion *away* from home showed an approximately similar trend: no difference by couples' work situation -- or parenthood -- and a marginal tendency ($p < .10$) for respondents' own hours at work to reduce a bit the hours they gave to religion. (See Appendix 2, Tables A4, A5, and A6. Adding interaction terms with gender [gender X work hours, gender X joint work schedules] added significantly to the explained variance, but none of the terms was significant in separate equations for wives and husbands. There

were hints that men's hours were reduced by having a working wife more than vice versa, but these were not significant.)

The notable finding here is not that respondents' work time reduced their devotional time; the simple mechanics of a 24-hour day should have created some loss. The more important results are that the loss of devotional time is relatively small and that there is no noteworthy effect of the *family's* time situation (joint hours or having children) on religious time. Perhaps in this case, the time burdens of parenthood evenly balanced the commitment to religion that accompanies parenthood.

Contributions

In a few years of the GSS, interviewers asked respondents whether and how much they had contributed financially to religious organizations. One hypothesis would be that time-bound couples substitute money for time and thus give more than other couples. In 1998, the GSS asked about 375 eligible respondents, "During the last year, approximately how much money did you and the other family members in your household contribute to each of the following: To your local congregation? To other religious organizations, programs, or causes?" About 75% of respondents had given *something*. Joint work hours made no difference in who did or did not give (and gender did not matter). But when we examined how *much* such donors gave to their local congregations, we found a marginally significant ($p < .09$) effect: Other factors such as household income held constant, respondents in the most heavily-employed couples gave *less* money to their congregations than did other couples. Because we controlled for the

respondents' own hours, something about being married to a full-time worker seemed to depress contributions. A similar pattern emerged among the roughly 125 respondents who contributed to other religious organizations: There was a marginally significant tendency ($p < .07$) for respondents in couples with long hours to give the least. Adding together the two types of contributions shows a significant difference ($p < .05$), all else being equal, between the most work bound couples and the rest: Although they were no less likely to give something, they gave less. (See Appendix 2, Tables A7 and A8. Controlling for the number of co-congregationalists among respondents' friends reduces the effect to statistical non-significance, but reduces the partial beta only from $-.18$ to $-.14$.)

Also, parents gave less money, in total, than nonparents. But that difference disappears once other factors, such as age and income, are held equal. Again, the commitment to religion and the financial constraints of parenthood may roughly balance out.

Earlier, in 1988, the GSS asked a similar question of over 750 eligible respondents: "About how much do you contribute to your religion every year (not including school tuition)?" Almost 80% tithed something, and there were no significant differences by our time bind variables. (Tables available from the authors.) Working-class respondents in the 80-plus hours couples gave notably *more* than other working-class respondents, but middle-class respondents in the 80-plus hours category gave notably *less* than other middle-class respondents. This pattern persists even after controlling for other factors, including household income and respondents' own work hours.

Summarizing the complex results, it seems that the time bind did not affect the decision to contribute or not. As to how much givers gave, the results are mixed: One finding suggests that longer joint hours may have depressed giving among the middle-class (but maybe increased it among working-class wives). There is only a weak case to make here. Parenting did not, in net, affect giving.

Discussion

We generally found, with important qualifications to be noted, that on average Americans between 1988 and 1998 did *not* constrict their joint religious activities in response to family time binds. Overall, respondents in couples with high joint hours of work were *no less likely* than others to declare a religious affiliation, to belong to a church group, to attend church services, or to give time to religion. And respondents with children at home were actually *more* likely than nonparents to declare, belong, and attend (and no less likely to give time or money to religious pursuits). The parent/nonparent difference persisted after controls as well. We might have expected, in particular, that respondents in couples who worked over 80 hours a week and who also had children would show the most withdrawal of religious activity, but that did not appear in the results. Respondents who reported personally working many hours gave somewhat less of their own time to devotional activities than those who worked fewer hours, but the effect was modest. Moreover, the *family* work situation did not affect religious time.

Two important qualifications must be made. First, respondents in *middle-class* couples who jointly worked 80 or more hours were *less* likely than

comparable middle-class respondents to report attending church and perhaps to make large religious donations. We might have expected, a priori, that working-class respondents would have, given their generally more constricted opportunities, been more pressed by long work hours. But the opposite was true. The reason for the middle-class effect is unclear. The distinctive feature of this pattern was that middle-class husbands' attendance was lower when they had wives who worked many hours. Perhaps some of these respondents belonged to the oft discussed, but numerically small (11% in our sample), "careerist" couples -- couples whose hours of work, social commitments, or both drew them away from church. Or perhaps these couples were culturally distinctive in ways that shaped their career patterns. The other results we have found -- for example, negligible time-bind effects among the working class and the positive or nil effects of parenthood -- lend weight to such an interpretation.

Our second qualification is, as Hertel (1995) and Putnam (2000) reported, that wives who were employed full-time attended church less often than other wives did and that middle-class husbands of such women attended less often than other middle-class men did. This correlation between more work and less attendance among wives (together with the finding that more hours at work correlated with fewer devotional hours) may be the strongest evidence we have of a modest work time crunch. It would be consistent with other things researchers have shown: that it is wives who suffer such time binds. We should not, however, discount the possibility that this correlation is due to third factors, such as preexisting cultural differences between wives who seek careers and those who do

not. The correlation between middle-class wives working more hours and their *husbands* attending less often could also reflect such cultural factors, or it could reflect such middle-class wives' lessened ability to "manage" their families' church attendance.

Our general conclusion is a negative one: We found neither a substantial nor a general time-bind effect on religious participation. Critics may note that negative findings can be produced simply by poor procedures. But we did find positive results, such as consistent class, gender, racial, and parental status differences in religious participation. Thus, we feel it warranted to conclude, with the previous qualifications concerning middle-class career couples and working wives' church attendance, that Americans in the 1990s seemed to largely protect their religious time from the constriction posed by the expanding time bind.

In terms of the home economics model, religious participation seems to be among those activities, like child care, that are less elastic, that give way less to time constraints. Why? Perhaps the answer is that church does not take that much time in any event: a Sunday morning and perhaps a few hours elsewhere. Another answer is that religious time, because it is largely weekend time, may not compete with work time the way that sleep or leisure may. A third answer is that religion may be especially central to families' values, self-definition, and child-rearing. The latter interpretation would lend weight to those who argue that religiosity is being sustained in contemporary America.

References

- Azzi, C. & Ehrenberg, R. (1975). Household allocation of time and church attendance. Journal of Political Economy 66, 911-17.
- Bianchi, Suzanne. 2000. "Maternal Employment and Time with Children: Dramatic Change or Surprising Continuity?" Demography 27, 401-14.
- Caplow, T., Bahr, H. M., & B. A. Chadwick. (1983). All faithful people: Change and continuity in Middletown's religion. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Families and Work Institute. (1999). The 1997 national study of the changing workforce. On-line: <http://www.familiesandworkinst.org> (accessed Fall 1999).
- Finke, R. & Stark, R. (1992). The churching of America, 1776-1990: Winners and losers in our religious economy. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Gallup. 2000. "Gallup Poll topics A-Z: Religion." The Gallup Poll. On-line.: www.gallup.com/poll/indicators/indreligion.asp (accessed 25 April 2000).
- Greeley, A. M. (1989). Religious change in America. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hadaway, C. K., Marler, P.L., and Chaves, M. (1993). "What the polls don't show: A closer look at U.S. Church attendance." American Sociological Review 58, 741-52.
- Hertel, B. R. (1995). "Work, family, and faith: Recent trends." In N. T.

Ammerman & W. C. Roof (Eds.), Work, family, and religion in contemporary society (pp. 83-121). New York: Routledge.

Bruce, Steve (ed.). 1992. Religion and Modernization: Sociologists and Historians Debate the Secularization Thesis. Oxford, Eng.: Clarendon Press.

Fischer, Claude S. 1982. To Dwell Among Friends. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hochschild, A. (1997). The time bind: When work becomes home and home becomes work. New York: Metropolitan Books.

Jacobs, J. A. & Gerson, K. (1998). "Who are the overworked Americans?" Review of Social Economy 56, 442-459.

Marty, M. (1984). Pilgrims in their own land: 500 years of religion in America. New York: Penguin.

O'Neill, M. 1993. "Drop the mop, bless the mess: The decline of housekeeping." New York Times, April 1, 1, 13.

Pew Center for the Public and the Press. 1997. Table on religion. On-line: <http://www.people-press.org/topten.htm> (accessed 22 December 1997).

Putnam, R. D. 2000. Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of american community. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Robinson, J. P. & Godbey, G. (1996). "The great American slowdown." American Demographics (June). On-line: <http://www.demographics.com> (accessed 12 July 1998).

Scott, J. (1999). "Do Americans Have more or less leisure time?" New York

Times July 10. On line: <http://www.nytimes.com> (accessed 13 July, 1999).

Stewart, D., Abbey, S., Meana, M., & Boydell, K. M. (1998). "What makes women tired? A community sample." Journal of Women's Health 7, 69-76.

Swatos, William H., Jr., and Kevin J. Christiano. 1999. "Secularization Theory: The Course of a Concept." Sociology of Religion, 60:209-28.

Wuthnow, R. (1988). The restructuring of American religion: Society and faith since World War II. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Appendix 1. Definitions of Variables

I. Dependent Variables

Membership in a church organization. 1 = respondent answered "yes" when asked if he or she was a member of "church-affiliated groups," 0 = "no."

Probability of attending religious services. The probability that the respondent attended services in any given week. Values range from 0 to .95. The GSS asked: "How often do you attend religious services?" The answers were: never (coded 0), less than once a year (.01), about once or twice a year (.02), several times a year (.05), about once a month (.23), two to three times a month (.58), nearly every week (.82), every week (.91), several times a week (.95).

Devotional time. Two questions: (1) "In the past month, about how many hours have you spent doing religious activities in your home (such as time spent praying, meditating, reading religious books, listening to religious broadcasts, etc)?" (2) "In the past month, about how many hours have you spent doing religious activities outside your home (such as attending religious services, prayer groups, Bible studies, fellowship meetings, church leadership meetings, etc.)?" First, we created dummy variables for each question: 1 = reported any time at all, 0 = not. Then, *only for those with any time*, we used the numbers of hours they reported. Because of some very high numbers (e.g., 150 hours per week -- 21 hours a day), we first recoded any responses over 120 to 120 and then logged. The units of these variables in the regression results are logged hours. Finally, we created a dummy coded 1 if the respondent reported any hours at home or away from home spent in religious activity. The result is five variables: any time at home, any time away from home, any time at or away from home, logged hours at home, and logged hours away from home.

Religious donations. Three questions yielded four measures of religious donations. The 1988 GSS asked: "About how much do you contribute to your religion every year (not including school tuition)?" The 1998 GSS asked two questions that we combined into one: "During the last year, approximately how much money did you and the other family members in your household contribute to each of the following: (a) To you local congregation? (b) To other religious organizations, programs, or causes?" We created dummy variables for each year: 1 = gave something in 1988 vs. 0 = did not; and 1 = gave something in 1998 vs. 0 = did not. Then, *only for those who gave something*, we used the reported dollars given in each year. The recorded answers were highly skewed, so we both recoded and logged. For the 1988 item, we topped the values at \$10,000 or more; for the 1998 item on donations to one's congregation, we topped the values at \$25,000 or more; and for the 1998 item measuring donations outside of the congregation, we topped the values at \$10,000 or more. We summed the two parts of the 1998 item and we logged the resulting values. In the end, there are four measures: gave in 1988 or not, gave in 1998 or not, logged dollars given in 1988, and logged dollars given in 1998.

II. Definitions of Independent Variables

Class. 1 = middle class, 0 = working class. If *both* respondent and partner had at least some college education, the variable was coded as middle class. (See discussion in text.)

Parenthood. 1 = respondent had any children 18 or younger living in the home, 0 = not.

Couple work hours ("Time Bind"). Three categories: (1) respondent was in a single-earner family, (2) respondent was in a dual-earner family in which joint work hours totaled less than 80 a week, and (3) respondent was in a dual-earner

family in which the joint work hours totaled 80 or more. In the regression equations, we included dummy variables for categories 2 and 3; the excluded category is 1, the single-earner family.

Middle class and working many hours. An interaction term coded 1 if the respondent was coded middle class *and* in category 3 of couple work hours -- a dual-earner family in which work hours total to 80 or more; coded 0 otherwise.

Number of respondent's work hours. The number of hours the respondent reported spending at work during one week. If the respondent worked the week prior to the interview, the GSS asked: "How many hours did you work last week, at all jobs?" If the respondent *did not* work the week prior to the interview but was employed, the GSS asked: "How many hours a week do you usually work, at all jobs?" The question regarding spouses' hours is similar.

Age. (1) the respondent's age in years, and (2) age squared.

Gender. 1 = female, 0 = male.

Race/ethnicity. A set of dummy variables: (1) 1 = black, 0 = not; (2) 1 = Latino, 0 = not; (3) 1 = other nonwhite, 0 = not. White is the excluded category.

Income. We assigned respondents their percentile rank on household income. (This permitted us to control for income and dollar differences across the many years of surveys.)

Childhood religious affiliation. A set of dummy variables: (1) 1 = respondent reported being raised as a Catholic, 0 = not; (2) 1 = raised as a nonfundamentalist Protestant, 0 = not, (3) 1 = raised as a fundamentalist Protestant, 0 = not, (4) 1 =

raised in another religion, 0 = not. Raised with "no religious affiliation" is the excluded category in the regressions.

APPENDIX 2

Tables

Table A1: Logistic Regression, Dependent Variable = Membership in a Church Organization

Initial -2LL = 2290.5

Final -2LL = 2181.8

N = 1708

Variable	Unstandardized Coefficient	Standard Error	Sig.	Exp (B)
(Constant)	-1.3058	.9817	.1835	
Respondent Is Middle Class	.8621	.1502	.0000	2.3681
Resp. Has Child at Home	.4813	.1219	.0001	1.6181
Both Work, less than 80	.0472	.1456	.7456	1.0484
Both Work, 80+ Hours	.0771	.1697	.6495	1.0801
Number of Resp.'s Work Hours	-.0008	.0035	.8288	.9992
Age of Respondent	-.0152	.0511	.7656	.9849
Age of Resp. Squared	.0416	.0654	.5249	1.0425
Resp. Is Female	.3493	.1216	.0041	1.4180
Resp. Is Black	.3902	.1935	.0438	1.4772
Resp. Is Latino	.5414	.2660	.0418	1.7185
Resp. Is Other Ethnicity	-.2858	.2904	.2500	.7514
Household Income	.0022	.0022	.3049	1.0022
Resp. Was Raised Catholic	-.4803	.3538	.1746	.6186
Resp. Raised Protestant (Fund.)	.2171	.3500	.5350	1.2425
Resp. Raised Protestant (Non-fund.)	-.1193	.3514	.7341	.8875
Resp. Raised Other Religion	-.7723	.4466	.0837	.4619
Resp. Is Middle Class and Both Work 80+ Hours	-.5206	.2100	.0132	.5941

Table A2: Ordinary Least Squares Regression, Dependent Variable = Probability of Attending Religious Services Any Given Week.

R squared = .065

N = 4734

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standard Error	Standardized Coefficients	Sig.
(Constant)	.219	.110		.046
Respondent Is Middle Class	.167	.017	.204	.000
Resp. Has Child at Home	6.639E-02	.013	.079	.000
Both Work, less than 80	2.754E-02	.016	.028	.093
Both Work, 80+ Hours	1.787E-02	.018	.022	.334
Number of Resp.'s Work Hours	-6.453E-04	.000	-.033	.090
Age of Respondent	5.499E-03	.006	.122	.329
Age of Resp. Squared	-1.688E-03	.007	-.029	.814
Resp. Is Female	6.595E-02	.013	.082	.000
Resp. Is Black	.108	.021	.075	.000
Resp. Is Latino	4.068E-02	.028	.023	.147
Resp. Is Other Ethnicity	6.344E-02	.029	.034	.027
Household Income	-5.102E-04	.000	-.036	.033
Resp. Was Raised Catholic	-6.968E-02	.038	-.080	.068
Resp. Raised Protestant (Fund.)	-3.438E-02	.038	-.041	.367
Resp. Raised Protestant (Non-fund.)	-.124	.038	-.138	.001
Resp. Raised Other Religion	-.256	.046	-.128	.000
Resp. Is Middle Class and Both Work 80+ Hours	-7.748E-02	.023	-.079	.001

Table A3: Ordinary Least Squares Regression, Dependent Variable = Probability of Attending Religious Services Any Given Week, by Gender.

Variables	<u>WIVES (R-sq=.066, n=2673)</u>				<u>HUSBANDS (R-sq=.049, n=2213)</u>			
	Unstand'zed		Stand'zed	Sig.	Unstand'zed Coefficients		Stand'zed	Sig.
	Coefficients		Coeff's				Coeff's	
	B	Std. Error	Beta	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.326	.139		.019	.123	.174		.478
Resp. Is Middle-class	.232	.042	.282	.000	.200	.030	.248	.000
Resp. Has Child Home	7.20E-02	.018	.086	.000	5.63E-02	.019	.067	.003
Nmb. Hours Resp. Works	-1.20E-03	.000	-.061	.002	3.04E-06	.001	.000	.995
Nmb. Hours Spouse Works	1.56E-03	.001	.070	.004	6.69E-04	.001	.033	.233
Age of Respondent	-2.36E-03	.007	-.054	.745	1.24E-02	.009	.273	.159
Age of Resp. Squared	9.50E-02	.009	.168	.310	-1.16E-02	.011	-.203	.295
Resp. Is Black	.146	.028	.100	.000	6.84E-02	.041	.049	.024
Resp. Is Latino	1.09E-02	.037	.006	.768	8.48E-02	.042	.048	.040
Resp Is Other Ethnicity	7.02E-02	.038	.037	.065	5.85E-02	.041	.032	.164
Household Income	-6.01E-04	.000	-.043	.059	-3.36E-04	.000	-.024	.351
Resp. Raised Catholic	-3.61E-02	.051	-.041	.480	-.110	.055	-.128	.040
Raised Prot. Fundam.	1.20E-02	.051	.014	.814	-8.64E-02	.055	-.103	.114
Raised Prot. Nonfundam.	-8.07E-02	.051	-.090	.115	-.168	.055	-.186	.002
Resp. Raised Oth. Relig.	-.232	.063	-.111	.000	-.276	.067	-.143	.000
Nmb. Hours Spouse Works for Middle-class Respondents	-1.93E-03	.001	-.116	.032	-3.40E-03	.001	-.155	.000

Table A4: Logistic Regression, Dependent Variable = Any time spent in religious activity, either at or away from home

Initial -2LL = 375.3

Final -2LL = 360.8

N = 369

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standard Error	Sig.	Exp (B)
(Constant)	-.7281	2.6995	.7874	
Respondent Is Middle Class	.0994	.2979	.7387	1.1045
Resp. Has Child at Home	-.4434	.3263	.1742	.6419
Both Work, less than 80	-.0767	.3840	.8416	.9261
Both Work, 80+ Hours	-.0594	.3792	.8754	.9423
Number of Resp.'s Work Hours	-.0053	.0088	.5499	.9947
Age of Resp	.0880	.1372	.5215	1.0920
Age of Resp. Squared	-.0946	.1741	.5870	.9098
Resp. Is Female	.2771	.3211	.3882	1.3192
Resp. Is Black	.2226	.4126	.5896	1.2493
Resp. Is Latino	.1014	.6005	.8659	1.1068
Resp. Is Other Ethnicity	.2132	.6177	.7299	1.2377
Household Income	.0070	.0060	.2454	1.0070
Resp. Was Raised Catholic	-.0598	.8800	.9458	.9419
Resp. Raised Protestant (Fund.)	.3941	.8822	.6551	1.4830
Resp. Raised Protestant (Non-fund.)	.2300	.8833	.7946	1.2586
Resp. Raised Other Religion	-1.1786	1.0222	.2489	.3077

Table A5 : Ordinary Least Squares Regression, Dependent Variable = Logged Number of Hours Spent in Religious Activity at Home

R-squared = .150

N = 268

Variables	Unstandardized	Standard	Standardized	Sig.
	Coefficients	Error	Coefficients	
(Constant)	1.860	1.359		.172
Respondent Is Middle Class	.322	.136	.153	.019
Resp. Has Child at Home	.118	.145	.054	.415
Both Work, less than 80	-.317	.184	-.119	.086
Both Work, 80+ Hours	3.735E-02	.174	.018	.830
Number of Resp.'s Work Hours	-8.684E-03	.004	-.179	.037
Age of Resp	5.644E-02	.065	.477	.384
Age of Resp. Squared	-5.990E-02	.081	-.409	.459
Resp. Is Female	2.932E-02	.149	.014	.845
Resp. Is Black	.676	.179	.228	.000
Resp. Is Latino	-.308	.301	-.072	.308
Resp. Is Other Ethnicity	-.170	.286	-.041	.553
Household Income	-5.754E-03	.003	-.152	.037
Resp. Was Raised Catholic	-.739	.524	-.319	.159
Resp. Raised Protestant (Fund.)	-.797	.518	-.373	.125
Resp. Raised Protestant (Non-fund.)	-.897	.522	-.389	.087
Resp. Raised Other Religion	-.987	.639	-.151	.123

Table A6: Ordinary Least Squares Regression, Dependent Variable = Logged Number of Hours Spent in Religious Activity Away from Home

R-squared = .141

N = 229

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standard Error	Standardized Coefficients	Sig.
(Constant)	2.498	1.349		.066
Respondent Is Middle Class	.382	.125	.213	.003
Resp. Has Child at Home	.138	.131	.074	.292
Both Work, less than 80	-5.942E-02	.170	-.027	.727
Both Work, 80+ Hours	-7.634E-02	.163	-.042	.640
Number of Resp.'s Work Hours	-6.511E-03	.004	-.153	.089
Age of Resp	-1.920E-02	.067	-.179	.775
Age of Resp. Squared	3.851E-02	.083	.293	.642
Resp. Is Female	-6.955E-02	.136	-.039	.609
Resp. Is Black	.629	.165	.252	.000
Resp. Is Latino	-.155	.303	-.037	.610
Resp. Is Other Ethnicity	.126	.260	.033	.629
Household Income	-5.614E-03	.002	-.178	.025
Resp. Was Raised Catholic	-2.084E-03	.410	-.001	.996
Resp. Raised Protestant (Fund.)	.277	.404	.151	.494
Resp. Raised Protestant (Non-fund.)	2.843E-02	.408	.014	.945
Resp. Raised Other Religion	9.181E-02	.579	.013	.874

Table A7: Logistic Regression, Dependent Variable = Gave to Local Congregation and Other Religious Organizations (1998 Measure)

Initial -2LL = 386.7

Final -2LL = 361.2

N = 356

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standard Error	Sig.	Exp (B)
(Constant)	-1.1581	2.7249	.6708	
Respondent Is Middle Class	.1010	.2971	.7339	1.1063
Resp. Has Child at Home	-.1006	.3106	.7461	.9043
Both Work, less than 80	-.1597	.3870	.6798	.8524
Both Work, 80+ Hours	-.2005	.3841	.6016	.8183
Number of Resp.'s Work Hours	-.0131	.0090	.1464	.9870
Age of Resp	.1685	.1331	.2056	1.1835
Age of Resp. Squared	-.2054	.1676	.2204	.8143
Resp. Is Female	-.3173	.3171	.3171	.7281
Resp. Is Black	.1556	.3910	.6906	1.1684
Resp. Is Latino	-1.2202	.5525	.0272	.2952
Resp. Is Other Ethnicity	-.2482	.5735	.6652	.6652
Household Income	.0126	.0062	.0415	1.0127
Resp. Was Raised Catholic	-.6484	1.1349	.5678	.5229
Resp. Raised Protestant (Fund.)	-.6546	1.1305	.5625	.5196
Resp. Raised Protestant (Non-fund.)	-.4819	1.1362	.6715	.6176
Resp. Raised Other Religion	-1.2105	1.2661	.3390	.2981

Table A8: Ordinary Least Squares Regression, Dependent Variable = Amount of Donations Made to Local Congregation and Other Religious Organizations (In Logged Dollars -- 1998 Measure)

R-squared = .232

N = 257

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standard Error	Standardized Coefficients	Sig.
(Constant)	4.131	2.155		.056
Respondent Is Middle Class	.660	.215	.194	.002
Resp. Has Child at Home	-.182	.223	-.051	.415
Both Work, less than 80	-.134	.278	-.033	.629
Both Work, 80+ Hours	-.603	.279	-.176	.031
Number of Resp.'s Work Hours	-3.023E-03	.006	-.039	.641
Age of Resp	1.765E-02	.107	.089	.869
Age of Resp. Squared	2.694E-02	.133	.109	.840
Resp. Is Female	-.235	.238	-.069	.325
Resp. Is Black	.967	.284	.199	.001
Resp. Is Latino	.765	.629	.083	.225
Resp. Is Other Ethnicity	9.467E-02	.559	.011	.866
Household Income	1.286E-02	.004	.218	.004
Resp. Was Raised Catholic	.257	.620	.068	.678
Resp. Raised Protestant (Fund.)	1.055	.617	.294	.088
Resp. Raised Protestant (Non-fund.)	.491	.616	.134	.426
Resp. Raised Other Religion	4.024E-02	.774	.005	.052