

Parental Religiosity and Youth Religious Outcomes: Variations by Family Structure

Richard J. Petts

Ball State University
Department of Sociology
North Quad 222
Muncie, IN 47306

This is a pre-copyedited, author-produced version of an article accepted for publication in *Sociology of Religion* following peer review. The version of record Richard J. Petts, Parental Religiosity and Youth Religiosity: Variations by Family Structure, *Sociology of Religion*, Volume 76, Issue 1, SPRING 2015, Pages 95–120, <https://doi.org/10.1093/socrel/sru064> is available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/socrel/sru064>.

Acknowledgements: The National Study of Youth and Religion (www.youthandreligion.org) was funded by the Lilly Endowment, Inc. and was led by Christian Smith (Professor of Sociology at the University of Notre Dame) and Lisa Pearce (Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill).

Parental Religiosity and Youth Religious Outcomes: Variations by Family Structure

Many studies have explored the links between family structure, parental religiosity, and youth religiosity, but results across studies have been inconsistent and have largely ignored new diverse family forms. Using data on 2,320 youth and their parents from the National Study of Youth and Religion, this study focused on whether and why religious transmission from parents to youth varies among diverse family structures. Overall, results suggest that parental religiosity was less influential in predicting youth religiosity for youth raised by stepfamilies, divorced single parents, never married single parents, and cohabiting families than for youth raised by married biological/adoptive parents. Results also suggest that less effective religious transmission within nontraditional families compared to traditional families is due (at least in part) to less effective religious socialization and lower quality parent-child relationships.

Research has increasingly focused on the religious lives of adolescents and young adults, exploring the ways in which youth construct their religious identities, the patterns of religiosity they experience during this life stage, and factors that influence these processes (e.g., Desmond, Morgan, and Kikuchi 2010; Petts 2009; Smith and Denton 2005; Smith and Snell 2009). Such studies are especially important because adolescence is a life stage often characterized by religious instability but also one that plays a key role in the development of a religious identity (Desmond et al. 2010; Petts 2009; Uecker, Regnerus, and Vaaler 2007).

The most important source of religious socialization is family. Youth raised in religious families are more likely to be religious than youth raised in nonreligious families (Cornwall 1989; Myers 1996; Smith and Denton 2005). Family structure also matters. Studies suggest that youth raised by married biological parents are most likely to be religious (e.g., Day et al. 2009; Myers 1996), but research on specific differences in adolescent religiosity by family structure have been mixed. For example, Myers (1996) finds that youth raised in stepfamilies have lower religiosity than those raised by biological parents, but other studies find a difference only between single and two parent families (Petts 2009; Uecker and Ellison 2012) and still others find no direct effect of family structure on youth religiosity (Denton 2012). Research also suggests that the influence of family structure on youth religiosity may vary by religious outcome (Desmond et al. 2010; Uecker and Ellison 2012; Zhai et al. 2007).

Despite advances in our understanding of family religious socialization, previous studies have focused primarily on religious transmission within married, divorced, or remarried families (Uecker and Ellison 2012; Zhai et al. 2007; 2008). Little is known about religious transmission in other family structures. This is an important limitation, as families have become increasingly diverse. Perhaps most notably, rates of cohabitation have increased dramatically since the 1980s:

33% of women in their childbearing years ever cohabited in 1987 compared to 60% in 2010 (Manning 2013). As a result, most people cohabit at least once in their lives, and the majority of marriages are preceded by cohabitation today (Cherlin 2010; Manning 2013). Due to high divorce rates and increases in out-of-wedlock childbearing, single parent families have also become more common; 24% of children reside in a single parent family, which is currently the second most common family structure for children (Cherlin 2010; Payne 2013). Thus, it is important to consider whether religious transmission may be different in these family structures.

The current study attempts to provide a more comprehensive examination of the relationships between parental religiosity, family structure, and youth religiosity. Using two waves of data from the National Study of Youth and Religion and focusing on five religious outcomes and six family types, two research questions are considered. First, does religious transmission from parents to children vary by family structure? Second, what explains these disparities? Variations in the consistency of parents' religiosity, level of parental religious socialization, and parent-child relationship quality have been suggested as possible explanations for why youth religiosity may vary by family structure (Bader and Desmond 2006; Myers 1996; Uecker and Ellison 2012; Zhai et al. 2007). The current study reconsiders these explanations.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Parents' Influence on Youth Religiosity

Youth religiosity is highly dependent on how much they are exposed to religion by their parents, as parents often serve as the primary source of socialization for their children (Cornwall 1989; Smith and Denton 2005; Stolzenberg, Blair-Loy, and Waite 1995). Religious socialization may also be different from other forms of socialization, as youth may feel especially pressured to adhere to their parents' religious beliefs (due to parental guilt, fear of eternal consequences, etc.).

The spiritual modeling and spiritual capital perspectives provide explanations for why family plays an important role in religious transmission. The spiritual modeling perspective suggests that youth develop spiritually by modeling the spiritual behavior of important people in their life (King and Mueller 2003). Thus, having a religious parent may lead youth to model their spiritual life after this parent. The spiritual capital perspective suggests that active religious training is important for fostering religious behavior (King and Muller 2003). That is, youth are more likely to be religious when they are exposed to religious activities by parents. Conversely, being raised by nonreligious parents increases the likelihood that youth are not religious.

Overall, although parental religiosity is a strong predictor of youth religiosity, not all families are the same. That is, some family structures may be more conducive to providing spiritual modeling and capital perhaps due to greater acceptance within religious institutions or the presence of two spiritual exemplars as opposed to one (Edgell 2006; Wilcox, Chaves, and Franz 2004; Zhai et al. 2007). Parental religious socialization may also vary in its influence on specific religious outcomes (i.e., public vs. private), although research on these differences has been mixed (Denton 2012; Desmond et al. 2010; Uecker and Ellison 2012; Zhai et al. 2007).

Youth Religiosity and Family Structure

The primary goal of this study is to examine whether religious transmission from parents to children varies by family structure, and contributes to the literature by examining a wide range of diverse family structures. Thus, it is important to consider why religious transmission may be strongest in married biological/adoptive families, how divorce (and subsequent family formation either as a single parent family or stepfamily) may disrupt religious transmission, and how religious transmission may vary in family structures that have not yet been explored in the literature such as never married single parent families (including those formed by the disruption

of a cohabiting relationship) and cohabiting families. Previous studies have suggested differences in religious transmission by family structure may be due to variations in the consistency of parental religiosity, effectiveness of religious socialization, and parent-child relationship quality between family structures and these explanations are highlighted in the following discussion.

Religious transmission may be strongest in intact, married families for a number of reasons. First, married parents are more religious (on average) than unmarried parents, perhaps due to an emphasis on a traditional family structure within religious institutions (Edgell 2006; Stolzenberg et al. 1995; Thornton, Axinn, and Hill 1992; Wilcox et al. 2004). Second, married parents who share religious beliefs may be better able to provide religious socialization to children by having teachings reinforced by multiple parents (Myers 1996; Regnerus and Uecker 2006). Indeed, receiving a consistent religious message from parents increases youth religiosity (Bader and Desmond 2006). Third, strong parent-child relationships increase the likelihood that youth adopt their parents' religious beliefs (Bao et al. 1999; Myers 1996; Ozorak 1989). Married parents may have more time to be engaged in children's lives than other parents (Amato 1987; McLanahan and Sandefur 1994), increasing the likelihood of religious transmission.

In contrast, divorce may disrupt religious transmission. The dissolution of a parental relationship may limit parents' ability to provide a consistent message about religion. Divorce may also weaken religious socialization due to one parent (often the father) leaving the household. Youth may have limited interaction with the nonresident parent, reducing the ability of the nonresident parent to serve as a religious model (King and Mueller 2003). Unmarried fathers are also less likely to be involved in a religious community, which may limit their ability to provide spiritual capital (Petts 2011). Indeed, research suggests that the loss of father's religious socialization after a divorce is associated with lower youth religiosity (Zhai et al. 2007).

Conflict stemming from divorce may also reduce parent-child relationship quality (Booth and Amato 1994), and nonresident parents are often less engaged in children's lives than resident parents (Amato, Myers, and Emery 2009). Thus, religious transmission may lessen following a divorce due to the weakening of parent-child relationships. This may be especially true for youth raised in religious families. Religious youth and their parents may sanctify family relationships (i.e., view these relationships as having spiritual significance) (Mahoney et al. 2003). Sanctification may lead religious youth to experience feelings of sacred loss if family relationships dissolve and make it difficult for them to maintain a high level of public and private religious activity (Denton 2012; Ellison et al. 2011; Warner, Mahoney, and Krumrei 2009).

The influence of divorce on youth religiosity may also depend on subsequent family formation. For example, most research finds no differences in religiosity between youth raised in intact families and stepfamilies (Petts 2009; Regnerus and Uecker 2006; Smith and Denton 2005; Uecker and Ellison 2012). Stepparents may help to provide a consistent religious message to youth if he/she shares religious beliefs with the biological parent (Bader and Desmond 2006). Gaining a stepparent may also help to compensate for spiritual loss following a divorce; if the stepparent is religious, then youth have another spiritual model to look up to and another parent who may provide spiritual capital (King and Mueller 2003). However, stepparents are less likely to be engaged, involved parents than biological parents (Coleman, Ganong, and Fine 2000; Hofferth and Anderson 2003). As a result, religious transmission between stepparents and stepchildren may be less effective due to weaker parent-child relationships, resulting in lower levels of public and private religiosity among youth raised in stepfamilies (Myers 1996).

In contrast to youth raised in stepfamilies, youth raised in single parent families following a divorce may be more likely to experience sacred loss. The loss of a resident parent likely

reduces the spiritual modeling and spiritual capital that youth have access to (King and Mueller 2003). Single parents may also experience sacred loss after the disruption of their marriage, which may lead to a decline in religious behavior and consequently less religious socialization for their children (Krumrei, Mahoney, and Pargament 2009; Mahoney et al. 2003). Single parents may also experience high levels of stress and have less time to participate in religious activities with their children, or may avoid public religious behavior because they feel stigmatized and unwelcome in religious institutions (McLanahan and Sandefur 1994; Sullivan 2008). Despite this stigma, single parents may provide spiritual capital to youth in the form of personal religious practices (Sullivan 2008), and some research suggests that private religious practices do not differ between youth raised by single parents and those raised by two parents (Petts 2009; Uecker and Ellison 2012; Zhai et al. 2007; 2008). However, other research suggests that sacred loss may lead youth to pray less and feel that religion is less important; sanctification of family relationships may result in feelings of loss if these relationships dissolve, creating internal spiritual struggles among youth who experience a parental divorce (Krumrei and Mahoney 2009; Warner et al. 2009). This feeling of spiritual loss may limit the effectiveness of religious transmission from divorced single parents to their children (Denton 2012).

Religious outcomes of youth raised by never married parents and cohabiting parents are less understood. Although never married parents may provide a consistent message about religion (as they are the only parent in the household), they often have less time to attend religious services and experience more stress than married parents (McLanahan and Sandefur 1994; Sullivan 2008). Youth may also have access to fewer spiritual models in never married families than two-parent families, resulting in less effective religious socialization (Myers 1996; Regnerus and Uecker 2006). Furthermore, never married parents may feel more stigmatized by

religious institutions than divorced single parents because religious denominations often view sex and childbearing outside of marriage as sinful (Edgell 2006; Thornton et al. 1992; Wilcox et al. 2004). However, there may also be variation in religious transmission within never married families; in addition to single parent families in which children never resided with another parent, single parent families may also be formed by the dissolution of a cohabiting relationship due to the relatively high level of instability of cohabiting unions (Cherlin 2010; Manning, Smock, and Majumdar 2004). Youth raised by never married parents who experience the dissolution of a parental cohabiting relationship may also experience sacred loss similar to divorced single parent families, resulting in less effective religious transmission (Krumrei and Mahoney 2009; Warner et al. 2009). In contrast, youth raised by single parents who never resided with another parent likely do not have to cope with spiritual loss in the same way. There is evidence to suggest that some single parents are highly involved in religion and place a high level of importance on religion, which may help to facilitate religious transmission to their children (Petts 2012; Sullivan 2008). Even so, the stigma of non-marital childbearing may still result in a lower likelihood that youth raised by never married single parents embrace these religious beliefs and practices relative to youth who are raised in families that are more accepted within religious institutions.

Similar to religious outcomes among youth raised by never married parents, religious transmission within cohabiting unions has been understudied. Although youth raised in cohabiting families may benefit from having two parents (especially if these parents share religious beliefs), the relative instability of cohabiting unions may limit the effectiveness of religious socialization that youth receive from parents in these families (Manning et al. 2004). Furthermore, cohabiting parents may feel also feel stigmatized by religious institutions due to the

belief that sex and childbearing outside of marriage are sinful (Edgell 2006; Thornton et al. 1992; Wilcox et al. 2004). Similar to stepparents, cohabiting parents may also be less invested in children's lives than married biological parents (Brown 2004), which may limit the effectiveness of religious socialization that children in these families receive. As a result, religious transmission may be weaker in cohabiting families than in married families.

HYPOTHESES

Three hypotheses grounded in the conceptual framework guide this study. First, religious institutions promote the married biological family as ideal and may stigmatize other family types, reducing the likelihood that youth raised in nontraditional families feel comfortable being actively involved in a religious community. Thus, I expect that:

H1: The influence of parental religiosity on public religious practices will be weaker for youth raised in nontraditional family structures than youth raised by married biological/adoptive parents.

Second, although some evidence suggests that parents in nontraditional family structures view private religious practices as important, parents within nontraditional families are less likely to be religious than married parents and youth within these families may experience feelings of spiritual loss, which may reduce the effectiveness of religious transmission. Thus, I expect that:

H2: The influence of parental religiosity on private religious practices will be weaker for youth raised in nontraditional family structures than youth raised by married biological/adoptive parents.

Finally, the dissolution of a parental relationship may disrupt the consistency of religious transmission to youth, and youth who reside in nontraditional families may have access to fewer spiritual models and less spiritual capital than youth residing with married parents. Parent-child

relationship quality may also be lower in nontraditional families than in married families, which may limit the ability for parents to transmit their religious beliefs effectively. Thus, I expect that:

H3: The relationships between family structure, parental religiosity, and youth religious outcomes will be partially mediated by consistency in religious beliefs between parents, religious socialization within the family, and parent-child relationship quality.

DATA AND METHODS

Sample

Data from two waves of the National Study of Youth and Religion (NSYR) were used. The NSYR is a nationally representative, longitudinal survey of 3,370 youth. Youth between the ages of 13 and 17 were first interviewed in 2002 along with one of their parents (W1).

Approximately 77% of the sample was retained for the first follow-up survey, which took place in 2005 when youth respondents were between the ages of 16 and 21 (W2). Of the 2,604 youth interviewed in both waves, 74 youth that were part of a Jewish oversample and 210 youth who had missing data on family structure or did not reside with a biological/adoptive parent at W1 were excluded. These exclusions result in a final sample size of 2,320 youth and their parents.

Dependent Variables

Five indicators of youth religiosity at W2 were used as dependent variables. *Religious Attendance* indicates how often (0 = *never* to 6 = *more than once a week*) youth attend religious services. *Religious Support* indicates how many adults (not including parents) that youth have access to in their religious group that they can turn to when they need support, advice, or help (ranging from 0 = *no adults* to 4 = *4 or more adults*). *Religious Salience* indicates how important youth's religious faith is in shaping how they live their daily life (ranging from 0 = *not important at all* to 4 = *extremely important*). *Closeness to God* indicates how close youth feel to God most

of the time (ranging from 1 = *extremely distant* to 6 = *extremely close*).¹ *Private Religious Practices* is measured by how often youth pray alone and how often they read religious texts alone² (ranging from 0 = *never* to 6 = *many times a day*). The mean was used as the indicator.

Independent Variables

Family Structure. Six categories of family structure (measured at W1) were used. Youth in this study reside with: (a) married biological/adoptive parents (reference group), (b) a married biological/adoptive parent and a stepparent or legal guardian, (c) a divorced biological/adoptive single parent (and youth experienced the breakup of the marriage), (d) a never married biological/adoptive single parent, (e) a never married biological/adoptive single parent in which youth experienced the dissolution of a marriage-like parental relationship, or (f) a biological/adoptive parent and his/her unmarried partner.³

Parental Religiosity. Four indicators of parental religiosity were used to create an index, and each indicator was based on one parent's reports of his/her religious activity at W1. Religious attendance indicates how often (0 = *never* to 6 = *more than once a week*) the parent attended religious services. Religious salience indicates how important (0 = *not important at all* to 4 = *extremely important*) religious faith is in providing guidance in their daily living. Prayer

¹ Youth who do not believe in God ($N = 108$) were not asked this question and were excluded from analyses involving this outcome, resulting in a smaller sample size ($N = 2,212$).

² Youth were asked about the religious text associated with their affiliation (Bible, Torah, etc.).

³ This category includes cohabiting relationships involving the other biological parent as well as those involving romantic partners. These groups are combined due to small sample sizes (there were only 11 cases involving cohabiting stepfamilies).

indicates how frequently (0 = *never* to 6 = *once a day or more*) parents prayed for their child. Finally, religious support indicates how supportive their church has been in trying to raise their child (responses ranged from 0 = *not supportive/helpful* to 4 = *extremely supportive/helpful*). Each measure was standardized ($\alpha = .84$), and the mean of the four measures was used as the indicator of parental religiosity.

Mediating Variables

Parents' Religious Affiliation. Parents were classified as (a) Conservative Protestant, (b) Other Religious Affiliation (used as reference group),⁴ or (c) No Religious Affiliation (Steenland et al. 2000). A variable was also included to indicate denominational homogamy; parents are considered denominationally homogamous if they reported sharing a religious affiliation with their partner/spouse or if there was only one parent in the household.

Religious Socialization. Two variables were used to indicate the degree to which religious socialization occurs within families at W1. First, *family religious practices* indicates whether youth engage in religious practices with their parents. Youth were asked whether they had prayed with one or both parents at least once in the previous year (other than at mealtimes or religious services) and how often their family talks about God, the Scriptures, prayer, or other religious or spiritual things together. Youth are considered to engage in religious practices with their family if they had prayed together with their family in the past year and talked with their family about religious things at least once a week. Second, *parent-child denominational homogamy* indicates youth who reported the same religious affiliation as their parent.

⁴ Including other indicators of religious affiliation did not provide any additional information.

Parent-Child Relationship Quality. Four variables were used to measure parent-child relationships at W1. *Monitoring* is measured by parents' reports on how much (0 = *never* to 4 = *always*) they monitor their child's television/movie watching and internet use. The mean is used as the indicator ($\alpha = .58$). *Engagement* indicates whether parents (a) visited a museum, art gallery, or historical site, (b) gone to a play, concert or other show, (c) visited a library, (d) worked on a project, and (e) played a game/sport or exercised with their child over the previous six months. Responses were summed to indicate the level of parental engagement. *Closeness* is based on youth's reports on how close (0 = *not close at all* to 5 = *extremely close*) they felt to their mother and/or father. For youth residing in two parent families, the mean response for both parents was used. *Affection* is based on youth's responses on how often (0 = *never* to 4 = *very often*) their mother and/or father (a) praise and encourage them, (b) hug them, and (c) tell them that they love them. The mean was used as the indicator ($\alpha = .74$ for mothers and $.85$ for fathers). For youth residing in two-parent families, the mean response for both parents was used.

Control Variables

A number of additional variables (measured at W1) were included as controls. These include parent's and youth's age (measured in years), parent's and youth's gender (1 = *female*), the total number of hours that the resident parent(s) worked per week, household income, resident parents' average education level (ranging from 1 = *did not complete high school* to 5 = *at least some graduate school*), whether the resident parent(s) owned their home and an indicator of parent's depressive symptoms. Parents were also asked about their assets and debt and this information was used to create an indicator of parent's wealth (0 = *in debt or just breaking even*, 1 = *at least some savings and assets*). Youth's race/ethnicity was categorized as White (used as

reference category), Black, Hispanic, and other racial/ethnic group. A variable was also included to indicate youth that report a different race/ethnicity from their parent.

To account for possible selection into particular family structures, Heckman's (1979) two-stage method was used. A probit model was used to predict whether youth resided with married biological/adoptive parents at W1 based on parental characteristics (age, race, income, religiosity, etc.). The model estimates were used to create a lambda term that represents the effects of characteristics associated with selection into a married biological/adoptive family.

Three variables were also included to account for changes in family structure between W1 and W2. The first variable indicates whether youth were no longer residing with their parent(s) at W2. The second variable indicates whether youth still residing with their parent(s) at W2 experienced any transition in resident family structure between waves. The third variable indicates whether youth experienced a break-up of their parents' marriage or marriage-like relationship (both resident and nonresident) between waves.

Analytic Strategy

Ordinary least squares regression models were used in this study.⁵ For each indicator of youth religiosity, three models were used. The first model includes the indicators of family structure, parental religiosity, and all control variables. Interaction terms are included in the

⁵ Ordered logistic models were also considered. Due to the violation of the proportional odds assumption for some models and similarity in results, OLS models are presented here.

second model to assess whether the influence of parental religiosity on youth religious outcomes varies by family structure. Finally, mediating variables were added in Model 3.⁶

Summary statistics for all variables are included in Table 1. Missing data was accounted for using multivariate normal imputation, and results from ten imputed models are shown here. Weights were included in all analyses to adjust for number of teenagers in household, number of household telephone numbers, census region of residence, and household income.

----- Insert Table 1 About Here -----

RESULTS

Results exploring the relationships between parental religiosity, family structure, and each religious outcome are presented in separate tables. Results focused on youth religious attendance are shown in Table 2. As seen in Model 1, family structure is not significantly related to youth religious attendance with one exception; youth raised in stepfamilies attended religious services less frequently than youth raised by married biological/adoptive parents ($b = -0.29, p < .05$). Not surprisingly, parental religiosity was a strong predictor of youth religious attendance ($b = 1.40, p < .05$). Interaction terms were included in Model 2 to examine whether the influence of parental religiosity varies by family structure, and results support H1. Specifically, parental religiosity was less likely to increase religious attendance for youth raised in stepfamilies ($b = -0.45, p < .01$), divorced single parent families ($b = -0.31, p < .05$), never married single parent families ($b = -0.84, p < .05$), single parent families who experienced a non-marital breakup ($b = -1.62, p < .001$), and cohabiting families ($b = -1.32, p < .01$) than youth raised by married parents.

⁶ Mediation tests were performed using methods described by Preacher and Hayes (2008), and the delta method was used to compute standard errors.

----- Insert Table 2 About Here -----

These results are further illustrated in Panel A of Figure 1, which shows predicted values from estimates in Model 2. As shown in this graph, higher levels of parental religiosity were associated with higher levels of religious attendance for youth raised by married parents. A similar pattern holds true for youth raised in stepfamilies, never married families, and divorced single parent families, but overall levels of religious attendance were lower for youth at moderate and high levels of parental religiosity in these family structures than for youth raised by married parents. In contrast, the relationship between parental religiosity and youth religious attendance was different for youth raised in cohabiting families and youth raised by single parents who experienced a non-marital breakup. For youth raised in these family structures, parental religiosity had little to no influence on their religious attendance.

----- Insert Figure 1 About Here -----

Mediating variables were included in Model 3 of Table 2, and parent-child homogamy ($b = 0.36, p < .01$), family religious practices ($b = 0.86, p < .001$), and parental affection ($b = 0.14, p < .05$) were all positively related to religious attendance. When these variables were included, the size of the coefficients for the interaction terms were slightly reduced and the interactions involving divorced single parent families and never married single parent families were no longer significant. Thus, results in Model 3 provided some evidence for H3 in showing that less effective religious transmission in divorced and never married single parent families was due to less effective religious socialization in these families and lower levels of parental affection. Overall, approximately 51% of the total effect is mediated by these three variables.

Results focused on a second indicator of public religiosity, religious support, are shown in Table 3. Similar to results in Table 2, results in Model 1 suggest that parental religiosity was a

strong predictor of youth religious support ($b = 0.61, p < .001$), but family structure was unrelated to youth religious support. Interaction terms were included in Model 2, and results only provide limited support for H1; parental religiosity was less likely to increase religious support among youth raised in stepfamilies than youth raised by married parents ($b = -0.25, p < .05$), but there were no significant differences in religious transmission among other family structures. These results are further illustrated in Panel B of Figure 2. Mediating variables were added in Model 3, and family religious practices ($b = 0.45, p < .001$) and parental affection ($b = 0.16, p < .01$) were positively associated with religious support (approximately 35% of the total effect was mediated). However, inclusion of these variables does not account for the difference in the influence of parental religiosity on religious support between youth raised in stepfamilies and married families, providing little support for H3.

----- Insert Table 3 About Here -----

Results focused on private religious outcomes are presented in Tables 4-6. Results in Table 4 focus on religious salience. Consistent with other religious outcomes, parental religiosity was a strong predictor of youth religious salience ($b = 0.80, p < .001$) in Model 1. Moreover, there was only one significant difference in family structure, with youth raised in stepfamilies having lower levels of religious salience than youth raised in married families ($b = -0.17, p < 0.05$). Interaction terms were included in Model 2, and results provide some support for H2. Specifically, parental religiosity was less likely to lead to higher levels of religious salience among youth raised in stepfamilies ($b = -0.23, p < .05$), never married single parent families ($b = -0.68, p < .01$), and single parent families who experienced a non-marital breakup ($b = -0.58, p < .05$) than youth raised by married biological/adoptive parents. These differences are further illustrated in Panel C of Figure 1, which illustrates that the influence of parental religiosity on

youth religious salience was especially lower for youth raised by never married parents, as the slopes of the lines for each type of never married single parent family were flatter than for other family structures.

----- Insert Table 4 About Here -----

When mediating variables were introduced in Model 3 of Table 4, a number of them were all positively related to religious salience including parent-child homogamy ($b = 0.33, p < .001$), family religious practices ($b = 0.45, p < .001$), parent-child closeness ($b = 0.08, p < .05$) and parental affection ($b = 0.11, p < .05$). When these variables were included, the size of the coefficients for the interaction terms was slightly reduced and the difference between single parent families with a non-marital breakup and married families was no longer significant. Thus, results in Model 3 provided some evidence for H3 in showing that less effective religious transmission in single parent families was due to less effective religious socialization in these families and lower levels of parental affection and parent-child closeness. Overall, approximately 47% of the total effect is mediated by these four variables.

Results in Table 5 focus on closeness to God. Once again, results in Model 1 suggest that parental religiosity was a strong predictor of feelings of closeness to God among youth ($b = 0.63, p < .001$), but family structure was unrelated to youth religious support. Results in Model 2 also provide only limited support for H2 with only one interaction term being significant; parental religiosity was less influential in predicting closeness to God among youth raised in single parent families with a non-marital breakup than youth raised by married biological/adoptive parents ($b = -0.47, p < .05$). This result is further illustrated in Panel D of Figure 1, which shows little change in closeness to God for youth raised by never married single parents with low and high levels of religiosity. Mediating variables were added in Model 3, and approximately 46% of the

total effect was mediated by parent-child homogamy ($b = 0.23, p < .05$), parental homogamy ($b = 0.17, p < .05$), and family religious practices ($b = 0.37, p < .001$). When these variables were included, the difference in the influence of parental religiosity on closeness to God between youth raised in single parent families with a non-marital breakup and youth raised in married families was no longer significant. Thus, results in Model 3 of Table 5 provide support for H3.

----- Insert Table 5 About Here -----

Results in Table 6 focus on private religious practices. Consistent with other religious outcomes, results in Model 1 show that parental religiosity was a strong predictor of youth youth's private religious practices ($b = 0.99, p < .001$). Moreover, there is only one significant difference in family structure, with youth raised by divorced single parents having lower levels of private religious practices than youth raised in married families ($b = -0.28, p < 0.05$). Interaction terms were included in Model 2, and results largely support H2; parental religiosity was less likely to lead to higher levels of private religious practices for youth raised by stepparents ($b = -0.28, p < .05$), divorced single parents ($b = -0.22, p < .05$), never married single parents ($b = -0.55, p < .01$), and never married single parents who experienced a non-marital breakup ($b = -0.77, p < .05$) than for youth raised by married biological/adoptive parents. These results are further illustrated in Panel E of Figure 1. Mediating factors were included in Model 3 of Table 6, and results again provide some support for H3. Specifically, parent-child homogamy ($b = 0.25, p < .05$) and family religious practices ($b = 0.91, p < .05$) were both positively related to private religious practices among youth. When these variables were included, the coefficients for the interaction terms were reduced and the differences between youth raised by divorced single parents, single parents who experienced a non-marital breakup, and youth raised by married biological parents were no longer significant. Thus, the lower influence of parental

religiosity on private religious practices for youth raised by single parents who experienced the dissolution of a committed relationship is due to less effective religious socialization in these families (accounting for approximately 55% of the total effect).

----- Insert Table 6 About Here -----

DISCUSSION

The goal of this study was to better understand the relationships between parental religiosity, family structure, and youth religious outcomes by using longitudinal data and a variety of family types to examine whether religious transmission varied by family structure and type of youth religiosity as well as whether and how consistency in parents' religiosity, religious socialization, and quality of parent-child relationships explain these differences.

Consistent with previous research, parental religiosity was as a strong predictor of youth religious outcomes in this study; youth were less likely to be religious when raised by parents with low levels of religiosity and vice versa (Cornwall 1989; Myers 1996; Smith and Denton 2005). The main goal of this study was then to examine whether this relationship varied by family structure, and results provide some support for the hypotheses.

First, there was some support for H1. Specifically, the influence of parental religiosity on religious attendance was lower for youth raised by divorced single parents, never married single parents, never married single parents who experienced the dissolution of a marriage-like relationship, and cohabiting parents than youth raised by married biological/adoptive parents. In addition, the influence of parental religiosity on both religious attendance and support was lower for youth raised in stepfamilies. Despite being consistent with H1, these results contrast with previous studies that found no difference in religious transmission between stepfamilies and married biological/adoptive families (Uecker and Ellison 2012). This may be due to weaker

relationships between stepparents and children or because adolescents may not perceive stepparents as good spiritual models (King and Mueller 2003; Myers 1996).

Results from this study also provided support for H2. Although a number of studies have found that private religious practices among youth do not vary by family structure (Desmond et al. 2010; Uecker and Ellison 2012; Zhai et al. 2007), results from this study suggested that the influence of parental religiosity on religious salience and private religious practices (praying and reading religious texts) was lower among youth raised in stepfamilies and both types of never married single parent families than youth by married parents. Again, this may be due to less effective religious socialization in stepfamilies and never married single parent families than married biological/adoptive parent families; stepparents may not be as actively involved in family religious practices and the stress of single parenthood may limit the ability to provide religious teachings to youth, resulting in less spiritual capital available for youth raised in these families and ultimately less effective religious transmission within these families (King and Mueller 2003; Myers 1996). Moreover, parental religiosity was less likely to increase feelings of closeness to God among youth raised by single parents who experienced the dissolution of a marriage-like relationship than youth raised by married parents, and parental religiosity was less influential in predicting private religious practices among youth raised by divorced single parents than youth raised by married parents. Less effective religious transmission in these cases may be due to feelings of sacred loss (Krumrei and Mahoney 2009; Warner et al. 2009).

In attempting to better understand why differences in religious transmission by family structure may exist, there is evidence to support the argument that religious socialization (both family religious practices and parent-child consistency in religious beliefs) helps to explain the less effective religious transmission that appears to exist in nontraditional families. Youth raised

by divorced single parents and never married single parents who experienced a non-marital breakup are less likely to pray with their parents and talk about religion frequently as well as less likely to identify with the same religious affiliation as their parent than youth raised by married biological/adoptive parents. Overall, these factors account for the lower levels of religious transmission within divorced single parent families and never married single parent families who experienced a non-marital breakup (with the exception of religious participation for youth raised by never married single parents). These results seem to provide support for the sacred loss argument; single parents and their children may experience feelings of loss after relationship disruption, leading parents to be less able to provide effective religious socialization to their children and youth being reluctant to model spiritual behavior due to internal spiritual struggles after experiencing loss (Denton 2012; Krumrei et al. 2009; Krumrei and Mahoney 2009).

Results from this study also provide additional evidence that religious socialization and parent-child relationship quality (to a lesser extent) help to partially explain the lower influence of parental religiosity on religious outcomes for youth raised by stepfamilies, never married single parents (who did not experience a non-marital breakup), and cohabiting parents than youth raised by married biological/adoptive parents. Stepparents, never married single parents, and cohabiting parents may be less likely to provide youth with spiritual capital; by engaging in religious activities together less frequently, youth raised in these families may not have the spiritual capital needed to maintain a high level of religious behavior during a stage in the life course that is often marked by religious instability (Desmond et al. 2010; Petts 2009; Uecker et al. 2007). Moreover, higher levels of stress and instability may weaken parent-child relationships and limit the effectiveness of religious transmission in single parent and cohabiting families (Brown 2004; McLanahan and Sandefur 2004). Furthermore, stepparents may be unsure of their

roles as parents due to a lack of institutionalized support regarding their parenting roles and thus may be less engaged in their children's lives, making it more difficult for them to act as spiritual models to their stepchildren (Cherlin 1978; Coleman et al. 2000).

There are also some limitations in this study to acknowledge. One key limitation is that information was only collected from one parent. While parents provided some information about their spouse/partner (e.g., whether they belonged to the same religious denomination) and youth reported on family religious behavior, detailed information about the religious behavior of the second parent is not available in the NSYR. Having measures of parental consistency in specific religious behaviors would be helpful in further strengthening the conclusions of this study.

Another limitation is that although this study utilizes longitudinal data, only two time points are considered. Previous research suggests that adolescents and young adults may experience patterns of religiosity that fluctuate over time (Desmond et al. 2010; Petts 2009), and that religiosity generally declines during adolescence (Uecker et al. 2007). Also, family structure was measured only in adolescence. Although this study attempts to account for possible selection into family structures, married biological/adoptive families in this study are likely selective of more stable, happy families. Thus, future research should consider utilizing prospective measures of family structure and more extensive measures of youth religiosity that may better capture these processes throughout the life course and whether the differences in religious transmission by family structure may help to better understand these patterns of youth religiosity.

Overall, this study contributes to our knowledge of religious transmission by exploring whether and why this process may vary among diverse family structures. In doing so, this study both supports previous research and adds to the complexity of this research; there is evidence suggesting that religious transmission from parents to children is less effective in nontraditional

families than in traditional married families, and this trend appears to exist for both public and private religious outcomes. Results also extend previous research by highlighting differences in religious transmission for youth raised by cohabiting parents and never married single parents, and demonstrate that at less effective religious socialization within nontraditional families explains at least part of the difference in religious transmission by family structure. Therefore, it is essential that future research continue to examine how and why family structure may influence youth religiosity, focusing on how these processes may vary across diverse family types.

REFERENCES

- Amato, Paul R. 1987. "Family Processes in One-Parent, Stepparent, and Intact Families: The Child's Point of View." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 49:327-337.
- Amato, Paul R., Catherine E. Myers, and Robert E. Emery. 2009. "Changes in Nonresident Father-Child Contact from 1976 to 2002." *Family Relations* 58:41-53.
- Bao, Wan-Ning, Les B. Whitbeck, Danny R. Hoyt, and Rand D. Conger. 1999. "Perceived Parental Acceptance as a Moderator of Religious Transmission Among Adolescent Boys and Girls." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 61:362-374.
- Bader, Christopher G. and Scott A. Desmond. 2006. "Do as I Say and as I Do: The Effects of Consistent Parental Beliefs and Behaviors Upon Religious Transmission." *Sociology of Religion* 67:313-329.
- Booth, Alan and Paul R. Amato. 1994. "Parental Marital Quality, Parental Divorce, and Relations with Parents." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 56:21-34.
- Brown, Susan L. 2004. "Family Structure and Child Well-Being: The Significance of Parental Cohabitation." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 66:351-367.

- Cherlin, Andrew. 2010. "Demographic Trends in the United States: A Review of Research in the 2000s." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 72:403-419.
- Cherlin, Andrew J. 1978. "Remarriage as an Incomplete Institution." *American Journal of Sociology* 84:634-650.
- Coleman, Marilyn, Lawrence Ganong, and Mark Fine. 2000. "Reinvestigating Remarriage: Another Decade of Progress." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 62:1288-1307.
- Cornwall, Marie. 1989. "The Determinants of Religious Behavior: A Theoretical Model and Empirical Test." *Social Forces* 68:572-592.
- Day, Randal D., Hinckley Jones-Sanpei, Jessica L. Smith Price, Dennis K. Orthner, Elizabeth C. Hair, Kristin Anderson Moore, and Kelleen Kaye. 2009. "Family Processes and Adolescent Religiosity and Religious Practice: View from the NLSY79." *Marriage and Family Review* 45:289-309.
- Denton, Melinda Lundquist. 2012. "Family Structure, Family Disruption, and Profiles of Adolescent Religiosity." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 51:42-64.
- Desmond, Scott A., Kristopher H. Morgan, and George Kikuchi. 2010. "Religious Development: How (and Why) Does Religiosity Change from Adolescence to Young Adulthood?" *Sociological Perspectives* 53:247-270.
- Edgell, Penny. 2006. *Religion and Family in a Changing Society*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Ellison, Christopher G., Anthony B. Walker, Norval D. Glenn, and Elizabeth Marquardt. 2011. "The Effects of Parental Marital Discord and Divorce on the Religious and Spiritual Lives of Young Adults." *Social Science Research* 40:538-551.

- Heckman, James T. 1979. "Sample Selection Bias as a Specification Error." *Econometrica* 47:153-161.
- Hofferth, Sandra L. and Kermyt G. Anderson. 2003. "Are All Dads Equal? Biology versus Marriage as a Basis for Paternal Investment." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 65:213-232.
- King, Pamela Ebstyn and Ross A. Mueller. 2003. "Parental Influence on Adolescent Religiousness: Exploring the Roles of Spiritual Modeling and Spiritual Capital." *Marriage and Family: A Christian Journal* 6:401-413.
- Krumrei, Elizabeth J., Annette Mahoney, and Kenneth I. Pargament. 2009. "Divorce and the Divine: The Role of Spirituality in Adjustment to Divorce." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 71:373-383.
- Mahoney, Annette, Kenneth I. Pargament, Aaron Murray-Swank and Nichole Murray-Swank. 2003. "Religion and the Sanctification of Family Relationships." *Review of Religious Research* 44:220-236.
- Manning, Wendy D. 2013. "Trends in Cohabitation: Over Twenty Years of Change, 1987-2010." (FP-13-12). National Center for Family & Marriage Research.
- Manning, Wendy D., Pamela J. Smock, and Debarun Majumdar. 2004. "The Relative Stability of Cohabiting and Marital Unions for Children." *Population Research and Policy Review* 23:135-159.
- McLanahan, Sara and Gary Sandefur. 1994. *Growing up with a Single Parent: What hurts, what helps*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Myers, Scott M. 1996. "An Interactive Model of Religiosity Inheritance: The Importance of Family Context." *American Sociological Review* 61:858-866.

- Ozorak, Elizabeth Weiss. 1989. "Social and Cognitive Influences on the Development of Religious Beliefs and Commitment in Adolescence." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 28:448-463.
- Payne, Krista K. 2013. "Children's Family Structure, 2013." (FP-13-19). National Center for Family & Marriage Research.
- Petts, Richard J. 2012. "Single Mothers' Religious Participation and Early Childhood Behavior." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 74:251-268.
- Petts, Richard J. 2011. "Is Urban Fathers' Religion Important for their Children's Behavior?" *Review of Religious Research* 53:183-206.
- Petts, Richard J. 2009. "Trajectories of Religious Participation from Adolescence to Young Adulthood." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 48:552-571.
- Preacher, Kristopher J. and Andrew F. Hayes. 2008. "Asymptotic and Resampling Strategies for Assessing and Comparing Indirect Effects in Multiple Mediator Models." *Behavior Research Methods* 40:879-891.
- Regnerus, Mark D. and Jeremy E. Uecker. 2006. "Finding Faith, Losing Faith: The Prevalence and Context of Religious Transformations during Adolescence." *Review of Religious Research* 47:217-237.
- Smith, Christian and Melinda Lundquist Denton. 2005. *Soul Searching: The Religious and Spiritual Lives of American Teenagers*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, Christian and Patricia Snell. 2009. *Souls in Transition: The Religious and Spiritual Lives of Emerging Adults*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Steensland, Brian, Jerry Z. Park, Mark D. Regnerus, Lynn D. Robinson, W. Bradford Wilcox, and Robert D. Woodberry. 2000. "The Measure of American Religion: Toward Improving the State of the Art." *Social Forces* 79:291-318.
- Stolzenberg, Ross M., Mary Blair-Loy, and Linda J. Waite. 1995. "Religious Participation in Early Adulthood: Age and Family Life Cycle Effects on Church Membership." *American Sociological Review* 60:84-103.
- Sullivan, Susan Crawford. 2008. "Unaccompanied Children in Churches: Low-Income Urban Single Mothers, Religion, and Parenting." *Review of Religious Research* 50:157-175.
- Thornton, Arland, William G. Axinn, and Daniel H. Hill. 1992. "Reciprocal Effects of Religiosity, Cohabitation, and Marriage." *American Journal of Sociology* 98: 628-651.
- Uecker, Jeremy E. and Christopher G. Ellison. 2012. "Parental Divorce, Parental Religious Characteristics, and Religious Outcomes in Adulthood." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 51:777-794.
- Uecker, Jeremy E., Mark D. Regnerus, and Margaret L. Vaaler. 2007. "Losing My Religion: The Social Sources of Religious Decline in Early Adulthood." *Social Forces* 85:1667-1692.
- Warner, Heidi L., Annette Mahoney, and Elizabeth J. Krumrei. 2009. "When Parents Break Sacred Vows: The Role of Spiritual Appraisals, Coping, and Struggles in Young Adults' Adjustment to Parental Divorce." *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality* 1:233-248.
- Wilcox, W. Bradford, Mark Chaves, and David Franz. 2004. "Focused on the Family? Religious Traditions, Family Discourse, and Pastoral Practice." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 43:491-504.

Zhai, Jiexia Elisa, Christopher G. Ellison, Norval D. Glenn, and Elizabeth Marquardt. 2007.

“Parental Divorce and Religious Involvement among Young Adults.” *Sociology of Religion* 68:125-144.

Zhai, Jiexia Elisa, Christopher G. Ellison, Charles E. Stokes, and Norval D. Glenn. 2008.

“‘Spiritual but not Religious:’ The Impact of Parental Divorce on the Religious and Spiritual Identities of Young Adults in the United States.” *Review of Religious Research* 49:379-394.

Table 1: Summary Statistics

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>Min</i>
Youth Religious Outcomes (W2)				
Religious Attendance	2.62	2.19	0.00	6.00
Religious Salience	2.26	1.30	0.00	4.00
Private Religious Practices	2.12	1.58	0.00	6.00
Closeness to God	3.87	1.19	1.00	6.00
Religious Support	1.45	1.42	0.00	4.00
Family Structure				
Married Biological/Adoptive Parents*	0.62	-	0.00	1.00
Stepfamily	0.14	-	0.00	1.00
Divorced Single Parent Family	0.15	-	0.00	1.00
Never Married Single Parent Family	0.03	-	0.00	1.00
Never Married Single Parent Family with Non-Marital Breakup	0.02	-	0.00	1.00
Cohabiting	0.04	-	0.00	1.00
Parental Religiosity	0.01	0.81	-2.22	1.37
Mediating Variables				
<i>Parents' Religious Affiliation</i>				
Parent is Conservative Protestant	0.42	-	0.00	1.00
Parent has Other Religious Affiliation*	0.51	-	0.00	1.00
Parent has No Religious Affiliation	0.07	-	0.00	1.00
Parental Denominational Homogamy	0.79	-	0.00	1.00
<i>Religious Socialization</i>				
Parent-Child Denominational Homogamy	0.86	-	0.00	1.00
Family Religious Practices	0.29	-	0.00	1.00
<i>Parent-Child Relationship Quality</i>				
Parental Monitoring	2.86	0.98	0.00	1.00
Parental Engagement	3.26	1.25	0.00	4.00
Parent-Child Closeness	3.82	0.96	0.00	5.00

Parental Affection	3.12	0.83	0.00	5.00
Control Variables				
Parent Age	42.73	6.20	22.00	70.00
Youth Age (W1)	15.44	1.49	13.00	18.00
White*	0.70	-	13.00	18.00
Black	0.13	-	0.00	1.00
Hispanic	0.11	-	0.00	1.00
Other Race/Ethnicity	0.06	-	0.00	1.00
Different Race/Ethnicity from Parent	0.08	-	0.00	1.00
Parent is Female	0.82	-	0.00	1.00
Youth is Female	0.50	-	0.00	1.00
Parents' Work Hours	62.19	30.01	0.00	1.00
Parents' Education	3.15	1.05	1.00	5.00
Household Income	6.49	3.01	0.00	11.00
Parent's Depressive Symptoms	1.21	1.71	0.00	140.00
Parents Own Home	0.78	-	0.00	1.00
Parents' Wealth	0.51	-	0.00	1.00
Does Not Reside with Parents (W2)	0.14	-	0.00	1.00
Resident Parent Transition (W2)	0.12	-	0.00	1.00
Experienced Parental Breakup (W2)	0.15	-	0.00	1.00

N = 2,320

*Used as reference category

Table 2: Results from OLS Regression Models Predicting Religious Attendance among Youth

Variable	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>
Family Structure						
Stepfamily	-0.29	0.14*	-0.24	0.14	-0.18	0.14
Divorced Single Parent Family	-0.15	0.17	-0.10	0.17	-0.15	0.17
Never Married Single Parent Family	-0.49	0.36	-0.40	0.34	-0.30	0.33
Single Parent Family with Non-Marital Breakup	-0.18	0.41	-0.22	0.37	-0.17	0.37
Cohabiting	-0.28	0.31	-0.53	0.28	-0.45	0.28
Parental Religiosity	1.40	0.08***	1.60	0.09***	1.15	0.11***
Mediating Variables						
<i>Parents' Religious Affiliation</i>						
Parent is Conservative Protestant					0.47	0.11***
Parent has no religious affiliation					0.14	0.20
Parental Denominational Homogamy					0.10	0.13
<i>Religious Socialization</i>						
Parent-Child Denominational Homogamy					0.36	0.13**
Family Religious Practices					0.86	0.11***
<i>Parent-Child Relationship Quality</i>						
Parental Monitoring					0.07	0.05
Parental Engagement					-0.02	0.04
Parent-Child Closeness					0.02	0.06
Parental Affection					0.14	0.07*
Control Variables						
Parent Age	-0.03	0.01*	-0.03	0.01*	-0.03	0.01*
Youth Age	-0.10	0.03**	-0.11	0.03**	-0.06	0.03
Black	0.05	0.22	0.10	0.22	0.03	0.21
Hispanic	-0.08	0.19	-0.06	0.18	0.05	0.17
Other Race/Ethnicity	-0.37	0.25	-0.29	0.25	-0.14	0.25
Different Race from Parent	0.10	0.23	0.05	0.22	0.08	0.22

Youth is Female	0.10	0.09	0.11	0.09	0.08	0.09
Parent is Female	-0.22	0.12	-0.23	0.12	-0.13	0.12
Parents' Work Hours	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.00
Parents' Education	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.10	0.07
Household Income	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.03
Parent's Depressive Symptoms	-0.07	0.03*	-0.07	0.03*	-0.05	0.03
Parents Own Home	0.01	0.22	-0.04	0.21	-0.23	0.21
Parents' Wealth	0.14	0.11	0.15	0.11	0.16	0.11
Lambda	-0.32	0.45	-0.44	0.45	-0.88	0.47
Does Not Reside with Parents (W2)	-0.24	0.15	-0.19	0.15	-0.21	0.14
Resident Parent Transition (W2)	-0.14	0.16	-0.15	0.16	-0.16	0.16
Experienced Parental Breakup (W2)	-0.09	0.15	-0.08	0.15	-0.04	0.14
Interactions						
Stepfamily x Parental Religiosity			-0.45	0.16**	-0.40	0.16*
Divorced Single Parent x Parental Religiosity			-0.31	0.16*	-0.27	0.15
Never Married Single Parent x Parental Religiosity			-0.84	0.41*	-0.70	0.32
Single Parent Family with Non-Marital Breakup x Parental Religiosity			-1.62	0.46***	-1.52	0.47**
Cohabiting x Parental Religiosity			-1.32	0.42**	-1.22	0.42**
R^2		0.28	0.29	0.34		
N = 2,320; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$						

Table 3: Results from OLS Regression Models Predicting Religious Support among Youth

Variable	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>
Family Structure						
Stepfamily	-0.12	0.10	-0.09	0.10	-0.03	0.11
Divorced Single Parent Family	-0.06	0.11	-0.05	0.11	-0.13	0.11
Never Married Single Parent Family	-0.06	0.21	-0.02	0.20	-0.03	0.20
Single Parent Family with Non-Marital Breakup	0.08	0.26	0.07	0.25	0.04	0.24
Cohabiting	-0.18	0.18	-0.24	0.20	-0.19	0.20
Parental Religiosity	0.61	0.06***	0.67	0.07***	0.44	0.09***
Mediating Variables						
<i>Parents' Religious Affiliation</i>						
Parent is Conservative Protestant					0.26	0.08**
Parent has no religious affiliation					0.22	0.13
Parental Denominational Homogamy					0.17	0.10
<i>Religious Socialization</i>						
Parent-Child Denominational Homogamy					0.11	0.09
Family Religious Practices					0.45	0.08***
<i>Parent-Child Relationship Quality</i>						
Parental Monitoring					-0.00	0.04
Parental Engagement					0.03	0.03
Parent-Child Closeness					-0.04	0.04
Parental Affection					0.16	0.05**
Control Variables						
Parent Age	-0.02	0.01	-0.02	0.01	-0.02	0.01
Youth Age	-0.02	0.02	-0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02
Black	-0.09	0.15	-0.05	0.15	-0.08	0.15
Hispanic	-0.27	0.12*	-0.26	0.12*	-0.18	0.12
Other Race/Ethnicity	-0.19	0.18	-0.16	0.18	-0.07	0.17
Different Race from Parent	-0.25	0.16	-0.27	0.16	-0.25	0.15

Youth is Female	-0.10	0.07	-0.09	0.07	-0.13	0.07*
Parent is Female	-0.01	0.09	-0.02	0.09	0.04	0.08
Parents' Work Hours	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Parents' Education	-0.01	0.04	-0.01	0.04	-0.01	0.04
Household Income	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02
Parent's Depressive Symptoms	-0.04	0.02	-0.04	0.02	-0.03	0.02
Parents Own Home	0.17	0.14	-0.16	0.14	0.09	0.14
Parents' Wealth	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.08	-0.01	0.07
Lambda	0.26	0.31	0.24	0.31	0.06	0.32
Does Not Reside with Parents (W2)	0.07	0.10	0.09	0.10	0.08	0.10
Resident Parent Transition (W2)	0.01	0.12	0.01	0.12	-0.00	0.11
Experienced Parental Breakup (W2)	-0.19	0.10	-0.18	0.09	-0.16	0.09

Interactions

Stepfamily x Parental Religiosity			-0.25	0.12*	-0.23	0.12*
Divorced Single Parent x Parental Religiosity			-0.03	0.11	0.02	0.11
Never Married Single Parent x Parental Religiosity			-0.37	0.20	-0.32	0.21
Single Parent Family with Non-Marital Breakup x Parental Religiosity			-0.40	0.37	-0.30	0.35
Cohabiting x Parental Religiosity			-0.34	0.22	-0.28	0.22

R^2	0.14	0.14	0.18
-------	------	------	------

N = 2,320; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Table 4: Results from OLS Regression Models Predicting Religious Salience among Youth

Variable	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>
Family Structure						
Stepfamily	-0.17	0.08*	-0.14	0.08	-0.08	0.08
Divorced Single Parent Family	-0.17	0.10	-0.15	0.10	-0.22	0.10*
Never Married Single Parent Family	-0.34	0.22	-0.25	0.20	-0.20	0.18
Single Parent Family with Non-Marital Breakup	-0.01	0.21	-0.02	0.20	-0.04	0.20
Cohabiting	-0.03	0.17	-0.07	0.17	0.01	0.17
Parental Religiosity	0.80	0.05***	0.88	0.05***	0.57	0.06***
Mediating Variables						
<i>Parents' Religious Affiliation</i>						
Parent is Conservative Protestant					0.31	0.06***
Parent has no religious affiliation					0.02	0.12
Parental Denominational Homogamy					0.10	0.08
<i>Religious Socialization</i>						
Parent-Child Denominational Homogamy					0.33	0.08***
Family Religious Practices					0.45	0.06***
<i>Parent-Child Relationship Quality</i>						
Parental Monitoring					0.04	0.03
Parental Engagement					-0.04	0.02
Parent-Child Closeness					0.08	0.04*
Parental Affection					0.11	0.04*
Control Variables						
Parent Age	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	-0.00	0.01
Youth Age	-0.00	0.02	-0.01	0.02	0.03	0.02
Black	0.14	0.12	0.19	0.12	0.16	0.12
Hispanic	0.18	0.10	0.19	0.09*	0.27	0.09**
Other Race/Ethnicity	-0.08	0.15	-0.04	0.15	0.06	0.14
Different Race from Parent	-0.10	0.13	-0.13	0.13	-0.10	0.12

Youth is Female	0.22	0.05***	0.22	0.05***	0.21	0.05***
Parent is Female	-0.04	0.07	-0.05	0.07	0.02	0.07
Parents' Work Hours	0.01	0.00**	0.01	0.00*	0.00	0.00
Parents' Education	-0.12	0.04**	-0.11	0.04**	-0.08	0.04*
Household Income	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.02
Parent's Depressive Symptoms	-0.04	0.02*	-0.04	0.02*	-0.02	0.02
Parents Own Home	0.29	0.12*	0.28	0.12*	0.12	0.12
Parents' Wealth	0.04	0.06	0.04	0.06	0.05	0.06
Lambda	0.66	0.25**	0.62	0.25*	0.28	0.27
Does Not Reside with Parents (W2)	-0.13	0.09	-0.11	0.09	-0.10	0.09
Resident Parent Transition (W2)	-0.11	0.09	-0.11	0.09	-0.11	0.09
Experienced Parental Breakup (W2)	0.03	0.08	0.04	0.08	0.08	0.08

Interactions

Stepfamily x Parental Religiosity			-0.23	0.09*	-0.19	0.10*
Divorced Single Parent x Parental Religiosity			-0.09	0.10	-0.05	0.10
Never Married Single Parent x Parental Religiosity			-0.68	0.24**	-0.57	0.22*
Single Parent Family with Non-Marital Breakup x Parental Religiosity			-0.58	0.28*	-0.51	0.30
Cohabiting x Parental Religiosity			-0.28	0.20	-0.25	0.21

R^2		0.27	0.28	0.34
N = 2,320; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$				

Table 5: Results from OLS Regression Models Predicting Closeness to God among Youth

Variable	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>
Family Structure						
Stepfamily	-0.13	0.08	-0.14	0.09	-0.06	0.09
Divorced Single Parent Family	-0.20	0.10	-0.20	0.10	-0.27	0.10*
Never Married Single Parent Family	-0.05	0.22	-0.07	0.22	-0.05	0.22
Single Parent Family with Non-Marital Breakup	0.02	0.21	0.00	0.20	-0.02	0.20
Cohabiting	-0.21	0.17	-0.26	0.17	-0.18	0.17
Parental Religiosity	0.63	0.05***	0.63	0.06***	0.37	0.07***
Mediating Variables						
<i>Parents' Religious Affiliation</i>						
Parent is Conservative Protestant					0.17	0.06**
Parent has no religious affiliation					0.01	0.15
Parental Denominational Homogamy					0.17	0.08*
<i>Religious Socialization</i>						
Parent-Child Denominational Homogamy					0.23	0.09*
Family Religious Practices					0.37	0.06***
<i>Parent-Child Relationship Quality</i>						
Parental Monitoring					0.06	0.03
Parental Engagement					0.02	0.03
Parent-Child Closeness					0.06	0.04
Parental Affection					0.08	0.05
Control Variables						
Parent Age	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Youth Age	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.04	0.02*
Black	-0.15	0.12	-0.13	0.12	-0.14	0.12
Hispanic	0.28	0.10**	0.26	0.09**	0.30	0.09**
Other Race/Ethnicity	-0.14	0.16	-0.13	0.16	-0.08	0.15
Different Race from Parent	-0.14	0.13	-0.15	0.13	-0.10	0.12

Youth is Female	0.17	0.05**	0.17	0.05**	0.16	0.05**
Parent is Female	0.03	0.07	0.03	0.07	0.09	0.07
Parents' Work Hours	0.01	0.00**	0.01	0.00**	0.00	0.00
Parents' Education	-0.10	0.04*	-0.10	0.04*	-0.11	0.04**
Household Income	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02
Parent's Depressive Symptoms	-0.06	0.02**	-0.06	0.02**	-0.04	0.02*
Parents Own Home	0.42	0.12**	0.41	0.12**	0.32	0.12*
Parents' Wealth	-0.05	0.07	-0.05	0.07	-0.07	0.07
Lambda	0.83	0.26**	0.81	0.26**	0.61	0.28*
Does Not Reside with Parents (W2)	-0.02	0.09	-0.01	0.09	0.01	0.09
Resident Parent Transition (W2)	-0.02	0.10	-0.03	0.10	-0.03	0.10
Experienced Parental Breakup (W2)	0.05	0.08	0.04	0.08	0.08	0.09

Interactions

Stepfamily x Parental Religiosity			-0.00	0.10	0.03	0.11
Divorced Single Parent x Parental Religiosity			0.06	0.12	0.10	0.12
Never Married Single Parent x Parental Religiosity			0.26	0.24	0.36	0.25
Single Parent Family with Non-Marital Breakup x Parental Religiosity			-0.47	0.22*	-0.40	0.24
Cohabiting x Parental Religiosity			-0.27	0.21	-0.25	0.21

R^2		0.15		0.16		0.20
-------	--	------	--	------	--	------

N = 2,212; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Table 6: Results from OLS Regression Models Predicting Private Religious Practices among Youth

Variable	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>
Family Structure						
Stepfamily	-0.15	0.11	-0.11	0.10	-0.07	0.10
Divorced Single Parent Family	-0.28	0.12*	-0.25	0.12*	-0.26	0.11*
Never Married Single Parent Family	-0.29	0.23	-0.22	0.22	-0.09	0.21
Single Parent Family with Non-Marital Breakup	-0.29	0.31	-0.30	0.28	-0.21	0.29
Cohabiting	0.07	0.19	0.03	0.20	0.08	0.20
Parental Religiosity	0.99	0.06***	1.09	0.07***	0.70	0.08***
Mediating Variables						
<i>Parents' Religious Affiliation</i>						
Parent is Conservative Protestant					0.50	0.08***
Parent has no religious affiliation					0.31	0.13*
Parental Denominational Homogamy					0.03	0.10
<i>Religious Socialization</i>						
Parent-Child Denominational Homogamy					0.25	0.10*
Family Religious Practices					0.91	0.09***
<i>Parent-Child Relationship Quality</i>						
Parental Monitoring					0.05	0.04
Parental Engagement					-0.01	0.03
Parent-Child Closeness					0.02	0.05
Parental Affection					0.10	0.05
Control Variables						
Parent Age	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Youth Age	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.07	0.03**
Black	-0.02	0.16	0.05	0.16	-0.06	0.15
Hispanic	-0.01	0.12	0.01	0.12	0.15	0.11
Other Race/Ethnicity	-0.32	0.18	-0.27	0.18	-0.11	0.16
Different Race from Parent	0.09	0.15	0.07	0.15	0.09	0.13

Youth is Female	0.34	0.07***	0.34	0.07***	0.33	0.07***
Parent is Female	-0.16	0.09	-0.17	0.09	-0.08	0.09
Parents' Work Hours	0.01	0.00**	0.01	0.00*	0.00	0.00
Parents' Education	-0.15	0.05**	-0.14	0.05**	-0.12	0.04**
Household Income	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Parent's Depressive Symptoms	-0.04	0.02	-0.04	0.02	-0.03	0.02
Parents Own Home	0.31	0.15*	0.28	0.15	0.12	0.15
Parents' Wealth	0.01	0.08	0.02	0.08	0.03	0.08
Lambda	0.92	0.31**	0.83	0.32*	0.46	0.33
Does Not Reside with Parents (W2)	-0.04	0.11	-0.01	0.11	-0.05	0.11
Resident Parent Transition (W2)	-0.13	0.10	-0.13	0.10	-0.13	0.11
Experienced Parental Breakup (W2)	0.05	0.10	0.06	0.10	0.09	0.10

Interactions

Stepfamily x Parental Religiosity			-0.28	0.12*	-0.25	0.12*
Divorced Single Parent x Parental Religiosity			-0.22	0.11*	-0.18	0.11
Never Married Single Parent x Parental Religiosity			-0.55	0.25**	-0.43	0.24*
Single Parent Family with Non-Marital Breakup x Parental Religiosity			-0.77	0.39*	-0.68	0.39
Cohabiting x Parental Religiosity			-0.36	0.20	-0.23	0.20

R^2	0.22	0.22	0.32
-------	------	------	------

N = 2,320; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Figure 1. Predicted Values of Youth Religious Outcomes based on Family Structure and Parental Religiosity (PR)

