The time bind and God's time

Authors: Claude S. Fischer, Michael Hout, Nancy Latham

Berkeley, CA: Center for Working Families, University of California, Berkeley, 2000

The Time Bind and God's Time

*Claude S. Fischer, Ph.D.,**
*Michael Hout, Ph.D.,***
and
*Nancy Latham****

Working Paper No. 18
October 2000

*Claude S. Fischer is a faculty member at the Center for Working Families, and a professor of Sociology at the University of California, Berkeley.

**Michael Hout is a faculty member at the Center for Working Families, and a professor of Sociology at the University of California, Berkeley.

***Nancy Latham is a graduate student in Sociology at the University of California, Berkeley

Abstract

We address the question of whether family time constraints lead Americans in the 1990s to cut back on their religious activities. Using the 1988-1998 General Social Surveys, we looked at the answers to several questions about church membership and activities of married respondents, aged 55 or less, living in households with at least one employed spouse. 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 – age, gender, ethnicity, income, and religion of origin). Having children and working many hours are the key indices of time pressure. In general, we found that Americans sustained their religious involvements despite high work commitments; and we found that parents were more involved than nonparents. Two notable exceptions arose: One, among middle-class couples only, high work hours – especially for wives' – depressed couples' church attendance (it is not clear why this was specific to the middle class). Two, long work hours reduced attendance and certain devotional activities among wives. The general pattern, however, suggests that religious activity was relatively inelastic to time pressures.

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, as parents, especially mothers in middle-class families, have worked increasingly many hours,[1] they have been forced to compromise other activities. They have cut back on time to themselves (Families and Work Institute 1999), housework (O'Neill 1993), and sleep (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 important 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.[2] Has – and, if so, how has – the time bind affected Americans' unusually strong commitments to religion? 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.

In overview, 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 the average, individuals who worked many hours gave up a measurable amount of time in their own religious practice, but the couple's religious commitments were not strongly affected. 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 presents 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 (Gallup 2000). They show a remarkable stability since the 1960s. 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.[3] 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 data analyses do not yield much evidence on our question.

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.[4] Hertl found that *full-time* employment of married women depressed their own religious activity, particularly church attendance, *and* depressed their husbands', as well. Part-time employed women, however, were more active than stay-at-home women. Hertel concluded that declines in religious activity since 1972 were due to the increasing numbers of women who worked full-time. Robert Putnam (2000:176, 200, 476 n. 26), in his widely noted book, *Bowling Alone*, contests the claim that women's employment was the critical factor in recent social change, 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, *whose* work has shortened free time and *whose* behavior is most affected may differ by gender.

Our task here is to look more closely at the connections between time pressures, such as faced by dual-job couples, and religious commitment.

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 (1) married, (2) aged 55 or younger, and (3) in a couple with at least one employed spouse. We then categorized these respondents according to three critical attributes: (1) their class position, defining middle class in terms of *education* (if both partners had at least one year of college education, the couple is defined as middle class; if at least one partner had no college education, the couple is defined as working class); (2) 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; and (3) their work-based time bind. The last distinction involved three classifications: (1) only one spouse worked; (2) both spouses worked, but the total work time they reported summed to less than 80 hours a week; and (3) 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.)[5] These distinctions gave us (2 x 2 x 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.

This design 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, income, race, and childhood religious background. In particular, we see to what extent respondents' religious behaviors were affected directly by their own, *individual* work hours and to what extent they were affected by a *family* work pattern (i.e., their spouses' employment hours).[6]

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 concerning 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. 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.[7] For our purposes, it is also important because it is directly connected to time: Couples pressed by a binding weekday schedule may well look to Sunday mornings to fulfill unmet practical or leisure needs (if they can avoid working during 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 not a simple one. Respondents in dual-earner couples working less than a combined 80 hours had the highest probability of attending, .48, followed by respondents in single-earner couples at .45, and dual-earners with a combined 80-plus hours of work had the least probability, .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 rates about .15 higher than did working-class respondents; but among couples with 80-plus hours, middle-class respondents reported rates 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, 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.[8] 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.[9] (There is reason, however, to suspect that middle-class hours were underestimated in the GSS because many respondents did not include the hours they spent at home doing office work.[10] But the Appendix 2, table A2, regression results indicate that there is no significant effect of respondents' work hours on their attendance rates, so the point may be moot.) 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 attendance, but why that should be so is unclear. This finding is clarified, 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. Moreover, it is largely due to middle-class men's attendance dropping as a function of how many hours their *spouses* 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 Wife Hours = 0	Husb. Hrs. = 40 Wife Hours = 20	Husb. Hrs. = 40 Wife Hours = 40	Husb. Hrs. = 60 Wife Hours = 40
Working-class wives	.41	.38	.36	.45
Working-class husbands	.27	.28	.30	.28
Middle-class wives	.47	.44	.42	.45
Middle-class husbands	.47	.42	**.36**	.42

* 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, especially among men, and that women were likelier to attend than men, especially in the working class. 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. .41, .38, .36 and .47, .44, .42 in columns one to three). But working-class women attended *more* often the more their *husbands* worked (.36 vs. .45 in columns three and four), and this positive effect of husbands' hours was stronger than the negative effect of their own work hours. 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 (.47, .42, .36). Recall that

Hertel (1995) and Putnam (2000) reported a similar finding, but we see here that the effect of wives' hours on men's attendance is specific to the middle class. Perhaps working-class men's attendance is generally so low that it cannot be influenced. Or perhaps what is special is the middle-class family with the stay-at-home wife, the one situation in which men attend at the same high rate (.47) that women attend. 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 women's attendance tended to decline the more hours they personally worked. And we found that middle-class men's attendance dropped the more hours that their wives worked. But the causality may run the other way – that religiosity shaped work patterns, rather than vice versa. Perhaps, wives most devoted to religion chose to work fewer hours. Perhaps, 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 variables measuring the respondents' childhood religious preferences as an effort to hold constant prior religiosity, but they may have been weak controls. So, we must keep reverse causality in mind as a possible explanation. 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 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 must be 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.)?" It 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.)?" Certainly, we would expect work hours to constrict the amount of time respondents could give to these activities. It did, but perhaps not as much as one 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 the work measures 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.[11] (See Appendix 2, Tables A4, A5, and A6.)

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 notable results are that the loss of devotional time is relatively small, as estimated previously, 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% 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 <u>much</u> 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.[12] (See Appendix 2, Tables A7 and A8.)

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)?" (See Appendix 2, Table A9). Almost 80% tithed something, and there were no significant differences by our time bind variables. We turn next to how *much* tithers actually gave. We found, at first glance, no difference by joint work hours. However, very different patterns emerged when we looked at combinatorial effects: 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 (Appendix 2, Table A10). Looking at combinations with gender suggests that these patterns differ somewhat for men and women.[13] Among wives, the more joint work hours, the more contributions they reported; among husbands, there was no connection between own or joint work hours and amount of contributions.

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 suggests that longer joint hours perhaps depressed giving among the middle-class (and maybe increased it among working-class wives), but overall 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).[14] We would have expected, in particular, that respondents in high-work couples who also had children would show the most withdrawal of religious activity, but that did not appear. 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; they may have been un-religious to start with and thus more willing to have the wife work. 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 a reverse causality or 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, that Americans in the 1990s seemed to largely protect their religious time from the constriction posed by the expanding time bind.

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. This variable represents the probability that the respondent attended services in any given week, and 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. The GSS has two devotional time variables: (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)?", and (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 simple dummy variables for each type of devotional time: 1 = reported any time at all, 0 = not. Then, *only for those with any time*, we used the numbers of hours they reported. However, we found some very high numbers (e.g., respondents coded for 150 hours per week – i.e., 21 hours a day). To deal with such outliers, 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. We used three questions to create two measures of religious donations. (1) The 1988 GSS asked: "About how much do you contribute to your religion every year (not including school tuition)?" (2) The 1998 GSS asked two questions that we combined into one variable: "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?" First, we created dummy variables: 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. 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 (defined in terms of education). If *both* respondent and partner had at least some college education, the variable was coded as middle class.

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

Couple work hours. 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 asks: "How many hours did you work last week, at all jobs?" If the respondent *didn't* work the week prior to the interview but is employed, the GSS asks: "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 in the regressions.

Income. We assigned respondents their percentile rank on household income. (This permitted us to control for income and dollar differences across the quarter-century 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 2: 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.

	WIVES (R-sq=.073, n=2575)				HUSBANDS (R-sq=.052, n=2158)			
Variables	Unstand'zed Coefficients		Stand'zed Coeff's	Sig.	Unstand'zed Coefficients		Stand'zed Coeff's	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		B	Std. Error	Beta	
(Constant)	**.402**	.140		.004	6.410E-02	.176		.716
Resp. Is Middle-class	**.169**	.023	.207	.000	**.156**	.025	.194	.000
Resp. Has Child Home	**7.117E-02**	.018	.085	.000	**5.742E-02**	.019	.068	.003
Both Work, < 80 Hours	**5.312E-02**	.024	.054	.025	3.255E-02	.024	.033	.179
Both Work, 80+ Hours	**7.236E-02**	.030	.089	.015	4.682E-03	.025	.006	.852
Nmb. Hours Resp. Works	**-2.164E-03**	.001	-.108	.000	2.667E-04	.001	.011	.644
Age of Respondent	-3.806E-03	.007	-.086	.606	1.586E-02	.009	.346	.076
Age of Resp. Squared	1.160E-02	.010	.203	.225	-1.596E-02	.011	-.278	.155
Resp. Is Black	**.148**	.029	.101	.000	**7.470E-02**	.031	.052	.015
Resp. Is Latino	6.689E-04	.038	.000	.986	**8.742E-02**	.042	.050	.037
Resp Is Other Ethnicity	6.268E-02	.039	.033	.105	5.892E-02	.043	.032	.172
Household Income	-5.871E-04	.000	-.041	.067	-4.272E-04	.000	-.030	.241
Resp. Raised Catholic	-3.043E-02	.052	-.035	.561	**-.115**	.056	-.134	.040
Raised Prot. Fundam.	8.975E-03	.052	.011	.864	-8.724E-02	.056	-.104	.117
Raised Prot. Nonfundam.	-8.373E-02	.052	-.094	.110	**-.170**	.056	-.189	.002
Resp. Raised Oth. Relig.	**-.242**	.064	-.117	.000	**-.279**	.067	-.146	.000
Resp. Middle Class **and** Both Work, 80+ Hours	-5.413E-02	.032	-.054	.088	**-9.584E-02**	.034	-.100	.005

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 Coefficients	Standard Error	Standardized Coefficients	Sig.
(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

Table A9: Logistic Regression, Dependent Variable = Gave to Religious Organizations Other than Schools (1988 Measure)

Initial -2LL = 718.8
Final -2LL = 670.9
N = 716

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standard Error	Sig.	Exp (B)
(Constant)	.7123	1.8790	.7046	
Respondent Is Middle Class	**.8180**	.2456	.0009	2.2660
Resp. Has Child at Home	.2968	.2296	.1962	1.3455
Both Work, less than 80	.5544	.2296	.0629	1.7409
Both Work, 80+ Hours	-.0185	.2599	.9433	.9817
Number of Resp.'s Work Hours	.0044	.0065	.4970	1.0045
Age of Resp	.0027	.0870	.9754	1.0027
Age of Resp. Squared	.0147	.1142	.8972	1.0149
Resp. Is Female	**.4888**	.2356	.0380	1.6304
Resp. Is Black	**1.1943**	.4952	.0159	3.3012
Resp. Is Latino	-.7623	.4085	.0620	.4666
Resp. Is Other Ethnicity	.5075	.5127	.3222	1.6611
Household Income	.0060	.0042	.1469	1.0060
Resp. Was Raised Catholic	-.5233	1.0815	.6285	.5926
Resp. Raised Protestant (Fund.)	-1.0668	1.0800	.3233	.3441
Resp. Raised Protestant (Non-fund.)	-1.0651	1.0813	.3246	.3447
Resp. Raised Other Religion	-1.0084	1.2034	.4021	.3648

Table 10: Ordinary Least Squares Regression, Dependent Variable = Amount of donations made to religious organizations other than schools (in logged dollars – 1988 measure)

R-square = .164

N = 571

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standard Error	Standardized Coefficients	Sig.
(Constant)	**4.001**	1.204		.001
Respondent Is Middle Class	**.969**	.182	.301	.000
Resp. Has Child at Home	.135	.149	.040	.364
Both Work, less than 80	-.145	.173	-.038	.402
Both Work, 80+ Hours	**.392**	.194	.125	.044
Number of Resp.'S Work Hours	-2.24E-03	.004	-.029	.594
Age of Resp	7.597E-02	.060	.439	.209
Age of Resp. Squared	-6.33E-02	.077	-.286	.413
Resp. Is Female	-5.22E-02	.148	-.017	.725
Resp. Is Black	.105	.224	.019	.641
Resp. Is Latino	-5.611E-03	.291	.001	.985
Resp. Is Other Ethnicity	-.285	.323	-.037	.377
Household Income	**9.541E-03**	.003	.169	.000
Resp. Was Raised Catholic	**-1.474**	.503	-.444	.003
Resp. Raised Protestant (Fund.)	-.818	.503	-.242	.104
Resp. Raised Protestant (Non-fund.)	**-1.250**	.506	-.363	.013
Resp. Raised Other Religion	**-1.472**	.569	-.200	.010
Resp. Is Middle Class **and** Both Work, 80+ Hours	**-.7 87**	.254	-.195	.002

Table 11: Ordinary Least Squares Regression, Dependent Variable = Amount of donations made to religious organizations other than schools (in logged dollars – 1988 measure) – by Gender.

		WIVES (R-sq=.156, n=366)				HUSBANDS (R-sq=.143, n=348)		
Variables	Unstand'zed Coefficients		Stand'zed Coeff's	Sig.	Unstand'zed Coefficients		Stand'zed Coeff's	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		B	Std. Error	Beta	
(Constant)	5.973	2.272		.009	-5.213E-02	2.906		.986
Resp. Is Middle-class	**1.102**	.388	.202	.005	**1.508**	.432	.266	.001
Resp. Has Child Home	.273	.306	.050	.373	.546	.344	.090	.113
Both Work, < 80 Hours	**.779**	.377	.124	.040	6.455E-02	.411	.009	.875
Both Work, 80+ Hours	**1.024**	.449	.199	.023	-4.537E-02	.409	-.008	.912
Nmb. Hours Resp, Works	-1.412E-02	.010	-.107	.152	8.383E-03	.010	.047	.394
Age of Respondent	-4.149E-02	.110	-.156	.707	.162	.149	.510	.277
Age of Resp. Squared	8.817E-02	.145	.254	.543	-.164	.190	-.406	.388
Resp. Is Black	**1.301**	.557	.119	.020	.590	.494	.063	.234
Resp. Is Latino	-.708	.580	-.066	.223	-.786	.630	-.073	.213
Resp Is Other Ethnicity	8.323E-02	.698	.006	.905	.320	.718	.025	.657
Household Income	**1.123E-02**	.005	.126	.041	**1.476E-02**	.006	.147	.016
Resp. Raised Catholic	**-2.867**	1.233	-.520	.021	-.789	1.105	-.135	.476
Raised Prot. Fundam.	**-2.520**	1.227	-.459	.041	-.927	1.118	-.161	.408
Raised Prot. Nonfundam.	-2.330	1.228	-.434	.059	-1.978	1.127	-.313	.080
Resp. Raised Oth. Relig.	-2.105	1.400	-.153	.134	-2.116	1.257	-.170	.093
Resp. Middle Class and Both Work 80+ Hours	-.346	.551	-.048	.531	-.560	.587	-.080	.340

Notes

1. Jacobs and Gerson (1998) estimate an increase in employed work of 10 hours a week per *couple* between 1990 and 1997. See this paper, also, for discussion of the distribution of work increases across occupations. Scott (1999) discusses controversies over changes in measured work hours, as in Robinson and Godbey (1996).

2. For overviews on American religious history, see, e.g., Caplow et al (1983), Marty (1984), Wuthnow (1988), Greeley (1989), and Finke and Stark (1992).

3. There has been major debate about the validity of respondents' church attendance reports. (See the American Sociological Review, 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.

4. Hertl (1995:88) restricted his analysis to whites aged 21 to 65, "who are not widowed, retired or temporarily unemployed."

5. We later discuss evidence suggesting that some of these counts may involve underestimates.

6. Our language here 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 be especially likely to prefer being or marrying stay-at-home mothers).

7. See Hadaway et al. (1993) and debate in February, 1998, issue of the *American Sociological Review*.

8. The strength of the interaction effect varied somewhat by year. The beta for the interaction term ranges from -.01 (1991) to -.16 (1990), for an unweighted mean of beta = -.08.

9. Middle-class respondents in the highest time bind category reported working an average of 47.3 hours versus 46.5 reported by the working-class respondents.

10. In another survey, wave 2 of the National Survey of Families and Households, researchers followed up a question about work hours and found that 3% of working-class respondents said that they brought work home and 17% of middle-class respondents said that they did. Of the working-class interviewees who said they brought work home, 38% had omitted counting those hours originally; of the middle-class respondents who said that they brought work home, 48% had omitted them. Combining these two results suggests that middle-class work hours may be generally underestimated.

11. 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.

12. 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.

13. Not shown in Appendix 2, Table A11, is that adding interaction terms for gender (gender X own hours worked, gender X the joint work hours measures) significantly increases the variance explained.

14. The parent/nonparent difference persisted after controls as well.

References

Azzi, Corry and Ronald Ehrenberg. 1975. "Household Allocation of Time and Church Attendance." *Journal of Political Economy* 66(5):911-17.

Caplow, Theodore, Howard M. Bahr, and Bruce 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.familiesand workinst.org (accessed Fall 1999).

Finke, Roger and Rodney Stark. 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, Andrew M. 1989. *Religious Change in America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hadaway, C. Kirk, Penny Long Marler, and Mark Chaves. 1993. "What the Polls Don't Show: Closer Look at U.S. Church Attendance." *American Sociological Review* 58(December):741-52.

Hertel, Bradley R. 1995. "Work, Family, and Faith: Recent Trends." Pp. 83-121 in Nancy Tatom Ammerman and Wade Clark Roof (eds.), *Work, Family, and Religion in Contemporary Society.* New York: Routledge.

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

Jacobs, Jerry A. and Kathleen Gerson. 1998. "Who Are the Overworked Americans?" *Review of Social Economy* 56 (Winter):442-459.

Marty, Martin. 1984. *Pilgrims in Their Own Land: 500 Years of Religion in America.* New York: Penguin.

O'Neill, Molly. 1993. "Drop the Mop, Bless the Mess: The Decline of Housekeeping." *New York Times*, April 11 : 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, Robert D. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Robinson, John P. and Geoffrey Godbey. 1996. "The Great American Slowdown." *American Demographics* (June). On-line: http://www.demographics.com (accessed 12 July 1998).

Scott, Janny. 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., S. Abbey, M. Meana, and K. M. Boydell. 1998. "What Makes Women Tired? A Community Sample." *Journal of Women's Health* 7(1):69-76.

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