Published in final edited form as:

Rev Relig Res. 2012 June ; 54(2): 239–254. doi:10.1007/s13644-012-0053-6.

Constructing Profiles of Religious Agreement and Disagreement Between Adolescents and Mothers: A Research Note

Anne E. Noonan,

Psychology Department, Salem State University, 352 Lafayette Street, Salem, MA 01970, USA

Allison Tracy, and

Wellesley Centers for Women, Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA, USA

Jennifer M. Grossman

Wellesley Centers for Women, Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA, USA

Anne E. Noonan: anoonan@salemstate.edu

Abstract

This research note describes the use of latent class analysis to examine how three dimensions of religiosity—the importance of religion (religious salience), attendance at religious services, and frequency of prayer—cluster together to form unique profiles. Building upon recent research identifying different profiles of religiosity at the level of the *individual*, we used data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health to identify *dyadic* profiles of religious concordance or discordance between 14,202 adolescents and their mothers. We identified five profiles: one concordant (27% of sample), two discordant (25% of sample), and two of mixed concordance/discordance (49%). The profiles distinguish between various levels of adolescent/mother relations, suggesting that they may represent distinct family dynamics. They also distinguish between several variables (race, adolescent age, geographical region) in predictable ways, providing additional demonstration of the categories' meaningfulness.

Keywords

Religion; Family relationships; Religious concordance; Religious congruence

A substantial body of research has identified links between family religiosity and family well-being (e.g., Manlove et al. 2008; Pearce and Axinn 1998; Regnerus and Burdette 2006). However, these connections have been shown to be more nuanced than the adage “a family that prays together stays together” would suggest. As two prominent researchers have succinctly stated, “not all religious households are happy ones” (Regnerus 2003), and “religion ... may help or harm family functioning in unique ways” (Mahoney et al. 2008, p. 90).

An important facet of the complexity in studying religiosity and family well-being is the extent to which adolescents agree or disagree with their families on matters of religion. As Pearce and Haynie (2004) pointed out, children may not always share their parents' religious beliefs, values, and practices, and that disconnect may impact the quality of family relationships. The past decades have seen substantial research interest in religious agreement (or concordance) and family well-being, with the general pattern of findings indicating that religious concordance is related to positive family relationships, while religious disagreement (discordance) is related to poorer relationships (Marks 2005; Pearce and Axinn 1998; Rossi and Rossi 1990).

Two recent studies using data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health) have extended this initial focus on family religious concordance by exploring not just *whether* adolescents and parents are concordant or discordant in religiosity, but *in what direction* any dissimilarity occurs, that is, whether it is the parents or the adolescents who are more religious. In a study of adolescent delinquency and religiosity (as measured by the importance of religion/religious salience and attendance at religious services), Pearce and Haynie (2004) found the lowest rates of delinquency among girls who were similar to their mothers in high religiosity, slightly higher rates among girls who were similar to their mothers in low religiosity, and the highest rates among girls who were religiously dissimilar from their mothers, regardless of whether it was the mother or child who was more religious. However, in an examination of relationship quality, Stokes and Regnerus (2009) found religious discordance (in importance/salience, attendance, and identification/denomination) only predicted lower adolescent/parent relationship quality when adolescents reported lower religious salience than their parents.

While valuable, the contributions of these studies are limited by the methodological treatment of the religious concordance variables. In the Pearce and Haynie (2004) study, the items tapping adolescents' and parents' salience and attendance were averaged together into religiosity variables for each party, which were then combined in an interaction term. Thus, an adolescent with extremely high salience and extremely low attendance (or vice versa) would have a similar religiosity score to one with moderate salience and attendance. In the Stokes and Regnerus (2009) study, the items tapping adolescents' and parents' salience, attendance, and identification/denomination were considered individually. We argue here that, rather than use these variables separately or in an additive fashion, it would be more useful to explore how these variables might cluster together to form certain patterns of agreement or disagreement. Such an approach more closely aligns with how the multiple dimensions of religiosity are experienced in everyday life; that is, they don't operate individually or even additively, but they cluster together in more interactive and dynamic ways to form unique and meaningful patterns—patterns that may be linked to family relations. In other words, a given adolescent experiences how important religion is (or is not) to her in conjunction with other dimensions of religiosity, such as her participation (or lack thereof) in a religious community, and she experiences these dimensions alongside her parents' own experience of those dimensions. This approach also accounts for the possibility that adolescents may not experience religious concordance or discordance with parents across the board, but rather may agree on some dimensions and disagree on others.

The Current Study

In the current study, we use data from Add Health and employ an analytic technique, latent class analysis (LCA) (described more fully in the next section), that allows us to examine how adolescents' and mothers' relative concordance or discordance on three dimensions of religiosity (religious salience, attendance at religious services, and frequency of prayer) cluster together into classes or profiles. Research Question 1 examines what profiles of religious concordance or discordance exist between adolescents and mothers. Research Question 2 asks whether these identified profiles differ on family relations, as well as on certain demographic characteristics, including religious affiliation, race/ethnicity, urbanicity, geographical region, age of adolescent, gender of adolescent, and maternal education level.

The work described in this research note is part of an emerging focus in religiosity research to discover profiles (or clusters, or types) of religiosity experiences among individuals. Smith and Denton (2005) described three types of overall religiosity among adolescents in the National Study of Youth and Religion (NSYR) (spiritual but not religious, nonreligious, and highly religious and devout). They also described types of religious service attenders (devout, regular, sporadic, disengaged, and an other/mixed type). Smith and Denton's work did not involve empirically derived types, but rather was based on "common understandings" in the culture of how religiosity might operate for teenagers, which were then confirmed by the NSYR data. More recently, Pearce and Denton (2010) used latent cluster analysis with NSYR data and identified five groups of teenagers (the highly religious "abiders," the middle-of-the-road adapters and assenters, avoiders, and atheists). In a study of ethnic and gender variations in religiosity, Jones and colleagues (Jones et al. 2011) identified five profiles of religious involvement among young adults (high religiosity, low religiosity, personal/experiential religiosity, personal ritual, and involved religiosity). To this emerging focus on profiles of religiosity experiences, we add the first study that we know of to use latent class analysis to form dyadic profiles of religious concordance or discordance in families.

Methods

Sample

Data for the present study come from the Wave I in-home interviews of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health) (Carolina Population Center 2010), a longitudinal study of the characteristics, behavior, and environments of adolescents and their health and achievement in adulthood. The Add Health sample is nationally representative of U.S. adolescents who were in grades 7–12 during the 1994–1995 school year. Our study sample consists of adolescents in the core sample who had never been married and whose mother completed the parent survey. (In Add Health, parental responders are mostly mothers.) The sample for the latent class analysis (Research Question 1) consists of 14,202 adolescent/mother pairs. The analysis sample for Research Question 2 is smaller. For these analyses, pairs were assigned membership in a "best-fitting" latent class using Bayesian posterior probability estimates. With this technique, not all pairs can be definitively identified as belonging to a single best fitting class. As a result, approximately 2000 pairs were dropped.

Measures

Demographic variables (see Table 1) consist of *gender*, *age*, *race/ethnicity*, *mother's education* (if mother's report is missing, adolescent report is used), *family type*, *urbanicity of residence*, and *geographical region*. Other control variables include the following adolescent-reported variables: *neighborhood resources* (dichotomous variable about use of fitness or recreation center), *neighborhood safety* (dichotomous variable about feeling safe most of the time), and *peer relations*. One multiple-item scale, *self esteem*, is also used as a control, in recognition of its established association with teen/parent relations (e.g., Bulanda and Majumdar 2009). This scale, consisting of four items, has adequate internal consistency ($\alpha = .79$).

We also examine three indicators of adolescents' relations with mothers. We examine adolescents' reports of the number of the following *shared activities* with mothers in the past four weeks: going shopping; playing a sport; attending a movie, play, museum, concert, sports event; working on a school project. Responses range from 0 to 5 with an overall mean of 1.58 (SD = 1.04). They were also asked about their overall *satisfaction with communication* with their mother. Responses range from 1 to 5 with an overall mean of 4.06 (SD = 1.01).

Adolescents were asked about *relationship quality* with their mothers, including how close they feel to their mothers, how much they think their mothers care about them, how much they agree that their mothers are warm and loving towards them, and how satisfied they are overall with their relationship with their mothers. This scale is coded such that higher values represent higher relationship quality. The variable ranges from 1 to 5 with an overall mean of 4.33 (SD = .65). This scale has a high internal consistency coefficient ($\alpha = .85$).

As described earlier, we use three variables for the concordance/discordance profiles (see Table 2): religious salience, frequency of prayer, and attendance at religious services. In Add Health, adolescents and mothers who actively claimed no religion were skipped out of the section containing these salience, prayer, and attendance questions. Thus, pairs containing these Add Health participants are omitted from this analysis. *Religious salience* is assessed by mothers' and adolescents' reports of how important religion is to them (very unimportant, fairly unimportant, fairly important, and very important). *Frequency of prayer* is assessed by asking mothers and adolescents "How often do you pray?" (never, less than once a month, at least once a month, at least once a week, and at least once a day). *Attendance at religious services* is assessed by asking mothers and adolescents how often they attended religious services in the past 12 months (never, less than once a month, less than once a week, and once a week or more).

We consider religious affiliation as a descriptive variable, rather than a dimension along which to base the religiosity profiles; whether or not the mother/adolescent pair claim the *same religious affiliation* was coded as yes/no.

Results

Research Question 1

The first research question examined what profiles of religious concordance exist between adolescents and mothers.

Construction of Religiosity Profiles—Latent class analysis (Mplus v5.2; Muthén and Muthén 1998–2007) was performed on adolescent and mother reports of religious salience, frequency of prayer, and attendance at religious services.¹ Latent class analysis is conceptually equivalent to conventional cluster analysis (Vermunt and Magidson 2002, 2004). Rather than examine characteristics of *variables*, cluster analysis and latent class analysis examine the characteristics of *individuals* by grouping individuals according to their responses across variables. It is important to note that a mother/adolescent pair's profile may not exactly fit any of the constructed profiles. It is helpful to think of pairs as having a *probability of belonging to each of the profiles*, with the highest probability associated with the profile that best captures the essence of the pair's responses.

In order to assure the generalizability of the findings, we conducted latent class analyses in two random halves of the sample: selecting among alternative models using data from the first half-sample and replicating the solution with data from the second half-sample.

We considered profile solutions that contained 2-, 3-, 4-, 5-, and 6- latent profiles.² In this study, the BIC criterion pointed to the 6-profile solution as being optimal (lowest BIC value).³ The LRT was not helpful in this application in that all of the alternative model solutions represented successively significant improvements over the previous models without reaching a point of diminishing returns. The 2-profile solution had the best classification certainty (.995)—not surprising since there is little room for misclassification in a 2-profile model. The classification certainty was not appreciably degraded with higher-level profile solutions. The estimated proportion of the population belonging to each profile showed that profiles with fewer than 10% did not appear until the 6-profile solution. Further, the 6-profile solution showed signs of estimation difficulty (unstable results, given multiple sets of starting values).

While the selection results were good for nearly all solutions, we selected the 5-profile solution. Our replication sample results show the stability of the 5-profile solution with respect to overall fit. An inspection of the parameter estimates in the estimation and replication samples for the 5-profile solution showed that the two were virtually identical. The full sample 5-profile solution was retained for all further analyses.

¹Adolescent age and gender are modeled as covariate effects on each profile indicator. The effects of these variables on each outcome can be obtained from the first author.

²Model fit statistics for these solutions are available from the first author by request.

³In selecting the optimal number of latent profiles, we compared the fit of 2-, 3-, 4-, 5-, and 6-profile solutions using the BIC statistic and the Lo–Mendell–Rubin likelihood ratio test (LRT: Lo et al. 2001), as recommended by Nylund et al. (2007). We also considered evidence of estimation difficulties (failure to replicate loglikelihood across sets of random starting values), the loglikelihood value for each solution, and the relative certainty of classification for each latent profile solution. The entropy statistic, a summary statistic reflecting the overall classification certainty, was also considered. This value is standardized; entropy values closer to 1 indicate a better fit.

Description of Religiosity Profiles—Analyses uncovered five classes or profiles of mother-adolescent dyads: one highly concordant profile, two highly discordant profiles, and two profiles of mixed concordance and discordance. The expected responses of mother and adolescent for each class are given in Table 2. We quantified the overall degree of discordance in each profile by creating z -scores for each estimated mother and adolescent response to each of the three religiosity indicator. The z -scores for adolescents were then subtracted from the z -scores for mothers and the absolute value of this difference was taken. The absolute mother-adolescent differences for each indicator and across all three indicators are shown in Fig. 1.

Profile 1: Fully Affiliated Believers (Concordant): In the one highly concordant profile (27% of sample), both the mother and the adolescent reported high levels of importance, high frequency of prayer, and high frequency of attendance at religious services. For ease of reference, we refer to members of this profile as *Fully Affiliated Believers*.⁴

There were two highly discordant profiles, both characterized by mothers with higher religiosity scores than their adolescent offspring, but with very different patterns.

Profile 2: Ambivalent Mothers/Unengaged Adolescents (Discordant): Profile 2 (11% of sample) contains mothers who reported religion to be somewhere between “fairly unimportant” and “fairly important,” they prayed “at least once a week,” and they reported some, though infrequent, religious service attendance. Their children, however, had the lowest religiosity scores in the study. Religion was “not important at all” to them, their average prayer frequency fell between “never” and “less than once a month,” and they did not attend religious services. For ease of reference, we refer to this profile as *Ambivalent Mothers/Unengaged Adolescents*.

Profile 3: Mothers Higher (Discordant): A second highly discordant profile was Profile 3 (14% of sample). In this profile, mothers were highly religious, reporting the highest possible responses for the importance of religion in their lives, frequency of prayer, and frequency of attendance at religious services. Their offspring, however, reported less attendance, less frequent prayer, and much lower levels of salience: average levels of “fairly unimportant” as compared to their mothers’ “very important.” For ease of reference, we name this profile *Mothers Higher*.

There were two profiles of mixed concordance and discordance.

Profile 4: Partially Affiliated Believers (Mixed Concordant/Discordant): Mothers in Profile 4 (21% of sample), reported religion as between fairly and very important, and prayed every day, but they reported infrequent attendance at services (less than once a month). Their children reported religion as “very important” and they prayed slightly more than once a week. However, they attended services more frequently than did their parents:

⁴Just as mother/adolescent pairs might not perfectly fit the profiles to which they belong, but rather have a higher probability of belonging to that profile than to the other profiles, the names for these profiles may not be perfectly descriptive of each dyad in the profile (e.g., not everyone in Profile 5 may in fact be “seeking”). Rather, the profile names are used for illustrative purposes and to guide the reader.

more than once a month, but less than once a week. Thus, we name members of this mixed profile *Partially Affiliated Believers*.

Profile 5: Mothers and Adolescents as Seekers (Mixed Concordant/Discordant): In Profile 5 (28% of sample), mothers reported religion as close to “fairly important” and they reported praying more than once a week. However, they reported the lowest religious service attendance of study participants claiming a religion—almost never. Their children rated religion as “fairly unimportant,” reported praying almost once a month, and reported attending services less than once a month.

A note of clarification is in order when interpreting profile 5. In profiles 2, 3, and 5, mothers are higher than adolescents in most (profile 5) or all (profiles 2 and 3) religiosity indicators. However, profile 3 (*Mothers Higher*) is distinct from profiles 2 and 5 because the mothers are higher than adolescents in all indicators *and* because the overall discordance between mothers and adolescents is high. A chance for confusion, we believe, is strongest when distinguishing between the discordant profile 2 (*Ambivalent Mothers/Unengaged Adolescents*) and the somewhat discordant (i.e., “mixed”) profile 5 (*Mothers and Adolescents as Seekers*). The differences between the two profiles are as follows: there is less overall discordance between mothers and adolescents in profile 5 than in profile 2, the profile 5 adolescents are less disengaged on all indicators than are those in profile 2, and the profile 5 mothers report higher levels of salience and prayer than do profile 2 mothers. Thus, we name profile 5 *Mothers and Adolescents as Seekers* to denote that these adolescents and mothers, to some degree, share a stance characterized by some engagement with religiosity.

Research Question 2

Research Question 2 examined whether these profiles differ with respect to family dynamics (shared activities, satisfaction with communication, and relationship quality) as well as demographic variables. Turning first to demographics, we found profile group differences in gender, age, race/ethnicity, mother’s education, family structure, urbanicity of residence, and region, as shown in Table 3. Two profiles (*Ambivalent Mothers/Unengaged Adolescents* and *Mothers Higher*) contained a significantly greater proportion of males and were older than the other profiles. The *Ambivalent Mothers* and *Mothers and Adolescents as Seekers* profiles contained the greatest proportion of White participants and the fewest Black participants, while the *Mothers Higher* profile contained the greatest proportion of Hispanic participants. The *Partially Affiliated Believers* profile had the lowest level of mother’s education and the highest proportion of single parent-headed households. *Fully Affiliated Believers* were least likely to live in an urban area. Mother/Adolescent pairs in three profiles (*Fully Affiliated Believers*, *Mothers Higher*, and *Partially Affiliated Believers*) were most likely to live in the South and least likely to live in the Northeast, *Ambivalent Mothers/Unengaged Adolescents* were most likely to live in the Midwest and Northeast, and *Mothers and Adolescents as Seekers* were most likely to live in the Midwest and South. The *Fully Affiliated Believers* and *Mothers Higher* profiles had the greatest proportion of mother-adolescent pairs reporting belonging to the same general denominational category.⁵

With regard to family relations, we examined associations between the profiles of religiosity and the adolescents' reports of relations with mothers (shared activities, satisfaction with communication, and perceived quality of the relationship with his/her mother). These associations were tested by a series of regression models.⁶ Estimated marginal means and post hoc pairwise comparisons are given in Table 4.

Shared Activities—The full regression model accounts for nearly 8% of the variability in shared activities [$F(10587/1195) = 1.150, p = .001$] although the contribution of profile class is minor (<1%). For this outcome, five post hoc profile comparisons were significant at the $p < .05$ level: adolescents in *Mothers Higher* ($M\text{-hat} = 1.51$) and *Ambivalent Mothers/Unengaged Adolescents* ($M\text{-hat} = 1.53$) report significantly fewer shared activities than those in *Fully Affiliated Believers* ($M\text{-hat} = 1.60$) and *Partially Affiliated Believers* ($M\text{-hat} = 1.60$), and those in *Mothers Higher* report significantly fewer shared activities than those in *Ambivalent Mothers* ($M\text{-hat} = 1.59$). These effects (Cohen's d) are very small (Cohen 1969), ranging from .01 to .09.

Satisfaction with Communication—Our model explains roughly 13% of the variability in satisfaction with parent–child communication [$F(10589/1194) = 1.345, p < .001$]. Profile membership, while statistically significant, explains less than 1% of this variability. Pairwise comparisons reveal significant profile group differences across all but two pairs. Adolescents in *Fully Affiliated Believers* and *Partially Affiliated Believers* report similar levels of satisfaction ($M\text{-hat} = 4.13$ and 4.12 , respectively), levels which are significantly higher than all other profiles. Adolescents in *Ambivalent Mothers/Unengaged Adolescents* and *Mothers Higher* ($M\text{-hat} = 3.89$ and 3.95 , respectively) are statistically indistinguishable and have significantly lower levels of satisfaction than those in all other profiles. Adolescents in *Ambivalent Mothers* reported satisfaction levels between the two sets of profiles ($M\text{-hat} = 4.06$). Effects range from .01 (very small) to .23 (small).

Relationship Quality—This model explains 19% of the variance in relationship quality [$F(10816/1204) = 1.216, p < .001$] with 2% of the variance attributable to profile membership. Relationship quality is highest for adolescents in *Fully Affiliated Believers* ($M\text{-hat} = 4.43$). Adolescents in all other profiles perceived significantly lower relationship quality ($M\text{-hat}$: *Partially Affiliated Believers* = 4.38, *Ambivalent Mothers* = 4.31, *Mothers Higher* = 4.25, *Mothers Higher* = 4.25, and *Ambivalent Mothers/Unengaged Adolescents* = 4.15). Effects range from .08 (small) to .43 (moderate). For relationship quality, the distinction between profiles is clear, in that all pairwise comparisons are significantly different.

Discussion

Building upon recent research identifying different profiles of religiosity at the level of the *individual* (Jones et al. 2011; Pearce and Denton 2010; Smith and Denton 2005), we used

⁵Denominational categories, following Regnerus (2003), were: Conservative Protestant, Mainline Protestant, Black Protestant, Roman Catholic, Jewish, Mormon/LDS, and Other. Information on coding Add Health responses into these categories can be obtained from the first author.

⁶Space considerations prevented a full reporting of these models. Tables of regression results are available on request.

data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health) to identify *dyadic* profiles of religious concordance or discordance between 14,202 adolescents and their mothers. Using latent class analysis, we identified five distinct profiles of religious concordance and discordance among adolescents and their mothers participating in the Add Health Study: one concordant, two discordant, and two of mixed concordance/discordance.

We were interested in how the profiles might represent different patterns of family dynamics, and we found that the profiles did distinguish between various levels of adolescent/mother relations. Adolescents in the concordant *Fully Affiliated Believers* profile and those in the mixed *Partially Affiliated Believers* profile reported significantly better relations with mothers than did youth in the other profiles. They did more things with their mothers, were more satisfied with the way they communicated, and felt closer to their mothers and more cared for and loved by them. In contrast, adolescents in the two discordant profiles—*Mothers Higher* and *Ambivalent Mothers/Unengaged Adolescents*—had significantly less positive relations with mothers than did other youth.

The finding of better relations in the concordant *Fully Affiliated Believers* profile than in the two discordant profiles is consistent with previous research linking concordance with positive family relations and discordance with poorer relations (Mahoney et al. 2001). However, our use of latent profile analysis allowed for the discovery of some important nuance in the links between religiosity and family relations. It was not concordance alone that was associated with positive family relations, given that the other profile enjoying more positive relations (*Partially Affiliated Believers*) was one of mixed concordance/discordance. In that profile, there is some discordance, although of a lesser degree than in the two discordant profiles, and both adolescents and mothers report moderate levels of engagement with religiosity. Future studies could examine this interplay between degree of concordance and engagement with religiosity to determine the relative impact of each factor on family relations.

That these profiles distinguished between other variables in predictable ways gives us additional confidence that the profiles represent meaningful categories. For example, the *Mothers and Adolescents as Seekers* profile had the fewest amount of Black participants, consistent with reported higher levels of religiosity among Black Americans (Smith et al. 2002; Taylor et al. 2004). Adolescents in the *Ambivalent Mothers/Unengaged Adolescents* and in the *Mother Higher* profiles were significantly older than adolescents in the other profiles, perhaps reflecting an established decline in adolescent religious participation with age (Smith et al. 2002). Mother/Adolescent pairs in three profiles (*Fully Affiliated Believers*, *Mothers Higher*, and *Partially affiliated Believers*) were most likely to live in the South and least likely to live in the Northeast, while *Ambivalent Mothers/Unengaged Adolescents* were most likely to live in the Midwest and Northeast; these findings are consistent with regional differences noted elsewhere (e.g., Smith et al. 2002).

Some study limitations are noteworthy. First, it is important to note that membership in the various concordance/discordance profiles explained only a limited amount of variance in the family relations dimensions. However, while the effect sizes of the differences between profiles on these family relations indicators are generally somewhat small, the skewed

distribution of the indicators toward more positive relationships would underestimate the standardized size of the differences than if the indicators were normally distributed, as is assumed in the calculation of Cohen's *d*. Second, due to our cross-sectional analysis, we were unable to test for causal pathways among variables, nor are we able to provide evidence of bidirectional influence. Third, this examination focused only on families with an identified religious affiliation, due to Add Health's practice of not asking religiosity questions of unaffiliated families. While the profiles still capture a broad range of religiosity experiences, future investigations would benefit from exploration of religiosity among non-affiliated families.

Researchers wishing to use latent class analysis are urged to attend to these limitations, and to explore associations between concordance/discordance and other outcomes of interest. They are also urged to pay careful attention to the choice of religiosity variables to include in the analyses. Here, we used three variables in an existing data set, yet other options abound, either in secondary analysis of existing data or in new data collection: beliefs in scriptural inerrancy (Sherkat and Darnell 1999), intrinsic vs. extrinsic beliefs (Gorsuch and McPherson 1989), frequency of attendance, intensity of beliefs, self-report of how religious one is, comfort received from religion, religious commitment, and orthodoxy (Chang et al. 1998; Nonne-maker et al. 2003). However, it is perhaps well-advised to include a measure of religious salience, because this variable has been shown related to the quality of relationship between parents and adolescents (Pearce and Axinn 1998; Regnerus and Burdette 2006).

Acknowledgments

This research uses data from Add Health, a program project designed by J. Richard Udry, Peter S. Bearman, and Kathleen Mullan Harris, and funded by a grant P01-HD31921 from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, with cooperative funding from 17 other agencies. Special acknowledgment is due Ronald R. Rindfuss and Barbara Entwisle for assistance in the original design. Persons interested in obtaining data files from Add Health should contact Add Health, Carolina Population Center, 123 W. Franklin Street, Chapel Hill, NC 27516-2524 (addhealth@unc.edu). No direct support was received from grant P01-HD31921 for this analysis.

References

- Bulanda, Ronald E.; Majumdar, Debarun. Perceived parent-child relations and adolescent self-esteem. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*. 2009; 18:203–212.
- Carolina Population Center. Add Health. 2010. Retrieved from <http://www.cpc.unc.edu/projects/addhealth>
- Chang, Bei; Noonan, Anne E.; Tennstedt, Sharon L. The role of religion/spirituality in coping with caregiving for disabled elders. *The Gerontologist*. 1998; 38:463–470. [PubMed: 9726133]
- Cohen, Jacob. *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. New York: Academic Press; 1969.
- Gorsuch, Richard L.; McPherson, Susan E. Intrinsic/extrinsic measurement: I/E-Revised and single item scales. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*. 1989; 28:348–354.
- Jones, Janine M.; St Peter, Josie R.; Ferandes, Sherira J.; Herrenkohl, Todd I.; Kosterman, Rick; David Hawkins, J. Ethnic and gender variation in religious involvement: Patterns of expression in young adulthood. *Review of Religious Research*. 2011; 53:207–225. [PubMed: 23002308]
- Lo, Yungtai; Mendell, Nancy R.; Rubin, Donald B. Testing the number of components in a normal mixture. *Biometrika*. 2001; 88:767–778.

- Mahoney, Annette; Pargament, Kenneth I.; Tarekshwar, Nalini; Swank, Aaron B. Religion in the home in the 1980s and 90s: A meta-analytic review and conceptual analysis of links between religion, marriage, and parenting. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*. 2008; 5:63–101.
- Manlove, Jennifer; Logan, Cassandra; Moore, Kristin A.; Ikramullah, Erum. Pathways from family religiosity to adolescent sexual activity and contraceptive use. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*. 2008; 40:105–117. [PubMed: 18577143]
- Marks, Loren. How does religion influence marriage? Christian, Jewish, Mormon, and Muslim perspectives. *Marriage and Family Review*. 2005; 38:85–111.
- Muthén, Linda K.; Muthén, Bengt O. *Mplus user's guide*. 5. Los Angeles, CA: Muthén and Muthén; 1998–2007.
- Nonnemaker, James; McNeely, Clea A.; Blum, Robert W. Public and private domains of religiosity and adolescent health risk behaviors: Evidence from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. *Social Science and Medicine*. 2003; 57:2049–2054. [PubMed: 14512236]
- Nylund, Karen L.; Asparouhov, Tihomir; Muthén, Bengt. Deciding on the number of classes in latent class analysis and growth mixture modeling. A Monte Carlo simulation study. *Structural Equation Modeling*. 2007; 14:535–569.
- Pearce, Lisa D.; Axinn, William G. The impact of family religious life on the quality of parent–child relationships. *American Sociological Review*. 1998; 63:810–828.
- Pearce, Lisa D.; Denton, Melissa L. *A faith of their own: Stability and change in the religiosity of America's adolescents*. New York: Oxford University Press; 2010.
- Pearce, Lisa D.; Haynie, Dana L. Intergenerational religious dynamics and adolescent delinquency. *Social Forces*. 2004; 82:1553–1572.
- Regnerus, Mark D. Religion and positive adolescent outcomes: Review of research and theory. *Review of Religious Research*. 2003; 44:394–413.
- Regnerus, Mark D.; Burdette, Amy. Religious change and adolescent family dynamics. *The Sociological Quarterly*. 2006; 47:175–194.
- Rossi, Alice S.; Rossi, Peter H. *Of human bonding: Parent–child relations across the life course*. Hawthorne, New York: Walter de Gruyter; 1990.
- Sherkat, Darren E.; Darnell, Alfred. The effect of parents' fundamentalism on children's educational attainment: Examining differences by gender and children's fundamentalism. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*. 1999; 38:23–35.
- Smith, Christian; Denton, Melinda L. *Soul searching: The religious and spiritual lives of American teenagers*. New York: Oxford University Press; 2005.
- Smith, Christian; Denton, Melinda L.; Faris, Robert; Regnerus, Mark. Mapping American adolescent religious participation. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*. 2002; 41:597–612.
- Stokes, Charles E.; Regnerus, Mark. When faith divides family: Religious discord and adolescent reports of parent–child relations. *Social Science Research*. 2009; 38:155–167. [PubMed: 19569298]
- Taylor, Robert J.; Chatters, Linda M.; Levin, Jeff. *Religion in the lives of African-Americans: Social, psychological, and health perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage; 2004.
- Vermunt, Jeroen K.; Magidson, Jay. Latent class cluster analysis. In: Hagenaars, JA.; McCutcheon, AL., editors. *Applied latent class analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2002.
- Vermunt, Jeroen K.; Magidson, Jay. Latent class models. In: McCutcheon, AL., editor. *Handbook of quantitative methodology for the social sciences*. Sage Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications; 2004.

Fig. 1.

Discordance between mothers and adolescents within each profile, expressed as the absolute value of the standardized estimated mean scores

Table 1

Descriptive statistics for demographic and analysis variables

	N	Mtn	Max	Mean or %	SD
Covariates					
Female	12195	0	1	.52	n/a
Age	12195	11	21	15.58	1.71
White	12195	0	1	.53	n/a
Hispanic	12195	0	1	.17	n/a
Black	12195	0	1	.21	n/a
Native American	12195	0	1	.02	n/a
Asian	12195	0	1	.06	n/a
Mother's education	12190	0	6	3.52	1.31
Two biological parents	12195	0	1	.56	n/a
No parent figure	12195	0	1	.04	n/a
Single parent	12195	0	1	.26	n/a
Adopted/foster parents	12195	0	1	.03	n/a
Step-parent and parent	12195	0	1	.10	n/a
Urban	12102	0	1	.55	n/a
Neighborhood resources	12168	0	1	.21	n/a
Neighborhood safety	12171	0	1	.90	n/a
West	12195	0	1	.23	n/a
Midwest	12195	0	1	.25	n/a
South	12195	0	1	.38	n/a
Northeast	12195	0	1	.15	n/a
Peer relations	12183	1	5	4.11	.76
Self esteem	12189	1	5	4.02	.73
Adolescent/mother relations					
Shared activities	11954	0	5	1.58	1.04
Satisfaction w/communication	11953	1	5	4.06	1.01
Relationship quality	12194	1	5	4.33	.65

Table 2

Frequencies of response options and estimated profile means for religiosity indicators

	Adolescent	Mother
Religious salience		
Very important	6000	8684
Fairly important	4923	3018
Fairly unimportant	845	361
Not important at all	402	99
Frequency of prayer		
At least once a day	5949	9067
At least once a week	2986	1677
At least once a month	1244	295
From time to time, but less than once a month	1086	994
Never	912	118
Frequency of attendance		
At least once a day	5496	5463
At least once a week	2752	2467
At least once a month	2420	2907
From time to time, but less than once a month	1506	1334
Never	6	13

	Importance	Prayer	Attendance
1: Fully affiliated believers (~27%)			
Adolescent	4.00 ^a	5.00 ^a	4.00 ^a
Mother	4.00 ^a	5.00 ^a	4.00 ^a
2: Ambivalent mothers/unengaged adolescents (~11%)			
Adolescent	.67	1.51	.93
Mother	2.56	4.00	1.32
3: Mothers higher (~14%)			
Adolescent	2.00	3.61	3.19
Mother	4.00 ^a	5.00 ^a	4.00 ^a
4: Partially affiliated believers (~21%)			
Adolescent	4.00 ^a	4.21	2.31
Mother	3.49	5.00 ^a	1.38
5: Mothers and adolescents as seekers (~28%)			
Adolescent	2.00	2.78	1.53
Mother	2.80	4.23	1.17

Note: Response categories for each religiosity indicator are as follows: Importance: 1 not important at all, 2 fairly unimportant, 3 fairly important, 4 very important; Prayer: 1 never, 2 less than once/month, 3 at least once/mo, 4 at least once/week, 5 at least once/day; Attendance: 1 never, 2 less than once/month, 3 less than once/week, 4 once/week or more

^aWhen responses in a profile are extreme, estimated values may extend beyond the boundary of admissible values. These values are shown here as the highest admissible value

Table 3

Difference in profile means of demographic and religiosity characteristics

	1: Fully affiliated believers	2: Ambivalent mothers/unengaged adolescents	3: Mothers higher	4: Partially affiliated believers	5: Mothers and adolescents as seekers	Post hoc tests of mean differences
Female	.55	.45	.45	.56	.54	1v2,1v3,2v4,2v5,3v4,3v5
Age	15.46	15.79	15.76	15.49	15.59	1v2,1v3,1v5,2v4,2v5,3v4,3v5
White	.45	.69	.48	.48	.62	1v2,1v5,2v3,2v4,2v5,3v5,4v5
Hispanic	.15	.17	.22	.17	.18	1v3,1v4,1v5,2v3,3v4,3v5
Black	.32	.07	.19	.27	.12	All
Mother's ed	3.65	3.61	3.54	3.34	3.49	1v3,1v4,1v5,2v4,3v4,4v5
Two biological	.61	.53	.64	.48	.52	1v2,1v4,1v5,2v3,3v4,3v5,4v5
Single parent	.22	.28	.19	.33	.28	1v2,1v4,1v5,2v3,2v4,3v4,3v5,4v5
Stepparent	.08	.12	.09	.12	.12	1v2,1v4,1v5,3v4,3v5
Urban	.51	.57	.58	.55	.56	1v2,1v3,1v5
West	.23	.21	.25	.21	.23	2v3,3v4
Midwest	.20	.33	.24	.21	.30	1v2,1v3,1v5,2v3,2v4,3v5,4v5
South	.47	.19	.33	.47	.29	1v2,1v3,1v5,2v3,2v4,2v5,3v4,4v5
Northeast	.09	.27	.17	.11	.18	1v2,1v3,1v5,2v3,2v4,2v5,3v4,4v5
Same denom ^d	.87	.79	.86	.80	.81	1v2,1v4,1v5,2v3,3v4,3v5

^dThis comparison was based on a set of denomination categories (see footnote 5)

Table 4

Post-hoc tests of profile differences in marginal means of adolescent/mother relations

Estimated marginal means	Shared activities	Satisfaction w/communication	Relationship quality
1: Fully affiliated believers	1.60	4.13	4.43
2: Ambivalent mothers/unengaged adolescents	1.53	3.89	4.15
3: Mothers higher	1.51	3.95	4.25
4: Partially affiliated believers	1.60	4.12	4.38
5: Mothers and adolescents as seekers	1.59	4.06	4.31
<i>d</i> Values			
1v2	.07*	.23**	.43***
1v3	.09*	.18*	.29*
1v4	.00	.01	.08*
1v5	.01	.07*	.19*
2v3	.02	.06	.15*
2v4	.07*	.22**	.34***
2v5	.06	.16*	.24**
3v4	.09*	.16*	.20**
3v5	.08*	.11*	.10*
4v5	.01	.06*	.11*

Difference scores are shown as absolute values

Note: Cohen (1969) describes standardized group differences of .20–.30 to be small and .40–.60 to be moderate*
 $p < .05$,**
 $p < .01$,***
 $p < .001$