

# Religious Orthodoxy and the American Worker

Kody Steffy\*

Indiana University

*Inspired by Weber's classic writings on religion and economic ethics and guided by moral cosmology theory's conceptualization of religious orthodoxy, this article responds to recent calls for renewed interest in religion and work. Analyzing data from the Economic Values Survey, it documents the complex ways that religion influences American workers. This study contributes to the sociologies of religion and work, along with the field of organizational behavior, in two ways. First, it shows that moral cosmology theory applies to an important sphere of social life: the workplace. Second, contrary to those who argue that religion serves a more therapeutic than directive role in the workplace, it shows that religious orthodoxy shapes work behaviors, orientations, and decision-making. In doing so, this article also contributes to the emerging literature in management studies regarding the role of the sacred in secular organizations.*

*Key words:* work/labor; orthodoxy; organizations; moral cosmology; calling; decision-making; beliefs.

In a series of essays, Max Weber documented the role of religion in shaping individuals' economic ethics, "the practical impulses for action which are founded in the psychological and pragmatic contexts of religion" (Weber 1958[1920]: 267). In the most widely read piece in this line of scholarship, Weber (2002[1905]) argued that the rise of ascetic Protestantism helped to usher in capitalism by changing the way people approached their work. Coupled with Luther's emphasis on hard work as God's will, Calvin's doctrine of predestination created the ideal capitalist worker, one who believed that actively pursuing a vocational calling was "the highest moral activity one could assume" (39). Despite the centrality of the religion-work nexus in Weber's writings and evidence that religion continues to influence economic ethics (Keister 2008), the literature on religion and work remains underdeveloped in

\*Direct correspondence to Kody Steffy, Indiana University, Ballantine Hall 744, 1020 E. Kirkwood Ave., Bloomington, IN 47405, USA. E-mail: ksteffy@indiana.edu.

© The Author 2013. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the Association for the Sociology of Religion. All rights reserved. For permissions, please e-mail: journals.permissions@oup.com.

both sociology (Grant et al. 2004) and management (Tracey 2012). While the reasons for this underdevelopment are likely multiple (Tracey 2012), it may reflect an assumption that the modern workplace has stripped work of its meaning by reducing workers to “cog[s] in this bureaucratic machine” (Weber 1978[1924]: LIX).

Even when focusing explicitly on the symbolic dimension of work (e.g., work values), sociologists of work have largely ignored the potential influence of religion on the workplace, focusing instead on the ascriptive correlates of work orientations (Johnson et al. 2007). Despite some important research on religion and work in the fields of management and organizational behavior, “for the most part, management researchers have stubbornly refused to engage meaningfully with religion and religious forms of organization, or to consider the effects of religious beliefs and practices on secular organizations” (Tracey 2012: 2). The few sociologists of religion who have examined work have generally argued that religion provides individuals with *meanings about* but not *direction for* their work (Sullivan 2006; Wuthnow 1994). In this article, I show that religion and morality remain relevant in the workplace, providing individuals not only with meaning about but also direction in their work.

While this study includes a comprehensive analysis of religious believing, behaving, and belonging (Steensland et al. 2000), my argument centers on religious orthodoxy. Orthodoxy has become a key feature of the religious landscape of postwar America (Hunter 1991; Wuthnow 1988), yet it has been largely neglected in studies of nonpolitical spheres of the social world, the workplace in particular. This is problematic, given that religious orthodoxy represents a communitarian, yet authoritarian, moral orientation that privileges the welfare of others and demands adherence to a rigid set of moral principles (Davis and Robinson 2006). Does such an orientation influence the way people go about their work, by orienting their work toward helping others and/or by inclining them to adhere strictly to the rules of the workplace?

Analyzing data from the Economic Values Survey, this article makes two important contributions to the extant literature. First, it contributes to the sociology of religion by applying moral cosmology theory (Davis and Robinson 2006) to one of the most important spheres of everyday life: the workplace. Second, it shows that religion serves not just a therapeutic but a directive role in the workplace, shaping workers’ decision-making, behaviors, and orientations. In doing so, this article contributes to the emerging literature in management studies regarding the role of the sacred in secular organizations (Tracey 2012).

## RELIGION AND WORK

### *The Social Psychology of Work*

Research in the social psychology of work has paid sustained attention to the job characteristics that individuals most value, variously referred to as

“work values,” “judgments about work,” and “work orientations.” Drawing from theory in social psychology that emphasizes intrinsic and extrinsic sources of motivation (Eccles and Wigfield 2002; Sansone and Harackiewicz 2000), much scholarship in this area distinguishes between intrinsic and extrinsic work orientations. The intrinsic–extrinsic dimension distinguishes between valuing rewards derived from the act of working and rewards given in return for work (Johnson et al. 2007). Extrinsic dimensions of work refer to rewards like pay, status, and the potential for advancement. Intrinsic rewards refer to things like the opportunity to express one’s creativity, to use one’s skills, and to perform work that one finds interesting.

While much of the literature focuses on the extrinsic–intrinsic dimension of work orientations, some studies have demonstrated the utility of examining other features of work valued by employees. Most notably, scholars have examined interpersonal and altruistic considerations. Beginning with Ginzberg et al. (1951), some scholars have examined interpersonal relations at work as an important dimension of work orientations, distinct from intrinsic and extrinsic considerations (MOW 1987; Taris and Feij 2001).<sup>1</sup> To be sure, workers tend to place more weight on economic (extrinsic) than interpersonal features of work (MOW 1987); nevertheless, the distribution of interpersonal work values is socially patterned with some groups (e.g., women) placing more weight on interpersonal concerns than others (e.g., men) (Herzog 1982; Marini et al. 1996). While the literature on altruistic work orientations is more limited, both Herzog (1982) and Marini et al. (1996) have found that women are more likely than men to value helping others and society through their work. In more general terms, scholars who have examined characteristics of work beyond the conventional extrinsic–intrinsic dimension (such as interpersonal and altruistic features) have come to the conclusion that material or extrinsic rewards are “distinct from self-actualizing work features” (Johnson et al. 2007: 293). This consistent finding suggests that the key distinction may be between extrinsic and nonextrinsic dimensions of work rather than between extrinsic and intrinsic dimensions.

Regardless of the particular dimensions of work orientations they are examining, scholars in this area have focused almost exclusively on their ascriptive antecedents (Johnson et al. 2007). The social patterning of work values by gender (e.g., Bridges 1989; Herzog 1982; Lueptow 1980; Marini et al. 1996;

---

<sup>1</sup>Note that scholars disagree on how best to characterize interpersonal work values. Ginzberg et al. (1951) and the tradition that followed (e.g., Taris and Feij 2001) argued that social work values should be considered an important third dimension, distinct from extrinsic and intrinsic values. While Marini et al. (1996) and Herzog (1982) analyzed intrinsic and interpersonal work values separately, Herzog (1982) argued that social relations can be considered an *intrinsic* feature of work. In contrast, Kalleberg (1977) labeled interpersonal concerns an *extrinsic* dimension of work.

Tolbert and Moen 1998), generational cohort (e.g., Kalleberg and Loscocco 1983; Loscocco and Kalleberg 1988), and social class background (e.g., Kalleberg and Loscocco 1983; Lindsay and Knox 1984; Mortimer and Kumka 1982) has been the almost exclusive focus of this literature. Thus, despite the sociological tradition of examining religion and orientations toward work, we know little about the contemporary relationship between religion and work.

### *Studies of Religion in Management and Organizational Behavior*

A small literature concerning the effects of religion on individual orientations toward work has developed in the field of organizational behavior. The results of these studies are quite mixed. For instance, Chusmir and Koberg (1988) examined the relationship between religious affiliation/religious commitment and a wide range of work-related outcomes, including motivation, job satisfaction, work ethic, and organizational commitment. They uncovered no significant relationships. Similarly, in their study of British entrepreneurs, Drakopoulou Dodd and Seaman (1998) found no correlation between individual religiosity and entrepreneurial activity.

In contrast, a number of studies have found that religion has significant effects on some aspects of work. Senger (1970) showed that religious managers differed from others on a number of fronts. They tended to be less interested in both extrinsic managerial goals such as profits and making money and goals typically labeled “intrinsic,” such as doing satisfying work and “becoming a whole person.” Religious managers exhibited higher levels of what Senger labeled “humanistic-social” orientations, including among other concerns, “personal activity in human affairs” (Senger 1970: 183). Lynn et al. (2009) have shown that faith maturity, church attendance, and denominational strictness (i.e., being an evangelical Protestant or a Mormon) are associated with higher levels of work–faith integration. Finally, at the cross-national level, Parboteeah et al. (2009) uncovered significant country-level effects on individual levels of work obligation, with mean levels of cognitive and normative religiosity (i.e., believing that God is important and attending religious services) being positively associated with individual work obligation.

While these studies have contributed to our understanding of religion and work, their findings have yet to aggregate into a coherent body of knowledge. As Tracey (2012) puts it, “the management literature does not offer a clear picture of the effects of religious beliefs on individual values, attitudes, or behaviors” (26). The mixed findings of this literature may be due in part to its failure to seriously engage with other disciplines, such as the sociology of religion, that have extensively outlined and operationalized the core dimensions of religion that should be included in systematic analyses of organizational life (Tracey 2012). The present study marks an advance by analyzing religious believing, behaving, and belonging (Steensland et al. 2000).

### *Work in the Sociology of Religion*

While the contemporary sociology of religion has paid only limited attention to the workplace, some important advances have been made. For instance, Davidson and Caddell (1994) found that high levels of religious salience and social-justice-oriented religious beliefs are associated with higher probabilities of viewing work as a calling rather than a career or a job. Thinking of work as a calling has consequences. Those who think of work as a calling are more likely than others to be motivated by intrinsic values, such as self-fulfillment, and less likely to be motivated by the prospects of making more money or being promoted (Wuthnow 1994).

In the most comprehensive treatment of the subject in recent years, Wuthnow (1994) painted a complex picture of the relationship between religion and work. For instance, people who regularly attend religious services value occupations like teaching and nursing more so than others; however, these commitments do not seem to influence whether or not they actually enter those occupations. Highly religious persons work as many hours as others and are just as likely to indicate that their work is very important to their sense of self-worth; however, they are more likely than others to view work as a way of serving their families. While persons most committed to religion do report slightly lower rates of engaging in questionable workplace behaviors, the crux of Wuthnow's analyses is that religion influences the way individuals approach their work, but in limited and complex ways that tend to apply more to values than actions.

But why is religion's effect on the workplace so limited? One explanation can be found in the nature of religious discourse about work. Out of fear of alienating adherents, religious leaders generally restrict their discussions of work to its psychological aspects. Rather than promoting particular types of work as more sacred than others, for instance, religious elites tend to advise that God is interested in individuals' happiness and that whatever one's work, it is important to God (Wuthnow 1994). The implication of this discourse for the workplace is that religion's role has become more therapeutic than directive. According to this line of reasoning, religion does not guide the decisions one makes regarding work; instead, it imbues one's work with meaning (Wuthnow 1994) and helps one to deal with stress on the job (Sullivan 2006).

Another reason religion may have limited effects on work is that the workplace has its own ethical code that governs workers' behavior without standing in the way of business goals. Among the implicit norms of this code are that workers should mind their own business and that no organization can be perfect (Wuthnow 1994). This, of course, varies by workplace. Lindsay and Smith (2010), for example, have shown that elite evangelicals enact their religious commitments in different ways depending on the extent to which a work environment is amenable or hostile to religion. Further, in organizations that provide employees with meaningful understandings of work, Roundy (2009) has theorized that individual religious commitments will tend to take a backseat. Indeed, the presence of this ethical code in most workplaces may be one

reason that scholars of religion and work have uncovered only limited effects. Another reason may be that these scholars have neglected a crucial element of American religious culture: *religious orthodoxy*.

## RELIGIOUS ORTHODOXY AND MORAL COSMOLOGY THEORY

In *The Restructuring of American Religion*, Wuthnow (1988) argued that the symbolic boundaries between Catholics, Protestants, and Jews that had previously defined American religion lost much of their salience throughout the latter half of the twentieth century. In their stead, new divisions, often intradenominational, arose between religious liberals and conservatives. Building on Wuthnow, Hunter (1991) argued that the most important divide in contemporary American religion (and culture, for that matter) is based not on denominational affiliation, but conflicting worldviews or competing moral visions. In his much discussed *Culture Wars*, Hunter suggested that a deep schism had emerged in American culture between the religiously orthodox, whose understanding of morality as timeless, divinely inspired, and detailed in scripture, drove them to reactionary politics, and modernists, whose understanding of morality as a product of the time drove them toward liberal politics.<sup>2</sup> Like Wuthnow, Hunter emphasized that this religious conflict was different from past conflicts in American culture. It was more fundamental than the doctrinal disputes of old (e.g., about the validity of Papal authority, the nature of salvation, or the place of sacraments in worship services). Indeed, it was about the very nature of morality.

In recent years, Davis and Robinson have done much to elucidate the consequences of religious orthodoxy, especially in the sphere of politics. Their analyses of survey data show that religious orthodoxy powerfully influences the political attitudes of adherents. Across a host of countries, including the United States (1996a, 1996b), nine European countries (1999a, 1999b, 2001), Israel (2001), and a number of Muslim-majority countries (2006; Junisbai 2010), the orthodox prefer communitarian policies. Economically, this means that the orthodox tend to prefer policies of redistribution and are supportive of generous welfare provisions. Culturally, they prefer restrictive policies on issues such as abortion and same-sex rights, believing that all should be held to the moral standards outlined in their sacred texts.

Consistent with Wuthnow's and Hunter's theorizing, Davis and Robinson argue that this is because religious orthodoxy is defined by a moral orientation that understands morality as eternal and outlined in sacred texts. The orthodox are inclined to view individuals as subsumed by the laws of an omnipotent

---

<sup>2</sup>Hunter (1991) opts for the term "progressives" over modernists. I agree with Davis and Robinson (1999b) that the term "progressive" comes with political connotations that may not be warranted.

God. Consequently, they find their moral guidance not within themselves, but in scripture and in abiding religious teachings. Because all people are understood to be bound by the same moral code, this inclination yields a communitarian worldview—one with both a strict and a caring side (Davis and Robinson 2006). The religiously orthodox feel a responsibility for one another. Thus, whether by insisting on adherence to orthodox conceptions of morality (for salvific purposes and to please God) or supporting policies that seek to minimize material hardship, the orthodox are oriented toward helping others. The caring side of orthodoxy has been documented in a number of studies. The orthodox are more likely to feel compassion for the less fortunate (Blouin and Robinson 2007), to support progressive economic policies (Clydesdale 1999; Davis and Robinson 1996a, 1999b, 2006; Junisbai 2010; Pyle 1993), and to derive a sense of community from their fellow worshippers, friends, neighbors, and co-workers (Ryle and Robinson 2006). The strict side of orthodoxy is also well documented. Starks and Robinson (2007) found that the orthodox are more likely than others to value obedience over autonomy in children. Additionally, many have shown that religious orthodoxy is associated with cultural authoritarianism (e.g., Davis and Robinson 1999a, 1996b, 2001; Hunter 1991; Powell and Steelman 1982).

With some exceptions (Ryle and Robinson 2006; Starks and Robinson 2007), the literature on religious orthodoxy has focused on political attitudes and behaviors. Much research is needed to clarify the effects of orthodoxy on everyday life. Outside the sphere of politics, what role does religious orthodoxy play in the social world? I begin to answer this question by examining the ways the religiously orthodox approach their work. The workplace is an important context in which to study the relationship between orthodoxy and everyday life for several reasons. First, Americans spend more time working than doing anything else. Indeed, the typical American worker spends almost 2000 hours per year in the workplace (Schor 1991; Wuthnow 1994). Further, the decisions people make in the workplace and the relationships that result from them are an important feature of stratification processes (Erickson 1996).

Theoretically, there is reason to believe that religious orthodoxy influences the way people go about their work. Orthodoxy is an other-focused moral orientation that draws strict, religiously justified, lines between right and wrong. Does this emphasis on others cause the religiously orthodox to put others before themselves as they go about their daily lives? Do the orthodox approach their work for more selfless reasons than others? Do orthodoxy's absolute moral boundaries encourage adherents to adhere strictly to workplace rules? From the purview of moral cosmology theory (Davis and Robinson 2006), these seem like reasonable expectations.

### *Beyond Orthodoxy*

Beyond religious orthodoxy, what other dimensions of religion might influence the way individuals think about and perform their work? While the

evidence is more limited, there is some reason to believe that evangelical Protestants will approach their work differently from others. Keister (2008) has shown that evangelical Protestants have “unique economic values.” Specifically, they are more likely than others to agree that: (1) money is the root of all evil, (2) riches prevent knowing God, and (3) saving for retirement is not important (Keister 2008).<sup>3</sup> Additionally, evangelical Protestants are more likely than affiliates of other religious traditions to think about what their religion has to say about work (Keister 2008). To the extent that evangelical Protestants devalue money and think of their work in religious terms (Keister 2008; Lynn et al. 2009), we might expect them to exhibit lower levels of extrinsic work motivation.

Additionally, since church attendance is associated with higher levels of faith–work integration (Lynn et al. 2009), there is some reason to expect that church attendance will influence work orientations. However, there are a number of reasons to suspect that rates of attendance might not matter for work. First, religious traditions differ markedly in their economic teachings (Davis and Robinson 1996a). Thus to the extent that religion influences work by exposing adherents to relevant teachings, there is little reason to expect consistent effects of attendance. Second, congregations, even within the same denomination, differ markedly in levels of orthodoxy (Reimer 2011; Wuthnow 1988). To the extent that religion shapes work orientations through orthodoxy, we would expect the effects of attendance to wash out due to congregational and denominational heterogeneity. Third, religious leaders tend not to discuss matters of work explicitly, except to emphasize that one’s work is important to God (Wuthnow 1994). Thus attending is unlikely to expose adherents to sermons about work. In brief, I find little reason to expect that church attendance will uniformly shape work behaviors, decision-making, or motivation.

## SUMMARY OF EXPECTATIONS

The distinguishing feature of religious orthodoxy is its communitarian understanding of morality that yields both a caring side and an authoritarian side. From this, I derive two hypotheses:

H1: The religiously orthodox are more likely than others to think about morality and the well-being of others in workplace decision-making.

H2: Orthodox religionists are less likely than others to deviate from workplace rules.

Additionally, we know that the orthodox are more likely than modernists to derive a sense of community from co-workers (Ryle and Robinson 2006).

---

<sup>3</sup>Keister uses the term “conservative Protestantism” to refer to two religious traditions that share a conservative theology but have distinct institutional histories in the United States (Steensland et al. 2000): evangelical Protestantism and black Protestantism.



Because nonextrinsic dimensions of work include opportunities to develop relationships with co-workers and act altruistically, I hypothesize that:

H3: The religiously orthodox exhibit higher levels of nonextrinsic work orientations.

Hypotheses regarding religious orthodoxy and valuing the extrinsic dimensions of work are less clear. Nevertheless, I explore this relationship because, while the extrinsic dimension of work has been a central concern in the social psychology of work, scholars in the area have not examined potential religious effects in any detail.

Beyond orthodoxy, I hypothesize the following:

H4: Evangelical Protestants exhibit lower levels of extrinsic motivation than others.

H5: Church attendance does not have consistent effects on the way respondents approach work.

## DATA AND METHOD

The data come from the Economic Values Survey, a survey of the active U.S. labor force age 18 and over and living in the United States. The data were compiled under the direction of principal investigator Robert Wuthnow in February and March 1992 via in-person interviews conducted by the Gallup Organization. The Economic Values Survey is now publicly available on the web site of the Association of Religious Data Archives. The survey design was a replicated probability sample down to the level of urban blocks or segments of townships. The sample was weighted in order to align the demographics of the sample with the actual demographics of the U.S. labor force (Wuthnow 1994).

The Economic Values Survey is a valuable data source for scholars interested in the intersection of religion and things economic. It is unique in providing such rich and detailed information about multiple dimensions of religion and a wide array of economic matters. The questionnaire includes hundreds of questions about economic matters (Keister 2008), including detailed items about workplace decision-making and specific workplace behaviors (e.g., bending the truth, arriving late) not available elsewhere. As such, it is the only publicly available data source that can address the questions about the workplace posed here.

### *Dependent Variables*

I model the effects of religious orthodoxy on rationales for decision-making at work, deviation from workplace rules, and work orientations (extrinsic and nonextrinsic). Three batteries of questions were used to construct the four outcomes, which included seven questions about workplace decision-making, nine about workplace rule compliance, and nine about work orientations.

Exploratory factor analysis followed by Promax oblique rotation was used to reduce the complexity of the analyses.<sup>4</sup> Factors were identified from the original batteries of questions via analyses of eigenvalues, scree plots, and factor loadings. Factors that had eigenvalues greater than one and met the straight-line criterion for scree plots were retained (e.g., Pett et al. 2003; Preacher and McCallum 2003). Factor-based, summative scales were then constructed, excluding items that loaded weakly (i.e.,  $<0.30$ ) (Hair et al. 1995; Pett et al. 2003) on a given factor. Factor-based scales were used instead of factor scores, because factor scores are generated from all items included in the EFA, even those that load weakly (Pedhazur and Schmelkin 1991; Pett et al. 2003).

The items used to construct the workplace decision-making scale were constructed from a battery of nine questions that asked: *Suppose you had a tough decision to make at work. Would each of these be a major consideration, a minor consideration, or not a consideration?* The following three items loaded onto a single factor (eigenvalue = 1.31;  $\alpha = 0.57$ ): *what you thought was morally right, what would benefit other people the most, and whether you would feel good about it.*<sup>5</sup> Combined, these items range from zero to six, where higher values indicate moral and altruistic concern (mean = 5.13).<sup>6</sup>

The battery of questions used to construct the deviation from workplace rules measure included nine variations of the following question: *In your work, have you done any of the following any time during the past month?* The following three items loaded onto a single factor (eigenvalue = 1.05;  $\alpha = 0.55$ ): *bent the rules in dealing with someone, covered for someone who had made a mistake, and bent the truth in what you told people.*<sup>7</sup> These three measures were combined into a summative scale, ranging from zero to three, with a mean value of 0.91. For each measure, a value of one indicates that a respondent had performed that

---

<sup>4</sup>Results are robust to varimax orthogonal rotation. Promax oblique rotation was used in the reported analyses because it allows for the factors to be correlated.

<sup>5</sup>Because “whether you would feel good about it” could, but does not necessarily indicate moral concern, I ran supplemental models that excluded the item. Results were robust. I chose to include the item in the reported models because: (1) it is consistent with social intuitionist understandings of morality (Haidt 2001) and (2) factors with fewer than three factors are not recommended (Costello and Osborne 2005).

The Cronbach’s  $\alpha$  for this item is lower than the ideal 0.70 criterion. This is to be expected, however, as  $\alpha$  coefficients are highly contingent on the number of items included in a scale (Pett et al. 2003; Zeller 2001). The scale contains the minimum number of items needed for scale construction (three). As an empirical check for robustness, however, I predicted each outcome separately. For each outcome, the effect of religious orthodoxy is significant and positive. The appendix includes a table with separate models predicting each item used to construct the four dependent variables.

<sup>6</sup>Because this item is highly left-skewed, in supplementary analyses, I used binary logistic regression analysis to model a dichotomous transformation of it, where a value of one indicates a score higher than the mean. The results are robust to this alternative scoring; the effects of religious orthodoxy remain significant and positive.

<sup>7</sup>Again, because of the small number of items in the scale, the lower  $\alpha$  is to be expected (Pett et al. 2003). To check for robustness, I estimated models for each item separately. See table A1.

act with the last month. Thus, higher values indicate increased deviation from workplace rules.

The items used to construct the work orientation scales were a series of questions that asked: *How much does each of the following motivate you to work hard and do your work really well; would you say it motivates you a great deal, a little, or none?* These items were recoded such that a *great deal* equals two, a *little* one, and *none* zero. Exploratory factor analysis of the nine items yielded two factors with eigenvalues greater than one, both of which met the straight-line, scree plot criterion. The following items loaded together onto a factor that I label *extrinsic orientation: fear of losing your job, being paid more money, the hope of a promotion or award* (eigenvalue = 1.66;  $\alpha = 0.67$ ). Combined into a summative scale, extrinsic orientation ranges from zero to six, with a mean of 2.95.

Three items loaded onto a factor that I label *nonextrinsic orientation: trying to fulfill your own potential, a supportive working environment, and knowing you've helped someone* (eigenvalue = 1.37;  $\alpha = 0.62$ ). Combined into a summative scale, nonextrinsic orientation ranges from zero to six, with a mean of 4.76.<sup>8</sup> I label this factor *nonextrinsic* rather than *intrinsic* orientation, because scholars disagree on how interpersonal relations at work and altruistic concerns should be labeled. For instance, Ginzberg et al. (1951) and Taris and Feij (2001) argue that interpersonal concerns are distinct from extrinsic and intrinsic concerns. Herzog (1982) suggests that interpersonal concerns can be considered intrinsic work orientations, while Kalleberg (1977) labels them extrinsic. Regardless of the labels applied, in studies that parsed out subcategories of work values beyond extrinsic and intrinsic, “material rewards such as pay and job security were always found to be distinct from self-actualizing work features” (Johnson et al. 2007: 293). Thus, the clustering of work orientation variables into extrinsic and nonextrinsic items is consistent with prior research. Table 1 provides descriptive statistics for all variables used in the analyses, including the factor-based scales used as outcomes.

### **Independent Variables**

The key predictors in the analyses include: religious orthodoxy, religious tradition, and attendance at religious services. Because the questions asked in this article were inspired by Davis and Robinson’s moral cosmology theory, the religious orthodoxy index used in the analyses is based on their prior operationalization of the concept. Note that the conceptualization and operationalization of religious orthodoxy in this article (and the approach taken by Davis and Robinson [e.g., 1999a, 1999b]) is distinct from the concept *Christian*

---

<sup>8</sup>Because nonextrinsic motivation is negatively skewed, I conducted supplemental analyses using binary logistic regression to model a dichotomous version of the outcome, where values above the mean are scored as one. The results are robust as the effect of religious orthodoxy remains significant and positive.

TABLE 1 Descriptive Statistics ( $N = 1,479$ )

	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Description
<b>Dependent variables</b>					
Workplace decision-making	5.13	1.17	0	6	Factor-based, summative scale of three items. Higher values indicate moral and altruistic concerns <sup>a</sup>
Deviation from workplace rules	0.91	0.99	0	3	Factor-based, summative scale of three items. Higher values indicate higher levels of deviation
Extrinsic work orientation	2.95	1.77	0	6	Factor-based, summative scale of three items
Nonextrinsic work orientation	4.76	1.43	0	6	Factor-based, summative scale of three items
<b>Independent variables</b>					
Religious orthodoxy	6.83	2.47	1	10	Factor-based, mean scale of three items. Higher values indicate higher levels of orthodoxy
Attendance	3.10	2.11	0	6	Higher values indicate higher levels of attendance
<i>Religious tradition</i>					
Evangelical	0.24		0	1	1 = affiliated
Protestant					
Mainline	0.23		0	1	1 = affiliated
Protestant					
Black Protestant	0.06		0	1	1 = affiliated
Residual	0.05		0	1	1 = affiliated
Protestant					
Catholic	0.27		0	1	1 = affiliated
Jewish	0.02		0	1	1 = affiliated
Other religion	0.07		0	1	1 = affiliated
Unaffiliated	0.06		0	1	1 = affiliated
<i>Controls</i>					
Work Identity	2.10	0.71	0	3	Importance of work for basic sense of worth
Calling	0.33		0	1	1 indicates that work is understood as a religious calling
Political conservatism	3.37	1.44	1	6	Higher values indicate political conservatism
Married	0.69	0.46	0	1	1 = married
Age	40.97	12.61	18	85	In years
Female	0.5		0	1	1 = yes

Continued

TABLE 1 *Continued*

	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Description
Black	0.09		0	1	1 = yes
Other race	0.03		0	1	1 = yes
<High School	0.10		0	1	1 = highest degree obtained
High School	0.29		0	1	1 = highest degree obtained
Tech/business degree	0.09		0	1	1 = highest degree obtained
Some college	0.21		0	1	1 = highest degree obtained
College degree	0.31		0	1	1 = highest degree obtained
Part-time	0.22		0	1	1 = yes
Private sector	0.68		0	1	1 = sector worked in
Nonprofit sector	0.10		0	1	1 = sector worked in
Public sector	0.19		0	1	1 = sector worked in
Other sector	0.03		0	1	1 = sector worked in
Workplace control	2.89	1.71	0	5	Summative scale of five items
Self-employed	0.14		0	1	1 = yes

Source: Economic Values Survey.

<sup>a</sup>See text for descriptions of scale construction and individual items.

*orthodoxy* developed in the psychology of religion (Fullerton and Hunsberger 1982; Laythe et al. 2002; Mavor et al. 2011) and used in recent attempts to categorize Christian congregations by level of orthodoxy (Reimer 2011) in two important respects.<sup>9</sup> First, Davis and Robinson's conceptualization applies to all faiths in the Abrahamic tradition. Thus, studies rooted in moral cosmology theory must use measures of orthodoxy that do not include questions about specific doctrinal elements (e.g., believing in heaven and hell or understanding Jesus Christ as savior). Second, Davis and Robinson understand political attitudes as correlated with, but distinct from, religious orthodoxy. Thus, measures of orthodoxy in this tradition should not include items concerning political issues such as same-sex marriage.

The measure of religious orthodoxy used here consists of three components, all of which load onto a single factor (eigenvalue = 1.30;  $\alpha = 0.73$ ). The first is biblical authority, an item used consistently by Davis and Robinson. This concept was constructed by combining the following two questions: *In your opinion, is each of the following statements about the Bible true or false? (1) Everything in the Bible should be taken literally, word for word. (2) The Bible is the*

<sup>9</sup>Davis and Robinson's conceptualization of religious orthodoxy is also distinct from right-wing authoritarianism, which is defined as a constellation of three attitude clusters (authoritarian submission, authoritarian aggression, and conventionalism) and operationalized using a battery of items tapping very specific beliefs and attitudes (Altemeyer 1996).

*inspired word of God*. Following Davis and Robinson (1999a, 1999b, 2001), respondents who agreed that the Bible should be taken literally were given the maximum score of 10 on the biblical authority measure, indicating an orthodox conception of biblical authority. Respondents who agreed that the Bible is the inspired word of God and disagreed that the Bible should be interpreted literally were given a score of 5.5 on biblical authority.<sup>10</sup> Finally, respondents who disagreed with both of these statements were given the minimum value of one (table 2).<sup>11</sup>

The second component of my orthodoxy measure taps the centrality of God in life. Davis and Robinson used a related measure in a number of their studies that asked whether “life is meaningful only because God exists” (1999a, 1999b, 2001). This item is: *How important is each of the following to your basic sense of worth as a person: absolutely essential, very important, somewhat important, not very important? Your relation to God*. Respondents who answered *absolutely essential* were given the maximum value of 10, *very important* seven, *somewhat important* four, and *not very important* one. Finally, the index includes an item unique to the Economic Values Survey, which represents an important dimension of religious orthodoxy: a propensity for seeking direction from divine sources. The item asks: *when you attend religious services, how important is each of the following to you: very important, fairly important, not very important, or not important at all? Getting divine guidance in making decisions*. Responses of *very important* were rescored to 10, *fairly important* to seven, *not very important* to four, and *not important at all* to one.

Respondents were assigned orthodoxy scores by averaging their responses to these items. Thus, religious orthodoxy is a factor-based, mean scale that ranges from one to 10, with higher values indicating higher levels of orthodoxy (mean = 6.83).<sup>12</sup> It was necessary to take the mean of these items rather than summing them because only respondents who attended religious services were asked the third item (divine guidance). Thus, the religious orthodoxy value of those who do not attend services is derived from summing their scores on biblical authority and centrality of God and dividing by two. For those who do attend services, the orthodoxy score is the mean value of the three items

<sup>10</sup>Of the 599 respondents who agreed that the Bible should be interpreted literally, 99 percent agreed that it was also the inspired word of God. In contrast, 61 percent of those who agreed that the Bible was the inspired word of God disagreed that it should be interpreted literally. These figures support the notion that these items represent degrees of orthodoxy.

<sup>11</sup>Descriptive statistics show that Jewish respondents ( $N = 32$ ) understood this item as applicable to themselves, as 31.3 percent of Jews agreed that the Bible was the “inspired word of God” and 3 percent said that the Bible should be read literally.

<sup>12</sup>This mean value is remarkably similar to the mean on Davis and Robinson’s index of religious orthodoxy in their analysis of the 1991 General Social Survey (1996a). On a 13-point scale, they found that Americans’ mean score was 9.97.

TABLE 2 Measurement Items for Religious Orthodoxy ( $N = 1,479$ )

Item	Response	Score	Percent
In your opinion, is each of the following statements about the Bible true or false?	Everything in the Bible should be taken literally, word for word	10	32
	The Bible is the inspired word of God	5.5	53
	Disagreement with both	1	14
How important is your relation to God to your basic sense of worth as a person?	Absolutely essential	10	42
	Very important	7	33
	Somewhat important	4	15
	Not very important	1	9
When you attend religious services, how important to you is getting divine guidance in making decisions?	Very important	10	33
	Fairly important	7	30
	Not very important	4	14
	Not at all important	1	5
	Does not attend services	—	17

included in the scale.<sup>13</sup> As a check for robustness, in supplemental analyses, I dropped respondents who were not asked the divine guidance question (and thus who did not attend religious services). The effects of religious orthodoxy held in all models.

In order to more fully examine the effects of religion on the workplace, I include measures of belonging and behaving in addition to religious orthodoxy (Steensland et al. 2000). Religious tradition was operationalized following Steensland et al.'s (2000) denominational classification scheme as rigorously as the data allowed. Respondents were coded into one of the eight categories: evangelical Protestant, mainline Protestant, black Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, other, unaffiliated, and residual Protestant.<sup>14</sup> I also include an ordinal measure of attendance at religious services, ranging from never attending to attending more than once per week.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>13</sup>Because one of my items (seeking divine guidance) is a unique measure of orthodoxy, in addition to assessing the scale's internal reliability using EFA, I tried each of the three measures separately as proxies of religious orthodoxy for each of the four outcomes. In all cases, the effects were in the same direction. In only three of the 12 models, did one of the items fail to reach significance at the .05 level.

<sup>14</sup>A relatively large number of respondents (5 percent) answered "Protestant" when asked for their religious affiliation and then answered either "Other Protestant," "Protestant, Unspecified," or refused when asked about their specific denomination. Since this group comprised a full 5 percent of the sample and I knew some information about their religious tradition, that they were Protestants, I decided to keep them in the sample. In supplemental analyses, I dropped residual Protestants. Results were robust.

<sup>15</sup>In additional analyses, I tried both a binary measure of regular attendance (attending at least one per week) and a transformation of the ordinal variable into number of services attended per year. The findings are robust to these alternative measures.

In addition to these religion measures, I include a number of work-related covariates. In particular, I include measures of full- versus part-time employment, self-employment, sector worked in, and self-direction in the workplace. Self-direction is a summative scale derived from five items that ask about respondents' levels of control in the workplace (Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.76$ ). These items ask, *In your own work, do you have a lot of control over the following or not?* and include the following: *organizing your daily schedule, setting your long-range objectives, making major day-to-day decisions, deciding how many hours to work, and allocating tasks to other people*. The scale ranges from zero to five, with a mean of 2.89. Beyond these features of work, I include measures of work identity and thinking of work as a calling in the full models. This is to account for the possibility that religious orthodoxy influences work orientations by defining work as a divine mandate and/or by increasing the salience of work in one's life. Work identity is measured with an item that asks how important work is for one's sense of worth. Calling is measured with an item that asks respondents whether they agree that "God has called [them] into the line of work [they are] in."

Finally, I include a series of control variables including political conservatism, marital status, age, gender, race, and education.<sup>16</sup> The average respondent is slightly younger than 41. Females account for 50 percent of the sample. Eighty-eight percent of the respondents identify as white, 9 percent as black, and 3 percent as another race. Slightly more than two-thirds of the respondents were married at the time of their interview. Ninety percent of the sample has at least a high school diploma, while 31 percent has at least a college degree.

For all four outcomes, I estimated three ordered logistic regression models.<sup>17</sup> The first includes only the control variables. The second adds measures of religious believing, behaving, and belonging. The third adds measures of thinking of work as a calling and work identity to examine whether religion influences work through these mechanisms.

## RESULTS

Does religious orthodoxy shape the way adherents go about their work? table 3 presents results from ordered logistic regression models predicting (1) concern for the well-being of others and morality in workplace decision-making and (2) deviation from workplace rules. From moral cosmology theory

---

<sup>16</sup>Family income was included in supplemental analyses. It only reached significance in one model (extrinsic motivation:  $b = -0.004$ ,  $p < .05$ ) and never altered the religion effects. Because a full 12 percent of respondents were missing, income is excluded from the models presented here.

<sup>17</sup>For each outcome, I also tried OLS models. Results were robust for each outcome.



TABLE 3 Ordered Logistic Regression Models Predicting (1) Workplace Decision-Making and (2) Deviation from Workplace Rules

	Moral and altruistic decision-making at work			Deviation from workplace rules		
Religious orthodoxy		0.13*** (4.73)	0.12*** (4.13)		-0.09*** (-3.34)	-0.09** (-3.11)
Attendance		-0.01 (-0.22)	-0.00 (-0.10)		-0.04 (-1.42)	-0.05 (-1.51)
Mainline Protestant <sup>a</sup>		-0.08 (-0.52)	-0.08 (-0.54)		0.10 (0.67)	0.10 (0.70)
Black Protestant <sup>a</sup>		-0.16 (-0.46)	-0.18 (-0.52)		-0.23 (-0.66)	-0.21 (-0.61)
Residual Protestant <sup>a</sup>		0.03 (0.11)	0.03 (0.13)		0.18 (0.74)	0.18 (0.74)
Catholic <sup>a</sup>		-0.13 (-0.86)	-0.14 (-0.95)		0.44** (3.07)	0.45** (3.11)
Jewish <sup>a</sup>		-0.29 (-0.81)	-0.29 (-0.81)		-0.43 (-1.24)	-0.43 (-1.23)
Other religion <sup>a</sup>		-0.19 (-0.87)	-0.20 (-0.90)		0.13 (0.56)	0.14 (0.61)
Unaffiliated <sup>a</sup>		-0.05 (-0.20)	-0.06 (-0.23)		-0.31 (-1.24)	-0.30 (-1.23)
Work identity			0.16* (2.20)			-0.07 (-0.98)
Calling			0.05 (0.41)			0.03 (0.24)
Political conservatism	0.11** (3.05)	0.05 (1.33)	0.05 (1.34)	-0.15*** (-4.32)	-0.10** (-2.79)	-0.10** (-2.80)
Married	-0.12 (-1.11)	-0.16 (-1.37)	-0.15 (-1.27)	-0.18 (-1.61)	-0.14 (-1.28)	-0.15 (-1.33)
Age	0.01 (1.82)	0.01 (1.48)	0.01 (1.28)	-0.01** (-2.66)	-0.01* (-2.30)	-0.01* (-2.24)
Female	0.51*** (4.96)	0.42*** (3.93)	0.42*** (4.01)	-0.32** (-3.14)	-0.24* (-2.34)	-0.25* (-2.39)
Black <sup>b</sup>	-0.08 (-0.43)	-0.15 (-0.50)	-0.16 (-0.55)	-0.11 (-0.60)	0.25 (0.87)	0.25 (0.85)
Other race <sup>b</sup>	0.03 (0.11)	0.02 (0.07)	-0.01 (-0.05)	-0.37 (-1.28)	-0.50 (-1.70)	-0.50 (-1.68)
<High school <sup>c</sup>	-0.00 (-0.02)	-0.04 (-0.24)	-0.05 (-0.25)	-0.13 (-0.72)	-0.10 (-0.54)	-0.10 (-0.52)

Continued

TABLE 3 *Continued*

	Moral and altruistic decision-making at work			Deviation from workplace rules		
Tech/business degree <sup>c</sup>	0.08 (0.43)	0.08 (0.42)	0.08 (0.41)	0.14 (0.76)	0.11 (0.56)	0.11 (0.59)
Some college <sup>c</sup>	0.29* (2.00)	0.31* (2.18)	0.30* (2.10)	0.24 (1.68)	0.24 (1.71)	0.25 (1.74)
College degree <sup>c</sup>	0.32* (2.36)	0.50*** (3.50)	0.49*** (3.37)	0.10 (0.74)	0.02 (0.12)	0.02 (0.15)
Part-time	-0.38** (-3.02)	-0.38** (-3.02)	-0.35** (-2.69)	-0.18 (-1.46)	-0.19 (-1.49)	-0.21 (-1.61)
Nonprofit sector <sup>d</sup>	0.25 (1.41)	0.23 (1.29)	0.21 (1.17)	0.14 (0.86)	0.16 (0.95)	0.15 (0.90)
Public sector <sup>d</sup>	0.36** (2.59)	0.37** (2.62)	0.37** (2.58)	-0.04 (-0.29)	-0.03 (-0.24)	-0.03 (-0.24)
Other sector <sup>d</sup>	-0.60* (-2.10)	-0.66* (-2.32)	-0.66* (-2.31)	-0.19 (-0.60)	-0.23 (-0.70)	-0.22 (-0.68)
Workplace control	0.08* (2.35)	0.09** (2.59)	0.07* (2.16)	0.14*** (4.33)	0.15*** (4.39)	0.15*** (4.49)
Self-employed	0.03 (0.18)	-0.02 (-0.10)	-0.04 (-0.22)	-0.55*** (-3.35)	-0.50** (-3.00)	-0.49** (-2.96)
Observations	1,479	1,479	1,479	1,479	1,479	1,479
Pseudo-R <sup>2</sup>	0.022	0.032	0.033	0.025	0.036	0.036

Notes:  $z$  statistics in parentheses.

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

Reference categories: <sup>a</sup>evangelical Protestant; <sup>b</sup>white; <sup>c</sup>high school degree; <sup>d</sup>private sector.

(Davis and Robinson 2006), I had derived the expectation that the religiously orthodox would be more moralistic and altruistic than others in their workplace decision-making. The results support this hypothesis. Indeed, orthodox religionists are more likely than others to report that morality and concern for others are important factors when making tough decisions at work. This effect holds even when controlling for work identity and thinking of work as a calling. Also, as expected, attending religious services has no significant effect on workplace decision-making. A Wald test for joint significance indicates that, collectively, the effect of nonevangelical faiths is no different from evangelical faiths ( $\chi^2 = 1.96$ ,  $df = 7$ ,  $p = .96$ ).

Table 3 also presents results from the models that predict deviation from workplace rules. I had hypothesized that the strict side of religious orthodoxy would cause individuals to adhere more closely than others to workplace rules. Again, the results support this hypothesis. Net of background and work characteristics, religious orthodoxy is associated with lower levels of deviation from workplace rules. This effect holds even when work identity and work as a calling are included in the model. Attending religious services has no discernible effect on rule compliance. Catholics stand out as more likely to deviate from workplace rules than evangelical Protestants. Finally, a Wald test shows that the joint effect of nonevangelical faith traditions is significant ( $\chi^2 = 20.54$ ,  $df = 7$ ,  $p < .01$ ), indicating that evangelicals do stand out on this dimension.

Table 4 presents the results of ordered logistic regression models predicting work orientations. From moral cosmology theory, I had derived the hypothesis that religious orthodoxy would be associated with higher levels of nonextrinsic work orientations. The findings support this hypothesis. Net of all other covariates in the model, the religiously orthodox are more likely than others to report that nonextrinsic rewards, like helping others and fulfilling their own potential, motivate them to work hard. Further, despite the exploratory nature of the models that examine the relationship between orthodoxy and extrinsic work orientations, the relationship is found to be significant and positive.

In order to examine whether the relationship between religious orthodoxy and higher levels of both nonextrinsic and extrinsic work orientations is due to its association with thinking of work as a calling or defining work as important, the final models in table 4 introduce measures of work identity and work as a calling. While the effects of both work identity and viewing work as a calling are significant, they account for only a small portion of the religious orthodoxy effects. Their inclusion does little to alter the orthodoxy effect in the extrinsic orientation models and they only partially mediate orthodoxy's effect on non-extrinsic orientations.

Beyond orthodoxy, I hypothesized that evangelical Protestants would be less likely than affiliates of other religious traditions to be motivated to work hard by extrinsic factors. The results fail to bear this out. A Wald test for joint

TABLE 4 Ordered Logistic Regression Models Predicting Work Orientations

	Extrinsic work orientation		Nonextrinsic work orientation			
Religious orthodoxy		0.10*** (4.10)	0.11*** (4.09)		0.13*** (4.83)	0.08** (2.96)
Attendance Mainline Protestant <sup>a</sup>		-0.06* (-2.04)	-0.04 (-1.54)		-0.07* (-2.28)	-0.06* (-2.10)
Black Protestant <sup>a</sup>		0.08 (0.59)	0.07 (0.53)		0.13 (0.87)	0.11 (0.75)
Residual Protestant <sup>a</sup>		-0.18 (-0.57)	-0.22 (-0.69)		-0.12 (-0.34)	-0.16 (-0.47)
Catholic <sup>a</sup>		-0.25 (-1.11)	-0.24 (-1.06)		-0.10 (-0.44)	-0.07 (-0.32)
Jewish <sup>a</sup>		0.26 (1.94)	0.25 (1.85)		-0.29* (-2.07)	-0.35* (-2.51)
Other religion <sup>a</sup>		-0.22 (-0.61)	-0.23 (-0.63)		-0.50 (-1.40)	-0.51 (-1.44)
Unaffiliated <sup>a</sup>		0.24 (1.15)	0.20 (1.00)		-0.05 (-0.22)	-0.06 (-0.25)
Work identity		0.35 (1.52)	0.34 (1.48)		-0.10 (-0.40)	-0.17 (-0.69)
Calling			0.19** (2.81)			0.49*** (6.74)
Political conservatism	0.03 (0.78)	0.01 (0.26)	-0.27* (-2.47)	0.05 (1.34)	-0.00 (-0.01)	0.32** (2.74)
Married		0.01 (0.39)			-0.00 (-0.01)	-0.00 (-0.11)
Age	-0.08 (-0.78)	-0.08 (-0.75)	-0.07 (-0.71)	0.21 (1.93)	0.20 (1.82)	0.26* (2.37)
Female	-0.04*** (-9.86)	-0.04*** (-9.76)	-0.04*** (-9.83)	-0.01 (-1.63)	-0.01 (-1.95)	-0.01** (-2.72)
Black <sup>b</sup>	-0.03 (-0.30)	-0.08 (-0.83)	-0.08 (-0.81)	0.25* (2.48)	0.16 (1.60)	0.20 (1.93)
Other race <sup>b</sup>	0.58*** (3.51)	0.74** (2.78)	0.74** (2.78)	0.10 (0.60)	0.05 (0.20)	0.06 (0.22)
<High school <sup>c</sup>	0.90** (3.19)	0.82** (2.84)	0.81** (2.82)	0.27 (0.94)	0.36 (1.25)	0.25 (0.86)
	-0.07 (-0.41)	-0.12 (-0.71)	-0.14 (-0.80)	0.04 (0.23)	0.02 (0.10)	0.01 (0.08)

Tech/business degree <sup>c</sup>	0.12 (0.65)	0.11 (0.58)	0.08 (0.44)	0.65*** (3.43)	0.68*** (3.55)	0.67*** (3.47)
Some college <sup>c</sup>	0.10 (0.78)	0.11 (0.86)	0.10 (0.78)	0.51*** (3.70)	0.58*** (4.19)	0.57*** (4.06)
College degree <sup>c</sup>	-0.21 (-1.63)	-0.10 (-0.77)	-0.10 (-0.76)	0.59*** (4.50)	0.80*** (5.80)	0.76*** (5.49)
Part-time	-0.51*** (-4.30)	-0.52*** (-4.32)	-0.47*** (-3.91)	-0.40** (-3.28)	-0.38** (-3.09)	-0.27* (-2.18)
Nonprofit sector <sup>d</sup>	-0.42** (-2.64)	-0.39* (-2.49)	-0.31 (-1.95)	0.19 (1.12)	0.18 (1.10)	0.11 (0.63)
Public sector <sup>d</sup>	-0.44*** (-3.54)	-0.43*** (-3.40)	-0.40** (-3.14)	0.39** (2.95)	0.41** (3.04)	0.39** (2.86)
Other sector <sup>d</sup>	-0.75* (-2.56)	-0.84** (-2.83)	-0.83** (-2.80)	-0.47 (-1.57)	-0.57 (-1.87)	-0.64* (-2.06)
Workplace control	-0.06* (-1.97)	-0.05 (-1.72)	-0.07* (-2.12)	0.20*** (6.09)	0.20*** (6.20)	0.16*** (4.97)
Self-employed	-0.73*** (-4.77)	-0.74*** (-4.80)	-0.74*** (-4.80)	-0.45** (-2.83)	-0.48** (-2.98)	-0.57*** (-3.50)
Observations	1,479	1,479	1,479	1,479	1,479	1,479
Pseudo-R <sup>2</sup>	0.045	0.050	0.052	0.033	0.042	0.055

Notes:  $z$  statistics in parentheses.

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

Reference categories: <sup>a</sup>evangelical Protestant; <sup>b</sup>white; <sup>c</sup>high school degree; <sup>d</sup>private sector.

significance shows that the effect of evangelical Protestantism does not differ significantly from the collective effect of nonevangelical faiths when it comes to being motivated by extrinsic rewards such as money and the hope of a promotion ( $\chi^2 = 10.41$ ,  $df = 7$ ,  $p = .17$ ). However, the results are somewhat different for nonextrinsic orientations, with Catholics being less likely than evangelical Protestants to be motivated by nonextrinsic factors.<sup>18</sup> Further, the joint effect of nonevangelical faith traditions approaches significance ( $\chi^2 = 13.98$ ,  $df = 7$ ,  $p = .052$ ).

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Through a thorough analysis of the effects of religious orthodoxy on a number of work-related outcomes, this article has made two important contributions to the sociologies of religion and work as well as to the field of organizational behavior. I first asked whether moral cosmology theory applied not only to political attitudes but also to one of the most important spheres of everyday life: the workplace. I found that, indeed, religious orthodoxy is a powerful predictor of work decision-making, behaviors, and orientations. Further, my findings support moral cosmology theory's claim that religious orthodoxy is characterized by both a caring and a strict side. In the workplace, orthodoxy's caring side shows up in the form of thinking about the welfare of others when making tough decisions. Its strict side shows up as well, as evidenced by orthodox religionists' tendency to adhere closely to workplace rules. While applying moral cosmology theory to the workplace marks an important advance, much work remains to be done. To date, outside the political sphere, moral cosmology theory has been applied to only a few dimensions of social life. Future research could examine spheres of everyday life beyond the workplace and child-rearing (Starks and Robinson 2007).

Second, I sought to examine whether religion serves only a therapeutic role in the workplace, as some have suggested (Sullivan 2006; Wuthnow 1994), or whether the religiously orthodox actually go about their work differently than others. In this respect, this article's most important finding is that religious orthodoxy is a powerful predictor of not only work orientations, but also decision-making and behaviors. While religion may indeed help adherents to find meaning in their work (Wuthnow 1994) and to deal with the stress

---

<sup>18</sup>In supplemental analyses, I estimated models that included the religious tradition dummies and excluded religious orthodoxy for each outcome. Overall, the results hold, although the following differences become significant: for the deviation outcome, "other religion" becomes significant and positive. For the nonextrinsic motivation outcome, the Jewish and Catholic effects become significant and negative.

that accompanies employment (Sullivan 2006), it also guides them as they go about their work. The strong and consistent findings reported here indicate that scholars of religion and organizations may do well to examine religious orthodoxy as a key component of religion. Without a measure of religious orthodoxy, this study would have been yet another that found only limited effects of religion on work. (Indeed, my hypothesis that evangelical Protestants would be less extrinsically motivated than others was not supported, and I found only limited effects of attendance.) In this respect, I echo Tracey's (2012) suggestion that management scholars would do well to seriously engage with the sociology of religion to identify the key components of religion that might matter for organizational behavior. Doing so would do much to further our understanding of the role of the sacred in secular organizations.

Like any study, this one is not without its limitations. Most obviously, in order to analyze such nuanced measures of religion and work, it was necessary to rely on somewhat dated data. While newer data would certainly be preferable, using older data to examine the relationship between religion and work is less problematic than doing so for more politically charged outcomes, such as social and political attitudes. Much has changed since the 1990s in American political culture; however, political discussions of work are generally limited. The idea that everyone has the obligation to work (e.g., in discussions of welfare policy [see Steensland 2008]) is one prominent exception, as are the media's recent discussions of "golden parachutes," greed, and corporate scandals. If anything, however, this type of discourse should strengthen the association between religion and work, as it frames work in moral terms. Further, the fact that religious leaders tend not to discuss work explicitly (Wuthnow 1994) suggests that the discursive environment linking religion and work has likely not undergone dramatic change. Nevertheless, it would be worthwhile to examine religion and work with newer data. While no publicly available data set provides the nuanced measures of both religion and work that appear in the Economic Values Survey, an examination of other data sets that would allow for an analysis of some aspects of religion and some aspects of work would be a valuable addition to the literature. One potential candidate is the 2006 ISSP Work Orientation module.

There are a number of other ways scholars could build upon this research. Perhaps most importantly, while I have shown that the religiously orthodox differ in their approach to work, I have not shown when and under what conditions their orthodox disposition matters. We still have much to learn about the cognitive and social psychological processes that connect religion and work. Indeed, something of a tension has emerged in the extant literature between theories of religious orthodoxy that emphasize worldviews and moral orientations (Hunter 1991; Davis and Robinson 2006) and a growing theoretical approach that stresses the contingency of religion's effects on the social world (Chaves 2010; Hart 1996; Read and Eagle 2011; Regnerus and Smith

1998; Weaver and Agle 2002). Is religious orthodoxy an identity that needs to be cued in order to become causally efficacious (Chaves 2010; Weaver and Agle 2002)? Or is it a unique worldview that consistently colors the perception of adherents, a lens through which orthodox religionists view the world and lead their lives (Davis and Robinson 2006; Hunter 1991)? While this debate seems quite abstract, its implications are not limited to social theory. Indeed, its resolution is crucial to understanding the complex relationship between religion and work.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This article has benefited from much sharp and insightful feedback. In particular, I would like to thank Brian Steensland, Brian Powell, Patricia McManus, Rob Robinson, Aaron Ponce, and Mike Vasseur. Useful comments were also provided by participants of Indiana Sociology's Politics, Economy, and Culture workshop, as well as the editor and three anonymous reviewers.



APPENDIX

TABLE A1 Regression Models Predicting Outcomes Separately

	Bases of workplace decision-making			Deviation from workplace rules			Extrinsic orientations			Nonextrinsic orientations		
	What would benefit others	What is morally right	Whether you would feel good about it	Bent the rules in dealing with someone	Covered for someone who made mistake	Bent the truth in what you told people	Fear of losing your job	Being paid more money	Hope of a promotion or award	Trying to fulfill your own potential	Supportive working environment	Knowing you have helped someone
Religious orthodoxy	0.12*** (4.08)	0.11** (2.86)	0.08** (2.60)	-0.12*** (-3.62)	-0.04 (-1.29)	-0.09** (-2.73)	0.06* (2.01)	0.12*** (4.32)	0.07** (2.65)	0.09** (2.77)	0.11*** (3.91)	0.12*** (3.76)
Observations	1479	1479	1479	1479	1479	1479	1479	1479	1479	1479	1479	1479
Pseudo-R <sup>2</sup>	0.041	0.072	0.029	0.071	0.045	0.041	0.058	0.061	0.067	0.072	0.041	0.063

Notes: (a) Models predicting deviation from workplace rules are binary logistic regression models; all others are ordered logistic models. (b) All models include the following covariates: church attendance, religious tradition, political conservatism, marital status, age, gender, race, education, part-time work status, work sector, self-direction at work, and self-employed status. (c) z-statistics in parentheses. (d) \* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

## REFERENCES

- Altemeyer, Bob. 1996. *The Authoritarian Specter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Blouin, David, and Robert V. Robinson. 2007. "What Makes People Good? The Social Bases of Compassion and Compassionate Public Policy in the United States." Joint annual meetings of the Midwest Sociological Society and the North Central Sociological Association, Chicago, IL.
- Bridges, Judith S. 1989. "Sex Differences in Occupational Values." *Sex Roles* 20, no. 3/4: 205–11.
- Chaves, Mark. 2010. "SSSR Presidential Address: Rain Dances in the Dry Season: Overcoming the Religious Congruence Fallacy." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 49, no. 1:1–14.
- Chusmir, Leonard S., and Christine S. Koberg. 1988. "Religion and Attitudes toward Work: A New Look at an Old Question." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 9, no. 3: 251–62.
- Clydesdale, Timothy T. 1999. "Toward Understanding the Role of Bible Beliefs and Higher Education in American Attitudes toward Eradicating Poverty, 1964–1996." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 38, no. 1:103–18.
- Costello, Anna B., and Jason W. Osborne. 2005. "Best Practices in Exploratory Factor Analysis: Four Recommendations for Getting the Most From Your Analysis." *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation* 10, no. 7:1–9.
- Davidson, James C., and David P. Caddell. 1994. "Religion and the Meaning of Work." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 33, no. 2:135–47.
- Davis, Nancy J., and Robert V. Robinson. 1996a. "Are the Rumors of War Exaggerated? Religious Orthodoxy and Moral Progressivism in America." *American Journal of Sociology* 102, no. 3:756–87.
- . 1996b. "Religious Orthodoxy in American Society: The Myth of a Monolithic Camp." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 35, no. 3:229–45.
- . 1999a. "Religious Cosmologies, Individualism and Politics in Italy." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 38, no. 3:339–53.
- . 1999b. "Their Brothers' Keepers? Orthodox Religionists, Modernists, and Economic Justice in Europe." *American Journal of Sociology* 104, no. 6:1631–65.
- . 2001. "Theological Modernism, Cultural Libertarianism and Laissez-Faire Economics in Contemporary European Societies." *Sociology of Religion* 62, no. 1:23–50.
- . 2006. "The Egalitarian Face of Islamic Orthodoxy: Support for Islamic Law and Economic Justice in Seven Muslim-Majority Nations." *American Sociological Review* 71, no. 2:167–90.
- Drakopoulou Dodd, Sarah, and Paul Timothy Seaman. 1998. "Religion and Enterprise: An Introductory Exploration." *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 23, no. 1:71–86.
- Eccles, Jacquelynne S., and Allan Wigfield. 2002. "Motivational Beliefs, Values, and Goals." *Annual Review of Psychology* 53:109–32.
- Erickson, Bonnie H. 1996. "Culture, Class, and Connections." *American Journal of Sociology* 102, no. 1:217–51.
- Fullerton, J. Timothy, and Bruce Hunsberger. 1982. "A Unidimensional Measure of Christian Orthodoxy." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 21, no. 4:317–26.
- Ginzberg, Eli, Sol W. Ginsburg, Sidney Axelrad, and John L. Herma. 1951. *Occupational Choice: An Approach to a General Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Grant, Don, Kathleen O'Neil, and Laura Stephens. 2004. "Spirituality in the Workplace: New Empirical Directions in the Study of the Sacred." *Sociology of Religion* 65, no. 3: 265–83.

- Haidt, Jonathan. 2001. "The Emotional Dog and Its Rational Tail: A Social Intuitionist Approach to Moral Judgment." *Psychological Review* 108, no. 4:814–34.
- Hair, Joseph F., Rolph E. Anderson, Ronald L. Tatham, and William C. Black. 1995. *Multivariate Data Analysis with Readings*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hart, Stephen. 1996. *What Does the Lord Require? How American Christians Think about Economic Justice*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Herzog, A. Regula. 1982. "High School Seniors' Occupational Plans and Values: Trends in Sex Differences 1976 through 1980." *Sociology of Education* 55, no. 1:1–13.
- Hunter, James Davison. 1991. *Culture Wars: The Struggle to Define America*. Scranton, PA: Harper Collins.
- Johnson, Monica Kirkpatrick, Jeylan T. Mortimer, Jennifer C. Lee, and Michael J. Stern. 2007. "Judgments about Work." *Work and Occupations* 34, no. 3:290–317.
- Junisbai, Azamat K. 2010. "Understanding Economic Justice Attitudes in Two Countries: Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan." *Social Forces* 88, no. 4:1677–702.
- Kalleberg, Arne L. 1977. "Work Values and Job Rewards: A Theory of Job Satisfaction." *American Sociological Review* 42, no. 1:124–43.
- Kalleberg, Arne L., and Karyn A. Loscocco. 1983. "Aging, Values, and Rewards: Explaining Age Differences in Job Satisfaction." *American Sociological Review* 48, no. 1: 78–90.
- Keister, Lisa A. 2008. "Conservative Protestants and Wealth: How Religion Perpetuates Asset Poverty." *American Journal of Sociology* 113, no. 5:1237–71.
- Laythe, Brian, Deborah G. Finkel, Robert G. Bringle, and Lee A. Kirkpatrick. 2002. "Fundamentalism as a Predictor of Prejudice: A Two-component Model." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 41, no. 4:623–35.
- Leuptow, Lloyd B. 1980. "Social Change and Sex-Role Change in Adolescent Orientations toward Life, Work and Achievement: 1965–1975." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 43, no. 1:48–59.
- Lindsay, D. Michael, and Bradley C. Smith. 2010. "Accounting by Faith: The Negotiated Logic of Elite Evangelicals' Workplace Decision-making." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 78, no. 3:721–49.
- Lindsay, Paul, and William E. Knox. 1984. "Continuity and Change in Work Values among Young Adults." *American Journal of Sociology* 89, no. 4:918–31.
- Loscocco, Karyn A., and Arne L. Kalleberg. 1988. "Age and the Meaning of Work in the United States and Japan." *Social Forces* 67, no. 2:337–56.
- Lynn, Monty, Michael Naughton, and Steve VanderVeen. 2009. "Faith at Work Scale (FWS): Justification, Development, and Validation of a Measure of Judaeo-Christian Religion in the Workplace." *Journal of Business Ethics* 85, no. 2:227–43.
- Marini, Margaret Mooney, Pi-Ling Fan, Erica Finley, and Ann M. Beutel. 1996. "Gender and Job Values." *Sociology of Education* 69, no. 1:49–65.
- Mavor, Kenneth I., Winnifred R. Louis, and Brian Laythe. 2011. "Religion, Prejudice, and Authoritarianism: Is RWA a Boon or Bane to the Psychology of Religion?" *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 50, no. 1:22–43.
- Mortimer, Jeylan T., and Donald Kumka. 1982. "A Further Examination of the Occupational Linkage Hypothesis." *Sociological Quarterly* 23, no. 1:3–16.
- MOW International Research Team. 1987. *The Meaning of Working*. London: Academic Press.
- Parboteeah, K. Praveen, Martin Hoegl, and John Cullen. 2009. "Religious Dimensions and Work Obligation: A Country Institutional Profile Model." *Human Relations* 62:119–48.
- Pedhazur, Elazar J., and Liora Pedhazur Schmelkin. 1991. *Measurement, Design, and Analysis: An Integrated Approach*. Hillside, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Pett, Marjorie A., Nancy R. Lackey, and John J. Sullivan. 2003. *Making Sense of Factor Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Powell, Brian, and Lala Carr Steelman. 1982. "Fundamentalism and Sexism: A Reanalysis of Peek and Brown." *Social Forces* 60, no. 4:1154–58.
- Preacher, Kristopher J., and Robert C. MacCallum. 2003. "Repairing Tom Swift's Electric Factor Analysis Machine." *Understanding Statistics* 2, no. 1:13–43.
- Pyle, Ralph E. 1993. "Faith and Commitment to the Poor: Theological Orientation and Support for Government Assistance Measures." *Sociology of Religion* 54, no. 4:385–401.
- Read, Jen'nan G., and David E. Eagle. 2011. "Intersecting Identities as a Source of Religious Incongruence." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 50, no. 1:116–32.
- Regnerus, Mark D., and Christian Smith. 1998. "Selective Deprivatization among American Religious Traditions: The Reversal of the Great Reversal." *Social Forces* 76, no. 4:1347–72.
- Reimer, Sam. 2011. "Orthodoxy Niches: Diversity in Congregational Orthodoxy among Three Protestant Denominations in the United States." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 50, no. 4:763–79.
- Roundy, Philip T. 2009. "Work and Religion: Artificial Dichotomy or Competing Interests?" *World Academy of Science, Engineering, and Technology* 55:827–33.
- Ryle, Robyn R., and Robert V. Robinson. 2006. "Ideology, Moral Cosmology, and Community in the United States." *City & Community* 5, no. 1:53–69.
- Sansone, Carol, and Judith M. Harackiewicz. 2000. *Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation: The Search for Optimal Motivation and Performance*. New York: Academic.
- Schor, Juliet B. 1991. *The Overworked American: The Unexpected Decline of Leisure*. New York: Basic Books.
- Senger, John. 1970. "The Religious Manager." *The Academy of Management Journal* 13:179–86.
- Starks, Brian, and Robert V. Robinson. 2007. "Moral Cosmology, Religion, and Adult Values for Children." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 46, no. 1:17–35.
- Steenland, Brian. 2008. *The Failed Welfare Revolution: America's Struggle over Guaranteed Income Policy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Steenland, Brian, Lynn D. Robinson, W. Bradford Wilcox, Jerry Z. Park, Mark D. Regnerus, and Robert D. Woodberry. 2000. "The Measure of American Religion: Toward Improving the State of the Art." *Social Forces* 79, no. 1:291–318.
- Sullivan, Susan Crawford. 2006. "The Work–Faith Connection for Low-Income Mothers: A Research Note." *Sociology of Religion* 67, no. 1:99–108.
- Taris, Rubin, and Jan A. Feij. 2001. "Longitudinal Examination of the Relationship between Supplies-Value Fit and Work Outcomes." *Applied Psychology* 50, no. 1:52–80.
- Tolbert, Pamela S., and Phyllis Moen. 1998. "Men's and Women's Definitions of "Good" Jobs." *Work and Occupations* 25, no. 2:168–94.
- Tracey, Paul. 2012. "Religion and Organization: A Critical Review of Current Trends and Future Directions." *The Academy of Management Annals* 6:1–48.
- Weaver, Gary R., and Bradley A. Agle. 2002. "Religiosity and Ethical Behavior in Organizations: A Symbolic Interactionist Perspective." *Academy of Management Review* 27, no. 1:77–97.
- Weber, Max. 1958[1920]. "Social Psychology of World Religions." *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, 267–302. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 1978[1924]. *Economy and Society*, edited by G. Roth, and C. Wittich. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 2002[1905]. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, translated by S. Kalberg. Los Angeles: Roxbury.

- Wuthnow, Robert. 1988. *The Restructuring of American Religion: Society and Faith since World War II*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . 1992. "Economic Values Survey." The Association of Religion Data Archives.
- . 1994. *God and Mammon in America*. New York: Free Press.
- Zeller, Richard A. 2001. "Reliability." In *Encyclopedia of Sociology*, edited by E. F. Borgatta, and R. J. V. Montgomery. New York: Macmillan.