

WILEY

SSSR

Social Affiliation from Religious Disaffiliation: Evidence of Selective Mixing Among Youth with No Religious Preference During the Transition to College

Author(s): Brandon Sepulvado, David Hachen, Michael Penta and Omar Lizardo

Source: *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, DECEMBER 2015, Vol. 54, No. 4 (DECEMBER 2015), pp. 833-841

Published by: Wiley on behalf of Society for the Scientific Study of Religion

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26651399>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Wiley and Society for the Scientific Study of Religion are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*

Social Affiliation from Religious Disaffiliation: Evidence of Selective Mixing Among Youth with No Religious Preference During the Transition to College

BRANDON SEPULVADO
*Department of Sociology
University of Notre Dame*

MICHAEL PENTA
*Department of Sociology
University of Notre Dame*

DAVID HACHEN
*Department of Sociology
University of Notre Dame*

OMAR LIZARDO
*Department of Sociology
University of Notre Dame*

The number of individuals claiming a nonreligious identity in the United States is on the rise, with one-fourth of the overall U.S. public failing to identify with any of the major religious traditions. In this article, we examine whether religious disaffiliation structures social network formation in a social context in which religious identification (and religiosity) is a salient cultural marker. We take advantage of unique data on the personal networks of youth transitioning into a college where religion is a culturally salient facet of everyday life. We hypothesize that, if there is nonreligious homophily, it may result from an attraction of the disaffiliated to each other or from a repulsion away from the religiously affiliated. Results of exponential random graph models suggest that both mechanisms may be at play. We find that religious “Nones” and affiliated non-Catholics are disproportionately more likely to form and maintain relationships with one another and are relatively less likely to form and maintain relationships with members of their respective religious out-groups. We close by outlining the implications of our findings and delineating promising avenues for future research.

Keywords: *religious Nones, social networks, homophily.*

INTRODUCTION

The number of individuals claiming a nonreligious identity in the United States is on the rise (Pew Research Center 2012, 2013). Almost one-fourth of the overall U.S. public and almost one-third of those under the age of 30 (so-called millennials) fail to identify with any of the major religious traditions (Hout and Fischer 2014; Pew Research Center 2013). Hout and Fischer (2002) propose that a good portion of the unaffiliated consists of persons who have developed a negative view of organized religion in the wake of the rise of an increasingly vocal “religious right” into the political arena during the 1990s. Increasing disaffiliation can thus be read as a way for these individuals to distance themselves from what are perceived to be intolerant social and moral views espoused by public religious figures. The demographic and attitudinal profile of persons who belong to the unaffiliated category is consistent with this hypothesis. For instance,

Acknowledgments: This work was made possible by a grant from the National Science Foundation (CBET-09-41565) and was sponsored by the Army Research Laboratory under Cooperative Agreement Number W911NF-09-2-0053.

Correspondence should be addressed to Brandon Sepulvado, Department of Sociology, University of Notre Dame, 810 Flanner Hall, Notre Dame, IN 46556. Email: bsepulva@nd.edu

Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion (2015) 54(4):833–841
© 2016 The Society for the Scientific Study of Religion

the unaffiliated are more likely to believe that religious organizations are too concerned with money and power and excessively involved in politics (Pew Research Center 2012), and are more likely to self-classify as “liberal” (36 percent) rather than “conservative” (7 percent) (Hout and Fischer 2014). A majority of the 46 million persons who claim no affiliation, however, continue to hold religious or spiritual beliefs, such as belief in God or a higher power (Hout and Fischer 2014:428–32; Pew Research Center 2013).

In addition, 31 percent of the unaffiliated now identify as atheist or agnostic; doubling in the last seven years, these individuals comprise about 7 percent of the U.S. population (Pew Research Center 2013). This is significant, given that atheism continues to be one of the most negatively regarded social identities in the United States today, more so even than other highly stigmatized individuals such as Muslims and LGBT individuals (Edgell, Gerteis, and Hartmann 2006). The nonreligious often are stereotyped as “judgmental,” “hard-headed,” “hard-hearted,” “cynical,” “critical,” “opinionated,” “radical,” and so on (Harper 2006:546).

Given this symbolic significance, it should come as no surprise that cross-sectional research shows that religion is often a central organizing characteristic of social networks, having an effect comparable to that of class and race (DiPrete et al. 2011). The goal of this article is to ascertain how these symbolic and social patterns surrounding religious “Nones” influence the dynamic formation of social networks in a social context in which religious identification (and religiosity) is a salient cultural marker. In spite of its substantive importance, we know very little about the local network structure of individuals who express no religious preference in the United States today, with existing studies examining relationship patterns between religious “Nones” and religious individuals producing mixed findings. For example, one study indicated that “just over half of individuals lack any interreligious tie” (Scheitle and Smith 2011:412), while another found that “68 percent of all respondents who belong to a religious tradition report having friends who are not religious at all” (Vargas and Loveland 2011:721). Research on the emotional support available to persons with no religious preference suggests that they have very restricted sources of such support, typically from only a few strong relationships (e.g., spouses and romantic partners) (Edgell, Mather, and Tranby 2013). In fact, many self-described atheists turn to the Internet to find community and cultivate their identities (Smith 2013).

In this article, we take advantage of a unique data source on the personal networks of youth transitioning into college in a context where religion is a culturally salient facet of everyday life and forms a key resource for interaction and the formation of personal relationships (a prominent Catholic university). Our aim is to ascertain to what extent religious affiliation plays a role in shaping the local network structure of college freshmen in this context. We focus on *homophily*, or the tendency for dyadic relationships to be more likely to form and persist among individuals who share certain traits, attitudes, beliefs, or sociodemographic markers (Lazarsfeld and Merton 1954; McPherson, Smith-Lovin, and Cook 2001; Mehra, Kilduff, and Brass 1998; Rivera, Soderstrom, and Uzzi 2010). In particular, we focus on homophily based on religious affiliation, which has been the subject of recent work (Cheadle and Schwadel 2012).

While the homophily phenomenon is one of the most well-established empirical generalizations in all of social science (McPherson, Smith-Lovin, and Cook 2001), recent research indicates that the *saliency* of certain markers in generating the homophily effect depends on context (Mehra, Kilduff, and Brass 1998; Mollica, Gray, and Trevino 2003). More specifically, a marker may become a more significant basis for relationship formation when it is: (1) culturally significant and (2) a given subcategory of that marker is relatively “rare,” making it a salient source for self-identification. As Rivera, Soderstrom, and Uzzi (2010:94) note, although any attribute could serve as the basis for homophily, it is usually “rare attributes” that have “the strongest influence on attachment.” For instance, in a context in which racial markers are a culturally salient basis for relationship formation and maintenance (as is typical in the United States), members of relatively underrepresented (minority) racial categories tend to exhibit a stronger likelihood of connecting to one another than members of the majority group. The basic idea is simple: “people in a social

context tend to identify with others with whom they share characteristics that are relatively rare in that context” (Mehra, Kilduff, and Brass 1998:442). In support of this hypothesis, Mehra, Kilduff, and Brass (1998) found that in a context in which both gender and race are culturally salient categories (a business school MBA program) and in which both women and nonwhites are relative minorities, homophily on race and gender was stronger for the members of minority groups in comparison to members of the majority group (adjusting for the baseline availability of similar others). This finding was replicated by Mollica, Gray, and Trevino (2003:129) in a similar setting.

Here, we extend Mehra, Kilduff, and Brass’s (1998) “minority distinctiveness” framework to the case of affiliative minorities in a context in which religion is a culturally significant category. Accordingly, we propose that, in a context in which the culture is defined in relation to a dominant religious tradition (in our case Catholicism), religious disaffiliation, along with affiliation with a minority religious culture—as contextually “rare” but symbolically significant categories—will become an important basis for homophily. Thus, we expect to find stronger tendencies toward homophily among groups who do not belong to the dominant religious culture (in our empirical setting, this includes both Nones and religious non-Catholics).

In addition, we attempt to shed light on the mechanisms that might be behind the minority distinctiveness effect. In the social networks literature, the first potential mechanism has been called *cultural matching* (Edelmann and Vaisey 2014; see also Lizardo 2006; Rivera 2012; Vaisey and Lizardo 2010). When cultural matching drives interactions, people preferentially connect to others who are similar on an important or valued marker. The second mechanism driving patterns of interaction consists in an aversion to form connections to dissimilar others, which may be termed *cultural distancing*. Scholarship has recently begun to stress the importance of distaste or aversion to certain traits in relational dynamics (Edelmann and Vaisey 2014). Thus, instead of resulting from a “pull” toward similar others, homophily might stem from people steering clear of certain others. For instance, Schaefer, Kornienko, and Fox (2011) have shown that homophily among depressed individuals is rooted in the nondepressed avoiding them. Given the negative characterization of Nones by the religiously affiliated (Harper 2006) and negative affect sometimes harbored by Nones for religious individuals (Zuckerman 2012), this distancing mechanism may structure connections across the affiliated/unaffiliated boundary.

In our analytic framework, we can infer that a cultural matching process is at work if we observe a disproportionate tendency for the creation of in-group ties (homophily) among Nones and among non-Catholics. We can infer that a cultural distancing process is at work if we observe a lower than expected likelihood of cross-group ties for either Nones or non-Catholics in relation to the Catholic majority. Our expectation is that, given the fact that religious disaffiliation is the more discordant (and thus salient) identification in this context, we should observe stronger tendencies matching and distancing at work among persons who do not identify with any religious tradition in comparison to affiliated non-Catholics.

DATA AND METHODS

The data used in this article come from an ongoing study at the University of Notre Dame called NetSense (Striegel et al. 2013). Researchers equipped a cohort of roughly 200 incoming first-year students with smartphones that track, among other things, the calls and texts made and received. Additionally, beginning before their matriculation and continuing every four months after that point, participants were surveyed about a series of beliefs, attitudes, and cultural tastes. In order to examine how religious identification affects social network formation, survey data from before matriculation are used to predict connections made during the first semester. This time ordering helps uncover the effects of religious identification on the network formation process in the context of newly forming personal relationships upon their arrival to campus.

The network under consideration consists of all observed ties ($E = 647$) formed by 186 study participants during their first semester in college. Because we are interested in tie formation, we included only students within the study. This allows us to examine only new ties and ensures we have survey information on each person. The network is constructed from students' calls and texts; a tie is said to exist if one student contacts another and the other student responds, which results in a nondirected network.¹ This is important since studies of homophily survey participants at a cross-section in regards to relationships that may be a mix of new and consolidated ties. Our empirical strategy, like that of Mollica, Gray, and Travino (2003), allows us to capture homophily in the context of newly forming relationships.

We use an exponential-family random graph modeling (ERGM) framework to analyze the data. This analytical approach attempts to maximize the probability of the entire observed network using statistics that capture global properties of a network, but it can also be interpreted as predicting the probability of two individuals being connected given a set of attributes (Goodreau et al. 2008:7–8). In fact, the ERGM framework has the major benefit of using both network and attribute data to estimate the probability of ties between certain individuals.

We consider three basic network statistics in the following analysis. The first is a term that accounts for the number of ties within the network, giving the probability that two randomly chosen individuals within the network will be connected. The second indexes homophily on a given trait by counting the number of ties for which both connected individuals share the same attribute value (e.g., both individuals identify as nonreligious). The third indexes the number of friends that individuals with a certain trait have (e.g., the number of friends that Nones have).

Given that ERGMs predict the probability of ties between two individuals, all of the substantive variables—including religious identification—are considered predictors. The religion variable is divided into three categories: Catholic (69.54 percent), “Other” non-Catholic (13.19 percent), and no preference (“None”; 17.24 percent). The other category consists of individuals identifying with various Protestant denominations, Hindus, Muslims, and Jews. The “None” category is composed of individuals who identify as atheist, agnostic, unsure, or who refuse to identify with any religious label. These categorical divisions are less than ideal but are roughly representative of the main axis of differentiation in this empirical context (a majority Catholic private school). We also estimate models that adjust for matching on gender, race, parental education (e.g., whether none, one, or both parents received a college degree), and political orientation (liberal, moderate, or conservative), given that previous work suggests these factors are correlated with religious identification and social networks (Scheitle and Smith 2011; Vargas and Loveland 2011).

RESULTS

Table 1 presents the results from five different models. The first model contains only the statistic accounting for the number of ties in the network. Model 1 predicts the probability of a connection between two randomly chosen people based solely on the number of people and ties in the network (Goodreau et al. 2008). The table reports parameter estimates in terms of effects on the log odds of a tie because they make it easy to see the directionality of influence that later attributes have upon the likelihood of connections. Model 2 adjusts for matching on sociodemographic characteristics other than religious affiliation along with the edges statistic to provide a basic model against which we may compare further models with the religious affiliation terms.

¹ Since this might be considered a low threshold from which to infer relationships, we replicated the following analyses on networks where a tie was said to exist if person *i* contacted person *j* more than five times and more than 10 times. The direction, magnitude, and statistical significance of the coefficients for Nones remained stable across all models. Additionally, these behavioral measures of contact and subjective relationship nominations from the survey data strongly predict each other.

Table 1: ERGM results

	Model 1	Model 2 ^a	Model 3	Model 4 ^a	Model 5	Model 6 ^a
Edges	−3.24*** (.04)	−4.62*** (.23)	−3.29*** (.05)	−4.56*** (.24)	−2.95*** (.15)	−4.14*** (.26)
Catholic–homophily			.006 (.08)	−.01 (.10)	−.35* (.16)	−.58** (.18)
Other–homophily			.88*** (.24)	.53* (.27)	.96** (.32)	.94** (.33)
None–homophily			.92*** (.18)	.79*** (.20)	1.55*** (.27)	1.50*** (.28)
Other–degree					−.21 (.16)	−.49** (.18)
None–degree					−.49** (.16)	−.65*** (.17)
AIC	5,516.47	5,252.44	5,491.08	5,241.02	5,484.71	5,230.24
Log likelihood	−2,757.23	−2,612.22	−2,741.54	−2,603.51	−2,736.35	−2,596.12

****p* < .001, ***p* < .01, **p* < .05.

^aModels 2, 4, and 6 include terms for gender, race, parental education, and political orientation.

The third model provides evidence for homophily based on religious (dis)affiliation by including terms that index the extent to which individuals in each of the three religion categories (Catholic, Other-Affiliated, and Nones) are more likely to form ties with members of the same category. Positive and statistically significant coefficients for these three terms indicate the presence of homophily. We find support for the hypothesis that members of the minority religious culture will be more likely to form within-group ties in this context. In contrast to Catholic students, both Nones and Other-Affiliated students exhibit a strong tendency to form ties with members of the same religious category. As shown in Model 4, this result remains even after we adjust for matching on other sociodemographic markers. This suggests that religious affiliation is an independent driver of the network structure net of matching on other factors (Cheadle and Schwadel 2012). Naturally, in Model 4 we do observe a drop in the religious homophily estimate, indicating that some of the raw religious homophily is actually the result of matching on other characteristics (e.g., race, class, political orientation, etc.). Note, however, that the drop in the magnitude of the religious homophily effect is almost three times as large for the Other-Affiliated (40 percent) than it is for the None (14 percent) category. This suggests that matching on Other-Affiliation is more likely to be driven by matching on other (nonreligious) sociodemographic markers than is matching on disaffiliation.

Model 5 adjusts for both homophily and degree terms for each religious group. With both sets of statistics in the model, the substantive interpretation of the degree effect changes, permitting us to disambiguate between matching and distancing mechanisms. The degree statistic for each affiliation group now should be interpreted as giving the log-odds that an individual from that group will have a tie with an individual from a different religious affiliation group (heterophily). The homophily statistic still represents the extent to which individuals within each religious affiliation category preferentially connect with same-category others.

The results are consistent with the hypothesis that both matching and distancing processes are operative for members of the minority religious culture. After adjusting for the tendency to connect to persons with a different religious affiliation, the homophily effect almost doubles for the unaffiliated. Most important, the Nones’ degree term is statistically significant and negative, indicating that in this context, unaffiliated individuals are *less* likely to connect to persons who claim a religious affiliation, whether Catholic or non-Catholic. This result is consistent with the

operation of a cultural distancing mechanism along the affiliated/unaffiliated boundary. We find a similar pattern of results for the Other-Affiliated students, suggesting that a similar dynamic is operative for persons in this category. Note, however, that the degree statistic for Other-Affiliated, while negative, does not reach conventional levels of statistical significance. This suggests that distancing processes along the Catholic/non-Catholic boundary are not as strong as along the affiliation/disaffiliation divide.

Model 6 adds homophily terms for matching on other sociodemographic markers to the Model 5 specification. Adjusting for these factors does little to change the strong homophily effect among members of religious minority categories. For both Nones and the Other-Affiliated, the homophily effect remains about the same as that estimated in Model 5, declining only slightly. Adjusting for matching along other sociodemographic factors actually makes the cultural distancing effect for both Nones and Other-Affiliated *stronger*; for this last group the degree statistic is now statistically significant. Taken together, these results indicate that both unaffiliated and non-Catholic affiliated students are both more likely to have ties with same-category members and less likely to have ties with members of other categories. “Other” category members are, of course, different for each of the two religious minority groups; for Nones, this means all affiliated students (regardless of Catholic/non-Catholic status), while for the Other-Affiliated this means either Catholic or unaffiliated students.

Since the models presented so far do not assume that the probability of a tie being present will be affected by other ties in the network (i.e., dependencies), the goodness of fit for the models can be assessed by standard measures (Harris 2014:61–71). Both the Akaike information criterion (AIC) and log-likelihoods are provided for each model. The AIC values for Models 1 and 2 suggest that including matching on sociodemographic variables other than religious affiliation dramatically increases model fit. Including terms for matching on religious affiliation only in addition to the edges term (Model 3) increases model fit over Model 1, but Model 2 is still the most preferable. Adding terms for matching on all sociodemographic covariates in Model 4 leads to a more marked improvement in fit over Models 1 and 3 and a slightly better fit than Model 2. Model 5 is the best among the models that do not account for matching on other sociodemographic characteristics, but is worse than Models 2 and 4. The final model, accounting for matching on all sociodemographic characteristics as well as out-group tie formation for each religious category, provides the best fit.

We also checked the goodness of fit for these models graphically, which is especially useful since the improvement in fit of Model 6 over Model 4 is small. The idea underlying graphical goodness-of-fit checks for ERGMs is using the results from each model to specify a simulation that generates artificial networks and then comparing these generated networks against the observed network on a set of criteria not explicitly modeled (Goodreau, Kitts, and Morris 2009). Following Goodreau, Kitts, and Morris (2009), we compared minimum geodesic distance, edge-wise shared partners, and degree distributions between the simulated and observed networks. The first corresponds roughly to the average shortest number of people that connect two randomly chosen students (if they are connected, this value would equal one). The edgewise shared partner distribution captures the number of friends each connected pair of students have in common, and the final is the distribution of how many connections students have. The results (available on request) are consistent with those obtained using the AIC and log-likelihood criteria above. However, graphical tests indicate a marked improvement of Model 6 over the others.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this study, we sought to ascertain whether we would observe homophily based on religious *disaffiliation* in the context of newly forming relationships during the transition to college. We argued that the growing prevalence of the unaffiliated (“None”) category in the

general population may result in this status becoming an important driver of the formation (or nonformation) of social relationships. We further argued that this effect might be exacerbated in a context in which religious identification is salient. We identified two possible ways in which religious (dis)identification may play a role in social networks. The first—a cultural matching process—suggests that people choose to interact because they share common attributes, and it leads to the hypothesis that individuals form a disproportionately large number of connections with similar others. The second mechanism—cultural distancing—suggests that people avoid interaction with dissimilar others and leads to the hypothesis that people form a disproportionately low number of ties with dissimilar others. Our results suggest that both of these mechanisms may be structuring interaction across the affiliated/disaffiliated divide. We found that Nones are disproportionately more likely to connect to other Nones and much less likely than chance to connect to affiliated students. We find a similar empirical pattern (i.e., frequent intragroup interactions and infrequent intergroup interactions) among religiously affiliated non-Catholics although with a smaller tendency toward same-group homophily.

The results from this study are consistent with the proposition that in specifiable empirical contexts, religious disaffiliation can become a powerful basis for relationship formation. These results are in line with recent research suggesting that homophily effects are dependent on the local relational and cultural context. In particular, we find that in a setting where religious identification is a culturally significant basis of relationship formation, disaffiliation—as a relatively rare but symbolically potent subcategory—generates a strong form of homophily, in which tendencies toward in-group preference and out-group avoidance are revealed even after a relatively short time span.

Our study has several advantages over previous studies of homophily based on religious affiliation (e.g., Cheadle and Schwadel 2012). First, rather than relying on network surveys that truncate the maximum total number of contacts and selecting on the strongest connections in the personal network while taxing the respondent's mnemonic and attentive capabilities (e.g., DiPrete et al. 2011), we collect data on the personal network completely unobtrusively, thus increasing the likelihood of capturing both strong and weak personal relationships. This also allows us to sidestep the problematic issue of cross-respondent heterogeneity in the interpretation of the meaning of relationship identifiers such as “friend” or “confidant” (Marin and Hampton 2007).

Second, rather than studying already consolidated relationships, our research design and empirical setting allow us to examine the process of assortative mixing into homophilous groups at a time when individuals are forming relationships in a new setting at a point in the life course likely to generate long-standing relationships (transitioning from high school to college). The patterns of homophily and heterophily that we observe are thus emergent from the interactional context rather than being a carryover from previously existing relational settings. Our empirical strategy therefore allows us to make a safer inference that in our case, both the disaffiliated and members of religious minorities are forming and maintaining homophilous relationships via a cultural matching mechanism rather than via proximity or other high-level structural processes. In other words, the homophily patterns based on affiliation status are likely produced by processes of “choice homophily” rather than “structural homophily” (McPherson, Smith-Lovin, and Cook 2001). Structural contexts, however, may be implicated in the distancing processes that we observe, as persons with no religious affiliation may self-select out of settings in which relationships are formed and maintained, such as Mass and other religious services.

Our findings complement previous work on the role of religion in shaping social networks and cementing salient social divisions in the United States (Cheadle and Schwadel 2012; DiPrete et al. 2011). Our results suggest that rather than being a generalized phenomenon, whether religious preference comes to have an effect on the interactional life of persons depends on the saliency of religion as a relevant source of social identification in a given context. While our findings are circumscribed to one such context, they do open up important questions for future research. This includes the extent to which our results may be generalizable to settings where religion is salient

in different ways, or whether they can be generalized to other contexts in which religion is not a primary source of social identification.

For example, in more secularized European nations such as France or Denmark (Norris and Inglehart 2004), it seems very plausible that religious affiliation might not be a salient characteristic driving patterns of interaction among the secular (as it is with Catholic students in our study). Instead, there we should expect that it is precisely the *religiously observant* who should be subject to minority distinctiveness effects exacerbating the effect of matching (generating high levels of intrareligious homophily) and distancing (separating them from the secular majority) processes. This may be behind, for instance, the difficulty encountered by immigrant groups with high levels of religious identification (such as North African Muslims in secular Europe) in achieving high levels of assimilation and social integration in these types of cultural settings. In this way, the two generative mechanisms evaluated in this article rely on local context to determine their substantive operation.

Of course, the United States is distinctive among the wealthy societies in the Global North precisely because of its “unusual” level of religious identification and belief (Norris and Inglehart 2004). In this cultural context, both the “unaffiliated” but especially the unaffiliated nonbelievers (e.g., atheists and agnostics) count as “distinctive minorities” in our sense (Mehra, Kilduff, and Brass 1998). This means that cultural matching and distancing processes in relation to the believing majority may be particularly salient among this portion of the “None” population. In this respect, the relatively pious American society makes religious identification salient in a way that may continue to exacerbate the cultural and social divide between the affiliated and the unaffiliated nonbelievers. This may also have consequences for the future growth and “spread” of nonbelief in the United States.

However, it is important to realize that network formation mechanisms are always embedded in context and seldom operate at the global level of entire national societies. The results reported here (in Model 6) indicate that the matching and distancing mechanisms operate for both Nones and non-Catholic religious students within this explicitly religious context, and future research should investigate how the mechanisms might decouple in other contexts and with populations at a different stage in the life course. As shown, for example, in Model 5 by the Other-Affiliated category, it could be that in some contexts religious identification draws certain people together (cultural matching) without necessarily leading them to withdraw from dissimilar others via cultural distancing.

REFERENCES

- Cheadle, Jacob E. and Philip Schwadel. 2012. The “friendship dynamics of religion,” or the “religious dynamics of friendship?” A social network analysis of adolescents who attend small schools. *Social Science Research* 41(5):1198–1212.
- DiPrete, Thomas A., Andrew Gelman, Tyler McCormick, Julien Teitler, and Tian Zheng. 2011. Segregation in social networks based on acquaintanceship and trust. *American Journal of Sociology* 116(4):1234–83.
- Edelmann, Achim and Stephen Vaisey. 2014. Cultural resources and cultural distinction in networks. *Poetics* 46(1):22–37.
- Edgell, Penny, Joseph Gerteis, and Douglas Hartmann. 2006. Atheists as “other”: Moral boundaries and cultural membership in American society. *American Sociological Review* 71(2):211–34.
- Edgell, Penny, Darin M. Mather, and Eric P. Tranby. 2013. Profiles of anticipated support: Religion’s place in the composition of Americans’ emotional support networks. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 52(2):293–308.
- Goodreau, Steven M., Mark S. Handcock, David R. Hunter, Carter T. Butts, and Martina Morris. 2008. A Statnet tutorial. *Journal of Statistical Software* 24(9):1–27.
- Goodreau, Steven M., James Kitts, and Martina Morris. 2009. Birds of a feather, or friend of a friend? Using exponential random graph models to investigate adolescent social networks. *Demography* 46(1):103–25.
- Harper, Marcel. 2006. The stereotyping of nonreligious people by religious students: Contents and subtypes. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 46(4):539–52.
- Harris, Jenine K. 2014. *An introduction to exponential random graph modeling*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Hout, Michael and Claude S. Fischer. 2002. Why more Americans have no religious preference: Politics and generations. *American Sociological Review* 67(2):165–90.

- . 2014. Explaining why more Americans have no religious preference: Political backlash and generational succession, 1987–2012. *Sociological Science* 1(9):423–47.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul F. and Robert K. Merton. 1954. Friendship as a social process: A substantive and methodological analysis. In *Freedom and control in modern society*, edited by M. A. Berger, T. Abel, and C. Page, pp. 18–66. New York: Van Nostrand.
- Lizardo, Omar. 2006. How cultural tastes shape personal networks. *American Sociological Review* 71(5):778–807.
- Marin, Alexandra and Keith N. Hampton. 2007. Simplifying the personal network name generator alternatives to traditional multiple and single name generators. *Field Methods* 19(2):163–93.
- McPherson, Miller, Lynn Smith-Lovin, and James M. Cook. 2001. Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks. *Annual Review of Sociology* 27(1):415–44.
- Mehra, Ajay, Martin Kilduff, and Daniel J. Brass. 1998. At the margins: A distinctiveness approach to the social identity and social networks of underrepresented groups. *Academy of Management Journal* 41(4):441–52.
- Mollica, Kelly A., Barbara Gray, and Linda K. Trevino. 2003. Racial homophily and its persistence in newcomers' social networks. *Organization Science* 14(2):123–36.
- Norris, Pippa and Ronald Inglehart. 2004. *Sacred and secular: Religion and politics worldwide*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Pew Research Center. 2012. *America's changing religious landscape: "Nones" on the rise*. Available at <<http://www.pewforum.org/2012/10/09/nones-on-the-rise/>>.
- . 2013. *America's changing religious landscape*. Available at <<http://www.pewforum.org/files/2015/05/RLS-05-08-full-report.pdf>>.
- Rivera, Lauren A. 2012. Hiring as cultural matching: The case of elite professional service firms. *American Sociological Review* 77(6):999–1022.
- Rivera, Mark T., Sara B. Soderstrom, and Brian Uzzi. 2010. Dynamics of dyads in social networks: Assortative, relational, and proximity mechanisms. *Annual Review of Sociology* 36(1):91–115.
- Schaefer, David R., Olga Kornienko, and Andrew M. Fox. 2011. Misery does not love company: Network selection mechanisms and depression homophily. *American Sociological Review* 76(5):764–86.
- Scheitle, Christopher P. and Buster G. Smith. 2011. A note on the frequency and sources of close interreligious ties. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 50(2):410–21.
- Smith, Jesse M. 2013. Creating a godless community: Identity work of contemporary American atheists. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 52(1):80–99.
- Striegel, Aaron, Shu Liu, Lei Meng, Christian Poellabauer, David Hachen, and Omar Lizardo. 2013. Lessons learned from the NetSense Smartphone Study. In *Proceedings of the 5th ACM Workshop on HotPlanet*, pp. 51–56. New York: ACM Press.
- Vaisey, Stephen and Omar Lizardo. 2010. Can cultural worldviews influence network composition? *Social Forces* 88(4):1595–1618.
- Vargas, Nicholas and Matthew T. Loveland. 2011. Befriending the "other": Patterns of social ties between the religious and non-religious. *Sociological Perspectives* 54(4):713–31.
- Zuckerman, Phil. 2012. *Faith no more: Why people reject religion*. New York: Oxford University Press.