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The oldest roots of modernity and liberalism can actually be found in the Christian concept of a human being and his/her indisputable freedom, even before almighty God. Zeljko Mardešić 2007, 837

We begin this chapter with a look at well-known general sociological theories of modernization, secularization, individualization and postmodernity and their potential impact on modern society. We then define the research questions used in our work — value orientations examined through an empirical survey consisting of qualitative interviews with teenagers. We observed the concept of religion at three levels: individual, institutional and societal. We used the concepts of authenticity and humanity as points of reference. We found that 55% of respondents are authentic, and 56% demonstrate a very humane position. We also found that nationality and gender are relevant factors in respect of these two dimensions. We found a strong connection between religiosity and the dimension of humanity across all three observed dimensions of religiosity. The nature of the connection between religiosity and authenticity is more complex. Religiosity among young respondents is more universalistic than ideological, and it is questionable as to whether this religious orientation is able to provide a consistent system of values.

The transformation of values along with social development, or more precisely, with modern and postmodern changes, is one of the main issues of contemporary social science research. As society is changing, value orientations seem to be changing as well. The main dispute among contemporary sociologists is over the direction of this process, and the factors which affect it. In this contribution, we focus on the relationship between religion and value orientations. We raise the question of whether religion makes a difference in modern society where the value orientation of individuals is concerned. To answer this question, we: 1) outline the main features of the relationship between values and religion, referring to recent empirical findings and current theories; 2) define our research question and describe our empirical instruments; 3) report our findings; and 4) discuss our findings in more detail.

7.1 The relationship between religion and values in modern society

In a discussion of modern society, the concepts of secularization and individualization are fundamental. The concept of secularization implies that “religious institutions, actions and consciousness lose their social significance” (Wilson 1982, 49; see also Davie 1994, 2000; Dobbelaere 2001; Martin 1978; Pollak 2003). At the societal level, religion fails to function as a source of social cohesion. At the institutional level, the Church is losing its influence on public and individual decisions. At the individual level, secularization marks the decline of religious belief and practices. According to the concept of secularization, this loss of social significance of religion is intrinsically and structurally linked to modernization (Bruce 1992). The processes of structural differentiation, socialization and rationalization cause a disenchantment of religious traditions and strengthen secular equivalents. “As a general rule the theory postulates that the more modern a society the less religious will be its population” (Casanova 2003, 19). The concept of individualization expresses the emancipation of the individual from traditional obliga-
tions (Beck/Beck-Gernsheim 2006; Friedrichs 1998; Howard 2007; Zorc-Mayer 2001). In modern society, traditional custom and convention lose their social significance. Furthermore, institutions standardize single segments of one’s life, but they are not able to influence an individual’s entire life. Accordingly it is the task of the individual to construct his/her own life. The individual is free to choose between various lifestyles and to construct his/her identity in line with his/her personal preferences and needs. At the same time, the individual has to maintain his/her sense of self and to ensure that his/her personal preferences and needs are met in daily life. The chance of success or the risk of failure is in the hands of the individual (Beck 1986).

According to the theory of postmodern value shift formulated by Ronald Inglehart (1990; 1997), secularization and individualization have led to a transformation of the system of values in modern society (cf. Inglehart/Norris 2004). Contrary to traditional societies, modern societies are characterized by increasing economic capabilities through industrialization, and political capabilities through bureaucratization. Modernization includes economic growth as the dominant societal goal, and achievement as the dominant individual goal (Inglehart 1997, 5). This also includes a shift from religious authority to state authority (Inglehart 1997, 72-74). Individual achievement motivation as a basic feature of modern society also implies that in reality, culture, economy, and politics are strongly interconnected. Although Inglehart explicitly rejects both cultural and economic determinism, valorization of culture as an important (inter)dependent variable has opened a primary look to the change of values, which indicates a fundamental shift from modern to postmodern conditions in advanced industrialized societies. The basic economic conditions achieved have resulted in a shift from survival values to values of well-being, and from achievement motivation to postmaterialist motivation (Inglehart 1997, 77). Thus, postmodern values result in a decline in confidence in various authorities (legal, political, religious…) and strengthening of the desire for individual participation and self-expression. In this sense, modernization is closely connected with secularization, while postmodern conditions deepen pluralization and individualization.

From the point of view of religion, the theory of postmodern value shift signifies a decreasing effect of religion on the relevant value system. First of all, religiously motivated values will decline. Inglehart himself concludes that traditional religious values are losing ground (1997, 390-396). This conclusion is corroborated by empirical findings based on longitudinal studies with a European background, such as the European Value Study (EVS), as well as studies with a national background, such as the DJI Youth Survey (Gille 2000, 172) or the Shell Survey (Gensicke 2002, 155). Young people place particular emphasis on values of individual autonomy and self-expression rather than on values of solidarity or belief in God (cf. Ziebertz/Kalbheim/Riegel 2003, 263-292). Furthermore, Inglehart’s theory implies that religion will vanish as a source of values. Economic well-being and the social welfare system reduce the need for religious support in situations of crisis. In addition, religious plurality, which is characteristic of a modern society, undermines the public authority of religion. There are various religious value systems, each of them claiming to represent eternal moral standards. To sum up, within the framework of the theory of postmodern value shift, religion is one source of values. However, it has lost most of it social authority and it offers values which are not appropriate to the modern condition. In consequence, religion will lose its affect on the value system.

However, this reading of the relationship between religion and values has been contested recently. First of all, the data from the most recent EVS shows that post-materialism is not on the rise in most developed countries, and that the less preferred materialist goals do not imply an increase in post-materialist values (Arts/Halman 2004). It also shows that two main basic values exist, socio-liberalism and normative-religious (Hagenaars/Halman/Moors 2003, 30-31). Individual freedom and personal autonomy are features of the first, and strict moral standards and respect for societal norms and institutions are features of the second. According to the analysis,
individualism is not to be interpreted in terms of egoism, narcissism, hedonism, or ethical relativism, but in terms of socially committed individualism. However, there is a clear moral alternative which is religiously supported. Thus, there is no empirical link between the state of secularization of a country and its moral pluralism (Draulans/Halman 2005). In addition, studies show that some basic moral norms have become part of the cultural distinctiveness of modern Europe, uncorrelated to individual religiosity, although religion certainly plays a role in their historic development (Zrinšćak 2004). Finally, there is empirical evidence of a re-emergence of religious conviction and practices (Berger 1999; Casanova 1996; Lambert 2004; Remond 2000; Tomka 2001; Ziebertz/Kay 2006; Zulehner/Hager/Polak 2001). In addition, religious institutions continue to play an important role in the diverse forms of national welfare systems (Fix 2003, Manow 2004; Yeung/Edgardh/Beckman/Pettersson 2006).

From a theoretical point of view, David Herbert suggests that in a heterogeneous society religion is a candidate for a system of orientation and belonging. In his reflection on Islam, he identifies Islam as a “nodal point” within several societal discourses on jurisprudence, ethics, politics, etc. (2004, 160). In this regard, Islam is a “master signifier” (2004, 160), able to establish a communal identity across various societal subsystems. Using the idea of Islam, Muslims are able to define their position in a heterogeneous world. This connecting power of Islam is a potential implicit in every traditional religion. Because they were once the source of societal cohesion, traditional religions like Christianity, Judaism, Sikhism, Hinduism or Taoism carry convictions and values which go beyond religious discourse. They are able to bridge the structural differentiation of contemporary society and offer a narrative which is capable of providing orientation and a sense of belonging. Of course, in contemporary society the circumstances of this affect have changed tremendously (Bukow 1993). It is the individual who has to integrate himself/herself into the community. Belonging is individualized. And it is unlikely that one particular confession will bear the cohesion of an entire society. However, religion is still an attractive candidate as a system for cultural belonging and offers distinct lifestyle patterns, including moral standards. In some societies it can be seen at the level of smaller social communities, but in others it can even be seen at the societal level (Črpić/Zrinšćak 2005). This is in line with criticism of the theory of secularization, which identifies the social significance of religion in the cultural background of Europe (Hervieu-Léger 2000), the public sphere of society (Casanova 1994), and beyond religious communities (Davie 2000).

All in all, the empirical data referring to the relationship between religion and values is complex. There is corroborated evidence that formal categories like religious belonging do not imply moral differences. These findings are in line with the theoretical concept of individualization. However, religion is more than a formal category. It is conviction as well as practice. According to the theory of secularization, the affect of these convictions and practices on the moral point of view will vanish; according to criticism of the theory of secularization, they may affect the moral point of view of the individual.

7.2 Research questions, concepts and method

In this contribution, we look at whether religion conceived as an individual attitude will show differences in the value orientation of young people in Europe and Israel. We begin by conceptualizing and operationalizing the value dimension, and then we conceptualize and operationalize religion as an attitude.

In the theoretical framework of this study, values have been conceptualized according to 9 dimensions: autonomy, humanity, self-management, attractiveness, modernity, authenticity, family orientation, and professional orientation (Ziebertz/Kay 2005, 32-36). Each dimension
represents a set of items which has been established through qualitative interviews with teenagers (Fritzscze 2000). This procedure ensures that our instrument represents the value system of the young people of today. To analyse the relationship with religion, we have chosen authenticity and humanity out of these 9 dimensions. Two criteria have motivated this selection. 1) The chosen dimensions should be free from religious bias. Family orientation, for example, is a value dimension, which is stressed by all of the major religions of this study (Cohn-Sherbok 1999, Elias 1999, Wilson 1999). Even in an individualized society, a relationship between religious and family orientation could be confounded by the religious bias of the latter. Authenticity, however, represents the desire for independence and for the freedom from obligations. The relevant elements are "conspire others of your opinion", "do or not do what you want or do not want to do", and "be free from obligations", insofar as authenticity represents a form of individualism which does not correspond with the moral standards of Christianity, Islam, or Judaism. Humanity represents the social commitment of the individual. The relevant elements are: "to be willing to help others"; "to make a contribution to society"; and "to share with others, and be able to give of yourself". Of course, there is some proximity with religious values, because humanity is the secular equivalent to a religiously motivated commitment to society. However, the items themselves do not imply any religious bias. Humanity may also be conceived as a secular concept. 2) The chosen items should be statistically independent. Most of the nine dimensions are correlated negatively or positively. Yet, correlation implies similar effects. Therefore we looked for statistically independent dimensions of the value orientation of young people. Authenticity and humanity do not correlate significantly, so they are independent of each other. According to these two criteria, authenticity and humanity are the only relevant dimensions of value orientation - they do not have a religious bias and they are independent.

Where religious attitudes are concerned, the theoretical framework of this study differentiates three levels (Ziebertz/Kay 2006a). The individual level refers to attitudes towards the religious practice and experience of an individual. The institutional level refers to attitudes towards religious institutions such as Christian churches, Jewish synagogues or Muslim communities gathering in mosques. At the societal level are attitudes towards the relationship between religion and society. These three dimensions of religious attitudes are in line with the conceptual framework of the theory of secularization (Dobbelaere 2001) and its critique (for instance, Casanova 1994). We have therefore chosen attitudes according to these three levels. 1) At the individual level we selected the instrument referring to religious experience. The possibility of religious experience is an essential topic in modern society. The related instrument differentiates three dimensions: a) the readiness to accept the possibility of religious experience; b) the desire to undergo religious experience; and c) the situation of having had such experience already. 2) At the institutional level we have chosen the relevance of religious institutions and the ideal of Religious Education at school. The relevance of institutions in modern society is a controversial subject. It can be asked whether religious institutions are important for the individual as well as for the public sphere. For each of these two dimensions we have chosen a particular scale. At the same time, there is an ongoing debate as to whether Religious Education (RE) should be part of the public school system, and if so, what the goals of Religious Education should be. This study offered five dimensions in this regard: RE in respect of church, RE in respect of faith, RE in respect of religion, RE in respect of life, and RE in respect of society. 3) At the societal level, this study dealt with three essential questions: a) Are religion and modernity compatible? b) Is religious pluralism enriching society? c) What should the relationship between different religions be? The latter question has been conceptualized according to a monoreligious dimension, a multireligious dimension, and an interreligious one.

In additional to these three dimensions of religious attitude, this study deals with diverse dimensions of the worldview on the part of young people. Some of these are relevant to our research question because they contain a religious or anti-religious bias. A religious bias is present in the
dimensions of Christianity/Judaism/Islam, Immanentism, and Metatheism. Of these dimensions, Christianity/Judaism/Islam represents a substantial approach towards the worldview, Immanentism denotes the presence of an Ultimate Being in the heart of mankind, and Metatheism outlines the total transcendence of an Ultimate Being. Atheism and Nihilism show an anti-religious bias. Whereas Atheism stresses the absence of an Ultimate Being, Nihilism is focused on the absence of any sense in this world.

On the basis of this conceptualization, we are able to define our research question: Is there a significant difference in the religious attitudes of young people stressing authenticity and those who do not? And is there a significant difference in the religious attitudes of young people who regard humanity as very important and those who do not? Both questions can be analyzed at the individual level, at the institutional level, at the societal level, and at the level of worldview.

To do this we dichotomized the value dimensions of authenticity and humanity. To establish equal subgroups, a respondent is called “less authentic” if his/her mean on authenticity is lower or equal to 3.0. If the mean is higher than 3.0, the respondent is labelled “authentic”. A respondent is marked “quite humane” if the mean on humanity is lower or equal to 4.0. If the mean is higher than 4.0 the respondent has been identified as “very humane”. Both scales - authenticity and humanity - have been assessed on a 5-point Likert-scale. The difference in the differentiating criteria can be justified by the fact that humanity today is accepted as a norm in Western societies.

According to the conceptual layout of the variables, we assume that very humane respondents will show stronger religious attitudes than their contemporaries who are quite humane. In contrast, a high performance of authenticity will show lesser religious attitudes. These assumptions are tested with t-tests.

7.3 Empirical findings

In our sample, 55% of the respondents are authentic and 56% are very humane (table 1). Nationality and gender are relevant factors in respect of the two dimensions of value orientation (table 2, 3). To be authentic is most important in Turkey, followed by Israel, whereas Germany and Finland are characterized by the lowest portion of authentic respondents. Humanity is most attractive in Israel and Finland. Here Poland, the United Kingdom, and Ireland are located at the bottom of the ranking. Although these differences are significant, only some of them are relevant. With the exception of Turkey and Israel in respect of authenticity, the differences are rather small. Furthermore, the differences do not show a clear picture. Neither the economic situation, nor the political system, nor the religious culture, nor the location in Europe provides a straightforward explanation. This is different where gender is concerned. Male youngsters tend to stress authenticity more than their female contemporaries, whereas it is female teenagers who favour humanity more than males. So in total numbers, the group of very humane respondents is dominated by females, while the group of authentic respondents is balanced in terms of gender.

| Table 7.1: Frequency of the types of egocentrism and humanity |
|----------------------------------------------|---|---|
| Type of egocentrism                       | N | %  |
| less egocentric                           | 4205 | 45.0 |
| egocentric                                | 5141 | 55.0 |
| Type of humanity                          | N | %  |
| quite humane                              | 4098 | 43.8 |
| very humane                               | 5265 | 56.2 |
### Table 7.2: Egocentrism by nation (differentiated by gender) (in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female (N = 5389)</th>
<th>less egocentric</th>
<th>egocentric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramers V = .27***

### Table 7.3: Humanity by nation (differentiated by gender) (in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female (N = 5401)</th>
<th>quite humane</th>
<th>very humane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramers V = .16***

### Male (N = 3891) quite humane very humane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male (N = 3891)</th>
<th>quite humane</th>
<th>very humane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramers V = .20***

Legend: ***: p < .001
Religion and values

What is the relationship between values and religious attitude? At the individual level, humanity is positively related to religious experience (table 7.4). Very humane respondents show a significantly higher readiness to accept the possibility of religious experience. Furthermore, they have a stronger desire to have religious experiences and more of them report that they have had religious experiences. Where authenticity is concerned, the picture is slightly different. As expected, it is the less authentic group which shows a significantly higher readiness to accept the possibility of religious experience. However, there is no difference in the desire for religious experience, and it is the authentic group which more often reports having had religious experiences. This last finding does not corroborate our assumptions.

Table 7.4: Values by religious experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Egocentrism</th>
<th>less egocentric</th>
<th>egocentric</th>
<th>sign.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RE authentic</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE desirable</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE self</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanity</td>
<td>quite humane</td>
<td>very humane</td>
<td>sign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE authentic</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE desirable</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE self</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: T-Test; n.s.: not significant; ***: p < .001. 3-point Likert-scale

At the institutional level there is a similar situation (table 7.5). On every dimension, very humane respondents show stronger religious attitudes than quite humane respondents. The first group believes that religious institutions have a positive impact on the public sphere; the latter is not sure in this regard.

Table 7.5: Egocentrism and humanity by attitudes towards religious institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Egocentrism</th>
<th>less egocentric</th>
<th>egocentric</th>
<th>significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church micro positive</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church macro positive</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel. Ed. into religion</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel. Ed. for faith</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel. Ed. about religion</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel. Ed. for life</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal Education</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanity</td>
<td>quite humane</td>
<td>very humane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church micro positive</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church macro positive</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel. Ed. into religion</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel. Ed. for faith</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel. Ed. about religion</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel. Ed. for life</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal Education</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: T-Test. n.s.: not significant; **: p < .01; ***: p < .001; 5-point Likert-scale

Very humane youngsters strongly agree that Religious Education should provide objective information about religions and prepare students to cope with life and society. Their quite humane contemporaries agree, but their approval is less manifest. Interestingly, the content of the religious attitude does not matter where the difference between both groups is concerned. It is always the very humane respondent who shows a stronger attitude, regardless of whether the subject is Religious Education in respect of religious community or Religious Education in respect of religion. Again the picture is more complex where authenticity is concerned. On the one hand, authentic teenagers opt more strongly for a Religious Education in respect of religions community and in respect of faith. On the other hand, less authentic young people have a
stronger preference for a Religious Education in respect of religion, life and society. In addition, the latter see greater possibilities for religious institutions to interfere positively in the public sphere. Particularly striking is the positive relation between religious authenticity and a Religious Education which is backed up by religious institutions. According to our assumptions, there should be a critical approach towards such a form of Religious Education.

Table 7.6 indicates the connection between a societal meaning of religion and the two dimensions of the value orientation. Those who appear to be more authentic hold a more negative view of the role of religion in the modern world, but also the more exclusivist view which positively values only one religion. A more positive view on religion in the modern world, and a more positive valuation of different religions are more connected with the less authentic position. Humanity is significantly connected with all views on religion. While it is understandable that a more positive view on religion in the modern world is connected with humanity, it is interesting to note that all (and partially contradictory) views on religion are significantly connected with humanity – those who positively value religious plurality, those who think that there are no qualitative differences between different religions, those who believe in dialogue between religions, but also those who hold an exclusively monoreligious view. Consequently a negative view on the role of religion in the modern world is negatively connected with humanity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Egocentrism</th>
<th>less egocentric</th>
<th>egocentric</th>
<th>significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion and Modernity (pos)</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion and Modernity (neg)</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plurality positive</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multireligious</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interreligious</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monoreligious</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humanity</th>
<th>quite humane</th>
<th>very humane</th>
<th>significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion and Modernity (pos)</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion and Modernity (neg)</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plurality positive</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multireligious</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interreligious</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monoreligious</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: T-Test; n.s.: not significant; **: p < .01; ***: p < .001; 5-point Likert-scale

At the level of worldview, authenticity is positively connected with Christianity/Judaism/Islam, but also slightly with Atheism and Nihilism (tab. 7.7). At first glance, this finding is confusing. In fact, atheism and nihilism are less rejected by authentic teenagers than by their less authentic contemporaries. But in absolute figures, both of them strongly disagree with these dimensions of worldview. Most striking is the marked difference in the attitude towards Christianity/Judaism/Islam. On this substantial dimension of a religious worldview, the authentic respondents show a mean of 3.30, while the less authentic ones show a mean of 3.12. On the other hand, the less authentic young people agree slightly more strongly on the meta-atheistic dimension. Humanity is again more consistently connected with worldview. Those who are very humane, are more inclined to agree with all three of the religious dimensions of worldview, and those who are quite humane tend to reject atheism and nihilism less strongly than those who are very humane. Again, the division is marked by the religious bias of the attitude.
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Table 7.7. Egocentrism and humanity by worldview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Egocentrism</th>
<th>less egocentric</th>
<th>egocentric</th>
<th>significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian/Judaism/Islam</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immanentism</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metatheism</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanism</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheism</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nihilism</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Humanity                | quite humane    | very humane | |
|-------------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Christian/Judaism/Islam | 3.11            | 3.31        | ***          |
| Immanentism             | 3.04            | 3.23        | ***          |
| Metatheism              | 3.45            | 3.58        | ***          |
| Humanism                | 3.13            | 3.29        | ***          |
| Atheism                 | 2.22            | 1.91        | ***          |
| Nihilism                | 1.98            | 1.69        | ***          |

Legend: T-Test. *: p < .05; ***: p < .001; 5-point Likert-scale

7.4 Discussion

We began our contribution with the question of whether religion and values are related in modern society, where religion is conceived as an individual attitude. According to our findings, they are related. Even the value dimension of authenticity, which clearly does not carry a religious bias, shows significant differences on nearly all aspects researched. Thus, values and religion are connected somehow in an individualized society, but what are the fundamental structures of this connection?

Where humanity is concerned, the findings paint a consistent picture: the more humane a person is, the more open he/she is towards religious attitudes. The very humane respondents show a greater emphasis on religious experience, they regard the role of religious institutions in public and school more positively, they consider religion as more important at the societal level, and they support religious dimensions of worldview more strongly. This positive connection between humanity and religion could have been expected. The major religions offer moral standards which stress solidarity with others if they are in need. Therefore, a first conclusion is: if religion becomes relevant for a modern person, it communicates at least its social impact. And, vice versa, if modern people are ready to share with others and make a contribution to society, they show at least some sympathy with religion. While we state there is a connection, we do not state what its direction is.

Furthermore, this connection between value orientation and religious attitude is not specified according to a particular religious orientation. Humanity is positively connected with all religious attitudes, regardless of their conceptual design. Very humane respondents showed a higher mean on the multireligious attitude as well as on the monoreligious attitude. They agreed more strongly to a Religious Education which aims to familiarize students with a particular religious community, and at the same time with a Religious Education which aims to give objective information about different religions. Humanity does not carry a particular religious ideology. This is a second conclusion: The more humane young people are, the more open they are to religion as a general phenomenon. They do not care about doctrinal unity/diversity; they do not use religion as a marker of difference. From the point of view of the civil society, this can be positive. If religion is perceived as a bearer of humanity without ideological claims, religious plurality leads neither to conflict, nor to a society of no solidarity. From the point of the religious communities, the sketched connection may be problematic. However, the finding that religions are noted for their social commitment may ensure the acknowledgment of religious institutions.

141
as part of the civil society and may be used as a means of establishing contact with people. Humanity is, however, a consequence and not the core of religious devotion. Any religious community has a particular set of convictions, doctrines and practices, which ensure its identity. These characteristic features of belief are not at disposal. However, they are not present in the connection between humanity and religious attitudes, at least where young Europeans, Turks and Israelis are concerned.

The findings concerning authenticity are more complex. There are a lot of significant differences, but at first glance they did not reveal a clear cut explanation. To expand on this in more detail, the connection between authenticity and religion is characterized by the following findings: The more important it is to be free from obligations, the more young people a) report having had religious experiences, b) prefer a Religious Education which is strongly related to a religious community, c) show a monoreligious attitude, d) think that religion does not fit into modernity, e) favour a dimension on worldviews which represents a particular religious tradition such as Christianity, Judaism or Islam. All these attitudes represent a religious orientation which is strongly related to an institutionalized religion. Christianity, Judaism and Islam are particular religious confessions with a long tradition and well developed doctrines and institutions. They indeed comprise the monoreligious claim to offer the only true path to salvation. This claim is defined differently by each of these three religions, but in the end each of them is convinced of having had the ultimate revelation. Furthermore, these religions have practices for communicating with God, Jahweh, and Allah respectively, so there is a set of different ways to experience this ultimate reality. Those in favour of a religious community are open to educational goals to familiarize students with this community. Finally, all of these religions are regarded today as traditional and not well adapted to the modern context. Therefore, it is plausible that these young people tend to perceive the relationship between religion and modernity as contradictory. Given this scenario, there is a third conclusion: young people who want to be free from obligations show a religious attitude which is related to a traditional religious orientation.

Their counterparts favour a multireligious attitude, they think that religion may play an important role in modern society, they strongly agree with a Religious Education which informs about different religions and helps students cope with life, they accept the possibility of having religious experiences, and they tend of prefer a meta-atheistic dimension of worldview. Some of these findings represent rather small differences. However, they depict a religious orientation which is free of ideological claims and offers a universalistic approach towards religion. There is no indication of any attachment to a religious institution; there is no connection to any particular religious belief system. The relevant young people accept the possibility that religious experiences may occur, but they do not report having had such experiences. And the meta-atheistic dimension of worldview represents a transcendent Ultimate Being which cannot be described by mankind. This leads to a fourth conclusion: young people who do not insist on values of authenticity show a universalistic religious orientation free of ideological claims.

How do these findings and conclusions fit into the debate which we have outlined in the first paragraph? Overall there is no corroborate of Inglehart’s theory. Inglehart suggests that a high degree of secularization will result in the promotion of post-materialistic values. Authenticity is a characteristic part of the post-materialistic dimension. However, it is favoured most by young people with a traditional religious orientation. One may argue that in a modern society traditional religiosity results in the counter effect of promoting authenticity: The more one is attached to a religious institution, the more he/she will regard it as important to be free of obligations. However, it is not a secularized attitude which is connected to authenticity. As already quoted analyses state, the picture is far more complex (Arts/Halman 2004; Hagenaaars/Halman/Moors 2003; Draulans/Halman 2005).
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On the other hand, the findings do not indicate that religion will recover as a “nodal point” (Herbert 2004) which offers orientation and community. To be a nodal point, religion has to offer a clear-cut belief system with distinct practices and moral standards. The religious orientation of most young respondents is universalistic and free from ideology. There is a basic connection to humanity, but there is no particular religious character behind it. According to Herbert, this universalistic religion is not a candidate for a nodal point to bridge the gaps between the societal subsystems by offering a distinct lifestyle. Instead, this universalistic sort of religion is free of commitment. In this regard it is well adapted to the modern context because it does not contain convictions and practices which may come into conflict with societal obligations and expectations. This may also be in accordance with claims of the spiritual revolution in the modern world (Heelas/Woodhead 2005), but one may ask whether a universalistic religious orientation is pronounced enough to operate as a bearer of values.