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Cultural Change and Its Impact on Religion and the Family

- Secularization thesis: Religion and traditional values decline with economic prosperity (Norris & Inglehart, 2011)


- Both processes fueled by economic development
  - What about the relation between religion/religiosity and family orientation?
  - Direction of influence? (Eberstadt, 2013)

- Differential impact of cultural change on different aspects of adolescents’ family orientation?
  - Traditional conservative values
  - Importance of family and children in the future
Multilevel Relations of Religiosity and Family Orientation

> Individual level: Beneficial effects of religiosity on well-being, mediated through social capital, e.g. the family (Sabatier, Mayer, Friedlmeier, Lubiewska, & Trommsdorff, 2011)

> Normativity of religiosity (in a culture) related to stronger effects of religiosity (Gebauer, Sedikides, & Neberich, 2012)

> The current study: Adolescents from 20 cultures in the VOC Study

---

Multilevel effects of personal religiosity and self-reported (relative) SES on different aspects of family orientation (traditional vs. future-oriented)

---

Extrapolation from multi-level cross-sectional model to effects of cultural change (more or less appropriate)

---

Indicators of cultural change (culture-level indicators):

- Level of religiosity (measured by mean religiosity)
- Level of affluence and human development (measured by HDI)
- Level of secular-rational value orientation (World Value Survey)
- Level of self-expression value orientation (World Value Survey)
Potential of Multilevel-Models in Cross-Cultural Research

- Culture-Level Variables
- Individual-Level Variables
- Unpackage cultural differences
- Unpackage functional differences (CLI)
- Identify functional differences
- Identify average effects across cultures and conditional effects per culture
- Identify cultural differences (ICC)
- VI = Variance Component of Intercept
- VS = Variance Component of Slope
- CLI = Cross-Level Interaction
- ICC = Intraclass-Correlation
### Multilevel relations among religiosity, and family orientation in adolescence: The role of cultural change

#### Sample & Individual-Level IVs: Adolescents from 20 cultures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Religiosity* Mean (SD)</th>
<th>SES** Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>2.36 (1.39)</td>
<td>2.68 (0.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>1.54 (1.14)</td>
<td>3.17 (0.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>1.38 (0.84)</td>
<td>2.66 (0.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2.38 (1.33)</td>
<td>3.47 (0.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>2.29 (1.31)</td>
<td>3.22 (0.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India (Varanasi)</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>4.28 (0.90)</td>
<td>3.17 (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India (Pondicherry)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>3.81 (1.02)</td>
<td>2.73 (0.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>4.84 (0.41)</td>
<td>2.83 (0.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>2.79 (1.17)</td>
<td>2.87 (0.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>4.14 (1.09)</td>
<td>3.20 (0.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>1.75 (1.07)</td>
<td>3.10 (0.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.55 (1.17)</td>
<td>3.07 (0.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestinian Authority</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>4.44 (0.79)</td>
<td>3.26 (0.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>3.91 (0.91)</td>
<td>3.06 (0.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.16 (0.92)</td>
<td>3.31 (0.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>2.92 (1.09)</td>
<td>2.76 (0.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>4.14 (1.06)</td>
<td>2.63 (0.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2.59 (1.35)</td>
<td>3.17 (0.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>3.93 (1.07)</td>
<td>3.13 (0.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>3.80 (1.33)</td>
<td>3.22 (0.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2254</td>
<td>3135</td>
<td>5389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Religious beliefs 1 = not at all important – 5 = very important  
**Economic status compared to others 1 = low – 5 = upper

\[ F = 237.6, p < .001, \eta^2 = .46 \]
\[ F = 24.1, p < .001, \eta^2 = .09 \]
Dependent Variables: Adolescents’ Family Orientation

1. Traditional (Conservative) Family Values
   — 5 items short scale derived from Georgas (2001)
   — “We should honor and protect our family’s reputation” (sample item)
   — Scale from 1 = “Not important at all” to 5 = “Very important”
   — Cronbachs’ Alpha between .45 and .81

2. Value of Children (VOC)
   — Utilitarian-normative VOC: Economic and social-normative reasons for having children
     – 8 items, e.g., “To have one more person to help your family economically” / “Because older relatives feel that you should have more children”
     – Cronbachs’ Alpha between .55 and .86
   — Psychological VOC: Psychological/emotional reasons for having children
     – 7 items, e.g., “Because it is a joy to have a small baby”
     – Cronbachs’ Alpha between .72 and .89

3. Family Future Orientation
   — Single item: “Family will be the most important thing in my life; everything else will be less important.”
   — Scale from 1 = “Not at all” to 5 = “Very much” (extent to which statement corresponds with your personal way of thinking)

4. Intended number of children (future family)
Correlations among Culture-Level IVs (1)

Multilevel relations among religiosity, and family orientation in adolescence: The role of cultural change

Correlations:
- $r = -0.60$
- $r = -0.07$

Graphs showing correlations between HDI and religiosity, and world values survey dimensions (wave 4).
Correlations among Culture-Level IVs (2)
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\[ r = 0.54 \]

\[ r = 0.53 \]
Correlations among Culture-Level IVs (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Religiosity</th>
<th>Secular-Rational Values</th>
<th>Self-Expression Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HDI</td>
<td>-.60**</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td>.54*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secular-Rational</td>
<td>-.92***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Religiosity and secular-rational values measure almost perfectly polar opposites
- Religiosity and HDI substantially negatively related, but not collinear
- Religiosity and secular-rational values unrelated to self-expression values
- HDI ≈ .50 related to both secular-rational as well as self-expression values
- Strategy: include HDI and religiosity as well as secular-rational values and self-expression values together as predictors in separate multi-level models
Religiosity and Family Values: Culture-Level Effects of Religiosity and HDI

Multilevel relations among religiosity, and family orientation in adolescence: The role of cultural change

Variance comps of random effects before/after including culture-level-predictors:
- Intercept: $0.11^{**} / 0.03^{*}$
- Slope: $0.003^{*} / 0.001$ ns

Culture-Level Predictors

- N = 20

Religiosity

- N = 5256

Religiosity

Religiosity and HDI

HDI

Religiosity

Religiosity and Family Values

Family Values
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### Summary of Results of ML-Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Individual-level</th>
<th>Culture-level (1)</th>
<th>Culture-level (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>SES</td>
<td>Religiosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Values</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian-normative VOC</td>
<td>.06**</td>
<td>-.03*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological VOC</td>
<td>.07**</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Future Orientation</td>
<td>.11***</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.04+</td>
<td>.31*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ p < .1  * p < .05  ** p < .01  *** p < .001. Unstandardized regression coefficients.
Religiosity important individual-level aspect for family orientation. In cultures with low religiosity, the relation is less strong. Overall small effect, though.

At the cultural level, the more normative religiosity is, the higher adolescents’ family orientation (traditional as well as future-oriented).

Individual-level SES hardly important for family orientation; culture-level affluence strong negative effect on traditional aspects, but no effect on future-oriented aspects (even positive on no. of children).

Economic development (+ syndromes of cultural individualism/independence) does not uniquely affect the importance of the family, but concomitant religious decline seems to lead to less overall family orientation.

Religiosity as part of cultural value systems ➔ more consideration in psychological models of family change.
Acknowledgements

“Value of Children and Intergenerational Relations”

Principal Investigators: Prof. Dr. G. Trommsdorff & Prof. Dr. B. Nauck

Team leaders and team members in the collaborating countries:

Czech Republic: Prof. Dr. Ivo Mozny, Prof. Dr. Petr Pakosta
China: Prof. Dr. Gang Zheng, Dr. Shaohua Shi, Dr. Hong Tang
Estonia: Dr. Kairi Kasearu
France: Prof. Dr. Colette Sabatier, Dr. Lyda Lannegrand-Willems
Germany: Prof. Dr. Gisela Trommsdorff, Prof. Dr. Bernhard Nauck, PD Dr. Beate Schwarz, Dr. Isabelle Albert, Dr. Daniela Klaus, Dr. Boris Mayer, Dr. Jana Suckow
India: Prof. Dr. Ramesh Mishra (Varanasi), Dr. Arun Tipandjan (Pondicherry)
Indonesia: Prof. Dr. Kusdwiratri Setiono, Dr. Lieke Wisnubrata, Prof. Dr. Samsunuwijati Marat, Peter R. Nelwan, MA
Israel and the Palestinian Authority: Dr. Asher Ben-Arie, Dr. Muhammad M. Haj-Yahia
Italy: Dr. Daniela Barni
Japan: Chiaki Yamada, MA
Jamaica: Annekatrin Bock, MA
Poland: Dr. Katarzyna Lubiewska
Romania: Prof. Dr. Mihaela Friedlmeier
Russia: Prof. Dr. Zarethkan Saralieva, Prof. Dr. Vladimir Blonin, Prof. Dr. Alexander Iudin
South Africa: Prof. Dr. Karl Peltzer
Switzerland: Dipl.-Psych. Karen Fux
Turkey: Dr. Bilge Ataca, Prof. Dr. Cigdem Kagitcibasi
United States: Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Friedlmeier, Prof. Dr. Mihaela Friedlmeier
Thank you!

boris.mayer@psy.unibe.ch

gisela.trommsdorff@uni-konstanz.de
References


