

The relation of family, freedom and religion – separate or connected values? (sociological and ethical implications)¹

Ondrej Štefaňak, Viera Zozuláková

DOI: 10.17846/SS.2021.6.1.86-101

Abstract

Research on family structure and values has burgeoned over the past few decades. The purpose of this study is to observe whether family, freedom and religion can be considered as separate or connected values and focus on religion and freedom as perceived in selected European countries (Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, Poland and Czech Republic). The presented conclusions are based primarily on a representative empirical research of Slovaks' value orientations (1000 respondents), carried out in 2019 as a part of the national research project. As such, they are intended to not be ideologically encumbered, but rather sociologically balanced. We also partially refer to the data from *European Values Study* carried out in 2017. The presented research consists of two main parts: Values of family, freedom and religion in selected European countries; and Relations between family, freedom and religion in Slovak society.

Keywords: family, freedom of choice, religion, values, culture

Introduction

According to Daniel Bell (1972, 1976), traditional culture is closely related to religion. Traditional value system was overturned by urbanization and new consumer habits, formation of consumer lifestyle and growth of mass consumption. In analyzing American society, Bell

¹ This work was supported by the Slovak Research and Development Agency under the contract No. APVV-16-0116.

points out that asceticism embodied in Puritan morality held back the hedonism based on actualization of human possibility, as it morally limited the pretentious shows of luxury. The weakening of religious influence has led to the society having almost no restraint and morale falters. One feels free when not limited by moral norms. Though Bell analyses American society, the tendencies observable in Europe are similar, despite it having long been divided into Western and Eastern blocs. Even here, it is possible to see the efforts to shed all hindrances. Additionally, in recent past, in the post-Eastern Bloc landscape, it has been possible to observe, alongside the growing liberalism of society, an increase in anti-Christian sentiment, verbal attacks on Christianity, Christian values and symbolism, both in media and on social networks. As if, after the socialist period, when atheism was an official ideology and religion's label of the enslaving opium of the people entered the society's awareness for several decades, a new type of man, *homo felix* (Lipovetsky 2006), unfettered, secular, building his own hedonist life. In his *A far glory: The Quest for the faith in the Age of Credulity* (1992), Peter L. Berger examines the importance of faith for contemporary world and inquires what does it mean 'to believe' in the age of rationality and carelessness. Many believe, as Sharon James (2020) states in analyzing the relationship of Christianity and Freedom that 'many people assume the liberty and justice that we take for granted today are the results of secular thinking'. The truth is that this stance arises from a misinterpretation of the essence of Christianity. Traditional culture, which also includes religious teachings, traditions and customs, is conservative, offers that which mass culture cannot – a coherent set of answers to existential predicaments which people encounter throughout their lives (Bell, 1976). In contemporary society, many changes take place, with the understanding of family and freedom shifting alongside the understanding of religion in general and Christianity specifically. As if family has stopped being the traditional cornerstone of society and has become perceivable as a hindering element in relation to freedom. Traditional close relationships are becoming impersonal. Anthony Giddens (1992) writes: 'Peter Berger, borrowing a notion from Arnold Gehlen, argues that the private sphere has become "deinstitutionalised", as a result of the general influence of mass society.

Conceptual Framework

For many years, the research of European values seems to put at irreconcilable odds the traditional (Christian) and modern (liberal, enlightenment) value systems. Tendency to adhere to enlightenment values, to which Western countries also subscribe, is permeating into other European cultures. The struggle between conservatives and liberals is growing stronger, especially in post-communist countries. The aim of the presented research is, in accordance with the project it is a part of, to observe the changes in the value system, relation of family and religion, family and freedom, as well as religion and freedom in selected European countries.

In reflecting on the interrelations of family, religion and freedom, the viewpoint of empirical sociology – which observes, analyzes and describes the social universe of contemporary humanity – should not be omitted. It asks e.g. what role does religion play in the discussion on the value of family, what is the necessary amount of freedom in familial life, to what extent are children and young adults brought up to value freedom of choice and how religiosity (belief) influences this freedom. Initially, it can be stated that all the mentioned values hold a relatively high position in Slovak culture, especially family and freedom, but religion as well – at least on a declarative level.

In the context outlined, it should be noted that the empirical analyses presented here are based on the respondents' self-evaluation. It is admissible that the accepted values express at least the readiness of respondents to act in accordance with the declared stances. Let us now introduce the methodology utilized and the specific empirical analyses. The relevant data from representative sociological research pertaining to Slovak society will be presented on the backdrop of data on selected European countries from *European Values Study* from 2017 (Bulgaria, Poland, Czech Republic, Austria and Slovakia). In addition to the theoretical-methodological foundation, the presented research consists of two main parts: Values of family, freedom and religion in selected European countries; and Relations between family, freedom and religion in Slovak society.

Methodology

The main goal (research problem) of the research is the analysis of relations between values of family, freedom and religion. Traditionally, value of family has been connected to the domain of religion, while freedom has been, in a certain sense, understood as its counter pole. Many believe that this is still the case. Some would even claim that when religion falters, family ‘falls’ and freedom ‘triumphs’. Can a believer feel free? In the context outlined, we would like to introduce several interesting sociological analyses and theoretical reflections, from which an image of real relation between family, freedom and religion in the awareness of Slovak people gradually emerges.

The presented conclusions are based primarily on a representative empirical research of Slovaks’ value orientations, with a sample size of 1000 respondents, carried out in 2019 as a part of the APVV-16-0116 project. As such, they are intended to not be ideologically encumbered, but rather sociologically balanced. We will also partially refer to the data from *European Values Study* carried out in 2017. Due to this, we are able to compare the importance of family, freedom and religion to Slovaks and to Bulgarians, Poles, Czechs and Austrians.

Correlation and statistical analyses of data were performed using SPSS statistical software, which served as the primary statistical calculating tool. In the analyses of statistical links and dependencies, we used χ^2 test and Cramér’s V . χ^2 test is one of the most frequently used statistical tests in social sciences. In its use, we utilize null hypothesis, which assumes that selected variables are independent of each other. Alongside increasing of the difference between expected and observed values, the value of χ^2 also increases. On the basis of the χ^2 test, the significance level (p) is calculated. In presenting the results of the empirical research, we will also employ the marginal significance level (α) 0.01 (cf. Pawkow and Pierce, 2003). Cramér’s V is also based on the χ^2 test. Its value falls on the interval [0, 1]. Dependence of the selected variables will be stronger when Cramér’s V nears the value of one (cf. Řoutil, 2004).

Values of family, freedom and religion in the selected European countries

Prior to introducing the correlations of values of family, freedom and religion in Slovak society, it is appropriate to first provide information on how much Slovaks value each of these separately – here done on the backdrop of data from other European countries (Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, Poland and Czech Republic) for reference. We will refer to the most up-to-date empirical results of the *European Values Study* (2017). Table 1 informs about the importance of family in these European countries.

Table 1. Importance of family in selected European countries (%).

Family	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total
Bulgaria	87.3	11.3	0.9	-	0.2	0.3	100.0
Poland	93.5	5.5	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.1	100.0
Czech Republic	87.7	10.1	1.5	0.3	0.1	0.3	100.0
Austria	83.6	13.0	2.9	0.3	-	0.1	100.0
Slovakia	91.2	8.2	0.6	-	-	-	100.0
Slovakia (APVV)	91.2	6.6	1.4	0.4	0.1	0.3	100.0

Family: A – very important; B – quite important; C – not important; D – not at all important; E – don't know; F – no answer.

On the basis of representative research of Slovaks' value orientation carried out as a part of APVV-16-0116, family is important to 97.8% of all respondents (very important to 97.8%; quite important to 6.6%), while only 1.8% do not consider it important (not important 1.4%; not at all important 0.4%). Comparison with selected European countries based on the data from *European Values Study* shows that Slovaks consider family to be very important a little less than Poles (93.5%), but a little more than Czechs (87.7%), Bulgarians (87.3%) and Austrians (83.6%). The importance of religion in selected European countries is addressed in Table 2.

Table 2. Importance of religion in selected European countries (%).

Religion	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total
Bulgaria	21.7	37.6	25.9	11.6	1.7	1.5	100.0
Poland	38.6	41.0	12.9	6.7	0.7	0.1	100.0
Czech Republic	8.5	12.1	26.7	48.5	1.1	3.1	100.0
Austria	13.8	30.2	32.7	22.3	0.5	0.4	100.0
Slovakia	28.5	29.0	26.3	15.7	0.2	0.3	100.0
Slovakia (APVV)	17.0	25.3	23.7	29.6	2.3	2.1	100.0

Religion: A – very important; B – quite important; C – not important;
D – not at all important; E – don't know; F – no answer.

On the basis of representative research of Slovaks' value orientation carried out as a part of APVV-16-0116, religion is more or less important to 42.3% of respondents (very important to 17.0%; quite important to 25.3%), while 53.3% do not consider it important (not important 23.7%; not at all important 29.6%). Comparison with selected European countries based on the data from *European Values Study* shows that Slovaks consider religion to be very important noticeably less than Poles (38.6%), approximately the same as Bulgarians (21.7%), and significantly more than Austrians (13.8%) and Czechs (8.5%). The perceived degree of freedom of choice in selected European countries is addressed in Table 3.

Table 3. Perceived degree of freedom of choice in selected European countries (%).

Degree of freedom of choice	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	A	B	Total
Bulgaria	3.1	3.3	4.8	6.8	14.2	10.4	13.7	16.0	7.7	15.1	3.1	1.7	100.0
Poland	2.7	1.1	2.6	3.1	16.3	8.7	17.0	21.9	11.2	13.2	1.8	0.2	100.0
Czech Republic	1.5	1.7	3.4	4.6	12.7	9.6	14.6	21.9	13.5	14.7	1.4	0.4	100.0
Austria	1.3	0.7	2.8	4.8	11.4	11.6	18.1	22.6	9.9	16.1	0.2	0.4	100.0
Slovakia	0.8	1.4	1.7	4.2	14.6	14.4	16.8	16.9	13.4	14.3	1.2	0.3	100.0
Slovakia (APVV)	0.8	1.2	3.0	5.3	9.9	9.7	15.3	19.4	14.9	19.2	0.8	0.5	100.0

Degree of freedom of choice: 1 – none at all; 10 – a great deal;
A – don't know; B – no answer.

Regarding the perceived degree of freedom of choice and control over one's life, on the basis of representative sociological research of Slovaks' value orientations carried out as a part of APVV-16-0116, 78.5% respondents more or less incline to belief that they possess freedom of choice, while 20.2% of the people questioned more or less believe they do not possess freedom of choice. Comparison with selected European countries based on the data from *European Values Study* shows that Slovaks tend to perceive the extent of personal freedom of choice approximately at the same degree as Austrians (78.3%), Czechs (74.3%) and Poles (72.0%) and, at the same time, a little more than Bulgarians (62.9%). The frequency of attendance of religious services in selected European countries is addressed in Table 4.

Table 4. Frequency of attendance of religious services in selected European countries (%).

Frequency of attendance of religious services	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	Total
Bulgaria	2.4	6.5	9.6	43.8	7.2	11.3	17.8	0.4	1.0	100.0
Poland	6.4	42.6	16.4	15.7	3.4	5.0	9.2	0.7	0.7	100.0
Czech Republic	1.4	5.2	2.7	10.4	10.0	9.5	59.2	0.4	1.2	100.0
Austria	2.0	11.3	14.3	22.7	6.0	12.4	31.0	0.1	0.2	100.0
Slovakia	7.2	23.8	10.0	13.7	3.8	16.2	24.4	0.1	0.7	100.0
Slovakia (APVV)	5.3	16.1	6.5	12.7	8.9	10.0	36.5	1.0	3.0	100.0

Frequency of attendance of religious services: A – more than once a week;

B – once a week; C – once a month; D – only on specific holy days;

E – once a year; F – less often; G – never, practically never; H – don't know;

I – no answer

Regarding the frequency of attendance of religious services, on the basis of representative sociological research of Slovaks' value orientations carried out as a part of APVV-16-0116, 21.4% of respondents attend religious services at least once a week (5.3% more than once a week; 16.1% once a week), 49.5% of questioned Slovaks attend religious services at least once per year (6.5% of them once per month; 12.7% only on particular holy days and 8.9% once a year) and 46.5% less than that or never (with 10.0% less than once a year, 15.1% practically never and

21.4% never attending). Comparison with selected European countries based on the data from *European Values Study* shows that Slovaks attend religious services markedly less than Poles (49.0%), and markedly more than Austrians (13.3%), Bulgarians (8.9%) and Czechs (6.6%). Religious denomination of population of selected European countries is addressed in Table 5.

Table 5. Religious denomination in selected European countries (%).

Religious denomination	Yes	No	Don't know	No answer	Total
Bulgaria	73.7	25.0	0.5	0.8	100.0
Poland	91.2	7.8	0.5	0.4	100.0
Czech Republic	26.0	72.6	0.4	1.0	100.0
Austria	73.1	26.7	0.1	0.2	100.0
Slovakia	74.9	24.3	0.3	0.5	100.0
Slovakia (APVV)	69.2	25.0	2.5	3.3	100.0

Regarding religious denomination, on the basis of representative sociological research of Slovaks' value orientations carried out as a part of APVV-16-0116, 69.2% of respondents professed belonging to a religious denomination, while 25.0% did not profess belonging to any religious organization (don't know – 2.5%; no answer – 3.3%). Comparison with selected European countries based on the data from *European Values Study* shows that Slovaks identify with a religious denomination less frequently than Poles (91.2%), almost the same as Bulgarians (73.7%) and Austrians (73.1%) and significantly more frequently than Czechs (26.0%).

Relations between family, freedom and religion in Slovak society

In the next part of this study, we would like to introduce several thought-provoking sociological analyses, which gradually reveal the shape of interrelations between the values of family, freedom and religion in Slovak society. The relation between the importance of religion and family in the awareness of Slovaks is shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Relation between the importance of religion and the importance of family (%).

Religion	A	B	C	D	Total
Very important	95.9	3.5	0.6	-	100.0
Quite important	92.1	5.6	1.6	0.8	100.0
Not important	93.2	5.1	1.3	0.4	100.0
Not at all important	86.8	10.8	2.0	0.3	100.0
Total (N = 955)	91.4	6.7	1.5	0.4	100.0

Family: A – very important; B – quite important; C – not important; D – not at all important.

Statistical tests ($\chi^2 = 15.83$; $df = 9$; $p = 0.071$; $V = 0.074$).

While a statistically relevant correlation was not observed in case of relation between the described variables ($p = 0.071$), a more careful look at the data presented reveals that the respondents who consider religion more important also declared family to be important in their lives somewhat more than those who consider religion less important. Specifically, family is very important to 95.9% of the respondents who consider religion very important, 92.1% of those who consider religion quite important, 93.2% of those who consider religion not important; at the same time, the smallest percentage – 86.8% – of those who consider religion not at all important consider family very important. The relation between importance of religion and perceived degree of freedom of choice is documented in Table 7.

Table 7. Relation between the importance of religion and perceived degree of freedom of choice (%).

Religion	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
Very important	1.8	-	3.6	6.0	7.8	9.0	12.7	17.5	16.3	25.3	100.0
Quite important	-	1.2	2.4	5.6	13.3	9.6	16.9	19.3	15.7	16.1	100.0
Not important	0.4	0.9	3.4	3.4	9.4	11.9	17.0	20.9	17.9	14.9	100.0
Not at all important	0.7	1.7	2.4	6.8	8.2	8.2	15.0	20.4	12.6	24.1	100.0
Total (N = 944)	0.6	1.1	2.9	5.5	9.7	9.6	15.6	19.7	15.4	19.9	100.0

Degree of freedom of choice: 1 – none at all; 10 – a great deal.

Statistical tests ($\chi^2 = 33.47$; $df = 27$; $p = 0.182$; $V = 0.108$).

As in the previous case, the interrelation of the described variables does not show statistically significant correlation ($p = 0.182$). However, the data reveal that those who consider religion very important perceive a slightly greater freedom of choice than those who consider religion not at all important. Taking into account the two highest values of perceived freedom of choice, it can be observed that a great freedom of choice is felt by 41.6% of those who consider religion very important and 31.8% of those who consider religion quite important, 32.8% of those who consider religion not important, and 36.7% of those who consider religion not at all important. The relation between frequency of attendance of religious services and perceived degree of freedom of choice is shown in Table 8.

Table 8. Relation between frequency of attendance of religious services and perceived degree of freedom of choice (%).

Attendance of religious services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
More than once a week	-	-	3.8	-	5.8	3.8	17.3	19.2	30.8	19.2	100.0
Once a week	-	1.3	1.9	9.4	11.9	12.6	13.2	18.9	11.3	19.5	100.0
Once a month	-	-	-	7.8	9.4	12.5	12.5	20.3	14.1	23.4	100.0
Only on specific holy days	0.8	0.8	4.0	2.4	10.3	9.5	13.5	21.4	23.8	13.5	100.0
Once a year	3.4	1.1	4.5	3.4	11.4	8.0	15.9	28.4	11.4	12.5	100.0
Less than once a year	-	1.0	1.0	5.1	8.1	15.2	19.2	17.2	16.2	17.2	100.0
Practically never	0.7	1.3	4.0	3.3	9.3	8.7	17.3	20.0	14.0	21.3	100.0
Never	0.5	2.3	3.3	6.1	10.3	7.5	15.5	16.4	13.6	24.4	100.0
Total (N = 951)	0.6	1.3	2.9	5.2	10.0	9.8	15.5	19.7	15.7	19.5	100.0

Degree of freedom of choice: 1 – none at all; 10 – a great deal.

Statistical tests ($\chi^2 = 78.85$; $df = 63$; $p = 0.086$; $V = 0.108$).

Again, the interrelation of the described variables here does not show statistically significant correlation ($p = 0.086$). A more thorough look at the presented results reveals, however, that the highest degree of freedom of choice is felt by respondents who attend religious services more than once a week (50.0% if taking into account the two highest values),

while the least freedom of choice is perceived by those who attend religious services once a year (23.9% if taking into account the two lowest values). Other groups of respondents fall in the middle without greater differences. The relation between religious denomination and opinion that a child needs both a mother and a father is documented in Table 9.

Table 9. Relation between religious denomination and opinion that a child needs both a mother and a father.

Religious denomination	A	B	Total
Yes	90.0	10.0	100.0
No	80.4	19.6	100.0
Total (N = 897)	87.4	12.6	100.0

Opinion that a child needs both a mother and a father:

A – more or less agree; B – more or less disagree

Statistical tests: ($\chi^2 = 13.67$; $df = 1$; $p < 0.0005$; $V = 0.123$).

On the basis of the representative sociological research of Slovaks' value systems carried out as a part of APVV-16-0116, 82.6% of Slovaks more or less agree with statement that a child needs both parents in order to grow up happily, while 11.8% of the people asked more or less disagree (don't know – 4.6%; no answer – 1.0%). In this case, the interrelation of the described variables does show statistically significant correlation, though with only a relatively weak force of dependence ($p < 0.0005$; $V = 0.123$). On the basis of the empirical indicators obtained, it can be stated that the respondents who professed a belonging to a religious denomination tend to believe that a child needs both parents to grow up happily more often, while respondents who did not profess a belonging to a religious denomination disagree with this statement more (with percentual difference of 9.6%). The relation between the importance of family and the opinion that a child needs both a mother and a father is documented in Table 10.

Table 10. Relation between the importance of family and opinion that a child needs both a mother and a father.

Family	A	B	Total
Very important	88.5	11.5	100.0
Quite important	76.3	23.7	100.0
Not important	63.6	36.4	100.0
Not at all important	100.0	-	100.0
Total (N = 941)	87.5	12.5	100.0

Opinion that a child needs both a mother and a father:

A – more or less agree; B – more or less disagree

Statistical tests: ($\chi^2 = 13.68$; $df = 3$; $p = 0.003$; $V = 0.121$).

The interrelation of the described variables in this case shows statistically significant correlation, though with only a relatively weak force of dependence ($p = 0.003$; $V = 0.121$). In any event, it can be stated that respondents who consider family more important tend to believe that a child needs both parents to grow up happily significantly more frequently than those for whom family is less important. Specifically, agreement with this statement was expressed by 88.5% of the respondents who consider family very important, 76.3% of those who consider family quite important, and 63.6% of those who consider family not important (data on the last option are not reliable, since only three respondents who answered this question consider family not at all important). Finally, the relation between the importance of family and the nature of parental responsibility towards children is documented in Table 11.

Table 11. Relation between the importance of family and the nature of parental responsibility towards children (%).

Family	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
Very important	24.0	16.0	15.1	10.8	16.8	5.1	4.4	3.2	2.3	2.1	100.0
Quite important	12.5	10.9	9.4	10.9	25.0	15.6	6.2	1.6	1.6	6.2	100.0
Not important	-	7.1	14.3	28.6	14.3	14.3	14.3	-	7.1	-	100.0
Not at all important	-	25.0	25.0	-	-	-	25.0	-	25.0	-	100.0
Total (N = 981)	22.8	15.6	14.8	11.0	17.2	5.9	4.8	3.1	2.4	2.3	100.0

Nature of parental responsibility: 1 – parents should do their utmost best for their children, even at the cost of their own well-being; 1 – parents have a life of their own and should not be asked to sacrifice their own well-being for the sake of their children.

Statistical tests: ($\chi^2 = 53.99$; $df = 27$; $p = 0.002$; $V = 0.135$).

The data obtained in representative sociological research of Slovaks' value systems carried out as a part of APVV-16-0116 show that, regarding the topic of parental responsibilities, 80.1% of respondents more or less agree that it is parents' duty to do their utmost best for their children, even at the cost of their own well-being, while 18.3% of respondents more or less agree that parents have their own lives and should not be asked to sacrifice their own well-being for their children (don't know – 0.9%; no answer – 0.7%). The interrelation of the variables described here also shows statistically significant correlation, though, as in previous cases, only with a weak force of dependence ($p = 0.002$; $V = 0.135$). On the basis of the obtained empirical indicators, it can be claimed that the respondents for whom family is more important significantly more frequently expressed the opinion that parents should do everything they can for their children, regardless of their well-being, than the respondents who consider family less important. If the two lowest values are taken into account, it can be specified that agreement with the described sentiment was expressed by 40.0% of respondents who consider family very important, 23.4% of those who consider family quite important, and only 7.1% of those who consider family not important (as in previous case, it has to be noted that only four respondents who answered this question consider family not at all important).

Conclusion

Summarizing the presented empirical analyses, it can be stated that among the surveyed Slovaks, there exist certain, generally positive, relations between family, freedom and religion. In the introduction of this text, we first outlined a thesis that the value of family has traditionally been connected to the domain of religion. This has been proven also by the empirical analyses presented here. We can notice e.g. the positive correlation between the importance of religion and family in the cognition of the surveyed persons, as well as between religious denomination and defense of so-called traditional family, in which a child has both a mother and a father. Moreover, we have also pointed out that, traditionally, freedom was, in a certain sense, understood as a counter pole to religion. Naturally, this statement can be controverted, especially in the context of totalitarian regimes, in which the domain of religion is understood rather as an oasis of freedom (cf. Mariański, 2005). The outlined dilemma is, in fact, reflected in the presented empirical analyses, which show that a higher degree of perceived freedom of choice and control over one's life is not connected only to lower degrees of religiosity, but even more so to its higher degrees, primarily in people who consider religion very important, or those who attend religious services more than once a week.

It is obvious that the notion of freedom of action is understood differently by different people – some see it as an option to do whatever they want, others as a possibility to do good, look for and spread the truth... but that is a topic for an entirely separate analysis. On the basis of the results of sociological research of life and moral values of Slovak youth in the beginning of the 2010s, however, it can be noted that a deeper religious faith is connected more to freedom in an objective understanding (freedom as an option to do good and to look for and spread the truth) – 76.9%, while indifference in belief and lack of belief are connected more to freedom in a subjective understanding (freedom as a possibility to do as one chooses) – 73.9% (cf. Štefaňak, 2013).

The comparison of data obtained with empirical data from selected European countries also indirectly validates the thesis that there is a positive relation between religion and family. We could observe, among other things, a positive correlation between importance of family and of religion, frequency of attendance of religious services and religious

denomination. In all the mentioned variables, highest indicators were observed among Poles, slightly lower among Slovaks and even lower in Bulgarians, Austrians and Czechs (cf. Mariański, 2012). Second of the outlined theses (relation of religion and freedom) cannot be explicitly validated nor invalidated, since Slovaks incline to belief that they have an option to direct their lives to approximately the same extent as Austrians, Czechs and Poles and, at the same time, somewhat more than Bulgarians. It seems that the perceived degree of freedom of choice is more related to the degree of economic development of a given country (or political establishment) than religion (cf. Norris and Inglehart, 2005).

Bibliography

- ABDULLA, M., R. (2018): Culture, Religion, and Freedom of Religion or Belief. In: *The Review of Faith & International Affairs*. 16:4, 102-115, DOI: 10.1080/15570274.2018.1535033
- BELL, D. (1972): The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism. In: *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, Vol. 6, No. 1/2, Special Double Issue: Capitalism, Culture, and Education (Jan. - Apr.), pp. 11-38, University of Illinois Press.
- BELL, D. (1976): *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism*. New York: Basic Books.
- BERGER, P. L. (1992): *A Far Glory: The Quest for the faith in the Age of Credulity*. Free Press.
- DALY, M. (2020): Conceptualizing and Analyzing Family Policy and How It Is Changing. In: Nieuwenhuis R., Van Lancker W. (eds) *The Palgrave Handbook of Family Policy*. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-54618-2_2
- DRIEZEN, A., VERSCHRAEGEN, G., CLYQC, N. (2020): Religion and everyday cosmopolitanism among religious and non-religious urban youth. In: *Current Sociology*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392120932942>
- European Values Study*: <https://europeanvaluesstudy.eu/>, Access online: Feb. 28, 2020.
- ESPING-ANDERSEN, G. (2016): *Families in the 21st Century*. Stockholm, Sweden: SNS Vorlag.
- GIDDENS, A. (1992): *The Cosequences of Modernity*. Polity Press.
- JAMES, S. (2020): *Christianity's impact on freedom and justice*. Online: <https://www.christian.org.uk/features/christianitys-impact-on-freedom-and-justice>
- LIPOVETSKY, G. (2005): *Hypermodern Times*. Polity Press.

- LIPOVETSKY, G. (2006): *Le bonheur paradoxal. Essai sur la société d'hyperconsommation*, ed. Gallimard.
- MARIAŃSKI, J. (2005): *Kościół katolicki w Polsce a życie społeczne*. Lublin: Gaudium.
- MARIAŃSKI, J. (2012): *Małżeństwo i rodzina w świadomości młodzieży maturalnej – stabilność i zmiana*. Toruń: Adam Marszałek.
- NORRIS, P., INGLEHART, R. (2005): *Sacred and Secular. Religion and Politics Worldwide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- PAWKOW, T. W., PIERCE, K. A. (2003): *Ready, Set, Go! A Student Guide to SPSS 11.0 for Windows*. Perdue: University Calumet.
- SANTOS, B. de Sousa (ed.) (2007): *Cognitive justice in a global world: prudent knowledge for a decent life*. Lanham: Lexington.
- SEN, A. (1999): *Development as freedom*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- SHAH, T. S., Hertzke, A. D. (ed.) (2016): *Christianity and Freedom*. Vol. 1: *Historical perspectives*. Cambridge University Press, <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781316408582>
- SHAH, T. S., HERTZKE, A. D. (ed.) (2016): *Christianity and Freedom*. Vol. 2: *Contemporary Perspectives*. Cambridge University.
- SOBCZYK, M. (2004): *Statystyka*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- ŠTEFAŃAK, O. (2013): *Wartości moralne maturzystów słowackich. Na przykładzie diecezji spiskiej*. Lublin: Norbertinum.
- WILKINSON, R., PICKETT, K. (2011): *The spirit level: why more equal societies almost always do better*. New York: Bloomsbury Press.

assoc. prof. Ondrej Štefaňak, PhD.

Department of Sociology, Faculty of Arts
Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra
Slovakia

email: ostafanak@ukf.sk

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-9362-993X

WOS Researcher ID: AAG-6800-2020

Viera Zozuláková, PhD.

Department of Sociology, Faculty of Arts
Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra
Slovakia

email: vzozulakova@ukf.sk

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-7035-8743

WOS Researcher ID: AAB-5534-2020

Scopus Author ID: 57191340873