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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

India is a secular democracy and is the home to Hinduism, Islam, Christianity, Buddhism, Jainism, Sikhism and many other religions. In India religion is a way of life, an integral part of one's day to day activities, influencing every aspect of life. Common practices through ages had influenced faiths and festivals that marked the sharing of music, dance, and feasting among all communities every year. Each religion has its own pilgrimage sites, legends and heroes.

1.1 Modernization:

Modernization is to be regarded as a new term for an old process—the process of social change whereby less developed societies acquire characteristics common to more developed societies (Learner, 1968), it is important to recall that effort to developed is an adequate conceptualization of the process extended to a century. In fact, Karl Marx was probably the first to note this process as activated by inter-social communication, when in the preface to Das Kapital he observed: “The country that is more developed industrially only shows, to the less developed the image of its own future”. This ‘showing’, one may argue, includes not only the ‘images’ transmitted to the elites and masses of the less developed countries through the normal channels of international communication and dissemination, but also the relatively sophisticated conceptualization and dissemination developed by the social scientists and theorist of he developed nations, transmit to their counterparts of the less developed nations. An interesting, though less noticed feature of this process in the recent past is the effort at
‘self-study’ to which the social scientists and scholars of the modernized societies have been progressively driven, while engaged in conceptualizing the process of modernization. The consequent re-consideration has not only entailed a substantial modification in the evaluation of the historical paths of these nations from the past to the present, but has also occasioned a considerable re-organization of their societal theories and policies, including new ways of estimating policy paths from the present to the future. This is not to minimize the importance of the significant advances made by them in the theoretical task of conceptualizing the complex process of modernization itself; for, despite conceptual and terminological differences of more or less importance, there appears today a large area of agreement in these circles regarding the salient characteristics (operational values) of modernity. The question rather is whether in the case of the social scientists of the less developed countries, particularly India, one could discern first, a similar indication for a national ‘self-study’, as an off-shoot or by-product of their efforts to conceptualize the phenomenon of modernization; and secondly, whether their theorization is based on a critical appraisal of the available models of the process, both in respect of their analytical characteristics, relevance and applicability to the Indian context.

The process of change in social life is a universal reality. No human society can remain stagnant forever. Social change is inevitable. The rates of change, however, vary not only from society to society but also form time to time. In developing countries, in spite of traditional obstructions and socio-cultural hindrances, societies are changing. This change in the mode of life, patterns of marital and social relationship, systems of economic distributions and ways of behaviour have given birth to a new process termed as modernization.
Modernization signifies the economic and political aspirations of the third world countries. It signifies a prescribed course of change for a traditional as well as a modernizing society. The salient features of the modernization are:

- It is a process of structural transformation of social, economic and political structures.
- It signifies a conscious process, a process of purposive and planned change.
- It implies transformation in the direction of increasing economic rationality, technological rapidity and structural elasticity.

1.1.1 Meaning of modernization:

“Modernization means the development of a modern outlook in every day life.” It does not mean the abandonment of religion and more acceptances of modern equipments, tools and gadgets. It refers to an inherent change in the mode of life. Technological achievements and scientific advancement in developing countries is limited. The development of rational outlook and scientific approach is also limited. Many aspects of socio-cultural life are still dominated by faith-oriented ideologies and traditions. Yet it can not be denied that the traditional approach is becoming significant and the traditional practices are being replaced by the modern ones.

“The reality which modernization seeks to size up is vast and complex. It implies a retrospective and prospective reference. In retrospect, modernization refers to the type of social change which originated in the industrial revolution in England during 1776-1830 and in the political revolution in France during 1784-1794.”

According to Deutch, “Modernization is a process in which major clusters of old social, economic and psychological commitments are eroded and broken and people become available for new pattern of socialization and behaviour.”
A modern society is characterized by a growing differentiation of the major elements of cultural and value systems such as religion, philosophy and science. It implies the spread of literacy and secular education and a complex system for the cultivation and advancement of specialized roles based on intellectual disciplines.

Some aspects of social change in recent times can be explained through the concept of modernization, which is considered to be a world-wide phenomenon. Despite voluminous literature on modernization, this concept still remains to be sharply defined. “There is no standard model of modernization and no fixed path, for its attainment.”

The term Modernization is derived from the word ‘Modern’. This idea is relative and much too vague. Ganguly has argued that, “If we divide the history of the world into ancient, medieval or modern, we find that the last period it covers a long stretch of time as well as a variety of trends”. “Under the influence of Pax Britannica, the social change that occurred is labeled as westernized”.

Singh considered, “The processes of economic growth, expansion of science and technology and change in the social structure commensurate with demands for social and economic growth as essential components of modernization”.

Dube has made an attempt to define modernization as “A process, a movement from a traditional or a quasi traditional order to a certain desired type of technology and associated forms of social culture, value orientation and motivations and norms.”

In the process of modernization, economic pressure is the prime mover and it is so powerful that the social structure has to change eventually. In other words, one does not modernize for the sake of modernization but does so under economic compulsion and social consequences of this process have to be accepted by the members of the
society in the absence of alternatives. Consequently, modernization becomes a rather confusing and difficult process from the point of view of the individual.

“Modernization symbolized a rational attitude towards issues and their evaluation form a universalistic, and not particularistic view points, when it involves an emotional response to problems orientation are emphatic and not constructive. Modernization is rooted in the scientific world view; it has deeper and positive association with levels of diffusion of scientific knowledge, technological skill and resources in particular society.”

“This has been manifested in the development of new personality orientations, trails and characteristics with greater ability to adjust to the broadening societal horizons; some ego-flexibility; widening spheres of interest; a growing evolution of self advancement dimension of human existence.”

Srinivas attributes modernization in Indian to the British colonizers and says that “they brought with them new technology, knowledge, belief, values and slowly laid the foundations of modern state.”

Hence from the above statements we can conclude that *Modernization involves changes not only in the material culture of the society but also in its beliefs system, values and the way of life on the whole. It is the process of the transformation of the society from its backward outlook to a forward looking, progressive and prosperous structural build up.*

It may be reiterated that modernization is not a process which takes place at a superficial level. A villager who sits in the train, or watches television but keeps his women at home in purdas is not a member of the modernized society. That is unless he accepts the modern social scientific outlook and his liability in the progressive social order modernization can not achieve. Modernization is a process of changing
the outlook of men and women and not simply adopting the culture of developed nations. Modernization is the process of long range of social and cultural change leading to the progressive and multifaceted development of the society which specifically leads to industrialization of economy, an increase in geographic and social mobility and secularization of ideas which give rise to secular, scientific and technical education. It also means a change from ascribed status to achieved status and high standard of living.

Modernization is the process of transforming the old traditional societies and nations to the modernity in the fields of economic, technological, industrial and social advancement. It is an effort made with the objective of bringing about radical changes in their economic bases, technological systems, industrial levels and social organizations. It is to bring a less advanced nation on par with the far-advanced court. It is the result of the growing recognition of the need for global harmonization in the larger interest of the humanity.

The process is to be viewed as an “all-in-all” process but not a compartmentalized one. Hence technical, economic, social, industrial and political orders are to be changed radically.

Changes in technical and economic spheres are usually slow and they are dependent on the socio-political changes, even though technical-economic changes have some profound influence on the socio-political order. The developing nations must be embracing modern. Science adds technology to attain richer and fuller life in the matter of material things. For bringing about modernization in the technological and economic spheres, changes in the social structure and values are needed. The U.S.S.R. and Japan stand as illustrious, rapid transportation countries. Industrialization,
urbanization, rapid transportation and communication, educational revolution, etc., are the steps in the progressive direction of modernization of a nation.

The process of modernization can be witnessed in the efforts of the liberated colonial countries in their attempt to elevate themselves to the standard of advanced countries after the World War II; the advent of independence on many of the soils gave a new impetus for this process of modernization.

1.1.2 Characteristics of Modernization

Modernization has the following note-worthy characteristics:

- It is not a process of imitation but a process of identification with the advanced countries in the matter of material affluence and physical abundance;

- Material prosperity is to be attained by the progressive programmes for the utilization of science and technology;

- It involves either adoption or adaption of the modern scientific and technological characteristics into the emerging patterns of modern nations.

- Modernization cannot be achieved by grafting of technological advancement into the body of developing nation but it should be secured by building up a new generation of people who are determined and motivated to operation in a modern society by providing massive transportation facilities and sources of energies and capacities for earning of more and more foreign exchange.

- It is not just acquisition of superficial traits but it involves development of proper behavioural systems through assimilation of the characteristic features of the urban, literate, industrial and participant societies of the advanced West, the US.
Standards of performance and achievements are to be accomplished by slow but sure degrees.

1.1.3 Objectives of modernization

Modernization of any nation has definite objectives, some of the prominent are as described below;

➢ Economic prosperity is the end-product which is to be achieved through the instrumentality of change, and

➢ Emergence of new behavioural systems involving considerable value-change and institutional re-arrangement.

Modernization is to be considered as neither as Westernization purely.

1.1.4 Models of modernization

As there are social models for men to copy and develop, there are models of modernization for nations to evolve and develop. The U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R are two great models at present before the developing nations of the world. The U.S.A. has an evolutional growth and worthy development to the present states of modernity while the U.S.S.R. has a revolutionary growth and spectacular development in the shortest span of life of a nation. One is a democratic model and the other is a totalitarian model.

The Western Europe also served as the model of modernization in the past and is serving at present also. Its strides towards modernization have also been evolutionary without any pre-planning and conscious effort on the part of the state regimes. At one time westernization and industrialization were taken as sin qua non of modernization.
But now they are considered as the implicit aspect of modernization and not modernization itself.

Now countries like India have also to provide democratic socialist models of modernization by modernizing themselves.

Are we then, in a cul-de-sac? Are we suggesting a total ‘self sufficiency’ in model-building, in which insights and cues generated by social scientists of the modernized societies have no meaningful contributions to make? Are we, for that matter, arguing for a ‘Swadeshi’ conceptualization? The foregoing is only a prolegomena to our argument in favour of a careful search for a relevant model that would be adequate for our situation. And one need not start from the search, for the labour of the scientific community has provided a minimum foundation for further construction in this difficult terrain. It would be, for instance, rewarding to pay some attention to two significant models of modernization to better theory construction in this difficult terrain. It would be, for instance, rewarding to pay some attention to two significant models of modernization, proposed by Eisenstadt (1966) and Levy (1966), as a prolegomena to better theory construction in the area.

One of the chief merits of these efforts is the explicit recognition given to the great structural variety of the modern as well as the modernizing societies. An attempt is, therefore, made to delineate the different patterns of modernization as they have developed in both the cases; these models, consequently, presuppose a minimal knowledge about the historical as well contemporary settings of the nations involved. The three models, to be sure, differ in their analytic rigour, areas of emphasis, as well as empirical infra-structure. It is, nevertheless, possible to treat them as three elements of a cluster, which, taken together, carries within it rich possibilities for further fruitful exploration and refinement.
Gerschenkorn, six propositions are worth recalling regarding modernization:

1. The more backward a country’s economy, the more likely was its industrialization to start discontinuously as a sudden great spurt proceeding at a relatively high rate of growth of manufacturing output.

2. The more backward a country’s economy, the more pronounced was the stress in its industrialization on the growth of manufacturing output.

3. The more backward a country’s economy, the greater was the stress upon producers’, goods as against consumers’ goods.

4. The more backward a country’s economy, the greater was the part played by special institutional factors designed to increase supply of capital to the nascent industries and, in addition, to provide them with less decentralized and better informed entrepreneurial guidance; the more backward the country, the more pronounced was the coerciveness and comprehensiveness of these factors.

5. The more backward a country’s economy, the heavier the pressure upon the levels of consumption of the population.

6. The more backward a country’s, the less likely was its agricultural to play any active role by offering to the growing industries the advantages of an expanding industrial market based in turn on the rising productivity of agricultural labour.

It is to Eisenstadt’s credit that he seeks to apply these propositions not only to the economic sphere, but to all major institutional spheres. The two additional variables of the nature of the initial impetus that gives the initial push to modernization and the policies of the more active elites of a society the, “modernizing elites, in combination with the first variable help to explain the structural variety of
modernization. Eisenstadt then proceeds to a comparative analysis of situations of breakdown and of sub-stained growth. To the basic question: what are the conditions of sustained growth as against conditions of breakdown or stagnation? –the answer given amounts to the negative proposition: ‘these conditions are not simply related to any of the socio-demographic or structural indices of modernization”.

Levy (1964) definition is arbitrary in two senses. First, these are an infinite number of other possibilities for defining the concept in such a way as to have exactly the same referent. Second, for different purposes, one might wish to define the concept as having a totally different referent. Levy then proceeds to define modernization in terms of uses of inanimate sources of power and the use of tools to multiply the effect of effort.

Levy attempts an analysis of the problem of modernization. The structures of modernization are always subversive of the status quo of relatively non-modernized societies for several reasons. Accordingly, he lists three most strategic problems of transition as these of (i) control, (ii) capital formation and the (iii) elements of ambivalence created by the process of modernization itself. The last of these is probably the most important. Some people who start out in favour of the process inevitably and up as its bitterest opponents, while others who may not have thought much about it one way or the other come to be opponents. The enthusiasm for things modern may also carry with it its own excesses. Sooner or later, thus, occur ‘fundamentalist reaction’, which may be defined as one in which the actors concerned regard the solution to present problems as they conceive them to lie in a return to the good old days from which they feel departure never should have been made. So the conclusion: “The problems of modernization for the numbers of relatively non-modernized societies are exceedingly serious ones about which we have little reason
to be optimistic. We do not know nearly as much as we need to know to solve these problems to the satisfaction of anyone’

1.1.5 Concept and process of Tradition and Modernization:

Modernization as a process began in Western Countries of Europe in the later time of nineteenth century. It started with the advent of industrialization and commercialization bringing about the following fundamental changes in the Western societies:

a. Ever-increasing new technology.

b. Ever-increasing use of inanimate power and technology in competitive market situation.

c. Ever-increasing rate of trade and voyage.

d. A scientific world view against traditional world view.

e. Fall of traditional-feudal structure and rise of democratic and totalitarian systems.

The process of modernization brought in its fold many new ideas and concepts which were utilized for collective action for change. The concepts like equality, freedom, justice, democracy, laissez-faire economy, etc. determined the content of cultural ethos. The course of modernization proceeded with the decline of medieval conditions of life and thought. It helped the evolution of these forces and institutions which either overthrow the old structure or renovated it gradually.

All over the world, human societies are undergoing transformation in various degrees for the past five hundred years. The general process of modernization is conceived of in developing phases from traditional (non-modernized) to modernizing societies. The phenomenon of modernization has assumed significance only in the 20th century
world. The present century has witnessed the collapse of great political ideologies and rise of accommodated political systems. There has emerged an autonomous hope in mankind to increase the social product with fair shares for all. The degree, nature and rate of development through modernization process are the essence of the national form of polity and policy.

The attributes of modernization are conceived in different ways by different scholars and of contemporary society. We are presenting below in a chart some of the attributes mentioned by certain known critics and scholars.

Cyril Balck (Economics) attributes of modernization as “Growth of knowledge to human affairs.”

- David McClelland (Psychology) attributes modernization “self reliance or achievement orientation.
- Anderson & Shils (Sociology), “Development of skill and spirit of creativity.”
- Apter (Political Science), “Non-economic process or choice concerning normative, structural and behavioural aspects.

The contents of the above table reveal certain orientations basic about modernization from different vantage points and different discipline-approaches. But they have not made a clear distinction between modernization, modernity, traditionalization and traditionality.

**Primarily modernity is a state of mind.** It creates and grasps such elements in human consciousness which enable the individual to adjust from his inner being to the rapidly changing conditions of modern complex societies. It implies a scientific and rational world view and inculcates universalistic-secular values.

**Modernization is not an ideology**, but it can be the corner stone of any political ideology or policy. It is ideology free in the sense that it indicates the common need
of the modern times for an overall growth of individual and society. Because of the speed and acceleration of change, modernization as a mode of adjustment becomes a felt necessity of our time. It is a break-up from traditional mode of life which is no more adjustable to the changing conditions. It is an escape from ideological commitment. The goals of higher standard of life, freedom, security, social justice are some of the universally accepted goals of modernism. These goals and culture of a modernizing society need not be ideology-bound, but a political system, driving the task of modernization, has to inculcate them.

We can conceive modernization as a process operation at the following levels.

(a) **Value System:**

At this level these social values and the entire complex of symbol system are included which define the goal, direction and means to modernization. The value system, would define the degree and range of modernization a social would like to accept. Accordingly there can be ‘little modernization’ or multidimensional modernization.

(b) **Social system:**

At this level status-role of the individual and collectivities are taken into consideration. Modernization creates differentiation of social structure involves specification and separation of social activities. Difference-making process in modernization is problematic but also extremely important.

(c) **Personality System:**

Modernization emphasizes the emergence of social personality distinct from competitive individuality.
On the basis of above observation, we can distinguish modernization and modernity. Modernization is a form of development in which value system, social system, personality system are interwoven in such a way that universalistic-secularist positive values make differentiation in status-role system and create a social personality. Modernity from the point of view of individual is a state of personality trait-scientific world view. Modernity from the point of view of a given society as a whole is a judgment on its level of development in material and ideational aspects.

1.1.6. Social perception of modernization: The Psychological Process

Perception is a psychological “process of information extraction”, which is defined as “a superset which subsumes the sub-sets of learning and thinking”. Perception, learning and thinking have been traditionally referred to as the cognitive process because they deal with the problem of acquiring knowledge. In this process, perception is generally defined as the process by which an organism extracts certain information about the environment. Learning is defined as ‘process by which this information is acquired through experience and become part of organism’s storage of facts. Learning modifies the organism so that later perception of the same stimuli will be different. The process of ‘thinking’, which results from previous learning, is the most complex of these cognitive processes; this modifies the organism because new learning occurs. Consequently, the perception of stimuli is modified.

Social perception studies can grouped as follows.

(a) The work of the Europeans has given us a technique for investigating the determiners of the judgment of emotional and motivation expression. Their studies suggest that this judgment is based on configurationally principles, such as common fate, radius of action, similarity, proximity and so on. Whether or
not human responses to social aspects of these configurations are innate or are results of learning is still an open question to be answered experimentally, the Gestalists have stated that the gestalt laws operate independently of experience, but would seem reasonable to expert that the social relevance of these laws is probably influenced by social learning, most studies tend to support this expectation.

(b) The work of the American on social perception points to another type of perceptual learning.

There are theories which postulate that experience produces associative assemblies, increased specificity and differential sensitivity. Thus perceptual attention is influenced not only by the nature of the stimulus but also by long-term sets resulting from learning. Therefore, such factors as values, anxiety, and the like influence or ability to perceive by affecting our judgment of already perceived stimuli, making us more or less sensitive to certain attributes of the stimulus complex. However, it is hoped that by the process of learning, individuals should be able to respond to differently to the potential cues or information even though they may be carried by stimulus complexes which are not-very clear.

In the early years of the twentieth century, a great deal of experimental work was done to investigate the nature of association involved in thinking; the method used was mainly introspective analysis of consciousness. One of the greatest outcomes of this group of investigations was the conclusion that “thinking can occur without calling up images for presenting knowledge and consciousness”. This was a negation of the structuralist position formulated earlier by Wundt and the structuralist. This controversy has not been resolved yet, but all experimentalists seem to conclude that thinking is usually accompanied by a “state of consciousness.”
Noteworthy advances made by other experimentalists include, (a) Selz, who made an important advance when he put forward the integrative nature of thought; (b) This in turn was criticized by gestalt psychologists who maintained that productive thinking consists of reorganization of past experience to meet the requirements of the present problem situation. This theoretical advance led to the distinction between the positive and negative effects of sets as they influence the direction of thought particularly as shown in the researches of Maier, Dunckar and Luchins.

A major advance made in this movement is to be noted to the Gestalt laws of perceptual organization. The investigation of thinking moved away from analysing the contents of thought into studying the act of thoughts as the process of thinking. This was experimentally more desirable because of the greater objectivity that became possible. The conclusion is that successful thinking depends largely on the individual’s ability to group or reorganize problem materials into a more meaningful relationship. Concept formation, therefore, becomes the important basis for problem-solving since it provides the categories which the individual will have available for grouping the elements presented in a problem statement.

A problem arises when the correct response expected by the stimulating situation is not immediately available. The result may be described as a perception’. The relative unavailability of the correct response is determined by the interaction between stimulus presentation and organism state. Thus the subject’s first task is to extract the relevant potential information form the stimulus. The ability to do this efficiently depends on:

1. The nature of the stimulus presentation. For example, positive instances usually generate more information that negative instances. This conclusion is related to the principle of contiguity.
2. The sequential relationship of task presentation. For example, reversal-shift learning is more difficult than non-reversible-shift learning. Also, learning sets facilitate subsequent problem solving.

3. The ease with which the subject can assimilate transmitted information. This ability depends on such factors as the presence of relevant sets which the subject can generate to categorize stimuli and the facility of changing these sets as necessary cognitive strain and risk regulation.

In short, this is the process of becoming which has received much emphasis in Indian philosophy. Development of adequate persons who see themselves in the process of becoming holds a great promise for the futures. Such a person is open to change and can trust his impulses and values as guides for behaviour in new circumstances; they are most likely to adapt and survive as the environment changes.

1.1.7 Modernization and Women:

India is a developing nation. The modern India has new technology in industry and agriculture and development in the modern education, transportation and communication facilities. The process of modernization has been instrumental in bringing about a change in the ways and work of the people of this country. The style of dress, food, habits, the standard of living and patterns of behaviour are changing under the impact of new influences. The publicity media, the press, the film the satellite television, internet etc have also contributed to the change. But changing taking places are not uniform throughout the country. The areas more exposed to the modern world are accepting modernity and the modern ways more rapidly than areas less exposed to these influence. Urban communities are more exposed than the rural areas, and
modernization has influenced fast the metropolitan cities in comparison to smaller towns. Modernization in India therefore depends on the extent of acceptance of modernism and the degree of exposure to modern forces.

The India of today is an old society but a new nation. It provides an example of the paradox of a modernized situation. It represents the mingling of two major trends—tradition and modernity. There are areas where a fair amount of synthesis has been achieved, but in many others, conflict persists. Modernization accentuates social differentiation. It created a need as well as an opportunity for educated and skilled women to take up employment in offices or commercial and industrial houses. This has led to a tremendous increase of women in the white collar force. Many working women have left their place of permanent residence and have settled down in cities and towns when jobs are available.

Modernization has thus created a need for organizational innovations such as working women’s hostels, crèches and other agencies for taking up domestic responsibilities. At the same time it has also given rise to tensions, conflicts, disruptions and crises of adjustment. The employed women are required to face these because most of them come from those sections of society that were, until recently, under the firm hold of tradition which prohibited them from taking the employment.

Working women have modernized themselves in the economic sphere of their life to the extent of taking up remunerative jobs, but they are still tradition bound in their social life. They are still members of caste groups and declining joint families, although their employment does not allow them to discharge associated traditional obligation effectively.
In the process of modernization this appears to be a transitional phase where economic changes have come about more rapidly but the concomitant social modification are yet to be completed.

Women’s emancipation continues to be class oriented in all communities in India. Girls of affluent westernized families have became air-hostesses, fashion models, beauticians, boutique owners etc. for the middle and lower class girls, the opening continues to be the ill-paid over crowed teaching profession. The women of underprivileged class still suffer in agony while the prized posts, the foreign culture delegates and even inclusion in the ministry and other higher posts go only to the elite families.

The emancipation of women in equality, economic liberty and social upheaval, proper understanding of their needs will certainly make a change of outlook. Their progress lies in the unity of cultural emancipation and economic stability. In all these endeavours attitude towards modernization plays a very important role.

1.1.8 Education as an instrument for modernization:

The education commission of India under the chairmanship of Dr. D.S. Kothari had reiterated in clear and unambiguous terms that education is the main instrument of change in all fields of life of the nation-social, cultural, economic, technological and industrial. It has realized the importance of education as an instrument for national development.

For education to perform its new task of modernizing the Indian society, the commission has suggested the following educational strategies:

“This can be done, if education,

➢ Is related to productivity,
Strengthens social and national integration;
Consolidates democracy as a form of government and helps the country to adopt it as a way of life; hastens the process of modernization; and strives to build character by cultivating social, moral and spiritual values.”

1.1.9 Modernization and Education:

Education and modernization are closely linked. It is education that serves as an efficient instrument for effective modernization. For a notion to modernize itself, the spread of education in rapid strides is quite essential. The cream of intelligential is but the product of education churning. Education is but another name for human resource development. It produces the skilled personnel to occupy different positions in life who would contribute for the growth of national wealth through their creative abilities and productive efforts. The pace of education as such serves an indication for the level of modernization a notion has attained.

Education is the key that opens the doors of modernization in various fields of nation’s life like economic, industrial, technological and social fields.

That modernization is the direct result of the educational efforts is obvious. Education is the powerful instrument that can wisely be exploited by the nation to modernize itself at the shortest time possible.

1.1.10 Implication of Modernization for Education:

On the other side, modernization process has its own implications for education. The impact of modernization on the educative process should be properly understood. Modernization demands that the teaching and testing technology should be modernized in order to achieve better quickly as possible. The development of science
and technology has influenced teaching and testing procedures so much that they are considered as belonging to technology by themselves. Today the instructional technology makes use of advanced auto-visual aids, tape-recorders, movies a broadcasting net-work, television and, “teacher-in-the sky satellites”. Especially worthy of mentioning are teaching machines and computer in the classroom. Unless and until we modernize the instruction techniques as are done in the far advanced countries our efforts for educating and modernizing the nation will not be far-fetching.

As a corollary, the conclusion will be that modernization should affect teacher education too for it is the teachers that should adopt modernized technology in the classroom situations. This is a prerequisite for modernizing instructional technology.

1.1.11 The subjective meaning of Modernization:

While it should be conceded that development and modernization are not synonymous yet in the Indian context the concept of development is largely used to imply a given direction, namely that modernization. It is true that both the concepts of development and modernization have been defined in various ways by different authorities, such as Apter, Shils, Levy, Spengler, Bra-bianti, Eisenstadt, Hagen and several others. It is important to realize that the concept of modernization is multi-dimensional, incorporating economic development, technology and industrial revolutions, rationality and scientific temper, emphasis on achieved status, equality, social justice, individualism and so on. It is in the very nature of definitions of modernization, that they would represent ideal types.

In fact, some of the components mentioned above are not to be taken separately but as a cluster. Therefore, the concept of modernization tends to be partially derived from
historical development but is more of an abstraction. In his delineation of ideal types, Weber also insisted that construction of ideal types is a methodological device but one also has to take into account they perceived a situation.

1.1.12 Education and the concept of modernization:

Education is cognitive primarily and is also supposed to inculcate rationality, scientific temper as well as promote secularism, equality, distributive justice, achieved status, etc. in fact, higher education is expected to transform its recipients into persons with rational, liberal and modern outlook.

Even when once postulates a direct relationship between education and modernization, it is necessary to investigate as to whether or not education is so conceived by its recipients.

Within the institutional structure, a part form family and kinship, the system of stratification whether based on caste or class occupies an important place. What are determinants of status? Whether status should be ascribed or achieved is another important point of enquiry. What are the views of students about equality? To what extent has education promoted rationality both in terms of beliefs ad practices is a second area of enquiry. Does education promote social sensitivity amongst students and if so, what is a manifestation? Do the students understand the concept of secular-useful to enquire into the goals and aims of education as well as the purpose of knowledge as it is conceived by college students? Then again, whether college education has promoted a questioning attitude towards the ism and if so, are they in favour of secularism?

Modernization puts a premium on achievement-orientation and a high level of aspiration and manipulation of physical and social environment.
1.2 Religiosity

A religion is a set of beliefs and practices, often centered upon specific supernatural and moral claims about reality, the cosmos, and human nature, and often codified as prayer, ritual, and religious law. Religion also encompasses ancestral or cultural traditions, writings, history, and mythology, as well as personal faith and mystic experience. The term "religion" refers to both the personal practices related to communal faith and to group rituals and communication stemming from shared conviction.

In the frame of European religious thought, religions present a common quality, the "hallmark of patriarchal religious thought": the division of the world in two comprehensive domains, one sacred, the other profane. Religion is often described as a communal system for the coherence of belief focusing on a system of thought, unseen being, person, or object, that is considered to be supernatural, sacred, divine, or of the highest truth. Moral codes, practices, values, institutions, tradition, rituals, and scriptures are often traditionally associated with the core belief, and these may have some overlap with concepts in secular philosophy. Religion is also often described as a "way of life" or a Life stance.

The development of religion has taken many forms in various cultures. "Organized religion" generally refers to an organization of people supporting the exercise of some religion with a prescribed set of beliefs, often taking the form of a legal entity. Other religions believe in personal revelation. "Religion" is sometimes used interchangeably with "faith" or "belief system," but is more socially defined than that of personal convictions.
1.2.1 Religiosity: A Psycho-social Term

Religiosity, in its broadest sense, is a comprehensive sociological term used to refer to the numerous aspects of religious activity, dedication, and belief, another term that would work equally well, though is less often used, and is religiousness. In its narrowest sense, religiosity deals more with how religious a person is, and less with how a person is religious (in practicing certain rituals, retelling certain myths, revering certain symbols, or accepting certain doctrines about deities and afterlife).

1.2.2 Components of Religiosity

Numerous studies have explored the different components of human religiosity (Brink, 1993; Hill & Hood 1999). What most have found is that there are multiple dimensions. For instance, Cornwall, Albrecht, Cunningham and Pitcher (1986) identify six dimensions of religiosity based on the understanding that there are at least three components to religious behaviour: knowing (cognition), feeling (affect), and doing (behaviour). For each of these components of religiosity there were two cross classifications resulting in the six dimensions.

- **Cognition**
  - Traditional orthodoxy
  - Particularistic orthodoxy

- **Affect**
  - Spiritual
  - Church commitment
  - Physical
**Behaviour**

- Religious behaviour
- Religious participation

Other researchers have found different dimensions, ranging generally from four to twelve components. What most measures of religiosity find is that there is at least some distinction between religious doctrine, religious practice, and spirituality.

For example, one can accept the truthfulness of the Bible (belief dimension), but never attend a church or even belong to an organized religion (practice dimension). Another example is an individual who does not hold orthodox Christian doctrines (belief dimension), but does attend a charismatic worship service (practice dimension) in order to develop his or her sense of oneness with the divine (spirituality dimension).

An individual could disavow all doctrines associated with organized religions (belief dimension), not affiliate with an organized religion or attend religious services (practice dimension), and at the same time be strongly committed to a higher power and feel that the connection with that higher power is ultimately relevant (spirituality dimension). These are explanatory examples of the broadest dimensions of religiosity and that they may not be reflected in specific religiosity measures.

Most dimensions of religiosity are correlated, meaning people who often attend church services (practice dimension) are also likely to score highly on the belief and spirituality dimensions. But individuals do not have to score high on all dimensions or low on all dimensions; their scores can vary by dimension.
1.2.3 Religion, Religiosity, and Gender

The role of organized religions in perpetuating norms that promote gender inequitable attitudes is complex because religious institutions themselves are not monolithic. A wide variety of voices are in evidence in religious organizations, even if dominated by hierarchical authorities. Through internal debates and struggles, religious doctrines, norms, and rules can change over time, albeit at a relatively slow pace. As hierarchical structures, however, a dominant factor in shaping gender attitudes is the views held those at the top of the religious structure at any given point in time.

Why gender norms inculcated by religious institutions might be gender inequitable. The first relates to the role of religion as a response to economic insecurity and the second underscores the role of hierarchy in formal institutions.

With regard to the former, some theorists adhere to the modernization thesis, arguing that the intensity of religious beliefs is a response to economic insecurity and is thus inversely correlated with the stage of economic development. Adherents predict a diminished role of religion with greater and more stable material well-being. One possible explanation for this is that religion provides both a solace and explanation for harsh, difficult, and insecure lives. Norris and Inglehart (2004), for example, link economic insecurity to the stage of economic development, with low-income agrarian societies the most insecure, and industrial and post-industrial societies having relatively greater economic security. Economic security, however, is not necessarily correlated with economic development. As the events of recent years have shown, capitalist development is characterized by volatility. An individual’s or household’s economic security is strongly dependent not only on own savings and assets, but also on the depth and breadth of the social safety net that can cushion volatility in household income. Welfare state spending varies widely across country, and is not
strictly determined by the level of per capita income, i.e., the stage of economic development. That said, religiosity is plausibly intensified under conditions of economic insecurity, whatever the stage of development.

What are the implications for gender attitudes, and in particular, why might we expect religious institutions to advance and inculcate gender inequitable norms? Assuming the link between religion and economic security is valid, we might anticipate that individuals under stress have a need for clear, rigid rules, including behavioural norms. Further, in such circumstances, survival instincts elevate the goal of high fertility in the face of high infant mortality and death rates. In such a scenario, attitudes towards gender roles may be rigid and dichotomous in response to a struggle for economic survival.

This view is arguably reductionist. The linkage of religiosity with the stage of development is contradicted by evidence of a continued role of religious faith in social practice in countries at varying stages of economic development. As Phillips (2009) points out, religious attachment has increased, not decreased in a wide variety of countries. Further, the operation of religious beliefs in private and public spheres is not static. The nature of religions as organizational structures, which tend to be hierarchically structured and conservative rule-based institutions, is a more plausible explanation for their inculcation of gender inequitable norms. A further impetus towards hierarchy is related to the economic role organized religions play. To varying degrees, they have access to and control over material resources, and as such, exercise power to create and maintain social norms that perpetuate structures of power that preserve their control. Elite groups tend to capture power in institutions, and thus, patriarchal dominance in the economic sphere is likely to be replicated in religious organizations.
Seen in this light, religious institutions may reflect patriarchal values in order to buttress the economic, social and political power of males to the disadvantage of women (Norris and Inglehart 2004; Kardam 2005; Sen 2007). Whatever their other roles, such as solace and even social support, if religious institutions inculcate gender norms and rules that disadvantage women, we might also expect they would hinder policy efforts aimed at closing gender gaps in important areas such as education and employment.

If organized religions in their current state do indeed perpetuate gender inequitable attitudes, we might expect that those people who exhibit higher degrees of religiosity hold more gender inequitable attitudes. It is useful to consider why religiosity and dominant religion might have an impact not only on attitudes but also on real economic outcomes. Two transmission mechanisms exist. First, at the micro level, as noted, gender unequal attitudes act as a “stealth” factor, shaping every day decisions. Employers' choices on whom to hire and whom to lay off are affected by norms regarding who is most deserving of a job in the gender hierarchy. Families make decisions on which child to invest resources in, and which family member should undertake paid labour or unpaid caring labour. Gender norms influence whom to elect to political office. We therefore might anticipate that insofar as religion affects norms and attitudes, there will be consequent and measurable effects at the country level on gender gaps in education, shares of the population, labour force, and income, to name a few.

The second transmission mechanism is the effect of religious attitudes on government’s distribution of resources (e.g., for education, health care) and regulation, such as enactment and enforcement of anti-discrimination legislation in employment, rules on access to loans, inheritance, property ownership, and so forth.
In countries with dominant religions that are gender inequitable in their attitudes, it is possible that gender outcomes are worsened through the government channel as well.

### 1.2.4 Religiosity and Intelligence

The concept of religiosity and intelligence pertains to relationships between intelligence and religiosity, the extent to which someone is religious. Multiple studies have been undertaken to examine these relationships.

Intelligence is an umbrella term used to describe a property of the mind that encompasses many related abilities, such as the capacities to reason, to plan, to solve problems, to think abstractly, to comprehend ideas, to use language, and to learn. There are several ways to define intelligence. In some cases, intelligence may include traits such as creativity, personality, character, knowledge, or wisdom. However, some psychologists prefer not to include these traits in the definition of intelligence.

Religiosity is a sociological term referring to degrees of religious behaviour, belief or spirituality. The measurement of religiosity is hampered by the difficulties involved in defining what is meant by the term. Numerous studies have explored the different components of religiosity, with most finding some distinction between religious beliefs/ doctrine, religious practice, and spirituality. Studies can measure religious practice by counting attendance at religious services, religious beliefs/ doctrine by asking a few doctrinal questions, while spirituality can be measured by asking respondents about their sense of oneness with the divine or through detailed standardized measurements. When religiosity is measured, it is important to specify which aspects of religiosity are referred to.
1.2.5 Religiosity and Spirituality

‘Religiosity’ is generally conceptualized as a formal, outward expression of belief, emphasizing involvement in a particular organized religion through adherence to its beliefs and participation in its doctrine and rituals (Mytko and Knight, 1999; Koenig, 2004). Miller and Thoresen (2003) have argued that religion is fundamentally a social phenomenon, binding individuals together through membership and modes of social organization. Within this definition, Allport (1966) differentiated between extrinsic religiosity, whereby individuals regard religion as a means to an end, and intrinsic religiosity, where religion is regarded as a means in itself. ‘Spirituality’ is often a more elusive concept to define, although there is some consensus. In contrast to ‘religiosity’, to be ‘spiritual’ does not necessarily require theistic belief or denominational affiliation. Spirituality is usually understood at the level of the individual within specific contexts (Thoresen, 1998). It is viewed as a more personal expression of values, meaning and principles, concerning belief in a transcendent force, addressing existential questions and providing guidance on how one’s life should be conducted (Ho and Ho, 2007).

The concepts of religiosity and spirituality are not mutually exclusive and can overlap; thus it is possible for an individual to consider themselves to be one and not the other, or to be both (as described by Mytko and Knight, 1999). This has been exemplified within the literature several times. In a study investigating perceptions of spirituality and religiosity, 42% of participants endorsed the idea that they overlapped but were not identical concepts, with 39% viewing spirituality as the broader concept incorporating religiosity (Zinnbauer et al., 1997). Woods and Ironson (1999), conducting interviews with participants with serious medical illnesses, reported that
43% of participants identified themselves as spiritual, 37% as religious, and 20% as both, with significant differences found between participants’ beliefs and behaviours. Spiritual individuals described themselves as more ‘at one’ with the universe, viewed God as more merciful and claimed more influence of self-empowerment on their health. Pardini, Plante, Sherman and Stump (2000) demonstrated a similar pattern when investigating spirituality, religious faith and mental health outcomes in individuals recovering from substance abuse.

Unfortunately, several factors have hampered previous research into spirituality and religiosity. Firstly, it is difficult to ensure their measurement as separate concepts (Mytko and Knight, 2001). Many studies have failed to recognize and address the distinction adequately, instead choosing to treat them as synonymous and thus potentially confounding results, whilst measurement has often focused on typically ‘religious’ rather than ‘spiritual’ measures (Miller and Thoresen, 2003). The majority of research that has chosen to explore religiosity separately from spirituality has considered only organized Western religion, primarily Christianity (Larson, Swyers and McCullough, 1998; cited in Miller and Thoresen, 2003), resulting in a paucity of research into the relationships between other world religions and health.

There has also been a strong emphasis on American studies. As 91% of Americans report resolutely believing in God or a higher power (Gallup International Millennium Survey, 2000), compared to just 21% of United Kingdom citizens (Social Trends, 2000), this focus may impact on the generalisability of any findings and therefore there is a definite need for increased research outside of the United States. Those studies that have investigated spirituality have met other methodological difficulties. As spirituality is particularly hard to quantify, psychologists tend to study perceptions or behaviours related to spirituality, which to the individual may appear as physical
manifestations far short of comprehending the ‘real thing’ (Miller and Thoresen, 2003). Thus there is a definite need for further scientific research into religiosity and spirituality, to ensure the development of standardized, valid measurements. The area would also benefit from a move away from the current focus on traditional Western religion.

1.3 Locus of Control:

Locus of control is a concept initially used to distinguish between two types of situations those in which outcomes are determined by skill in contrast to setting where chance is the main determinant of success and failure. For example, in games such as chess sporting events such as tennis, and exams in fields such as mathematics, it is reasoned that positive and negative outcomes are determined primarily by ability and level of skill. This does not imply that chance has no influence whatsoever on what has transpired. After all, perhaps the tennis match was affected by a gust of wind, or the math exam score influenced by a guess at a true or false alternative. Nonetheless, outcomes in these events primarily are determined (or, are perceived as determined) by ability is located within the person’ hence, the so-called locus of control is internal. On the other hand, if a “head” or a “tail” will be showing in a coin toss, or whether red or black will the place the ball stops in roulette, is determined (or, is perceived to be determined) by chance (assuming the game is “fair”). Of course, some may think they can sway where the roulette ball stops or that they can guide the appearance of a head or a tail on a coin toss, so that ability may be conceived as influencing task outcome. Nonetheless, outcomes in these events primarily are determined (or, are perceived as determined) by ability. Ability is located within the person; hence, the so-called locus of control is internal. On the other hand, if a “head” or a “tail” will be
showing in a coin toss, or whether red or black will be the place the ball stops in roulette, is determined (or, is perceived to be determined) by chance (assuming the game is “fair”). Of course, some may think they can sway where the roulette ball stops or that they can guide the appearance of a head or a tail on a coin toss, so that ability may be conceived as influencing task outcome. Nonetheless, most individuals on most occasions believe that success and failure at these tasks are chance determined. Chance is regarded as external to the person, resulting in the external locus of control label.

Locus of control was formulated within the framework of Rotter's (1954) social learning theory of personality. Lefcourt (1976) defined perceived locus of control as follows: “Perceived control is defined as a generalized expectancy for internal as opposed to external control of reinforcements” (Lefcourt 1976). Early work on the topic of expectancies about control of reinforcement had, as Lefcourt explains, been performed in the 1950s by James and Phares prepared for unpublished doctoral dissertations supervised by Rotter at The Ohio State University. Attempts have been made to trace the genesis of the concept to the work of Alfred Adler, but its immediate background lies in the work of Rotter students, such as William H. James (not to be confused with William James), who studied two types of expectancy shifts:

- **Typical expectancy shifts**, believing that a success or failure would be followed by a similar outcome; and
- **Atypical expectancy shifts**, believing that a success or failure would be followed by a dissimilar outcome.

Work in this field led psychologists to suppose that people who were more likely to display typical expectancy shifts were those who more likely to attribute their outcomes to ability, whereas those who displayed atypical expectancy would be more
likely to attribute their outcomes to chance. This was interpreted as saying that people could be divided into those who attribute to ability (an internal cause) versus those who attribute to luck (an external cause). However, after 1970, Bernard Weiner pointed out that attributions to ability versus luck also differ in that the former are an attribution to a stable cause, the latter an attribution to an unstable cause.

A revolutionary paper in this field was published in 1966, in the journal *Psychological Monographs*, by Julian B. Rotter. Early history of the concept can be found in Lefcourt (1976), who, early in his treatise on the topic, relates the concept to learned helplessness. Rotter (1975, 1989) has discussed problems and misconceptions in others’ use of the internal versus external control of reinforcement construct.

1.3.1 Attribution Theory:

How do we attach meaning to other's behaviour, or our own? This is called **attribution theory**. For example, is someone angry because they are bad-tempered or because something bad happened?

“Attribution theory deals with how the social perceiver uses information to arrive at causal explanations for events. It examines what information is gathered and how it is combined to form a causal judgment” (Fiske & Taylor, 1991)

Attribution theory is concerned with how and why ordinary people explain events as they do.

**Heider (1958)** believed that people are naive psychologists trying to make sense of the social world. People tend to see cause and effect relationships even where there is none!
Heider didn’t so much develop a theory himself as emphasise certain themes that others took up. There were two main ideas that he put forward that became influential.

1. When we explain the behaviour of others we look for enduring **internal attributions**, such as personality traits. For example we attribute the behaviour of a person to their naivety or reliability or jealousy.

2. When we try to explain our own behaviour we tend to make **external attributions**, such as situational or environment.

### 1.3.1.1 Jones and Davis Correspondent Inference Theory:

Jones and Davis (1965) thought that people pay particular attention to intentional behaviour (as opposed to accidental or unthinking behaviour).

Jones and Davis’s theory helps us understand the process of making an internal attribution. They say that we tend to do this when we see a correspondence between motive and behaviour. For example when we see a correspondence between someone behaving in a friendly way and being a friendly person.

**Dispositional (i.e. internal)** attributions provide us with information from which we can make predictions about a person’s future behaviour.

The correspondent inference theory describes the conditions under which we make dispositional attributes to behaviour we perceive as intentional.

Davis used the term correspondent inference to refer to an occasion when an observer infers that a person’s behaviour matches or corresponds with their personality. It is an alternative term to dispositional attribution.

So what leads us to make a correspondent inference? Jones and Davis say we draw on 5 sources of information:
1. **Choice**: If behaviour is freely chosen it is believed to be due to internal (dispositional) factors.

2. **Accidental vs. Intentional Behaviour**: Behaviour that is intentional is likely to be attributed to the person’s personality and behaviour which is accidental is likely to be attributed to situation / external causes.

3. **Social Desirability**: Behaviours low in sociably desirability (not conforming) lead us to make (internal) dispositional inferences more than socially undesirable behaviours. For example, if you observe a person getting on a bus and sitting on the floor instead of one of the seats. This behaviour has low social desirability (non conforming) and is likely corresponding with the personality of the individual.

4. **Non-common effects**: If the other person’s behaviour has important consequences for ourselves. For example if the person asks us out on a date we assume it was the fact that they like you that was important (not that you were simply available!).

5. **Hedonistic Relevance**: If the other person’s behaviour appears to be directly intended to benefit or harm us, we assume that it is “personal”, and not just a by-product of the situation we are both in.

### 1.3.1.2 Kelley Co-variation Model:

Kelley’s (1967) co-variation model is the best known attribution theory. He developed a logical model for judging whether a particular action should be attributed to some characteristic (internal) of the person or the environment (external).

**The term co-variation simply means** that a person has information from multiple observations, at different times and situations, and can perceive the co-variation of an observed effect and its causes.
He argues that in trying to discover the causes of behaviour people act like scientists. More specifically they take into account three kinds of evidence. Kelley believed that there were three types of causal information which influenced our judgements. Low factors = dispositional (internal) attributions.

- **Consensus**: the extent to which other people behave in the same way in a similar situation. E.g. Alison smokes a cigarette when she goes out for a meal with her friend. If her friend smokes, her behaviour is high in consensus. If only Alison smokes it is low.

- **Distinctiveness**: the extent to which the person behaves in the same way in similar situations. If Alison only smokes when she is out with friends, her behaviour is high in distinctiveness. If she smokes at any time or place, distinctiveness is low.

- **Consistency**: the extent to which the person behaves like this every time the situation occurs. If Alison only smokes when she is out with friends, consistency is high. If she only smokes on one special occasion, consistency is low.

**Let’s look at an example** to help understand his particular attribution theory. Our subject is called Tom. His behaviour is laughter. Tom is laughing at a comedian.

1. **Consensus**: Everybody in the audience is laughing. Consensus is high. If only Tom is laughing consensus is low.

2. **Distinctiveness**: Tom only laughs at this comedian. Distinctiveness is high. If Tom laughs at everything distinctiveness is low.

3. **Consistency**: Tom always laughs at this comedian. Consistency is high. Tom rarely laughs at this comedian consistency is low.
Now, if everybody laughs at this comedian, if they don’t laugh at the comedian who follows and if this comedian always raises a laugh then we would make an external attribution, i.e. we assume that Tom is laughing because the comedian is very funny. On the other hand, if Tom is the only person who laughs at this comedian, if Tom laughs at all comedians and if Tom always laughs at the comedian then we would make an internal attribution, i.e. we assume that Tom is laughing because he is the kind of person who laughs a lot.

So what we’ve got here is people attributing causality on the basis of correlation. That is to say, we see that two things go together and we therefore assume that one causes the other. One problem however is that we may not have enough information to make that kind of judgement. For example, if we don’t know Tom that well we wouldn’t necessarily have the information to know if his behaviour is consistent over time. So what do we do then?

According to Kelley we fall back on past experience and look for either

1) **Multiple necessary causes.** For example, we see an athlete win a marathon and we reason that she must be very fit, highly motivated, have trained hard etc. and that she must have all of these to win

2) **Multiple sufficient causes.** For example, we see an athlete fail a drug test and we reason that she may be trying to cheat, or have taken a banned substance by accident or been tricked into taking it by her coach. Any one reason would be sufficient.

1.3.1.3  **The Social Learning Theory of Julian B. Rotter:**

When Rotter developed his social learning theory, the dominant perspective in clinical psychology at the time was Freud's Psychoanalysis, which focused on people's deep-seated instinctual motives as determining behaviour. Individuals were seen as being
naive to their unconscious impulses, and treatment required long-term analysis of childhood experience. Even learning approaches at the time were dominated by drive theory, which held that people are motivated by physiologically-based impulses that press the individual to satisfy them. In developing social learning theory, Rotter departed from instinct-based Psychoanalysis and drive-based behaviourism. He believed that a psychological theory should have a psychological motivational principle. Rotter chose the empirical law of effect as his motivating factor. The law of effect states that people are motivated to seek out positive stimulation, or reinforcement, and to avoid unpleasant stimulation. Rotter combined behaviourism and the study of personality, without relying on physiological instincts or drives as a motive force.

The main idea in Julian Rotter's social learning theory is that personality represents an interaction of the individual with his or her environment. One cannot speak of a personality, internal to the individual that is independent of the environment. Neither can one focus on behaviour as being an automatic response to an objective set of environmental stimuli. Rather, to understand behaviour, one must take both the individual (i.e., his or her life history of learning and experiences) and the environment (i.e., those stimuli that the person is aware of and responding to) into account. Rotter describes personality as a relatively stable set of potentials for responding to situations in a particular way.

Rotter sees personality, and therefore behaviour, as always changeable. Change the way the person thinks, or change the environment the person is responding to, and behaviour will change. He does not believe there is a critical period after which personality is set. But, the more life experience you have building up certain sets of beliefs, the more effort and intervention required for change to occur. Rotter
conceives of people in an optimistic way. He sees them as being drawn forward by their goals, seeking to maximize their reinforcement, rather than just avoiding punishment.

Rotter has four main components to his social learning theory model predicting behaviour. These are behaviour potential, expectancy, reinforcement value, and the psychological situation.

**Behaviour Potential:**

Behaviour potential is the likelihood of engaging in a particular behaviour in a specific situation. In other words, what is the probability that the person will exhibit a particular behaviour in a situation? In any given situation, there are multiple behaviour one can engage in. For each possible behaviour, there is behaviour potential. The individual will exhibit whichever behaviour has the highest potential.

**Expectancy:**

Expectancy is the subjective probability that a given behaviour will lead to a particular outcome, or reinforce. How likely is it that the behaviour will lead to the outcome? Having "high" or "strong" expectancies means the individual is confident the behaviour will result in the outcome. Having low expectancies means the individual believes it is unlikely that his or her behaviour will result in reinforcement. If the outcomes are equally desirable, we will engage in the behaviour that has the greatest likelihood of paying off (i.e., has the highest expectancy). Expectancies are formed based on past experience. The more often behaviour has led to reinforcement in the past, the stronger the person's expectancy that the behaviour will achieve that outcome now.
It is important to note that expectancy is a **subjective** probability, because one common source of pathology is irrational expectancies. There may be no relationship whatsoever between the person's subjective assessment of how likely a reinforcement will be and the actual, objective probability of the reinforcer's occurring. People can either over- or underestimate this likelihood, and both distortions can potentially be problematic.

**Reinforcement Value:**

Reinforcement is another name for the outcomes of our behaviour. Reinforcement value refers to the desirability of these outcomes. Things we want to happen, that we are attracted to, have a high reinforcement value. Things we don't want to happen, that we wish to avoid, have a low reinforcement value. If the likelihood of achieving reinforcement is the same, we will exhibit the behaviour with the greatest reinforcement value (i.e., the one directed toward the outcome we prefer most).

As with expectancy, reinforcement value is **subjective**, meaning that the same event or experience can vastly differ in desirability, depending on the individual's life experience. Punishment from a parent would be negatively reinforcing to most children, and something to be avoided. However, children who get little positive attention from parents can seek out parental punishment because it has a higher reinforcement value than neglect.

The value of any given reinforcement is determined in part by other future reinforces it might lead to. For example, doing well on an exam in a particular class would have a heightened reinforcement value, if you believe that doing well in that class will lead to being able to work in your professor's lab. Therefore, even an apparently trivial
event can have a very strong reinforcement value, either positive or negative, if the individual sees it as leading to other strongly valued reinforces.

The least amount of reinforcement that still has a positive value is known as the **minimal goal**. If people achieve an outcome that equals or exceeds their minimal goal, they will feel that they have succeeded. When the level of reinforcement falls below an individual's minimal goal, that reinforcement feels like failure. People differ in their minimal goals. Thus, the same outcome may represent success to one person (with a lower minimal goal) while it feels like failure to another person (with a higher minimal goal).

**Predictive Formula:**

Behaviour Potential (BP), Expectancy (E) and Reinforcement Value (RV) can be combined into a predictive formula for behaviour:

\[
\text{BP} = f(E \& RV)
\]

This formula can be read as follows: behaviour potential is a function of expectancy and reinforcement value. Or, in other words, the likelihood of a person's exhibiting a particular behaviour is a function of the probability that that behaviour will lead to a given outcome and the desirability of that outcome. If expectancy and reinforcement value are both high, then behaviour potential will be high. If either expectancy or reinforcement value is low, then behaviour potential will be lower.

**Psychological Situation:**

Although the psychological situation does not figure directly into Rotter's formula for predicting behaviour, Rotter believes it is always important to keep in mind that different people interpret the same situation differently. Again, it is people's
subjective interpretation of the environment, rather than an objective array of stimuli, that is meaningful to them and that determines how they behave.

**Generality versus Specificity:**

An important dimension of personality theories is the generality versus specificity of its constructs. General constructs are broad and abstract, while specific constructs are narrow and concrete. Both types of constructs have their advantages. A theory with general constructs allows one to make many predictions, across situations, from knowing only a small amount of information. The disadvantage of general constructs, though, is that they are harder to measure and the predictions made from them have a lower level of accuracy. Specific constructs, on the other hand, are easier to measure, and they can be used to make more accurate predictions. However, these predictions are limited to being situation-specific.

For example, knowing that someone is a generally hostile person allows us to make predictions that this individual will be hostile toward a range of people. Across situations, this person is likely to be more hostile to others than someone who is low in hostility. However, our ability predict how hostile this person would be to Jane, for example, is limited, because there may be other factors that determine whether this individual will treat Jane in a hostile way during a particular encounter (e.g., person likes Jane, or situational factors inhibit an expression of hostility). On the other hand, if we know that this person hates Jane, we can predict with a high level of accuracy that this person will be hostile toward Jane. But, we will not be able to predict whether this person will treat other people in a hostile way.

Strength of Rotter's social learning theory is that it explicitly blends specific and general constructs, offering the benefits of each. In social learning theory, all general
constructs have a specific counterpart. For every situationally specific expectancy there is a cross-situational generalized expectancy. Social learning theory blends generality and specificity to enable psychologists to measure variables and to make a large number of accurate predictions from these variables.

"Locus of Control" For many people, their only exposure to the ideas of Julian B. Rotter is his concept of generalized expectancies for control of reinforcement, more commonly known as locus of control. Locus of control refers to people's very general, cross-situational beliefs about what determines whether or not they get reinforced in life. People can be classified along a continuum from very internal to very external.

People with a strong internal locus of control believe that the responsibility for whether or not they get reinforced ultimately lies with themselves. Internals believe that success or failure is due to their own efforts. In contrast, externals believe that the reinforcers in life are controlled by luck, chance, or powerful others. Therefore, they see little impact of their own efforts on the amount of reinforcement they receive.

Rotter has written extensively on problems with people's interpretations of the locus of control concept. First, he has warned people that locus of control is not a typology. It is not an either/or proposition. Second, because locus of control is a generalized expectancy it will predict people's behaviour across situations. However, there may be some specific situations where people, for example, who are generally external, behave like internals. That is because their learning history has shown them that they have control over the reinforcement they receive in certain situations, although overall they perceive little control over what happens to them. Again, one can see the importance of conceiving of personality as the interaction of the person and the environment.
1.3.2 Locus of control personality orientations:

Rotter (1975) cautioned that internality and externality represent two ends of a continuum, not an either or typology. Internals tend to attribute outcomes of events to their own control. Externals attribute outcomes of events to external circumstances. For example, college students with a strong internal locus of control may believe that their grades were achieved through their own abilities and efforts, whereas those with a strong external locus of control may believe that their grades are the result of good or bad luck, or to a professor who designs bad tests or grades capriciously; hence, they are less likely to expect that their own efforts will result in success and are therefore less likely to work hard for high grades. (It should not be thought however, that internality is linked exclusively with attribution to effort and externality with attribution to luck, as Weiner’s work makes clear). This has obvious implications for differences between internals and externals in terms of their achievement motivation, suggesting that internal locus is linked with higher levels of N-ach. Due to their locating control outside themselves, externals tend to feel they have less control over their fate. People with an external locus of control tend to be more stressed and prone to clinical depression (Benassi, Sweeney & Dufour, 1988; cited in Maltby, Day & Macaskill, 2007)

1.3.3 Characteristics of locus of control orientations

Empirical research findings have implied the following differences between internals and externals:

- Internals are more likely to work for achievements, to tolerate delays in rewards and to plan for long-term goals, whereas externals are more likely to lower their goals. After failing a task, internals re-evaluate future performances and lower
their expectations of success, whereas externals may raise their expectations. These differences relate to differences in achievement motivation (as noted above, Rotter (1966) believed that internals tend to be higher in achievement motivation than externals). However, empirical findings have been ambiguous here. There is some evidence that sex-based differences may complicate these findings, with females being more responsive to failures, males to successes.

- Going back to Dialer’s (1961), considerable data suggest that internal locus of control is associated with increased ability to delay gratification. However, at least one study has found this effect does not apply to all samples. Walls and Miller (cited in Lefcourt, 1976) found an association between internal locus and delay of gratification in second and third grade children, but not in adults who were vocational rehabilitation clients.
- Internals are better able to resist coercion. This relates to higher outer-directedness of externals, another factor which Rotter (1966) believed distinguished the two orientations.
- Internals are better at tolerating ambiguous situations. There is also a lot of evidence in clinical research that internality correlates negatively with anxiety, and that internals may be less prone to depression than externals, as well as being less prone to learned helplessness. However, this does not mean that the emotional life of the internal is always more positive than that of the external, as internals are known to be more guilt-prone than externals.
- Externals are less willing to take risks, to work on self-improvement and to better themselves through remedial work than internals.
- Internals derive greater benefits from social supports.
• Internals make better mental health recovery in the long-term adjustment to physical disability.

• Internals are more likely to prefer games based on skill, while externals prefer games based on chance or luck.

1.3.4 Familial origins:
The development of locus of control is associated with family style and resources, cultural stability and experiences with effort leading to reward. Many internals have grown up with families that modeled typical internal beliefs. These families emphasized effort, education, responsibility and thinking. Parents typically gave their children rewards they had promised them. In contrast, externals are typically associated with lower socioeconomic status, because poor people have less control over their lives. Societies experiencing social unrest increase the expectancy of being out-of-control, so people in such societies become more external.

The research of Eschewing (1995; cited in Schultz & Schultz, 2005) suggests that “children in large single parent families headed by women are more likely to develop an external locus of control” (Schultz & Schultz, 2005,). Schultz and Schultz also point out that children who develop an internal locus tend to come from families where parents have been supportive and consistent in self-discipline. There has been some ambiguity about whether parental locus of control influences a children’s locus of control, although at least one study has found that children are more likely to attribute their successes and failures to unknown causes if their parents had an external locus of control.

As children grow older, they gain skills that give them more control over their environment. In support of this, psychological research has found that older children
have more internal locus of control than younger children. Findings from early studies on the familial origins of locus of control were summarized by Effort: “Warmth, supportiveness and parental encouragement seem to be essential for development of an internal locus”.

1.3.5 Self-efficacy:

Self-efficacy is another related concept, introduced by Albert Bandura. Although someone may believe that how some future event turns out is under their control, they may or may not believe that they are capable of behaving in a way that will produce the desired result. For example, an athlete may believe that training eight hours a day would result in a marked improvement in ability but not believe that he or she is capable of training that hard. Self-efficacy has been measured by means of a psychometric scaled and differs from locus of control in that whereas locus of control is generally a measure of cross-situational beliefs about control, self-efficacy is used as a concept to relate to more circumscribed situations and activities. Bandura has emphasized how the concept differs from self-esteem - using the example that a person may have low self-efficacy for ballroom dancing, but that if ballroom dancing is not very important to that person, this is unlikely to result in low self-esteem.

Psychiatrist and expert on trauma and dissociation, Colin A. Ross, M.D., describes the inappropriate self-blame that characterizes many adult survivors of childhood trauma as “the locus of control shift.” This theory is pivotal in his therapeutic sessions with near-psychotic people at the Ross Institute for Psychological Trauma. It is important to appreciate that differences do exist between internal locus of control and self-efficacy.
Smith (1989) has argued that the Rotter scale to assess locus of control cannot be taken as a measure of self-efficacy, because “only a subset of items refer directly to the subject’s capabilities”. Smith noted, in his empirical study, that coping skills training led to increases in self-efficacy, but did not affect locus of control as measured by Rotter’s (1966) scale.

1.4 Religion:

Religion has been defined in a wide variety of ways. Most definitions attempt to find a balance somewhere between overly sharp definition and meaningless generalities. Some sources have tried to use formalistic, doctrinal definitions while others have emphasized experiential, emotive, intuitive, valuational and ethical factors. Definitions mostly include:

- A notion of the transcendent or numinous, often, but not always, in the form of theism
- A cultural or behavioural aspect of ritual, liturgy and organized worship, often involving a priesthood, and societal norms of morality (ethos) and virtue (arete)
- A set of myths or sacred truths held in reverence or believed by adherents

Sociologists and anthropologists tend to see religion as an abstract set of ideas, values, or experiences developed as part of a cultural matrix. For example, in Lindbeck's Nature of Doctrine, religion does not refer to belief in "God" or a transcendent Absolute. Instead, Lindbeck defines religion as, "a kind of cultural and/or linguistic framework or medium that shapes the entirety of life and thought… it is similar to an idiom that makes possible the description of realities, the formulation of beliefs, and the experiencing of inner attitudes, feelings, and sentiments.” According to this
definition, religion refers to one's primary worldview and how this dictates one's thoughts and actions.

Other religious scholars have put forward a definition of religion that avoids the reductionism of the various sociological and psychological disciplines that reduce religion to its component factors. Religion may be defined as the presence of a belief in the sacred or the holy. For example Rudolf Otto's "The Idea of the Holy," formulated in 1917, defines the essence of religious awareness as awe, a unique blend of fear and fascination before the divine. Friedrich Schleiermacher in the late 18th century defined religion as a "feeling of absolute dependence."

1.4.1 Development of religion:

There are a number of models regarding the ways in which religions come into being and develop. Broadly speaking, these models fall into three categories:

- Models which see religions as social constructions;
- Models which see religions as progressing toward higher, objective truth;
- Models which see a particular religion as absolutely true.

In pre-modern (pre-urban) societies, religion is one defining factor of ethnicity, along with language, regional customs, national costume, etc. As Xenophanes famously comments:

*Men make gods in their own image; those of the Ethiopians are black and snub-nosed, those of the Thracians have blue eyes and red hair.*

Ethnic religions may include officially sanctioned and organized civil religions with an organized clergy, but they are characterized in that adherents generally are defined by their ethnicity, and conversion essentially equates to cultural assimilation to the people in question. The notion of gentiles ("nations") in Judaism has reflected this
state of affairs, the implicit assumption that each nation will have its own religion. Historical examples include Germanic polytheism, Celtic polytheism, Slavic polytheism and pre-Hellenistic Greek religion.

1.4.1.1 The Axial Age:
Karl Jaspers, in his *Vom Ursprung und Ziel der Geschichte (The Origin and Goal of History)*, identified a number of key Axial Age thinkers as having had a profound influence on future philosophy and religion, and identified characteristics common to each area from which those thinkers emerged. Jaspers saw in these developments in religion and philosophy a striking parallel without any obvious direct transmission of ideas from one region to the other, having found very little recorded proof of extensive inter-communication between the ancient Near East, Greece, India and China. Jaspers held up this age as unique, and one which to compare the rest of the history of human thought to. Jaspers' approach to the culture of the middle of the first millennium BCE has been adopted by other scholars and academics, and has become a point of discussion in the history of religion.

In its later part, the "Axial Age" culminated in the development of monism and monotheism, notably of Platonic realism and Neo-Platonism in Hellenistic philosophy, the notion of atman in Vedanta Hindu philosophy, and the notion of Tao in Taoism.

1.4.1.2 Middle Ages:
The present-day world religions established themselves throughout Eurasia during the Middle Ages by: Christianization of the Western world; Buddhist missions to East Asia; the decline of Buddhism and rise of Hinduism in the Indian subcontinent; and
the spread of Islam throughout the Middle East, Central Asia, North Africa and parts of Europe and India.

During the Middle Ages, Muslims were in conflict with Zoroastrians during the Islamic conquest of Persia; Christians were in conflict with Muslims during the Byzantine-Arab Wars, Crusades, Reconquista and Ottoman wars in Europe; Christians were in conflict with Jews during the Crusades, Reconquista and Inquisition; Shamans were in conflict with Buddhists, Taoists, Muslims and Christians during the Mongol invasions; and Muslims were in conflict with Hindus and Sikhs during Muslim conquest in the Indian subcontinent.

Many medieval religious movements emphasized mysticism, such as the Cathars and related movements in the West, the Bhakti movement in India and Sufism in Islam. Monotheism reached definite forms in Christian Christology and in Islamic Tawhid. Hindu monotheist notions of Brahman likewise reached their classical form with the teaching of Adi Shankara.

1.4.1.3 Modern period:

European colonization during the 15th to 19th centuries resulted in the spread of Christianity to Sub-Saharan Africa, the Americas, Australia and the Philippines. The 18th century saw the beginning of secularization in Europe, rising to notability in the wake of the French Revolution.

In the 20th century, the regimes of Communist Eastern Europe and Communist China were explicitly anti-religious. A great variety of new religious movements originated in the 20th century, many proposing syncretism of elements of established religions. Adherence to such new movements is limited, however, remaining below 2% worldwide in the 2000s. Adherents of the classical world religions account for more than 75% of the world's population, while adherence to indigenous tribal religions has
fallen to 4%. As of 2005, an estimated 14% of the world's population identifies as nonreligious.

The birth of the psychology of religion can hardly be attributed to the work of any single individual or group of thinkers, nor did it unfold naturally out of any particular tradition. In fact, it is hard to speak of it as having been “born” at all. It rather arose out of a particular intellectual climate in which scientific method and the study of religion had matured to the point that they were bound to rub against one another again and again as both approached a number of different questions. In the sense the psychology of religion was much a new stimulus to the study of religion as it was to the science of psychology. Only the hindsight of a later generation has allowed certain key contributions to this encounter to be singled out as the beginnings of the discipline itself, though even here there is no universal agreement.

The nineteenth century, it should be remembered, was witness to the first great flowering of non-sectarian disciplined approaches to the study of religious phenomena in the West. Stimulated by the discovery, translation and editing of Eastern religious and philosophical texts, as well as by new rigors brought to the anthropological study of primitive societies, the study of religion quickly produced methods and models for comparing various traditions and relocating Western religious traditions on a wider and more objective field.

It was against this general background that Willhem Wundt (1832-1930) carried on his work in experimental psychology. In contrast to “psychophysics” Which grounded the science on a quantifiable relationship between stimulus and sensation (a position exemplified in the work of Gustave Theodor Fechner, 1801-1887)? Wundt favoured a psychophysiology aimed at establishing patterns of parallelism between the psychical facts of human consciousness and their accompanying physical phenomena. From the
start his aim was to ground psychology as a “natural science” in introspection tempered by experimentation. His interest in the higher processes of the psyche or “apperception” turned him further and further away from concrete that he made use of comparative methods and evolutionary models circulating in anthropology to offer his own functional approach to the origins of religious behaviour. Thus Wundt distinguished four stages in the history of consciousness, each of which represented a distinctive manifestation of the struggle of the human spirit to assert its identity in the world of nature: primitive ritual, totemism, myths of heroes and gods, and humanism. The laboratory for experimental psychology that he set up in ‘Leipzig’ in 1879—credited as the first of its kind in the world—inspired similar efforts from other, including those who wanted to pursue his study of cultural and religious consciousness. Given the blend of the philosophical and the scientific in Wundt’s methods, it is not surprising that his influence here was of two sorts. On the one hand, his work led to new effort to bring greater objectivity to the science; on the other, it led to the attempt to introduce introspection into the laboratory. The key figure in this latter tendency of “thought psychology” was Oswald Kulpe (182-1915), whose so called Wurtzburg school (after the University of Wurtzburg where it was founded) introduced the use of questionnaires, interviews, and autobiographical records into the study of religious phenomena. The opposition between the individual-oriented introspectionism of the Wurtzburg school and the psycho cultural orientation of the mature Wundt was partly influenced by and partly influential in shaping the ideas of Franz Brentano and Willhelm Dilthey, whose reaction against objectivist psychology spread into the phenomenological and existentialist strains of Western philosophy, including their attitudes to religion. Indeed, much of the psychological flavor one senses in the works of such scholars of
religion as Geradus van der Leeuw, Rudof Otto, Nathan Soderblom, and Friedrich Heiler has to be seen in the context of this storm over introspective psychology. Karl Girgensohn (1875-1925) and Werner Gruhn (1887-1961) carried on Kulpe’s investigations into the empirical foundations of religion, arguing against the pursuit of a single elementary “religious emotion” in favor of a complex structure of thought and feeling constellated in the religious personality.

Psychology of religion is the psychological study of religious experiences, beliefs, and activities. It aims to inform understanding of religion through science. In the past couple of decades, scholars have conceptualized religion as a way of living, rather than merely a belief system or institution. This conception of religion eases its operationalization and fosters its scientific study. For instance, scholars can look at relatively objective practices, such as ritual performance and church attendance, rather than solely rely on subjective report to study religion.

A distinction between religion and spirituality has recently grown. However, Pargament contends that the search for the sacred (the divine, truth, reality) is common to both. Moreover, religion and spirituality are not mutually exclusive, but most often coincide. Positive psychology has also facilitated the study of spirituality at the individual level and religious institutions at the group level. However, views on the ability of spirituality and religion to promote positive qualities vary.

1.4.2 Theories of religion:

Theories of religion can be divided into substantive theories (focusing on what religion is) and functional or reductionist theories (focusing on what it does). Influential substantive theories have been proposed by Tylor and Frazer (focusing on
the explanatory value of religion for its adherents), by the theologian Rudolf Otto (focusing on the importance of religious experience, more specifically experiences that are both fascinating and terrifying), Mircea Eliade (focusing on the longing for otherworldly perfection, the quest for meaning, and the search for patterns in mythology in various religions).

Influential functional theories have been proposed by Karl Marx (focusing on the economic background), Sigmund Freud (focusing on neurosis as a psychological origin of religious beliefs), and Émile Durkheim (focusing on the Social function of religions).

Max Weber did not so much propose a general theory of religion as he focused on the interaction between society and religion. He also introduced a number of key concepts to the sociology of religion.

The rational choice theory has been applied to religions, among others by the sociologists Rodney Stark and William Sims Bainbridge. They asserted that religion is able to function as a compensator for un-obtained rewards.

Pre-scientific theories have been proposed since pre-Socratic times. Herodotus (484 – 425 BCE) stated that the gods of Greece were the same as the gods of Egypt. Euhemerus (appr. 330 – 264 BCE) wrote that gods were excellent historical persons who eventually became worshiped.

Theorizing beyond mere speculation became possible after data from tribes and peoples all over the world became available in Europe and the United States in the 18th and 19th century. The founder of the scientific study of religion is generally considered to be Max Müller (1823–1900), who advocated comparative religion. Later serious doubts were raised, among others by Geertz about the question whether it is possible to provide a general theory of all religions.
1.4.2.1 Karl Marx (1818–1883)

The social philosopher Karl Marx (1818–1883) held a strictly materialist world view and saw economics, including class distinctions, as the determining factor of society. He saw the human mind and human consciousness as part of matter. He saw religion originating from alienation and aiding the persistence of alienation. He saw religion as supportive as the status quo, in correspondence with his famous saying that religion is opium of the people. Marx saw religion as a source of happiness, though illusory and temporary, or at least a source of comfort. Marx saw religion not as a necessary part of human culture.

1.4.2.3 Emile Durkheim and functionalism:

Different from most other scholars, Émile Durkheim (1858–1917) saw the concept of the sacred as the defining characteristic of religion, not faith in the supernatural. He saw religion as a reflection of the concern for society. He based his view on recent research regarding totemism among the Australian aboriginals. With totemism he meant that each of the many clans had a different object, plant, or animal that they held sacred and that symbolizes the clan. Durkheim saw totemism as the original and simplest form of religion. According to Durkheim, the analysis of this simple form of religion could provide the building blocks for more complex religions. He asserted that moralism cannot be separated from religion.

1.4.2.4 Sigmund Freud:

*Sigmund Freud* (1856–1939) saw religion as an illusion. By illusion Freud means a belief that people want very much to be true. Unlike Tylor and Frazer, Freud attempted to explain why religion persists in spite of the lack of evidence for its tenets. Freud asserted that religion is a largely unconscious neurotic response
to repression. By repression Freud meant that civilized society demands that we cannot fulfill all our desires immediately, but that they have to be repressed. Rational arguments to a person holding a religious conviction will not change the neurotic response of a person. This is in contrast to Tylor and Frazer who saw religion as a rational and conscious, though primitive and mistaken, attempt to explain the natural world.

1.4.2.5 Rudolf Otto:
The theologian Rudolf Otto (1869–1937) focused on religious experience, more specifically moments that he called numinous which means "Wholly other". He described it as mysterium tremendum (terrifying mystery) and mysterium fascinans (awe inspiring, fascinating mystery). He saw religion as emerging from these experiences.

He asserted that these experiences arise from a special, non-rational faculty of the human mind, largely unrelated to other faculties, so religion cannot be reduced to culture or society. Some of his views, among others that the experience of the numinous was caused by a transcendental reality, are un-tastable and hence unscientific. His ideas strongly influenced phenomenologist and Mircea Eliade.

1.4.2.6 Mircea Eliade:

Mircea Eliade's (1907–1986) approach grew out of the phenomenology of religion. Like Otto, he saw religion as something special and autonomous that cannot be reduced to the social, economical or psychological alone. Like Durkheim, he saw the sacred as central to religion, but differing from Durkheim, he views the sacred as often dealing with the supernatural, not with the clan or society.
The daily life of an ordinary person is connected to the sacred by the appearance of the sacred, called hierophany. Theophany (an appearance of a God) is a special case of it. Eliade wrote that archaic men wish to participate in the sacred. Archaic men long to return to lost paradise, outside the historic time, as explained in Eliade's book Eternal return (Eliade) to escape meaninglessness. The primitive man could not endure that his struggle to survive had no meaning. He wrote that man had a nostalgia (longing) for an otherworldly perfection. Archaic man wishes to escape the terror of time and saw time as cyclic. Historical religions, like Christianity, Judaism revolted against this older concept of cyclic time. They provided meaning and contact with the sacred in history through the God of Israel.

1.4.2.7 E. E. Evans-Pritchard:

The anthropologist Edward Evan, Evans-Pritchard (1902-1973) did extensive ethonographic studies among the Azande and Nuer peoples who were considered "primitive" by society and earlier scholars. Evans-Pritchard saw these people as different, but not primitive.

Unlike the previous scholars, Evans-Pritchard did not propose a grand universal theory and he did extensive long-term fieldwork among "primitive" peoples, studying their culture and religion, among other among the Azande. Not just passing contact, like Eliade. He argued that the religion of the Azande (witchcraft and oracles) can not be understood without the social context and its social function. Witchcraft and oracles played a great role in solving disputes among the Azande. In this respect he agreed with Durkheim, though he acknowledged that Frazer and Tylor were right that their religion also had an intellectual explanatory aspect. The Azande's faith in witchcraft and oracles was quite logical and consistent once some fundamental tenets
were accepted. Loss of faith in the fundamental tenets could not be endured because of its social importance and hence they had an elaborate system of explanations (or excuses) against disproving evidence.

1.4.2.8 Clifford Geertz:
The anthropologist *Clifford Geertz* (1926-2006) made several detailed ethnography studies in Javanese villages, a more complex and multi-religious society than Evans-Pritchard had studied. He avoided the subjective and vague concept of group attitude as used by Ruth Benedict by using the analysis of society as proposed by Talcott Parsons who in turn had adapted it from Max Weber. Parsons' adaptation distinguished all human groups on three levels i.e. 1. an individual level that is controlled by 2. a social system that is in turn controlled by 3. a cultural system. Geertz followed Weber when he wrote that "man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in search of meaning". Geertz held the view that mere explanations to describe religions and cultures are not sufficient: interpretations are needed too. He advocated what he called thick descriptions to interpret symbols by observing them in use. He therefore held the view that the anthropologist must be both empirically rigorous and a good interpreter. In 1972 he wrote that “cultural analysis is (or should be) guessing at meanings, assessing the guesses and drawing explanatory conclusions from the better guesses.”
Geertz saw religion as one of the cultural systems of a society. He defined religion as

- a system of symbols
- which acts to establish powerful, pervasive and long-lasting moods and motivations in men
- by formulating conceptions of a general order of existence and
- clothing these conceptions with such an aura of factuality that
- The moods and motivations seem uniquely realistic.

With symbols Geertz meant a carrier that embodies a conception, because he saw religion and culture as systems of communication.

This definition emphasizes the mutual reinforcement between world view and ethics. Though he used more or less the same methodology as Evans-Pritchard, he did not share Evans-Pritchard's hope that a theory of religion could ever be found. Geertz proposed methodology was not the scientific method of the natural science, but the method of historians studying history.

**1.4.2.9 Rational choice theory:**

The rational choice theory has been applied to religions, among others by the sociologists *Rodney Stark* (1934–) and *William Sims Bainbridge* (1940). They see religions as systems of "compensators". Compensators are a body of language and practices that compensate for some physical lack or frustrated goal. They can be divided into specific compensators (compensators for the failure to achieve specific goals), and general compensators (compensators for failure to achieve any goal). They define religion as a system of compensator that relies on the supernatural. They assert that only a supernatural compensator can explain death or the meaning of life.
It has been observed that social or political movements that fail to achieve their goals will often transform into religions. As it becomes clear that the goals of the movement will not be achieved by natural means (at least within their lifetimes), members of the movement will look to the supernatural to achieve what cannot be achieved naturally. The new religious beliefs are compensators for the failure to achieve the original goals. Examples include the counterculture movement in America: the early counterculture movement was intent on changing society and removing its injustice and boredom; but as members of the movement proved unable to achieve these goals they turned to Eastern and new religions as compensators.

Most religions start out their lives as cults or sects, i.e. groups in high tension with the surrounding society. Over time, they tend to either die out, or become more established, mainstream and in less tension with society. Cults are new groups with a new novel theology, while sects are attempts to return mainstream religions to their original purity. Mainstream established groups are called denominations. The comments below about cult formation apply equally well to sect formation. There are four models of cult formation: the Psychopathological Model, the Entrepreneurial Model, the Social Model and the Normal Revelations model.

1.4.3 Psychopathological model:

Religions are founded during a period of severe stress in the life of the founder. The founder suffers from psychological problems, which they resolve through the founding of the religion.
1.4.3.1 Entrepreneurial model:

Founders of religions act like entrepreneurs, developing new products (religions) to sell to consumers (to convert people to). According to this model, most founders of new religions already have experience in several religious groups before they begin their own. They take ideas from the pre-existing religions, and try to improve on them to make them more popular.

1.4.3.2 Social model:

Religions are founded by means of social implosions. Members of the religious group spend less and less time with people outside the group, and more and more time with each other within it. The level of affection and emotional bonding between members of a group increases, and their emotional bonds to members outside the group diminish. According to the social model, when a social implosion occurs, the group will naturally develop a new theology and rituals to accompany it.

1.4.4 Normal revelations:

Religions are founded when the founder interprets ordinary natural phenomena as supernatural; for instance, ascribing his or her own creativity in inventing the religion to that of the deity.

1.4.4.1 Evolutionary theories:

In recent years evolutionary psychology and scientific cultural anthropology have been incorporating neo-Darwinist models of human behaviour into their thinking. Nowhere has this been more interesting than in the field of religion. Prior to this pointing intellectual history, the anthropological study of religion was rather anemic
in its presentation and testing of theoretical models of religious behaviour. It relied somewhat on the sociology of Weber (1963) and Durkheim (1915) to generate ideas and often referred back to the ideas of Tylor (1874), who seemed just as up-to-date as anyone, although he was 19th century anthropologist.

The 19th century ideas of the evolution of religious behaviour and its structure were more about the evolution of a cultural form rather than about a behaviour driven by the underlying capacities of the human brain. Religion was conceived of as a set of myths and rituals, most of which were completely alien to the European mind and, therefore, had to be put low on the line of cultural evolution leading from savagery to civilization.

The difference between the early and the modern evolutionary theories of religion is that the early theories were blank-slate theories in which the biology of the brain was not involved. Early evolutionary theories assumed that culture was progressing, at least in technological terms, from a state of savagery to that of civilization. It was believed, or at least hoped, that science was replacing superstition as culture progressed, so the superstitious side of religion would eventually evaporate; however, the facts hardly supported this optimistic conclusion. Now we recognize that human beings usually replace non-empirical religious beliefs with new non-empirical religious beliefs as fast as the old ones are discarded. Religion is not disappearing. It is now recognized that religious behaviour is most likely encoded in the human brain (Boyer 2001) and that it is the product of biological evolution (Atran 2002). At the moment there are a number of interesting theories about the evolution of religion based not on the earlier idea of myths being written on blank slates but on the biological evolution of the human central nervous system. I would like to look at some of these from an adaptations point of view, a view that looks at the function of
religion for human survival and reproduction in groups. Several of these theories are quite new.

1.4.4.2 The Evolutionary Process:

Religion is a communication of a world view, or a created reality, that people develop as a group. Such realities have to start out in the mind of one person. Then they spread to others. How and why have human beings developed the ability to create these internal realities and then communicate them? Let us move back in evolutionary time to our mammalian origins. The central nervous system evolved, at least in mammals, to facilitate survival and reproduction by relating input from sensory organs to an output of behaviour. It has evolved so as to make this neural data processing adaptive in the sense of promoting survival and reproduction. In order to do this it creates internal models of external realities. In fact there are no absolute external reality only models of it that are created by the CNS. Thus, we can think of the central nervous system as a data processing machine. Its inputs are the senses. Its internal memory is a neural network.

Its central processing unit is a complex neural processor that is soft-wired to increase the probability of certain connections and decrease the probability of others. Its output is behaviour and emotions. Dangerous feedback loops such as drug addiction are possible. Behavioural aberrations due to faulty internal construction are always possible, as in any living system, but, by a large, it is an incredible mechanism that we hardly have begun to understand.
1.4.4.3 Ecological Regulation Theory:

The first modern evolutionary theory of religion was an ecological regulation theory most often associated with the anthropologist Roy Rappaport (1984). This theory proposes that religion has evolved to send control signals to a group telling it about the state of its interaction with the natural environment. There are several critical assumptions in this theory: (1) that religion alone has the emotional power to alter group behaviour whereas other signals lack the authority and emotional impact to get the job done, (2) that religion responds to changes in the group's relationship to the natural environment, and (3) that the group is a significant unit of natural selection.

1.4.4.4 Commitment theory:

A more recent evolutionary theory is commitment theory. This is mostly associated with the economist Robert Frank (1988) and the anthropologists William Irons (2001) and Richard Sosis (2004). Commitment theory starts with the paradox that religion is simultaneously rational and irrational. It is rational in that it leads people to successful cooperation within a group, but it is irrational in that it requires a belief in unverifiable superhuman entities and forces. By making an irrational commitment to an unverifiable truth, people signal other members of the group that they can be trusted.

1.4.4.5 Cognitive theory:

The cognitive theorists are asking what makes religious models so popular and widely accepted. Instinctive non-rational popularity implies that there was a strong selective process in the past that genetically imprinted the behaviour on the human brain because it was successful at survival and reproduction. Atran (2002) has hit on a number of things that makes religious beliefs exciting to the individual: (1) they make
use of a fundamental quest to find agents that make things happen; (2) they provide easily remembered stories for learning important cultural ideas; (3) they evoke meaningful and therapeutic states in the brain; and (4) they produce pleasant rhythms and sounds. The attractive and common features of religion point to evolved cognitive capacities in the brain, modules if you think in terms of the modular brain (Barkow, Cosmides, and Tooby 1992). A central problem in understanding the evolved structure of religion today is to separate those modules that evolved to solve other problems and those modules that evolved in the context of religion as an adaptive complex itself. This problem has caused a division in the approaches to understanding religion from an evolutionary biology point of view. People such as Atran (2002) and Boyer (2001) who look at cognitive structures in general tend to see religion as composed of a complex of modules that evolved to solve different problems, for example awareness of predators or the detection of cheaters. Most other anthropologists immersed in the comparative studies of religions tend to see religion as a complete complex of its own evolving culturally in different directions but with a single overall adaptive pattern. Cognitive scientists tend to divide up the study of the brain into different lines of inquiry, so an application of their discoveries to the analysis of religion tends to model religion as a mosaic of behaviours that have evolved for other purposes. For this reason alone, most of the cognitive theories have not seen religion as a single adaptive system.

Cognitive theory proposes that religion is a by product of adaptation in other areas of behaviour. By-product theories pop up in many areas of evolutionary psychology. For example, Margo Wilson has pointed out that killing one's sexual partner hardly is a good way to increase one's reproduction, but it occurs from time to time with great passion. She sees it as a by product of mate-guarding that, by and large, increases the
reproduction of those emotional genes. It only appears bizarre and irrational when it
goes overboard.

Cognitive theory propose that religion is an overboard manifestation of some very
adaptive behaviour that should be seen apart from this complex. Religion is a
culturally constructed complex of behaviour that captures a number of adaptively
unrelated behavioural modules. One problem in utilizing cognitive theory is that some
of the modules are pre-human and we need input from animal as well as human
studies.

1.4.5 Psychology of Religion:

The psychology of religion, as understood today, owes its existence to the coincidence
of the birth of comparative religion in nineteenth-century Europe with the birth of two
other disciplines initially unrelated to religion: depth psychology, which appeared
within medical science as the first systematic pursuit of a theory of the unconscious
mind for the purposes of healing mental illness, and psychophysiology, which grew
out of physiology as an attempt to replace the philosophical moorings of perceptual
theory with concrete measurement and experimentation. Despite the extraordinary
breadth of learning and the broad-minded approach in the work of the early pioneers
of the psychology of religion, this dual ancestry started the discipline off with two
fundamentally opposing orientations that eventually produced the whole spectrum of
approaches that characterize psychology of religion at present.

Neither the notion of an unconscious dimension of the psyche and its importance to
the stability of the personality nor the applications of such insights to religious
phenomena were new. Both Eastern and Western civilizations had known centuries of
philosophical debate on the psyche and a wide variety of religious methods for healing spiritual disorders. This fact has led those at the extreme of the empirically oriented branch of the discipline to complain that depth psychology’s contribution to the psychology of religion represents little more than a gathering together and reassembling of insights scattered throughout intellectual history under the somewhat suspicious mantle of psychotherapeutic practice.

Meantime, the introduction of scientific methods modelled after the physical sciences into the study of the psychological dimensions of religion must be seen as one link in a long chain of attempts, reaching back to the origins of philosophy itself, to explain religion in rationalistic terms. Critics of the psycho-physiological approach to religion would argue that the very fact that religion has survived to serve as the subject matter for this newest attempt of rationalist investigation and shows no signs of weakening under the pressure of its discoveries should give experimental researchers cause to consider how far those aspects of religion that they are able to dissect and quantify are in fact from the core of religious experience.

Fortunately, most contemporary psychology of religion has mellowed as the mass of research being carried on from a variety of approaches continues to accumulate, and regularly makes use of both measurement and introspective techniques. Given its origins, however, the whole process remains a construct of Western academia. To be sure, the discipline is steadily making in roads into Asian cultures, but even so it is still an analytical method seen as foreign to non-Western traditions and that can at best be applied to these traditions as a heuristic structure for rereading them. Systematic attempts to produce psychologies of religion based on non-Western models of philosophy, religion, and medicine are all but nonexistent.
1.4.6 Spirituality:

Members of an organized religion may not see any significant difference between religion and spirituality. Or they may see a distinction between the mundane, earthly aspects of their religion and its spiritual dimension.

Some individuals draw a strong distinction between religion and spirituality. They may see spirituality as a belief in ideas of religious significance (such as God, the Soul, or Heaven), but not feel bound to the bureaucratic structure and creeds of a particular organized religion. They choose the term spirituality rather than religion to describe their form of belief, perhaps reflecting disillusionment with organized religion, and a movement towards a more "modern", more tolerant, and more intuitive form of religion. These individuals may reject organized religion because of historical acts by religious organizations, such as Christian Crusades and Islamic Jihad, the marginalization and persecution of various minorities or the Spanish Inquisition. The basic precept of the ancient spiritual tradition of India, the Vedas, is the inner reality of existence, which is essentially a spiritual approach to being.

1.4.7 Myth:

The word myth has several meanings.

1. A traditional story of ostensibly historical events that serves to unfold part of the world view of a people or explain a practice, belief, or natural phenomenon;

2. A person or thing having only an imaginary or unverifiable existence; or

3. A metaphor for the spiritual potentiality in the human being.

Ancient polytheistic religions, such as those of Greece, Rome, and Scandinavia, are usually categorized under the heading of mythology. Religions of pre-industrial
peoples, or cultures in development, are similarly called "myths" in the anthropology of religion. The term "myth" can be used pejoratively by both religious and non-religious people. By defining another person's religious stories and beliefs as mythology, one implies that they are less real or true than one's own religious stories and beliefs. Joseph Campbell remarked, "Mythology is often thought of as other people's religions, and religion can be defined as misinterpreted mythology."

In sociology, however, the term myth has a non-pejorative meaning. There, myth is defined as a story that is important for the group whether or not it is objectively or provably true. Examples include the death and resurrection of Jesus, which, to Christians, explains the means by which they are freed from sin and is also ostensibly a historical event. But from a mythological outlook, whether or not the event actually occurred is unimportant. Instead, the symbolism of the death of an old "life" and the start of a new "life" is what is most significant.

1.4.8 Cosmology:

Humans have many different methods which attempt to answer fundamental questions about the nature of the universe and our place in it. Religion is only one of the methods for trying to answer one or more of these questions. Other methods include science, philosophy, metaphysics, astrology, esotericism, mysticism, and forms of shamanism, such as the sacred consumption of ayahuasca among Peruvian Amazonia's Urarina. The Urarina have an elaborate animistic cosmological system, which informs their mythology, religious orientation and daily existence. In many cases, the distinctions between these means are not clear. For example, Buddhism and Taoism have been regarded as schools of philosophies as well as religions.
Given the generalized discontents with modernity, consumerism, over-consumption, violence and anomie, many people in the so-called industrial or post-industrial West rely on a number of distinctive religious worldviews. This in turn has given rise to increased religious pluralism, as well as to what are commonly known in the academic literature as new religious movements, which are gaining ground across the globe.

1.5 Brief Introduction to major Religions:

1.5.1 Hinduism:

Hinduism is a religion that originated in the Indian subcontinent. Purists refer to it more as Sanātana Dharma (the eternal path/law) than a religion, as it is believed to be a virtuous way of life.

It is the oldest practised religion in the world and has the third largest following after Christianity and Islam. It has over a billion practising followers, 90% of whom live in South Asia, particularly India, Nepal, Sri Lanka and Bhutan (which is the only official Hindu state in the world). Having originated in the Indian subcontinent, it has spread selectively to other parts of the world owing to migration, as the ideas of conversion and evangelisation are absent in Hinduism. Other countries having high Hindu populations include Bangladesh, Pakistan, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Mauritius, Fiji, Suriname, Guyana, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom and Canada.

The term Hinduism is derived from the word ‘Hindu’, which is a Persian distortion of ‘Sindhu’, the ancient name for the River Indus running through northern India. To that end, it is less a religion than a codification of the evolving way of life and beliefs of the inhabitants of the region. A conglomerate of diverse beliefs and traditions, Hinduism has no single founder.
The advent of the Aryans into north India assimilated certain beliefs of the late Neolithic and early Harappan period (5500–2600 BC) to their own religious beliefs. Modern Hinduism grew from the ancient texts called Vedas, and bore much similarity to other Indo-European religions like Zoroastrianism, incorporating strong elements of nature gods and their worship. Vedic Hinduism had spread all over the Indian subcontinent by the 4th century BC, assimilating elements of all local religious beliefs and practices. Over the next 10 centuries, it evolved further and also absorbed tenets of Buddhism and Jainism, which included the doctrine of non-violence and an emphasis on vegetarianism. Under the classical Golden Epoch of the Gupta period (4th to 6th century AD) more formalized Hindu thought and its systematization flourished. By then many classical works (shastras) of Hindu philosophy had been codified, the major epics—the Rāmāyana and Mahābhārata—received their present form and rules for idol worship, representations of the deities and for building structures and temples also developed. This assimilation lasted until the advent of political Islamic control in India in the 7th century. While there were a number of attempts to reconcile both Hindu and Muslim theology over the next eight centuries, mainstream Hinduism became more orthodox and codified. The rise of the Bhakti (devotion) and Sufi movements at this time, preaching piety and love for God, brought about a point of communion between the two religions that left in its wake some of the most evocative devotional corpus in Indian history. Under the British Empire, Hinduism underwent a number of social reforms, and there were many revivalist and spiritual movements in the 19th century.

Hinduism has no central doctrinal authority and most practicing Hindus do not claim to belong to any particular denomination. However, there are various denominations in Hinduism based primarily on the God worshipped as the Supreme One, as well as
those that developed as a result of the reform and revivalist movements within
Hinduism, though they are not antagonistic to each other.

The religious texts of the Hindus span a very large corpus, most important of which
are the four Vedas (called Ṛg-, Śāma- Yajus- and Atharva-) which focus on rituals,
and the Upanishads and Puranas, which focus on spiritual insight, mythological
accounts and philosophical teachings. Apart from this, there are a number of classical
texts (shastras) of Hindu philosophy as well as the major epics—the Rāmāyana and
Mahābhārata.

While it is difficult to completely define Hindu beliefs, the major themes in Hinduism
include Dharma (code of ethical conduct), Samsāra (The continuing cycle of birth,
life, death and rebirth), Karma (action and subsequent reaction), Moksha (liberation
from samsara), and the various Yogas (paths to attain Moksha). The concept of God
is very complex. Most Hindus believe in Brahman, the supreme spirit that pervades
the Universe, and that the human spirit or soul (ātman) is eternal and an indistinct part
of Brahman. The goal of life is to realize non-duality, and to lead a life that leads to
this realisation and thereby reaches Moksha (liberation or freedom). Other dualistic
schools worship Brahman as Vishnu, Brahma, Shiva or Shakti depending on the sect.

The Hindu scriptures and mythology refer to celestial entities, called Devas who
embodiments of nature, or qualities. They are however often distinguished from a
supreme personal God. Corporeal human manifestations of God are known as
Avatara.

Most practising Hindus engage in religious rituals daily to seek blessings from various
Gods, engaging in worship (puja) of the divine idol, either in shrines at home or in
temples. While it is not obligatory to visit temples, it is customary practice to do so on
important festivals. Vedic rites of fire-oblation (yajna) are now only occasional
practices although they are highly revered in theory. In Hindu wedding and burial ceremonies, however, the *yajña* and chanting of Vedic mantras are still the norm. Occasions like birth, marriage, and death involve what are often elaborate sets of religious customs. On death, cremation is considered obligatory and is typically performed by wrapping the corpse in cloth and burning it on a pyre.

Pilgrimage is not mandatory in Hinduism, though Hindus have several holy cities and temple cities. Important centres of Hindu pilgrimage include Allahabad, Varanasi, Hardwar, Tirumala - Tirupati and Katra, home to the Vaishno Devi temple, as well as sets of pilgrim centres linked together with theology. Hinduism has many festivals throughout the year, which are assigned by the Hindu calendar. Hindu festivals usually have their grounding in mythology, and some widely observed Hindu festivals include Holi, Dussera and Diwali.

However, the most important impact of Hinduism has been on the evolution of society. According to traditional Hindu belief, there are four stages of a human life (*Āshramas*), which are the stage as a student (spent in celibate, controlled, contemplation under a teacher), householder, retirement (gradual detachment from the material world) and finally asceticism to find Moksha. Society was classified into four classes, called *Varnas* – teachers and priests (*Brahmins*), warriors, nobles, and kings (*Kshatriyas*), farmers, merchants, and businessmen (*Vaishyas*) and the servants and labourers (*Shudras*). This classes slowly evolved to extremely rigid castes and sub-castes, setting in place an exceedingly oppressive hierarchy over the course of history. Most reform movements in the 19th and early 20th century addressed a number of these issues, and modern Hinduism is far more liberal, though the principles of caste and class still tend to become important in issues of marriage and social norms and politics.
1.5.2 Islam:

The word “Islam” is Arabic word which means “submission to the will of God”. This word comes from the same root as the Arabic word “salam”, which means “peace”. As such, the religion of Islam teaches that in order to achieve true peace of mind and surety of heart, one must submit to God and live according to His Divinely revealed Law. The most important truth that God revealed to mankind is that there is nothing divine or worthy of being worshipped except for Almighty God, thus all human beings should submit to Him.

The word “Muslim” means one who submits to the will of God, regardless of their race, nationality or ethnic background. Being a Muslim entails wilful submission and active obedience to God, and living in accordance with His message. Some people mistakenly believe that Islam is just a religion for Arabs, but nothing could be further from the truth. Not only are there converts to Islam in every corner of the world, especially in England and America, but by taking a look at the Muslim World from Bosnia to Nigeria, and from Indonesia to Morocco, one can clearly see that Muslims come from many various races, ethnic groups and nationalities. It is also interesting to note that in actuality, more than 80% of all Muslims are not Arabs - there are more Muslims in Indonesia than in the whole Arab World! So, though even though it is true that most Arabs are Muslims, the large majority of Muslims are not Arabs. However, anyone who submits completely to God and worships Him alone is a Muslim.

1.5.2.1 Continuity of the Message:

Islam is not a new religion because “submission to the will of God”, i.e. Islam, has always been the only acceptable religion in the sight of God. For this reason, Islam is
the true “natural religion”, and it is the same eternal message revealed through the ages to all of God’s prophets and messengers. Muslims believe that all of God’s prophets, which include Abraham, Noah, Moses, Jesus and Muhammad, brought the same message of Pure Monotheism. For this reason, the Prophet Muhammad was not the founder of a new religion, as many people mistakenly think, but he was the final Prophet of Islam. By revealing His final message to Muhammad, which is an eternal and universal message for all of mankind, God finally fulfilled the covenant that He made with Abraham, who was one of the earliest and greatest prophets.

Sufficient is it to say that the way of Islam is the same as the way of the prophet Abraham, because both the Bible and the Quran portray Abraham as a towering example of someone who submitted himself completely to God and worshipped Him without intermediaries. Once this is realized, it should be clear that Islam has the most continuous and universal message of any religion, because all prophets and messengers were “Muslims”, i.e. those who submitted to God’s will, and they preached “Islam”, i.e. submission to the will of Almighty God.

1.5.2.2 The Oneness of God:

The foundation of the Islamic faith is belief in the Oneness of Almighty God - the God of Abraham, Noah, Moses and Jesus. Islam teaches that a pure belief in One God is intuitive in human beings and thus fulfils the natural inclination of the soul. As such, Islam’s concept of God is straightforward, unambiguous and easy to understand. Islam teaches that the hearts, minds and souls of human beings are fitting receptacles for clear divine revelation, and that God’s revelations to man are not clouded by self-contradictory mysteries or irrational ideas. As such, Islam teaches
that even though God cannot be fully comprehended and grasped by our finite human minds, He also does not expect us to accept absurd or demonstrably false beliefs about Him.

According to the teachings of Islam, Almighty God is absolutely one and his oneness should never be compromised by associating partners with Him - neither in worship nor in belief. Due to this, Muslims are required to maintain a direct relationship with God, and therefore all intermediaries are absolutely forbidden. From the Islamic standpoint, believing in the Oneness of God means to realize that all prayer and worship should be exclusively for God, and that He alone deserves such titles as “Lord” and “Saviour”. Some religions, even though they believe in “One God”, do not make all of their worship and prayers for Him alone. Also, they also give the title of “Lord” to beings that are not All-Knowing, All-Powerful and Un-Changing - even according to their own scriptures. Suffice it to say that according to Islam, it is not enough that people believe that “God is One”, but they must actualize this belief by proper conduct.

In short, in the Islamic concept of God, which is completely based on Divine Revelation, there is no ambiguity in divinity - God is God and man is man. Since God is the only Creator and continual Sustainer of the Universe, He is transcendent above His creation - the Creator and the creature never mix. Islam teaches that God has a unique nature and that He is free from gender, human weaknesses and beyond anything which human beings can imagine. The Quran teaches that the signs and proofs of God’s wisdom, power and existence are evident in the world around us. As such, God calls on man to ponder over the creation in order to build a better understanding of his Creator. Muslims believe that God is Loving, Compassionate and Merciful, and that He is concerned with the daily affairs of human beings. In this,
Islam strikes a unique balance between false religious and philosophical extremes. Some religions and philosophies portray God as just an impersonal “Higher Power” who is uninterested, or unaware, of the life of each individual human. Other religions tend to give God human qualities and teach that He is present in His creation, by being incarnate in someone, something - or even everything. In Islam, however, Almighty God has clarified the truth by letting mankind know that He is “Compassionate”, “Merciful”, “Loving” and the “Answerer of Prayers”. But He has also emphasized strongly that “there is nothing like unto Him” and that He is high above time, space and His creation. Finally, it should be mentioned that the God that Muslims worship is the same God that Jews and Christians worship - because there is only one God. It is unfortunate that some people mistakenly believe that Muslims worship a different God than Jews and Christians, and that “Allah” is just the “god of the Arabs”. This myth, which has been propagated by the enemies of Islam, is completely false since the word “Allah” is simply the Arabic name for Almighty God. It is the same word for God which is used by Arabic-speaking Jews and Christians. However, it should be clarified that even though Muslims worship the same God as Jews and Christian, their concept of Him differs somewhat from the beliefs of other religions - mainly because it is based completely on Divine Revelation from God. For example, Muslims reject the Christian belief that God is a Trinity, not only because the Quran rejects it, but also because if this was God’s true nature, He would have clearly revealed it to Abraham, Noah, Jesus and all of the other prophets.
1.5.3 Buddhism:

Buddhism goes back to Siddhartha Gautama who was born some 2500 years ago in Lumbini, which now lies in Nepal. He belonged to the royal clan of the Shakyas and grew up in a wealthy environment. Siddhartha Gautama's received an education according to his standing and developed an outstanding personality. Already at his birth some priests prophesied that he would accomplish things of great significance, either in worldly or spiritual matters. For this reason his father placed great effort into Gautama's education, wishing for him a worldly career, screened off from all influences that could awaken his spiritual interest. Nonetheless, Siddhartha Gautama was repeatedly confronted with the suffering of sickness, of old age and death. He realized that neither his broad worldly knowledge and skills, nor his wealth and influence could eventually be of any help with the suffering that all human beings are subject to. His encounter with a Yogi who was sitting in deep meditation, brought him to the decision to leave the worldly life behind. He chose the inner way in order to conquer once and for all all suffering and to bring his innate qualities to maturation. Siddhartha Gautama left his family and practiced in the beginning severest asceticism. Soon he realized that this extreme form would not - just like his earlier wealth and affluence - bring him any closer to his goal. He therefore decided on the Middle Path, and thanks to his intensive meditation he could bring his inner potential to maturation.

Siddhartha Gautama realized Buddha hood, the condition of an "Awakened One". He transcended all feelings and attitudes that could cause suffering, brought all ignorance to an end and all his latent qualities to maturation. The full realization of Buddha hood which Siddhartha Gautama reached is independent of belonging to any particular race or culture. He was a human being, lived the life of a human being and was subject to
the same laws of life like all of us. However, with his example he demonstrated that every person, independent of gender, his or her age or social background, posses the potential of full realization which can be reached through proper training of the mind. Approximately two months after reaching his enlightenment Shakyamuni Buddha began to teach for more than 40 years until the end of his life. His activity occurred during the peak of Indian religious and philosophical culture. His long teaching activity within a highly developed society is the explanation for the richness of his statements to practical life-related questions on the one hand and on the other to scientific and philosophical ones. Whatever Buddha taught, he taught from personal experience and passed on his knowledge in a fresh and life-related manner. He repeatedly advised his disciples to examine his teachings and not to trust them blindly. He did not teach in order to gain disciples who were dependent on him, but to make all people realize their own boundless possibilities and inner freedom.

The aim of Buddhism is the realization of Buddha hood. This means to be free of all suffering and problems as well as to unfold and mature all the qualities and abilities latent in our mind. In order to achieve this goal we first have to carefully examine our present life-situation. It was for that purpose that Buddha taught right from the start about 'The Truth of Suffering" and "The Truth of the Cause of Suffering'. In a sort of analysis of the condition of our world he showed how our lives are permeated with problems and that the cause of all the suffering lies in the fact that we do not understand reality as it really is. The Buddha made it clear that a wrong understanding of our own person and the world around us lead to inward disturbances which are constantly the cause for actions that are harmful. Those negative actions and impressions leave imprints on our mind that is further cause for new problems and suffering. This law as part of every action is called 'Karma- in Sanskrit. Karma
means simply 'cause and effect'. The effect is always in accordance with the action. From this follows that positive actions will lead to joy and happiness, negative actions on the other hand to pain and suffering. Therefore, karma does not mean that we are subject to a predestined fate; rather, we ourselves are responsible for the quality of our life. We determine the quality of our life, because with our attitude and actions we influence our karma, create new karma and this way continuously shape the quality of our life. In the context of false ideas which the individual person has of him- or herself and the world around us, we create a very personal relationship to everything. Whatever happens to us we can experience only in the light of our subjective experience - and thus are trapped in our own personal world. This process continues from life to life and is called the “conditioned circularity of existence". Recognizing the connectedness in our present situation goes hand in hand with the understanding that we ourselves have also the potential to reach Buddha hood. With the "Truth of Ending Suffering' and the "Truth of the Path' which are the third and fourth of the Four Noble Truths, Buddha pointed at the ultimate goal which is enlightenment. He showed that each person is able to overcome his or her ignorance in regard to his or her own person and the world around us, as well as overcoming our own flaws and reaching Buddha hood. To realize this Buddha recommended to walk the path which he himself had walked. In principle this path consists of getting a grip on our mind, of 'taming the mind'. With the aid of meditation and conscious positive attitude we deepen our love and compassion for all living beings and in addition the insight in the nature of all things. This leads to the gradual reduction of our egocentricity, to seeing the true reality and lastly reaching Buddha hood. Meditation and the practice of mindfulness are a mind-training which helps us in developing a healthy, clear and joyful mind and recognizing its unlimited nature. This enables us to see ourselves,
other people and the world we live in, according to the way 'it really is". We begin to
disentangle from our own fixated ideas, interpretations, wishes and fears, which make
a clear and direct perception impossible. Positive actions and attitudes which are
motivated by our intention not to be harmful to ourselves and others, aid us in our
mental maturation. They make for a harmonious life and give us a foundation for
inner strength which is very important for the praxis of meditation. There are
different Buddhist traditions with different methods of meditation but they all have
two aspects in common: meditation of a calm mind and of clear insight. The Buddha
analysed our world with its governing law and in accordance with it created a Way
that made it possible for everyone to work with his or her mind. Through our
maturing insight and positive attitude can we then overcome suffering and become
increasingly able to help others. It is a Way of absolute acceptance of responsibility
for our own actions. Even Buddha himself could do no more than give advice and
pointers for this Way. It depends on each individual whether he or she will pay heed
or not. The basic structures of Buddhism are "The Four Noble Truths" which Buddha
expounded with numerous instructions on the manifold themes and questions
regarding our life. The different Buddhist traditions vary in emphasizing certain
elements of his teachings. This broad palette of presenting his teachings, praxis and
meditation answers to the many different needs and inclinations of the individual. just
like we need different medication to heal different kinds of illnesses, so do we need
different kinds of mental training in order to get a hold an the various inner
disturbances. No matter which Buddhist tradition we deal with, all have the same
aim: to arouse and nourish our innate abilities, to develop love and compassion, to
reach peace of mind and gain insight - and, last, but not least, the realization of
Buddha hood - the full unfolding of the innate potential of each and every person.
1.5.4 Christianity:

Christianity is the largest world religion at the moment. It has over 2 billion followers, who classify themselves under 34,000 different denominations. Initially, Christianity was derived from Judaism, as Jesus Christ was a Jew, as were his twelve disciples. Christianity is based mainly around the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, and is monotheistic. Christians believe in the Bible being the word of God, and although some choose to take it more literally than others, it is generally considered to be inspired by the Holy Spirit.

1.5.4.1 Beliefs and Principles:

Christians believe that Jesus Christ is the anointed saviour of the world and that his presence on earth was the fulfilment of the prophesies made in the Old Testament about the Messiah who was to come and save humanity from their sins. This was achieved for Christians, by the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, whereby he defeated Satan and paid the price for all the sin in the world. The consequence of this is that anyone who accepts this belief is given eternal life and freedom from sin. Christians hold that Jesus will return on Judgment Day to fulfil the rest of the Old Testament prophesies, to judge the living and the dead and establish God’s kingdom in the new creation.

According to the Gospels, Jesus was conceived by the Holy Spirit and born to the Virgin Mary in Bethlehem. Not much is said about Jesus’ childhood, but his last years on earth were heavily documented in the Gospels. Christians consider Jesus’ death, resurrection and ascension to be the most important doctrines in their faith. This is because Jesus shows his omnipotence over death and ultimately is the most convincing evidence for Christians that he is fully God.
The Bible itself is not debated within Christianity, only its interpretation. Many believe that it was intended only to be read as a story book, full of myths and moral messages. Others contend that the whole Bible is supposed to be read literally and then there are those who read the different types of books in the Bible differently, for example the Psalms as illustrative poems and the Gospels as facts. Although Christianity is a monotheistic religion, Christians also believe that Jesus was God’s Son and that He, and the Holy Spirit, are both also fully God, as well as being separate entities entirely. This is a concept many find hard to grasp, and some Christians choose not to accept, but the majority of Christians see it as an essential part of their faith. The Bible does not specifically refer to the Trinity, but it is a common doctrine and is included in the Nicene Creed which serves to outline the core beliefs of Christianity.

1.5.4.2 History and Origins:

The early church was founded by the Twelve Apostles, but this did not occur straight after Jesus’ death and ascension. A great deal of persecution followed Jesus’ ascension and many of his followers were killed and imprisoned simply because of what they believed. Christianity only became legal in the fourth century, when Constantine I formed the First Council of Nicea, which wrote the Nicene Creed. This creed is still used throughout the Church of England, the Roman Catholic Church and the Eastern Orthodox Church. In 380, Christianity was officially made the religion of the Roman Empire. In the following years, it was declared that Jesus was both fully man and fully God, the books of the Bible were determined, and they also decided that the Nicene Creed was a permanent doctrine of the church at the Council of Rome. After the demise of the Roman Empire, the church expanded its missionary work in
the rest of the world and the faith spread widely through the Germanic, Slavic, Celtic, Viking, Finn, and Hungarian people. After about 630, Islam began to increase quickly and soon took over previously Christian countries such as Spain and most of North Africa. Also straight after the collapse of the Romans, monasteries began to form all over Europe, which started off as simple learning centres, but soon gave rise to the first universities, such as the University of Paris, Bologna, and Oxford. Their subjects expanded from just theology to include law, medicine, and philosophy.

The Crusades are an important part of church history because of the rising Islamic population in the Holy Land and surrounding areas. The crusades failed in their main objective and lead to extensive suppression of heresy in the following decades, mostly initiated by the Inquisition establishments.

Over about seven centuries the church gradually divided into two sections, the Western - Catholic and Eastern – Orthodox branches. There are several disagreements within the two sides, the most notable being the issue of papal primacy of jurisdiction. This refers to the Pope’s authority over the church, and how far it should extend. There have been two attempts at reuniting the churches, but ultimately their differences seem to be irreconcilable.

In the 16th Century, there was a reformation in the Catholic Church, mainly lead by Martin Luther, which ended in the Act of Supremacy being passed in England, effectively making the King the head of the Church of England. The Pope was excommunicated, and the Catholic Reformation was initiated. In the following years, the divide between Protestantism and Catholicism became irrevocably interwoven with politics. During all this, due to the discovery of the Americas, and subsequent colonial expansion by European countries, Christianity began to spread across the world, to the Americas, sub-Saharan Africa, and East Asia.