

Amy L. Ai
Paul Wink
Raymond F. Paloutzian
Kevin A. Harris *Editors*

Assessing Spirituality in a Diverse World

 Springer

Assessing Spirituality in a Diverse World

Amy L. Ai • Paul Wink
Raymond F. Paloutzian • Kevin A. Harris
Editors

Assessing Spirituality in a Diverse World

 Springer

Editors

Amy L. Ai
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL, USA

Raymond F. Paloutzian
Westmont College
Santa Barbara, CA, USA

Paul Wink
Department of Psychology
Wellesley College
Wellesley, MA, USA

Kevin A. Harris
Algos Behavioral Health Services
San Antonio, TX, USA

ISBN 978-3-030-52139-4 ISBN 978-3-030-52140-0 (eBook)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-52140-0>

© Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2021

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors, and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

The Post-Christian Spirituality Scale (PCSS): Misconceptions, Obstacles, Prospects



Dick Houtman and Paul Tromp

Abstract According to the received view in sociology of religion, post-Christian spirituality is radically privatized, individualized, and fragmented, and as such lacks a coherent worldview or ideology. A more specialized literature exposes this notion as a misconception, however, so that it is possible after all to measure post-Christian spirituality by means of a standardized unidimensional scale. This literature conveys seven logically interrelated ideas that are central to the worldview of post-Christian spirituality: (1) perennialism (the notion that ‘deep down’ all religions are identical and interchangeable); (2) bricolage (the notion that one needs to feel free to draw on different religions in a way that makes sense personally); (3) immanence of the sacred (the notion that the sacred is present in the cosmos as an impersonal spirit, energy, or life force); (4) aliveness of the cosmos (the notion that the cosmos is not inanimate but alive); (5) holism (the notion that the sacred connects everything within the cosmos); (6) self-spirituality (the notion that the sacred resides within rather than without the self); and (7) experiential epistemology (the notion that experiences and emotions are emanations of the spiritual self that lies within). These seven notions have been operationalized into Likert-type items that together form a reliable and unidimensional Post-Christian Spirituality Scale that can, among other things, be used in health-related research.

Keywords Cultic milieu · Mystical religion · Post-Christian spirituality
Religious privatization · Spiritual but not religious · Spiritual turn

D. Houtman (✉) · P. Tromp
KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium
e-mail: dick.houtman@kuleuven.be

© Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2021
A. L. Ai et al. (eds.), *Assessing Spirituality in a Diverse World*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-52140-0_3

1 The Post-Christian Spirituality Scale

While in the past decades ‘spirituality’ has quickly become one of the new buzzwords in the study of religion, it has proven to be notoriously difficult to pin down conceptually and operationally. The main reason is that it manifests itself in a myriad of different ways and social contexts, both within established Christian churches and beyond. Indeed, in his seminal study *After Heaven: Spirituality in America since the 1950s*, Robert Wuthnow (1998) distinguishes three different manifestations, types, or forms of spirituality. Besides a more traditional “dwelling” spirituality he discusses a more recently emerged, more individualistic “seeking spirituality”, and a “practice” form of spirituality that can be found both within and beyond church communities. This diversity on the ground points out that it is vital to escape crude and “one-size-fits-all” binaries of “religion versus spirituality” and to be clear about the type of spirituality one addresses.

In this chapter, we discuss, conceptualize and operationalize one type of spirituality that markedly overlaps with Wuthnow’s “seeking spirituality” and that we call “post-Christian spirituality”. By using this label we do not suggest that it by definition lacks support in Christian churches and communities—indeed, it is found in liberal Christian circles, too (Campbell, 2007; Houtman, Pons, & Laermans, forthcoming). More than that, to study where exactly this type of spirituality is most and least typically found we first need a scale that accurately measures it. The label “post-Christian spirituality” rather expresses that this type of spirituality sets itself decidedly apart from traditional Christian understandings of religious authority. As we will explain in more detail below, this does not mean that it dismisses God, the Bible or the ideas of Christian preachers out of hand as false and flawed. It rather means that the latter are no longer accepted as authoritative in the sense of being understood as superior to sources of religious authority found in other religions.

Indeed, discontents about traditional Christian understandings of religious authority have meanwhile made many in the West suspicious of the notion of “religion” and keen to identify as “spiritual but not religious” (Fuller, 2001). This is why present-day sociologists of religion and religious studies scholars jot down remarkable answers to fairly elementary interview questions. *Are you religious?; No, I am not. I am quite interested in spirituality, though. Or: No, I am not religious; I want to follow my personal spiritual path. Or even: No, I am not religious, because (sic) I want to follow my personal spiritual path.* Another example of a nowadays often-heard and profoundly new response pattern: *Do you believe in God?; No, I do not, but I do believe that there is something.* Many Westerners apparently no longer understand God as a person and creator who needs to be believed in and obeyed, but rather as a diffuse and vaguely defined “something.”

Answers like these puzzle anyone raised with the notion that religion is about church-based belief in a God who has created the world and revealed the truth. Such answers appear to occur more frequently in Western Europe than in North America, arguably due to historically informed differences pertaining to religion and freedom. For while in Europe religion has always had to carry the historical burden of

oppression, persecution, and lack of freedom, the first colonists that landed on the Atlantic shores of North America had precisely fled religious strife in Europe to build a new society based on ideals of religious freedom (e.g., Woodhead, 2004, pp. 94–95). There are nonetheless no good reasons to assume that such spiritual understandings of religion have meanwhile become widespread in Western Europe only, while they are virtually non-existent in North America – indeed, Wuthnow’s (1998) work provides compelling counterevidence for the United States, as does recent work by Watts (2018a, 2018b) for Canada. Yet, for the historical reasons just cited, it may well be the case that in North America those who embrace such spiritual understandings of religion are more involved in Christian churches and communities than their Western-European counterparts are. Whether or not this is the case is an important question for future research.

Be this all as it may, answers in Western Europe to elementary interview questions like the ones just cited indicate that the traditional language of religion has increasingly given way to one of spirituality, with many today disliking the former and embracing the latter. Spirituality is in effect no longer primarily perceived as the opposite of materiality (as in “spirit and matter”), but also often understood as the opposite of religion (Huss, 2014). So while traditional Christian religion has surely lost much of its former appeal and legitimacy in Western Europe, it has not simply given way to secular non-religiosity, but also to various types of spirituality, not least a post-Christian type that is eager to distinguish itself from Christian religion’s traditional understandings of religious authority. This process of religious change is typically theorized as a general shift from “religion” to “spirituality”, often identifying the latter with New Age and conceiving it as “post-Christian,” “alternative,” or “holistic” (e.g., Heelas & Woodhead, 2005). Even though as indicated above there is certainly more to spirituality than this, we here just address the latter, referring to it as “post-Christian spirituality”.¹

This post-Christian spirituality differs profoundly from Christian religion as the West has known it for centuries. It embraces a conception of the sacred as a diffuse spirit or life force that permeates and unifies all of the cosmos and that can only be personally experienced, which causes external sources of religious authority to be rejected as illegitimate. Sociologists of religion have traditionally taken it to be radically fragmented and individualized, suggesting that unlike Christian religion, it lacks a coherent and unifying worldview. If this were indeed the case, it would of course be impossible to study it by means of a standardized scale. We explain below why this notion of a coherent underlying spiritual worldview being absent is flawed, however, and discuss in detail how this informs our Post-Christian Spirituality Scale.

This Post-Christian Spirituality Scale is important because it enables a recalibration of religious research to major changes that have occurred on the ground. Most students of religion in the West, particularly Western Europe, agree nowadays that Christian religion has declined significantly since the 1960s, while alongside other

¹ It is certainly possible that some of the people who adhere to post-Christian spirituality are of Jewish or Islamic descent. We acknowledge therefore that correct terminology is an ongoing challenge, and that every available term (including our own) has its imperfections.

manifestations of spirituality post-Christian spirituality has become increasingly widespread in the same period (e.g., Campbell, 2007; Heelas & Woodhead, 2005). The latter has its historical roots in the so-called counterculture of the 1960s and 1970s (e.g., Roszak, 1969), which witnessed a massive increase in interest in post-Christian spirituality and oriental religions (Campbell, 2007; McLeod, 2007; Sebald, 1984). The interest of The Beatles in the teachings of the Maharishi Yogi (“The man who gave transcendental meditation to the world”) and their visits to his ashram in Rishikesh, India, constitutes a case in point. Even though post-Christian spirituality has meanwhile lost much of its former socially critical edge, it even today echoes the characteristic countercultural rejection of external authorities and its foregrounding of the inner world as an entry to genuine freedom and liberty.

Much like the counterculture of the 1960s and 1970s itself, the dissemination of post-Christian spirituality since then is first of all a Western phenomenon, sparked by typically Western cultural discontents about alienating modern orders. Indeed, the turn to post-Christian spirituality signifies a shift from a Western dualistic worldview towards a monistic or holistic Eastern one (i.e., an Easternization of the West; Campbell, 2007). Yet, due to Western modernity’s spread to non-Western countries, post-Christian spirituality has also begun to spread to countries like Japan (Mullins, 1992; Shiroya, 2017), Nigeria (Hackett, 1992), and South Africa (Oosthuizen, 1992).

The profound transformation of the religious landscape of the West that has resulted from the spiritual turn since the 1960s calls for a scale for post-Christian spirituality to complement scales for the measurement of other types of spirituality and traditional Christian beliefs. For such a scale is not only vital for mapping the corollaries and consequences of post-Christian spirituality, not least in the realm of health and health care, but also for systematically testing contemporary theories of religious change. For today’s long-standing international survey programs like the European Social Survey (ESS), the European Values Study (EVS), and the World Values Survey (WVS) feature an overly narrow and Christian-informed conception of religion, which biases research findings towards decline of religion rather than religious change. Their questionnaires are in effect more useful for recording the dissolution of the Christian religious formations of the past than for mapping the newly emerging ones. They maneuver much of contemporary religion out of sight, arguably its most rapidly expanding part (Houtman, Heelas, & Achterberg, 2012). The unfortunate absence of a good scale for post-Christian spirituality has forced students of religious change to rely on second-best options. One is comparing the young and the elderly to then interpret any differences found as cohort effects that indicate religious change rather than life cycle effects that have emerged across the life course (Houtman & Mascini, 2002). Another solution—if that is what it is—is to make use of overly crude and unreliable measures that leave much to be desired (Houtman & Aupers, 2007).

2 Theoretical Basis

2.1 *Religion Beyond Church and Sect*

The widespread misconception that post-Christian spirituality lacks a coherent worldview stems from the deeply ingrained identification of religion with either church or sect, two categories introduced at the beginning of the twentieth century by the sociologically inclined Protestant theologian Ernst Troeltsch (1992 [1912]). Troeltsch's church model posits the existence of just one church that envelops all members of a community and understands itself as intimately bound up with the latter. Becoming a church member is hence not a deliberate personal act: one is born into a community and its church and in principle stays a member until one's final days. This model of religion moreover features a priesthood that has privileged access to the sacred and hence mediates between God and the community of believers. The priesthood organizes communal gatherings, takes care of the appropriate performance of religious rituals, socializes rank-and-file church members and new priests, and is entrusted with administering the sacraments to believers. Due to the priesthood's privileged access to God, the church model of religion assumes religious hierarchy: the priesthood is understood as more or less sacred in and of itself and hence as less worldly and profane than rank-and-file church members. Empirically speaking, the Roman Catholic Church comes closest to this first model of religion as defined by Troeltsch.

It is to this model of religion that the Protestant Reformation revolted by underscoring the authority of God, and God alone. Protestantism is thus characterized by a marked contrast between the world and the church on the one hand and an all-powerful God who has revealed the truth on the other, so that the Word of God, as contained in the Holy Bible, constitutes the only valid source of religious authority (Troeltsch, 1992 [1912]). Protestants in effect cannot rely on church authority in telling them how to live but have the Bible as their only guideline. Here, religion is hence not about being a loyal member of a church and a community but about obeying God—being a pious believer according to His commandments rather than those of the church. The sect model in effect features a critical rejection of the social environment in which the sect finds itself, because, measured against God's strict commandments, the world as it is inevitably falls short.

While modern students of religion have favorably received and widely adopted Troeltsch's church and sect types of religion, understanding the two first and foremost as types of religious organization, his third cult type of religion has traditionally been neglected. This accounts for the many misapplications of the sect category back in the 1960s and 1970s, when the latter was frequently used to refer to newly emerged non-Christian cults (Campbell, 2002 [1972]; Streib & Hood, 2011). In Troeltsch's understanding, cults differ profoundly from both churches and sects, however, because unlike these they are fleeting phenomena: they are typically short-lived, have no clear organization, typically form an egalitarian group or social network, lack clear hierarchy and leadership, lack strict religious doctrines, and

know no strong boundaries between insiders (members) and outsiders (non-members).

Campbell 2002 [1972] points out how this very fleetingness makes the study of just one single spiritual group or practice in isolation of others quite meaningless. What needs to be studied instead, he maintains, is the wider milieu of religious heterodoxy in which cults find their home, which he refers to as the *cultic milieu*:

Cults must exist within a milieu which, if not conducive to the maintenance of individual cults, is clearly highly conducive to the spawning of cults in general. Such a generally supportive cultic milieu is continually giving birth to new cults, absorbing the debris of the dead ones and creating new generations of cult-prone individuals. (Campbell, 2002 [1972], pp. 121–122)

In this understanding, cults relate to the cultic milieu like icebergs to glaciers; while the former are inevitably fleeting and will eventually melt away altogether, the latter are persistent and periodically spawn new icebergs.

2.2 *Post-Christian Spirituality as Mystical Religion*

Troeltsch identifies cults with a variety of mystical religion that has completely broken away from, and boasts disdain for, the institutional and doctrinal features of religion (see also Daiber, 2002), just like the post-Christian groups in today's spiritual milieu do (Campbell, 1978). Indeed, observers of post-Christian spirituality have pointed out how the latter reject “voices of authority associated with established orders... even rejecting ‘beliefs’” (Heelas, 1996, p. 22), to the effect that “prescriptions of others, of tradition, of experts, of religious texts, and all such external sources are not considered legitimate” (Adams & Haaken, cited in Heelas, 1996, p. 22). As a mysticism that has broken away from religious institutions and doctrines, post-Christian spirituality entails “a religious principle in its own right divorced from a containing frame-work of dogma, ritual or ecclesiasticism” (Campbell, 1978, p. 149), indeed “a distinct religion in its own right with a distinct system of beliefs” (Campbell, 1978, p. 147), which understands itself as “the true inner principle of all religious faith,” as Streib & Hood (2011, p. 448) put it.

Post-Christian spirituality hence constitutes a religion stripped of its institutional and doctrinal aspects: a promise of and a quest for pure religion and real sacrality that posits a spiritual realm that can neither be captured in human-made institutions nor reduced to religious doctrines and dogmas. Conceiving of pre-given religious (and non-religious) orders and doctrines as hidebound, short-witted, and suffocating, it rejects church religion as authoritarian and as demanding blind obedience and conformity, and it dismisses sect religion's doctrinal tendencies as a dogmatic and narrow-minded escape from reality. Boasting ideals of breaking free from such constraints, post-Christian spirituality does hence not incite its adherents to *ascetically* define themselves as active *tools* in the hands of God (subordination to God and engaging in a life devoted to the active pursuit of His demands), but rather to

mystically think of themselves as passive *vessels* of the divine that need to open themselves up to the sacred to ultimately become one with it: “the creature must be silent so that God may speak” (Weber, 1963 [1922], p. 326).

The point, in short, is that post-Christian spirituality cannot be defined in terms of membership, loyalty, or affinity with a particular spiritual group or practice, but only in terms of a lasting commitment to the spiritual or cultic milieu as a whole and to the spiritual worldview that underlies the latter and provides it with ideological unity. This is precisely where the intellectual significance of the quantitative study of post-Christian spirituality lies: it enables students of spirituality to move beyond the idiosyncrasies of particular spiritual groups and practices and study affinity with the underlying spiritual worldview that the various groups and practices have in common.

3 Literature Review

3.1 *A Spiritual Turn in the West?*

The intellectual significance of the quantitative study of post-Christian spirituality has increased sharply in the wake of the crisis of secularization theory since the 1980s. Before that decade, the latter constituted sociology of religion’s theoretical flagship, predicting a decline of the social significance of religion, which basically meant Christian religion back then. A cluster of loosely connected theories rather than a coherent and monolithic theory in and of itself, secularization theory among other things predicts increasing numbers of people to become less and less religious (e.g., Bruce, 2002; Casanova, 1994; Dobbelaere, 2002; Tschannen, 1991; Wallis & Bruce, 1992). From the 1980s onwards, this thesis of religious decline has become increasingly challenged by the claim that since the 1960s, religion has not so much declined but rather transformed profoundly.

Contemporary students of religion have observed that “religious life... is not so much disappearing as mutating” (Davie, 1994, p. 198), entailing a “turn away from worlds in which people think of themselves first and foremost as belonging to established and ‘given’ orders of things which are transmitted from the past” (Heelas & Woodhead, 2005, p. 3). Others even go so far as to observe “a fundamental revolution in Western civilization, one that can be compared in significance to the Renaissance, the Reformation, or the Enlightenment” (Campbell, 2007, p. 41). In her book *Religion in Britain since 1945*, probably better known by its subtitle, *Believing without Belonging*, Davie (1994) asserts that what we have been witnessing in Western Europe since the 1960s is not so much a decline in religion, but rather a decline in church affiliation. The result is widespread “unattached religion” (Davie, 1994, p. 199) and hence a “mismatch between... religious practice and... levels of religious belief” (p. 4). The implication is that standard accounts of secularization as a decline in religion are “getting harder and harder to sustain” (p. 7),

because it is in fact “more accurate to describe late-twentieth-century Britain... as unchurched rather than simply secular” (p. 7).

In keeping with its subtitle, Davie’s book has typically been interpreted as offering a theory of the de-institutionalization of Christianity, according to which people do not cease to hold Christian beliefs, but increasingly do so without affiliating with churches (e.g., Voas & Crockett, 2005). Her book, however, also hints at an alternative theory that is basically identical to Heelas and Woodhead’s (2005) and Campbell’s (2007) accounts of a turn towards post-Christian spirituality in the West. For writing about believing and belonging, Davie points out how in Britain, religious “feelings, experience and the more numinous aspects of religious belief demonstrate considerable persistence,” whereas “religious orthodoxy, ritual participation and institutional attachment display an undeniable degree of secularization” (Davie, 1994, pp. 4–5). This is in effect a theory about a turn towards post-Christian spirituality (Campbell, 2007; Heelas & Woodhead, 2005), so a theory about de-Christianization rather than de-institutionalization of Christianity. It is not a theory about people leaving the church, while sticking to their Christian beliefs, but about people turning away from Christian religion towards post-Christian spirituality with its characteristic rejection of religious institutions, religious doctrines, and religious beliefs alongside its equally characteristic foregrounding of personal spiritual experience.

3.2 Post-Christian Spirituality as Fragmented and Individualized Privatized Religion?

One of the major shortcomings of studies of post-Christian spirituality in sociology of religion is its incessant portrayal as radically individualized and privatized. This interpretation can also be traced to the traditional neglect of Troeltsch’s *cult* category, because he defines the latter precisely by the absence of the institutional bulwark of the church and the absence of the firm religious doctrines of the sect (see Woodhead, 2010, for a critical discussion). The typical reference in justifying this interpretation is Thomas Luckmann’s *The Invisible Religion* (1967), one of the most influential books in postwar sociology of religion. In his book, Luckmann identifies the one-sided focus on churches, church attendance, and allegiance to official church doctrines as the major shortcoming of post-classical sociology of religion. For in his understanding, the decline of the Christian churches does not simply mean the end of religion, but rather the emergence of a *market of ultimate significance*, with religious consumers shopping for strictly personal packages of meaning, based on individual tastes and preferences. Many studies of post-Christian spirituality echo this account of post-Christian spirituality as merely reflecting individual choices that differ from one person to the next, made on a pluralistic market of ultimate significance. The late Bryan Wilson’s work about secularization, equally prominent in the sociology of religion, for instance, similarly characterizes

post-Christian cults as representing, “in the American phrase, ‘the religion of your choice,’ the highly privatized preference that reduces religion to the significance of pushpin, poetry, or popcorns” (1976, p. 96). Post-Christian spirituality, in short, has again and again been portrayed as strikingly different from Christian religion: as strictly personal, ephemeral, uncommitted, shallow, and superficial, as a radically privatized do-it-yourself-religion (Baerveldt, 1996) or pick-and-mix religion (Hamilton, 2000), as religious consumption à la carte (Possamai, 2003), as a spiritual supermarket (Lyon, 2000), and as in effect more fuzzy, less culturally coherent, and less religiously real than good-old Christianity (see for a critique Woodhead, 2010).

Indeed, even granting notable exceptions like Wuthnow (1998), Besecke (2005) does not exaggerate much when she concludes that “Luckmann’s characterization of contemporary religion as privatized is pivotal in the sociology of religion; it has been picked up by just about everyone and challenged by almost no one” (p. 186). She is, however, also correct in pointing out Luckmann’s debatable conceptualization of the private. In his hands, the latter becomes “really a catch-all word for everything that falls outside of... primary [economic or political] social institutions... or... specialized religious institutions” (Besecke, 2005, p. 186). As much as Luckmann’s book is to be praised for widening the scope of modern sociology of religion beyond the study of firmly institutionalized Christian religion, it as such also needs to be critiqued for forcing religion onto the Procrustean bed of a distinction between the institutional and the private realm. This neglects sociology’s traditional third option, i.e., the cultural realm as exemplified by Emile Durkheim’s 1995 [1912] classical account of religion as a discourse informed by distinctions between the sacred and the profane (Alexander & Smith, 2005). Such a cultural-sociological approach raises the question of whether post-Christian spirituality is really as privatized and individualized as the theory of religious privatization takes it to be.

The short answer is no, and the most straightforward way to elaborate it is to start with what is typically invoked as proof for its privatized and individualized character: its radical pluralism in at least two respects. On the one hand, there is the sheer diversity and fragmentation of the spiritual or cultic milieu, which consists of a colorful collection of variegated groups and practices, ranging “from aromatherapy to Buddhism, circle dancing to the Alexander Technique, naturopathy to reiki” (Heelas & Woodhead, 2005, p. 24). On the other hand, there are the characteristic individual practices of spiritual seeking and bricolage, or the notion that one needs to feel free to draw on different religions in a way that makes sense personally. In spiritual seeking and bricolage, those involved do not identify with just one particular group, practice, or idea, but rather combine a whole range of them, more often than not with rapidly fleeting interests and preferences. This does not, however, justify the claim that post-Christian spirituality lacks a coherent, unifying, and underlying worldview. More than that, not only *does* post-Christian spirituality boast such a worldview, but the latter even more so *accounts for* the omnipresence of bricolage and spiritual seeking in these circles, as we will explain below. This worldview epitomizes precisely the coherence that has so often been denied.

3.3 *The Post-Christian Spirituality Worldview*

The worldview of PCSS consists of seven notions that are logically interrelated and, in effect, assume, validate, and legitimate each other:

1. *Perennialism*: the notion that deep down, all religions are identical and interchangeable;
2. *Bricolage*: the notion that one needs to feel free to draw on different religions in a way that makes sense personally
3. *Diffuseness and immanence of the sacred*: the notion that the sacred is present in the cosmos as an impersonal spirit, energy, or life force;
4. *Aliveness of the cosmos*: the notion that the cosmos is not inanimate but alive;
5. *Holism*: the notion that the sacred connects everything within the cosmos;
6. *Self-spirituality*: the notion that the sacred resides within rather than without the self;
7. *Experiential epistemology*: the notion that experiences and emotions are emanations of the spiritual self within.

Perennialism Central to the worldview of post-Christian spirituality is a profound relativizing of the doctrinal and institutional idiosyncrasies of religious traditions. These particularities are understood as inevitably human-made and invented, as distracting from what religion is (or rather: should) really be about: engaging in a personal contact with the sacred (Roeland, Aupers, Houtman, De Koning, & Noomen, 2010). Articulating ideals of pure religion and real sacrality, the spiritual worldview thus posits the primacy of a realm that can neither be captured in human-made institutions nor be reduced to religious doctrines. Post-Christian spirituality does as such not unequivocally reject religious traditions, but rather understands them as placing too much emphasis on ritual conformity and institutional and doctrinal side issues. Religious traditions are hence understood as referring deep down to one single identical and universal spiritual source, even though in some instances the latter has been buried more deeply away than in others. Good examples of the former would be Orthodox strains of Protestantism or Islam with their marked emphasis on literal belief in the Bible or the Qu’ran as God’s revealed Word. Good examples of the latter are Eastern religions like Hinduism or Buddhism, which provide more opportunities for personal spiritual experience (think of meditational practices). Religious traditions are, in effect, not only understood as basically, deep down referring to the same spiritual source, but also as more flawed and misleading to the extent that they define themselves as different from, conflicting with, and superior to others. This notion that what religious traditions have in common is more important than what sets them apart is known as “polymorphism” (Campbell, 1978, p. 149) or more typically *perennialism*. *Philosophia perennis* or perennial philosophy teaches that all religious traditions are equally valid because they ultimately all worship the same divine source (i.e., the idea that there are many paths, but there is just one truth). As one of the spiritual trainers quoted by Aupers and Houtman (2006) put it:

I feel connected with the person of Jesus Christ, not with Catholicism. But I also feel touched by the person of Buddha. I am also very much interested in shamanism. So my belief has nothing to do with a particular religious tradition. For me, all religions are manifestations of god, of the divine. If you look beyond the surface, then all religions tell the same story. (Aupers & Houtman, 2006, p. 203)

Bricolage What many sociologists of religion have missed is how this perennialism incites bricolage, or the notion that one needs to feel free to draw on different religions in a way that makes sense personally. These very practices of bricolage have as such often been misinterpreted as proving the non-existence of a unifying spiritual worldview. For if all religions are understood as deep down identical and interchangeable, one should, logically speaking, feel free to draw on different religions in a way that makes sense personally. Indeed, what matters then is precisely to prevent oneself from getting stuck to just one single religious tradition and starting to believe that it is superior to all others, because this would fly in the face of the doctrine of perennialism as discussed above.

Diffuseness and Immanence of the Sacred The single identical and universal spiritual source that all religious traditions are basically held to refer to is here not the God of the monotheistic, Abrahamic religions of The Book (Judaism, Christianity, and Islam). The latter conceive of the sacred as a person-like entity who has created the world and as such precedes the latter rather than being part of it. Needless to say, this traditional Western ontology of the sacred is more strongly present in some traditions than in others. As indicated above, it is especially prominent in orthodox strains of Judaism, Protestantism, and Islam, which conceive of God as radically transcendent so as to espouse a sharp dualism between God and the world. This is why religious traditions like these are seen as least attractive in the spiritual milieu. Jewish Kabbalah, Christian mysticism (e.g., Hildegard of Bingen, Meister Eckhart, Francis of Assisi), and Sufism in Islam can count on much more sympathy, precisely because of their refusal to conceive of the sacred as radically divorced from the world. This applies even more to Eastern religions like Hinduism and Buddhism, which foreground the diffuseness and immanence of the sacred even more. By means of an alternative ontology of the sacred, the spiritual worldview distinguishes itself from these monotheistic traditions of the West, especially from their more orthodox and dualistic renditions. The sacred is here not conceived as a person-like transcendent God who has created the world, but rather as a diffuse impersonal spirit, life force or energy that is—and always has been—present in the world and the cosmos rather than residing in a separate realm of its own.

Holism This conception of the sacred as an immanent and diffuse spirit, life force or source of energy implies that the latter connects and unifies everything. Even though the world's apparent dualisms and fragmentations (e.g., between body and mind, self and society) may suggest otherwise, the worldview of post-Christian spirituality hence holds that invisible unity exists at a deeper level because the omnipresent spirit or life force connects everything. Due to this, the spiritual worldview differs profoundly from the radically dualistic and disenchanting Protestantism that according to Max Weber 1978 [1904–1905] paved the way for modernity from

the sixteenth century onwards (see also Berger, 1967). Making the divine more radically transcendent than it had ever been before, this orthodox Protestantism purged the world of the sacred and transformed it into a soulless thing without any room left for magic or mystery.

Aliveness of the Cosmos The understanding of the sacred as an omnipresent spirit or life force not only underlies the notion that everything is connected but also robs the world of its status as a mere soulless and inanimate entity. In marked contrast to radically dualistic religious traditions like orthodox Protestantism (e.g., Calvinism) or Orthodox Islam (e.g., Salafism), the holism that post-Christian spirituality boasts also incites an understanding of the cosmos as being alive and in effect in a continuous state of change and evolution.

Self-spirituality The holistic notion that everything is connected also applies to the self and the sacred, because human beings are basically understood as knots in a field of spiritual energy. The sacred is in other words conceived as permeating the deeper layers of one's own consciousness, too, so that unlike the transcendent God of Christianity, it resides within rather than without. Writing about New Age, Paul Heelas (1996) refers to this innerness of the sacred as self-spirituality, which is the notion that due to its omnipresence the sacred can also be found within as a sort of natural or spiritual self that lies hidden underneath the mundane or conventional self: the "most pervasive and significant aspect of the *lingua franca* of the New Age is that the person is, in essence, spiritual" (Heelas, 1996, p. 19). In the deepest layers of one's own consciousness, the divine spark—to borrow a term from ancient Gnosticism—is hence held to be smoldering, waiting to be reconnected with and to succeed the socialized self: "The inner realm, and the inner realm alone, is held to serve as the source of authentic vitality, creativity, love, tranquility, wisdom, power, authority and all those other qualities which are held to comprise the perfect life" (Heelas, 1996, p. 19). This is what the spiritual path to salvation in post-Christian spirituality—its soteriology, if one prefers the technical term—is all about: liberating oneself from the entrapments of the false self that is basically nothing more than what society wants one to be, but that should not be mistaken for who one really or at deepest is, who one is by nature: "The great refrain, running throughout the New Age, is that we malfunction because we have been indoctrinated... by mainstream society and culture" (Heelas, 1996, p. 19). Following the spiritual path to salvation hence requires relativizing the authoritative status of external sources of authority, like holy texts, religious elites, and even scientific experts. In deciding what to do and what to abstain from, one is rather encouraged to listen to one's inner voice: one's personal feelings, intuitions, and emotions, understood here as emanations of a spiritual self that needs to be taken seriously because it defines who one really is.

Experiential Epistemology Finally, post-Christian spirituality's characteristic ontology of the sacred hence also informs its equally characteristic epistemology of personal experience. What is true and what is not is here not a matter of belief, but rather results from a sort of inner knowing, often referred to as gnosis: "According to [gnosis,] truth can only be found by personal, inner revelation, insight or 'enlight-

enment.’ Truth can only be personally experienced” (Hanegraaff, 1996, p. 519). Needless to say, this marked emphasis on the significance of personal feelings and intuitions in the pursuit of spiritual truth also incites the very practices of bricolage that have so often been misinterpreted as proving the non-existence of a unifying spiritual worldview.

3.4 A Coherent Spiritual Worldview

To summarize the foregoing, the point is not that post-Christian spirituality is not individualistic, but rather that it embodies an individualism that is collectively embraced by those concerned. With some exaggeration, one might say that its characteristic individualism constitutes a sort of dogma of non-conformity that is uncontested in these circles, so that it entails a collectively shared and coherent spiritual worldview that incites those concerned to take their personal feelings seriously and to embark on strictly personal spiritual quests. While this surely encourages practices of bricolage and results in the characteristic diversity and fragmentation of the spiritual milieu, these features do hence not at all prove the absence of a coherent spiritual worldview. In a fashion that is as interesting as it is paradoxical, it is rather the other way around: it is a coherent spiritual worldview that incites, provokes, brings forth, and hence ultimately accounts for bricolage, diversity, and fragmentation. As Aupers and Houtman (2006) have put it, “the diversity of the spiritual milieu *results from* rather than *contradicts* the existence of a coherent doctrine of being and well-being” (p. 206; emphasis in original).

4 Method

Our scale for the measurement of post-Christian spirituality consists of seven Likert-type items that capture the seven notions discussed above (see Appendix A). Some items were not entirely new but resemble items in previous studies. For example, the item measuring the *diffuseness and immanence of the sacred* can be found in a slightly altered form in the WVS, in the EVS, in the Religious and Moral Pluralism (RAMP) survey, and in CentERdata’s ‘Who Designs the Best Telepanel Study’ of 1997. The RAMP survey also contains, in a slightly modified form, the item measuring *self-spirituality* (see Heelas & Houtman, 2009; Houtman et al., 2012), and CentERdata’s ‘Who Designs the Best Telepanel Study’ of 1997 also includes the item measuring *perennialism* (see Houtman & Mascini, 2002).

Our Post-Christian Spirituality Scale was included in a large online survey conducted in the Netherlands in the fall of 2008 by CentERdata, a Dutch institute for data collection and research based at Tilburg University. CentERdata maintains a panel of respondents that is representative for the Dutch population aged sixteen years and older. Of the 2423 panel members who were invited to participate, 87.5%

actually did so ($n = 2121$), with 85.9% ($n = 2081$) completing the online questionnaire as a whole. The sample consisted of 1135 males (53.5%) and 986 females (46.5%) with an average age of 51 years ($SD = 16.13$), a mean monthly net household income of € 2733 ($SD = 3852$), and an average educational level that lies in between “higher general continued education/preparatory scholarly education” and “middle-level applied education” ($M = 3.63$, $SD = 1.53$). (The response options for educational level were 1 = *basisonderwijs* (i.e., elementary school); 2 = *VMBO* (i.e., preparatory middle-level applied education); 3 = *HAVO/VWO* (i.e., higher general continued education/preparatory scholarly education); 4 = *MBO* (i.e., middle-level applied education); 5 = *HBO* (i.e., higher professional education); and 6 = *WO* (i.e., scientific education).) More than four out of ten respondents ($n = 895$, 42.2%) considered themselves religious, more than half of the sample did not ($n = 1080$, 50.9%), and a small minority did not know ($n = 113$, 5.3%). A quarter of the sample considered itself spiritual ($n = 530$, 25%), nearly two-thirds of respondents did not ($n = 1375$, 64.8%), and again a minority did not know ($n = 183$, 8.6%). Cross tabulating the latter two variables shows that most people considered themselves ‘neither religious nor spiritual’ ($n = 868$, 41.6%), almost a quarter of the sample self-identified as ‘religious but not spiritual’ ($n = 461$, 22.1%), around every sixth participant regarded oneself ‘religious and spiritual’ ($n = 337$, 16.1%), and nearly one out of ten respondents considered themselves ‘spiritual but not religious’ ($n = 169$, 8.1%). The majority of the sample did not identify with a religious denomination ($n = 1023$, 48.2%), just over a quarter considered themselves Catholic ($n = 535$, 25.2%), slightly more than a fifth Protestant ($n = 438$, 20.6%), and a small minority ($n = 92$, 4.3%) selected Other. The seven items, all with a five-point Likert-type scale, were not asked successively in the questionnaire but were scattered across a larger battery of statements on religious and spiritual matters. The response categories ranged from (1) *agree strongly* through (5) *disagree strongly*, with a category (3) *neither agree, nor disagree* in the middle, plus a separate *don’t know* category.

5 Results and Psychometric Properties

5.1 The Instrument Structure

To evaluate the construct validity of the Post-Christian Spirituality Scale, the seven items were factor-analyzed with SPSS 22.0 using principal components analysis without any rotation. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.84, which is well above the suggested minimum of 0.60, indicating that the items are measuring a common factor. Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity was significant ($\chi^2(21) = 3092.356$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that the correlation matrix can be submitted to factor analysis because it contains coefficients that differ significantly from those that could be obtained by chance (Tobias & Carlson, 1969). Subsequently,

only one component was extracted with an Eigenvalue greater than 1 ($\lambda = 3.475$), explaining almost half of the variance of the seven items (49.6%). Inspection of the component loadings shows that all variables are highly correlated with the common component, with loadings ranging between 0.587 and 0.831. These results indicate that the structure of our scale is indeed unidimensional. Using pairwise deletion instead of listwise deletion increased the sample size from 1285 respondents to 1648–1856 respondents, but this did not change anything substantially, hence the results are robust.

5.2 Reliability

Reliability analysis yields a strong internal consistency (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.83). All inter-item correlations are positive and range from 0.26 to 0.76, with an average of 0.41. The lowest correlation was found among the items *bricolage* and *aliveness of the cosmos* ($r = 0.26$). Cronbach's Alpha does not increase any further if any one of the items is deleted from the scale.

5.3 Construct and Predictive Validity

The Post-Christian Spirituality Scale has been used previously by Van Bohemen, Achterberg, Houtman, and Manevska (2012) in a study that analyzed the same 2008 CentERdata to explain differences in environmental consciousness between those adhering to traditional Christian beliefs and those adhering to post-Christian spirituality. They distinguished among three conceptions of nature, two of them dualistic with roots in Christianity (i.e., *dominion* and *stewardship*) and one of them monistic or holistic and based in post-Christian spirituality (i.e., *eco-spirituality*). *Dominion* refers to conceiving nature as something that humans can master, or rule over, with “no other purpose than serving mankind” (Van Bohemen et al., 2012, p. 165), whereas *stewardship* entails that humanity has a responsibility to take good care of nature “rather than to use and exploit it for its own benefit” (p. 166). *Eco-spirituality*, on the other hand, sees nature as “inherently or intrinsically sacred” (p. 168).

With respect to convergent and discriminant validity, theoretically speaking, our Post-Christian Spirituality Scale should be related to neither *dominion* nor *traditional Christian beliefs*, which is indeed the case as we observe correlations of -0.04 (n.s.) and 0.10 ($ps < 0.01$), respectively. Furthermore, and unsurprisingly, our Post-Christian Spirituality Scale was positively related to *environmental consciousness*, *stewardship*, and *eco-spirituality*, with significant correlations of 0.21, 0.27, and 0.62, respectively ($ps < 0.01$). For comparison, *traditional Christian beliefs* were unrelated to *environmental consciousness* ($r = -0.04$, $p = \text{n.s.}$), much more weakly related to *stewardship* and *eco-spirituality* ($r = 0.17$ and 0.20 , respectively, $ps < 0.01$), and more strongly to *dominion* ($r = 0.32$, $p < 0.01$). In addition to these

zero-order correlations, Van Bohemen et al. (2012) conducted a principle components factor analysis with varimax rotation of the items measuring *dominion*, *stewardship*, and *eco-spirituality* and found that the 14 items that were used for constructing the three scales indeed corresponded to three separate factors. They performed the same analysis for the items measuring post-Christian spirituality and traditional Christian beliefs and found that the 13 items that were used for constructing the two scales indeed corresponded to two distinct factors.

5.4 *Utility of the Post-Christian Spirituality Scale*

Research into post-Christian spirituality in sociology of religion and religious studies tends to be qualitative; there is an urgent need to open up this field for quantitative analysis by means of a reliable and valid scale for its measurement. Such quantitative studies do exist, to be sure, but they are rare, and their measurement of post-Christian spirituality often leaves much to be desired. One strategy that is often used is seeking recourse to respondents' self-definitions as spiritual but not religious (SBNR), which in effect leaves completely open what the spiritual worldview of those concerned actually looks like. Another strategy is use of the response category *I believe that there is some sort of impersonal spirit or life force* from a question with four response options (the other three being *I believe in a personal God*, *I don't know whether a personal God or an impersonal spirit or life force exists*, and *I don't believe in either a personal God or an impersonal spirit or life force*) (e.g., Houtman & Aupers, 2007; Houtman & Mascini, 2002). While there is no reason to doubt that such crude binary variables are correlated with the Post-Christian Spirituality Scale, they leave quite unclear what else the spiritual worldview of those concerned entails (see Heelas & Houtman, 2009). Including our Post-Christian Spirituality Scale in future survey research, especially the large and long-standing international survey programs (e.g., ESS, EVS, WVS, ISSP), would therefore make it possible to more systematically and convincingly test theories of religious change like those proposed by contemporary students of religion (e.g., Campbell, 2007; Davie, 1994; Heelas & Woodhead, 2005).

6 Critique of the Post-Christian Spirituality Scale

One thing to reconsider when our Post-Christian Spirituality Scale is going to be included in future surveys are the possible response categories. Currently, they range from *agree strongly* through *disagree strongly*, with a category of *neither agree, nor disagree* in the middle, plus a separate *don't know* category. This separate *don't know* category resulted in relatively high proportions of missing values for all seven items (range 11–21%, $M = 15\%$). The reasons why respondents choose this response option are doubtlessly multifarious, but the most obvious one is that one

has really no idea what the statement is about. It may however also have been used as an easy way out by those who were not very motivated to think extensively about the most appropriate answer. Alternatively, it may reflect truly agnostic attitudes, even though in that case the option *neither agree, nor disagree* could also have been chosen. Simply combining the *don't know* with the *neither agree, nor disagree* answers does not seem appropriate, and the same holds for removing both categories altogether so as to force respondents by means of a four-point Likert-type scale to either *strongly agree* or *strongly disagree*, even if they are in fact undecided or have really no idea what a statement is about. In sum, for future use of the scale, it seems worthwhile to reconsider the response options to be used, as an average of 15% missing values is generally considered to be quite high. Another way to reduce such responses is to think carefully about the composition of the population to which the scale is presented. Additional analyses show that some groups of people respond more often with 'don't know' than others, i.e. the 15–24 year-olds, those with a monthly net household income \leq € 2600, those with an elementary school or preparatory middle-level applied education, those who do not (or do not know whether to) consider themselves religious or spiritual, and those who do not identify with a religious denomination or consider themselves Catholic. Substantial differences between men and women were not found.

Secondly, it is evident that more studies into the predictive validity of the Post-Christian Spirituality Scale are needed. In keeping with the principal focus of this book, it may be applied particularly fruitfully in health research, especially the less well-trodden path of physical health. One of the major changes in the world of health care in the West is the increased role of complementary and alternative medicine (CAM), much of it based on a post-Christian holistic worldview. CAM in effect sits uneasily with the body-mind dualism that informs the double-blind medical trial with its dismissal of the placebo-effect as a mere “nuisance variable” (Crum & Philips, 2015, p. 6; Raaphorst & Houtman, 2016). The notion of the placebo-effect is, however, awkward, because while it acknowledges that cultural worldviews have consequences for health outcomes, it simultaneously defines these outcomes away as somehow less than really real (Houtman & Achterberg, 2016). It as such exposes “the paradoxes and fissures in our own self-created definitions of the real and active factors in treatment,” as Harrington (1997, p. 1) puts it.

The very existence of placebo-effects and the deeply felt biomedical urge to experimentally wipe out and discredit them invite path-breaking research into physical health that gives adherence to post-Christian spirituality its due. Particularly adding the latter as an active variable to an otherwise experimental research design appears promising, if only because it transforms the conventional research question *Does it work?* into a more nuanced and culturally sensitive *For whom does it work?* That CAM therapies typically fail in conventional double-blind medical trials does not mean after all that they are also ineffective for those who adhere to post-Christian spirituality—indeed, the very notion of the placebo-effect already suggests otherwise. Similarly, those who embrace a dualistic worldview that treats mind and body as radically disconnected are more likely to benefit from traditional biomedical therapies than those who adhere to post-Christian spirituality do. Studying these

and other health-related consequences of (dis)belief in post-Christian spirituality calls for culturally enriched experimental research (Houtman & Achterberg, 2016).

7 Multicultural Applications

The Post-Christian Spirituality Scale has thus far not been used extensively in empirical studies, the only exception being Van Bohemen et al. (2012) mentioned above, so we cannot compare the psychometric properties of the scale between countries. What we can do, however, is a within-country comparison to validate the multicultural applicability of the scale using the 2008 CentERdata from the Netherlands. We compared males and females, and we recoded age, educational level, and net monthly household income into three equally large groups, resulting in youngsters (16–43 years), the middle-aged (44–59 years), and the elderly (60–93 years); lower (elementary school + VMBO), medium (HAVO/VWO + MBO), and higher educated (HBO + WO); and low (€ 0–2029), medium (€ 2031–2996), and high earners (€ 3000 +), respectively. We performed the same factor and reliability analyses as those for the sample as a whole for each of these subgroups and in all instances found one-factor solutions with adequate factor loadings and a strong internal consistency, indicating that the psychometric properties of the scale are stable for various demographic groups within the Netherlands.

The theory predicts that our scale is applicable in at least all Western countries. Even though it captures a basically non-dualist Eastern worldview (Campbell, 2007), the marked Western, individualist bias in at least some of the items leaves it an open question whether it is also applicable in Southeast Asia. Given that post-Christian spirituality has meanwhile spread to Nigeria (Hackett, 1992) and South Africa (Oosthuizen, 1992), it may be applicable in at least some African countries.

8 Conclusion

Much of the sociological literature understands the omnipresence of practices of bricolage (i.e., the notion that one needs to feel free to draw on different religions in a way that makes sense personally) and spiritual seeking (i.e., constantly exchanging groups or practices for others) within the spiritual milieu as an obstacle to the standardized measurement of post-Christian spirituality. We have shown that this is a misconception because these very practices are in fact called for by a shared underlying spiritual worldview or ideology. We have therefore constructed a brief Post-Christian Spirituality Scale that consists of seven Likert-type items to measure the latter. It is unfortunately too late now to use this scale to systematically map the processes of religious change that have occurred in the West in the past few decades. Yet, it can still be used to map the processes of religious change that are taking place in the future, as we see no clear reasons why the turn towards post-Christian

spirituality in the West would suddenly come to a halt. Furthermore, the Post-Christian Spirituality Scale can obviously be used for many other purposes, not least an assessment of how post-Christian spirituality relates to various types of moral and expressive individualism that foreground the self rather than the social order (e.g., Höllinger, 2017). As explained above, particularly promising applications can also be found in health research, especially in studies of whether and how particular worldviews spark or undermine the placebo effects that are evoked by various types of medical treatments.

Appendix A: Post-Christian Spirituality Scale in English

Samira van Bohemen, Peter Achterberg, Dick Houtman, and Katerina Manevska

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement using the scale below.

- 1 = strongly disagree
- 2 = disagree
- 3 = neither disagree nor agree
- 4 = agree
- 5 = strongly agree
- 6 = don't know

1. Personal spirituality is more important than allegiance to a religious tradition.
2. Every person has a higher spiritual 'self' that can be awakened and enlightened.
3. There is some sort of spirit or life force which permeates all life.
4. The divine does not originate outside, but within every person.
5. The one and only true religion does not exist, but there are truths that one can find in all religions of the world.
6. The cosmos is a living entity.
7. The entire universe springs from one universal spiritual energy.

Researchers using the scale for statistical analyses are recommended to treat the *don't know* answers as missing values, or perhaps leave out the *don't know* category altogether (see also the section Critique of the Post-Christian Spirituality Scale).

Appendix B: Post-Christian Spirituality Scale in Dutch/ Flemish (Nederlands/Vlaams)

Samira van Bohemen, Peter Achterberg, Dick Houtman, and Katerina Manevska

Wilt u voor elk van de onderstaande uitspraken aangeven in hoeverre u het er mee eens dan wel oneens bent?

- 1 = helemaal mee oneens
- 2 = mee oneens
- 3 = noch mee oneens, noch mee eens
- 4 = mee eens
- 5 = helemaal mee eens
- 6 = weet niet

1. Persoonlijke spiritualiteit is belangrijker dan trouw aan een religieuze traditie.
2. Elke persoon heeft een hoger spiritueel 'zelf' dat gewekt en verlicht kan worden.
3. Er bestaat een soort geest of levenskracht die overal in aanwezig is.
4. Het goddelijke bevindt zich niet ergens daarbuiten, maar binnenin ieder persoon.
5. Hoewel de enige ware religie niet bestaat, zijn er wel waarheden die je in alle religieuze tradities kunt terugvinden.
6. De kosmos is een levend geheel.
7. Het gehele universum komt voort uit één alomvattende spirituele energie.

Appendix C: Post-Christian Spirituality Scale in French

Liza Cortois (KU Leuven) & Paul Cortois (KU Leuven)

S'il vous plaît, indiquez dans quelle mesure vous êtes d'accord ou en désaccord avec chaque proposition en utilisant l'échelle ci-dessous.

- 1 = Pas du tout d'accord
- 2 = Pas d'accord
- 3 = Ni en désaccord ni d'accord
- 4 = D'accord
- 5 = Tout à fait d'accord
- 6 = Ne sait pas

1. La spiritualité personnelle est plus importante que l'appartenance à une tradition religieuse.
2. Chaque personne a un soi spirituel qui peut être éveillé et éclairé.
3. Il existe en quelque sorte un esprit ou une force vitale qui imprègne toute la vie.
4. L'origine du divin ne se trouve pas à l'extérieur, mais à l'intérieur de chaque personne.
5. Il n'y a pas une seule religion ayant le privilège exclusif de la vérité, mais il existe des vérités qu'on peut trouver dans toutes les religions du monde.
6. L'univers est un organisme vivant.
7. L'univers entier provient d'une énergie universelle de nature spirituelle.

References

- Alexander, J. C., & Smith, P. (Eds.). (2005). *The Cambridge companion to Durkheim*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Aupers, S., & Houtman, D. (2006). Beyond the spiritual supermarket: The social and public significance of new age spirituality. *Journal of Contemporary Religion, 21*(2), 201–222.
- Baerveldt, C. (1996). New Age-religiositeit als individueel constructieproces [New-age religiosity as a process of individual construction]. In M. Moerland (Ed.), *De kool en de geit in de nieuwe tijd: Wetenschappelijke reflecties op New Age [The fence, the hare, and the hounds in the new age: Scientific reflections on new age]* (pp. 19–31). Utrecht, The Netherlands: Jan van Arkel.
- Berger, P. L. (1967). *The sacred canopy: Elements of a sociology of religion*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Besecke, K. (2005). Seeing invisible religion: Religion as a societal conversation about transcendent meaning. *Sociological Theory, 23*(2), 179–196.
- Bruce, S. (2002). *God is dead: Secularisation in the West*. Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Campbell, C. (1978). The secret religion of the educated classes. *Sociology of Religion, 39*(2), 146–156.
- Campbell, C. (2002). The cult, the cultic milieu and secularization. In J. Kaplan & H. Löw (Eds.), *The cultic milieu: Oppositional subcultures in an age of globalization* (pp. 12–25). Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press. (Original work published 1972).
- Campbell, C. (2007). *The easternization of the West: A thematic account of cultural change in the modern era*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
- Casanova, J. (1994). *Public religions in the modern world*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Crum, A., & Phillips, D. J. (2015). Self-fulfilling prophecies, placebo effects, and the social-psychological creation of reality. In R. Scott & S. Kosslyn (Eds.), *Emerging trends in the social and behavioral sciences: An interdisciplinary, searchable, and linkable resource* (pp. 1–14). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Daiber, K.-F. (2002). Troeltsch's third type of religious collectivities. *Social Compass, 49*(3), 329–341.
- Davie, G. (1994). *Religion in Britain since 1945: Believing without belonging*. Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Dobbelaere, K. (2002). *Secularization: An analysis at three levels*. Brussels, Belgium: Peter Lang.
- Durkheim, E. (1995). *The elementary forms of religious life*. New York, NY: Free Press. (Original work published 1912).
- Fuller, R. C. (2001). *Spiritual, but not religious: Understanding unchurched America*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Hackett, R. (1992). New Age trends in Nigeria. In J. R. Lewis & J. G. Melton (Eds.), *Perspectives on the New Age* (pp. 215–231). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Hamilton, M. (2000). An analysis of the festival for mind-body-spirit, London. In S. Sutcliffe & M. Bowman (Eds.), *Beyond new age: Exploring alternative spirituality* (pp. 188–200). Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press.
- Hanegraaff, W. J. (1996). *New Age religion and western culture: Esotericism in the mirror of secular thought*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.
- Harrington, A. (1997). Introduction. In A. Harrington (Ed.), *The placebo effect: An interdisciplinary exploration* (pp. 1–11). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Heelas, P. (1996). *The New Age movement: The celebration of the self and the sacralisation of modernity*. Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Heelas, P., & Houtman, D. (2009). Research note: RAMP findings and making sense of the “God within each person, rather than out there”. *Journal of Contemporary Religion, 24*(1), 83–98.
- Heelas, P., & Woodhead, L. (2005). *The spiritual revolution: Why religion is giving way to spirituality*. Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Höllinger, F. (2017). Value orientations and social attitudes in the holistic milieu. *British Journal of Sociology, 68*(2), 293–313.

- Houtman, D., & Achterberg, P. (2016). Quantitative analysis in cultural sociology: Why it should be done, how it can be done. In D. Inglis & A.-M. Almila (Eds.), *Sage handbook of cultural sociology* (pp. 225–236). London, England: Sage.
- Houtman, D., & Aupers, S. (2007). The spiritual turn and the decline of tradition: The spread of post-Christian spirituality in 14 Western countries, 1981-2000. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 46(3), 305–320.
- Houtman, D., Heelas, P., & Achterberg, P. (2012). Counting spirituality? Survey methodology after the spiritual turn. In L. Berzano & O. P. Riis (Eds.), *Annual review of the sociology of religion – Volume Three: New methods in the sociology of religion* (pp. 25–44). Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.
- Houtman, D., & Mascini, P. (2002). Why do churches become empty, while new age grows? Secularization and religious change in the Netherlands. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 41(3), 455–473.
- Houtman, D., Pons, A., & Laermans, R. (forthcoming). Religion and solidarity: The vicissitudes of Protestantism. In I. van Hoyweghen, V. Pulignano, & G. Meyers (Eds.), *Shifting solidarities: Trends and developments within western societies*. London, England: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Huss, B. (2014). Spirituality: The emergence of a new cultural category and its challenge to the religious and the secular. *Journal of Contemporary Religion*, 29(1), 47–60.
- Luckmann, T. (1967). *The invisible religion: The problem of religion in modern society*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Lyon, D. (2000). *Jesus in Disneyland: Religion in postmodern times*. Oxford, England: Polity Press.
- McLeod, H. (2007). *The religious crisis of the sixties*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Mullins, M. R. (1992). Japan's New Age and neo-new religions. In J. R. Lewis & J. G. Melton (Eds.), *Perspectives on the New Age* (pp. 232–246). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Oosthuizen, G. C. (1992). The 'newness' of the New Age in South Africa and reactions to it. In J. R. Lewis & J. G. Melton (Eds.), *Perspectives on the New Age* (pp. 247–270). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Possamai, A. (2003). Alternative spiritualities and the cultural logic of late capitalism. *Culture and Religion*, 4(1), 31–45.
- Raaphorst, N., & Houtman, D. (2016). A necessary evil that does not 'really' cure disease: The domestication of biomedicine by Dutch holistic general practitioners. *Health: An Interdisciplinary Journal for the Social Study of Health, Illness and Medicine*, 20(3), 242–257.
- Roeland, J., Aupers, S., Houtman, D., De Koning, M., & Noomen, I. (2010). The quest for religious purity in new age, evangelicalism and islam: Religious renditions of Dutch youth and the Luckmann legacy. In G. Giordan (Ed.), *Annual review of the sociology of religion, Volume 1: Youth and religion* (pp. 289–306). Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.
- Roszak, T. (1969). *The making of a counter culture: Reflections on the technocratic society and its youthful opposition*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Sebald, H. (1984). New Age romanticism: The quest for an alternative lifestyle as a force of social change. *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations*, 11(2), 106–127.
- Shiroya, T. (2017). *La 'spiritualité', une nouvelle forme rhizomique de religiosité: Étude comparative s'appuyant sur des festivals de spiritualité au Japon, en France et aux pays-Bas* (PhD thesis). Aix-en-Provence, France.
- Streib, H., & Hood, R. W. (2011). 'Spirituality' as privatized experience-oriented religion: Empirical and conceptual perspectives. *Implicit Religion*, 14(4), 433–453.
- Tobias, S., & Carlson, J. E. (1969). Brief report: Bartlett's test of sphericity and chance findings in factor analysis. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 4(3), 375–377.
- Troeltsch, E. (1992). *The social teachings of the Christian churches*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press. (Original work published 1912).
- Tschannen, O. (1991). The secularization paradigm: A systematization. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 30(4), 395–415.
- Van Bohemen, S., Achterberg, P., Houtman, D., & Manevska, K. (2012). Spirituality and environmental consciousness in the Netherlands: A comparison of post-Christian spirituality and

- Christian dualism. In P. Heelas (Ed.), *Spirituality in the modern world: Within religious tradition and beyond* (Vol. 4, pp. 164–182). London, England: Routledge.
- Voas, D., & Crockett, A. (2005). Religion in Britain: Neither believing nor belonging. *Sociology*, 39(1), 11–28.
- Wallis, R., & Bruce, S. (1992). Secularization: The orthodox model. In S. Bruce (Ed.), *Religion and modernization: Sociologists and historians debate the secularization thesis* (pp. 8–30). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Watts, G. (2018a). Missing the forest for the trees: ‘Spiritual’ religion in a secular age. *Toronto Journal of Theology*, 34(2), 243–256.
- Watts, G. (2018b). On the politics of self-spirituality: A Canadian case study. *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses*, 47(3), 345–372.
- Weber, M. (1963). *The sociology of religion*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press. (Original work published 1922).
- Weber, M. (1978). *The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*. London, England: Allen & Unwin. (Original work published 1904–1905).
- Wilson, B. (1976). *Contemporary transformations of religion*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Woodhead, L. (2004). *Christianity: A very short introduction*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Woodhead, L. (2010). Real religion and fuzzy spirituality? Taking sides in the sociology of religion. In S. Aupers & D. Houtman (Eds.), *Religions of modernity: Relocating the sacred to the self and the digital* (pp. 31–48). Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.
- Wuthnow, R. (1998). *After heaven: Spirituality in America since the 1950s*. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Dick Houtman, PhD, is Professor of Sociology of Culture and Religion at KU Leuven, Belgium. His principal research interest is cultural change in the West since the 1960s, especially how the process has transformed the realms of politics, religion, consumption, and social science itself. He has published extensively on religion and spirituality in journals like *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *Social Compass* and *Journal of Contemporary Religion*. He is currently completing two books, provisionally titled *Science under Siege: Contesting Scientific Authority in the Postmodern Era* (edited with Stef Aupers and Rudi Laermans) and *On the Wings of Imagination: The Romantic Turn in the West*. Personal website: www.dickhoutman.nl.

Paul Tromp, MSc, is a PhD candidate at KU Leuven, Belgium. His PhD project focuses on religious decline and religious change in (Western)Europe since the 1980s. Recently, he also completed a book chapter with Professor Peter Achterberg, titled *Cultural Worldviews and Climate Change: A Vignette Experiment in the Netherlands* in which we show that news stories about climate change are interpreted (or understood) differently depending on the cultural worldview of its reader. This chapter is forthcoming in the provisionally titled book *Science under Siege: Contesting Scientific Authority in the Postmodern Era* (edited by Dick Houtman, Stef Aupers and Rudi Laermans).