

DOMINIK SZCZYGIELSKI

MORAL ATTITUDES IN POLAND: “TOWARDS”, “AWAY” AND  
“AGAINST PEOPLE” – SOCIO-CULTURAL DETERMINANTS AND  
RELIGIOUS IMPLICATIONS:  
A 2017 EUROPEAN VALUES STUDY

**Abstract.** According to the latest research institutional trust may serve as a significant predictor of prosociality. The main purpose of this article is to examine types of trust as predictors of moral attitudes “towards”, “away” and “against” people. Another aim is to examine institutional trust as a predictor of moral attitudes in correlation to other significant predictors, like religiousness, education and size of town. This paper presents an analysis in the course of which interpersonal and institutional trust has been confirmed as alternative (potentially competing) predictors of moral attitudes than other established variables, e.g., religiousness. The presented findings allow one to pose the question about the future of religion in stable, democratic societies.

**Keywords:** prosociality; social trust; institutional trust; moral orientations; civil religion.

## INTRODUCTION

Moral orientations are defined as organized principles linked to existential judgments influencing human behavior, allowing one to make decisions of moral nature (Misztal, 1980). Moral orientations or types of morality are often described as axes or standards validating accepted norms related to them (Kiciński, 2015). The fundamentals of moral orientations lay in the phenomenon of “how people validate norms, values, convictions, verbalized judgments and evaluations they themselves find appropriate” (Kiciński, 1998, p. 20). The essence of a moral orientation is driven from seeking an answer to the question, why a specific

---

Dr. DOMINIK SZCZYGIELSKI, John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Institute of Sociological Sciences; publication address: ul. Radziszewskiego 7, 20-039 Lublin, Poland; e-mail: [dominik.szczynski@kul.lublin.pl](mailto:dominik.szczynski@kul.lublin.pl); ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4111-9924>.

behavior ought to be condemned (Kiciński, 1998). In pluralist societies it is natural to expect the occurrence of a variety of moral orientations.

One of the most important differentiations of moral orientations is the typology proposed by Janusz Mariański (Mariański, 1990). In this approach moral attitudes range from prosociality to egoism on a three-step continuum: attitudes towards people, attitudes away from people and attitudes against people.

According to Mariański's approach (Mariański, 1990), moral attitude towards people is oriented towards sacrificing oneself for the benefit of others, avoiding conflicts and rivalry, broadening the circle of people one endows with generalized trust. This approach, heavily marked with allocentric values and selflessness, results in the moral development to the point where individuals creatively synthesize private goals with those of others (especially if they are far from their private social environments) for the benefit of personal satisfaction.

Attitude away from people stems from the need of independence and autonomy. This moral orientation is characterized by the need of distancing oneself from others and not seeking emotional engagement. Those who represent this moral attitude focus on trusting themselves or the close circle of trusted people. This approach is free from hostile reference but is also characterized by a lesser sensitivity towards values of selflessness.

To complete the spectrum of moral attitudes the attitude against people is worth mentioning. Individuals representing this moral approach perceive social environment as hostile and competitive. The vision of human nature is marked by egoist drives and self-interest. This attitude involves unfriendliness, hatred, isolation, manipulating others for one's own profit, lack of empathy, neglecting the point of view of partners of social interaction, indifference to the needs of out-groups. The imperative of rivalry and competition prevents individuals representing this moral orientation from prosocial participation and active engagement for the common good. Other traits related with the attitude of negative competition emphasize the need to elevate oneself at others' expense, neglecting social cooperation, treating others as means to achieve private goals.

In sociological literature one may find various explanations of prosocial attitudes (Simpson & Willer, 2015). The most commonly known is the one emphasizing the role of social norms – people's concern for the good of others is the result of adopting social norms encouraging them to behave in a way that is beneficial to society and is socially rewarded by acts of approval or prohibition when norms are violated (Durkheim, 1997, 1982). Another explanation assumes that prosociality is motivated by the need for gaining respect and good reputation – people undertaking prosocial activity are viewed as more respectable,

trustworthy, attractive in terms of social interactions (Barclay, 2004; Barclay and Willer, 2007). And finally, being embedded in social relations might be a sufficient explanation for prosociality itself – dense social networks and relations entail exposure to the needs of others resulting in moral obligation or commitment to the public good. Various studies show that networks and relations promote generalized trust to strangers as a result of broadening the potential social perspective through positive experience with others (Glanville et al., 2013) or enhance solidarity by paying off “social debts” in interactions with random individuals (Tsvetkova and Macy, 2014). Yet another observation is worth mentioning. As research shows collectivist cultures (in comparison to individualist cultures) may inhibit generalized trust due to dense social relations that may work as potential ostracizing mechanism in case of exploitation, thus preventing confidence in others’ good intentions to develop in the long run (Gheorghiu et al., 2009; Yamagishi and Yamagishi, 1994).

Various sociodemographic and individual factors described in literature influence the general attitude towards prosociality. For example, age has a significant impact on prosociality – as an individual grows older the level of prosocial activity increases (Matsumoto et al., 2016; Van Lange et al., 1997). City size turns out to be a significant factor of prosociality – towns dwellers are more willing to engage in helping behavior than residents of cities (Hedge and Yousif, 1992). Religious factors also need to be taken into account – according to Shariff and Norenzayan (Shariff and Norenzayan, 2007) mentioning religious concepts like God, divine, spirit and prophet in experiments increases the tendency to allocate money to anonymous strangers. Van Lange and colleagues (Van Lange et al., 1997) reported the existence of a positive link between gender and helping behavior. According to their studies women declared prosocial value orientation more often than men and individualistic value orientation less often than men.

Another factor worth taking into consideration is social capital. The key elements of social capital are found in Putnam’s work who defined it as “connections among individuals – social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them” (Putnam, 2000, p. 19). In social sciences level of education is considered to be one of the most important variables positively shaping the prosocial behavior. The concept of social capital helps to understand why education plays such a significant role (Gesthuizen et al., 2008). People with a higher level of education are exposed to various social situations through which they build their networks, skills and abilities that eventually

allow them to act prosocially on the basis of greater sense of responsibility, awareness and empathy (Wilson, 2000).

Trust seems to be a particularly interesting predictor of prosocial moral attitude. As it is observed, “higher trust leads to more prosocially oriented behavior as it is central to the development of a sense of interdependence with others and contributes to the belief that others will reciprocate” (Glanville et al., 2016, pp. 529-530). An amount of research proves the existence of the link between prosocial behavior and generalized trust (Bekkers, 2012; Glanville et al., 2016), as well as institutional trust (Andriani and Sabatini, 2015). The findings of the latter introduce a new perspective to the analysis. According to Andriani’s and Sabatini’s study (Andriani and Sabatini, 2015) institutional trust can be a better predictor of prosociality than other forms of trust. In the light of this discovery, another important question can be asked – is social trust, as well as institutional trust a better predictor of prosocial attitudes towards people than other essential variables, like for instance religion or education. It seems there is still the need for further sociological studies that would focus predominantly on a variation of social trust called institutional trust using diverse statistical procedures. The purpose of this article is to fill this gap and to shed more light on the matter.

The main objectives for this article are to answer the following questions:

1. To what extent given moral orientations are prevalent within Polish society?
2. What is the correlation between moral orientations, types of social trust, and various sociodemographic determinants?
3. Which sociodemographic and cultural determinants have been found to increase or decrease the examined moral orientations?

Taking into account the above presented theoretical frames three hypotheses will be tested:

H1: Greater susceptibility to moral orientation towards people is to be detected among respondents representing higher level of social trust (interpersonal and institutional trust), a higher level of religiosity, a higher level of education, residence in larger cities.

H2: Greater susceptibility to moral orientation against people is to be detected among respondents representing a lower level of social trust (interpersonal and institutional trust), a lower level of religiosity, a lower level of education, residence in smaller cities.

H3: In traditional Polish society the odds ratio of prosociality is higher for religiosity than other alternative variables.

## 1. MATERIALS AND METHODS

To answer the above-mentioned research questions data from the European Values Study (EVS, 2017) have been used. European Values Study is a multinational, longitudinal research project focusing on measuring human values and social attitudes. To focus on the recent and up to date findings within the Polish society the fifth wave of EVS 2017 has been included into the analysis ( $N = 1352$ ).

The basic concept of moral attitudes towards people and away from people have been measured using the following variables in the dataset with response ranging between: 1 = *very much*, 2 = *much*, 3 = *to a certain extent*, 4 = *not so much*, 5 = *not at all*; v212 = “Are you concerned with people’s neighborhood?” (original labeling); v213 = “Are you concerned with people’s own religion?”; v214 = “Are you concerned with fellow countrymen?”; v215 = “Are you concerned with Europeans?”; v216 = “Are you concerned with humankind?”; v217 = “Are you concerned with elderly people?”; v218 = “Are you concerned with unemployed people?”; v219 = “Are you concerned with immigrants?”; v220 = “Are you concerned with the sick and disabled?”.

The initial characteristics of the scale built upon the above-mentioned items is as follows. The factor analysis reveals two dimensions: the first is based on variables v212-v216 emphasizing concern regarding broader circles of people; and second one, based on variables v217-v220 accentuating social empathy towards disadvantaged groups. For the purpose of meeting the theoretical criteria of Mariański’s concept a complete set of nine variables was used to build the social empathy index. The reliability of such index achieved a very satisfying degree of reliability (Cronbach’s Alpha = 0.907). The indicators describing characteristics of distribution have reached results allowing to assume its normality (skewness = 0.228 and kurtosis = 0.196;  $N = 1273$ ; Missing values = 79). Twenty-four cases of extreme values were removed from the set slightly improving its characteristics (skewness = 0.095 and kurtosis = -0.172;  $N = 1249$ ; missing values = 103).

## 2. RESULTS

### *Prevalence of Moral Attitudes in Poland*

In the process of two-step cluster analysis, the social empathy index allowed us to automatically produce three clusters corresponding to the theoretical framework. The distance measure used for clustering was the log-likelihood criterion. The analysis provided the following results: the dominant moral orientation regarding

maintaining social bonds is keeping away from people (45.9%). The second most common orientation is against people – almost a third of Poles are characterized by lack of concern for others (30.7%). Attitude towards people is represented by almost a quarter of Poles (23.4%). The following groups differ by means reached on the social empathy index – the lower the mean the greater the social concern about broader categories of people external to individuals clustered in segments (Table 1).

Table 1. Attitudes towards people, away from people and against people by the social empathy index

Moral segments	Mean	SD	N	%
Attitude towards people	18.8253	2.68001	292	23.4
Attitude away from people	26.0716	1.80523	573	45.9
Attitude against people	33.7917	3.26599	384	30.7
Total	26.7510	6.05011	1249	100

Source: EVS 2017.

*Factors of moral attitudes in Poland: size of town and educational level*

Various sociological determinants differentiate presented moral orientations. Procedures of statistical analysis reveal the existence of statistically significant correlation between size of town where interview was conducted and attitude towards people ( $\chi^2 = 12.502$ ,  $df = 4$ ,  $N = 1249$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). According to analysis, representatives of an attitude towards people are more likely to live in medium size cities (between 20 and 100 thousand) or metropolitan areas (above 500 thousand). Findings presented in Table 2 lead to the conclusion that along with the increasing size of town the likelihood of attitude towards people also rises. Further examination showed no statistically significant correlations between the size of the town where an interview was conducted and the attitude away from people, as well as the attitude against people.

Table 2. Attitude towards people by size of town where interview was conducted

Size of town where interview was conducted	N	Other moral orientations (%)	Attitude towards people (%)
General population	1,249	76.6	23.4
< 5,000	438	78.5	21.5
5,000 – 20,000	155	83.9	16.1
20,000 – 100,000	315	73.0	27.0
100,000 – 500,000	180	78.3	21.7
> 500,000	161	69.6	30.4

Source: EVS 2017.

Additional investigation revealed statistically significant correlation between educational level and type of moral orientation. In order to allow  $\chi^2$  calculations the initial variable describing educational level (v243\_EISCED) has been transformed by removing the least numerous extreme categories: “no formal or less than primary education” ( $N = 4$ ) and “other” ( $N = 2$ ). Data shown in Table 3 afford an interesting observation regarding educational level and attitude towards people – the probability of occurrence of attitude towards people is higher among respondents who obtained advanced degrees of education in comparison to lesser educated individuals. Among respondents oriented towards people, the proportion holding an MA is almost twice as large as those who concluded their education at the primary level. On the other hand, as the level of education increases the percentage of respondents representing less prosocial orientations decreases (14 p.p. difference between primary and MA). In consequence, the conclusion additionally backed by statistical calculations ( $\chi^2 = 14.134$ ;  $df = 6$ ;  $N = 1236$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ) is that a higher degree of education supports the attitude of social proximity and engagement.

Table 3. Attitude towards people by educational level

Educational level of respondent	$N$	Other moral orientations (%)	Attitude towards people (%)
General population	1,236	76.5	23.5
Primary education	58	84.5	15.5
Lower secondary (including vocational training that is not considered as completion of upper secondary education)	349	81.9	18.1
Upper secondary without access to higher education	157	76.4	23.6
Upper secondary with access to higher education	260	74.2	25.8
BA level	76	76.3	23.7
MA level and higher	267	70.4	29.6

Source: EVS 2017.

Inverted regularity is evident in the case of segment accumulating attitudes against people. As it is shown in Table 4 the proportion of individuals representing this moral orientation decreases as the level of education increases reaching almost double decline between participants who received only primary education and those with master’s diploma. Parallely, respondents who received

university education present higher susceptibility for other moral orientations than that of attitude against people. The above observations find its confirmation in statistical tests ( $\chi^2 = 28.668$ ;  $df = 6$ ;  $N = 1236$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ). No significant correlations were found in the case of attitudes away from people.

Table 4. Attitude against people by educational level

Educational level of respondent	<i>N</i>	Other moral orientations (%)	Attitude against people (%)
General population	1,236	69.5	30.5
Primary education	58	58.6	41.4
Lower secondary (including vocational training that is not considered as completion of upper secondary education)	349	62.2	37.8
Upper secondary without access to higher education	157	66.9	33.1
Upper secondary with access to higher education	260	69.6	30.4
Post-secondary/advanced vocational education below bachelor's degree level	69	78.3	21.7
BA level	76	72.4	27.6
MA level and higher	267	79.8	20.2

Source: EVS 2017.

### *Religion*

According to the conducted analysis religious determinants are statistically significant correlates of moral orientations. The *t*-Student test for two independent samples revealed interesting observations among segments of moral orientations when respondents were asked about the importance of God in their life using a 10-point scale ranging from 1 = *not at all important* to 10 = *very important*. Proponents of healthy and trustful social interactions with a broader circle of individuals declare higher importance of God in their life ( $M = 8.07$ ) in comparison to adherents of other moral orientations ( $M = 7.65$ ). The observed difference meets assumed criteria for statistical significance ( $t(521.992) = -2,500$ ,  $p \leq 0.05$ ) and leads to the conclusion that a higher level of religiousness promotes attitudes towards people.

The opposite regularity is observed in the segment of respondents driven by self-interest in social relations. As the results of the *t* test demonstrate, the

importance of God among those representing the attitude against people is significantly lower in comparison to other moral segments. The mean value on the scale of importance of God in life for the segment against people reached 7.52, while for other segments combined the same indicator was 7.85. The results of the  $t$  test validate the conclusion that lower level of religiousness favor occurrence of attitudes against people ( $t(672,624) = 1.971, p \leq 0.05$ ). Regarding individuals clustered in the segment of attitude away from people no significant differences were found.

### *Interpersonal trust*

Aside from prosociality, societies, in order to maintain a stable system, need a specific type of bond based on an expectation that other members will act and behave in helpful and reliable manner that is beneficial to partners of social interaction (Kwon, 2019). This type of bond is described as social trust and is usually categorized in two forms: interpersonal trust, when it refers to in-group members or institutional trust, generally described as confidence of citizens in institutions (Kwon, 2019). In the analysis two types of trust can be measured using the available set of variables. To generate interpersonal trust index the following variables have been used: v33 = "How much you trust people in your neighborhood?" (original labeling), v34 = "people you know personally", v35 = "people you meet for the first time", v36 = "people of another religion", v37 = "people of another nationality". To each question was added a scale of responses ranging from 1 = *do not trust at all*, 2 = *do not trust very much*, 3 = *trust somewhat*, 4 = *trust completely was added*. The response scale was transformed from its original descending form to ascending order. An interpersonal index scale so constructed exhibits satisfying level of reliability (Cronbach's alpha = 0.803). This level of Cronbach's alpha has been reached by excluding the first position available in the set – how much you trust your family. The initial interpersonal trust index ranging from 5 to 20 points for the purpose of  $\chi^2$  analysis has been recoded to the form of a 5-point scale.

Table 5. Attitude towards people by interpersonal trust

Interpersonal trust	<i>N</i>	Other moral orientations (%)	Attitude towards people (%)
General population	1,009	75.3	24.7
1 = <i>Do not trust at all</i>	37	91.9	8.1
2	123	84.6	15.4
3	384	82.0	18.0
4	436	66.3	33.7
5 = <i>Trust completely</i>	29	62.1	37.9

Source: EVS 2017.

Table 5 presents the distribution of interpersonal trust and moral orientation towards people. The conducted analysis shows that only every twelfth member of this segment reports complete lack of trust in interpersonal relationships (8.1%), while more than a third of respondents in this category declare belief in helpfulness and trust towards partners of interaction (37.9%). The observed relation is two-fold: an increasing level of interpersonal trust progressively raises the percentage of those affiliated with attitude towards people and a decreasing level of interpersonal trust raises the fraction of representatives of other moral orientations, where 9 out of 10 respondents declaring complete lack of trust in social interaction will belong to a segment other than towards people. The above observed relation is statistically significant ( $\chi^2 = 42,302$ ;  $df = 4$ ;  $N = 1009$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ).

Table 6. Attitude against people by interpersonal trust

Interpersonal trust	<i>N</i>	Other moral orientations (%)	Attitude against people (%)
General population	1,009	70.0	30.0
1 = <i>Do not trust at all</i>	37	48.6	51.4
2	123	53.7	46.3
3	384	65.9	34.1
4	436	80.0	20.0
5 = <i>Trust completely</i>	29	69.0	31.0

Source: EVS 2017.

Interpersonal trust is one of the factors shaping affiliation regarding attitude against people (Table 6). This moral segment is heavily marked by a complete lack of trust – half of its members are characterized by no confidence in others' good will (51.4%). Along with the increasing level of interpersonal trust the fraction of members of this moral segment also diminishes, most visibly at the level 4 of interpersonal trust, where only a fifth is accounted as members of this moral segment (20.0%). Those declaring complete trust constitute one third of this segment (31.0% for level 5). In conclusion, a lower level of interpersonal trust significantly contributes to the attitude against people and a higher level of interpersonal trust decreases chances for representing this moral orientation. The observed differences have been confirmed as statistically significant using the  $\chi^2$  test ( $\chi^2 = 47.709$ ;  $df = 4$ ;  $N = 1009$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ; V Cramer = 0.217). Moral orientation away from people proved no significant correlation with interpersonal trust.

#### *Institutional trust*

Confidence of Polish citizens in institutions has been measured using 14 items available in the EVS 2017 dataset: v115 = “how much confidence in church” (original labeling), and the following: v116 = “armed forces”, v117 = “education system”, v118 = “the press”, v120 = “the police”, v121 = “parliament”, v122 = “civil service”, v123 = “social security system”, v124 = “European Union”, v126 = “health care system”, v127 = “justice system”, v129 = “environmental organizations”, v130 = “political parties”, and v131 = “government”. Items regarding “trade unions”, “United Nations Organization”, “major companies” and “social media” have not been included due to the large proportion of “do not know” answers coded as missing values. The reliability of such index achieved satisfying level of reliability (Cronbach's alpha = 0.836). Respondents answered using 4-point scale, where 1 = *a great deal*, 2 = *quite a lot*, 3 = *not very much*, 4 = *none at all*. In the process of transformation original points have been inverted so the index could form an ascending order. Initially, the institutional trust index ranging on a scale between 14 and 56 has been adjusted by removing extreme values (14 and less; 49 and above) which resulted in following coefficients of normal distribution: skewness = 0.057 and kurtosis = -0.058;  $N = 996$ ; missing values = 356. Ultimately, the index ranging between 16 and 48 has been further on recoded to form a 5-point scale.

Table 7. Attitude towards people by institutional trust

Institutional trust	<i>N</i>	Other moral orientations (%)	Attitude towards people (%)
General population	956	75.1	24.9
1 = <i>None at all</i>	49	87.8	12.2
2	246	78.0	22.0
3	441	76.0	24.0
4	189	68.3	31.7
5 = <i>A great deal</i>	31	61.3	38.7

Source: EVS 2017.

Confidence of citizens in institutions results in higher predisposition to represent attitude towards people (Table 7). In the segment of moral orientation towards people the percentage of respondents reporting full institutional trust is almost three times higher than individuals acknowledging complete disbelief in institutions (38.7% to 12.2%). The fraction of representatives of this moral orientation increases throughout the ascending span of institutional trust. On the other hand, probability for representing alternative moral orientation decreases with every other rising level of institutional trust. While almost 9 out of 10 members of alternative moral orientation declare complete distrust towards institutions (87.8% = *none at all*), only 6 out of 10 would represent a similar moral view if they shared contradictory opinions on institutions (61.3% = *a great deal*). Applied statistical procedures confirm that reporting greater confidence in institutions results in increased chance for representing allocentric concerns ( $\chi^2 = 13.416$ ;  $df = 4$ ;  $N = 956$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ).

Table 8. Attitude away from people by institutional trust

<i>Institutional trust</i>	<i>N</i>	Other moral orientations (%)	Attitude away people (%)
General population	956	52.8	47.2
1 = <i>None at all</i>	49	57.1	42.9
2	246	61.8	38.2
3	441	45.4	54.6
4	189	55.6	44.4
5 = <i>A great deal</i>	31	64.5	35.5

Source: EVS 2017.

The correlation between attitude away from people and institutional trust is the first confirmed association regarding this segment (Table 8). The conducted analysis shows that increasing confidence in institutions favors other moral orientations than the attitude centered on social restraint. This conclusion is drawn from the fact that on the scale of institutional trust the fraction of those representing other moral orientation between extreme levels rises by 7.4 p.p. (from 57.1% = *none at all* to 64.5% = *a great deal*). Invert regularity characterizes the investigated segment – along increasing trust in institutions the chances of representing this moral segment drop. The difference in proportion between skeptics and proponents of institutional activity in Poland differs by the same value of 7.4 p.p. (from 42.9% = *none at all* to 35.5% = *a great deal*). The statistical difference has been confirmed by the appropriate test ( $\chi^2 = 20.448$ ;  $df = 4$ ;  $N = 956$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ).

Table 9. Attitude against people by institutional trust

Institutional trust	<i>N</i>	Other moral orientations (%)	Attitude against people (%)
General population	956	72.1	27.9
1 = <i>None at all</i>	49	55.1	44.9
2	246	60.2	39.8
3	441	78.7	21.3
4	189	76.2	23.8
5 = <i>A great deal</i>	31	74.2	25.8

Source: EVS 2017.

The significance of institutions in the process of strengthening social bonds is visible in the case of attitude against people. Strong belief in institutions clearly limits the spread of moral apathy regarding this social environment. Findings presented in Table 9 justify the statement that as trust in institutions improves, the proportion of membership in the segment against people diminishes. While almost half of respondents declaring a complete lack of trust in institutions are accounted for this moral segment (44.9 = *none at all*), the proportion of individuals positively assessing activity of institutions and not being concerned for others constitutes only a quarter (25.8% = *a great deal*). Invert regularity is observed in the parallel segment. While skeptics make up more than a half of all respondents representing other moral orientations, satisfied with activity of institutions constitute almost three fourths of this grouping

(74.2% = *a great deal*). This leads to the conclusion that stronger confidence in institutions inhibits the attitude centered on self-interest and lack of concern for others. Additionally, this interpretation is sustained by conducted statistical calculations ( $\chi^2 = 35.587$ ;  $df = 4$ ;  $N = 956$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ).

*Interpersonal and institutional trust, importance of God, size of town and educational level as predictors of moral orientations*

The final stage of statistical analysis included binary logistic regression. Its purpose was to examine the efficacy of earlier tested variables: (interpersonal and institutional trust, importance of God, size of town, educational level) and to build models that could explain the occurrence of analyzed moral orientations. Additional analysis using the Spearman measure revealed the existence of negligible or weak correlations between social empathy index and interpersonal trust, as well as institutional trust in their 5-intervals forms. There was a negative weak correlation between social empathy and interpersonal trust ( $r(df = 1007) = -.266$ ,  $p < .001$ ). The association between social empathy and institutional trust has been proved to be very weak ( $r(df = 954) = -.167$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Other tested variables (educational level, size of town, importance of God) also proved negative correlations with social empathy index of .167 and lower with a corresponding  $p$  value of .05.

Logistic binary regression allowed us to estimate the likelihood of two types of attitudes: towards people and against people. No significant observations were found for the attitude away from people. Selected variables have been entered into the model in a sequential mode keeping its recoded form, as previously tested using  $\chi^2$  statistics.

In the case of attitude towards people the following variables have been included in the analysis: interpersonal and institutional trust, importance of God, size of town (Table 10). The first tested variable was interpersonal trust coded on a 5-point scale. Entering this variable results in the conclusion that interpersonal trust increases odds of attitude towards people. Although this model explains only 5.7% of variance (all  $R^2$  measures in the analysis refer to Nagelkerke statistics), there are no prerequisites to question its significance and goodness of fit ( $\chi^2 = 39.349$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , Hosmer–Lemeshow test = 0.091).  $B$  coefficient for interpersonal trust tested as positive number ( $B = 0.587$ ), which means that this predictor increases the likelihood of the moral orientation centered on prosociality. Further analysis shows that by raising interpersonal trust by 1 point, chances for attitude towards people to occur rise by almost 80% ( $\text{Exp}(B)=1.798$ ).

Table 10. Summary of the logistic regression analysis of interpersonal and institutional trust, importance of God and size of town, as predictors of attitude towards people

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>df</i>	Exp( <i>B</i> )	<i>p</i>
Step 1					
Constant	-3.111	0.355	1	0.045	< 0.001
Interpersonal trust	0.587	0.099	1	1.798	< 0.001
Step 2					
Constant	-4.170	0.504	1	0.015	< 0.001
Interpersonal trust	0.578	0.110	1	1.782	< 0.001
Institutional trust	0.375	0.097	1	1.455	< 0.001
Step 3					
Constant	-4.642	0.560	1	0.010	< 0.001
Interpersonal trust	0.586	0.111	1	1.796	< 0.001
Institutional trust	0.324	0.100	1	1.383	0.001
Importance of God in life	0.077	0.034	1	1.080	0.025
Step 4					
Constant	-5.079	0.605	1	0.006	< 0.001
Interpersonal trust	0.561	0.111	1	1.753	< 0.001
Institutional trust	0.349	0.101	1	1.417	< 0.001
Importance of God in life	0.092	0.035	1	1.097	0.009
Size of town	0.127	0.063	1	1.135	0.043

Source: EVS 2017; Step 1,  $R^2 = 0.057$ ,  $\chi^2 = 39.349$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , HL = 0.091; Step 2,  $R^2 = 0.082$ ,  $\chi^2 = 46.658$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , HL = 0.317; Step 3,  $R^2 = 0.090$ ,  $\chi^2 = 50.801$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , HL = 0.842; Step 4,  $R^2 = 0.097$ ,  $\chi^2 = 54.889$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , HL = 0.981.

In the next step institutional trust coded on a 5-point scale has been added to the model. Appropriate coefficients leave no doubts regarding significance and goodness of fit ( $\chi^2 = 46.658$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , HL = 0.317). Entering subsequent predictor rises measure of variance for the dependent variable to 8.2%. Both *B* coefficients of tested variables are marked positively ( $B = 0.578$  and  $B = 0.375$  respectively), which allows one to expect its progressive effect on the dependent variable. The odds ratio for the tested independent variables (Exp(*B*) = 1.782 and Exp(*B*) = 1.455 respectively) indicate that a unit increase in interpersonal trust and institutional trust raise the chances for attitude towards people by 78% and 45%, respectively. In the third step, importance of God in life coded on a 10-point scale was added to the model. A subsequent addition of independent variable makes it possible to build a model explaining 9% of

variance of the dependent variable. Required coefficients for significance and goodness of fit allow further analysis ( $\chi^2 = 50.801$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , HL = 0.842). All  $B$  coefficients for three predictors are marked positive, which means that these variables improve the likelihood of event ( $B = 0.586$ ,  $B = 0.324$ ,  $B = 0.077$ , respectively). Including importance of God in the model slightly weakens the effect of institutional trust – rising its value by one unit will result in an increased odds ratio of the occurrence of the tested attitude by 38% (Exp(B) = 1.383), 79% in case of interpersonal trust (Exp(B) = 1.796). Every 1-point increase in importance of God in life will increase odds ratio for the event to occur by 8% (Exp(B) = 1.080). Finally, the size of town has been added as a fourth and last independent variable. An initial analysis leads to the conclusion that model fits well to the data ( $\chi^2 = 54.889$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , HL = 0.981). Each dependent variable increases the likelihood of the tested moral orientation since logistic regression coefficients for all predictors are positive numbers (interpersonal trust  $B = 0.561$ ; institutional trust  $B = 0.349$ ; importance of God  $B = 0.092$ ; size of town  $B = 0.127$ ). Adding the size of town variable slightly weakens the effect of interpersonal trust and strengthens the effect of institutional trust. Now a unit increase of interpersonal trust will result in 75% increase of odds ratio in the occurring of attitude towards people (Exp(B) = 1.753). A similar change within institutional trust will now result in 41% increase of odds ratio (Exp(B) = 1.417). Almost a 10% increase of the odds ratio in favor of the tested moral orientation would be a result of a 1-point increase of importance of God (Exp(B) = 1.097). A unit increase in size of town would result in the increase of odds ratio by 13% (Exp(B) = 1.135). Model based on four predictors would explain almost 10% of variance ( $R^2 = 0.097$ ).

First three variables: interpersonal and institutional trust as well as importance of God are significant negative predictors of the opposite moral orientation – attitude against people. The model explaining the occurrence of this type of attitude can be supplemented by educational level (Table 11). All of the tested independent variables work as inhibitors of attitude against people.

In the first step adding interpersonal trust results in a model of disputable coefficients ( $\chi^2 = 39.914$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , HL = 0.018) – although the model is significant, the Hosmer–Lemeshow statistics suggest further exploration for additional variables. The negative value of logistic regression coefficient for interpersonal trust ( $B = -0.506$ ) indicate its inverted causation in case of attitude against people. A unit increase of interpersonal trust results in reducing odds ratio for this moral orientation by 40% (Exp(B) = 0.603). The model based on interpersonal trust explains only 5.5% of the variance of the dependent variable. Institutional trust seems to be having a similar effect on attitude against people – it reduces

the likelihood of the tested moral segment. Initial statistics suggest further search for set of variables that would complement the model ( $\chi^2 = 45.003$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , HL = 0.039), but basic coefficients allow preliminary estimations: logistic regression coefficients for both predictors are negative numbers ( $B = -0.487$  and  $B = -0.338$  respectively), which indicates a negative relationship between variables. Increasing both predictors by 1 point will decrease the likelihood of the tested moral orientation by 39% in the case of interpersonal trust (Exp(B) = 0.614) and 29% in case of institutional trust (Exp(B) = 0.713). Adding institutional trust would improve variance of the dependent variable to 7.7%. If importance of God is added in subsequent step of the analysis coefficients of significance and goodness of fit reach satisfying values ( $\chi^2 = 48.412$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , HL = 0.498). Model built on three independent variables fits data well and explains 8.3% of variance of the dependent variable. All of the predictors have a negative effect on the likelihood of the attitude against people. This conclusion is drawn from observations of  $B$  coefficients for each variable: interpersonal trust ( $B = -0.497$ ), institutional trust ( $B = -0.286$ ), importance of God in life ( $B = -0.069$ ). Overall analysis suggests that adding importance of God slightly weakens the effect of institutional trust (Exp(B) = 0.751) – rising its value by one unit will also result in decreasing odds ratio of occurring attitude centered on self-interest by 25%, 40% in the case of interpersonal trust (Exp(B) = 0.608). Every 1-point increase in the case of importance of God in life will result in 7% decrease in odds ratio of occurring the tested moral orientation (Exp(B) = 0.934).

Table 11. Summary of the logistic regression analysis of interpersonal and institutional trust, importance of God, educational level, as predictors of attitude against people

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>df</i>	Exp(B)	<i>p</i>
Step 1					
Constant	0.787	0.267	1	2.196	0.003
Interpersonal trust	-0.506	0.081	1	0.603	< 0.001
Step 2					
Constant	1.647	0.394	1	5.192	< 0.001
Interpersonal trust	-0.487	0.092	1	0.614	< 0.001
Institutional trust	-0.338	0.091	1	0.713	< 0.001
Step 3					
Constant	2.046	0.443	1	7.737	< 0.001
Interpersonal trust	-0.497	0.093	1	0.608	< 0.001
Institutional trust	-0.286	0.094	1	0.751	0.002
Importance of God in life	-0.069	0.029	1	0.934	0.02

Step 4					
Constant	2.485	0.473	1	12.000	< 0.001
Interpersonal trust	-0.417	0.097	1	0.659	< 0.001
Institutional trust	-0.320	0.095	1	0.726	< 0.001
Importance of God in life	-0.081	0.030	1	0.922	0.007
Educational level	-0.131	0.045	1	0.878	0.004

Source: EVS 2017; Step 1,  $R^2 = 0.055$ ,  $\chi^2 = 39.914$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , HL = 0.018; Step 2,  $R^2 = 0.077$ ,  $\chi^2 = 45.003$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , HL = 0.039; Step 3,  $R^2 = 0.083$ ,  $\chi^2 = 48.412$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , HL = 0.498; Step 4,  $R^2 = 0.097$ ,  $\chi^2 = 56.714$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , HL = 0.966.

In the final step educational level has been added to the model. Overall, the model fits well to the data and shows significance allowing further analysis ( $\chi^2 = 56.714$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , HL = 0.966). All four variables have a negative effect on chances to occur in the attitude that lacks prosocial traits. This conclusion is drawn from the fact that coefficients of logistic regression for all independent variables are negative numbers: interpersonal trust:  $B = -0.417$ ; institutional trust:  $B = -0.320$ ; importance of God:  $B = -0.081$ ; educational level:  $B = -0.131$ . For every one unit increase in the level of education, chances for occurrence of moral orientation centered on self-interest decrease by 13% ( $\text{Exp}(B) = 0.878$ ). Adding educational level slightly modifies the odds ratio for the previously included variables. Now every one unit increase in interpersonal trust results in a 35% decrease of the likelihood of the tested moral orientation ( $\text{Exp}(B) = 0.659$ ), 28% for confidence in institutions slightly improving its effect ( $\text{Exp}(B) = 0.726$ ), and 8% for importance of God ( $\text{Exp}(B) = 0.922$ ). In general, the model explains almost 10% of variance of the dependent variable, which is relatively satisfying for this type of regression.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The analysis showed that the most frequent type is the attitude away from people – shared by nearly a half of Polish society (45.9%). Apart from the lower level of institutional trust, no significant associations with sociocultural determinants have been detected in the analysis. The second largest segment is created by representatives of attitudes against people (30.7%). In terms of sociocultural determinants, this moral segment is characterized by a lower level of interpersonal and institutional trust, a lower level of religiosity and education.

The least common moral orientation – attitude towards people – is shared by almost a quarter of society in Poland (23,4%). In terms of sociocultural determinants, individuals sharing such traits as higher level of interpersonal and institutional trust, higher level of religiosity, and living in larger cities are susceptible to this moral orientation.

Sociological literature provides interpretations for the role of social and institutional trust affecting prosociality (Irwin, 2009; Kumlin and Rothstein, 2005) but in this case the positive effect on attitudes focused on prosociality might be a result of a specific sense of security that comes along with confidence in institutions. Prosocial activity requires trust in institutions in the sense that while obliging oneself to acts of charity external institutions secure one's own interest and resources. Leaving one's own matters aside for the sake of others would not be possible without an elementary level of trust that institutions responsible for security will create a stable environment and secure private properties or assets. This interpretation explains why and how prosocial activity is possible in modernized and secularized societies.

Interestingly enough, institutional trust seems to increase the attitude towards people and decrease the attitude against people more than religion, although it is necessary to report that variables were measured on different scales: 5-point and 10-point scales. This observation might lead to the conclusion that confidence in institutions as a motivator of prosocial activity belongs to the phenomenon described by Robert Bellah as civil religion (Bellah, 1967) in opposition to the classical concept of religion associated in Poland with the Catholic faith. Is the clash between these two types of religion possible when it comes to reign over Polish souls?

The attitude towards people centered on the concern for others is undoubtedly much expected and needed in modern open societies. The Catholic concept of universal destination of goods reminds that those who possess goods will use them in a manner that benefits others, since created goods belong to the whole humankind. Not sharing what one possesses is depriving others from what rightly belongs to all (Francis, 2020). In one of his philosophical works, Karol Wojtyła (2021) introduced the concept of the personalistic value of human act through which a man can fulfil himself and manifest his personalistic trait. A special moment of manifesting personalistic traits in a man is participation together with others. This involves moments of inner desire to be of aid, to assist, and benefit from togetherness. When a man decides to participate, to cooperate, to attach himself voluntarily to a community, then one might speak of transcending and truly fulfilling oneself. Now the question might be asked: Can religion still

actively address the basic human needs and desires, and if not, why? What kind of stimulus needs to be revived within the religious environment to help religion serve humans better? Without vivid religious factors civic religion might replace spiritual one in serving and answering basic needs of modern societies.

## REFERENCES

- Andriani L., and Sabatini F. (2015), *Trust and Prosocial Behaviour in a Process of State Capacity Building: the Case of the Palestinian Territories*, *Journal of Institutional Economics*, 11, p. 823-846; <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1744137414000575>.
- Barclay P. (2004), *Trustworthiness and Competitive Altruism Can also Solve the "Tragedy of the Commons,"* *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 25, p. 209-220; <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2004.04.002>.
- Barclay P., and Willer R. (2007), *Partner Choice Creates Competitive Altruism in Humans*, *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 274, p. 749-753; <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2006.0209>.
- Bekkers R. (2012), *Trust and Volunteering: Selection or Causation? Evidence From a 4 Year Panel Study*, *Political Behavior*, 34, p. 225-247; <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-011-9165-x>.
- Bellah R.N. (1967), *Civil Religion in America*, *Daedalus*, 96, p. 1-21.
- Durkheim E. (1997), *The Division of Labor in Society*, New York: The Free Press.
- Durkheim E. (1982), *The Rules of Sociological Method*, New York: The Free Press.
- EVS, 2017. European Values Study Longitudinal Data File 2017 (EVS 1981-2017). GESIS Data Archive, Cologne. ZA7500\_v4-0-0.sav Data file.
- Gesthuizen M., van der Meer T., and Scheepers P. (2008), *Education and Dimensions of Social Capital: Do Educational Effects Differ due to Educational Expansion and Social Security Expenditure?*, *European Sociological Review*, 24, p. 617-632; <https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcn021>.
- Gheorghiu M.A., Vignoles V.L., and Smith P.B. (2009), *Beyond the United States and Japan: Testing Yamagishi's Emancipation Theory of Trust across 31 Nations*, *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 72, p. 365-383; <https://doi.org/10.1177/019027250907200408>.
- Glanville J.L., Andersson M.A., and Paxton P. (2013), *Do Social Connections Create Trust? An Examination Using New Longitudinal Data*, *Social Forces*, 92, p. 545-562; <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/sot079>.
- Glanville J.L., Paxton P., and Wang Y. (2016), *Social Capital and Generosity*, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 45, p. 526-547.
- Hedge A., Yousif Y.H. (1992), *Effects of Urban Size, Urgency, and Cost on Helpfulness: A Cross-Cultural Comparison between the United Kingdom and the Sudan*, *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 23, p. 107-115; <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022192231008>.
- Irwin K. (2009), *Prosocial Behavior Across Cultures: The effects of Institutional Versus Generalized Trust*, [in:] S.R. Thye, E.J. Lawler (Eds.), *Advances in Group Processes*, Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited, p. 165-198; [https://doi.org/10.1108/S0882-6145\(2009\)0000026010](https://doi.org/10.1108/S0882-6145(2009)0000026010).
- Kiciński K. (2015), *Orientacje moralne. Leksykon socjologii moralności: podstawy – teorie – badania – perspektywy*, Kraków: Zakład Wydawniczy NOMOS.
- Kiciński K. (1998), *Orientacje moralne. Próba typologii*, Warszawa: Instytut Stosowanych Nauk UW.

- Kumlin S., and Rothstein B. (2005), *Making and Breaking Social Capital: The Impact of Welfare-State Institutions*, *Comparative Political Studies*, 38, p. 339-365; <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414004273203>.
- Kwon O.Y. (2019), *Social Trust and Economic Development. The Case of South Korea*, Edward Elgar Publishing; <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781784719609.00008>.
- Mariański J. (1990), *Moralność w procesie przemian. Szkice socjologiczne*, Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy PAX.
- Matsumoto Y., Yamagishi T., Li Y., and Kiyonari T. (2016), *Prosocial Behavior Increases with Age across Five Economic Games*, *PLOS ONE*, 11, p. 1-16; <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0158671>.
- Misztal M. (1980), *Problematyka wartości w socjologii*, Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Pope Francis (2020), *Encyclical letter "Fratelli tutti" of the Holy Father Francis on fraternity and social friendship*, Vatican.
- Putnam R. (2000), *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks.
- Shariff A.F., and Norenzayan A. (2007), *God Is Watching You: Priming God Concepts Increases Prosocial Behavior in an Anonymous Economic Game*, *Psychological Science*, 18, p. 803-809; <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01983.x>.
- Simpson B., and Willer R. (2015), *Beyond Altruism: Sociological Foundations of Cooperation and Prosocial Behavior*, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 41, p. 43-63; <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-073014-112242>.
- Tsvetkova M., and Macy M.W. (2014), *The Social Contagion of Generosity*, *PLoS ONE* 9, e87275; <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0087275>.
- Van Lange P.A.M., De Bruin E.M.N., Otten W., and Joireman J.A. (1997), *Development of Prosocial, Individualistic, and Competitive Orientations: Theory and Preliminary Evidence*, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, p. 733-746; <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.73.4.733>.
- Wilson J. (2000), *Volunteering*, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, p. 215-240; <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.215>.
- Wojtyła K. (2021), *Person and Act and Related Essays*, Washington: The Catholic University of America Press.
- Yamagishi T., and Yamagishi M. (1994), *Trust and Commitment in the United States and Japan*, *Motivation and Emotion*, 18, p. 129-166; <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02249397>.

POSTAWY MORALNE W POLSCE: „DO”, „OD” I „PRZECIW” LUDZIOM  
– SPOŁECZNO-KULTUROWE DETERMINANTY I RELIGIJNE IMPLIKACJE  
NA PODSTAWIE DANYCH Z EUROPEJSKIEGO SONDAŻU WARTOŚCI 2017

Streszczenie

Na podstawie dostępnych badań można stwierdzić, że zaufanie instytucjonalne może stanowić istotny predyktor prospołeczności. Głównym celem niniejszego opracowania jest zbadanie współzależności pomiędzy typami zaufania a typami orientacji moralnych „do”, „od” i „przeciw” ludziom. Kolejnym celem jest także określenie współzależności pomiędzy zaufaniem instytucjonalnym a orientacjami moralnymi z uwzględnieniem takich zmiennych, jak religijność, wykształcenie i wielkość miejscowości zamieszkania. W artykule zaprezentowano analizę, która pozwala uznać zaufanie interpersonalne oraz zaufanie instytucjonalne za alternatywne (potencjalnie konkurencyjne) predyktory orientacji moralnych w porównaniu do innych bardziej ugruntowanych czynników, tj. religijność. Wyniki badań pozwalają stawiać pytanie o przyszłość religii w stabilnych i demokratycznych społeczeństwach, której rola i funkcje mogą być kwestionowane.

**Słowa kluczowe:** prospołeczność; zaufanie społeczne; zaufanie instytucjonalne; orientacje moralne; religia cywilna.