


Article

Kenyan Catholics' Religiosity and Understanding of Marriage on the Basis of Individuals Associated with Shalom Center in Mitunguu: Educational and Pastoral Perspective

Jacek Goleń ¹ , Jan Kobak ^{1,*} , Florence Kabala ² and Małgorzata Szyszka ³ ¹ Institute of Theology, The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, 20-950 Lublin, Poland² Moral Department, Tangaza University College, Nairobi P.O. Box 15055-00509, Kenya³ Institute of Sociological Sciences, The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, 20-950 Lublin, Poland

* Correspondence: jan.kobak@kul.pl

Abstract: This article presents the results of research into religiosity and understanding of marriage among a selected group of young Catholics, all of whom are current students or graduates of Shalom Center in Mitunguu, Kenya. The goal of our study was to determine the correlations between the two variables so as to reach some conclusions and suggestions for religious education and pastoral care. The research made use of Stefan Huber's Centrality of Religiosity Scale, while the respondents' understanding of marriage was analyzed with the use of a questionnaire prepared by the authors of this study. As our research shows, one's Catholic understanding of marriage increases alongside an increase in interest in religiosity and in one's religious convictions, while it does not correlate—or does so only weakly—with a centrality of religiosity. Correlations with centrality occurred more often among men than among women. Mutual connections were most frequent among the youngest group of respondents, those who were up to 20 years of age and current students. This may indicate that religious formation and education of youth in the Shalom Center exerts a clear impact on shaping Catholic views on marriage. With the passing of time, traditional cultural precepts seem to gain prominence among the graduates.



Citation: Goleń, Jacek, Jan Kobak, Florence Kabala, and Małgorzata Szyszka. 2023. Kenyan Catholics' Religiosity and Understanding of Marriage on the Basis of Individuals Associated with Shalom Center in Mitunguu: Educational and Pastoral Perspective. *Religions* 14: 13. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel14010013>

Academic Editor: Bill Schmidt

Received: 14 October 2022

Revised: 3 December 2022

Accepted: 15 December 2022

Published: 22 December 2022



Copyright: © 2022 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Keywords: marriage; religiosity; Catholic education; pastoral theology; pastoral care of families; empirical theology

1. Introduction

Marriage is closely connected with God's creation of a human being as a man and a woman (Cf. Gen 2:18–24), and marriage in itself is God's creation (Cf. *Gaudium et spes* 1965, no. 48). Formed “in the image and likeness of God,” a human being was created of love and for love (Cf. John Paul II 1981, no. 11). An individual can find the meaning of life and happiness thanks to uncovering and realizing God's plan of love. The Catholic church teaches that a man and a woman constitute two ways of participating in the Divine Being (Congregation for Catholic Education 1983, no. 26), while at the same time underscoring the orientation of human sexuality towards conjugal love: “The human body, marked with the sign of masculinity or femininity, ‘includes right from the beginning the nuptial attribute, that is, the capacity of expressing love, that love in which the person becomes a gift and—by means of this gift—fulfils the meaning of his being and his existence’” (Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith 2004, no. 6; John Paul II 1980, no. 1). Thanks to each other, as conjugal partners a man and a woman may discover human predisposition for love inscribed in the human heart as a mutual gift of self. Within the institution of marriage they may also realize their calling for love not as separate individuals but as a couple, as a community of love (Cf. Congregation for Catholic Education 1983, no. 26). Owing to this, they contribute to each other's development, help each other shape their identity, and make each other more of a man/woman (Cf. Francis 2016, no. 221). Despite the emerging attempts to contest

God's intention (See [Kowalski 2021](#)), a man and a woman—as internally conditioned for sexual unity and fecundity—through their partner experience community with God in their marriage and participate in God's creative love (Cf. [Congregation for Catholic Education 1983](#), no. 26; [Goleń 2022](#)).

The Second Vatican Council emphasizes a personalist vision of marriage, calling it “the intimate partnership of married life and love (. . .) rooted in the conjugal covenant of irrevocable personal consent” (*Gaudium et spes* 1965, no. 48; see [Wąsik 2021](#)). The council accentuated the need to overcome a legalist understanding of marriage as a contract for the sake of marriage as a personalist covenant of a man and a woman (See [Kobak 2018](#)). Conjugal unity engages a man and a woman as persons in an integral way, that is physically, psychically, and spiritually, both as individuals and socially. In such a take, a vital role is played by the mutual gift that the spouses become for each other. The gift in question is not only of a private character but pertains as well to communal and social life. A marriage between baptized individuals is a sacrament in which the earthly reality is included by God in the dynamics of salvation. In this way, the relationship of a man and a woman married “in the Lord” (1 Cor 7:39) is not severed from the everyday and the worldly but adds a deeper dimension to the earthly realities by situating them in the perspective of eternity. As a complete personal community of life and love rooted in God, marriage constitutes a foundation for high ethical requirements related to the indissolubility of marital union, to conjugal purity, and to openness to life (Cf. [Vidal 2005](#), pp. 104–7; [Faggioni 2022](#)). Christian spouses, linked as they are through a covenant of mutual love, faithfulness, and honesty—based both on the divine and sacramental as well as social and cultural realities—aim to realize a twofold goal of marriage, namely mutual help and procreation. The divine mercy heals, perfects, and elevates human love, which not only unites the married couple but also radiates onto the surrounding world, especially through the gift of giving birth to and raising children (Cf. [Granados 2014](#), pp. 52–56).

In Central Africa marriage is often understood and experienced not so much as an event or state of life, but rather as an ongoing process with a rich cultural framework engaging extended family and local community. It encompasses customary, religious, and civil elements. The custom of bridewealth payment is deeply ingrained, with families of the bride and the groom negotiating its amount ([Baral et al. 2021](#), p. 5). Marriage is associated with the development of broad and diverse bonds between the families of the spouses ([Manderson and Block 2016](#), p. 206). Even for Catholics, it is common to first have a traditional wedding and only some time later a church ceremony. One of the reasons for postponing the latter is the fact that it requires a rich and costly set-up. This is related to a general social acceptance of informal and traditional relationships. Strictly civil marriages, however, are almost completely devoid of social validation ([Baral et al. 2021](#), p. 7).

Religiosity may be approached from a theological, philosophical, religious studies, psychological, or sociological perspective. This diversity, on the one hand, constitutes an advantage and opportunity for a multi-faceted understanding of the issue, while on the other it may lead to a lack of terminological or methodological clarity (Cf. [Holdcroft 2006](#), p. 89; [Szymczak et al. 2022](#), pp. 1–2). From a theological perspective, religiosity may be rendered as a virtue of justice towards God, which finds its reflection in worship and obedience towards him (Cf. *Catechismus Catholicae Ecclesiae* 1997, nn. 2095–2103, 2135, 2144; [Słomkowski 2000](#), p. 151). Within social studies, in turn, religiosity is treated as a conglomerate of specific attitudes and behaviors related to faith and to inner and outer religious commitment. A precise study of religiosity, especially a quantitative one, needs to focus on its various dimensions, such as experimental, ritualistic, ideological, intellectual, and consequential—as proposed by Glock and Stark, or the ones enumerated by Chumbler, that is subjective, cognitive, behavioral, social, and cultural (Cf. [Holdcroft 2006](#), pp. 89–91). Huber's idea for the study of centrality of religiosity seems especially valuable with the view of applying the research results to theological and pastoral analyses ([Huber and Huber 2012](#)).

Social research shows that in comparison with individuals not identifying with any denomination, Christians and the followers of the majority of other religions evince more traditional attitudes to marriage, its indissolubility, and its unique and key value for the society (See Thornton 1985; Pearce and Thornton 2007; Adamczyk 2013; Halman and Van Ingen 2015; Wilkins-LaFlamme 2016; Aman et al. 2019). Individuals who are more actively involved in religion share more traditional views on marriage (See Jaspers et al. 2007; Finke and Adamczyk 2008; Adamczyk and Pitt 2009; Liefbroer and Rijken 2019). Some studies indicate that living in a religious environment per se has a bearing on more traditional convictions on marriage even among individuals who do not declare themselves as following any particular religion (See Thornton 1985; Moore and Vanneman 2003; Finke and Adamczyk 2008; Adamczyk and Hayes 2012; Wilkins-LaFlamme 2016; Liefbroer and Rijken 2019). This contingency, however, is not universally espoused (See Jaspers et al. 2007; Adamczyk 2008).

Research has confirmed a positive correlation between one's active involvement in a religious community and one's satisfaction with marriage (See Bahr and Chadwick 1985; Willits and Crider 1988; Marks et al. 2016; Dollahite et al. 2017) and a level of support that a family offers to its members (See Ellison and George 1994). Research shows as well that marriages of partners professing the same faith are more stable (See Curtis and Ellison 2002; Lehrer and Chiswick 1993; cf. Bahr 1981, p. 260; Maxwell et al. 2020) and are characterized by a higher level of satisfaction with conjugal life (See Koenig et al. 2001; Olson et al. 2015). Furthermore, religiosity is related to greater involvement in marital life and satisfaction with marriage (See Larson and Goltz 1989; Burr et al. 2012; Mahoney et al. 2001; Sherkat and Ellison 1999; Wieradzka-Pilarczyk and Pilarczyk 2016; Spencer et al. 2021), and it is especially the husbands' higher religiosity that leads to the wives' greater satisfaction with marriage (Rose et al. 2018). One's declaration of belonging to a given denomination does not correlate with the quality of marital life if it does not go hand in hand with religious involvement. However, when partners show a similar level of participation in religious practice, it correlates positively with the quality and stability of their marriage (See Call and Heaton 1997; Curtis and Ellison 2002; cf. Bahr and Chadwick 1985, pp. 410–11; Lakatos and Tamás 2019). The spouses' religiosity is also related to a higher stability (See Call and Heaton 1997) of their marriage and to faithfulness, as well as to a greater level of marital satisfaction and involvement in the relationship (See Bahr and Chadwick 1985; Thomas and Cornwall 1990; Doherty et al. 1998; Langlais and Schwanz 2017; Latifa et al. 2021). What is more, religiosity is linked to a perception of marriage as a holy union. Spiritual intimacy constitutes a resource for the couple, deepening their mutual trust, attachment, emotional safety, and sense of belonging to the spouse (Padgett et al. 2019).

A number of studies show as well that a couple's religiosity correlates positively with their ability to deal with life's problems (See Brody et al. 1994; Ellison et al. 1999; cf. Goodman et al. 2013, pp. 820–21; Pollard et al. 2014; Wendołowska and Czyżowska 2021), even though for some spouses, religiosity may be related to resorting to destructive methods of problem-solving (Sherkat and Ellison 1999; Dollahite et al. 2018).

This article aims to analyze the perception of marriage of young Catholics—students and graduates of the Shalom Center in Mitunguu in Kenya. A key question in this respect is how young people who have received Catholic formation understand marriage and conjugal love. It has been assumed that religiosity (attitudes to Catholicism) affects one's understanding of marriage in Catholic terms. Even though the present research is of a preliminary character and is not based on a representative group of respondents, the results that it generates have significant informative value, especially for religious instruction and pastoral care. If religious formation and the education of youth at the Shalom Center exerts a clear impact on the shaping of Catholic views on marriage, it is imperative that priests and teachers impart it in a proper and responsible way. For this reason, present analysis aims also to point out conclusions and pastoral suggestions for Catholic education and pastoral care of families.

2. Methods and Participants

2.1. Research Design

The research was conducted among individuals associated with the Catholic Shalom Center in Mitunguu in Central Kenya (Cf. [Schools—Catholic Diocese of Meru 2022](#)).

The Shalom Home pastoral center is located in Matetu, which is part of the Saint Francis of Assisi parish in Mitunguu, in the diocese of Meru in Meru County, close to the equator in Central Kenya. The center was established in 2011 by Rev. Francis Gaciata, who has been the parish priest since 2008. The Shalom Home pastoral center consists of a center for children who have been orphaned, abandoned, or are in danger of abuse, as well as of primary school, secondary school, and vocational school, which can be attended by outsiders as well. Orphaned children as well as all the teachers and the majority of other employees live in the center, creating a community based on prayer, formation, education, and cooperation. The relatives and friends of those who live in the center are also connected to the place, at times participating in its various events or in the events organized by the parish with the help of the inhabitants of the Shalom Home. The orphaned, abandoned, and vulnerable children who live in the Shalom Home primarily come from the Gakaromone slums in the town of Mitunguu. The Shalom Home took on its first 40 children in 2011. As a result of its dynamic activity, in 2018 it had approximately 400 wards, while at present, in 2022, it has about 500 individuals and 50 teachers and other employees, including two mission and seven religious volunteers. Former wards also keep in touch, sometimes working for the center and receiving help in furthering their education and becoming independent. The center takes care of children and youth from the age of 3 to the age of 25. The Shalom Home pastoral center was established thanks to funding by two Italian charity organizations: Melamango and Val di Sole. At the moment, the activity of the center is also supported in terms of money, organization, and content by the Diakonia for Missions of the Light-Life Movement, through the programme of Remote Adoption and missionary voluntary work ([La Loro Storia n.d.](#); Interview conducted on 19 November 2022 by the authors with the volunteers of the Diakonia for Missions of the Light-Life Movement n.d.).

2.2. Procedure and Participants

As sociological and pastoral studies indicate, “if the starting point of the research project is pastoral theology, an analysis containing all the elements of theological reflection is indispensable in order to maintain its specificity, autonomy and theological identity. Thus, the formulated indications remain in the theological sphere” ([Szymczak 2020](#), p. 523). Empirical research within practical theology follows the model of a three-stage study: the normative stage, the execution stage, and the praxeological stage. The description of the procedure and participants as well as the presentation and analysis of the empirical research results correspond to the second of these, that is the execution stage ([Kamiński 2018](#), p. 35).

The empirical research conducted to date was comprised of two stages: (1) The respondents’ religiosity has been studied from a psychological perspective with the use of Stefan Huber’s Centrality of Religiosity Scale (which measures the following aspects: intellectual dimension, ideology, public practice, private practice, and religious experience) (see Table 1). (2) The respondents’ understanding of marriage has been studied through a survey method with the use of a questionnaire specially designed for the purposes of this study. The questionnaire was composed of 14 close-ended questions (see Table 1).

The questions were created by the authors of this study on the basis of the teaching of the Catholic Church on marriage, sexual morality, and parenthood. Some aspects of the cultural specificity of the region that the respondents came from were also taken into consideration. Subsequently, the choice of questions was verified by competent raters, whereby the team of seven raters was composed of experts in Catholic sexual ethics, theology of marriage and family, practical theology, social psychology, psychology of family, and sociology of family. The accuracy and internal consistency of the survey was measured through Cronbach’s alpha, whose value was established at 0.68, while the average correlation between the statements was 0.20.

Table 1. Research tools—descriptive statistics.

Marriage Understanding Questionnaire	Descriptive Statistics (N = 156, 100%)		
	Mean	SD	Median
1—Parents or society can decide about the marriage of their children	−0.87	2.15	−2
2—Friendship between husband and wife is very important to a marriage	2.47	0.96	3
3—Spouses should be completely faithful to each other	2.32	1.12	3
4—Sexual bind is very important for a marriage	2.15	1.24	3
5—In a marriage the woman has a lower status than the man	−0.99	2.18	−2
6—Love of husband and wife is the basis of a marriage	2.44	0.93	3
7—Only union between one man and one woman can be considered to be a marriage	1.88	1.69	3
8—Spouses should be honest with each other	2.38	1.07	3
9—Spouses should have respect to each other	2.47	0.99	3
10—Marriage should be blessed in the Church	2.22	1.10	3
11—A marriage can only be successful through God’s grace, which works in the sacraments	2.14	1.34	3
12—In some situations violence against the spouse can or should be used	−1.59	1.73	−2
13—Marriage is for life	2.03	1.40	3
14—Husband and wife should pray together	2.27	1.08	3
Huber’s Centrality of Religiosity Scale	Descriptive Statistics (N = 156, 100%)		
	Mean	SD	Median
Intellectual dimension	12.42	1.99	13
Ideology	14.10	1.66	15
Private practice	13.54	1.70	14
Religious experience	12.60	1.94	13
Public practice	13.58	1.94	15
Centrality	66.24	6.78	67

SD—standard deviation.

The study was conducted in March 2022 among the oldest students of the Catholic Shalom Center in Mitunguu in Central Kenya and the school’s graduates. The method of purposive sampling was used to choose the respondent group. The respondents were selected on the basis of their participation in the education process in the Catholic Shalom Center and in Catholic formation as well as their involvement in the center’s activity after their graduation. For this reason, the respondents were divided into three age groups (below 20, from 21 to 25, and over 25). The survey was prepared and the research was carried out in English. Because education in the Catholic Shalom Center is in English, the respondents had no problems answering the survey questions. The data was selected with the use of CAWI (Computer Assisted Web Interview) during the researchers’ meeting with the students and graduates (auditorium questionnaire). The survey was of a voluntary and anonymous character.

The respondents were first asked to fill in Huber’s CRS questionnaire, and subsequently to respond to the statements provided by determining to what extent they agree

or disagree with them. The statements were assessed on the scale from -3 to 3 , where the lowest number indicated total lack of acceptance, while the highest—complete acceptance of the statement (-3 —I definitely disagree, -2 —I disagree to a large extent, -1 —I rather disagree, 0 —It is hard to say, 1 —I rather agree, 2 —I agree to a large extent, 3 —I definitely agree). The data was then statistically processed to check the correlation between one's religiosity and understanding of marriage with the use of Spearman's rank correlation coefficient.

The research sample was 156 individuals professing Catholic faith. Men comprised 51.3 percent of the respondents, while women constituted 48.7 percent (see Table 2). 38.5 percent of the respondents were between 21 and 25 years of age, with 32.0 percent over the age of 25, and 29.5 percent below 20. Residents of small towns comprised 55.1 percent of the respondents, while residents of the countryside—30.8 percent, and city-dwellers—14.1 percent. Half of the respondents described themselves as religious (50.0 percent), with a subsequent 41.0 percent as very religious, and only 9.0 percent of the respondents as weakly religious or religiously indifferent. 62.5 percent of the respondents were raised in complete families, with both parents present, while the remaining individuals came from various types of incomplete families, polygamous families, and others. 84.6 percent of the respondents were single, 1 in 10 was in a Catholic or civil marriage, and 3.8 percent were in an informal relationship.

Table 2. Characteristics of the study group.

Characteristics	Categories	Parameter	
		N/M	%/SD
Sex	Women	80	51.3
	Men	76	48.7
Age		25.97	9.10
	Below 20	46	29.5
	Between 21 and 25	60	38.5
	Over 25	50	32.1
Conjugal-familial situation	Church/civil marriage	16	10.3
	Informal relationship	6	3.8
	Single	134	85.9
Place of residence	Countryside	48	30.8
	Town	86	55.1
	City	22	14.1
Family	Family with both parents	96	61.5
	Other types of family	60	38.5
Siblings	None	38	24.4
	Yes	118	75.6
Affiliation with a religious organization	Yes	140	89.7
	No	16	10.3
Attitude to faith	Very religious	64	41.0
	Religious	78	50.0
	Non-practicing believer	6	3.8
	Spiritual but not religious	2	1.3
	Indifferent	6	3.8

N—frequency; %—percentage; M—mean; SD—standard deviation.

It should be emphasized that the respondent group was selected in accordance with the theological-pastoral goal of the project and its pilot study character. The use of statistical methods, however, made it possible to formulate certain conclusions and theological-pastoral and pedagogical suggestions. Still, it needs to be remembered that our sample was not representative and does not account for the distribution of the socio-demographic features within the Kenyan society or its specific regions. For those reasons, caution needs to be exercised while extrapolating the results of our study.

2.3. Statistical Methods

The first step of analysis was the characterization of the respondent group, with the percentage and frequency of occurrence of each of the categories provided. Quantitative variables were statistically processed to calculate mean and standard deviation. Spearman's rank correlation coefficient was used to check the correlation between religiosity and an understanding of marriage. The impact of the independent variables of sex and age on the results has also been taken into consideration.

3. Correlations between Religiosity and Understanding of Marriage

Research into religiosity and opinions on sacramental marriage conducted in Papua New Guinea (See [Niścigorski 2022](#), pp. 183–319) corroborated the existence of correlations between the two, legitimizing our study of views on marriage among the selected group of Kenyan Catholics. Our study shows that in general such correlations do not occur frequently. The Catholic convictions on the role of conjugal love, the sexual bond of the partners, and the need for mutual respect correlate positively in a statistically significant way on a low level with intellectual dimension and ideology, but do not correlate with centrality of religiosity. An unethical conviction that in some situations violence against one's spouse is acceptable or necessary (12) correlates negatively with centrality of religiosity. This means that the respondents tend to agree with this statement ever more rarely as the centrality of religiosity in their lives increases. However, it seems puzzling that there are no statistically significant correlations between religiosity and two other problematic opinions: that the parents or the community may decide about their children's marriage (1) and that the woman has a lower status in marriage than a man (5)—see Table 3.

Table 3. The value of correlation (r) between the respondents' religiosity and their opinions on marriage.

Core-Dimensions of Religiosity According to S. Huber (CRS)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Intellectual dimension	−0.01	0.03	0.10	0.16	0.03	0.25	0.16	0.12	0.19	0.09	0.08	−0.08	0.02	0.13
Ideology	−0.17	0.07	0.07	0.27	0.06	0.17	0.01	0.10	0.21	0.24	0.22	−0.27	0.17	0.31
Private practice	−0.01	−0.08	−0.01	0.05	0.14	0.06	−0.01	0.01	0.04	−0.10	−0.10	−0.29	−0.16	−0.08
Religious experience	0.11	−0.12	0.00	0.08	0.13	0.12	0.08	0.03	0.13	0.01	0.04	−0.09	−0.02	0.11
Public practice	−0.11	−0.15	0.00	−0.03	−0.05	−0.02	0.03	−0.04	−0.05	0.14	0.05	−0.16	−0.11	0.07
Centrality	−0.05	−0.10	0.03	0.12	0.11	0.14	0.11	0.04	0.13	0.11	0.06	−0.20	−0.06	0.14

The results relate to the Spearman Correlation Test (r). The results in bold indicate that for this correlation the significance level $p < 0.05$. Statements about marriage: 1—Parents or society can decide about the marriage of their children; 2—Friendship between husband and wife is very important to a marriage; 3—Spouses should be completely faithful to each other; 4—Sexual bind is very important for a marriage; 5—In a marriage the woman has a lower status than the man; 6—Love of husband and wife is the basis of a marriage; 7—Only union between one man and one woman can be considered to be a marriage; 8—Spouses should be honest with each other; 9—Spouses should have respect to each other; 10—Marriage should be blessed in the Church; 11—A marriage can only be successful

through God’s grace, which works in the sacraments; 12—In some situations violence against the spouse can or should be used; 13—Marriage is for life; 14—Husband and wife should pray together.

The presence of and increase in statistically significant correlations between the respondents’ religiosity and opinions on marriage is affected by the variable of sex. Among men, some positive statements on marriage correlate positively but on a low and average level with religiosity (intellectual dimension, ideology, and centrality). An increase in religiosity goes hand in hand with the more frequent acceptance of statements that the spouses should respect each other (9), that marriage is based on love between the husband and the wife (6), and that a sexual bond is very important in a marriage (4). For women, in turn, a more pronounced religiosity (intellectual dimension, ideology) is significantly related to a stronger conviction that partners should be married in church (10) and that the spouses should show mutual respect (9)—see Table 4.

For men, religious experience correlates positively with a traditional cultural conviction that the parents or the community may decide upon their children’s marriage (1) and with the view that a woman’s position in a marriage is lower than that of a man (5). For women, in turn, a stronger centrality of religiosity correlates negatively (on an average level) with the belief that sometimes one may or should resort to violence towards their spouse (12), which means that the higher the centrality of religiosity, the more strongly women disagree with the statement. An increase in religiosity does not correlate among women with their rejection of the belief that a woman has a lower position in a marriage than a man (5)—see Table 4.

Table 4. The value of correlation (r) between the respondents’ religiosity and their opinions on marriage, taking into account the variable of sex.

Core-Dimensions of Religiosity According to S. Huber (CRS)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Men														
Intellectual dimension	0.14	0.06	0.15	0.24	0.03	0.30	0.12	0.06	0.35	−0.14	−0.05	−0.10	0.08	0.08
Ideology	−0.01	0.14	0.02	0.27	0.09	0.24	0.01	−0.14	−0.02	0.11	0.22	−0.07	0.16	0.26
Private practice	0.16	0.06	0.04	0.23	0.12	0.09	0.17	0.04	0.22	−0.10	0.03	−0.18	0.08	0.08
Religious experience	0.23	0.08	0.16	0.14	0.25	0.19	0.15	0.16	0.31	0.06	0.10	−0.20	0.08	0.07
Public practice	−0.16	−0.30	−0.12	−0.17	−0.21	−0.13	0.00	−0.11	−0.06	0.13	0.09	−0.05	−0.03	0.11
Centrality	0.09	0.02	0.13	0.19	0.07	0.24	0.21	0.07	0.32	0.06	0.10	−0.17	0.11	0.21
Women														
Intellectual dimension	−0.16	0.03	0.09	0.13	0.05	0.21	0.27	0.17	0.09	0.35	0.25	−0.06	−0.05	0.18
Ideology	−0.36	−0.02	0.07	0.22	0.06	0.10	0.06	0.24	0.33	0.34	0.20	−0.43	0.16	0.36
Private practice	−0.12	−0.15	−0.02	−0.07	0.16	0.03	−0.22	0.02	−0.02	−0.08	−0.20	−0.39	−0.36	−0.23
Religious experience	0.03	−0.27	−0.12	0.03	0.02	0.05	−0.03	−0.07	0.01	−0.04	−0.02	0.02	−0.09	0.15
Public practice	−0.08	−0.04	0.08	0.07	0.12	0.09	0.07	0.03	−0.05	0.14	0.01	−0.25	−0.20	0.04
Centrality	−0.16	−0.19	−0.04	0.08	0.19	0.05	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.19	0.04	−0.22	−0.20	0.09

The results relate to the Spearman Correlation Test (r). The results in bold indicate that for this correlation the significance level $p < 0.05$. Statements about marriage: 1—Parents or society can decide about the marriage of their children; 2—Friendship between husband and wife is very important to a marriage; 3—Spouses should be completely faithful to each other; 4—Sexual bind is very important for a marriage; 5—In a marriage the woman has a lower status than the man; 6—Love of husband and wife is the basis of a marriage; 7—Only union between one man and one woman can be considered to be a marriage; 8—Spouses should be honest with each other; 9—Spouses should have respect to each other;

10—Marriage should be blessed in the Church; 11—A marriage can only be successful through God’s grace, which works in the sacraments; 12—In some situations violence against the spouse can or should be used; 13—Marriage is for life; 14—Husband and wife should pray together.

Research results vary in a statistically significant way when the respondents’ age is taken into consideration. This is most clearly visible for the youngest group of respondents (below 20 years of age), for whom there are clear positive correlations between centrality of religiosity and the Catholic convictions that: a marriage is a relation of one man and one woman only (7), that the foundation of marriage is love of the husband and the wife (6), that partners should be married in church (10), that a husband and a wife should pray together (14), and that the spouses should be completely faithful to each other (3). These results are further enhanced by the co-presence of an increase in religiosity and the rejection of the “need” to use violence against one’s spouse in some situations (12)—see Table 5.

For the respondents between 21 and 25 years of age the results show correlation only with respect to the rejection of violence against the spouse (12). Surprisingly, in this group of respondents there occurs a negative correlation of religiosity with the Catholic belief that friendship between a husband and a wife is very important in a marriage (2). What is more, private practice and religious experience correlate positively with the belief that the parents or the community may make decisions about their children’s marriage (1)—see Table 5.

Table 5. The value of correlation (r) between the respondents’ religiosity and opinions on marriage, taking into account the variable of age.

Core-Dimensions of Religiosity According to S. Huber (CRS)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Under 20														
Intellectual dimension	−0.08	0.24	0.38	0.17	0.16	0.50	0.39	0.27	0.30	0.36	0.28	−0.16	−0.02	0.25
Ideology	−0.36	0.29	0.21	0.44	0.06	0.49	0.40	0.10	0.23	0.46	0.34	−0.31	0.43	0.67
Private practice	0.12	0.31	0.39	0.21	0.33	0.29	0.39	0.27	0.20	0.31	0.25	−0.43	−0.01	0.23
Religious experience	0.08	0.15	0.30	0.41	0.44	0.48	0.40	0.09	0.25	0.43	0.44	−0.11	0.31	0.59
Public practice	0.10	−0.11	−0.05	0.07	−0.01	0.24	0.03	−0.17	−0.18	0.11	0.08	−0.33	−0.08	0.07
Centrality	−0.03	0.18	0.35	0.28	0.26	0.56	0.43	0.10	0.21	0.47	0.29	−0.29	0.14	0.52
From 21 to 25														
Intellectual dimension	0.25	−0.07	0.01	0.23	0.06	0.11	0.24	0.11	0.14	0.05	0.24	−0.13	0.22	0.10
Ideology	−0.05	0.04	0.04	0.36	0.03	0.06	−0.20	0.16	0.22	0.14	0.24	−0.27	0.06	0.05
Private practice	0.26	−0.32	−0.18	−0.04	0.15	−0.33	−0.19	−0.08	−0.09	−0.18	−0.31	−0.17	−0.22	−0.23
Religious experience	0.30	−0.12	0.02	0.01	0.04	−0.23	0.08	0.16	0.16	−0.12	−0.11	−0.13	−0.03	−0.07
Public practice	−0.16	−0.27	−0.11	−0.03	−0.16	−0.25	−0.07	−0.21	0.02	0.06	−0.09	−0.28	−0.25	−0.13
Centrality	0.17	−0.31	−0.13	0.12	0.02	−0.22	0.02	0.01	0.15	0.00	−0.04	−0.31	−0.13	−0.10
Over 25														
Intellectual dimension	−0.22	−0.03	0.00	0.06	−0.14	0.18	−0.08	−0.01	0.13	−0.12	−0.25	0.05	−0.25	0.03
Ideology	−0.12	−0.04	0.06	−0.04	0.04	−0.02	−0.07	0.09	0.22	0.26	0.16	−0.16	−0.01	0.31
Private practice	−0.46	−0.30	−0.30	−0.03	−0.02	0.11	−0.19	−0.26	−0.11	−0.42	−0.26	−0.14	−0.41	−0.32
Religious experience	−0.26	−0.37	−0.34	−0.21	−0.07	0.17	−0.18	−0.20	−0.10	−0.23	−0.18	0.19	−0.53	−0.22
Public practice	−0.28	−0.01	0.20	−0.08	0.04	0.04	0.15	0.30	0.06	0.30	0.22	0.07	0.07	0.31
Centrality	−0.33	−0.22	−0.09	−0.11	0.04	0.10	−0.07	0.03	0.05	−0.07	−0.10	0.06	−0.30	0.03

For the respondents over 25 years of age, a stronger centrality of religiosity coexists with the rejection of the belief that the parents or the community may decide about their children’s marriage (1), while at the same time a stronger religiosity is related to the rejection

of the Catholic belief that a marriage is a relationship for life (13). An increase in individual parameters of religiosity (private practice and religious experience) goes hand in hand with a lack of acceptance of the Catholic beliefs that friendship between the husband and the wife is very important in marriage (2) and that the spouses should be completely faithful to each other (3). What is more, in this group of respondents a stronger religiosity is not related to a repudiation of violence in a marriage or the questioning of a woman's lower position vis-à-vis that of a man.

The results relate to the Spearman Correlation Test (r). The results in bold indicate that for this correlation the significance level $p < 0.05$. Statements about marriage: 1—Parents or society can decide about the marriage of their children; 2—Friendship between husband and wife is very important to a marriage; 3—Spouses should be completely faithful to each other; 4—Sexual bind is very important for a marriage; 5—In a marriage the woman has a lower status than the man; 6—Love of husband and wife is the basis of a marriage; 7—Only union between one man and one woman can be considered to be a marriage; 8—Spouses should be honest with each other; 9—Spouses should have respect to each other; 10—Marriage should be blessed in the Church; 11—A marriage can only be successful through God's grace, which works in the sacraments; 12—In some situations violence against the spouse can or should be used; 13—Marriage is for life; 14—Husband and wife should pray together.

4. Conclusions and Suggestions for Catholic Education and Pastoral Care of Families

On the basis of our research results, the following conclusions and pastoral suggestions may be legitimately formulated within practical theology:

1. The correlations between centrality of religiosity and an understanding of marriage occur rarely, but with more frequency with respect to certain individual parameters of religiosity. These correlations are of a low or average level. Positive correlations (simultaneous increase in indicators) are present most often between certain parameters of religiosity and positive Catholic convictions on marriage. Negative correlations (increase in religiosity coexists with disapproval of a given conviction) pertain most frequently to some ethically dubious convictions on marriage which are rooted in the respondents' local culture, but not to all of them. Some ethically problematic beliefs—such as the notion that the parents or the community may decide upon their children's marriage (1) and that a woman has a lower position in marriage than a man (5)—essentially show no statistically significant links with the respondents' religiosity. This may mean that in general terms religiosity—including the mature religiosity of a central character—is not related to and does not modify (neither enhances nor weakens) the respondents' patriarchal and traditional mentality. In light of generally weak correlations between religiosity and convictions on Catholic marriage, pastoral and pedagogical work should concentrate on the need to consistently lead a life based on faith, also within the conjugal and familial sphere (See Polak 2022). On the other hand, religious instruction and education of youth declaring themselves as Catholics and identifying with the Catholic church should place more emphasis on crucial ethical and theological content pertaining to marriage (See Bujo 2009, pp. 37–61, 94–99, 130–32).

2. Some positive opinions on marriage correlate with religiosity both among men and women, but more frequently among the former. For men, an increase in some parameters of religiosity is linked more often than in the case of women both with acceptance of some Catholic convictions on marriage and of some non-Catholic ones. At the same time, for men there is no negative correlation between religiosity and opinions of a negative ethical character (1), (5), (12), while, on the contrary, positive correlations are sometimes present. This may mean that for men, religious formation and education does not impact in a satisfactory way the shaping of Catholic convictions on marriage nor does it sufficiently amend traditional but unethical mental patterns and customs. Pastoral care of men should therefore place more emphasis on the Christian model of marital relations, pointing out aspects of the cultural paradigm of Kenya that are valuable and those that require change.

The selection of particular methods of influencing men should privilege those that are more likely to reach them (See [Churu 2015](#), pp. 138–47).

3. For women, a stronger religiosity (of a central character) is rarely connected with positive Catholic convictions on marriage. At the same time, it is linked rarely but clearly with a rejection of some ethically negative statements, such as the idea that violence against one's spouse is acceptable or necessary in some situations (12). What seems troubling is the indication that a stronger religiosity among women does not correlate with their repudiation of the belief that a woman's position in a marriage is lower than that of man (5). This may show that, for the Kenyan women surveyed, religious formation and education shapes Catholic convictions on marriage even more rarely and weakly than for men. Granted, some unethical convictions are more markedly corrected, but not all of them. In light of the above, it seems imperative to further research the model of relationships between a husband and a wife which operate in Africa and to conceive of and implement pastoral care with the view of decisive rejection of violence as well as of acceptance of the equality of the sexes (See [Kisemo et al. 2010](#), pp 117–42). Pastoral care and education should address children as well, who oftentimes experience corporal punishment, violence, and the unequal treatment of women in their families (See [Kisemo et al. 2010](#), pp. 143–58; [Nambiri 2017](#)).

4. For the youngest group of respondents, religiosity correlates positively most often and most strongly with the majority of positive convictions on marriage and negatively with the rejection of violence against one's spouse (12). This seems to corroborate the effectiveness of Catholic education and formation that current students receive at the Shalom Center. For older respondents, however, an increase in religiosity correlates with stronger disapproval of some positive Catholic beliefs on marriage. What is more, for the older respondents an increase in religiosity is typically unrelated to disapproval of unethical convictions on marriage.

One can conclude, therefore, that the present-day formation and education in Shalom Center is more integral, profound, and effective than several years ago and more. This notwithstanding, the results may also testify to the youngest group's fresh memory of the content inculcated in them in Shalom Center or simply indicate their stronger idealism, which in the face of everyday life may soon undergo a serious crisis. For this reason, it seems crucial to organize and improve pastoral care of engaged and married couples as well as families, and offer it to individuals that underwent valuable religious formation in their youth (See [Mwangi et al. 2015](#), pp. 54–60).

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, J.G., J.K.; methodology, J.G.; formal analysis, J.G.; investigation, J.K., F.K.; data curation, J.G.; writing—original draft preparation, J.G., J.K.; writing—review and editing, J.G., J.K., F.K. and M.S.; visualization, J.G. and M.S.; project administration, J.G. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: The article is funded by John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin—Subsidy of the Department of Theology—Discipline Theological Sciences, Discipline Grant: “Ludzka seksualność i jej realizacja w świetle badań empirycznych”, no. 01-0701-2.

Institutional Review Board Statement: The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, and approved by the Ethics Committee of The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin (protocol code 3/2022/KEBN WT KUL and date of approval: 12 February 2022).

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement: Data supporting reported results can be found at: <http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12153/3801> (accessed on 12 October 2022).

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Adamczyk, Amy. 2008. The effects of religious contextual norms, structural constraints, and personal religiosity on abortion decisions. *Social Science Research* 37: 657–72. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
- Adamczyk, Amy. 2013. The effect of personal religiosity on attitudes toward abortion, divorce, and gender equality. Does cultural context make a difference? *Euramerica* 43: 213–53.
- Adamczyk, Amy, and Brittany E. Hayes. 2012. Religion and sexual behaviors: Understanding the influence of Islamic cultures and religious affiliation for explaining sex outside of marriage. *American Sociological Review* 77: 723–46. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Adamczyk, Amy, and Cassady Pitt. 2009. Shaping attitudes about homosexuality: The role of religion and cultural context. *Social Science Research* 38: 338–51. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Aman, Jaffar, Jaffar Abbas, Mohammad Nurunnabi, and Shaher Bano. 2019. The Relationship of Religiosity and Marital Satisfaction: The Role of Religious Commitment and Practices on Marital Satisfaction Among Pakistani Respondents. *Behavioral Sciences* 9: 30. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Bahr, Howard M. 1981. Religious intermarriage and divorce in Utah and the mountain states. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 20: 251–61. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Bahr, Howard M., and Bruce A. Chadwick. 1985. Religion and family in Middletown, USA. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 47: 407–14. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Baral, Anna, Valérie Golaz, Norah Kiereri, and Nanna Schneidermann. 2021. Marriage as a Connector: A Conversation about Spatial and Temporal Scales of Partnership and Self-accomplishment in Kenya and Uganda. *Les Cahiers d'Afrique de l'Est/The East African Review [En ligne]* 56: 1–20. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Brody, Gene H., Zolinda Stoneman, Douglas Flor, and Chris McCrary. 1994. Religion's role in organizing family relationships. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 56: 878–88. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Bujo, Bénédet. 2009. *Plea for Change of Models for Marriage*. Nairobi: Paulines Publications Africa.
- Burr, Wesley R., Loren D. Marks, and Randal D. Day. 2012. *Sacred Matters: Religion and Spirituality in Families*. New York: Taylor and Francis.
- Call, Vaughn R. A., and Tim B. Heaton. 1997. Religious influence on marital stability. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 36: 382–92. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Catechismus Catholicae Ecclesiae*. 1997. Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Churu, Beatrice. 2015. Elements of the African Marriage and Family that can be Usefully Adopted for the Pastoral Care for Christian Families. In *African Family Today*. Edited by Giuseppe Caramazza and Beatrice Churu. Nairobi: Paulines Publications Africa, pp. 138–57.
- Congregation for Catholic Education. 1983. *Educational Guidance in Human Love: Outlines for Sex Education*. Rome: Congregation for Catholic Education.
- Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. 2004. *Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic Church on the Collaboration of Men and Women in the Church and in the World*. Rome: Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.
- Curtis, Kristen Taylor, and Christofer G. Ellison. 2002. Religious heterogamy and marital conflict. *Journal of Family Issues* 23: 551–76. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Doherty, William J., Edward F. Kouneski, and Martha F. Erickson. 1998. Responsible fathering: An overview and conceptual framework. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 60: 277–92. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Dollahite, David, Loren Marks, and Hilary Dalton. 2018. Why Religion Helps and Harms Families: A Conceptual Model of a System of Dualities at the Nexus of Faith and Family Life. *Journal of Family Theory & Review* 10: 219–41.
- Dollahite, David, Loren Marks, and Kaity Young. 2017. Relational Struggles and Experiential Immediacy in Religious American Families. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality* 11: 9–21. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Ellison, Christofer G., and Linda K. George. 1994. Religious involvement, social ties, and social support in a southeastern community. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 33: 46–61. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Ellison, Christopher G., John P. Bartkowski, and Kristin L. Anderson. 1999. Are there religious variations in domestic violence? *Journal of Family Issues* 20: 87–113. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Faggioni, Maurizio Pietro. 2022. Teologia małżeństwa w adhortacjach Familiaris consortio i Amoris laetitia. *Aspekty duszpasterskie. Verbum Vitae* 40: 133–45. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Finke, Roger, and Amy Adamczyk. 2008. Cross-national moral beliefs: The influence of national religious context. *Sociological Quarterly* 49: 617–52. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
- Francis. 2016. *Amoris laetitia: Adhortatio apostolica post-synodalis episcopis presbyteris diaconis personis consecratis christianis coniugibus omnibus christifidelibus de amore in familia*. Vatican: Tipografia Vaticana.
- Gaudium et spes: Constitutio pastoralis de Ecclesia in mundo huius temporis. Sacrosanctum Concilium Oecumenicum Vaticanum II*. 1965. *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*. 58, pp. 1025–115. Available online: <https://www.cctwincities.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/Gaudium-et-Spes-Pastoral-Constitution-on-the-Church-in-the-Modern-World.pdf> (accessed on 12 October 2022).
- Goleń, Jacek. 2022. Ludzka seksualność w posoborowym nauczaniu Kościoła. *Verbum Vitae* 40: 1–19. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Goodman, Michael A., David C. Dollahite, Loren D. Marks, and Emily Layton. 2013. Religious Faith and Transformational Processes in Marriage. *Family Relations* 62: 808–23. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Granados, José. 2014. *Una sola carne in un solo spirito. Teologia del matrimonio*. Siena: Edizioni Cantagalli.

- Halman, Loek, and Erik Van Ingen. 2015. Secularization and changing moral views: European trends in church attendance and views on homosexuality, divorce, abortion, and euthanasia. *European Sociological Review* 31: 616–27. [CrossRef]
- Holdcroft, Barbara. 2006. What is religiosity? *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice* 10: 89–103. [CrossRef]
- Huber, Stefan, and Odilo W. Huber. 2012. The Centrality of Religiosity Scale (CRS). *Religions* 3: 710–24. [CrossRef]
- Jaspers, Eva, Marcel Lubbers, and Nan Dirk De Graaf. 2007. ‘Horrors of Holland’: Explaining attitude change towards euthanasia and homosexuals in The Netherlands, 1970–1998. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 19: 451–73. [CrossRef]
- John Paul II. 1980. The Human Person Becomes a Gift in the Freedom of Love. *Insegnamenti* III 1: 148.
- John Paul II. 1981. *Familiaris consortio*: Adhortatio apostolica de Familiae Christianae muneribus in mundo huius temporis. *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 74: 81–191.
- Kamiński, Ryszard. 2018. Pastoral Care of the Family—A Scientific Reflection. In *Catholic Family Ministry: The Scientific Reflection and the Practical Ministry of the Church*. Edited by Jacek Goleń, Ryszard Kamiński and Grzegorz Pyżlak. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, pp. 27–39.
- Kisemo, Benezeri, Magesa Laurenti, and Shorter Aylward. 2010. *African Cristian Marriage*. Nairobi: Paulines Publications Africa.
- Kobak, Jan. 2018. Anthropological Foundations. In *Catholic Family Ministry: The Scientific Reflection and the Practical Ministry of the Church*. Edited by Jacek Goleń, Ryszard Kamiński and Grzegorz Pyżlak. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, pp. 107–20.
- Koenig, Harold G., Michael E. McCollough, and David B. Larson. 2001. *Handbook of Religion and Health*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kowalski, Marcin. 2021. Odrzucenie praw Stwórcy i relacje homoseksualne w Rz 1,26–27. *Verbum Vitae* 39: 255–80. [CrossRef]
- La Loro Storia. n.d. Available online: <https://melamango.wordpress.com/la-nostra-storia/> (accessed on 21 November 2022).
- Lakatos, Csilla, and Martos Tamás. 2019. The Role of Religiosity in Intimate Relationships. *European Journal of Mental Health* 14: 260–79.
- Langlais, Mickael, and Sierra Schwanz. 2017. Religiosity and Relationship Quality of Dating Relationships: Examining Relationship Religiosity as a Mediator. *Religions* 8: 187. [CrossRef]
- Larson, Lyle E., and J. Walter Goltz. 1989. Religious participation and marital commitment. *Review of Religious Research* 30: 387–400. [CrossRef]
- Latifa, Rena, Salsabila Salsabila, and Heri Yulianto. 2021. Understanding the Relationship between Religiosity and Marital Commitment to Marital Stability: An Investigation on Indonesian Female Journalists. *Religions* 12: 242. [CrossRef]
- Lehrer, Evelyn L., and Carmel U. Chiswick. 1993. Religion as a determinant of marital stability. *Demography* 30: 385–403. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Liefbroer, Aart C., and Arieke J. Rijken. 2019. The Association between Christianity and Marriage Attitudes in Europe. Does Religious Context Matter? *European Sociological Review* 35: 363–79. [CrossRef]
- Mahoney, Annette, Kenneth I. Pargament, Nalini Tarakeshwar, and Aaron B. Swank. 2001. Religion in the home in the 1980s and 90s. *Journal of Family Psychology* 15: 559–96. [CrossRef]
- Manderson, Lenore, and Ellen Block. 2016. Relatedness and care in Southern Africa and beyond. *Social Dynamics* 42: 205–17. [CrossRef]
- Marks, Loren, David Dollahite, and Jacob Freeman. 2016. Faith in Family Life. In *Successful Marriages and Families: Proclamation Principles and Research Perspectives*. Edited by Alan J. Hawkins, Thomas Draper and David Dollahite. Provo: BYU Studies, pp. 185–95.
- Maxwell, Mark D., Sean D. Davis, Marianne Miller, and Scott Woolley. 2020. Covenant Attachment: A Constructivist Grounded Theory of Christian Couples and God. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy* 46: 110–23. [CrossRef]
- Moore, Laura M., and Reeve Vanneman. 2003. Context matters. Effects of the proportion of fundamentalists on gender attitudes. *Social Forces* 82: 115–39. [CrossRef]
- Mwangi, George, Salome Mwangi, and Peter Gichure. 2015. Caring for the Family. In *African Family Today*. Edited by Giuseppe Caramazza and Beatrice Churu. Nairobi: Paulines Publications Africa, pp. 51–63.
- Nambiri, Jane. 2017. Teaching and Learning Space: Towards Better Education for Children in Light of “Amoris Laetitia”. In *The Echo of “Amoris Laetitia” in Africa: Towards Living the “Joy of Love Experienced by Families” in the Church*. Nairobi: The Catholic University of Eastern Africa, pp. 297–319.
- Niścigorski, Wojciech. 2022. Religijność a przekonania dotyczące małżeństwa sakramentalnego. Studium empiryczne z duszpasterstwa rodzin na podstawie badań małżonków z diecezji Goroka w Papui Nowej Gwinei. Górna Grupa: Wydawnictwo Verbinum.
- Olson, Jonathan, James Marshall, H. Wallace Goddard, and David Schramm. 2015. Shared religious beliefs, prayer, and forgiveness as predictors of marital satisfaction. *Family Relations* 64: 519–33. [CrossRef]
- Padgett, Emily, Annette Mahoney, Kenneth Pargament, and Alfred DeMaris. 2019. Marital Sanctification and Spiritual Intimacy Predicting Married Couple. Observed Intimacy Skills across the Transition to Parenthood. *Religions* 10: 177. [CrossRef]
- Pearce, Lisa D., and Arland Thornton. 2007. Religious identity and family ideologies in the transition to adulthood. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 69: 1227–43. [CrossRef]
- Polak, Mieczysław. 2022. From “Familiaris Consortio” to “Amoris Laetitia”: Pope Francis’ Renewed Vision of the Pastoral Care of Families. *Verbum Vitae* 40: 407–21. [CrossRef]
- Pollard, Sara, Shelley Riggs, and Joshua Hook. 2014. Mutual Influences in Adult Romantic Attachment, Religious Coping, and Marital Adjustment. *Journal of Family Psychology* 28: 615–24. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

- Rose, Andrew, Shayne Anderson, Rick Miller, Loren Marks, Trevan Hatch, and Noel Card. 2018. Longitudinal Test of Forgiveness and Perceived Forgiveness as Mediators between Religiosity and Marital Satisfaction in Long-Term Marital Relationships. *The American Journal of Family Therapy* 46: 356–74. [CrossRef]
- Schools—Catholic Diocese of Meru. 2022. Available online: <https://catholicdioceseofmeru.org/schools/> (accessed on 23 September 2022).
- Sherkat, Darren, and Christopher G. Ellison. 1999. Recent developments and current controversies in the sociology of religion. *Annual Review of Sociology* 25: 363–94. [CrossRef]
- Słomkowski, Antoni. 2000. *Teologia życia duchowego w świetle Soboru Watykańskiego II*. Ząbki: Apostolicum.
- Spencer, Ashley Tuft, Loren D. Marks, David C. Dollahite, and Heather H. Kelley. 2021. Positive Relational Transformation in Religious Families: Supports and Catalysts for Meaningful Change. *Family Relations* 70: 1514–28. [CrossRef]
- Szymczak, Wioletta. 2020. Interdisciplinarity in Pastoral Theology: An Example of Socio-Theological Research. *Verbum Vitae* 38: 503–27. [CrossRef]
- Szymczak, Wioletta, Paweł Michał Mąkosa, and Tomasz Adamczyk. 2022. Attitudes of Polish Young Adults towards the Roman Catholic Church: A Sociological and Pastoral Analysis of Empirical Research among Young Adults and Teachers. *Religions* 13: 612. [CrossRef]
- Thomas, Darwin L., and Marie Cornwall. 1990. Religion and family in the 1980s: Discovery and development. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 52: 983–92. [CrossRef]
- Thornton, Arland. 1985. Changing attitudes toward separation and divorce: Causes and consequences. *American Journal of Sociology* 90: 856–72. [CrossRef]
- Vidal, Marciano. 2005. *Il matrimonio. Tra ideale cristiano e fragilità umana. Teologia, morale e pastorale*. Brescia: Editrice Queriniana.
- Wasik, Wojciech. 2021. The Concept of Matrimonial Consent in Can. 1057 CIC 1983. *Verbum Vitae* 39: 1217–32. [CrossRef]
- Wendołowska, Anna M., and Dorota Czyżowska. 2021. Centrality of Religiosity and Dyadic Coping in Close Romantic Relationships: Actor Partner Interdependence Mode. *Religions* 12: 978. [CrossRef]
- Wieradzka-Pilarczyk, Anna, and Hubert Pilarczyk. 2016. Problem dojrzałości osób przygotowujących się do sakramentu małżeństwa. *Teologia i Moralność* 2: 163–80. [CrossRef]
- Wilkins-LaFlamme, Sarah. 2016. Secularization and the wider gap in values and personal religiosity between the religious and nonreligious. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 55: 717–36. [CrossRef]
- Willits, Fern K., and Donald M. Crider. 1988. Religion and well-being: Men and women in the middle years. *Review of Religious Research* 29: 281–94. [CrossRef]

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.