Religious Individualization among Muslims in the Netherlands and Belgium

An Analysis of Theoretical Approaches

Marigje Penard

Master Thesis
Religies in
Hedendaagse
Samenlevingen

Faculty of Humanities
Utrecht University

June, 2014

Supervised by:
Dr. Welmoet Boender
Second reader:
Dr. Christoph Baumgartner

Abstract

This thesis critically analyses theoretical approaches of various social scientific scholars within different sub-disciplines on religious individualization among Muslims in the Netherlands and Belgium. Based upon pluralist epistemological perspectives I argued that, by critically assessing and comparing different studies on the same subject, our understanding of that subject can be enhanced, individual limitations can be overcome, and new research questions can be formulated for future research. Nadia Fadil proposed a reading of religious individualization as a form of liberal governmentality, which results in a set of techniques that regulates (religious) ethical positioning in relation to power structures. I have enriched her insights by relating it to complementary insights in the social scientific field of study on religiosity and religious individualization among Muslims in the Netherlands. I suggested that Fadil's approach can be enriched by giving attention to the manner in which social identities, cognitive mechanisms, and social contexts inform and influence the self, ethical subjectivation and religious conduct. Her propositions on power relations can be enriched by considering the manner in which an internalized understanding of power systems develops, assessing how childhood socialization, cultural bonds, identity politics and repertoires can be of importance to this, determining different types of authority structures and unfold their influence structurally. The precise interrelation between power structures and the self and their influence on ethical substance and religious conduct can be resolved more comprehensively in future studies. Likewise, future theoretical approaches to religious individualization can incorporate the abovementioned insights.

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

1 Introduction

The topic of secularization is highly debated within religious studies. Although, the original thesis −with modernity religion will disappear− has been refuted, discussion about secularization is far from over. Numerous theories regarding decline of religiosity in Western Europe or religious stability elsewhere have been proposed, while others have either revised the thesis or rejected it all together.

At the heart of the debate lies the quest of understanding a decline of Christianity in Western Europe. Casanova (1994), proposed several distinct and independent secularization processes. Namely, the differentiation between secular spheres and religious institutions and norms; the marginalization of religion to a private sphere and a decline of religion beliefs and practices (Casanova, 1994, p. 122). From then onwards, specific attention has been given to individualization of religion, to autonomous negotiation of religiosity and authenticity in religious understanding and experience. Charles Taylor (2007) proposed an historical based comprehension of the retreat of Christendom the last century. According to him, society has moved into an 'age of authenticity'. This is an age of expressive individualism and a search for an authentic lifestyle, in which religiosity is a personal choice rather than given by institutional authorities. It is in particular this authenticity ideal that is a thriving principle in our current 'secular age'.

With rising numbers of Muslim migrants in Western Europe a new dimension has been brought to the secularization debate. Muslim terrorist attacks, such as 9/11, but also the murder of Theo van Gogh in the Netherlands, gave rise to fearing fundamentalism and orthodoxy. As a result, developments in religiosity among Muslims have been tracked closely. How does the religiosity of Muslims migrants develop? Will living in a secularized context alter religiosity among those migrants? And considering the religious developments of Muslim migrants, what insights can be given to the secularization debate?

My research will be exactly at the crossroads between the theoretical secularization discourse on the one hand, and studies concerning the Muslim minority context in the Netherlands and Belgium on the other hand. I intend to analyze various contemporary social scientific studies on religiosity and identity construction of Muslims that all use different methodologies. I aim to clarify and deepen our understanding of religious individualization by performing an analytical inquiry on the theoretical approaches of these studies. However, before I will elucidate my research intention into depth, some clarifications on secularization and Islam need to be made. I will give brief overviews of religion and Islam in the Netherlands in paragraph 1.1. In paragraph 1.2 to 1.4 some prominent concerns within the secularization discourse will be addressed. Paragraph 1.5 contains an exposition of my research design and research questions.

1.1 Religion and Islam in the Netherlands

The religious landscape in the Netherlands has changed dramatically over the last century. Until the mid 20th century, the Dutch religious-, social and political landscape was characterized by a 'pillarized' system (*verzuiling* in Dutch). Differentiation of religion and in particular conflicts between different religious movements had led to a highly segregated society according to religion or ideology. The four 'pillars'; the Protestant, Catholic, Social-Democratic and Liberal/Neutral pillar, structured life, hence each accounting for own schooling, social clubs, grocery stores, newspapers, political parties and so on (van Slotboom & van Voorst, 2002). After the Second World War, this pillarized system collapsed, and meanwhile a process of dechurching (*ontkerklijking* in Dutch*)* took place. The percentage of citizens that do not belong to one of the Christian churches in the Netherlands has increased from 24% in 1958 to about 60% in 2002, according to Houtman and Mascini (2002). Although, exact numbers differ per study, it is apparent that increasing numbers of people have changed their opinions about religion, are less affiliated with religion and are not going to church anymore. Knippenberg states that the Netherlands is one of the most secular countries in the world. Yet, although the Christian community is declining in numbers, the Muslim community is growing (Knippenberg, 1998).

The Netherlands is traditionally a country of emigration and immigration. In need of cheap labor force, the Netherlands welcomed immigrants from Muslim countries, during the 1960s. Currently, the Netherlands is an ethnically diverse country which hosts populations from different cultural and religious backgrounds, mainly from the Indonesian Republic, Turkey, Morocco, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles. In total about 3.5 million people (about 21% of the Dutch population) are considered immigrants or 'allochthonous', based on their own birth or that of one or both of their parents outside the Netherlands. The majority of this group consists of Turks and Moroccans, both groups numbering almost 400.000 (CBS, 2014).

Among other countries, the Netherlands adopted multiculturalism from the beginning of the major migrant influxes; endorsing and institutionalizing pluralism. Expecting a return to the country of origin, migrants were stimulated to keep their own cultural practices and were prevented from assimilating to the Dutch society. Later, multicultural policies were adopted out of principle, from a cultural relativistic point of view (de Jong, 2008), and supporting minority groups' right to maintain their own cultural practices (Sniderman & Hagendoorn, 2007). Central Dutch values of tolerance and acceptance of pluralism were considered to be at the foundation of 'our' multicultural society.

Although, multiculturalism can offer minority groups the opportunity to maintain their own culture which is essential for the development of a positive ethnic identity for minority groups, it can also

pose a threat for majority groups and it can be problematic for the cohesion in society (Joppke, 2004; Sniderman & Hagendoorn, 2007; Verkuyten, 2006). Studies within the Netherlands have shown the failure of the endorsement of multiculturalism and the increase of values' conflicts between Muslim and Dutch communities (Joppke, 2004; Sniderman & Hagendoorn, 2007; Verkuyten, 2006). Indeed, at the turn of the 21th century, the previous celebrated adoption of multiculturalism came under increasing attack. The multicultural politics of the 80s and 90s were viewed to create exclusion and division instead of inclusion, what the policy makers hoped for. The resentment towards minorities already present among many Dutch majority members was sparked by Pim Fortuyn, a charismatic politician, campaigning against multiculturalism. He gave a voice to growing feelings of antipathy about the lack of assimilation of foreigners. From then onwards, the position of minorities became increasingly marginalized (Hylarides, 2005).

Various incidents intensified a perception of incompatibility between majority and minority groups. In particular, the killing of Dutch movie maker Theo van Gogh, by a Moroccan-Dutch Muslim has sparked resentment towards Islam. The attacker, Mohammed Bouyeri, was labeled a terrorist and joined the list of Muslims fundamentalists who killed in name of their religion, like Mohamed Atta and Mohammed Sidique Khan, involved respectively in 9/11 and the suicide bombings in London of July 7th 2005.

Within a decade, the public opinion towards Islam changed from tolerating it as part of multiculturalism, towards it being an obstacle to integration or even dangerous for the stability and safety in the Netherlands. Public opinion has been associating Islam with it being a backward religion, hampering integration and equating it with violence and extremism. The Islam debate has become increasingly inspired by fear and resentment, in which the headscarf has become symbolic for the problematic position of women in Islam; it has been equated with oppression and violence towards women. Wilders, a right-wing politician, continuously criticized Islam. He infamously called for a 'kopvodden tax', using a derogatory term for headscarf and asking to put a tax on wearing it. Yet, other issues as Islam's problematic stance towards homosexuals and Islam being a threat to the democratic liberal state were often subjects within the public debate about Islam (Peters & Vellenga, 2007).

Interestingly, Bracke (2013) argues that the Dutch multicultural model is closely linked to its history of pillarization. Ethnic minority policies developed in the 1970s reflected, according to Bracke, the accommodation of pluralism that was characteristic of the pillarized system. The process of de-pillarization was highly discussed in public debate, linking it to a decline in church membership, liberation from religion and to a sexual revolution. In this transformation towards a liberal and

secular society 'Muslims came to be understood as a rejection of this 'Dutch way of life' and Islam came to be stand-in for theft of enjoyment' (Bracke, 2013, p. 218). Yet, Bracke indicates that the collapse of the pillarized system was not followed by a change in state policies towards religion. She argues that only recently, in light of a call of Muslim integration, the pillarized system is further delegitimized. In relation to the Islam a shift developed in state-regulatory practices; 'a more significant transformation of the Dutch secular arrangement occurred in relation to 'the multicultural debate' and the question of Islam in the Netherlands' (Bracke, 2013, p. 225).

Besides migrants and Islam being a heightened topic in public debate, developments within minority groups are subject of study within the social sciences as well. Such studies have, among other things, focused on changes and continuities in cultural orientation of immigrants by looking at their acculturation status (Berry, 2005). Moreover, developments in social economic status, education level, language proficiency, social capital, well-being, etc. of migrants has been investigated extensively (see e.g. Stevens, Vollebergh, Pels, & Crijnen, 2007; van Tubergen, 2006). Likewise, religious developments among migrants are monitored closely. Considering the secular context of the Netherlands and fearing extremism, both secularization and fundamentalization tendencies among Muslims are scrutinized.

1.2 Secularization, Secularism and the Secular

The secularization thesis attempts to describe a decline of religiosity, or a change of the social significance or religion in everyday life (Steve Bruce, 2011). Peter Berger was probably one of the first and foremost scholars to describe secularization as a progressive theory. Due to increasing scientific knowledge, industrial capitalism and modernization societies would become gradually more secular, leading to a disappearance of religion (Berger, 1967). Peter Berger proposed an encompassing sociological theory in which he described secularization as a process 'by which sectors of society and culture are removed from the domination of religious institution and symbols' (Berger, 1967, p. 107). Yet, he acknowledges that secularization is not just a social-structural process, but also a subjective one, as increasing numbers of individual lives are not shaped by religion anymore.

Although, secularization theory as decline of the social significance of religion is still discussed and defended (Steve Bruce, 2011), many scholars have highly criticized such progressive understanding. In particular the context of the United States, in which church attendance did not decline like it did in Western-Europe, is considered to be an example of religious vitality. The case of the United States led to a revision by Peter Berger of his original thesis. A lengthy discussion regarding European or American exceptionalism followed, in which the difference between the two is, for example, attempted to be explained by means of rational choice theory, religious market theory, different

historical processes between the two, or different church-state relations (Berger, Davie, & Fokas, 1998; Davie, 2006). Moreover, other religious developments as religious revival in Pentacostal, Charismatic and Easternization movements raised further questions regarding a progressive reading of secularization theory (Campbell, 2007; Canton Delgado, 2010; Hocken, 2006), as did accounts on variation in patterns of religious participation and church-state relations between European countries (Casanova, 1994).

Important revisions of the theory have been proposed, shaping a different light on the definition and meaning of secularization. Demerath calls for an understanding of secularization as religious change, rather than religious demise (Demerath, 1998). However, secularization theory does not stop there. As mentioned above, Casanova (1994) made an important contribution to the discussion by suggesting several distinct and independent secularization processes. Likewise, Dobbelaere put forward the multidimensionality of the concept (Chaves, 1998). Not only did he specify secularization as task to sort out patterns of religion on the societal, organization and individual level and secularization as a decrease of religion's social authority, but also secularization as social project.

A distinction should be made between secularization used as a descriptive term, and, secularism referring to an ideological perspective in which actors advocate a society which is not bound by religion. In this latter respect, secularism becomes a political project (Chaves, 1998; Wilson, 1998). It is important to be aware of the possible politicization of the concept and potential evaluative use of it, both in analyzing secularization research of others, as in using the concept oneself. Within the scientific study of religion, secularization should, in my view, be primarily used as an analytical concept. Secularization theory, in this regard, should describe contemporary changes in religiosity as objectively and neutrally as possible.

This is even more of a concern in studying developments within Islam in Europe. Especially within the public debate a 'backward' or 'dangerous' Islam is often presented against a so called 'neutral' secular European society. Not only can one risk Enlightenment thinking, Western ethnocentrism or even racism; one could raise questions whether there is such a thing as 'the secular'.

The secular refers to a state of being, hence of being non-religious. Thus, a society in which the public space is non-religious. Capucao argues that the Dutch society- which is in general considered to be highly secular- is bound to the Judeo-Christian tradition. This tradition is at the core of Dutch civil religion, which permeates the entire Dutch society (Capucao, 2010). Davie on the other hand put forward the concept of 'believing without belonging'; as a majority of the (British) population is still attached to some form of religiosity, although they are not necessarily affiliated to a church tradition.

Moreover, she described a tendency where religion is performed by an active minority with the knowledge and the approval of a passive majority, namely vicarious religion (Davie, 2006). Also Fadil, makes a strong argument against the perception of 'the secular' as neutral terrain (Fadil, 2008, p. 371).

1.3 Modernity versus Post-Modernity

Above I touched upon some of the theoretical issues concerning the conceptualization of secularization and the distinction between secularization, secularism and the secular. A review of the entire discourse is beyond the scope of my research. As may have become clear, the initial core premise of secularization theory was a disappearance of religion with modernity. Clearly, the religious landscape has changed dramatically over the last century. Modernity saw some important developments which lead to a change in perception regarding religion. According to Dobbelaere (2002), who undertook a socio-structural analysis of secularization, at the core of this change lays a structural differentiation of religion. This, subsequently, opened the door for a process of religious individualization in which religion is increasingly experienced and negotiated individually (Dobbelaere, 2002).

Heelas (1998), connects differentiation processes to both modern and postmodern societal development, yet importantly, he argues that simultaneously dedifferentiation tendencies took place. By disassembling modern and postmodern differentiation and dedifferentiation processes, he is able to show their interrelation. Modernity is characterized by a differentiation; namely a separation between religion state and religion, and the emergence of an individual religion. Yet, a countervailing dedifferentiation tendency occurred simultaneously. Awareness arose that human beings are the same and thus equal; differences are culturally bound. A strong positivism was its foundation, namely the idea that there is a 'Truth' and that it can be known. Hence, an ethic of humanity developed, namely, the search for core principles connecting all human beings. Related to this is a shift from exclusivist to inclusivist stances towards other religions. Behind a mask of (cultural) diversity, a same spirituality can be found in all traditions. The pluralism thesis goes even further, attempting to make a case for unity, or shared core, within and across religions. The basic premise is that at the heart all religions are a representation of the same Ultimate Reality, or as Hick calls it, 'the Real an sich' (Race, 2001; Vroom, 2006).

In post-modernity this search of an overarching core of humanity or of religion is abandoned by some as the existence of any such thing as a 'Truth' is questioned. Grand narratives are met with skepticism, while continuing fragmentations and deregulations are acknowledged. Differences are

considered to be incomparable and insurmountable; differences are simply differences. This is at the heart of cultural relativism (Heelas, 1998).

Structural differentiation leads to a weakening of identification with a church, a change in church-state relationships, an estrangement from the ethics and authority of churches and hence, its authority in and control over society. Indeed, deregulation and differentiation relate to diminishing compliance with authority structures. According to Taylor (2007), a shift occurred from an age of mobilization; distinguished by a cultural and sexual revolution in which individual autonomy is embraced, to an age of authenticity; in which individual self-fulfillment is prominent. Clearly, in post modernity the construction of one's own identity is emphasized, which can be seen in expressive individualism; a search for authenticity, for finding oneself, being oneself and being true to oneself (Heelas, 1998; Taylor, 2007). The age of authenticity is mostly a retreat of Christendom instead of a disappearance of religion, according to Taylor. Religion will not just disappear; rather a subjective, personal spirituality outside the church will grow. The result is a change of the place of religion in society and in personal lives (Taylor, 2007).

1.4 Religious Individualism and Liberalism

Important is that the differentiation and detraditionalization of society are considered to be a pre-condition to a development of (religious) individualization. Individualization is by many defined as a process of social change; a development in which bonds with social groups become loose, power structures lose influence, and traditions become less enforcing. As a consequence individuals are considered to be free agents who can make own decisions (Dobbelaere, 2001, 2002). Yet, individualization is a complex multilayered concept. Lukes (1973) discusses the concept descriptively by emphasizing several core facets of its modern understanding. I will discuss some of these shortly.

First, Lukes discerns a moral principle, namely, individual human beings have intrinsic, supreme value. This principle is historically based, grounded in biblical descriptions of the human being and its relation to God and Jesus, but probably best expressed, according to him, by Kant in his assertion that man exist as an objective end in himself. Kant has contributed greatly to our thinking about the modern self, as having agency and autonomous will. Here, we come to a second principle of individualism; the notion of autonomy and self-control. Lukes indicates that this is, again, rooted in Christianity, conveyed by Thomas van Aquino in his claim that individuals have to examine their actions with the knowledge they are given from God. Spinoza and Kant took this further. Man has freedom to use the power of thought, to be a thinking being, and to have autonomy of will (Lukes, 1973). Here, a connection with liberalism is easily made; individuals are free thinking individuals, who can act upon their will. They are their own master and can self-direct. Indeed, central to liberalism is

this notion of autonomy, individuals have the capacity to make own choices and decisions, to reflect upon them and act according to their will. According to Taylor (2007), autonomy is especially related to break from traditional power structures in the 60's and 70's, during what he calls the 'age of mobilization', which most of all led to alienation from the traditional Christian church. Now, a third notion of individualism needs to be discussed. People should be able to have a private existence, separated from the public world. A distinction is made between the private and the public sphere. This notion of privacy is expressed in the call for civil liberties and rights and protection against infringement of authorities, as well as the notion of individual sovereignty or individual independence and individual liberty to have one's own thoughts, feeling and opinions. This is according to Lukes (1973) essentially a modern idea, although it can be traced back to a cultivation of an inner sphere in Christian mysticism, or to Roman Epicureanism. Nevertheless, the conceptualization of a private sphere that should be free from the public realm is a modern, liberal idea and relates closely to political notions of individualism. In French this is probably taken the furthest in the principle of 'laicité'. The public sphere is expected to be completely neutral, exempt from any religious influences. A last element of individualism I want to discuss is the notion of self-development. This has mostly a Romantic origin. Here, self-fulfillment, self-realization and self-enrichment are important goals in life. Evidently, this is a psychological notion of individualism. The pursuit of happiness or strive for one's own well-being is surely considered to be crucial in modernity.

These aspects of individualism are also expressed in religious individualism. Lukes, defines religious individualism 'as the view that the individual believer does not need intermediaries, that he has the primary responsibility for his own spiritual destiny, that he has the right and the duty to come to his own relationship with his God in his own way and by his own effort' (Lukes, 1973, p. 94). Clearly, also within religion, individuals are considered to be autonomous agents who experience a personal spiritual development. Authority structures as the church have diminishing influence on personal identities. Due to a permeable demarcation between denominations, movement between them is possible; as is the assemblage of one's own religiosity out of elements from various traditions. The latter is described with the term 'religious bricolage' by Hervieu-Leger. Evidently, religion is experienced personally.

Although, Lukes provides a clear-cut overview of various elements of individualism, and place those elements into a historical framework, Charles Taylor ,in his book *'Sources of the Self'* (1989) is able to provide a more encompassing understanding of the development of the modern self throughout history. He is able to identify the various shifts in thinking about the self over time and shows their

interrelatedness. He argues that the development of the self is historically based and not naturally given; he makes a strong case against the study of man primarily from within natural sciences. Rather, he emphasizes the importance of society in the development of individual meaning and identity. According to him, you can only understand the modern self when understanding how it relates to developments in thinking about morality. He discerns three moral frameworks construing modern identity; beliefs about the value of human life, about what kind of life is worth living and beliefs that pervade our choices and actions. Taylor attempts to sort out the conditions to which these frameworks arose. The awareness of a distinction between inner thoughts and feelings, and the outer material world is a key element to this. In the course of history a shift took place from placing the 'Good' in the cosmos, to internalization of morality. According to Taylor, Augustine was one of the first in whose writing an inner reflectivity can be found. He continues with a lengthy historical account of the development of the modern self. Overall he indicates three sources for our current moral standards: theism, naturalist rationality and romantic expressionism. Relevant for my discussion is that he pinpointed to a new understanding of the wording of the modern self. Not only does he emphasize the importance of social and societal developments, he recognizes the importance of morality for understanding the modern self.

In his book 'a Secular Age' (2007), he continues his analysis of the modern self (and its position in modern society). He takes the notion of individualism further to include an authenticity ideal. Charles Taylor describes this 'culture of authenticity' as 'the understanding of life…that each one of us has his/her own way of realizing our humanity, and that it is important to find and live out one's own, as against surrendering to conformity with a model imposed on us from outside, by society, or the previous generation, or religious or political authority' (Taylor, 2007, p. 475). This does not only relate to an expressive individualism in which one has the liberty to cultivate and express the self through which one can realize well-being and spiritual growth (Dobbelaere, 2001), it goes further by describing an ethic of authenticity. Self-expression is not only a choice, but has become an obligation; one is expected to realize oneself and to convey this realization. In this manner, Taylor connects developments on thinking about the self and perceptions on morality.

Yet, in 'a Secular Age', Taylor also wrote an encompassing historically based sociological account attempting to explain a move from religion to a humanistic alternative. He does not only contribute to our thinking about the self and its place in society, he also attempts to explain the change in Western society in which it used to be virtually impossible not to belief in God to it being an option of many. He does this by making a strong argument against what he calls '*substraction stories*' (Taylor, 2007, p. 22). With this he means the current dominant explanation of modernity or secularization as

liberation from earlier limiting ideas or restricting sets of knowledge. According to him it is more complex. The root of secularization, according to him, lies in a change of the self living in an enchanted world in which the self was susceptible to forces and spirits, to a self living in a disenchanted world. The place of human in society has altered form one embedded in society, which is in turn embedded in a cosmos which is incorporated into the divine, to one where humans are individuals and separate from God and the cosmos. Secularization is thus not simply a structural differentiation of society, or primarily the result of rational thinking which does not allow for the existence of a God, but rather is related to historical shifts in thinking about the self. The last century saw a shift from an age of mobilization to expressive individualism in which an ethic of authenticity is guiding and structuring individual lives.

Above I have given an overview of current concerns within the secularization discourse. Again, a complete understanding of all the changes in religion and the place of religion in society is beyond the scope of this project. In the next paragraph I will explicate my research plan and research questions.

1.5 Research design

As may have become clear, the discussion on secularization ranges from investigating contemporary religious developments in its broadest scope to examining the meaning of the concept or even questioning whether there is any such thing as secularization or the secular. Without going further into this discussion and limiting myself to the Western European context, I think it is apparent that Western European societies and religions in those societies are going to drastic changes. This leaves me, and with me many others puzzled as how to understand those changes.

Moreover, within the social sciences and humanities extensive discussions are being held on understanding the modern self and its placement in our modern (secular) society. With increasing numbers of Muslims living in Western European countries, this discussion is brought to a new dimension. Questions are raised on how religiosity among Muslims develops, how their (religious) identity formation takes place and how this can be understood? How does their religiosity and identity formation relate to, or is altered, by the Western European context? What is the relevance of secularization (given the Western Christian foundation of the discourse) to the context of Islam and what possible insights can this Islamic context give to the secularization discourse? And likewise what insights can be given to our understanding of (religious) individualization given the context of Islam in Western Europe?

My aim is to investigate current new contributions to the discussion on religious individualization of second generation Muslims in Western-Europe. How does research within various social scientific disciplines contribute to the academic discussion on religious individualization? In what manner are research methodologies connected to theoretical perspectives on individualization? And how can social scientific studies from within different sub-disciplines, through comparison, enrich our understanding of religious individualization?

This research aspires to bring together social scientific studies from various disciplines on the same subject in order to enhance the discussion on religious individualization, to critically assess it and to provide a better understanding on the subject at hand. This will be done by taking Nadia Fadil's (2008) dissertation as starting point. Subsequently, I will compare her theoretical approach and methodology to that of four social scientists, namely to Maykel Verkuyten (2005), Mieke Maliepaard (2012), Martijn de Koning (2008) and Welmoet Boender (2007). Each of these scholars are currently conducting research among Maghrebi in the Netherlands or Belgium, yet do so from various perspectives, from within different social scientific disciplines, and use different research methods. I will analytically enquire and critically asses their theoretical approaches, methodologies and research findings. In doing so, I intend to disentangle this divided field of study, while simultaneously attempting to further and deeper our understanding of religious individualization.

The central question is therefore: *To what extent could Fadil's approach towards religious individualization be enriched by complementary insights in the contemporary social scientific field and how can these complementary insights contribute to a better understanding of religious individualization?*

I will address this central question by subdividing it into three sub-questions:

– *How can Fadil's conceptualization and operationalization of secularization and religious individualization be enriched by conceptualizations and operationalizations of Verkuyten and Maliepaard?* (chapter 2)
– *How can suggestions on the self and identity formation by Verkuyten, Maliepaard and de Koning enrich Fadil's conceptualization of the (religious) self?* (chapter 3)
– *How can suggestions on authority structures by Boender, de Koning and Maliepaard enrich Fadil's proposition on power relations?* (chapter 4)

As a review of the entire study-field on religious individualization is beyond the scope of this thesis, I will limit myself to the work of the above mentioned scholars. Below, I will explicate my choice for these social scientists, as well as, elucidating my sub-questions and providing a chapter overview.

Nadia Fadil (2008) conducted research on the intersect between secularization, religious individualization and the Muslim context in Western Europe. Her work is relevant for answering the central question, as she undertakes her investigation from a specific, Foucaultian angle. Her distinctive, post-structural theoretical and -methodological approach makes it relevant to compare and relate it to other social scientific endeavors on the same topic. Moreover, her research is interesting and inspiring given that she proposes a new conceptualization of secularization and religious individualization.

Fadil continues the discussion on thinking about the modern self and its relation to society –as carried out by Charles Taylor, Steve Bruce and Karel Dobbelaere amongst others– to the context of individual religious trajectories of Muslims in Belgium (Steve Bruce, 2011; Dobbelaere, 2001, 2002; Taylor, 1989, 2007). She carried out 57 interviews among second generation Maghrebi in Belgium. By using a discursive methodology in her research, she attempts to disentangle the patterns and structures beneath their vocabularies. In doing so, she intends to map out their religious trajectories, as well as providing insights into the regulatory ideals that shape those trajectories. She indicates that a liberal understanding of the self is guiding the regulation of religious experience and conduct. Hence, religious individualization should be understood as set of vocabularies and techniques that subscribe a liberal regulatory ideal. In the forthcoming chapters I will elaborate further on her ideas on religious individualization.

To me, her contribution seems to be important, shedding a different light on the secularization and individualization debate. Yet, naturally this raises questions to the relevance of her research. How can we relate other scholarly findings on secularization and religious individualization (among second generation Muslims) to her research findings? And what implication does her (poststructuralist) research method have on her findings and suggestions? As she conducts her research among Maghrebi, has a distinctive theoretical and methodological approach and suggest a new conceptualization of religious individualizations, I find it suitable to take up her work as foundation for my thesis.

In analyzing Fadil's dissertation, I discerned three distinct, yet interrelated aspects that are in my view at the basis to contemporary social scientific discussions on religious individualization. Firstly, studies diverge in their conceptualizations of secularization and religious individualization and depending on this, they use different research methodologies. Secondly, various studies have different views on the self or identity formation. Lastly, a significant part of the discussion is related to the views on the relationship between the self and society, more specifically to the role of power

relations. In my thesis I will attempt to disentangle these elements in order to clarify the debate on religious individualization and discuss them separately in the chapter two to four.

Fadil's approach to these elements will be discussed in relation to four scholars, namely to Maykel Verkuyten, Mieke Maliepaard, Martijn de Koning and Welmoet Boender.

Maykel Verkuyten (2005) has a multidimensional approach towards identity formation among Muslims in the Netherlands. In his book, 'The Social Psychology of Ethnic Identity' he reviews contemporary social psychological perspectives on identity formation among migrant groups, as well as, discusses studies he conducted on this matter, using various methodologies. His elaborate insights on identity formation and his methodological insights, I believe, could enrich our discussion on religious individualization. Therefore, I find it relevant to relate him to the approaches of Fadil.

Mieke Maliepaard (Maliepaard & Gijsberts, 2012; Maliepaard, 2012) carried out elaborate studies on religiosity among Turkish- and Moroccan-Dutch, both for her dissertation, and in commission of the SCP (the Netherlands Institute of Social Research) in which she specifically investigates secularization and religious revitalization. She conducts quantitative research, and in doing so, contrasts with Fadil's discursive methodology. Moreover, she has a different conceptualization of secularization compared to Fadil. I therefore, find it significant to discuss Maliepaard in this thesis.

Martijn de Koning (Koning de, 2008) conducted ethnographic research among Muslim youth in Gouda, the Netherlands, studying identity strategies. His elaborate insights on identity formation among Muslims, and his analysis of significant 'others' in relation to which the youngsters develop their identity, makes it relevant to relate him to Fadil. I believe he can enhance our discussion, both on the self (chapter three) and on power relations (chapter four).

Welmoet Boender (2007) has done an elaborate study on the role of the Imam in Dutch society by studying the public debate and conducting case studies in three mosques and a Muslim student organization. She provides a detailed and structured account on the role of Imam. She can augment our comprehension of power relations. I find it, therefore, important to relate her insights to those of Fadil power structures (chapter four).

In chapter two I will discuss Fadil's conceptualization and operationalization of secularization and religious individualization in-depth. She approaches this discussion from a Foucaultian perspective. Moreover, she uses a distinct research method, namely a discursive analysis of the interviews she conducted. Her specific research angle is connected to her conceptualization of religious individualization. I intend to relate her conceptualization and operationalization to that of Verkuyten

and Maliepaard. I only discuss these two, as their views regarding individualization and their methodologies are most distinct from Fadil. Boender and de Koning do have different focal points compared to Fadil which I will reveal in the discussion on the self or on authority structures. The sub-question addressed in this chapter is: *How can Fadil's conceptualization and operationalization of secularization and religious individualization be enriched by that of Verkuyten and Maliepaard?* My intent is to clarify and lay barren some of the theoretical and methodological differences between those studies and to seek a manner in which they can aid each other.

Closely, related to this discussion on religious individualization are two important, interrelated aspects; views on the self and on the relationship between the self and society. In chapter three I will discuss Fadil's contribution on the construction of the (religious) self. She attempts to unfold the discursive mechanisms that guide the development of the self of Maghrebi and investigates the manner in which secularization can both produce and regulate subjectivities. She, particularly, looks at how religious and secular practices are guided by a liberal regulatory ideal of autonomy and authenticity and finds that orthodox conduct does not necessarily sit at odds with liberal agency. Hence, she is able to disentangle praxis from the rationale behind the praxis. Fadil's Foucaultian approach allows her to examine discursive structures of her interlocuter's narratives. Yet, she has a very specific approach to investigating the construction of the self, namely by focusing on a liberal regulatory ideal. Maykel Verkuyten (Verkuyten, 2005) conducted research on identity formation among Muslims in the Netherlands from various methodologies, advocating a multidimensional approach. His social psychological studies can possibly give more information on identity construction, negotiation and consolidation within this group. Likewise, Mieke Maliepaard (Maliepaard & Gijsberts, 2012; Maliepaard, 2012) studied religiosity among Turkish- and Moroccan-Dutch in which she looks closely at religious- and ethnic identity formation. Lastly, Martijn de Koning (Koning de, 2008) studies identity strategies among Moroccan youth in Gouda. These three researchers will be examined in relation to Nadia Fadil's suggestions on (religious) individualization and conceptualization of the self. Each of these three contributed to our understanding of identity formation among Muslims in the Netherlands, however undertook their study from within different disciplines and used other research methods than Nadia Fadil. Comparing the four will, therefore, most likely shed a different light on the subject, providing the opportunity to answer the sub-question: H*ow can suggestions on the self and identity formation by Verkuyten, Maliepaard and de Koning enrich Fadil's conceptualization of the (religious) self?* In chapter three this question will be addressed.

A third aspect of Fadil's thesis, is her proposition on power relations. She proposes a new approach in thinking about power relations between individuals and authority structures. She argues that individualization is not at odds with power structures; rather individuals are free to relate to them on their own terms. This is described by liberal governmentality, which entails certain techniques of governance by institutions, as well as techniques of individuals to self-direct. Religious individualization, according to her, points, foremost, to a problematization of particular authority structures. In viewing individualization in this manner and by adopting the discursive tradition, she lays open the rationale behind these problematizations and is able to show Islam as field of contestation. I will attempt to deepen her discussion on the relation of the self and authority structures on three aspects: the Imam as authority figure, internet as source of authority and the relationship between parent- and child religiosity. Welmoet Boender (2007) conducted an elaborate study on the role of the Imam in Dutch society by studying the public debate and conducting case studies in three mosques and a Muslim student organization. This can provide a deeper insight on the contestation of the role of the Imam. Martijn de Koning (2008) gave attention to internet as authority source for Muslim youth and their search for pure Islam. Lastly, Mieke Maliepaard (Maliepaard & Gijsberts, 2012; Maliepaard, 2012) investigated the relation between parent and child's religiosity. Each of these three raised awareness on specific power structures in Islam and can, therefore, enhance Fadil's comprehension on the relation between the individual and sources of authority. This is only a selected reading on power structures and the list is not exhaustive. I choose specifically to go into these three aspects, as Boender, de Koning and Maliepaard elaborated on these specific power structures in-depth. Moreover, each of these three sources of contestation –the role of the Imam, parent-child religiosity and internet– are notable fields of study within the social sciences. In chapter four attention will be given to authority structures in Islam, attempting to answer the sub-question: *How can suggestions on authority structures by Boender, de Koning and Maliepaard enrich Fadil's proposition on power relations?*

The above mentioned three aspects are intertwined, enhancing the complexity of Fadil's thesis and the subject matter at hand. Nevertheless, in order to answer the main question it is necessary to disentangle it into delineated subsections; providing structure and demarcation. I have selected the focal aspects of Fadil's dissertation and discuss them in the chapter two to four. In chapter five, the concluding chapter, the central question will be answered. This will be done by conducting an analytical inquiry of the current social scientific debate on religious identification among Muslims in Western-Europe. By bringing together studies from various disciplines and comparing them, I intend to trace this field of knowing that is utterly divided. I intend to show the diverse perspectives, but in doing so I hope to contribute to our understanding of this field. I will argue that the various

conceptualizations and methodologies do not necessarily exclude each other, rather, and in that sense I advocate an epistemological pluralism, each contributes to our understanding. By bringing them together and critically analyzing them they can aid each other.

Before I will embark on answering my research questions, some clarifications need to be made on the comparability of the Dutch and Belgium Muslim population and how I address religion and Islam. The scholars I discuss conducted research among Muslim populations in the Netherlands and Belgium. Although, the two countries have divergent histories and differ in their church-state relationships, there is similarity in the position Muslims uptake in the two countries. I, therefore, treat the work of Fadil, Verkuyten, Maliepaard, de Koning and Boender as comparable. For a better account on the difference and similarities between the Belgium and Dutch Islamic context I refer to Shadid and van Koningsveld (2008).

Even though Islamic developments in Belgium and the Netherlands may be comparable, I do want to stress that there is great diversity in religious interpretations and practices between Muslims living in the two countries. Moreover, Muslims living in these countries have different cultural and ethnical backgrounds. In this regard it is problematic to speak of 'an Islam'; it consisting out of a unified group of people. Moroccan and Turkish Muslims represent the majority of Muslim in the Netherlands and Belgium, and, hence, most studies are conducted among these groups. Yet, among them are groups who differ in their religious ideologies, as for example, Shiites, Sunnites, Salafists, Wahabists and other groups (Koning de, 2008 bijlage II; Shadid, 1991).

This variety in interpretation and practices makes it difficult to make a clear-cut definition of Islam. With Talal Asad approaching Islam as a discursive tradition, controversies in understanding Islam have been intensified (Asad, 1996). Likewise, in the sociology and anthropology of religion, lengthy discussions are being held on defining religion. Despite contributions of great scholars, as Weber, Durkheim, and Geertz, no consensus had been reached on a definition of religion (S. Bruce, 1995). Without going into this debate, I find it important to acknowledge the great diversity in Islam and the difficulty in providing a clear-cut definition. As I am analyzing contributions of social scientist in the field of Islam, I am primarily interested in the manner they approach religion, religiosity and religious individualization. I, therefore, do not provide a careful delineation of religion and Islam myself. Likewise, in speaking of Muslims I may not always do justice to the variety groups and interpretations. As the scholars I discuss conduct their research among Maghrebi, their method of- and approach to studying Maghrebi will be at the center of analysis in my thesis. While reading my thesis, it should be kept in mind that the social scientific studies I review do not represent all Muslim groups, but only provide a general understanding of trends in religiosity among Maghrebi Muslims.

2 Conceptualization and Operationalization of Religious Individualization

2.1 Introduction

Each of the scholars I discuss in this thesis, have different approaches towards secularization and religious individualization. Moreover, they use various research methods. In this chapter I will relate Verkuyten and Maliepaard's approaches to that of Fadil. In doing so I will attempt to answer the sub-question of this chapter: *How can Fadil's conceptualization and operationalization of secularization and religious individualization be enriched by conceptualizations and operationalizations of Verkuyten and Maliepaard?*

In this chapter I will first give a general exposition of the ideas of Fadil in paragraph 2.2. Next I will subdivide the discussion in two parts, in paragraph 2.3 I will discuss the divergent approaches towards secularization and religious individualization and in paragraph 2.4 I will go into the various research methods used.

2.2 Fadil's views of Religious Individualization and Secularization

Nadia Fadil argues for a reformulation of religious individualization and, hence, secularization. She follows Talal Asad's view of secularization, which he sees as governmentality. Governmentality, as described by Foucault, can be understood as a view of governments and governance. It infers a willingness of individuals to actively engage in governance and to self-direct. This form of governance has the well-being of its citizens in mind. It implies an understanding of the self and society that regulates the relationship between the two. Knowledge and understanding of this governmentality shapes both the view of the self (as self-directing and self-governing agent) and its interaction with power structures (as to governmental institutions). Foucault underlines, as described by Rose and Lemke, a two way thinking about power (Lemke, 2002; Rose, O'Malley, & Valverde, 2006). Governmentality describes that state power is not just a top-down endeavor by enforcing law, it rather involves guiding and directing people: 'governing the forms of self-government, structuring and shaping the field op possible action of subjects' (Lemke, 2002, p. 32). On the other hand, governmentality links to this self-governance. It refers to processes of subjectivation in which citizens exercise self-techniques, self-control and direct themselves. Hence, governmentality describes the relationship between the two, between technologies of domination by institutional governance and technologies of self by individual governance. As Foucault explains: 'the contact point, where individuals are driven by others is tied to the way they conduct themselves, is what we can call, I think government. Governing people, in the broad meaning of the word, governing people is not a way to force people to do what the governor wants; it is always a versatile equilibrium, with

complementarity and conflicts between techniques which assure coercion and processes through which the self is constructed or modified by himself'(Foucault, 1993, pp. 203–204; Lemke, 2002, pp. 52–53).

Fadil's conceptualization of secularization is grounded in this notion of governmentality. By using this notion, she seeks to explain the interrelation and reciprocity between the self, religion and governance. Indeed, individualization must be seen in light of a governmentality that seeks the activation of its subjects and a subjectivation of individuals. This is, as she describes: 'a particular governmentality which shapes a specific understanding of the 'self' and of 'society', and regulates the relationship between both, according to liberal-humanistic (and secular) scripts and sensibilities'. The self actually finds its 'existence and substance through power relations' (Fadil, 2008, p. 53).

As a consequence, Fadil rejects the view of individualization which sees the individual and the social as opposed to each other; the position where individual agency is considered to be unbound by power relations, which in turn is considered to be the result of increased fragmentation of (religious) authority structures.

Fadil analyses Foucault's attempt to understand individual shaping of the self. Foucault, as Fadil reviews, finds man an autonomous being, shaped by a particular discursive idea. The self is a result of power relations with the self and others, but also the result of a particular ethical mode of subjectivation. With this is meant the way in which people live up to moral obligations, how individuals shape themselves according to an ethic and act according to prescriptive elements of that ethic. Grounded in this idea of an ethical mode of subjectivation is a view that ethics are a product of will and reflect autonomy of will. In modernity this mode of subjectivation is commonly based in liberal expressions of authenticity and autonomy.

As Fadil notes, Foucault strives to attribute agency and self-determination to the individual, but retains that one becomes a subject through power relations. Here, again a connection is made to the notion of governmentality. It is the politicization of the individual, or how the individual is governed. Fadil's interest is in liberal governmentality, which is 'a particular form of governance that has freedom and the well-being of its population as one of its main political rationalities' (Fadil, 2008, p. 62). It entails not a direct regulation of subjects, but rather works through an inclusion of those subjects. It seeks to activate individuals to govern themselves. This notion of governance and self-governance is shared in modern secularized societies. It actually cultivates a certain agency. At the heart of this cultivation is a shared belief that the individual should be free, and should be able to act freely according to his/her own morality. The subject is not required to obey to a general morality,

rather it should be able to form its own moral or ethical conduct. Agents should be sovereign, and have their own source of authority.

Thus, Fadil does not consider autonomy and sovereignty as being free from power structures; rather it's a freedom to relate individually to one's own authority structures. Thus, religious individualization is not necessarily the result of increased fragmentation as Chaves and Dobbelaere seem to suggest (Chaves, 1998; Dobbelaere, 2001, 2002). On the contrary, it hints at a problematization of religious authorities. The argument is that the individual is still bound by authorities, yet the form of those authorities shift. Religious individualization, actually, is a form of governance that regulates this relationship between the individual and power structures. Hence, as Fadil states: 'the point is not that religious individualization describes an increased capacity to live one's religiosity freely, but rather that a liberal understanding of freedom (and autonomy) has become authoritative in regulation one's religious conduct. Religious individualization describes a particular set of vocabularies (i.c. the language of freedom), (self) techniques and problematization concordant with a liberal regulative model' (Fadil, 2008, p. 68). It is considered as product of choice and can therefore be seen as form of governance. As there is a shared understanding of this ideal of self governance, the liberal vocabularies of authenticity and autonomy related to it are also shared and preferred. In other words, a particular role is ascribed to individuals in modern societies, this is an expectation to decipher and express one's own individuality. This is what Taylor calls the ethic of authenticity. A particular mode of individuality, or of subjectivation, is expected. This ethic of subjectivation is grounded in a liberal language of autonomy and authenticity. Yet, this language in turn is expected by Fadil to regulate and shape religious and secular subjectivities.

This is exactly what Fadil attempts to investigate. For her research Fadil conducted 57 interviews among second generation Maghrebi in Belgium. She uses a poststructuralist method of analyzing their vocabularies and attempts not only to map the content of their religious (or secular) trajectories, but also to conduct a discursive analysis to determine the patterns and structures underneath their expressions. She hypothesizes that individual religiosity is expressed through a use of liberal terminology, as in our secularized society these vocabularies of autonomy and authenticity are commonly preferred and used. It is this use of this language that in turn regulates and shapes individual religiosity.

In her analysis, Fadil divided her participants in three groups: orthodox, non-orthodox and secular Muslims. The narratives confirm, according to Fadil, 'that a liberal mode of subjectivation figures as one of the main agency models through which my interlocutors shape and cultivate their religious and/or secular selves' (Fadil, 2008, p. 340). All the respondents' narratives on their religiosity where

grounded on rationalistic and liberal concerns. Being a pious or orthodox Muslims, does not necessarily sit at odds with subscribing to a liberal ethical concern. With this, a liberal mode of subjectivation is detached from necessarily having a religious, orthodox, non-secular praxis as well as implying a secular, non-religious praxis. Whereas notions of autonomy and authenticity tend to be related to secularization, Fadil shows that this is not inevitably the case; both secular *and* religious trajectories can be grounded in liberal-ethical positions to the self, as well as, non-liberal one's. One can express one's religious praxis in an orthodox manner, while maintaining a liberal ethic. For example, practicing can be a matter of self-fulfillment, and does not need to be a means to obey God. Likewise, secular positioning does not necessarily need to be related to a liberal mode of subjectivation. This is, for example, revealed by the adaptation of a language of silence regarding their secular orientation by some, in which they do not out and express their interiority. Rather, new ways of relating to the self had to be found in order to deal with their secular orientation.

Above, I gave an overview of Fadil's views on secularization and religious individualization and I discussed her method of research. In the subsequent paragraphs I will relate her views to those of Verkuyten and Maliepaard.

2.3 Secularization as Integration

As explained above, Fadil views religious individualization as a governmentality which regulates the relationship between individuals, religion and governance. This is reflected in the vocabularies of her interlocutors. Such qualitative approaches sometimes may seen to be diametrically opposed to quantitative approaches. Indeed, Maliepaard and Gijsberts (2012) conceptualize secularization as decline of number of Muslims, of importance attached to one's religion (conceptualized as religious identification), of religious participation and in agreeing to religious beliefs or religious propositions. They study change in religiosity both by analyzing longitudinal data and by comparing religiosity between generations. This is done primarily in relation to the decline versus revitalization debate. Secularization is seen as decrease in religious behavior or weakening of religious beliefs as a consequence of modernization. Revitalization, on the hand is regarded as increase in religiosity, for example as a consequence of negative media portrayal of Islam or of (perceived) discrimination. Unfortunately, such an approach does not pay attention to problematization of authority structures or liberal ethical conduct, as Fadil suggests. It falls short in incorporating modern understandings of the self and its consequential problematic relation to power structures, in comprehending individualization. In chapter three and four I will analyze the self and its relation to power structures more in-depth.

Closely, related to the religious decline perspective is a view to of secularization as outcome- or degree of integration. In quantitative studies it is common to investigate religiosity of Maghrebi in relation to acculturation strategies. Verkuyten (2005), seeks to explain identity formation of migrations, which he often does so in relation to acculturation models (e.g. Verkuyten, Thijs, & Stevens, 2012). He, foremost, studies identity processes among migrants in Western Europe and is less concerned with the general secularization discourse. He ascribes himself to a social psychological approach in investigating identity formation among migrants in the Netherlands. In his book 'The Social Psychology of Ethnic Identity' (Verkuyten, 2005) he gives an extensive overview of contemporary social scientific thinking on identity, here he focuses on ethnic identity as social identity and -category. Identity as he describes, is 'the key word for conceptualizing the relationship between the individual and society' (Verkuyten, 2005, p. 10). It directly links to the manner in which people categorize themselves and others and how these categories get meaning.

Acculturation models depict positions when different cultural or ethnic groups come in contact with each other. Acculturation is mostly conceptualized as one dimensional, in which individuals are expected to gradually lose their own cultural heritage, while incorporating the dominant culture. An influential, two-dimensional model is developed by Berry (2005). Based on the degree of maintenance of the culture of origin on one axis and on adaptation to the host culture on the other axis, four acculturation strategies are indicated; assimilation entails the rejection of one's own culture, replacing it by the host culture, while separation results in the rejection of the host cultural practices, and maintenance of one's own culture. Integration involves a selective adoption of the host culture, meanwhile maintaining one's culture of origin and marginalization implies a loss of one's own cultural heritage, and a failure to adopt new behaviors corresponding to those of the other culture. Yet in this model no distinction is made between culture, ethnicity and religion. Roccas and Brewer (2002) on the other hand, proposed the concept of social identity complexity to account for the interrelationship between multiple group identities and provide a theoretical model for hybrid, mixed, partial or merged identities.

Fadil finds such approaches reflecting a European Islam perspective that is Eurocentric in nature. She argues that developments among young Muslims in Europe should not be seen as a consequence of European contact, but rather as a continuation of Islamic reform. Likewise, reducing such developments to a matter of integration ignores, according to her, the new and challenging questions that are formulated by Muslims. Moreover, by equating religious individualization with integration, one could run into the danger of naturalizing secularism and concurring other trends, as revitalization or separation, with fundamentalism (Fadil, 2008, pp. 43–48, 345–347). Here, Fadil aims

at elucidating the highly politicized nature of the so called 'neutral' terrain of secularism and secularization. By unpacking the narrative of integration she is able to depict the norms that are imposed by such narrative. Although, the acculturation models aim at depicting some of the identity positions migrants can uptake, it risks, in my view, to equate (religious) behavior and beliefs to issues of integration. In doing so, it may ignore the variety of positioning of individuals and the complexity and intricacies in the rationales underneath it. Moreover, acculturation models can be limited, as they are unable to depict individualization tendencies.

However, many studies investigating issues of migration seek to understand problems of social cohesion in society (see e.g. Joppke, 2004; Sniderman & Hagendoorn, 2007; Verkuyten, 2006). The initial SCP study, concerning religiosity of Muslims, carried out by Phalet and Ter Wal (2004b), was initiated as a consequence of controversial statements of two Imams in Dutch media. Many social scientific studies are carried out in light of a fear for fundamentalist tendencies in Islam and a call for understanding such developments. Such studies may contribute to a further politicization of the subject. Indeed, they may reflect certain Eurocentric tendencies. Yet, those studies find their legitimization in incidents as 9/11 or problems in social cohesion. Although, Fadil rightly warns for Eurocentric tendencies in studying religiosity among Muslims in Western Europe, and raises questions on the neutrality of such research, I do not find her to propose a proper alternative for studying Islam, in relation to problems of social cohesion and conflict in societies.

2.4 Methodology

2.3.1 Verkuyten and Multidimensional Approach

As explained above, Fadil uses a discursive, Foucaultian method in studying religions individualization. Verkuyten on the other hand argues for a multidimensional approach. In the first chapter of his book, Verkuyten (2005, pp. 15–16) describes important differences between two kinds of approaches to the notion of identity. These two are relevant in placing Verkuyten and Fadil in relation to each other and into a larger social psychological framework. One approach, *'a more mainstream psychological approach'* (Verkuyten, 2005, p. 16) inscribes into a social psychological tradition which takes the standpoint of the individual as starting point. This seeks to examine tendencies and cognitive processes that are underneath perceptions and behavior. The other, '*a discursive approach',* in which Nadia Fadil inscribes herself, takes the social environment as starting point; here social relationships and interactions are emphasized by focusing on the social and historical context. Emphasis is laid on individual meanings and autonomous actions. Verkuyten, on the other hand, argues that it is possible and even necessary to engage in both these approaches in order to develop a multidimensional understanding of identity formation. Both approaches,

according to him, have their strengths and weaknesses; as Verkuyten explains 'mainstream social psychologists emphasize that discursive psychologists ignore important cognitive and affective processes, whereas discursive psychologists argue that mainstream approaches fail to address the practical activities entered into by people in their interactions' (Verkuyten, 2005, p. 16). It is possible to combine them, as they have different emphases which do not necessarily contradict or exclude each other.

Maykel Verkuyten pinpoints to three levels at which identity formation can be studied; the individual, interaction and societal level. The individual level relates to intraindividual processes such as personal characteristics, sense of identity, cognitive structures, identity status, self-schemas, self-esteem, and identification. The interaction level relates to process that arise when the individual interacts socially; here identity formation is examined in situated interactions. This is the level at which Fadil operates. The societal level relates to, for example, political or cultural features. Here, identity is studied in relation to state regulations, the public discourse, transnational movements, and globalization movements.

Nadia Fadil deliberately chose a discursive approach, and in doing so she is able to reveal the manner in which the self is structured through a liberal agency model. She exposes the ethical interrogations of her interlocutors and locates some of the liberal or non-liberal self-techniques they use. As Verkuyten points out, discursive theorists like Foucault analyze the manner in which people are created by discursive formations, as discourses are viewed to affect subject positions and relationships by enabling and constraining possible actions. This is done by defining, denying or ignoring positions. The subject is produced through his discursive system as he is bearer of it. The interest in theorist like Foucault lies, according to Verkuyten, in 'the ways that historical and cultural resources that are grounded in dominant institutions construct people's lives' (Verkuyten, 2005, p. 22). Yet, he indicates that by focusing on textual deconstructions and discursive regimes one could leave unexamined the extent to which the discursive regime affect people's actions or self-understanding in everyday situations. The discursive tradition can provide interesting insights in the diversity of positions, relationships and power structures between individuals. However, by focusing on interactions and the discursive regimes that arise out of those interactions, the discursive psychologist runs into the danger of reducing the individual to the interactional level. Moreover, discursive approaches can have a too deterministic stance and view the self solely as the outcome of a particular context, while neglecting underlying mental states and psychological processes (Verkuyten, 2005, pp. 22–25). The consequences and affects of discourses outside the framework of

the textual deconstruction are often left unexamined. Development psychologist, on the other hand, may focus on intrapsychic outcomes of identity formation.

Verkuyten makes a strong case for combining the different approaches in order to overcome each of their limitations. By acknowledging the different methods used, the different levels at which they operate, the different questions they ask, and the different theories and concepts that use, one could adopt a multidimensional perspective. Only by doing so, it is possible to account for the complexities of understanding phenomena as identity formation and maintenance and issues of ethnicity.

Nadia Fadil's does not specifically investigate ethnicity, but rather focuses on identity as sense of self and the manner in which liberal scripts and sensibilities structure this sense of self (see further chapter 3.1). Her aim is to uncover the regularities that guide her interlocutors' narrative and the manner in which, through their speech, both their selves and the social context is shaped and reproduced. Her primary interest, thus, lies not in the religious experiences themselves but rather in the manner that the experiences are produced and reproduced in the descriptions of her interlocutors. She criticizes positivist epistemologies that view 'sociological knowledge as a reflection of the social world' (Fadil, 2008, p. 20) and instead aligns with a situated epistemological perspective which views that knowledge is always mediated by a specific discourse that is the result of selections, limits and regularities. The aim is to lay barren the assumptions underlying knowledges and experiences.

In this regard Fadil disagrees with Verkuyten, who argues for a dialectical approach to knowledge: 'reality constructs the person and the person constructs reality' (Verkuyten, 2005, p. 233). Whereas Fadil finds knowledge to be produced in situated interactions, Verkuyten argues that this does not mean that situated knowledge cannot be constraint by facts. Verkuyten's dialectical approach allows him to study issues of ethnicity from a multidimensional perspective.

From this it becomes clear that Fadil's epistemological approach is entwined with her research methodology. The one logically results from the other. In this regard, epistemologies and methodologies can pose limitations in studying issues of religiosity. As a result of Fadil's theoretical perspectives, she aims to investigate religious trajectories in their own right. It is not her objective to relate the narratives of her subjects to ethno-cultural backgrounds, the Belgian society or to social-economic circumstances. Rather, she warns that studies that do so can be Eurocentric in nature. Yet, such a view poses problems for studying religiosity in relation to societal issues as intergroup relations, social cohesion, integration, and social-economic developments, and explaining this.

Verkuyten's multidimensional perspective is in my view better able to account for the varied levels (micro, meso, and macro) at which issues of religion and ethnicity can be studied, and is better able to relate it to societal issues and to explain it. Verkuyten indeed, relates social identity, to social-economic backgrounds, intergroup relations and –conflicts, ethical attitudes etc. (Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2012; Verkuyten, 2005, 2007). He intends to understand the self both as self-feeling and self-understanding, as well as belonging to social categories (see further chapter 3.3). One of the ways in which he, and also Mieke Maliepaard, studies social identity is by conducting quantitative research.

2.3.2 Maliepaard and Quantitative Research

Maliepaard and Gijsberts (2012) conducted quantitative research to study religiosity of Turkish- and Moroccan Muslims in the Netherlands. One of the limitations of conducting qualitative research, as Fadil did, is problems with generalizing the research findings. This is why Maliepaard and Gijsberts can provide a different perspective on developments in Islam, and can enrich Fadil.

In many social-psychological, quantitative studies about religion, religiosity is subdivided into distinct elements; religiosity (being religious), strength of religious identification (degree to which religion is important to the identity of a person), religious participation (practices such are praying, going to the mosque, fasting/ participating in the Ramadan) and religious beliefs (subscribing to or agreeing with religious rules and norms such as finding it important that children attend Islamic schooling, women wear headscarf, supporting religious homogamy etc.) (Maliepaard & Gijsberts, 2012; Phalet & ter Wal, 2004b; SCP/WODC/CBS, 2005). In her dissertation, Maliepaard indicates that it is important to investigate these elements separately, as they do not necessarily have to be interrelated. Group membership does not have to mean that a person attaches meaning to this membership and religious attitudes do not need to have behavioral consequences (Maliepaard, 2012, p. 10).

These three items, religious identification, religious participation, and religious beliefs, are widely used measures to investigate Islamic religiosity. Yet, in my view, they only provide a limited examination of religiosity among Muslims. One of the shortcomings of quantitative research is the difficulty of reflecting the intricacies and complexities of issues as religiosity. Although, such quantitative categories and measures can be problematic, they are tested on internal consistency and reliability and validity (e.g. Abu Raiya, Pargament, Mahoney, & Stein, 2008). Raiya et al. (2008) investigated the reliability and validity of measures on Islamic religiosity, and found besides religious identity and religious practice, also reliable and relevant measures for items as ethical conduct and Islamic universality (belonging to larger Islamic community). Moreover, they investigated some psychological dimensions of religion by including measures on religious struggle (doubt or conflicts

concerning one's faith), religious coping (having a secure relationship with God), religious introjections (adopting of religious beliefs as personal values), and religious introjections (adopting religious beliefs out of anxiety or guilt). Including such measures, may give a more dynamic view of religiosity.

Fadil, indeed, is better able to reveal some of the internal struggles and complexities involved in the religiosity of her subjects compared to Maliepaard. It must be noted that it is Maliepaard's objective to study trends in religiosity and religious change (see chapter 2.4) and not to study the intricacies of the religion exhaustively. Yet, as only a minority of Maghrebi leaves their religion, one can question whether focusing on religious decline is able to provide an accurate portrayal of religious developments within Islam. Therefore, I find it relevant to study internal dynamics within Islam more closely. In particular, as Fadil shows, there is great diversity among Muslims in their ethical positioning. Moreover, many struggle with issues of piety, independent reasoning (Ijtihad), and relationship to authority figures. It would be interesting to also study these aspects quantitatively, in order to gain a more generalized understanding of it.

2.3.3 Types of Muslims

As described above, I find the use of acculturation models in explaining religious positioning, -as used by Verkuyten-, and Maliepaard's quantitative measures of religion, limited in accounting for the complexity and intricacies of religious positioning. Both Verkuyten and Maliepaard do take effort in gaining a more in-depth understanding of the variety of positioning by using quantitative measures (Maliepaard & Gijsberts, 2012, Chapter 5; Verkuyten & Yildiz, 2010). Maliepaard and Gijsberts (2012, Chapter 5) investigate whether there are different types of Muslims. They differentiate between ritual religious practice (attending the mosque and praying) and social religious practice (eating halal and participating in the Ramadan), after which the styles of practicing are crossed.[1] They find five types of religious behavior; a group of practicing Muslims who engage in all types of religious behavior; private practicing Muslims who engage in all types of religious behavior, yet attend the mosque rarely; a group who only engage in social practicing as eating halal and participation in the Ramadan; and non-practicing Muslims who hardly engage in any of the religious practices (Maliepaard & Gijsberts, 2012, pp. 100–103). Subsequently, they investigate the relationship between these groups of Muslims and religious identification, religious beliefs, social-economic status, cultural orientation and contacts with individuals of the same ethnicity or with Dutch.

The group private practicing Muslims, are, according to Maliepaard and Gijsberts, predominantly not going regularly to the mosque because they are not able to combine it with work. Hence, this does

---

[1] See internetbijlage B5 Moslim in Nederland, www.scp.nl Moslim in Nederland 2012

not seem to relate to religious individualization as discussed by Fadil, but is proposed to be a consequence of their lifestyle rather than a product of choice. Fadil sees religious individualization primarily as a problematization of the self and authority structures in which religiosity is structured as a product of choice and subject to one's will. Maliepaard and Gijsberts, in their literature discussion, do mention that, as a consequence of modernization and differentiation, a private or individual Islam can develop (Maliepaard & Gijsberts, 2012, pp. 32–35). They discuss Phalet and Ter Wal (2004b), Phalet (2003) and Demant (2005) who indicate variation among Muslims in their strictness towards religious doctrines and prescriptions and variation in conformist or critical attitudes towards Islam. Maliepaard and Gijsberts discuss the possible existence of four types of Muslims; loyal-, cultural-, liberal Muslims and new fundamentalists. Both the 'new fundamentalists' and 'liberal Muslims' are critical towards their beliefs, yet the former is more strict, while the latter is more lenient in their interpretation of Islam. This critical engagement comes probably closest to Fadil's conceptualization of religious individualization. However, in their study they indicate not to have found this group of critical or individual Muslims in their analyses (Maliepaard & Gijsberts, 2012, p. 114). They acknowledge that they probably do not have the accurate variables in their study to identify this group of Muslims. Maliepaard and Gijsberts only investigate different types of Muslims by their religious practices, not by informing critical engagement, a quest for authenticity or rationales behind practicing/not-practicing.

In an article with Yildiz, Verkuyten studied identity consolidation and political mobilization (Verkuyten & Yildiz, 2010). In doing so they distinguished between personal and communal interpretations of being Muslim. This personal interpretation of Islam entails, according to them, the consideration of Islam as a private matter in which the relationship with God is experienced individually. It involves the pursuit of a personal religiosity. This is expected to be related to supporting the right and opportunity to express one's religiosity, while to be unrelated to the endorsement of political organization of Muslims in the Netherlands. This is indeed what they found. On the other hand, a communal interpretation of Islam, -which is interpreted as commitment to religious practice and towards Ummah- and orthodoxy –the search for a pure Islam that is viewed as unchangeable- relate to both the expression of rights and the call for the political organization of Muslims.

Verkuyten, clearly, investigates religious individualization differently compared to Fadil. He views it as a personal interpretation of Islam and does not relate it to a problematization of authorities or the expression of a liberal ethical conduct. On the other hand, the endorsement of rights to publicly

express one's religions can be viewed in line with liberal regulative model that underlines individual rights.

It is interesting that the above studies by Verkuyten and Maliepaard investigated religious positioning more in-depth, by including measures on individual- , communal- and orthodox interpretations of Islam. Yet, it became clear that there is ambiguity in studying different types of Muslims. I find their theoretical exposition on which they base their search for types of Muslims to be unclear, and their measurement of different types of Muslims could be more thorough. Moreover, when studying types of Muslims one should be careful with a strict delineation between these groups as it neglects the diversity and complexity of positioning. Likewise, on should be cautious with drawing conclusions of types of Muslims, based on patterns in behavior solely.

Nevertheless, both studies are important as they set out to develop a more thorough understanding of Islamic views. The generalizable nature of quantitative studies can elaborate Fadil's findings. I certainly advocate a continuation of such studies, which take more elaborate measures of religiosity.

2.3.4 Epistemological Pluralism

Some of the discussion I carried out above reflects a more general debate regarding qualitative versus quantitative research. Much of the diversity, ambiguity and confusion in the study of religious individualization stems from seemingly opposing epistemological perspectives and research methodologies. Without going into this discussion, I do find it important to transgress boundaries between various research methods. I agree both with the multidimensional perspective of Verkuyten, and, for example, Bryman and Sale et al. who advocate mixed-method research (Bryman, 2006; Sale, Lohfeld, & Brazil, 2002). In this regard I advocate an epistemological pluralism (Friedman, 2008; Kellert, Longino, & Waters, 2006). I assume that the divergent scientific approaches are not necessarily irreconcilable, but each contributes to our understanding of the subject at hand. Although, the various studies I discuss ask different questions, have divergent epistemological perspectives, and clearly use diverse methodologies, they are in my view comparable.

Scientific pluralism, as advocated by Kellert et al. (2006), is based upon the notion that reality is too complex to be explained by a single theory and be studied by a single scientific methodology. Kellert et al. present scientific pluralism in response to scientific monism, which entails the aim to establish a single, all-encompassing theory of the natural world. They argue that such single set of principles may never be found. Therefore, a plurality of approaches and methodologies may be the best way to investigate the natural world. As they indicate: 'the plurality in contemporary science provides evidence that there are kinds of situations produced by the interaction of factors each of which may be representable in a model or theory, but not all of which are representable in the same model or

theory' (Kellert et al., 2006, p. xiv). This is not to say that contradictory approaches are necessarily both true, rather it holds the position that reality is too complicated to be captured by one single approach. Only a plurality of approaches is able to best describe reality.

Here, scientific pluralism is presented against scientific monism. I agree that reality can be best described by a plurality of approaches and methodologies. They make their argument against monistic epistemological claims, and not against situational approaches that describe construction of knowledges in language. Situational approaches are primarily concerned with the manner in which knowledges have meaning for individuals, in the manner in which it is constructed in language. Yet, that reality is produced in speech, does not mean that there is no underlying reality to be known, independent of language. A plurality of approaches is in my view best suited to grasp most of this reality (Verkuyten, 2005, pp. 27–30).

A pluralistic stance is best capable of bringing together studies from various disciplines that use different methodologies. Unfortunately, a pluralistic stance can have its own pitfalls. Such a view can accept all research uncritically, by claiming that each in their own manner add to our understanding or reality. Rather, I find it important to critically assess studies, relate them to each other and in doing so further our understanding and knowledge. In this thesis, I critically compare social scientific studies. Yet, I seek to keep justice to the individual research aims of the studies while simultaneously using the various insights of them to deepen our understanding of the matter at hand: religiosity of Muslims in the Netherlands and Belgium.

Another problem of the pluralist stance is the comparison of various constructs and concepts. Diversity in defining and using concepts, further complicates this social scientific field of study on religiosity and religious individualization. It is difficult to infer whether notions in different studies measure the same phenomena. One, therefore, should be cautious with comparing concepts and constructs between studies, as one risks to compare apples with oranges. On the other hand, I still maintain that the studies I discuss all investigate a similar subject and, therefore, can enhance our understanding of that subject. A careful analysis can lay barren the diversity in theoretical approaches and variation in the use, conceptualization and measurement of constructs between different studies.

2.5 Discussion and Conclusion

In this chapter I have disclosed some of the different epistemological perspectives on studying religiosity among Muslims. Moreover, I sought to connect these perspectives to theoretical conceptualizations of secularization and religious individualization, as well as, to specific methodological approaches. The sub-question of this chapter is: *How can Fadil's conceptualization and operationalization of secularization and religious individualization be enriched by conceptualizations and operationalizations of Verkuyten and Maliepaard?*

To answer the sub-question I compared Verkuyten and Maliepaard to Fadil. As described, Fadil sees individualization as governmentality. This Foucaultian concept refers to a two way thinking about the relationship between individuals and governance. On the one hand, it refers to, as Lemke described, the manner in which governments seek the activation of subjects in their governance over them, on the other hand, it links to techniques of self-governance by individuals (Lemke, 2002). Religious individualization, in this regard, entails a set of vocabularies, techniques and problematizations that regulate individual religious positioning. This is often done in relation to vocabularies of autonomy and authenticity, as this currently is a conventional manner of relating to the self. Such vocabularies reflect a liberal ethical mode of subjectivation.

In relation to Fadil, it becomes clear that Verkuyten does not elaborate on secularization or religious individualization in his book, as he is more concerned with identity processes. He often studies identity positions in relation to acculturation patterns. Such a link to integration is heavily criticized by Fadil, as it embodies according to her Eurocentrism. Indeed, one can raise questions whether such model is able to depict some of the struggles and controversies that nowadays are going on within Muslim communities. However, studies that focus on integration can be legitimized by problems of social cohesion in society. I do not find Fadil to provide a solution for the study of Islam from such perspectives. Yet, she does raise awareness to the possible politicization of this field of study and the tacit 'neutrality' that is embodied in many studies. It is important to keep this in mind when studying Islam.

Maliepaard studies secularization in relation to the decline versus revitalization debate. She uses quantitative methodologies to study patterns in religiosity among Muslims. She is able to generalize her findings to the Dutch Muslim population. In this regard, she can complement Fadil. However, Fadil reveals that Maliepaard's view on secularization does not incorporate modern viewpoints on the self and its relationship to authority structures. Moreover, Fadil shows variety and complexity of individual religious trajectories. Her insights reveal the limitations of Maliepaard's measurements on religiosity. Clearly, focusing on religious behavior and -identity presents a limited account of

religiosity. I have suggested that more varied and elaborate measurements of religiosity would allow reviewing the complexities of religiosity more in-depth. The studies of Verkuyten and Maliepaard to investigate types of Muslims and to include measures of religious interpretations are promising in that regard.

In analyzing Fadil and Maliepaard, it became clear that theoretical approaches to individualization, epistemological perspectives and research methodologies are often entwined. Studies from within different disciplines tend to ask different questions, and seek to answer them differently. As a consequence a view has developed in which such studies, in particular qualitative and quantitative, are considered to be incompatible and incomparable. I find it important that boundaries between fields of study are transgressed. Research findings from various sub-disciplines can, when critically analyzing them, contribute to our field of possible knowing. In this regard one could connect my view to epistemological pluralism. I agree that reality is too complex to be known by a one theoretical model. Verkuyten indicates that by combining approaches one is able to overcome each of their limitations. The main scholars I review in my thesis, namely Fadil, Verkuyten, Maliepaard, de Koning and Boender, contribute to our understanding and knowledge of the development of religiosity among Muslims. Through analytical inquiry of studies from different sub-disciplines on the same subject, one can further the understanding of that subject, improve the study of that subject and formulate new research questions for future studies.

In this regard, Fadil complements Maliepaard's insights, as she discloses the intricacies of individual religious positioning, and Maliepaard complements Fadil, as she uncovers general trends in religiosity. Moreover, by bringing the studies together, new research questions are asked. Indeed, it would be interesting to study liberal ethical positioning of second generation Muslims-Dutch quantitatively, as to get insights into the generalizability of Fadil's suggestions. Likewise, quantitative religious measurements could be improved by including, for example, measures on ethical conduct, issues of Ijtihad, the Sunnah (teachings and practices of the prophet Mohammed), and importance of the Ummah (the global Muslim community).

I will discuss the manner in which the four scholars can aid Fadil more closely in the following chapters.

3 The Self

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter Nadia Fadil's conceptualization of the self will be analyzed. This will be done in relation to Maykel Verkuyten's, Mieke Maliepaard and Martijn de Koning's suggestions on (religious) individualization and the self. By doing so, in this chapter the following sub-question will be answered: '*how can suggestions on the self and identity formation by Verkuyten, Maliepaard and de Koning enrich Fadil's conceptualization of the (religious) self?*'

In this chapter, Nadia Fadil's view on the self will be clarified first, after which her views will be related to suggestions of the other three.

3.2 Nadia Fadil on the Self

Nadia Fadil (2008) follows Foucault's conceptualization of the self. What it means to be human can be understood as a specific subjectivity model. This consists of sets of knowledges and power relations and is construed out of a shared ethical code. As Foucault argues, our understanding of morality has been highly influenced by Kant. Due to his writings, morality is not anymore understood as prescribed by society and governments, rather individuals are regarded to be able to structure their own ethical conduct and to have a responsibility to do so. This is reflected in liberal governmentality, which considers subjects to have freedom to act and express themselves. This liberal governmentality seeks to include subjects instead of ruling over them. According to Fadil, it is the notion of freedom which guides the autonomy of the subject, and which structures the reciprocal relationship between the self, society and governance. It is clear that Fadil does not consider the construction of the self to be isolated; rather it arises out of our understanding of a specific ethical code and evolves in relation to an understanding of a particular form of governance. This is a governance which 'treats human beings as autonomous individuals, with a particular interiority that need to be confessed in order to be saved' (Fadil, 2008, p. 64). It is the expectation to express oneself and to problematize categories as class, sexuality and ethnicity that guides our construction of the self. At the basis of this formation of the self are problematizations of the self and of authority structures.

Individualization should be understood in relation to a problematization of the self and authorities. The result is a particular mode of subjectivation, or a way of relating to the self through liberal affects and sensibilities. This subjectivity model is positioned as a consequence of a set of practices, techniques and discourses, which cannot exist independently from discursive formation and power structures. The result is a liberal regulatory ideal, grounded in vocabularies of autonomy and

authenticity, which is guiding the development of the self. In this respect religious individualization is structured as a product of choice and subject of one's own will, and hence, can be framed as a form of (self)governance (Fadil, 2008, pp. 63–70).

Fadil seeks to explore this liberal regulatory ideal by analyzing religious or secular practices of second generation Maghrebi. She does so by tracing fields of problematization and self-techniques that underpin the trajectories of her interlocutors. Interestingly, and adding to complexity, is her positioning of the self in relation to power structures and in relation to a specific ethical code of subjectivation. Although, I investigate, as explained in chapter 1.5, the construction of the self and its relation to power structures separately, the two are considered by Nadia Fadil as intertwined. Nevertheless, in this chapter, I intend to focus on the positioning of the self by Fadil. Although this positioning may be done in relation to authority formations, I will not discuss this here; rather, I will concentrate on the effect of it -the relation of the self towards these power constructions- on the development of the self.

As stated, Fadil investigates the religious or secular self by means of a discursive analysis of narratives of second generation Maghrebi. The description of their religiosity is viewed by Fadil as 'discursive self enactment' (Fadil, 2008, p. 106) or as a manner in which individuals shape their identity. She does not interpret their narratives simply as their experiences, but by deconstructing their discursive patterns and considering them in their own right, she is able to pinpoint the manner in which her subjects make sense of their selves, by drawing boundaries, using oppositions or making use of certain self-techniques.

In various chapters, Fadil goes in detail into the narratives of her interlocutors and makes explicit the discursive mechanisms by which they make sense of their (religious or secular) self. In chapter four, for instance, Fadil discusses accounts of God's existence. Fadil distinguishes several different rationales or justification techniques underneath her subjects' accounts; namely rationalistic arguments, emotional justifications and experiential assertions. The rationalistic claims are according to Fadil reflective of the modern liberal-secular discourse in which doubt, critical interrogation and intellectual reflections are used as techniques to position oneself (2008, pp. 111–117). On the other hand, through emotional justifications respondents expressed the psychological need of God's existence for their own existence, well-being or for the functioning of society as a whole. God is viewed as an agent who is necessary for the development of the individual. Although these arguments are not rationalistic, they nevertheless reflect, according to Fadil, a second regulatory ideal of modernity, namely a ´Romantic-Expressivist legacy which displaces the focus from the cognito to one's emotionality' (Fadil, 2008, p. 131). The last type of rationale, the experiential

assertions, is not placed by Fadil in a liberal-modern discourse, where the self is central in justifying the (non)existence of God. Rather, God in this argumentation pattern simply 'is' and does not need to be justified. Here, God is not interrogated or critically assessed and therefore these vocabularies reflect a non-liberal mode of subjectivation.

In this manner, Nadia Fadil places her subject's accounts into a framework of liberal or non-liberal modes of subjectivation. God's existence is by some negotiated through individual interrogation; whereas others express that they become subject through God. The former is exemplar of liberal mode of subjectivations as the self is developed independently from God, while the latter signifies a non-liberal mode of subjectivation, as the persons develops the self through God (Fadil, 2008, p. 131).

In chapter five of Fadil's dissertation, the construction of the self according to liberal sensibilities is conversed more thoroughly. In this chapter, Fadil discusses her interlocutor's accounts on how they relate to Islamic education received from their parents. I will go more in-depth into the relationship between parent and child religiosity in the next chapter, as parents' Islam can be seen as an authority structure. The manner in which the subjects relate to this is exemplar of the interconnection between the self and authority structures. For now, my interest lies into the manner Fadil describes the pronunciation of the self in relation to the Islam of the parents, and the subsequent positioning of the self by her.

Nadia Fadil stresses that underneath her interlocutors expressions on Islamic education received from their parents, an ethic of the self is expressed. The relation to the parents Islam does not, according to her, reflect a de-traditionalization, rather, patterns of continuation and discontinuation underpin their accounts. These patterns can be found, as some distance themselves from their parents Islam, while others associate themselves with it (Fadil, 2008, p. 165).

Relevant for my discussion is Fadil's articulation of the self-shaping mechanisms of her participants. The accounts, as stated by Fadil, express ethical concerns, yet these concerns are diverse in nature. Some articulate coercion by their parents to act according to their practices. Some of them left their parents religion in order to remain truthful to their selves or to lead an authentic life. For example, one was forced to wear a headscarf, which she found a violation of her autonomy. Fadil states that this indicates a liberal ethical concern. The subjects positioning is placed in opposition to their parents coercive and non-liberal practices (Fadil, 2008, p. 136).

This was also manifest in accounts on prohibitions and taboos of parents on female sexuality. Categories of halal and haram were used in Islamic education to fashion the female body and to

indicate (im)proper conduct. Interestingly, distancing from the parents' tradition was differently done by various interlocutors. Some presented the non-liberal, coercive facets of their upbringing as reflecting cultural traditions of their parents; relating to ethnicity and not to Islam. They contrasted parents' ethnic identification against authentic Islam[2]. Others found religion in general non-liberal and placed Islam in opposition to their secularist conduct, or pinpointed fundamentalist tendencies in their parents' conduct and distanced themselves from the non-tolerant aspects of their upbringing, while attributing a lack of agency to their parents. In this way the non-liberal others (the parents) are placed in opposition to the liberal self. Accordingly, the self is viewed as master of one's own conduct, agency is attributed to the self, and liberal principles of autonomy and freedom where stressed in positioning the self. In this manner, Nadia Fadil laid barren the various ways of positioning the self in opposition to parents (2008, pp. 139–144).

However, not all participants portrayed discontinuity towards their Islamic upbringing; rather some viewed their parents' religion as liberal and ascribed liberal agency to their parents. This was done by, for example, portraying them as self-conscious and autonomous or pinpointing towards aversion of their parents to some Islamic tendencies. In this manner, they expressed liberal-sameness with their parents. Interestingly, some retained a positive representation of the Islam of the parents and their tradition, while at the same time, giving a negative assessment of religious (conservative) tendencies of Muslims youth (Fadil, 2008, pp. 149–165).

In these instances the subjects either distanced themselves from their parents' Islam, or identified with it. This was consistently done in relation to liberal principles of freedom, progressiveness and autonomy, representing liberal modes of subjectivation. However, Nadia Fadil indicates that the positioning of the interlocutors was not only mediated by liberal scripts. Some narratives reflected a desire to align with God's expectations, a search for proper Islamic knowledge, a quest for virtues, or an aspiration for a pious lifestyle as motivating factors for a discontinuity with the (inadequate) Islamic education they received. In these cases the self was fashioned according to non-liberal codes.

Yet, others viewed the substance and quality of their Islamic education as good and in accordance with (a desirable) Islamic orthodoxy. The importance of the Muslim orthodox tradition was underlined in the ethical self-fashioning, as they took pride in their religious upbringing and identity. Moreover, these accounts were based on a positivist-rationalist concern in evaluating the education received.

---

[2] A pattern also distinguished by Martijn de Koning (2008), see chapter 3.5.

In this manner, Nadia Fadil, consistently relates her interlocutor's discursive positioning of the self to two axes. A first one, relates to a liberal/non-liberal agency model in which the subject self-fashioning mode is related to liberal maxims of autonomy or authenticity on the one hand, or to obeying God on the other hand. The second axis is based on the ethical substance, or the religious conduct followed, which moves on a continuum from orthodox conduct to secular conduct. I find this last axis surprising. In her dissertation she subdivides her interlocutors into three groups: orthodox, non-orthodox and secular Muslims. Unfortunately, she does not indicate an argumentation for the existence of these three groups, nor a clear delineation between them. Her subdivision into these groups is remarking as Fadil argues to take each religious trajectory individually and to treat them in their own right.

In the subsequent chapters, she investigates the positioning of orthodox Muslims more in-depth. In chapter 6, this was done by investigating how the 'self' relates to religious authorities. It became clear that the standpoints were not static, but rather revealed contestations and struggles in their positioning. Yet important for the discussion here, is that all positioned themselves according to a liberal regulatory ideal. Many were concerned with the historicity, integrity and authenticity of certain religious sources and authorities (as the Sunnah, the role of the Imam or other religious scholars). Although, this was not the case for their accounts on the Quran, as orthodox and non-orthodox participants alike resonated the divine origin of the Quran; regarding the Sunnah or the question of Ijtihad there was great variation in positioning. This was in turn often mediated by a liberal concern of the self. For example, some stressed the need to have direct access to religious sources, questioned authorities as the imam or Muslim scholars, or rejected some religious sources as the Sunnah. The discursive mechanisms behind their positioning, for example, revealed reason-based argumentation, the stress on independence, the allocation of autonomy to the self, and the premise of individual freedom. Yet, the Islamic discursive tradition was also mediated and regulated through the maintenance of certain limits, as, for instance, was done by highlighting the authenticity of the Quran. These boundaries also reflected a non-liberal agency model in which obedience to God acted as formative principle.

This agency model in which God's will, and not the autonomy of the individual is the primary guiding motive, was explored more in-depth by Nadia Fadil in chapter 7 of her dissertation. This revealed that utterances can be composed out of different, both liberal and non-liberal ethical narratives. For example, the importance of God's presence could be expressed by the desire to live according to His will, as well as, the reiteration to have the freedom to follow one's religious conduct. This latter statement relates to the liberal maxim of autonomy and entitlement, whereas the former hints at

the non-liberal maxim to subject oneself to the will of God. The narratives of the participants, hence, illustrated that both liberal and non-liberal positions could be upheld simultaneously (Fadil, 2008, p. 251).

From the above exposition, the manner in which Fadil relates the narratives of her subjects to liberal or non-liberal ethical conduct became clear. She views the self as a specific subjectivity model. Individuals can be attributed agency in structuring their ethical conduct. The self is guided and structured by a shared ethical code which includes the expectation to structure one's own conduct and express this; likewise the self is shaped by a liberal governmentality. This shared ethical code and liberal governmentality structure the reciprocal relationship between the self, society and governance. It is expressed through a liberal language of autonomy and authenticity. Yet, this in turn shapes the self.

In the subsequent paragraphs, Fadil's conceptualization of the self will be examined in relation to Verkuyten's, Maliepaard's and de Koning's positioning on this. The aim is to enrich Fadil's insights and place her views into a framework of contemporary social scientific research on 'the self'.

3.3 Maykel Verkuyten and Social Identity

In his book, Maykel Verkuyten examines questions of ethnic identity from various perspectives by carrying out a multidimensional approach. He studies 'the self' by examining identity formation among migrant groups. He does so by using surveys, interviews, group discussions, participant observation, and experiments to gather data. Due to the varied methodology, I believe he can aid Fadil's conceptualization of the self. In his book he gives specific attention to ethnicity. For an in-depth understanding of the complexities involved in this concept I, therefore, refer to Verkuyten's book (Verkuyten, 2005).

Verkuyten views ethnic identity as a social identity. He builds upon work by Erik H. Erikson, who investigated stages in psychosocial development. Verkuyten distinguishes between two conceptualizations of identity; identity as member of a social category or group and identity as sense of self. It must be noted that self and social identity does not necessarily refer to the same thing. The self involves self-understanding and self-feeling, while social identity relates primarily to categorical group membership. This membership can in turn inform self-understanding and self-feeling and, hence, is closely entwined to the self.

Social identities, as Verkuyten explains, 'involve social categories and designate the person's position in a social structure or social space that is larger and longer-lasting than any particular situation' (Verkuyten, 2005, p. 44). A social identity consists out of three components. It, first of all, is a social

classification. Secondly, this classification involves behavioral- and normative consequences and expectations that are based upon a shared understanding of the social world. The categories gain content or substance in the social world and gain prominence through a shared understanding of the boundaries between social categories. Although, the content often involves stereotyping, the categories can nevertheless be challenged, disputed or rejected. A last component of social identity is judgments of an ontological nature. A social category does not only get meaning through the social context, but also by the people that are categorized and who identify with the social category.

Verkuyten makes clear that social identities are not static, but are fluid categories that arise in social contexts. Not only can people have partial or overlapping identities, the prominence of a certain category depends on the significance of it in a particular context, the relations between members within the group and between members of other groups and the importance attached to the social category by the individual member. Moreover, social categories can be negotiated and challenged by the entire group or by individual members. Verkuyten, furthermore, points out that there is a difference between identity as a social fact and the psychological meaning an individual can attach to an identity, as he explains: 'identity issues concern both personal interpretations and socio-cultural constructions, and these issues cannot be reduced to one another' (Verkuyten, 2005, p. 61). I belief it is important to give attention to identity as a social construction and to the subjective experiences that are related to it. As may have become clear, an important element of an individual's self-concept is derived out of its membership to social groups, the knowledge derived out of it and the emotional significance that is attached to it.

Nadia Fadil focuses on identity as sense of self and the manner in which liberal scripts and sensibilities structure this sense of self. She considers the self primarily in relation to a liberal or non-liberal agency model in which the self is either shaped and cultivated though notions of autonomy and authenticity, or else through the desire to confirm to God's will. She analyses discursive self-techniques that guide her interlocutors self-fashioning processes, such as the centrality of rationality, importance of the will, insistence on making own choices, having freedom to make those choices, stressing understanding and knowledge, claiming integrity, emphasizing authenticity, remaining truthful to the self, and being able to express oneself. These techniques reveal discursive mechanisms that shape and cultivate the (religious or secular) self in relation to power structures and ethical substance (i.e. the Muslim tradition). Yet, in my opinion, she does not address important cognitive and social processes, as belonging to a social category, which may be relevant for the positioning of her participants and for understanding both their religious trajectories and the construction of their selves.

Her aim is to uncover the regularities that guide her interlocutors' narratives and the manner in which, through their speech, both their selves and the social context is shaped and reproduced. Her primary interest, thus, lies not in the religious experiences themselves, but rather in the manner that the experiences are produced and reproduced in the descriptions of her interlocutors. She criticizes positivist epistemologies that view 'sociological knowledge as a reflection of the social world' (Fadil, 2008, p. 20) and instead aligns with a situated epistemological perspective which views that knowledge is always mediated by a specific discourse that is the result of selections, limits and regularities. The aim is to lay barren the assumptions underlying knowledges and experiences.

As a consequence she gives, in my opinion, too little attention to the social categories her subjects belong to out of its own right, and to being a Muslim, or having a Maghrebi ethnicity in relation to the non-Muslim or non-Maghrebi society in which they live. Maykel Verkuyten argues that belonging to such categories and relating to other categories have consequences to self-conceptualization and self-description. Moreover, depending on context the categories can gain prominence, knowledge can be derived out of categorical group membership and emotional experiences can be attached to it. I, therefore, believe that it is important to take the dimensions of categorical identities into consideration when studying minority group members.

Fadil's approach to the self is informative as it provides new insights into the manner in which Maghrebi employ (or do not employ) liberal regulatory ideals in their self-fashioning processes. Moreover, she shows how her subject's conduct is shaped through their vocabularies and through the reciprocal relationship between the self, authority structures and society. This is important as it allows for a new conceptualization of religious individualization. However, I believe that her conceptualization of the self is partial, as she focuses on her interlocutors' vocabulary in relation to a liberal or non-liberal agency model. She overlooks the influence of social categorical identities in her analysis. As Verkuyten points out, the social categories to which her interlocutors belong to and accompanying internal psychological processes are, in my opinion, also relevant in the construction of their selves. On her other hand, Verkuyten could give more attention to the manner in which power structures inform self-understanding. Moreover, his future studies could be expanded by investigating liberal and non-liberal subject positioning.

Fadil does give attention to some of the social categories that are relevant for her subjects, for example, by discussing the relation of her subjects to the religion of their parents, by including a group of ex-Muslims and by the manner in which her subjects position themselves in relation to other Muslims. She discusses the ambivalences that characterize the non-religious group by investigating their relationship to the category Muslim, to Muslim practices as praying or fasting, and

the manner in which secular practices are embodied. The problematization of- and ambivalences to this category on the one hand, and the expression of secular bodily techniques on the other, actually, confirm, in my view, the relevance of the social category 'Muslim'. However, Fadil does not, thoroughly, discuss the construction, content and meaning that is given to the category of Muslim. or Neither does she explain the manner in which her subjects relate to this category, nor the cognitive mechanism involved in such categorization. Moreover, she leaves questions of ethnicity largely unexamined. This is all the more relevant as all her subjects grew up and live in a social environment in which both their ethnicity and religious identity is constantly made salient, and is reified in media and everyday life situations.

3.3.1 Self-categorization Theory and Social Identity Theory

Two influential, interrelated theories are used by social psychologists to describe the mechanisms behind group identity and intergroup processes, namely self-categorization theory and social identity theory.

Self-categorization theory describes the manner in which personal and social identities can be represented as a hierarchy of different identities, which for example can range from being a human being, an individual or member of a group. Social identity theory, on the other hand, is mostly used to describe intergroup relations. Yet, the underlying cognitive mechanism is categorization in terms of the social group.

Social identity theory, hence, argues that individuals derive their identity from social groups. Various studies have shown that minimal group differences can lead to: in-group favoritism, discrimination or prejudice against the out-group, categorization in terms of the category provided, and self-conceptualization derived out of membership op a social group (Reynolds & Turner, 2001; Verkuyten, 2005). When social identity is salient, group membership becomes a significant idiom of identification. Moreover, individuals seek to evaluate themselves positively 'by belonging to groups that provide them with a secure and positive social identity and are motivated to maintain positive distinctiveness through intergroup comparisons' (Verkuyten & Thijs, 2010, p. 31). Group members tend to favour their own in-group against an out-group. For individuals it is of crucial importance to identify with social groups as this can enhance self-esteem. When social identity becomes salient, research has shown that a process of depersonalisation takes place. This leads to a heightened perception of similarity to members of the in-group. The individual personality becomes contrasted against the out-group instead of against other individuals (Reynolds & Turner, 2001, pp. 169–170; Verkuyten, 2005).

Self-identification with a social category influences behavior as it involves self-stereotyping. The norms, beliefs and behavior ascribed to a social group will influence the behavior of the individual who ascribes to that particular group, as he will act according to what he believes is appropriate behavior as member of that group. Yet, self-categorization is situational, as depending on the context the category can become more or less salient and can evoke more or less strong sentiments. The manner in which group identity is psychologically central depends on the context, and upon individual differences. As Verkuyten explains, 'the concept of ethnic self-categorization emphasized the significance and consequence of a person's ethnicity within a particular context, whereas the concept of ethnic identification emphasizes individual differences in the degree to which ethnicity develops in psychologically central and valued group membership' (Verkuyten, 2005, p. 70).

There are different manners in which the individual can relate to a social category he belongs to. For example, individuals can resist identification with a group or can identify with a group he does not belong to. Social identity can be of importance to a person as it can evoke emotional feelings of belonging to a group and can enhance self-esteem. The emotional meaning of group identity is an important element in understanding the importance of social identity. Verkuyten describes that the need to belong is a powerful and pervasive motivation. Feelings of belongingness and connectedness are driving motivations for human beings (Verkuyten, 2005, pp. 67–69). Intergroup differentiation is a means to achieve a positive social identity, and hence, is a powerful mechanism to obtain self-esteem.

Verkuyten suggests that social identity can involve powerful cognitive mechanisms as categorization and stereotyping that informs the self as well as one's relation to other individuals and groups. Moreover, it can evoke motivating, emotional feelings as, for example, self-esteem and belonging. This, in my view, reveals that social identity can be significant for identity formation. When studying identity processes, I believe it is important to take this into account.

3.3.2 Ethnicity and Context
Verkuyten considers social identity to be important for identity formation. He further elaborates on the concept by revealing two more aspects that are relevant for understanding social identity. First, he has an in-depth discussion on the construction, and the meaning given to ethnicity. Although, religiosity is not and cannot be reduced to ethnicity, his discussion on ethnicity does raise questions as to how we possibly could understand religiosity, as being a social identity and informing the self. Secondly, Verkuyten stresses the importance of the social, situational context for the manner in which an identity informs the self. This raises question to the, sometimes, perceived stability and coherence of identity. In this paragraph I will discuss these two aspects.

Verkuyten explains that ethnicity has become an important feature of self-understanding and social structure. He makes clear that there is substantial discussion among scientist on the conceptualization of ethnicity (Verkuyten, 2005, p. 74). Ethnicity is considered to involve the belief in a common origin, descent and history. However, the content and meaning that is given to ethnicity can vary; ethnic boundaries can be flexible and negotiated. Nevertheless, it needs justification for both in-group members and outsiders for it to become a meaningful identity. In particular, the relation between ethnicity and culture is a complex one, as there can be a great overlap between ethnicity and cultural elements as language, tradition and religion. Yet, cultural similarity does not necessarily involve ethnicity (Verkuyten, 2005, pp. 74–81).

Maykel Verkuyten argues that ethnic minority identity is dependent on various constructive processes (2005, p. 91). Comparisons can be made against more than one out-group, intergroup comparison does not necessarily be of primary concern for individuals or groups and in-group comparison can be relevant as well (Verkuyten, 2005, p. 93). Hence, as Verkuyten indicates: 'Category relations can take different forms that have different consequences' (Verkuyten, 2005, p. 94). From this it may become clear that a great variety of social comparisons can be upheld. Moreover, the categories are not always clear-cut as hybrid identities develop in which subjects can have variable, fragmented, situational identities (Verkuyten, 2005, p. 178). Individuals can be attributed agency in deciding against which categories they posit themselves and in the manner in which they reify, reproduce, challenge or negotiate their identities against categories.

Verkuyten conducted research among ethnic Dutch and ethnic minorities (Turkish, Moroccan and Hindustani people), by conducting surveys, and following various focus-groups in which group members met on several occasions to discuss issues of ethnicity. He analyzed a series of discussions among nine second-generation Turks. He indicates that ethnic self-definition is a complex process in which distinctions between many categories are relevant, but also dependent on the comparison at hand. Comparisons were made, for example to other, both first and second generation Turks living in the Netherlands, to Turks in Turkey, to other minority groups in the Netherlands and to Dutch majority members. In defining themselves, the subjects constructed various categories, however, the descriptions and features attributed both to the self and the referent category depends on the specific comparison. For example, the subject could identify with being a 'foreigner' when comparing to Dutch or identify as Turkish in contrast to Moroccans. Hence, there was variation in the descriptions and features that were used to ascribe the self and the out-group based on the comparison. Verkuyten makes clear that self-definitions are situational and can be actively negotiated.

Despite variation in possibilities to relate to social categories, Verkuyten shows that psychological essentialism is a powerful mechanism in which these categories get content and meaning. He conducted both survey analysis and followed focus groups of ethnic Dutch and ethnic Turks. He indicates that 'people tend to infuse an essence into social groups in order to explain group differences, and a discourse about ethnic group essentialism has important interactive and perceptual consequences' (Verkuyten, 2005, p. 147). The link between ethnicity and culture was presented in the discussions as obvious, natural and inevitable, as one is socialized into it and, hence, shaped and marked by culture. By making this intrinsic link between ethnicity and culture, the Turkish participants were able to resist assimilationist ideas and claim group rights.

Fadil does reveal variation in positioning between interlocutors. This became in particular apparent in chapter five, in which she discussed her interlocutors' relation to the religion of the parents. Her subjects had experienced their religious education differently and often positioned themselves against different categories, as for example a non-liberal or too liberal religion of their parents, or a too liberal or non-liberal Islam of the youth. However, relating Verkuyten's insights to Fadil's, I want to point out three aspects that can aid Fadil's analysis. First of all, Verkuyten makes clear that ethnicity can be a powerful and pervasive category that can become a meaningful locus of identity. I find this is in particular relevant, as Fadil's subjects live in a context in which they are an ethnic minority and their ethnicity is constantly reified in media and social life. She, therefore, could have paid attention to her subjects' ethnicity. Secondly, Verkuyten makes clear that the reference category is relevant for informing the self. Fadil, indeed points out that her subjects positioned themselves differently in relation to their parents' Islam or to Islam of youth. Keeping Verkuyten's insights in mind, description of own religiosity may, actually, depend on the specific category used; hence, self-description may vary in relation to the mother or father, siblings, other people or groups. I believe it is relevant to make apparent the variations in positioning of an individual in relation to different 'others'. Thirdly, Fadil is able to account for the diversity of positions between her interlocutors, however, she is not able to investigate the manner in which an individual can vary in the positions he takes, depending on the situation. Reading Verkuyten, it becomes clear that individual positioning is not necessarily stable and coherent over time, given the specific referent category used or the social context. Below, I will explicate this latter point more thoroughly. Verkuyten observed conversation of individuals in various settings and in doing so allowed to account for such individual variation.

Although, Verkuyten stresses the relevance of context and the importance of cognitive mechanisms, he does not have a deterministic view of individuals. He makes clear that people have agency in their

positioning of the self. For example, he indicates that, although, asymmetrical power relations can be present between majority and minority group members, and issues of discriminations or feelings of exclusion can enhance ethnic self-understanding, the extent to which this is relevant depends on personality and on context (Verkuyten, 2005, p. 120). Power relations can be resisted or reproduced by shifting identity definitions and associations. Hence, whether and how ethnicity informs self-understanding is different per individual and per context. Verkuyten's insights raise questions to the manner in which Fadil's subjects relate to various social categories, and the manner in which these social categories inform the self.

As mentioned above, identities are not always clear-cut as people can have multiple, mixed identities in which a plurality of positions can be upheld and negotiated that resist strict boundaries between categories. Yet, this raises questions to the manner in which individuals deal with multiple identities and these identities relate to each other. Scholars have proposed many theories to explain how various identity positions within the self are dealt with and negotiated. One possible manner is that identities interrelate through a situational hierarchy (Verkuyten, 2005, pp. 178–179). Another, influential model is that of Berry (2005) (see chapter 2.3).

Both models are widely used to asses identity strategies and interrelatedness between social categories (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2003; Stevens et al., 2007; Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2012). It must be noted that Fadil criticizes a European Islam perspective that is based on a Eurocentric view of Islam. This includes a tendency to focus on questions of integration, while disregarding 'the fact that Muslims are formulating new and challenging questions through their mobilization, questions which also refashion the architecture of the European public sphere' (Fadil, 2008, p. 45). This certainly is problematic in studies on Muslims minorities. Many of those studies focus on acculturation strategies and the consequences of these strategies. Quantitave research is limited in the possibilities to account for the variations in positions that are upheld and the complexities involved. On the other hand, Verkuyten attempts to obtain a more diverse understanding of ethnicity, by conducting various studies and using different research methods, and in doing so, is better able to account for the intricacies involved.

Verkuyten points out that sense of identity is not necessarily fixed and stable (Verkuyten, 2005, p. 183). He discusses apparent inconsistencies in self-descriptions of a 15-year old Turkish boy. In one situation he claimed to feel Turkish, and stressed the importance of being Turkish, while in another situation he indicated to have become Dutch and expressed the irrelevance of his Turkish identity.

This first of all, seems to point to the importance of context, as the first of the two utterances, was made in a classroom context during a discussion about ethnic diversity, while the second was made in the canteen, discussing his future in the Netherlands with peers. Various research supports that social context is highly influential for ethnic self-descriptions and evaluation of ethnic identity (Verkuyten, 2005, p. 184). For example, the salience of ideological frameworks, as endorsing multiculturalism or supporting assimilation, in a social context influences ethnic group identification (p187-189). Moreover, as Verkuyten indicates: 'personal identity is particularly related to intragroup comparison, whereas social self-definition is more likely to occur in an intergroup context' (2005, p. 189) and accordingly self-description can vary. Additionally, as the idea of cultural frame-switching suggests, individuals can possess various cultural identities, and depending on situational cues, switch between identities and cultural appropriate behaviors (Verkuyten, 2005, p. 195).

Another approach suggests that statements, such as those made by the Turkish boy, do not necessarily have to contradict each other. In the different contexts, he could have referred to different aspects or dimensions of his Turkish identity (p196-197). As Verkuyten explains, different dimensions of ethnic identity can be 'being', referring to biological aspects as visible characteristic, parents, homeland; 'feeling', e.g. importance attached to membership of the group, evaluation, commitment; 'doing', e.g. behaving according to ethnic prescriptions as participating in-group activities, friendships, clothes; and 'knowing', e.g. knowledge of beliefs, culture and history (Verkuyten, 2005, pp. 197–198).

These insights raise important questions regarding Fadil's research. It is unclear whether or how her participants were influenced by the context in which the interviews were taken place and how this influenced their statements. Her focus is on the discursive regimes that underpin their accounts and the meaning this has for our understanding of religious individualism and secularism. Yet, one can question the stability and coherence of such discursive regimes, over time, and depending on context. A fundamental premise of Fadil's approach to the self is the reciprocal relation between the self, society and governmentality. Clearly, she acknowledges the importance of the social context for the development of the self. Yet, her research design does not allow for investigating the effect of different social contexts on her subjects' accounts. From the suggestions of Verkuyten it became clear that the social comparative context affects self-description. Fadil mentions, for example, how her interlocutors took up different position towards their parents' Islam (distancing from it or embracing it) by comparing their religiosity with their parents' or other Muslims' Islam. This suggests that primarily intra-group (intra-Islamic) comparisons were made. If so, this, first of all, raises questions whether or how their utterances would differ when intergroup comparisons were made;

secondly, it is unclear whether and how the social context influences expressions based on liberal regulatory ideals and the stability of liberal agency positions. Additional research could possibly give more insights into this.

As discussed in chapter 2.3.1, Verkuyten pinpoints towards some limitations of discursive research. Discursive approaches, according to him, 'do not tell us much about why particular identity positions are taken up in a specific situation…' (Verkuyten, 2005, p. 205). Individuals have agency in managing their identity, yet, this is not only influenced by 'discursive regimes and the politics of recognition, but also by personal resources such as feelings, capacities, abilities and the structured mental representation of one´s experiences and self´ (Verkuyten, 2005, p. 205).

Cognitive-structural approaches focus on psychological dimensions of (ethnic) identity and emphasize the role of individual characteristics in social identities, the relation between group membership and self-esteem and the development of the (ethnic) self. Many models on the development of the ethnic self are based on Erikson's model of developmental stages in which a person passing on from infancy to adulthood can develop a secure and stable self. Nadia Fadil has a specific outlook on the development of the self. She highlights agency in the development of the self. Yet, I find it important to acknowledge the relevance of cognitive aspects for the self, talking about the self and identity formation. Although, Fadil's research should be analyzed in its own right, and the aim of her research should be kept in mind, Verkuyten's perspectives deepen our comprehension of Fadil's study and situate it in a social psychological framework. Moreover, it has raised questions which need further research to be clarified. It has become clear that identity formation among minority group members is complex and involves both social contextual factors as well as intra-psychic processes.

3.4 Mieke Maliepaard and Quantitative measures

Mieke Maliepaard and Mérove Gijsberts (2012) conducted an elaborate quantitative study on the religiosity of Turkish- and Moroccan-Dutch in assignment of the SCP (the Netherlands Institute of Social Research). The aim of the research was to study religious experiences among various Muslim groups in the Netherlands, and to investigate whether secularization- or revitalization tendencies occur among them. They conceptualize secularization as a disappearance of religion in the political or public domain and as decline of the significance of religion for individuals. This decline is seen as a consequence of modernization and differentiation. Although, they do discuss theories that expect religious privatization among Muslims in Western countries, or the development of an individual, cultural, or symbolic Islam, they investigate secularization primarily from a religious decline perspective (Maliepaard & Gijsberts, 2012, pp. 32–34).

As discussed in chapter 2.3.2, Maliepaard and Gijsberts conducted quantitative research and have a different conceptualization of secularization and religious individualization compared to Fadil. Therefore, their research findings can provide a distinct perspective on developments in Islam; and can enrich Fadil's suggestions on religious individualization.

Maliepaard and Gijsberts investigate the religious self as social identity (2012, pp. 55, 136). This is investigated by means of survey analysis in which strength of religious identification is measured on a scale from 1 (disagree completely) to 7 (agree completely), on questions like: 'my religion is an important component of myself', 'it hurts when someone negatively talks about my religion', and 'being Muslim is something I think about often'[3]. They are concerned with the relation between religious identification and ethnic identification. This is interesting, as Verkuyten's insights on social identities raises questions on the relationship between religious and ethnic identities. Maliepaard and Gijsberts, specifically, analyzed whether length of stay in the Netherlands relates to a stronger identification with the Dutch society, and whether identification with the Netherlands relates to a diminished Muslim identification. They found that, in general, across migration cohort both Turkish and Moroccans identify very strongly with their religion (Maliepaard & Gijsberts, 2012, pp. 138–139). Moreover, duration of stay in the Netherlands relates to a decline in strength of Turkish or Moroccan identity, however, length of stay is not associated with strength of religious identification. Additionally, religious identification is positively associated with ethnic identification, as those that identify more with their Turkish or Moroccan background, identify more strongly with their religion (Maliepaard & Gijsberts, 2012, pp. 142–143).

Studying religious participation, Maliepaard and Gijsberts find considerable variation in religious practice between Turks and Moroccans, between age groups, first and second generation and educational background (Maliepaard & Gijsberts, 2012, pp. 74–76). Across groups a very high percentage of participants indicates to be religious and to identify strongly with their religion. Regarding religious behavior there is more variation. Nevertheless, Maliepaard and Gijsberts indicate that overall Muslims tend to eat halal and participate in the Ramadan. Conducting longitudinal studies between 1998 and 2011, they found a slight increase in mosque attendance after 2004 among the first generation and a greater increase in this period among the second generation (Maliepaard & Gijsberts, 2012, pp. 117–123). The high degree of religious participation could, according to them be a result of the social character of Islam (2012, p. 97). Unfortunately, they do not explicate the meaning of this, nor relate this to secularization. Nevertheless, they view the high

---

[3] In Dutch: 'mijn geloof is een belangrijk deel van mezelf', 'het doet pijn als iemand iets slechts zegt over mijn geloof', 'dat ik Moslim ben, is iets waar ik vaak aan denk' (Maliepaard & Gijsberts, 2012, p. 82)

degree of religious participation to signify religious stability or even religious revitalization. They find further indications for religious stability in investigating religious beliefs (Maliepaard & Gijsberts, 2012, p. 124).

As may have become clear in chapter 2.3, social identity can be an important and powerful aspect of the self. The strong religious identification of both Turkish-Dutch and Moroccan-Dutch, in my opinion, indicates that religious identity is of relevance in studying Islam in the Netherlands. However, although Maliepaard and Gijsberts provide information about the prevalence and significance of social identity and religious participation, it does not tell us much about the intricacies in which religion is experienced.

Clearly, it is not the intention of Maliepaard and Gijsberts to investigate the Muslim self in-depth. The aim of their study was to investigate trends of secularization and religious revitalization among Muslim groups in the Netherlands. The 'self' is only investigated as social identity. However, they do point out that an individual Islam can develop in Western-European countries. It is expected that there will be heterogeneity among Muslim in which some will strive for a fundamentalist interpretation of Islam, while others choose for a private form of Islam. As mentioned in chapter 2.3, Maliepaard and Gijsberts investigate different types of Muslims (Maliepaard & Gijsberts, 2012, Chapter 5). This typology of Muslims is primarily based upon differences in religious practices. Unfortunately, they do not investigate rationales behind practicing.

Likewise, rationales behind adhering to certain religious beliefs are not investigated. Only in studying wearing a headscarf, they asked the reason behind veiling or not veiling. Overall, 48% of the Turkish-Dutch women and 64% of the Morroccan-Dutch women do wear a headscarf. Of those who wear a headscarf, most indicate that they wear it because one is expected to do so by the religious community, or because it is a religious prescription. Only a minority denotes to wear it because they find it beautiful, as pronunciation of their Muslim identity, to avoid slander, or have another reason. Those who do not veil, indicate to do this because they are not yet ready to do so, because they do not see it as a religious prescription, or have another reason for not wearing it. Only a small percentage indicates to not wear it because you need to be really religious to wear it, because they view it better for integration in the Netherlands or want to avoid discrimination or aggravating behavior (Maliepaard & Gijsberts, 2012, pp. 76–78).

It is interesting that they investigated motivations behind wearing or not wearing a headscarf. Unfortunately, the answer possibilities are limited and survey analysis does not allow for investigation of the complexities involved in making these choices. Nevertheless, these findings do

seem to suggest that most of those who do wear a headscarf, hint at a non-liberal rationale behind their choice, as they indicate to do so because it is part of their religion or religious duty to do so. In her interviews, Fadil, likewise, questions rationales behind veiling or not veiling. Some of her interlocutors similarly indicated to veil primarily because they saw it as their duty to do so or mentioned to do it out of love for God (Fadil, 2008, pp. 225–228).

Yet, considering veiling as symbol of beauty or as pronunciation of Muslim identity could very well hint at a liberal agency model, as it, for example, may be done as a means to actualize the self, or as bodily practice that is grounded on a liberal quest of autonomy. Likewise, those who do not veil could do this out of a liberal agency model. For example, not deeming veiling to be a religious obligation could hint at a rational agency model and an expression of autonomy. Also, the other motives for not veiling could possibly reflect liberal techniques as doubt, rationalization or emotional justification underpinning their accounts. More research would be needed to confirm this.

The rationales of veiling hint at liberal of non-liberal modes of subjectivation. As the rationales where studied quantitatively, an indication can be given of the prevalence liberal or non-liberal rationales. Yet, Maliepaard and Gijsbert's study was not conducted for the purpose of investigation liberal agency models and, hence, it is risky to draw conclusions from the above mentioned data. Nevertheless, it is still an indication of the relevance of Fadil's proposition. Quantitative research on liberal agency models could provide more information on the significance of Fadil's proposition on secularization and could give information on differences in liberal positioning between Muslim groups, different cohorts, and generations.

3.5 Martijn de Koning and Identity Politics

Martijn de Koning (2008) conducted ethnographic research in Gouda, the Netherlands, where he worked as school-career coach for adolescents in two mosques. The aim of his research was to investigate how Moroccan-Dutch construe their identity as Muslim in relation to their in-group and the out-group. He approaches identity as both primordial and situational. His interest lies in analyzing in which conditions an identity is experienced as primordial, or under which circumstances a social identity informs social action (Koning de, 2008, pp. 27–28). He does not intend to relate this to the grander secularization debate or to investigate religious change in Islam.

A central tenet in his investigation of Muslim identity is 'identity politics'. With this he means negotiation of definitions and interpretations, practices and experiences that shape a specific identity. De Koning finds the construction of identity to arise in interaction with others. Through interaction and constant negotiation, choices are formed and argued and (religious) identity is

developed. This is done by making uses of repertoires. Repertoires, according to him, describe best the reciprocity of individual thinking and acting on the one hand, and the influence of social structures on the other hand. He describes a culture as a repertoire of both possibilities and limitations in knowing and experiencing reality (Koning de, 2008, pp. 20, 39).

De Koning distinguishes between identity as 'self' and as social identity. Both ethnicity and religiosity can serve as identity marker among Moroccan-Dutch and can form a social identity. De Koning argues that it is important to dissolve ethnic and religious identity in order to better understand how and why adolescents make a distinction between culture and religion. He follows Verkuyten in his conceptualization of ethnic identity as a (sometimes mythical) feeling of bonding and kinship with ancestors. Muslim identity distinguishes from ethnic identity in producing, maintaining and reproducing a connection with Allah. Important is a spiritual bonding. This does, according to de Koning, not necessarily mean, that a religious identity cannot entail cultural characteristics; however, central is a claim on a universal, transempirical reality (Koning de, 2008, pp. 28–30).

De Koning explains that Muslim identity is the result of both conscious and unconscious reflections, routines, dispositions and choices. Reflection of the self, a quest for authenticity, self-realization and autonomy are aspects of modernity, which strengthens involvement in Islam. Living in a non-Muslim surrounding forces youth to make a conscious decision to be Muslim, forces them to reflect upon it, and to position themselves in relation to others. As a consequence, individualization takes place as each has to construe his identity and make choices out of different cultural repertoires and develop an authentic self. Yet, subsequently, identities can be experienced as primordial. Authenticity, therefore, is the ideal to remain truthful to the real 'self'. This is different from identity, as here the aim is to be loyal to one's in-group. Hence, identity is based upon ethnic, religious and other social loyalties and distinctions. An individual has to constantly negotiate between his authentic self and loyalties to social groups (Koning de, 2008, pp. 30–34).

Interestingly, De Koning combines the self, as conceptualized by Taylor, and social identity as seen by Verkuyten. In doing so, he has a multifaceted understanding of the self and identity, which connects to Verkuyten's call for a multidimensional understanding of (ethnic) identity. Yet, Verkuyten focuses on identity as social construction. He sees the self primarily as sense of self, or the manner in which an identity can inform self-feeling. De Koning's conceptualization of the 'self' on the other hand relates better to Fadil's conceptualization, in which agency is attributed to the individual in constructing his identity consciously. The quest for authenticity and reflectivity is guiding the self.

However, de Koning chooses not to follow a discursive tradition. He indicates that the discursive tradition is able to pay attention to socialization and power structures in the construction of identity. However, he argues that Islam is more than a discursive tradition, as it also entails realities and experiences. Moreover, he finds that the discursive tradition pays too little attention to the impact of religious authority figures and religious transmission. Fadil does pay attention to religious experiences and various power structures, but she limits herself to the discursive tradition. As a consequence, she is, in my opinion, not able to grasp the dynamics of religion and religious identity formation in everyday situations. Since, Martijn de Koning performed anthropological participant observation he can provide different insights into the identity development among Muslims and therefore enriches Fadil's work. Moreover, de Koning is able to account for the diverse nature of identity structurally, by discerning and discussing various dimensions of identity. Fadil attempts to approach each individual agency model separately, and wants to do justice to each narrative. As a result, I find her analyses, at times, to lack structure, demarcation and overview.

According to de Koning, repertoires best describe the reciprocity of individual decision making on the one hand, and social structures on the other hand. By focusing on these repertoires, de Koning, thus, intends to connect the self and identity. Yet, the construction of the self occurs according to him both through negotiations with others −he describes this by using the term 'identity politics'−, reflectivity and individualization. However, he criticizes a view of reflectivity and individualization as being inherently modern and in opposition to tradition. In this regard he agrees with Fadil, who argues that Muslims can individualize through their religion. Likewise, he does not see reflectivity and individualization as detached from the cultural context, rather it is a cultural process which youth needs to go through in order to relate to the (changing) social context. The social context is used to position autonomously. De Koning sees reflectivity and individualization as a social process, as adolescents go through this process socially. With this he seems to stress the importance of social contexts for individualization processes. Fadil, on the other hand, does not highlight the social element of individualization, but sees individualization primarily as a form of (self)governance (Fadil, 2008, pp. 34–37).

De Koning distinguishes between several dimensions of identity, based on the various relationships in which 'identity politics' take place. He discerns an ethnographic dimension, an external-, an internal-, a gender-, a transemperical- and a virtual- dimension (Koning de, 2008, pp. 40–45).

First of all, he discerns an ethnographic dimension (Koning de, 2008, p. 40). Fundamental here, is the relationship between researcher and researchgroup. De Koning indicates that complete objectivity and neutrality is not possible, as analyses will be influenced by personal opinions and social

circumstances. Reflection upon one's position as researcher will make this visible and increases the validity of the study. He discerns various diagnostic events in which, as a consequence of incidents or conflict situations, his position and the manner in which others view his position became apparent.

It is interesting that de Koning spends considerable attention to analyzing his position as researcher. Verkuyten (2005) reveals that social context affects self-description. As researcher, de Koning is part of the direct social context of his research group. De Koning describes remarks by others who categorized him as insider or outsider. In some instances he is seen as '*kafir*'[4], while in other situations as Dutch Berber (2008, pp. 59–68). Although, any researcher may influence his subject group −for example the phenomenon of social desirable answering is well known in social scientific research− this may be even more the case when studying identity formation among minority members, by conducting interviews or participant observation. Similarly, Nadia Fadil, may also have affected the narratives of her participants by, for example, unconscious categorization as insider or outsider. Yet, how and whether this is the case is unclear. It would have been interesting if she had reflected upon this.

In addition to the ethnographic dimension, de Koning distinguishes an external dimension (2008, p. 41). The external dimension reflects non-Muslims in opposition to which his participants develop themselves. This aspect entails cultural and religious differences adolescents discover in contrast to these 'other' non-Muslims. The internal dimension entails the relationship of the adolescents with older Moroccan-Dutch and Muslim peers. Central is the manner in which they relate to religious authority figures, peers and to elders. The gender dimension, on the other hand, focuses on the manner in which the boys and girls negotiate their Muslim identity, their masculinity or femininity in relation to each other, and how elders influence this negotiation. The transemperical dimension involves the way in which the adolescents give meaning and content to their relationship with Allah. De Koning indicates the importance of analyzing the religious practices and images of adolescents, the situations in which they get meaning and the emotional and bodily experiences related to it. By using different repertoires and by emphasizing different aspects of Islam (or, for example, ritual prescriptions or political interpretations), religious identities are constructed. Lastly, he mentions the virtual dimension. De Koning indicates that the internet is a specific field in which negotiations take place both about what Islam is, as well as, what being Muslim means in everyday life situations. The internet websites do not only provide information for Muslim youngsters, but are also, 'spaces of communication in which the identity, meaning and boundaries (…) are continually constructed, debated and reimagined' (Koning de, 2008, pp. 44–45).

---

[4] Derogatory term for an unbeliever

De Koning indicates that these dimensions are entwined; nevertheless he distinguishes them in order to do justice to the diverse processes involved in identity construction. These dimensions describe interactions with significant others that are relevant for identity politics and identity development for the adolescents. Hence, they reflect foremost the social context in which identity is developed. Verkuyten has pointed out the importance and significance of the social context in which identity formation takes place. In this regard de Koning and Verkuyten seem to agree with each other.

Verkuyten also mentioned the relevance of cognitive processes. It is the aim of de Koning to investigate the manner in which Moroccan-Dutch adolescents form their identity in relation to significant others, and not to give an exhaustive overview of how overall identity is formed Nevertheless, in my opinion the notion of repertoires partly reflect such cognitive processes as described by Verkuyten. De Koning describes repertoires as cultural structures that have a more or less structural form. They entail, for example, being a youngster in Dutch society, a minority members, or a Muslim (Koning de, 2008, p. 39,91). This seems to reflect categorization processes as described by Verkuyten. However, although de Koning describes that his informants make use of repertoires, he, in my opinion, does not explicate in-depth the manner in which these 'repertoires' are formed, nor the content and meaning of various 'repertoires' for the youngsters. Likewise, he does not go into personal psychological characteristics or individual life invents, that may influence identity formation of those youngsters. It is, therefore, not possible to conclusively relate repertoires to cognitive processes.

3.6 Discussion and Conclusion

In this chapter I have attempted to reveal contemporary scientific thinking on the 'self' and identity formation in the context of Muslims migrants in the Netherlands and Belgium. In doing so I seek to aid Fadil's viewpoints, answering the sub-question: '*how can suggestions on the self and identity formation by Verkuyten, Maliepaard and de Koning enrich Fadil's conceptualization of the (religious) self?*

I believe that Fadil's research findings can be enriched by Verkuyten, Maliepaard and de Koning, as their different approaches do not necessarily exclude each other. Rather, by relating the various scholars to Fadil, individual shortcomings can be overcome, new insights can be found, and new questions can be asked. They collectively advance our understanding of the subject matter at hand: religiosity and religious individualization among Muslims in the Netherlands and Belgium (see chapter 2.3.4).

Fadil has a Foucaultian perspective on the self. The self arises through scripts and sensibilities that reflect individual understanding of an ethical subjectivity model. This subjectivity model is shaped by a liberal governmentality; that is a view of the self as having agency and autonomy. Fadil focuses on the discursive techniques that direct her participants' development of the self. According to the Foucaultian approach, reality is shaped, cultivated and reproduced through speech. The narratives of Fadil's interlocutors reveal their religious or secular positioning. Their discursive self-techniques, as for example, denoting rationality, own will, choice, authenticity, autonomy, but, also confirming to God's will, and piety, reveal liberal and non-liberal ethical modes of subjectivation.

By relating the views of Verkuyten, Maliepaard and de Koning to Fadil, I unfolded some important insights on the self and identity formation that can aid Fadil's research.

First of all, the importance of social identities was revealed. Verkuyten and Fadil differ in their understanding of the self. Fadil primarily investigates the manner in which sense of self is structured through discursive mechanisms and techniques. Verkuyten, on the other hand, distinguishes between sense of self, and social identity. Social identity is identity as member of a group. It involves social categorization. Group membership can evoke strong emotions of belonging and self-esteem, and can be important for self-understanding and identity development. Fadil does neither investigate the relevance of the category 'Muslim' for her interlocutors, nor the content and meaning that they attach to this category. Likewise, she leaves issues of ethnicity unexamined. This is significant as her interlocutors live in an environment in which such categories are constantly reified.

Secondly, Verkuyten pointed towards the importance of cognitive processes for identity formation. Social identity involves processes of social categorization, stereotyping, and intergroup comparison. Such processes seem to have a primordial character; yet, Verkuyten indicates that categorization processes can be resisted as individuals have agency in challenging and negotiating identities and categories. Moreover, such group identities can be fluid, partial and fragmented, and do not necessarily inform the self stably and coherently over time and in different situations and contexts. Nadia Fadil does not discuss the manner in which cognitive mechanisms could be of importance for the development of the self, self-governance, and subjectivation, or how it influences the narratives of her interlocutors. Her research could be complemented by studying the effect of cognitive structures on religious positioning.

De Koning describes the relation between individual thinking and acting, and social structures by the concept of repertoires. Repertoires, as I understand it, reflect cognitive representations of cultural systems and influence behaviors and beliefs as they provide possibilities and limitations in

experiencing reality. In this manner he, in my view, incorporates cognitive aspects into his theoretical approach towards identity development. Such notion of repertoires could aid Fadil, as it reflects the cognitive manner in which cultural systems influences identity.

Thirdly, both Verkuyten and de Koning reveal the importance of the social context for perceiving the self. In everyday life situations, the self is informed differently, depending on, for example, the reference category against which the self is positioned. This raises questions on the stability, coherence and consistency of Fadil's subjects' positions on their religiosity in various social contexts or when making use of different reference categories. Her research could, therefore, be elaborated on by using distinct methodologies and studying religious or secular positioning in a variety of contexts. Likewise, de Koning shows that there are several dimensions to identity formation of Moroccan adolescents. Their identity develops, through identity politics with significant others in their direct social environment. The various social contexts in which youngsters interact with others is of crucial importance for the development of their identity. In this respect, Fadil's research could be aided by giving more attention to the variety of social contexts that are relevant for identity formation and religious positioning.

In a similar manner, de Koning revealed that the social context that arises in interaction between the researcher and the research groups, also affects identity formation. He included the ethnographic dimension, as one of the identity dimensions against which, in interaction, his subjects developed their identity. Fadil as researcher can affect her interlocutors' positioning. De Koning coped with this by reflecting upon his position as researcher.

From the above exposition, it becomes clear that identity formation is complex and multilayered. It involves both sense of self and social identity. Moreover, cognitive mechanisms, such as categorization, stereotyping, and repertoires, influence perception of the self and the social environment. Likewise, the direct social context may affect identity formation and perception of the self. These insights can be added to Fadil's investigation of the discursive self-techniques that are expressed by her interlocutors. The interlocutor's ethical subjectivity models and their religious positioning may in part be the result of (liberal) governance. Indeed, a liberal understanding of the self can, to some extent, direct ethical substance and religious conduct. Yet, in part, modes of subjectivation can be influenced and explained by social identities, cognitive processes and social contexts. The precise interrelation between these various identity dimensions and the manner in which they influence individual religious positioning should be studied more comprehensively.

Fadil's research is important, as she is able to reveal some of the patterns underneath the narratives of her interlocutors. In deconstructing their vocabularies, she pointed out liberal and non-liberal modes of subjectivation. Yet, by relating her insights to Verkuyten, Maliepaard and de Koning, some deficits of discursive research were expounded.

Firstly, overall qualitative research, as conducted by Fadil, has difficulty to generalize research findings to the larger population. This is why Maliepaard's quantitative research can aid Fadil. Maliepaard conceptualizes the self, solely as social identity. She reveals the importance of religious identification and ethnic identification for the Turkish-Dutch and Moroccan-Dutch Muslims. Likewise, Maliepaard investigates trends over time and differences between generations in religious practice, as praying, mosque attendance, participating in the Ramadan and eating halal. In studying veiling she is able to reveal general trends in wearing a headscarf. The rationales behind veiling may hint at liberal or non-liberal agency models. Future quantitative research should study this more extensively. It, for example, would be interesting to study liberal and non-liberal agency models among migrants quantitatively, in order to show the significance of Fadil's study, to investigate general trends of such positioning, to study differences between generations, and to obtain some possible explanations of differences in positioning.

At the other side of the coin, Maliepaard's quantitative research has difficulty in studying the intricacies and complexities of religious positioning. Her measurement on religion could be more diverse. Fadil's insights raise questions to the validity of Maliepaard's measurement of religion, as her measurements are unable to investigate some of the internal dynamics that are currently going on within the Muslim community. Likewise, the focus on social identities falls short in incorporating modern and multilayered understandings of the self. In this regard, I suggest future quantitative research on Muslim religiosity to include more diverse measurements on religiosity, identity and, liberal or non-liberal agency models, and to study their interrelatedness.

Secondly, Verkuyten indicated that discursive research has difficulty in explaining their findings. Although, Fadil is able to show the diversity and intricacies of individual religiosity, she has difficulty explaining this diversity. This may be related to her situational epistemological perspective, which views reality to be mediated by discourses. Yet, I find it important and relevant to attempt to explain diversity in religious practices and ethical conducts. As argued in chapter 2, this can be best done by a plurality of approaches and methodologies.

By connecting Fadil's dissertation to Verkuyten's, Maliepaard's and de Koning's research, I attempted to lay barren some of the differences in social scientific thinking on the self. In doing so, I have sought

to clarify various insights and to relate them to each other. Yet, I continuously sought to do this by doing justice to each individual research aim. The above critiques should, therefore, be read by keeping this in mind.

4 Power Relations

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter Nadia Fadil's views on authority structures will be analyzed. This will be done in relation to Welmoet Boender's, Martijn de Koning and Mieke Maliepaard's research on power relations. In this chapter it will be attempted to answer the sub-question: '*how can suggestions on authority structures by Boender, de Koning and Maliepaard enrich Fadil's proposition on power relations?*'

First Nadia Fadil's insights on authority structures will be explained after which they will be related to the views of the other three.

4.2 Nadia Fadil on Power Relations

Nadia Fadil sees religious individualization as the result of a governmentality which shapes the self and society. As she explains, it 'can be viewed as a particular form of governance, which regulates the relationship between the self and religion in accordance with liberal-humanist registers' (Fadil, 2008, p. 54). The self is seen by her as the result of various power relations which organizes both society and individuals. As explained in chapter 2, liberal governmentality inscribes both a view of the self as self-directing agent and a particular manner in which individuals relate to power structures. It describes state-techniques of domination as well as (self-) techniques of agency. Crucial is that the self is not unbound by power relations, but rather finds meaning through it (Fadil, 2008, p. 53). This is, according to her, a form of governance that seeks to activate individuals and sees them as free, self-directing, and sovereign people. It is an expectation of the individual to form his own ethical conduct, to fulfill the self and to act autonomously (2008, p. 64). However, this autonomy and sovereignty entails a freedom to relate individually to authority structures. The related vocabularies and (self-) techniques hint at a problematization of authorities, and hence, individuals are neither considered to be free from it, nor as opposed to it. This problematization of authorities indicates, according to Fadil, a liberal-secular regulatory ideal, in which certain governmental interventions that impede own ethical conduct are being opposed. This is not seen as indicative for increased religious agency, but rather as part 'of a liberal-secular discursive order which seeks to disseminate a liberal mode of being and relating to the self' (Fadil, 2008, p. 69). A liberal governmentality, thus, seems to produce particular subjectivities. Fundamental is that it implies an understanding that the self, governance and religion mutually shape each other; hence the self finds substance through power relations. The Muslim tradition itself, is viewed by her as a power structure that provides ethical substance. Fadil is primarily interested in the manner that her interlocutors shape their own ethical agency (i.e. mode of subjectivation) as a result of this governmentality, and in relation to the Muslim

tradition. She does this by analyzing vocabularies, fields of problematization and self-techniques and aims to unpack liberal or non-liberal ethical agency underpinning these vocabularies.

In the previous chapter, I already discussed Nadia Fadil's account on the relationship of her interlocutor's to their parents Islam. It became clear that there was great variation in their positioning. Yet, through their relationship with their parents Islam and their religious upbringing -by some in opposition to it and by others in continuation of it-, their own ethical substance was shaped.

Likewise, Fadil investigated orthodox and heterodox positions guiding the relationship between the 'self' and religious authorities, in chapter 6 of her dissertation. The problematization of authority structures became apparent. The standpoints towards the Sunnah, the Imam or other religious scholars were not fixed, but pointed towards struggle and scrutiny, in which the status and interpretation of sources were questioned and contested. The critical engagement towards authority structures but also the maintenance of certain limits revealed liberal and non-liberal modes of subjectivation (Fadil, 2008, pp. 211–212). In particular, regarding the status of the Quran many maintained essential and non-negotiable boundaries regarding its divine origin, criticizing rationalistic and deconstructivist approaches towards it (2008, pp. 176–177). Yet, also regarding, for example, the Sunnah or Ijtihad, some orthodox respondent's upheld limitations, which highlighted, according to Fadil, an orthodox discursive modus (pp. 212). Transgressing these boundaries was sometimes experienced as an intrusion or violence and was met with disbelief and shock. These limits reflect, according to Fadil, non-liberal positioning, in which God and obedience to him guided the vocabularies of these subjects. Yet, besides these non-liberal concerns, many also indicated to attach importance to remain truthful to their self's in dealing with the Islamic sources and authorities. An important liberal discursive formation that Fadil discerns is temporalizing religious sources. She finds that some of her orthodox respondents maintained these limits by respecting the integrity of the Quran and the Sunnah. Some of her non-orthodox interlocutors, on the other hand, called for adapting the sources to the present context. They situate the sources, as Fadil explains, as a product of the past: 'this call for temporalising the religious sources can be understood as a discursive tactic of secular governance, which aims at refashioning religious subjects – and religious traditions – in accordance with liberal sensibilities and epistemologies' (2008, p. 208).

Another field of contestation regards the status of authority figures and the issue of Ijtihad. This revealed, according to Fadil, the prevalence of liberal ethics as many non-orthodox informants underlined the importance to have direct access to religious sources. Moreover, many refused to acknowledge the authority of Muslim scholars, criticized their dogmatic approaches, or highlighted that they only embody an interpretation of Islam. In this manner authorities are problematized.

Furthermore, by discussion non-orthodox trajectories in chapter 8, Fadil exposed that their religious subjectivities are shaped by a liberal governmentality. As she explains: 'their self-governance and religious practice seems to be primarily guided by a liberal concern with freedom, sovereignty, individuality, tolerance; hence illustrating the operation of (liberal) governmentality which disciplines and shapes religious subjectivities according to liberal epistemologies, affects and sensibilities. (2008, p. 254). This became, for example, manifest by some who indicated that being a 'good' Muslim is reflected in being a 'good' person, and not necessarily by religious practice. These accounts are, as Fadil states: 'indicative for the operation of liberal-secular governmentality which differentiates a domain of 'morality' from the religious system, and locates the sources of moral conduct primarily in one's interiority' (2008, p. 292). Nevertheless, fulfilling religious duties remained to be important for many. However, some indicated that it was only when done out of their own will. A link to remain truthful to the self and to their own well-being was constantly made (2008, pp. 270-271). Fadil sees these accounts as reflecting liberal self-governance.

In her discussion Fadil criticizes the individualization paradigm, as discussed by amongst others Dobbelaere, who views this stress on own will, desire, own choice, and well-being as the result of a structural differentiation in which individuals increasingly have the possibility to experience their religion freely and to engage in it according to their own needs (Chaves, 1998; Fadil, 2008, pp. 270–271). Fadil, however, indicates that these accounts should be understood as a specific narrative, reflecting the dominance of a liberal ethos, in which they are not necessarily freer. It, rather, should be seen as a 'self-disciplining process which is primarily guided and molded according to liberal scripts and codes...' (2008, p. 273). Yet, simultaneously some upheld limits in, for example, questioning religious sources as the Quran or the Sunnah.

Fadil indicates that orthodox respondents often expressed a double concern, on the one hand, they were informed by a liberal ideal to make own choices and live according to one's will, on the other hand, they indicated the imperative to live up to God's will and to be obedient to him. However in chapter 9, discussing secular Muslims, she indicated that these respondents could also be guided by a non-liberal ethos, for example, when adopting a language of silence with regard to their secular orientation which sits at odds with the liberal imperative to express one's interiority. In this manner Fadil attempted to disentangle liberal and non-liberal modes of subjectivation from orthodoxy, indicating that the manner of practice does not need to be related to rationale behind the practice. (2008, pp. 340–343).

With regards to authority structures, Fadil makes clear that a central tenet of liberal governmentality is a shared ideal to relate individually to authority structures. It is in response to the Islamic tradition

that her interlocutors cultivate and express their religious conduct. She discusses explicitly how her interlocutors relate to religious sources, authority figures and their parents Islam. It became clear that the authority structures in relation to which the self and ethical agency develops can be manifold. In this chapter, I will disentangle some of these structures, and treat the role of the imam, internet and parents separately. In doing so, I will discuss Fadil's findings and views in relation to that of Boender, de Koning and Maliepaard.

4.3 Welmoet Boender and the Imam

Welmoet Boeder (2007) is concerned with the role Imam's have in mosques and in Dutch society. She conducts her research in light of growing public and political attention for the role of Imam's, its negative portrayal in media, public concerns for possible hampering effects on integration and a search for Muslim leadership from the political arena. On the other hand, from within Muslim communities different issues may rise regarding the role of the Imam. Boender's aim is, therefore, to unravel the differences and similarities in attitudes towards the role of the Imam between the Dutch public debate and the Muslim community (2007, pp. 11–13). She investigates this by conducting a discourse analysis of the public space and by doing anthropological research in a Moroccan mosque, a Turkish mosque and among members of an Islamic student organization. As she carries out a thorough investigation of one of the power structures that are relevant within the Muslim community, her research may be interesting to discuss in relation to Fadil's arguments on authority formations.

Boender places her discussion on the role of the imam in a broader spectrum of religious individualization of Muslims in Europe. She discusses, amongst others, Pieterman and Cesari who see individualization as process in which traditional social-cultural bonds lose their obviousness, the function of religion diminishes and the relationship between religion and the public space changes as a consequence of structural differentiation. She herself indicates to see it as a 'reflexive process in which religious persons increasingly and innovatively, independently focus on their own rational interpretations of belief systems' (Boender, 2007, p. 32 translation, MP). As a result, religion can be shaped individually, but the religious practice itself can also be individualized. For the Muslim context religious knowledge and interpretations are increasingly accessible; young Muslims engage with this critically, and as a consequence a 'real' Islam is sought in opposition of the 'cultural' Islam of the parents (see also Koning de, 2008). Boender refers to Fadil and agrees that many practicing Muslims do not separate from their religion, but rather individualize through it by continuously making choices in relation to Islam. This is why we, according to Boender, need to keep paying attention to the 'normative power of patterns that arise out of the Islamic tradition' (2007, p. 27 translation, MP).

In this regard, the ideas of Fadil and Boender largely seem to correspond. Yet, Fadil sees individualization as a consequence of liberal governance and places the discussion on religious individualization in a social structural context. Boender does describe social structural theories regarding religious individualization, yet, she does not seem to link it to a change in the relationship between governments and citizens. According to Fadil, liberal governance places moral responsibility to individuals; individuals are expected to develop their own identity, make own choices, express this and relate individually to authority structures. Religious individualization is therefore reflected in a liberal manner of relating to one's religion. Fadil focuses on the discursive techniques underpinning the religious trajectories of her subjects, i.e. vocabularies grounded in liberal principles as autonomy and authenticity and a problematization of authority structures. As liberal governance is according to Fadil central to religious individualization, she focuses largely on whether and how her subjects have liberal concerns when relating to their religion. Boender, on the other hand, is less concerned with a structural effect liberal governance might have and does not make an explicit connection between independent, rational decision making processes and a change in governance.

Fadil studies the modern dynamics of authority structures primarily by focusing on liberal discursive techniques as problematization of power relations. As Boender studies the role of the imam, she has a more diverse approach towards studying the dynamics of power relations. Not only does she investigate the role of the Imam by studying the external perspective of the Dutch public debate and the internal perspective of both the perspective of the Imam and that of believers; she also has a more elaborate theoretical approach towards understanding the effect of power structures. I find Fadil to miss a demarcated and structured approach in unpacking her subjects' vocabularies.

Boender discerns three fundamental concepts in comprehending this power: role, authority and influence. According to Boender, role refers to standardized patterns of action in interaction with others, norms and expectations regarding a certain position, and the exchange of thoughts and feelings in interaction (2007, p. 33). As the Imam is expected to be influential, to have authority is according to Boender a fundamental aspect of its role. In studying the authoritative role of the Imam, Boender distinguishes between authority legitimized out of the institutional position of the Imam, authority resulting out of his message and out of his personality. Lastly, Boender investigates the influence of the Imam, by analyzing the force and scope of the Imam (Boender, 2007, pp. 33–35). From this theoretical approach to the position of Imam, I believe it becomes clear that the influence of power structures is more dynamic and complex than solely the problematization of it according to liberal or non-liberal ethical concerns of individual believers.

A last important theoretical aspect of Boender's research is the attention she gives to the contexts in which Imams operate. They operate within Islamic-Dutch communities, but also maintain cultural bonds with traditions of the country of origin and with the Dutch secular context. Boender defines cultural bonds as point of reference which determines someone's moral ideas and shapes action (2007, pp. 36–37). This concept seems to be related to de Koning's concept of cultural repertoires (see chapter 2.5 and 3.4). Both describe a link between cultural systems and personal thinking and acting. Although, Fadil does reveal that her interlocutors relate to their parents' Islam, and to the religious tradition they have been socialized in, she, in my view, does not infer that these socializations inform understanding of authority structures and make individuals susceptible to it.

In her research, Boender indicates that the cultural and ethnic bonds of both religious practitioners and the Imams give meaning and normative power to the role of the Imam. These bonds are imbedded in traditions of the country of origin and give way to certain patterns of behaving (Boender, 2007, p. 136). For example, in the case of the Turkish Ayasofya mosque this became apparent in the role Imams have in leading religious prayer, giving sermons providing religious knowledge and taking care of rituals. Yet, she indicates that in the Dutch context Imams have a more elaborate role in providing religious information or giving guidance in conflict situations compared to Imams in Turkey (pp. 124-126). The Imams grant themselves primarily an advising role, yet this is embedded in the Islamic discursive tradition. Both the Imams and the religious adherents indicate that the role of the Imam emanates from expectations and obligations in providing religions normative structures and is legitimized by the institutional position he embodies (2007, pp. 133, 137, 149, 168).

Boender indicates that a bridge is constantly made between living in the Dutch social context and the traditional Turkish cultural and ethnic bonds, for example, in the sermons of the imams. They attempt to make Islam compatible to Dutch society, by emphasizing and relating to the Ummah; the global Muslim community (2007, pp. 149, 168). Otherwise, the cultural bonds to Turkey become apparent in their social activities. Moreover, Boender reveals that the cultural and historical bonds with Turkey are also important for the second generation, as they make commonly use of the Turkish language and participate in Turkish cultural events and organizations (2007, p. 156). Also, in the case of the Moroccan El-Islam mosque, it is revealed that, to a large extent, religious authority is given to the Imam due to the socialization of the youth into the tradition. The authoritative knowledge concerning the Islamic theology and jurisprudence of the Imam legitimizes his position and compensates his poor comprehension of Dutch. Also the Moroccan Imam connects to a large extend to bonds with the religious tradition in his moral counseling (2007, pp. 225-226).   From this it

becomes clear that the role of the Imam does not arise in an isolated sphere. Rather, the expectations and obligations related to his role are partly rooted in the religious traditions of the country of origin. These insights place Fadil's approach to authority structures into another perspective; it becomes clear that power systems are legitimized by, for example, cultural bonds, and childhood socialization. Fadil leaves the embedding of such systems unexamined.

Yet, Boender makes clear that there are also other conditions necessary for the Imam to be authoritative. The religious adherents indicate that his authority needs to be legitimized out of his institutional position, from the message he communicates, and as a result of his charismatic capabilities. The Imam needs to be available for questions, and needs to give information concerning what is halal and haram. Moreover, Boender points out that the second generation expects the Imam to sufficiently communicate and explain his knowledge of religious rules and obligations and to connect this to their every day context of living. In particular, this younger generation reflects critically on the position of the Imam, as they expect certain capacities of the Imam, as for example, to rationally explain religious obligations, provide a historical understanding of it and leave room for discussion. They, moreover, indicate to not automatically take over the position of the Imam. They also make use of other sources, as the Quran, internet, and their peers to form their opinions (2007, pp. 149–152).

Also, the members of student organization Iqra indicate to make use of various sources in their search for information about Islam. A recurrent theme, in public debates, is their struggle between being an individual, a member of the Islamic community, and being part of the Dutch society. Many attempt to individually find and interpret information regarding the Quran, Sunnah and Fiqh (Islamic jurisprudence) in order to develop their religious identity, while simultaneously adapting to the demands of living in the Dutch context. They move between cultural bonds, and need to make choices regarding the religious obligations and values they adhere to and their everyday living situation. They do so individually and critically. Also, among these students the search for finding a 'true' Islam is important (pp.237, 241, 243, see chapter 2.5).

It is significant that the students do not turn to the Imam as primary source for information. Boender indicates that parents still are an important source of religious information for many. In this regard, parents provide a religious normative framework and are an important authority structure. Of the students only a small minority turn to the Imam when in need for advice. This is, in part, due to poor language skills of the Imams or the hierarchical distance to him, but also due to critical attitudes towards Imams. The students stress the responsibility of individuals to develop their own stances, to

critically assess Islam, to search for a 'true' Islam, and the need to adapt Islam to the current time and context (Boender, 2007, pp. 260–167).

This seems to correspond with Fadil's description of the liberal manner in which her interlocutors often relate to religious authorities. Fadil's discussion takes place in relation to the question of Ijtihad and the authority of scholars. Two of her respondents stress that the authority of Muslims scholars depends, partly, on their knowledge and expertise of the procedures and regulations of the Islamic discursive tradition. Others, also, indicate that personality, charisma, moral integrity or someone's reputation in the Muslim community, are important facets that determine a scholars credibility and authority (Boender, 2007, pp. 195, 196). In this manner power structures are questioned, evaluated and problematized.

In my view, it is clear that both Boender and Fadil's participants reveal liberal ways of relating to authority figures as Imams or Islamic scholars. Yet, Boender reveals the importance of social and cultural bonds with the country of origin and the religious tradition for the legitimization of the authority of the Imam and the normative religious framework he provides. In this regard, I believe that religious socialization is of key importance to understanding the scope and influence of religious authority figures. In particular, for the members of the Amsterdam and The Hague mosques, the cultural bonds seem to be relevant for the authority that is given to the Imam. Fadil does not elucidate an understanding of the power that is given to authorities and in this regard I find Boender to add to Fadil's insights. Moreover, besides the institutional imbedding of the Imam, Boender reveals that his personality, expertise, language capacities and his message are important for the influence he has. Probably, similar criteria play a role for the influence of other religious power structures as that of parents, peers and religious scholars. The socialization through upbringing and cultural bonds is, in my view, in particular important, as the legitimization of power structures is internalized through this. De Koning's concept of cultural repertoires seems to describe this internalized representation of cultural systems. The limitations and boundaries some of Fadil's interlocutors maintained, are, possibly, the result of socialization into the Islamic tradition and cultural bonds.

I believe it is important to take these aspects as socialization, personality and capacities into account when assessing the influence of authority figures. Only after understanding and endorsing an authority system, it can be critically assessed and problematized. Following Fadil, this problematization can be seen as a consequence of liberal governance. Moreover, reading her theoretical account closely, maybe though liberal governance a certain internalization process has taken place of liberal ethical modes of subjectivation. This then could possibly be seen as a repertoire

(Koning de, 2008). Yet, it is risky to make such one on one relation between liberal governance and repertoires, as Fadil and de Koning explain the concepts differently and do not themselves connect the two to each other.

4.4 Martijn de Koning and Internet

Martijn de Koning (Koning de, 2008) discusses, as described in the previous chapter, the notion of 'identity politics'. With this he means the negotiations with others, through which identities develop. It becomes clear that he does not see identity development as isolated; rather he focuses on the social interactions through which identity formation takes place. Hence, the various dimensions of identity; as interactions with the researcher, non-Muslim peers, Muslim peers, elder Moroccan-Dutch, and the virtual space of the internet, are foremost social dimensions (Koning de, 2008, pp. 40–45). Each of these identity dimensions involves power. He explains that negotiation entails defending one's own position and dealing with other positions. In this respect, it is relevant to relate Fadil's views to de Koning's.

As discussed in the previous chapter, de Koning sees identity as social identity and as self, in which identity politics with others; central identity processes of modernity like personal autonomy, authenticity, individual choice and reflexivity; and cultural repertoires are relevant. Clearly, there is theoretical overlap between Fadil and de Koning in their views on the self. Yet, relevant for the discussion in this chapter, are their views on the relation between religion, the self and power structures. To describe this relationship, de Koning's uses the concepts of identity politics and (cultural) repertoires, whereas Fadil that of (liberal) governmentality. These concepts are different and reflect the divergence of their underlying theoretical approach.

As discussed in the previous chapter, with identity politics de Koning means the constant negotiation of definitions and interpretations, practices and experiences with significant others, through which identity develops. He indicates that the concept of cultural repertoires describes the reciprocity between personal thinking and acting, and social structures. De Koning, however, provides in my view a limited explanation of the concept of repertoires. I believe it can be best described as a cognitive representation of a cultural system. De Koning does mention that a repertoire can be more or less systematic, but can also change and does not always need to be consistent. Moroccan-Dutch youth can make use of various repertoires, as for example Islam, the Dutch society and being a minority group (Koning de, 2008, p. 39). Yet, although the concept of repertoires is one of the central tenets in his research, de Koning does not provide a detailed and structural explication of the concept or a clear cut definition of it.

De Koning explains that each repertoire can influence religious identity, through reflection on- and by making choices out of accessible repertoires. This is the manner in which the concept of cultural repertoires and identity politics are linked. The former describes the representations of cultural systems, whereas, the latter describes how, through negotiation over these representations, identity develops. With these two concepts de Koning links cultural systems, social interaction and the self. Boender (2007), in a similar manner, seeks to explain the link between cultural systems and authority that is given to the Imam, by using the concept of cultural bonds.

Fadil, likewise seeks to explain this connection, yet does so by using the concept of (liberal) governmentality. As explained above, central to this concept is a shared liberal understanding of what it entails to be human; this includes the perception that people are free, and are able to form their own ethical conduct. This is reflected both in governance by institutions, and in self-governance. People are expected to relate individually to authority structures. As a consequence, individuals are guided by liberal regulatory ideals. Fadil, indeed, stresses that this liberal mode of subjectivation is the primary agency model through which her interlocutors shape their religious or secular selves. De Koning does not analyze his observations in terms of liberal agency models. Although, he has a modern liberal understanding of the self, he does not view the development of (religious) identity as a consequence of liberal governance. Although, the notion of cultural repertoires does describe the connection between cultural systems and the self, it primarily reflects limitations and possibilities of behaving as a consequence of knowledge of these systems. Yet, for Fadil, liberal governance seeks the activation of individuals and views individuals as active agents that need to relate to power structures individually. This results in liberal discursive mechanism, critical engagement with- and a problematization of power relations. Fadil describes an active agency model in which individuals relate to the Islamic tradition on their own terms, in liberal or non-liberal manners. De Koning, on the other hand, stresses limitations in behaving and knowing imposed by cultural repertoires; as a result of social expectations and knowledge derived out of cultural systems.

The concepts of governmentality and repertoires, thus, differ theoretically. However, both describe a link between respectively an understanding of shared liberal understanding of the self and cultural systems, and individual positioning. In this respect, both concepts could have a cognitive component. Yet, neither of the two relates their concept to such cognitive representation. It is therefore risky to make such conclusion. It would be relevant if future research would more clearly delineate cognitive components in investigation religiosity or religious individualization among Muslims.

Fadil and de Koning, differ in their research approach. Fadil follows a discursive tradition in which her analytical approach is situated at the interaction level. This allows her to connect the vocabularies,

self-techniques and problematizations of her interlocutors to sociological process as religious individualization and liberalism; i.e. she makes a socio-structural analysis of her subjects' discourses. De Koning, on the other hand, uses participant observation as method of study. He does investigate interactions of his participants to significant others, yet, his underlying theoretical approach focuses on the individual level. Making use of repertoires, reflectivity and making choices are foremost individual processes. His research, therefore, is more psychologically orientated and he draws less sociological inferences. Regarding power relations, de Koning focuses on direct social interaction. Fadil is interested in a grander theoretical discourse of secularization and religious individualization and links her subject's trajectories to this discourse. De Koning, rather, is primarily interested into the manner in which Moroccan youth develop their identity. Fadil and de Koning have a different manner in which they discuss their interviews. Fadil wants to pay attention- and do justice to each individual trajectory. She, therefore, refrains from summarizing positions as she wants to review each narrative individually. De Koning does make general inferences, based upon his observations and interviews.

Another important difference between the two is their sample. Unfortunately, Fadil does not describe the age, education and social-economic background of her interviewees. This is striking, as such aspects influence religious positioning (Maliepaard & Gijsberts, 2012). From the sample description (Fadil, 2008, pp. 85–90) I infer that most are young adults, possibly high educated of whom many are actively involved in Muslim organizations. She is, foremost, concerned about having diversity in orthodoxy within her sample. Martijn de Koning's sample, on the other hand, consists of second generation Moroccan adolescents, who he met during his work in two mosques. This is an important difference. During adolescence individuals develop their identity. It is a period in which the influence of parents diminishes, while that of their peers and other authority figures increases. Adolescents break from the traditional religious socialization and start to relate to religion individually. During young adulthood, most individuals have formed a more or less secure identity and developed their religious positioning. The participants of the sample's of Fadil and de Koning are in another stage of identity development (see Erikson, 1968).

As a result of the divergent theoretical propositions, research methods, and sample backgrounds, Fadil and de Koning focus on different kinds of authority structures. De Koning focuses on direct interactions, as to peers or the Imam, against which identities are shaped, whereas Fadil concentrates on power relations within the Islamic tradition, i.e. the Sunnah, Ijtihad and religious authority figures. Hence, a pivotal difference between the two lies in the theoretical underpinning of the role of power structures and the practical interpretation of the authority structures. Given the

differences in their research approaches, samples, and the types of authority structures they discuss, de Koning can enrich Fadil.

As mentioned before, de Koning investigates various identity politics against which, through negotiation, the participants develop their identity. He describes that at the start of his research, internet was still insignificant. Yet, as it gained prominence, he decided to include it in his research. De Koning indicates that internet, as identity politics, is different from any other authority structure, due to its anonymity and the lack of social control (2008, p. 260). As the internet can be a source of information, and a platform for negotiation, it is a relevant 'authority structure' for adolescents. Fadil pays little attention to the role of internet as power structure. De Koning's research can therefore provide insights into a developing source of power relations and can provide new perspectives on Fadil's research.

4.4.2 Internet

The internet, as de Koning describes, can be seen as a public spaces with their own rules and regulations. In this regard, websites form new cultural systems, in which individuals actively negotiate their identity. De Koning indicates that there is great variety in the kind of websites his informants visit; i.e. sites with various religious or ethnic affiliations, weblogs, e-mailgroups, forums, and msn-groups. In this manner, they can find like-minded individuals, but also have increasing accessibility to religious texts, information and are therefore less dependent on traditional religious authority figures (2008, p. 262). As they have anonymity online, the adolescents have more freedom to express themselves on the internet and are able to create their own identity on the internet. Internet is a space where Islam and issues of integration are hotly debated and they offer a space to share emotions and to express opinions (Koning de, 2008, pp. 263–265).

Furthermore, the internet sites and -forums provide ways to share religious information, texts and knowledge. In particular, Salafies[5] are dominant in spreading religious knowledge and texts, which often involve what they consider to be 'true' Islam. Likewise, Jihadies mobilize on the internet and call for a violent jihad. De Koning indicates that due to their activities, a Dutch jihadi repertoire arises. These groups are influential, and are, by many, considered to be authoritative. De Koning discusses some of the themes of their texts. They often refer to the global crisis of the Ummah and call for action. Interestingly, de Koning also indicates that these groups often stress the importance of righteousness, the search for purity, also within oneself, authenticity and spiritual self-fulfillment (Koning de, 2008, pp. 266–272).

---

[5] Salafies are a radical subdivision in Islam, who seek a 'pure' Islam; Jihadies are a militant subdivision in Islam.

De Koning explains that modern media as internet not only provide new forms of production, distribution and consumption of knowledge, but also lead to new forms of power and leadership and the accompanying structures of identity politics. He indicates that Salafi-groups, constantly, negotiate over who represents true Islam. Although, these groups are popular, there is also great opposition against them. On forums there is discussion on certain religious or social issues and, hence, identity politics takes place. Some sites are made by individuals themselves, yet, many forums of larger sites have moderators who can censor violent, hateful, or otherwise impropriate messages. In this respect, these moderators are part of the power structures of these websites. Clearly, the internet spaces can be important loci of power. The multiplicity of sites and groups may make internet an unclear field of power relations, nevertheless this virtual context can be important and relevant for the identity politics of adolescents (Koning de, 2008, pp. 272–276).

During his fieldwork de Koning investigated the manner in which internet functioned as identity marker for his participants. He indicates that many use the internet to find religious information, in which they often choose what interests them and what they find relevant. They weigh the authority of the sources, discuss their findings with their peers and make choices in interaction with them. This can lead, according to him, to some extent to an individualized Islam, yet identity, mostly, develops in social interaction (Koning de, 2008, p. 278).

The goal of most adolescents is to find the true nature of Islam, to find its authentic universal essence. Yet, in this search, they make use of various repertoires, express own opinions and feelings and selectively use religious sources. Some sources may be found significant; these texts can be copied, altered, combined, produced and shared on internet. As a result there is great discussion on forums concerning the authenticity and legitimacy of texts and sites. De Koning indicates that through internet a new sense of belonging and connection with likeminded others can arise. Yet, he makes clear that it is not a unified community, due to plethora of groups, the struggles between them and confusion about them (2008, pp. 279–282). The relation of internet and identity construction is therefore ambivalent. Nevertheless, de Koning discusses some important aspects for which the adolescents turn to the internet. The internet can provide (religious) information; it can be space to discuss societal issues; to identify with other Muslims, sometimes against the non-Muslim other; to connect to the greater Ummah; find a sense of belonging; negotiate gender identity; search (with others) for a 'pure' Islam and so on (2008, pp. 282, 286, 287). More importantly, de Koning points out that the Moroccan youth he studies, actively engage with material on the internet. In their search for a pure Islam they make use of different repertoires.

By discussing and negotiating the online sources with peers, a translation is being made to the offline world. Online movements do not necessarily have direct influence on offline religious life. On the other hand, de Koning mentions that his informants tend to seek likeminded others on the internet with whom they share texts, images and ideas. In this manner they form and share religious and political orientations that can activate certain religious repertoires. In this regard it does influence the offline world and forms one of the identity politics of adolescents (2008, p. 294,295).

Fadil gives little attention to the role of internet as authority structure. This can be the case because of the elder age of her sample. During their adolescence the internet may not have been significant. And now it may be less relevant as source for information or locus for identity development. The adolescence is an important period in which (religious) identity is formed and religious and political ideas are negotiated and internalized. Among Fadil's interlocutors the religious or secular identity may be more secure and as a result, the questions they ask and manners in which they deal with these questions may be different.

Martijn de Koning's research on the role of internet as identity politics, not only showed the relevance and the complexity of the digital space's for the development of adolescent identity, it for most shows that the various internet sites and forums provide their own power structures to which the adolescents need to relate. It is clear that the authenticity of texts and opinions is questioned and negotiated (2008, pp. 292–295). In this regard, de Koning's findings can be connected to Fadil's liberal imperative of 'problematization' of authority structures.

Yet, de Koning reveals the relevance of 'the other' in identity formation. Fadil's research could, in my opinion, be elaborated on by including these 'others' as idiom of investigation. Religious positioning is the result of interaction and negotiation with 'others' and could, partly, be explained by these interactions. This is step is, in my view, skipped by Fadil. Moreover, De Koning shows that religious individualization is not a private endeavor; rather it is social in nature. However, the manner in shich identity politics relates to liberal or non-liberal positioning is unclear. Further research could examine this more closely.

4.5 Maliepaard and Parent-Child Religiosity

Maliepaard studied, specifically, intergenerational differences in religious participation and experiences, both as part of her PhD dissertation and with Gijsberts in research for the SCP (Maliepaard & Gijsberts, 2012; Maliepaard, 2012). This latter study was a continuation of an elaborate study on religious involvement among Muslims in the Netherlands by the SCP in 2004 (Phalet & ter Wal, 2004a, 2004b). A third interesting study regarding religiosity among Muslims was

conducted by a joint investigation of the SCP, WODC (Scientific research and documentation centre of the Dutch ministry of justice) and CBS (Statistics Netherlands) (SCP/WODC/CBS, 2005). These studies give interesting insights into intergenerational differences in religious experiences and participation and the importance attached to family bonds. This can aid Fadil's (2008) discussion on patterns of continuity and opposition towards parent's Islam as they conducted quantitative research and, hence, are able to provide insights into general patterns of religiosity.

The three studies conducted in assignment of the SCP have a similar approach towards secularization. Alike to Maliepaard (see chapter 2.2), they see secularization as a decline in religiosity over time, due to modernization processes as rationalization, functional differentiation, and individualization. They indicate that secularization should entail cohort and period effects. Change in religiosity should not be solely associated to a phase in life, but also to both differences in cohorts, i.e. intergenerational changes in religiosity; and to structural changes over time (Phalet & ter Wal, 2004b, p. 40). In this regards they investigate intergenerational differences to unravel cohort effects. Thus, religiosity is investigated as indicator of secularization, religious constancy or -revitalization.

They expect strong family bonds and bonds with the religious community to decrease secularization. One of the strongest predictors for religiosity among youngsters is the influence of parents, yet, interestingly, they suggest that the influence of peers is minor (Phalet & ter Wal, 2004b, p. 42). The latter differs from suggestions by de Koning (2008). He indicates that parents indeed structure Muslim identity of the youth through socialization. However, the second generation searches for new authority figures and finds own sources of knowledge. The influence of parents diminishes, according to de Koning, due to growing autonomy of the youth. The youngsters turn to their peers for guidance in religious and social-ethnical issues. This can even lead to crises or conflicts between generations. (Koning de, 2008, pp. 158,159,299–301). Nevertheless, de Koning certainly acknowledges the great formative and structuring influence of the parents.

Maliepaard indicates that religious socialization during the youth contributes significantly towards religiosity later in life. This socialization can be taught to children explicitly by conveying cultural norms and values, but is also learned implicitly by observing and imitating parents. The transmittance of religiosity by parents has a structural effect on children, and is one of the most important predictors of religiosity later in life (Maliepaard & Gijsberts, 2012, p. 39,40). Likewise, de Koning reveals that loyalty towards parents leads to a primordial Muslim identity. Yet, he argues that the Muslim identity gets content and meaning over life, through negotiation with significant others.

Comparing religiosity between generations, each of the studies point towards a decrease in religiosity between generations, however, there are some differences in their findings. In the *'jaarrapport integratie'*, the SCP/WODC/SCP point out, in agreement with Maliepaard (see chapter 2.2) that Turks and Moroccans indicate to be highly religious; approximately 94% subscribes to Islam (SCP, 2005, p 120). Comparing religiosity between generations, they found hardly any difference among Turks, however 2nd generation Moroccans subscribe slightly less to Islam than the 1st generation. This has hardly changed between 1998 and 2005. However, the religiosity among both the first and the second generation declined somewhat. Likewise, both groups scored high on religious identification, but again there was a slight difference between generations. Regarding religious participation there was a larger difference between younger and older generations; the 1st generation attends religious services more often and prays more frequently. The divergence in participating in the Ramadan is smaller.

Phalet and ter Wal (2004a) indicate that participating in the Ramadan is, foremost, an expression of bonding with the social community and less connected to religiosity. Regarding religious beliefs, only attaching importance to wearing a headscarf triggers disparities between the generations. According to Phalet and ter Wal (2004a, Chapter 4), these findings show a movement towards religious liberalism. Yet, this liberalism only entails open-mindedness towards euthanasia and sexuality and Fadil, thus, has a different conceptualization of liberalism.

Phalet and ter Wal (2004) found similar results as SCP/WODC/SCP did; overall religiosity is important for elder, as well as, younger generation Muslims; regarding religious identification and religious beliefs there were no generational differences found; members of the 2nd generation did attend the mosque less often. Moreover, individuals who are longer in the Netherland are less religious compared to those who arrived more recently. In other words: despite a high subjective attachment to their religion, younger generations do participate less in their religion. According, to Phalet and ter Wal, this signifies that among younger generations, religious experience and identification is increasingly detached from religious practice.

However, research performed by Maliepaard (2012, Chapter 2) in her dissertation, may give another perspective on the matter. Similar to the above discussed studies, comparing the 1st to the 2nd generations, differences in religious identification and participation were found. The younger generation Moroccans and Turks, are less likely to call themselves Muslims and engage less frequent in religious practices as participating in the Ramadan and prayer, and engage less in ethno-cultural practices as, for example, watching television from the country of origin. However, Maliepaard also showed that religious identification and practice is more strongly associated with ethnic

identification for second generation- than for first generation Muslims. This indicates according to her that, although in general members of the second generation attach less to both their religion and their ethnicity, those among the second generation that do attach to their ethnicity also attach strongly (more strongly than the members of the first generation) to their religion. Hence, a Dutch Islam, according to her does not seem to exist. Here she raises questions about whether the decline in religiosity is truly a secularization pattern or more an integration/assimilation pattern.

On the other hand, Maliepaard (2012, Chapter 2) also found, counter intuitively, that among the second generation, higher educated individuals who are religious engage more in religious practices than lower educated individuals, while the reverse is the case for members of the first generation. This complicates a simple connection to integration. Fadil criticizes such associations between secularity and assimilation, which view Muslims who have secular orientation as more integrated. She finds this problematic because it reproduces secularism, leading to a politicization of the subject, but also views secularism to be a product of western society, while it is shared in parts of the 'Muslim world' (Fadil, 2008, p. 337).

Performing a longitudinal study covering data between 1998 and 2006, Maliepaard (2012, Chapter 4) is able to too look more closely at the trends in religiosity between generations. She indicates that the trend of religious decline halted after 2004; both religious practice and religious attitudes seem to have stabilized at a fairly high level. Interestingly, taking compositional factors into account, they found that the 2nd generation attended the mosque more often over time, while the 1st generation did so less frequently. Moreover, across the population in general, preference for religious homogamy increased throughout the years.

Maliepaard and Gijsberts (2012) also found that after a general decline in mosque attendance across the entire Muslim population between 1998 and 2004, in 2004 this trend was stabilized. Yet, between 2004 and 2011 mosque attendance grew again. Comparing 1st and 2nd generation Muslims, they found that this increase in attendance mostly took place among 2nd generation Moroccans, and somewhat less among 2nd generation Turks. On the other hand, among 2nd generation Turks, also an increase in those who never attend the mosque was found. This however is not the case for the 2nd generations Moroccans. Among them the group that never goes to the mosque declined in numbers (Maliepaard & Gijsberts, 2012, pp. 118–119).

From the above data it becomes clear that are no great differences in religious identification and religious beliefs between the generations, the main differences concerned religious participation. Although, the studies differ somewhat in their outcomes, a general trend of stability – in terms of

religious identification, practice and believes- seems to be present. Yet, unfortunately the constructs investigated do not allow for a more in-depth investigation of trends and changes in religious experiences and beliefs. Both Fadil and de Koning show that there is great discussion and variation among Muslims in their interpretation of various religious sources, concerning question of Ijtihad, the Sunnah, but also behavioral question as wearing a veil, maintaining piety, and drinking alcohol. The above discussed studies are unable to grasp more of the internal dynamics presently occurring within the Islamic community.

However, interestingly, Maliepaard (2012, Chapter 3) in her dissertation, studied religious transmission in migrant families more closely. Their data allowed using unique parent-child dyads which made it possible to investigate specific factors that can hamper or facilitate religious socialization of parents. In this study again differences were found in religiosity between parents and their children. Only one percent of the children of religious parents were not religious. Moreover, in general the children scored lower on mosque attendance, preference for homogamy, and favoring going to a religious school. Attempting to explain child religiosity, they tested the effect of religiosity of the parents, having mostly Dutch friends, and level of education. In general, parental religiosity best explains child religiosity; ethnicity of friends did negatively affect homogamy preference and mosque attendance, but did not significantly predict religious school preference. Educational attainment did not significantly predict religiosity. Overall, educational attainment and friendship with Dutch peers, in general, only contributed slightly to predicting homogamy preference, school preference and mosque attendance. They did find that there were ethnic differences; the religiosity of Turkish-Dutch parents had a stronger effect on child religiosity compared to that of Moroccan-Dutch parents. This was in particular strong for mosque attendance; whereas Moroccans parents were especially weaker in transferring mosque attendance. They explain that this is the case because Turks tend to have stronger family bonds; the group is characterized by higher levels of in-group cohesion; and they focus more on conformity to social and religious norms (Maliepaard, 2012, p. 48).

It is interesting that they attempted to study religious socialization more in-depth and attempted to unravel some of the factors that may influence this. This gives more insights into the complexities of religious transmittance to children. It became clear that parents are an important factor in the socialization of children and the influence of ethnic friendships and educational attainment matter relatively little. It would, however, be interesting to also investigate other factors. De Koning for example indicated that also the internet can be an important platform in which religious identity is shaped and developed. It would be interesting to investigate the effect of using internet for gaining knowledge or discussing about Islam on religious socialization of parents. But also regular contact

with an imam or participating in religious meetings may be relevant. Moreover, Boender showed that personality, language capacities, and expertise influenced the authoritativeness of Imams. It may be interesting to investigate whether parent's personality, competency in Dutch, educational attainment, and knowledge of Islam, relates to parent-child religious transmittance. Lastly, Maliepaard only investigated mosque attendance, preference for homogamy and religious schooling. This represents only a few of the issues. Fadil found patterns of continuity and discontinuity in parent-child religiosity, for her participants also issues of Ijtihad, the Sunnah, female sexuality, and piety were relevant issues which they discussed. Comparing children and paren ts on these issues may also be relevant, as well as investigating liberal ethical regimes.

4.6 Discussion and Conclusion

In this chapter I analyzed three specific authority structures in-dept: the role of the Imam, the internet and parent-child relationships. In doing so I engaged into the theoretical discussion on power structures, and sought to disclose current research findings on the abovementioned topics. The sub-question I answer in this chapter is: '*how can suggestions on authority structures by Boender, de Koning and Maliepaard enrich Fadil's proposition on power relations?*'

It became clear that understanding the nature and effect of power structures is complex. This understanding is further complicated by the diversity of perceptions between the scholars. Fadil approaches it from a Foucaultian perspective. Liberal governmentality inscribes a self-directing agency model. As a consequence, individuals relate individually to power systems. This is expressed by the self-techniques and fields of problematization in the vocabularies of her interlocutors. Indeed, she reveals that their narratives disclose patterns of continuity and opposition to their parents Islam, struggle and scrutiny to religious scholars, questioning and contestation of religious sources as the Sunnah, but also the maintenance of limitations in their interpretations. Their vocabularies hint at liberal and non-liberal ethical agency models. In relation to the Islamic tradition –as system of power– ethical substance is formed.

Boender, de Koning and Maliepaard reveal the complexity of power dynamics and show that there is more involved in the influence of systems of power than just liberal or non-liberal concerns individual believers have. They add to Fadil's insights on authority structures in several ways.

Firstly, comprehension of power structures needs to develop before one can engage with authorities. By using the term cultural bonds, Boender attempts to link cultural systems to personal thinking and acting. De Koning does this similarly by using the concept of repertoires. This brings us to one of the shortcomings of Fadil's research. As she focuses on discursive regimes, she pays little attention to the

manner in which power dynamics come into being. The discursive regimes are, in my opinion, the result of formative processes in which power structures are internalized and legitimized. Maliepaard shows the importance of childhood socialization for mosque attendance, preference for homogamy and religious schooling. This socialization forms, as described by de Koning, repertoires in which cultural systems are internalized. These repertoires impose limitations and possibilities in perceiving reality and acting upon this perception. Only hereafter, when an understanding of power relations is developed, individuals can problematize- and critically engage with authorities.

Secondly, Boender reveals that the power of Imams involves the legitimization of his role, his authority and influence. Indeed, Boender shows that the authoritativeness of the Imam lies in its institutional legitimization, the emanating expectations and obligations of his position, the messages he carries out, his personality, socialization of youth into the Islamic tradition and the manner in which the Imam succeeds in connecting to cultural bonds. In delineating between these three aspects, she has a more comprehensive approach towards authority structures than Fadil. In this regard, I found Fadil to miss a clear and structured approach in understanding the relation between individual religiosity and power structures. Although, Fadil reveals that power shapes particular subjectivities by including them instead of operating above them, she does not explain the influence and authority of power systems. Boender indicates that aspects as institutional legitimization, cultural bonds, socialization, personality, capacities, and negotiations, all determine the influence and scope of power structures.

Thirdly, de Koning shows that power systems, as the internet, can be ambiguous and that relating to such power systems is not an individual endeavor. Moroccan adolescents, constantly, negotiate their identity in relation to significant others. This involves a constant search for authenticity and loyalties. The internet is an important locus of power, as religious information is produced and spread through the various sites, forums and msngroups. However, it is an ambiguous field, to which the adolescents relate differently. The discussions carried out on the internet are often continued off-line with their peers. In this regard, I agree with de Koning, who views Islam to be more than a discursive tradition, as it is carried out in everyday life, in constant interaction and negotiation with others, and involves emotions, experiences and practices.

Fourthly, Maliepaard shows the relevance and significance of religious transmittance by parents. She, foremost, complements to Fadil's research, by her quantitative approach. She is able to disclose some general patterns in parent to child religious transmittance. Comparing generations, she found a general pattern of religious stability over time. The second generation did practice religion somewhat less. However, as I indicated above, unfortunately, her measurements of religion do not allow

disclosing other aspects of religious transmittance. It would be interesting to study religious transmission of issues of Ijtihad, and the Sunnah; the influence of other sources of authority, as being active on the internet, or contact with the Imam; or the effect of parent's personality and capacities on child's religiosity.

In conclusion, I find Boender, de Koning and Maliepaard to add to Fadil's research, in their theoretical account on authority structures, as well as, their insights on the Imam, the internet and parent-child religious transmittance. By connecting the scholars, our understanding of power structures is deepened, yet it also laid barren some of the ambiguities that revolve around issues of power. More research is needed to unravel these ambivalences.

5 Conclusion

In this thesis I brought together contemporary social scientific studies from various disciplines on religiosity among Muslims in the Netherlands and Belgium. In doing so, I critically assessed our understanding of religious individualization, as well as, revealing some of the interconnections between epistemological perspectives, research methodologies, and research findings. This was done by taking Fadil's dissertation as starting point, and relating it to four scholars: Verkuyten, Maliepaard, de Koning and Boender. In this chapter I will answer the central research question: *To what extent could Fadil's approach towards religious individualization be enriched by complementary insights in the contemporary social scientific field and how can these complementary insights contribute to a better understanding of religious individualization?*

In the first chapter, I reviewed some of the divergent interpretations on secularization. The concept initially reflected a decline of religiosity as a consequence of modernization. This view, advocated by Peter Berger, is still defended by Steve Bruce. Yet, reality proves to be complex, as no simple pattern of religious decline has been found. Not only do the high religiosity levels in the United States dispute an easy reading of secularization, also religious revitalization processes in Charismatic, Pentecostal and Easternization movements add to the complexity of understanding secularization.

Scholars like Casanova, Dobbelaere and Taylor have, since its proposal by Berger, continued to develop secularization theory. Fadil's theoretical approach can be situated as continuation of this discussion in the context of Muslims. Her Foucaultian approach allows her to disentangle vocabularies of her interlocutors. In doing so, she is able to reveal liberal and non-liberal ethical modes of subjectivations and to disentangle these ethical agency models from orthodox or secular conduct. Secularization is seen by Fadil as a form of governmentality, which shapes and regulates subjectivities. Religious individualization can be situated in the context of liberal governmentality. Underpinning this liberal governmentality is a view of individuals to be free thinking, rational beings that can self-direct. This results in a set of techniques and problematizations that regulates (religious) ethical positioning. Yet, this ethical positioning does not develop independent from power structures, but rather in relation to it. Indeed, Fadil argues for an entwinement of the self and power relations. In this respect she views the Islamic tradition as a power structure. Giving a close analysis of Fadil's dissertation, I determined three, interrelated aspects of the contemporary social scientific discourse on religious individualization: theoretical approaches and methodologies, views on the self, and views on the relationship between the self and power structures. In chapter two to four, I discussed these aspects separately, in relation to the following sub-questions:

- *How can Fadil's conceptualization and operationalization of secularization and religious individualization be enriched by conceptualizations and operationalizations of Verkuyten and Maliepaard?* (chapter 2)
- *How can suggestions on the self and identity formation by Verkuyten, Maliepaard and de Koning enrich Fadil's conceptualization of the (religious) self?* (chapter 3)
- *How can suggestions on authority structures by Boender, de Koning and Maliepaard enrich Fadil's proposition on power relations?* (chapter 4)

In answering the sub-question, *How can Fadil's conceptualization and operationalization of secularization and religious individualization be enriched by conceptualizations and operationalizations of Verkuyten and Maliepaard,* in chapter two, I, revealed some of the interconnections between epistemological perspectives, theoretical views on religious individualization and methodologies by relating Verkuyten's and Maliepaard's perspectives to those of Fadil. Indeed, the studies ask different questions and seek to resolve them differently. Much of the confusion and ambivalences in the social scientific study field of religion and religious individualization stems from the diversity in research approaches. Yet, I find it important to transgress such boundaries between sub-disciplines and to clarify some of these ambivalences.

Some of the ambiguity between studies stems from different epistemological perspectives. Underlying Fadil's Foulcaultian approach lays a situated epistemological perspective. She assumes that knowledge is interceded by discourses. Her critique on positivist epistemologies brings her in opposition to epistemological perspectives of Verkuyten. Indeed, studies from different disciplines seem to be incompatible, building upon contradictory premises. I, however, advocate an epistemological pluralist perspective, that views studies from various disciplines, using diverse methodologies, to each contribute to our understanding of the subject at hand: religious individualization among Muslims in the Netherlands and Belgium. By relating the chosen studies to each other and critically assessing them, our comprehension of the subject can be deepened, limitations of approaches can be overcome and new questions can be formed. That reality is developed, nurtured and reproduced in speech, as Fadil advocates, does not mean that reality itself cannot be grasped, or that reality does not form subjects.

This epistemological pluralist stance forms the foundation upon which I base the comparisons between the different social scientific studies that I discuss. This epistemological stance allows scientific studies from different disciplines, using different methodologies to be related to each other. Its basic premise is the view that reality is too complex to be known by a single theory or be captured by single methodology. In order not to unconditionally accept all studies, I maintain that it

is necessary to critically assess the diverse studies. When relating and comparing studies to each other, one should be aware of individual research aims and diversity in defining and using concepts and constructs between studies. Yet, when this is kept in mind, I believe that it is possible to relate the studies of Verkuyten, Maliepaard, de Koning and Boender to Fadil, and in doing so to enrich Fadil and to advance our knowledge of the subject matter at hand: religious individualization among Muslims in the Netherlands and Belgium.

Relating Maliepaard to Fadil, some striking differences were revealed. First of all, their methodological approaches resembles around the classic qualitative versus quantitative approach. Yet, whereas Fadil is able to account for the intricacies and complexities of religious positioning, Maliepaard reveals general patterns in religiosity among Muslims. They can, therefore, complement some of the other's weaknesses. Secondly, their theoretical approach to secularization and religious individualization differs. Maliepaard studies secularization from the religious decline perspective. She views individualization to be the result of modernization- and structural differentiation processes. Her approach does not account for the complexities of our understanding of the modern self and its problematic relation to power structures. Both Taylor and Fadil argued for a liberal approach to the self. The notion of governmentality describes the interconnection between governance by institutions and governments, and self-governance. It inscribes an agency model in which subjects relate individually to religious structures. Indeed, Fadil shows that in their vocabularies, her interlocutors make use of self-techniques as referring to own choice, free will, authenticity, autonomy, but also the maintenance of certain limits, subjecting to God's will and maintaining piety. Thirdly, the two vary in their operationalization of religion and religiosity. I find that Maliepaard's focus on religious practice, -identity, and -beliefs, only provides a partial understanding of religiosity among Muslims. I, therefore, propose to include more diverse and elaborate measures on religiosity when studying it quantitatively, in order to better disclose the intricate and internal variation in religiosity among Muslims. Studies of Verkuyten and Maliepaard that include measures on religious interpretations and investigate types of Muslims are promising in that regard.

By relating Verkuyten and Maliepaard to Fadil, it became clear that in many of their (quantitative) studies, a link between religiosity and acculturation was made. Such connection is criticized by Fadil to represent Eurocentrism. She uncovers that secularism is not a 'neutral' terrain. Indeed, such links are unable to grasp the controversies and struggles that are going on within the Muslim community. On the other hand, they can be understood in light of incidents as 9/11 and be legitimized by problems of social cohesion in society. Fadil does not seem to reflect upon this perspective. Nevertheless, she does inform on the possible politicization of this field of study.

In chapter three I compared the chosen scholars on their views of the self, answering the sub-question: *How can suggestions on the self and identity formation by Verkuyten, Maliepaard and de Koning enrich Fadil's conceptualization of the (religious) self?*

By relating Verkuyten's views to those of Fadil their distinct approaches to the self were revealed. First of all, Verkuyten differentiates between sense of self and social identity. From his elaborate assessment of ethnic identity, it became clear that social identities can be powerful and pervasive in informing the self, as they can induce emotions of belonging and self-esteem. Secondly, processes of social categorization and intergroup comparison can be primordial in nature, and seem to reflect underlying cognitive mechanisms. Fadil does not consider the influence of cognitive mechanism on her interlocutors' positioning, nor does she address questions of ethnicity. Indeed, Verkuyten reveals the importance of social group membership, yet also indicates that categorization processes can be resisted, and that social identities can be partial, fluid and fragmented. Thirdly, his insights show the importance of context for self-description. Social identities do not necessarily inform the self stably and coherently depending on the context and social situation. From this the stability and consistency of the positioning of Fadil's subjects can be questioned. It would be interested to study ethical agency models in a variety of contexts.

The influence of the social context for identity formation was further solidified by de Koning. He incorporated the influence of various social contexts for identity development of Moroccan adolescents in his research, by examining various identity dimensions. His use of the notion 'identity politics' pointed towards the importance of interaction and negotiation with significant others for identity development. By discerning the various identity dimensions he is able to uncover the layered nature of identity in a structured manner. He also included an ethnographic dimension in research, in which de Koning's reflected on his position as researcher. This suggests that Fadil, as researcher, possibly affected her interlocutors' narratives as well.

Based on this, I infer several aspects that can enrich Fadil's conceptualization of the self. Attention can be given to the manner in which social identities, cognitive mechanisms, and social contexts inform and influence the self, ethical subjectivation and religious conduct. The self can be approached as multilayered and can be accounted for structurally, by viewing it as multilayered.

In chapter four, I set out to answer the sub-question: *How can suggestions on authority structures by Boender, de Koning and Maliepaard enrich Fadil's proposition on power relations?*

Firstly, both Boender and de Koning used, respectively, the concept of cultural bonds and of repertoires to describe the influence of inherent, internalized, and in my opinion cognitive

representations of cultural systems. Only after an understanding of power relations is developed, through, for example, socialization, individuals can problematize- and critically engage with authorities. Fadil seemed to omit this point. I find the discursive regimes to be the result of formative processes in which power structures are internalized and legitimized.

Maliepaard, in her dissertation, adds to this, as she confirms the importance of childhood socialization. Her quantitative measures point out the significance of religious transmittance by parents for mosque attendance, and endorsement of homogamy and religious schooling of their children.

Secondly, de Koning reveals that influence of power systems, as the internet, can be ambiguous and that relating to power systems is not an individual endeavor. He shows the ambiguity of the internet as locus of power. The internet provides a field in which religious information is produced and shared. Yet, his participants relate differently to the internet, and the discussions carried out on the internet are often continued in offline interaction with their peers. In this respect, there is no one-to-one relationship between the online- and offline world. With this, de Koning also underlines the importance of peers for negotiating and developing identity. Maliepaard, on the other hand, indicates that parents are most influential on their children's mosque attendance and preference for homogamy and religious schooling, while friendships with Dutch peers and educational attainment were less influential on children's religiosity. The precise manner in which various 'others' influence individual religious positioning should, therefore, be further unraveled by future studies.

Thirdly, Boender shows the complexity of the authoritativeness of Imams. By distinguishing between his role, authority and influence, she has a comprehensive, structural approach to power structures. She finds that the authority of Imams is embedded in its institutional legitimization, but also emanates from expectations of his position, his personality, language capabilities, his knowledge of Islam, the message he carries out, and the manner in which he succeeds in making connections to cultural bonds. In this manner, Boender reveals that the authority of Imams does not solely emanate from its institutional religious position, rather his power is multifaceted. Boender is, in my view, better able to account for and explain the complexity of authority figures compared to Fadil. In this regard Boender enriches Fadil's understanding of power systems.

Lastly, I want to make some connections to Fadil. Boender and de Koning reveal some of the ambiguities of power relations. This ambivalence could very well, partly, lie in modern, liberal manners in which individuals relate to power systems. This hints, in accordance to Fadil, to an interrelatedness of the self and authority system, and hence I find that religious individualization

cannot only be solely understood as an increased separation between individuals and power relations.

Based on this, I want to address some elements that could enrich Fadil's proposition on power relations. First of all, attention can be given to the manner in which an internalized understanding of power systems develops. Besides Fadil's suggestion on liberal governance, childhood socialization, cultural bonds, identity politics and repertoires can be of importance to this development. Secondly, different types of authority structures can be determined, and in the influence of them can be unfolded structurally. Thirdly, the ambiguity of some power structures can be better unraveled in future studies. Fourthly, the precise interrelation between power structures and the self and their influence on ethical substance and religious conduct can be resolved more comprehensively in future studies.

To answer the central question of this thesis: *To what extent could Fadil's approach towards religious individualization be enriched by complementary insights in the contemporary social scientific field and how can these complementary insights contribute to a better understanding of religious individualization?*, I want to address some aspects.

I suggested that, by following a pluralist epistemological approach, studies from different social scientific sub-disciplines can be related to each other. By critically assessing them, our understanding of a subject matter can be enhanced. I connected insights of Verkuyten, Maliepaard, de Koning and Boender to those of Fadil, and in doing so, I enriched Fadil's insights on religious individualization among Muslims in Western Europe. Yet, I maintain that throughout my critical analysis of the various scholars, their individual research aims should be kept in mind.

This raises some questions on how we can understand Fadil's proposition on religious individualization, the self and authority structures in light of the complementary insights of Verkuyten, Maliepaard, de Koning and Boender. I want to bring up a few ideas.

I find that Verkuyten's insights on the influence of categorization, social identities, and context; Boender's and de Koning's notions of repertoires and bonds; and Maliepaard's suggestions on the importance of socialization, indicate that religious individualization cannot solely be understood in terms of liberal governance. Individuals are still bound by cognitive and social processes in their interpretations of the world surrounding them. Current interpretations of religious individualization seem to have difficulty in incorporating such psychological insights. It would be interesting if future theoretical approaches would address this. However, this does not mean that Fadil's perspective on religious individualization is not relevant. Her discursive approach allows disentangling ethical

substance from religious conduct. In doing so, she reveals the significance of (liberal) governance for individual religious trajectories. The pluralistic stance allows diverse theoretical accounts to exist alongside each other, as they can each explain a part of reality. In this regard, it could very well be that Fadil reveals some aspects of religious individualization, while other can reveal other aspects.

Moreover, I find that a view of secularization, solely, in terms of religious decline, does not do justice the diverse and complex secularization and individualization processes that occur in the field of Islam. Also, a reading of secularization, only as increased differentiation in society, has difficulty in accounting for the ambiguous relationship between individuals and power structures. Possibly, in a similar manner as Casanova pointed out various independent, but interrelated secularization processes, there could be several distinct, yet interrelated religious individualization processes. Future research could asses this more thoroughly.

It became clear that the social scientific study field on religious individualization is complex, ambivalent and multilayered. This ambivalence may, in part, relate to interconnections between epistemological perspectives, research methodology, and theoretical approaches on the self and power structures. More research is needed to improve our understanding of general trends in liberal- and non-liberal positioning, to unravel some of the ambivalences in the relationship between individual religious positioning, identity formation and authority structures, to better study internal complexities of religious positioning among Muslims quantitatively, and to better assess the importance of social contexts upon religious positioning. Clearly, there is much to do to increase our understanding of religious individualization.

Bibliography

Abu Raiya, H., Pargament, K. I., Mahoney, A., & Stein, C. (2008). A psycological measure of Islamic religiousness: development and evidance for reliability and validity. *The Internal Joural for the Psychology of Religion*, *18*, 291–315.

Arends-Tóth, J., & van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2003). Multiculturalism and acculturation: views of Dutch and Turkish-Dutch. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *33*(2), 249–266.

Asad, T. (1996). The Idea of an Anthropology of Islam. In J. A. Hall & I. Jarvie (Eds.), *The Social Philosophy of Ernest Gellner*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Berger, P. L. (1967). *The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion*. New York: Anchor Books.

Berger, P. L., Davie, G., & Fokas, E. (1998). *Religious America, Secular Europe? A Theme and Variations.* Hampshire: Ashgate.

Berry, J. (2005). Acculturation: Living succesfully in two cultures. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *33*, 249–266.

Boender, W. (2007). *Imam in Nederland*. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Bert Bakker.

Bracke, S. (2013). Transformation of the secular and the "Muslim question". Revisiting the historical coincidence of depillarisation and the institutionalisation of Islam in the Netherlands. *Journal of Muslims in Europe*, *2*, 208–226.

Bruce, S. (1995). *The Sociology of Religion*. Aldershot: Elgar.

Bruce, S. (2011). *Secularization: In Defence of an Unfashionable Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bryman, A. (2006). Integrating quantitative and qualitative research: how is it done? *Quanlitative Research*, *6*(1), 97–113.

Campbell, C. (2007). *The Easternization of the West*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.

Canton Delgado, M. (2010). Gypsy Pentacostalism. Ethnopolitical uses and construction of belonging in the South of Spain. *Social Compas*, *57*(2), 253–267.

Capucao, D. D. (2010). *Religion and Ethnocentrism: An Empirical-theological Study*. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill.

Casanova, J. (1994). *Public Religions in the Modern World.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

CBS. (2014). Bevolking; generatie, geslacht, leeftijd, herkomstgroepering, 1 januari. *Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek*. Retrieved May 23, 2014, from http://statline.cbs.nl/StatWeb/publication/?VW=T&DM=SLNL&PA=37325&D1=a&D2=0&D3=0&D4=0&D5=0-4,137,152,220,237&D6=0,4,9,(l-1),l&HD=130605-0936&HDR=G2,G1,G3,T&STB=G4,G5

Chaves, M. (1998). In Appreciation of Karel Dobbelaere on Secularization. In R. Laermans, B. R. Wilson, & J. Billiet (Eds.), *Secularization and Social Integration: Papers in Honor of Karel Dobbelaere*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Davie, G. (2006). Is Europe an exceptional case? *International Review of Mission*, *95*(378/379), 247–258.

De Jong, S. (2008). *Een wereld van verschil*. Amsterdam: de Bezige Bij.

Demant, F. (2005). *"Islam is Inspanning": De Beleving van Islam en de Sekseverhoudingen bij Marokkaanse Jongeren in Nederland*. Utrecht: Verwey-Jonker instituut.

Demerath, N. J. (1998). Secularization Disproved or Displaced. In R. Laermans, B. R. Wilson, & J. Billiet (Eds.), *Secularization and Social Integration: Papers in Honor of Karel Dobbelaere*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Dobbelaere, K. (2001). Individualisation: A Multi-Dimensional Process? In A. van Harskamp & A. . Musschenga (Eds.), *The Many Faces of Individualism*. Leuven: Peeters.

Dobbelaere, K. (2002). *Secularization: An Analysis at Three Levels*. Brussels: P.I.E-Peter Lang.

Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and Crisis*. New York: Norton.

Fadil, N. (2008). *Submitting to God, Submitting to the Self. Secular and Religious Trajectories of Second Generation Maghrebi in Belgium*. Leuven: Unpublished Dissertatoin, Social Sciences.

Foucault, M. (1993). About the beginning of the hermeneutics of the self (Transcription of two lectures in Dartmouth on 17 and 24 November 1980, ed. M. Blasius). *Political Theory*, *21*(2), 198–227.

Friedman, H. (2008). Humanistic and Positive Psychology: The Methodological and Epistomological Divide. *The Humanist Psychologist*, *36*, 113–126.

Heelas, P. (1998). Introduction: One Differentiation and Dedifferentiation. In P. Heelas (Ed.), *Religion, Modernity and Postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Hocken, P. (2006). New patterns of formation of the Roman Catholic Renewal. *Asian Journal of Pentacostal Studies*, *9*(1), 127–141.

Houtman, D., & Mascini, P. (2002). Why do Churches Become Empty, While New Age Grows? Secularization and Religius Change in the Netherlands. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *41*(3).

Hylarides, P. C. (2005). Multiculturalism in the Netherlands and the murder of Theo van Gogh. *Contemporary Review*, *286*, 73–78.

Joppke, C. (2004). The retreat of multiculturalism in the liberal state: Theory and policy. *British Journal of Sociology*, *55*.

Kellert, S. H., Longino, H. E., & Waters, C. K. (2006). Introduction: The Plurist Stance. In *Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science: Volume XIX Scientific Pluralism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Knippenberg, H. (1998). Secularization in the Netherlands in its historical and geographical dimensions. *Geojournal*, *45*, 209–220.

Koning de, M. (2008). *Zoeken naar een "zuivere" Islam. Geloofsbeleving en Identiteitsvorming van Jonge Marokkaans-Nederlandse Moslims.* Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Bert Bakker.

Lemke, T. (2002). Foucault, Governmentality, and critique. *Rethinking Marxism*, *14*(3).

Lukes, S. (1973). *Individualism*. New York: Harper & Row.

Maliepaard, M. (2012). *Religious Trends and Social Integration : Muslim Minorities in the Netherlands*. Utrecht: Utrecht University.

Maliepaard, M., & Gijsberts, M. (2012). *Moslim in Nederland*. The Hague: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.

Peters, R., & Vellenga, S. (2007). Contested tolerance: Public discourse in the Netherlands on muslim migrants. In M. Wohlrab-Sahr & L. Tezcan (Eds.), *Konfliktfeld Islam in Europa* (pp. 221–240). Baden-Baden: Nomas.

Phalet, K. (2003). De constuctie van ethnisch-religieuze identiteit en alteriteit: beeldvroming enbeliving van Islam in Nederland. In M. Fobelts & E. Cornelis (Eds.), *Identiteitsbeleving bij allochtone jongeren* (pp. 155–184). Leuven: Acco.

Phalet, K., & ter Wal, J. (2004a). *Moslim in Nederland/ Diversiteit en Verandering in Religieuze Betrokkenheid: Turken en Marokkanen in Nederland 1998-2002*. Den Haag: SCP.

Phalet, K., & ter Wal, J. (2004b). *Moslim in Nederland/ Religie en Migratie: Sociaal-Wetenschappelijke Databronnen en Literatuur*. Den Haag: SCP.

Race, A. (2001). *Interfaith Encounter*. London: SCM Press.

Reynolds, K. ., & Turner, J. C. (2001). Prejudice as a Group Process: The Role of Social Identity. In M. Augoustinos & K. J. Reynolds (Eds.), *Understanding Prejudice, Racism, and Social Conflict*. London: Sage.

Roccas, S., & Brewer, M. B. (2002). Social Identity Complexity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *6*(2), 88–106.

Rose, N., O'Malley, P., & Valverde, M. (2006). Governmentality. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, *2*, 83–104.

Sale, J. E. M., Lohfeld, L. H., & Brazil, K. (2002). Revisiting the quantitative-qualitative debate: implications for mixed-method research. *Quality & Quantity*, *36*, 43–53.

SCP/WODC/CBS. (2005). *Jaarrapport Integratie 2005*. Den Haag.

Shadid, W. (1991). The intergration of Muslim minorities in the Netherlands. *Intergrational Migration Review*, *25*(2).

Shadid, W., & van Koningsveld, P. S. (2008). *Islam in Nederland en België. Religieuze Institutionalisering in twee landen met een gemeenschappelijke voorgeschiedenis.* Leuven: Peeters.

Sniderman, P. M., & Hagendoorn, L. (2007). *When Ways of Life Collide*. Princeton: Princenton University Press.

Stevens, G. W. J. M., Vollebergh, W. A. M., Pels, T., & Crijnen, A. A. M. (2007). Problem behavior and acculturation in Moroccan immigrant adolescents in the Netherlands: Effects of gender and parent-child conflict. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *38*, 310–317.

Taylor, C. (1989). *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, C. (2007). *A Secular Age*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Van Slotboom, R., & van Voorst, A. (2002). *Nederland en hun Gezagdragers: Verzuiling, Polarisering en Herwonnen Consensus.* Amsterdam: Thieme Meulenhof.

Van Tubergen, F. (2006). *Immigrant Integration: A Cross-National Study*. New York: LFB Scholarly Publishing.

Verkuyten, M. (2005). *The Social Psychology of Ethnic Identity*. Hove: Psychology Press.

Verkuyten, M. (2006). Multicultural recognition and ethnic minority rights: A social identity perspective. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *17*.

Verkuyten, M. (2007). Religious group identification and inter-religious relations: A study among Turkish-Dutch Muslims. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *10*(3), 341–357.

Verkuyten, M., & Martinovic, B. (2012). Social identity complexity and immigrants' attitude toward the host nation: the intersection of ethnic and religious group identification. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, *38*(9), 1165–77.

Verkuyten, M., & Thijs, J. (2010). Religious Group Relations among Christian, Muslim and non-Religious Early Adolescents in th Netherlands. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, *30*, 27–49.

Verkuyten, M., Thijs, J., & Stevens, G. W. J. M. (2012). Multiple identities and religious transmission: a study among Moroccan-Dutch Muslim adolescents and their parents. *Child Development*, *83*(5), 1577–1590.

Verkuyten, M., & Yildiz, A. A. (2010). Religious identity consolidation and mobilization among Turkish Dutch Muslims, *447*(April 2009), 436–447.

Vroom, H. M. (2006). *A Spectrum of Worldviews. An Introduction to Philosphy of Religion in a Pluralistic World*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Wilson, B. R. (1998). The Secularization Thesis: Criticisms and Rebuttals. In R. Laermans, B. R. Wilson, & J. Billiet (Eds.), *Secularization and Social Integration: Papers in Honor of Karel Dobbelaere*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.