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Abstract

Construction of a cross-confessional model for studying religiosity is proposed based on a widened definition of religion and its interpretation as a two-part phenomenon including experience (inner part) and a system of presentation of the experience (outer part). The system of religion is understood as a three-dimensional unity of beliefs, activity, and institutions; religiosity as involvement into the system of the named dimensions. Each dimension of involvement is marked with empirical features. Each feature is scaled in a range from formal (outer) involvement to transforming (inner). The combination of involvement into each dimension (set by the features) gives a degree (index) of individual religiosity. Individual degrees form into types characterizing the range of society’s religiosity.
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Despite the rich enough experience in studying religiosity in Belarus, the problem of defining the place and the role of religion in the life of society is still urgent. The religious situation in the country is significantly defined by a wide range of confessions different from each other in the number of followers, in its doctrinal, cultic, and organizational features. So, it is timely for us in Belarus to elaborate the concept of studying religiosity which would allow studying the poly-confessional environment.

In Belarus, as in many other post-Soviet countries, the 1990s were marked with rapid growth of religiosity of the population. In the 2000s, this growth slowed down and until now remains in the same frames. Stabilization of religiosity shows not only the satiation and therefore, fading of people’s interest in religion, but also changes in people’s attitude to it. Religiosity stopped growing extensively, quantitatively, but it undoubtedly moved to the phase of more or less intensive qualitative changes. Studying its qualitative, substantial dynamics is one of the most important tasks for the scholars of religion today.²

The religious situation in Belarus was studied more or less regularly since 1980s. No less than ten large-scale measurements with the number of respondents from 1000 to 1500 were made, among them those with comparable methodology (in frames of the program of European values study) were the researches of 1990, 1996, 2000, and 2008. The data of these researches (of those that were published) may be summed up in a table.³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worldview positions of the respondents (attitude to religion)</th>
<th>Believers</th>
<th>Quasi-believers</th>
<th>Hesitating</th>
<th>Non-believers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholics</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christians in whole</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other denominations</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of confessions</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In the table, the number of respondents who skipped the question is not reported, therefore total value for the column may be under 100%.

There are data published in 2008 for one of the parameters mentioned in the table (left column: confessional self-identification of the believers). Considering this, it is possible to give an extremely generalized resume: as of 2008, the share of religious people (more correctly: those declaring themselves religious) in total population of Belarus was 60%; among them Orthodox—86 %, Catholics—12 %, other denomination—12 %.4

The given numbers reflect the quantitative side of religiosity in Belarus and qualify it based on a rather narrow Christianocentric concept of religion. Meanwhile, religious situation in Belarus, as in many other post-Soviet countries, is characterized by poly-confessionality which should not be ignored even considering significant quantitative advantage of Orthodoxy. Other religions and denominations, both traditional and non-traditional, constitute thin yet stable alternative of religious self-determination of Belarusian (and all post-Soviet) population. Besides, it is necessary to understand the motives and contents of people’s religious choice in social scale, its confessional character and its impact on the state of the society.

To organize the all-aspect regular studies of religiosiy and religious situation in Belarus, it is necessary either to have two or three active scientific and practical centers specializing in the study of religion, then the results of their activity could be compared and analyzed periodically; or to create a complex research program which would allow conducting at once a large-scale project for studying religious situation in the country and later to integrate various separated in time private researches into the general vision.

---

4 There are published data on the number and confessional adherence of religious people as of 2011. The presented numbers are as follows: 93.5 % of the population of Belarus consider themselves to various denominations (attention: this position differs from the earlier accepted which asked the respondent about declaring oneself religious), among them 81 %—Orthodox, 10.5 %—Catholics, 2 %—other (1 %—Judaism, 0.5 % each—Protestant and Muslim). However, the quoted publication does not mention the model of research and the way of collecting data, as well as the size of the sample. So, it is impossible to compare these numbers with other. See: ‘The Republic of Belarus in the Mirror of Sociology’ in Collection of Materials of Sociological Researches of 2011, Minsk: Biznesofset, 2012.
As such, the proposed approach aimed at measuring religiosity of the population of Belarus based on cross-confessional (widened) definition of religion understood as a multi-dimensional phenomenon is developed by the Center of Religious Studies at the Faculty of Philosophy and Social Sciences of Belarusian State University.

The program was developed using classic concepts and models of foreign and domestic scholars.

Research in religiosity has been conducted since the 1920s\textsuperscript{5} around the world. The interpretations of the phenomenon have been changing with time. In the 1980s, the \textit{multidimensional} approach to the study of religiosity received a wide distribution (its models started to develop in the 1960s\textsuperscript{6}): it not only represented religiosity in one of its manifestations (such as going to church, taking part in performing rituals, knowing the sacred texts, etc.), but combined its different parameters as an \textit{integral} value on which the characterization and comparison performed were based.

One of the most effective concepts of multi-dimensional research was introduced by the American sociologists C. Glock and R. Stark (1965).\textsuperscript{7} J. Faulkner, G. DeJong also elaborated on the concept (1966, 1976).\textsuperscript{8} It was a so-called 5-dimensional approach (or a 5-D approach)\textsuperscript{9} to the study of religiosity which defined it as a complex phenomenon and showed it in its five dimensions;\textsuperscript{10}

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(1)] the ritualistic,
\end{itemize}

---


\textsuperscript{6} Peter C. Hill, Ralph W. Hood Jr., \textit{Measures of religiosity}, Birmingham, Alabama: Religious Education Press.


\textsuperscript{9} Peter C. Hill, Ralph W. Hood Jr., ‘Multidimensional Scales of Religiosity’ in \textit{op. cit.}, 279—292; William H. Swatos Jr., \textit{op. cit.}

\textsuperscript{10} Charles Y. Glock, Rodney Stark, ‘Religion as a Social Phenomenon, Ch. 2. On the Study of Religious Commitment’ in \textit{op. cit.}, 18—38.
(2) the ideological,
(3) the experiential,
(4) the intellectual, and
(5) the consequential.

In Western science, the study of religiosity was influenced by the concept of American psychologist G. Allport who classified human’s relation to religion as a value. As the poles of this relation, G. Allport offered positions “religion as a purpose” (i. e. religion is a sense of life, corresponding “mature religiosity”) and “religion as a means” (i. e. an instrument for adapting to life circumstances, corresponding “immature religiosity”). This dichotomy was later supplemented with intermediate positions forming the scales of “religious orientation.”

The multidimensional models of religiosity combined with the evaluative models of person and society were standardized in the 1980s in frames of large-scale European and international values studying programs — European Values Study (EVS), World Values Survey (WVS), European Social Survey (ESS), International Social Survey Program (ISSP).

The largest-scale post-Soviet studies of religiosity were organized and conducted in Russia by D. E. Furman, S. B. Filatov, L. M. Vorontsova, R. N. Lunkin, M. A. Tarusin,

---

11 See: about the continua of religious positions (as opposed to Allport’s dichotomy) which were elaborated almost at the same time by the sociologists G. Lenski (1954) and G. Fichter (1961): Gordon Allport, A person in psychology, Moscow: KSP+; Saint-Petersburg: Juventa, 1998, 151—216. See also: the development of Allport’s dichotomy by including the third element in it — ‘seeking religiosity’, by D. Batson: Peter C. Hill, Ralph W. Hood Jr., ‘Scales of Religious Orientation. 3.7 Quest Scale’ in op. cit., 138—142. See also: Daniel C. Batson, Patricia Schoenrade, Larry W. Ventis, Religions and the Individual: a Social-Psychological Perspective, New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
V. F. Chesnokova, Yu. Yu. Sinelina, and others. In Belarus, such projects were elaborated and conducted by the scholars from the Institute of Sociology of National Academy of Sciences of Belarus and the Center for Sociological and Political Researches of BSU, and with them — L. G. Novikova, S. A. Morozova, and others. These researches were based on understanding religiosity as “the reflection of believers’ conscience state.” As a basic characteristic for thus understood religiosity “the belief in super-natural being as an object for worship” was taken, and religiosity was understood as the measure of religion’s influence on the conscience and behavior of individuals and groups. In frames of that model, the following scales of features were used:

1) the respondent declares having religious belief;

2) the respondent verifies his/her adherence to a certain confession;

3) the respondent reports how regularly he/she performs the cult practices.

These features characterize religiosity based on its formal manifestations and sort it in groups: the non-religious (non-believers and atheists) — the hesitating — the religious (believers). Noteworthy, the religious concept used by L. G. Novikova and other Belarusian sociologists follows, as in many Western projects, the Christianocentric interpretation of religious object as a transcendent personalized God which is fair for the Abrahamic religions.

18 Valentina Chesnokova, Along the dark path: the process of baptizing the people of Russia at the end of the 20th century, Moscow; Academic project, 2005.
20 Lydia Novikova, “‘Religious boom” in Belarus: myth or reality?’, Sociology 2 1999, 29—36; Lydia Novikova, Religiosity in Belarus at the turn of the centuries: trends and peculiarities of manifestation (sociological aspect), Minsk: BTN-inform, 2001; Ivan Pirozhnik et al., ‘Belarus after the “religious boom”: what has changed?’, Sociology 4 2006, 46—55; etc.
23 Ibid.
(Judaism, Christianity, and Islam) but is unacceptable for the Dharmic religions (Buddhism, Hinduism), as well as for the religions of other cultural and historical types which have become widely distributed in the post-Soviet territories lately. The survey data collected in Belarus in the 1990s to the 2000s based on the named Western and Russian approaches were a meaningful factor for estimating the religious situation in the country. However, this situation is evolving and currently, along with applying the already formed methods of studying religiosity, the elaboration of new ones is necessary.

The religious field in Belarus is represented by a significant diversity of subjects both numerous and qualitative.

The poly-confessional Belarusian society makes relevant the issue of searching the universal characteristics of religiosity, which could be compared in its intensity and not depend on the confessional adherence of its carriers. Solving this problem is possible based on understanding religiosity as a complex multi-dimensional phenomenon where the main aspects are universal for any religion but are expressed differently in each of them. In frames of this approach, it seems possible to create a typology of universal cross-confessional religious positions, which could help get the understanding of not only confessional saturation in Belarus, but also the intensity of religious situation.

Building a typology of religiosity demands the conceptualization of the main concepts explaining this phenomenon. The source concept for this particular research is the concept of religiosity. According to the earlier elaborated cross-confessional constructs (C. Glock, R. Stark, etc.), it is defined as the involvement (of an individual, a group, the society) into religion formed (in a certain degree of intensity) into a religious system existing in the form of religious tradition and religious movement.24

---

This definition is disclosed through the concept of religion which, in this research, is based on the concept of the transcendent.\textsuperscript{25} It is important for the cross-confessional research to interpret both this concepts as widely as possible. Therefore, religion is defined as the sphere of society’s (individual’s) life representing the institutionally formed symbolical system of beliefs and practices focused on the sense of the ultimate (transcendent) contents, which bear the status of the holy (sacred).

This definition interprets religion widely and includes the monotheistic, other theistic (pantheistic, polytheistic), as well as non-theistic (animatic, animistic) systems.\textsuperscript{26} Some of the assigned types of religiosity keep functioning in contemporary culture as the organized influential traditions (e.g. monotheistic religiosity of the world religions — Christianity, Islam, Judaism), they form confessional religiosity of the modern society. Some of them ceased to exist as the organized traditions after the cultures they were created by have disappeared (e.g. the polytheistic religions of archaic societies) but their remains continue to function in contemporary culture as elements of old traditions and practices and sometimes they get synthesized with each other or with elements of other world-views (both religious and non-religious) into various models of non-confessional religiosity.

In social environment, religion creates the sphere of the sacred evolving from the human’s need of the ultimate (specifically transcendent) explanation and substantiation of one’s being, and elaborating the corresponding ideas and practices. Contemporary Western Social science defines two models of finding the solution of the ultimate questions or, in other words, two types of “the ultimate world-view perspectives”: the humanist one, which recognizes the

\textsuperscript{25} Religion should be defined through the transcendent, not only through ultimate (as does, for example, P. Tillich) nature of its objects, because defining exactly through the transcendent fixes the specifics of religion.

material world as the ultimate reality and value, and the religious one, which recognizes the transcendent\textsuperscript{27} reality as the ultimate one.

The term transcendent\textsuperscript{28} defines a reality exceeding the spatial and temporal limits and causal boundaries of the existing. An individual’s conviction about this reality automatically sets the transcendent sense of one’s being, i.e. reasons for all his decisions and actions in a life perspective exceeding the limits of the existing reality.

Similarly to the term religion, the term transcendent is interpreted very widely. On the one hand, it is based on the explication of such characteristics of the transcendent objects of various religions, as self-sufficiency; on the other hand, it abstracts from the certain forms and images which in various cultures fix the presence or activity of the transcendent. By self-sufficiency, the status of reality is understood, which needs nothing for its existence apart from itself. Such reality is always transcendent in relation to anything existing due to other reasons — to everything existing due to the cause-and-effect relationships, spatial and temporal limits, and depending on anything else. Synonyms for self-sufficient (reality) may be the term absolute, and the term self-acting is used as the attributive definition.

In the study of religion, the narrow interpretation of the term transcendent goes back to Christian theology. This interpretation, formed in the Christianocentric discourse, was used by the anthropologists of the 19\textsuperscript{th} and 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries to define primitive (natural) or archaic (cosmic) religions as those knowing no transcendent basics and representing their own religious objects — e.g. the unified mana, the plurality of the spirits, demons, gods, as well

\textsuperscript{28} Transcendent (from Latin transcenden) — bestriding, exceeding the limits. The term appeared in a scholastic philosophy to determine everything that exceeds the limits of sensitive experience and empirical cognition and is the subject of metaphysical and religious cognition. I. Kant extended the meaning of the term also defining with its help the unreachable for the rational knowledge and being the object of faith (God, soul, immortality). — See: Sergei Averintsev et al., eds., Philosophical encyclopaedic dictionary, 2\textsuperscript{nd} edition, Moscow: Soviet encyclopaedia, 1989, 665.

The term transcendent was introduced to the study of religion by the Swedish theologian and religious scholar N. Söderblom (1866—1931) in connection to the definition of religion in the article ‘Holiness’ for ‘Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics’ in 1913. — See: GregorAhn, Op. cit.
as Dao, Brahman, and other living powers and principles — as the beings immanent to the world.

Nevertheless, the “immanent super-natural” of primitive and archaic religions is immanent only from the Christian God idea point of view, while for the primitive or archaic individual the super-natural is always transcendent because it has a different nature (radically different, ganzandere\textsuperscript{29}): self-sufficient, self-acting, incomprehensible in its sources, unpredictable, etc. In its essence, it is beyond the limits of things, forces and connections of the world, ontologically it is before the world: it holds the world, rules the world, dominates the world, etc. and however close and vulnerable (liable to the fears and diseases, helpless, unlucky, even mortal) are the agents of the transcendent (spirits, demons, gods) in primitive (non-theistic) and archaic (polytheistic) religions, they permanently restore their strength, change their face, and continue to play their roles.

The accepted interpretation of the transcendent is here based on the distinction of: 1) its nature (substance), or the ontological source of the self-acting omnipresent forces (like mana), demons, deities, cosmic principles, etc., and 2) its hierophanies (manifestations) and personifications (agents). Nature (the substance) is external in relation to the structure of the existing reality — it is transcendent, and the manifestations, the personifications of this nature and its influence on the human are immanent to the world.

So, in the field of Philosophy and Religious Studies, the offered approach fixes the broad understanding of religion\textsuperscript{30} — as the ultimate world-view perspective appealing to the transcendent — and correspondingly, the wide interpretation of the transcendent as the self-sufficient and self-acting reality.


\textsuperscript{30} For instance, in the study of religion such interpretation goes back to the evolutionary or morphologic principle of religions systematisation introduced by E. Tailor, K. P. Tiele, N. Söderblom, M. Eliade, etc.
In the sociological approach, religion is understood as a complex phenomenon which may be presented as the unity of the necessary aspects, or dimensions, which are not reduced to each other: religious beliefs (expressing the transcendent idea of religion), religious activity (realizing the principle and means of exercising the idea), religious institutions (organizing the followers of the idea into a community). This complex unity functions as a system for preserving and reconstructing religious meaning source of which religious experience acts as a base for religion as a system.

Religious experience may be interpreted in two ways:

1) **narrowly** (going back to the ideas of N. Söderblom, R. Otto, J. Wach, F. Hailer, etc. in the phenomenology of religion; to the ideas of W. James in psychology of religion; to the ideas of P. Radin in anthropology; to the ideas of S. Radhakrishnan in religious philosophy, etc.) as a state which a human being discovers himself/herself in being directly connected to the transcendent reality (when the transcendent to the world living source becomes immanent for the personal experience); this state has a revolutionary meaning for a person, transforms her or him into a being ultimately motivated by the transcendent goals;

2) **broadly** (elaborated in sociology and anthropology of religion) as any act of person’s participation in the life of religious tradition (movement) regardless to the nature of his or her belonging to religion.

In both cases, religious experience is a perfect state for a particular religion; in the first case, it is fully felt by the bearer(s) of the tradition, in the second — desired. As long as the perfect example of the connection to the transcendent object experience is in demand, the religious system based on this example continues to be kept as tradition and passed from one generation to another.

So, the main (essential and not reducible to each other) aspects of religion—the system of religious beliefs, the system of religious activity, the organizational forms of religious
community’s life, or institutions, \(^3\) — in total, form a *religious system*. Each of these aspects is characterized by certain parameters.

The *system of religious beliefs* is a system of symbolically shaped truths of the ultimate contents (“the truth of faith”) which form an hierarchy of 1) the incontrovertible statements of religion considering the nature of the transcendent reality on which basis the 2) religious interpretation of the world and a human being considering their origins, being and faith are elaborated, as well as 3) the system of piety regulations for a person.

The *system of religious activity* is a system of principles and forms organizing the activity of the followers of a particular religion in order to meet its transcendent goals. It is divided into the ritual (cult) practices, the forms of daily and holiday piety, the missionary and/or socio-cultural activity.

The *system of religious institutions* is a system of principles and forms of organizing the life of a religious community.

The assigned components of a religious system are presented in any religion though to a different degree. Therefore, during the period of evolving and becoming, religious system is more of a *movement* than of a formed systematic formation, and after a while, it becomes a *tradition* (gets passed from one generation to the next).

Religious movement and religious tradition differ in the degree of elaboration and stability of their system components. *Religious movement* is a symbolic system of beliefs and practices of the ultimate (transcendent) contents which is either weakly organized or not organized yet and has a short period of traditionalization, or exists within the current generation. *Religious tradition* is an institutionalized symbolical system of meanings and

practices of the ultimate (transcendent) contents which due to the stable demand of its contents is passed from one generation to another for a long time.

During the process of traditionalization, religion is divided into directions-confessions or denominations. The denomination, according to the interpretation in the Russian language dictionaries, is a kind of religious system with a specific doctrine, rites and institutionalism. Sometimes in the Russian-speaking environment, the terms confession, denomination, religion are replaced with the word faith.32

The adherence of a person to a certain religion—tradition or movement—is reflected in his or her religiosity which means the involvement (of an individual, a group, a society) with religious system or religious movement.33

Considering the described aspects of religious system, religiosity appears as an integral value which consists of the combination of the various degrees of involvement of a follower into each dimension of religion.

Inside oneself, a person feels the state of involvement as devotion which, according to the dictionaries, means: 1) attachment, addiction, loyalty to somebody/something; 2) devotion, truthfulness, desire to support somebody/something. Considering this, the devotion to religion means readiness to follow its transcendent idea or transcendent sense. Following the sense is based on accepting it as an absolute, ultimate and in the meanwhile, self-obvious truth, i.e. on accepting it, regardless to the factual and logical proofs, directly to the structure of personality as a basic motive (principle) of life behavior. Such way of accepting the truth is called faith.34

---

34 See, for example, the definition by V. Soloviov: Faith is the admittance of something as true, often without previous factual and logical check, merely due to the total inner subjective belief which needs no proof to be grounded though sometimes looks for it. See: Philosophic dictionary by Vladimir Soloviov, Rostov-on-Don:
Thus, the construction of the typology of religiosity takes the complex structure of religion into consideration defining the *type of religiosity* as the *combination of the degree of involvement to the universal dimensions of religion*, namely:

1) a certain religious idea and the system of beliefs expressing it (the system of “the truth of faith”); in this case devotion is expressed through religious faith;

2) a definite system of religious activity, based on a certain system of beliefs; in this case, devotion is expressed through performing rituals, obeying the piety norms and forms, holidays (and holiday periods), as well as through participation in (missionary and) socio-cultural activity of religious society;

3) a certain, more or less organized religious community consolidated by the common aim of maintaining connectivity with the religious object by worshiping and serving it; in this case, devotion is expressed through being a member or a participant of the cult and/or socio-cultural life of the community.

In Belarusian religious field, religious communities and organizations act as the main forms of religious activity.

*Religious community* is a primary unit of religious association, kind of a social group. According to the Belarusian legislation, a union of groups of Belarusian citizens in one or several locations is recognized as religious community based on devotion to one denomination for common worship and satisfying other religious needs.35

*Religious organization*, according to the Belarusian legislation, is a voluntary association of citizens of the Republic of Belarus or other persons constantly and legally living on the

---

territory of the Republic of Belarus created for the common profession and dissemination of faith and registered as a legal entity in accordance with the law.\textsuperscript{36}

The elaboration of the typology of religiosity demands building a system of empiric indicators which would fix certain forms of expression of the individual’s devotion to the certain dimensions of religion. The devotion to the religious idea may be fixed by a set of characteristics, such as: a person declaring his/her religious position himself/herself; the actual knowledge of its contents; the individual’s statement of his/her readiness to sacrifice something for his/her religious position; self-estimation of faith’s value in life. In total, these indicators form the characterization of religiosity which reflects the \textit{certainty} (or uncertainty) \textit{of religious position (faith)}.

Devotion to the principles and forms of religious activity is defined based on how regularly the person performs individual practices (basic forms of which are prayer, meditation), participates in collective rituals (commonly performed ritual acts and rites, basic forms of which are common prayer, meditation, mystery, sacrament), how the person widens his knowledge about the religion he is adherent to, obeys the norms of civil piety, how regularly the person participates in religious holidays and in social and cultural life of the community. The complex of the listed indicators forms the characteristic of religiosity as \textit{a degree of religious activity}.

Devotion to a more or less organized religious community is detected based on the individual’s declaration of his/her adherence to it, indication of his/her status or function in this community or the lack of those, as well as the individual’s report on his/her free participation in social and cultural activity of religious community. The set of the listed indicators forms the characteristic of religiosity as \textit{the level of integration into community}.

\textsuperscript{36} Ibid.
Apart from the named attributive features of religiosity, the characteristics having no straight relation to religiosity but connected with it as its causes or effects may also be used to clarify the features of religiosity. Such include the reasons of a person’s religious choice (personal motives or outer circumstances) and the results of this choice for his/her life (the depth of religiosity’s impact on lifestyle).

Studying expressions of the listed indicators altogether allows creating an integral description of each individual’s religiosity, which is expressed through the certainty of religious position, the degree of religious activity, and the level of integration into religious community. Comparing the descriptions of the individual’s religiosity distributes them into religious groups. The list of groups formed depending on the degree of individuals’ involvement into religion builds the typology of religious positions varying from declaratively involved through weak and moderate to deeply involved.

Thus, the concept presented allows identifying quantitative indicators of religiosity regardless to the confessional adherence of the subjects of religious field and, correspondingly, defining the specifics of religious situation in Belarus at the present stage. Above all, adding some qualitative features of the types of religiosity to the named characteristics allows identifying their individual expression (the nature of motivation, effect on one’s lifestyle) and confessional peculiarities (specifics of understanding the transcendent, ways of serving and worshiping it).