

# Specific Features Of The Value Orientation System Of Students With Different Types Of Religiosity

1<sup>st</sup> Braun Olga Arturovna  
Department of Psychological  
Sciences  
Socialno-Psychological Institute  
Kemerovo, Russia,  
braun\_olgha@mail.ru

2<sup>nd</sup> Avilov Gennady  
Michailovich  
Department of Psychological  
Sciences  
Socialno-Psychological Institute  
Kemerovo, Russia,  
avilg@mail.ru

3<sup>rd</sup> Kanina Natalya Anatolievna  
Department of Psychological  
Sciences  
Socialno-Psychological Institute  
Kemerovo, Russia,  
89039074388@mail.ru

4<sup>th</sup> Khakimova Nurya Ravilievna  
Department of Psychological  
Sciences  
Socialno-Psychological Institute  
Kemerovo, Russia,  
khakimova@kemsu.ru

**Abstract**— The article is devoted to the study of the values of students with different types of religiosity. The article analyzes theoretical approaches to the study of personal values studied by M. Rokich, S. H. Schwartz, A. Maslow, M. S. Yaniskiy, as well as the principles and approaches to the problem of religiosity, various types of religiosity described in the studies of G. Allport, R.S. Titov, A. Krylow, V.I. Khomenko. Based on a combination of two factors: the formal belonging to a religious denomination and the presence or absence of religious identity, four types of religiosity are proposed: holistic religiosity, subjective religiosity, external religiosity, lack of religiosity (religious indifference). It was found that the type of religiosity correlated with the value orientations of the personality. On a sample of 97 people, using the methodology by S. H. Schwartz, a study of the value orientations of students with different types of religiosity was carried out. It was proved that the type of religiosity captures the peculiarities of students' value orientations. Most of all, religion affects the significance of the "pro-social" values and the importance of tradition. The more pronounced is the subjective significance of religion and religious identity, the higher influence of religiosity on value orientations becomes.

**Keywords** — *religiosity, type of religiosity, religious identity, values, value orientations, students.*

## I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, psychological and social researches have significantly intensified studies of factors and conditions that affect the structure of personal values. This is quite understandable, considering that the structure of values is decisive in all human activity, predetermining human's behavior, activities and general orientation. There are two closely related terms within the meaning: values and value orientations.

In the domestic psychology, value orientations are determined as a rule through the concepts of relation, reflection and attitude. Moreover, value orientations as one of the basic personal grounds, are embedded within a broader synthetic concept of personality orientation, which contains the dominant value orientations and attitudes that are manifested in any situation [16].

Most domestic researchers recognize the role of social mediation of personality formation in relation to its value orientations. According to the socio-psychological approach to the definition of values, the socially conditioned character of the acceptance of values by a person is recognized.

In the current domestic research (B.S. Bratus, G. E. Zaleski, E.I. Golovakha N.I. Nepomnyaschaya, S. Bubnova, M.S. Yaniskiy, A.V. Seryy) personal values are considered as a complex hierarchical system, which takes place on the intersection of the need-motivational sphere of personality and ideological structures of consciousness, acting as a regulator of human activity [15].

In foreign studies, the problem of personal values was most fully developed in humanistic and existential psychology. According to the theory by A. Maslow, the self-actualizing personality seeks to realize the existential values. These values act as vital needs. The highest values, according to the author, exist in human nature itself [9]. G. Allport believes that the source of most personal values is the moral of society. However, the author identifies a number of values not dictated by moral norms (curiosity, erudition, communication, etc.). Moral norms and values act more as means and conditions for achieving internal values that are the goals of the individual. According to G. Allport, value is a kind of personal meaning [3].

The notion of a system of values as a hierarchy of personal beliefs is characteristic of the works of M. Rokich, S. H. Schwartz, W. Bilsky. M. Rokich defines values as a firm belief that a certain mode of behavior or the ultimate goal of existence is preferable from a personal or social point of view [11].

According to the modern approach, value studies can be carried out at two levels.

1. At the level of the individual (individual differences). In this case, the personality is the unit of analysis. For people (individuals), values are motivational goals that serve as guidelines in their lives [11, 13].

2. At the level of social culture (differences in social norms, customs and traditions of social groups). In this case, values characterize the social culture of a society or a group of people,

and reflect what is common to all people who make up this culture. In this context, according to S. H. Schwartz, the concept of culture is similar to the concepts of nation, nationality, ethnic or religious group, and subculture and is understood as a specific social group characterized by social norms and traditions [11, 13].

S. H. Schwartz developed a new theoretical and methodological approach to the study of values. Following S. H. Schwartz, we assume that values are more the criteria that people use to select and substantiate their actions, as well as to evaluate other people, themselves and events. According to S. H. Schwartz's theory, personal values exist on two levels: at the level of normative ideals and at the level of individual priorities [13]. The first level is more stable and reflects the person's idea of how to act, thereby determining his life principles of behavior. The second level is more dependent on the external environment, for example, on group pressure and correlates with specific human actions [13]. Thus, individuals belonging to the same or different social groups are significantly different in value priorities. These differences reflect their genetic inheritance, personal experience, social status and cultural influence, including religious [4]. The study by Shalom H. Schwartz & Sipke Huismans analyzes the relationship between value priorities and religiosity in four western religions in a cross-cultural study [12].

Religiosity as a subject of scientific psychological analysis was developed by scientists such as G. Allport (the concept of internal and external religiosity), J. Wach, G. Lenski (multi-dimensional concept of the substantial religiosity), S. Gatri, D. Barrett (cognitivist concept of religiosity), P. Hill (multidimensional functional concept), D. Ugrinovich (concept of the influence of religious beliefs), S. Ryzhova (concept of confessional identity), Yu. Sinelina (concept of religiosity - enchurchment), V.I. Khomenko (theoretical and methodological grounds for measuring religiosity).

Within the framework of the religiosity concept by G. Allport, religiosity is understood as an integral, comprehensive and structured life philosophy of the individual integrating both cognition (the picture of the world) and motivation (moral application, hierarchization of motives). It gives a purpose in life to a value system [18]. Depending on the place in the motivation of the person, G. Allport analyzes two opposing forms of religiosity - extrinsic and intrinsic [1]. In the first case, it is an example of using a religion for extraneous purposes (social status, personal psychological comfort), and in the second case it is bringing other interests and beliefs in accordance with person's own religious interests and beliefs. In our opinion, the criterion of internal acceptance of religion can be the presence or absence of a religious identity, by which we mean the awareness of belonging to some form of religion and / or religious group, expressed in an emotionally significant attitude and acceptance of its ideas, norms, attitudes, values.

According to many researchers, the religiosity of modern student youth in Russia is rather superficial: there is a desire to be like everyone else, to be called believers, to correspond to the stereotype of spirituality disseminated in modern society by the mass media, from time to time celebrate religious holidays,

and observe certain rituals. The religious consciousness of young people, in the opinion of M. S. Leonova & O. V. Bondarenko [17] is declared, religious norms are not regulators of the individual behavior of young people in their daily lives. In addition, this religiosity is increasingly becoming non-confessional. Hence, the following questions arise: will those changes in the system of value orientations lead to true inner religiosity and religious identity and whether there are differences between confessional and non-confessional believers. In this regard, the purpose of our study was to examine the characteristics of the value system of students with different types of religiosity.

## II. METHODOLOGY

In 2016-2017, we conducted a study of the characteristics of the value system of student youth. 112 students from various universities of the city of Kemerovo took part in the study. As the main method of research S. H. Schwartz's questionnaire translated by V. N. Karandashev [16] was selected. The undoubted advantage of this questionnaire is the possibility of analyzing the value system both at the level of a social group and at the level of an individual. All values are divided into 10 scales, for each scale the average score is calculated, the higher the average score, the more significant is the value (the higher its rank). The most significant are the values that took the first three places (rank 1-3), and the least significant values took the last three of them (rank 8-10).

As a factor influencing the value system, among other things, the religion of the unsubs was also considered. When assessing religiosity, we, based on the theory of extrinsic and intrinsic religiosity by G. Allport, evaluated two components: the formal religious affiliation of the unsubs (the answer to the question of the questionnaire: "Your religion") and the subjective significance of religion. Among the variants of answers to the question about religion, besides the names of specific denominations, there were variants: "Atheist" and "I consider myself a believer, but I do not belong to any confession".

To assess the significance of religiosity in the structure of the image of "I", we propose to rank by importance a list of 16 elements of the self-image. The proposed options included the most frequently encountered social-role categories in self-descriptions: I am a man / woman; husband / wife (future husband / wife); son / daughter; father / mother (future father / mother); I am a student; professional (future professional); I am a representative of my folk; citizen of my country; an inhabitant of the given city; a follower of my religion; I am a representative of youth; member of the informal group; friend / girlfriend; representative of the species *Homo sapiens*. Thus, the proposed elements of the image of "I" reflected all the main spheres of the life activity of students: study, work, family, relationships, leisure, etc. When interpreting the results to subjectively significant we classified categories that received a rank from 1 to 5 inclusive.

In accordance with the tasks of our research, we were primarily interested in the peculiarities of students' personal orientations, for which religion is an important part of their life, that is, the category "I as a follower of my religion" has a high

rank (from 1 to 5). The respondents not considering religiosity as a significant element of their self-image were selected for the comparison group. Other 15 students were classified as undecided in their attitude to religion and their results are not considered in this article. As a result, the sample was 97 people.

Thus, the comparison of 2 characteristics: formal religiosity and its subjective significance allowed to divide all subjects into 4 groups (see table below).

TABLE 1. TYPES OF RELIGIOSITY OF SUBJECTS

		The subjective significance of religiosity in the structure of the image of the "I"	
		High (ranks 1-5)	Low (ranks 11-16)
Formal belonging to a religious group (confession)	Yes	Group 1 (Holistic religiosity) (n = 8)	Group 3 (External religiosity) (n = 43)
	No (variants of responses: "Atheist", "I consider myself a believer, but I do not belong to any confession")	Group 2 (Subjective religiosity) (n = 3)	Group 4 (Absence of religiosity, indifference) (n = 43)

Participants of the first group (average grade of religiosity 3.00, standard deviation  $\pm 1.07$ ) are characterized by both declared belonging to a certain confession, and subjective significance of religiosity. And if in the structure of religiosity both external and internal components exist, we propose to call this type "holistic religiosity".

The second group (average grade of religiosity 3.00, standard deviation  $\pm 2.00$ ) consisted of students who formally do not relate themselves to any religious group, but at the same time this attitude to religion is subjectively significant to them. Such an attitude may be a sign of their belief in higher powers, or of militant atheism, which itself begins to substitute for religion, or is accidental [14, 6].

Subjects of the third group (average grade of religiosity 14.12, standard deviation  $\pm 1.16$ ), with formal membership in a particular confession, do not consider this significant for them. This type of religiosity we call "external".

In the fourth group (average grade of religiosity was 14.02, standard deviation  $\pm 1.10$ ), test subjects showed consistent indifference to religion.

It is impossible not to notice the fact that the second group has a very modest size. However, the presence of the subjects met the criteria of the model proposed confirms its applicability, and a small number of respondents in separate groups only necessitates the use of appropriate statistical processing techniques to work with small samples.

### III. RESULTS

#### A. General characteristics of students' values system

In general, at the level of group norms, the desire for independence, pleasures and security dominate in the students' values system (Table 2). In our opinion, such priorities reflect the age features, in particular the desire for emancipation from parents, craving for pleasure. As for the desire for security, this can be a reaction to the general sense of change, instability of the modern world. It should be noted that our results are quite significantly different from the results obtained by V. N. Karandashev and S. V. Rettges in 2000-2002 during the study of students at the Vologda Pedagogical University. Then the first three places in the system of students' values were taken by kindness, achievement and security [16]. And if security in our research is also ranked, and the desire for achievements, although it occupies the fourth place, but fits into the system of values of students, which in our opinion can be characterized as selfish, the significance of kindness as a "pro-social" value has significantly decreased. It is likely that this fact reflects the general direction of the evolution of the value system of Russian society from the collectivistic to the individualistic.

TABLE 2. CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS' VALUES SYSTEM (N = 97)

Values	Average Score	Rank
<b>Values at the level of normative ideals</b>		
Independence	4.93	1
Hedonism	4.74	2
Security	4.59	3
Achievements	4.58	4
Kindness	4.41	5
Conformity	4.07	6
Power	3.65	7
Universalism	3.76	8
Stimulation	3.73	9
Traditions	2.95	10
<b>Values at the level of individual priorities</b>		
Hedonism	2.72	1
Independence	2.71	2
Achievements	2.34	3
Stimulation	2.24	4
Kindness	2.17	5
Security	1.95	6
Universalism	1.90	7
Conformity	1.54	8
Power	1.48	9
Traditions	0.96	10

It is noteworthy that the priority values at the level of normative ideals revealed during our research completely coincide with the leading values at the level of individual priorities obtained in the research by V. N. Karandashev and S. V. Rettges in 2000-2002. It means that those things which were what individually permissible 15 years ago, after a while became generally accepted.

The system of values at the level of individual priorities generally coincides with the normative: hedonism, independence and achievements. The difference lies in the somewhat greater importance of personal success.

Separately, we would like to draw your attention to the fact that in the first and second list the priorities are the values

associated with self-elevation and the desire for a new, while the "prosocial" values, or in the terminology of Schwartz, "values of self-transcendence" occupy the bottom positions.

### *B. General characteristics of the system of value orientations of students with different types of religiosity*

Let us consider the set of values of each of these groups (Table 3). We draw your attention to the fact that representatives of the first and second groups have a fairly similar system of values. In addition, in the list reflecting the understanding of the common values the first five values among members of these groups are identical in content. As the most significant, both at the level of individual priorities and at the level of normative ideals, the value of "security" stands out, and in each list of values, at least one prosocial value falls in the top three: kindness (at the level of normative ideals) or universalism (at the level of value priorities).

For groups characterized by subjective indifference to religion - the priorities are values, which in our opinion can be called selfish, e.g. "independence", "hedonism" and "achievements".

TABLE 3. VALUE ORIENTATIONS OF STUDENTS WITH DIFFERENT TYPES OF RELIGIOSITY

Holistic religiosity (1)	Subjective religiosity (2)	External religiosity (3)	Religious indifference (4)
<b>Values at the level of normative ideals</b>			
Security	Security	Independence	Independence
Hedonism	Kindness	Achievements	Hedonism
Universalism	Universalism	Hedonism	Security
Kindness	Independence	Kindness	Achievements
Independence	Hedonism	Security	Kindness
Achievements	Stimulation	Conformity	Conformity
Conformity	Conformity	Power	Stimulation
Traditions	Achievements	Stimulation	Universalism
Power	Traditions	Universalism	Power
Stimulation	Power	Traditions	Traditions
<b>Values at the level of individual priorities</b>			
Security	Security	Independence	Hedonism
Kindness	Hedonism	Hedonism	Independence
Conformity	Kindness	Achievements	Achievements
Universalism	Independence	Stimulation	Kindness
Achievements	Stimulation	Kindness	Stimulation
Independence	Achievements	Security	Universalism
Stimulation	Universalism	Universalism	Security
Hedonism	Conformity	Power	Power
Traditions	Power	Conformity	Conformity
Power	Traditions	Traditions	Traditions

### *C. Comparative analysis of the system of value orientations of students with different types of religiosity*

A descriptive analysis of the value system of students with different types of religiosity conducted during the study made it possible to reveal some peculiarities. To assess the reliability of differences in the value system in the groups described, we used the H criterion of Kruskal-Wallis test; The average scores and the rank of values were determined using descriptive statistics by the Statistica 10 program. It should be noted that the size of the second group does not allow making

unambiguous statistical conclusions, but it makes it possible to formulate certain assumptions and indicate the vector of future research.

The most differences in the system of values was fixed among students with a holistic type of religiosity and external religiosity. Since the differentiation of subjects in these groups was carried out on the basis of the presence of religious identity, it can be assumed that it is the subjective significance of religion that influences the importance of traditions and values of acceptance of another, tolerance in the hierarchy of values. This fact fully agrees with the results obtained by G. Allport during his studies of the relationship between religiosity and the propensity to prejudice [2].

Several more statistically significant differences were recorded between unsubs of different groups in assessing values at the level of individual priorities (Table 4, 5). This is quite predictable, given that normative ideals reflect the culture of society as a whole to a greater degree.

TABLE 4. DIFFERENCES IN THE VALUE SYSTEM - NORMATIVE IDEALS OF SUBJECTS WITH DIFFERENT TYPES OF RELIGIOSITY

Values at the level of normative ideals (total p, value of criterion H)	The significance of differences in groups (p)	Groups (average ranks)			
		Holistic religiosity (1)	Subjective religiosity (2)	External religiosity (3)	Lack of religiosity, indifference (4)
Traditions (p=0.003); H=14.05)	1-3 (0.023) 1-4 (0.002)	8	9	10	10
Universalism (p=0.035); H=8.62)	1-3 (0.047)	3	3	9	8

*Note. Here and below, only statistically significant differences between the groups described are presented in the tables.*

When analyzing the value system at the level of individual priorities, the same tendency is traced, the differences are fixed between subjects with holistic religiosity, external religiosity and students indifferent to religion. The general vector of differences can be designated as a decrease in the importance of values of subordination to the society. Simply put, while reducing subjective importance of religion, it reduced the value of tradition, conformity, security. It can be assumed that it is the need for security that forces one person to join to groups showing conformism and adherence to traditions.

TABLE 5. DIFFERENCES IN THE VALUE SYSTEM-INDIVIDUAL PRIORITIES OF SUBJECTS WITH DIFFERENT TYPES OF RELIGIOSITY

Values at the level of individual priorities (total p, value of criterion H)	The significance of differences in groups (p)	Groups (average ranks)			
		Holistic religiosity (1)	Subjective religiosity (2)	External religiosity (3)	Lack of religiosity, indifference (4)
Conformity (p=0.0043; H=13.16)	1-3 (0.0043) 1-4 (0.0019)	3	8	9	9
Traditions (p=0.0033; H=13.76)	1-3 (0.0070) 1-4 (0.0015)	9	10	10	10
Security (p=0.0034; H=13.64)	1-3 (0.0179) 1-4 (0.0052)	1	1	6	7



#### IV. DISCUSSION

The features of the value sphere of the individual as a hierarchical dynamic system are determined by belonging to a particular socio-cultural environment and this influence is greater the more the reference group is. As an indicator of the importance of the group for an individual, identity with this group can be used. Person can accept a religion on two levels: external, formal, declared (external religiosity) and internal, when the norms and values of religion become part of the value-semantic sphere of the individual (internal religiosity). A criterion of internal religiosity can be considered religious identity. As shown by our research, the relationship between religious affiliation and values identity observed more clear in participants with holistic type of religiosity. At the level of values, the decrease in the subjective significance of religiosity is manifested in the form of a decrease in the importance of prosocial values and values of traditions and the growing importance of the value of independence.

The obtained results suggest that an essential factor for the greater importance of prosocial values, primarily universalism, is the subjective acceptance of religion, that is, religious identity. So in groups of subjects, where religious identity is not an important component of the self-image, universalism refers to the number of rejected values (8-9 rank). We can also explain the results obtained by the fact that religious identity is associated with the priority of values of collectivism.

#### V. CONCLUSIONS

The results of this study confirm and concretise the idea of the influence of religiosity on the personality values system. The results we obtained demonstrate the applicability of the selected types of religiosity for analyzing the influence of religion on the individual, and also the justification of using religious identity as a criterion for assessing the subjective significance of religiosity.

A promising direction of the research is further operationalization of the concept of "subjective religiosity", the study of the content of religious beliefs and features of value orientations of subjects with religiosity of a given type.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] G. W. Allport, "The individual and his religion: a psychological interpretation" - Oxford: MacMillan, 1950. - 147 p.
- [2] G.W. Allport, J.M. Ross. "Personal religious orientation and prejudice". // Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 1967. V. 5. № 4.

- [3] G. W. Allport «The person in psychology: Selected essays». Boston, Beacon Press, 1968. 440 p
- [4] D. Boer & R. Fischer, "How and when do personal values guide our attitudes and sociality? Explaining cross-cultural variability in attitude-value linkages". Psychological Bulletin, 139 (5), 1113-1147. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0031347> (references)
- [5] J.M. Carter, "Advancing Identity Theory: Examining the Relationship between Activated Identities and Behavior in Different Social Contexts" // Social Psychology Quarterly Vol 76, Issue 3, pp. 203 – 223 First Published August 7, 2013 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0190272513493095> (references)
- [6] A.B. Cohen, M.S. Wu, J. Miller Religion and Culture: Individualism and Collectivism in the East and West // Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology Vol 47, Issue 9, 2016 pp. 1236 – 1249 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022116667895> (references)
- [7] T. G. Emel'ianova, E. Loginova "The value orientations of college students" / Journal Russian Education & Society (2014) volume 43 issue 2, 38 – 40. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2753/res1060-9393430238> (references)
- [8] A. H. Krylow, "Religious identity. Individual and collective self-awareness in post-industrial space" [Religioznaya identichnost'. Individual'noye i kollektivnoye samosoznaniye v postindustrial'nom prostranstve.] Moscow: Ikar, 306 p.
- [9] A. H. Maslow, "Toward a Psychology of Being". Litton Education Publishing, 1968.
- [10] D. Papastilianou, E. Lampridis, "Social values priorities and orientation towards individualism and collectivism of Greek university students" / Journal of Beliefs & Values volume 37 issue 1, 40–54. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13617672.2016.1141528> (references)
- [11] M. Rokeach, "The nature of human values".-N.Y., Free Press, 1973. 438 pp.
- [12] S.H. Schwartz, S. Huismans, "Value priorities and religiosity in four Western religions" // Social Psychol. Quart. 1995. V. 58. P. 88—107.
- [13] S. H. Schwartz & W. Bilsky, "Toward a universal psychological structure of human values" // Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53, pp. 550-562. (references)
- [14] S. Stowers, "The Concepts of 'Religion', 'Political Religion' and the Study of Nazism" // Journal of Contemporary History. Vol 42, Issue 1, pp. 9–24. 2007. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022009407071628> (references)
- [15] M.S. Yaniskiy, "Values of personality as a dynamic system" [Tsennostnyye oriyentatsii lichnosti kak dinamicheskaya sistema]. Kemerovo: Kuzbassvuzizdat, 204 p.
- [16] V. N. Karandashev, "Schwartz's method for studying the values of personality: the concept and methodological guidance" [Metodika Shvartsa dlya izucheniya tsennostey lichnosti: kontseptsiya i metodicheskoye rukovodstvo]. - SPb.: Rech', 70 p.
- [17] M. S. Leonova, O. V. Bondarenko, "The place of religion in the system of values of Russian students" [Mesto religii v sisteme tsennostey rossiyskogo studenchestva] // Vestnik URGU (NPI). - 2013. - No 6 - p. 134-139.
- [18] R.S Titov, "The concept of individual religiosity G. Allport: the concept of religious orientations" [Kontseptsiya individual'noy religioznosti G. Olporta: ponyatiye religioznykh oriyentatsiy] // Cultural-historical psychology. - 2013. No. 1, p. 2-9.
- [19] V.I. Khomenko, "Religiosity of the population of Russia: theoretical and methodological bases of measurement [Religioznost' naseleniya rossii: teoretiko-metodologicheskiye osnovaniya izmereniya]: the dissertation ..." The candidate of sociological sciences: 22.00.06. Moscow, 2017. 203 p.