

The Calling and Humility Scale: Extending the Weberian Approach to the Research of the Elective Affinity between Religion and the Economy*

Ivan Zabaev

Candidate of Sociological Sciences, Associated Professor, Theological Faculty,
St. Tikhon's Orthodox University
Address: 6 Likhov lane, 1, Moscow, Russian Federation 127051
E-mail: zabaev-iv@yandex.ru

Elena Prutskova

Lecturer, Research Fellow, St. Tikhon's Orthodox University
Address: 6 Likhov lane, 1, Moscow, Russian Federation 127051
E-mail: evprutskova@gmail.com

Weber's famous work *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* has been widely applied in sociological research. Weber formulated the question of the relationship between religion and the economy in the sense that certain types of Protestant denominations fostered the development of capitalism. One of the main factors which Weber paid attention to was the "Protestant ethic" concept of calling/vocation. The authors of this research have integrated these findings and extended the original Weberian approach in which ethics plays the central role in the analysis of the elective affinity between religion and the economy. It can be shown that humility is the second component of the ethical variable used by Weber in his sociology of religion. This approach makes the concept of economic ethics relevant for studying all major Christian denominations, that is, not only Catholic and Protestant, but also Orthodox. The aim of the current article is to develop an empirical research method based on this theoretical approach. We propose a scale measuring the ethics of calling and humility which can be assessed in quantitative surveys. The scale was pre-tested in October–November 2017 in four countries (233 respondents in Russia, Switzerland, Georgia, and Romania). After corrections based on the pre-test results, the scale was applied in a survey of parishioners of four Christian denominations in Russia (1262 respondents), those of the Orthodox, Catholic, "traditional" Protestant (Lutheran, Baptist, etc.), and the "new" Protestant (Pentecostal) denominations, in 2017–2018.

Keywords: economic ethics, humility scale, calling scale, M. Weber, F. Nietzsche, M. Scheler, Catholic, Protestant, Pentecostal, Orthodox Christianity

© Ivan Zabaev, 2019

© Elena Prutskova, 2019

© Centre for Fundamental Sociology, 2019

DOI: 10.17323/1728-192X-2019-2-62-88

* The research project "Religion and patterns of social and economic organization. Elective affinity between religion and economy in Christian denominations in Switzerland and Russia" is supported by the grant of the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (RFBR) No. 16-23-41006.

Introduction

Weber's famous work, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (2011), has been widely applied in sociological research (Eisenstadt, 1968; Kalberg, 2011; Lehmann, Roth, 1995; Marshall, 1982; Schluchter, Graf, 2005; Swatos, Kaelber, 2016). Weber formulated the question of the relationship between religion and the economy in the sense that certain types of Protestant denominations fostered the development of capitalism. One of the main factors which Weber paid attention to was the "Protestant ethic" concept of calling/vocation. The connection between theology and economic ethics has also been studied in other settings, such as the religious roots of Indian (Kapp, 1963; Singer, 1956), Jewish (Tamari, 1987), or Japanese societies (Bellah, 1985), the role of Pentecostalism in Latin America (Martin, 1993), as well as Islam and Buddhism in Asia (Means, 1969; Sarkisyanz, 1965), and the different branches of Christianity (Eisenstadt, 1968; Fanfani, 2008; Guiso, Sapienza, Zingales, 2003; Porta, Lopez-de-Silanes, Shleifer, Vishny, 1996). Weber's ideas have also been applied to the analysis of contemporary Russian Orthodox Christianity (Buss, 1989, 2003; Dinello, 1998; Makrides, 2005; Marsh, 2008; Knorre, 2011; Fedotova, Kross, 2006; Kharkhordin, 2002). In a study of economic ethics in communities formed around monasteries, it has been found that humility and obedience are the main ethical concepts that shape monastic Russian Orthodox economic thought (Zabaev, 2015).

The authors of this research have integrated these findings and extended the original Weberian approach in which ethics plays the central role in the analysis of the elective affinity between religion and the economy. This tradition has a certain deficiency in that it lacks generality. Researchers have been looking for the ethics of vocation/calling in different settings, while there are denominations with other ethical tenets. Weber himself noted the distinction between the "humility" of Lutherans and the "vocation" of Calvinists. Later, this distinction was transformed into the "asceticism-mysticism" dichotomy. These other ethical tenets may have other potential economic and social effects. Since these other ethical tenets are not analyzed, these possible effects remain underestimated. In line with the critics of modernity and the role the ethics of calling played in it, these effects may turn out to be not only negative. It can be shown that humility is the second component of the ethical variable used by Weber in his sociology of religion (Zabaev, 2018b). This approach makes the concept of economic ethics relevant for studying all of the major Christian denominations, not only Catholic and Protestant, but also Orthodox. The aim of the current article is to develop an empirical research method based on this theoretical approach. We revise the existing scales of calling and humility, and try to construct our own scale. In contrast to the existing scales, it is more related to religion. We take three consequent steps to solve this problem. First, we shortly introduce the ethical variable which has two main components, those of calling and humility. It has a basis in the *The Protestant Ethic*, and later in Weber's *Sociology of Religion*. After this, we review the existing attempts to measure calling and humility in empirical research, and propose our own operationalization of these concepts. Finally, we describe the results of testing this scale in a survey of parishioners of four Christian denominations in Russia. We con-

clude that the ethical views of contemporary religious people can be analyzed using the approach suggested by Weber. The respondents perceive reality in accordance with the principles that Weber anticipated.

We propose a scale measuring the ethics of calling and humility, which can be assessed in quantitative surveys. This scale was designed in the course of a joint Russian-Swiss research project titled “Religion and patterns of social and economic organization: elective affinity between religion and economy in Christian denominations in Switzerland and Russia.” The scale was pre-tested in October–November 2017 in four countries (233 respondents in Russia, Switzerland, Georgia, and Romania). Although the sample was not representative, it allowed for evaluating the structure and psychometric properties of this scale. After corrections based on the pre-test results, the scale was applied in a survey of parishioners of four Christian denominations in Russia (1262 respondents), from the Orthodox, Catholic, “traditional” Protestant (Lutheran, Baptist, etc.), and “new” Protestant (Pentecostal) denominations, in 2017–2018. It was conducted in different Russian regions among participants at religious services in several parishes of each of the four Christian denominations.¹

There are several distinct features which contribute to the scientific novelty of our approach. First, there are many scales which evaluate the Protestant ethic of calling/vocation (Miller, Woehr, Hudspeth, 2002), and many scales of humility (McElroy, 2017; Worthington, Davis, Hook, 2017), but our scale is the first in which these two concepts are evaluated against each other within a common theoretical framework. Second, our scale includes two additional concepts which allow for differentiating humility and calling from relatively-close empirically, but quite-distant-theoretically concepts like resentment and careerism (Scheler, 1972). Third, our conceptualization of humility is based on a theological and philosophical rather than only a psychological approach (applied in most of the existing scales), which makes our scale more relevant for studying religious ethics in particular. In addition, the word “humility” is not used in the scale items, and the respondents are not directly asked to assess how humble they are.

The “Asceticism–Mysticism” Dichotomy and its Corresponding Central Categories

The Weberian tradition began as the analysis of how the ethics of vocation/calling (*Beruf*) contributed to the formation of capitalism. For more than a century, Weber’s thesis has been a subject of criticism and clarification. In particular, a number of authors showed that there was no connection between capitalism and Protestantism (Barro, McCleary, 2003; Becker, Woessmann, 2009; Blum, Dudley, 2001; Cantoni, 2013; Delacroix, Nielsen, 2001; Grier, 1997). In this regard, it might seem pointless to continue working in line with the Weberian approach. However, we propose to bring ethics, not religiosity, to the

1. Similar surveys of four Christian denominations were also conducted in Switzerland, so a cross-country comparison will be possible in further research. The current analysis is based on only the Russian dataset.

forefront of the analysis. The point is that calling is an ethical category, although it has a religious background. We think that this approach is closer to the original Weberian idea. This idea was that the (Protestant) ethics had some (perhaps causal) relation to a number of elements of the spirit of capitalism, rather than that Protestantism was the cause of capitalism.

The Weberian tradition does not constitute a single stream of research. Rather, there are various sub-traditions. One of these is the development of “work ethic” scales to measure the ethics of calling. Researchers have made significant progress in this direction.

Our scale of practical religious ethos has also been elaborated according to Weber’s ideas described in both *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* and later works. An analysis of Orthodox Christianity in the framework of the Weberian tradition meets with a number of difficulties. In the *The Protestant Ethic*, Weber introduces the opposition between asceticism and mysticism, describing Orthodox Christianity as being closer to mysticism.

Humility is the key concept for mysticism in the same way that calling is the key concept for asceticism (Zabaev, 2018a). Thus, a scale of “humility” is needed in order to analyze the influence of ethics cultivated in Orthodox Christianity with the same logic. The situation becomes even more complicated if we also take into account that the *The Protestant Ethic* contains explicit and implicit references to F. Nietzsche’s texts. As a result of a reconstruction of the discussion between M. Scheler and Nietzsche, the ethical variable acquires the form of a “square,” where the opposition of asceticism and mysticism according to Weber intersects with the distinction of “noble” and “common” types of people according to Scheler. This results in four components of ethics, those of (1) calling, (2) humility, (3) careerism, and (4) resentment (Zabaev, 2018b).

Nietzsche differentiates between the “noble” and “slave” valuation mode when he writes that

The slave revolt in morality begins when *ressentiment* itself becomes creative and gives birth to values: the *ressentiment* of natures that are denied the true reaction, that of deeds, and compensate themselves with an imaginary revenge. While every noble morality develops from a triumphant affirmation of itself, slave morality from the outset says No to what is “outside,” what is “different,” what is “not itself”; and *this* No is its creative deed. This inversion of the value-positing eye — this need to direct one’s view outward instead of back to oneself — is of the essence of *ressentiment*: in order to exist, slave morality always first needs a hostile external world . . . (2011: 37–38; emphasis in the original)

Nietzsche links the emergence of resentment with the Judeo-Christian religion. Scheler believes that Christianity could not be the source of the ethical changes that Nietzsche attributes to it. The two key components of humility, according to Scheler, are: (1) “letting go” of our ego, “losing” or even “abandoning” ourselves without fear, emancipation from the ideas of dignity, merits, rights, self-worthiness, self-respect and instead of it; (2) perceiving everything as being given to us as a gift (2005: 24). Scheler differenti-

ates between the “noble” and “common” type of person. He writes: “The noble man experiences value *prior* to any comparison, the common man *in and through* a comparison” (Scheler, 1972: 37; emphasis in the original). The latter can also be of two types: “The energetic variety of the ‘common’ man becomes an *arriviste*, the weak variety becomes the *man of resentment*” (Ibid.: 38; emphasis in the original).

In line with this theoretical argument, a scale of practical religious ethos based on the four components (calling vs. careerism, and humility vs. resentment) has been elaborated and tested in quantitative empirical surveys of parishioners of four Christian denominations.

In developing this scale, we tried not to ignore the humility problem that Weber inherited from Nietzsche. For Nietzsche, humility was a symbol of the negative character traits that Christianity fostered in people. For him, humility was almost a vivid expression of resentment. Weber introduces his typology of asceticism and mysticism (with the corresponding ethical categories of “calling” and “humility”), in connection with the Nietzschean idea of resentment (Tyrell, 2014). Weber demonstrates two fundamentally different ways to achieve salvation, correlated with two ways of coping with resentment in Nietzschean theory. Each of them presupposes its own way of life (*die Lebensführung*). Contemporary psychological approaches to humility often abandon this problem, treating humility as some supplement aimed at making a person of vocation (with his activity, self-realization, achievement of goals, etc.) a little bit more human in not always forgetting about others. A Weberian thesis would have been that these two ethical perspectives might not co-exist so easily in one person.

Conceptualization and Operationalization of Calling

Calling/vocation (*Beruf*) is the key category describing asceticism in the Weberian typology of rational salvation techniques. Calling is often defined as finding deep meaning in one’s work (Wrzesniewski et al., 1997), or a commitment to the value and importance of hard work (Miller et al., 2002). It is often connected with the cultivation of some activity, skill, or virtue. In the classical text of R. Baxter used by Weber in his analysis of Protestant ethics, the following idea is given: “A man without a calling thus lacks the systematic, methodical character which is, as we have seen, demanded by worldly asceticism” (Weber, 2011). The Protestant value of asceticism, that is, hard work together with the rejection of luxury and this-worldly pleasures, was one of the factors which led to the development of the attitude towards life which Weber called “the spirit of capitalism.” Weber’s thesis has been widely discussed and criticized, as little empirical evidence has been found for the association between belonging to a particular religion and the work ethic. The “Protestant” work ethic has been found among Catholics and Muslims (Inglehart, Norris, 2004; Shirokanova, 2015).

There are two main versions of the Calling conceptualization. In the framework of the first approach, a calling is described as the ability to derive a sense of purpose or meaningfulness from one’s role in life, and holding other-oriented values and goals as

primary sources of motivation (Dik et al., 2012; Duffy, Dik, 2013). An example of this approach is the distinction between seeing one's work as "either a Job (focus on financial rewards and necessity rather than pleasure or fulfillment; not a major positive part of life), a Career (focus on advancement), or a Calling (focus on enjoyment of fulfilling, socially useful work)" (Wrzesniewski et al., 1997: 21). Our theoretical approach goes in line with the second tradition where calling is conceptualized as a component of the work ethic, as done by Weber and his followers and/or critics. An example of this approach is a variety of multidimensional work ethic scales that are more-or-less detailed. For instance, Miller et al. proposed the following dimensions; importance of hard work, self-reliance, leisure avoidance, centrality of work, morality/ethics, delay of gratification, and avoidance of wasted time (2002). Modrack proposed to shorten the list to four core components of "hard work, no leisure, asceticism, independence/self-reliance" (2008: 6). Our operationalization of calling was inspired by the approach proposed by Miller et al. (2002), although their original scale has been revised.

Calling should be differentiated from Careerism. Careerism is not just a pursuit of power and money, but a pursuit of power, money, or being more highly esteemed than others, etc., *without thinking of one's work in terms of its intrinsic value* (Scheler, 1972).

Conceptualization and Operationalization of Humility

Humility is the key category in describing mysticism in the Weberian typology of rational salvation techniques. On the one hand, the Weberian definition of a mystic emphasizes passivity vs. activity, and acceptance vs. struggle:

The contemplative mystic minimizes his activity by resigning himself to the order of the world as it is . . . He is constantly striving to escape from activity in the world back to the quietness and inwardness of his god. Conversely, the ascetic, whenever he acts in conformity with his type, is certain to become god's instrument. . . . Therefore the success of the ascetic's action is a success of the god himself, who has contributed to the action's success, or at the very least the success is a special sign of divine blessing upon the ascetic and his activity. But for the genuine mystic, no success which may crown his activity within the world can have any significance with respect to salvation. For him, his maintenance of true humility within the world is his sole warranty for the conclusion that his soul has not fallen prey to the snares of the world. (Weber, 1965: 174)

On the other hand, the traditional Christian connotations linking "acceptance" with the "other" are present: "There lives in the Orthodox Church a specific mysticism based on the East's unforgettable belief that *brotherly love and charity* . . . form a way not only to some social effects that are entirely incidental, but to a knowledge of the meaning of the world, to a mystical relationship to God" (Toennies et al., 1973: 144–145; emphasis added).

This vision can be conceptualized in different ways. In its simplest form, it leads to distinguishing three components: (1) passivity of the perceiving subject, or a willingness

to accept, a perspective which Scheler designated as *the world as a gift*, as opposed to perception of the world as given to us by right in accordance with our dignity; (2) *openness to a different perspective*, which is the ability to take a different view, to look at what is happening from a different angle, or to admit one's mistakes; and (3) *the lack of attention to oneself and high other-focus*, which is accepting others in all the concreteness of their existence and in being able to feel their needs and helping them.

In contemporary psychology, researchers often try to escape from the negative connotations of humility by using J. P. Tangney's definition and explaining it with the beautiful metaphor of R. Warren: "Humility is not thinking less of yourself; it is thinking of yourself less" (Tangney, 2002: 148). According to Tangney, the key components of humility are:

accurate assessment of one's abilities and achievements (*not* low self-esteem, self-deprecation); ability to acknowledge one's mistakes, imperfections, gaps in knowledge, and limitations (often vis-à-vis a "higher power"); openness to new ideas, contradictory information, and advice; keeping of one's abilities and accomplishments — one's place in the world — in perspective (e.g., seeing oneself as just one person in the larger scheme of things); relatively low self-focus, a "forgetting of the self," while recognizing that one is but one part of the larger universe; appreciation of the value of all things, as well as the many different ways that people and things can contribute to our world. (Tangney, 2000: 73–74)

Tangney's view of humility seems somewhat one-sided as compared to the articles even in theological encyclopedias (Adnès, 1969; Dihle, 1957). Tangney portrays humility as "a rich, multifaceted construct, in sharp contrast to dictionary definitions that emphasize a sense of unworthiness and low self-regard" (2000: 73). While acknowledging the psychological approach to the conceptualization of humility, we, at the same time, try not to abandon the passivity and self-abasement aspects of humility that are present in the position of "old" Christianity, where it is written that "Obedience is absolute renunciation of our own life . . . Obedience is the tomb of the will and the resurrection of humility. A corpse does not argue or reason as to what is good or what seems to be bad" (Climacus, St. John, 2012: Step 4).

Without both rejecting these connotations in advance and putting additional emphasis on them, we take into account the initial Weberian approach, largely inspired by Nietzsche's moral philosophy. It is important to preserve the distinction of humility and resentment in the research inventory. A reference is made to both the initial equating of humility and resentment made by Nietzsche (2011) and the protection of the Christian virtue of humility and differentiation of these perspectives carried out by Scheler (1972, 2005). Resentment is a hidden desire for revenge, a modality of human existence in which people prefer to suffer and wait for a chance of revenge, (at least in their imagination), than actively resisting something.

The currently existing scales of humility can be divided into direct and indirect scales. Direct scales use the word "humility" and cognate words. Respondents are asked to directly assess their degree of being humble. (There are two types of indirect measures,

those of self-report and other-report scales. For a detailed review of the psychological scales of humility, see Hill et al., 2017; McElroy, 2017; Zabaev, 2018a.) For this study, the most influential is the approach by J. C. Wright et al., who suggest measuring humility as a sum of the two components of “low self-focus” and “high other-focus” (2017).

Researchers of humility are faced with the paradox of how to rely on a person’s self-report for evaluation of a characteristic which presupposes low attention (or even self-neglect) to oneself. D. E. Davis et al. propose a concept of relational humility which can be measured as an observer’s judgment of whether the target person is humble or not (2011). R. E. Landrum proposes to measure “dispositional humility,” which assumes that humble people like other humble people. He suggests that instead of asking direct questions like “Are you humble?,” a different wording of “Do you like people who are...?” can be used (2011). We also attempted to overcome this difficulty in the current study. The key components of this attempt were (1) opposing humility as a virtue to another virtue, that of calling, (2) the introduction of negative components (ressentiment and careerism) which additionally enhance the distinctiveness of the scale, and (3) using question wording which suggests a certain shift in the respondents’ attention from themselves.

Results

The Calling and Humility Scale consists of 31 statements describing different people². The respondents are asked to evaluate to what extent these people are like them on a six-point scale (“very much like me,” “like me,” “moderately like me,” “a little like me,” “not like me,” “not at all like me,” or “hard to answer”). Where possible, the scale items were formulated in gender-neutral language. In items where this was difficult, gender-specific formulations (he/she) were used. The model was evaluated via Confirmatory factor analysis using the M-Plus 7.3 software package (Muthén, Muthén, 2017). Some of the scale items were omitted at different stages of analysis³, and the final model included 23 statements. The factor loadings are presented in Table 1⁴. The measurement model of Humility consists of three latent factors, those of *High Other-Focus*, the *World as a Gift*, and *Openness to a Different Perspective*. The model of Calling includes five latent factors, those of *Achievement*, *Self-Worthiness*, *Centrality of Work*, *Productivity*, and *Independence*. Two additional concepts are represented by *Careerism* and the *Ressentiment* factor.

2. The full list of the scale items is provided in Appendix I.

3. Item 28 was dropped from the model because the respondents did not understand it well, and often chose the “hard to answer” option. Item 13 was dropped from the analysis because it loaded on the wrong factor. Several items were deleted because of significant cross-loadings. Our aim was to construct the most parsimonious scale with a minimal amount of indicators, which provided the best model fit. For this reason, the remainder of the omitted descriptions of people were dropped from the model because there were enough items which loaded on a particular factor.

4. The model was constructed in several stages. Only the main resulting versions of the models are described in the text.

Table 1. Factor Loadings (Standardized)*

	M1. Calling	M2. Humility	M3. Final total model	M4. An alternative total model with several cross-loadings
<i>HIGH OTHER-FOCUS</i>				
5 This person is concerned if other people are in trouble		0.569	0.567	0.567
19 This person feels the needs of other people		0.726	0.700	0.699
25 This person likes to help other people		0.601	0.635	0.637
<i>THE WORLD AS A GIFT — PASSIVITY</i>				
6 If this person is treated unfairly, he/she tries to be patient and not to think about it		0.400		
12 This person tries to follow the natural course of events, not actively oppose it		0.523	0.533	0.559
24 If bad things happen to him/her, this person does not fight actively against it		0.502	0.523	0.511
31 This person always wants to be a winner				-0.306
<i>OPENNESS TO A DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVE</i>				
11 This person easily admits his/her mistakes		0.480	0.491	0.535
17 This person considers advice from others carefully		0.521	0.509	0.700
<i>ACHIEVEMENT</i>				
21 This person is proud of his/her achievements	0.565		0.564	0.600
31 This person always wants to be a winner	0.635		0.639	0.581
<i>SELF-WORTHINESS</i>				
4 This person tries to defend his/her interests under all circumstances	0.710		0.703	0.698
16 This person does not allow others to act unfairly upon him/her	0.575		0.598	0.599

22 This person tries to defend his/her point of view to the end	0.658	0.648	0.649
11 This person easily admits his/her mistakes			-0.186
<i>CENTRALITY OF WORK</i>			
14 Even if this person was financially able, he/she would not stop working	0.709	0.707	0.706
30 Life without work would be very boring for this person	0.729	0.721	0.732
9 Career growth is much more important for this person than the opportunity to follow his/her vocation		-0.330	-0.264
<i>PRODUCTIVITY</i>			
23 This person schedules the day in advance to avoid wasting time	0.707	0.681	0.686
26 This person tries to use his/her time productively	0.766	0.797	0.789
9 Career growth is much more important for this person than the opportunity to follow his/her vocation			-0.160
<i>INDEPENDENCE</i>			
18 This person tries to do everything by himself/herself	0.618	0.663	0.672
20 This person doesn't like having to depend on other people	0.621	0.580	0.574
17 This person considers advice from others carefully			-0.394
<i>CAREERISM</i>			
9 Career growth is much more important for this person than the opportunity to follow his/her vocation		0.751	0.763
15 This person strives strongly to earn as much money as possible		0.719	0.714
27 This person invests most of his/her time and resources in his/her career		0.743	0.749

RESENTIMENT

10 If this person is treated unfairly, he/she feels hurt, and hopes that bad, unjust acts will be retributed	0.877	0.895
29 This person is convinced that in the long run all bad people will get what they deserve	0.598	0.586

*All factor loadings are significant at the $p \leq 0.001$ level. Cross-loadings are marked in grey.

Calling

The analysis was conducted in several stages. First of all, the Calling measurement model was constructed (M1). The goodness-of-fit measures indicate that our model fits the data well ($\chi^2(34) = 71.03$, $p = 0.0002$; RMSEA = 0.03; CFI = 0.98; TLI = 0.97; SRMR = 0.02). Only the significant χ^2 indicates that this five-factor model lacks an exact fit to the data. However, it has been shown in the literature that the use of χ^2 as a measure of model fit is over-restrictive because of its sensitivity to sample size. It has been proven to be almost unrealistic to find a well-fitting model with insignificant χ^2 in empirical research if the sample size is large (Byrne, 2012: 66–68), which is true in our case. Several more realistic fit indices have been proposed to overcome the problematic nature of χ^2 . We report four of them.⁵ Values close to 0 (0.05 or less) for the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) and the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR), as well as values close to 1 (more than 0.90 or 0.95) for the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), indicate a well-fitting model (Ibid.: 69–77).

The first factor in the Calling measurement model is *Achievement*, which is measured by two statements: “This person is proud of his/her achievements” and “This person always wants to be a winner.” This factor emphasizes the importance of this-worldly success. The doctrine of predestination played a central role in Weber’s thesis, as illustrated when he writes “the question of eternal salvation constituted people’s primary life concern during the Reformation epoch” (2011: 119). People were searching for signs of being among the faithful blessed by God. Calvinists believed that such signs of being predestinated for salvation were manifested “in this life, also in a material sense” (Ibid.: 165). That was the reason why success and achievement were very important to them.

In the Puritans’ view, the elect who acquired their state of grace serve to increase God’s glory. Thus, God’s grace is manifested in human life. The idea of grace is somewhat different in Catholicism. The principle of Human Dignity is central to Catholic social teaching. It emphasizes that, as humans were created after the image and likeness of God, each human life is sacred and every person has inherent worth and dignity. The grace and dignity aspect of calling is expressed in the *Self-worthiness* latent factor which includes the three statements of “This person tries to defend his/her interests under all

5. More detailed information on fit measures is reported in Appendix II.

circumstances,” “This person does not allow others to act unfairly upon him/her,” and “This person tries to defend his/her point of view to the end.”

Christians believe that God has given every human being some unique talents and skills. It is a person’s duty to develop this gift from God. People fulfill their personal vocation through the development of their talents, and persistent work in their profession. One of the outcomes of the predestination doctrine was strong religious anxiety which could be released only through hard work: “*Work without rest in a vocational calling* was recommended as the best possible means to *acquire* the self-confidence that one belonged among the elect” (Weber, 2011: 125, emphasis in the original). Work should be central to a Christian’s life, and the “unwillingness to work is a sign that one is not among the saved” (Ibid.: 161). The *Centrality of work* dimension of calling accounts for the importance of work in one’s life. It includes the two statements of “Even if this person was financially able, he/she would not stop working,” and “Life without work would be very boring for this person.”

The avoidance of wasting time is another important feature of the Protestant ethics of calling emphasized by Weber. He wrote that “According to the will of God, which has been clearly revealed, *only activity*, not idleness and enjoyment, serves to increase His glory. Hence, of all the sins, *the wasting of time* constitutes the first and, in principle, the most serious” (Ibid.: 160; emphasis in the original). The time given to each human being is limited, so one should use it carefully. This aspect constitutes the next factor of *Productivity*, measured by the two statements of “This person schedules the day in advance to avoid wasting time,” and “This person tries to use his/her time productively.”

Weber stressed that the doctrine of predestination resulted in the spiritual isolation and loneliness of a solitary individual. People “were directed to pursue their life’s journey in solitude . . . And no one could help them” (Ibid.: 119). Puritan literature often warned against friendship and trust in others (Ibid.: 121). Accordingly, self-reliance is one of the key features of the ethics of calling. This aspect is reflected in the factor of *Independence* in our model. There are two statements on this factor, those of “This person tries to do everything by himself/herself” and “This person doesn’t like having to depend on other people.”

We tried to check if a second-order factor of Calling which manifests in the five latent factors described above exists, but the model quality decreased substantially after adding this global factor. This is rather predictable based on previous studies which showed that the Protestant work ethic is constituted of a list of independent factors. We propose that a more general Calling work ethic factor should be constructed in the formative logic. Every factor in the model accounts for an important constitutive feature of this phenomenon. The latent factors of Calling are complementary, not interchangeable. They cannot replace each other because the phenomenon in question would be substantially different.

Humility

The measurement model of Humility (M2) was constructed in the second stage of analysis. The fit indices for this model are excellent ($\chi^2(17) = 25.47$, $p = 0.085$; RMSEA = 0.02; CFI = 0.99; TLI = 0.98; SRMR = 0.03), and even the χ^2 statistic is insignificant.

The first component of the Humility model is the *World as a gift* factor. The factor is measured by three statements: “If this person is treated unfairly, he/she tries to be patient and not to think about it,” “This person tries to follow the natural course of events, not actively oppose it,” and “If bad things happen to him/her, this person doesn’t fight actively against it.” This factor represents the attitude of accepting all that comes (even unpleasant things) with thankfulness, as opposed to acquiring or gaining something in accordance with one’s rights, dignity, or merits. M. Scheler expressed it as follows:

The genuine “letting go” of our ego and its value, daring to adventure upon the fearful emptiness that gapes beyond what is related to the ego consciously and semi-consciously — that is just what matters! Dare to be amazed and thankful before the fact that thou art not nothing, that anything at all is — and not rather Nothingness! Dare to dispense with all thy presumed inward “rights,” thy “worthiness,” thy “merits,” all the respect of men — especially, however, with your “self-respect” — with any and all claim to be “worthy” of any kind of good fortune and to look instead upon it as a gift: Then only art thou humble! (2005: 24).

This factor reveals that humility is closer to passivity and contemplation, as opposed to activity and breaking through obstacles.

The second component of humility is the factor of *Openness to a different perspective* with two statements: “This person easily admits his/her mistakes” and “This person considers advice from others carefully.” The ability to accept a different point of view, to look at what is happening from a different angle, and to admit one’s mistakes are manifestations of low self-focus. Not prioritizing oneself opens space for being more attentive to the existence of different views, which might enrich one’s own vision of the situation. As Wright et al. put it, “humility is a corrective to our natural tendency to treat our ‘selves’ as ‘special,’ to strongly prioritize or privilege our own mental states (e.g. our beliefs, values, etc.) and capacities (e.g. skills, abilities, etc.) . . . and have undue attachment to them simply because they are ours” (2017: 5). This aspect of humility is different from just low self-esteem. It accentuates an openness to new, challenging ideas and information which comes from sources other than ourselves. This aspect of humility is emphasized today in business literature. Collins’s study shows that companies which made the biggest breakthrough “from good to great” were led by managers who were humble (2001). In contrast to the first component which is not social, here the other person appears as a horizon, as a potential opportunity, or as one towards whom people realize themselves in the world.

The third latent factor in the model of Humility is *High other-focus*. Three items load on this factor: “This person is concerned, if other people are in trouble,” “This person feels the needs of other people,” and “This person likes to help other people.” In this factor, sociality reaches its peak. It could be assumed that the third factor is very similar to the second, that is, high other-focus is another side of low self-focus. In our sample, these

components are highly related to each other (the Pearson correlation between the latent factors is 0.8). However, they are theoretically distinct. Helping and caring about others does not necessarily follow from being able to accept other people's advice or to admit one's mistakes. It can be hypothesized that in some societies these two components can be merged, but in others, separated. This can be one of the tasks for further cross-cultural research on the scale measurement invariance.

The Total Model

The final model (M₃) includes Calling and Humility specified on the previous stages of analysis, as well as two additional latent factors, those of *Ressentiment* and *Careerism*. The model quality is quite satisfactory, since all fit indices (except the significant χ^2) are within the proposed cut-off points ($\chi^2(184) = 509.7$, $p < 0.001$; RMSEA = 0.04; CFI = 0.93; TLI = 0.90; SRMR = 0.04).

Psychological literature today gives many positive connotations to humility and puts it somewhere near modesty. Nevertheless, a number of ambivalent phenomena are often thought of as humility or in close connection with it. One of them is resentment, which should be differentiated from humility. The idea of resentment, i.e., a sense of hostility towards external "evil" which causes one's own failures coupled with a hidden desire for revenge, is articulated in Nietzsche's philosophy and also discussed by Scheller in connection with the Christian ideal of humility (1972). In Nietzsche's words, "the man of *ressentiment* is neither upright nor naïve nor honest and straightforward with himself. His soul *squints*; his spirit loves hiding places, secret paths and back doors, everything covert entices him as *his* world, *his* security, *his* refreshment; he understands how to keep silent, how not to forget, how to wait, how to be provisionally self-deprecating and humble" (2011: 38; emphasis in the original).

The *Ressentiment* factor is measured by the two statements: "If this person is treated unfairly, he/she feels hurt, and hopes that bad, unjust acts will be retributed" and "This person is convinced that in the long run all bad people will get what they deserve." As can be seen from the correlations (Table 2), *Ressentiment* is actually to a large extent independent of the three humility factors. The only significant correlation with the World as a gift factor is very low in magnitude ($r = 0.23$).

Calling should be differentiated from careerism. In Scheller's words, a careerist (*der Streber*)⁶ "is not someone who energetically and potently pursues power, property, honor, and other values. He does not deserve this name as long as he still thinks in terms of the intrinsic value of something which he actively furthers and represents by profession or calling. The ultimate goal of the arriviste's aspirations is not to acquire a thing of value, but to be more highly esteemed than others" (1972: 11). A careerist tries to get at the top, and to achieve success at any cost. Careerism is a pursuit of career and income for the sake of career and income only, without caring for the work content and meaning. In our model, the *Careerism* factor is measured by three statements; "Career growth is much more important for this person than opportunity to follow his/her vocation," "This per-

6. Translated into English as "an arriviste."

son strives strongly to earn as much money as possible,” and “This person invests most of his/her time and resources in his/her career.”

After adding the Careerism factor, we decided to introduce a cross-loading for one of its items based on a high Modification index (MI=45.6), that is, “Career growth is much more important for this person than the opportunity to follow his/her vocation” on the *Centrality of work* factor. The cross-loading was negative (-0.33), significant, and (most important) very meaningful. It allows for intensifying the opposition between *Careerism* as orientation towards career only, and *Centrality of work* as orientation towards career as a reflection of mastering one’s vocation.

To be consistent, we also report results of an alternative total model (M₄) with several other interpretable cross-loadings added one-by-one based on Modification indices. They seem logical; however, they are not very strong and increase the complexity of the model. We would propose to treat these additional cross-loadings with caution. They should be retested on different samples. Although the fit indices for this model are better ($\chi^2(180) = 432.76$, $p < 0.001$; RMSEA = 0.04; CFI = 0.95; TLI = 0.92; SRMR = 0.03), at this stage of research we consider the more parsimonious model with one cross-loading (M₃) to be the final model.

Another modification to the final model which we introduced using exploratory logic after revision of the results was omitting the item “If this person is treated unfairly, he/she tries to be patient and not to think about it.” This indicator was specified to load on the *World as a gift* factor, but modification indices suggested that actually it has salient loadings on three other factors, those of *Achievement* (negative), *Self-worthiness* (negative), and *Ressentiment* (positive). These cross-loadings are meaningful, but their existence makes the statement unable to differentiate well among the factors of our interest. For this reason, we decided to drop the item from the final model.

In addition to the possibility of testing specific hypotheses about the structure of latent factors, confirmatory factor analysis allows for estimating the correlations between these factors.

One of our main hypotheses was that Humility and Calling are not independent, and can be counterposed against each other in some sense. Calling presupposes cultivation of some activity and self-focus while humility is associated with passivity, acceptance, and other-focus. However, they cannot be represented as complete opposites or poles of a singular scale since they are contrasted not on one common basis, but rather like activity and state, or doing and being. Our results demonstrate that the calling and humility components can be differentiated as separate factors, but they are not completely independent. Moreover, different aspects of humility are correlated with particular aspects of calling in opposite directions (Table 2).

The *Achievement* and *Self-worthiness* factors are negatively related to the *World as a gift* factor (in both cases, the Pearson correlation coefficient $r = -0.35$, $p \leq 0.001$), which is consistent with theoretical expectations. At the same time, the *Centrality of work* and *Productivity* factors are positively associated with *High other-focus* ($r = 0.26$ and 0.36 , respectively, $p \leq 0.001$), as well as with *Openness to a different perspective* ($r = 0.34$ and 0.43 , respectively, $p \leq 0.001$).

Table 2. Latent Factor Correlations (Total Model — M3)

	WORLD AS A GIFT — PASSIVITY	OPENNESS TO A DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVE	ACHIVEMENT	SELF-WORTHINESS	CENTRALITY OF WORK	PRODUCTIVITY	INDEPENDENCE	CAREERISM	RESENTMENT
HIGH OTHER-FOCUS	0.12	0.81***	-0.12*	0.03	0.26***	0.36***	0.27***	-0.08	-0.06
WORLD AS A GIFT — PASSIVITY		0.25**	-0.35***	-0.35***	0.00	-0.06	0.08	-0.08	0.23***
OPENNESS TO A DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVE			-0.04	0.04	0.34***	0.43***	0.19**	0.13*	0.01
ACHIVEMENT				0.84***	0.54***	0.28***	0.38***	0.89***	0.29***
SELF-WORTHINESS					0.34***	0.19***	0.41***	0.62***	0.33***
CENTRALITY OF WORK						0.37***	0.34***	0.56***	0.18***
PRODUCTIVITY							0.25***	0.28***	0.00
INDEPENDENCE								0.32***	0.11*
CAREERISM									0.30***

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001.

Conclusion

Weber's *The Protestant Ethics* laid the foundation for the analysis of the contribution of religion (religious ethics) to the formation of personality and modern society. In the 20th and early 21st centuries, Weber's interpreters analyzed the contribution of ethics of calling to the formation of the most productive economic attitudes (in relation to the modern society). Such research was conducted in the framework of modernization theory and cross-cultural studies. The ethics of calling turned out to be one of the components of the triumphant culture-society-economy bond, denoting a positive goal and purpose of human history alongside such components as, for example, economic growth, free market, and democracy (Shcherbak, 2018). Parallel to this, however, there developed an alternative perception of the world, as well as scientific approaches connected with it where this bond was criticized. To a large extent, this criticism was associated with the emergence of fascism (as well as World War II or the Holocaust, as examples) in the center of the civilized world. It was clear to the authors who developed such ideas that the successful development of Western societies either could not prevent the emergence of fascism, or even became its cause (Arendt, 1973; Fromm, 1994; Polanyi, 2001). Later, the criticism of neoliberalism and the distribution of power in modern society emerged, as the social stratification and inequality associated with it was revealed.

Apart from the grand-criticism of modern society, literature on management and organizational leadership started to emphasize the importance of such forms of leadership that were not similar to the business captains of the heroic era of capitalism⁷ like the "servant leader" (Greenleaf, 1998), or the "humble leaders of the fifth level" (Collins, 2001). Thus today, calling is no longer the one and only positive version of the practical ethos or the anthropological human type associated with it.

In this regard, it seems appropriate to revise the original Weberian ethical typology and transform it into an empirical method for the analysis of the contribution of various religions to the formation of the character of their adherents. This seems even more justified since Weber himself showed that the ethics of calling was spread in a relatively small number of faiths and denominations. Recognition of the ethics of calling as the key factor to the formation of a proper and productive people of modernity directed the search for the effects of religious ethics in this direction. A large number of researchers were looking for analogs of the ethics of calling in other religions and cultures.

It seems that today we can proceed to a more comprehensive analysis of the ethical⁸ contribution of religions to the formation of the economy and social relations. In this article, we attempted to develop a scale for conducting such an analysis, a scale that takes into account not only the ethics of calling, but also its main opponent, that of the ethics

7. For reviews, see Avolio, Walumbwa, Weber, 2008; Morris, Brotheridge, Urbanski, 2005; Nielsen, Marone, 2018; Owens, Johnson, Mitchell, 2013; Parris, Peachey, 2013.

8. We deliberately speak about the effect of ethics since the influence of religion on the economy and human activity in other areas can also pass through other channels, such as through institutions, including the construction of a particular ecclesiological model, economic, or other doctrines, through the direct participation of churches and religious organizations in the economy and social life.

of humility. In addition, we are trying to consider some other ethical components that were important to Weber at the time when he was developing his “asceticism-mysticism” dichotomy (primarily, we mean the ethics of resentment).

Unlike previous attempts where only the calling scale was constructed (often as equivalent to the work ethic), here an attempt was made to solve a larger problem by taking into account Weber’s opposition of “asceticism” (“calling” as the key category) and “mysticism” (“humility” as the key category), and crossing this opposition with the distinction between the “noble” and “common” types according to Scheler. This has made it possible to distinguish “positive” humility and calling from their “negative” counterparts, those of careerism and resentment.

Additional tasks addressed by the project were to construct a scale of humility that does not ignore its “dark” side, meets the requirements of the psychological measurement quality (high reliability), and overcomes the “humble cannot call themselves humble” paradox. The scale can be applied in surveys of both religious and non-religious people as well as in different countries and denominations.

The results of this analysis show that the structure of the ethical variable assumed by Weberian theory is consistent with the structure of the perception of reality by the parishioners of four Christian denominations in Russia who participated in our survey. The scale can be used for the measurement of practical religious ethos. The formal scale quality indicators appear to be quite satisfactory and the structure is in line with theoretical considerations, although additional analysis would be necessary to gain more information on the scale reliability, validity, and measurement invariance.

Appendix I. The Humility and Calling Scale — Initial Operationalization with 31 Items

General instructions

English version

Below are descriptions of different people. To what extent are these people like you? Are they “very much like you,” “like you,” “moderately like you,” “a little like you,” “not like you,” “not at all like you”?

Russian version

Далее приведены описания разных людей. Насколько описанные люди похожи на Вас? Они «очень похожи на Вас», «похожи на Вас», «умеренно похожи на Вас», «мало похожи на Вас», «не похожи на Вас» или «совсем не похожи на Вас»?

Answer options

No.	English version	Russian version
1	very much like me	очень похож на меня
2	like me	похож на меня
3	moderately like me	умеренно похож на меня
4	a little like me	мало похож на меня
5	not like me	не похож на меня
6	not at all like me	совсем не похож на меня
99	hard to answer	затрудняюсь ответить

Descriptions

No.	English version	Russian version	Concept
1	Income is much more important for this person than usefulness of his/her job for people	Доход для этого человека намного важнее, чем польза, которую его работа приносит людям	Careerism
2	This person likes to overcome obstacles, to go against fate	Этот человек любит преодолевать препятствия, идти наперекор судьбе	Calling
3	Work takes a lot of this person's time, leaving little time to relax	Работа занимает у этого человека много времени, оставляя мало времени, чтобы расслабиться	Calling
4	This person tries to defend his/her interests under all circumstances	Этот человек старается защищать свои интересы при любых обстоятельствах	Calling
5	This person is concerned if other people are in trouble	Этот человек переживает, когда у других неприятности	Humility
6	If this person is treated unfairly, he/she tries to be patient and not to think about it	Если с этим человеком поступают несправедливо, он(а) старается терпеть и не думать об этом	Humility
7	This person tries to be simple and modest	Этот человек старается быть простым и скромным	Humility
8	Having done something good, this person would not want other people to know about it	Сделав что-то хорошее, этот человек не хотел бы, чтобы об этом узнали другие люди	Humility

9	Career growth is much more important for this person than the opportunity to follow his/her vocation	Карьерный рост для этого человека намного важнее, чем возможность следовать своему призванию	Careerism
10	If this person is treated unfairly, he/she feels hurt, and hopes that bad, unjust acts will be retributed	Если с этим человеком поступают несправедливо, он(а) чувствует обиду и надеется, что за плохие, несправедливые поступки людям воздастся	Ressentiment
11	This person easily admits his/her mistakes	Этот человек легко признаёт свои ошибки	Humility
12	This person tries to follow the natural course of events, not actively oppose it	Этот человек старается следовать естественному ходу событий, активно не противодействовать ему	Humility
13	This person usually asks other people for advice when making decisions	Принимая решения, этот человек обычно спрашивает совета у других людей	Humility
14	Even if this person was financially able, he/she would not stop working	Даже если бы материальное положение позволяло, этот человек не перестал бы работать	Calling
15	This person strives strongly to earn as much money as possible	Этот человек прилагает все усилия, чтобы заработать как можно больше денег	Careerism
16	This person does not allow others to act unfairly upon him/her	Этот человек не позволяет другим поступать с собой несправедливо	Calling
17	This person considers advice from others carefully	Этот человек внимательно прислушивается к советам	Humility
18	This person tries to do everything by himself/herself	Этот человек старается делать всё самостоятельно	Calling
19	This person feels the needs of other people	Этот человек чувствует нужды других людей	Humility
20	This person doesn't like having to depend on other people	Этот человек не любит зависеть от других людей	Calling
21	This person is proud of his/her achievements	Этот человек гордится своими достижениями	Calling

22	This person tries to defend his/her point of view to the end	Этот человек старается до конца отстаивать свою точку зрения	Calling
23	This person schedules the day in advance to avoid wasting time	Этот человек заранее планирует свой день, чтобы избежать потери времени	Calling
24	If bad things happen to him/her, this person doesn't fight actively against it	Если с этим человеком случается что-то плохое, он(а) не оказывает активного сопротивления	Humility
25	This person likes to help other people	Этому человеку нравится помогать другим людям	Humility
26	This person tries to use his/her time productively	Этот человек старается использовать свое время продуктивно	Calling
27	This person invests most of his/her time and resources on his/her career	Этот человек вкладывает большую часть своего времени и ресурсов в свою карьеру	Careerism
28	Good things which the person hasn't deserved often happen in his/her life	В жизни этого человека часто случаются хорошие вещи, которых он(а) не заслужил(а)	Humility
29	This person is convinced that in the long run all bad people will get what they deserve	Этот человек убежден, что со временем все плохие люди получат по заслугам	Ressentiment
30	Life without work would be very boring for this person	Жизнь без работы была бы для этого человека очень скучной	Calling
31	This person always wants to be a winner	Этот человек всегда хочет быть победителем	Calling

Appendix II. Model Fit Information

	M1. Calling	M2. Humility	M3. Total model with one cross-loading	M4. Alternative Total model — with several cross-loadings	Cut-off values for a well-fitting model
AIC	32613.667	21210.254	65401.250	65332.312	The lower — the better
BIC	32826.097	21343.719	65970.041	65920.888	The lower — the better
Sample-Size Adjusted BIC	32689.524	21257.963	65604.786	65542.928	The lower — the better

Chi-Square — Estimate	71.031	25.471	509.695	432.757	The lower — the better
Degrees of Freedom	34	17	184	180	
P-Value	0.0002	0.0847	0.0000	0.0000	A well-fitting model should have an insignificant Chi-Square, but this is almost unrealistic with large samples
RMSEA — Estimate	0.032	0.022	0.041	0.037	0.6 (some authors propose 0.8) or lower — acceptable; 0.5 or lower — good
90 Percent C.I. for RMSEA	0.022 0.043	0.000 0.039	0.037 0.046	0.032 0.041	The Confidence Interval should stay below 0.05
Probability RMSEA ≤ .05	0.997	0.999	1.000	1.000	0.95 or higher
CFI	0.981	0.990	0.930	0.945	0.9 or higher — acceptable; 0.95 or higher — good
TLI	0.969	0.983	0.903	0.923	0.9 or higher — acceptable; 0.95 or higher — good
SRMR	0.022	0.026	0.035	0.031	0.6 (some authors propose 0.8) or lower — acceptable; 0.5 or lower — good

References

- Adnès P. (1969) Humilité. *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité Ascétique et Mystique, Doctrine et Histoire, Vol. 7* (eds. M. Viller, F. Cavallera, J. de Guibert), Paris: G. Beauchesne et Ses Fils, pp. 1136–1187.
- Arendt H. (1973) *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Avolio B. J., Walumbwa F. O., Weber T. J. (2008) Leadership: Current Theories, Research, and Future Directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, vol. 60, pp. 421–449.
- Barro R. J., McCleary R. M. (2003) Religion and Economic Growth across Countries. *American Sociological Review*, vol. 68, no 5, pp. 760–781.
- Becker S. O., Woessmann L. (2009) Was Weber Wrong? A Human Capital Theory of Protestant Economic History. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 124, no 2, pp. 531–596.
- Bellah R. N. (1985) *Tokuğawa Religion: The Cultural Roots of Modern Japan*, New York: Free Press.
- Blum U., Dudley L. (2001) Religion and Economic Growth: Was Weber Right?. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, vol. 11, no 2, pp. 207–230.

- Buss A. E. (1989) The Economic Ethics of Russian-Orthodox Christianity: Part I. *International Sociology*, vol. 4, no 3, pp. 235–258.
- Buss A. E. (2003) *The Russian-Orthodox Tradition and Modernity*, Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- Byrne B. M. (2012) *Structural Equation Modeling with MPLUS: Basic Concepts, Applications, and Programming*, New York: Routledge Academic.
- Cantoni D. (2013) The Economic Effects of the Protestant Reformation: Testing the Weber Hypothesis in the German Lands (Munich Discussion Paper, No 2013-4), Munich: University of Munich.
- Collins J. C. (2001) *Good to Great: Why Some Companies Make the Leap — and Others Don't*, New York: HarperBusiness.
- Davis D. E., Hook J. N., Worthington E. L., Van Tongeren D. R., Gartner A. L., Jennings D. J., Emmons R. A. (2011) Relational Humility: Conceptualizing and Measuring Humility as a Personality Judgment. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, vol. 93, no 3, pp. 225–234.
- Delacroix J., Nielsen F. (2001) The Beloved Myth: Protestantism and the Rise of Industrial Capitalism in Nineteenth-Century Europe. *Social Forces*, vol. 80, no 2, pp. 509–553.
- Dihle A. (1957) *Demut. Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum: Sachwörterbuch zur Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der antiken Welt*, Vol. 3 (ed. T. Klauser), Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, pp. 735–778.
- Dik B. J., Eldridge B. M., Steger M. F., Duffy R. D. (2012) Development and Validation of the Calling and Vocation Questionnaire (CVQ) and Brief Calling Scale (BCS). *Journal of Career Assessment*, vol. 20, no 3, pp. 242–263.
- Dinello N. (1998) Russian Religious Rejections of Money and Homo Economicus: The Self-Identifications of the “Pioneers of a Money Economy” in Post-Soviet Russia. *Sociology of Religion*, vol. 59, no 1, pp. 45–64.
- Duffy R. D., Dik B. J. (2013) Research on Calling: What Have We Learned and Where are We Going?. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, vol. 83, no 3, pp. 428–436.
- Eisenstadt S. N. (ed.) (1968) *The Protestant Ethic and Modernization: A Comparative View*, New York: Basic Books.
- Fanfani A. (2008) *Catholicism, Protestantism, and Capitalism*, Chicago: IHS Press.
- Fedotova V., Kross S. (2006) Pravoslavie, Weber i novyj russkij kapitalizm [The Orthodoxy, Weber and New Russian Capitalism]. *Social Sciences and Contemporary World*, no 2, pp. 41–51. (In Russian)
- Fromm E. (1994) *Escape from Freedom*, New York: H. Holt.
- Greenleaf R. K. (1998) *The Power of Servant-Leadership: Essays*, San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Grier R. (1997) The Effect of Religion on Economic Development: A Cross National Study of 63 Former Colonies. *Kyklos*, vol. 50, no 1, pp. 47–62.
- Guiso L., Sapienza P., Zingales L. (2003) People's Opium? Religion and Economic Attitudes. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, vol. 50, no 1, pp. 225–282.
- Hill P. C., Laney E. K., Edwards K. J., Wang D. C., Orme W. H., Chan A. C., Wang F. L. (2017) A Few Good Measures: Colonel Jessup and Humility. *Handbook of Humility:*

- Theory, Research, and Applications* (eds. E. L. Worthington, D. Davis, J. N. Hook), New York: Routledge, pp. 119–133.
- Inglehart R., Norris P. (2004) *Sacred and Secular: Religion and Politics Worldwide*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- John Climacus (2012) *The Ladder of Divine Ascent*, Boston: Holy Transfiguration Monastery.
- Kalberg S. (2011) Introduction to *The Protestant Ethic*. Weber M., *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 8–66.
- Kapp K. W. (1963) *Hindu Culture, Economic Development and Economic Planning in India: A Collection of Essays*, Bombay: Asia Publishing House.
- Kharkhordin O. (2002) *Oblichat' i litsemerit': genealogiia rossiiskoi lichnosti* [Reveal and Dissimulate: A Genealogy of the Russian Personality], Saint Petersburg: EU Press. (In Russian)
- Knorre B. (2011) Kategorii viny i smireniya v sisteme cennostej cerkovno-prihodskoj subkul'tury [Categories of Guilt and Humility in the System of Values of the Church-Parish Subculture]. *Prihod i obshchina v sovremennom pravoslavii: kornevaya sistema rossijskoj religioznosti* [Parish and Community in the Modern Orthodoxy: The Root System of Russian Religiosity] (eds. A. Agadzhanian, K. Russele), Moscow: Ves Mir, pp. 317–340. (In Russian)
- Landrum R. E. (2011) Measuring Dispositional Humility: A First Approximation. *Psychological Reports*, vol. 108, no 1, pp. 217–228.
- Lehmann H., Roth G. (1995) *Weber's Protestant Ethic: Origins, Evidence, Contexts*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Makrides V. N. (2005) Orthodox Christianity, Rationalization, Modernization: A Reassessment. *Eastern Orthodoxy in a Global Age: Tradition Faces the Twenty-First Century* (eds. V. Roudometof, A. Agadjanian), Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press, pp. 179–209.
- Marsh C. (2008) Counting One's Blessings: The Economic Values of Russian Orthodox Christians. *Markets, Morals and Religion* (ed. J. B. Imber), New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, pp. 179–190.
- Marshall G. (1982) *In Search of the Spirit of Capitalism: An Essay on Max Weber's Protestant Ethic Thesis*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Martin D. (1993) *Tongues of Fire: The Explosion of Protestantism in Latin America*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- McElroy S. (2017) *A Review of Humility Measures and a Test of the Social Bonds and Social Oil Hypotheses* (PhD Thesis), Atlanta: Georgia State University.
- Means G. P. (1969) The Role of Islam in the Political Development of Malaysia. *Comparative Politics*, vol. 1, no 2, pp. 264–284.
- Miller M. J., Woehr D. J., Hudspeth N. (2002) The Meaning and Measurement of Work Ethic: Construction and Initial Validation of a Multidimensional Inventory. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, vol. 60, no 3, pp. 451–489.
- Modrack S. (2008) The Protestant Work Ethic Revisited: A Promising Concept or an Outdated Idea? (Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB) Discussion Paper, SP I 2008–101).

- Morris J. A., Brotheridge C. M., Urbanski J. C. (2005) Bringing Humility to Leadership: Antecedents and Consequences of Leader Humility. *Human Relations*, vol. 58, no 10, pp. 1323–1350.
- Muthén L. K., Muthén B. O. (2017) *Mplus User's Guide*, Los Angeles: Muthén & Muthén.
- Nielsen R., Marrone J. A. (2018) Humility: Our Current Understanding of the Construct and its Role in Organizations. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, vol. 20, no 4, pp. 805–824.
- Nietzsche F. (2011) On the Genealogy of Morals. *On the Genealogy of Morals and Ecce Homo* (ed. W. A. Kaufmann), New York: Vintage Books, pp. 3–198.
- Owens B. P., Johnson M. D., Mitchell T. R. (2013) Expressed Humility in Organizations: Implications for Performance, Teams, and Leadership. *Organization Science*, vol. 24, no 5, pp. 1517–1538.
- Parris D. L., Peachey J. W. (2013) A Systematic Literature Review of Servant Leadership Theory in Organizational Contexts. *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 113, no 3, pp. 377–393.
- Polanyi K. (2001) *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*, Boston: Beacon Press.
- Porta R. L., Lopez-de-Silane F., Shleifer A., Vishny R. (1996) Trust in Large Organizations (National Bureau of Economic Research Report, No W5864), Cambridge: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Sarkisyanz E. (1965) *Buddhist Backgrounds of the Burmese Revolution*, Dordrecht: Springer.
- Scheler M. (1972) *Ressentiment* (ed. L. A. Coser; trans. W. W. Holdheim), New York: Schocken.
- Scheler M. (2005) On the Rehabilitation of Virtue. *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly*, vol. 79, no 1, pp. 21–37.
- Schluchter W., Graf F. W. (eds.) (2005) *Asketischer Protestantismus und der "Geist" des Modernen Kapitalismus: Max Weber und Ernst Troeltsch*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Shcherbak S. (2018) Gipoteza modernizatsii i neoliberalizm [Modernization Hypothesis and Neoliberalism]. *Russian Sociological Review*, vol. 17, no 3, pp. 291–328. (In Russian)
- Shirokanova A. (2015) A Comparative Study of Work Ethic among Muslims and Protestants: Multilevel Evidence. *Social Compass*, vol. 62, no 4, pp. 615–631.
- Singer M. (1956) Cultural Values in India's Economic Development. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 305, pp. 81–91.
- Swatos W. H., Kaelber L. (2016) *The Protestant Ethic Turns 100: Essays on the Centenary of the Weber Thesis*, New York: Routledge.
- Tamari M. (1987) *With All Your Possessions: Jewish Ethics and Economic Life*, New York: Free Press.
- Tangney J. P. (2000) Humility: Theoretical Perspectives, Empirical Findings and Directions for Future Research. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, vol. 19, no 1, pp. 70–82.

- Toennies F., Simmel G., Troeltsch E., Weber M. (1973) Max Weber on Church, Sect, and Mysticism. *Sociological Analysis*, vol. 34, no 2, pp. 140–149.
- Tyrell H. (2014) “Religion” in *der Soziologie Max Webers*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Warren R. (2002) *The Purpose-driven Life: What on Earth am I Here for?*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Weber M. (1965) *The Sociology of Religion* (eds. J. Winckelmann, T. Parsons; trans. E. Fischoff), London: Methuen & Company.
- Weber M. (2011) *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Worthington E. L., Davis D., Hook J. N. (eds.) (2017) *Handbook of Humility: Theory, Research, and Applications*, New York: Routledge.
- Wright J. C., Nadelhoffer T., Perini T., Langville A., Echols M., Venezia K. (2017) The Psychological Significance of Humility. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, vol. 12, no 1, pp. 3–12.
- Wrzesniewski A., McCauley C., Rozin P., Schwartz B. (1997) Jobs, Careers, and Callings: People’s Relations to Their Work. *Journal of Research in Personality*, vol. 31, no 1, pp. 21–33.
- Zabaev I. (2015) The Economic Ethics of Contemporary Russian Orthodox Christianity: A Weberian Perspective. *Journal of Economic Sociology*, vol. 16, no 4, pp. 148–168.
- Zabaev I. (2018a) Operacionalizacija “smirenija” v psihologii [Operationalisation of the Concept of Humility in Psychology]. *St. Tikhon’s University Review*, no. 76, pp. 107–129. (In Russian)
- Zabaev I. (2018b) Religija i ekonomika: mozhem li my vse eshche opirat’sia na Maksa Vebera? [Religion and Economics: Can We Still Rely on Max Weber?]. *Russian Sociological Review*, vol. 17, no 3, pp. 107–148. (In Russian)

Шкала призвания и смирения: развивая веберовский подход к исследованию избирательного сродства между религией и экономикой

Иван Забаев

Кандидат социологических наук, заведующий научной лабораторией «Социология религии», доцент кафедры философии и религиоведения Православного Свято-Тихоновского гуманитарного университета (ПСТГУ).

Адрес: Лихов пер., д. 6, стр. 1, Москва, Российская Федерация 127051

E-mail: zabaev-iv@yandex.ru

Елена Пруцкова

Научный сотрудник научной лаборатории «Социология религии», преподаватель кафедры философии и религиоведения Православного Свято-Тихоновского гуманитарного университета (ПСТГУ)

Адрес: Лихов пер., д. 6, стр. 1, Москва, Российская Федерация 127051

E-mail: evprutskova@gmail.com

Авторы настоящей статьи развивают веберовский подход, в котором этика играет центральную роль в анализе избирательного сродства между религией и экономикой. Работа М. Вебера «Протестантская этика и дух капитализма» является одним из классических социологических исследований. В ней Вебер сформулировал вопрос о соотношении религии и экономики в том смысле, что определенные типы протестантских деноминаций способствовали развитию рационального капитализма. Одним из главных факторов, на который обратил внимание Вебер, была сформулированная в этике протестантов концепция призвания. Авторы данной статьи показывают, что вторым значением этической переменной, используемой Вебером в его социологии религии, является «смирение». Такой подход делает веберовскую теорию хозяйственной этики актуальной для изучения всех основных христианских конфессий — не только католицизма и протестантизма, но и, например, православия. Целью настоящей статьи является разработка методики эмпирического исследования, основанной на данной теории. В статье разрабатывается шкала измерения этики призвания и смирения, которая может быть использована в количественных опросах. Шкала была предварительно протестирована в октябре — ноябре 2017 года в четырех странах (233 респондента в России, Швейцарии, Грузии и Румынии). После корректировки по результатам предварительного тестирования шкала была применена в опросе прихожан четырех христианских конфессий в России (1262 респондента) в 2017–2018 гг.: православных, католиков, «традиционных» протестантов (лютеран, баптистов и др.) и «новых» протестантов (пятидесятников).

Ключевые слова: хозяйственная этика, шкала смирения, шкала призвания, ресентимент, Макс Вебер, Фридрих Ницше, Макс Шелер, католичество, протестантизм, православие