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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-Silane, 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 ressentiment 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 ethoses 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) ressentiment (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 ressentiment 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-
iates 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 ressentiment” (Ibid.: 38; emphasis in the original).

In line with this theoretical argument, a scale of practical religious ethoses based on the four components (calling vs. careerism, and humility vs. ressentiment) 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 ressentiment. Weber introduces his typology of asceticism and mysticism (with the corresponding ethical categories of “calling” and “humility”), in connection with the Nietzschean idea of ressentiment (Tyrell, 2014). Weber demonstrates two fundamentally different ways to achieve salvation, correlated with two ways of coping with ressentiment 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 ressentiment in the research inventory. A reference is made to both the initial equating of humility and ressentiment made by Nietzsche (2011) and the protection of the Christian virtue of humility and differentiation of these perspectives carried out by Scheler (1972, 2005). Ressentiment 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 (resentment 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 people. 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 analysis, and the final model included 23 statements. The factor loadings are presented in Table 1. 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGH OTHER-FOCUS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 This person is concerned if other people are in trouble</td>
<td>0.569</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 This person feels the needs of other people</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>0.699</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 This person likes to help other people</td>
<td>0.601</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>0.637</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE WORLD AS A GIFT — PASSIVITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 If this person is treated unfairly, he/she tries to be patient and not to think about it</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 This person tries to follow the natural course of events, not actively oppose it</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 If bad things happen to him/her, this person does not fight actively against it</td>
<td>0.502</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 This person always wants to be a winner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPENNESS TO A DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 This person easily admits his/her mistakes</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 This person considers advice from others carefully</td>
<td>0.521</td>
<td>0.509</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACHIEVEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 This person is proud of his/her achievements</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 This person always wants to be a winner</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>0.581</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELF-WORTHINESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 This person tries to defend his/her interests under all circumstances</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 This person does not allow others to act unfairly upon him/her</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRALITY OF WORK</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td>0.648</td>
<td>0.649</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRODUCTIVITY</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEPENDENCE</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAREERISM</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**RESSENTIMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 If this person is treated unfairly, he/she feels hurt, and hopes that bad, unjust acts will be retributed</td>
<td>0.877 0.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 This person is convinced that in the long run all bad people will get what they deserve</td>
<td>0.598 0.586</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All factor loadings are significant at the p ≤ 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 $\chi^2$ 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 $\chi^2$ 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 $\chi^2$ 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 $\chi^2$. We report four of them. 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 predestined 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.
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 $\chi^2$ 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 $\chi^2$) are within the proposed cut-off points ($\chi^2(184) = 509.7, p < 0.001; \text{RMSEA} = 0.04; \text{CFI} = 0.93; \text{TLI} = 0.90; \text{SRMR} = 0.04$).

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 ressentiment, which should be differentiated from humility. The idea of ressentiment, 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 Scheler'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 $r = −0.35, p ≤ 0.001$), 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, $p ≤ 0.001$), as well as with Openness to a different perspective ($r = 0.34$ and $0.43$, respectively, $p ≤ 0.001$).
Table 2. Latent Factor Correlations (Total Model — M3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>World as a Gift — Passivity</th>
<th>Openness to a Different Perspective</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Self-Worthiness</th>
<th>Centrality of Work</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
<th>Independence</th>
<th>Careerism</th>
<th>Resentment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Other-Focus</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.81***</td>
<td>-0.12*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.26***</td>
<td>0.36***</td>
<td>0.27***</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World as a Gift — Passivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>-0.35***</td>
<td>-0.35***</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.23***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to a Different Perspective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.34***</td>
<td>0.43***</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.84***</td>
<td>0.54***</td>
<td>0.28***</td>
<td>0.38***</td>
<td>0.89***</td>
<td>0.29***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Worthiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.34***</td>
<td>0.19***</td>
<td>0.41***</td>
<td>0.62***</td>
<td>0.33***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrality of Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.37***</td>
<td>0.34***</td>
<td>0.56***</td>
<td>0.18***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25***</td>
<td>0.28***</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.32***</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careerism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resentment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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 capitalism 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 ethical 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, Marrone, 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 ressentiment).

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 ressentiment.

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 ethoses. 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>English version</th>
<th>Russian version</th>
<th>Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>very much like me</td>
<td>очень похож на меня</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>like me</td>
<td>похож на меня</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>moderately like me</td>
<td>умеренно похож на меня</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>a little like me</td>
<td>мало похож на меня</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>not like me</td>
<td>не похож на меня</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>not at all like me</td>
<td>совсем не похож на меня</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>hard to answer</td>
<td>затрудняюсь ответить</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>English version</th>
<th>Russian version</th>
<th>Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Income is much more important for this person than usefulness of his/her job for people</td>
<td>Доход для этого человека намного важнее, чем польза, которую его работа приносит людям</td>
<td>Careerism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>This person likes to overcome obstacles, to go against fate</td>
<td>Этот человек любит преодолевать препятствия, идти наперекор судьбе</td>
<td>Calling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Work takes a lot of this person's time, leaving little time to relax</td>
<td>Работа занимает у этого человека много времени, оставляя мало времени, чтобы расслабиться</td>
<td>Calling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>This person tries to defend his/her interests under all circumstances</td>
<td>Этот человек старается защищать свои интересы при любых обстоятельствах</td>
<td>Calling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>This person is concerned if other people are in trouble</td>
<td>Этот человек переживает, когда у других неприятности</td>
<td>Humility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>If this person is treated unfairly, he/she tries to be patient and not to think about it</td>
<td>Если с этим человеком поступают несправедливо, он(а) старается терпеть и не думать об этом</td>
<td>Humility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>This person tries to be simple and modest</td>
<td>Этот человек старается быть простым и скромным</td>
<td>Humility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Having done something good, this person would not want other people to know about it</td>
<td>Сделав что-то хорошее, этот человек не хотел бы, чтобы об этом узнали другие люди</td>
<td>Humility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Trait</td>
<td>Russian Translation</td>
<td>English Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Career growth is much more important for this person than the opportunity to follow his/her vocation</td>
<td>Карьерный рост для этого человека намного важнее, чем возможность следовать своему призванию</td>
<td>Careerism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>If this person is treated unfairly, he/she feels hurt, and hopes that bad, unjust acts will be retributed</td>
<td>Если с этим человеком поступают несправедливо, он(а) чувствует обиду и надеется, что за плохие, несправедливые поступки людям воздастся</td>
<td>Ressentiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>This person easily admits his/her mistakes</td>
<td>Этот человек легко признаёт свои ошибки</td>
<td>Humility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>This person tries to follow the natural course of events, not actively oppose it</td>
<td>Этот человек старается следовать естественному ходу событий, активно не противодействовать ему</td>
<td>Humility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>This person usually asks other people for advice when making decisions</td>
<td>Принимая решения, этот человек обычно спрашивает совета у других людей</td>
<td>Humility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Even if this person was financially able, he/she would not stop working</td>
<td>Даже если бы материальное положение позволяло, этот человек не перестал бы работать</td>
<td>Calling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>This person strives strongly to earn as much money as possible</td>
<td>Этот человек прилагает все усилия, чтобы заработать как можно больше денег</td>
<td>Careerism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>This person does not allow others to act unfairly upon him/her</td>
<td>Этот человек не позволяет другим поступать с собой несправедливо</td>
<td>Calling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>This person considers advice from others carefully</td>
<td>Этот человек внимательно прислушивается к советам</td>
<td>Humility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>This person tries to do everything by himself/herself</td>
<td>Этот человек старается делать всё самостоятельно</td>
<td>Calling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>This person feels the needs of other people</td>
<td>Этот человек чувствует нужды других людей</td>
<td>Humility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>This person doesn't like having to depend on other people</td>
<td>Этот человек не любит зависеть от других людей</td>
<td>Calling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>This person is proud of his/her achievements</td>
<td>Этот человек гордится своими достижениями</td>
<td>Calling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. This person tries to defend his/her point of view to the end.
   Этот человек старается до конца отстаивать свою точку зрения.

23. This person schedules the day in advance to avoid wasting time.
   Этот человек заранее планирует свой день, чтобы избежать потери времени.

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.

25. This person likes to help other people.
   Этому человеку нравится помогать другим людям.

26. This person tries to use his/her time productively.
   Этот человек старается использовать свое время продуктивно.

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.

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).

29. This person is convinced that in the long run all bad people will get what they deserve.
   Этот человек убеждён, что со временем все плохие люди получат по заслугам.

30. Life without work would be very boring for this person.
   Жизнь без работы была бы для этого человека очень скучной.

31. This person always wants to be a winner.
   Этот человек всегда хочет быть победителем.

Appendix II. Model Fit Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cut-off values for a well-fitting model</th>
<th>M1. Calling</th>
<th>M2. Humility</th>
<th>M3. Total model with one cross-loading</th>
<th>M4. Alternative Total model — with several cross-loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>32613.667</td>
<td>21210.254</td>
<td>65401.250</td>
<td>65332.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIC</td>
<td>32826.097</td>
<td>21343.719</td>
<td>65970.041</td>
<td>65920.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample-Size Adjusted BIC</td>
<td>32689.524</td>
<td>21257.963</td>
<td>65604.786</td>
<td>65542.928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---
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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). 
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