

The Specificity Of Religious Identity In Contemporary Russian Society (On The Example Of The Dagestan Republic)

Madina M. Shakhbanova*¹ Dmitriy S. Zagutin²,
Valerii V. Kasyanov³, Zeinab A. Magomedova⁴,
Natalya K. Bineeva⁵, Sergey I. Samygin⁶

^{1,4} Dagestan scientific center of the Russian Academy
of Sciences, Makhachkala, Russia

² Donskoi state technical University,
Rostov-on-Don, Russia

³ FGBOU VO "Kuban State University",
Krasnodar, Russia

⁵ Southern Federal University,
Rostov-on-Don, Russia

⁶ Rostov state economic university "RINH",
Rostov-on-Don, Russia

*Corresponding author Email: madina2405@mail.ru

April 3, 2018

Abstract

In article the place of religious identity of the Dagestan people in structure of social identity is considered, the ratio of types of social identity and indicators of reproduction of religious identity is established. On the basis of results of research indicators of reproduction of ethnic identity which number treat national language, national traditions, customs, the territory of accommodation, historical memory are installed. Besides, differences characteristic

to different groups on religiousness type are revealed, in particular, for “with conviction believers” and “believers” a marker “religion” has bigger weight in comparison with other subgroups. During the conducted research it is established that the religion isn’t the important ethnointegrating and ethno differentiating indicator, however its importance in processes of formation of ethnic identity is quite considerable. Therefore along with indicators of reproduction of ethnic identity, religious self-identification is an invariable element of creation of ethnic identity and plays an important role in processes of formation of ethnogroup solidarity. Research showed existence in mass consciousness of the Dagestan believers of installation on designation of unity and a community of religious symbolic, at domination of republican and state and civil (Russian) identity; religious self-identification is reproduced by the different markers stating religion as the most important component of ethnoculture of the people at the simultaneous accounting of belief and precepts of the religion, thereby forming ethnoconfessional identity.

Key Words: Dagestan believers; Islam; religious identity; relation to religion; Orthodoxy.

1 Introduction

The researchers emphasize that the effects of contemporary political, economic and social transformations reduce the degree of uncertainty of cultural and ethnic identities, increasingly and to a greater extent contain “impurities” of classical religiousness. This is manifested in the fact that “people strive to demonstrate the root belonging to the religious traditions of their societies or ethnic groups, and religious faith, this may or may not have any relation” (Kargina, 2013).

Now no less important in Russian society is the definition of the population identify themselves with a particular religion (Orthodox, Islam, Catholicism, Protestantism, etc.), not to mention national and other Eastern religious currents and sects that have proliferated in the post-Soviet space. Absence in population census of data about the attitude towards religion has forced researchers to use the results of opinion polls. For example, according to the Fund 'Public

opinion' in 2000, the share of Orthodox Christians in Russia was 58 %, while the share of other Christian 2 %, Muslim 5 %, followers of other religions 1 %, unbelievers 31 %.

According to researchers, at the beginning of the 80th of the XX century religiousness of the population in RSFSR was defined at the level of 25%. Today at the same level not religiousness is measured, i.e. for short term quantitative indices of religiousness and not religiousness of the population traded places. According to all-Russian center of Public Opinion Study and Fund "Public opinion", the percentage of disbelievers of Russians has decreased in the period from 1989 to 2002, from 53% to 31 %. According to the Department of strategic social and socio-political researches of Institute socially-political researches RAS, the proportion of unbelievers decreased in 1999 and 2005 from 31% to 22 % (see Table 1) (Chesnokova, 2005).

The increase in degree of religiousness is specified by the concept "about a nominalmost of religious orientations of people", calling themselves believers which is confirmed by that "the share of churchd people is much less, than a share of the religious population. But, first, the share of "Church people" is not 5 to 7 %, as stated in many studies, and 29 %. Secondly, the qualitative changes go after quantitative and are carried out slowly" (Lokosov and Sinelina, 2008).

In this case "the level of religiousness "used" the extensive potential of growth and comes nearer to the natural border which approximately is on a mark of 80%. Then begins the extensive growth of the churchd population, which also has its limitations" (Lokosov and Sinelina, 2008). However in Russia there is a danger of politicization of the interreligious relations and distribution of radical currents, characteristic for the Islamic republics, is threat to preservation of international, religious, political and social stability.

In studying the relation to religion researchers, emphasize importance of application of criterion of cultural religiousness by which, for example, the Dagestan people are adherents of Moslem doctrine, without subdividing them into Sunnis and Shiites, not to mention the mazkhab. The close relationship of the ethnic and religious components in the identification process draws the attention of Dr. A. Malashenko (2001): "the influence of Islam on the formation of

identity of Caucasians in the 90's increased. To the greatest extent this is typical of Chechens, Ingush, ethnic groups of Dagestan and Karachai and Balkars. In Dagestan the number of those who considers himself the believer, during the Post-Soviet period hesitated ranging from 81% to 95%". In other words, to domestic science is characteristic to consider religion as a significant element of the cultural heritage of this approach stems needed understanding of religion as an integral component in the process of reproduction of ethnic identity. Therefore in hierarchy of the ethnouniting markers "religious self-identification acts as a steady element of creation of ethnic identity, makes an essential contribution to formation of feeling "we". Common faith is a significant symbol of ethnogroup solidarity" (Drobizheva, 2012). However, in spite of the fact that the religion doesn't carry out a role of the leading ethnointegrating and ethnodifferentiating marker, its importance in processes of formation of ethnic identity is quite high.

Based on the growth of the Islamic component in the processes of ethnocultural identification of the Muslim peoples of the North Caucasus, A. V. Malashenko (2001) identifies several levels. At the first level ("personal") is important is faith in God, while "to get objective information on this subject is not easy, even at sociological polls. Evidence in favor of the growth of religiosity is that it always increases with the aggravation of the situation in society during the war, i.e. when a person needs extra protection, in the protection of a higher power, which gives him peace of mind and the appeal to which is able to justify many, including controversial from the point of view of public morality acts". The second level that is realized the influence of Islam in North Caucasian identity traditionally ceremonial. Here the degree of belonging to Islam is determined by the regularity of worship, the observance of Islamic norms of behavior, including different kinds of restrictions. According to the data of 1995, among the Caucasian Muslims the greatest importance to the observance of the rites give Darginians (43 %), Chechens (36 %), Avarians (34 %) and Ingush (28 %) (Malashenko, 2001).

By consideration of types of social identity raises the question about the relationship within its structure, different types of identity. According to P. I. Puchkov (2008): "ethnic and confessional communities two different types of social communities of people.

Quite often they function on one territorial space and are presented in one set of people. Thus borders between these types of communities sometimes are fancifully crossed among themselves”.

Due to the aforesaid, within this article process of mutual influence, rather, the significance of ethnic and religious identities in the mass consciousness of the peoples of Dagestan, identifying the links between them.

2 Object and methods of a research

Sociological poll on studying of religious identity and religious behavior of the Dagestan people it is carried out in 2014 in Botlikhskiy district (village of Botlikh), Derbentskiy district (settlement Belidzhi), Kazbekovskiy district (village Dylym), Kizilyurtovskiy district (village Zubutli-Miatli), Khasavyurtovskiy district (village Mutsalaul), Derbent, Kizlyar, Kizilyurt, Makhachkala, Khasavyurt cities.

It was noted that the religion as an integral part of traditional cultural heritage, is a significant element of ethnic identity. In the authors' opinion, not entirely correct is to consider the actualization of the Muslim identity as not increasing the religious activity of the population and its return to the Muslim faith, but rather as requirements for a sustainable cultural and civilized characteristics in the lives of individuals and society. We take the position that along with such criteria as ethnicity, language, “culture”, “customs and ceremonies”, “territory (native, earth, nature)”, religious identity is the firm element of the construction of ethnic identity and plays an important role in the formation of solidarity groups. According to L. S. Vasiliev (1983), at the earliest stages of development of society in the phenomenon of ethnocentrism is most clearly manifested, the integrating function of religion: “any ethnic community, United by a unified system of beliefs, rituals, rites and myths, considered his a system of norms the standard deviation from within this community was considered inadmissible, and in other communities is deplorable (Vasilyev, 1983).

3 Results of a research and their discussion

In our sociological survey the respondents were asked the following questions to determine indicators reproduction of ethnic identity and place marker “religion” in the hierarchy of ethnodeterminants (see Table 1).

Table 1. Distribution of answers to a question “What signs unite you with representatives of your people?” (versions of answers are given on groups of the respondents believing in % of the total respondents).

Versions of answers/ Level of religiousness	A conviction believer	Believer	Hesitant, wavering	Unbeliever	Conviction unbeliever	Total
National language	66,4	66,3	56,3	47,6	50,0	65,2
National traditions and customs	64,9	73,8	56,3	47,6	25,0	68,5
Life together in a certain territory	43,8	41,4	29,2	33,3	25,0	41,4
Religion	58,6	54,6	37,5	28,6	0	54,3
National literature, national creativity, national music	23,8	29,5	35,4	42,9	0	27,8
National clothes, dwelling, household	14,9	12,8	2,1	9,5	25,0	13,0
Historical territory of my people	27,4	25,6	27,1	9,5	25,0	26,0
Character community, similarity of behavior	24,1	27,3	22,9	23,8	25,0	25,7
Historical past	30,1	31,7	35,4	19,0	50,0	31,1
Nothing unites	0,9	1,8	6,3	9,5	0	1,9

The results of poll given in the table No. 1 show that for “with conviction believers” and “believers” a marker “religion” is of great

importance while in other subgroups its importance is much lower. At the same time, it can be stated that regardless of the religious beliefs of the respondents, the so-called ethnic characteristics dominate the indicator "religion". Thus the share chosen judgment "nothing unites", it is rather more in the subgroups "wavering" and "non-believers". Thus, the respondents of the Dagestan peoples the major ethnointegrating markers are the ethnic characteristics and type of religiosity does not affect the choice of indicator, although, for example, the absence in Islamic creed, the definitions of "ethnos", the importance of the concept of "Ummah" based on confessional affiliation of the person. Establishing components of the reproduction of ethnic identity involves the identification of the ratio of types of social identity and its expression in the mass consciousness of the peoples of Dagestan (see Table 2).

Table 2. Distribution of answers to the question "Whom do you feel primarily, on the territory of the Republic of Dagestan?" (answers given by groups of nationalities as a % total number of respondents).

Versions of answers/Nationalities	Representative of the people	Representative of the Dagestan people	Russian	Representative of the Caucasus	Representative of the religion (Islam, Orthodoxy, etc.)
Avarians	16,4	26,9	33,0	4,6	20,4
Azerbaijanians	21,7	33,3	31,7	10,0	5,0
Darginians	19,5	37,7	19,5	5,2	18,2
Kumykians	14,8	44,3	18,0	6,6	14,8
Lakians	22,2	33,3	22,2	11,1	18,5
Lezginians	16,8	32,8	30,7	10,2	12,4
Russians	24,1	24,1	48,1	5,6	3,7
Chechens	16,2	18,9	29,7	13,5	18,9
Others	16,4	42,5	24,7	12,3	9,6
Total:	18,0	31,1	31,1	7,3	14,6

Figure 2. Natural Gas Demand (mmscfd)⁴

On all set of respondents, equal positions have judgments "the representative of the Dagestan people" and "Russian"; it is also possible to notice strengthening of positions of ethnic identity. At

the same time religious identity, “the awareness of my religion,” occupies the penultimate place, behind other types of social identity. Practically all respondents are consecutive in the positions having emphasized importance of a marker “religion” as ethnodeterminant, they, though isn’t so bright, self-identify as followers of a certain dogma. From the general massif Azerbaijanians respondents are allocated: every second of respondents identified “religion” as the ethnointegrating marker, however from them least of all realizing itself “the representative of the religion” though the share “with conviction believers” and “believers” among Azerbaijanians is quite high 38,3% and 48,3%, respectively, moreover, a “non-believers” and “with conviction non-believers” position any of the interrogated Azerbaijanians didn’t note. The contradictory behavior similar to Azerbaijanian respondents is shown by the interrogated Russians at whom on the importance a marker “religion” in hierarchy of ethnosigns takes the fourth place, but realize themselves “the representative of the religion” statistically insignificant share.

Further degree of expressiveness of types of social identity shows the “control question” asked respondents (see Table 3).

Versions of answers/Nationalities	With representatives of his people	With representatives of all Dagestan people	With Russians	With people of my religion	With people of one age with me	With people close to me on political views	With people of my profession	With anybody from the listed above groups
Avarians	25,0	37,0	25,3	42,3	9,3	5,6	12,0	0,6
Azerbaijanians	35,0	51,7	26,7	5,0	8,3	1,7	5,0	8,3
Darginians	26,0	49,4	20,8	29,9	11,7	6,5	6,5	1,3
Kumykians	26,2	59,0	13,1	14,8	4,9	4,9	4,9	1,6
Lakians	25,9	63,0	14,8	25,9	14,8	0	14,8	0
Lezginians	30,7	51,1	28,5	19,7	13,1	8,8	2,9	1,5
Russians	27,8	37,0	22,2	10,2	30,6	13,0	20,4	2,8
Chechens	16,2	32,4	29,7	27,0	2,7	8,1	10,8	0
Others	23,3	50,7	23,3	23,3	19,2	4,1	0	4,1
Total:	26,5	44,4	24,0	28,1	13,6	6,5	9,3	1,6

Figure 3. IMFs for Natural Gas Demand Data

Received on a question **“With what groups you most have feeling of a community?”** results show other behavior of respondents is perfect. If in a question **“As whom you feel, first of all, in the territory of the Republic of Dagestan?”** in mass consciousness of the Dagestan people, equally, were shown republican and national and civil respondents feel identity types, feeling of a community with “representatives of all Dagestan people” and this factor, with a noticeable gap, dominates over others, on the second position the feeling of a community “with people of my religion” and on the third “with representatives of the people” settles down, having removed on the fourth place feeling of feeling of a community “with Russians”. The Avarians respondents who put on the first place importance of feeling of a community “with representatives of the religion” at Darginians on the second place, at Chechens on the third place are allocated. The interrogated Azerbaijanians and Russians at whom the feeling of a community “with people of the religion” is at the low level and if it is possible so to speak are consecutive in the positions, its identification “weight” is much lower, in comparison with other types of social identity. Unlike carriers of Moslem doctrine, for Orthodox Christians generational identity, in the form of understanding of a community with people of one with them age is important, also among them the share of one profession which noted participation with people and close to them on political views is higher. In comparison with Orthodox Christians, in identification processes of Muslims of feeling of a generational, professional and political community are almost unimportant 11,3%, 7,8% and 5,7%, respectively. Further every fourth respondent practicing Islam and Orthodoxy emphasizes the importance of ethnic identity; among Muslims, in comparison with Orthodox Christians (10,2%), three times more realizing the participation with representatives of the religion (30,5%). Thus, we can conclude about the presence of respondents of the Dagestan peoples deep differences in the choice of the basis in determining the type of social identity and sense of community.

In a section of the relation to religion “with conviction believers”, as one would expect, emphasize the community “with people of the religion” (42,3%), unlike the “believers” “hesitating”, “non-believers” and “with conviction non-believers” for which the feeling of a community “with representatives of all Dagestan peo-

ple” 49,8% is more important, 47,9%, 42,9% and 25,0%, respectively. Thus, in comparison with other subgroups, the most part “wavering” (29,2%) and “non-believers” (38,1%) demonstration of the national and state identity through feeling of a community “with Russians” is characteristic. Certainly, historically developed interlacing of a religious and ethnic origin, it is necessary to consider in the analysis of the relation of the Dagestan believers to national problems therefore during research of religious identity the task to define the statuses (importance/no significance) of a religious and national identity and their ratio in mass consciousness of the Dagestan people (see Table 4).

Table 4. Distribution of answers to a question “What of judgments is more important for you?” (versions of answers are given on groups of nationalities in % of total of respondents).

Versions of answers/Nationalities	Only my religious accessory is very important for me	Only my national identity is very important for me	My religious and national identity are very important for me	My religious and national identity aren't important for me at all
Avarians	19,4	3,1	62,7	7,1
Azerbaijanians	20,0	10,0	48,3	13,3
Darginians	16,9	7,8	63,6	6,5
Kumykians	11,5	6,6	68,9	8,2
Lakians	14,8	14,8	51,9	18,5
Lezginians	24,1	5,8	52,6	12,4
Russians	9,3	9,3	31,5	38,0
Chechens	37,8	5,4	40,5	8,1
Others	19,2	5,5	54,8	9,6
<i>Total:</i>	<i>18,8</i>	<i>6,0</i>	<i>55,1</i>	<i>12,6</i>

The received results of poll show characteristic to respondents “dual” or “multiple” identity, i.e. desire at the same time to show importance of “national and religious identity”. Every second respondent emphasizes that it “is a very important religious and national identity,” and such more among the Avarians, Darginians, Kumykians, Lakians, and Lezginians. Sharing this judgment, in comparison with other respondents, it is rather less among Russians, and every third of them with a small difference emphasizes

contradictory positions: “very important to me my religious and national identity,” and “I can’t important my religious and national identity”. Adhering to the position “for me is very important my national identity” least among respondents of the Avarians and the Chechens. Comparison of the received results on two questions “**With what groups you most have feeling of a community?**” and “**What of judgments it is more important for you?**” shows the discrepancy existing in mass consciousness of respondents: on the one hand, updating of ethnic identity of the Dagestan people, importance of understanding of feeling of a community with representatives of the people is observed, on the other hand, respondents emphasize no significance of specifically national identity, at a prevalence of a position “mine are very important for me religious and national accessories”, followed by close connection between these two types of social identity. In other words, our research shows bright manifestation of ethnoconfessional identity at the Dagestan people. To historically Russian people, in our case Dagestan, is characteristic to show rather to identify these two factors national and confessional: “it is frequent at the level of ordinary consciousness, the concept “Muslim” gets not only the religious, but also ethnic contents” (Kurbanov and Kurbanov, 2006). The emphasis on the importance of the national identity is placed by statistically small group of respondents among “with wavering believers” (5,4%) and “believers” (4,6%); a share emphasizing importance of an ethnic origin among “fluctuating” and “faithless” nearly 2 - 4 times higher 10,4% and 19,0%, respectively.

Divergences between judgments about importance of national and religious identity in a section of the relation to religion are noticeable. Subgroups “with **wavering** believers” (56,3%) and “believers” (59,7%) emphasize importance of “a religious and national identity”, unlike “**wavering**” (39,6%), “non-believers” (47,6%) and “with **wavering** non-believers” (100%) adhering to a position “mine aren’t important for me religious and national accessories at all”. Subgroups of Muslims (58,3%) and Orthodox Christians (31,5%) note importance of “national and religious identity” though every fifth respondent among Muslims emphasizes importance only of “religious accessory”, and those among Orthodox Christians every eleventh respondent.

For the purpose of deeper studying of the importance of religious

identity to respondents “the control question” (see Table 5).

Table 5. Distribution of answers to a question “In what degree your religious accessory is important for you?” (versions of answers are given on groups of nationalities in % of total of respondents).

Versions of answers/Nationalities	My religious accessory is very important for me	My religious accessory isn't really important for me	My religious accessory isn't important for me at all
Avarians	71,9	6,5	1,5
Azerbaijanians	46,7	21,7	1,7
Darginians	58,4	11,7	3,9
Kumykians	67,2	14,8	1,6
Lakians	59,3	25,9	0
Lezginians	51,1	17,5	2,9
Russians	29,6	24,1	22,2
Chechens	62,2	5,4	0
Others	57,5	17,8	2,7
<i>Total:</i>	<i>58,6</i>	<i>13,7</i>	<i>4,4</i>

The specification of a question shows change in judgments of respondents: if in a question “**What of judgments it is more important for you?**” the respondent demonstration of “dual identity” is characteristic, it is possible to tell ethnoconfessional identity, (“very important to me my religious and national accessories”), that in the second question, more than a half of respondents emphasize judgment “my religious accessory is very important for me”, and growth of the importance of religious accessory even in those subgroups which didn’t allocate a marker “religion” as the ethnointegrating component is observed, didn’t realize themselves “the representative of the religion” and had no feeling of a community “with representatives of the religion”. In a section of the relation to religion, “with conviction believers” (70,8%) and “believers” (57,5%) emphasize importance of the religious accessory while “**wavering**” (41,7%) and “non-believers” (38,1%) are consecutive in the positions and note “my religious accessory isn’t really important for me”; “with conviction” (75,0%) the judgment is closer to non-believers “my religious accessory isn’t important for me at all”. The

respondents professing Moslem emphasize importance of "religious accessory" (62,6%), and among Orthodox Christians the share of those is twice less (29,6%). It should be noted that in positions of Orthodox Christians "blurring" in definition of the status (importance/not importance) of religious accessory is observed: so every fourth respondent (24,1%) adheres to judgment "my religious accessory isn't really important for me" and every fifth (22,2%) "for me my religious accessory is absolutely unimportant". On set of judgments "my religious accessory isn't really important for me" and "for me my religious accessory is absolutely unimportant" in public consciousness of Orthodox Christians prevail over a position about the importance of confessional accessory. Sharing these positions among Muslims, in comparison with Orthodox Christians, it is much less 12,3% and 2,0%, respectively.

During research identification of the tendencies existing in mass consciousness concerning self-identification with concrete religion and degree of religiousness therefore during the analysis two questions were compared "Is not less important you believe in God?" and "To what religion you carry yourself?" (see Table 6).

Table 6. Distribution of answers to a question "You believe in God?" and "To what religion you carry yourself?" (%)

Versions of answers	I believe in Allah (God) who created the world and operating it	I believe not in Allah (God), and in other supernatural and mystic forces	I allow Allah (God) existence or a certain supernatural force, but isn't convinced of it	I don't believe in Allah (God), I am an atheist
I carry myself to Islam	97,0	0,8	1,5	0,1
I carry myself to Orthodoxy	67,5	1,2	31,3	0
I believe in Allah (God), but I don't practise concrete religion I believe in Allah (God), but I don't practise concrete religion	60,6	3,0	33,3	0
I to any religion don't carry myself, I am an atheist	7,1	0	14,3	64,3
Total:	91,2	0,9	6,0	1,2

Comparison of results of the above-named questions shows that the share self-identifying with “Islam” and “Orthodoxy” with belief “in Allah (God) who created the world and operating it” prevails, however in mass consciousness associating themselves with Orthodox place and other position takes “I believe not in Allah (God), and in other supernatural and mystic forces”. Atheists who emphasize the irreligiousness are consecutive in the positions, respectively, don’t carry themselves to any concrete religion. Further, at a bigger share of the interrogated Russians who are associating themselves with followers of Orthodoxy, among them, in comparison with carriers of Islam, least of all defined themselves as “with conviction believers”. In this regard it is possible to assume the assumption that the interrogated Russian designation of the participation with orthodox culture and demonstration of cultural self-identification is characteristic, however such conclusion will correspond not fully to reality, at least because there is a problem of their reckoning to a certain group on religiousness type. For example, to what category to refer people who at mature age host a baptism, get married, in days of large orthodox holidays take part in church services and at the same time it is impossible to tell about them that they are focused on maintenance of active cult behavior. If to return to a question of cultural self-identification, whether that in answers to a question **“You agree with judgment “ the religion of my people is a component of culture of my people”?”** every second respondent among Russians gave the affirmative answer, at the same time every fourth respondent doesn’t consider Orthodoxy a component of culture of the people. We can say that at first sight there is an impression that respondents Russians show discrepancy between self-identification with concrete religion and level of religiousness, however the passive cult behavior of the interrogated Russians isn’t the basis for a conclusion that they have a low manifestation of religiousness. In other words, now it is observed both the growth, and reduction of number of believers which is followed by their self-identification with a certain religion Islam or Orthodoxy. However these processes don’t testify to radical and high-quality shifts in outlook: the respondent is characteristic to identify himself with a certain religion, but thus the level of expressiveness of their religiousness doesn’t coincide with the religion professed by them. Whether therefore there is a question “It is possible to con-

sider all who designated the confessional accessory, real adherents of concrete religion? In particular, in the sociological community have formed strong opinions about what religious identity “Orthodox”, as it has developed at present, appears to be much broader than actually religious identity “believers” (Zorkaya, 2009; Sinelina, 2001; Kublitskaya, 2009; Vozmitel, 2007; Chesnokova, 2005). It is shown that the number of the people identifying themselves as “Orthodox Christians”, steadily grows according to Levada Center, from 17% in 1989 to 73% in 2009, coming nearer as a percentage of a share of the Russian population of the country. But thus the share of the convinced believers among Orthodox Christians, i.e. those who certainly believes in God (consent with judgment “I know that God exists, and I have in it no doubts”), is much lower than a share of Orthodox Christians on self-identification and, reflecting dynamics of growth of orthodox identity, made in 2009 42% (in 1991 36%, in 1998 and 2008 of 39%) (Zorkaya, 2009). In such situation it is possible to assume that “considerable if not overwhelming, the part of respondents identifies itself with this or that religion rather by casual, than steady religious and deep criteria, and sometimes it is simply formal” (Anurin, 2013). If 71,3% of respondents Russians self-identify as followers of orthodox religion, the share is much lower, expressing degree of the religiousness “I believe in the God who created the world and operating it” (64,8%), and every third respondent shares judgment “I allow existence of God or a certain supernatural force, but isn’t convinced of it”.

Thus, the received results of sociological poll show the most difficult processes, characteristic for religiousness: on the one hand, manifestation in mass consciousness of the interrogated Dagestan people of feeling of a community with “representatives of all Dagestan people” and “understanding of by the representative of the Dagestan people”, with another, is emphasized importance of “a religious and national identity” (ethnoconfessional identity), with specification by every second respondent “my religious accessory is very important for me”. At research of a religious component unambiguously there is a question of a religion role in modern society therefore in poll of 2008 the question “What impact was asked respondents the religion has on modern life?” (Shakhbanova, 2010). On all massif, 72,0% of respondents emphasized possibility of religion in preservation of national traditions and customs,

against 12,6% not concordant with this thesis. Among those who negatively estimated a religion role in preservation of traditional culture of the Dagestan people, Lezginian respondents and respondents Lakians 36,0% and 34,3%, respectively are allocated. Results of poll show existence in mass consciousness of the Dagestan people of a positive assessment of a role of a religious factor in preservation of cultural and historical heritage of the Dagestan people and the Muslim people, in the main weight, many religious instructions in the household sphere perceive as elements of national culture of the people.

4 Conclusion

1. In spite of the fact that a marker “religion” doesn’t carry out function of the leading ethnouniting and ethnodifferentiating factor, at domination of importance of other ethnocultural components of reproduction of ethnic identity (“national language”, “national traditions and customs”, etc.) its place and a role is very noticeable in processes of formation and expressiveness of ethnic identity because “household Islam is perceived by most of the population as the defining, integral element of national traditions, its influence is provided with rigid public opinion”. And the religion is very important component in processes of strengthening of intra group unity, plays a noticeable role in formation of ethnoconfessional identity.

2. In mass consciousness of the Dagestan believers there is an orientation to a community of religious values, despite the high status of republican and Russian types of identity, and importance of religious identity via the most various indicators is emphasized (the ethnouniting sign, “the religion of my people is a component of culture of my people”, importance of the accounting of religious beliefs and precepts, the professed religion in everyday life, an identification of a religious and ethnic origin (ethnoconfessional identity) that testifies to importance of religious identity of the Dagestan people in hierarchy of types of social identity.

3. Noticeable differences in manifestation of priority of various types of social identity between the Dagestan Muslims and the Dagestan Orthodox Christians it isn’t revealed. For the first the defining type of social identity is republican and ethnic, while for

Orthodox Christians state and civil (every second respondent), ethnic and republican. However among Orthodox Christians, in comparison with Muslims (30,5%), 3 times less feeling the participation with followers of one with them religions (10,2%). Thus carriers of Islamic religion poorly feel a community with people of the generation, the adhering similar political views and professions. On the contrary, among Orthodox Christians is 3 - 4 times more feeling of a generational, political and professional community. Such substitution can be caused by preservation at the traditional family foundations and related unity of generations professing Moslem which, probably Orthodox Christians fully didn't manage to keep. Followers of Islam, unlike Orthodox Christians in a smaller measure, attach significance to political views, at the same time, designating the importance of a community with representatives of the religion.

References

- [1] Anurin, V. F. (2013). Religion as a factor of social integration. Sociological research, 1: 135-146. (In Russ.)
- [2] Chesnokova, V.F. (2005). A close way: the process of the churching of the population of Russia at the end of the 20th century. Moscow: Academic Project. (In Russ.)
bibitemgasrahbibitemgasrah Drobizheva, L. M. (ed.) (2012). Identity and consolidation resource of inhabitants of the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia). In: Information and analytical bulletin (46-61). Moscow: Sociology Institute of the RAS. (In Russ.)
- [3] Kargina, I.G. (2013). Key trends in studying of modern manifestations of religiousness. Sociological researches, 6: 108-115. (In Russ.)
bibitemgasrahbibitemgasrah Kublitskaya, E. A. (2009). Features of religiousness in modern Russia. Sotsis, 4: 96-104. (In Russ.)
bibitemgasrahbibitemgasrah Kurbanov, M. R. and Kurbanov, G. M. (2006). Religion in the culture of the peoples of Dagestan. Makhachkala: Publication House of the "People of Dagestan". (In Russ.)

- [4] Lokosov, V. V. and Sinelina, Yu.Yu. (2008). The Interrelation of religious and political orientations of orthodox Russians. In: Religion in consciousness of the people (a religious factor in identification processes) (135-158). Moscow: Sociology Institute of the RAS. (In Russ.)
- [5] Malashenko, A.V. 2001. Islamic guidelines of the North Caucasus. Moscow: Gandalf. (In Russ.)
- [6] Puchkov, P. I. (2008). Ratio of ethnic and confessional in Russia. In: Religion in the consciousness of the people (the religious factor in the identification process) (109-134). Moscow: Sociology Institute of the RAS. (In Russ.)
- [7] Shakhbanova, M. M. (2010). Interethnic communication and international tolerance in the Republic of Dagestan: state, tendencies and interference. Makhachkala: ALEPH. (In Russ.)
bibitemgasrahbibitemgasrah Sinelina, Yu. Yu. (2001). About criteria of determination of religiousness of the population. Sociological researches, 7: 89-96. (In Russ.)
- [8] Vasilyev, L. S. (1983). History of religions of the East. Moscow: High school. (In Russ.)
- [9] Vozmitel, A. A. (2007). Sociology of religion and way of life. Sociological researches, 2: 110-117. (In Russ.)
- [10] Zorkaya, N. (2009). Orthodoxy in non-religious society. Bulletin of public opinion, 2: 139-141. (In Russ.)