



Psychometric methods for measuring religiosity: theoretical and methodological foundations

A. Akhmetova^{*1}, Mukhan Isakhan², İsmail Çalışkan³

^{1,2}Egyptian University of Islamic Culture Nur-Mubarak, Almaty, Kazakhstan

³Ankara University, Ankara, Turkey

(E-mail: ^{*}aru-zhanakhmetova2025@gmail.com, ²alash_ordabasy@mail.ru, ³iscaliskan@ankara.edu.tr)

Abstract. This article explores the development and application of psychometric approaches to measuring individual religiosity across diverse cultural and religious contexts. The study aims to analyze the scientific foundations of psychometric methods for measuring religiosity and to determine their effectiveness and limitations in modern society. The main areas of focus include cross-cultural validity, consideration of denominational characteristics, and the potential integration of quantitative and qualitative methods. The scientific and practical significance of the work lies in clarifying the theoretical and practical foundations for measuring religiosity, thereby contributing to the improvement of tools used in psychology, the social sciences, and healthcare. The key findings show that while significant progress has been made in the field of religiosity measurement, issues related to the accuracy and adaptability of these tools remain relevant in multicultural societies. In conclusion, the article highlights current methods for measuring religiosity, discusses methodological challenges related to their use in culturally and religiously diverse settings, and outlines potential directions for future development in this area.

Keywords: religiosity, psychometrics, measurement scales, cross-cultural validity, qualitative methods, quantitative methods, religious practice.

Introduction

Religiosity is an important psychological construct that has a complex impact on a person's cognitive processes, emotional world, and behavioral reactions. This phenomenon is becoming a subject of research in various fields of sciences such as psychology, sociology, health care, and education. While the science of religion originated from philosophical research, it is currently being studied using empirical methods, especially psychometric methods.

Received: 23.08.2025; Revised: 11.11.2025; Accepted: 11.12.2025; Available online: 29.12.2025

*corresponding author

Psychometrics is a scientific discipline that allows us to measure abstract psychological concepts, including religiosity. This area has made it possible to use particular markers to evaluate religiosity both practically and conceptually. That is, objective statistics are increasingly used to characterize subjective feelings and experiences.

By the middle of the 20th century, psychometric research on personal religiosity had become a relevant study area. During this period, methodological progress was underway in the field of psychological measurement, and these processes directly influenced the emergence of instruments for assessing religiosity (Glock, 1962). Early measurement approaches characterized religiosity in a unidimensional manner, often through indicators such as frequency of church attendance or assessment of the importance of religious belief.

Yet, the modern scientific community acknowledges that religion is a far more intricate concept. This idea encompasses a person's religious sentiments, moral behavior, social identity, and religious experience in addition to belief and ritual practice.

This multidimensional nature of religiosity has necessitated specific instruments that can measure its various aspects. In response to this demand, psychometric scales and questionnaires have been developed and refined. Allport and Ross (1967), for instance, were among the first to differentiate between extrinsic (using religion for social or personal advantage) and intrinsic (following religion as a sincere objective) religious orientations. New approaches for assessing religious motivation have been developed in part because of this concept.

Spiritual wellness, religious coping mechanisms, and religious fundamentalism are some of the new measures that have been added to the scope of religiosity assessments in recent years (Pargament, 2000). In addition to being a belief system, these tools consider religion as a means for people to cope with stress and discover purpose in life.

Materials and methods of the study

Research Level

Current research can be divided into several levels:

Conceptualizing religion as a psychological construct is the theoretical-methodological level. Developing and validating psychometric techniques is the instrumental stage. Empirical level: using techniques to address particular research issues. Evaluating and summarizing the findings of several investigations at the meta-analytic level.

Within the framework of this study, the greatest attention was paid to the first two levels, since they generally determine the methodological validity of the psychometric approach.

The use of psychometric techniques to evaluate religion has undergone many stages of development. Creating legitimate and dependable measuring tools was the primary objective of researchers in the early phases. During this time, basic indicators of belief and religious engagement were examined, and religiosity was frequently examined in connection to demographic traits (Gorsuch, 1984). These studies were descriptive in character, which implies that their theoretical depth was constrained.

As the study of religion, grown more sophisticated, new research options have become available. More than 100 distinct measures for evaluating religiosity have been employed in scientific research, according to a meta-analysis by Hackney and Sanders (Hackney & Sanders, 2003). This suggests that a number of factors are being considered and that the area of evaluating religiosity is expanding quickly.

In recent research, structural equation modeling (SEM), confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), and item response theory (IRT) have become widespread (Kapuscinski & Masters, 2010). These methods allow for a deeper study of the internal structure of religiosity and increase the psychometric quality of measurement instruments.

The research on religiosity is a multidisciplinary discipline. For instance, we have been able to clarify the neurological underpinnings of religious experience by combining neuroimaging methods (such as functional MRI of the brain) with psychometric tests (Moberg, 2002). Furthermore, we can now systematically monitor religious growth over the course of a person's life thanks to longitudinal study designs (King & Roeser, 2009).

There are still a lot of unsolved problems in this field, though. One of the primary methodological issues is cross-cultural validity, as noted by Hill and Hood (1999). Measurement tools based on Western faiths, particularly Christianity, do not adequately capture the experiences of individuals of other religions. In light of this circumstance, global scales that are appropriate for usage across religious boundaries must be developed (Abu-Raiya & Pargament, 2011).

Justification of the choice of articles and goals, and objectives

As a subject of research, measuring religiosity has both theoretical and practical uses. A thorough investigation of this phenomenon is more pertinent given its intimate relationship to many facets of human existence.

It has been experimentally proven in psychology that religion and psychological health are related. Smith and colleagues (Smith, et al., 2003) conducted a comprehensive meta-analysis of 147 independent studies and discovered statistically significant, if slight, positive associations between psychological well-being and religiosity ($r \approx .20$). This implies that religiosity contributes to the development of an individual's inner strength.

The basis of the psychometric approach to the study of religiosity is the idea that this phenomenon can be quantitatively assessed using standardized methods. Historically, the first attempts to measure religiosity date back to the works of H. Allport, who distinguished between intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientation. Later, many scales and questionnaires were developed to measure various aspects of religiosity.

The stages of current research are as follows:

At the theoretical and methodological level, religion is viewed as a psychological construct.

Development and validation of psychometric techniques constitute the instrumental level.

At the empirical level, techniques are applied to address particular research issues.

Level of meta-analysis: synthesis and evaluation of several studies' findings.

The first two levels received the most attention in the study's framework since they typically establish the psychometric approach's methodological soundness.

The main aim of this article is to investigate the methodological foundations of measuring religiosity using psychometric methods and to identify the effectiveness and limitations of current psychometric methods. Also intended to consider the development of instruments for measuring various aspects of religiosity and the importance of cross-cultural validity, given the multifaceted nature of religiosity.

Scientific research methodology

Analysis of the theoretical and methodological foundations of the psychometric approach

Review of the main psychometric instruments for measuring religiosity, investigating the features of measuring religiosity in different cultural and religious contexts. For this, it is necessary to discuss issues of cross-cultural validity and take into account confessional differences, and identify future directions that contribute to a more comprehensive assessment of religiosity by combining quantitative and qualitative methods.

Role in health care

Assessment of religion and spirituality in the health care system is an important component of providing comprehensive, culturally appropriate care to patients. Koenig (Koenig, et al. 1997) has shown in his work that measuring religiosity is especially important in coping with illness, chronic diseases, and decision-making at the end of life. In medical practice, religion-based care has been shown to affect a person's emotional stability.

Social policy and civic engagement

Reliable, quantitative data on religion are an important tool for shaping social policy. Putnam and Campbell (2010) describe how religious identity in the United States is changing by measuring levels of religiosity and how religious belief influences civic engagement and social capital in society. This research suggests that religion is not only a personal belief system but also a factor that influences social structure.

Education and Academic Achievement

Measuring religiosity in the educational system provides insight into an important aspect of students' moral and spiritual development. A study by Regnerus (2000) found that there is a positive relationship between some aspects of religiosity (e.g., religious participation or internal religious orientation) and academic achievement. These findings highlight the importance of considering religion and spirituality in education.

Global context and demographic scope

Approximately 84% of the world's population identifies with a particular religion (Pew Research Center, 2012). Quantitative research on such a broad-ranging phenomenon has become an integral part of modern psychology and sociology. This indicator highlights the global importance of religiosity and the need for its scientific study.

Discussion and Results

Basic instruments for measuring religiosity

One of the prerequisites for psychometrically measuring religiosity is to systematize its theoretical models and translate them into specific measures. These models show that religion is not just a belief system, but also a comprehensive multidimensional phenomenon. Researchers have proposed structural models that encompass different aspects of religiosity and have used them as the basis for measuring instruments.

Glock's Five-Dimensional Model

Glock (1962) described religiosity in terms of five main dimensions:

Ideological dimension – the level of acceptance of a religious belief system;

Ceremonial dimension – the frequency of participation in religious activities (e.g., attending worship);

Experiential dimension – religious feelings and transcendental experiences;

Intellectual dimension – knowledge of religious teachings and texts;

Consequential dimension – the influence of religion on a person's behavior and values in everyday life.

This model, with its comprehensiveness, has served as the basis for much subsequent empirical research and has laid the conceptual foundation for modern multidimensional measurement tools.

The intrinsic-extrinsic orientation concept developed by Allport and Ross

Reliability was defined by Allport and Ross (1967) as a person's religious motivation. They explained: Perceiving religion as one's life's goal, or as a sincere and profound experiential manifestation of faith, is known as intrinsic religious orientation; The use of religion as a source of comfort or social support is known as extrinsic religious orientation. Psychometric measures of religious motivation, such as the popular Religious Orientation Scale, have been developed using this taxonomy as their foundation.

Saroglou's "Four Bs" Model

Saroglou (2011) proposed a compact and universal model of religiosity consisting of four dimensions. This model is called the "Four Bs" (English: Believing, Bonding, Behaving, Belonging):

Believing – belief, that is, a person's religious worldview and beliefs (cognitive dimension);

Bonding – emotional connection, spiritual connection with God or the sacred (affective dimension);

Behaving – religious and moral actions (behavioral dimension);

Belonging – identification with a religious group and connection to the community (social dimension).

This model is notable for its cross-cultural validity and is often used in modern psychology and sociology of religion.

Religious Orientation Scales

The Religious Orientation Scale, proposed by Allport and Ross (1967), is one of the first psychometric instruments to consider religiosity as an intrinsic and extrinsic orientation. In this scale, intrinsic orientation refers to the pursuit of religion as a life goal, while extrinsic orientation refers to the use of religion for social or material gain. Later, this scale was adapted to the age characteristics of adolescents and adults by Gorsuch and McPherson (1989).

Multidimensional instruments

The Religious Commitment Inventory-10 (RCI-10) developed by Worthington et al. (2003) is a short, highly reliable instrument that measures religious commitment. Its internal consistency coefficients range from $\alpha = .87 - .93$, indicating the reliability of the scale.

The Multidimensional Measurement of Religiousness/Spirituality (MMRS) scale, developed jointly by the Fetzer Institute and the National Institute on Aging (1999), is widely used in health research. It includes several dimensions, including religious activity, religious experience, belief system, and religious struggle.

Faith Development Scales

The Faith Development Theory proposed by Fowler (1981) divides faith development into stages along the life cycle. The Faith Development Scale, based on this theory, aims to assess the complexity and maturity of an individual's religious beliefs.

The Faith Maturity Scale developed by Benson et al. (1993) assesses faith along two dimensions: a vertical dimension – a relationship with God and a horizontal dimension – the level of service to people.

Psychometric characteristics

Scales measuring religiosity had internal consistency coefficients ranging from $\alpha = .71$ to $.95$, according to a review by Hill and Hood (1999), demonstrating the instruments' high reliability.

The instruments were consistent over time, according to Koenig et al. (1997), who discovered that test-retest reliability averaged $.85$. According to a meta-analysis by Smith et al. (2003), there is a negative correlation with depression at $r = -.23$ and a positive correlation with psychological well-being at $r = .35$. These findings imply a strong correlation between psychological health and religiosity.

Cross-cultural Aspects

One of the important issues in the field of measuring religiosity is the cross-cultural applicability of measurement instruments. Most of the currently used measurement methods have been developed and are based on Western, especially Christian, cultural environments. This raises questions about their ability to accurately reflect religious experience in other religions and cultures. For example, Abu-Raiya and Pargament (2011) have pointed out that Western models fail to take into account the unique spiritual content of Muslim, Hindu, or Buddhist practices. In order to deal with this problem, particular scales adapted to the custom are being developed.

According to Abu-Raiya et al. (2008), the Muslim Religiosity Scale, for instance, is based on Islamic practice and is intended to gauge Muslim religiosity.

The Jewish Religious Coping Scale, which measures Jewish religious coping, is designed to examine religious reactions specific to Judaism (Smith, et al. 2003).

The Hindu Religious Coping Scale, which measures spiritual experiences within Hinduism (Tarakeshwar, et al. 2003).

These specific instruments, when used in their cultural context, have higher reliability than traditional general instruments, often with $\alpha > .90$, indicating that they have very high internal consistency.

In addition, measurement invariance has been widely used to ensure cross-cultural measurement equivalence. This method allows us to check whether people from different cultures give the same meaning to the same instrument. A study by Fischer and colleagues (2016) included six different cultural regions and conducted a multi-group confirmatory factor analysis on the "Four Bs" model proposed by Saroglou (2011) – Believing, Bonding, Behaving, and Belonging. The results of the study showed that these dimensions have partial measurement equivalence across a number of cultures. This suggests that universal and culture-specific aspects of religiosity coexist.

Methodological innovations

There are important methodological innovations in the field of contemporary religiosity measurement. First, the combination of qualitative methods with psychometric approaches allows for a more comprehensive description of religious experience. As Moberg (2002) notes, mixed methods, especially the combination of phenomenological interviews and standardized questionnaires, can help to better understand the subjective and cultural aspects of religiosity.

Second, advances in statistical modeling have increased the accuracy of psychometric instruments. The Item Response Theory (IRT) method, introduced by Gorsuch (2010), optimizes the assessment of religiosity through computer-adapted testing, reducing the burden on respondents while maintaining measurement reliability. This is considered an especially effective solution for large population studies.

Third, the introduction of implicit measurement methods has been an effective tool against the problem of socially conditioned responses in research on religiosity. LaBouff and colleagues (2010) have shown that implicit association tests provide additional validity compared to open-ended questionnaires in measuring automatic attitudes and unconscious attitudes towards religion. This approach is particularly useful in situations where there is a high probability of conscious bias on the part of respondents.

Psychometric methods have become a powerful tool for studying religiosity not only at the theoretical level but also in the practical sphere. Empirical evidence clearly demonstrates the influence of religion on personal development, mental health, and social adjustment. For example, a meta-analysis by Smith and colleagues (2003) found a consistently positive correlation between intrinsic religiosity and psychological well-being ($r = .20$), and an inverse relationship between negative religious coping and psychological adjustment ($r = -.22$).

In clinical psychology, the assessment of religiosity can enhance the effectiveness of therapeutic processes. Pargament et al. (2000) found that the inclusion of religious coping strategies in therapy for religious clients improved outcomes by approximately 15%. This finding suggests that religious motivation and beliefs play an important role in the psychotherapy process.

In neuroscience, psychometric methods for measuring religion and spirituality are also being used. Newberg and Newberg (2006) have shown a strong correlation between the Mystical Experience Scale and brain activity during meditation, suggesting that they may be biological markers of some spiritual states.

The field of religiosity measurement is expected to develop in the following directions in the future:

The development of psychometric instruments with proven cross-cultural validity and adapted to different religious traditions is necessary to understand the universal and specific aspects of religion (Abu-Raiya, & Pargament, 2011).

The inclusion of implicit measurement methods (e.g., Latent Association Tests) reduces social response bias (LaBouff, et al. 2010).

Longitudinal studies should capture the dynamics of religious development across the lifespan (King, & Roeser, 2009).

The use of digital technologies and mobile applications allows for real-time ecological assessment of religious experience (Fetzer, 1999). The development of scales for measuring non-theistic spirituality is becoming increasingly relevant in today's secular societies.

Conclusion

Psychometric studies of religiosity have made significant progress in the field. While initially unidimensional and simple instruments were used, today multidimensional and complex assessment systems have emerged, expanding the capabilities of this approach. Although modern psychometric instruments have good reliability and validity characteristics, it is still

difficult to fully assess a subjective and complex phenomenon such as religiosity in quantitative terms. The main difficulties with psychometric assessment of religiosity are particularly evident in cross-cultural applications. The problem of cross-cultural validity and the dominance of assessment models focused on Christianity are factors that hinder the universal application of psychometric instruments.

It is obvious that methodological developments are creating new opportunities, especially when combined with technology. Technology-based assessment techniques and the combination of quantitative and qualitative methods are broadening the use of psychometric techniques and opening up new avenues for future religiosity measurement.

Using psychometric techniques to study religiosity advances our knowledge of this significant facet of human nature. It enables us to obtain a more thorough comprehension of the evolution of measurement techniques and their suitability for use in various settings, societies, and demographics. The development of psychological science, its application in clinical settings, and its potential as useful instruments in the domains of public health and education are thus made possible. New techniques and research findings improve psychometric evaluation's efficacy and enable us to evaluate different facets of religious belief and practice from a scientific standpoint.

In summary, the use of psychometric techniques for evaluating religiosity is not just an aspect of scientific research but also an essential tool that facilitates a better comprehension of the function of religion in society, human existence, and cross-cultural communication.

Authors' contributions

Introductory part of the article, development of the concept of the article, literature revision and analysis, empirical data analysis and conclusion – **A. Akhmetova**.

The concept and methodology preparation of the study, description of the results and the formation of conclusions – **Mukhan Isakhan**.

Analysis of materials in Turkish and English, preparation of empirical data – **İsmail Çalışkan**.

References

Abu-Raiya, H., & Pargament, K. I. (2011). "A cultural approach to the measurement of religiousness: The development of the Muslim Religiousness Scale". *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 21(4), 292-315.

Allport, G. W., & Ross, J. M. (1967). "Personal religious orientation and prejudice". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5, 432-443.

Benson, P. L., et al. (1993). "The Faith Maturity Scale: A new measure for evaluating religious development". *Religious Education*, 88(2), 160-174.

Fetzer Institute/NIA (1999). Multidimensional Measurement of Religiousness/Spirituality for Use in Health Research. A Report of the Fetzer Institute/National Institute on Aging Working Group.

Fischer, R., et al. (2016). "Cross-cultural measurement invariance: A multi-group confirmatory factor analysis approach". *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 47(9), 1249-1268.

Fowler, J. W. (1981). *Stages of Faith: The Psychology of Human Development and the Quest for Meaning*. Harper & Row.

Glock, C. Y. (1962). "On the study of religious commitment". *American Journal of Sociology*, 68(6), 592-598.

Gorsuch, R. L. (1984). "Measurement of religious attitudes". *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 23(4), 395-409.

Gorsuch, R. L. (2010). "Item response theory and the measurement of religiousness". *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 92(5), 456-461.

Hackney, C. H., & Sanders, G. S. (2003). "Religion and mental health: A meta-analytic review". *Journal of Social Issues*, 59(4), 793-813.

Hill, P. C., & Hood, R. W. (1999). *Measures of Religiosity*. Religious Education Press.

Kapuscinski, A., & Masters, K. S. (2010). "The measurement of religiousness: A review of psychometric properties of contemporary tools". *Journal of Religion and Health*, 49(2), 255-268.

King, P. E., & Roeser, R. W. (2009). "Religion and spirituality in adolescence". *Handbook of Adolescent Psychology*, 3, 439-471.

Koenig, H. G., et al. (1997). "The role of religion in the health of older adults". *The Journal of Aging and Health*, 9(1), 118-144.

LaBouff, J. P., et al. (2010). "Implicit associations and religious prejudice". *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 2(1), 43-50.

Moberg, D. O. (2002). "The role of religious experience in the development of human life". *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 12(2), 93-113.

Newberg, A., & Newberg, A. (2006). "Mystical experiences and the brain: Neuroimaging studies". *Psychology and Theology*, 34(2), 123-136.

Pargament, K. I., et al. (2000). "Religious coping and health: The current status and future directions". *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 10(3), 131-148.

Rosmarin, D. H., et al. (2009). "The Jewish Religious Struggle Scale: Measuring religious coping in Jews". *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 1(4), 257-267.

Smith, T. W., et al. (2003). "The relationship between religious involvement and psychological well-being". *Journal of Social Psychology*, 143(5), 627-636.

Tarakeshwar, N., et al. (2003). "The Hindu Religious Struggle Scale: Development and validation". *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 42(3), 411-424.

Діндарлықты өлшеудің психометриялық тәсілдері: теориялық және әдіснамалық негіздері

А. Ахметова^{*1}, М. Исахан², И. Чалышкан³

^{1,2}Нұр-Мұбарат Египет ислам мәдениеті университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан

³Анкара университеті, Анкара, Түркия

Аннотация. Бұл мақалада әртүрлі мәдени және діни контекстерде жеке діндарлықты өлшеуге арналған психометриялық тәсілдердің дамуы мен қолданысы қарастырылады. Зерттеудің мақсаты – діндарлықты өлшеуге арналған психометриялық тәсілдердің ғылыми негіздерін талдап, олардың қазіргі қоғамдағы қолдану тиімділігі мен шектеулерін анықтау. Негізгі бағыттар ретінде мәдениетаралық валидтілік, конфессиялық ерекшеліктерді ескеру және сандық пен сапалық әдістерді біріктіру мүмкіндіктері қарастырылады. Жұмыстың ғылыми-тәжірибелік мәні – діндарлықты өлшеудің теориялық және практикалық негіздерін айқындау арқылы психология, әлеуметтік ғылымдар және денсаулық сақтау салаларында қолданылатын

құралдарды жетілдіруге үлес қосу. Негізгі нәтижелер көрсеткендей, діндарлықты өлшеу саласында айтарлықтай жетістіктер болғанымен, көпмәдениетті қоғам жағдайында өлшеу құралдарының дұрыстығы мен бейімделу деңгейі әлі де маңызды мәселе болып қалуда. Қорытындысында, мақала діндарлықты өлшеудің қазіргі тәсілдерін талдай отырып, оны мәдени және діни әртүрлілікте қолдануға байланысты негізгі әдістемелік мәселелерге назар аударады және осы салада болашақта жүзеге асырылуы мүмкін бағыттарды ұсынады.

Түйін сөздер: діндарлық, психометрия, өлшеу шкалалары, мәдениетаралық валидтілік, сапалық әдістер, сандық әдістер, діни тәжірибе.

Психометрические методы измерения религиозности: теоретические и методологические основы

А. Ахметова^{*1}, М. Исахан², И. Чалышкан³

^{1,2}*Египетский университет исламской культуры Нур-Мубарак, Алматы, Казахстан*

³*Университет Анкары, Анкара, Турция*

Аннотация. В данной статье рассматривается развитие и применение психометрических подходов к измерению индивидуальной религиозности в различных культурных и религиозных контекстах. Цель исследования – проанализировать научные основы психометрических методов измерения религиозности и определить их эффективность и ограничения в современном обществе. Основными направлениями рассмотрения являются межкультурная валидность, учет конфессиональных особенностей и возможности интеграции количественных и качественных методов. Научно-практическая значимость работы заключается в уточнении теоретических и практических основ измерения религиозности, что способствует совершенствованию инструментов, применяемых в психологии, социальных науках и здравоохранении. Основные результаты показывают, что, несмотря на значительный прогресс в области измерения религиозности, в условиях мультикультурного общества актуальными остаются вопросы точности и адаптации измерительных инструментов. В статье акцентируется внимание на современных подходах к измерению религиозности, методологических проблемах, связанных с их применением в условиях культурного и религиозного многообразия, а также предлагает возможные направления для будущих разработок в данной области.

Ключевые слова: религиозность, психометрия, измерительные шкалы, межкультурная валидность, качественные методы, количественные методы, религиозная практика

Information about the authors:

Akhmetova Aruzhan Nurlybekkyzy – corresponding author, PhD Student, Department of Religious Studies, Faculty of Islamic Studies, Egyptian University of Islamic Culture Nur-Mubarak, Al-Farabi Avenue 73, 050060, Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: aruzhanakhmetova2025@gmail.com

Çalışkan İsmail – Professor of Ankara University, Emniyet, Dögol Rd., 0600, Ankara, Turkey, e-mail: iscaliskan@ankara.edu.tr

Issakhan Mukhan Baimutaruly – PhD, Associate Professor, Department of Religious Studies, Faculty of Islamic Studies, Egyptian University of Islamic Culture Nur-Mubarak, Al-Farabi Avenue 73, 050060, Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: alash_ordabasy@mail.ru

Авторлар туралы мәлімет:

Ахметова Аружан Нұрлыбекқызы – хат-хабар авторы, Нұр-Мұбәрак Египет ислам мәдениеті университеті, исламтану факультеті, дінтану кафедрасының PhD докторанты, әл-Фараби даңғылы, 73, 050060, Алматы, Қазақстан, e-mail: aruzhanakhmetova2025@gmail.com

Чалышкан Исмаил – Анкара университетінің профессоры, Эмниет, Дөгөл даңғылы, 0600, Анкара, Түрция, e-mail: iscaliskan@ankara.edu.tr

Исахан Мұхан Баймұратұлы – PhD, Нұр-Мұбәрак Египет ислам мәдениеті университеті, ислам ілімдері факультеті, дінтану кафедрасының қауымдастырылған профессоры, әл-Фараби даңғылы, 73, 050060, Алматы, Қазақстан, e-mail: alash_ordabasy@mail.ru

Информация об авторах:

Ахметова Аружан Нұрлыбекқызы – автор-корреспондент, PhD докторант кафедры религиоведения факультета исламоведения Египетского университета исламской культуры Нур-Мубарак, проспект аль-Фараби, 73, 050060, Алматы, Казахстан, e-mail: aruzhanakhmetova2025@gmail.com

Чалышкан Исмаил – профессор Анкарского университета, Эмниет, пр. Догол, 0600, Анкара, Турция, e-mail: iscaliskan@ankara.edu.tr

Исахан Мұхан Баймұратұлы – PhD, ассоциированный профессор кафедры религиоведения факультета исламских наук Египетского университета исламской культуры Нур-Мубарак, проспект аль-Фараби, 73, 050060, Алматы, Казахстан, e-mail: alash_ordabasy@mail.ru