

Vicarious Religion as A Methodological Challenge in Modern Sociology of Religion

Muhammad Jamil¹, Raden Rezeki Alam², Dody S. Truna³, Rifki Rosyad⁴

^{1,2,3,4}*Sunan Gunung Djati State Islamic University Bandung, Indonesia*

E-mail: Muhammadjamildakwah@gmail.com

Inputted : July 9, 2026

Revised : July 27, 2026

Accepted: August 21, 2026

Published: August 28, 2026

Abstract

This study explores the concept of vicarious religion introduced by Grace Davie to explain the transformation of religiosity amid modernity, a process initially predicted to trigger total secularization. The concept refers to a phenomenon in which religious practice is carried out by an active minority on behalf of a passive majority who, despite not participating routinely, still expect religion to be present as a guardian of morals and collective identity. This study aims to explain the theoretical framework of vicarious religion, identify its forms of manifestation, and analyze the methodological challenges it raises for modern sociology of religion. The findings show that vicarious religion is manifested through delegative rituals, beliefs entrusted to specific authorities, moral representation in public issues, and the reactivation of religion's role as a "reservoir of meaning" in times of crisis. Methodologically, this phenomenon challenges conventional quantitative approaches that measure only physical attendance, and encourages the use of interpretive and mixed methods to capture the latent dimensions of religiosity. In conclusion, there has been a shift from obligation-based to choice-based religion, in which religion continues to perform significant social and symbolic functions through mechanisms of representation.

Keywords: *Vicarious Religion; Sociology of Religion; Secularization; Methodology; Modern Religiosity*

Citation:

Jamil, M., Alam, R. R., Truna, D. S., & Rosyad, R. (2026). Vicarious religion as a methodological challenge in modern sociology of religion. *MSJ: Majority Science Journal*, 4(3), 123–132. <https://doi.org/10.61942/msj.v4i3.640>

Corresponding Author:

Muhammad Jamil

Muhammadjamildakwah@gmail.com

1. Introduction

The advance of modernity has brought major transformations to social life, including the domain of religion. Since the nineteenth century, classical thinkers such as Max Weber, Émile Durkheim, and Karl Marx predicted that modernization would lead to the marginalization of religion in the public sphere. This view later became known as secularization theory, which assumed that rationalization, industrialization, and social differentiation would substantially diminish the role of religion.

However, empirical reality from the late twentieth into the early twenty-first century shows that religion has not disappeared altogether. Instead, it has undergone a transformation in form, expression, and function. Peter L. Berger himself revised his earlier position, arguing that the modern world has in fact undergone “desecularization,” in which religion continues to play a significant role in both public and private life (Berger, 1999, p. 2).

In this context, Grace Davie introduced the concept of vicarious religion to explain patterns of religiosity in Europe that could not be adequately understood through conventional indicators such as church attendance or formal membership. The concept refers to a condition in which religious practice is carried out by an active minority on behalf of a passive majority that nonetheless retains a symbolic and expectational attachment to religion (Davie, 2000, p. 79).

This phenomenon challenges a foundational assumption in the sociology of religion, particularly regarding the measurement of religiosity. Quantitative approaches long relied upon—such as surveys of worship attendance or formal affiliation—are unable to capture the latent dimensions of religiosity that are implicit, symbolic, and situational. Vicarious religion is thus not merely a descriptive concept, but also an epistemological and methodological problem.

Furthermore, this phenomenon is connected to broader structural changes in modern society, such as growing individualization, value pluralism, and a shift of authority from institutions to individuals. Under these conditions, religion is no longer a collective obligation but a flexible personal choice. Even so, religious institutions are still expected to serve as guardians of morality, providers of ritual, and symbols of collective identity in moments of crisis. The study of vicarious religion is therefore important not only for understanding religious dynamics in Europe, but also for examining its possible relevance in a global context, including in non-Western societies such as Indonesia, which possess a distinct character of religiosity.

It should also be noted that vicarious religion cannot be separated from the institutional dynamics of religion itself in confronting modernity. In many cases, religious institutions are not merely objects of change but active agents that adapt to the demands of the times. This is evident in the efforts of churches and other religious institutions to sustain their relevance through liturgical reform, engagement with social issues, and the use of modern media. Within this framework, religion functions not only as a belief system but also as a social institution with adaptive capacity. This perspective aligns with José Casanova’s argument that modern religion has not been fully privatized but continues to be present in the public sphere through various forms of social and moral participation (Casanova, 1994, p. 5). Vicarious religion can thus be understood as part of religion’s strategy for sustaining its existence under the pressure of secularization, and as an indicator that the relationship between religion and modern society is dynamic, negotiated, and continuously reconstructed.

Finally, from a methodological standpoint, this phenomenon demands critical reflection on the instruments and indicators used in the sociology of religion. Approaches that overemphasize quantitative measures risk overlooking the symbolic and latent dimensions of religiosity that are, in fact, at the core of vicarious religion. A more context-sensitive approach—such as ethnography, phenomenology, and narrative analysis—is therefore needed to capture the complexity of religious experience in modern society. In this respect, Clifford Geertz’s contribution on religion as a system of symbolic meaning provides an important foundation for understanding how religion remains alive even when it is not always visible in formal practice (Geertz, 1973, p. 112).

2. Method

This study employs a qualitative method in the form of library research. Library research draws on a range of literary sources as primary data to understand, analyze, and interpret a social concept or phenomenon in depth, without direct field data collection (Moleong, 2018, p. 6). The focus of this study is directed at the concept of vicarious religion developed by Grace Davie as a perspective within contemporary sociology of religion.

The study adopts a descriptive-analytical approach, aimed at describing the development of vicarious religion theory, explaining its principal characteristics, and analyzing its methodological implications for the development of modern sociology of religion (Creswell, 2018, p. 183). The analysis draws on primary literature, particularly Grace Davie's own works—*Religion in Britain Since 1945: Believing without Belonging* (1994), *Europe: The Exceptional Case* (2002), and *Religion in Modern Europe* (2000)—as well as various scholarly articles discussing the theory.

The research data consist of primary and secondary data. Primary data are drawn from Grace Davie's works that directly address the concept of vicarious religion. Secondary data are drawn from books, articles in reputable journals, conference proceedings, and prior research on secularization, changes in religiosity, and methodological developments in the sociology of religion (Davie, 1994, pp. 1–15).

Data were collected through documentation—identifying, cataloguing, and reviewing scholarly sources relevant to the research theme. The data were then analyzed using content analysis, that is, identifying key themes, connecting concepts, and interpreting the social meaning contained within the literature on vicarious religion (Krippendorff, 2018, pp. 24–31).

To maintain the validity of the study, source triangulation was applied by comparing Grace Davie's arguments with the views of other sociologists of religion, including José Casanova, Peter L. Berger, Steve Bruce, and Danièle Hervieu-Léger, on the relationship between modernity, secularization, and religious transformation (Casanova, 1994; Berger, 1999; Bruce, 2002; Hervieu-Léger, 2000). This ensured that the resulting interpretation rested not on a single theoretical perspective, but also took into account the broader academic discourse in contemporary sociology of religion.

3. Results and Discussion

1. Theoretical Foundation

a. *The Concept of Vicarious Religion*

The concept of vicarious religion was developed by Grace Davie to explain the religious pattern of contemporary European society, which shows a decline in active participation that is not accompanied by the loss of religion's social function. According to Davie, religion remains "alive" in society but is carried out by a small number of individuals who act as collective representatives. They perform rituals, preserve traditions, and maintain religious values on behalf of the wider public that is not directly active. This concept emphasizes that the relationship between the individual and religion is not binary (active versus inactive), but rather a complex spectrum. Religiosity, in this sense, is measured not only by concrete practice but also by social expectations toward the continued presence of religion (Davie, 2002, p. 15).

Vicarious religion is also closely related to the concept of collective memory. Religion often functions as a repository of tradition, values, and historical identity passed down across generations. Even as religious practice declines, religious memory persists in the form of symbols, rituals, and cultural narratives. Maurice Halbwachs's notion of collective memory offers a theoretical framework for understanding how religion remains alive in social consciousness even when it is not always translated into concrete action (Halbwachs, 1992).

Furthermore, this phenomenon also challenges the assumption of rationality embedded in modernization theory, which tends to view religion as something irrational destined to be replaced by science. Vicarious religion instead demonstrates that religion possesses a functional dimension that cannot be entirely substituted by other institutions, particularly with regard to providing existential meaning and managing social crisis. Niklas

Luhmann's account of religion as a system for managing the complexity of meaning is relevant here, since religion supplies an interpretive framework for an uncertain and ambiguous reality (Luhmann, 2013).

Vicarious religion is therefore not merely a descriptive concept of religious practice, but also an analytical framework that allows us to understand how religion continues to operate in modern society through mechanisms of representation, symbolization, and social expectation. The concept expands the scope of analysis in the sociology of religion from mere empirical practice toward a deeper latent dimension, thereby opening the way for interdisciplinary approaches that combine sociology, anthropology, and cultural studies in understanding contemporary religious phenomena.

b. Believing without Belonging

Before formulating vicarious religion, Davie introduced the concept of believing without belonging, a condition in which individuals retain religious belief despite not being engaged with religious institutions (Davie, 2000, p. 57).

This concept was later considered insufficient to explain a more complex phenomenon, because in many cases society does not merely "believe without belonging," but also "expects others to belong on their behalf." From this emerged the concept of vicarious religion as a theoretical development.

The progression from believing without belonging to vicarious religion reflects a shift of focus in the sociology of religion, from the individual as the unit of analysis toward broader social relations. Within this framework, religiosity is no longer understood purely as an internal matter for the individual, but as a social phenomenon that involves collective expectation and mechanisms of representation. This indicates that even as direct participation declines, society continues to sustain a need for the presence of religion as an institution performing symbolic and normative functions. In other words, religion is not only "believed in" or "abandoned," but also "relied upon" indirectly. This perspective enriches the discourse on the transformation of modern religiosity and shows that the relationship between the individual, society, and religious institutions is dynamic, non-linear, and continually renegotiated within a wider context of social change.

c. Critique of Secularization Theory

This concept implicitly critiques classical secularization theory. José Casanova argues that secularization does not always entail the privatization of religion, but may instead involve a transformation of religion's role within the public sphere (Casanova, 1994, p. 5). Within this framework, vicarious religion demonstrates that religion continues to serve social functions as:

- a guardian of collective memory;
- a provider of moral legitimacy; and
- a symbolic institution within society.

Secularization, therefore, should be understood as differentiation rather than the elimination of religion. Beyond this, the critique of classical secularization theory is also directed at the assumption of linearity—the idea that modernization automatically leads to religious decline. In reality, this process is uneven and highly dependent on the historical and cultural context of each society. Charles Taylor's notion of the "secular age" is relevant here, in which secularity is understood not as the disappearance of religion, but as a change in the "conditions of belief," a situation in which faith becomes one option among the many alternative sources of meaning available (Taylor, 2007). Vicarious religion can thus be understood as one form of religious adaptation to these conditions, in which religion remains present not as a universally binding obligation, but as a source of meaning collectively sustained through mechanisms of social representation. This concept further affirms that religion in modern society does not lose its relevance but undergoes a repositioning within an increasingly complex social structure. Religion no longer dominates every aspect of life, but continues to play an important role in certain domains, particularly those concerning existential meaning, social solidarity, and moral legitimacy. From this perspective, secularization can be understood as a process of functional differentiation, as described by Niklas Luhmann, in which religion

becomes one subsystem within society with a specific function, rather than a system that integrates the whole of social life (Luhmann, 2013). Vicarious religion, therefore, reflects how religion continues to operate effectively within the new boundaries set by the structure of modern society.

2. Forms of Vicarious Religion

a. Ritual on Behalf of Society

Society expects religious leaders to keep the faith alive, even when they themselves do not practice it actively. This creates a delegative relationship in religiosity. This phenomenon shows that religious ritual functions not only as an individual practice, but also as a mechanism of social representation that connects the individual to the wider community. In many cases, society continues to want important rituals—such as birth, marriage, and death rites—to be carried out, even though its members are not themselves actively engaged in everyday religious life. This indicates that ritual carries a symbolic dimension that extends beyond personal practice, serving as a means of maintaining collective identity and the continuity of tradition.

This delegative relationship also reflects a religious division of labor in modern society, in which spiritual authority is concentrated among particular groups regarded as having legitimacy and competence. In classical sociological terms, this can be linked to Max Weber's concept of charismatic authority, in which the legitimacy of religious leaders derives not only from institutions but also from social recognition of their capacity to represent sacred values (Weber, 1978). Religious practice thus becomes institutionalized through representative figures who act on behalf of the community.

The continuity of ritual practice through this mechanism of representation also demonstrates that religion continues to function as a provider of symbolic services within society. Even as participation declines, the need for ritual does not disappear entirely; rather, it is transferred to other parties regarded as competent to carry it out legitimately. In this context, vicarious religion shows that religiosity need not always be realized through direct participation, but may proceed through mechanisms of social substitution that sustain the continuity of religious functions in collective life.

b. Delegated Belief

The phenomenon of delegated belief shows that the dimension of faith in modern society is not always individual and internal, but can also undergo externalization through an authoritative figure. Here, society implicitly entrusts the continuity of faith to religious leaders, so that religiosity does not disappear entirely but instead undergoes a transformation in form. Belief is no longer always expressed in personal practice, but continues to exist as a social expectation attached to religious institutions and actors.

Furthermore, this relationship reveals a form of symbolic dependence on religious authority, in which religious leaders function as guardians of orthodoxy and value stability within society. This perspective can be linked to Peter L. Berger's concept of the "sacred canopy," which emphasizes that religion grants legitimacy and orderliness of meaning in social life (Berger, 1967). Within the framework of vicarious religion, this canopy remains upheld even though most individuals no longer actively stand beneath it in daily practice.

At the same time, this phenomenon also points to a paradox in modern religiosity: the more individuals feel free from religious obligation, the greater their expectation that others will sustain the continuity of religion. Delegated belief thus reflects not only a decline in participation, but also a transformation in the form of religious attachment—from direct to indirect. This strengthens the argument that modern religiosity must be understood as a complex spectrum, in which the presence of religion is not always visible in practice, yet remains alive within the structure of society's social and symbolic expectations.

c. Moral Representation

Religion's role as a form of moral representation shows that even as individual participation in religious practice declines, the normative authority of religion continues to be recognized in the public sphere. Religious institutions often serve as points of reference on complex ethical issues—such as bioethics, family relations, and social justice—particularly when society faces moral dilemmas that cannot be fully resolved through instrumental rationality. In this context, religion functions as a source of value legitimacy that goes beyond pragmatic considerations.

This function of moral representation further reflects the continuity of religion's role in shaping public discourse, albeit in a more limited and non-dominant form. Jürgen Habermas's account of religion's contribution to the post-secular public sphere affirms that religious arguments retain relevance in contemporary moral debate, provided they can be translated into universally comprehensible terms (Habermas, 2006). Vicarious religion thus shows that religion remains a source of ethical reference delegated to particular institutions and actors, rather than being wholly abandoned by society.

d. A Space for Social Debate

Beyond serving as a guardian of morality, religion also functions as a space for social debate that brings together diverse views on public issues. Although not every individual is actively engaged in religious practice, religious institutions remain an important arena for the articulation of values, identity, and social interests. In this sense, religion serves not only as a repository of tradition, but also as a medium for dialogue that enables the negotiation of meaning within society.

This function further shows that religion possesses a deliberative capacity in public life, in which various groups can draw on religious frameworks to articulate their positions on contemporary issues. This perspective aligns with Charles Taylor's view that modern identity is formed through a dialogical process involving multiple sources of meaning, including religion (Taylor, 1989). Vicarious religion, accordingly, does not merely sustain tradition but also allows religion to remain relevant as part of an ongoing social conversation.

3. The Iceberg Analogy

The iceberg analogy proposed by Grace Davie functions not merely as a simple illustration, but also as a conceptual framework for understanding the complexity of religious reality in modern society. The portion visible above the surface—such as attendance at rituals, participation in institutions, and formal worship practice—is often treated as the principal indicator in quantitative research. However, an excessive focus on this visible portion risks overlooking the deeper and less visible dimensions that in fact constitute the foundation of religiosity itself.

From the perspective of social phenomenology, as developed by Alfred Schutz, social reality consists not only of observable actions but also of the subjective meanings individuals attach to those actions (Schutz, 1967). The latent level within the iceberg analogy therefore encompasses religious consciousness, inner experience, and the structures of meaning that live within social interaction. This dimension is intersubjective in nature, as it is shaped through the sharing of meaning within a community, even when it is not always expressed explicitly in ritual practice.

4. Religion in Moments of Crisis

The phenomenon of religion's "social reactivation" in moments of crisis shows that religiosity does not disappear entirely, but remains in a latent condition capable of resurfacing when society faces uncertainty and disruption. In situations such as the death of a public figure, a national disaster, or a social tragedy, religious institutions often become the primary point of reference for expressing grief, seeking meaning, and building collective solidarity. This affirms that religion carries a powerful symbolic function in managing social emotion and providing an interpretive framework for events that are difficult to comprehend rationally.

Furthermore, the concept of religion as a *reservoir of meaning* shows that religion functions as a repository of meaning that can be drawn upon when other social systems—such as politics or the economy—fail to provide adequate answers. Peter L. Berger's thought remains relevant here, particularly his notion of religion as a source of legitimacy and orderliness of meaning in social life (Berger, 1967). In moments of crisis, structures of meaning that are ordinarily latent become active once more, and religion emerges as a mechanism for restoring the symbolic equilibrium of society.

Moments of crisis also reveal that society's relationship with religion is situational and not always reflected in everyday practice. Individuals who were previously religiously inactive may re-engage with ritual or religious activity in response to particular circumstances. This strengthens the argument that religiosity is not static but dynamic and contextual. Within the framework of vicarious religion, this phenomenon shows that society retains a form of "right of access" to religion, even when it does not exercise that right routinely.

At the same time, the reactivation of religion in situations of crisis also serves as a mechanism for social integration. Collective rituals, communal prayer, and religious symbols become means of strengthening solidarity and building a sense of togetherness amid conditions of intense pressure. This perspective aligns with Émile Durkheim's view of religion as a source of social cohesion, particularly in situations where society requires a reinforcement of collective bonds (Durkheim, 1995). Religion, therefore, provides not only individual meaning but also plays a role in restoring a disrupted social order.

5. The Shift from Obligation to Choice

The shift from obligation-based religion to choice-based religion is one of the principal features of religious transformation in modern society. Whereas in traditional society religion was normative and passed down across generations as a collective obligation, in the modern context religion is increasingly understood as an individual and reflexive choice. Individuals no longer automatically inherit a religious identity from their social environment, but must actively determine their own position and involvement in religious life.

From Ulrich Beck's perspective, the process of individualization places the individual at the center of decision-making across many aspects of life, including religion (Beck, 1992). Modern individuals are required to construct a "choice biography," in which identity—including religious identity—is no longer given but constructed. In this context, religion becomes one of many options available within a "market of meaning," making religious involvement selective, flexible, and often situational.

This shift also weakens the authority of traditional religious institutions. As religion becomes a matter of choice, institutional legitimacy no longer derives solely from tradition but must be continuously negotiated with individual preferences. This has given rise to more personal forms of religiosity, such as individual spirituality, syncretism, and "pick and choose" religious practice. Under these conditions, vicarious religion can be understood as a mechanism that bridges individual freedom and the collective need for the continued presence of religion.

6. Methodological Challenges

The methodological challenges arising from the concept of vicarious religion are fundamentally rooted in a mismatch between the complexity of modern religious phenomena and the research instruments used to measure them. The positivist approach that has long dominated the sociology of religion tends to rely on measurable and observable indicators, such as frequency of worship, institutional membership, and formal affiliation. Yet as the concept of vicarious religion demonstrates, the most significant dimensions of religiosity often reside in the latent, symbolic, and indirectly observable domain. As a result, a reduction of religious meaning occurs whenever a complex phenomenon is forced to be measured through limited instruments.

a. The Limits of Quantitative Data

The limitations of the quantitative approach lie not only in its instruments, but also in its underlying epistemological assumptions. Measuring religiosity through numerical indicators often overlooks the social context and subjective meaning attached to religious practice. In many cases, a low level of participation does not necessarily indicate weaker religiosity, but may instead reflect a change in the form of engagement. Quantitative data therefore need to be read critically and should not be treated as the sole representation of religious reality.

b. The Need for Mixed Methods

To address these limitations, a mixed-methods approach is needed—one that combines the strengths of quantitative and qualitative methods. Surveys can provide a general picture of patterns of religiosity, while in-depth interviews and ethnography can uncover the meaning, motivation, and subjective experience of individuals. This approach enables researchers to capture both the manifest and latent dimensions of vicarious religion, producing a more comprehensive and contextual analysis.

c. The Importance of Discourse Analysis

Beyond empirical methods, discourse analysis is also essential for understanding how religion is represented and given meaning within society. Language, narrative, and symbols play a key role in constructing social reality. Michel Foucault's account of discourse shows that knowledge is not neutral, but shaped by relations of power and particular social structures (Foucault, 1980). The study of religion therefore needs to attend to how religious discourse is produced, distributed, and consumed in modern society, including within the media and the public sphere.

d. Redefining Religiosity

The concept of vicarious religion calls for a redefinition of religiosity itself. Religiosity can no longer be understood merely as an individual's level of practice or belief, but also as a form of social attachment that is implicit and collective in nature. Here, society's expectation of the continued presence of religion—even in the absence of active participation—becomes part of the indicators of religiosity that must be taken into account. The study of religion therefore needs to adopt a more flexible and multidimensional approach in defining and measuring religiosity.

Overall, the methodological challenges presented by vicarious religion call for a paradigm shift in the sociology of religion, away from a purely empirical-quantitative approach and toward one that is more interpretive, reflexive, and contextual. This not only enriches academic analysis but also enables a more accurate understanding of the dynamics of religiosity within a complex modern society.

7. The Future of Vicarious Religion

The future of vicarious religion is largely shaped by the evolving relationship between individuals, religious institutions, and social structure. Although the concept is rooted in the relatively secular European context, its application in non-Western societies such as Indonesia opens up new and more complex avenues of analysis. Higher levels of religiosity, together with religion's involvement in public life, mean that the pattern of "representation" does not always appear as a consequence of declining practice, but instead as part of the very structure of religiosity itself.

In the Indonesian context, the phenomenon of delegating authority to religious scholars (*ulama*) shows that the vicarious dimension can take a different form—not because society is disengaged, but because of a socially entrenched division of religious roles. Society remains symbolically and emotionally active, even as the authority to interpret and practice religion is often entrusted to particular figures. This can be understood through Clifford Geertz's concept of religious authority, which views religion as a cultural system sustained through symbols, practices, and authoritative figures within the community (Geertz, 1973, pp. 90–113).

Furthermore, moral expectations directed at religious institutions in Indonesia show that religion remains a primary reference point in setting standards of public ethics. Unlike the European context, which has undergone a sharp differentiation between religion and state, religion in Indonesia continues to hold strong legitimacy in the public sphere. Vicarious religion here therefore functions not only as a mechanism of representation, but also as an active source of social and political legitimacy (Geertz, 1973, pp. 90–113).

Moreover, the invocation of religion in moments of social crisis—such as natural disasters, social conflict, or pandemics—shows that the function of religion as a reservoir of meaning remains relevant across cultural contexts. Unlike in Europe, however, the reactivation of religion in Indonesia often involves broader participation, not limited to representation by an active minority. This suggests that the concept of vicarious religion needs to be contextually adapted so as not to be oversimplified as a uniform, universal phenomenon.

Looking ahead, global developments such as digitalization, religious pluralism, and generational change will also shape the forms vicarious religion takes. Religious authority is no longer monopolized solely by traditional institutions, but is increasingly held by new actors within the digital sphere. In this context, the mechanism of representation may undergo a transformation—from an institution-based to a network-based authority—in which individuals choose figures or communities they regard as personally representative. The future of vicarious religion therefore depends not only on the continuity of religious institutions, but also on religion's capacity to adapt to social, technological, and cultural change. The concept remains relevant as an analytical tool, but requires further theoretical development to explain the varied forms of religiosity within an increasingly diverse global context (Castells, 1996, pp. 469–500).

4. Conclusions and Suggestions

The concept of vicarious religion put forward by Grace Davie makes a significant contribution to reconstructing how religiosity in modern society is understood. Rather than viewing religion as a phenomenon in decline due to modernization, this concept points instead to a structural and functional transformation in how religion is present and how it operates. Religion is no longer always realized through direct participation, but continues to exist through mechanisms of social representation carried out by an active minority on behalf of a passive majority. Furthermore, vicarious religion affirms that religiosity cannot be reduced to surface-level empirical indicators such as ritual attendance or formal membership. Rather, it encompasses a latent dimension comprising social expectation, symbolic attachment, and a collective need for meaning and moral legitimacy. In this respect, religion continues to play an important role as a provider of meaning, a guardian of values, and a source of social integration, particularly in situations of crisis and uncertainty.

Methodologically, this concept challenges the dominant paradigm in the sociology of religion, which tends to be positivist and quantitative. Vicarious religion calls for an approach that is more interpretive, contextual, and multidimensional, one capable of capturing the complexity of religious experience in modern society. Future studies of religion therefore need to integrate a range of methodological approaches to arrive at a more comprehensive understanding of the dynamics of religiosity. Furthermore, the relevance of this concept in a global context, including in Indonesia, shows that although its form may differ, mechanisms of representation in religion remain a significant phenomenon. This opens opportunities for the development of a more contextual and cross-cultural theory, so that vicarious religion becomes not only a concept explaining Europe, but a more universal analytical framework capable of context-specific adaptation.

References

- Beck, U. (1992). *Risk society: Towards a new modernity*. Sage Publications.
- Berger, P. L. (1967). *The sacred canopy: Elements of a sociological theory of religion*. Doubleday.
- Berger, P. L. (1999). *The desecularization of the world: Resurgent religion and world politics*. Ethics and Public Policy Center.

- Bruce, S. (2002). *God is dead: Secularization in the West*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Casanova, J. (1994). *Public religions in the modern world*. University of Chicago Press.
- Castells, M. (1996). *The rise of the network society*. Blackwell.
- Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Davie, G. (1994). *Religion in Britain since 1945: Believing without belonging*. Blackwell Publishers.
- Davie, G. (2000). *Religion in modern Europe: A memory mutates*. Oxford University Press.
- Davie, G. (2002). *Europe: The exceptional case: Parameters of faith in the modern world*. Darton, Longman & Todd.
- Durkheim, É. (1995). *The elementary forms of religious life* (K. E. Fields, Trans.). Free Press. (Original work published 1912)
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977* (C. Gordon, Ed.). Pantheon Books.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. Basic Books.
- Habermas, J. (2006). Religion in the public sphere. *European Journal of Philosophy*, 14(1), 1–25.
- Halbwachs, M. (1992). *On collective memory* (L. A. Coser, Ed. & Trans.). University of Chicago Press.
- Hervieu-Léger, D. (2000). *Religion as a chain of memory*. Rutgers University Press.
- Krippendorff, K. (2018). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Luhmann, N. (2013). *A systems theory of religion* (D. A. Brenner & A. Hermann, Trans.). Stanford University Press. (Original work published 2000)
- Moleong, L. J. (2018). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif*. PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Schutz, A. (1967). *The phenomenology of the social world* (G. Walsh & F. Lehnert, Trans.). Northwestern University Press.
- Taylor, C. (1989). *Sources of the self: The making of the modern identity*. Harvard University Press.
- Taylor, C. (2007). *A secular age*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology* (G. Roth & C. Wittich, Eds.). University of California Press. (Original work published 1922)