



---

## Measuring Religious Support as Protective Factor: The Religious Life

*Panmei Peter*

Manipur university, Anthropology department

---

### ABSTRACT

Religious social support can be described as the social support individuals receive as a result of their religious beliefs and participation in religious activities. The current research was performed to determine the positive factor of religious support among the male respondent. The descriptive analytical study was carried out. The study population comprised of the male among the Rongmeis in Longmai (Noney). Regression analysis was carried out. The cut off value of alpha is 0.05. When it lesser or nearer to 0 (1), then protective factor was relied. The results show a positive as from analysis it show a significant.

---

**Keywords:** Religious support, Rongmeis, regression, male, protective.

---

### INTRODUCTION

Measuring religious support on male rongmei is important to study. It is so far not study among the rongmeis. When we talk about rongmei, here may be mention that, rongmei is the inhabitant in Manipur. Specifically the study area was chosen at Longmai, Manipur. It is need to study the paper by using reliability statistics and regression. Age income, educational status, occupation was taken to compare the measuring religious identity. This was related to protective factor with religious life.

With this context, this exploratory article attempts to describe two confusing issues related with Likert scale- (would be) preferable numbers of points on a scale and analysis of the scale. There are not issues emerged as thrust area amenable for further exploration and lucid explanation for the measuring religious support.

Since the inception of human race there is an inclination to capture the ethereal attributes of human behaviour and performance. Simultaneously, it has been a challenge from the same time to quantify the thing which cannot be measured through conventional measurement techniques. The perceived need of this quantification lies in the necessity to transform an individual's subjectivity into an objective reality. Attitude, perceptions and opinions are such qualitative attributes amenable for quantitative transformation due to above mention reason. Qualitative research techniques do try to compensate, by depicting the complexity of human thoughts, feelings and outlooks through several social science techniques, still the quantification of these traits remains a requirement and that's how psychometric techniques come into picture.

Internal consistency is the consistency of test takers' performance on different questions or problems in the same edition of the test. It answers the question, "To what extent do the test takers who perform well on one question also perform well on other questions?" If all the questions on the test measure similar knowledge or skills, the internal consistency will be high. If the questions measure different kinds of knowledge or skills, the internal consistency will not be so high.

Here, in this paper, protective factor will be reliable when the depicted value is lesser than alpha value (0.05) or nearer to zero (1). This will show a positive factor.

---

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

#### Study design

A cross sectional offline survey design was adopted to obtain the data. 120 male was collected among the rongmei community in Longmai (Noney) of

Manipur. Data collection was stop when no responses were observed on the survey. 18 years and older, living in Longmai and willing to participate in the study.

### **Tools**

#### **BMMRS of Fetzer institute**

The survey used is called the Brief Multidimensional Measure of Religiousness/Spirituality (BMMRS). It was developed in 1999 and revised in 2003. One of the main advantages of this instrument is that it was developed by a panel of experts in the field. This survey was used more prevalently in the research of examining the relationship between variables of religiosity and spirituality and their association to health factors. A single subscale in the BMMRS measures both religious and spiritual features. According to a study by Johnstone and associates, the BMMRS demonstrated adequate convergent and divergent validity when correlated with the TCI Transpersonal Identification scales.

#### **Procedure**

Offline survey questionnaire was distributed to male members. The participants are requested to complete the survey and then to submit in in time 120 individuals was collected for the subject.

#### **Ethical consideration**

There is no much ethical consideration as the study is part and partial of the research work. But acknowledgement from village leaders was obtained for the study.

**Table 1: descriptive statistics of the respondents on religious support**

<b>Descriptive Statistics</b>			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Gender	.0000	.00000	120
Age	3.0417	.81370	120
How often do the people in your congregation make you feel loved and cared for?	1.0000	.00000	120
How often do the people in your congregation listen to you talk about your private problems and concerns?	1.4500	.49958	120
How often do the people in your congregation express interest and concern in your well-being?	1.4500	.49958	120
How often do you make the people in your congregation feel loved and cared for?	1.4500	.49958	120
How often do you listen to the people in your congregation talk about their private problems and concerns?	1.4500	.49958	120
How often do you express interest and concern in the well-being of people you worship with?	1.4500	.49958	120
How often do the people in your congregation make too many demands on you?	1.4500	.49958	120
How often are the people in your congregation critical of you and the things you do?	3.8000	.40168	120
How often do the people in your congregation try to take advantage of you?	4.0000	.00000	120

Not: standard deviation determine the cut off alpha value (0.05),  $p < 0.05$  is significant; standard deviation meets the cut off score of alpha value.

**Table 2: ANOVA analysis of the respondent on religious support**

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	3.669	2	1.834	2.857	.061 <sup>b</sup>
Residual	75.123	117	.642		
Total	78.792	119			

Sig value for independent sample, F value for one way ANOVA,  $p < 0.05$ . Sig indicate the protective factor for religious support with reference to religious life.

### Statistical analysis

Data were analysed using statistical package for Social Science version 20.0. Amonk, NY: IBM Corp. Strobe reporting guidelines were followed. Religious support was examined for normality using standard deviation, Sig, R, R square, Adjusted Rsquare, R square change. Regression analysis was used to find independent variables that predicts the presence of protective factor.

### RESULTS

**Table 3: Model summary of the respondent for religious support as protective factor**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics	
					R Square Change	F Change
1	.216 <sup>a</sup>	.047	.030	.80130	.047	2.857

Model	Change Statistics		
	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	2 <sup>a</sup>	117	.061

Table 3 shows the model summary of the respondent for religious support as protective factor. In R, it is .216<sup>a</sup>, R square is .047, Adjusted R Square is .030, standard error of the estimate is .80130, R Square change is .047 and F change is 2.857. Sig F change is recorded as .047.

**Table 4: demographic analysis of the repondent**

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Age	2.9000	.96493	120
Sex	1.0000	.00000	120
Occupation	1.2167	.66337	120
education	2.9917	1.94675	120
income	1.0833	.33263	120

Standard deviation determine alpha score (at 0.05)

Table 4 shows the demographic analysis of the respondent. In age, mean is observed at 2.90000 and standard deviation is .96493. In sex wise, mean is found to be 1.0000 and standard deviation is .00000. In occupation wise, mean is 1.2167 and standard deviation is .66337. In education wise, mean is 2.9917 and standard deviation is 1.94675. In income wise, mean is 1.0833 and standard deviation is .33263.

## DISCUSSION

**Table 5: correlation of religious support of the respondent**

		Correlations				
		Age	sex	occupation	education	Income
Age	Pearson Correlation	1	. <sup>a</sup>	.047	-.273**	.105
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.	.608	.003	.255
	N	120	120	120	120	120
Sex	Pearson Correlation	. <sup>a</sup>	. <sup>a</sup>	. <sup>a</sup>	. <sup>a</sup>	. <sup>a</sup>
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.	.	.	.
	N	120	120	120	120	120
occupation	Pearson Correlation	.047	. <sup>a</sup>	1	.489**	.108
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.608	.		.000	.241
	N	120	120	120	120	120
education	Pearson Correlation	-.273**	. <sup>a</sup>	.489**	1	.170
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.	.000		.064
	N	120	120	120	120	120
income	Pearson Correlation	.105	. <sup>a</sup>	.108	.170	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.255	.	.241	.064	
	N	120	120	120	120	120

Table 5 explore correlation of the religious support on demographic. It is determine on pearson correlation. In occupation, sig (2-tailed) and pearson correlation were .608, -.273\*\*. In education, sig (2-tailed) and pearson correlation were.003, and .105. In income, sig (2-tailed is .255. These were observed in horizontal view in age group. It is significant as protective factor.

**Table 6: residual statistics of religious support as protective factor**

Residuals Statistics <sup>a</sup>					
	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	2.7874	3.2120	3.0417	.17558	120
Residual	-1.87025	1.21255	.00000	.79453	120
Std. Predicted Value	-1.448	.970	.000	1.000	120
Std. Residual	-2.334	1.513	.000	.992	120

Note: standard deviation determine the alpha label

Table 6 explore on residual statistics of the religious support. In predicted value, minimum is 2.7874, maximum is 3.2120, mean is 3.0417 and standard deviation is .17558. In residual, minimum is -1.87025 maximum is 1.21255, mean is .00000 and standard deviation is .79453. In standard predicted value, minimum is -1.448, maximum is .970, mean is .000 and standard deviation is 1.000. In standard residual, minimum is -2.334, maximum is 1.513,

mean is .000 and standard deviation is .992.

### **Religious Support Scale (RSS)**

The RSS consists of three seven-item scales, measuring the participant's perception of support from sources that are relevant to a religious context—How often do the people in your congregation make you feel loved and cared for? How often do the people in your congregation listen to you talk about your private problems and concerns? How often do the people in your congregation express interest and concern in your well-being? How often do you make the people in your congregation feel loved and cared for? How often do you listen to the people in your congregation talk about their private problems and concerns? How often do you express interest and concern in the well-being of people you worship with? How often do the people in your congregation make too many demands on you? How often are the people in your congregation critical of you and the things you do? How often do the people in your congregation try to take advantage of you? Each item was rated on a five-point Likert response scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). As such, higher scores on the RSS indicated a higher degree of feeling religiously supported. In order to examine the protective factor, standard deviation, R square, R change, R and Sig were analysed.

### **Limitations**

In regard to the shortcomings of the study, it should be emphasized that the cross-sectional design limits our ability to make a causal interpretation of the findings. Second, the study was based on individuals' self-reports, and thus, response bias could not be controlled. However, this possibility may be tempered somewhat by the fact that respondents completed the measures anonymously. Third, the sample consisted of adults from one community, dominated mostly by Baptist. Therefore, the results need replication in samples with inclusion of people of different faiths. Fourth, measuring religious support, we did not differentiate three types of support—God, clergy, and congregation support—which might show different patterns of associations with religious support struggle. This also refers to meaning making, which can include more emotional or cognitive processes. In future studies, after increasing the sample size, we would recommend testing more complex models. Therefore, the results need to be replicated with samples where the current shortcomings are minimized. The findings are noteworthy in several aspects.

---

### **Conclusions**

Taken together, this study aimed to investigate the protective factor of the influence of religious support struggles based on questionnaire. In light of our findings, we can conclude that religious support as a protective factor of the religious life. Depending on the types of religious support questionnaire, people may feel that God is their ally and supports them in their struggle or, by contrast, they may feel deprived of God's support, which can result in an increase or decrease of well-being. Based on cut off alpha value (0.05), community does not struggle and those they are not deprived of religious support, which makes it more difficult for them to give meaning to their religious life, and may adversely influence well-being. Thus, the findings from this study suggest that religious support may not be a destructive, well-being-reducing potential or may help people improve their psychological well-being.

### **Acknowledgement:**

---

It is appreciated to help in research. It is also grateful to the study participants for their involvement in research study.

### **Funding**

Author is a recipient of Indian Council of Social Science Research Doctoral Fellowship. His article is largely an outcome of his doctoral work sponsored by ICSSR

**Conflicts of Interest:**

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

**Reference**

- Abraham, Kristen M., and Catherine H. Stein. 2015. "Stress-Related Personal Growth among Emerging Adults Whose Mothers Have Been Diagnosed with Mental Illness". *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal* 38: 227–33.
- Abu-Raiya, Hisham, and Kenneth I. Pargament. 2015. "Religious Coping among Diverse Religions: Commonalities and Divergences". *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality* 7: 24–33.
- Abu-Raiya, Hisham, Julie J. Exline, Kenneth I. Pargament, and Qutaiba Agbaria. 2015. "Prevalence, Predictors, and Implications of Religious/Spiritual Struggles among Muslims: Muslim Religious/Spiritual Struggles". *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 54: 631–48.
- Ano, Gene G., and Kenneth I. Pargament. 2013. "Predictors of Spiritual Struggles: An Exploratory Study". *Mental Health, Religion & Culture* 16: 419–34.
- Beck, Richard, and Sara Taylor. 2008. "The Emotional Burden of Monotheism: Satan, Theodicy, and Relationship with God". *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 36: 151–60.
- Blalock, H. M., Jr. 1970. "Estimating measurement error using multiple indicators and several points in time". *American Sociological Review* 35(1), 101-111.
- Bradshaw, Matt, and Blake Victor Kent. 2018. "Prayer, Attachment to God, and Changes in Psychological Well-Being in Later Life". *Journal of Aging and Health* 30: 667–91.
- Bryant, Alyssa N., and Helen S. Astin. 2008. "The Correlates of Spiritual Struggle during the College Years". *The Journal of Higher Education* 79: 1–27.
- Carver, Charles S. 1997. "You Want to Measure Coping but Your Protocol' Too Long: Consider the Brief Cope". *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine* 4: 92.
- Cassel, J. 1976. "The contribution of the social environment to host resistance". *American Journal of Epidemiology* 104, 107-123.
- Cohen, S., Underwood, L., & Gottlieb, B.H. "Social support measurement and intervention: A guide for health and social scientists". New York: Oxford University Press, 2000
- Debnam, K., Holt, C. L., Clark, E.M., Roth, D.L., & Southward, P. 2011. "Relationship between religious social support and general social support with health behaviours in a national sample of Africans". *Journal of Behavioural Medicine*.
- Dunn, M., & O'Brien, K. 2009. "Psychological health and meaning in life". *Hispanic Journal of Behavioural Sciences* 31(2), 204-227.
- Gorsuch, R.L. 1995. "Religious aspects of substance abuse and recovery". *J Soc Issues* 51:65-83.
- Graham, S., George, L.K., Ellison, C.G., & Larson, D.B. 2002. "Exploring the relationship between religious involvement and health". *Psychological Inquiry* 13, 190–200.
- Idler E, Kasl S. 1997b. "Religion among disabled and nondisabled persons I: attendance at religious services as a predictor of the course of disability". *J Gerontol: SocSci* 52B(6):S306-S316.
- Johnstone, B., McCormack, G., Yoon, D., & Smith, M. 2012. "Convergent/Divergent Validity of the Brief Multidimensional Measure of Religiousness/Spirituality: Empirical Support for Emotional Connectedness as a 'Spiritual' Construct". *Journal Of Religion & Health* 51(2), 529-541. doi:10.1007/s10943-011-9538-9
- Likert, R. 1931. "A technique for the measurement of attitudes". *Archives of Psychology*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- McIver, J. P., & Carmines, E. G. 1981. "Unidimensional scaling". *Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage*.
- Piedmont, R. L., Mapa, A. T., & Williams, J. E. G. 2007. "A factor analysis of the Fetzer/NIA brief multidimensional measure of religiousness/spirituality". *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion* 17, 177–196.
- Pressman P, Lyons JS, Larson DB, Strain J. 1990. "Religious belief, depression, and ambulation status in elderly women with broken hips". *Am J Psychiatry* 147:758-760.