

## Relationship between Religiosity, Self-Esteem and Locus of Control: A Comparative Study

Nadeem Luqman\*

\*Ansal University, Gurugram, India.

Received February 05, 2019; Accepted February 06, 2020; Published July 06, 2020

### ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to determine the relationship between religiosity, self-esteem and locus of control. A total of 100 students (50 male and 50 female) aged 18-23 enrolled at various North Indian universities. The instruments used in the study were the centrality of religiosity scale (CRS), Rosenberg's self-esteem scale (SES) and Levenson's multidimensional locus of control scale. Results of the study show a significant positive correlation among all the three variables; religiosity, self-esteem and locus of control. There was found no significant difference in the levels of religiosity and locus of control among male and female students however male students reported significant higher scores on the levels self-esteem. Further suggestions and recommendations are discussed.

**Keywords:** Religiosity, Self-esteem, Locus of control

### INTRODUCTION

The terms religiousness/religiosity is utilized conversely however frequently characterized as a person's conviction, dedication, and love towards holiness. Religiosity is a term used to describe the extent to which religion influences societies and intersects with other areas of public life. It defines the role that religion plays in society, including the extent of people's beliefs, commitments, and levels of engagement with their particular religion. In the most complete utilization of religiosity, it can have every one of the components of religion, yet this idea of religiosity can be utilized in a restricted sense to signify extraordinary sense and over commitment to religious customs and tradition. This resolute type of religiosity in its heart is frequently seen as a negative side of the religious experience, it can be composed by an over contribution in religious practices which are permitted to be past the social standards of one's acknowledgment. Individuals who are progressively religious will in general connect less in such hazard practices as substance misuse or hazardous sexual practices. It ought to be noticed that a few examinations have discovered no connection among religiosity and saw pressure.

Despite the fact that these researchers found no relationship, the examples they contemplated were multi-denominational. Since the exploration writing shows that pressure methods for dealing with stress may change by ethnicity and sexual orientation, it is additionally vital to decide if the connections among religiosity and stress veer off by these

factors. Countless examinations have proposed that there are noteworthy contrasts in adapting methodologies between sexes.

Religious concepts are not evolved biological adaptations but rather by-products of more general cognitive structures that are adaptations. Adaptationist versions concentrate on the benefits provided by religion, such as increased social cohesion and the individual benefits that stem from it, such as better physical [1]. Positive religious adapting has been related with great well-being results, and negative religious adapting to the inverse. Negative religious adapting incorporates aloof trusting that God will control the circumstance, reclassifying the stressor as a discipline from God or as a demonstration of the fallen angel and scrutinizing God's affection. Religious practices can keep up psychological wellness. They help to adapt to nervousness, fears, dissatisfaction, outrage, anomie, inadequacy sentiments, sorrow and detachment.

**Corresponding author:** Dr. Nadeem Luqman, Associate Professor, Ansal University, D03 403 Sare Homes Sector 92, Gurugram, Haryana, India, Tel: 8826658571; E-mail: nluqman2307@gmail.com

**Citation:** Luqman N. (2021) Relationship between Religiosity, Self-Esteem and Locus of Control: A Comparative Study. *J Psychiatry Psychol Res*, 4(1): 204-209.

**Copyright:** ©2021 Luqman N. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

As a kid experiences pre-adulthood, the individual is exposed to a wide range of difficulties, stressors and openings. A populace of understudies that requires nearer consideration is understudies who have been determined to have a learning incapacity. Understudies with learning handicaps are evaluated to speak to 2% to 10% of the understudy populace. Understudies with learning incapacities battle with self-idea and confidence, which can prompt change troubles, substance misuse, sorrow and suicide ideation. As mental health consultant, it is critical to screen the self-esteem of understudies and help enhance their self-idea and confidence. Confidence is characterized based on two mental procedures: Assessment and influence. Next to no culturally diverse research on confidence has been finished. Assessment highlights the job of perception, while influence underscores the job of sentiments as they relate to confidence. Researches characterize four fundamental ways that confidence is characterized: (1) as a specific mentality, (2) in view of disparity, (3) as a mental reaction an individual holds toward himself or herself and (4) as an element of identity.

Locus of control is an articulation that emerges from the social learning hypothesis and attempts to comprehend why individuals bargain in various ways not withstanding when confronting a similar issue. An inner locus of control is normally connected with prosperity and outer on with discouragement and tension [2]. A religious conviction can support an inward locus of control with effect on psychological wellness. [3]. The idea got from Rotter Social learning hypothesis [4] and from the individual elucidation made on their control level over occasions of life. The people, who have the inward locus of control, surmise that they have a major job on influencing the occasions which impact their lives. Besides, they evaluate themselves as having the power for the frame of mind they need to show by having the positive sense of self idea and they trust that they can coordinate their lives the manner in which they want. The people trust that the occasions influencing their lives cannot be anticipated and controlled. People with inner locus of control are cautious, alarm, overwhelming, concentrated on progress, self-assured and smart. Then again, the people with outer locus of control are less cautious, influenced by the gathering individuals, effectively impacted by outside powers, less fearless, and they show shaky exhibitions [5].

Thus, Locus of control centers around capacity to adapt to vulnerability. While the people who have less resilience oppose to the change, the ones with high resistance can adjust to the change more easily. The locus of control build portrays a person's summed up conviction about the degree to which life results rely on the person's practices (inner) or are dependent upon ground-breaking others or good fortune (outside); locus of control is commonly estimated on a continuum from internal to outer [6]. An examination by researchers found that understudies who had an abnormal

state of good thinking were likewise bound to have an interior locus of control [7-9]. Numerous religious associations feel that it is their obligation to show moral qualities, so one can accept that religious understudies are additionally prone to score high on an ethical thinking scale [10]. Previous studies have discovered that individuals, who have a high requirement for accomplishment, likewise have a faith in their own capacity or aptitude to decide the result of their endeavors [11-14].

The examination centers on relationship and correlation between religiosity, confidence and locus of control among male and female understudies.

## METHODOLOGY

It includes research design sampling procedure, tools used and their administration and selected statistical procedure. Keeping this in view, the study follows a planned procedure set by investigator under experts' advice to draw empirical inferences.

### Statement of the problem

The proposed study intends to find relationship and comparison between religiosity, self-esteem and locus of control among male and female students.

### Objectives

To find the relation between religiosity, self-esteem and locus of control.

To study and compare the religiosity, self-esteem and locus of control among male and female students.

### Hypothesis

Keeping in view the objective of the present study and in light of relevant research literature, the following null, hypotheses were formed considering our investigation purpose. These are as follows:

(H01) There would be no significant relation between religiosity, self-esteem and locus of control.

(H02) There would be no significant difference in scores of religiosity between male and female students.

(H03) There would be no significant difference in scores of self-esteem between male and female students.

(H04) There would be no significant difference in scores of locus of control between male and female students.

### Design of the study

The design of the study is both correlational and comparative in nature.

### Sample

100 students (N=100) were taken through purposive sampling from a North Indian university, aged between 18-23 years. Equal number of male (n=50) and female (n=50)

students from various streams and religious orientation were taken as the part of the study.

**MEASURES USED**

**The Centrality of Religiosity Scale (CRS)**

The basic scale is provided in three lengths with 15 (CRS-15), with 10 (CRS-10) and with 5 items (CRS-5). These versions suitable at least for Abrahamic religions (Judaism, Christianity and Islam) are nested in each other and grow more economical. The internal consistency of the CRS-5 in the total sample of the Religion Monitor is 0.85, that of the CRS-10 is 0.93, and that of the CRSi-7 is 0.84 (Cronbach's Alphas).

**Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (SES)**

The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale is a tool for assessing global self-esteem. The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale presented high ratings in reliability areas; internal consistency was 0.77, minimum Coefficient of Reproducibility was at least 0.90 [15-18].

**Levenson's Multidimensional Locus of Control Scale**

The Multidimensional Locus of Control IPC Scale consists of three separate dimensions: Internality, Powerful Others, and Chance. Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the IPC LOC Scale subscales were 0.74 for Internality, 0.79 for Powerful Others, and 0.79 for Chance [19-21].

**PROCEDURE**

Informed consent of all the participants was obtained. They were informed of the objective of the study and assured that participation was voluntary. Thereafter the questionnaires were administered by self-completion method. The

participants were asked to fill the questionnaires as honestly as possible. Confidentiality of the study was emphasized. They were informed that the data will be used for research purpose only.

After getting willingness of participants, a congenial rapport was established to make them comfortable. Participants were informed that they could withdraw from the study at any time. The test tools were presented to the participants. The general testing conditions were satisfactory and the procedure was uniform all through. The filled questionnaires were collected by the researchers. All the tests were scored as per the procedure described in respective test instructions.

**STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES USED**

The statistical techniques used involve independent samples t test and Pearson's correlation test. The data was analyzed using SPSS Statistics 24.0.

**RESULTS**

The results obtained from descriptive statistics show that the mean value and the standard deviation for religiosity is M=46.17, SD=15.69, the mean value and the standard deviation for self-esteem is M=29.32, SD=6.81 and the mean value and standard deviation for Locus of control is W=90.90, SD=13.6 for the total population, i.e., N=100.

**Table 1** shows the correlation between the chosen variables, i.e., religiosity, self-esteem and Locus of control. From the figures it is found that there is a significant positive correlation between religiosity and self-esteem (0.272), significant positive correlation between religiosity and locus of control (0.277) and significant positive correlation between locus of control and self-esteem (0.266). All correlations are significant at the 0.01 confidence level.

**Table 1.** Correlations between religiosity, self-esteem and Locus of control.

	Religiosity	Self-esteem	Locus of control
Religiosity	1	0.272**	0.277**
Self-esteem	0.272**	1	0.266**
Locus of control	0.277**	0.266**	1

Therefore the hypothesis H01, stating that there would be no correlation between religiosity and self-esteem and locus of control was rejected respectively.

**Table 2** shows the mean comparison of males and females on religiosity and from the table it can be seen that the mean value for the females is (M=44.76, SD=17.58), while for males it is (M=47.58, SD=13.58). From the values it can be clearly seen that there is no significant difference on mean for males and mean value of the females and is signified by the t value, i.e., t=0.898.

**Table 2.** Showing mean comparison of both genders on religiosity.

Religiosity	Mean	Standard Deviation	t	P value
Female	44.7600	17.58775	-0.898	Not significant
Male	47.5800	13.56480		

Therefore the hypothesis stating that there would be no significant difference in scores of religiosity between male and female students (H02) is accepted.

**Table 3** shows the mean comparison of males and females on self-esteem and from the table it can be seen that the

mean value for the females is (M=27.30, SD=7.34), while for males it is (W31.34, SD=5.60). From the values it can be clearly seen that the mean for females is higher than the mean value of the males which is signified by the t value, i.e., t=(-3.09), p=0.003.

**Table 3.** Showing mean comparison of both genders on self-esteem.

Self-esteem	Mean	Standard Deviation	t	P value
Female	27.3000	7.34916	-3.09	P<0.05 (0.003)
Male	31.3400	5.60470		

Therefore the hypothesis stating that there would be no significant difference in scores of self-esteem between male and female students (H03) is rejected.

**Table 4** shows the mean comparison of males and females on locus of control and it can be seen that the mean value for

the females is (M=93.40, SD=15.14), while for males it is (M=88.40, SD=11.48). From the values it can be clearly seen that the mean for females is higher than the mean value of the males which is signified by the t value, i.e., t=1.86, p=0.066.

**Table 4.** Showing mean comparison of both genders on Locus of control.

Locus of control	Mean	Standard Deviation	t	P value
Female	93.4000	15.14286	1.86	Not significant (p=0.066)
Male	88.4000	11.48024		

Therefore the hypothesis stating that there would be no significant difference in scores of locus of control between male and female students (H04) is rejected.

**DISCUSSION**

In this research it was found that there is a significant positive correlation between religiosity and self-esteem (0.272), significant positive correlation between religiosity and locus of control (0.277), and significant positive correlation between locus of control and self-esteem (0.266) [22-25]. These results are consistent with previous researches. There was no significant difference on mean for males and mean value of the females on the levels of religiosity and locus of control [26]. Though the results found are inconsistent with previous research works, a response to a researcher, ‘Is the relationship between religiosity and personality “contaminated” by social desirability’ as assessed by the Lie Scale revealed that women report higher religiosity than men but this could be because of various reasons such as similar living conditions,

attitude towards examination and studies etc. which can be dwelled upon in further researches.

The mean score for males was higher than the mean value of the females on the self-esteem which was found significant. Previous researches have shown similar results.

There was significant difference in scores of locus of control between male and female students as the mean for females is higher than the mean value of the males.

**CONCLUSION**

The primary focus of this study was to determine the relationship between religiosity, self-esteem and locus of control in students. A second focus was to evaluate the gender differences among male and female students on levels of religiosity, self-esteem and locus of control.

Both objectives were achieved as this study found that there was a significant association between religiosity, self-esteem and locus of control. As the self-esteem increased, the prevalence of religiosity and locus of control were also increased. The present study is a pioneering research work

that brings to light the difference in religiosity and self-esteem between adolescents having internal and external locus of control. In the present scenario it is important to enhance religiosity, self-esteem and locus of control in college students and in upcoming generation to provide healthier society. The finding of the present research would be of importance as these would suggest the ways to enhance self-esteem and religiosity (like always speak truth, be yourself, take conscious control of own decisions, practice forgiveness, connect through prayer, pursue spirituality, think and act positive) in student.

### LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

One of the major limitations of this study was small sample size. This decreases the generalizability of results. Using a cross-sectional study design presented only a one-time view of the relationships among all of the variables that were determined, eliminating the ability to observe these associations over a long period of time as a longitudinal study could. Therefore further research can be done with increased sample size over a longer period of time with identifying the risk factors for loneliness, depression and stressors to create a proper guideline for dealing with mental health issues in students.

### REFERENCES

- Sanderson SK (2008) Adaptation, evolution, and religion. *Religion* 38: 141-156.
- Dollinger SJ, Taub SI (1977) The interaction of locus of control expectancies and providing purpose on children's motivation. *J Res Pers* 11: 118-127.
- Pargament K, Hood RW, McCullough ME, Swyers JP, Larson DB, et al. (2000) Conceptualizing Religion and Spirituality: Points of Commonality Points of Departure. *J Theory Soc Behav* 30: 51-77.
- Rotter JB (1966) Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied* 80: 1-28.
- Rotter JB (1990) Internal versus external control of reinforcement: A case history of a variable. *American Psychologist* 45: 489-493.
- Lefcourt HM (1982) *Locus of Control: Current Trends in Theory & Research*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Boyan SA (1968) *Defining Religion in Operational and Institutional Terms*. University Of Pennsylvania Law Review 116: 479.
- Halpert R & Hill R (2011) *The Locus of Control Construct's Various Means of Measurement: A Researcher's Guide to Some of the More Commonly Used Locus of Control Scales*. Beach Haven: Will to Power Press.
- Bodill K & Lynne DR (2013) Implicit theories of intelligence and academic locus of control as predictors of studying behavior. *Learning and Individual Differences* 27: 163-166.
- Schipor MD & Schipor OA (2014) Motivation and Locus of Control: Relational Patterns Activated in Training for Teaching Career. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 128: 420-425.
- Levenson H (1973) Reliability and Validity of the I, P, and C Scales - A Multidimensional View of Locus of Control.
- Ryan RM, Rigby S & King K (1993) Two types of religious internalization and their relations to religious orientation and mental health. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 65: 586-596.
- Huber S (2007) Are religious beliefs relevant in daily life? In *Religion Inside and Outside Traditional Institutions*, edited by Heinz Streib. Lieden: Brill Academic Publishers. PP: 211-230.
- Brougham RR, Zail CM, Mendoza & Miller JR (2009) Stress, sex differences, and coping strategies among college students. *Current Psychology* 28: 85-97.
- Brvg JR (2009) *Heart Disease and Stress. What's the Link?*
- Burchfield SR (1979) The stress response: A new perspective. *Psychosomatic Medicine* 41: 661-672.
- Clark R (2004) Religiousness, Spirituality, and IQ: Are they linked? *Explorations: An Undergraduate Research Journal* PP: 35-46.
- Cohen S, Kessler RC, Underwood-Gordon L (1997) *Measuring Stress: A Guide for Health and Social Scientists*. Oxford University Press.
- Fabricatore AN, Handal PJ & Fenzel LM (2000) Personal spirituality as a moderator between stressors and subjective well-being. *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 28: 221-229.
- Paloutzian RF, Ellison CW (1982) *Spiritual Well-Being Scale*. New York: Wiley.
- Royce JE (1987) Alcohol and other drugs in spiritual formation. *Studies in Formative Spirituality* 8: 211-222.
- Adeyemo DA, Adeyeye AT (2008) Emotional Intelligence, Religiosity and Self-Efficacy as Predictors of Psychological Well-Being among Secondary School Students in Ogbamoso, Nigeria. *Europes Journal of Psychology* 4.
- Berry DM & York K (2012) Depression and Religiosity and/or Spirituality in College: A

- Longitudinal Survey of Students in the USA. *Nurs and Health Sci* 13: 76-83.
24. Calderan C (2012) The Effects of Social Integration on Stress and Risk of depression in college Students. *Perspectives (University of New Hampshire)* 4: 212.
  25. Holdcroft BB (2006) What is Religiosity? *Catholic Education: A Journal of Enquiry and Practice* 10: 89-103.
  26. Abramowitz SI (1969) Locus of control and self-reported depression among college students. *Psychological Reports* 25: 149-150.