The Influence of Religiousness on Resilience in Failure Situations

Yerikha Puteri Dewi Kencana

Universitas Paramadina, Jakarta, Indonesia
Email: yerikha.kencana@students.paramadina.ac.id
Correspondence: yerikha.kencana@students.paramadina.ac.id[*]

KEYWORDS	ABSTRACT
Religiosity; Resilience; Failure; Mental Health; Intervention	This research examines the influence of religiosity on resilience in individuals facing failure. Titled "The Influence of Religiosity on Resilience in Situations of Failure," the study aims to understand how different levels of religiosity affect resilience amid the psychological stress of failure. Data was collected from 100 adults aged 18-65 who had experienced failure and were members of a religious community. Participants completed the Brief Resilience Scale (BRS) questionnaire to measure resilience and the Religious Commitment Inventory (RCI) to measure religiosity. The research hypothesis stated that higher levels of religiosity correlated with greater resilience. The results showed that religiosity has a direct impact on resilience in the context of failure. The findings revealed a positive relationship between religiosity and resilience, supporting the hypothesis that the more religious a person is, the higher their resilience. This relationship was significant, with t-tests and F-tests confirming that religiosity contributed significantly to explaining variation in participants' resilience scores. Regression analysis reinforced these findings, emphasizing the importance of religiosity for resilience. Greater commitment to religious practices and beliefs was shown to improve coping strategies, emotion regulation and the ability to bounce back from failure. The findings imply that religiosity can act as a protective factor, providing individuals with a sense of purpose, meaning and community support to cope with adversity and failure. This research contributes to the understanding of the role of religiosity in enhancing psychological resilience.

Introduction

Resilience, or an individual's ability to recover from stress and adversity, has become a topic of increasing attention in mental health. (Wang et al., 2023) state that resilience is not only related to an individual's experience of failure but is also influenced by various external factors, including religiosity. "The phenomenon of failure, which individuals often experience in various aspects of life as academics, careers, and relationships, causes significant negative impacts on mental health,

including increased anxiety and depression" (Johnson, 2021). Therefore, it is important to understand the factors that can support individuals in managing stress and increasing their resilience.

In the face of these challenges, many individuals seek sources of support that can help them overcome adversity. One recognized source of support is religiosity, which can provide meaning and hope in difficult situations.

The study by (Smith et al., 2008) states that individuals with higher levels of religiosity tend to have better resilience after experiencing failure. This is in line with the theory proposed by Deci & Ryan (2000), which states that religiosity can fulfill basic human needs, such as autonomy, competence, and social connection-factors that all support the development of resilience. In stressful situations, religious practices can provide a deep sense of connectedness to something greater, give meaning to suffering, and reinforce the belief that life's difficulties are part of a broader process.

As emphasized by Pargament and Exline (2021) "religious-based coping strategies often assist individuals in coping with stress, emphasizing the importance of religiosity in the resilience process."

Individuals experiencing loss or career change may find strength through evolving religious practices. Research by Koenig et al. (2020) shows that religiosity is related to higher subjective well-being, contributing to stress reduction and increased resilience.

In Indonesia, there are several previous studies, such as by Umam (2021) provides empirical evidence of the relationship between religiosity and resilience amid the pandemic. Their study shows that individuals active in religious practices tend to have higher levels of resilience, allowing them to better deal with challenges. These findings highlight the important role of religion in providing emotional and spiritual support for individuals, especially in crises. In addition, research by Bukhori et al. (2022) suggests that religiosity can act as a mediator in reducing the negative impact of stress on mental health among Indonesians. Bukhori et al. (2022), "religious practices can serve as a buffer between stress and mental health disorders, especially in urban environments".

Two other relevant studies include research by Kurniawan et al. (2024), who found that religiosity contributes to increasing students' resilience in dealing with academic stress. In addition, research by Bal et al. (2025) showed that religious practices can increase the resilience of individuals who experience loss and grief. These studies suggest that religiosity not only provides psychological support but also serves as a source of strength in difficult situations.

Based on this background, this study aims to explore the extent to which religiosity levels play a role in enhancing the resilience of individuals who experience failure. By analyzing the relationship between religiosity levels and resilience, it is hoped that this study can provide insight into how religiosity can be used as a tool to enhance coping strategies. In addition, this study also aims to identify potential religiosity-based interventions that can be implemented by psychology practitioners. Understanding this relationship may also help design support programs that are more in line with people's religious values, especially in the context of mental health.

Materials and Methods

Participants

The participants in this study were one hundred adults aged 18 to 65 who had experienced failure in various aspects of life, such as academics, career, and interpersonal relationships. Participants were selected through a purposive sampling method, where inclusion criteria included individuals who were actively involved in a religious community and willing to participate in this study. This method was chosen to ensure that participants had a level of religiosity that could be measured by the instruments provided.

According to Campbell et al. (2020), purposive sampling is an effective research technique that requires participants with specific characteristics relevant to the research objectives. The selected participants are expected to provide representative data regarding the relationship between religiosity and resilience in the face of failure. In addition, this study considers demographic factors such as gender, education level, and cultural background to support a more comprehensive analysis.

All participants provided written consent to participate in this study after receiving information regarding the purpose and procedures of the study. The process was by the research ethics guidelines recommended by the American Psychological Association (APA, 2017) to ensure confidentiality and privacy of participants' data. This study also followed ethical principles that prioritize the welfare of participants and avoid potential risks that harm them.

Exclusion criteria included individuals with clinically confirmed diagnoses of psychiatric disorders or those undergoing intensive therapy for mental health issues. This was done to reduce bias due to psychological conditions affecting the results of measuring resilience and religiosity. Considering these criteria, this study is expected to produce valid and reliable findings.

Design

This study used a quantitative approach with a correlational design to explore the relationship between religiosity levels and resilience in individuals who experienced failure. The correlational design was chosen because it allows researchers to identify the statistical relationship between two variables without manipulating them (Pandey & Pandey, 2015). Through this approach, researchers can measure the extent to which religiosity variables contribute to resilience in dealing with stressful situations or failure.

This design is also cross-sectional, where data is collected at a single point in time to evaluate the relationship between variables (Wang & Cheng, 2020). Cross-sectional research effectively provides a quick overview of the relationship between religiosity and resilience without requiring long-term observation. In addition, the design is relevant for understanding dynamic psychological phenomena in diverse populations.

Using this design, researchers were able to analyze the linear correlation between scores on the Religious Commitment Inventory (RCI) and Brief Resilience Scale (BRS) to test the hypothesis that higher levels of religiosity are positively associated with better levels of resilience. The results of the correlation analysis are expected to provide empirical insights that can be used to design

religiosity-based interventions that support individuals' psychological resilience in situations of failure.

Instrument

This study used two main instruments to measure the variables of religiosity and resilience. The first instrument is the Religious Commitment Inventory (RCI-10) developed by (Zacchaeus, 2021). RCI-10 The items consist of ten designed to measure an individual's religious commitment, such as the dimensions of religious belief and practice in daily life. The instrument has high validity and reliability, with an internal reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha) of 0.92, indicating excellent internal consistency (Zacchaeus, 2021). Religious Commitment Inventory scores are calculated by summing responses on a 5-point Likert scale, where higher scores indicate stronger levels of religious commitment. The instrument has been widely used in cross-cultural research and has proven relevant in measuring religiosity in diverse social contexts, including the Indonesian population (Suryadi & Hayat, 2021).

The second instrument is the Brief Resilience Scale (BRS) developed by (Smith et al., 2008) to assess an individual's ability to recover from stress and pressure. The Brief Resilience Scale consists of six items measured using a 5-point Likert scale, with higher scores indicating better levels of resilience. (Smith et al., 2008) reported that the Brief Resilience Scale has strong validity and internal reliability, with Cronbach's alpha values ranging from 0.80 to 0.91, making it a reliable measurement tool in assessing psychological resilience. The Brief Resilience Scale has been widely used in international research and is considered effective for measuring individual resilience across difficult situations, including failure (Fung, 2020).

Both instruments were chosen for their simplicity, reliability, and ability to measure psychological aspects relevant to the research objectives. Prior to collecting data, the instruments were translated and tested for validity and reliability in the Indonesian cultural context by the measuring instrument adaptation procedure. Combining these two instruments is expected to provide accurate and comprehensive data on the relationship between religiosity and participant resilience.

Procedure

This research procedure begins with the preparation process, which includes preparing research instruments and validity and reliability tests on a small sample to ensure the measuring instruments' accuracy (Sürücü & Maslakci, 2020). After the instruments were declared valid and reliable, the researcher continued recruiting participants through purposive sampling techniques, which focused on individuals aged 18 to 65 years who had experienced failure and were members of a religious community. Recruitment was done by distributing invitations to participate on social media, community groups, and personal networks, as recommended by (Darmawan et al., 2020) to increase the representation of relevant samples.

Data collection was conducted online using an online questionnaire platform (Google Form), which is effective in reaching participants more widely and efficiently, especially in situations that

limit face-to-face meetings (Moises Jr, 2020). Each participant received a link to the questionnaire that included an informed consent form to ensure research ethics and the protection of their personal data by the guidelines of the American Psychological Association (APA, 2017, p. 20).

After agreeing to participate, participants were asked to complete demographic data and answer two research instruments, the Religious Commitment Inventory (RCI-10) and the Brief Resilience Scale (BRS), with an estimated completion time of approximately 10 to 15 minutes. The questionnaires were designed to provide anonymous responses to increase participants' comfort and honesty (Fink, 2024).

After the data were collected, the next stage was data cleaning and coding to ensure completeness and consistency of responses before being statistically analyzed using SPSS version 26 software. The analysis included descriptive tests, reliability tests, and Pearson correlation analysis to test the relationship between religiosity and resilience. The analysis results were then interpreted to answer the research hypothesis and provide practical recommendations based on the findings. With this procedure, the research is expected to provide results that are valid, reliable, and relevant to the research objectives that have been designed previously.

Results and Discussion

The validity test was carried out to ensure that the instruments used in this study measured the intended constructs, namely religiosity and resilience. Validity is important in research because the results obtained from valid instruments will reflect accurate reality. This study conducted the validity test on the data initially collected from participants before the main data collection stage. The validity test aims to evaluate the extent to which each item in the Religious Commitment Inventory (RCI-10) and Brief Resilience Scale (BRS) represents the measured theoretical concept. The approach used was construct validity, which was tested through Pearson correlation analysis to ensure that each item correlated well with the overall scale. This study can provide reliable and relevant results to answer the research objectives by ensuring the instrument's validity. The following are the results of the validity test.

Table 1. Results of the Religiosity Validity Test

No.	Correlation Coefficient	Significance	Description
1.	0,679	0,000	Valid
2.	0,694	0,000	Valid
3.	0,841	0,000	Valid
4.	0,727	0,000	Valid
5.	0,699	0,000	Valid
6.	0,645	0,000	Valid
7.	0,810	0,000	Valid
8.	0,804	0,000	Valid
9.	0,706	0,000	Valid
10.	0,794	0,000	Valid

Table 2. Resilience Validity Test Results

No.	Correlation Coefficient	Significance	Description
1.	0,701	0,000	Valid
2.	0,099	0,324	Invalid
3.	0,664	0,000	Valid
4.	0,713	0,000	Valid
5.	0,717	0,000	Valid
6.	0,130	0,196	Invalid

The test results for the validity of the Religious Commitment Inventory (RCI-10) and Brief Resilience Scale (BRS) instruments show that most of the items on both instruments have adequate validity. Based on Table 1, all items in the Religious Commitment Inventory show correlation coefficients ranging from 0.645 to 0.841 with a significance value 0.000, below the 0.05 limit. This indicates that all items in the religiosity instrument are valid and can measure the intended construct.

Meanwhile, in Table 2, the validity test results for the resilience instrument show that four of the six items have significant and valid correlation coefficients, with coefficient values ranging from 0.664 to 0.717 and a significance of 0.000. However, item 2 (correlation coefficient of 0.099; significance of 0.324) and item 6 (coefficient of 0 correlation .130; significance of 0.196) were declared invalid because their significance values exceeded 0.05. This indicates that the two items do not adequately represent the resilience construct measured in this study.

After ensuring the validity of the instrument, the next step is to conduct a reliability test to assess the internal consistency of the items contained in each instrument, namely the Religious Commitment Inventory (RCI-10) and the Brief Resilience Scale (BRS). Reliability is an important aspect that shows the extent to which the instrument produces consistent results when used in repeated measurements. This study measured reliability using Cronbach's alpha, which is generally considered adequate if the value obtained is more than 0.60. The reliability test was conducted to ensure that both instruments have a good level of consistency in measuring the constructs of religiosity and resilience in the research sample so that the data generated can be trusted and used in further analysis. The following are the results of the reliability test.

Table 3. Test Result Reliability

Variables	Cronbach's alpha coefficient	Description
Religiosity	0,905	Reliable
Resilience	0,866	Reliable

The reliability test results show that both instruments used in this study have excellent internal consistency. Based on Table 3, the instrument Religious Commitment Inventory (RCI-10) has a coefficient Cronbach's alpha of 0.905, indicating a very high-reliability level. This indicates that the items in the religiosity instrument consistently measure the intended construct. Meanwhile, the instrument Brief Resilience Scale (BRS) shows a coefficient Cronbach's alpha of 0.866, also

above the 0.60 threshold. Thus, the instrument is declared reliable and can measure the resilience construct consistently. This finding ensures that both instruments can be used for data collection in the study with high confidence.

Respondent Profile

Table 4. Respondent Profile

Category	Frequency	Percentage
Age		
12-18 years	2	2%
19-40 years old	45	45,5%
41-60 years old	44	44,4%
61 years and above	8	8,1%
Gender		
Male	46	45,5%
Female	55	54,5%
Religion		
Agnostic	1	1%
Buddha	2	2%
Hindu	2	2%
Islam	19	18,8%
Catholic	15	14,9%
Trust	1	1%
Protestant Christianity	61	60,4%
Jobs		
State Civil Apparatus	9	8,9%
Housewife	15	14,9%
Private employee	25	24,8%
Student	4	4%
Religious minister	8	7,9%
Self-employed	13	12,9%
Retired	2	2%
Lecturer	1	1%
Teacher	2	2%
Designer	1	1%
Researcher	1	1%
Students	1	1%
More	18	17,8%

Table 4 provides an overview of the characteristics of respondents based on age, gender, religion, and occupation. In terms of age, most respondents were in the 19-40 age range (45.5%), followed by the 41-60 age group (44.4%). The 12-18 years old and 61 years old and above age groups had smaller numbers of respondents, at 2% and 8.1%, respectively. Regarding gender, the

distribution of respondents was quite balanced, with slightly more female respondents (54.5%) than male (45.5%).

By religion, the majority of respondents were Protestant Christians (60.4%), followed by Islam (18.8%) and Catholicism (14.9%). Other religions, such as Buddhism and Hinduism, account for 2% of respondents each, while respondents who identify as agnostic or adherents of other faiths account for only 1% each.

In the occupational category, the largest number of respondents were private employees (24.8%), followed by housewives (14.9%) and self-employed (12.9%). The religious service group is also significant, reaching 7.9% of the respondents. Other professions, such as state civil apparatus (ASN), students, and retirees, account for smaller numbers, each below 10%. Some specific professions, such as lecturers, designers, researchers, and students, have minimal respondents (1%). A total of 17.8% of respondents filled in the job category classified as other.

Descriptive Analysis

This descriptive data also helps provide context for the results of statistical tests carried out at a later stage. The following are the results of the descriptive analysis.

Table 5. Descriptive Analysis

Variables	Average	Standard Deviation	Minimum Score	Maximum Score
Religiosity	38,99	6,64	22	50
Resilience	19,45	2,12	15	27

Table 5 shows the results of descriptive analysis for religiosity and resilience variables. For the religiosity variable, the average score obtained by respondents was 38.99, with a standard deviation of 6.64. The religiosity scores ranged from 22 to 50, indicating a fairly wide variation in the level of religious commitment among respondents. Meanwhile, for the resilience variable, the average score obtained was 19.45, with a standard deviation of 2.12. The respondents' resilience scores varied between 15 and 27, indicating that most respondents had relatively good levels of resilience, although there were clear differences between individuals. The results of this descriptive analysis provide an overview of the distribution of data on the two variables studied, which can later be used to analyze the relationship between religiosity and resilience further.

Normality Test

By knowing whether the data follows a normal distribution, researchers can determine whether parametric or non-parametric tests are more appropriate to test the hypothesis in this study. The following are the results of the normality test.

Table 6. Test Results Normality

Variables	Significance	Description
Religiosity	0,064	Normal

Resilience	0,006	Not Normal

Table 6 shows the normality test results for the religiosity and resilience variables. The significance value of 0.064 is greater than 0.05 for the religiosity variable, which indicates that the religiosity data follows a normal distribution. Conversely, for the resilience variable, the significance value of 0.006 is smaller than 0.05, which indicates that the resilience data does not follow a normal distribution.

Linearity Test

By knowing the presence or absence of linearity, researchers can decide the appropriate statistical method to test the relationship between variables in this study. The following are the results of the linearity test.

Table 7. Test Results Linearity

Variables		F	Significance	Description
Religiosity - Resilience	Linearity	20,111	0,000	Linear
	Deviation from Linearity	0,857	0,659	Linear

Table 7 shows the results of the linearity test between the religiosity and resilience variables. The linearity test results show an F value of 20.111 with a significance of 0.000, which means there is a significant linear relationship between religiosity and resilience. Meanwhile, the test results deviation from linearity shows an F value of 0.857 with a significance of 0.659, which is greater than 0.05, indicating no significant deviation from linearity. Thus, it can be concluded that the relationship between religiosity and resilience is linear, and the assumption of linearity is acceptable for further analysis.

Simple Linear Regression Test

By using the simple linear regression test, researchers can gain a clearer understanding of the causal relationship between the two variables and test the hypotheses proposed in this study. The following are the results of the simple linear regression test.

Table 8 Simple Linear Regression Test Results

Variables	Regression Coefficient	t	Significance	Description
Constant	14,244			
Religiosity	0,133	4,568	0,000	Significant effect

The results of the simple linear regression test show that religiosity has a significant influence on resilience. Based on the table, the regression coefficient for the religiosity variable is 0.133, with a calculated t-value of 4.568 and a significance level of 0.000 ($p < 0.05$). This shows that every one-unit increase in the level of religiosity is expected to increase the resilience score by 0.133 with a significant effect. In other words, the higher the level of religiosity of individuals, the higher their resilience level. This finding supports the proposed hypothesis that religiosity

contributes positively to increasing resilience, particularly in the face of failure.

F test

The F test is used to determine whether the independent variable, in this case, religiosity, significantly contributes to explaining variations in the dependent variable, namely resilience. In other words, the F test will provide an overview of whether the built regression model has enough ability to explain the relationship between religiosity and resilience. The following are the results of the F test, which can provide further insight into the effectiveness of this model.

Table 9. F Test Results

Variables	F	Significance	Description
Religiosity - Resilience	20,866	0,000	Significant effect

F-test results show that the regression model built to analyze the effect of religiosity on resilience is significant. With an F value of 20,866 and a significance of 0.000 (p < 0.05), it can be concluded that the independent variable, religiosity, has a statistically significant effect on the dependent variable, resilience. This means that the regression model used can explain the relationship between the two variables. Thus, religiosity has been proven to make a significant contribution to influencing the level of individual resilience.

Determination Coefficient Test

The test is important to provide an overview of the strength of the relationship between the two variables and to evaluate the effectiveness of the regression model used in this study. The following are the results of the coefficient of determination test.

Table 10. Determination Coefficient Test Results

Variables	R-Square Coefficient
Religiosity - Resilience	0,174

The coefficient of determination test results show that the value R-Square is 0.174. This means that the religiosity variable is able to explain 17.4% of the variation that occurs in the resilience variable. In other words, about 17.4% of changes in the level of resilience in individuals can be influenced by their level of religiosity. Meanwhile, the remaining 82.6% is explained by other variables that are not included in this research model. These results indicate that although religiosity has a significant influence on resilience, there are other factors outside of religiosity that also contribute to individual resilience.

Discussion

The results of this study indicate that religiosity has a significant influence on resilience, as evidenced by a simple linear regression test with a regression coefficient value of 0.133 and a significance level of 0.000. This finding is consistent with previous research which shows that religiosity plays an important role in building individual resilience when facing life pressures or

challenges (Ab Rahman et al., 2020). Religiosity provides a moral, spiritual, and emotional foundation that helps individuals understand the meaning of the difficult situations they face, thus increasing their ability to rise above adversity.

The significant F test results (F = 20.866; p < 0.05) also indicate that the regression model used as a whole can explain the relationship between religiosity and resilience. In addition, the coefficient of determination (R^2) of 0.174 indicates that religiosity explains 17.4% of the variability in resilience. Although this contribution is quite meaningful, there are indications that other factors such as social support, past experiences, and personality traits also play a role in building resilience (Permatasari et al., 2021).

One of the main explanations why religiosity affects resilience is that religion often provides individuals with strategies more adaptive. According to theory coping (Pargament & Exline, 2021) religious, religious practices such as prayer, worship, and reading scripture can be a source of inner calm, reduce stress, and help individuals view their problems with a broader perspective. These practices are also often associated with increased feelings of meaning in life, which is an important component of resilience coping (Ostafin & Proulx, 2020).

In addition, religious communities can provide significant social support, which is empirically known to be one of the main factors in building resilience (Revens et al., 2021). By feeling part of a caring community, individuals tend to have a sense of security and support that allows them to face challenges with more confidence. Religiosity can also help individuals manage negative emotions such as guilt or despair by giving them a sense of hope and trust in a greater divine power or destiny.

However, the results of this study also show that most of the variance in resilience is explained by other factors outside of religiosity. This is in line with research which states that resilience is the result of complex interactions between various factors, such as biological, psychological, social, and environmental factors (Boyce et al., 2021). For example, individuals with optimistic personality traits or who have experience facing previous challenges tend to be more resilient (Baker et al., 2021).

Practically, these findings underscore the importance of strengthening aspects of religiosity in psychological interventions to enhance resilience, particularly in individuals facing severe stress or trauma. Counselors and psychologists can utilize clients' religious beliefs as a valuable resource in their recovery process. However, it is important to keep in mind that such approaches should be personalized and sensitive to individual beliefs, given the diversity of religions and spiritualities in society.

In conclusion, this study provides empirical evidence that religiosity significantly influences resilience, although its contribution is not entirely dominant. Therefore, further research that considers other variables, such as social support and environmental conditions, is needed to understand more complex factors in building individual resilience.

Conclusion

This study shows that religiosity significantly affects resilience. Religious beliefs and practices help individuals face life's challenges by providing meaning, hope, and positive coping strategies. However, other factors, such as social support, personality, and life experiences, also contribute to resilience, so a holistic approach is needed.

In practical terms, religiosity can be considered in psychological programs to increase resilience, especially in individuals experiencing severe stress or trauma. Practitioners and counsellors can adapt their approach to the client's religious values. Religious communities also play an important role in providing social support.

Further research is recommended to explore other factors that influence resilience and its interaction with religiosity. Resilience-building programs should include religious, psychological, social, and emotional aspects and be supported by formal and informal education about the importance of resilience and the role of religiosity.

References

Ab Rahman, Z., Mohd Noor, A. Y., Kashim, M., Saari, C. Z., Hasan, A. Z., Pa'ad, N. S., Ridzuan, A. R., Md Sham, F., & Mohammed, A. F. (2020). Critical review of the relationship between resilience, self-esteem and religiosity among the tabligh during the fight of COVID-19. *Journal of Critical Review*, *7*(5), 1136–1144.

Baker, F. R. L., Baker, K. L., & Burrell, J. (2021). Introducing the skills-based model of personal resilience: Drawing on content and process factors to build resilience in the workplace. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *94*(2), 458–481.

Bal, F., Çokluk, G. F., & Savaş, E. (2025). Investigation of the effectiveness of short-term grief-focused group intervention for 1st degree losses in earthquake. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*, 151852.

Boyce, W. T., Levitt, P., Martinez, F. D., McEwen, B. S., & Shonkoff, J. P. (2021). Genes, environments, and time: the biology of adversity and resilience. *Pediatrics*, *147*(2).

Bukhori, B., Ma'arif, S., Siaputra, I. B., & Afghani, A. A. A. (2022). A Study on muslim university students in Indonesia: The mediating role of resilience in the effects of religiousity, social support, self-efficacy on subjective well-being. *Islamic Guidance and Counseling Journal*, *5*(2), 152–171.

Campbell, S., Greenwood, M., Prior, S., Shearer, T., Walkem, K., Young, S., Bywaters, D., & Walker, K. (2020). Purposive sampling: complex or simple? Research case examples. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, *25*(8), 652–661.

Darmawan, I., Bakker, C., Brockman, T. A., Patten, C. A., & Eder, M. (2020). The role of social media in enhancing clinical trial recruitment: scoping review. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, *22*(10), e22810.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The" what" and" why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, *11*(4), 227–268.

Fink, A. (2024). *How to conduct surveys: A step-by-step guide*. SAGE publications.

Fung, S. (2020). Validity of the brief resilience scale and brief resilient coping scale in a Chinese sample. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *17*(4), 1265.

Johnson, A. L. (2021). Changes in mental health and treatment, 1997–2017. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, *62*(1), 53–68.

Koenig, H. G., Al-Zaben, F., & VanderWeele, T. J. (2020). Religion and psychiatry: Recent developments in research. *BJPsych Advances*, *26*(5), 262–272.

Kurniawan, D., Fitriawan, A. S., Setyaningsih, W. A. W., Wulandari, A. N., Wijoyo, E. B., Samutri, E., Suparmanto, G., Achmad, B. F., Retnaningsih, L. N., & Sudiarti, P. E. (2024). Association Between Sources of Social Support and Depression Among Nursing Students During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Nurse Media Journal of Nursing*, *14*(2), 160–174.

Moises Jr, C. (2020). Online data collection as adaptation in conducting quantitative and qualitative research during the COVID-19 pandemic. *European Journal of Education Studies*, *7*(11).

Ostafin, B. D., & Proulx, T. (2020). Meaning in life and resilience to stressors. *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping*, *33*(6), 603–622.

Pandey, P., & Pandey, M. M. (2015). *Research methodology: Tools and techniques*.

Pargament, K. I., & Exline, J. J. (2021). Religious and spiritual struggles and mental health: Implications for clinical practice. *Spirituality and Mental Health across Cultures*, 395–412.

Permatasari, N., Ashari, F. R., & Ismail, N. (2021). Contribution of perceived social support (peer, family, and teacher) to academic resilience during COVID-19. *Golden Ratio of Social Science and Education*, *1*(1), 1–12.

Revens, K. E., Gutierrez, D., Paul, R., Reynolds, A. D., Price, R., & DeHaven, M. J. (2021). Social support and religiosity as contributing factors to resilience and mental wellbeing in Latino immigrants: A community-based participatory research study. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*, *23*(5), 904–916.

Smith, B. W., Dalen, J., Wiggins, K., Tooley, E., Christopher, P., & Bernard, J. (2008). The brief resilience scale: assessing the ability to bounce back. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, *15*, 194–200.

Sürücü, L., & Maslakci, A. (2020). Validity and reliability in quantitative research. *Business & Management Studies: An International Journal*, *8*(3), 2694–2726. https://doi.org/10.15295/bmij.v8i3.1540

Suryadi, B., & Hayat, B. (2021). *Religiusitas Konsep, Pengukuran, dan Implementasi di Indonesia*. Bibliosmia Karya Indonesia.

Umam, R. N. (2021). Aspek religiusitas dalam pengembangan resiliensi diri di masa pandemi covid-19. *SANGKéP: Jurnal Kajian Sosial Keagamaan*, *4*(2), 148–164.

Wang, J. C., McFarland, W., Arayasirikul, S., & Wilson, E. C. (2023). The association between religiosity and resilience among young trans women. *PLoS One*, *18*(7), e0263492.

Wang, X., & Cheng, Z. (2020). Cross-sectional studies: strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations. *Chest*, *158*(1), S65–S71.

Zacchaeus, E. A. (2021). Examining The Role Of Religious Commitment And Resilience As Predictors Of Posttraumatic Growth In A Nigerian Sample Of Trauma Survivors. *International Journal of Education and Psychology in the Community*, *11*(1/2), 25–46.