A Many-Analysts Approach to the Relation Between Religiosity and Well-being: The Dataset

Suzanne Hoogeveen*[1], Alexandra Sarafoglou*[1], Michiel van Elk[2], and Eric-Jan Wagenmakers[1]

[1]Department of Psychology

University of Amsterdam

The Netherlands

[2]Institute of Psychology

Leiden University

The Netherlands

Abstract

In this document, we outline the dataset that was used in the Many-Analysts Religion Project (MARP). Specifically, we provide details on how participants were recruited and what materials were used. The dataset itself is openly available at osf.io/k9puq/. If you want to use the data, please cite this document.

The Dataset

The dataset provided to the analysts featured information of 10,535 participants from 24 countries collected in 2019. The data were collected as part of the cross-cultural religious replication project (see also Hoogeveen et al., 2021; Hoogeveen and van Elk, 2018).

---

*The first two authors contributed equally to this work.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to: Suzanne Hoogeveen, Nieuwe Achtergracht 129B, 1001 NK Amsterdam, The Netherlands, E-mail: suzanne.j.hoogeveen@gmail.com.

Suzanne Hoogeveen https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1304-8615

The dataset contained measures of religiosity, well-being, perceived cultural norms of religion, as well as some demographics. The full dataset, the data documentation file, and original questionnaire can be found on the OSF project page (osf.io/qbdce/).

Participants. Participants were recruited from university student samples, from personal networks, and from representative samples accessed by panel agencies and online platforms (MTurk, Kieskompas, Sojump, TurkPrime, Lancers, Qualtrics panels, Crowdpanel, and Prolific). Participants were compensated for participation by a financial remuneration, the possibility for a reward through a raffle, course credits, or no compensation. There were no a priori exclusion criteria; everyone over 18 years old could participate. Participants were forced to answer all multiple choice questions, hence there was no missing data (except for 36 people who did not provide a valid age). The countries were convenience-sampled (i.e., through personal networks), but were selected to cover all six continents and include different ethnic majorities and religious majorities (Christian, Muslim, Hindu, Jewish, Eastern religions, as well as highly secular societies).

Data collection for the cross-cultural study was approved by the local ethics committee at the Psychology Department of the University of Amsterdam (Project #2018-SP-9713). Additional approval was obtained from local IRBs at the Adolfo Ibáñez University (Chile), the Babes-Bolyai University (Romania), James Cook University (Singapore), Royal Holloway, University of London (UK), the University of Connecticut (US), and the Max Planck Society, as well as the Senate Department for Education, Youth and Family from the Ministry of Education in Berlin (Germany). All participants were treated in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

Measures. Personal religiosity was measured using standardized self-report items taken from the World Values Survey (WVS; World Values Survey, 2010), covering religious behaviors (institutionalized such as church attendance and private such as prayer/mediation), beliefs, identification, values, and denomination. The well-being measure consisted of 18 self-report items from the validated short version of Quality of Life scale as used by the World Health Organization (WHOQOL-BREF; WHOQOL Group, 1998).

Included items cover general health and well-being, as well as the domains physical health, psychological health and social relationships. Specific items evaluate the quality of life in general, and satisfaction of overall health (general), pain, energy, sleep, mobility, activities, dependence on medication, and work capability (physical domain), life enjoyment, concentration, self-esteem, body-image, negative feelings, and meaningfulness (psychological domain), and personal relationships, social support, and sexual satisfaction (social domain). Cultural norms of religiosity were measured with two items assessing participants' perception of the extent to which the average person in their country considers a religious lifestyle and belief in God/Gods/spirits important (Wan et al., 2007). Finally, demographics were measured at the individual level (age, gender, level of education, subjective socioeconomic status (SES), and ethnicity) and GDP per capita (current US$, World Bank Group, 2017), sample type (e.g., university students, online panels), and means of compensation (e.g., course credit, monetary reward) were determined at the country/sample level. Items were reverse-coded when applicable. Personal religiosity items were additionally rescaled to a 0-1 scale. GDP was provided as a raw value as well as standardized at the country level.

References

Hoogeveen, S., Haaf, J. M., Bulbulia, J. A., Ross, R. M., McKay, R., Altay, S., Bendixen, T., Berniūnas, R., Cheshin, A., Gentili, C., Georgescu, R., Gervais, W. M., Hagel, K., Kavanagh, C., Levy, N., Neely, A., Qiu, L., Rabelo, A., Ramsay, J. E., ... van Elk, M. (2021). The Einstein effect: Global evidence for scientific source credibility effects and the influence of religiosity. *PsyArXiv*. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/sf8ez

Hoogeveen, S., & van Elk, M. (2018). Advancing the Cognitive Science of Religion through Replication and Open Science. *Journal for the Cognitive Science of Religion*, *6*(1-2), 158–190. https://doi.org/10.1558/jcsr.39039

Wan, C., Chiu, C.-y., Tam, K.-P., Lee, S.-l., Lau, I. Y.-m., & Peng, S. (2007). Perceived cultural importance and actual self-importance of values in cultural identification.

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *92*(2), 337–354. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.92.2.337

WHOQOL Group. (1998). Development of the World Health Organization WHOQOL-BREF Quality of Life Assessment. *Psychological Medicine*, *28*(3), 551–558. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0033291798006667

World Bank Group. (2017). World Bank Group - International Development, Poverty, & Sustainability.

World Values Survey. (2010). Wave 6 Official Aggregate v. 20150418.