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Hendra Cipta*

*IAIN Syaikh Abdurrahman Siddik Bangka Belitung, Indonesia

Abstract: This article intends to find an answer to the high level of community participation in Tuatunu Urban Village in the City of Pangkalpinang, Bangka Belitung Islands Province in the sacrificial worship (qurban) motivation during the Eid al-Adha feast day. Tuatunu Urban Village only has a population of approximately 9,000 inhabitants and the average livelihood of its inhabitants is as pepper, rubber, and pineapple farmer. But in Eid al-Adha 2019, the level of participation of the people who follow the sacrificial worship from the five mosques in this area is highest when compared to the seven sub-districts in the Municipality of Pangkalpinang. Tuatunu Urban Village sacrifices approximately 32 cows at Eid al-Adha 2019, where seven people bear one cow. This urban village celebrates Eid al-Adha like Eid al-Fitr where residents visit each other's neighbors. This article is the result of quantitative research with the dependent variable is a sacrificial worship motivation and the independent variables are religiosity, generosity, avoid harm, and social status. This study found that the variables that influence the motivation to sacrificial worship the people of Tuatunu Urban Village are the factors of religiosity, social status, and avoid harm while the elements of generosity do not significantly influence the motivation to sacrifice.
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Introduction

Eid al-Adha, which is a Muslim holiday, is marked by the slaughter of sacrificial animals as part of the worship that is carried out on Eid al-Adha (Khaeriyah, 2016). In the time of the Prophet Muhammad, the Eid al-Adha feast was more celebrated than the Eid al-Fitr. It is not the same as today that Eid al-Fitr is more famous than Eid al-Adha (Mahfud, 2014). Takbir even celebrates the day of victory on the Eid al-Adha feast carried out more than one day (during the day of Tashriq), while on Eid al-Fitr the Takbir is only carried out for one day.

Sacrificial worship today is not only an embodiment of worship for Muslims, but sacrificial worship is now a symbol of the stability of one's social status in the central community in economic terms. It is not uncommon to classify those who can sacrifice themselves with cows or those who can sacrifice themselves with goats (Rohimi, 2018). Mahmudi and Rini (2015) revealed that sacrificial worship could be an embryo for the formation of social identity in the community, the different methods of socializing sacrificial worship conducted by the sacrificial worship committee towards people with upper social strata and lower social levels as proof of this statement. Sacrificial socialization methods that distinguish this class according to researchers can be the embryo of social status identity formation in society.

Putri (2015) found a significant influence between sacrificial worship education on the level of religiosity of Agus Salim Middle School Semarang students. The substantial effect observed in this study was quite high at 89% (coefficient of determination). T-test results of this study with a significance value of 5% (95% confidence level) also found a significant favorable influence between the variables of sacrificial worship education and the level of religiosity of Agus Salim Middle School Semarang students.
Ansari (2016) revealed that religious routines carried out at SDIT Ukhuvah Banjarmasin students were able to foster student religiosity in the school. Spiritual methods are practiced in this brotherhood. SDIT students are divided into a term of days, weeks, months, and years. The distribution of qurban meat practiced by school students in the annual religious routine. This study also found that the role of students in distributing sacrificial lamb not only fostered student religiosity but also fostered a caring attitude towards others. Arbi (2018) expressed the same opinion that the qurban animal payment program was able to improve the teachers' social piety competence in teaching. This research revealed that community-based learning education could improve the quality of Islamic religious education in schools.

Khan et al. (2015) in a study conducted in Pakistan with 156 respondents from the students stated that religiosity played an essential role in the implementation of sacrificial worship according to the respondents. Consideration of obedience to religious orders is the dominant factor that makes people want to sacrifice based on this research.

Sacrificial worship by setting aside possessions through almsgiving in the form of sacrificial animals is an embodiment of philanthropy which theoretically is giving in the way of alms without expecting rewards, serving with no strings attached, and making associations with no strings attached because they want to help others in need. The term philanthropic in English is equal to charity. The implementation of philanthropy in Islam is on zakat, infiq, alms, and endowments (Amar, 2017). Sacrifice is included in the category of almsgiving by those who sacrifice because by sacrificing, he gives away their property without self-interest. Benayad (2018) added that animal sacrifice worship in Islam is a form of gratitude and obedience to Allah's commands as exemplified by Prophet Ibrahim and animal sacrifice is also one of the kinds of charity practiced by Muslims for offering animal sacrifice meat to the poor. Khan and Mohyuddin (2013) said that qurban is an expression of gratitude and a form of individual piety.

Sacrificial worship made on Eid al-Adha is the most preferred one of the primary worship in Zulhijjah and perform sacrifices in prayer is based on the hadith Hakim, Ibn Majah, and Tirmizi will bring happiness and joy. While in the hadith reported by Ahmad and Ibn Majah also said that each strand of fur from animals that were sacrificed would be suitable for people who sacrifice an animal in the month of Zulhijjah (Jayusman, 2012). Based on these two traditions there is wisdom that people who perform animal sacrifice worship will get happiness and happy people usually are people avoiding harm and danger.

Kartini in her research revealed that there was an opinion of the people that if they did not sacrifice, they would be harmed so that among the people, the purpose of the sacrifice was to prevent themselves from being damaged (Kartini, 2015). Nwauce (2017) in her research in Tanzania, Mali, Senegal, and South Africa stated that more than half of the population surveyed believed that sacrifices made to their ancestors would protect themselves from all danger and harm.

The implementation of sacrificial worship on Eid al-Adha is not only an impact on the observance of religious orders and social relations. It turns out that the application of animal sacrifice worship also influences the economic growth of rural communities and maintains a steady increase in the number of livestock in rural areas (Hussain & Khan, 2009). The spirit of sacrifice is the same as zakat, donations, and alms namely in order to realize equitable economic welfare and minimize social inequality between rich and poor. Apart from that, from a socio-cultural perspective, sacrificial worship is not only a form of worship but also a symbol of an anti-wasteful and consumptive lifestyle (Marliina et al., 2019).

Tuatunu Urban Village is located in the Municipality of Pangkalpinang, Bangka Belitung Islands Province. In this village, in 2019, community participation in the sacrifice is exceptionally high, because in the village, the majority of farmers can sacrifice up to 32 cows. Sacrificial worship conducted by the community is quite a concern because many cows are sacrificed even though economically the profession of the population is mostly pineapple, pepper, and rubber farmers. In Bangka Belitung, the pineapple production center is in this village, and the pineapple produced by this village is also sent to areas outside the Bangka Belitung Islands Province. It is the reason for this theme and location to be chosen as research objects.
Meaning of Sacrificial Worship (Qurban)

Qurban, which in Arabic means close (Sugandi, 2016) or almost, is rooted in the word qaruba-yaqrabu-qurban. In other Arabic versions, the word synonym of sacrificial worship is also said with udiyyah which means the slaughtering of sacrificial animals intending to get closer to the creator namely Allah Subhanahu Wa Ta’ala. This animal sacrifice worship can be done on the 10th-13th of the month of Zulhijjah (Hadi, 2018).

From the etymological version of sacrificial worship, it is the slaughtering of animal sacrifice which is carried out during Eid al-Adha. The use of the word Adha in Eid al-Adha according to Az-Zuhaili (1989) is related to the time of the slaughter of sacrificial animals which at dhuha (when the sun begins to move up from the starting point of its rise). Traditions that developed in the community animal sacrifice animals on the 10th of Zulhijjah at dhuha time after the Eid al-Adha prayer, and the following day on the 11th-13th of Zulhijjah. Muslim families on this Eid al-Adha feast slaughter animal sacrifice animals and share them with their closest relatives, friends from family, and to the poor (Akhtar & Varma, 2012).

Qurban was first practiced by the two sons of the Prophet Adam, Qabil and Habil when both of them "competed" to marry Iklima. Al-Qur’an in surah Al-Maidah verse 27 says:

Relate to them in truth O Prophet the story of Adam’s two sons—how each offered a sacrifice: Abel’s offering was accepted while Cain’s was not. So Cain threatened, “I will kill you!” His brother replied, “Allah only accepts the offering of the sincerely devout.”

Al-Kasysyaf’s interpretation state that Habil and Qabil are both sons of the Prophet Adam. God conveyed his revelations to the Prophet Adam to marry his two sons. Candidates for Qabil and Habil are beautiful women named Iklima. But to be able to propose Iklima, Qabil and Habil must compete by offering an animal sacrifice. The winner of this competition is when Allah accepts the sacrifice. The winner of the match was Habil, and the sacrifice offered by Habil was approved, making Qabil unacceptable with the results of this competition which made him even more spiteful and angry, which eventually killed Habil.

In its history, the animal sacrifice worship between Qabil and Habil is a competition to woo Iklima, the future wife. But, the essence of animal sacrifice itself according to Az-Zamakhshyari (2006) in Tafsir al-Kasysyaf is worship whose purpose is to get closer to Allah. The shape of prayer is a charity to the poor and needy who need to consume the meat.

Al-Qur’an in Surah Ash-Shaffat verses 102-107 say the story of sacrifice:

Then when the boy reached the age to work with him, Abraham said, “O my dear son! I have seen in a dream that I must sacrifice you. So tell me what you think.” He replied, “O my dear father! Do as you are commanded. Allah willing, you will find me steadfast.” Then when they submitted to Allah’s Will, and Abraham laid him on the side of his forehead for sacrifice, We called out to him, “O Abraham! You have already fulfilled the vision.” Indeed, this is how We reward the good-doers. That was truly a revealing test. And We ransomed his son with a great sacrifice.

In this verse, the Prophet Abraham dreamed of slaughtering his son Ismail, from the dream he obtained, Prophet Ibrahim realized there was an order to sacrifice by killing his son. Finally, the vision was conveyed to his son Ismail. Because his son Ismail was a child who obeyed Allah’s command, so Ismail agreed to the commandments of God delivered through the dream of his father, Ibrahim (Shihab, 2012).

When the slaughter procession where Ismail is already lying on the ground, Allah in his majesty replaced Ismail with a healthy and well-built sheep. With the greatness and power of Allah, the Prophet Ismail was saved and replaced by a sheep (Ash-Shiddieqy, 2000). Based on the story of “slaughtering,” this is interpreted as an obligation to perform animal sacrifice worship on every Eid al-Adha for Muslims who can sacrifice.

Research Methodology

This research is quantitative. Quantitative research methods are research with the stages of formulating research problems, conducting research model preparation, finding research data, obtaining solutions, testing solutions, analyzing research results, and applying research results (Kuncoro, 2011). The
quantitative analysis used in this study is multiple regression analysis with four independent variables and one dependent variable.

In quantitative research, populations and samples to be used must be measured. Community is the whole element of the object being targeted in a study can be people, objects, transactions, symptoms, values, events, and so on (Machfudz, 2014). The population is the subject of research on a large scale total. While the research sample is a small-scale research subject that is part of the study population (Riduwan, 2012). The community in this study were participants who contributed to the animal sacrifice in Tuatunu Urban Village, Pangkalpinang, Bangka Belitung Islands Province. If seen by the number of cows that sacrificed five existing mosques in the village numbering 32 cows and one cow repaid by seven people, then the population who participated in animal sacrifice cow around 224 people. By using the Slovin formula through the significance of 5%, the sample obtained for this study was 143 people. Here is the calculation using the Slovin formula:

\[
n = \frac{N}{Nd^2 + 1}
\]

The formula's description is:

\[
\begin{align*}
n & : \text{Samples to be used} \\
N & : \text{Total population} \\
d^2 & : \text{Precision (in this study using 5%) (Riduwan and Akdon, 2013).}
\end{align*}
\]

The calculation:

\[
n = \frac{224}{224 + 0.05^2 + 1} = 143.5
\]

The sample selection of this study uses a purposive random sampling method which is a method of determining samples based on the competencies of the example by the research theme (Martono, 2012). So, this purposive random sampling method is a method of random sampling, but still considers the competence of samples taken per the topic of this study, or terms of Arikunto (1998) also said by determining the sample based on the specific purpose of an investigation.

The variables of this study divide into the dependent variable, the motivation of the sacrifice, and the independent variable, namely religiosity (x1), social status (x2), generosity (x3), and avoiding harm (x4). The formula of these five regression models variables are:

\[
Y = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \varepsilon
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
Y & : \text{Motivation to sacrifice} \\
\alpha & : \text{Constant} \\
\beta_1 - \beta_4 & : \text{Coefficient} \\
X_1 & : \text{Religiosity} \\
X_2 & : \text{Social Status} \\
X_3 & : \text{Generosity} \\
X_4 & : \text{Avoiding Harm}
\end{align*}
\]

The data used in this study are primary data obtained through research questionnaires that were answered by respondents who participated in the sacrifice of cattle in Tuatunu Urban Village, Pangkalpinang Municipality, amounting to 143 people. The data collection method used in this study was a questionnaire with a Likert scale where there are 26 statements of five variables tested in this study.

The primary data of this study were obtained from questionnaire answers distributed to respondents which were used as research data before this data was used in regression testing and hypothesis testing, then the information is first tested for validity and reliability. The data used is said to be valid if it can measure what should be measured in a study. If it turns out the data used is not able to measure what should be measured in a survey, then the data is certainly not useful. Kuncoro (2009) quoted Sekaran (2003) as saying that validity is divided into three types, namely content legality, criteria validity, and construct validity.
The regression model used in this research is multiple regression with processing applications Eviews version 9. After tested the validity and reliability of the data obtained through the questionnaire, then performed classical assumption with normality test, multicollinearity, autocorrelation, and heteroscedasticity test. Later in the final step, the research data was tested with a hypothesis test consisting of the T-test, the F-test, and the coefficient of determination test (R²).

Get to Know Tuatunu Urban Village

Tuatunu Urban Village, which is the location of this research object is located in Gerunggang District, Pangkalpinang Municipality, which is the capital of the Bangka Belitung Islands Province. Pangkalpinang Municipality consists of seven districts with Rangkui and Bukit Intan Districts as the most populous districts. While Gerunggang District is the third most populous population in the Municipality of Pangkalpinang (BPS Municipality of Pangkalpinang, 2019). In detail about the people in the Municipality of Pangkalpinang can be seen in Figure 1.

District of Gerunggang where Tuatunu Urban Village is part of this district is a religious area. It is marked with the number of pilgrims of this district, even it is also a contributor to the highest number
of pilgrims for Municipality Pangkalpinang (BPS Municipality of Pangkalpinang, 2019) as shown in Figure 2. The detail of the population per village in the Gerunggang District is shown in Figure 3.

Bukit Merapin Urban Village with a population of 9,524 people as the capital of Gerunggang District occupies the first area of the most populous region in Gerunggang District in 2017 while Tuatunu Urban Village with a population of 9,375 inhabitants ranks second as the most populous area (BPS Municipality of Pangkalpinang, 2018). Based on data obtained from the Tuatunu Urban Village Office, the people of Muslims is 99% (Kelurahan Tuatunu Indah, 2019). From the data collected from the Tuatunu Urban Village Office, information was obtained that the majority of Muslims who participated in animal sacrifice worship came from Tuatunu Urban Village.

**Research Result**

The instrument used to collect data in this study was a questionnaire. The research questionnaire was filled by 143 samples, with ages ranging from 11-80 years. For more details, the age group division that fills this questionnaire can be seen in Figure 4.

![Figure 4. Ages of Questionnaire Filled by Respondents](source)

The age group that most filled out the questionnaire in this study was the age range 21-30 years with a total of 42 people, while the age group that filled out the least questionnaire was the age range 71-80 years with the number 2 people. From the age division, it is seen that the population who most participated in the animal sacrifice at the Eid al-Adha in Tuatunu Urban Village was residents in the age range of 21-30 years. Meanwhile, if viewed based on gender differences, the following data is shown in Figure 5.

![Figure 5. Distribution of Respondents by Gender](source)

Based on gender, the respondents who mostly filled out this questionnaire were women by 53%, while the remaining 47% were from men. Whereas based on the profession of the inhabitants of Tuatunu Urban Village who participated in animal sacrifice can be seen in Figure 6.
The professions and groups that filled the questionnaire the most were housewives with a total of 58 people. Based on the occupations that fill in the survey, it can also be analogous that the jobs and groups that mostly attend the sacrificial worship are housewives and farmers. The job of a farmer in Tuatunu Urban Village is indeed one of the principal occupations in the community, the crops produced by the people of Tuatunu Urban Village are pineapple, rubber, and pepper.

There are 26 items of statements prepared in this study questionnaire. The total of 26 comments was divided into five research variables, namely four independent variables and one dependent variable. Details of the 26 statements in this research questionnaire are divided into 6 comments for the animal sacrifice motivation variable (Y), 6 comments for the religiosity variable (X1), 4 comments for the social status variable (X2), 6 comments for the generosity variable (X3), and 4 comments for the avoidance of harm variables (X4).

Table 1. Questionnaire Validity Test

| No | Item Questions | R-Calculate | R-Table | Decision |
|----|----------------|-------------|---------|----------|
| 1  | Q1             | 0.082       | 0.1631  | Invalid  |
| 2  | Q2             | 0.204       | 0.1631  | Valid    |
| 3  | Q3             | 0.383       | 0.1631  | Valid    |
| 4  | Q4             | 0.346       | 0.1631  | Valid    |
| 5  | Q5             | 0.190       | 0.1631  | Valid    |
| 6  | Q6             | -0.094      | 0.1631  | Invalid  |
| 7  | Q7             | -0.059      | 0.1631  | Invalid  |
| 8  | Q8             | 0.063       | 0.1631  | Invalid  |
| 9  | Q9             | 0.530       | 0.1631  | Valid    |
| 10 | Q10            | -0.036      | 0.1631  | Invalid  |
| 11 | Q11            | 0.354       | 0.1631  | Valid    |
| 12 | Q12            | 0.398       | 0.1631  | Valid    |
| 13 | Q13            | 0.310       | 0.1631  | Valid    |
| 14 | Q14            | 0.273       | 0.1631  | Valid    |
| 15 | Q15            | 0.315       | 0.1631  | Valid    |
| 16 | Q16            | 0.294       | 0.1631  | Valid    |
| 17 | Q17            | 0.317       | 0.1631  | Valid    |
| 18 | Q18            | 0.479       | 0.1631  | Valid    |
| 19 | Q19            | 0.330       | 0.1631  | Valid    |
| 20 | Q20            | 0.440       | 0.1631  | Valid    |
| 21 | Q21            | 0.513       | 0.1631  | Valid    |
| 22 | Q22            | 0.528       | 0.1631  | Valid    |
| 23 | Q23            | 0.654       | 0.1631  | Valid    |
| 24 | Q24            | 0.579       | 0.1631  | Valid    |
| 25 | Q25            | 0.607       | 0.1631  | Valid    |
| 26 | Q26            | 0.567       | 0.1631  | Valid    |

Source: Processed Research Data.
Before being used in data processing, a 26 point statement then tested for validity and reliability with the help of SPSS version 26. The purpose of conducting this validity and reliability test is to measure the validity and reliability of measurements made without errors, the questionnaire that has passed the validity and reliability test is stable and consistent in assessing a concept and theory and maintaining the quality of data correctness (Sekaran, 2003).

The validity test of this study used the Pearson Product Moment Correlation theory by comparing the values of r-arithmetic and r-tables. If the value of r-count > r-table then the data tested is considered valid (Priyatno, 2014). The r-table of this study was obtained from the r-table of Product Moment r-value with N = 143 and a significance level of 5%, so the r-table value was obtained for 0.1631. The results of the validity test of the data of this study are presented in Table 1.

After 26 statement items tested through the validity test, only 21 statement items were declared valid because the value of r-calculates > r-table. While five-item statements are not valid. That exists in point statement to 1, 6, 7, 8, and 10. From 5 items invalid statement is divided into two pieces on the statement of the variable Y and the third item on the statement religiosity variable (X1). Meanwhile, as many as 21 valid statement items were spread to the five variables tested in this study.

After conducting a validity test, the next step is to do a reliability test of 21 items of valid statements after the validity test. The reliability test results in this research data are presented in Table 2.

The data reliability test of this study used the method of seeing the value of Cronbach's Alpha by comparing the amount of Cronbach's Alpha with a value of 0.60. If the Cronbach's Alpha value > 0.60 then the data tested is declared reliable. The overall amount of Cronbach's Alpha data of this study is seen at 0.758 > 0.60, therefore, 21 items of the statement in this study are stated to be reliable (Priyatno, 2014). The result of the reliability test can be seen in Table 3. After looking at it as a whole, it turns out that the Cronbach's Alpha value per-item statement which amounts to 21 items is declared reliable all because of the Cronbach's Alpha value with a value of 0.7 > from 0.60.

After "filtering" the research questionnaire statement items through the validity and reliability test, the statement items that are already valid and reliable are tested using classic assumptions with normality test, multicollinearity test, autocorrelation test, and heteroscedasticity test. The first step carried out in this classic assumption test is the normality test with the Jarque-Bera test. The results of the normality test are shown in Figure 7.

| Table 2. Overall Reliability Test |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Cronbach's Alpha                 | N of Items |
| 0.758                            | 21         |

Source: Processed Research Data.

Data is said to be normally distributed if the Jarque-Bera probability value > 5%, the significance level is 5% (Winarno, 2011). The normality test results in Figure 7 show that the data are normal because the Jarque-Bera probability is 0.109210 > 0.05, then, the next classical assumption test stage (multicollinearity test, autocorrelation test, and heteroscedasticity test) can be performed.

The classic assumption test at the second stage in this study is the multicollinearity test. The test results are shown in Table 4. To determine whether multicollinearity occurs or not in this study, it can be seen from the centered VIF value, the provisions are if the centered VIF value < 10, then it was decided that there was no multicollinearity problem (Ghozali, 2011). Based on Table 4, it can be seen that the results of the multicollinearity test did not show any centered VIF value > 10, so it was decided that there was no multicollinearity problem. From the five variables tested in this study, the average VIF value is still in the number 1, because it is still far from 10, it can be concluded that this research data is still far from the possibility of multicollinearity problems.

The third stage of the classical assumption is to check the autocorrelation in the data by employing Lagrange Multiplier (LM) method. The Lagrange Multiplier (LM) method was chosen because with the Durbin Watson (DW) method there were weaknesses in terms of the DW value at the position which could not decide whether or not autocorrelation occurred. This method was introduced by Breusch-Godfrey, so there is also a method called the Lagrange Multiplier (LM) method with the Breusch-Godfrey test. The method used to determine whether autocorrelation occurs or is to look at the probability value Obs * R-squared, if the probability value Obs * R-squared > 0.05 then it is decided...
that there is no autocorrelation problem (Nachrowi & Usman, 2006). More details about the results of the autocorrelation test with the Breusch-Godfrey test method can be seen in Table 5.

Table 3. Per-Item Statement Reliability Tests

| Item Questions | Scale Mean if Item Deleted | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item-Total Correlation | Cronbach's Alpha if Deleted Item |
|----------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Q2             | 72.42                     | 33.471                         | -0.016                          | 0.764                           |
| Q3             | 72.98                     | 32.556                         | 0.146                           | 0.758                           |
| Q4             | 74.79                     | 29.195                         | 0.284                           | 0.756                           |
| Q5             | 73.17                     | 32.986                         | 0.065                           | 0.762                           |
| Q9             | 73.40                     | 30.171                         | 0.356                           | 0.745                           |
| Q11            | 73.19                     | 32.464                         | 0.174                           | 0.756                           |
| Q12            | 73.17                     | 32.014                         | 0.258                           | 0.752                           |
| Q13            | 73.24                     | 32.211                         | 0.201                           | 0.755                           |
| Q14            | 75.08                     | 30.275                         | 0.264                           | 0.754                           |
| Q15            | 74.90                     | 30.610                         | 0.241                           | 0.756                           |
| Q16            | 75.18                     | 29.812                         | 0.314                           | 0.749                           |
| Q17            | 73.13                     | 32.384                         | 0.184                           | 0.756                           |
| Q18            | 73.06                     | 31.056                         | 0.395                           | 0.745                           |
| Q19            | 73.09                     | 31.604                         | 0.318                           | 0.749                           |
| Q20            | 73.91                     | 26.182                         | 0.535                           | 0.727                           |
| Q21            | 73.11                     | 30.593                         | 0.440                           | 0.741                           |
| Q22            | 73.52                     | 27.533                         | 0.679                           | 0.718                           |
| Q23            | 73.64                     | 27.879                         | 0.631                           | 0.722                           |
| Q24            | 73.01                     | 30.937                         | 0.462                           | 0.742                           |
| Q25            | 73.01                     | 30.718                         | 0.397                           | 0.744                           |
| Q26            | 73.01                     | 30.718                         | 0.397                           | 0.744                           |

Source: Processed Research Data.

Figure 7. Normality Test

Table 4. Multicollinearity Test

| Variable   | Coefficient Variance | Uncentered VIF | Centered VIF |
|------------|----------------------|----------------|--------------|
| C          | 1.265752             | 187.7938       | NA           |
| Religion   | 0.006306             | 133.188        | 1.280549     |
| Social     | 0.001574             | 26.50814       | 1.083059     |
| Generosity | 0.002146             | 181.4635       | 1.614765     |
| Avoid Harm | 0.003575             | 131.8884       | 1.975165     |

Source: Processed Research Data.

Table 5. Autocorrelation Test

| Breusch-Godfrey Serial Correlation LM Test: |
|---------------------------------------------|
| F-statistics | 0.668826 | Prob. F (2,136) | 0.5140 |
| Obs * R-squared | 1.392803 | Prob. Chi-Square (2) | 0.4984 |

Source: Processed Research Data.
The function of this autocorrelation test is to find out whether there are links between residuals because the principle that must be obeyed in the autocorrelation test is that there should be no linkages between residuals or in other words the residuals must be independent (Rosadi, 2012). In Table 5, the Obs * R-squared probability value is 0.4984 > 0.05, so the data of this study is decided that there is no autocorrelation problem and it is decided that there is no association between residuals in this study.

The fourth test conducted at the classical assumption stage is the heteroscedasticity test. This test is performed to determine whether there is a constant variance in the residuals of this study. If there is a heteroscedasticity problem in a survey, the credibility of the results of the T-test and F-test can no longer be trusted (Kuncoro, 2011). The heteroscedasticity test results of this study are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Heteroscedasticity Test

| Heteroscedasticity Test: Glejser |   |   |
|----------------------------------|---|---|
| F-statistics                     | 1.779852 |   |
| Obs * R-squared                  | 7.015431 | 0.1363 |
| Scaled explained SS              | 6.017980 | 0.1978 |

Source: Processed Research Data.

This heteroscedasticity test uses the Glejser method, the determination of whether or not heteroscedasticity occurs in this method is if the probability of Obs * R-squared > 0.05, then it is concluded that there is no heteroscedasticity problem (Ajija et al., 2011). The results of the heteroscedasticity test by the Glejser method in this study show the probability value Obs * R-squared 0.1351 > 0.05 so that it was decided that there was no heteroscedasticity problem in this study.

The result of the estimation of the model used in this study is as follows.

\[
\text{Motivation} = 9.871396 + 0.181809 \text{Religiosity} + 0.088920 \text{Social Status} - 0.038788 \text{Generosity} + 0.220219 \text{Avoid Harm}
\]

The data have been confirmed that there is no problem in the classical assumption test through the normality test, multicollinearity test, autocorrelation test, and heteroscedasticity test. The next is to perform a hypothesis test consisting of the T-test, F-test, and the coefficient of determination test (R^2) that the complete results are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. T-Test, F-Test, and R^2 Test

| Dependent Variable: Motivation | Coefficient | Std. Error | T-Statistics | Probability |
|--------------------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| C                              | 9.871396    | 1.125056   | 8.774135     | 0.0000      |
| Religiosity                    | 0.181809    | 0.079408   | 2.289550     | 0.0236      |
| Social Status                  | 0.088920    | 0.039676   | 2.241123     | 0.0266      |
| Generosity                     | -0.038788   | 0.046320   | -0.837384    | 0.4038      |
| Avoid Harm                     | 0.220219    | 0.059791   | 3.683141     | 0.0003      |
| R-squared                      | 0.259851    |            |              |             |
| Adjusted R-squared             | 0.238398    |            |              |             |
| F-statistics                   | 12.11224    |            |              |             |
| Prob (F-statistic)             | 0.000000    |            |              |             |

Source: Processed Research Data.

From the results of the T-test (partial test) contained in Table 7, three independent variables have a significant effect on sacrificial worship motivation, namely religiosity, social status, and the avoidance of harm. T-test results of religiosity variable seen the probability value of 0.0236 < 0.05 and the calculated T value of 2.289550 > 1.97730 (T-table value), so it was decided that the variable of religiosity had a significant positive effect on the motivation to sacrifice. The purpose of positive significance is that when there is an increase in community religiosity, the motivation to sacrifice is also increasing.

The next variable that has a significant effect is the social status variable whose probability value is 0.0266 < 0.05 and the calculated T value is 2.241123 > 1.97730 (T table value), then it is decided that the social status variable has a significant positive effect on the motivation to sacrifice the
community. The positive meaning is that when the social status of the population increases, the motivation to sacrifice the people also grows.

The last variable that has a significant effect on people's motivation to sacrifice is the avoidance of harm. In the T-test results, the probability value is 0.0003 < 0.05 and the calculated T value is 3.683141 > 1.97730 (T table value), so it is concluded that the avoidance variable has a significant positive effect on people's motivation to sacrifice. Here we see a positive relationship between the two variables. The meaning is when there is an increase in the desire of the community to avoid harm, then the motivation to sacrifice also increases.

Among the four independent variables tested in this study, only one variable did not have a significant effect, namely the generosity variable. The results of the T-test shows the probability value of the generosity variable is 0.4038 > 0.05 and the calculated T value is -0.837384 < 1.97730 (T table value). Based on the probability value and the computed T value, the variable of generosity does not have a significant negative effect on the variables of sacrificial worship motivation. Because the relationship is negative, it can be expressed when the generosity of the community decreases, it is precisely the motivation to sacrifice the community. For more details, the conclusions of the regression test results in this study can be seen in Table 8.

Table 8. Summary of Regression Test Results

| Dependent Variable       | Independent Variable | Relationship | Significance |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Sacrificial Worship Motivation | Religiosity          | Positive     | Significant  |
|                          | Social status        | Positive     | Significant  |
|                          | Generosity           | Negative     | Insignificant|
|                          | Avoiding Harm        | Positive     | Significant  |

Source: Processed Research Data.

From the F test results in Table 7, it is known that the calculated F value of this study is 12.11224 which when compared to the F table with a significance of 5%, obtained an F table value of 2.44. After F arithmetic and F table are found, it is seen the amount of F arithmetic 12.11224 higher than the F table with a value of 2.44 so that it is decided all independent variables (religiosity, social status, generosity, and avoiding harm) simultaneously affect the dependent variable (animal sacrifice motivation). If seen from the probability value F of 0.000000 < 0.05, it can also be said simultaneously all independent variables affect the dependent variable.

The final test in this hypothesis testing stage is the coefficient of determination ($R^2$) test. The coefficient of determination in this study was obtained from the adjusted R-squared value whose value is 0.238398, as shown in Table 7. It means that the independent variable used in this study affects the dependent variable by 23%, while 77% remaining influenced by other variables.

Discussion

The results of the hypothesis test showed that the variable of religiosity had a significant positive effect on the motivation of the people in the community of Tuatunu Urban Village. The results of this study are following the results of research conducted by Putri (2015) which states that there is a significant positive relationship between sacrificial worship education and the level of religiosity. Similar results are also seen in research conducted by Ansari (2016) which states that the role of students in the distribution of animal sacrifice meat can foster religiosity and concern. Arbi (2018) in his research conclusion also revealed that the sacrificial worship program was able to increase the loyalty of teachers. The results of this study also agree with investigations conducted by Khan et al. (2015) who also stated that religious factors greatly influenced respondents’ decisions in Pakistan in performing animal sacrifice worship.

The second variable that has a significant positive effect on sacrificial worship motivation is the social status variable. The results of this study are the same as those of Mahmudi and Rini (2015) who argued that the practice of animal sacrifice worship conducted in society would shape one's identity and social status. The same thing was also expressed by Rohimi (2018) who found that animal sacrifice worship has now become a symbol for the establishment and social status in society. Social status is
based on a person's power and position in society and his dignity in economic status. Thus, the higher a person's social status in society, the more privileged his position in society will be (Kim et al., 2020). According to Aidenberger et al. (2020), people who have high social status are also connected with noble and trustworthy behavior because of their honesty.

The third variable, the variable of avoiding harm, also has a significant positive effect on motivation to sacrifice. The results of this study are the same as the results of a survey conducted by Kartini (2015) who found that the intention of some people who sacrifice is to avoid harm and danger. Then, the results of subsequent studies that are in line with the results of this study are the findings Nwauche (2017) who revealed that the tradition of sacrifice carried out by people in Tanzania, Mali, Senegal, and South Africa is because of the belief that sacrifice can protect themselves from harm.

There is one variable that does not significantly influence the motivation of the sacrificial worship, namely the generosity variable. The results of this study are different from the results of Mahfud (2014) which found that animal sacrifice worship can shape a person's personality to be more humanistic, tolerant, and generous because when someone sacrifice, he is giving alms to people who are less able to meet their daily needs to consume meat. The results of this study are also different from the research conducted by Benayad (2018) who declared animal sacrifice as one of the forms of one's charity and generosity.

Conclusion

This study found that the factors that influence the motivation of the sacrificial worship of community of Tuatunu Urban Village, Pangkalpinang Municipality, Bangka Belitung Islands Province are religiosity, social status, and the understanding of the sacrificial worship will avoid harm. It can be seen from the results of the T-test conducted in which these three variables have a significant positive effect on the motivation of the community sacrifice. Because of the positive relationship, then when there is an increase in religiosity, social status, and the desire to avoid harm, the motivation to sacrifice also increases. While the philanthropic variable does not have a significant influence on the motivation of the people who sacrifice.
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