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The study aimed to analyze the religiosity among students of universities and the madrassas system. It also compares the religiosity of university and madrassa students. The researchers chose a mixed-method research design. The study sample selects through a multi-stage sampling technique. The study participants were 896, including 640 students (320 from universities and 320 from madrassas) and 256 teachers/heads of the departments/institutions. The study used two research instruments to collect data from respondents. To measure the level of student's religious belief (religiosity) self-developed questionnaire was employed. By semi-structured interview schedule, views of teachers and heads of institutions were composed. The data were analyzed using SPSS version 21, means level and Independent Samples T-Test (t-test). The study results show that both university and madrassa students maintain a high level of religiosity. Comparing students by institution displays that there were significant differences in religiosity between them. Madrassa students have a high level of religiosity, while university students are at a moderate level. The study suggests large-scale, in-depth research, including public and private universities and madrassas throughout Punjab.
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1. Introduction

Religion plays an important part in the life of people to shape their behaviour and attitudes (Zamani-Farahani and Musa, 2012; Ullah and Hameed, 2021). It is important that religion influence on moral and ethical values of people through the provision of Islamic principles and religious philosophies. Several times in the life of people they follow Islamic values and act on these principles of religion (Niazi, Ghani, & Aziz, 2019; Ullah and Hameed, 2021). Religion Islam has the most popular or second-largest religion in the modern world it has also fifty Muslim countries in the world. Moreover, sixty-two percent of the Muslim population lives in the Asia region, and people heart-to-heart follow the religion of Islam. Therefore, with more than two hundred million population of people, Pakistan stands as the third-largest Muslim country. The majority statistics of the Muslim population in Pakistan is
approximately 96% which is equal to eleven percent of the Muslim world (Niazi et al., 2019; Ullah and Hameed, 2021).

The concept of religiosity has long been known in the fields of education and philosophy. During recent years, a going interest has been witnessed in the concept of religiosity among the scholars and practitioners in the field of positive psychology (Berkowitz & Bier, 2004, Damon & Lerner, 2008, Lapsley & Narvaez, 2006, Peterson & Seligman, 2004, Shubert, 2018). Psychological research usually focuses on the behavior of individuals in pathological settings. However, the understanding of human interests evolved into positive psychology aimed at establishing superiority. Individual behavior has virtues that can help communities survive but can also enhance human power (Seligman, 2002; Ahmed, 2009). Students may be exposed to many factors that increase honesty and self-esteem under healthy conditions.

According to Karl Marx, religion can offer hope of supernatural intervention to solve problems on earth. Humans try to do anything significant to help improve their current conditions. The theory of Jung Carl, (2020) declares that religion is one of the many psychological attitudes people adopt towards life. He does not confine religiosity to any specific type, but he does place its value in how much a person is willing to place any specific thing as something they value. Alshehri and Fotaki, (2019) describe religiosity as a belief in Almighty Allah with commitment and following the principles of Allah. Pratono, (2019) suggests that the background of religiosity is to influence the behavior and attitudes of humans. Religiosity describes the practices of social and personal expressions of connections to the purity of the soul. According to Łowicki, and Zajenkowski, (2020) religiosity appears as the participation of people in social structure relates to religion and formal outward.

Religious organizations and grassroots communities often focus on the same goals and experiences to gain a stable sense of community (Erickson, 1965; Ahmed, 2009). The religious belief support role of trusted mentors, such as like-minded parents and friends, who can help cultivate positive values and beliefs as the basis for youth support (Busseri et al., 2006; Jessor et al., 1998; Ahmed, 2009). The establishment of interpersonal relationships between adults provides a framework in which young people can work and establish their status in society (Erikson, 1965, 1968; Ahmed, 2009). However, religious institutions help young people develop self-regulation skills. These institutions provide opportunities to simulate pro-social behavior in a structured environment. They also protect young people from anti-social behavior (Cook, 2000; Ahmed, 2009). Therefore, the religious environment encourages the development of young people's self-esteem and provides a set of beliefs (Cook, 2000).

2. Literature Review
The construct of religiosity is a difficult task to define (Farhan and Rofi, 2021). The notion of religiosity first comes from western traditions that reflect people's religious phenomena. The etymology of the word religiosity refers to “religious” and their roots connect with the Latin word religio. Religiosity in the conceptual point of view describes as spirituality, piety, and obedience. The aspect of religiosity devotes religious belief and religious activities in the frustrated world of people (Farhan and Rofi, 2021). The person's religiosity teaches the important values of religion and individuals to believe in the reality of ALLAH (SWT), (Olufadi, 2017; Farhan and Rofi, 2021).

The multidimensional aspect of religiosity gives the phenomena of self-satisfaction. Stark & Glock (1965); Farhan and Rofi, (2021) stated that religiosity in a person consists of five dimensions belief in ALLAH (SWT), prayer, the experience of good or bad, intellectual religious matters, and paying
respect to other peoples in accordance to religious education. Islam is the religion of peace and it has made in the prosperity of humans and other creatures. In Islam, there are three vital elements for every human being first, one is faith in ALLAH (SWT) as a means to act prayer, second is the imam which guides the people the system of knowledge and provides understanding to belief in ALLAH (SWT). At last the third is Ehsan the representation of the reality of ethical principles and spiritual concepts (Sahih al-Bukhari, Vol. 6, Book 60, Number 300, Ḥadīth 47). Islamic religiosity plays a healthy part in the life of human beings. The system of Islam is believed to influence the moral values, positive habits, and better lifestyles of human beings. Therefore, religiosity is known to encourage people’s behaviour, life satisfaction, and various dimensions of people’s wellbeing. Fatima et al., (2017) explain the positive effect of religion on human life cannot be discarded because Islam refers to moral guidelines for learners. Islam is the only religion of the world that encourage their followers to compete in seeking knowledge. The students who learn Islamic religiosity tend to know Islamic teaching about the importance of religious knowledge. Being a Muslim and a follower of Islam, it is important to be an outstanding learner. Islam encourages students to study the religious norms and values of morality.

The literature on religiosity research shows that if students have interested in religious learning, they have high enthusiasm. Religion display a positive element of culture in the civilized society that diffuses the permeates of people life either they believe in religion or not (Hamza, (2010); Yahya and Saad, (2015). Johnstone, (1975); Yahya and Saad, (2015) stated that religion provides a system of practice and belief which dictates peoples to respond to a supernatural reality. The influence of religion promotes the goals of people and religion motive others to get life satisfaction. The dominant role of religion is shaping people’s attitudes towards religious services. The laws of religion play a vital and ethical role to shape the lives of people according to their benefit. Faith on ALLAH (SWT) provides the reasoning, knowledge, and foundation for moral life (Yahya and Saad, 2015). Religion acts as the opening of the cognitive world for every individual. Other than that religiosity supports the individual to be committed to their religion, profession, and learning which reflect religious commitment. Religious commitment influences human behaviour and religious attitude.

Although, the religious behaviour of an individual influence his self-identity. The self-identity of a person turns into internalization and expectations offered by religion (Weaver and Angel, (2002); Yahya and Saad, (2015). According to Zuckerman, Siberman and Hall, (2013); Yahya and Saad, (2015) explain the degree of religion as encouraging the involvement of people in all facets of religiosity. Facets of religion are categorized such as supernatural belief and commitments of faith offering to lower anxieties and validate the religious belief. Religiosity is divided into two types intrinsic religiosity and extrinsic religiosity. Allport provides the basic concept of religiosities that impact empirical research (Yahya and Saad, (2015). The author Allport 1960’s separated religion and commitment of a person into two types i.e. intrinsic religiosity and extrinsic religiosity. The meaning of intrinsic religiosity endows the framework for individuals to understand the terms of life. Extrinsic religiosity refers to social convention, the comfort of religion, and approach to shape a person self-service and intrinsic religiosity assumed as a person’s positive relationship with religious ethics (Donahue, 1985; Yahya and Saad, 2015).

3. Hypothesis

   _H_{01}:_ There is no significant mean difference between the religiosity of university and madrassa students.
4. Material and Methods

4.1 Research Design

The research design explains the basic structure and guidance for conducting research. The research reflects plans that can be quantitative or qualitative (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015). The researchers chose a mixed-method research design.

4.2 Participants of the Study

In the final stage of the research, 10 Bachelor of Science students (10x32 = 320) from each selected department and 10 Shahadatul Alia and Shahadatul Almiya students (10x32 = 320) from each madrassa; four university teachers from each department, including the Head of the departments (4x32 = 128) and four madrassa teachers, including the Head of the institute (Nazim) (4x32 = 128) were selected conveniently. In this way, the total sample of study is 896 which includes 640 students and 256 teachers/heads of the institutions.

4.3 Research Instruments

A self-developed questionnaire was used to gather information from respondents. At the same pattern, the semi-structured interview schedule comprising the aspects of religiosity was developed for teachers and heads of the departments.

4.4 Questionnaire for Participants

The student questionnaire consists of demographic information and 30 items. These items present religiosity on a 5-point Likert scale based on religiosity values (forgiveness, dutifulness, egalitarian, social support, comfort, self-esteem). At the same pattern, the semi-structured interview schedule comprising the aspects of religiosity was validated through expert opinion.

4.5 Data Collection and Analysis

The researcher personally visited the universities and madrassas. Before starting the data collection process, the researcher visited the sampled institutions and sought permission from the head of the institutions. The questionnaire was distributed among the students and they were briefed about the things they would have to take care of while filling in a questionnaire. During collecting the questionnaires, the researcher scrutinized them to see any kind of discrepancies therein. If there were some incomplete questionnaires, the respondents were requested to fill them again. Written interview schedules were distributed among the teachers and heads of the institutions of both the university and madrassas after getting permission and planning meeting time.

The data were analyzed using SPSS version 21, means level and Independent Samples T-Test (t-test).

| S. No | Main Theme/Sub-themes                  | Mean Score | Level   |
|-------|----------------------------------------|------------|---------|
|       | Religiosity of University Students     | 3.75       | Moderate|
| 1     | Intrinsic Religiousity                 | 3.60       | Moderate|
| 2     | Extrinsic Religiousity                 | 3.90       | Moderate|

Table 1: Level of Religiosity of University Students

Table 1 represents the religiosity of university students as moderate (M=3.75). Moreover, the ‘intrinsic religiosity’ of university students (M=3.60), and ‘extrinsic religiosity’ are also moderate (M=3.90).
Table 2: Level of Intrinsic Religiosity of University Students

| S. No | Themes/Sub-themes              | Mean Score | Level |
|-------|--------------------------------|------------|-------|
| 1     | Forgiveness                    | 3.64       | Moderate |
| 2     | Dutifulness                    | 3.68       | Moderate |
| 3     | Egalitarianism                 | 3.49       | Moderate |

Table 2 displays the ‘intrinsic religiosity’ of university students as moderate ($M=3.60$). Similarly, the ‘forgiveness’ of university students ($M=3.64$), ‘dutifulness’ ($M=3.68$), and ‘egalitarianism’ are also moderate ($M=3.49$).

Table 3: Level of Extrinsic Religiosity of University Students

| S. No | Themes/Sub-themes          | Mean Score | Level |
|-------|---------------------------|------------|-------|
| 1     | Social support            | 3.97       | Moderate |
| 2     | Comfort                   | 3.67       | Moderate |
| 3     | Self-esteem               | 4.06       | High |

Table 3 denote the ‘extrinsic religiosity’ of university students as moderate ($M=3.90$). Likewise, the ‘social support’ of university students ($M=3.97$) ‘comfort’ ($M=3.67$), and ‘self-esteem’ are high ($M=4.06$).

Table 4: Level of Religiosity of Madrassa Students

| S. No | Main Theme/Sub-themes      | Mean Score | Level |
|-------|----------------------------|------------|-------|
| 1     | Intrinsic Religiosity      | 4.31       | High |
| 2     | Extrinsic Religiosity      | 4.41       | High |

Table 4 embodies the ‘religiosity’ of madrassa students as high ($M=4.36$). Moreover, ‘intrinsic religiosity’ of madrassa students ($M=4.31$) and ‘extrinsic religiosity’ are also high ($M=4.41$).

Table 5: Level of Intrinsic Religiosity of Madrassa Students

| S. No | Theme/Sub-themes           | Mean Score | Level |
|-------|----------------------------|------------|-------|
| 1     | Forgiveness                | 4.13       | High |
| 2     | Dutifulness                | 4.34       | High |
| 3     | Egalitarianism             | 4.46       | High |

Table 5 displays the ‘intrinsic religiosity’ of madrassa students as high ($M=4.31$). Similarly, the ‘forgiveness’ of madrassa students ($M=4.13$), ‘dutifulness’ ($M=4.34$), and ‘egalitarianism’ are also high ($M=4.46$).
Table 6: Level of Extrinsic Religiosity of Madrassa Students

| S. No | Theme/Sub-themes          | Mean Score | Level |
|-------|--------------------------|------------|-------|
|       | Extrinsic Religiosity of Madrassa Students | 4.41       | High  |
| 1.    | Social support           | 4.09       | High  |
| 2.    | Comfort                  | 4.57       | High  |
| 3.    | Self-esteem              | 4.58       | High  |

Table 6 represents the ‘extrinsic religiosity’ of madrassa students as high (M=4.41). Likewise, ‘social support’ of madrassa students (M=4.09), ‘comfort’ (M=4.57), and ‘self-esteem’ are high (M=4.58).

Table 7: Comparison of Religiosity of Students

| Aspect       | Group              | N  | Mean   | SD   | t    | df  | Sig (2-tailed) |
|--------------|--------------------|----|--------|------|------|-----|----------------|
| Religiosity  | Madrassas students| 320| 4.3640 | .27568 | 3.36 | 638 | .001           |
|              | Universities students | 320 | 4.2807 | .34531 |      |      |                |

Table 7 illustrates that the mean score of religiosities of madrassas students is 4.36 with SD .275 and the mean score of religiosities of universities students is 4.28 with SD .345. The computed t value for df 638 is 3.369. As the computed t-value is greater than the required table value, consequently, it may be concluded that the results of both groups are different regarding religiosity aspects. Therefore, the null hypothesis “there is no significant mean difference between the religiosity of madrassas students and universities students” was dismissed. It was inferred that the madrassas students reflect the contrast in religiosity.

5. Findings

5.1 Religiosity among University Students

The overall level of ‘religiosity’ among university students is moderate (M=3.75). Alongside, ‘intrinsic religiosity’ of university students (M=3.60), and ‘extrinsic religiosity’ are also moderate (M=3.90).

5.2 Intrinsic Religiosity of University students

The level of ‘intrinsic religiosity’ among university students is moderate (M=3.60). Similarly, the ‘forgiveness’ of university students (M=3.64), ‘dutifulness’ (M=3.68), and ‘egalitarianism’ of university students are also moderate (M=3.49).

5.3 Extrinsic Religiosity of University students

The level of ‘extrinsic religiosity’ among university students is moderate (M=3.90). Likewise, the level of ‘social support’ (M=3.97), ‘comfort’ (M=3.67), and ‘self-esteem’ of university students are high (M=4.06).

5.4 Religiosity among Madrassa Students

The overall level of ‘religiosity’ among madrassa students is high (M=4.36). Likewise, ‘intrinsic religiosity’ of madrassa students (M=4.31), and ‘extrinsic religiosity’ are also high (M=4.41).
5.5 **Intrinsic Religiosity of Madrassa Students**

The level of ‘intrinsic religiosity’ among madrassa students is high (M=4.31). Similarly, the ‘forgiveness’ of madrassa students (M=4.13), ‘dutifulness’ (M=4.34) and ‘egalitarianism’ of madrassa students are also high (M=4.46).

5.6 **Extrinsic Religiosity of Madrassa Students**

The level of ‘extrinsic religiosity’ among madrassa students is high (M=4.41). In the same way, ‘social support’ of madrassa students (M=4.09), ‘comfort’ (M=4.57), and ‘self-esteem’ of madrassa students are high (M=4.58).

5.7 **Comparison of Religiosity of University and Madrassa Students**

The computed $t$-value revealed that there is a significant difference between the religiosity of madrassa and university students. It was inferred that the madrassas students reflect the contrast in religiosity.

6. **Discussion and Conclusion**

The present study aimed to analyze religiosity among university and madrassa students in Punjab, Pakistan. The comparison was made between the students of both education systems based on their religiosity. The findings of the study revealed that the level of religiosity among university students is moderate. Similarly, the level of religiosity among madrassa students is high. Berthold and Ruch, (2014) established that those participants who practice their religion regularly scored higher on the strengths scale regarding several strengths as compared to the participants who were not regular practitioners of the religion. The present study also tried to compare the religiosity of university and madrassa students. The computed $t$-value revealed that there is a significant difference between the religiosity of university and madrassa students. It was also inferred that the madrassa students reflect the contrast in religiosity. The study conducted by Berthold and Ruch, (2014) on the comparison of the religiosity between the practising and non-practising religious people. The findings of the present study are consistent with it.

It was concluded from the findings of the study that the level of religiosity among university students was moderate. Alongside, the madrassa students were found to have a high level of religiosity as well. The comparison of the religiosity of the university and madrassa students revealed that there is a significant difference between the religiosity of university and madrassa students. The computed $t$-value revealed that there is a significant difference between the religiosity of university and madrassa students. It was also inferred that the madrassas students reflect the contrast in religiosity. The study concludes that both systems should use joint ventures for this purpose, such as teacher training programs, an innovative teaching method, and educational seminars. In this context, universities should organize and provide teacher training programs for madrassa teachers, and religious scholars should provide services to improve the religious knowledge of university teachers.
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