
MUSLIM YOUTH RELIGIOSITY: WITH THE REFERENCES OF GENDER DIFFERENCES AND EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Warsiyah

Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Tarbiyah (STIT) Madina Sragen, Indonesia

E-mail: warsiyah0609@gmail.com

Received: 22th April 2018; Revised: 27th Mei 2018; Accepted: 28th June 2018

Abstract

This study aims to determine differences in the religiosity of Muslim adolescents regarding differences in the educational environment and gender. Data analysis was performed by the score collected by questionnaire, which was developed to measure the level of adolescent religiosity consisting of four dimensions: faith, intellectual, ritual and social. The study involved 97 Muslim teenagers taken random cluster sampling from an affordable population of students studying at SMA N and MA in Simo district Boyolali district. The results showed that subject scores varied and were above the theoretical averages, indicating that Muslim youth in Simo had a high degree of religiosity. The result of t-test analysis shows that there is a difference of religiosity level between adolescents studying in heterogeneous and homogenous institutions. The value of t-count is 2,668 bigger than t criterion ($t\text{-Table} = 2.010$) at 5% significance level.

Keywords: environmental education; religiosity; gender; muslims young

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui perbedaan dalam religiusitas remaja Muslim dalam hal perbedaan di lingkungan pendidikan dan jenis kelamin. Analisis data dilakukan berdasarkan skor yang dikumpulkan melalui kuesioner, yang dikembangkan untuk mengukur tingkat religiusitas remaja yang terdiri dari empat dimensi: iman, intelektual, ritual dan sosial. Penelitian ini melibatkan 97 remaja Muslim yang diambil melalui tehnik sampel gugus (*cluster random sampling*) dari populasi siswa yang belajar di Sekolah Menengah Atas Negeri dan Madrasah Aliyah di Kecamatan Simo, Kabupaten Boyolali. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa skor subjek bervariasi dan berada di atas rata-rata teoritis, menunjukkan bahwa pemuda Muslim di Simo memiliki tingkat religiusitas yang tinggi. Hasil analisis uji-t menunjukkan bahwa ada perbedaan tingkat religiusitas antara remaja yang belajar di lembaga-lembaga yang heterogen dan remaja yang belajar di lembaga-lembaga yang homogen. Nilai t-count adalah 2.668 lebih besar dari kriteria t ($t\text{-Tabel} = 2.010$) pada tingkat signifikansi 5%.

Kata kunci : lingkungan pendidikan; religiusitas; jenis kelamin; pemuda muslim

How to Cite : Warsiyah. (2018). Muslim Youth Religiosity: With the References of Gender Differences and Educational Environment. *TARBIYA: Journal of Education in Muslim Society*, 5(1), 19-29.
doi:10.15408/tjems.v5i1.7842.

Permalink/DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15408/tjems.v5i1.7842>

Introduction

Adolescence is a period of human life that is a strategic, important and broad impact for the next development. Adolescence is a transition from childhood to adulthood that develops all aspects to enter adulthood (Rumini and Sundari, 2004, p. 53). Physically the development of adolescent body shape resembles an adult, but emotional and social development still takes time to grow adults. Teenagers have not been able to assume responsibilities as adults cannot yet make a living for themselves is still very dependent on adults, especially parents. Meanwhile, a physical development, especially in biological, is followed by a rising sexual development that can encourage them to like things that are pornographic (Santrock, 2006, p. 369). These changes cause anxiety, worry and even emotional distress in adolescent (Daradjat, 2005, p. 133). Sexual development that is not followed by strong self-control and lack of adherence to the practice of religion can lead teenagers to free sex behaviors.

The results of research conducted by Smith (2003: 17-30) show that religion is a factor that influences the lives of teenagers who often influence their attitudes and behavior in a positive and constructive way. Octarini (2008) also shows that the more religious a person is, the more positive the way of thinking. Religion lives within and is experienced by its adherents in various aspects of everyday life or is called religiosity (Batson and Ventis, 1982: 1-2). In reality, we can see between individuals showing different levels of religiosity. Some researchers often associate religiosity with gender differences.

The importance of involving gender differences in researching on diversity because gender differences affect gender differences. Although the concept of gender is different from the gender, the two concepts cannot be separated. Gender is artificial, which is the result

of social and cultural construction throughout the history of human life and is not natural (Fakih, 1996: 8). Gender refers to aspects, functions, or non-physical characteristics of a person about social relations (Udry, 1994: 561). Individually gender is divided into feminine (which is associated with female sex) or masculine (which is associated with male sex). Differences in sex and gender have an impact on differences in biological functions and social functions. These different roles are reflected in the division of social functions between men and women in the domestic (household) and public (work and political) spheres. Therefore, gender differences that are biological can affect many aspects of individual social behavior. This fact is interesting to study gender differences and their relation to religious differences, as Vaus et al. (1987), Feltey and Paloma (1991), Hoffman and Miller (1995) and Stark (2002).

Furthermore, adolescents in research are adolescents that coincide with the high school years; it will be more meaningful if it is associated with differences in the educational environment. In Indonesia, there are two types of educational institutions, namely general education institutions under the Ministry of Education and Culture and Islamic education institutions (Madrasah) under the auspices of the Ministry of Religion. Both institutions apply different curricula especially in the subject of Islamic education. Meanwhile, the needs of all students to obtain Islamic religious education are the same as to guide and foster their religious life for the better. By looking at how the differences in youth religiosity from these two educational institutions are expected to be a material consideration for improving Islamic religious education in both public schools and Islamic schools. Thus the purpose of this study is to find out how the differences in religious religiousness of Muslim men and women regarding the Educational Environment.

Religiosity: Concepts and Dimensions

Religiosity is the embodiment of "religion" in various aspects of human life that belief, possess, and embrace it. Religiosity is one of the main factors in human life. So the concept of religiosity cannot be separated from the sense of religion itself. In the perspective of social psychology, for example, the Dictionary of Behavioral Studies (1989) Religion is defined as an organized belief system that provides social, moral guidance, developing the concept of right or wrong, regarding behavior. Leuba (Rachmat, 2003: 26) divides the definition of religion into three categories: intellectualism (confirms belief), voluntarist (emphasizing will), and affectivity (concerning feelings).

Nashori (2002) interpreted religiosity as how far the knowledge, how strong the belief, how the worship and the rules, and how deep appreciation of religion adopted. Religiosity is a multi-dimensional construct that is reflected in different aspects of a person's "religious life". These dimensions are independent of each other, although they are also interconnected (Batson & Ventis, 1982: 53). Hill and Hood Jr. (1999: 269) mentions that the instruments that have been developed by researchers to measure Religiosity contain some diverse dimensions. Suppose Glock (1962), as quoted by Billiet (2002: 5), suggests five dimensions that must be distinguished as expressions of religion, namely dimensions: experiential, ideological, *ritual* (practice), intellectual (knowledge), and consequential.

To use the concept of plural dimension in research for Muslim societies, some researchers directly adopted the concept of the dimensions of Religiosity proposed by Glock and Stark; others adapted the concept to the teachings of Islam. This difference in teachings and cultures demands a different concept, developed from Muslim cultural values. Nafis et al. (1995) developed the concept of the dimensions of

Religiosity adapted from the concept of Glock and Stark by maintaining the teachings of Islam. The teachings of Islam are broadly divided into three: *aqidah* (an aspect of belief), *shariah* (ritual aspect), and *akhlaq* (social aspect). Religiosity (Islam) is a blend of three dimensions, which is owned by a Muslim as a manifestation embodiment of Islamic teachings are believed. The dimension of faith includes the belief or acceptance of the subject of the truth of Islamic teachings. While the dimension of commitment refers to the willingness of a person (Muslim) to respond or respond to Islamic teachings in a positive or negative. The ritual and social dimension refer to the intensity of subjects' activities in carrying out religious commands, especially for the worship of Allah (*hablun minallah*) and social worship (*Hablun minannaas*) (Nafis, 1995: 25).

This difference in teachings and cultures demands a different concept, developed from Muslim cultural values. Therefore, in the context of research this adolescent religiosity researcher using four dimensions that are; dimensions of faith, intellectual, ritual and social. The dimension of the faith is the acceptance of the truth of religious teachings (Islam), especially about the Godhead and the occult, the book and the Apostle, the last day, and *qadla* and *qadar* (Warsiyah, 2014: 92). A ritual dimension is a form of behavior as a manifestation of one's obedience about God. In other words, the ritual is the intensity of a religious person in carrying out religious orders relating to the relationship with God (*hablun min Allah*), whether in the form of worship *mahdlah* or *ghoiru mahdlah*. The manifestation of one's religiosity is also related to its social behavior. The social dimension is the intensity of a person in carrying out religious teachings relating to relationships with fellow human beings (*hablun minan nas*), whether related to personal relationships (due to kinship, friendship, or neighbors) and intra-

personal (due to the organization, and community). The intellectual dimension refers to the level of Muslim knowledge and understanding of the teachings of their religion. This aspect concerns the knowledge of the contents of the Qur'an, the principal teachings to be believed and carried out, the laws of Islam and so forth.

Method

The study involved 97 Muslim youths studying at SMAN 1 and MA Muhammadiyah in Simo District Boyolali with a balanced ratio. Thus, all students who attend school are both affordable and accessible population. Both institutions are selected because they are different educational environments, especially about religious education. SMA reflect a heterogeneous educational environment because it teaches a wide variety of religious education and accepts students from various religious backgrounds. The MA reflects a homogeneous educational environment that only teaches Islamic education and accepts only Muslim students. While the sample is selected by cluster random sampling technique that is sampling based on class or group with random so that all class or group have equal opportunity to be a sample.

The data of the research are analyzed descriptively by using the descriptive statistical technique to measure the tendency of centralization, as well as the propensity of the spread of variables and dimensions. The analytical techniques used are mean, or arithmetic means, median, mode, variance, standard deviation, standard error (Murwani, 1999: 19). Based on the results of the descriptive analysis will then be compared how the religiosity of students studying in MA with students who study in high school. The entire calculation of descriptive statistics is done with the help of W-Stats Program 2015 (Hadjar,

2015). A further test is a dependent t-test analysis to test the difference in mean of the two groups or the relative conditions that can be compared to each other (Hadjar, 2014: 254). The dependent t-test is performed for each dimension as well as on the religiosity variable itself. The value of t is an index to determine whether the null hypothesis is accepted or not accepted in given confidence (β) or error (α) range.

Results and Discussion

By the prevailing education system in Indonesia, general secondary education is divided into two types, Public High School namely *Sekolah Menengah Atas* (SMA) and public high schools typical of Islam namely *Madrasah Aliyah* (MA). At Public High School, it accommodates students from various religious backgrounds and only teaches religious education 2 hours per week. While the *Madrasah Aliyah* only accepts students from Islamic backgrounds other than that Islamic education that is taught varies covering the History of Islamic Culture, Fiqh, Al-Qur'an and Hadith. So obviously the difference between these two institutions provides a different social climate. So in this context, the public secondary education institution (SMU) is a heterogeneous educational institution and. *Madrasah Aliyah* is a homogeneous educational institution. Heterogeneous because it provides an opportunity for students to interact with students from different backgrounds of a different religion, while homogeneity only provides opportunities for students to interact with Muslim students only. The results of descriptions based on the educational environment and gender will be seen as illustrated in the following Tables.

Dimension of Faith

Table 1 Summary of the dimension of Faith Score Depth

Subject Group	N	Low	High	Mean	SB
Heterogen	50	49	69	59	3,75
Women	44	49	69	59,1	3,93
Men	6	56	61	58,5	2,07
Homogen	47	32	66	57,4	5,34
Women	34	32	66	57,38	5,9
Men	13	52	62	57,5	3,38
Overall	97	32	69	58,25	4,64
Theoretical		18	72	27	

Based on Table 1, theoretically, the scores of subjects ranged from 18 to 72 with the mean (the midpoint of the scale) 27. From the Table shows that overall adolescents have a high level of confidence above the theoretical score (27), i.e. 58.4. It is also not much different from the cross-based belief scores between heterogeneous and homogenous educational institutions, as well as by gender. This suggests that there is no significant difference between adolescent beliefs that schools in heterogeneous institutions with homogeneous and gender-based differences. While the standard intersection (SB) indicates that the overall subject scores are spread homogeneously.

Table 2 The significance of Faith difference

Faith	M	Average Difference	T	t-Table 5%
Heterogen	59,04	1,636	2,392	2,010
Homogen	57,40			

Based on Table 2 the value of t is 2.392 greater than t criteria at 5% significance level. This means that there is a difference in the level of faith between adolescents studying in heterogeneous education environments with adolescents who are schooling in a homogeneous educational institution with an average difference of 1.636. The Table also shows that the level of faith of adolescents studying in

heterogeneous educational institutions has a higher level of faith compared with adolescents studying in homogeneous institutions. These results show that adolescents who attend heterogeneous educational institutions have stronger faith than adolescents who attend homogeneous schools. This can be caused by differences in benchmarks of faith for them because of differences in religious education material and religious climate they experience. A homogeneous educational environment certainly has obedient and pious teachers, and then this becomes their benchmark so that their faith is still weak compared to their teachers. While in heterogeneous educational institutions, adolescents interact with other teenagers who do not rule out the possibility of being less obedient than them, so they assume that the faith they have is stronger than their friends.

Ritual Dimension

Table 3 Summary of Spread Dimension of Adolescent Ritual Dimension Based on Education and Gender Environment

Subject Group	N	Low	High	Mean	SB
Heterogen	50	58	34	46,89	6,42
Women	44	34	58	46,55	6,21
Men	6	39	57	51	7,01
Homogen	47	23	65	43,13	9,18
Women	34	24	65	44,38	8,02
Men	13	23	54	39,65	11,40
Overall	97	23	65	45,06	8,06
Theoretical		0	68	34	

Based on Table 3, theoretically, the subject scores range from 0 to 68 with the mean (the midpoint of the scale) 34. From Table 3 show that overall the teenager has a high ritual level above the theoretical score (34) that is 45.06. The Table also shows that the rituals of adolescents studying in heterogeneous educational institutions have a higher ritual level compared with adolescents who are schooling in homogeneous educational institutions. Differences in sex also showed differences in

ritual levels, whereas in heterogeneous educational institutions adolescent boys had higher ritual levels (51) compared with females (56.55) in contrast to ritual levels in adolescent boys (39.65) in lower homogeneous educational institutions compared with young women (44.38). While the standard crossover (SB) and the subject scores range indicate that the overall subject scores are spread heterogeneously.

Table 4 the significance of ritual differences

Ritual	M	Average Difference	T	t-Table 5%
Heterogen	46.88	3.752	2.944	2.010
Homogenous	43.13			

Table 4 show that the value of t is 2.944 greater than t criteria at 5% significance level. This means that there is a difference in the intensity of ritual worship among adolescents studying in heterogeneous education environments with adolescents studying in homogeneous education institutions with a mean difference of 3.752. The Table also shows that the intensity of adolescent worship rituals that study in heterogeneous educational institutions has a higher level of confidence compared with adolescents studying in homogeneous institutions.

Social Dimension

Table 5 Summary of Spread of Youth Social Depth Scores Based on Education and Gender Environment

Subject Group	N	Low	High	Mean	SB
Heterogin Women	50	21	48	36.82	6.30
Men	44	21	48	36.64	6.56
Homogin Women	6	32	43	38.18	4.07
Men	47	53	12	37.89	11.74
Overall	34	53	12	38.53	12.37
Theoretical	13	18	52	36.23	10.17
	97	12	53	37.89	11.74
		0	56	28	

Theoretically, the subject scores range from 0 to 56 with the mean (the midpoint of the scale) 28. From the Table shows that overall the adolescent has a high level of social worship above the theoretical score (28) is 37.89. The Table has shown that the social worship of adolescents studying in homogeneous educational institutions has higher ritual levels (37.89) than with adolescents who are schooling in heterogeneous educational institutions (36.82). Differences in sex also showed differences in ritual levels, whereas in heterogeneous educational institutions adolescent boys had higher ritual levels (38.18) than women (36.64) in contrast to ritual rates in adolescent boys (36.23) in lower homogeneous educational institutions compared with juvenile girls (38.53). While standard intersection (SB) showed that overall subject, scores were spread heterogeneously (11.74).

Table 6 the significance of differences in Social intensity between adolescents studying in heterogeneous and homogeneous environments

Social	M	Average Difference	T	t-Table 5%
Heterogen	36.82	-1.074	0.524	2.010
Homogenous	37.89			

Based on Table 6 the magnitude of t value is 0.524 smaller than t criteria at 5% significance level. This means that there is no difference in social intensity in adolescents studying in heterogeneous education environments with adolescents studying in homogeneous education institutions.

Intellectual Dimension

Table 7 Summary of Student Intellectual Scattering Depth Based on Education Environment

Subject Group	N	Low	High	Mean	SB
Heterogen	50	80	95	85.9	2.84
Women	44	80	90	85.61	2.29
Men	6	82	95	88	5.25
Homogen	47	61	88	81	5.72
Women	34	76	88	82.88	3.57
Men	13	61	85	76.82	7.34
Overall	97	61	88	81	5.72
Theoretical		10	100	75	

Based on Table 7, theoretically, the subject scores range from 10 to 100 with the mean (Minimum Criterion Criterion) 75. From the Table indicates that overall adolescents have a high level of religious knowledge above the theoretical score of 81. The Table also shows that religious knowledge adolescents studying in homogeneous educational institutions have higher religious knowledge (85.9) than with juveniles who are schooling in heterogeneous educational institutions (81). Differences in sex also show differences in religious knowledge, if in heterogeneous educational institutions boys have higher religious knowledge (88) than women 85.61) are different from ritual levels in boys (76.82) in institutions homogeneous education is lower than that of young women (82.88). While the standard intersection (SB) shows that the overall subject scores are spread homogeneously.

Based on Table 8 the value of t is 3.448 greater than t criteria at 5% significance level (2.010). This means that there is a difference in religious knowledge between adolescents who are studying in heterogeneous education environments with adolescents studying in homogenous institutions with an average difference of 4.9. The Table also shows that the religious knowledge of adolescents studying in heterogeneous educational institutions has a

higher level of confidence compared with adolescents studying in homogenous institutions.

Table 8 The significance of differences in Intellectual between adolescents studying in heterogeneous and homogeneous environments

Intellectual	M	Average Difference	T	t-Table 5%
Heterogen	85.9	4.900	3.448	2.010
Homogenous	81			

Religiosity

Score Data of Religiosity is a composite score compiled from four dimension scores: Faith, Ritual Intensity, Social Intensity, and Religious Knowledge, as discussed earlier. Processing the score is done by first changing the original score of each dimension into the default score Z (with the mean value = $MZ = 0,0$ and the standard intersection = $SBZ = 1,0$). Furthermore, the Z score of each subject for each dimension is changed into the default score T, with the mean value = $MT = 50$ and the standard intersection = $SBT = 10$. The composite score of the Religiosity Level is the average of the entire T score of the four dimensions obtained by the subject. Processing into a T score is performed for the overall subject (N = 97). Therefore, the Religiosity Level score obtained by the subjects is a relative score of the subject compared to the other subjects as a whole, rather than relative to the other subjects in the group. The results of the descriptive analysis of the Religiosity Level score in summary and detail are presented in Table 4.5 in the following pages.

Table 9 shown that the Religiosity score obtained by the subjects as a whole has a range of 25 (spread from 40 to 65). While the mean value of all subjects is $M = 56.05$ and the standard intersection is $SB = 4.85$. The standard deviation (SB) value indicates that the overall subject

scatters distribution is more homogeneous than theoretical spread (10).

Table 9 Summary of Student religiosity Scattering Depth Based on Education Environment

Subject Group	N	Low	High	Mean	SB
Heterogen	50	51	64	57.17	3.21
Women	44	53	64	59.00	3.95
Men	6	51	62	56.92	3.06
Homogen	47	40	65	54.86	5.94
Women	34	43	65	55.79	5.47
Men	13	40	63	52.40	6.62
Overall	97	40	65	56.05	4.85
Theoretical				50	10

Meanwhile, the spread of scores based on the cross-group between the Education and Sex environments is also not much different from the overall subject, although more varied. The highest (most religious) concentration tendency of the Religiosity Level score is owned by the Women group of the Heterogeneous Education Environment (with a mean value, M = 59) and the lowest (least religious) tendency is owned by the Men's group from the Homogeneous Education Environment (average, M = 52.40). While based on its distribution, the male group of Heterogeneous Education Environment is the most heterogeneous (with standard deviation value, SB = 6.62).

Thus, Religiosity tends to concentration and spread that varies between groups, both based on the Education Environment and the gender and interaction of both. However, the concentration of scores of each group did not differ much from the relative theoretical average (M = 50). Meanwhile, all trends in the spread of the overall and total group Religiosity scores were smaller than the standard theoretical intersections (SB = 10). The difference of tendency of concentration and spread of score of Religiosity Level between the empirical and theoretical give a hint that the scores obtained by the subject are relatively inconsistent from one dimension to another

dimension. This can happen because the relationship between the dimensions of Religiosity obtained by the subject is not too strong.

Table 10. The significance of differences in Religiosity between adolescents studying in heterogeneous and homogeneous environments

Religiosity	M	Average Difference	T	t-Table 5%
Heterogen	57,17	2,314	2,668	2,010
Homogen	58,86			

Based on Table 11, the value of t is 2.668 greater than t criteria at 5% significance level. This means that there is a difference in religiosity between adolescents who are studying in heterogeneous education environments with adolescents studying in homogeneous institutions with an average difference of 2,314. The Table also shows that the religiosity of adolescents studying in heterogeneous educational institutions has a higher level of confidence than adolescents studying in homogeneous institutions.

Conclusion

Religiosity, as outlined in a theoretical framework, is not something given but must be achieved through both active and passive efforts. This, of course, indicates that a person's religiosity is formed by the factors that influence it. Factors affecting the religiosity of a person must cause variations in the degree of religiosity between individuals is different. Many factors can affect the level of one's religiosity, one of which is the environmental factor. In the context of this study, adolescents as the object of research is an individual who is undergoing the process of education in the upper middle stage, of course, is in an environment. The environment, in this case, is more focused on the educational environment. The educational environment is everything that is around children who are

undergoing the process of education (Hadjar, 2010: 41).

Based on the findings of the results of the proposed hypothesis research did not support that adolescents who study in homogeneous educational institutions are more religious than teenagers who study in heterogeneous environments. The t-test analysis shows that there is a difference in the level of religiosity between adolescents studying in heterogeneous educational institutions and those studying in homogeneous educational institutions. However, the significance of these differences indicates that 2.668 t is higher than the criterion at a significance level of 5%. The results of the analysis also show that each dimension of religiosity shows the tendency of adolescents studying in heterogeneous educational institutions to have higher levels of confidence, ritual intensity, and higher religious knowledge than those who study in homogeneous education environments. On the social dimension does not show a significant difference from both groups. However, both groups show a high degree of religiosity above the theoretical averages.

The findings of the study are certainly not final, but it must be understood that religiosity is a complex phenomenon that exists in the individual, so many factors influence not only environmental factors. The environment surrounding teenagers is of course not only the educational environment there are family and community environments that also have a large influence on the lives of adolescents. The formal education environment is the school is the second environment for teenagers after the family environment. According to Ki Hajar Dewantara, the education environment consists of family environment, school environment, and community environment (Munib, 2004: 76). These three environments are often referred to as educational center dance that will affect humans in varying degrees.

The family environment also has a very important role in fostering the religiousness of a child. The family is the first environment that will be experienced by someone in his life, besides the family is the main environment because most of the human life is in the family (Nur Uhbiyati, 2012: 240). The family has the main task of laying the foundation of moral education and religious life view (Hasbullah, 2005: 38). About this study where adolescents who are the object of research of both groups may come from a religious family background. Based on the observations of researchers, adolescents who study in both educational institutions are from religious families who live in the village that still upholds religious values and community norms. So that the teenagers are grown and raised in a family environment and a conducive and religious community. In this case, of course, the formal education environment is not the only institution that provides religious education for adolescents. This means that adolescents get the influence of religiosity not only because of the influence of the educational environment but also the family and community environment.

Limitations of research samples and residence of subjects residing in the village are believed to still uphold religious values compared to adolescents living in the city. Although currently, the influence of globalization and IT development has reached the villages the moral values that exist in the village are still inculcated to adolescents since childhood both from the family environment, schools and even the community.

References

- Batson, C. Daniel & W. Larry Ventis. (1982). *The Religious Experience: A Social Psychological Perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Daradjat, Z. (2005). *Ilmu Jiwa Agama*. ed. 17. Jakarta: Bulan Bintang.
- Fakih, M. (1996). *Menggeser Konsepsi Gender dan Transformasi Sosial*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Feltey, Kathryn M. dan Margaret M. Poloma, "From sex differences to gender role beliefs: Exploring effects on six dimensions of religiosity," *Sex Roles* 25, no. 3 (1 Agustus 1991): 181–93, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00289853>.
- Glock, C.Y. & R. Stark. (1965). *Religion and Society in Tension*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Glock, C.Y. (1962). "On the Study of Religious Commitment," *Review of Recent Research on Religion and Character Formation (Research supplement to Religious Education, July-August 1962)*; 98-110.
- Hadjar, I. (2010). *Prasangka Keagamaan*. Semarang: Walisongo Press.
- Hadjar, I. (1999). *Dasar-dasar Metodologi Penelitian Kuantitatif dalam Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Hadjar, I. (2014). *Dasar-dasar Statistik untuk Ilmu Pendidikan, Sosial dan Humaniora*. Semarang : Pustaka Zaman.
- Hasbullah. (2015). *Dasar-dasar Ilmu Pendidikan*. Jakarta : Rajawali Pers.
- Hill, Peter C., Ralph W. Hood (Ed.). (1999). *Measure of Religiosity*. Birmingham: Religious Education Press.
- Laura B. Koenig et al. (2005) "Genetic and Environmental Influences on Religiousness: Findings for Retrospective and Current Religiousness Ratings," *Journal of Personality* 73, no. 2: 471–88, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2005.00316.x>.
- Miller, Alan S., John P. Hoffmann, "Risk and Religion: An Explanation of Gender Differences in Religiosity," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 34, no. 1 (Maret 1995): 63, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1386523>.
- Murwani, R. Santoso. (1999). *Statistika Terapan (Teknik Analisis Data)*. Jakarta: PPS UNJ
- Nashori, F., Diana, R. (2002). *Mengembangkan Kreativitas Dalam Perspektif Psikologi Islam*. Yogyakarta: Menara Kudus.
- Nafis, dkk. (1995). *Religiusitas Masyarakat Muslim Kodia Semarang*. Semarang: Pusat Penelitian IAIN Walisongo Semarang.
- Octarini, F. C. (2008). Hubungan Religiusitas dengan Berpikir Positif pada Remaja Putri. Skripsi: UII Yogyakarta.
- Rachmat, J. (2003). *Psikologi Agama*. Bandung: Mizan
- Rumini, S., Sundari, S. (2004). *Perkembangan Anak dan Remaja*, Jakarta : PT. Rineke Cipta.
- Santrock, John W. (2006). *Life-span development*. 10th ed, Boston, Mass: McGraw-Hill.
- Smith, C. (2003). Theorizing Religious Effects Among American Adolescent. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 42, no. 1: 17–30.
- Stark, R. (2002). "Physiology and Faith: Addressing the 'Universal' Gender Difference in Religious Commitment," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 41, no. 3: 495–507, <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5906.00133>.
- Udry, J. Richard. (1994) "The Nature of Gender," *Demography* 31, no. 4: 561, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2061790>.

- Vaus, David de, dan Ian McAllister. (1987). Gender Differences in Religion: A Test of the Structural Location Theory. *American Sociological Review* 52, no. 4: 472–81. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095292>.
- Warsiyah. (2014). *Menyontek, Prokrastinasi dan Keimanan*. Yogyakarta: Trussmedia.