Correlational Analysis of Socioeconomic Status (SES) and Interfaith Harmony in Islamabad, Pakistan

Muhammad Sardar Alam[1], Muhammad Rahmatullah Farooqi[2] & Majid Hussain Alias Ghalib Hussain[3]

[1]Parole Officer Rawalpindi, Punjab Probation and Parole Service, Home Department, Government of Punjab, Pakistan; MPhil Sociology, PMAS-Arid Agriculture University, Rawalpindi
[2] School Health and Nutrition Supervisor, Health Department Punjab
[3] Assistant Professor, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Bahria University, Islamabad Campus, Pakistan

ABSTRACT

Religious acceptance extends beyond mere belief, encompassing the acknowledgment of rights, tolerance of worship freedom, and participation in political and educational realms. This phenomenon aims to foster mutual understanding through embracing diverse beliefs and values. In today's society, marked by escalating political and personal discord, interfaith harmony emerges as a pathway to peace. Embracing religious acceptance implies that coexistence can counter the rising tide of aggression by emphasizing shared elements of peace among different faiths. This study explores the correlation between religion and socioeconomic status (SES) in the context of G-7/2, Islamabad, Pakistan. SES, comprising education and income, was examined for its impact on interfaith harmony. The sample, drawn from the residential population of Muslims and Christians in the neighborhood, revealed a moderately positive correlation of 4.81**. Notably, education emerged as a primary factor, suggesting that enhancing SES could mitigate extremism and intolerance, with education playing a pivotal role in promoting interfaith harmony. These findings underscore the potential for socio-economic interventions to contribute to fostering a more harmonious coexistence among diverse religious communities.

Corresponding Author's Email: sardaralammuhammad@gmail.com
DOI: https://doi.org/10.61503/cissmp.v2i4.102

Citation: Alam, M. S., Farooqi, M. R., & Hussain, M. (2023). Correlational Analysis of Socioeconomic Status (SES) and Interfaith Harmony in Islamabad, Pakistan. *Contemporary Issues in Social Sciences and Management Practices, 2*(4), 272-289.

1.0 Introduction

Religion has been around for as long as humans, in the form of superstitions or religious myths in the name of faith. It exists in all cultures and societies. Religion penetrates deeply into devotees' hearts and disregards their identities and social statuses, transcending all social boundaries (Bill, 2008). All major religions in the world stress basic virtues like honesty, harmony, tolerance, consideration, and acceptance for others. Religion is concerned with more than just moral behaviors; it also controls personal views and outlines a code of conduct that predicts human behaviors (Backlund *et al.,* 1996).

Religious acceptance or acceptance of other religions does not mean embracing or believing in all the religious beliefs of other religions. It means giving them the right to accept or tolerate the other religion by giving them freedom of worship, politics, education, and performing their rituals. Acceptance could be further explained as cooperation and positive mutual interaction among people of different religions, faiths, and beliefs. The purpose of this phenomenon of acceptance is always to create mutual understanding of each other's beliefs through the likeness and attentiveness of different beliefs and values (Arrow *et al.,* 2000; Zeng et al., 2021). Religious acceptance, tolerance or harmony is about the co-occurrence of two or more different religious groups, which means freedom to live and let live. Interfaith harmony is also a way of achieving peace and accomplishment in today's society, which is increasing political as well as disagreement (Chakim et al., 2023).

Religious acceptance suggests that there is still coexistence between people of different religions and its purpose is to remove disagreements, whether violent or non-violent. This needs a worldly understanding that all religions and their believers are equally respectable and have equal rights to practice their beliefs and traditions in this evaluating modern life (Inamullah, 2004). Religions can work to reverse this increasing flow of aggression by powerfully cooperating on shared positive elements of peace in different faith traditions (Gunn, 2000). Religious tolerance is particularly associated with accepting differences in society; people may accept the religious differences and respect others' religious thoughts (Krok & Zarzycka, 2021; Sadowski, 2021).

Many sociologists have studied the correlation between religion and socioeconomic status (SES); Max Weber specifically examined the gap between the SES of Protestants and Catholics. Socioeconomic status affects the whole of human functioning in both physical and mental health, the surroundings in which we live, routine activities, and access to material sources. SES refers to the individual's access to the desired resources, which might be material goods, power, authority, social networks, healthcare facilities and educational opportunities. Social hierarchy is recognized by everyone in every society (Smith et. al., 2011). People typically define socioeconomic status (SES) as the social position or class of an individual or group. It is usually calculated as a blend of education, material income, livelihood, material goods, and the living standards of an individual, family, or group (Hauser, Sheridan, & Warren, 1997; Khan, 2011). For the current study, we chose economy and education to document religious tolerance. Economic dependency on family members is directly related to the number

of dependents. Various studies (Litt et al., 2020; Muttamba et al., 2021; Quarshie, Waterman & Home, 2020) stated that finance is always a problem that shrinks self-development (Chakim et al., 2023).

2.0 Literature Review

Religious acceptance is the fundamental basis of a civilized society. There is a belief that no single religion has all the ways to salvation. Religious acceptance leads to tolerance and harmony among different religions (Howden-Chapman, 2004). According to some religious scholars, religion-based organizations can play a lot of roles, not only in creating differences but also as a tool to reduce conflicts and produce interfaith harmony (Haynes, 2009).

Islam has a complete code of conduct to promote peace and harmony and guidelines for conflicts in a particular society. Islam represents and expands due to its moral, human friendly and ethical principles, so it produces harmony and acceptance. Islamic values and practices of peace endorsement, interfaith harmony, conflict management and accepting others' faiths are based on the Islamic idea of peace, which is derived from the Qur'an, the Hadith, and the Sunnah. In the Qur'an, the philosophy of Islam suggests that peace, tolerance and harmony are the central themes of religion. Peace in Islam arises with Allah as Asalam, which means peace is one of the most beautiful ninety-nine names of Allah (Bouta et. al., 2005). The history of Muslim empires shows that the Muslim empire was a haven for all religions. In spite of class, color, creed, or social position, there is no one similar to Islam with an indication of promoting interfaith harmony (Khan 2011).

Pakistan is a country with a lot of diverse religions, sects, and ethnic groups. It is a Muslim state and the majority of the population, which is more than 90 percent, is Muslim. Interfaith harmony is promoted by all faiths by teaching the lessons of love, justice, compassion, harmony and empathy and promoting harmony (Zeng et al., 2021). The objections to interfaith harmony can be tackled through the use of these shared values. Muslims, Christians, Sikhs, and Hindus are different groups that make up the population of Pakistan (Akbar & Yaseen, 2020). After Muslims, the second majority of religious groups living in Pakistan are Ahmadees, also known as Qadianis; Bahais; Buddhists; Hindus; Jains; Kalasha; Parsis; Sikhs; and Ismalia living in Pakistan (Malik, 2002; Phillips, 1993).

Pakistan is one of those unfortunate countries that is facing religious intolerance, religious violence and terrorism. This religious violence seemed to be a hurdle between Pakistan and its development. It was considered that the madrassa and the education system of Pakistan were responsible for such violence. Pakistan's government is trying to minimize this problem by promoting harmony through various interventions (Khan, 2014). Limited interaction with other religious groups works as a hurdle in the promotion of religious tolerance (Jamilah, 2021). The study by Lu and Yang (2020) also stated that religious diversity may lead to social tension when there is no central force for social interaction. The study by Veloudaki (2023) highlighted that interfaith is the social relationships of various religious groups within a specific environment. The work of Ringwald and Wright (2021) concluded that the interaction of the different religious groups leads to greater sympathy and empathy among co-inhabitants. Another study, Little et al.

(2014), endorsed the same findings that education and income could be the motivating factors of interfaith harmony.

The creation of the Ministry of National Harmony in 2008 and the engagement of a particular advisor for minority affairs under the Minister of Minority Affairs were two of them. Christianity is the second largest religious community in Pakistan and there is a lot of evidence to show the interests and efforts of Christians in the creation of Pakistan. The present study tried to find out the coexistence of Muslims and Christians in closed vicinities. Socioeconomic status has a great influence on one's perception and behavior. The present study investigates the relationship between socioeconomic status and interfaith harmony, with a major emphasis on education and income, to document acceptance and tolerance. Interfaith harmony is an important public and social interest because it affects the community as a whole. The study included socioeconomic determinants to document interfaith harmony.

H_1= There is no association between socioeconomic status and interfaith harmony.

H_0= There is an association between socioeconomic status and interfaith harmony.

3.0 Methodology

The universe of the study encompassed the entirety of G-7/2, and the target population consisted of Muslim household heads residing in this territory. To derive a representative sample, the voter's list of the sector was obtained from the Union Council, and 160 respondents were purposively selected using the Yammne and Tarro formula for sample size determination. This approach ensured that the study captured a cross-section of the community, allowing for meaningful insights into the interplay between socioeconomic factors and interfaith harmony.

The interview schedule served as the primary tool for data collection. It incorporated a mix of open-ended and close-ended questions, providing a comprehensive understanding of the participants' perspectives on the relationship between socioeconomic status and interfaith dynamics. The sample size of 160 households was determined based on the population size (N = 264) and the desired level of precision (e = 0.05), as calculated using the formula $n = N / 1 + N(e)^2$.

Sample Size Determination

$n = N / 1 + N(e)^2$

Where:

n   Sample Size

N   Population Size

e   The level of Precision

So

N= 264

e = 0.05

$n = 264/ 1 + 264 (0.05)^2$

n = 264/ 1+ 0.66

n=160

4.0 Data Analysis
4.1 Descriptive Statistics

Table No. 1 depicts the statistical and demographic information of respondents, like gender, age and marital status. The first part of the table elaborates on the respondents' ages in the form of frequencies and percentages. The table depicts the percentage of the age. There were 25.6 percent of respondents in the first age category (20–30), 30.6 percent in the second category (31–40), and 26.9 percent in the third category (41–50). There were 15.6 percent in the fourth category, 51–60, and in the last 1.2 percent of respondents present under the 61–70 year old category. The second part of the table presents the gender-based characteristics. The table also contains marital status and various categories associated with marriage. The number of males in the study was 80.6 percent, whereas 19.4 percent of females also documented their responses. Of the total sample, 78.1 percent were married and 16.9 percent were unmarried.

Table No. 2 displays the frequency and percentages of respondents' educational status. The table shows 30 percent of respondents have education 1–5, 46.9 percent have education 6–10, and 16.2% were in category three, 11–14, whereas 6.9 percent were in the last category.

Table 3 shows the occupational and working status of the respondents. The first part of the table shows the occupation's frequencies. The table illustrates that the housewives among the respondents were 13.8 percent, and farmers were 20.6 percent. From the whole sample size, 12.5 percent of respondents were self-employed, 19.4 percent had private jobs and 15.2 percent were engaged in government jobs, whereas 20.6 percent were working as laborers. It was concluded that the majority (53.7 percent) of the respondents were self-employed or had businesses in the present study. The second part of the table contains the working status of respondents during the data collection process. The table shows that the number of unemployed respondents was 8.8 percent. 3.1 percent of respondents were retired, 9.4 percent were working as domestic workers, and 68.1 percent were working as full-time employees. Hence, the table concluded that most of the respondents were in full-time working conditions.

Table No. 4 shows respondents' and respondents' family monthly income in the form of frequency and percentage. The first part of the table shows the monthly income of the respondent and the family monthly income of the respondent. It describes that 12.5 percent of respondents had less than 5000 rupees in monthly income. 9.4 percent of respondents had income between $5001 and $10,000. 15.6 percent of respondents have an income of $1,000–15,000 While 15 percent of respondents had an income of 1500–1500 and 13.1 percent of respondents had an income of 2000–25000, 13.1 percent of respondents had income from 25001 to 30,000 and 5 percent of respondents had income from 30,001 to 35,000 and between 35001 and 40,000, there were 5 percent of respondents. And from 40,001 to 45,000, there were 1.5 percent. Also, respondents from 45,001 to 50,000 incomes were 1.2 percent and finally 10.2 percent on more than 50,000 incomes. Whereas respondents have monthly incomes ranging from 10,001 to 15,000. The second part of the table documents respondents' monthly income from all resources at the family level. This table shows that 1.2 percent of respondents had a family income of less than $10,000. From 10,001 to 20,000 respondents, 15.6 percent of their family incomes. And respondent's family income ranges from 20,001 to 30,000, and then from 15.6 percent of

respondents between 30,001 and 40,000. Between 40,001 and 50,000, the respondents had 14.4 percent of their family income. And 31.9 percent of respondents have more than $50,000 in family income. The table concluded that most of the respondents had more than $50,000 in family income.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Categories	Frequency	Percentage
I. Age of the Respondent		
20-30	41	25.6
31-40	49	30.6
41-50	43	26.9
51-60	25	15.6
61-70	2	1.2
II. Gender		
Male	129	80.6
Female	31	19.4
III. Marital status		
Single	27	16.9
Married	125	78.1
Characteristics	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Separated	2	1.2
Divorced	3	1.9
Widow	3	1.9
Total	160	100

Table 2: Education of the Respondents

Categories	Frequency	Percentage
1-5	48	30.0
6-10	75	46.9
11-14	26	16.2
15 & above	11	6.9
Total	160	100.0

Table 3: Occupation and working status

Categories	Frequency	Percentage
I. Occupation		
Housewife	22	13.8
Labor	33	20.6
Farmer	33	20.6
Self-employed	20	12.5
Private job	31	19.4
Govt. job	21	15.2
Total	160	100.0
II. Working status		

Unemployed	14	8.8
Retired	5	3.1
Domestic work	17	10.6
Working part time	15	9.4
Working full time	109	68.1
Total	160	100.0

Table 4: Income of the Respondents

Categories	Frequency	Percentage
I. **Respondents' monthly income**		
less than 5000	20	12.5
5001-10,000	15	9.4
10,001-15,000	25	15.6
15,001-20,000	24	15
20,001-25,000	21	13.1
25,001-30,000	18	11.2
30,001-35,000	8	5
35,001-40,000	8	5
40,001-45,000	2	1.2
40,001-45,000	2	1.2
more than 50,000	17	10.6
Total	160	100
II. **Monthly Family Income**		
less than 10,000	2	1.2
10,001-20,000	25	15.6
20,001-30,000	34	21.2
30,001-40,000	25	15.6
40,001-50,000	23	14.4
More than 50 thousand	51	31.9
Total	160	100

Table 5 gives a picture of the tolerance of respondents toward Christians. The first statement is about permitting Christians to enter the respondent's home. 62.5 percent of respondents chose the option of allowing the Christians to enter their house 'to some extent'. While 20.0 percent of respondents answered no option at all, 17.5 percent of respondents allowed minorities to be in their homes to a great extent. The next question shows to what extent you allow a Christian to touch your household accessories. It demonstrates that the majority of respondents (50.0 percent) were those who allow Christians to touch their household accessories to some extent. 36.9 percent did not answer at all, and 13.1 percent chose to a great extent.

Table No. 6 shows the picture of socialization. In this table, item (i) shows to what extent respondents advise their children to respect Christians. The table indicates that 23.8 percent of respondents did not advise their children to respect Christians; 51.2 percent of respondents said that to some extent; and 25 percent of respondents said that to a great extent they advise their children to respect Christians. It is a model interpretation; write according to this paragraph. In

the reply to the next question, 32.5 percent said they did not allow their children to make Christian friends, while 53.8 percent answered, and 18.8 percent chose to a great extent. The next question was: to what extent do they allow their children to play with Christian children on a common playground? In the reply to this question, 28.8 percent answered not at all, 52.5 percent chose to some extent and 18.8 percent chose to a great extent.

Table 7 shows the religious festival celebration. 33.8 percent said they did not respond at all. 43.8 percent answered to some extent, and 22.5 percent chose the answer to a great extent. In response to the next question about to what extent one allows a Christian to participate in their festival, 55 percent answered not at all. 27.5 percent chose to some extent, and 17.5 percent chose to a great extent. In answer to the next question, 55 percent said not at all. 32.5 percent answered to some extent, and 12.5 percent answered greatly. After the question was answered, 40.0 percent of respondents did not answer at all. 44.4 percent chose to some extent, and 15.4 percent answered to a large extent.

Table 8 gives a picture of the exchange of sweets and eatable things. The first question is, to what extent do you allow Christians to eat with you? 53.1 percent of respondents responded to none at all. 36.9 percent of respondents answered to some extent, and 10 percent responded to a great extent. They allow the Christians to eat with them. The next question pertains to sharing food with Christians. In response, 50 percent responded not at all, 40 percent to some extent and 10 percent to a great extent. In the next part of the table, in response to the question about the exchange of sweets, 43.8 percent responded not at all. 45.6 percent responded to some extent and 10.6 percent chose to a great extent. In this part of the table, the question is about using Christian utensils. 66.2 percent of respondents answered not at all. 26.2 percent responded to some extent, and 7.5 percent chose greatly.

Table 9 depicts religious pluralism. In response to allowing Christians to build a church in your village, 42.5 percent of people answered to some extent. While 36.2 percent answered not at all and 21.2 percent responded to a great extent, In response to the next question, provide financial help to Christians to build their church. 49.4 percent said they did not respond at all. 38.1 percent responded to some extent, and 12.5 percent chose to a great extent. In the answer to the next question about becoming a Christian in your worship place, 55 percent said not at all, 28.8 percent said to some extent and 12.6 percent said to a great extent. In response to the next question, 48.1 percent said not at all. 33.1 percent chose to some extent and 18.8 percent chose to a great extent. In the last section of the table, 50 percent answered to some extent. While 38.1 percent responded to not at all and 11.9 percent answered to a great extent.

Table 10 depicts the social obligations of Christians. To some extent, 44.4 percent answered. 35.6 percent responded as not at all, while 20 percent responded that, up to a great extent, they participate in Christians's gatherings and marriage ceremonies. The next question is about to what extent an individual condolence on Christian death. In reply to that, 43.8 percent responded to some extent. 38.8 percent responded to not at all and the other 28.1 percent

answered to a great extent. In response to the next question, to what extent do you go to visit a Christian when they are injured? 39.4 percent answered in some way. 32.5 percent answered not at all. 12.6 percent to a great extent. In response to the question, to what extent do you invite Christians to your wedding? In reply to that, 41.2 percent said not at all and 41.2 percent chose to some extent. Whereas 17.5 chose to a great extent.

Table 11 describes the facilitation of political participation. In response to the first statement, 40 percent of respondents answered not at all. 36.9 percent of respondents chose to some extent and 23.1 percent were those who answered up to a great extent. The next question was, to what extent do you encourage Christians to register to vote? In answer to this, 38.1 percent answered not at all. 38.1 percent chose to some extent, and 23.8 percent chose greatly. The next question in this table is: To what extent do you display signs and stickers for Christian candidates? In response to this, 55.6 percent chose not to respond at all. 26.9 percent answered to some extent and 17.5 percent answered to a great extent. The last question in this table was: to what extent do you provide Christian voters with transport to the polling station? In response to this question, 43.8 percent chose not at all. And 31.2 percent answered to some extent and 25 percent chose to answer to a great extent.

Table 5. Tolerance

Sr.	Tolerance	Not at all		To some extent		To great extent	
A	**Questions** (Up to What Extent)	**F**	**per cent**	**F**	**per cent**	**F**	**per cent**
I	Do you allow Christians to enter in your home?	32	20.0	100	62.5	28	17.5
Ii	Do you allow Christians to touch your household accessories?	59	36.9	80	50.0	21	13.1

Table 6: Socialization

Sr.	Questions	Not at all		To some extent		To great extent	
B	**Socialization** (Up to What Extent)	**F**	**per cent**	**F**	**per cent**	**F**	**per cent**
I	Do you advise your children to respect Christians?	38	23.8	82	51.2	40	25.0
II	Do you allow your children to have a Christian Friend?	52	32.5	86	53.8	22	13.8
Sr.	**Questions**	**Not at all**		**To some extent**		**To great extent**	
B	**Socialization** (Up to What Extent)	**F**	**per cent**	**F**	**per cent**	**F**	**per cent**
Iii	Do you allow your children to play with Christian children on a common playground?	46	28.8	84	52.5	30	18.8

Table 7: Celebration of religious festivals

Sr.	Questions	Not at all		To some extent		To great extent	
C	**Celebration of religious festivals (Up to What Extent)**	**F**	**per cent**	**F**	**per cent**	**F**	**per cent**
I.	Do you allow Christians to perform their religious ceremonies and festivals?	54	33.8	70	43.8	36	22.5
II.	Do you allow Christians to participate in your festivals?	88	55.0	44	27.5	28	17.5
III.	Do you participate in Christian festivals?	88	55.0	52	32.5	20	12.5
IV.	Do you exchange gifts with Christians at festivals?	64	40.0	71	44.4	25	15.6

Table 8: Eatables and sweets exchange

Sr.	Questions	Not at all		To some extent		To great extent	
D	**Eatables and Sweets exchange (Up to What Extent)**	**F**	**per cent**	**F**	**per cent**	**F**	**per cent**
I.	Do you allow Christians to eat with you?	85	53.1	59	36.9	16	10.0
II.	Do you exchange eatables with Christians?	80	50.0	64	40.0	16	10.0
III.	Do you exchange sweets with Christians?	70	43.8	73	45.6	17	10.6
IV.	Do you allow Christians to eat in your utensils?	106	66.2	42	26.2	12	7.5

Table 9: Pluralism

Sr.	Questions	Not at all		To some extent		To great extent	
E	**Pluralism (Up to What Extent)**	**F**	**per cent**	**F**	**per cent**	**F**	**per cent**
I.	Do you allow Christians to build a church in the village?	58	36.2	68	42.5	34	21.2
Sr.	**Questions**	**Not at all**		**To some extent**		**To great extent**	
E	**Pluralism (Up to What Extent)**	**F**	**per cent**	**F**	**per cent**	**F**	**per cent**
II.	Do you provide financial help to Christians for building churches or other Institutes?	79	49.4	61	38.1	20	12.5
III.	Do you allow Christians to enter your worship places?	88	55.0	46	28.8	26	16.2
IV.	Do you guide Christians to resolve their disputes?	77	48.1	53	33.1	30	18.8
V.	Do you provide Christians the economic assistance when they need it?	61	38.1	80	50.0	19	11.9

Table 10: Social obligations

Sr.	Questions	Not at all		To some extent		To great extent	
F	**Social obligations (Up to What Extent)**	**F**	**per cent**	**F**	**per cent**	**F**	**per cent**
I.	Do you participate in Christian marriage ceremonies?	57	35.6	71	44.4	32	20.0
II.	Do you go for condolence to Christians on deaths?	62	38.8	70	43.8	28	17.5
III.	Do you go to see when a Christian got injured?	45	28.1	63	39.4	52	32.5
IV.	Do you invite Christians to your marriage ceremonies?	66	41.2	66	41.2	28	17.5

Table 11: Facilitation in political participation

Sr.	Questions	Not at all		To some extent		To great extent	
G	**Facilitation in political participation**	**F**	**per cent**	**F**	**per cent**	**F**	**per cent**
I.	Do you facilitate the Christian in their election campaign?	64	40.0	59	36.9	37	23.1
II.	Do you encourage Christians to vote registration?	61	38.1	61	38.1	38	23.8
Sr.	**Questions**	**Not at all**		**To some extent**		**To great extent**	
g.	**Facilitation in political participation (Up to What Extent)**	**F**	**per cent**	**F**	**per cent**	**F**	**per cent**
III.	Do you display signs and stickers for Christian's candidates?	89	55.6	43	26.9	28	17.5
IV.	Do you provide transport to Christian voters towards polling stations?	70	43.8	50	31.2	40	25.0

Normality Test

After entering the data into SPSS, it was essential to check the normality of the collected data. The Kolomogorov-Smirnov test was used by the researcher to check the normality of the independent variable and the dependent variable. The normality test for socioeconomic status revealed that the data distribution was not normal. Because the value of p is less than 0.05, it is rejected that the data distribution of socioeconomic status is normal.

Normality Test of Interfaith Harmony

As the normality test was performed by the researcher to check the distribution of the independent variable, a similar test was also performed by the researcher to check whether the data distribution of the dependent variable is normal or not. Table 13 shows that the value of p is less than the level of significance ($\alpha = 0.05$), which shows that the data was not normal.

Factor Analysis

Factor analysis has been applied to the data to explain the impact of fundamental factors, with no observed variables to showcase the correlation. It may be used in data reduction; after the analysis, various meaningless items from the selected scales were removed, and the remaining indicators showed a significant relationship with others.

Reliability analysis

We also conducted a reliability test to assess the reliability of the scales. After performing the reliability test, a few questions were excluded from the questionnaire because those questions were problematic. As some questions were excluded, some questions were also modified for the reliability of the scale. Table 14 shows that all indicators of acceptance that are used in the present research have a Crobach alpha above. 7, which was necessary for the reliability of the scale to accept pluralism. Although Crobach alpha for pluralism was lower than. Seven researchers used it because it was used in many previous studies to measure acceptance.

Spearman's Correlation Coefficient

The Spearman correlation coefficient is a statistical test to check the correlation between two variables. It is used when Pearson's correlation test cannot be useful because of its assumptions. Spearman's correlation coefficient is a nonparametric test that can be used to find a correlation between data with an abnormal distribution.

By performing the Spearman correlation coefficient, we can identify whether a correlation exists between two variables or not and if it does, is it a positive or negative correlation? It can be used for ordinal or continuous variables. It is denoted by and it can be controlled or interpreted as follows:

$-1 \leq r_s \leq 1$

Similar to Pearson's correlation, it is interpreted as r_s will be closer to +1. A strong correlation between two variables can be found.

There are two main assumptions in Spearman's correlation test. A test can't be applicable if these two assumptions can't be fulfilled by the collected data.

Variables should be measured on an ordinal or ratio scale.

There should be a monotonic relationship between variables.

The monotonic relationship can be defined as a relationship between two variables: when one variable increases, the other should not decrease and when one variable decreases, the other should not increase. It is a nonparametric test, so there is no need for a normal data distribution to perform it.

Relationships of Spearman's Correlation Coefficient

There is a very weak coloration between variables when the r_s will be.00 to.19.

There is a weak correlation when RS will be. 20 to 39.

When rs =.40 to.59, there is a moderate correlation.

When rs =.60 to.79, there is a strong correlation.

When rs =.80 to 1.0, there is a very strong correlation.

3.8 Interpretation of the Test

When the normality test shows that the data distribution of the present study is not normal, the researcher uses the Spearman correlation coefficients test. The researchers used this test because the collected data fulfills all the assumptions of the test.

Hypothesis Testing

There is no correlation between socioeconomic status and interfaith harmony.

H1: There is a correlation between socioeconomic status and interfaith harmony. Level of significance: $\alpha = 0.05$

Test Statistics Non-Paramatric Spearman's correlation

Enlightenment

For the current study, Spearman's correlation was adopted to determine the relationship between education and income with several determinants such as the celebration of religious festivals, socialization, tolerance, exchange of foods, pluralism, facilitation of political participation and social obligation under the acceptance of Christians. The statistical analysis showed a significant positive correlation between the stated variables concerning Christians' acceptance by Muslims.

Data showed that rs =.481, n = 160, and $p < 0.05$ have a significant positive correlation between SES and acceptance of Christians by Muslims. So the test proved that there is a positive correlation between the independent variable and the dependent variable. Table 15 explains the correlation between independent and dependent variables. To find the socioeconomic determinants that affect the acceptance of Christians by Muslims, once again, spearman's correlation was performed.

Table 16 shows that for the present study, education and income were measured as determinants of socioeconomic status. When Spearman's correlation coefficient was performed to determine the relationships between these determinants and the dependent variable, it was concluded that there is a positive correlation between all these determinants of SES and the acceptance of Christians by Muslims.

Education as a determinant of SES has a moderately positive correlation with the dependent variable.

r_s= .537**

p = 0.00

N= 160

The table also shows that education income has a positive correlation with the acceptance of Christians.

r_s= .309**

p = 0.00

N =160

Education and income were investigated in the present research and found to have a positive correlation with the acceptance of Christians by Muslims. But the study finds that education is the most effective socioeconomic determinant that has an appositive correlation with religious acceptance.

Table 12: Normality test for Socioeconomic Status

	Kolomogorov-Smirnov[a]		
	Statistic	**Df**	**Sig.**
Socioeconomic status	.093	160	.002

a.   Lilliefors Significance Correction

Table 13: Normality test for Interfaith Harmony

	Kolomogorov-Smirnov[a]		
	Statistic	**Df**	**Sig.**
Interfaith Harmony	101	160	.000

a.   Lilliefors Significance Correction

Table 14: Data Reliability Test

Sr. No	Indicators	No. of items	Cronbach Alpha
i.	Tolerance	2	.72
ii.	Socialization	3	.723
iii.	Celebration of religious festivals	4	.731
iv.	Sweets and eatable things exchange	4	.706
v.	Pluralism	5	.695
vi.	Social obligations	4	.701
vii.	Facilitation in political participation	4	.752

Table 15: Correlation between Socioeconomic Status and Acceptance

		Socioeconomic status	Acceptance of Christians
Spearman's rho Socioeconomic status Correlation Coefficient		1.000	.481**
Sig. (2-tailed)		.	.000
N		160	160
Acceptance of Christians	Correlation Coefficient	.481**	1.000
Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.
N		160	160

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 16: What are the socioeconomic determinants having a positive correlation with Muslim's acceptance of Christians

Determinants of socioeconomic status	Acceptance of Christians by Muslims
Spearman's rho **Education**	
Correlation Coefficient	.537**
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.00
Income	
Correlation Coefficient	.309**
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.00
N	160

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Discussion and Conclusion

The major aim of the study was to document the relationship between socioeconomic status and interfaith harmony among Muslims in Sector G, Islamabad. Socioeconomic status, i.e., education and income, was used as the independent variable. Whereas, religious tolerance among the respondents and religious acceptance were the dependent variables; to measure the various aspects such as socialization with Christians, joint celebrations of religious festivals, exchange of food items and tolerance, Researchers assessed these indicators to determine the religious acceptance of Christians in the Muslim population.

Descriptive analysis tested the hypothesis of the study to analyze and document the objectives. For a comprehensive presentation of the collected information, a cross-tabulation was made to present the levels of socialization, exchange of food items, celebration of festivals and tolerance of the respondents. For the present research study, the respondents' religious orientation was Muslim. At the end, Spearman's correlation was performed to document the relationship between socioeconomic status and religious acceptance. The results shown in the tables reveal a significant positive correlation between dependent and independent variables.

Education and interfaith harmony

The foremost important determinants of the study were income and education as socioeconomic status, which influence the acceptance level of Christianity by the Muslim population (respondents); for these purposes, most importance has been given to the educational status of the respondents. It was found that a moderately positive correlation of education with the dependent variables was observed. The results of the study endorsed by Daniel (2011) that was conducted to find out the effects of education on religion in Canada concluded that higher educational status leads to lower religious participation. Each level of educational advancement may lessen the 4.0 percent point identification of respondents through religious recognition or ideation. The study of Khan (2014) also endorsed the results of the current study that education

is a significant source in promoting tolerance for other religious groups or faiths.

Income and Interfaith Harmony

Income and personal or family level both directly impact the social lives of people. For the present research study, individual and family-level income was documented, considering its effectiveness through various other studies. Initially, for the current study, the self-income of the respondents was their income, whereas the family income was calculated to include women's economic participation in the households because they were not the main earning individuals of the households. To assess the levels of poverty, the income indicator was adopted to document the level of respondents regarding the official poverty line (Krieger, Williams, & Moss, 1997; Veloudaki, 2023); for that purpose, both the incomes of households have been collected. The statistical analysis of the study found a positive but relatively weak (0.309) correlation between income and interfaith harmony. A household's economic status has an association with all the SES; income not only influences the material condition of the families but also a direct source for educational access, which in both ways, i.e., directly and indirectly, influences the tolerance of Muslims towards Christians.

Both the indicators, e.g., education and income, have a positive but weak correlation with the interfaith harmony in the current study. The study of Hauser, Sheridan and Warren (1997) endorsed the findings of the current study that the selected indicators can influence the interaction of individuals with the external world, and in such cases, they may be helpful to enhance interfaith harmony in both ways.

Peace and social harmony are very important in interfaith relations for a progressive and harmonious society in Pakistan (Sadowski, 2021). This could be helpful in eradicating religious extremism and personal biases promoted by social interactions within different religious groups. Religious harmony in the current study found a significant direct correlation with SES; the lower the SES, the lower the interfaith harmony, and the higher the SES, the higher the interfaith harmony. From income and education, it was found that education has a higher tendency and correlation as a determinant for strong interfaith harmony.

Conclusion

The acceptance of various faith groups is important for harmony in society. Religious extremism and intolerance regarding acceptance of other faith groups may be eliminated through an increase in the SES of citizens. If educational structure is given priority, it will play a major role in increasing interfaith tolerance and a peaceful, harmonious society. The ratio of Muslims to other religious sects is higher in the country, whereas Christians are the second largest community in numbers. Generally, it was observed and conceptualized that the Muslims of the country did not accept the freedom and religious independence of the Christians. Sometimes SES correlates with religious extremism; in the present study, such a correlation was explored to document the impact of the former on the latter. The present research found a moderately positive correlation (4.81**) between income and education and interfaith harmony in the selected population.

Muhammad Sardar Alam: Problem Identification and Model Devolpement,
Muhammad Rahmatullah Farooqi: Supervision and Drafting

Majid Hussain Alias Ghalib Hussain: Literature search, Methodology

Conflict of Interests/Disclosures

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest in this article's research, authorship, and/or publication.

References

Akbar, M. and Yaseen, H (March, 2020). Interfaith Harmony in Pakistan: An Analysis. *Global Political Review, 5*(1), 9-18.

Arrow, K. J, S. Bowles, and S.N. Durlauf,. (2000). *Meritocracy and economic inequality.* Princeton University Press.

Backlund, E, P.D, Sorlie and N.J, Johnson, (1996). The shape of the relationship between income and mortality in the United States: evidence from the National Longitudinal Mortality Study. *Annals of epidemiology, 6*(1), 12-20.

Bill, B. (2008). *The Big Sort: Why the Clustering of Like-Minded America Is Tearing Us Apart*.

Bouta, T. S.A. Kadayifci-Orellana., and Abu-Nimer, M. (2005). *Faith-Based Peace-Building: Mapping and Analysis of Christian, Muslim and Multi-Faith Actors.* Netherlands institute of international relations' Clingendael.

Chakim, S., Fauzi, F., Budiyono, A., Prasetiyo, A.R.B. & Solikhah, U., (2023). Increasing religious tolerance levels among youth with Our Moderate Game app: Is it effective?. *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies 79*(1), a8162. https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v79i1.8162

Gunn, T. J. (2000). *Preliminary Response to Criticisms of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998*, A. BYU L. Rev., 841.

Hauser, R. M., J.T, Sheridan, and J.R Warren,. (1997). Socioeconomic Achievements of Siblings in the Life Course New Findings from the Wisconsin Longitudinal Study. *Research on Aging, 21*(2), 338-378.

Haynes, J. (2009). Conflict, conflict resolution and peace-building: The role of religion in Mozambique, Nigeria and Cambodia. *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics, 47*(1), 52-75.

Howden-Chapman, P. (2004). Housing standards: a glossary of housing and health. *Journal of epidemiology and Community health, 58*(3), 162-168.

Inamullah, S. M. (2004). Religious Liberty, Political Choice and Ethnic Pluralism in Nigeria: Starting a Dialogue of Acceptance. *Humanities, 1*(2), 99-108.

Jamilah, S., (2021). Moderate Islamic education to enhance nationalism among Indonesian Islamic student organizations in the era of society 5.0. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research, 12*(3), 79-100.

Khan, M. S., and G. Rafi,. (2014). Religion, Politics and the Christians of Pakistan: Is KPK a Better Option to Live?. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research, 21*(6), 975-983.

Khan, S. A,. (2011). *A Voyage to Modernism*. Primus Books.

Krieger, N., D.R, Williams, and N.E, Moss,. (1997). Measuring social class in US public health

research: concepts, methodologies, and guidelines. *Annual review of public health, 18*(1), 341-378.

Krok, D. & Zarzycka, B., (2021). Interpersonal forgiveness and meaning in life in older adults: The mediating and moderating roles of the religious meaning system. *Religions 12*(1), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12010037

Litt, E., Zhao, S., Kraut, R. & Burke, M., (2020). What are meaningful social interactions in today's media landscape? A cross-cultural survey. *Social Media and Society 6*(3), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305120942888

Little, W., McGivern, R and Nolan, C. (2014). Chapter 15: Religion. In Introduction to Sociology 1st Canadian Edition. B Ccampus. https://opentextbc.ca/introductiontosociology/chapter/chapter-15- religion/

Lu, Y and Yang, X. Y. (2020). The Two Faces of Diversity: The Relationships between Religious Polarization, Religious Fractionalization, and SelfRated Health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 61*(1):79-95.

Malik, I. H. (2002). *Religious Minorities in Pakistan* (Vol. 6). London: Minority rights group international.

Muttamba, W., Bbuye, M., Baluku, J.B., Kyaligonza, S., Nalunjogi, J., Kimuli, I. et al., (2021). Perceptions of adolescents and health workers towards adolescents. TB diagnosis in Central Uganda: A cross-sectional qualitative study. *Risk Management and Healthcare Policy* 14, 4823–4832. https://doi.org/10.2147/RMHP.S340112

Phillips, M. (1993). Rural gentrification and the processes of class colonisation. *Journal of rural studies, 9*(2), 123-140.

Quarshie, E. N. B., Waterman, M.G. & House, A.O., (2020). Adolescent self-harm in Ghana: A qualitative interview-based study of first-hand accounts. *BMC Psychiatry 20*(1), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-020-02599-9

Ringwald, W. R and Wright, A. G. C. (2021). The Affiliative Role of Empathy in Everyday Interpersonal Interactions. *European Journal of Personality, 35*(2):197-211.

Sadowski, R. F., (2021). The Role of Catholicism in Shaping a Culture of Sustainable Consumption. *Religions 12*(8), 598. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12080598

Smith, E. A., M.B, Mulder, S. Bowles., and K. Hill,. (2011). Wealth Inequality in Foraging, Horticultural, Pastoral, and Agricultural Populations. *Current Anthropology, 52*(4), 579-580.

Veloudaki, C. (2023). Inter-faith relations and their spatial representation in the Late Medieval Aegean: the double-apsed churches of Kythnos in the Western Cyclades. *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, 47*(1):37-53.

Zeng, S., Peng, Z. & Wu, L., (2021). Is there a role of religion? The moderation role of religious identity and religious practice between traditional media usage and moral evaluation. *Religions 12*(2), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12020137.