



The Effect of Religious Orders on the Interaction Between Individualism and Collectivism

Zahra Jahankhah¹, Seyed Hekmatollah Hashemipour^{2*}, Mohammad Ali Heidari³

1. Ph.D Student, Department of Jurisprudence and Fundamentals of Islamic Law, Najafabad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Najafabad, Iran.

2. Assistant Professor, Department of Islamic Studies, Yasuj Branch, Islamic Azad University, Yasuj, Iran.

Email: Hashemipour.hekmatollah@yahoo.com

3. Assistant Professor, Department of Jurisprudence and Fundamentals of Islamic Law, Najafabad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Najafabad, Iran.

Corresponding Author: Seyed Hekmatollah Hashemipour

Abstract

As symbolic and institutional mechanisms, religious orders shape the interaction between individual religious self-awareness and collective obligations, but the question is how and through what mechanisms this effect is realized. The conflict between individual freedom and collective order, diverse jurisprudential interpretations, and the role of institutions and public policy in directing or imposing these orders have consequences for individual identity, social solidarity, and civil rights. The present study, using a descriptive-analytical method, attempts to explain these mechanisms and consequences in the context of contemporary religious societies and seeks to restore individual dignity and collective cohesion. The results of the study show that religious orders organize the interaction between individuality and collectivism in a dual and path-breaking way; education starting from childhood and the repetition of rituals transform religious behaviors into a sensual queen, while collective rituals such as congregational prayer and Hajj create symbolic capital and social cohesion. The effectiveness of this interaction depends on mechanisms such as the emotional bond between the teacher and the student, the preservation of autonomy and dignity, gradual preparation, the strengthening of religious reasoning, and balanced supervision; in their absence, worship becomes a mere form or tool of imposition, leading to meaninglessness and generational resistance. Therefore, institutions should focus on teaching meanings, participation, and support for teachers.

Keywords: religious orders, individualism, collectivism

Received: 16 November 2023

Revised: 21 December 2023

Accepted: 29 December 2023

Introduction

Worshipful precepts, as religious orders and customs that regulate individual rituals and behaviors, are not only spiritual manifestations of individuals; they also play a decisive role in reproducing collective identities and regulating relationships between individuals and society, in conjunction with social, moral, and institutional structures. These precepts, which range from prayer and fasting to pilgrimage and zakat, provide symbolic and practical formats that oblige individuals to perform specific functions not only before God but also before their fellow human beings and social institutions, and in this way strengthen bonds of solidarity, a sense of shared duty, and a shared value system. From a theoretical perspective, religious precepts simultaneously have two reciprocal functions: on the one hand, they give the individual meaning, identity coherence, and spiritual experience, and on the other hand, they determine rules for participation, compassion, and social responsibility; thus, these precepts redefine the boundary between the private and public spheres in such a way that individuality crystallizes in the context of collectivism. However, this

interaction is not always without tension, because individualism and collectivism typically represent two different value orientations, each seeking to prioritize individual growth or collective well-being; religious orders can moderate or exacerbate this conflict in various ways. For example, the fluidization of religious rituals in the family and community can narrow the space for the exercise of individual freedom of choice and self-awareness, but on the other hand, these rituals can expand the grounds of social support, social capital, and networks of cooperation that are vital for collective well-being. Moreover, diverse interpretations of the same rules—depending on different jurisprudential, cultural, and political orientations—can produce important transformations in the meaning and social function of these rules; thus, analyzing the impact of religious orders on the interaction of individualism and collectivism requires attention to the meaning-making, institutional practice, and power relations that shape these interpretations. From a legal and institutional perspective, the link between religious orders and public order also raises fundamental questions, as the legal regulation of religious acts can both facilitate social solidarity and be a platform for the reproduction of hegemonic attitudes that limit individual freedom. In contemporary societies faced with diverse beliefs and secular tendencies, how religious orders integrate or conflict with individual rights, legal guarantees, and public policy becomes a complex issue with implications that extend beyond the realm of personal spirituality, including in the areas of political participation, gender justice, and social cohesion. Moreover, social mechanisms—such as religious education, popular networks, and the role of clergy or religious institutions—are instrumental in shaping the way religious orders are implemented and reinterpreted, and therefore an analysis of the effects of these orders would be incomplete without considering these actors and processes. Given the theoretical and practical importance of this issue, the present study attempts to fill the gaps in understanding the direct and indirect effects of religious orders on the balance between individual autonomy and collective obligations, and, particularly in the context of contemporary religious-civil societies, to examine the ways in which these orders contribute to the reproduction or revision of individual identities and collective norms. This study not only explains the social and institutional mechanisms, but also considers the legal, cultural, and political consequences of this interaction in order to enable the design of policies and mechanisms that both uphold individual dignity and freedom and strengthen collective capacities for solidarity and participation. This research answers the question of how and through what mechanisms do religious orders shape the interaction between individuality and collectivism, and what consequences do these effects have for individual identity, social solidarity, and civil rights and institutions in contemporary religious societies?

1- Religious education

Religious education is a complex concept that requires us to first clarify “education” and “worship” separately and then define the combination of the two. “Education” is originally derived from the root “ribu” and the verb “tafa’il” meaning to nurture, raise, and raise (Amid, 1360: 559). Various wordings of this root have been reported in Arabic texts: a hill is called “ribu” because it is raised above the ground, and breathing is called “ribu” because the chest bulges (Ibn Fares, 1979: 2/483). Khalil bin Ahmad Farahidi considered the root to mean “excess” and cited examples of usages such as “riba al-jarh” والذرة والمال Farahidi, Bayta: 8/284). Ragheb Isfahani also interpreted the principle of “Lord” as promoting and gradating growth and emphasized the step-by-step aspect of training (Ragheb Isfahani, 1412: 336-340). These linguistic expressions show that training is not an instantaneous event but an incremental and gradual process that leads the being towards perfection. In the terminology, training refers to providing the grounds and actions that cause the inner talents of a living being to flourish; that is, it consists of helping and guiding to actualize the potential powers and capabilities in such a way that the individual moves on the path of perfection and goodness. This view emphasizes two basic points: first, training must be carried out in accordance with the nature and character of the being and nothing can be developed through force; And secondly, education is a gradual matter and requires the provision of conditions and a guiding agent (mentor) (Mutahari, 1392: 1/56; Aarafi, 1391: 141-131).

“Ibadat” is also derived from the Arabic word “abd” and sometimes means humiliation and obedience, sometimes submission and submission, and in some interpretations it means submissive following of the Lord (Ragheb Isfahani, 1412: 542; Ibn Manzur, 1414: 2/272; Fayumi, 1397: 2/381). Allama Tabataba’i considers the truth of worship to be the servant’s being in a position of humiliation and remembering God and His remembrance (Tabataba’i, 1374 AH: 18/388). In jurisprudential terminology, specific worship

refers to actions whose validity requires the intention of nearness and the performance of the quality determined by the lawgiver, such as prayer, fasting, and pilgrimage (Mishkini, 2013: 366). On the other hand, there is also a broader interpretation of worship that includes obedience and everyday behaviors whenever accompanied by divine intention (Anwari, Bayta: 5, 4963). By combining these two areas, it is possible to give “worship training” a precise and cognitive meaning. What is meant in this treatise is the first meaning of worship, which is “specific worship”; Therefore, religious education is a disciplined and planned process for teaching the quality of performing worship and cultivating the spirit of servitude and prayer in the trainee in such a way that he not only learns the etiquette and jurisprudential rules of religious acts, but also cultivates the inner state of humility, the intention of closeness, and the heartfelt commitment to performing these duties (Mishkini, 2013: 366; Aarafi, 2012: 58). In other words, religious education is a stage after faith education that aims to transfer the spirit of worship and familiarity with the state of servitude from the cognitive level to a deep emotional and behavioral level so that the individual can achieve a real commitment to the rituals. The basic characteristics of religious education can be listed as follows: First, the gradual nature of the process, which is rooted in the literal meaning of "Lord" and requires the development of talents; Second, the simultaneous emphasis on learning the religious quality of actions and cultivating the intention and spirit of servitude; Third, paying attention to the nature and capacities of the trainee so that his growth is not achieved through coercion and pressure, but through gentle guidance and role modeling (Ragheb Isfahani, 1412: 336; Motahari, 2013: 1/56). In addition, religious training requires two-way interaction between the trainer and the trainee to strengthen the trainee's credibility and participation and to replace the merely superficial or habitual behaviors with desirable changes in him (Arafi, 2012: 131). According to what has been said, religious training is the process of the trainer helping and guiding the trainee over a gradual period of time, the goal of which is to develop and organize the trainee's internal capacities in order to internalize the state of humility, the intention of closeness, and practical commitment to the specific acts of worship that the legislator has determined; This process includes both teaching the jurisprudential and ritual quality of actions and cultivating emotion, motivation, and cognition that elevates worship from an outward form to the status of true worship (Arafi, 2012: 58; Motahari, 2013: 1/56; Meshkini, 2013: 366).

2- Distinguishing religious education from punishment and discipline

Explaining the fundamental differences between “worshipful education” and the terms “punishment” and “discipline” requires going back to the lexical and idiomatic origins of each and then reviewing their functions and purposes in educational and religious contexts. The word “punishment” originally comes from the root “nabhe” meaning to awaken and inform, and in general applications it has come to mean scolding and punishment (Mehyar; Abdullah, 1413: 2/590). However, when this word is examined in the realm of behavioral and educational sciences, it acquires a more precise meaning; punishment in behavioral definitions is the presentation of an unpleasant stimulus or the removal of a positive reinforcement immediately after a response occurs in order to reduce the likelihood of repeating that behavior, and in its more specific meaning it can include physical actions and inflicting pain to correct behavior (John Lyons et al.; Seif, 1368: 264). On the other hand, legal institutions and international organizations have defined corporal punishment as any physical punishment that is carried out with physical force and with the intention of causing pain or discomfort, and have considered it an example of a violation of the rights of the child. From this set of definitions, three common features of the definition of corporal punishment can be extracted: first, the physical nature of the act; second, the presence of the intention to cause pain or discomfort; and third, the goal of correcting or controlling behavior (Hosseini, 2010: 45). In addition, in broader understandings of “punishment”, things such as threats, deprivation, reprimand or neglect are also included in its semantic spectrum, although some of these examples have also been criticized from an ethical and scientific perspective. The word “discipline”, however, has two semantic procedures that clearly distinguish it from punishment and from religious education. In jurisprudential and legal terminology, discipline sometimes means punishment, reprimand, and reprimand; that is, what is used to keep an individual away from an ugly act and force him to return to moral virtues (Hosseini, 1414: 1/144; Fayumi, 1397: 1/9). In the same jurisprudential process, when jurists speak of “child discipline,” they often mean a kind of warning or coercive duty that a teacher or father imposes on a child (Fayz Kashani). But on the other hand, discipline means “etiquette,” that is, a process that leads an individual to moral virtues and scientific and cultural learning, and therefore, to some extent,

it is equivalent and overlaps with concepts such as education and upbringing; for this reason, literary derivatives have been mentioned in classical educational texts as titles for teaching and promoting manners. In contrast to these terms, “devotional education” has an evolutionary, internalizing, and goal-oriented nature; devotional education is a process that aims to cultivate the spiritual and moral capacities of a person in such a way that qualities such as the intention of nearness, humility, and heartfelt commitment to performing acts of worship are realized within the learner. This type of education has characteristics that distinguish it from any punitive procedure: First, devotional education is based on gentleness, repetition, and creating favorable conditions, and assumes that spiritual growth is gradual and in accordance with human nature; hence, the use of force and coercion is not a responsible solution for the true cultivation of devotion (Motaheri, 2013: 1/56; Aarafi, 2012: 58). Second, devotional education simultaneously teaches the formal and jurisprudential rituals of worship and cultivates internal motivations and states; That is, in addition to teaching the outward quality of prayer or fasting, it emphasizes the formation of intention, attention, and humility so that worship can be elevated from an outward habit to a heartfelt and practical commitment (Mishkini, 2013: 366). By putting these definitions together, it is possible to identify the linear and substantive distinctions. From a goal perspective, the purpose of worship education is incremental and guiding towards perfection; that is, education tries to actualize potential capacities and guide people to true commitment in worship matters. In contrast, punishment has a deterrent and reductive purpose; specifically, it seeks to reduce the likelihood of undesirable behavior, and discipline in the sense of punishment is also in this circle (Saif, 2019: 264). From a methodological perspective, worship education is based on supportive and educational tools; The coach acts as a guide and a source of role models, and two-way interaction between the coach and the trainee is a condition for influence (Aarafi, 2012: 131). However, punishment is often reactive and based on giving points to annoying stimuli or removing reinforcement, which is far from the philosophy of educational practice and, in its physical form, can be accompanied by entering the realm of physical and legal harm (Hosseinihah, 2010: 4).

Another important aspect is that the object of each of these procedures is different. In punishment, the object is mainly the specific behavior that must be reduced and not the person as a human being (Alson, 2006: 116). In punitive discipline, the focus is also on correcting the undesirable act, although in practice, the discipline may be directed at the individual as a deterrent (Hosseini, 1414: 1/144). However, in religious education, the focus is on cultivating the soul and spirit of the person; the aim is to create a change in intention, consciousness, and state of mind so that religious behaviors arise from a spiritual commitment and are not carried out solely out of fear or external condemnation (Mishkini, 2013: 366; Aarafi, 2012: 58). This difference also has moral and legal consequences: from the perspective of religious sources and modern educational teachings, constructive and non-harmful strategies are preferable in cultivating obedience, and corporal punishment or any physical punishment that is carried out with the aim of causing pain, or at least faces severe legal and moral considerations (Hosseini, 2010: 45). It can be said that religious education is a long-term, justified and constructive type of education that strengthens internal motivations and forms moral and religious obligations, while punishment is a reactive and sometimes physical tool to reduce undesirable behavior, and discipline can also operate in two different domains: a domain that is close to punishment and retribution, and a domain that reflects politeness and education. From the perspective of a desirable religious and moral educational program, priority is given to mechanisms that lead to the development of true worship in the heart and soul of the trainee, and any harassing or humiliating method that undermines the health of the soul and body or human dignity is rejected by religious sources and contemporary legal and educational standards, or at least emphasized with caution and limitation (Qaemi, 2003: 138; Motahari, 2013: 1/56).

3- Mechanisms of interaction between individuality and collectivism through religious precepts

Performing acts of worship from a young age, both from a psychological and religious perspective, lays the groundwork for religious practice to become a “queen” in the human soul; early experiences and repetitions of prayer and fasting make it easier and more consistent for an individual to perform these duties in adulthood, while delaying the start of these practices until reaching the age of responsibility can cause difficulty in accepting and continuing them. This is a fundamental point that religious education should begin in childhood so that religious customs and traditions can take root in the child’s heart and mind; therefore, families, educators, and religious institutions have the responsibility to take children to

religious institutions such as mosques and religious gatherings so that from that time they can become familiar with spaces and people of faith and provide a suitable emotional and symbolic basis for commitment (Amini, 2011: 252-251).

The revelational and narrative foundations also confirm the necessity of providing the foundations for religious education in childhood; The Quran commands the family to perform prayers and insists on their persistence (Taha, 132), and the Prophet Ismail is mentioned as an example of encouraging his family to pray and pay zakat (Maryam, 54). Hadiths from the life of the infallibles also introduce early ages as the time when the command to pray and fast should be gradually initiated; the Prophet (PBUH) recommended teaching prayers from the age of seven (Maghribi, 1385: 194), Imam Ali (PBUH) recommended teaching prayers before reaching puberty (Harrani, 1363 AH: 115), and other narrations explain how to teach fasting in stages and in accordance with the child's ability (Kulaini, 1407: 3/409). Therefore, from a religious perspective, religious education is not only a later stage of religious obligation, but it is necessary to prepare the groundwork for it beforehand.

From an educational and theoretical perspective, views such as the thoughts of Shahid Motahari consider childhood education as the basis for building morality and human traits; he considers human nature as a tree that needs constant care and watering from the beginning, and reminds us that traits that are established in youth or later cannot be removed, and although change is possible, it is easier and more effective to establish traits during childhood (Motahari, 78). This perspective gives us a clear lesson about the necessity of combining the timing of education and its content: the earlier and more systematic the effort to form worship behaviors, the higher the likelihood that they will be sustained in the individual identity. In practice, the mechanisms for transforming worship into a practice are multiple and interconnected. First, love and emotional bond between the instructor and the trainee play a pivotal role; the instructor's love provides the basis for role modeling and a heartfelt tendency, and through this, commitment to worship is motivated from within rather than being caused by pressure; When a child has love and trust for his/her teacher, it becomes easier to accept his/her messages and behaviors. Second, maintaining the freedom and autonomy of the learner means that coercion and reluctance in religious education should be limited so that worship becomes a meaningful and godly choice; successful religious education is one that keeps the mind and freedom active and does not reduce the sense of servitude to hatred or apparent events through external imposition. The third mechanism is gradual preparation and grounding; religious acts should be presented in accordance with the child's physical and mental development and gradually lead him/her to initial successful experiences to provide motivation to continue on the path. This principle prevents the sudden imposition of heavy duties and the creation of a sense of failure or reluctance, and allows the teacher or parent to play a compensatory role to some extent in the event of neglect by the family. Fourth, maintaining the child's dignity and self-esteem are vital elements of survival and deepening the need; When the human status of the student is respected, he becomes less vulnerable to pressure and the tendency to show off or abandon religion decreases; hence, corporal punishment is condemned as a general and primary method of dealing with educational errors and the promotion of respect and strengthening of individual competence is recommended (Dilshad, 2014: 230-232). Fifth, reasoning and thinking, along with solid education, transform worship from mere meaningless repetition into actions based on reason and understanding; when the student understands the causality and moral and personal effects of prayer and fasting, his decision-making in dusty situations will be based on insight and not baseless imitation; therefore, teachers and parents must strengthen the atmosphere of questioning and reflection so that worship education becomes both rational and sustainable. Sixth, continuous but balanced supervision and care are necessary; Careful monitoring of opportunities for freedom will reveal weaknesses and correct them in a timely manner, while excessive care will reinforce feelings of lack of freedom and reluctance, and inaction will facilitate abandonment. The interaction between individuality and collectivism in this educational framework appears complementary, not merely reciprocal; collective worship, such as congregational prayer and ritual ceremonies, provides symbolic and institutional structures through which individuals find shared identity and social capital, but if the enrichment of the collective element comes at the cost of imposing and denying individual agency, this interaction will turn into conflict. Therefore, while strengthening collective experiences, it is necessary to recognize the individual's capacity for choice, dignity, and the possibility of independent thought so that worship can be both a source of solidarity and personal growth. This is the balance that religious teachings

and educational experiences of great figures such as Motahari emphasize: effective education is a process that combines love and order, freedom and rule, and emotion and reason to create a space for the flourishing of nature. At the institutional level, mosques, religious schools, and cultural centers must play the role of both social facilitators and protectors of dignity and encourage thought; these institutions can only help reproduce healthy norms and produce collective identities if their education is based on love, respect for freedom, gradual preparation, and balanced care, and they avoid turning teachings into hegemonic or controlling tools. Ultimately, successful religious education is one that, starting from childhood, fosters individual commitment along with a sense of collective responsibility through repetition of experiences, creating emotional bonds, strengthening reason, and providing an appropriate institutional space; Such an approach both upholds human dignity and strengthens society's capacity for solidarity and mutual support, and conversely, any kind of neglect or pressure and imposition can weaken both individuality and collective cohesion.

4- The consequences of the interaction between individuality and collectivism through religious orders in contemporary religious societies

In contemporary religious societies, religious orders act as one of the main platforms for the connection between the individual and the collective realms; on the one hand, worship, especially prayer, fasting, and pilgrimage, is an arena that emphasizes the intention of the individual to be close and intentional and directs the direction of action toward a personal relationship with God; and on the other hand, these same rituals in collective and institutional forms (congregational prayer, ritual ceremonies, pilgrimage rituals) create a shared experience that strengthens the social identity, cultural capital, and moral order of the group. This dual coexistence—intentional individuality and symbolic collectivism—has multifaceted and sometimes contradictory consequences on individual and social orders, which can be explained by examining them with regard to theoretical foundations and narratives, as well as educational dimensions mentioned in the sources. The first positive outcome of the interaction of these two areas is the formation of a balanced religious identity; Because religious education is in its nature a combination of doctrinal teachings and practical actions, and when it is pursued from childhood along with scientific education in worship and the cultivation of pure intention, belief and action become intertwined and faith is transferred from the level of assertion to the heart and its actions are confirmed (Majlisi, 1403: 66/72). Therefore, when the family and social institutions simultaneously focus on teaching the jurisprudential and semantic aspects of worship, as well as providing collective opportunities for religious experience, the individual finds an identity that has both religious obligations and experiences social belonging; which is the foundation of religious stability and the prevention of individual deviations (Davoodi, 1390: 26). The second constructive outcome is the creation and strengthening of social capital and collective cohesion. Collective religious rituals are the basis for reproducing shared symbols, values, and moral orders, and they play an important role in learning social rights and duties and cultivating a sense of responsibility; in this way, religious orders not only organize the individual's relationship with God, but also establish the rules of social life and the bonds between individuals. This process is more effective when religious education is based on appropriate educational methods—including cognitive justification of the orders, creating an emotional atmosphere, and practical modeling.

But this interaction also has challenging consequences. One of the most important risks is the transformation of worship into a purely formal and habitual behavior; when there is too much emphasis on repeating rituals without cultivating rational intention and understanding, worship is deprived of its original purpose (the intention of proximity) and its educational and moral function is reduced. Such a situation harms both the individual level (lack of religious insight and internal motivation) and the social level (the display of religiosity and distancing from the moral content of religion) (Davoodi, 2011: 26; Sajidi and Shokrollahi, Beta: 58). In addition, if collective actions are imposed or carried out with pressure and suppression of individual freedom, they can weaken individuality and provoke generational resistance and distrust; meaning that strengthening the collective element comes at the cost of negating individual freedom, which in turn leads to rebound reactions and a decrease in genuine commitment.

Another important consequence of interaction is the difference in the impact on different educational dimensions. Devotional education, which relies on the intention of closeness and commitment to the commandments, can develop strength in mutual relations with other educational areas—including

doctrinal, moral, and emotional education—but if it does not follow the correct cognitive, emotional, and behavioral paths, it may cause disruption in those areas. For example, if devotional education is limited to ritual instructions only and emotional and epistemic dimensions are not strengthened, it will not be able to cultivate moral virtues, love, and commitment (Sajidi and Shokrollahi, *ibid.*). On the other hand, when devotional education is accompanied by reflection and awareness, it provides the basis for the formation of religious rationality and helps develop the power of religious thought (Arafi, 2018: 22).

The determining factor in regulating outcomes is educational methods and policies. Theoretical and narrative discussions have emphasized the role of the family and the educator in creating emotional bonds and practical role models; a child who grows up in an environment full of love and practical models of worship is likely to accept religion as a natural part of life and internalize it (Harr Ameli, 1988: 15/97). In contrast, methods based on coercion, constant scolding, or disproportionate punishment both threaten the child's dignity and lead to resistance or the adoption of dramatic servitude; therefore, religious education should be based on the principle of gradualization, respect for dignity, and strengthening the learner's autonomy (Sajidi and Shokrollahi, *Bita*: 58). One important institutional consequence of the interaction is the need to redefine the role of mosques and cultural institutions. When these institutions focus only on performing rituals, they may simply reinforce the reproduction of outward behaviors; But if their educational role is strengthened—including teaching meanings, providing opportunities for questioning, and combining collective programs with individual opportunities to cultivate intention and thought—then they can create a constructive interaction between individuality and collectivism and avoid any cultural hegemony or control (Davoodi, 2011: 26).

From a preventive and community-building perspective, the correct interaction between individuality and collectivism also has positive consequences: religious education, if accompanied by intention and knowledge, can be effective in reducing abnormalities and promoting social responsibility, because cultivating morality and adhering to religious laws provides grounds for responsible behavior and preventing deviation (Majlisi, 1403: 66/72). This preventive capacity is especially important in contemporary societies that are facing complex economic, cultural, and sexual challenges, and makes the need to integrate different educational areas more apparent than ever (Arafi, 1397: 139). In conclusion, it can be said that the consequences of the interaction between individuality and collectivism through religious laws in contemporary religious societies are neither confined to a set of fixed results nor necessarily a binary of good and evil; Rather, depending on educational methods, institutional structures, and the way educational areas are integrated, it can lead to the development of a healthy religious identity, social cohesion, and the prevention of deviant behavior, or, conversely, it can lead to the weakening of individual agency, the transformation of worship into a meaningless habit, and the strengthening of imposed social control. The middle and operational path to guide this interaction toward positive outcomes is based on: simultaneous emphasis on cognitive adaptation and the cultivation of intention, emotional and loving modeling in families, gradual and age-appropriate education, preserving the dignity and freedom of choice of the individual, and promoting the educational and reflective role of religious institutions so that worship becomes both a source of the individual's approach to God and a factor of social stability and solidarity.

Conclusion

The impact of religious rules on the interaction between individuality and collectivism is dual in nature and at the same time path-breaking; on the one hand, the beginning of religious education from childhood and the regular repetition of rituals pave the way for the transformation of religious behaviors into sensual queens, and in this way, a stable individuality is formed within the framework of religious commitment, and on the other hand, collective religious experiences such as congregational prayer, ritual ceremonies, and Hajj produce symbolic and social capital that creates bonds that strengthen the cohesion, responsibility, and moral order of the group. The effectiveness of this interaction depends on educational methods and mechanisms; the emotional bond between the educator and the learner, maintaining the individual's freedom and authority, gradual preparation in line with the child's development, respecting dignity and self-esteem, strengthening the capacity for reasoning and religious thought, and balanced supervision are all necessary elements for worship to be both a source of internal commitment and a generator of social solidarity. However, serious risks arise in the absence of these mechanisms; Turning

worship into a merely formal and repetitive ritual, using pressure and imposition to ensure collective presence, and ignoring the dignity and authority of individuals can lead to religious meaninglessness, generational resistance, and weakening social solidarity. Therefore, the desired practical orientation is for family and religious institutions to simultaneously play an educational, emotional, and institutional role, and for mosques, religious schools, and cultural centers to provide a space for teaching meanings, questioning, practical modeling, and strengthening conscious decision-making, rather than being merely a place to perform rituals; such an approach will simultaneously make worship a source of the individual's approach to God and a factor in producing social capital and collective moral order. At the level of educational policymaking, it is suggested that programs emphasize gradual and goal-oriented strategies, rational teaching of precepts, support for capable educators, and the creation of participatory mechanisms in order to, on the one hand, prevent religion from becoming a tool of social control, and, on the other hand, strengthen individual participation and collective commitment in a balanced and respectful manner; this is possible only when attention to inner growth and human dignity is the focus of all worship education programs.

References

1. Ibn Faris, Abu al-Husayn, Ahmad (1979). Dictionary of the Dimensions of Language. Researcher: Abdul Salam, Harun, Islamic Media School.
2. Ibn Manzur, Muhammad ibn Makram (1414 AH). Lisan al-Arab.
3. A'rafi, Ali Reza (1391). Educational Jurisprudence; Foundations and Presuppositions. Qom: Institute of Illumination and Mysticism.
4. (1397)Raising a Child with a Jurisprudential Approach, written by Seyyed Naqi Mousavi. Institute of Illumination and Mysticism.
5. Amini, Ibrahim (1390). Education. Qom: Bostan Kitab.
6. Anwari, Hassan (Beita). Great Dictionary of Speech.
7. Hurr A'mli, Muhammad ibn Hassan (1367 AH). Shia Resources. Beirut: Darahiya al-Turaht al-Arabi.
8. Harrani, Hassan ibn Ali ibn Hussein ibn Shu'bah (1363 AH). Memoirs of the Prophet's Family. Jamia al-Modaresin, Qom.
9. Hosseinihah, Seyyed Javad (2009). Corporal Punishment of Children in the International System of Human Rights and Imami Jurisprudence.
10. Hosseini, Mohammad Morteza (1414 AH). Taj al-Arous. Beirut: Dar al-Fikr.
11. Davoudi, Mohammad (2011). Religious Education. Seminary and University Research Institute, Qom.
12. Dilshad, Mustafa (2014). A Journey in Islamic Education. Qom: Darya Publishing House.
13. Raghib Isfahani, Hussein bin Muhammad (2012 AH). Al-Mufradat fi Gharib al-Quran. Beirut: Dar al-Qalam.
14. Sajidi, Abolfazl and Shokrollahi, Mahdi. (Bita). Methods of Spiritual Worship Education.
15. Seif, Ali Akbar. (1368). Educational Psychology. Tehran: Agah Publishing House.
16. Tabatabaei, Seyyed Mohammad Hussein (1374). Nihayat al-Hikmah. Qom Seminary Teachers' Association: Islamic Publishing House.
17. Amid, Hussein (1360). Farhang Amid. Tehran: Amir Kabir Publications.
18. Farahidi, Khalil bin Ahmad (Bita). Al-Ain, Qom: Hijrat.
19. Fayumi, Ahmad bin Muhammad (1397 AH). Al-Misbah al-Munir in Gharib al-Sharh al-Kabir. Ch. II, Cairo: Dar al-Ma'arif.
20. Ghaemi, Mohammad Reza (1383 AH). Harmful Methods in Education from the Perspective of Islamic Education, Research Institute of Seminaries and Universities.
21. Majlisi, Mohammad Baqir. (1403 AH). Bihar al-Anwar. Dar Ihya al-Turat al-Arabi.
22. Meshkini, Ali (1392 AH). Jurisprudential Terms. Qom: Dar al-Hadith Scientific and Cultural Institute.
23. Mostafavi, Hassan (1368 AH). Investigation of the Words of the Quran. Tehran: Ministry of Culture and Islamic Guidance.
24. Motahari, Morteza. (1392 AH). Collection of Works. Tehran: Sadra Publications.
25. Maghribi, Numan bin Muhammad bin Mansour bin Ahmed bin Hayyun (1385 AH). Da'aim al-Islam, Qom.