Ulumuna
Vol. 27, No. 1, 2023, p. 416-448
Journal of Islamic Studies Published by State Islamic University Mataram
p-ISSN 1411-3457, e-ISSN 2355-7648, available online at https://ulumuna.or.id

ISLAMIC RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AND INTERRELIGIOUS TOLERANCE IN A MULTI-RELIGIOUS COUNTRY: Challenges, Typological Implications, and the Proposed Strategy

Mohamad Iwan Fitriani
Universitas Islam Negeri Mataram
Email: iwanfitriani@uinmataram.ac.id

Abstract: This research seeks to examine contemporary challenges relating to the realization of intra- and interreligious tolerance within the Indonesian Islamic Religious Education (IRE) system. To this end, I identify three areas requiring revisiting: the challenges facing teachers of IRE in regard to the promotion of intra- and interreligious tolerance, the implications of these challenges for typologies of student tolerance and intolerance, and the proposed strategy to cope with the challenges. The study utilizes a qualitative approach across multiple sites. Data were collected in the form of in-depth interviews, document analysis, and observation at a madrasah (MA, Indonesian: Madrasah Aliyah) and two high schools (SMA, Indonesian: Sekolah Menengah Atas). Data were analyzed through six steps of Braun and Clarke's thematic analysis. This research finds that: (1) challenges related to the emergence of intra- and interreligious intolerance are traced to the domination of the mono-religious education model within the study of IRE in MA and SMAs; (2) the domination of this mono-religious education model is implicated in a number of tolerance and intolerance student typologies, such as active-passive intolerance and active-passive tolerance and active intra- and interreligious tolerance; (3) the proposed strategy to cope with challenges faced by IRE teachers to promote intra and inter-religious tolerance is mutual supporting religious education model, which could be supported via macro-, meso-, and micro-educational system policy and regulation.

Keywords: Religious Education, Interreligious tolerance, Integrative model

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.20414/ujis.v23i1.765

Introduction

DESPITE its self-image as a tolerant Muslim-majority country, several high-profile cases of intra- and interreligious intolerance

among religious groups have emerged in contemporary Indonesia.[1] This intra- and interreligious intolerance has included terror, violence, suicide bombings, destruction of places of worship, and the persecution of religious figures in the name of a particular religion.[2] These actions demonstrate the contradictory dual potential of religion as an instigator of both tolerance and intolerance; if religion is not a solution, it is part of the problem.[3]

One proposed method to shift religious actors from "part of the problem" to "part of the solution" is through education. Education is the best medium for combatting intolerance, as education can replace a culture of war with peace. Numerous experts over the last two decades, including Parker[4], Nuryatno[5], and Sterkens & Yusuf[6], have found that religious education (RE) plays a critical role in overcoming religious intolerance. In order to apply this finding in the Indonesian context, this article focuses on Islamic religious education (IRE), because it is the form of religious education received by the large majority of Indonesian students, including in various Islamic educational institutions such as Madrasah Ibtidaiyyah (Islamic elementary schools), Madrasah Tsnawiyah (Islamic middle schools), Madrasah Aliyah (Islamic high schools), Perguruan Tinggi Islam (Islamic colleges and universities), and Pondok Pesantren (traditional Islamic boarding

[1] Nicola Colbran, "Realities and Challenges in Realising Freedom of Religion or Belief in Indonesia," *The International Journal of Human Rights* 14, no. 5 (September 1, 2010): 678–704, https://doi.org/10.1080/13642980903155166.

[2] Setara Institut, "Ringkasan Eksekutif Laporan Kbb Setara Institute 2021 (1).Pdf," Google Docs, 2021, https://drive.google.com/file/d/1JL-IU0GtDU2-wNrzmQ-GZw_uL3oKzZdn/view?usp=embed_facebook.

[3] Orton, "Interfaith Dialogue: Seven Key Questions for Theory, Policy and Practice," *Religion, State & Society* 44, no. 4 (2016): 349–65, https://doi.org/10.1080/09637494.2016.1242886.

[4] Lyn Parker, "Religious Education for Peaceful Coexistence in Indonesia?," *South East Asia Research* 22, no. 4 (2014): 487–504, https://doi.org/10.5367/sear.2014.0231.

[5] M. Nuryatno, "Comparing Religious Education in Indonesia and Japan," *Al-Jami'ah: Journal of Islamic Studies* 52 (December 30, 2014): 435, https://doi.org/10.14421/ajis.2014.522.435-458.

[6] Carl Sterkens and Mohamad Yusuf, "Preferences for Religious Education and Inter-Group Attitudes among Indonesian Students," *Journal of Empirical Theology* 28, no. 1 (June 5, 2015): 49–89, https://doi.org/10.1163/15709256-12341324.

schools), as well as the state education system. RE (and, for any Muslim student, IRE specifically) is one of the subjects in Indonesian schools of all levels.[7] IRE encompasses the study of morals (Indonesian and Arabic: aqidah-ahlak), jurisprudence (Arabic: fiqh; Indonesian: fikih), the Qur'an, Hadith, and history of Islamic civilization (SKI, Indonesian: sejarah kebudayaan Islam).

Indonesian government support for RE within both public and private education is strong.[8] For example, Government support for RE can be seen in (1) Article 29 of the 1945 constitution, which guarantees freedom of religion and belief in Indonesia[9] ; (2) Law No. 20 of 2003 regarding the national education system. Aside from the governmental support mentioned above, the majority of the Indonesian public also supports RE, as religion forms an integral part of the worldview and life experiences of all Indonesian people.[10] To this day, RE remains a compulsory subject[11] and success in RE is considered one of the principal indicators of student qualification for graduation from educational institutions.[12]

Beyond government and public support, Islamic teachings are also full of intra- and interreligious tolerant values. For example, the Quran states that differences are sunnatullah (God's design), as, should Allah have willed it, then all humanity on this earth would have been created as one people (11:118); however, Allah

[7] Kevin W. Fogg, "State and Islamic Education Growing into Each Other in Indonesia," in *Southeast Asian Education in Modern History* (Routledge, 2018).

[8] Jennifer Plupessy Wowor, "The Role of Religious Education in Promoting Religious Freedom: A Mutual Enrichment Between 'My Story,' 'Your Story,' and 'Our Stories'," *The Review of Faith & International Affairs* 14, no. 4 (2016): 98–106, https://doi.org/10.1080/15570274.2016.1248527.

[9] Paul Marshall, "The Ambiguities of Religious Freedom in Indonesia," *The Review of Faith & International Affairs* 16, no. 1 (January 2, 2018): 85–96, https://doi.org/10.1080/15570274.2018.1433588.

[10] Wowor, "The Role of Religious Education in Promoting Religious Freedom: A Mutual Enrichment Between 'My Story,' 'Your Story,' and 'Our Stories',."

[11] Fogg, "State and Islamic Education Growing into Each Other in Indonesia."

[12] Wowor, "The Role of Religious Education in Promoting Religious Freedom: A Mutual Enrichment Between 'My Story,' 'Your Story,' and 'Our Stories',."

created man as different clans and nationalities with the goal that these groups could acknowledge each other (49:113) and assist each other (5:2). Islam also forbids coercion about religion or spirituality (1; 256), as God gave alternatives to man to provide a choice between becoming a believer (Indonesian: mukmin, Arabic: mu'min) or non-believer (Indonesian and Arabic: kafir) (18: 29). The Qur'an also teaches interreligious tolerance by declaring; "to you your religion and to me my religion" (109:6), to give only a few examples.

The three forms of support mentioned above (the government, the public, and Islamic teachings) ideally produce students' intra- and interreligious behaviors. However, why does IRE often lead to student intra- and interreligious intolerance?. One of the causes is the mono-religious model applied in IRE, as stated by Nuryatno,[13] Sterkens & Yusuf[14] and Yusuf.[15] Multi and interreligious models are rarely found in the implementation of under-research findings of IRE by Asrori[16] or Yusuf.[17] Because of this, interreligious concepts are needed within RE to avoid intra-religious intolerance found in contemporary Indonesia .[18]

This research positions itself within international studies of RE and Indonesia-focused studies of RE and IRE. Moyaert[19] states that

---

[13] Nuryatno, "Comparing Religious Education in Indonesia and Japan."

[14] Sterkens and Yusuf, "Preferences for Religious Education and Inter-Group Attitudes among Indonesian Students."

[15] Mohamad Yusuf, "Religious Education in Indonesia: An Empirical Study of Religious Education Models in Islamic, Christian and Hindu Affiliated Schools" (Radboud University Nijmegen, 2016).

[16] Achmad Asrori, "Contemporary Religious Education Model on the Challenge of Indonesian Multiculturalism," *Journal of Indonesian Islam* 10, no. 2 (2016): 261–84, https://doi.org/10.15642/JIIS.2016.10.2.261-284.

[17] Mohamad Yusuf, "Why Indonesia Prefers A Mono-Religious Education Model? A Durkhemian Perspective," *Al-Albab* 9, no. 1 (June 8, 2020): 37–54, https://doi.org/10.24260/alalbab.v9i1.1555.

[18] Jonas Kolb, "Modes of Interreligious Learning within Pedagogical Practice. An Analysis of Interreligious Approaches in Germany and Austria," *Religious Education* 116 (January 12, 2021): 142–56, https://doi.org/10.1080/00344087.2020.1854416.

[19] Marianne Moyaert, "On the Role of Ritual in Interfaith Education," *Religious Education* 113, no. 1 (January 1, 2018): 49–60, https://doi.org/10.1080/00344087.2017.1383869.

RE emphasizes becoming "religiously literate" rather than "inter-religiously literate," meaning that the concerns seen in this case study in Indonesia are also present across many countries and different faith traditions. Similarly, Moore notes that RE is often approached through a devotional lens, not an academic lens.[20] The academic lens is needed to avoid the fact that religion is mainly an individual dimension instead of a social one. Focusing in on Indonesia, Yusuf and Sterkens[21], as well as Yusuf[22], find that the national education system in Indonesia causes issues for RE, generally giving preference to the mono-religious approach. Nuryatno[23], Asrori[24] find that the dominant RE model in Indonesia is a "within the wall" model, therefore requiring transformation to an "at the wall" and then "beyond the wall" model. This is further supported by the findings of Baidhawy[25], who states that RE, as it is in Indonesia, is still in the stage of "learning into religion" rather than "learning about religion", and beyond, "learning from religion". This study builds on previous works by articulating the specific levels of student tolerance and intolerance and correlating these with particular features of IRE. This granular work proposes new solutions for improving Indonesian IRE, broadly toward the aims envisioned by previous authors.

This study argues that the dominant RE model causes various problems of IRE in promoting intra- and interreligious tolerance in Indonesia practiced in Islamic educational institutions. The dominant model often traps individuals within a particular understanding and application of tolerance. This trap occurs when

[20] Diane L. Moore, *Overcoming Religious Illiteracy: A Cultural Studies Approach to the Study of Religion in Secondary Education*, 1st ed. (Palgrave Macmillan US, 2007), http://gen.lib.rus.ec/book/index.php?md5=ae7c99c01fd517c754fa59f664464c25.

[21] Sterkens and Yusuf, "Preferences for Religious Education and Inter-Group Attitudes among Indonesian Students."

[22] Yusuf, "Why Indonesia Prefers A Mono-Religious Education Model?"

[23] Nuryatno, "Comparing Religious Education in Indonesia and Japan."

[24] Asrori, "Contemporary Religious Education Model on the Challenge of Indonesian Multiculturalism."

[25] Zakiyuddin Baidhawy, "Pendidikan Agama Islam Untuk Mempromosikan Perdamaian Dalam Masyarakat Plural," *ANALISIS: Jurnal Studi Keislaman*, 2014.

students consider themselves to be tolerant people, but this tolerance is, in actuality, limited only to certain madhhab or religious beliefs. However, a religiously plural society like Indonesia also requires intra- and interreligious tolerance. Therefore, revisiting the IRE model for the promotion of intra- and interreligious tolerance in the contemporary era is highly important to ascertain and analyze (1) the challenges facing IRE teachers concerning the promotion of intra- and interreligious tolerance, and (2) the implications of the applied IRE model for typologies of student tolerance and intolerance. From these two areas of focus, alternative solutions are given with the hopes of contributing to (1) the Indonesian government's creation of policies relevant to a plural society to promote intra- and interreligious tolerance; (2) IRE instructors in the design and implementation of IRE models; (3) Muslim students as citizens of Indonesia and the world, so that they may display behaviors of intra- and interreligious tolerance for the sake of a peaceful and harmonious life.

Research Question

Three research questions guided this study:

1. What are the challenges facing teachers of IRE in promoting intra- and interreligious tolerance?
2. What are the implications of these challenges for student tolerance and intolerance typologies?
3. How do we manage IRE to promote intra- and interreligious tolerance?

Theoretical Framework

Religious Education Model Theory

Referring to Hermans[26], there are three models of RE, namely, mono-, multi- and inter-religious models. To comprehend and

[26] C. Hermans, "Participatory Learning: Religious Education in a Globalizing Society," 2003, https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Participatory-Learning%3A-Religious-Education-in-a-Hermans/e2c90bb3140c789f87fffec10fe0a8722af28144.

distinguish between the RE models mentioned above, Yusuf[27] describes a few common required elements: objective (cognitive, affective, and attitudinal), content, and method. Similarly, Boven[28] also describes a few elements, being cognitive-affective and attitudinal goals, matter, methods, normative basis, and societal context.

The first model is the mono-religious model. According to Arifin and Ubaidillah[29] and Hermans[30], this model is based on an ideology of exclusivism because it focuses on only one religion, teaching a single religion from its internal perspective[31] Moreover, considering students as passive parties meant only to receive truth from instructors.[32]Outside religions are often viewed as a threat. Thus, from the view of student, content, and instructor, this first model can be seen as a model that teaches one religious' message delivered by mono-religious instructors. The principal goal of the first model is to construct a religious identity.[33] This principal goal is elaborated with further cognitive, affective, and attitudinal goals. Cognitively, the mono-religious model seeks to understand religion from an internal perspective. Affectively, the model seeks to increase student interest in and connection to the specific religion only.[34] Attitudinally, this model seeks to motivate students to participate in religious practice.[35] The weakness of this first model is a decreased appreciation of plurality. However, this

[27] Yusuf, "Religious Education in Indonesia: An Empirical Study of Religious Education Models in Islamic, Christian and Hindu Affiliated Schools."

[28] T. M. A. van Boven, "Religious Education for Tolerance," 2017, https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Religious-Education-for-Tolerance-Boven/4d2ce32e9fafdde0e05b5edf10158d4eab85048c.

[29] Imron Arifin and Aan Fardani Ubaidillah, "Religion Education with Beyond the Wall Model to Promote Tolerant Behavior in The Plural Society of Indonesia" (International Conference on Learning Innovation (ICLI 2017), Atlantis Press, 2017), 182–86, https://doi.org/10.2991/icli-17.2018.35.

[30] Hermans, "Participatory Learning."

[31] Baidhawy, "Pendidikan Agama Islam Untuk Mempromosikan Perdamaian Dalam Masyarakat Plural."

[32] Nuryatno, "Comparing Religious Education in Indonesia and Japan."

[33] Yusuf, "Why Indonesia Prefers A Mono-Religious Education Model?"

[34] Hermans, "Participatory Learning."

[35] Sterkens and Yusuf, "Preferences for Religious Education and Inter-Group Attitudes among Indonesian Students."

model has a positive side in the form of "my story," which aims to secure one's identity before interaction with different teachings or religions.[36]

The second model is the multi-religious model. The normative basis for this model is religious relativism.[37] In contrast to the first model, the second model teaches religious plurality. Cognitively, this model aims to give students a comprehension of religious plurality.[38] Affectively, this model aims to motivate students to want to learn about different religions.[39] Attitudinally, this model aims to promote respect towards other religions.[40] This second model has both strengths and weaknesses. The strengths of this model are that it teaches about various religions while treating religion as a subject for academic study to find similarities. The weaknesses are found when different religions are still portrayed with and through the dominant religion. Furthermore, from the view of the student, content, and instructor, the second model can be seen as teaching students about various religious traditions delivered by instructors sharing a dominant religion with students, using an internal perspective based on the dominant religion.

The third model is the inter-religious model. The normative basis for this model is theological pluralism.[41] According to Baidhawy.[42] this model situates students at the center of an educational process to discover answers to their questions about religious and moral issues. Cognitively, this model aims to provide comprehension of religion to promote dialogue between diverse religious communities. Affectively, the third model motivates students to foster inter-religious dialogue. Attitudinally,

---

[36] Wowor, "The Role of Religious Education in Promoting Religious Freedom: A Mutual Enrichment Between 'My Story,' 'Your Story,' and 'Our Stories',."

[37] Boven, "Religious Education for Tolerance."

[38] Yusuf, "Why Indonesia Prefers A Mono-Religious Education Model?"

[39] Sterkens and Yusuf, "Preferences for Religious Education and Inter-Group Attitudes among Indonesian Students."

[40] Hermans, "Participatory Learning."

[41] Boven, "Religious Education for Tolerance."

[42] Baidhawy, "Pendidikan Agama Islam Untuk Mempromosikan Perdamaian Dalam Masyarakat Plural."

the model aims to encourage a lifestyle of practical dialogue to promote harmony by searching for similarities between different religions and forgiving (without disregarding) differences.[43] The model's advantage is found in its goal of promoting interreligious dialogue. According to Swidler[44], "dialog is not just talking together but is a whole way of seeing oneself and the world and then living accordingly." The epistemological base of the model is that "nobody knows everything about anything".[45] Interreligious dialogue is a critical tool for promoting interreligious tolerance. In this context, Hans Kung asserts: "there will be no peace between the civilizations without a peace between the religions! And there will be no peace between the religions without a dialogue between the religions".[46]

It must be noted that although this third model has strengths with regard to the promotion of interreligious dialogue, it also has weaknesses. One weakness is that the third model cannot be directly applied, but rather it must be combined with the two earlier models, i.e., mono- and multi-religious education. Referring to Menchik' level of tolerance (complete intolerance, semi-intolerance, neutral, semi tolerance and complete tolerance)[47], the combined model is aimed at transforming full intolerance into full tolerance.

Thus, a fourth integrative model is required. The fourth model is integrative, allowing students from different religious backgrounds and cultures to learn and live together. [48] This model

[43] Yusuf, "Why Indonesia Prefers A Mono-Religious Education Model?"

[44] Leonard Swidler, *Dialogue for Interreligious Understanding: Strategies for the Transformation of Culture-Shaping Institutions*, 1st ed., Interreligious Studies in Theory and Practice (Palgrave Macmillan US, 2014), http://gen.lib.rus.ec/book/index.php?md5=483d5c6aaa67505413699ff4f728858e.

[45] Swidler.

[46] Hans Kung, *A Global Ethic for Global Politics and Economics*, 1998, http://gen.lib.rus.ec/book/index.php?md5=c584d69f30af2be5e928ae8e9230dd3b.

[47] Jeremy Menchik, *Islam and Democracy in Indonesia: Tolerance without Liberalism*, Cambridge Studies in Social Theory, Religion and Politics (Cambridge University Press, 2016),

[48] Wanda Alberts, "The Academic Study of Religions and Integrative Religious Education in Europe," *British Journal of Religious Education* 32, no. 3 (September 1, 2010): 275–90, https://doi.org/10.1080/01416200.2010.498621.

is a secular approach, regardless of students' religious or non-religious beliefs. It does not depend on specific religious groups.

Type of Students Tolerance/Intolerance

Here, Menchik's level of tolerance/intolerance will be used to analyze students' tolerance/intolerance, as shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Menchik's level of tolerance and intolerance[49]

No	Level of Tolerance
1	Full intolerance (persecution)
2	Semi intolerance (discrimination)
3	Neutrality
4	Semi tolerance (support)
5	Full tolerance (recognition, cooperation, alliance)

Underlying Factor of the IRE Model

RE's two main underlying factors can be understood as (1) religious relations with the state regarding religious influence on state ideology and (2) state relations with education. First, referring to Fox[50] and Nuryatno[51]From the angle of religious relations with the state, Indonesia is categorized as a "state with more than one religion." Indonesia acknowledges six official religions: Islam, Protestantism, Catholicism, Hinduism, Buddhism, and Confucianism. The Indonesian government addresses its immense religious plurality by providing equal rights for all religions to establish religious educational institutes and develop RE per these religious beliefs. Regarding state ideology, Indonesia is neither a religious nor a secular state but rather a democratic state based on the "Pancasila" ideology. Consequently, RE is permitted (indeed, required) in private and public schools.[52] The

[49] Menchik, *Islam and Democracy in Indonesia*.

[50] Jonathan Fox and Shmuel Sandler, *Bringing Religion into International Relations*, 2004, https://doi.org/10.1057/9781403981127.

[51] Nuryatno, "Comparing Religious Education in Indonesia and Japan."

[52] Nuryatno.

origins of mono-religious education emerge from these conditions as the values of different religions begin to compete through their respective religious educational institutions.

Second, in considering state relations with education, Gutman (1987), as quoted by Moore[53] mentions four models, that is, "the family state", "the state of families," "the state of individuals," and "democratic education." According to Moore, Gutmann critiques the first three of these models and promotes the final model. "The family state" model is critiqued because it gives ultimate authority over all matters related to education to the state, as the state is presumed to have a natural right of authority over its citizens. Next, "the state of families" is critiqued because it gives "ultimate authority to parents for education based on the assumptions that they have a natural right of authority over their children." Further, "the state of individuals" provides the opportunity and conditions of neutrality for individuals to choose whatever they judge is best for them.

Method

Setting

This study was conducted at one Madrasah Aliyah (MA) and two general high schools (SMA, Indonesian: Sekolah Menengah Atas). All three of these schools are majority Muslim and engage in IRE. MA Nurul Haramain Narmada (MANHN) represents a private MA within the Islamic schools. SMA Negeri 1 Narmada (SMA 1 N) represents a public SMA within the high schools. In contrast, SMA NW Narmada (SMA NW N) represents a private SMA (as the name suggests, it is a school with Islamic values but teaches a generalist curriculum).

Approach

This study uses a qualitative-descriptive approach because the researcher describes the meaning behind the data found in the field. Then, all data are systematically narrated to link one fact or event with another. Descriptive means this study describes and

[53] Moore, *Overcoming Religious Illiteracy*.

analyzes data naturally and objectively according to qualitative research procedures.

Data collection method and participants

Data were collected in the form of in-depth interviews with a total of 15 teachers and nine students from the chosen MA and SMAs, with interviews coded as follows: teachers from MANHN (A-1, A-2, A-3, A-4, A-5); teachers from SMA NW N (B-1, B-2, B-3, B-4, B-5); and teachers from SMA 1 N (C-1, C-2, C-3, C-4, C-5); and all students (S-A1, S-A2, S-A3, S-B1, S-B2, S-B3, S-C1, S-C2, S-C3). All interview results were transcribed for analysis; the average interview time was 30 minutes. Interview results are presented with a combination of direct and indirect quotations.

Thematic analysis method

This study applies thematic analysis to analyze data. Thematic analysis is a method of data analysis that involves discovering patterns or themes in data acquired by the researcher.[54] For the thematic analysis, the researcher followed Braun and Clarke's six steps: (1) familiarization, (2) coding, (3) generating themes, (4) reviewing themes, (5) defining and labeling themes, and (6) writing up.[55]

Result and Discussion

After collecting data from the informants, the researchers used theme analysis to examine and interpret the information. Overall, eight themes emerge, with 20 sub-themes. Four topics connected to IRE challenges (with ten sub-themes); 2 themes related to the implications of the IRE model for the typology of student tolerance and intolerance (with four sub-themes); and two themes related to the recommended strategy, followed by aspects that support it (with six sub-themes).

---

[54] Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke, "Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology," *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 3, no. 2 (January 1, 2006): 77–101, https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa.

[55] Heriyanto Heriyanto, "Thematic Analysis sebagai Metode Menganalisa Data untuk Penelitian Kualitatif," *Anuva* 2, no. 3 (November 22, 2018): 317, https://doi.org/10.14710/anuva.2.3.317-324.

IRE CHALLENGES	
THEME	**SUB-THEMES**
Objectives	1. Memahami agama Islam sebagai suatu satu-satunya kebenaran 2. Memahami agama Islam sebagai salah satu dari kebenaran agama-agama
Contents	3. Mono-Religious Content 4. Multi-religious content 5. Lack of interreligious content
Method	6. Learning about 7. Learning Into 8. Learning From
Normative base and societal context	9. Exclusivism 10. Fanaticism
TYPOLOGY OF TOLERANCE/INTOLERANCE	
THEME	**SUB-THEMES**
Intolerance	11. Active intolerance 12. Passive intolerance
Tolerance	13. Passive tolerance 14. Active tolerance
THE PROPOSED IRE MODEL TO PROMOTE INTRA-INTER-RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE	
THEME	**SUB-THEMES**
Model	15. Mono-religious education to build self-identity 16. Mono-religious education is followed by multi-religious education to understand "your identity." 17. Multi-religious education to build "our identity."
Supporting IRE	18. Macrosystem 19. Meso System 20. Microsystem

Challenges of promoting intra- and interreligious tolerance through IRE in Madrasah and Schools

The dominant IRE model practiced in the educational institutions studied here (MA NH N, SMA 1 N, and SMA NW) will be portrayed using the previously described three theory model of RE with particular attention being paid to a few

elements, namely objective (cognitive-affective-attitudinal), teachers, teaching method, content, normative basis, and societal context.

Challenges related to IRE objectives

Regarding the three objectives (cognitive, affective, and attitudinal), the data demonstrate that cognitively, every teacher in the MA and SMAs stated that IRE aims to deliver only Islamic teachings without relating these teachings to other religious beliefs. Affectively, IRE aimed to motivate the student to understand Islamic teachings. Attitudinally, the delivered IRE aimed to make students capable of practicing Islamic teachings within their daily life (A-1, B-1, C-1, D-1). This IRE did not introduce external religious teachings because the teachers said these external religions have their separate religious education (A-2, B-2, C-2). The religious teachers at MA NH N Narmada and SMA 1 N did not want to consider taking the role of teacher of other religions, such as teaching RE of Hinduism, Buddhism, Christianity, or Confucianism (A-3, B-3, C-3).

Meanwhile, at SMA NW N, the religious teachers had different reasons. One of the IRE teachers did not aim to introduce other religions because this would be considered a forbidden (Indonesian and Arabic: haram) act that could lead students to polytheism (C1). Putting aside the teaching of other religions, even the teaching of other madhhabs was not permitted at SMA NW (C2). The reason for this is that the teaching of other madhhabs often leads to unlawful innovations (Indonesian and Arabic: bid'ah); the teachers provided examples, including pilgrimages to graves, celebrating the birthday of the Prophet, etc. (C2).

Based on this data, when IRE only aims to introduce one religion, IRE can be classified as mono-religious education, as stated by Herman,[56] Sterkens and Yusuf[57] as Islamic teachings are separated from other religious teachings by a tall, restrictive wall. Additionally, mono-religious education can be further narrowed

[56] Hermans, "Participatory Learning."

[57] Yusuf, "Why Indonesia Prefers A Mono-Religious Education Model?"

down to mono-madhhab education, when a school only permits teaching one madhhab to students.

Table 2: IRE Objectives in MA and SMAs

School name	Objective	Category
MANHN Narmada	Introduce only Islamic teachings in a way cognitively, affectively, and attitudinally aligned with the Shafi'i *madhhab*	Learning into religion, dominantly one *madhhab*
SMA 1 N	Introduce only Islamic teachings in a way cognitively, affectively, and attitudinally aligned with the Shafi'i *madhhab*	Learning into religion, dominantly one *madhhab*
SMA NW N	Introduce only Islamic teachings in a way cognitively, affectively, and attitudinally	Learning about religion, particularly one *madhhab*

Challenges related to IRE material

Considering the subject matter of the teachings, IRE in MA and SMAs also generally adheres to the mono-religious model, with small differences. IRE in MAs consists of lessons on morals, jurisprudence, the Qur'an, Hadith, and history of Islamic civilization, while IRE in SMA uses the term "IRE" without subdividing it into lesson categories. Next, I will provide a few examples of the differences in mono-religious IRE content based on document analysis and interviews.

First, in MA and SMAs, the history of Islamic civilization ideally covers material related to how the intellectual achievements and peaceful spirit of Islam contributed to the world in line with its universal mission (namely, to be a blessing on Earth; Arabic: *rahmatan lil-'alamin*); however, in reality, this subject mostly focuses on a history of conflict rather than peace. This kind of content, on the one hand, provokes sympathy within the students for their religion and, on the other hand, provokes antipathy or even hatred towards other religions (A-1, B-2). Furthermore, the history of Islamic civilization material also includes content that dichotomizes religions as either *samawi* or *ardhi.* A *samawi* religion is a religion that originates from God, and

an *ardhi* religion is a "cultural religion" created by humans (A-5, B-5, C-5). This dichotomy is also found within IRE materials in SMAs (C-3). According to Baidhawy,[58] This kind of dichotomy often causes feelings of superiority in believers who identify themselves with the *samawi* religions, as they regard followers of *ardhi* religions as inferior. This is not a wrong step as long as other tolerance perspectives follow it.

Second, jurisprudence material is also dominated by mono-religious or mono-*madhhab* education. One cause of this is that jurisprudence is taught following the views of earlier Islamic scholars (Indonesian and Arabic: '*ulama*), who were often compiling jurisprudential manuals in times of conflict, both internally between Muslim groups and externally with other religious groups.[59] Because of this, mono-religious content along the lines of "binary opposition" is found in many jurisprudence materials, both in MA and SMAs. This content incites dangerous thinking in student attitudes towards other religions or groups, creating such binaries as Muslim vs non-believer (Indonesian and Arabic: *kafir*), the realm of peace vs. the realm of disbelief or war (Arabic: *daru al salam* vs *darul kufri/darul harbi*), caliphate vs democracy, Islamic product vs Western product, etc. (A-1, A-2, A-3). A more extreme stance is found where teachers stated that teaching "binary opposition" is necessary for distinguishing right and wrong. Besides this, jurisprudence materials are also dominated by one *madhhab* at each school, those being the Shafi'i *madhhab* at MA NH N (A-2) and SMA 1 N (B-4) and the Shafi'i *madhhab* at SMA NW N.

Third, materials for teaching about the Qur'an and Hadith also adhere to the mono-religious content model. The Qur'an and Hadith truly teach about tolerance, for example, the Surah *Al-*

[58] Zakiyuddin Baidhawy, "Building Harmony and Peace Through Multiculturalist Theology Based Religious Education, An Alternative for Contemporary Indonesia," *British Jornal Of Religious Education*, 2007, https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1080/01416200601037478.

[59] Zakiyuddin Baidhawy, "Building Harmony and Peace through Multiculturalist Theology-based Religious Education: An Alternative for Contemporary Indonesia," *British Journal of Religious Education* 29, no. 1 (January 1, 2007): 15–30, https://doi.org/10.1080/01416200601037478.

Kafirun in the Qur'an. However, in this surah, the tolerance being taught is passive tolerance, not active tolerance. This is especially seen in the verse that states "to you your religion and to me my religion" (Arabic: *lakum dinukum waliyadin*), because these religious teachers define tolerance as allowing others to do what they please (A-3, B-4, C-5) without the need to actively participate in interreligious dialogue. Additionally, some teachers believe that studying other religions can damage students' belief, leading to disbelief and sin. Therefore, it is common for other religions to be examined from an internal perspective. The maximal tolerance that could be obtained from this perspective is internal tolerance, not interreligious tolerance.

Fourth, the final kind of formal materials also provide mono-religious education content, namely the materials on morals. Within these materials, the value of Islamic brotherhood (Arabic: *ukhuwwah*) is taught as the primary form of brotherhood or solidarity. The reasons why instructors predominantly teach Islamic brotherhood are because inter-religious fraternity is not explained in detail in the materials (B-1); teachers fear that they will be considered polytheist (Indonesian: *syirik*) if they further interact with other religions (C-2); and teachers fear that they will be considered as "liberal teachers" because the majority of the Sasak (the majority ethnicity of Lombok) community are adherents of the Shafi'i *madhhab* and are averse to liberalism (B-1, C-2, C-3).

It follows that if IRE is still teaching students about the Crusades (from the history of Islamic civilization lessons), the realm of peace vs. the realm of disbelief or war (Arabic: *daru al salam* vs *darul kufri/darul harbi*; from the jurisprudence lessons), that Jews and Christians will not accept anyone who is not following their religion (from the Qur'an and Hadith lessons), Islamic brotherhood exclusively (from the morals material), and that Islam is the greatest religion, then teachings of tolerance will be based on exclusivism, fanaticism and revenge.

Table 3: IRE content that encourages intolerance

Religious Subject	Problem	Example
History of	Presents a history of	It often includes historical material

Islamic Civilization	conflict rather than intellectual history or examples of peace	related to the Crusades, demonstrating conflict between Muslims and Christians and various conquests, both Islamic conquests of other peoples or conquests of Muslims by non-Muslims. This often leads to feelings of revenge or antipathy in Muslim students towards other groups.
Jurisprudence	Instills exclusive attitudes about religion and deification of individual thought	Provides no room to compare *madhhabs*; dominated by the Shafi'i *madhhab* to the point that others are considered wrong. It also provides many binary oppositions, such as Muslim vs *Kafir*, caliphate vs democracy, Islamic product vs Western product, majority vs minority, true vs false, etc.
Morals	The exclusive teaching of internal solidarity dominates material on solidarity/brotherhood.	Even though various forms of *ukhuwwah* exist, such as *wathaniyyah (nationalism), dualiyyah (internationalism) and nasabiyyah (ethnic),* the dominant taught form is Islamic *ukhuwwah.* This is despite the fact that *ukhuwwah wathaniyyah* and *dualiyyah* are needed for a pluralist society like Indonesia.
The Qur'an and Hadith	Prone to fanaticism and intolerance	Indoctrinates with exclusivist Qur'anic passages such as: "you are best people sent down to the Earth" and "The Jewish and Christian people will never accept you unless you follow their religion" (1:12); encourages at most, a passive tolerance along the lines of "to you your religion and to me my religion" (Arabic: *lakum dinukum waliyadin)*

Challenges related to teaching methods

In terms of teaching methods, challenges emerge from teachers' fears about deviating from the IRE methods considered

"established." Currently, educational methods found in MA and SMAs include example-based, habituation, practice, demonstration, rational and emotional (A-1, A-2, A-3). The habituation method is based on familiarizing students with applications of Islamic teachings (A-1). The example-based model provides examples of applications of Islamic teachings, both directly and indirectly (B-5). The rational method is based on inviting students to think further about Islamic teachings (C-5). The emotional method motivates students to become interested in understanding and practicing Islamic teachings (B-1, B-2, C-1). The demonstration and practical methods are based on teaching students to demonstrate and practice Islamic teachings (C-5).

These methods are already well established and produce positive results in certain areas. However, concerning tolerance, these models still only lead to internal tolerance, or at most a passive external tolerance, or a tolerance that only accepts the existence of others without the desire for mutual exchange.

Challenges related to teachers and students

Seen from the perspective of teachers and students, MAs and SMAs apply mono-religious education because IRE is taught by teachers sharing the same religion with students, or what Baidhawy[60] calls "the teaching of a religion from its perspective by an internal party." The idea of having multireligious teachers and students is impossible because government policies state that students must be taught by teachers who share their religion (A-1, B-1, C-1). It's based on the National Education System Law (*Undang-Undang no. 2 tahun 2003 mengenai Sistem Pendidikan Nasional*); Executive Regulation no. 55 of 2007 (*Peraturan Pemerintah no. 55 tahun 2007*); and Minister of Religion Statute No. 16 of 2010 regarding the management of religious education (*Peraturan Menteri Agama no. 16 tahun 2010 tentang Pengelolaan Pendidikan Agama*). Particular to MAs, there are new statutes that allow non-Muslim teachers to become teachers in Mas (Based on the Minister of Religion Statute No. 60 of 2015 (*Peraturan Menteri*

[60] Baidhawy, "Pendidikan Agama Islam Untuk Mempromosikan Perdamaian Dalam Masyarakat Plural."

Agama no. 60 tahun 2015) and Minister of Religion Statute No. 66 of 2016 (*Peraturan Menteri Agama no. 66 tahun 2016*), but these apply only to teachers of general subjects, not IRE teachers. Beyond that, non-Muslim teachers applying to be general teachers usually only receive positive responses from some public MAs, not from private MA affiliated with certain Islamic organizations (C-3, A-2).

These government policies have both positive and negative aspects. The positive side of mono-religious teachers within IRE is that students receive a relatively deep understanding of their own religious teachings (B-2). The negative side is that students will not be exposed to comparative discourses and will not receive truths from the perspectives of other religions (A-1, B-3). At most, they will be taught that other religions exist outside of Islam, such as Hinduism, Christianity, Buddhism, and Confucianism (B-4, B-5, C-3).

From the perspective of religion-state relations, the points above demonstrate that, on one hand, the Indonesian government, in theory, supports religious education to promote interreligious tolerance. However, on the other, the government also supports mono-religious schools. As Fox[61] this type of government policy is a consequence of Indonesia's status as a "state with more than one religion" that seeks to uphold equal rights for each of its religious groups to carry out its own RE in separate educational institutions or classes. This observation is strengthened by the findings of Nuryatno,[62] who states that while Indonesia is neither religious nor secular, religious education is allowed in public and private schools. Consequently, religious education tends to strengthen religious self-identity, producing followers and culminating in exclusivism. Thus, while it is usually impossible for students to be taught IRE by teachers of different religions in SMAs and especially so in MA, teachers are expected to have an interreligious outlook, or what Moyaert calls "interreligious literacy"[63].

---

[61] Fox and Sandler, *Bringing Religion into International Relations*.

[62] Nuryatno, "Comparing Religious Education in Indonesia and Japan."

[63] Marianne Moyaert, "On the Role of Ritual in Interfaith Education," *Religious Education* 113, no. 1 (2018): 49–60, https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1080/00344087.2017.1383869.

From the perspective of state-education relations, government policies towards religious education demonstrate the dilemma of IRE within a democratic nation, because IRE can be in the form of "the family state", "the state of families" or "the state of individuals". When the educational system (including educational material) follows state policy because the state is presumed to know the best for its citizens, this educational model is called "the family state." Next, when the state turns over the educational system to certain families or groups because the state considers its citizens to have the right to shape their education, this model is called "the state of families." Finally, when individuals are given the neutrality and freedom to develop their education, this model is called "the state of individuals." All of these models are found within Indonesian religious education. However, the most dangerous is "the state of families" because, in many cases, this model provides opportunities for certain educational institutions to develop religious education, which can potentially threaten the state's ideology.

Challenges related to normative basis and societal context

Normative basis and societal context are interconnected. There are two societal contexts for MA and SMAs to discuss: MA/SMAs, founded by the government and filled by teachers belonging to different *madhhabs,* and MA affiliated with certain organizations and specific *madhhabs.* These societal contexts have a few consequences: (1) teachers of IRE either teach content given to them by the government, both via the Ministry of Religion for MA and the Ministry of Education and Culture for SMAs, or (2) teachers of IRE teach according to the *madhhab* followed by the educational institution (especially in private schools). Teachers are afraid to teach differing opinions because of their personal feelings and because they must consider their own material income. That is because if a teacher teaches a different *madhhab* or religious teaching, they risk being fired from the institution (B-1, B-2).

Another societal context that leads to mono-religious education is the training of IRE teachers, in particular from Faculties of Education (Indonesian: *Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Ilmu Keguruan*) and subsidiary Departments of Islamic Religious

Education at state-backed Islamic institutions of higher education (STAIN, IAIN and UIN). As the programs that educates the most prospective IRE teachers, these departments often focus too little on materials related to comparative approaches to *madhhabs* and religions (A-1, B-2). The specific faculty that provides the deepest education in comparative religion on state-backed Islamic university campuses is usually the Faculty of Philosophy (Indonesian: *Fakultas Ushuluddin*), but alumni of these programs rarely become religious teachers (A-5).

The impact of mono-religious education on student tolerance and intolerance

Interviews and observations of informants at the research sites have been used to evaluate the application of mono-religious education in terms of the resulting tolerance and intolerance among Muslim students in MA and SMAs. The categorization of tolerance and intolerance can be broken down into passive tolerance and passive intolerance (sometimes also called perceived intolerance and perceived tolerance) and active tolerance and active intolerance (sometimes also called actual tolerance and actual intolerance). These attitudes build on one another.

Active intolerance towards Muslim groups considered deviant and minorities

All students considered Islamic minority groups or deviant groups to be heretics. This is based on religious edicts (Indonesian and Arabic: *fatwa*) issued by Indonesian Islamic scholars, like the state-backed Majelis Ulama Indonesia (MUI, Indonesian Council of Islamic Scholars), which consider certain Islamic groups to be heretical, including Shi'a, Ahmadiyyah and Gafatar (Indonesian: *Gerakan Fajar Nusantara*, a new religious group). In Lombok, examples of active intolerance are seen in cases related to different minority groups, including those mentioned above. These groups are often attacked and expelled by the societal majority. Information about these groups is spread through online mass media, as well as through word-of-mouth offline. These conditions also influence student intolerance (B-1, B-3).

Passive intolerance towards fellow Muslims of different madhhabs and non-Muslims

Passive intolerance is intolerance stored in student beliefs but not shown through behavior. One student stated that Imam Shafi'i is the most comprehensive of the Imams because the other Imams, especially Maliki, often considered Shafi'i groups that linked Islamic teaching with local culture to be non-belief, heresy, or unlawful innovations (S-1). Other students stated that the most excellent form of Islam was the Islam of the era of the Prophet and his direct companions and followers. They argue that modern Islam has deviated from the original Islamic teaching because of exchange with local cultures (S-3).

Here, passive intolerance towards non-Muslims is seen when students at the research site state that the only true religion recognized by God is Islam, all others are wrong, and for those who do not follow Islamic teachings, their deeds of worship will not be accepted (S-5). The students "allow them to do what they wish, although we cannot join" (S-2).

Active tolerance towards fellow Muslims of the same madhhab

This form of tolerance refers to student behaviors towards only fellow Muslims who share the same *madhhab* or approach to Islam. This form of tolerance cannot be considered internal religious tolerance because tolerance for only one *madhhab* does not ensure tolerance towards other *madhhabs* within Islam (traditionally, all four schools of jurisprudence are accepted as orthodox). For example, other madhhabs are considered incorrect when students understand religious truths through Shafi'i *madhhab* (S-1, S-2) or Hambali *madhhab* (S-7). This type of tolerance can be found both in MA and SMAs; however, it is mostly found in MAs and SMAs affiliated with specific organizations. In line with Tan, this is a consequence of indoctrination[64], or "teaching for commitment" to only one *madhhab.* This commitment to one

[64] Charlene Tan, *Islamic Education and Indoctrination: The Case in Indonesia*, 1st ed. (Taylor and Francis, 2011), http://gen.lib.rus.ec/book/index.php?md5=bc7835242d6f0d40fe5f9a7e93990840.

madhhab then creates "belief control"[65] as a tool for seeing one's own *madhhab* as supreme and other *madhhabs* as false. This indoctrination can also be called a narrow-minded perspective, often euphemized as "wearing blinders" (Indonesian: *perspektif kaca mata kuda*). This is a consequence of *madhhab* education instead of religious education because *madhhabs* are merely components of religions. Uniquely, *madhhabs* are already considered separate religions (C-1). Consequently, active tolerance for one *madhhab* becomes a dominant feature. Following conflict theory, this active tolerance is based on existing plurality, which creates in-group solidarity and out-group distrust. Meanwhile, from the perspective of constrict theory, differences (such as in religion or ideology) push individuals to become more self-limiting or to withdraw from others following these differences.

Passive and active tolerance towards different madhhabs

This third type of tolerance is higher than the first two. This type of tolerance occurs when Muslim students show tolerance towards other students of different *madhhabs* but show no desire to be actively tolerant. For example, a student who disagrees with the celebrating of the birthday of the Prophet (Indonesian and Arabic: *Mawlid al-Nabi*) can show tolerance by not criticizing the tradition, but he or she will still not want to participate in the celebration (C-3). This teacher always taught active tolerance to one *madhhab* in the school where he worked, but when not in school (because he is a student in the doctoral program of the local state Islamic university), he would demonstrate passive tolerance. When this teacher was invited by their friends to attend a celebration of the birthday of the Prophet in a classmate's house, he only smiled and said, "*Afwan* [Arabic: sorry], I can't come" (S-8). Another side of passive tolerance can be found in some differences between rituals, such as the performance of pre-dawn prayers with or without standing supplications (Arabic: *qunut*), differences in the number of repetitions in *tarawih* prayers (between 11 and 23 *raka'at*), the application of traditions of grave pilgrimages, and so

[65] Tan.

on, when these differences do not create conflict between groups (S-1, S-3).

Meanwhile, active tolerance towards groups of different *madhhabs* is displayed by students outside of school. While one student does not agree with celebrating the birthday of the Prophet because their teachers have taught them that this celebration is not based on the teachings of the Prophet, they still accepted their friend's invitation because of mutual respect born from long friendships (C-1, A3). This evidence supports contact theory, or more interactions lead to less prejudice. According to Sterkens and Yusuf[66] "inter-group contact reduces in-group/out-group distinctions and induces out-group solidarity."

Passive and active tolerance towards non-Muslims

This type of tolerance is defined as allowing adherents of other faiths to have their own different beliefs or rituals without disrupting these beliefs or rituals and without engaging in various interreligious activities, such as interreligious ritual participation[67] or interreligious dialogue.[68] Within this category, Muslim students do not want to become involved with celebrations of togetherness with other religions because each religion has unique features (S-2, S-S3). The normative basis is formed by "to me my religion and to them their religion" (S-1, S-2, S-3).

Then, active tolerance towards non-Muslims is the last type. This type is the opposite of the five above types, where students actively demonstrate tolerance through different behavior towards other religions through a few specific permitted rituals. This active tolerance can be observed when Muslim students from SMA 1 N participate as security for Hindus during the Nyepi holiday celebrated locally. The same type of tolerance is observed when Hindu students participate in Islamic *takbir* parades to welcome

[66] Sterkens and Yusuf, "Preferences for Religious Education and Inter-Group Attitudes among Indonesian Students."

[67] Zuhairi Misrawi, "Kesadaran Multikultural Dan Deradikalisasi Pendidikan Islam: Pengalaman Bhinneka Tunggal Ika Dan Qabul Al-Akhar," *Jurnal Pendidikan Islam* 2, no. 1 (2013): 197–215, https://doi.org/10.14421/jpi.2013.21.197-215.

[68] Swidler, *Dialogue for Interreligious Understanding*.

Eid al-Fitr (the end of the fasting month and the first day of the Islamic month Shawwal) in Narmada (C-2, S-1, S-9).

Illustrations above mean that mono religious education has implications for several types of tolerance/intolerance; *first*; passive intolerance, namely hiding disapproval of a different *madzhab*, sect, or religion without committing various acts of intolerance; *second*, active intolerance, namely showing disapproval of different *madzhab*, sects or religions by carrying out various acts of intolerance; *third*, neutral, namely avoiding interaction with other *madzhab*, sect or religion; *fourth*, passive tolerance, namely accepting differences towards different *madzhab*, sect or religion without the willingness to engage with them in the real behavior; and *fifth*, active tolerance, which shows acceptance of different *madzhab*, sect or religion by celebrating togetherness and participating in real behavior, especially in social issues. The typology above follows the pattern of Menchik's level of tolerances/intolerance, which consists of full-semi intolerance, neutral and full-semi tolerance.

Although mono-religious education successfully establishes active tolerance or full tolerance in the peak position, the actors are in the minimal category because in certain cases only, namely full tolerance toward internal groups with the same *madzhab*.

The Proposed IRE Model to Manage Inter-religious Tolerance

This study agrees with the statements of Nuryatno[69] Ahmad Asrori [70]and Baidhawy[71], who state that mono-religious education is the dominant form of religious education in Indonesia. They suggest that the Islamic religious education model needs to be transformed into a multi- or interreligious model. Pelupessy-

[69] Nuryatno, "Comparing Religious Education in Indonesia and Japan."

[70] Asrori, "Contemporary Religious Education Model on the Challenge of Indonesian Multiculturalism."

[71] Zakiyuddin Baidhawy, "pendidikan agama islam untuk mempromosikan perdamaian dalam masyarakat plural," *Analisis: Jurnal Studi Keislaman* 14, no. 2 (2014): 289–309, https://doi.org/10.24042/ajsk.v14i2.690.

Wowor[72]also suggests that the best model for IRE is an integrative-mutual enrichment model. This approach recommends that each model should not be seen in isolation, but rather, each model can reinforce the others. Her reasoning is that the first model strengthens internal identity, the second strengthens external understanding, and the third strengthens reciprocal dialogue. This is the integration between "my story," "your story," and "our story." The combination of "me" and "my group" with "you" and "all of us" will encourage dialogue, promoting interreligious tolerance. Alberts puts forth another integrative approach.[73] This is the integrative secular (non-confessional) model. In the Indonesian context generally, and especially in MAs and SMAs in Lombok, Albert's integrative secular model, while satisfactory, cannot be applied because the Islamic educational system, in general, cannot accept secular models.

Table 2: Analysis of the relevance of IRE models

RE Model	Suitable place
Mono-Religious Education Model	Mono-religious community
Multi-Religious Education Model	Pluralistic community
Inter-Religious Education Model	Pluralistic community
Integrative non-confessional (secular)	Pluralistic secular community
Integrative and mutual enrichment	Pluralistic religious community

Based on the above table, the best solution for promoting religious tolerance is through the application of the last model in the table, integrative and mutual enrichment, through developmental processes as shown in the next table:

[72] Wowor, "The Role of Religious Education in Promoting Religious Freedom: A Mutual Enrichment Between 'My Story,' 'Your Story,' and 'Our Stories',."

[73] Alberts, "The Academic Study of Religions and Integrative Religious Education in Europe."

Table 3: Developmental processes of IRE from Mono to Multi and Inter-Religious education models

Religion	My Right (Mono-Religious Education)	Your Righ (Multi-Religious Education)	Our Right (Inter-Religious Education)
All Religions in Indonesia	My teachings are correct (internally strengthen identity as a religious follower)	Other teachings (outside of my religion) also have their perspectives on religious truth (increase understanding of "the other")	We are different, but we share similarities (in certain areas or not at all) to foster dialogue

The developmental processes described in the above table need to be supported at the macro level (national context), meso level (regional context), and local level (individual educational institutions). *First*, macro-level solutions are related to national policies supporting mono, multi, and inter-religious education integration. *Second*, meso-level solutions are related to the Ministry of Education and Culture, the Ministry of Religion at the regional level, and the State Islamic University network (Indonesian: *Perguruan Tinggi Agama Islam Negeri*) at the provincial level, which would be expected to provide opportunities for policies supporting integration between mono, multi and inter-religious education. *Third*, at the micro level, leaders in SMAs and MAs need to support integration between mono, multi, and inter-religious education following the assumption that mono, multi, and inter-religious education are not separate models but rather three components of a developmental method/process. In this case, Saeed[74] asserts that the best way to promote peace and harmony in a multi-religious country where Muslims are the majority, like Indonesia, is through the leadership of a leader whose multi-or interreligious insight.

[74] Abdullah Saeed, "Towards Religious Tolerance through Reform in Islamic Education: The Case of the State Institute of Islamic Studies of Indonesia," *Indonesia and the Malay World* 27, no. 79 (November 1, 1999): 177–91, https://doi.org/10.1080/13639819908729941.

The largest challenge at the micro level is certain schools are strongly prejudiced against other *madhhabs* or religious teachings. This institutional model has become increasingly popular in Indonesia in the form of integrated Islamic SMAs. These types of institutions thrive due to government policies following what Gutmann[75] calls "the state of families," that is, the delegation of educational issues, including religious education, to certain groups, which sometimes institute different processes than what the government desires.

Conclusion

This study finds that teachers of IRE face multiple challenges in building intra-and interreligious tolerance due to the established model of IRE is mono-religious education. It is caused by a number of governmental policies at the national level, which are further implicated in regional policies and their implementation at the local level. The mono-religious model has consequences for students' levels of passive and active tolerance as well as passive and active intolerance. Solutions are divided into three levels; the macro level (especially national education policy related to teachers, students and curriculum management), the meso level (continuity of national education policy in regional/provincial area) and the micro level (educational system at the local area). In terms of theoretical implications, the study finds that the mono, multi and inter-religious educational models are not to be seen correlational, but rather as a developmental process from mono, to multi and interreligious model for the sake of encouraging harmonious lives in the midst of plurality at the local, national and international levels. It's called as "integrative and mutual-supporting". The model is needed to create intra- and inter-religious tolerance. In this way, IRE will contribute to world peace.

[75] Amy Gutmann, *Democratic Education: Revised Edition* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1987).

Limitation and recommendation

This study uses a qualitative approach, further research could address the model of religious education and its implication toward students' intra- and interreligious tolerance in Indonesia with a quantitative or mix-method approach.

References

Alberts, Wanda. "The Academic Study of Religions and Integrative Religious Education in Europe." *British Journal of Religious Education* 32, no. 3 (September 1, 2010): 275–90. https://doi.org/10.1080/01416200.2010.498621.

Arifin, Imron, and Aan Fardani Ubaidillah. "Religion Education with Beyond the Wall Model to Promote Tolerant Behavior in The Plural Society of Indonesia," 182–86. Atlantis Press, 2017. https://doi.org/10.2991/icli-17.2018.35.

Asrori, Achmad. "Contemporary Religious Education Model on the Challenge of Indonesian Multiculturalism." *Journal of Indonesian Islam* 10, no. 2 (2016): 261–84. https://doi.org/10.15642/JIIS.2016.10.2.261-284.

Baidhawy, Zakiyuddin. "Building Harmony and Peace Through Multiculturalist Theology Based Religious Education, An Alternative for Contemporary Indonesia." *British Journal of Religious Education*, 2007. https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1080/01416200601037478.

———. "Building Harmony and Peace through Multiculturalist Theology-based Religious Education: An Alternative for Contemporary Indonesia." *British Journal of Religious Education* 29, no. 1 (January 1, 2007): 15–30. https://doi.org/10.1080/01416200601037478.

———. "Pendidikan Agama Islam Untuk Mempromosikan Perdamaian Dalam Masyarakat Plural." *ANALISIS: Jurnal Studi Keislaman*, 2014.

Boven, T. M. A. van. "Religious Education for Tolerance," 2017.

Braun, Virginia, and Victoria Clarke. "Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology." *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 3, no. 2 (January 1, 2006): 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa.

Colbran, Nicola. "Realities and Challenges in Realising Freedom of Religion or Belief in Indonesia." *The International Journal of Human Rights* 14, no. 5 (September 1, 2010): 678–704. https://doi.org/10.1080/13642980903155166.

Fogg, Kevin W. "State and Islamic Education Growing into Each Other in Indonesia." In *Southeast Asian Education in Modern History*. Routledge, 2018.

Fox, Jonathan, and Shmuel Sandler. *Bringing Religion into International Relations*, 2004. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781403981127.

Gutmann, Amy. *Democratic Education: Revised Edition*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1987.

Heriyanto, Heriyanto. "Thematic Analysis sebagai Metode Menganalisa Data untuk Penelitian Kualitatif." *Anuva* 2, no. 3 (November 22, 2018): 317. https://doi.org/10.14710/anuva.2.3.317-324.

Hermans, C. "Participatory Learning: Religious Education in a Globalizing Society," 2003. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Participatory-Learning%3A-Religious-Education-in-a-Hermans/e2c90bb3140c789f87fffec10fe0a8722af28144.

Kolb, Jonas. "Modes of Interreligious Learning within Pedagogical Practice. An Analysis of Interreligious Approaches in Germany and Austria." *Religious Education* 116 (January 12, 2021): 142–56. https://doi.org/10.1080/00344087.2020.1854416.

Kung, Hans. *A Global Ethic for Global Politics and Economics*, 1998. http://gen.lib.rus.ec/book/index.php?md5=c584d69f30af2be5e928ae8e9230dd3b.

Marshall, Paul. "The Ambiguities of Religious Freedom in Indonesia." *The Review of Faith & International Affairs* 16, no. 1 (January 2, 2018): 85–96. https://doi.org/10.1080/15570274.2018.1433588.

Menchik, Jeremy. *Islam and Democracy in Indonesia: Tolerance without Liberalism*. Cambridge Studies in Social Theory, Religion and Politics. Cambridge University Press, 2016. http://gen.lib.rus.ec/book/index.php?md5=ab63f752c2730fc0d8ef0a89f3d12290.

Misrawi, Zuhairi. "Kesadaran Multikultural Dan Deradikalisasi Pendidikan Islam: Pengalaman Bhinneka Tunggal Ika Dan Qabul Al-Akhar." *Jurnal Pendidikan Islam* 2, no. 1 (2013): 197–215. https://doi.org/10.14421/jpi.2013.21.197-215.

Moore, Diane L. *Overcoming Religious Illiteracy: A Cultural Studies Approach to the Study of Religion in Secondary Education*. 1st ed. Palgrave Macmillan US, 2007. http://gen.lib.rus.ec/book/index.php?md5=ae7c99c01fd517c754fa59f664464c25.

Moyaert, Marianne. "On the Role of Ritual in Interfaith Education." *Religious Education* 113, no. 1 (2018): 49–60. https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1080/00344087.2017.1383869.

———. "On the Role of Ritual in Interfaith Education." *Religious Education* 113, no. 1 (January 1, 2018): 49–60. https://doi.org/10.1080/00344087.2017.1383869.

Nuryatno, M. "Comparing Religious Education in Indonesia and Japan." *Al-Jami'ah: Journal of Islamic Studies* 52 (December 30, 2014): 435. https://doi.org/10.14421/ajis.2014.522.435-458.

Orton. "Interfaith Dialogue: Seven Key Questions for Theory, Policy and Practice." *Religion, State & Society* 44, no. 4 (2016): 349–65. https://doi.org/10.1080/09637494.2016.1242886.

Parker, Lyn. "Religious Education for Peaceful Coexistence in Indonesia?" *South East Asia Research* 22, no. 4 (2014): 487–504. https://doi.org/10.5367/sear.2014.0231.

Saeed, Abdullah. "Towards Religious Tolerance through Reform in Islamic Education: The Case of the State Institute of Islamic Studies of Indonesia." *Indonesia and the Malay World* 27, no. 79 (November 1, 1999): 177–91. https://doi.org/10.1080/13639819908729941.

Setara Institut, Setara. "RINGKASAN EKSEKUTIF LAPORAN KBB SETARA Institute 2021 (1).Pdf." Google Docs, 2021. https://drive.google.com/file/d/1JL-IU0GtDU2-wNrzmQ-GZw_uL3oKzZdn/view?usp=embed_facebook.

Sterkens, Carl, and Mohamad Yusuf. "Preferences for Religious Education and Inter-Group Attitudes among Indonesian Students." *Journal of Empirical Theology* 28, no. 1 (June 5, 2015): 49–89. https://doi.org/10.1163/15709256-12341324.

Swidler, Leonard. *Dialogue for Interreligious Understanding: Strategies for the Transformation of Culture-Shaping Institutions*. 1st ed. Interreligious Studies in Theory and Practice. Palgrave Macmillan US, 2014. http://gen.lib.rus.ec/book/index.php?md5=483d5c6aaa67505413699ff4f728858e.

Tan, Charlene. *Islamic Education and Indoctrination: The Case in Indonesia*. 1st ed. Taylor and Francis, 2011. http://gen.lib.rus.ec/book/index.php?md5=bc7835242d6f0d40fe5f9a7e93990840.

Wowor, Jennifer Plupessy. "The Role of Religious Education in Promoting Religious Freedom: A Mutual Enrichment Between 'My Story,' 'Your Story,' and 'Our Stories',." *The Review of Faith & International Affairs* 14, no. 4 (2016): 98–106. https://doi.org/10.1080/15570274.2016.1248527,.

Yusuf, Mohamad. "Religious Education in Indonesia: An Empirical Study of Religious Education Models in Islamic, Christian and Hindu Affiliated Schools." Radboud University Nijmegen, 2016.

———. "Why Indonesia Prefers A Mono-Religious Education Model? A Durkhemian Perspective." *Al-Albab* 9, no. 1 (June 8, 2020): 37–54. https://doi.org/10.24260/alalbab.v9i1.1555.