

Review Article

Religious Tolerance in High Schools: Between Civic Education, Teachers, Parents, and Intellectual Humility

Amira Eka Pratiwi* and Eva Septiana

Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia

*Correspondence to: Amira Eka Pratiwi, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia, E-mail: amira.eka71@ui.ac.id.

Abstract

Beside individuals characteristic, we believe that values and virtues are also instilled through learning process and shared attitudes between families and school communities. This study aims to examine to what extent civic education performance, parents' religious tolerance, teachers' religious tolerance, and intellectual humility can predict students' religious tolerance. The data provided by 182 high school students were analyzed using multiple regression analysis. The result indicates that all variables simultaneously predict the religious tolerance of the sample population. However, on an individual basis, only parents' religious tolerance and intellectual humility significantly predicted the religious tolerance of the sample. This study provides some implications for schools or educational institutions about virtues and positive attitude encouragement, especially regarding intellectual humility and religious tolerance.

Keywords: Religious Tolerance, Intellectual Humility, Civic Education, High School Students..

Introduction

Religious diversity generates certain challenges in social life everywhere around the world. These challenges mean that it has become essential to make the effort to help both individuals and groups to get along with other religions (Woodruff et al., 2014). These challenges can be found in every part of society, including educational institutions. In Indonesia, signs of religious intolerance are starting to emerge in educational institutions as a result of religious diversity. Research on religious tolerance in schools conducted by several educational, research, and cultural institutions in Indonesia shows many Indonesian students still show a tendency toward religious intolerance. For example, many high school students in Indonesia are still reluctant to acknowledge and congratulate others on their religious holiday or are reluctant to elect a president for a student body from a minority religion (Suryowati, 2017). Another study reports that 63.7% of Muslim teachers (as part of the majority religious group) in Indonesia hold intolerant opinions. These teachers come from all levels of primary educational institutions, from kindergarten to high schools (Suyanto, 2018).

The issue of religious tolerance in educational institutions is important considering schools have a role in developing tolerance. Education in schools has a responsibility to develop the attitudes of individuals and can contribute to the formation of individual attitudes (Cam, 2011). Therefore, education must be able to create systems and environments that encourage tolerant attitudes in their students. Cam (2011) also explains that schools are responsible for providing education regarding tolerance to their students, and this can be done by teaching students to respond positively to differences. Students need to be taught how to maximize safety and minimize violence in a variety of social contexts.

Religious tolerance is a set of attitudes and behaviors that involves respecting the rights of others to openly hold their own religious beliefs and practices (Putnam & Campbell, 2012). Other accounts generally explain religious tolerance as understanding religious rights and having the ability to maintain positive views and good relationships with other religious groups (Hook et al., 2016; Van Tongeren, Stafford, et al., 2016).

Religious tolerance is more difficult to achieve than other tolerances (i.e., tolerance of ethnic and racial differences). Religion is a mechanism used by humans to understand life and reduce anxiety about life after death (death anxiety). Religion or beliefs held by individuals give meaning to life and a sense of security in the face of death anxiety, therefore, individuals tend to be defensive when encountering beliefs that are different from those that they have held for a long time. When people meet others with different beliefs, there is a worry that this difference in ideas will weaken their own beliefs. Religious individuals fear that different beliefs will disrupt the meaning of their life, leaving them at greater risk of death anxiety. Thus, religious individuals would prefer to avoid or even get rid of people who have different beliefs rather than risking their personal beliefs (Vail et al., 2010; Woodruff et al., 2014).

Intolerance usually arises from a lack of knowledge or a misunderstanding regarding differences. Lack of information about the beliefs of others reinforces the concern that respecting differences will threaten personal beliefs. One way of overcoming this is to provide adequate knowledge and understanding about differences and diversity within the education system. If education can provide extensive and detailed knowledge about a particular culture and practice, then intolerance can be reduced (Balint, 2011).

Knowledge about diversity and differences needs to be included in the curriculum to prevent the development of intolerance among students. Civic Education (CE) is one way in which the education system in Indonesia is trying to provide adequate knowledge. Wibowo and Wahono (2017) explained that CE attempts to motivate students to respect diversity. Through CE lessons, students are taught how to hold the values of Pancasila (as their ideology), and they are expected to understand diversity and plurality in Indonesia.

According to Balint (2011), extensive and detailed knowledge about a particular culture will encourage tolerance, therefore, the better the score regarding the knowledge and understanding of CE, the higher their tolerance. To date, there has been no study investigating the relationship between CE and tolerance, especially religious tolerance. Thus, not enough information is available on the effectiveness of CE lessons in terms of providing adequate information and understanding difference and diversity.

Once the knowledge and understanding of difference and diversity has been properly planned in the CE syllabus, it is also necessary to examine whether teachers' delivery regarding the value of religious tolerance has an influence on student attitudes. Religious tolerance can be seen as an attitude because it influences one's behavioral intentions, which in turn results in certain behaviors. The social environment can influence attitudes. An individual can change their attitude if others influence them. This may be because they want to elicit a positive reaction from someone, because they want their identity to be associated with a certain person, or because it is intrinsically rewarding to agree with certain attitudes (Kelman, 1958). Therefore, as the one delivering the lesson, it is not impossible that the values adopted by the teacher filter through during the lesson.

Values instilled in a family, especially by the parents, also form the foundation of a student's attitude and behavior. Children gain knowledge and have exposure to various issues through repeated intergenerational interactions with their parents. Therefore, ideas develop regarding values and beliefs during this interaction process (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002). Children learn about the values, beliefs, and attitudes of their parents through both direct teaching and indirect observation. Both are ways in which the information and guidance that children are actively looking for or passively accept are introduced and influence their way of life (Glass et al., 1986). Therefore, there is a possibility that parents' attitudes will influence the attitudes of their children. Some recent research on intergroup attitudes shows that there are significant influences, both one way (from parent to child) and mutually between parents and teenagers (Degner & Dalege, 2013; Jugert et al., 2016; Miklikowska, 2016; Miklikowska, 2017). These influences are further strengthened when there is a supportive relationship between parents and children (Miklikowska, 2016). The findings indicate that parents' attitudes can play a major role in the formation of students' attitudes. If parents have an intolerant attitude and are consistently intolerant at home, it is entirely possible that students will have the same attitude.

After discussing various factors in terms of education that can influence students' religious tolerance, we feel that the character of the students is also an important point for discussion. Some recent studies have found that intellectual humility is a characteristic that has an influence on one's tolerance, especially religious tolerance. Intellectual humility (IH) refers to a person's ability to regulate their need to feel right; their ability to respond non-defensively when their perspective is questioned; and their ability to express curiosity, interest, and a willingness to learn different perspectives (Woodruff et al., 2014). An individual who possesses IH does not feel that they must always be considered right. They are open to new information and willing to review and adjust their views (Hook et al., 2015). A study found a positive relationship between IH and religious tolerance. Pastors who have IH show high levels of religious tolerance (Hook et al., 2016).

This study aims to investigate the role of CE, religious tolerance of parents and teachers, and IH in predicting the religious tolerance of high school students. High school students were chosen as participants because developmentally speaking, adolescents are experiencing a process of identity formation (Erikson, 1950, 1968, as cited in Santrock, 2013). At this stage of development, adolescents experience a crisis caused by the effort to understand themselves and by their surrounding environment. Considering that their ideas regarding their way of life have not yet been fully formed, their opinions, perspectives, and attitudes tend to change and are easily influenced by others.

Religious tolerance

Religion is part of morality, and morality is a personal matter, thus people should not be forced to follow a certain standard. Everyone can maintain their beliefs and practice their religion uninhibited. Therefore, individuals who have religious tolerance will exhibit attitudes and behaviors that respect each other's right to practice their religion (Putnam & Campbell, 2012). Hook et al. (2016) see religious tolerance as an intellectual and social concept. Regarding beliefs and values, religious tolerance involves the understanding that everyone has the fundamental right to choose their religion and practice their own beliefs. In terms of society, religious tolerance involves how one relates to others, families, and communities with different religious views. In line with this view, Van Tongeren et al. (2016) formulated the idea that religious tolerance is a condition where individuals remain committed to their beliefs, but (a) view their beliefs moderately and understand the strengths and weaknesses relative to those beliefs, (b) can look at other religious groups positively and empathetically, and (c) can interact with others in ways that encourage positive relations between groups. Religious tolerance can also be seen when various communities coexist (both physically and in matters of technology) without letting religious differences cause conflict between the generations (Juergensmeyer, 2003, as cited in Woodruff et al., 2014).

It should be noted that religious tolerance has a peculiarity that means that it is considered to be generally more complicated than any other kind of tolerance, explained by Terror Management Theory (TMT). This theory explains that humans are the only living things capable of anticipating their own death. However, the ability to anticipate death is not followed by the ability to manage death-related anxiety. The anticipation actually increases death anxiety in humans. In order to manage this anxiety, humans seek and choose beliefs or cultural views of their world that help them to feel safe (Greenberg et al., 1986, as cited in Woodruff et al., 2014).

Religion is one of the cultural beliefs used by humans to make sense of life and manage death anxiety. Therefore, individuals tend to be defensive when they encounter beliefs that are different from their long-held beliefs. They may fear that these differences could change their understanding of life, interfere with their sense of security, or compromise their own beliefs. Thus, religious individuals may avoid or get rid of people with different beliefs rather than risking their personal beliefs (Vail et al., 2010; Woodruff et al., 2014).

The TMT perspective could explain why individuals who have religious tolerance do not feel the beliefs of others will compromise their personal beliefs. These individuals can still maintain their beliefs without needing to avoid or getting rid of people with different religious beliefs. Thus, they can still respect the religious rights of others and maintain positive relationships with people of other religious groups without feeling threatened.

Intellectual humility

IH is a virtue. This term describes a person's ability to regulate their need to feel right, their ability to respond non-defensively when their perspective is questioned and the ability to express curiosity, interest, and a willingness to learn different ideas (Woodruff et al., 2014). Individuals with IH do not feel that they must always be considered right, be open to new information, or be willing to review and adjust their views. They realize that intellectuals have strengths and weaknesses that can cause errors. They are not threatened by intellectual differences, they are not arrogant about their knowledge,

they respect the viewpoints of others and are open to reviewing their own point of view, and they do not engage in threatening behavior when they disagree with others (Hook et al., 2016; Hoyle et al., 2016; Leary et al., 2017).

Intellectual humility and religious tolerance

The importance of the psychological function of religion for humans increases the tendency for conflicts and disputes caused by religious differences. Religion can be seen as a form of culture (Vail et al., 2010), hence, religion can have a strong influence on one's beliefs, values, and attitudes regarding various subjects. The strong influence of values from different religions can inevitably lead to various cultural disputes (Rodriguez et al., 2019). Religious conflicts and disputes usually occur between (a) individuals and groups of different religions, (b) individuals and groups of the same religion, and (c) religious and non-religious (agnostic/atheist) individuals and groups (Rodriguez et al., 2019).

IH may be very difficult to practice when it comes to values, attitudes, and religious beliefs. However, some previous theories related to humility support the idea that IH can encourage religious tolerance. One study shows that humility encourages social bonding by repairing and forming strong social bonds (Davis, Worthington, Hook, Emmons et al., 2013). Another study shows that humility still encourages social bonding even when factors such as cultural differences appear to threaten relationships (Hook et al., 2013). Thus, humility will actually encourage individuals to prioritize social values over personal beliefs. In addition, IH involves an awareness of one's limitations in understanding intellectual problems, as well as an openness to alternative perspectives. An individual with high religious IH will likely acknowledge the limitations of his religious ideas and be open to the possibility that the perspectives of other religions might have stronger intellectual arguments (Rodriguez et al., 2019). Furthermore, Woodruff et al. (2014) formulated the idea that the level of someone's religious IH is directly related to their religious orientation and also to their ability and motivation to explore and understand different perspectives.

Previous studies have explored the relationship between religious IH and religious tolerance. One study found that individuals with strong religious beliefs but lower religious IH tend to be more reactive to articles that describe the conflicting positions of their religious beliefs (Hopkin et al., 2014). In line with these findings, Van Tongeren et al. (2016) found that humility is associated with lower defensive attitudes toward members of other religious groups. This is possibly due to the fact that individuals who have a strong commitment to their religious beliefs, and view religion as part of their identity, find it more difficult to acknowledge the limitations of their religious convictions (Rodriguez et al., 2019). Additional recent research shows that religious IH is positively correlated with religious tolerance. There is also an interaction between religious IH and religious diversity with religious tolerance. In groups with high religious IH, a positive correlation was found between exposure to religious diversity and religious tolerance. This means the more individuals with high religious IH are exposed to religious diversity, the higher their tolerance of diversity tends to be. In contrast, in groups with low religious IH, no significant relationship was found between exposure to religious diversity and religious tolerance (Hook et al., 2016).

Implementation of religious tolerance in civic education

In the Indonesian education curriculum, CE is an educational strategy that highlights the cultural differences (e.g., ethnicity,

language, religion, gender, class, and race) found among students. CE teaches students to become citizens who hold the values of the national ideology, and to understand diversity and plurality in Indonesia (Wibowo & Wahono, 2017). The role of CE is to prepare students to overcome difficulties and problems they might find in multicultural societies, and to teach them to respect social and cultural differences, and culture in general (Wihardit, 2010).

Furthermore, Wihardit (2010) explains that through CE, students must be critical and analytical in relation to the concepts, principles, and values of cultural diversity and equality. For this to be achieved, students need to first understand the concepts of human rights, democracy, justice, law, and politics. Therefore, CE as a subject needs to accommodate the following three areas of knowledge: (1) Knowledge of diversity, which includes culture, religion and customs; (2) Understanding life in the community and the nation; (3) Practicing tolerance, justice, respect, appreciation, empathy, harmony, peace, and democracy in daily life. The scope of the CE syllabus in primary and secondary education is designed to accommodate the knowledge, understanding, and attitudes needed to study cultural diversity and equality.

Methods

Participants

Participants in this study are adolescents registered as active high school students in the City and Regency of Bogor, with an age range of 14–18 years. The sampling was done using the convenience sampling method in three high schools in the City and Regency of Bogor. This location was chosen as it is considered to be one of the most intolerant cities in Indonesia according to Setara's Tolerant City Index (Setara Institute, 2018). The total number of participants in this study is 365 grade 10–12 high school students, 182 parents, and 77 teachers. Participants were obtained from three high schools. Based on the criteria selection as per the study interests, we only processed 182 samples of students, 182 samples of parents, and 62 samples of teachers.

Instrument

Religious tolerance: Religious tolerance is measured by adapting the measurement used by Van Tongeren et al. (2016) and Hook et al. (2016). Adapting to the research interests and ethics applicable in Indonesia, we translated and slightly adjusted the items. Our instrument consists of 4 Likert-scale items (scales 1–5) to measure views regarding people of different religions. For the current sample, a coefficient of Cronbach's Alpha in this instrument is only satisfactory: 0.64

Intellectual humility

Measurement of IH variables was done by using the Comprehensive Intellectual Humility Scale (CIHS) developed by Krumrei-Mancuso and Rouse (2016). The measuring instrument consists of 22 statement items (11 favorable and 11 unfavorable). Each item has a choice of answers in the form of a Likert scale of 1–5 (1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Agree; and 5 = Strongly agree). For the current sample, the coefficient of Cronbach's Alpha is 0.81.

Performance in civic education

Performance in CE is measured based on the latest report card score. The report card is the accumulation of daily exam scores, midterm exam scores, assignment scores, presentation scores, and participation scores obtained in the semester wherein the study was conducted. Scores are considered to meet the measurement criteria if the test material includes content that accommodates the aforementioned three areas

Table 1. Distribution of Religious Tolerance Items

No.	Question	Scale
1	To what extent do you feel a close relationship with people of different religions?	1 = Very distant 2 = Distant 3 = Indifferent 4 = Close 5 = Very close
2	To what extent will you support or oppose the construction of a religious building that is not part of your religion in your neighborhood?	1 = Strongly against 2 = Against 3 = Indifferent 4 = Support 5 = Strongly support
3	To what extent do you believe that people of different faiths will go to heaven or get salvation?	1 = Will not go to heaven or get salvation 2 = Might not go to heaven or get salvation 3 = I do not know 4 = Might go to heaven or get salvation 5 = Will go to heaven or get salvation
4	To what extent do you believe that people of different religions can be good members of society?	1 = Cannot be good members of society 2 = Might not be good members of society 3 = I do not know 4 = Might be good members of society 5 = Can be good members of society

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Performance in CE, Intellectual Humility, and Religious Tolerance.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
CE Score	182	70	95	86.40	3.44
Parent's Religious Tolerance	182	8	20	14.16	2.43
Teacher's Religious Tolerance	62	10	20	13.56	2.11
Intellectual Humility	182	59	100	78.28	6.44
Student's Religious Tolerance	182	10	20	15.19	2.08

Table 3. Multiple Regression Testing Results according to CE Score, Religious Tolerance of Parents and Teachers, and Intellectual Humility as regards Students' Religious Tolerance.

Variable	df	F	Sig. F	R ²	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
					B	SE	β		
	4	15.05	0.000	0.254					
	177								
<i>Constant</i>					7.03	4.13		1.70	0.09
CE Score					-.01	.04	-.02	-.27	0.78
Parents' religious tolerance					.41	.06	.48	7.33	0.00
Teachers' religious tolerance					-.01	.06	-.01	-.16	0.88
Intellectual Humility					.04	.02	.14	2.11	0.04

of knowledge. Report card scores were obtained from the coordinator of the CE teachers in each school after consent was granted from the participating students.

Procedure

Data collection was carried out in three schools, where, in each school, we conducted the study in 3–5 classes across grades 10–12. Before the data collection of students was done, participants received informed consent sheets, which we also read to them. Along with the informed consent, we also explained that we would request their latest CE score from their teacher. We explained that by agreeing and signing the consent form, it would mean that they allowed us to obtain their CE score. Afterward, we explained the guidelines for filling out the questionnaire and gave them 15–25 minutes to complete it. The questionnaire consisted of the religious tolerance instrument and the CIHS instrument for 15–25 minutes. Data collection of the parent sample was done on an individual basis at home. After students filled out and submitted their questionnaires, we distributed the parent questionnaires to each student. We asked the students to give the questionnaires to their parents and to return them the next day. Data collection of the teacher sample was done on an individual basis in each teacher's room. We made sure that the participating teachers were

assigned to teach in our participants' class. After collecting data from each participant, we explained that the participant would receive a delayed reward in the form of an e-wallet voucher of Rp 10,000, which would be processed 1–2 months after the data collection.

Findings and Discussion

Findings

Descriptive analysis of each variable through the calculation of mean and standard deviation yields the following findings. The mean score of CE is quite high ($M = 86.40$; $SD = 3.44$). Thus, the average student exhibits a good performance regarding the understanding of diversity taught during the CE lessons. The participant with the lowest score is 5 SD below the mean (score = 70), and the participant who has the highest score is 2 SD above the mean.

The mean score of parents' religious tolerance was also high ($M = 14.16$; $SD = 2.43$). This means that the average parent shows a promising level of religious tolerance. Based on the distribution of data, it can be seen that parents with the lowest religious tolerance have a score of 2 SD below the mean (score = 8), and the parents with the highest religious tolerance have a score of 2 SD above the mean (score = 20). Mean scores were also found to be relatively high as regards

teachers' religious tolerance ($M = 13.56$; $SD = 2.11$). This means the average teacher shows a fairly good level of religious tolerance. Based on the distribution of data, it was found that teachers with the lowest religious tolerance have a score of 2 SD below the mean (score = 10), and teachers with the highest religious tolerance have a score of 3 SD above the mean (score = 20).

The mean score of the IH variable is high ($M = 78.28$; $SD = 6.44$). The average students have a relatively high score of IH. Based on the distribution of data, it was found that students with the lowest IH have a score of 3 SD below the mean (score = 59), and students with the highest IH have a score of 3 SD above the mean (score = 100).

The mean score of the students' religious tolerance variable is the highest compared to the two other participant categories ($M = 15.19$; $SD = 2.07$). Thus, the average student has good religious tolerance. Based on the distribution of data, it can be seen that students with the lowest religious tolerance have a score of 2 SD below the mean (score = 10), and students with the highest religious tolerance have a score of 2 SD above the mean (score = 20).

Multiple regression testing was conducted to see the role of performance in CE, teachers' and parents' religious tolerance, and students' IH in predicting students' religious tolerance. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 3.

The regression equation is as follows: $F(4, 177) = 15.05$, $p < 0.000$, with R^2 of 0.254. This shows that simultaneously, CE scores, parents' religious tolerance, teachers' religious tolerance, and IH significantly predict students' religious tolerance. The prediction of students' religious tolerance is obtained from the equation $7.03 - .01$ (CE score) + $.41$ (parents' religious tolerance) - $.01$ (teachers' religious tolerance) + $.04$ (IH). The variance proportion explained by the four variables is 25.4%, while the remaining 74.6% is explained by other variables outside the study. It is also known that students' religious tolerance increased by $.04$ points for each 1-point increase in IH and increased by $.41$ points for each 1-point increase for parental religious tolerance. Thus, it can be said that parents' religious tolerance and IH are significant predictors of students' religious tolerance. However, no significant influence was found from CE scores and teachers' religious tolerance.

Discussion

Based on the testing of the hypothesis, it can be concluded that there is a relationship between performance in CE, teachers' and parents' religious tolerance, and IH as regards religious tolerance among high school students. The four independent variables were found to simultaneously predict the level of religious tolerance in students. However, when analyzed separately, only parents' religious tolerance and IH can significantly predict religious tolerance. It is predicted that the higher the level of parents' religious tolerance and the IH of students, the higher the level of students' religious tolerance.

This research was conducted to find out how the role of performance in CE, teacher and parent attitudes, and IH can predict students' religious tolerance. The choice of CE as a predictor is based on the assumption that intolerance often stems from a lack of knowledge and understanding related to cultural diversity and differences. Therefore, providing extensive and detailed knowledge about a particular culture and practice is considered to reduce the occurrence of intolerance (Balint, 2011).

The success of instilling the values of diversity contained in CE to students depends on the learning process. Extensive and detailed knowledge and comprehension about diversity would not be obtained

simply by rote learning. Therefore, the Indonesian curriculum uses Bloom's taxonomy to encourage higher thinking processes in learning.

The complexity of the concepts and values in CE means that learners need to have skills and abilities in the higher level of the taxonomy, at least in the cognitive domain, in order to achieve the competencies included in CE. For example, students need to first comprehend the concepts of human rights, democracy, justice, law, and politics. This comprehension is then used to criticize and analyze the concepts, principles, and values of cultural diversity and equality (Wihardit, 2010). For diversity, which is trying to be instilled through CE, to be internalized, students need to reach at least the cognitive analysis stage in the learning process of CE.

Data regarding how the CE learning process occurs in the cognitive domain was not attained in this study. Judging from the demographic data, it can be seen that most of the subjects have a religious background that tends to be homogeneous (87.4% of subjects are Muslim). Based on these data, it can be assumed that the opportunity for students to apply the concept of religious tolerance tends to be minimal. The ability of students to analyze the concepts of diversity and cultural equality needs to be included in the syllabus design. The effectiveness of the learning process also needs to be driven by the teacher as a facilitator. Therefore, quantitative data alone is not enough to know whether the subject's learning through CE activities has been ideal. Qualitative data and analysis are needed to complement quantitative data so that a more comprehensive picture is obtained related to learning through CE. Qualitative analysis can include interactions that occur in the classroom, teacher competence in the delivery of material, syllabus design, stimulation provided by the teacher to encourage the achievement of cognitive skills at a higher level, factors that make the learning process ineffective, and so on.

Not only is the CE score ineffective in predicting students' intolerance, but it turns out that teacher attitudes are also insignificant in this regard. Attitudes can be influenced by the social environment. The transference of attitudes from teacher to student can also be influenced by various other factors; for example, the extent to which a student admires their teacher that they consider them an exemplary figure. If a student views their teacher as a role model, then it is likely that they will adopt the same attitude as their teacher because they want to get a good reaction from their model, or they want their identity to be associated with the teacher. Another thing that can lead to teachers' attitude failing in predicting students' religious tolerance is the absence of an intrinsic reward felt by students. For example, based on our conversation with several participants in one of the schools, we found that teachers had been openly urging students not to choose students from religious minorities as presidents of the student body. This instead provokes negative emotional reactions and makes students feel uncomfortable. Therefore, no matter how often the teacher tries to instill values and attitudes, students still do not adopt the same attitude because they do not receive any reward from that attitude.

The insignificance of teachers' attitudes in predicting student attitudes can also happen when there is a lack of an effective persuasion and communication process that occurs between teachers and students. Persuasion happens when changes related to personal beliefs or attitudes occur because of the reception of a message (Cialdini et al., 2007). The elaboration likelihood model (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986, as cited in Aronson et al., 2006) explains that there are two ways that persuasion can make a person change his or her attitude: (a) centrally, when individuals are motivated and able to pay attention to the logic of the arguments presented by other people, or (b) peripherally, when individuals do not pay attention to the argument given but are influenced

by other characteristics that are more superficial (for example, the way it is delivered, who is conveying it, appearance, etc.). Changes in attitude that occur centrally are stronger and tend to last longer than peripheral ones. Thus, the teacher's success in influencing student attitudes is likely to be affected by many other variables not examined in this study. For example, how much is a student's motivation to listen to teachers' arguments related to religious tolerance, or how much the teacher's characteristics affect students' views regarding religious tolerance, and so forth.

The tendency of religious tolerance to be more difficult to achieve than any other tolerance is also one of the factors regarding influences from the environment. The significant role of religion as a mechanism used by humans to overcome death anxiety makes the influence of religious tolerance in relation to the social environment more complex. Even though there are factors that could make teachers' attitudes influence students' attitudes, it still does not guarantee that students will have religious tolerance similar to that of their teacher. Student religious orientation can be a more influential factor in students' religious tolerance. Some previous studies explain the relationship between religious orientation and prejudice, racism, ethnocentrism, tolerance, etc. For example, it is known that individuals with an extrinsic religious orientation are significantly more prejudiced toward other groups compared to individuals who have an intrinsic religious orientation (Allport & Ross, 1967). In addition, it was also found that fundamentalist religious orientation was highly correlated with racism and religious ethnocentrism (Altemeyer, 2003). Meanwhile, individuals with quest religious orientation actually tend to have a greater tolerance for religious diversity (Van Tongeren, et al., 2015). Thus, it is possible that even if a student idolizes their teacher, the teacher's attitude still does not affect the student's attitude because both have different religious orientations.

Different from the finding regarding teachers' attitudes, the results of this study indicate that parents' religious tolerance significantly predicts their children's religious tolerance. Through repeated interactions between the generations, parents provide exposure and knowledge to their children regarding various problems. In the process of interaction, there is usually socialization regarding the value systems and beliefs that parents want to instill in their children (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002). Previous studies have shown that the religious life of children, especially adolescents, is greatly influenced by their parents. Examples such as parenting styles, supportiveness, and attachment all affect children's religiosity (Gunnoe & Moore, 2002; Kim-Spoon et al., 2012; Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002). The great influence of parents on children's religiosity makes us assume that parents and children tend to have the same religious orientation. Thus, tolerance as regards religious diversity will tend to be similar between parents and children.

This study has some limitations. In the data collection process, quite a number of participants (especially, adult participants) refused to fill out the questionnaire when reading items regarding the religious tolerance instrument. Bearing in mind that religion is part of a worldview, research in the realm of religious behavior can be more complex. Factors such as cultural bias, the political situation, social background, rituals and religious practices, as well as various other things can influence the process and the results of the research. In addition, when considering that religious tolerance is more difficult to achieve, and the fact that there is a diversity of religious orientations, it can be understood that participants' reactions can be very diverse.

One idea for further research is to widen the study by forming research models that involve other variables such as religious orientation and variables related to family dynamics. Using a

mediation or moderation model is worth considering. Also, the religious tolerance measurement based on TMT theory is quite limited, especially in Indonesia. Thus, researchers can further develop religious tolerance measurements that refer to TMT theory. By developing a new measuring instrument, it is expected that in the future, we will have some religious tolerance measurement that is more valid and reliable, thus minimizing the extraneous research variables.

The results of this study can contribute to educational institutions such as schools in terms of their effort to achieve safe schools and ensure human rights. The results of this study indicate that IH significantly predicts religious tolerance in students. Thus, the risk of religious intolerance instilled by parents can be minimized if schools make efforts to introduce and strengthen the concept of IH. Individuals with IH have a high level of curiosity when seeking data and confirming the accuracy of their own beliefs. They think based on data and evidence; they are open and flexible in their thinking; and they are sure and confident in their arguments. The concept of IH can be introduced either through formal activities (part of the curriculum, taught through counseling classes, etc.) or informal (initiated as part of a student organization or extracurricular programs). The introduction of concepts can first focus on developing certain characteristics so that eventually, students are accustomed to applying IH when arguing both in academic situations and in everyday life. The application and establishment of IH values will help build religious tolerance.

Educational institutions in Indonesia can also use this research as a reference to review CE syllabuses to fulfill their objective of providing knowledge and understanding of diversity so that proper improvements can be made. Most importantly, the results of this study open up opportunities for psychological practitioners to develop intervention and development programs related to IH and religious tolerance, especially in educational settings.

Acknowledgements

This work was funded by Universitas Indonesia through "Hibah Riset Publikasi Internasional Terindeks Mahasiswa Magister (PITMA B)" programme 2019 under grant NKB-1010/UN2.R3.1/HKP.05.00/2019.

References

1. Allport, G. W., & Ross, J. M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5(4), 432-443. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0021212>
2. Altemeyer, B. (2003). Why do religious fundamentalists tend to be prejudiced? *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 13(1), 17-28.
3. Aronson, E., Wilson, T., & Akert, R. (2005). *Social Psychology*. Pearson Education.
4. Balint, P. (2011). Education for Tolerance. In E. B. Coleman & K. White (Eds.). *Religious tolerance, education, and the curriculum* (pp. 41-51). Sense Publishers.
5. Cam, P. (2011). Educating for Tolerance. In E. B. Coleman & K. White (Eds.). *Religious tolerance, education, and the curriculum* (pp. 53-65). Sense Publishers.
6. Cialdini, R., Kenrick, D., & Neuberg, S. (2007). *Social psychology: Goals in interaction*. Pearson Education.
7. Davis, D. E., Worthington Jr, E. L., Hook, J. N., Emmons, R. A., Hill, P. C., Bollinger, R. A., & Van Tongeren, D. R. (2013). Humility and the development and repair of social bonds: Two longitudinal studies. *Self and Identity*, 12(1), 58-77. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2011.636509>

8. Degner, J., & Dalege, J. (2013). The apple does not fall far from the tree, or does it? A meta-analysis of parent-child similarity in intergroup attitudes. *Psychological Bulletin*, 139(6), 1270-1304. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031436>
9. Glass, J., Bengtson, V. L., & Dunham, C. C. (1986). Attitude similarity in three-generation families: Socialization, status inheritance, or reciprocal influence? *American Sociological Review*, 51(5), 685-698. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095493>
10. Gunnoe, M. L., & Moore, K. A. (2002). Predictors of religiosity among youth aged 17-22: A longitudinal study of the National Survey of Children. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 41(4), 613-622. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5906.00141>
11. Hook, J. N., Davis, D. E., Owen, J., Worthington, E. L., Jr., & Utsey, S. O. (2013). Cultural humility: Measuring openness to culturally diverse clients. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 60(3), 353-366. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032595>
12. Hook, J. N., Davis, D. E., Van Tongeren, D. R., Hill, P. C., Worthington Jr, E. L., Farrell, J. E., & Dieke, P. (2015). Intellectual humility and forgiveness of religious leaders. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 10(6), 499-506. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2015.1004554>
13. Hook, J. N., Farrell, J. E., Johnson, K. A., Van Tongeren, D. R., Davis, D. E., & Aten, J. D. (2016). Intellectual humility and religious tolerance. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 12(1), 29-35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2016.1167937>
14. Hopkin, C. R., Hoyle, R. H., & Toner, K. (2014). Intellectual humility and reactions to opinions about religious beliefs. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 42, 50-61. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009164711404200106>
15. Hoyle, R. H., Davison, E. K., Diebels, K. J., & Leary, M. R. (2016). Holding specific views with humility: Conceptualization and measurement of specific intellectual humility. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 97, 165-172. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.03.043>
16. Jugert, P., Eckstein, K., Beelmann, A., & Noack, P. (2016). Parents' influence on the development of their children's ethnic intergroup attitudes: A longitudinal analysis from middle childhood to early adolescence. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 13(2), 213-230. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2015.1084923>
17. Kelman, H. C. (1958). Compliance, identification, and internalization three processes of attitude change. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2(1), 51-60. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002200275800200106>
18. Kim-Spoon, J., Longo, G. S., & McCullough, M. E. (2012). Parent-adolescent relationship quality as a moderator for the influences of parents' religiousness on adolescents' religiousness and adjustment. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 41(12), 1576-1587. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-012-9796-1>
19. Koerner, F. A., & Fitzpatrick, M. A. (2002). Understanding family communication patterns and family functioning: The roles of conversation orientation and conformity orientation. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 26(1), 36-65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2002.11679010>
20. Krumrei-Mancuso, E. J., & Rouse, S. V. (2016). The development and validation of the Comprehensive Intellectual Humility Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 98, 209-221. doi:10.1080/00223891.2015.1068174
21. Leary, M. R., Diebels, K. J., Davison, E. K., Jongman-Sereno, K. P., Isherwood, J. C., Raimi, K. T., Samantha, A. D., & Hoyle, R. H. (2017). Cognitive and interpersonal features of intellectual humility. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 43(6), 793-813. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167217697695>
22. Miklikowska, M. (2016). Like parent, like child? Development of prejudice and tolerance towards immigrants. *British Journal of Psychology*, 107(1), 95-116. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjop.12124>
23. Miklikowska, M. (2017). Development of anti-immigrant attitudes in adolescence: The role of parents, peers, intergroup friendships, and empathy. *British Journal of Psychology*, 108(3), 626-648. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjop.12236>
24. Putnam, R. D., & Campbell, D. E. (2012). *American Grace: How Religion Divides Us and Unites Us*. Simon & Schuster.
25. Rodriguez, D., Hook, J. N., Farrell, J. E., Mosher, D. K., Zhang, H., Van Tongeren, D. R., Don, E. D., Jamie, D. A., & Hill, P. C. (2019). Religious intellectual humility, attitude change, and closeness following religious disagreement. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 14(2), 133-140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2017.1388429>
26. Santrock, J. W. (2014). *Adolescence* (15th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
27. Setara Institute. (2018). *Press Release Indeks Kota Toleran (IKT) Tahun 2018 Setara Institute for Democracy and Peace*. Retrieved from website of Setara Institute. <http://setara-institute.org/indeks-kota-toleran-ikt-tahun-2018/>
28. Suryowati, E. (2017, May 3). Asal Muasal Penelitian Kemendikbud dan Temuan Sikap Intoleransi di Sekolah. *Jernih Melihat Dunia*. <https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2017/05/03/14380761/asal.muasal.penelit?page=all>
29. Suyanto, B. S. (2018, 10 Oktober). *Guru Intoleran dan Ancaman Degradasi Pendidikan*. Retrieved on 9 8, 2019 from <https://mediaindonesia.com/read/detail/191485-guru-intoleran-dan-ancaman-degradasi-pendidikan>
30. Vail, K. E., III, Rothschild, Z. K., Weise, D. R., Solomon, S., Pyszczynski, T., & Greenberg, J. (2010). A terror management analysis of the psychological function of religion. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 14, 84-94. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868309351165>
31. Van Tongeren, D. R., Hakim, S., Hook, J. N., Johnson, K. A., Green, J. D., Hulseley, T. L., & Davis, D. E. (2015). Toward an understanding of religious tolerance: Quest religiousness and positive attitudes toward religiously dissimilar others. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 26(3), 212-224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508619.2015.1039417>
32. Van Tongeren, D. R., Stafford, J., Hook, J. N., Green, J. D., Davis, D. E., & Johnson, K. A. (2016). Humility attenuates negative attitudes and behaviors toward religious out-group members. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 11(2), 199-208. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2015.1037861>
33. Wibowo, A. P., & Wahono, M. (2017). Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan: usaha konkret memperkuat multikulturalisme di Indonesia. *Jurnal Civics: Media Kajian Kewarganegaraan*, 14(2), 196-205. <https://doi.org/10.21831/civics.v14i2.16043>
34. Wihardit, K. (2010). Pendidikan multikultural: suatu konsep, pendekatan dan solusi. *Jurnal Pendidikan*, 11(2), 96-105. <https://doi.org/10.33830/jp.v11i2.561.2010>
35. Woodruff, E., Van Tongeren, D. R., McElroy, S., Davis, D. E., & Hook, J. N. (2014). Humility and religion: Benefits, difficulties, and a model of religious tolerance. In C. Kim-Prieto (Ed.), *Religion and spirituality across cultures* (pp. 271-285). Springer Science.