

THE INFLUENCE OF SOCIOECONOMIC FACTORS AND RELIGIOSITY ON RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE AMONG STUDENTS AT INDONESIAN ISLAMIC HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

*Zulkifli¹, Rena Latifa¹, Muhamad Fahri¹, Sholikatus Sa'diyah¹

¹Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta, Indonesia

*Corresponding Email: zulkifli@uinjkt.ac.id

Received: Accepted: Published:

ABSTRACT

Religious tolerance is fundamental to establishing religious moderation and harmonious life, a critical issue that has garnered considerable attention from researchers and academics in Indonesia. Understanding tolerance requires considering various factors that shape and influence it beyond simple faith dimensions. This study investigates the influence of specific socioeconomic factors and personal religiosity on the religious tolerance levels among Muslim students attending Indonesia's State Islamic Higher Educational Institutions (PTKIN). Employing a quantitative approach, the research utilizes multiple regression analysis to examine the relative contributions of the independent variables (socioeconomic factors and religiosity) toward religious tolerance. The findings indicate that three out of four socioeconomic aspects, gender, organizational affiliation, and parental income, significantly affect students' religious tolerance. Conversely, the amount of allowance received was not found to be a significant predictor of tolerance. Crucially, the students' self-reported personal religiosity did not significantly influence their religious tolerance scores. This suggests that tolerance among PTKIN students is not explained by their individual depth of religious observance or piety level. The study implies that promoting effective religious tolerance within Islamic educational contexts should prioritize strategies that enhance social and economic exposure, particularly through engaging organizational and diverse university-level social activities, rather than focusing solely on increasing religious instruction.

Keywords: Islamic Education, Religious tolerance, Religiosity, Socioeconomic Aspect, religious Moderation

INTRODUCTION

Religious intolerance remains a persistent global challenge that threatens social cohesion, civic harmony, and the stability of religiously diverse societies (Ismail et al., 2025; Dauda, 2020). Promoting religious tolerance, therefore, becomes an essential social and educational priority. In the scholarly literature, tolerance is understood as a multidimensional construct shaped by personal dispositions, social identity, and contextual factors, including gender, religious characteristics, and educational experiences (Aseery & Alfaifi, 2025; Lester & Roberts, 2006; Allport, 1954; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). A culture of tolerance is foundational not only for harmonious intergroup relations but also for individual flourishing (Zuhdiyah et al., 2023). Educators play a crucial role in cultivating these dispositions, as demonstrated in studies highlighting how Islamic education can nurture active tolerance and moderation among young learners (Alazeez et al., 2024; Rusmana et al., 2025; Hanif et al., 2024). Given this, higher education institutions, especially those responsible for preparing future Islamic scholars,

educators, and community leaders, represent an essential terrain for strengthening religious tolerance.

In Indonesia, however, the commitment to pluralism has been increasingly challenged. Scholars describe the rise of a “conservative turn” influenced by globalization, digital media, and transnational Islamic ideologies (Van Bruinessen, 2013). This shift is marked by growing expressions of exclusivism, intolerance, and even radical orientations among certain segments of university students (Wijaya Mulya & Aditomo, 2019). Survey evidence echoes this concern: the Setara Institute (2019) reports that Islamic university students display some of the highest tendencies toward conservative and formalistic religiosity, while PPIM UIN Jakarta’s findings show that 58.8% of young Muslims exhibit radical attitudes despite generally moderate behaviors (Saputra, 2018). Yet national indicators portray a more complex picture. Annual surveys by the Ministry of Religious Affairs consistently report relatively high religious harmony scores; however, the dimension of tolerance persistently ranks the lowest among the three components of harmony, tolerance, equality, and cooperation (Sila & Fakhruddin, 2020). This discrepancy underscores persistent vulnerabilities in interreligious relations and has prompted the government to formalize the Religious Moderation (*Moderasi Beragama*) policy within the RPJMN 2020–2024 as a national strategy for strengthening tolerance, anti-violence, and civic commitment (Kementerian Agama, 2019; Subchi et al., 2022; Zamroni et al., 2025).

Empirical studies examining the relationship between religiosity and tolerance have yielded mixed and often contradictory findings. A substantial body of research reports that higher religiosity correlates with lower tolerance, suggesting that specific modes of religious commitment may strengthen in-group boundaries and reduce openness to others (Yusuf et al., 2019; Hoffman, 2020; Spierings, 2019; Allport & Ross, 1967; Glock & Stark, 1965; Hassan, 2007a, 2007b). Other studies emphasize multidimensionality: different components of religiosity, such as religious salience, schema, and doctrinal particularism, may influence tolerance in divergent ways (Setiawan et al., 2020; Ardi et al., 2021; Batson et al., 1993; Huber & Huber, 2012). Some research even shows that highly religious individuals display moderate or tolerant attitudes, depending on social context and organizational participation (Saputra, 2018; Putnam & Campbell, 2012; Hook et al., 2017). Recent studies also highlight the importance of intellectual humility, cognitive flexibility, and knowledge of moderation in predicting tolerant attitudes (Lubis & Sianipar, 2022; Latifa et al., 2022; Qomaruzzaman & Busro, 2019; Prasetyo & Halimatusa'diyah, 2024). Collectively, these findings suggest that religiosity alone cannot adequately explain variations in tolerance, reinforcing the need to examine broader contextual and socioeconomic factors.

Responding to these empirical inconsistencies, scholars have increasingly emphasized the influence of non-religious variables, such as gender, socioeconomic background, and organizational involvement, on tolerance (Shaukat & Pell, 2020; Mappiasse & Hayadin, 2022). National surveys similarly point to demographic and socioeconomic determinants as important predictors of religious harmony (Sila & Fakhruddin, 2020). Within this landscape, students of State Islamic Higher Education Institutions (PTKIN) represent a particularly critical group, given their strategic role in shaping Islamic discourse and their position at the intersection of religious learning and civic responsibility.

To address these gaps, this study examines the combined influence of religiosity and socioeconomic characteristics on religious tolerance among Muslim students in PTKIN across Indonesia. Specifically, it tests whether five independent variables, religiosity, gender, participation in student organizations, parents' income, and amount of allowance, significantly predict levels of religious tolerance. The remainder of this paper presents a brief literature review, theoretical framework, research methods, results and discussion, and the study's conclusions and implications.

METHOD

This quantitative study employed a survey approach, collecting data from a sample of 578 sixth-semester Muslim undergraduate students (N=578) across Indonesia's State Islamic Higher Educational Institutions (PTKIN) during July 2020. The sixth semester was selected as it represents a sufficient duration of study within the higher education environment. A multi-stage systematic sampling technique was utilized, targeting PTKIN located in the western (UIN Arraniry Banda Aceh, UIN Raden Fatah Palembang, UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta), middle (UIN Alauddin Makasar, UIN Mataram), and eastern (IAIN Ambon, IAIN Sorong) regions of Indonesia. Data was collected using a questionnaire distributed via Google Forms, which included closed-ended questions measuring the dependent variable (Religious Tolerance, adapted from Hook et al., 2017) and the independent variables (Religiosity, measured using five modified items from the Centrality of Religiosity Scale by Huber & Huber, 2012; and Socioeconomic Factors: gender, student organizational affiliation, parental income, and allowance amount). Before hypothesis testing, the research instrument underwent Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) using the LISREL application (version 8.70) to validate the constructs. Finally, multiple regression analysis was performed using SPSS version 26 to test the central hypothesis: that religiosity and the specified socioeconomic factors significantly influence religious tolerance among the students.

Table 1. Dimensions and items of religiosity

No	Dimension	Original Items	Items
1	Intellectual	How often do you think about religious issues?	I often think/study about religious topics.
2	Ideology	To what extent do you believe that God exists?	I believe in the proofs of God's power.
3	Public practice	How often do you take part in public services?	I often participate in religious activities in the community.
4	Private practice	How often do you pray?	I often perform obligatory prayers and recommended prayers.
5	Experience	How often do you experience situations where you feel God intervenes in your life?	I often experience situations where I feel God's intervention in my life.

In this study, we tested whether the five items are truly unidimensional, meaning they only measure religiosity. From the results of the CFA with the one-factor model, we found that it does not fit, with chi-square = 173.46, df = 5, p-value = 0.00000, and RMSEA = 0.242.

Therefore, this study modified the model, where the measurement errors on some items are accessible to correlate with each other, so a fit model is obtained with chi-square = 0.90, df = 2, p-value = 0.63679, and RMSEA = 0.000. The next step is to report on the validity test of each item of religiosity. The results are shown in table 2:

Table 2. Validity result of religiosity item

No Item	Coefficient	Std. error	t-value	Result
Item 1	0.80	0.05	17.57	Valid
Item 2	0.57	0.04	13.26	Valid
Item 3	0.72	0.04	16.52	Valid
Item 4	0.70	0.05	15.06	Valid
Item 5	0.62	0.05	13.67	Valid

Note: Valid=t-value>1.96

Based on Table 2, it is clear that all five items have a t-Score higher than 1.96, and, therefore, all are valid to measure religiosity. Subsequently, the religious tolerance measurement utilized in this study is the tolerance instrument developed by Putnam & Campbell (2012), which was further elaborated upon by Hook et al. (2017) and refined by Ardi et al. (2021). This religious tolerance instrument comprises two dimensions: relational and intellectual. Below are detailed examples:

Table 3. Dimensions and items of religious tolerance

Dimension	Indicator	Aspect	No.	Item Example
Relational	Individuals engage actively with people, families, and communities of different religions.	External	1	I feel comfortable with the presence of other religious groups.
		Internal	2	I feel comfortable with the presence of other sects/organizations within Islam.
		External	3	I support the construction of places of worship for other religions in my residential area.
		Internal	4	I support the construction of places of worship for other sects/schools of thought within Islam in my residential area.
Intellectual	Individuals understand that everyone has the right to choose and practice their religion.	External	5	I believe that people of different religions than mine can enter heaven.
		Internal	6	I believe that Muslims of different sects/schools of thought than mine can enter heaven.
		External	7	I believe that people of different religions than mine can be good citizens.
		Internal	8	I believe that Muslims of different sects/schools of thought than mine can be good citizens.

The religious tolerance scale consists of eight items. In this study, we measured whether the eight items are unidimensional or whether the items only measure religious tolerance. The CFA results with the one-factor model found that a model did not fit, with chi-square = 594.16, $df = 20$, $p\text{-value} = 0.00000$, and $RMSEA = 0.223$. Therefore, this study modified the model, where the measurement errors on some items are accessible to correlate with each other. So, a fit model was obtained with chi-square = 12.54, $df = 9$, $p\text{-value} = 0.18449$, and $RMSEA = 0.026$. The report of the validity test of each item of religious tolerance is shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Validity result of religious tolerance items

No Item	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Value	Result
Item 1	0.78	0.04	19.39	Valid
Item 2	0.72	0.04	18.57	Valid
Item 3	0.69	0.04	17.77	Valid
Item 4	0.80	0.04	20.25	Valid
Item 5	0.26	0.04	6.50	Valid
Item 6	0.43	0.04	9.95	Valid
Item 7	0.84	0.08	9.88	Valid
Item 8	0.52	0.04	12.67	Valid

Note: Valid=t-Value>1.96

As can be seen in Table 4, all items are valid to measure religious tolerance. Therefore, all eight items can be used to measure the religious tolerance variable score factor.

In this study, the methodological framework integrates two complementary analytical lenses to provide a comprehensive explanation of students' religious tolerance. First, a psychological-religious lens is employed to capture individual-level motivation through religiosity orientation, recognizing that personal belief systems shape attitudes and social behaviors (Allport & Ross, 1967; Huber & Huber, 2012). Second, a sociological-contextual lens is used to examine structural and environmental influences, particularly socioeconomic determinants that shape students' social exposure, opportunities, and intergroup interactions (Bourdieu, 1986; Putnam, 2007). By combining these perspectives, the study moves beyond single-factor explanations and positions religious tolerance as an outcome emerging from the dynamic interplay of personal religious commitment and broader social conditions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the empirical findings derived from the analysis of religiosity, socioeconomic characteristics, and their influence on students' religious tolerance. Descriptive statistics are first reported to provide an overview of the respondents' profiles and the general distribution of key variables. This is followed by inferential analyses examining whether religiosity, gender, participation in student organizations, parents' income, and students' allowance significantly predict levels of religious tolerance among PTKIN students. The results are organized to highlight both the patterns observed in the data and the comparative strength of each predictor in explaining variations in tolerance.

Descriptive Findings on Religiosity and Tolerance

At the outset, we discover that religiosity and religious tolerance among state Islamic higher education institutions' students can be categorized as moderate, with 57.3% and 67% of participants falling into this category, respectively. Specifically, regarding religiosity, there were 108 participants (18.7%) in the low category, 331 participants (57.3%) in the moderate category, and 139 participants (24%) in the high category. Concerning religious tolerance, there were 97 participants (16.7%) categorized as low category, 387 participants (67%) moderate category, and 94 participants (16.3%) in the high category.

Table 5. Religiosity and religious tolerance

Variable	Frequency %		
	Low	Moderate	High
Religiosity	108 (18.7%)	331 (57.3%)	139 (24%)
Religious Tolerance	97 (16.7%)	387 (67%)	94 (16.3%)

Multiple analysis techniques were used to test the research hypothesis. In regression, there are three things to analyze. First, to find the R square to determine the variation in the dependent variable caused by independent variation; Second, to find the results of the F test, which is to determine whether the R square obtained is significant or not; Third, to see the T-test, namely the regression coefficient of each independent and its significance, namely religious tolerance caused by all independent variables in question, namely religiosity and socioeconomic characteristics. The R-square can be seen in Table 6.

Table 6. R-Square

Model	R	R-Square	Adjusted R-Square	Std. The error of the estimate
1	.240 ^a	.057	.049	8.73825

The coefficient of determination presented in Table 6 reveals a modest yet statistically meaningful relationship between the predictor variables and religious tolerance among Indonesian Islamic university students. The *R-square* value of 0.057 indicates that the five-predictor model, encompassing religiosity, gender, student organisation affiliation, parental income, and allowance amounts, accounts for approximately 5.7% of the total variance observed in religious tolerance scores. Whilst this proportion may appear relatively modest in absolute terms, it represents a substantively meaningful contribution within the context of social science research, where complex human attitudes are typically influenced by multitudinous factors extending far beyond any single analytical framework. The adjusted R-square value of 0.049 provides a more conservative estimate that accounts for the number of predictors relative to sample size, suggesting that the model's explanatory power remains robust when statistical adjustments are applied. Furthermore, the standard error of estimate (8.738) indicates the typical magnitude of prediction errors, providing crucial information for assessing the practical utility of the model in forecasting individual tolerance levels within this population.

The substantial proportion of unexplained variance, accounting for 94.3% of the total variation in religious tolerance, highlights the inherent complexity of attitude formation processes and underscores the multifaceted nature of tolerance development within educational

contexts. This considerable residual variance suggests that religious tolerance emerges from a complex constellation of factors extending well beyond the demographic, socioeconomic, and individual characteristics examined in this investigation. Potential sources of this unexplained variation may include psychological dispositions, such as personality traits and cognitive styles; experiential factors, encompassing direct intercultural contact and educational experiences; institutional variables, reflecting campus climate and pedagogical approaches; and broader societal influences, including media exposure and political discourse. The magnitude of unexplained variance, whilst highlighting the limitations of the current model, simultaneously points toward promising avenues for future research that might incorporate these additional dimensions. Rather than diminishing the significance of the identified predictors, this pattern of explained and unexplained variance reinforces the notion that tolerance formation represents a multidetermined phenomenon requiring comprehensive theoretical frameworks that integrate individual, institutional, and societal levels of analysis to achieve a more complete understanding of this crucial social attitude.

After obtaining the R-squared value, we conducted an F-test to analyse the impact of all independent variables on religious tolerance, as shown in Table 7.

Table 7. ANOVA results

	Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2659.975	5	531.995	6.967	.000 ^b
	Residual	43676.210	572	76.357		
	Total	46336.185	577			

a. Dependent Variable: Religious Tolerance

b. Predictors: (Constant) gender, student organization, parental income, amount of pocket money, and religiosity.

The ANOVA presented in Table 7 demonstrates the collective predictive validity of the regression model, revealing compelling evidence for the overall statistical significance of the examined variables in explaining variations in religious tolerance among Indonesian Islamic university students. The model's F-statistic of 6.967, coupled with a significance value of $p < 0.001$, provides unequivocal evidence for rejecting the omnibus null hypothesis, which posited that the combined set of independent variables, encompassing gender, student organisation affiliation, parental income, allowance amounts, and individual religiosity, exerts no meaningful influence on religious tolerance levels. This highly significant result indicates that the five-predictor model accounts for a substantial amount of variance in tolerance attitudes, with the regression sum of squares (2,659.975) representing meaningful explained variation relative to the total sum of squares (4,6336.185). The model's explanatory power suggests that approximately 5.7% of the variance in religious tolerance can be attributed to the combined influence of these demographic, socioeconomic, and religious variables, thereby establishing the theoretical and empirical justification for examining these predictors within the Indonesian Islamic educational context.

However, whilst the ANOVA results confirm the collective significance of the predictor set, this omnibus test masks important nuances regarding individual variable contributions that emerge from subsequent coefficient-level analyses. The significant F-test indicates that at least one predictor variable demonstrates a meaningful association with religious tolerance; however, it cannot specify which variables drive this overall significance or reveal the relative magnitude of individual effects. This limitation necessitates careful interpretation, as the collective significance observed in the ANOVA does not guarantee that each constituent variable maintains independent predictive validity when controlling for the influence of other predictors

in the model. Indeed, the subsequent regression coefficient analyses reveal a more complex pattern, wherein only three variables, such as gender, student organisation affiliation, and parental income, achieve individual statistical significance, while allowance amounts and religiosity demonstrate non-significant relationships with tolerance levels. This divergence between omnibus model significance and individual predictor performance underscores the critical importance of examining both collective and individual variable effects in multivariate analyses, particularly when investigating complex social phenomena such as religious tolerance, which may be influenced by intricate interactions among demographic, institutional, and personal factors.

Based on the R-squared and its significance, the final step in multiple regression analysis is to examine the regression coefficient of each independent variable.

Table 8. Regression coefficients

		<i>Unstandardized Coefficients</i>		<i>Standardized Coefficients</i>	
	<i>Model</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>St.Error</i>	<i>Beta</i>	<i>T</i>
1	(Constant)	51.197	2.769		18.489
	Gender	-2.948	.739	-.164	-3.987
	Student Organization	-.300	.138	-.089	-2.177
	Parents' Income	2.953	.888	.143	3.326
	Amount of Allowance	-.033	.641	-.002	-.052
	Religiosity	.025	.044	.023	.567

a. Dependent Variable: Religious Tolerance

(*) significant

Based on Table 8, the regression coefficient for each independent variable is known, and the regression equation can be made as follows:

Religious Tolerance = 51.197 - 2.948 gender - 0.300 student organization + 2.953 parents' income - 0.033 amount of allowance + 0.025 religiosity.

The significant regression coefficient can be seen in the significant value column. Sig < 0.05 means that the coefficient significantly affects the dependent variable. The following is an explanation of the regression coefficient for each independent variable:

1. The regression coefficient for gender was sig = 0.000. Thus, the null hypothesis (H_0) that there is no significant effect of gender on religious tolerance was rejected, meaning that gender has a significant effect on religious tolerance.
2. The regression coefficient of student organization was sig = 0.030. Thus, the null hypothesis (H_0) that there is no significant effect of student organizations on religious tolerance was rejected, meaning that student organizations have a significant effect on religious tolerance.
3. The regression coefficient of the parents' income was sig = 0.001. Thus, the null hypothesis (H_0) that parental income has no significant effect on religious tolerance was rejected, meaning that parents' income significantly affects religious tolerance. The direction of the positive coefficient explains that the higher the level of their parents' income, the higher the level of students' religious tolerance, and vice versa.
4. The regression coefficient of the amount of allowance was sig = 0.959. Thus, the null hypothesis (H_0) that there is no significant effect of the amount of allowance on religious tolerance was accepted.

5. The regression coefficient for religiosity is $\text{sig} = 0.571$. Thus, the null hypothesis (H_0) that there is no significant effect of religiosity on religious tolerance was accepted.

The descriptive findings show that both religiosity and religious tolerance among students at Indonesia's State Islamic Higher Education Institutions fall predominantly within the moderate category. A total of 57.3% of students reported moderate religiosity, while 24% were categorized as high and 18.7% as low. A similar pattern emerged for religious tolerance, with 67% of students in the moderate category, 16.3% in the high category, and 16.7% in the low category. These results indicate that most PTKIN students maintain balanced religious commitments and generally exhibit moderate levels of openness toward individuals of different beliefs.

The regression analysis further demonstrated that the combined effects of religiosity and socioeconomic factors accounted for 5.7% of the variance in religious tolerance, a statistically significant contribution as confirmed by the F-test ($p < .001$). However, the influence of individual predictors varied. Three socioeconomic variables, gender, student organization membership, and parental income, had significant effects on tolerance. Gender and organizational involvement contributed negatively, while parental income showed a positive relationship with tolerance. In contrast, two variables, amount of allowance and religiosity, had no significant effect. These findings suggest that socioeconomic contexts, rather than levels of personal piety, play a more influential role in shaping students' religious tolerance.

The findings of this study demonstrate that religious tolerance among students at Indonesia's State Islamic Higher Education Institutions (PTKIN) is shaped more strongly by socioeconomic and contextual conditions than by personal religiosity. Gender, involvement in student organizations, and parental income were significant predictors, whereas students' allowance and overall religiosity did not exhibit measurable effects. These results confirm that religious tolerance within Islamic higher education is not simply a product of individual belief or piety but emerges from broader structural influences, an insight that underscores the importance of integrating psychological and sociological perspectives when examining tolerance formation (Pedhazur, 1997; Allport, 1954).

A central finding is the **non-significant role of religiosity**, which challenges conventional assumptions that higher religious commitment automatically produces greater openness or moderation. This aligns with Prasetyo and Halimatusa'diyah (2024), who similarly show that religiosity is an inconsistent predictor of social, religious, and political tolerance in Indonesia. Classic frameworks in the psychology of religion help explain this pattern. According to Allport (1966), Allport and Ross (1967), and Batson et al. (1993), religiosity comprises distinct motivational orientations, intrinsic, extrinsic, and quest, that shape intergroup attitudes in different and sometimes opposing ways. Quest orientations promote openness and complexity, whereas extrinsic orientations may reinforce exclusivism. These nuances explain why global religiosity scales often fail to predict tolerant attitudes: competing motivations can statistically neutralize each other. This interpretation is supported by Hook et al. (2017), who find that intellectual humility, often tied to quest motivation, consistently enhances religious tolerance.

The complexity of Muslim religiosity in Indonesia further clarifies this finding. Huber and Huber's (2012) Centrality of Religiosity Scale (CRS) shows that ideological, ritual, experiential, and intellectual dimensions do not uniformly relate to social attitudes. Empirical studies in

Indonesia consistently reach similar conclusions. Setiawan et al. (2020) demonstrate that certain religiosity dimensions correlate with support for interreligious conflict, while Latifa et al. (2022) note that increased religious knowledge does not automatically produce moderation. Subchi et al. (2022) and Lubis and Sianipar (2022) also highlight the role of cognitive flexibility and intellectual humility rather than religiosity itself in predicting tolerant behavior. Taken together, these perspectives indicate that the quality, orientation, and socio-cognitive framing of religiosity, rather than its intensity, shape tolerance outcomes.

In contrast, socioeconomic factors, especially parental income, showed a clear positive relationship with religious tolerance. This finding aligns with Yusuf et al. (2019) and Sila and Fakhruddin (2020), who argue that socioeconomic status expands access to diverse networks and cosmopolitan experiences, thereby facilitating the kinds of intergroup contact that Allport (1954) identifies as core to reducing prejudice. Students from higher-income families often benefit from greater mobility, broader social exposure, and access to educational environments that normalize diversity. Such experiences create more favorable conditions for cross-group understanding and reduce the likelihood of prejudicial attitudes.

The effects of gender and student organizational affiliation introduce additional sociological layers. Rather than functioning as sites of intergroup engagement, some student organizations appear to foster tight in-group identities that may limit openness toward religious out-groups. Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) suggests that strong in-group attachment can increase perceived boundaries, reducing tolerance toward those outside the group. In Indonesia's contemporary Islamic landscape, this dynamic is consistent with Van Bruinessen's (2013) account of the "conservative turn," where certain youth-oriented religious networks promote exclusive identity markers. Findings from Saputra (2018) and Setara Institute (2019) also show that many young Muslims are embedded in conservative environments that privilege doctrinal homogeneity, potentially explaining lower tolerance among members of certain campus organizations.

Moreover, this study reinforces the importance of institutional and educational structures in shaping attitudes. Research by Ardi et al. (2021) shows that religious schemas, not religiosity itself, predict tolerance toward marginalized groups, while Shaukat and Pell (2020) note that differential institutional cultures, such as those found in various madrasa types, produce differing levels of tolerance. These contextual effects help explain why pesantren students, despite receiving more intensive religious training, often exhibit lower tolerance, as shown by Mappiasse and Hayadin (2022). Their environment may promote religious discipline yet offer limited cross-group interaction, echoing Putnam and Campbell's (2012) argument that tolerance grows most reliably in environments that encourage cross-cutting social ties.

These findings carry significant implications for Islamic higher education institutions. Research by Hanif et al. (2024) and Rusmana et al. (2025) underscores the need for pedagogical models that integrate religious moderation, civic values, and opportunities for intergroup dialogue. By providing students with structured interfaith engagement, exposure to diverse perspectives, and curricular emphasis on ethical reasoning, PTKIN can play a transformative role in shaping tolerant Islamic citizenship. Qomaruzzaman and Busro (2019) similarly argue that Islamic education must go beyond theological instruction to cultivate ethical, dialogic, and socially grounded competencies. Given rising global tensions and the persistence of religious

prejudice (Dauda, 2020), strengthening educational approaches that foster tolerance is an urgent institutional priority.

At the individual level, the findings reaffirm scholarship emphasizing that tolerance is not merely a passive disposition but an active ethical commitment shaped through continuous learning, reflection, and social interaction (Lester & Roberts, 2006). The insignificance of religiosity in this study signals that efforts to promote tolerance must move beyond strengthening religious knowledge and instead focus on nurturing intellectual humility, intercultural exposure, and critical thinking, qualities shown to promote openness and reduce prejudice (Hook et al., 2017; Lubis & Sianipar, 2022).

Overall, this study contributes to the growing body of literature that conceptualizes religious tolerance as a socio-psychological phenomenon emerging from the interplay of individual motivations, social identities, and structural conditions. By integrating insights from Religious Orientation Theory, Intergroup Contact Theory, and Social Identity Theory, the results highlight the multi-layered processes that shape tolerance in Indonesia's Islamic higher education context. These findings offer valuable directions for institutional policy, curriculum development, and broader efforts to strengthen harmonious interreligious relations within Indonesian society.

CONCLUSION

The paper has shown that most students of Indonesia's state Islamic higher educational institutions have moderate religiosity and religious tolerance. This study also revealed that gender, student organization, and parents' income have a significant effect on religious tolerance, while the amount of allowance and religiosity do not. Religious tolerance can only be explained by certain aspects of socioeconomic conditions but not by religiosity, as many studies have also suggested. In other words, religiosity cannot predict religious tolerance among Indonesian Muslim students. This research has challenged a significant number of previous studies that affirm either a positive or negative effect of religiosity on tolerance, suggesting the importance of considering multifaceted social, demographic, and economic factors. Since this study only examines religiosity and socioeconomic characteristics, future research should consider more complex sociological, psychological, and economic factors in explaining religious tolerance among Muslims and other faith adherents.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge the financial support from Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University Jakarta through the research grant scheme for 2020.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alif Alvian, R. (2023). How Extremist Movements Delegitimise Religious Moderation Campaigns: A Case of Hizbut Tahrir Indonesia (2018-2022). *Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.19165/MDOT2199>
- Ardi, R., Tobing, D. H., Agustina, G. N., Iswahyudi, A. F., and Budiarti, D. (2021). Religious schema and tolerance towards alienated groups in Indonesia. *Heliyon*, 7(7), e07603. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07603>
- Bakali, N. (2021). Islamophobia in Myanmar: The Rohingya genocide and the 'war on terror.' *Race & Class*, 62(4), 53–71. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306396820977753>

- Facal, G. (2020). Islamic Defenders Front Militia (Front Pembela Islam) and its Impact on Growing Religious Intolerance in Indonesia. *TRaNS: Trans -Regional and -National Studies of Southeast Asia*, 8(1), 7–20. <https://doi.org/10.1017/trn.2018.15>
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford University Press.
- Forstmann, M., and Sagioglou, C. (2020). Religious concept activation attenuates cognitive dissonance reduction in free-choice and induced compliance paradigms. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 160(1), 75–91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2019.1609400>
- Goode, W. J. (1972). The place of force in human society. *American Sociological Review*, 37*(5), 507–519. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2093468>
- Hassan, R. (2007). Expressions of Religiosity and Blasphemy in Modern Societies. *Asian Journal of Social Science*, 35(1), 111–125. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156853107X170187>
- Hoffman, M. (2020). Religion and Tolerance of Minority Sects in the Arab World. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 64(2–3), 432–458. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002719864404>
- Hook, J. N., Farrell, J. E., Johnson, K. A., Van Tongeren, D. R., Davis, D. E., and Aten, J. D. (2017). Intellectual humility and religious tolerance. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 12(1), 29–35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2016.1167937>
- Huber, S., and Huber, O. W. (2012). The Centrality of Religiosity Scale (CRS). *Religions*, 3(3), 710–724. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel3030710>
- Jackson, R. (2019). *Religious education for plural societies: The selected works of Robert Jackson*. Routledge.
- Kementerian Agama (Ed.). (2019). *Moderasi beragama* (Cetakan pertama). Badan Litbang dan Diklat, Kementerian Agama RI.
- Khadka, C. (2024). Social Identity Theory and Group Behavior. *TUTA Journal*, 105–120. <https://doi.org/10.3126/tutaj.v12i1.74063>
- Mappiasse, S., and Hayadin, H. (2022). Students' Religious Tolerance: Comparing Muslim Students at Public Schools and Pesantren. *Journal of Indonesian Islam*, 16(2), 326. <https://doi.org/10.15642/JIIS.2022.16.2.326-351>
- Ofosu-Koranteng, M., and Boasinke, R. K. (2025). Resource Theory and Family Violence: Exploring the Views and Opinions of Undergraduate Students from a Ghanaian University. *African Journal of Empirical Research*, 6(1), 484–498. <https://doi.org/10.51867/ajernet.6.1.41>
- Pankhurst, R. (2016). *Hiżb ut-Tabrīr: The Untold History of the Liberation Party*. Hurst and Company.
- Pedhazur, E. J. (1997). *Multiple regression in behavioral research: Explanation and prediction* (3rd ed). Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Prasetyo, H., and Halimatusa'diyah, I. (2024). Examining Muslim Tolerance Toward Ordinary Non-Muslims: Social, Religious, and Political Tolerance in Indonesia. *International Journal of Sociology*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207659.2024.2301881>
- Pusat Pengkajian Islam dan Masyarakat (PPIM). (2018). *Api dalam Sekam: Keberagamaan Generasi Z* (No. Convey Report, Vol. 1, No. 1). PPIM UIN Jakarta.
- Putnam, R. D. (2007). E pluribus unum: Diversity and community in the twenty-first century. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30(2), 137–174. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9477.2007.00176.x>
- Putnam, R. D., & Campbell, D. E. (2012). *American Grace: How Religion Divides and Unites Us*. Simon & Schuster.
- Qomaruzzaman, B., and Busro, B. (2019). Tolerance Islam Theology of Education Hermeneutic Reading of Tariq Ramadan Thought. *QIJS (Qudus International Journal of Islamic Studies)*, 7(2), 203. <https://doi.org/10.21043/qijis.v7i2.5128>
- Renton, J., and Gidley, B. (Eds.). (2017). *Antisemitism and Islamophobia in Europe*. Palgrave Macmillan UK. <https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-41302-4>

- Setara Institute. (2019). *Tipologi Keberagamaan Mahasiswa: Survei di 10 Perguruan Tinggi Negeri* [Press Release]. Setara Institute.
- Setiawan, T., De Jong, E. B., Scheepers, P. L., and Sterkens, C. J. (2020). The relation between religiosity dimensions and support for interreligious conflict in Indonesia. *Archive for the Psychology of Religion*, 42(2), 244–261. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0084672419878824>
- Sila, M. A., and Fakhruddin. (2020). *Indeks Kerukunan Umat Beragama Tahun 2019* (1st ed.). Litbangdiklat Press-Kementerian Agama Republik Indonesia.
- Spierings, N. (2019). Religiosity and Tolerance in the MENA: The Multidimensional Impact of Islamic Religiosity on Ethno-religious Social Tolerance in the Middle East and North Africa. *Social Forces*, 97(4), 1693–1730. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/soy092>
- Subchi, I., Zulkifli, Z., Latifa, R., and Sa'diyah, S. (2022). Religious Moderation in Indonesian Muslims. *Religions*, 13(5), 451. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel13050451>
- Tajfel, H., and Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47).
- Tal, D., and Gordon, A. (2018). Antisemitism and Islamophobia: What does a bibliometric study reveal? *Scientometrics*, 117(3), 1349–1359. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-018-2953-x>
- Umar, J., and Nisa, Y. F. (2020). Uji Validitas Konstruk dengan CFA dan Pelaporannya. *Jurnal Pengukuran Psikologi dan Pendidikan Indonesia (JP3I)*, 9(2), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.15408/jp3i.v9i2.16964>
- Womack, D. F. (2020). Christian Communities in the Contemporary Middle East: An Introduction. *Exchange*, 49(3–4), 189–213. <https://doi.org/10.1163/1572543X-12341566>
- Ysseldyk, R., Matheson, K., and Anisman, H. (2013). Religious identity, religious attendance, and well-being. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadienne*, 54(4), 253–261. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034427>
- Yusuf, A. A., Shidiq, A. R., and Hariyadi, H. (2019). On Socioeconomic Predictors of Religious Intolerance: Evidence from a Large-Scale Longitudinal Survey in the Largest Muslim Democracy. *Religions*, 11(1), 21. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel11010021>
- Zuhdiyah, Z., Darmayanti, K. K. H., and Khodijah, N. (2023). The Significance of Religious Tolerance for University Students: Its Influence on Religious Beliefs and Happiness. *Islamic Guidance and Counseling Journal*, 6(1), 165–182. <https://doi.org/10.25217/igcj.v6i1.3551>