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Abstract

Although the Indonesian Constitution guarantees freedom of religion for every citizen, the problem of religious harmony is still existent. Intolerant Islamic groups are very active in voicing that non-Muslims and minority schools of thought are deviants and infidels. The term ‘religious harmony’ is one of the competencies in the national curriculum of universities but is unfortunately weak in implementation. These research results showed that most students have an exclusive and intolerant religious mindset. Therefore, this study aims to test the effectiveness of the dialogue-argumentative method in Islamic Religious Education (PAI) to build moderate thinking patterns among students by employing a quasi-experimental research method. The research sample, which comprised 300 students participating in the PAI course, was divided into 150 persons, each placed into the four experimental and control classes. Before and after the lecture, pre-tests and post-tests were provided for both groups of students. The research proved that the dialogue-argumentative method was a more effective alternative in building moderate Islamic thinking patterns among students. However, the researchers also need to find models, methods, or other means that are much more effective than these findings.
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1. Introduction

The problem of religious harmony in Indonesia is disturbed by the strengthening of radical Islamic groups. They rejected non-Muslim candidates for the regional head. They also reject Shi’a. They are conservative who according to Sylvia Beyer have negative stereotypes against minority racial and religious groups. Their targets are groups tradition-ally subject to discrimination (Beyer, 2020).

The issue of Ahok, a Chinese-Christian, they politicized it by accusing Ahok of insulting the Qur’an. They mobilized millions of people from various provinces to hold massive demonstrations in the nation’s capital and demanded that the legal apparatus impose a prison sentence on him (Tempo.co, 2018a). In another case, a Buddhist woman protested by asking mosques to reduce the volume of their toas, and this action was criminalized on charges of blasphemy. The mob then dragged the woman into law and burned seven Buddhist temples (BBC-News, 2018), which was a very unfair retaliation. The same is true of the Muslim minority in Sri Lanka. They get bad treatment from the...
majority of Buddhas (Fowsar et al., 2020). Meanwhile, the Christian community closed two mosques in Kupang and Ende (Panggabean & Ali-Fauzi, 2014).

Shi’a has been present in Indonesia since the VII or X century AD (Sojan, 2013: x; Daneshgar, 2014) and has ruled Aceh, Sumatra (Hasymy, 1993; Dewi, 2016). The development of this community was the fastest after the Iranian Islamic revolution in the early 1980s, started by the intellectuals who began to read Shi’a books. Then the students studied the fiqh (Dewi, 2016) in Iran, and many were influenced and sympathized with the Shi’a (Sahara, 2001). Then, numerous Shi’a institutions were established in Indonesia, and many people have converted to this form of Islam (Zulkifli, 2016). Some Sunni communities in big Indonesian cities also follow Shi’a rituals (Muwahidah, 2016), and in 2012, about 2.5-5 million residents were arrested (Tempo.co, 2012a).

Since the early 1980s, the contra group suspected the development of the Shi’a. In 2010-2011, the biggest crimes were perpetrated by the Sampang (Madura) people, who launched massive attacks on the Shi’a community. They burned mosques, Islamic boarding schools, and Shi’ite houses, killed the cleric, injured several other residents, and drove them out of Madura (Fianto, 2015). In 2014, the Anti-Shi’a National Alliance was established in Bandung city (Abubakar et al., 2018).

Indonesian Ulema Council (MUI) and the central government have never banned Shi’i teachings (Junaidi, 2015). Likewise, Nahdhatul Ulama (NU) and Muhammadiyah, two of Indonesia’s largest Islamic organizations, have never banned Shi’ites (Siraj, 2012; Syamsuddin, 2017). But some regional MUIs are misleading the Shi’a, particularly those in East Java (MUI-Jatim, 2012) and South Sulawesi (TribunMakassar, 2016). NU and Muhammadiyah rejected the regional MUI fatwa (Tempo.co, 2013; Abdul Mu’ti, 2017). A similar attitude emerged from Rois Syuriah NU of Yogyakarta Special Region (Tempo.co, 2013). Cases of violence against Shi’a residents in Sampang caused concern for many parties and the Minister of Religion at that time (Saifuddin, 2014). However, the ban on Shi’a continues, and in 2015, the Mayor of Bogor did not allow Shi’a residents to commemorate Ayura Day (Tempo.co, 2015). Meanwhile, information was heard that the Ashura warning around the campus was dismissed by intolerants.

The researchers, which are Islamic Religious Education (PAI) lecturers, wish to contribute to the improvement of courses to develop and build religiosity and a moderate Islamic mindset for Indonesian students.

2. Review of Literature

The PAI course functions to develop the students’ faith and devotion to God Almighty, and noble characters, according to Law No. 20 Indonesian National Education System (2003). It also helps build a moderate religious mindset (Decree of the Director-General of Higher Education, 2020).

Religious intolerance among Indonesian students is very high. In a 2006-2009 research, religious exclusivity, intolerance, and religious radicalism has spread rapidly to the wider community. The reason is that the right-hand media that have sprung up often spread cynical news about teachings outside the group. Also, preachers often give religious sermons in the form of curses, deviations, and insults against non-mainstream groups. The symptoms of religious radicalism are marked by several factors, including the tendency to interpret texts, such as the Al-Qur’an and hadith, freely without ignoring the context, alongside an orientation towards Shari’a (Islamic law) enforcement and anti-pluralism (Syafi’i, 2006). Other research results show that at least one in ten Indonesians agrees with acts of violence and terrorism (Mujani, 2006), and the Muslim community still frowns on different religions and sects (Thalib, 2014). Other research results show that more than half of UPI and PTN-PTS students in West Java have an exclusive religious thinking style (Rahmat, 2012). In a 2016-2020 research, a larger part of the students stated that followers of religions outside of Islam were infidels and would go to hell, while Muslims were automatically believers and heavenly expert (Firdaus & Rahmat, 2016a; Rizal & Rahmat, 2019; Firdaus & Rahmat, 2020; Rahmat et al., 2021). Then, only 15% of the 380 UPI and UNSIL students accepted the presence of minority Islamic schools, while 52% were neutral, and 33% rejected it (Rahmat & Firdaus, 2020b).
The main factor of student intolerance is their misunderstanding of the meaning of believing and being kafir, the main teachings of other religions, as well as the main teachings of the Islamic minority sects. For example, they accused Christians and Hindus of having three gods (each god) having the same position. They said that Indonesian citizens must have faith in God Almighty. Whereas God the Creator of Christianity and Hinduism is One (Blog-Tinta-Yesus, 2015; Blog-Ilovehindu, 2014). They accused Shi`a of glorifying Ali ibn Abu Talib more than Prophet Muhammad. Even though the accusation is false. They glorify the Prophet Muhammad as the Messenger of Allah and Ali ibn Abu Talib as the Imam who speaks the tongue of the Prophet Muhammad (Ahlulbaitindonesia, 2020). On that basis, they accuse the adherents of these minority religions and sects of Islam of being infidels. Furthermore, students ranked them as second-class citizens.

To ward off religious intolerance in students, it is necessary to develop inclusive teaching materials and the most trusted religious references. The references referred to are mainly, first, the Al-Qur’ān, in which Allah affirms that “among the people of the book, particularly adherents of non-Islamic religions, there are some that God determines to be faithful and pious.” Second, the belief that every Muslim is automatically a believer is false. According to the Prophet’s words, “my people will be divided into 73 groups, and only one will go to heaven, while the rest will go to hell” (Abudawud, 2013; Tirmidzi, 2013; Ibnumajah, 2013). The Prophet also forbade accusing someone of being infidels, because there was a risk that God would convict the accuser as an infidel (Bukhari, 2013; Muslim, 2013). Third, the Amman Risalah in 2005 stipulated that both Shi’a Ja`fariya and Zaidiya were Islamic and the same as Sunnis, who are followers of four schools of thought (Wikipedia, 2020). Fourth, the Al-Azhar Conference in 2020 made an article on prohibiting the takfir, which involves accusing someone of kafir. It was emphasized by saying, “if there are 99 features of disbelief from a person’s oral expression but one characteristic of Islam remains, then that individual must be declared a Muslim” (Conference-Al-Azhar, 2020).

3. Research Methods

3.1 Research Design

This study aims to examine the effectiveness of the dialogue-argumentative method in PAI in developing a moderate, tolerant, and anti-religious radicalism mindset among students of the Bandung Islamic University (UNISBA) and the Indonesia University of Education (UPI) Bandung, Indonesia. According to the research objectives, the appropriate design was quasi-experimental, where the experimental classes used the dialogue-argumentative method. This method entailed discussing the main teachings of other religions or minority Islamic schools that were often misread or misinterpreted by intolerants. Conversely, the control classes used conventional methods, such as lectures, question-and-answer, and regular discussions. Religious tolerance was measured twice, particularly at the beginning of the even semester in 2019-2020, and the pre-test performed was in early January 2020, while the post-test was conducted in early April 2020 after eight lectures. Both tests used the same research instrument.

The dialogue-argumentative method is a rational, non-emotional, open discussion form that is not fanatical of religion or madhhab. Also, it is argumentative based on the Qur’ān, hadith, and the views of authoritative scholars, especially the results of international ulama conferences. Intolerant students usually refer to scholars that are fanatical, emotional, and without strong arguments from the Al-Qur`ān and hadith, who refuse to refer to authoritative international or national scholars.

3.2 Population and Sample Selection

The population solely comprised UNISBA and UPI students that took the PAI course for the even 2019-2020 semester. Meanwhile, the samples were determined purposively and involved classes where the lecturers were willing to use the dialogue-argumentative method. There were four experimental and control classes each, and both groups consisted of 150 persons.
3.3 Research Instrument

The pre and post-test research instrument was the Inventory of Religious Moderation. This inventory consisted of five aspects, which were the rejection of radical Islam, alongside the acceptance of non-Muslim regional head candidates, existing non-Islamic religions, Shi`a, and other sect. Each aspect had four items, making a total of twenty (20), which consisted of ten positive and negative items each, where the answers were “often, rarely, or never.” For instance, number 3 said, “all adherents of non-Muslim religions are infidels and experts in hell,” and 19 was “Shi`a should not develop in Indonesia.” The three UNISBA and UPI experts were asked to test the validity of the instrument content and initially agreed on all the twenty items. These validity and reliability tests were performed with a sample of 100 students using IBM SPSS Statistics. The validity test used the Analyze Correlate Bivariate, while the reliability test with the split-half method employed the Scale Reliability Analysis. All the twenty items were valid, with a high reliability $r = 0.73$, and significant at alpha 0.01.

3.4 Data Analysis

The data were analyzed via IBM SPSS Statistics, and the first step involved scoring the inventory. Answers of “often” on positive items or “never” on negative items were given a score of two (2), while “never” on positive items or “often” on negative items were rated zero (0). Meanwhile, answers of “rarely” on positive or negative inquiries were given a score of one (1), and the total for each aspect was 0-8. Second, the comparative test between the experimental and control classes or the post-test and pre-test results employed the Analyze Paired Samples Statistics.

The qualitative analysis used three categories, including “moderate” with per-aspect scores of 6-8 and totals of 25-40, respectively. The other categories were “neutral” and “intolerant” with per-aspect scores of 4-5 and 0-3, or totals of 17-24 and 0-16, respectively.

4. Results

4.1 Student Religious Moderation Profile

The students’ moderation profiles before and after implementing the dialogue-argumentative method in Islamic Education can be seen in the following table.

![Chart 1. The results of the pre and post-tests of students’ religious moderation in the experimental and control classes](image)
Chart 1 shows that most of the experimental class students, at a score of 64.0%, and half of the control class students, valued at 50.7%, had religious mindsets that were intolerant before the lectures. A small proportion was neutral, at 26.7% and 39.3%, and only a few were moderate, at 9.3% and 10%, respectively. After implementing the dialogue-argumentative method, an increase in the quality of religious moderation was observed. The proportion of intolerant students decreased to 50.0%. Likewise, the value of neutral students reduced to 18.7%, and the moderate quantity increased sharply from 9.3% to 31.4%. However, only minor changes occurred in the control classes.

The mindset regarding the religious moderation aspect can be seen in the following charts.

**Chart 2.** The results of the pre and post-tests of students’ attitudes towards radical Islam in the experimental and control classes

Chart 2 shows that the attitudes of the experimental and control class students towards radical Islam were relatively the same before the lectures. Nearly half had neutral attitudes at 49.3% for both classes, a quarter was moderate, at a value of 26.0% each, while another half were intolerant, at 24.7% each. After implementing the dialogue-argumentative method, there was an increase in the quality of religious moderation. The proportion of moderate students increased to 52.7%, while the neutral value decreased to 22.0%. However, the quantity of intolerant participants slightly increased to 25.3%. An astonishing change occurred in the control class, as the proportion of neutral students decreased to 36.0%, while moderate students increased to 30.6%. Likewise, the

**Chart 3.** The results of the pre and post-tests of students’ attitudes towards non-Muslim in the experimental and control classes
Chart 3 shows that the attitudes of the students in the experimental and control class towards non-Muslims were the same before the lecture. Less than half were intolerant, according to the 39.4% value, nearly one-third were neutral, at 32.0% each, while more than a quarter were moderate, with a 28.6% result, respectively. After implementing the dialogue-argumentative method, there was an increase in the quality of religious moderation. The number of intolerant students decreased slightly from 39.4% to 28.0%, as did the neutral students to 24.7%. Also, the number of moderate students increased sharply to 37.3%. However, no change was noted for the control class, except for the number of intolerant students, which increased from 10.7% to 12.0%, while the very intolerant participants reduced to 26.7%.

Chart 4. The results of the pre and post-tests of students’ attitudes towards Shi’a in the experimental and control classes

Chart 4 shows that in the experimental and control classes, the students’ attitudes towards Shi’a were relatively the same before the lecture. More than half of them were intolerant, with values 52.0% and 55.3%, a small proportion was neutral at 28.0% and 30.0%, and another fraction was moderate at 20.0% and 14.6%. After implementing the dialogue-argumentative method, an increase in the quality of religious moderation was observed. The number of intolerant students decreased sharply from 52.0% to 33.6%, while the proportion of neutral students increased slightly to 29.3%. Likewise, the number of moderate students elevated sharply to 37.4%, while only slight changes occurred in the control classes. The total intolerant students decreased to 48.6%, the proportion of neutral participants increased slightly to 30.7%, and the proportion of moderate students increased to 20.6%.

4.2 The effectiveness of the dialogue-argumentative method

After implementing the dialogue-argumentative method, an increase in the quantity and quality of students’ Islamic thought patterns was noted, as shown in the following table.

Table 1. Mean of the experiment and control groups, and the students’ religious tolerance t-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean 1</th>
<th>Mean 2</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Post-pre experiment</td>
<td>19.99</td>
<td>16.34</td>
<td>12.419</td>
<td>Significant at alpha 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Post-pre control</td>
<td>17.01</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>3.990</td>
<td>Significant at alpha 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pre experiment-control</td>
<td>16.34</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>-3.16</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Post experiment-control</td>
<td>19.99</td>
<td>17.01</td>
<td>2.890</td>
<td>Significant at alpha 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Experiment-control gain</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>10.794</td>
<td>Significant at alpha 0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n experiment = 150 students, n control = 150 students
Table 1 shows that the experimental and conventional PAI teaching methods improved the students’ religious moderation by $t = 12.419$ and $3.990$, which were significant at alpha .01 and df 149. Initially, the two groups had relatively similar mean tolerance scores, specifically 16.34 and 16.60 or $t = -.316$, which were insignificant at alpha 0.05 and df 149. After the lectures in April 2020, the experimental class scores increased to 19.99 from 17.01, producing a value of $t = 2.890$ that was significant at alpha 0.01 and df 149. This difference was confirmed by the gain test using $t = 21.630$, which was significant at alpha 0.01 and df 149. Therefore, the dialogue-argumentative method was proven to be more effective in increasing students’ religious tolerance than the conventional technique.

On examining Chart 1, the mean score of 11-19 was shown to be at the intolerant level, meaning that the increase from 16.34 to 19.99 in this religious moderation remained at this level. However, the changes were very significant statistically.

Tables 2 shows how students’ attitudes change towards aspects of religious moderation.

### Table 2. Mean of experiment and control groups, and the t-tests of the students’ attitudes to radical Islam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean 1</th>
<th>Mean 2</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Post-pre experiment</td>
<td>5.013</td>
<td>4.200</td>
<td>7.970</td>
<td>Significant at alpha 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Post-pre control</td>
<td>4.127</td>
<td>4.193</td>
<td>-.953</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pre experiment-control</td>
<td>4.200</td>
<td>4.193</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Post experiment-control</td>
<td>5.013</td>
<td>4.127</td>
<td>3.870</td>
<td>Significant at alpha 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Experiment-control gain</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>7.158</td>
<td>Significant at alpha 0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n_{experim} = 150$ students, $n_{control} = 150$ students

Table 2 shows that the experimental PAI teaching methods improved the students’ attitudes to radical Islam by $t = 7.970$, which was significant at alpha .01 and df 149. The inability of the conventional method to change their religious thinking patterns was $t = -.953$, which was insignificant at alpha .05 and df 149. Initially, the two groups had relatively similar mean tolerance scores, specifically 4.20 and 4.19 or $t = .033$, which was insignificant at alpha 0.05 and df 149. After the lectures in April 2020, the experimental class score increased from 4.13 to 5.01, with a value of $t = 3.870$, which was significant at alpha 0.01 and df 149. This difference was confirmed by the gain test using $t = 7.158$, which was specifically significant at alpha 0.01 and df 149. Therefore, the dialogue-argumentative method was effective in increasing students’ attitudes towards radical Islam.

According to Chart 2, the mean score of 4-5 was at the neutral level, and the increase in the students’ attitudes from an average score of 4.20 to 5.01 remained neutral. However, the changes were very significant statistically.

### Table 3. Mean of experiment and control groups, and the t-test of students’ attitude’ to non-Muslims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean 1</th>
<th>Mean 2</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Post-pre experiment</td>
<td>3.940</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>5.695</td>
<td>Significant at alpha 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Post-pre control</td>
<td>3.687</td>
<td>3.633</td>
<td>2.897</td>
<td>Significant at alpha 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pre experiment-control</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>3.633</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Post experiment-control</td>
<td>3.940</td>
<td>3.687</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Experiment-control gain</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>4.551</td>
<td>Significant at alpha 0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n_{experim} = 150$ students, $n_{control} = 150$ students

Table 3 shows that the experimental and conventional PAI teaching methods improved the students’ attitudes to non-Muslims by $t = 5.695$ and 2.897, which were significant at alpha .01 and df149. Initially, the two groups had relatively similar mean tolerance scores, specifically 3.60 and 3.63 or $t = -.108$, which was insignificant at alpha 0.05 and df 149. After the lectures in April 2020, the experimental class score increased from 3.60 to 3.94. Although this change, $t = .817$ was insignificant at alpha 0.05 and df 149,
the gain difference, \( t = 4.551 \) was significant at alpha 0.01 and df 149. Therefore, the dialogue-argumentative method was more effective in increasing students’ attitudes towards non-Muslims than the conventional technique.

From Chart 3, the mean score of 2-3 was at the intolerant level, and the increase in the scores of this aspect, from an average of 3.60 to 3.94, remained at this level. However, the changes were very significant statistically.

Table 4. Mean of experiment and control groups, and the t-test of students’ attitudes to Shi’a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean 1</th>
<th>Mean 2</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Post-pre experiment</td>
<td>4.493</td>
<td>3.160</td>
<td>9.688</td>
<td>Significant at alpha 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Post-pre control</td>
<td>3.580</td>
<td>3.273</td>
<td>5.129</td>
<td>Significant at alpha 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pre experiment-control</td>
<td>3.160</td>
<td>3.580</td>
<td>-4.07</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Post experiment-control</td>
<td>4.493</td>
<td>3.580</td>
<td>7.157</td>
<td>Significant at alpha 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Experiment-control gain</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>7.157</td>
<td>Significant at alpha 0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows that the experimental and conventional PAI teaching methods improved the students’ attitude to Shi’a by \( t = 9.688 \) and \( 5.129 \), which were significant at alpha 0.01 and df 149. Initially, the two groups had relatively similar mean tolerance scores, specifically 3.16 and 3.27 or \( t = -4.07 \), which were insignificant at alpha 0.05 and df 149. After the lectures in April 2020, the scores from the experimental class increased from 3.58 to 4.49, with \( t = 7.157 \), which was significant at alpha 0.01 and df 149. This difference was confirmed by the gain test of \( t = 7.157 \), which was significant at alpha 0.01 and df 149. Therefore, the dialogue-argumentative method was more effective in increasing the students’ attitudes to Shi’a than the conventional technique.

According to Chart 4, the increase in the quality of the students’ religious moderation regarding their attitude to Shi’a in the experimental class was quite significant. Consequently, it increased from an intolerant level, with a mean score = 3.58, to a neutral level, at an average of 4.49.

5. Discussion

The research discovered that, first, the students’ religious moderation was at an intolerant level, and second, there was an increase in the scores obtained from the experimental class at this level. Third, the aspects of religious moderation that improved the most in this class were students’ attitudes towards radical Islam and Shi’a, which increased to a neutral level. Meanwhile, two other aspects, which were students’ attitudes towards existing non-Muslims and minority sect of Islam increased their scores but remained at the same intolerant level. Then, the attitude towards non-Muslim regional head candidates was at the lower intolerant level, meaning they were rejected.

These study results reinforce previous research findings that the intolerance of Indonesian students is very high (Ali, 2002; Rahmat, 2012; Rahmat et al., 2019; Rahmat et al., 2021; Rahmat & Yahya, 2021b). This deduction was the same for religious intolerance (E. Firdaus & Rahmat, 2016b; Rizal & Rahmat, 2019), and these results correspond with the Islamic intolerance movement since the early 2000s (Syafi’i, 2006; Mujani, 2006). Furthermore, the Setara Institute declared West Java, where the UNISBA and UPI campuses are located, as the most intolerant area in the last 12 years. There are at least 629 incidents of violations of freedom of religion and belief in this province (Setara-Institute, 2019). The Wahid Institute in 2014 reported several prominent cases of religious intolerance, such as church sealing and attacks, the sealing of Ahmadiya mosques. Cases of anti-Shi’a declarations in various places were also reported (The-Wahid-Institute, 2015), the first of which occurred in Bandung city (AnnasIndonesia.com, 2018). A 2012 CSIS study in twenty-three (23) provinces discovered that 68% of individuals living with followers of different religions in the same neighborhood reject the construction of these dissimilar houses of worship (Suleeman, 2016). Also, 38% of Muslim students in
Jakarta reject non-Muslim teachers (Yasmine et al., 2007). This intolerance in Islamic societies seems like a global phenomenon, as the Wahabi-Salafi Muslim cleric of Saudi Arabia hates Shi’a and accuses them of being heretical and infidels. The authorities have deprived these citizens of their rights in Shi’a-majority areas (Wikipedia.org, 2020) so that Saudi Shi’ite scholars must assert their identity as Saudis, not foreigners (Al-Rasheed, 1998). King Abdullah (2005-2015) minimized the Sunni-Shi’a conflict by inviting representatives to the Saudi National Dialogue meeting and encouraged Sunni clerics to visit these communities. In 2008, the King sponsored religious tolerance conferences in Madrid and Mecca and even invited the controversial and outspoken Iranian Shi’ite political leader, Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani, to Mecca (Gallarotti & Al-Filali, 2012; Ismail, 2012). Although Saudi Arabia and Iran do not directly face each other, these two countries use Iraq, Lebanon, Palestine, Afghanistan, and Yemen as their battlefields (Cardinali, n.d.). Meanwhile, another conflict arose between the two countries concerning Syria and Yemen (Maulana, 2018), which has impacted Sunni-Shi’ite relations globally. The reason is that some of the world’s Muslim communities view Saudi Arabia as the leader of the Islamic world (Munadi, 2016). In 2011 the Shi’a minority was expelled from the suburbs of Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia (Musa, 2013). Also, there has also been rejection and violence against the Shi’a minorities in Indonesia since the year began (Liputan6.com, 2016; MUI-Jatim, 2012; Beritasatu.com, 2012; Tempo.co, 2012b; Fianto, 2015; Tempo.co, 2015; TribunMakassar, 2016; Suara.com, 2016; Tempo.co, 2018b; Liputan6.com, 2020).

The factors causing students’ intolerance appears to be their socio-religious environment (Gabrillin, 2016; Komnas-HAM, 2018, 2019; Komnas-HAM, 2020), religious education background (BBC-News, 2011; Firdaus & Rahmat, 2016a; Rizal & Rahmat, 2019; Koran-Tempo, 2019). Another cause is the strengthening of intolerance and radical Islam (Syafi’i, 2006; Mujani, 2006; The-Wahid-Institute, 2015).

The research results on the efficacy of the dialogue-argumentative method reinforce previous findings that innovative techniques are more effective in increasing students’ religious moderation. Consequently, the NU-Muhammadiyah school typology method successfully increased students’ acceptance of the two largest Indonesian Islamic organizations (Rahmat & Fahrudin, 2018). The study of religions based on the Qur’ān has also succeeded in increasing their acceptance of non-Islamic religions (Rahmat et al., 2019). Meanwhile, the typology method of the Sufi-Islamic Shari’a enhanced students’ recognition of Sufism (Yahya & Rahmat, 2020), and the hiwar jadali or dialogue-Qur’ani technique increased their religious tolerance (Rahmat & Firdaus, 2020a). The Sunni-Shi’a typology method also successfully improved the acceptance of Shi’a (Rahmat et al., 2021), as has other innovative techniques. Furthermore, moral education based on the core Sufistic character increased the noble character of students (Rahmat et al., 2016), and religious education based on this teaching has succeeded in improved their substantive diversity. Sufism-based religious education methods have also increased students’ honesty (Rahmat & Yahya, 2021a). Similarly, the development of inclusive PAI teaching materials has effectively enhanced students’ religious tolerance (Rahmat & Yahya, 2021b).

The aspects of religious moderation that were mostly improved in this study, although still at a neutral level, were students’ rejection of radical Islam and their acceptance of Shi’a. Meanwhile, the main factor in society accepting radical Islam and rejecting Shi’a was misinformation. The research results show that Kandang Semangkon village in Lamongan, East Java, contributes to the largest terrorists in Indonesia. It turns out that the Islamic learning pattern in this village was wrong, and the society had a radical view of the religion. Through continuous assistance with Participatory Action Research and correct Islamic materials, this mindset was finally lost, and the village is no longer a contributor to terrorists (Lutfiyah et al., 2016). Also, the result of another research showed that the inclusive PAI curriculum has been proven to be successful in increasing students’ religious tolerance (Rahmat & Yahya, 2021b).

6. Conclusion

The results of the pre-test showed that students’ religious moderation was at the intolerant level. They were amazed by radical Islam, rejected non-Muslim regional head candidates, followers of non-Islamic
religions, Shi’a, and other sect of Islam from developing their religious activities. The factors causing the students’ intolerance appeared to be their socio-religious environment, a religious educational background, and the strengthening of intolerance and Islamic radicals. Hence, the PAI course was implemented to reduce the number of intolerant students by employing a dialogue-argumentative method as an alternative to building a moderate Islamic mindset. It emphasizes a rational, unemotional, and open dialogue that is not fanatical about religion or madhhab. Also, it is argumentative based on the Qur’ān, hadith, and the views of authoritative scholars, especially the results of international ulama conferences. The post-test results proved that the dialogue-argumentative method was more effective in increasing students’ religious moderation. Consequently, this technique was recommended as an alternative to build a moderate Islamic mindset for students. However, the researchers need to find models, methods, or other means that are much more effective than these findings.
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