

Contribution of Prejudice to Shiite groups on Student Tolerance

Novia Dyah Rahmatika, Asti Meiza and Elisa Kurniadewi*

Abstract--- *Indonesia is a plural country, one of which is religion. The majority of Indonesian people embraced Islam. In Islam there are several sects that have different views in understanding Islam, one of them is the Shiite group. Today, Indonesians tend to view Shi'ism negatively. However, from the preliminary study of UIN SunanGunungDjati Bandung students, they tend to see Shiite positively. Researchers are interested to see whether prejudice contributes to the tolerance of UIN SunanGunungDjati Bandung students. This research uses quantitative method with data processing technique that is simple linear regression analysis. Data were collected using the Prejudice Scale and Tolerance Scale on 350 subjects. From the results of inferential analysis using a significant level of 1% indicates that prejudice affects the tolerance of UIN SunanGunungDjati Bandung students against the Shiite group. While the results of descriptive analysis indicates the subject is more at the level of prejudice that is and have a tolerance that is also.*

Keywords--- *Prejudice, Simple Regression, Shiite, Tolerance.*

I. INTRODUCTION SECTION

Indonesia is a pluralistic country in religion. The 2010 report mentions the number of Muslims (87.21%), Christians (6.96%), Catholics (2.91%), Hindus (1.69%), Buddhists (0.72%), Confucians (0, 05%), and others (0.5%) (Bahari, 2010: 1). Islam has several streams. Among them Khawarij, Shiite, Murji'ah, Jabariyah, Qodariyah, Mu'tazilah, AhlussunnahWa Al-Jama'ah, Wahabi, Bahai, Ahmadiyah, and Jama'ahTabligh. Data in The Wahid Institute (2014) mentions that Shiites are one of the groups that have experienced discrimination both in the form of groups or individuals. The victims of the individual categories were most experienced by Shiite members with 236 victims. Shiite is seen to have a different doctrine than the teachings of other Islamic religions. Developing Shiites in Indonesia is the Shiite ImamiyahItsna 'Asyariyah is adopted personally (Ahlulbait Indonesia, 2014: 333) that believes there are twelve priests altogether from the descendants of Ali bin Abi Thalib and FathimahAz-Zahra (Shihab, 2014: 61). The major disparity between the two factions is over the succession to the Prophet Muhammad, where Sunnis believe that Muslims should select their ruler while Shiites believe that the Imam, a successor of the Prophet Mohammed, has to rule (Blanchard, 2005 dalam Ali A. Dashti, Ali A. Al-Kandari, Hamed H. Al-Abdullah, 2015).

In "Tolerance: the threshold of peace A teaching / learning guide for education for peace, human rights and democracy", published by UNESCO, intolerance can be in the form of exclusive, degrading, and slanderous language which reduces, denigrates, stereotypes, mocks- fun, bad thinking, discrimination, neglect, harassment, snapping, expulsion, segregation, oppression, and crackdown (The Wahid Institute, 2013). Seeing from several cases

Novia Dyah Rahmatika, Fakultas Psikologi, UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Jalan A.H. Nasution No. 105, Cipadung, Cibiru, Kota Bandung, Jawa Barat, Indonesia.

Asti Meiza, Fakultas Psikologi, UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Jalan A.H. Nasution No. 105, Cipadung, Cibiru, Kota Bandung, Jawa Barat, Indonesia.

Elisa Kurniadewi, Fakultas Psikologi, UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Jalan A.H. Nasution No. 105, Cipadung, Cibiru, Kota Bandung, Jawa Barat, Indonesia. E-mail: elisa.kurniadewi@uinsgd.ac.id*

described above, it can be concluded that attacking behavior, burning people's homes, dissolving religious activities are forms of intolerance (p. 20).

Understanding differences often trigger conflicts between groups, as defined by Blumer that one of the causes of social prejudice is the feeling of being different from other groups or other people, for example between the majority group and minority group.

Abrams (2010) defines prejudice as a bias that demeans people based on their membership in social groups. The bias referred to here is the knowledge of people who are incomplete or wrong, and they are also not right in generalizing their knowledge to produce prejudice.

Bias in relations between groups arises because of in-group favoritism and out derogation (Hewstone, et al, 2002). Both of these concepts are sources of bias in relations between groups. According to Tajfel (in Inguglia and Musso, 2013), in group favoritism is people who have a tendency to display systematic preferences for members in the group. Whereas out group derogation is people who have a tendency to show negative attitudes towards people who are in other groups (Inguglia and Musso, 2013).

One important solution for dealing with this situation is tolerance. Tolerance is a fundamental thing to develop mutual understanding, mutual respect and mutual respect for differences that exist, as well as being the key so that an atmosphere of harmony can be realized in the harmony between religious groups (Bahari, 2010: 2).

Tolerance in a psychological perspective is one of social controls, where tolerance requires that individuals really care about the behavior or beliefs of other individuals, and try to suppress and control negative responses to these individuals (Dijker, 2007: 11).

According to Van der Walt (2014), tolerance is the extent to which individuals accept things that we disagree with; the degree to which we understand differences and learn how to be different from others, and also does not hinder appreciation for what is good in other religions. From this definition, it is concluded that there are 3 dimensions in tolerance, namely acceptance, appreciation and social interaction. Acceptance can be interpreted as someone's willingness to accept others as they are, without any requirements or judgments (Bukhori, 2012). Appreciation is a willingness to respect individuals who have different views of themselves even though they disagree. Social interaction is a reciprocal relationship between one individual with another individual, individuals with groups. Social interaction allows the community to process in such a way that builds a relationship pattern. Social interaction leads to behavior (Safety Institute of Australia, 2012).

Research on the relationship between prejudice and aggressive behavior in Javanese society towards the Chinese community in Kemlayan Surakarta District shows a very significant positive relationship between prejudice and aggressive behavior with a correlation coefficient of 0.867 where $p < 0.01$ (Fajar, MuhNur, 2009: 66).

Other research shows that although prejudice does not automatically lead to discrimination, it will encourage it to think of acting discriminatory and even violent (Zick, Andreas, et al., 2011). Prejudice that arises will be high, if individuals and groups in their environment have minority groups in small amounts (Eccles et al., 2014: 180).

As a preliminary study, a sample of 49 UIN SunanGunungDjati Bandung students was taken to fill an open questionnaire about their views on Shiite. The results of the preliminary study showed 53.06% said that Shiite was a heretical group, 16.32% said that Shiite was not misguided, 20.4% were in a neutral position and 6.12% did not determine.

II. METHOD

The research subjects in this study were students of SunanGunungDjati UIN Bandung who were active in lectures with the population in this study were all UIN SunanGunungDjati Bandung students who actively attended 19,889 people. The researcher used the concept of Sugiyono (2015) in determining the number of samples from certain populations with a level of error of 5%, so that the number of samples was 347 and rounded up to 350 subjects (Sugiyono, 2015: 131). The sampling technique used in this study was a random sampling technique. The research instrument consisted of the Prejudice Scale (20 items) and the Tolerance Scale (39 items) that had been compiled by the researchers and validity had been tested with a total item-correlation score (rit) ranging from: 0.3-0.7. The results of the reliability test of the Prejudice scale showed Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.878 and the tolerance scale of 0.936.

III. RESULT

The results of this study consisted of descriptive analysis, classic assumption test for regression analysis and inferential analysis in the form of hypothesis testing.

		Prejuce	Tolerance
N	Valid	350	350
	Missing	0	0
Mean		55.1629	106.1229
Std. Error of Mean		.30699	.81222
Median		55.0000	108.0000
Mode		56.00	108.00 ^a
Std. Deviation		5.74324	15.19517
Variance		32.985	230.893
Range		36.00	102.00
Minimum		38.00	52.00
Maximum		74.00	154.00
Sum		19307.00	37143.00

Based on Table 1, the mean for the prejudice variable is 55.16. With a range of scores 1-4 on the prejudice scale which has 20 items, the average score for each item is 2.758 which is categorized quite high. In the tolerance

variable, it is obtained an average of 106.12. With a range of scores 1-4 on the tolerance scale which has 39 items, the average score on each item is 2.721 which is categorized quite high.

Description of the level of prejudice in the Shiitegroup at the students of SunanGunungDjati UIN Bandung.

The description of the level of prejudice is carried out with level (ordinal) categorization. The aim is to place individuals into separate groups in stages as in Table 2. It was found that the students of SunanGunungDjati UIN Bandung who had Prejudice levels in the Very High category were 13 students, the High category were 37 students, the Medium category were 246, the Low category were 45, and the Very Low category were 8 students.

Table 2: Prejudice Description of UIN SunanGunungDjati Bandung Students

Category	Total	Percentage
Very Low	8	2.29
Low	45	12.85
Medium	246	70.28
High	37	10.57
Very High	13	3.71

Description of tolerance of students at SunanGunungDjati UIN Bandung

It can seen at Table 3. From Table 3 students of SunanGunungDjati UIN Bandung who have Tolerance levels in the Very High category of 11 students, 21 students in the High category, 277 in the Medium category, 28 students in the Low category, and 13 in the Very Low category.

Table 3; Tolerance Description of UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung Students

Category	Total	Percentage
Very Low	13	3.71
Low	28	8
Medium	277	79.14
High	21	6
Very High	11	3.14

We can obtain the results of cross tabulation of the two variables, Prejudice and Tolerance as seen in Table 4.

Table 4: Contingency Table

Tolerance	Prejudice					Total
	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Very High	
Very Low	0	0	8	1	4	13
Low	0	2	16	6	3	27
Medium	6	32	205	29	6	278
High	0	9	10	1	1	21
Very High	2	3	6	0	0	11
Total	8	46	245	37	14	350

The demographic data of research subjects based on gender, semester, faculty, and affiliation can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5: Demographic Data of Research Subjects

Demographic Data of Research Subjects		Frequency	Percentage(%)
Gender	Male	153	43.71
	Female	197	56.29
Total		350	100
Semester	III	174	49.71
	V	93	26.57
	VII	74	21.14
	IX	9	2.58
Total		350	100
Faculty	Faculty of Social and Political Sciences	90	25.71
	Faculty of Ushuluddin	63	18
	Faculty of Science and Technology	60	17.14
	Faculty of Law and Syari'ah	16	4.57
	Faculty of Education	31	8.86
	Faculty of Psychology	20	5.71
	Faculty of Da'wah and Communication	13	3.72
	Faculty of Adab and Humanities	57	16.29
Total		350	100
Afiliation	NahdatulUlama	217	62
	Muhammadiyah	32	9.14
	Persis	24	6.86
	Others	77	22
Total		350	100

Table 6: Prejudice Score Distribution for each Faculty

Variable	Faculty	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Prejudice	Faculty of Science and Technology	90	55.8889	4.97961	.52490
	Faculty of Ushuluddin	63	54.7619	5.60735	.70646
	Faculty of Education	60	56.1667	5.56675	.71866
	Faculty of Law and Syari'ah	16	53.8750	5.59613	1.39903
	Faculty of Da'wah and Communication	31	52.5806	6.74178	1.21086
	Faculty of Social and Political Sciences	20	54.1000	5.26058	1.17630
	Faculty of Adab and Humanities	13	57.1538	7.88296	2.18634
	Faculty of Psychology	57	55.0877	5.97100	.79088

We also can find the distribution of Prejudice Score based on each faculty as seen at Table 6. It can be seen that the difference in the average prejudice score is not too far away. The highest average prejudice score was in the Adab and Humanities Faculty with an average of 57.15, and the lowest average score was in the Da'wah and Communication Faculty with an average score of 52.58.

The next distribution at Table 7 is Tolerance score based faculties in UIN SunanGunungDjati Bandung.

Table 7: Tolerance Score Distribution based on Faculty

Variable	Faculty	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Tolerance	Faculty of Science and Technology	90	104.2444	14.72162	1.55179
	Faculty of Ushuluddin	63	106.9524	13.04141	1.64306
	Faculty of Education	60	102.7000	15.80635	2.04059
	Faculty of Law and Syari'ah	16	111.0000	12.44722	3.11181
	Faculty of Da'wah and Communication	31	105.5484	13.71092	2.46255
	Faculty of Social and Political Sciences	20	108.7000	12.74073	2.84891
	Faculty of Adab and Humanities	13	115.8462	21.90071	6.07416
	Faculty of Psychology	57	107.5965	17.04182	2.25724

From Table 7, it can be seen that the difference in the average tolerance score is quite far. The highest average score of tolerance is in the Adab and Humanities Faculty with an average of 115.8462, and the lowest average score is in the Da'wah and Communication Faculty and also Faculty of Education with an average score of 102.7.

IV. INFERENCE ANALYSIS

In this section a simple linear regression analysis is carried out which requires testing classical assumptions in the form of a normality test and linearity test.

Normality Test

In this study the normality test used Kolmogorov Smirnov because there were more than 200 subjects. The results are shown in Table 8.

		Tolerance	Prejudice
N		350	350
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	106.1229	55.1629
	Std. Deviation	15.19517	5.74324
Most Extreme ; .Differences	Absolute	.086	.077
	Positive	.086	.075
	Negative	-.066	-.077
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.602	1.445
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.012	.031
a. Test distribution is Normal.			
b. Calculated from data.			

The criteria for testing normality using Kolmogorov-Smirnov is if the results of Kolmogorov-Smirnov's calculation with two sides have a score greater than 0.01. From Table 8 it can be seen that the score obtained by the Prejudice variable is 0.012 and the Tolerance variable is 0.031, so that these two variables have greater than 0.01. From these results it can be concluded that the two groups of data are normally distributed.

Linierity Test

We used ANOVA. The results can be seen at Table 9.

			Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Tolerance * Prejudice	Between Groups	(Combined)	25729.180	33	779.672	4.492	.000
		Linearity	19282.986	1	19282.986	111.087	.000
		Deviation from Linearity	6446.193	32	201.444	1.160	.258
	Within Groups		54852.538	316	173.584		
	Total		80581.717	349			

From Table 9 can be seen that linearity significant is 0,000. It can concluded that there is a linear correlation between two variables because *p-value* is smaller than α , 0,01.

Correlation between Prejudice and Tolerance

This part is used to investigate if there is correlation between two variables. The result is shown at Table 10.

		Tolerance	Prejudice
Pearson Correlation	Tolerance	1.000	-.489
	Prejudice	-.489	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	Tolerance	.	.000
	Prejudice	.000	.
N	Tolerance	350	350
	Prejudice	350	350

From Table 10 we get Pearson’s correlation is -0.489. This is at Medium category. It can conclude that there is a negative correlation between Prejudice and Tolerance. It means that higher Prejudice to Shiite implicate the lower Tolerance at UIN SunanGunungDjati Bandung students. Then also got the probability value is 0,000, smaller than significance, α , 0,000 < 0,01.

Regression Model Test

The result of this test is the significance of ANOVA Test. This is done to test the feasibility of the regression model with the criterion that a good regression model must have a probability value smaller than the specified significance level, 0.01. It can be seen at Table 11.

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	19282.986	1	19282.986	109.472	.000 ^b
	Residual	61298.731	348	176.146		
	Total	80581.717	349			
a. Dependent Variable: Tolerance						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Prejudice						

From Table 11 it can be seen that the probability value is 0,000. With a significance level of 0.01, obtained 0.000 < 0.01. This suggests that choosing a simple linear regression model to see the contribution of prejudice to tolerance is appropriate.

Regression coefficients

Regression coefficients can be used to determine the constant number and test the hypothesis of the significance of regression coefficient. H_0 is rejected if $p_value \leq \alpha$, besides, the research hypothesis is not accepted. The results can be seen in Table 12.

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	177.517	6.860		25.876	.000
	Prejudice	-1.294	.124	-.489	-10.463	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Tolerance

From Table 12, we got $p_value < \alpha$ ($0,000 < 0,01$). It can be concluded that H_0 is rejected. This means that Prejudice influences Tolerance at Sunan Gunung Djati UIN Bandung Students.

The formula for Regression Linear Model:

$$\hat{Y} = a + bX$$

With

\hat{Y} : Dependent Variable (predictive value)

a : Constant, value of \hat{Y} if $X = 0$

b : Regression Coefficients, the increase or decrease in the value of the dependent variable follows the change in the value of the independent variable

X : Independent Variable

The coefficients in Table 12 are substituted into the regression equation, obtained by the following equation:

$$\hat{Y} = 177.517 - 1.294 X$$

This regression equation is interpreted that every addition of one unit to the Prejudice variable, the Tolerance variable will decrease by 1.294, so it can be said that the increase in Prejudice on SunanGunungDjati UIN Bandung Students will reduce their Tolerance.

Coefficient of determination

The coefficient of determination is used to determine the percentage effect of independent variables on the dependent variable as listed in Table 13.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df 1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.489 ^a	.239	.237	13.27199	.239	109.472	1	348	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Prejudice
 b. Dependent Variable: Tolerance

From Table 13 can be seen that the R score is 0.489 with R-square 0.237. It can be concluded that the Prejudice variable has an interaction of 23.9% with the Tolerance variable, and the other 76.1% is influenced by variables other than Prejudice.

V. DISCUSSION

From the results of data processing, it is known that there is an influence of prejudice on Shiite's group on the tolerance of students at SunanGunungDjati UIN Bandung. The results of the feasibility test of the regression model obtained F count of 109.472 with a significance of 0.000 <0.01 indicating that the regression model is correct, meaning Prejudice has an influence on Tolerance.

Then, based on the hypothesis test with the results of 0.000 <0.01 it can be concluded that there is the influence of the Prejudice in the Shiite group on the Tolerance of students at SunanGunungDjati UIN Bandung. From the results of the regression coefficient calculation the regression equation is obtained as follows:

$$\hat{Y} = 177.517 - 1.294 X$$

This equation is interpreted as adding one unit to the prejudice variable, then Tolerance will decrease by 1.294 or the higher the Prejudice of SunanGunungDjati UIN Bandung students to the Shiite group, the more their tolerance for this group will decline.

This is in accordance with the concept of The Contact-Based Hypothesis of Allport, which was perfected by Amir, Cook and Pettigrew (in Brown, 2005) who said that to reduce prejudice, individuals can make contact with various conditions. Contact-based interventions have been the most widely applied, studied, and consistently effective prejudice reduction approach (Aboud et al., 2012; Beelmann & Heinemann, 2014; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Alaina Brenick, Samantha E. Lawrence, Daniell Carvalheiro, Rony Berger, 2019). These interventions draw upon contact theory (Allport, 1954; Alaina Brenick, Samantha E. Lawrence, Daniell Carvalheiro, Rony Berger, 2019), which asserts that, if people engage in meaningful cross-group interactions (i.e., contact that involves the "optimal" conditions of equal status, common goals, intergroup cooperation, and support of authorities), they are more likely to understand and accept each other and show reduced prejudice as a result.

The first condition is to create contact between groups that allows the development of meaningful relationships among members of the groups concerned. This condition must have high acquaintance potentials. This is called *social interaction* on the dimension of tolerance. The second condition is cooperation. As long as the members of different groups are interdependent in achieving goals that are equally desirable, they have instrumental reasons for developing friendlier relationships. For good cooperation there is a need for individuals to accept the opinions of other individuals and appreciate them. This is called *acceptance* and *appreciation* of the dimension of Tolerance.

The calculation results provide a correlation coefficient of -0.489. The negative sign (-) means that the correlation is negative, that is, the higher the Prejudice, the lower the Tolerance. In addition, the score on the coefficient of determination (R Square) is 0.239. That is, at 23.9% the variable Prejudice interacts with the Tolerance variable and at 76.1% is influenced by other variables. This is in line with what was stated by Van Doorn (2012) in his journal entitled "Tolerance", that empirical research shows a more complex relationship between Prejudice and Tolerance.

The results of the descriptive analysis show that the average level of prejudice and the level of tolerance of students at SunanGunungDjati UIN Bandung are in the moderate category. In addition, descriptive analysis based on

gender, semester, faculty, and affiliate categories shows the dynamics of the two variables studied. The semester category is influenced by other factors, such as age and stage of development, so that according to Brown's argument that there are significant changes at the adult level (Brown, 2005: 240). Then the semester categories are influenced by moral development, according to Kohlberg and Candee's theory (1948) that moral development will increase from early adolescence to early adulthood.

VI. CONCLUSION

It can be concluded that the average prejudice of SunanGunungDjati UIN Bandung students is in the medium category. Similarly, the Tolerance level is also in the medium category. The cross distribution results show that the students of SunanGunungDjati UIN Bandung had a level of Prejudice and Tolerance level in the medium category.

While inferential results conclude that there is the influence of Prejudice on Shiite groups on the tolerance of students at SunanGunungDjati UIN Bandung. It can be concluded that the magnitude of the variable interaction of Prejudice against the Tolerance variable is 23.9%, while as much as 76.1% is influenced by other variables not examined in this study.

VII. SUGGESTION

Methodological advice

Research on tolerance is still minimal so it needs to be reviewed in the next study. From the results of the study, it was found that prejudice in the Shiite group had an effect on the tolerance of students at SunanGunungDjati UIN Bandung even though it was small enough to require research on other variables, such as personality, educational background, etc. In addition, this study only looked at the level of Prejudice and Tolerance levels in the Shiite group and whether there were any influences between the two variables, so that they could not be generalized to the other groups. To further ascertain whether there are influences between the two variables, it is necessary to have research in a more general context.

Practical advice

There needs to be a cross-sectional discussion to provide an understanding of the Shiite group that comes directly from the characters, so as to minimize bias in this case Prejudice, which will emerge.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abrams. 2010. Processes of Prejudice: Theory, evidence and intervention. *Manchester: Equality and Human Rights Commission Research Report Series*
- [2] Ahlulbait Indonesia. (2014). Syiah Menurut Syiah. *Jakarta Selatan: Dewan Pengurus Pusat Ahlulbait Indonesia*
- [3] Alaina Brenick, Samantha E. Lawrence, Daniell Carvalheiro, Rony Berger, Teaching tolerance or acting tolerant? *Evaluating skills- and contact-based prejudice reduction interventions among Palestinian-Israeli and Jewish-Israeli youth.* (2019)
- [4] Ali A. Dashti, Ali A. Al-Kandari, Hamed H. Al-Abdullah, The influence of sectarian and tribal discourse in newspapers readers' online comment about freedom of expression, censorship and national unity in Kuwait (2015)
- [5] Bahari, H. (2010). *Buku Toleransi Mahasiswa. Jakarta: Maloho Jaya Abadi Press*

- [6] Bukhori, Baidi. 2012. Toleransi terhadap Umat Kristiani Ditinjau dari Fundamentalisme Agama dan Kontrol Diri. *Semarang: Laporan Penelitian Individual*
- [7] Brown, Rupert. (2005). Prejudice: Its Social Psychology. *Inggris: Blackwell Publishing*
- [8] Dijiker, Anton J. M. (2007). Stigmatization, Tolerance and Repair. *UK: Cambridge University Press*
- [9] Eccles, dkk. (2014). *Journal of Society on Adolescence (Schools, Peers, and Prejudice in Adolescence)*. _____: _____
- [10] Hewstone, dkk. (2002). Intergroup Bias. *UK: Jurnal*
- [11] Inguglia dan Musso. 2013. In group favoritism and out group derogation in childer. Italia: _____
- [12] NurFajar, Muh. (2009). *Hubungan Antara Prasangkadengan Perilaku Agresifpada Masyarakat Jawaterhadap Masyarakat Tionhoa di Kelurahan Kemlayan Surakarta*. Surakarta: Skripsi
- [13] *Safety Institute of Australia*. 2012. *The Human: Principles of Social Interaction*. Australia: _____
- [14] Shihab, M. Quraish. (2014). Sunnah Syiah Bergandengan Tangan! Mungkinkah?. *Tangerang: Penerbit Lentera Hati*
- [15] Sugiyono, AgusSusanto. (2015). Cara Mudah Belajar SPSS & LISREL Teoridan Aplikasiuntuk Analisis Data Penelitian. *Bandung: ALFABETA*
- [16] *The Wahid Institute*. (2013). Laporan Tahunan Kebebasan Beragama Berkeyakinan dan Intoleransi 2013. *Jakarta: The Wahid Institute*
- [17] *The Wahid Institute*. (2014). Laporan Tahunan Kebebasan Beragama Berkeyakinan dan Intoleransi 2014. *Jakarta: The Wahid Institute*
- [18] Van Der Walt. (2014). *Measuring Religious Tolerance in Education*. _____: _____
- [19] Van Doorn. (2012). Tolerance. *Amsterdam: Jurnal*
- [20] Zick, Andreas, dkk. 2011. Intolerance, Prejudice and Discrimination A European Report. *Berlin: Nora Langenbacher*.