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ABSTRACT

The research aimed to measure the level of inclusiveness of religious education teachers in Indonesia in 2018. The research method was a survey, conducted thorough capital cities in 34 provinces. The respondents were religious education teachers from Moslem, Christian, Catholic, Hinduism, and Buddhism at the secondary school level. The total sample was 3675 from 7976 population in the whole province capitals. They were selected based on Proportional Random Sampling technique and used Yamane formula at the level of confidence at 95 percent. The instrument research was the questionnaire of religious understanding which was constructed from three dimensions of variables, namely religious understanding toward the relation of religion and state, the relation among different religions and the relationship within the same religion. The research data technique analysis used structural equation modeling. The result showed that the inclusiveness level of religious education teachers was at 76.55, which was higher than the cut off value which was at 75.0. It means that the religious understanding of religious education teachers was good or generally at an inclusivism level.
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INTRODUCTION

Religious subject becomes the main instrument for transmitting religious ideas in educational institutions. The curriculum is the realm of state policy in constructing religious ideas that develop in a country; and in practice, the curriculum is transformed into textbooks, teacher handbooks, and student worksheets. Hasim (2015: 267) found that textbook at religious education was not spread and it built social piety for growing social order and tolerance value. Those books and other materials then would be applied by teachers in various classes, according to teachers’ understanding and competency. As a result, the teacher’s religious understanding will greatly influence student learning. The similar finding was stated by Fuad (Fuad, 2017: 662) who said that radicalism entered through textbooks. The books used were the official books published by the government and private institutions through worksheets. Both positive and negative influences can be transmitted through religious education.

In this context, religious education teachers play an important and strategic role in realizing the goals of religious education in schools. The role of teachers in schools does not only transmit ideas but also to transform and catalyze values and attitudes. In the National Education System, it is stated that the teacher is a professional educator. Through this law, religious education teachers are required to develop their professionalism to the top performance. Professional teachers can encourage enthusiasm and concern to solve problems at school and carry out their duties and functions well.

Religious education teachers are required to master religious knowledge related to their profession as well as their role as educators. They
also have to master the skills in implementing knowledge in the learning process of religious education in schools. The teacher is an important element that must play a significant role and put themselves as professional ones. Each teacher has a responsibility to bring their students to a certain maturity level. Moreover, the teacher of religious education must be able to transmit religious knowledge and values to his students correctly.

In accordance with the function of religious education, which is to shape Indonesian people who are faithful and devoted to God the Almighty, the Government Regulations (PP No. 55 of 2007) had stated that the purpose of religious education is to foster the ability of students to understand, appreciate and practice religious values that balance their mastery in science, technology, and art. In addition, religious teachers are also supposed to shape people with noble characters and can maintain peace and harmony among people from different religions. Other than the law statement, experts had also delivered many religious education roles and functions. One important role of religious education in school is as a tool to create bridges among people, help them to understand each other, accept them and finally love each other (Niculescu, 2013: 342). The religious education has significant influences on the formation of moral and consciousness of students (Manea, 2014: 518-523). Other expert stated that religious education can contribute to adolescent mental health in school settings (Estrada et al., 2019: 1-6). In the diversity life world, religious education could promote community cohesion (Francis et al., 2017). From a broader perspective, religious education could give a contribution to sustainable development (Kvamme, 2018: 24).

In its implementation, the practice of administering religious education in schools is on the responsibility of religious teachers. For this reason, teachers play an important role in the process of teaching-learning religious education. The efficiency of valorization of religious education in order to strengthen the moral and morality of the young generations depends mostly on the ability of teachers to design educational activities which combine ethical values and principles with those religious in nature (Manea, 2014: 518).

The diversity of religious understanding among religious education teacher, in turn, will affect religious understanding and knowledge of students (Abdullah, 2005: 19-20). In the context of inclusivism and exclusivism views, attitudes, and behaviors of students, all those are related to the role of the teacher as an educator in schools or classroom because teachers, especially religious teachers, have a strategic role in transmitting religious knowledge and internalizing religious values to form tolerant attitudes and behaviors for their students.

In social science, religious education has become a central part of a long history and deep frequently debate (Gearon, 2014: 235 - 238), and has theological characteristics and traits (Anderson, 2004: 75). In the context of religious understanding, religious education in schools has potential to refer to exclusive religious beliefs or inclusive. The type of scale and colors of religious understanding were triggered by religious understanding both in school environment and also outside school. Education, especially religious education, is not only a matter of teaching knowledge but also the strengthening of religious and ideological doctrines. Certain ideologies or religious understandings received by the teacher, both inside and outside the school, will come into the school. Through the teachers, the constellation of religious ideas in the public sphere is included in the school environment.

As education in schools was a producer of knowledge that continues to strengthen the spread of religious ideas, the existence and the position of religious education in schools is significant to the contestation of exclusive and inclusive ideas in religion. The interplay between the religious understanding of the government that produces education policy, the teachers who strengthen and disseminate religious ideas directly through teaching students, and the community as an external element that influences religious public
discourse becomes significant to determining exclusive and inclusive religious ideas.

The tendency of the exclusively religious ideas began to emerge among teachers in the matter of relations between religion and state and interfaith relations or the relationship among people from various religions. The survey results conducted by Institute for Islamic and Peace Studies (LaKIP) in 2010 revealed that 21% of teachers stated that Pancasila as the state foundation was no longer relevant (Lestari, 2016: 1). This finding raises a heated debate about the religious understanding of teachers as direct educators in schools assigned by the state to safeguard Pancasila as an ideological values.

However, the study of the State Islamic University (UIN) of Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta showed different finding. It said that the Islamic religious education teachers continued to support Indonesia based on Pancasila and the 1945 constitution, although some teachers have strong aspirations for the application of Islamic law (Sharia). In a study conducted in October 2016, 78 percent of religious teachers agreed if the government was based on Islamic law and more than 80 percent respondents were reluctant if the principal, head of governmental office, or the head of region was led by non-Muslims. However, more than 80 percent respondents gave support for Pancasila and the 1945 constitution (Ayu, 2017). Moreover, Darmadi (2016: 1) even stated that religious education teachers became more intolerant; and based on the most up to dated survey some religious teachers had any radical opinion or attitude toward other religion followers and toward state law officers (PPIM UIN Jakarta and Convey, 2018).

This research came with the most up to dated data and information with broader coverage area and sums of samples. This research took specifically to the religious education teacher as the main sources of religious doctrine at schools.

The problem statement in this study were “How is religious understanding of religious teachers in Indonesia? What factors did influence the teachers’ inclusiveness and how much they influence the level of the teachers’ inclusiveness?”

In general, the goals of this research were to describe the religious education teachers’ level of inclusiveness in Indonesia. In detail, it is to find out inclusiveness level of the teachers on aspects related to the religious understanding. In addition, it is also to know the factors which influence the inclusiveness and how much these factors affect teachers’ religious understanding.

The results of this study are useful for enriching information on the religious understanding either in Indonesia or other countries. This study used broader sample so that it can take a stronger position in making maps of religious understanding in Indonesia, especially regarding the distribution of inclusive manners. Activists of religious harmony can take advantage of this research in developing a climate of tolerance and a culture of peace. Educational practitioners can use the data and results of this research as a basis for developing tolerant and peaceful lessons in school.

**Conceptual Framework**

Religion is belief in God which is embraced by a society in the form of doctrine and teachings. However, in practice, religion is interpreted and practiced by its followers in various ways. The plurality of religious interpretations later became the religious understanding of the people which originated from religious doctrines and teachings. Over time, religious understanding experienced institutionalization in many religious groups. According to Concise Dictionary of Sociology (Marshail, 1994: 447), religion is a set of beliefs, symbols, and practices (rituals) that are based on something sacred and that unites its followers into the socio-religious community. The similar opinion was also stated by Young and Young (2017), while Kadar and Scott described religion or religiousness related to spirituality (Kadar et al, 2015).

In terms of terminology, religious understanding is a school of thought, which is the result of human thought related to the
interpretation and practice of religious texts. The religious understanding then became the basis and world view of various religious communities in the world (Mufid, 2011: viii-ix). Religious understanding can also be interpreted as the understanding or knowledge of a person or group of people about a religion they believe in, related to teachings, worship and rituals, social relations, organizations and so on, based on their interpretation (Ahsanul and Zirwansyah, 2013).

Walshe and Teece (2013: 314-315) proposed an interpretation of religious understanding which focuses on the soteriological dimension of religion, thus it provides people with a particularly religious lens through which he/she understands religious traditions in religious education and concludes by outlining what such an approach might look like in practice. Thus, religious understandings are opinions, thoughts, flow, direction, and views of a person or group about a set of beliefs, symbols, and practices (rituals) based on something related to religion. This is similar to what Ellis (2017: 78-79) described as personal transformation tool.

There is no single typology of religious understanding both in theory and in practice, but rather different and even differs vis a vis from one another. Exclusive and inclusive religious ideology is a religious notion that rests on a different foundation diametrically. Exclusivism religious ideas have contradictory characters to inclusivism religious ideas. Other academician categorized religious understanding as ideal-rationality and pragmatic-materialistic (Ishomuddin, 2017: 243)

The word “exclusive” often refers to exclusive theology, exclusivism, or exclusive religious understanding (Shihab, 1998: 79-80). Exclusive understanding does not accept the truth of other religions. Other religions are heretical, and there is no way of salvation. This exclusive understanding is based on literal and scriptural interpretation (Painikkar, 1994). The expert (Madjid, 1999) states that the notion of exclusivism views other religions as the wrong way, which is misleading to followers.

Thus, exclusivism directs followers to be intolerant to diversity and pluralism. Exclusivism can also be drawn to the extreme by committing violence, either intellectually, psychologically or physically towards anyone who is considered different (Ali, 2007: xii-xiii). Exclusive groups usually tend to interpret their religion not only literally and narrowly but also consider other people who disagree with them as outsiders. They are ready to reject people who do not accept their way of thinking. Even worse, they commit violence not only against people from other religions but also to the people from the same religion with different views from theirs (Ahmed, 2004).

Exclusive religious understanding teaches people spirit of domination of one religion over another. This group views that outsiders will not safe unless they admit the exactly same faith as theirs. The expression of this group, either their understanding, attitudes, or behavior tends to be exclusive, conservative, fundamentalist, extremist, intolerant, apological and dogmatic, so that it is not conducive to see other religions in a friendly manner, and over-emphasizing similar side of the equation (Banawiratima, 1993).

According to Azra (2002), exclusivism is divided into two types, namely extreme exclusivism and moderate exclusivism. Extreme exclusivism is a type of exclusivism which is a very closed, true-false and radical dichotomy. This group only justifies its views by immediately blaming, misleading, and forgiving other guards. Moderate exclusivism is limited to justifying his school and blaming or misleading other schools, without forgiving.

The other side of exclusive is inclusive, which linguistically means including, countless, inclusion or openness. Inclusive religious ideology is associated with the views of Karl Rahner, a Catholic theologian, who believes that there is salvation outside the Gospel so that followers of other religions are also believed to have salvation (Shihab, 1998: 81). In this term, according to Painikkar (1994: 20) in inclusivism religious understanding, a person will tend to accept differences, even if he disagrees with the
truth of others. Inclusive religious understanding emphasizes the understanding of religious teachings contextually, by capturing the essence of religious messages in accordance with the context of space and time, socio-cultural situations and conditions. In line with this, Madjid (1999: 177-190) interpreted inclusivism as an open and tolerant attitude towards followers of other religions.

Azra (2002) calls inclusiveness as moderate inclusiveness which holds the view that there are some non-Muslims who can survive and enter heaven or paradise because they believe in Allah, believe in judgement day, and conduct good deeds. This group views anyone having the same right because of the three aforementioned factors; while the understanding of extreme liberalism is a group that does not discriminate against religion anymore. According to this group, all religions, especially major religions, are essentially Islamic. Therefore, all religions, because they are Muslims, are true. What distinguishes among a religion which is named Islam and other religions which are named non-Islam is only in terms of quality.

According to Shihab (1998), inclusivism religious groups view that the truth of religious thinking of Islam is relative. What is ultimately absolute is the Koran as a holy book and the Prophet Muhammad. Islam that is understood by the followers of Muhammad, including those understood by the scholars, is relative. An inclusivism group wants Muslims to unite in religion. As for the rationale, that all Islamic scholars agree on the existence of One Al-Quran as an absolute correct reference. And to the existence of the Prophet Muhammad, and the existence of Sunnah of the Prophet that is true. All Muslims also agree to the existence of the same fundamental beliefs and worship, and an understanding of the impossibility of having one opinion about the same religious procedure.

As explained above, this study limits the exclusivity and inclusivity of opinions, thoughts, streams, directions, and views of religious education teachers about a set of beliefs, symbols, and practices (rituals) based on Islam, Christianity, Catholicism, Hinduism and Buddhism as the official state religion in the formal education unit of secondary education. The mapping of the typology of the religious understanding of religious education teachers in these schools is constructed from various theories of religious understanding.

The inclusivism religious understandings of religious education teachers in schools were measured from three dimensions, namely relations between religion and state, the relation among same religious people and relations among different religious people. These three dimensions/aspects are taken based on state policy in legislation. This concept is derived from the government policy of religious harmony, called “Trilogi kerukunan umat beragama’ which was introduced by the Ministry of Religious Affairs in 1982 (Perwiranegara, 1982: 45 - 54). On the dimensions of the relationship between religion and state, the whole of the state components had agreed on a national consensus on state ideology, the political system, and the legal system in the constitution. In the dimensions of internal and external interreligious relations which include regulation of worshipping houses, religious broadcasting, religious ceremonies, marriages, and community relations, the state has formulated a harmony policy contained in the joint ministry decree on Ministry Religious Affair and Home Affairs ministry, and also the decision of the Constitutional Court.

**Religious Understanding in the Dimensions of Religion-State Relations**

In the dimensions of relations between religion and state, the inclusiveness of the teacher’s religious understanding is measured by indicators of state ideology, the legal system, and the political system. These three topics have always been a fierce debate in the community that has always been associated with the religious doctrines about the acceptance of Pancasila, democracy, and national law. Not surprisingly,
teacher’s inclusiveness or exclusiveness of religious understanding will come into contact with these issues.

In the preamble of the 1945 constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, whole Indonesian people agreed that Pancasila was a state ideology, which united the plural groups, religions, ethnic groups and tribes. Pancasila is a state ideology, not a substitute for religion, but Pancasila reflects religious values that grow and live in society. Democracy is a political system adopted by the Indonesian people in carrying out political and state life. Likewise, the Indonesian national law comes from customary law, Islamic law, and Western law, which interact in forming legal norms that apply. Therefore, the views of religious education teachers in schools that reject and accept Pancasila, democracy and national law will determine their exclusive or inclusive religious understandings.

**Religious Understanding in the Dimensions of Internal and external Religious Relations**

In the dimensions of internal and external-interreligious relations, the exclusiveness and inclusiveness of teachers’ religious understandings were measured by indicators of their view toward houses of worship establishment, religious broadcasting, religious ceremonies and rituals, social relations, and marriages. These indicators have always been a heated debate in the community which has always been associated with a religious doctrine about the construction of houses of worship, being involved in other religious rituals, neighborhood, friendly, and trading with other religions, and interfaith marriages. So clearly, the exclusiveness and inclusiveness of teachers’ religious understandings will reflect these issues.

One of the legal sources that regulate inter-religious relations is the joint regulation of the Minister of Religious Affairs and Minister of Home Affairs number 9 of 2006 and number 8 of 2006. This regulation was concerning on the Duties of Regional Heads or City Major in the maintenance of religious harmony, empowerment of religious harmony forums, and establishment of houses of worship, procedures for development houses of worship and religious harmony. In broader means, this regulation regulates houses of worship. Likewise, about friendship, neighboring relations, trading, and being involved in other religious ceremonies will determine the religious understanding of religious education teachers; whether exclusive or inclusive. Moreover, in matters of marriages among people from different religion as decided by the constitutional court, there will be a serious debate. All of these are indicators in determining the exclusiveness and inclusiveness of teachers’ religious understandings.

**RESEARCH METHOD**

This research used a quantitative approach with survey methods. The target of the research was the teachers of religious education at schools. The research covered all provincial capitals, namely 34 cities. The selection of provincial capitals is based on consideration as an area that gets maximum attention from the government and regional government, and socially has a high level of diversity. The population and sample of the study were teachers of the Islamic religion in the Madrasa Aliyah (MA), Islamic religious teachers in senior high schools (SMA) and vocational senior high schools (SMK), Christian, Catholic, Hindu and Buddhist religious education subject teachers in SMA and SMK. The samples were determined through “Proportional Random Sampling technique.” It was based on the percentage of the number of religious teachers in each area of the provincial capital. The total samples were 3675 respondents from 7976 population of teachers derived from each province capital.

Calculation of the number of samples used the Yamane formula, with an error margin set at 0.07, and a confidence level of 95%. Calculation of the number of samples according to YAMANE formula (Singh and Masuku, 2014: 15), as follows.

\[
N\sqrt{\frac{1}{n} + \frac{(e)^2}{N}}
\]

Notes:

\[n = \text{Sum of samples}\]
The measured research variable was “Religious Understanding of Religious Education Teachers (RUoRET),” which refers to the level of inclusivism of religious education teachers. The concept of religious understanding is broken down into several dimensions, namely: the relationship between religion and state, external-religious relations, and internal religious relations.

The instruments used in this survey were questionnaires with two options. Before conducting the survey, the instruments were validated using point biserial and KR-20. The research questionnaire as a tool for measuring Religious Understanding (Y) consists of 3 dimensions, namely the Religion and State relations (Y1) External-religious relations (Y2) Internal-religion Relations (Y3).

Data analysis technique

Data analysis was carried out through the following stages:

The first, data entry. All data at the research location were entered by field officers (enumerator) to the excel application, according to the template made by the research coordinator. The second is sorting data. The research coordinator did this. The purpose of sorting data is to make sure about completeness of all instruments. Instruments that are not filled properly were immediately removed (excluded). Afterward, incorporating provincial data into national data (tabulation). It was 34 provinces. After finishing these three steps, the data was ready for analysis.

Descriptively, the measurement results take the average score of the religious education teacher inclusivism in Indonesia in 2018. That score is an inclusive picture of religious teachers in Indonesia. The score of the religious teacher inclusivism, rated from 1.00 (one point zero) which is the lowest to 100 (one hundred) for the highest. The higher the score, the more inclusive the religious understanding of religious education teachers (RUoRET) in Indonesia. Conversely, the lower the score, the lower the inclusivism of RUoRET. In a bipolar perspective, the higher the inclusiveness, means the lower the exclusion, and the lower the inclusiveness, the higher the exclusivism.

The category of inclusiveness level is divided into low, medium and high. From the range of one to one hundred, three levels were made with the same distance, namely: 1 to 33.33 is a low-level category, 33.34 to 66.66 is a middle-level category, and 66.67 to 100 is a high-level category of inclusivism. Furthermore, a significance level test was carried out using One t-test compare means, with a cut-off value of 75. A panel of researchers and experts determines the number 75 as a cut-off.

At the data analyzing stage inferentially, some data analysis techniques performed were: Structural Equation Modeling (SEM), Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), and K-mean cluster analysis. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) is a statistical method increasingly used in scientific studies in the fields of social sciences (Civelek, 2018) with large size of sample more than 200 (Pynnönen, 2016: 26); yet, others stated could be at least 100 of sample size (Newsom, 2018: 1). It is to find out the dominant factors that contribute to the fulfillment of specific dimensions measured. It is also part of multivariate tests. So, this research was carried out using first-order Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM). This is following the nature of the variables measured, namely the teachers’ religious understanding and its dimensions, as mentioned above, were variables that can - not be measured directly (latent).

These tests had two main functions. First, to find out the accuracy of the measurement model for the measured dimensions. This way of test should ensure whether all indicators been able to reflect that dimension. Second, to find out which indicators are the dominant factors of the measured dimensions (Civelek, 2018). The tool or software using to get the output of analysis was
Lisrell.

A Model of equations measurement in a variable of factor analysis is mentioned FIT or compatible with the data if it meets the test criteria as follows.

** The value of Chi-square inference statistics is quite small, which is < 2 df (degrees of freedom)

** The value of p-value Chi-square is quite large, namely > 0.05 or close to 1

** Value of descriptive statistics RMSEA < 0.08

By this test, Hypothesis was followed as below:

\[ H_0 : \Sigma = \Sigma(\theta) \] (Structural equation models fit with data)

\[ H_1 : \Sigma \neq \Sigma(\theta) \] (Structural equation models are not fit with data)

Test Criteria:

Accept the \( H_0 \) hypothesis at a significant level \( \alpha \) if the above test criteria are met.

Conclusion: If \( H_0 \) accepted, then the structural equation model is fit with the data. If \( H_0 \) rejected, then the structural equation model is not fit with the data.

In addition to SEM dan CFA, the research also used K-mean cluster analysis. This way of analysis applied in the process to partition the population based on provinces according to the similarity or nearly (Rai, 2011).

**RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

This section describes the findings and data analysis of “Religious Understanding of Religious Education Teachers (RUoRET) in Indonesia in 2018” which aims to point out the average score of the religious understanding of religious education teachers. Sequentially, this section describes the identity of respondents, the inclusiveness figures of the teacher’s religious understanding in each dimension and aggregate, and the description of the cluster of the religious understanding of the teacher based on the level of inclusivism.

1. **Characteristics of Respondents**

Descriptive analysis of respondents’ identities includes: teacher status, subjects, gender, age, education, organizational background, and type of school.

a. Teacher status

Based on employment status, religious teacher respondents are distinguished from those with status as civil servants and not civil servants. The distribution of respondents looks like the table 1.

**Table 1.** The Distribution of Respondents Based on Employment Status.

| Number | Categories                | \( f \) | %   |
|--------|---------------------------|--------|-----|
| 1      | Civil servants teachers   | 1388   | 43.21|
| 2      | Non-Civil servants teachers | 2087  | 56.79|
|        | Total                     | 3675   | 100.00|

The table 1 shows the distribution of characteristics of religious teacher respondents in 34 provinces in Indonesia studied in 2018. Most of them were were non-civil servant religious teachers who reached as many as 2087 respondents (56.79%), while the respondents who are civil servants are 1588 respondents (43.21%).

b. Subjects

Based on the subjects, the religious teacher respondents were divided into Islamic education teachers, Christian, Catholic, Hindu, Buddhist, and Confucian education teachers. The distribution of respondents looks like the table 2.

**Table 2.** The Distribution of Respondents Based on Religious Subject Lesson

| Number | Subjects    | \( f \) | %  |
|--------|-------------|--------|----|
| 1      | Islamic education | 2843  | 77.36|
| 2      | Christian education | 440  | 11.97|
| 3      | Catholic education  | 201  | 5.47 |
| 4      | Hindu education   | 135   | 3.67 |
| 5      | Buddhism education | 56   | 1.52 |
| 6      | Confucian education | 0   | 0.00 |
|        | Total         | 3675  | 100.00|

Table 2 shows the distribution of characteristics of respondents as religious teachers in 34 provinces in Indonesia which were examined in 2018. The highest number of respondents were teachers of Islamic subjects who reached 2843 respondents (77.36%), followed by
teachers of Christian subjects who reached 440 respondents (11.97%), while the least were the teachers of Buddhist subjects who only reached 56 respondents (1.52%) only. Also, no respondent is the teacher who teaches the subjects of the Confucian.

c. Gender

The distribution of respondents by sex looks like the table 3:

Table 3. The Distribution of Respondents Based on Gender

| Sex  | Gender | f   | %   |
|------|--------|-----|-----|
| a    | Male   | 2001| 54.45 |
| b    | Female | 1674| 45.55 |
|      | Total  | 3675| 100.00 |

Table 3 shows the distribution of characteristics of respondents as religious teachers in 34 provinces in Indonesia studied in 2018. Most respondents were male teachers as many as 2001 respondents (54.45%), while the female ones reached as many as 1674 respondents (45.55%).

d. Age

The age of respondents was categorized into three parts based on the assignment period and teaching experience. The distribution of respondents based on their age looks like the table 4:

Table 4. The Distribution of Respondents Based on Age

| Number | Ages                  | f   | %   |
|--------|-----------------------|-----|-----|
| 1      | <36 years             | 875 | 23.81 |
| 2      | 36-49 years           | 2108| 57.36 |
| 3      | More than 49 < years  | 692 | 18.83 |
|        | Total                 | 3675| 100.00 |

The table 4 shows the distribution of the characteristics of respondents in 34 provinces in Indonesia studied in 2018. Most of them are teachers who are 36-49 years old. Their number reached as many as 2108 respondents (57.36%), the second is the teachers who are younger than 36 years old who reached 875 respondents (23.81%). While respondents who were older than 49 years old were 692 respondents (18.83%).

e. Education

The distribution of respondents based on education level looks like the table 5:

Table 5. The distribution of respondents based on last education

| Number | Level of Education         | f   | %   |
|--------|---------------------------|-----|-----|
| 1      | Religious-based Senior high schools | 6   | 0.16 |
| 2      | Senior high school        | 16  | 0.44 |
| 3      | Diploma                   | 14  | 0.38 |
| 4      | Bachelors                 | 5   | 0.14 |
| 5      | Undergraduate             | 2807| 76.38|
| 6      | Postgraduate, magister    | 821 | 22.34|
| 7      | Post graduate, Doctorate / Ph.D | 6   | 0.16 |
|        | Total                     | 3675| 100.00 |

Table 5 shows the distribution of characteristics of respondents as religious teachers in 34 provinces in Indonesia studied in 2018. The highest number of respondents were respondents with undergraduate level which reached 2807 respondents (76.38%), followed by religious teachers with magister (S2) which reached as many as 821 respondents (22.34%) while the fewest respondents were the religious teacher with the latest education level of Bachelor Degree which only reached five respondents (0.14%) only.

f. Organizational experience

The distribution of respondents based on their organizational experience can be seen in the table 6:

Table 6. The Distribution of Respondents Based on Organizational Experience

| Number | Organizational experiences                | f   | %   |
|--------|------------------------------------------|-----|-----|
| 1      | Intra-School Student Organization (Student Council) | 2428| 66.07|
| 2      | Spiritual organization                    | 2710| 73.74|
| 3      | Intra / extra campus organization        | 2424| 65.96|
| 4      | Spiritual organization at campus         | 2240| 60.95|
| 5      | Religious mass organizations             | 1421| 38.67|
The table 6 shows the distribution of the characteristics of respondents as religious teachers in 34 provinces in Indonesia studied in 2018. Most respondents were religious teachers who had been active in “school spirituality organizations” which reached 2711 respondents (73.77%), then respondents who are currently religious teachers who at school/college were active in “Student Council” which reached as many as 2429 respondents (66.10%) while the fewest were respondents, who are currently religious teachers who are currently active in “community/mass organizations” which only reached 1427 respondents (38.83%).

**g. School type**

Based on the type of school, the respondents are distinguished from the Islamic senior high school (MA), public senior high school (SMA), and vocational senior high school (SMK). The distribution of respondents by the type of school looks like the table 7:

| Types of School                        | F    | %   |
|---------------------------------------|------|-----|
| Madrasah / Islamic senior high school | 1137 | 30.94 |
| SMA / Public senior high school       | 1433 | 38.99 |
| SMK / Vocational senior high school   | 1105 | 30.07 |
| Total                                 | 3675 | 100.00 |

The table 7 shows the distribution of characteristics of respondents as religious teachers in 34 provinces in Indonesia studied in 2018. The highest number of respondents were respondents who are currently teaching in senior high schools (SMA) which reached as many as 1433 respondents (38.99%), then respondents who are currently teaching in Islamic Senior High Schools (MA) which reached as many as 1137 respondents (30.94%). Whereas the least number were respondents from vocational senior high schools (SMK) which reaches the number of 1105 respondents (30.07%).

### 2. Level of Inclusivism of Religious Education Teachers

The following is data analysis result of religious teacher understanding that illustrates the inclusive level of the teachers. These include the views of religious teachers on the relationship between religion and state, relations among people from different religion, and the relations among people within the same religion, relationships among variables, and cluster analysis.

#### 2.1. The Views of Religious Education Teachers Understanding model on the relationship between religion and state (Y1)

Based on the results of descriptive calculations on the research data in 34 provinces in Indonesia, the results of Category Analysis for the dimensions of Religion and State Relations (Y1) is described by table 8.

**Table 8.** The result of descriptive analysis toward religion-state relation

The table 8 shows that most of the respondents are religious teachers who have a level of understanding of the relationship between religion and state (Y1) in the High Inclusive category. Seen from the table, 2911 respondents (79.21%) had a score on the level of understanding of the relationship between religion and state (Y1), in the middle inclusive category. And the remaining four respondents (0.11%) were in the low inclusive category.

Here is the result of the one t-test compare means, to find out that the total score of the dimensions of the religion and state relations variable has reached the Cut Off value, as a standard influence factor with the optimal category.
Table 9. The result of the One t-test compare means of Y1

| Variable                                                                 | Average Percentage of Real Samples | Hypothesis Average Percentage (µ0) | Decision | Cut Off |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------|---------|
| The relationship between religion and state (Y1)                         | 78.49 ± 12.51                    | 78.5                              | Significant | 75.00    |
| The relationship between religion and state (Y1) was 'good.'             | 79.0                              | Not significant                   |          |         |

From the table 9, we can see that the average total score of the dimensions of Religion and State Relations (Y1) of the 3675 respondents studied reached an average value of 78.49 with a standard deviation of 12.51, the total estimated score for the population or mean hypothesis (µ0) is significant at 78.5. Therefore, it can be concluded that “in the population of religious teachers throughout Indonesia, the total score of the dimensions of Religion and State Relations (Y1) is significant at 78.5”. This means that religious understanding on aspects of religious and state relations belongs to the category of Good (> 75.00).

Religious teachers in 34 provinces in Indonesia have an attitude which reflects the harmony between religious understanding and their acceptance of the unitary state of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI), or in accordance with the implementation of laws relating to religious concepts. Their attitude of acceptance almost reaches the maximum score.

As for the dominant factors that shape the dimensions of Religion and State Relations (Y1), testing is carried out using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). The results of model testing and estimation of Loading Estimation parameters (weight values) for model equations in factor analysis of indicators of Religion and Country Relationship Dimensions (Y1) using Lisrel software 8.72 can be seen in the conformity test table of the following models:

Table 10. The measurement result of Goodness of Fit for Equation Models Analysis of Confirmatory Factors Dimensions of Religion-State relations (Y1)

| Conformity Indices / index | Value | Information |
|---------------------------|-------|-------------|
| RMSEA                     | 0.077 | Model Approaching fit |

The results show that statistically, the model suitability test output shows that the model is close to Good Fit. This is indicated by the model suitability index value using RMSEA below 0.08. Thus it can be concluded that the suitability of the factor model, of the 14 indicators of the religion and state relations dimension (Y1) is approaching good or fit with the data. The results above show that all indicators in the dimensions of religion and country relations (Y1) are significant factors. The significance value of the lambda loading factor is called t-count > t-table (0.05; 8926) = 1.960 so that in the hypothesis test the decision of H0 is taken which means all indicators are significant factors forming the dimensions of religion and state relations (Y1).

Therefore, the strategy of increasing the understanding of religious teachers on Religion and State Relations (Y1) in 34 provinces in Indonesia is through improving the quality of all existing indicators by considering the priority scale of quality improvement indicators. The main priority for improving the quality of indicators that must be done is to improve the quality of the most dominant indicators because it has the...
highest average loading factor, namely “I agree with the democratic system applied in Indonesia” and “Leaders must be reminded to implement the religious law.”

2.2. The Views of Religious Education Teachers Understanding model on the Relationship among Religions (Y2)

Based on the results of a detailed calculation of the data in 34 provinces in Indonesia, the results of category analysis for the dimensions of religion external relations (Y2) that were obtained from all respondents (totaling 3675) religious teachers as follows.

Table 11. The result of descriptive analysis toward relation among religions

| Teachers view of The External - Religion relations (HEA) | f | %  |
|--------------------------------------------------------|---|----|
| High Inclusive                                         | 3242 | 88.22 |
| Middle Inclusive                                       | 433  | 11.78 |
| Low Inclusive                                          | 0    | 0.00 |
| Total                                                  | 3675 | 100.00 |

The table 11 is the result of a descriptive analysis of the dimensions of Religion External Relations/HAN (Y2) felt by respondents as religious teachers. The results of the analysis show that most of them are religious teachers who have a level of understanding of Religion External Relations (Y2) in the High Inclusive category. A number of 3242 respondents (88.22%) scored a dimension of religious understanding related to External Religion Relations (Y2) in the HIGH category. Other 433 respondents (11.78%) had scored on the level of understanding of Religious External Relations (Y2) in the MEDDLE INCLUSIVE category. Also, no one is included in the low inclusive category.

To present a comprehensive test of the dimensions of Religion External Relations (Y2) for all religious teachers in 34 provinces in Indonesia, an average Test 1 statistic was tested to determine whether the total score of the variable had reached the minimum set value (Cut Off) by the researcher as a standard of influence factors that fall into the category of optimal influence factors.

Table 12. The result of the One t-test compare means of Y2

| Variable                  | Average Percentage of Real Samples | Hypothesis Average Percentage (µ0) | Decision | Cut Off |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------|---------|
| External - Religion relations (Y2) | 77.16 12.66                | 77.5 | Significant | 75.00 |

The table 12 shows that the average score of the dimension of Religion External Relations (Y2) from 3675 respondents reached an average value of 77.16 with a standard deviation of 12.66, then the total estimated score for the population or mean hypothesis (µ0) it turns out that it is significant at 77.5. It is known to be insignificant. By lifting this significance (77.5) it can be concluded that “in the population of religious teachers throughout Indonesia, the total score of the dimension of Religion External Relations (Y2) is significant at 77.5, which means the attitude of religious teachers related to religious understanding on aspects of Religious External Relations included in the category of Good Fit (>75.00) “.

In other words, religious teachers in 34 provinces in Indonesia have attitudes that reflect the harmony between religious understanding and their acceptance of the people of other religions in Indonesia which are entirely in accordance with the understandability that every citizen should have. It can also be said to be in accordance with what is desired for the implementation of laws relating to religious concepts. So, their attitude of acceptance almost reaches the maximum score.

Almost the optimal dimensions of Religion External Relations certainly cannot be separated from the score of each measured research indicator. Therefore, it needs to be seen, which dimensions have high, medium, and low scores or maybe score very low. It also needs to be seen
which dimension is the dominant factor that forms
the dimension of Religion External Relations
(Y2), so that appropriate policy patterns can be
formulated in increasing this dimension in order
to reach the optimal category.

As for the dominant factors that shape the
dimensions of Religion External Relations (Y2),
testing is carried out using Confirmatory Factor
Analysis (CFA). The results of model testing and
estimation of Loading Estimation parameters
(weight values) for model equations in factor
analysis of indicators of Religion External
Relations (Y2), using Lisrel software 8.72 can be
seen in the conformity test table of the following
models:

![Figure 2](image-url)

Table 13. The measurement result of Goodness
of Fit For Equation Models Analysis of Confirmatory Factors Dimensions of External - Religion relations (Y2)

| Conformity Indices/ index | Value | Information |
|---------------------------|-------|-------------|
| RMSEA                     | 0.045 | Model Approaching fit |

The results show that statistically, the
suitability test output model shows that the
model is close to Good Fit. This is indicated by
the model suitability index value using RMSEA
below 0.08. Thus, it can be concluded that the
compatibility of the factor model, of the 12
indicators of the Religion External Relations
dimension (Y2) is close to good or fit with the data.
The above results show that all indicators on the
dimensions of Religion External Relations (Y2)
are significant factors. The significance value of
the lambda loading factor called t-count > t-table
(0.05; 8926) = 1.960 so that the hypothesis test
is taken Ho rejected which means all indicators
are significant forming the dimensions of religion external relations (Y2).

Therefore, the strategy of increasing the
understanding of religious teachers on the religion
eexternal relations (Y2) of religious teachers in 34
provinces in Indonesia, by improving the quality
of all existing indicators, by considering the
priority scale of quality improvement indicators.

The main priority for improving the quality of
the indicators that have the highest average factor
loading, namely the indicator “I agree to help the
affected person without distinguishing religion”
and “I feel sorry for followers of other religions
because they will not go to heaven.” These two
indicators are the most dominant factors to
improve the quality of the dimensions of the
Religion External Relations of religious teachers
in Indonesia.

2.3 The Views of Religious Education
Teachers Understanding Model on The
Internal Relations People within The Same
Religion (Y3)

Based on the results of detailed calculations
on the data of research in 34 provinces in
Indonesia, the results of category analysis for the
dimensions of the internal relations of religious
people/ relationship of the same religion within
(Y3) that were obtained from all respondents
totaling 3675) religious teachers as follows.

Table 14. The result of descriptive analysis
toward relation within religions (Y3)

| Teachers view of The Internal - Religion relations (Y3) | f   | %   |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|
| High Inclusive                                        | 2590| 70.48|
| Middle Inclusive                                      | 1039| 28.27|
| Low Inclusive                                          | 46  | 1.25 |
| Total                                                 | 3675| 100.00|

The table 14 shows that most of the total
respondents are religious teachers who have a
level of understanding of the internal relations of
religious people (Y3) in the high inclusive category.
Seen from the table, 2590 respondents (70.48%) had a score of the religious understanding of
dimensions related to the internal relations
of religious people (Y3) in the HIGH inclusive category. Another 1039 respondents (28.27%) have scores on the level of understanding of the internal relations of religious people (Y3), in the MIDDLE inclusive category. And the remaining 46 respondents (1.25%) were in the LOW inclusive category.

Here is below the result of the one t-test average assessment, to find out whether the total score of the dimensions of the internal relations of religious people has reached the Cut Off value, as a standard influence factor with the optimal category.

**Table 15.** The result of the One t-test compare means of Y3

| Variable | Average Percentage of Real Samples | Hypothesis Average Percentage (µ0) | Decision | Cut Off |
|----------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------|--------|
| Internal - Religion relations (Y3) | 74.01 | 74.5 | Significant | 75.00 |

The relationship of Internal people within religion (Y3) was ‘not-good.’

Table 15 shows the average total score of the dimensions of internal relations of religious people (Y3) of the 3675 respondents studied reached an average value of 74.01 with a standard deviation of 18.71, the total estimated score for the population or mean hypothesis (µ0) is significant at 74.5. Therefore, it can be concluded that “in the population of religious teachers throughout Indonesia, the total score of the dimensions of internal relations of religious people (Y3) is significant at 74.5”. This means that religious understanding on aspects of internal relations of religious people falls into the category of enough (> 75.00).

Religious teachers in 34 provinces in Indonesia have an attitude that did not reflect the harmony between religious understanding and their acceptance of the unitary state of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI), or in accordance with the implementation of laws relating to religious concepts. So, their attitude of acceptance reaches the average score.

As for the dominant factors that shape the dimensions of internal relations of religious people (Y3), testing is carried out using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). The results of model testing and estimation of Loading Estimation parameters (weight values) for model equations in factor analysis of indicators of internal relations of religious people Dimensions (Y3) using Lisrel software 8.72 can be seen in the conformity test table of the following models.

**Figure 3**

Path Diagram of Confirmatory Factor Analysis from Latent Variables of Internal Religion Relations (Y3)

![Path Diagram](image)

**Table 16.** The measurement result of Goodness of Fit For Equation Models Analysis of Confirmatory Factors Dimensions of The External - Religion relations (Y3)

| Conformity Indices / Index | Value | Information |
|---------------------------|-------|-------------|
| RMSEA                     | 0.078 | Model Approaching fit |

The results show that statistically, the model suitability test output shows that the model is close to Good Fit. This is indicated by the model suitability index value using RMSEA below 0.08. Thus it can be concluded that the suitability of the factor model, of the 18 indicators of the internal relations of religious people dimension (Y3) is approaching good or fit with the data. The results above show that all indicators in the dimensions of internal relations of religious people (Y3) are significant factors. The significance value of the lambda loading factor is called t-count > t-table (0.05; 8926) = 1.960 so that in the hypothesis test the decision of Ho is taken which means all indicators are significant factors forming
the dimensions of internal relations of religious people (Y3).

Therefore, the strategy of increasing the understanding of religious teachers on internal relations of religion (Y3) in 34 provinces in Indonesia is through improving the quality of all existing indicators, of course considering the priority scale of quality improvement indicators. The main priority for improving the quality of internal relations of religious people is to improve the quality of the most dominant indicators because it has the highest average loading factor, namely “expel other groups with different understandings or streams” and “to attend religious traditions that are different in understanding or different religious organizations.”

2.4. The Religious Teachers Understanding (Y)

This is reflecting the aggregate of religious teachers views toward the relationship of religion and state, the external relationship among religions, and the internal relations within religion.

Based on the results of descriptive calculations on the data of research in 34 provinces in Indonesia, the results of Category Analysis for The Religious Teachers Understanding (Y) that were obtained from all respondents (totaling 3675) religious teachers as follows:

Table 17. The result of descriptive analysis toward RUoRET (Y)

| Religious Teachers Understanding (Y) | J | % |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| High Inclusive                      | 2907 | 79.10 |
| Middle Inclusive                    | 767 | 20.87 |
| Low Inclusive                       | 1 | 0.3 |
| Total                               | 3675 | 100.00 |

Table 17 shows that most of the total respondents are religious teachers who have a level of religious understanding (Y) in the High Inclusive category. Seen from the table, 2907 respondents (79.10%) had a score of religious understanding in the HIGH inclusive category. Another 767 respondents (20.87%) have scored on the level of religious understanding in the MIDDLE inclusive category. And the remaining just one respondent (0.3%) was in the LOW inclusive category.

Here is the result of the one t-test average assessment, to find out whether the total score of The Religious Teachers Understanding (Y) has reached the Cut Off value, as a standard influence factor with the optimal category.

Table 18. The result of the One t-test compare means of Y

| Variable                        | Average Percentage of Real Samples | Hypothesis Average Percentage (µ0) | Decision | Cut Off |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------|---------|
| Religious Understanding (Y)     | 76.55                             | 76.5                               | Significant | 75.00 |
|                                 | 11.81                             | 77.0                               | Not significant |        |

From the table 18 we can see that the score of the Religious Teachers Understanding (Y) from 3675 respondents reached an average value of 76.55 with a standard deviation of 11.81, the total estimated score for the population or mean hypothesis (µ0) is significant at 76.5. Therefore, it can be concluded that “in the population of religious teachers throughout Indonesia, the total score of the Religious Teachers Understanding (Y) is significant at 76.5”. This means that religious understanding falls into the category of Good (> 75.00).

As for the dominant factors that shape the Religious Teachers Understanding (Y), from three dimensions (teachers understanding of the relationship between state and religion; external relationship among religions; and internal relationship within religion), testing is carried out using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). The results of model testing and estimation of Loading Estimation parameters (weight values) for model equations in factor analysis of indicators of Religious Teachers Understanding (Y) using Lisrel software 8.72 can be seen in the
Table 19. The measurement result of Goodness of Fit For Equation Models Analysis of Confirmatory Factors of Religious Understanding variable (Y)

| Conformity Indices / index | Value  | Information     |
|---------------------------|--------|----------------|
| RMSEA                     | 0.035  | Model Approaching fit |

The results show that statistically, the model suitability test output shows that the model is close to Good Fit. This is indicated by the model suitability index value using RMSEA below 0.08. According to Brown and Cudeck in Bachrudin (2002), it is stated if the statistical test criteria are met, indicating that the Good Fit measurement model. Thus, it can be concluded that the suitability of the factor model, of the three dimensions of the Religious Understanding variable (Y), is approaching good or fit with the data.

2.5. Clusters analysis

Based on the three dimensions of religious understanding of religious education teachers, namely understanding on the relationship between religion and state, on internal religion relations; and external religion relations, cluster analysis was carried out to see regional groupings of religious understanding and streams. as the results, the regions or provinces could be divided into three groups or clusters of religious understanding.

The first cluster is any provinces with a high level of inclusivism in all dimensions measured.

The second cluster is any provinces with a high level of inclusivism on the dimensions of understanding of relations among religions and relation within same religion, but on the low level of inclusivism in religious and state relations.

The third cluster is a province with a low level of inclusiveness in all dimensions measured.

The table 20 shows the clusters of the religious teacher’s inclusivism tendencies.
2.6. The Relationships Among Variables and Religious Understanding

The results testing and estimation of Loading Estimation parameters model (Gamma weight values) for the structural equations model of the influence of latent variable: Teacher Status, Subjects matter, Gender, Age, Last Education, Organizational, and School Types towards Religious Understanding of Religious Teachers in Indonesia using Lisrel software 8.72 can be seen in the path diagram and conformity test table of the following models.

Figure 5
Path Diagram of Structural Equation Model (SEM) on Effect of Teacher Status, Subjects, Gender, Age, Last Education, Organizational, and Type of School together toward Religious Understanding of Religious Teachers in Indonesia

The results show that statistically, the suitability test output model shows that the model is close to Good Fit. It is indicated by the model suitability index value using RMSEA which is close to 0.08. Thus it can be concluded that the compatibility of the influence of the structural equation model of the Latent Variable Estimation (Gamma weight value) for Teacher Status, Subjects, Gender, Age, Education, Organizational, and Type of School towards Religious Understanding of Religious Teachers in Indonesia are approaching well or fit with data.

Below will be described the relationship of the one by one variable among variables (X) with the religious understanding of religious teachers (Y).

• Relationship of Variable Teacher Status (X1) with Religious Understanding (Y)

From the figure 5 (five), it can be seen that there is a significant relationship between Teacher Status variables (X1) and the Variables of Religious Understanding (Y) in 34 Provinces in Indonesia with correlation values that are at the number 0.081 even though the category is very weak.

To see which categories that have more inclusive religious understandings, further testing of variations in religious understanding in each category of teacher status can be seen as follows.

Table 21. The Goodness of Fit Size of the Effect of Structural Equations Model

| Conformity Indices / index | Value | Information |
|---------------------------|-------|-------------|
| RMSEA                     | 0.065 | Model       |
|                           |       | Approaching fit |

• Relationship of Subject Variables (X2) with Religious Understanding (Y)

From Figure 5, it can be seen that there is a significant relationship between the Subjects
Lesson variable (X2) and the variables of Religious Understanding (Y) in 34 Provinces in Indonesia with a correlation value that is at the number 0.309 even though it is in the weak category.

To see which categories that have more inclusive religious understandings, further testing of variations in religious understanding in each subject category can be seen as follows.

**Figure 7**
The Diagram of the level of Religious Education Teacher Inclusiveness based on Subject Lesson

- **Relationship of Sex Variables (X3) with Religious Understanding (Y)**

  From the figure 5 (five), it can be seen that there is a significant relationship between Gender variables (X3) and variables of Religious Understanding (Y) in 34 Provinces in Indonesia with a correlation value that is at the number 0.087 even though the category is very weak.

  To see which categories have more inclusive religious values, further testing of variations in religious understanding in each sex category can be seen as follows.

**Figure 8**
The Diagram of the level of Religious Education Teacher Inclusiveness based on sex/gender

- **Relationship of Age Variables (X4) with Religious Understanding (Y)**

  From the figure 5 (**), it can be seen that there is a significant relationship between the Age variables (X4) and the variables of Religious Understanding (Y) in 34 Provinces in Indonesia with a correlation value that is at the number 0.135 even though the category is very weak.

  To see which categories have more inclusive religious understanding, further testing of variations in religious understanding in each age category can be seen as follows.

**Figure 9**
The Diagram of the level of Religious Education Teacher Inclusiveness based on Teachers’ ages

- **Relationship of the Educational Variables (X5) with Religious Understanding (Y)**

  From the figure 5, it can be seen that there is a non-significant relationship between the Educational variable (X5) and the variable Religious Understanding (Y) in 34 Provinces in Indonesia with a correlation value of 0.055 with a very weak category.

- **Relationship of Variable Participation on Intra / Extra School Organizations (X6) with Religious Understanding (Y)**

  From the figure 5 above, it can be seen that there is a non-significant relationship between the variables Active on Intra / Extra School Organization (X6) and the Variables of Religious Understanding (Y) in 34 Provinces in Indonesia with a correlation value of 0.085 with a very weak category.

- **Relationship of Variable Active on Organizational**
Organizational activist (X7-X10) with Religious Understanding (Y)

From the figure 5, it can be seen that there is a significant relationship and there is not significant among the Organizational activism variables (X7-X10) and the Variables of Religious Understanding (Y) in 34 Provinces in Indonesia with a correlation value of 0.074-0.092 even though the category is very weak.

To see which categories have more inclusive religious values, further testing of variations in religious understanding in each category of Active School Spiritual Organizations can be seen as follows.

**Figure 10**
The Diagram of the level of Religious Education Teacher Inclusiveness based on Variable Active on Organization.

**DISCUSSION**
The description of data explained above showed that the level of inclusivism of religious understanding of religious education teacher (RUoRET) in Indonesia in 2018 was good, namely on number 76.55. The score is above the cut off standard number namely 0.75. It means that the majority of religious education teacher in Indonesia was in inclusive attitude and view toward their religious understanding. The score of RUoRET was contributed by the score of three dimensions measured of Religious understanding. In the dimension of religious understanding toward the relationship of religion and state (Y1), the religious education teachers had scored on 78.49, which is higher than the cut off standard number. In the dimension of religious understanding toward the relationship of external - religions (Y2), the religious education teachers had scored on 77.16, which is higher than cut off standard number. In the dimension of religious understanding toward the relationship of internal - religion (Y3), the religious education teachers had scored on 74.01, which is lower than cut off standard number.

The scores above confirmed that it was the Y1 that gave a high positive contribution to RUoRET, and then the Y2. What many researchers had a concern about and worry of tolerance toward other religion was not proven by this research. This research even proved that religious education teacher had no problems with other religious people. Yet, the scores above still showed few respondents those had low inclusivism or had exclusive religious understanding. It means that the number of inclusive religious education teacher is more than the exclusive ones. And what the previous researcher warned about radicalism or intolerant in schools or at education institution may be concluded were originated from these fewer teachers.

However, this research denied what any previous research revealed about teachers intolerance, and teachers viewed toward Pancasila and state foundation. This research even supports and confirm what previous research result stated that more than eighty percent of teachers expressed support for Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution.

Meanwhile the third dimension of RUoRET namely teachers view toward internal relation within religion (Y3) gave negative contribution toward RUoRET score. This finding is rather disappointing, and newly revealed of the empirical facts. Why this could happen is interesting to be discussed. All this time, many researchers, government and social practitioner gave wide concern at interfaith conflict and dialogue, and less attention toward cooperation within the same religion. Both the government and non-government organization had many programs to arrange interfaith dialogue. By this finding, both government and non-government organization should have to develop and arrange
some program to re-build the harmony within religions.

Such inclusivism level of religious education teachers was influenced by some variables. The variables which contribute positive significant to RUoRET were: the teacher status (whether civil servant or not); Ages of teachers, Gender, Subject lesson; Type of schools; Experience at the spiritual organization while at a senior high school and university. In the context of teacher status, that the civil servant status was more inclusive than the non-civil servant, confirm the opinion that non-civil servant teachers had no standard competency such as civil servant teachers had in teaching religion subject at schools. Any non-civil servant religious education teachers did not meet education and training qualification. Government effort in increasing non-civil servant teacher competency met many problems such as lack of finance and the state budget.

Meanwhile, any variables were not contributing positively; those were: The last education experienced by teachers; teacher organizational experienced while in school and campuses; and teacher experienced as a member at the religious community organization. Those all variables could be understood as the major problems of teacher quality as a whole. So, it was clear, that the effort to increase high-level inclusivism of teachers especially religious education teachers should be arranged by increasing teacher quality and qualification. Besides, the process of recruitment must be professional based on a merit system to ensure the best candidate for religious education teachers.

In the context of a teacher experienced as a member at the religious community organization that gave a negative contribution to RUoRET, this could be viewed as the effect of organizational doctrines or such ideology thought by the organization to their members. As there were many religious-based organizations, many religious education teachers were lead to serve as an officers or active members in such an organization.

In the context of “The Trilogy Kerukunan” doctrines, there was a problem in the aspect of internal religious harmony. While on the aspects of the relationship of religion and state; and the relationship among different religions, it was even less problematic.

In the context of the region at where this research had taken on, 16 out of 34 provinces had significantly high inclusivism. These provinces were categorized in the green area of RUoRET. Meanwhile, 12 provinces are categorized in the yellow area of RUoRET, in which any of the dimension measured was significantly high inclusivism, and another one is significantly low inclusivism. The other six provinces, on the contrary, had significantly low inclusivism in all dimensions and categorized as the red area.

**CONCLUSION**

Returning to the question posed at the beginning of this study, it is now possible to state that generally, the religious understanding of religious education teacher (RUoRET) in Indonesia was at high-level inclusive category. Yet, there was middle-level inclusivism of religious understanding of religious education teacher in the context of internal religion relation.

The factors giving influence to the high level of inclusiveness of RUoRET were: the teacher status (whether civil servant or not); ages of teachers, gender, subject lesson; type of schools; experience at the spiritual organization while at a senior high school and university. Meanwhile, the factors that gave negative influence to the level of inclusiveness of RUoRET were: the last education experienced by teachers; teacher organizational experience while in school and campuses; and teacher experience as a member of religious community organization.

The findings of this study have a number of important implications for future practice. First, the government must take concern in managing internal religion organization or relation among religion-based organizations. Second, non-civil servant religious education teachers must be
well-managed in providing religious education services in schools, by fulfilling education standard competency and significant rewards.

Another possible area of future research would be to investigate why internal religion relation was worse than external religion relation. Is that caused by internal religion organizational problems, or caused by external variables such as social, economic and political variables.
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