

Permadi, A. S., Ismail, R., & Kasim, A. Bt. C. (2022). Content validity and exploratory factor analysis (EFA) on 26 items of the interreligious harmony scale. *Indigenous: Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi*, 7(1), 15-27. doi: <http://doi.org/10.23917/indigenous.v7i1.16744>

Content Validity and Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) on 26 Items of The Interreligious Harmony Scale

Aad Satria Permadi¹, Rozmi Ismail², Arena Bt. Che Kasim³

Fakulti Sains Sosial dan Kemanusiaan, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia^{1,2,3}

Submitted: 19 December 2021

Accepted: 4 January 2022

Published: 31 March 2022

Abstract. *A qualitative study in Waingapu revealed five factors that form interreligious harmony: belief in one ancestor, religious dogma, respect, perception of interreligious incidents, and internal attribution. This study aimed to test the content validity and EFA of 26 items compiled based on these five factors. Content validity was carried out by querying an assessment from 18 raters using the Aiken's V formula. Five hundred fourteen respondents fill out the scale of interreligious harmony. The data from 514 respondents were then processed with the JASP for Windows 10 program. All items obtained Aiken's V values >0.65. The Aiken's V value means that the items are valid in terms of their content. Overall MSA value was 0.610, and Bartlett's test p-value was <0.001. The EFA calculation result in seven items that were aggregated in two factors with a loading factor was >0.4. The EFA calculation shows that the seven items that constructed these two factors are valid for measuring the theoretical construct of Interreligious Harmony. The difference between theoretical factors and those formed after EFA is also discussed in this article as well.*

Keywords: *content validity; confirmatory factor analysis; interreligious harmony.*

INTRODUCTION

The third millennium is the century of cooperation (Toffler, 1980). Human beings switch from ways of competition and conflict towards ways of peace and harmony to survive (Ancok, 2005). Human harmony is interreligious harmony. Data in 2012 show that 83.7% of people on earth adhere to a particular religion (Hackett & Grim, 2012). In 2020, most of the people on earth remain religious, reaching approximately 76.58% (Obateru, 2020). Thus, if religious adherents live in harmony, the world will be at peace. Awareness of the importance of interreligious harmony is marked by the holding of an annual event called World Interfaith Harmony Week (WIHW) by the United Nations (UN) (United Nations, 2021). In addition, the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) sponsors peace education in countries prone to interreligious conflict (Lauritzen, 2016).

Interreligious harmony is oftentimes used as a tool of state control over its people (Neo, 2019). Therefore, several countries create political policies to develop interreligious harmony. Some instances of countries that can manage interreligious harmony politically are Russia (Lisovskaya,

*Corresponding author: aad.satria@ums.ac.id

2016), Bosnia-Herzegovina (Lovrić, 2017), and Singapore (Tan, 2008). These three countries organize interreligious harmony in their countries through education politics. Russia applies state ideology as the basis for interreligious harmony. Meanwhile, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Singapore educate their people to have the values of tolerance and good citizenship. The world community also takes part in fostering interreligious harmony. Some cases of world communities that develop interreligious harmony are the people of India (Hossain, 2018), Kazakhstan (Shabdenova & Alimbekova, 2019), and Thailand (Li & Xu, 2021). Communities in those three countries foster interreligious harmony through common traditions and cultural contacts.

In Indonesia, social harmony exists in the state philosophy, namely *Bhineka Tunggal Ika* (Susilo, 2020). If translated, the meaning of *Bhineka Tunggal Ika* is Unity in Diversity. In the context of interreligious harmony, *Bhineka Tunggal Ika* implies every religious adherent in Indonesia must tolerate, respect, and cooperate (Anshory, 2008; Sila & Fakhruddin, 2020). Indonesian people have been in coexistence such as, the life of the Javanese, the largest tribe in Indonesia. Javanese people make harmony as a philosophy of life and the virtue of daily behavior. Javanese people believe that social life will be compatible if every human respects and restrains each other (Huda, 2017; Suseno, 1991). The International Freedom Report reports that Indonesia is a country that has laid the foundation for interreligious harmony in its country through the 1945 Constitution article 29 paragraph 2 (Ismail, 2014). The 1945 Constitution article 29 paragraph 2 was then translated into Law (UU) number 39 of 1999 on Human Rights (HAM) articles 4 and 22. There is also Law number 13 of 2002 on Manpower articles 80 and 185, as well as the Book of Article 175 of the Criminal Code (KUHP) (Tim Legality, 2018).

Countries and the world community are trying to create interreligious harmony. However, these efforts have not been supported by sufficient scientific work. Researches on interreligious harmony are still very limited compared to studies on interreligious conflicts. Based on a search of Scopus indexed journals with TITLE-ABS-KEY ("religious harmony"), 104 articles were found. Meanwhile, when using TITLE-ABS-KEY ("religious conflict"), 1,086 articles were detected. Once TITLE-ABS-KEY was changed to "interreligious harmony" and "interreligious conflict," then comparing articles between the two is 20 versus 41 articles.

The contribution of psychological research in the scope of interreligious harmony remains microscopic. According to a search for Scopus indexed journals with TITLE-ABS-KEY ("religious harmony"), only two psychological articles discuss the interreligious harmony theme. While the social sciences contributed 73 articles, Arts and Humanities yielded 43 articles, and Business, Management, and Accounting obtained eight articles. Furthermore, suppose use TITLE-ABS-KEY ("interreligious harmony," psychology only contributed one article. Thus, scientific psychology articles that discuss the theme of interreligious harmony are based on the TITLE-ABS-KEY formula "religious harmony" and "interreligious harmony", which procured three articles.

The three articles comprise: The client's perspectives on therapists who build a family and personal harmony (Yap-Tan & Foo, 2020), The relationship between parental religiosity and mental health of pre-adolescents in a community sample: TRAILS study (van der jagt-jelsma et al., 2011), and Respect, internal attribution, and CORFing as Muslims' cultural, psychological strategies in fostering interreligious harmony in Waingapu (Permadi et al., 2020). The difference between the three articles is in their social context. The social context of harmony in the first article (Yap-Tan & Foo, 2020) is intrapersonal. In the second article (van der jagt-jelsma et al., 2011), it is clear that the social context is interpersonal. Simultaneously, the third article (Permadi et al., 2020) presents the intergroup context.

This study aims to develop a scale of interreligious harmony derived from empirical research

on psychology in Indonesia. There are two reasons why developing the scale of interreligious harmony based on Indonesian psychological phenomena is significant. First, the behavior of Indonesians is related to the Indonesian culture (Hofstede et al., 2010). If an instrument is developed based on theories outside Indonesian culture, then the instrument cannot fully describe the behavior of Indonesians. This misguided phenomenon continues to occur in the psychology setting (Shweder, 1991). Second, the current trend of developing psychological theories and instruments is psychology adapted to respective place's cultural conditions (Lawson et al., 2017). Many countries have begun to develop instruments of interreligious harmony based on local culture. One example is the Religious Harmony Index in Malaysia (Abdullah et al., 2016). The religious harmony index refers to local qualitative aspects of Malaysia, which are then developed into a measuring tool.

So far, the scale of interreligious harmony used as a reference in Indonesia does not come from empirical research and scope of psychology. For example, the book entitled *Index Kerukunan Umat Beragama 2019* (Sila & Fakhrudin, 2020) was sponsored by the Indonesian Ministry of Religious Affairs. In the book, three indicators of religious harmony are listed: Tolerance, Equality, and Cooperation. These indicators were developed based on the Joint Regulation of the Minister of Religious Affairs and the Minister of Home Affairs Number 9 of 2006. However, the formulation of the indicators for religious harmony is not departed from empirical psychological research but on experts' opinions in their books. An example of a book used as the main reference in the *Index Kerukunan Umat Beragama 2019* is *Agama dan Pembangunan di Indonesia* (Ali, 1975). However, professor Mukti Ali is prominent as a scholar who bases his thoughts on Islamic theology *Rahmatan lil 'Alamin* (Rambe, 2020).

Another example is the index of interreligious harmony in South Konawe, which uses the theory of Walzer and Diana L. Eck (Saprillah, 2016). The aspects of the measuring instrument are social relations, religious relations, social values, social locus, and government support. These five aspects are not psychological and are not aspects derived from Indonesian culture. Walzer and Diana L. Eck are scientists whose background is non-psychological. Walzer is a political scientist (American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 2021), while Diana L. Eck is in religious studies (Kahn, 2011). The theories of these two figures also have nothing to do with the context of Indonesian society.

Therefore, we applied the empirical findings in the article Respect, internal attribution, and CORFing as Muslims' cultural, psychological strategies in fostering interreligious harmony in Waingapu (Permadi et al., 2020) to create a psychological scale construct of interreligious harmony. Five factors form interreligious harmony (Permadi et al., 2020): Belief in One Ancestor (BOA), Religious Dogma (RD), Respect (Re), Perception of Interreligious Incident (PII), and Internal Attribution (IA). These five attributes emerged from empirical data which were analyzed using qualitative methods. We want to investigate whether the items and constructs of these factors are valid or otherwise, using content validity and exploratory factor analysis (EFA) approaches.

METHOD

Stage 1: Creating the Scale Items

We compiled the scale items based on five factors and indicators of interreligious harmony (Permadi et al., 2020), namely BOA, RD, Re, PII, and IA. There were 26 scale items formed based on the five factors of interreligious harmony.

Table 1.
 Items on The Scale of Interreligious Harmony

Factors	Indicators	Items
BOA	Sense of brotherhood	I feel connected to people of different religions (i8)
		I get annoyed with people of different religions (i9)
	Sense of common ancestor	I feel that all religious people come from common ancestor (i13)
		I feel that I come from an ancestor who is of a higher rank than people of different religions (i4)
		I can understand why friends from different religions don't wish me religious holiday (i5)
		I'm offended if friends from different religions don't wish me religious holiday (i6)
RD	Does not demand respect for other religious people	I believe that God commands respect for the celebration of other religious holidays (i7)
		I feel guilty if I interfere with the celebration of other people's religious holidays (i1)
	Respect other religious holidays Do good/help other religious people who are in trouble	I believe that God commands to help those in trouble, even though they come from different religions (i2)
		I believe I will be rewarded by God if I help those in trouble even though they come from different religions (i10)
Re	Remind time of worship	I feel the need to remind my friends from different religions to perform their worship (i11)
	Repaying the help of people of different religions	I feel that reminding my friends from different religions to perform their worship is a loss (i12)
	Special treatment for people of different religions	I will repay the kindness to people of different religions who have helped me (i23)
		I feel the need to do good to people of different religions who have helped me (i14)
		In my opinion, every religious person does not need to be treated specially (i15)
I understand that in a certain religion, animals must be slaughtered by their own group (i16)		
PII	Regarding interreligious conflicts as the act of agent provocateurs	I believe that interreligious conflicts are the work of agent provocateurs (i17)
	Assuming that interreligious conflicts are caused by misunderstandings	I feel that interreligious conflicts are caused by jealousy between them (i24)
	Regarding interreligious conflict as a political conspiracy	I believe that interreligious conflicts are caused by misunderstandings (i19)
		I believe that interreligious conflicts are caused by the intention of each religious group to hurt each other (i20)
		I'm sure it is the politicians who pit religious people against each other, therefore they hate each other (i21)
I believe religious people will always be in conflict because of their own actions (i25)		
IA	Weak religious education in the internal family	I believe that people who change religion are caused by the weak religious formation in their families (i3)
	Individual freedom to choose religion	I consider everyone is free to change religion (i18)

Factors	Indicators	Items
IA		I believe that other religious groups influenced my friend so that he converted (i22) I think that everyone should not change their religion arbitrarily (i26)

Stage 2: Expert Judgment

This stage is the content validity stage. The content validity process is assessed by experts (raters), whether the statements of the scale items are appropriate (rational) with the factors or otherwise (Azwar, 2017). The raters assigned a value to each item in the range of 1 (very inappropriate) to 5 (very appropriate). We asked 18 raters to rate the 26 items on the interreligious harmony scale. The qualifications of the raters are as follows: nine raters have master's degrees in psychology, four are Ph.D. (Cand.) of Psychology, four are Doctor of Psychology, and one is Professor in psychology.

One way to calculate content validity is to use Aiken's V formula (Azwar, 2011). Aiken's V formula (Figure 1) facilitate the calculation of the content-validity coefficient based on the results of the item rating. The assessment context is the extent to which the item represents the construct being measured (Aiken, 1985).

$$V = \frac{\sum s}{[n(c-1)]}$$

Figure 1.
 Aiken's formula

Note. $s = r - lo$, lo = the lowest score of validity (eg 1), c = the highest validity rating score (e.g. 5), r = number given by rater, n = number of raters

Stage 3: Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

EFA is one of the scale contract validity tests. EFA is used to see on how scale items can measure existing theoretical constructs (Norris & Lecavalier, 2010). The EFA validity test is used because the theoretical contract does not have a solid theoretical form (Finch & West, 1997). For example, the theoretical construct of interreligious harmony (Permadi et al., 2020) is not yet robust because it is generated from qualitative analysis solely. Therefore, there needs to be an EFA construct validity test to find if the scale items can measure the construct and see how the theoretical construct looks like concomitantly.

At this stage, the items will be collected according to the strength of their correlation. This set of strongly correlated items is called the factors that make up the construct of the measuring instrument (Norris & Lecavalier, 2010).

We took data from 514 subjects using the cluster-purposive sampling method in Waingapu and manually gave the scale to domiciled people with a Waingapu Identity Card (KTP). Data collection clusters are villages in Waingapu. There are seven sub-districts in Waingapu (Statistics Indonesia of East Sumba Regency, 2018) included in the research cluster: Kamalaputi (91 subjects), Matawai (62 subjects), Hambala (104 subjects), Kambajawa (167 subjects), Mbatakapidu (31 subjects), Pambotanjara (50 subjects), and Lukukamaru (9 subjects).

The scale model administered a Likert scale with five answer options (Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree). The favorable items are worth 5-4-3-2-1, while the

unfavorable items are in the order of 1-2-3-4-5.

EFA analysis was carried out using JASP 0.13.1.0 software for windows. The standard loading factor used is 0.4. Thus, items with a minimum loading factor of 0.4 are eligible to be maintained (Stevens, 1999). If the overall MSA Keiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Barlett's test used is above 0.5 and $p < 0.05$, then the analysis can proceed to the EFA stage (Ghozali, 2009).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of calculating the validity of items using Aiken's V formula show that all items have a V value >0.65 . If the value of V >0.65 and the number of raters yields 18 people, the item is declared valid (Aiken, 1985). Thus, all items on the Harmony among Religious People scale are valid in respect to a content validity approach.

Table 2.
Aiken's V score on interreligious harmony items

Items (A)	Aiken's V (A)	Items (B)	Aiken's V (B)
i1	0.889	i14	0.875
i2	0.806	i15	0.903
i3	0.847	i16	0.889
i4	0.833	i17	0.736
i5	0.903	i18	0.917
i6	0.806	i19	0.778
i7	0.861	i20	0.861
i8	0.931	i21	0.778
i9	0.958	i22	0.833
i10	0.931	i23	0.778
i11	0.833	i24	0.903
i12	0.819	i25	0.792
i13	0.833	i26	0.889

From the results of the KMO calculation, it was found that the overall MSA value was 0.610 (KMO >0.5), and the Bartlette test value was 0.001 ($p < 0.05$). Therefore, the calculation proceeded to investigate the grouping of items that make up the theoretical factors.

Table 3.
KMO value output in JASP

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test	
Items	MSA
Overall MSA	0.610
i1	0.507
i2	0.516
i3	0.554
i4	0.506
i5	0.513
i6	0.338

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test	
Items	MSA
i7	0.680
i8	0.783
i9	0.731
i10	0.752
i11	0.640
i12	0.486
i13	0.707
i14	0.708
i15	0.538
i16	0.647
i17	0.707
i18	0.391
i19	0.674
i20	0.384
i21	0.569
i22	0.396
i23	0.459
i24	0.514
i25	0.405
i26	0.469

Table 4.
 Bartlett's test value output in JASP software

Bartlett's test		
X ²	df	p
1382.261	325.000	< 0.001

By using standard Eigenvalues 1, five factors represented variables. However, there were only two factors with Eigenvalues >1. Therefore, Factor 1 and Factor 2 could explain the variance of 29.3% and 21.3%. Thus, the ability of these two factors to explain the variance was 50.6%.

Table 5.
 Total variance explained output of JASP

Factor Characteristics				
Factors	SumSq.	Loadings	Proportion var.	Cumulative
1	1.415		0.293	0.293
2	1.065		0.213	0.506
3	0.903		0.181	0.687
4	0.855		0.171	0.858
5	0.710		0.142	1.000

Based on the loading factor, the items formed two groups (factors). The first factor consisted of 8, 9, 13, and 14. At the same time, the second factor comprised items numbers 3, 18, and 22.

Thus, 19 items could not be maintained because of smaller loading factor, which was less than 0.4.

Table 6.
 Output loading factor items in JASP

Items	Factor 1	Factor 2	Uniqueness
i1			0.980
i2			0.943
i3		-0.512	0.737
i4			0.999
i5			0.995
i6			0.991
i7			0.929
i8	0.521		0.728
i9	0.443		0.804
i10			0.912
i11			0.936
i12			0.986
i13	0.795		0.367
i14	0.711		0.495
i15			0.996
i16			0.973
i17			0.824
i18		0.433	0.813
i19			0.827
i20			0.935
i21			0.991
i22		0.475	0.773
i23			1.000
i24			0.997
i25			0.999
i26			0.995

Based on Table 6, the scale items can be grouped as presented on Table 7.

Table 7.
 Grouping of items based on the factor

Factors	Items
1	I feel connected to people of different religions (i8) I get annoyed with people of different religions (i9) I feel that all religious people come from the common ancestor (i13) I feel the need to do good to people of different religions who have helped me (i14)
2	I believe that people who change religion are caused by the weak religious formation in their families (i3) I consider everyone is free to change religion (i18) I believe that other religious groups influenced my friend so that he converted (i22)

The next EFA stage is to name the two factors in Table 3. The items grouped in Factor 1 are items 8, 9, 13, and 14. Items 8, 9, and 13 were taken from the qualitative theoretical construct of the BOA while item 14 came from Re. The items grouped in Factor 2 were collectively derived from IA.

In the theoretical construct of interreligious harmony (Permadi et al., 2020), BOA is an aspect that affects Re and PII aspects. Religious groups in Waingapu have mutual respect because, from the beginning, they perceived other groups as descended from the common ancestor. The Waingapu see view the identity of their ancestors as a unifying identity. The closeness of interaction between individuals due to the perception of similarity in identity is known as social cohesion (Fonseca et al., 2019). Social cohesion was found in item 13. The identity of common ancestor becomes the highest identity and unites all religious groups.

Item 8 emphasizes the emotional domain that causes individuals to feel connected to those of different religions. For example, a sense of brotherhood is a positive affective tone that is a well-known emotional cohesion phenomenon (Forsyth, 2012). On the contrary, item 9 implies the impression that the individual feels a negative affective tone so that he feels disturbed when he is around people of different religions.

In item 14, individual feels the need to repay others in order to maintain harmony between them. There are actions, in which individuals show their interactions with followers of other religions. The strength of this positive action-based interaction is referred to as task cohesion (Huang et al., 2019).

Item 3 has a negative direction due to a technical error in placing the favorable and unfavorable criteria. Item 3 should be unfavorable, but there was a technical error, so it is included in the favorable criteria. Item 3 joins the Internal Attribution group of items whose nuances refer to personal responsibility. The statements in item 3 do not refer to individual responsibility but groups that are not specified as ingroups or outgroups. Therefore, item 3 should be unfavorable.

Based on the above analysis, we determine that Factor 1 is named “cohesion.” However, factor 2 is called “internal attribution” since all items come from the corresponding theoretical construct.

Table 8.
Grouping of items on “cohesion” and “internal attribution” factors

Factors	Items
Cohesion	I feel connected to people of different religions (i8)
	I get annoyed with people of different religions (i9)
	I feel that all religious people come from the common ancestor (i13)
	I feel the need to do good to people of different religions who have helped me (i14)
Internal Attribution	I believe that people who change religion are caused by the weak religious formation in their families (i3)
	I consider everyone is free to change religion (i18)
	I believe that other religious groups influenced my friend so that he converted (i22)

The only theoretical construct aspects whose all items cannot measure the theoretical construct are RD and PII. All items in the RD and PII obtained a loading factor smaller than 0.4. RD religious values are what underlie the behavior of interreligious harmony in Waingapu. Research respondents conveyed these religious values from religious leaders (Permadi et al., 2020). Meanwhile, religious values, which verbatim are the arguments of the holy book, are not realized by

ordinary people who are the subject of research. People do not understand the scriptures. They are only aware of their thoughts, feelings, and behavior. However, the behavior of the Waingapu people is following the postulates of the scriptures that support interreligious harmony. When the research subjects filled out the scale of interreligious harmony, they did not perceive religious propositions as a factor influencing their behavior. Hence, the items in religious dogma earned a loading factor less than 0.4.

Waingapu is an area where there has been no conflict between religious communities for more than a century. The only incident that almost became an interreligious conflict occurred in 1997 in Kambera District. Religious leaders resolved the interreligious incident in 1997 shortly. Only a part of the Kambera community experienced this incident, so the majority of the subjects had no experience in encountering the interreligious incident. The loading factor of PII items was <0.4 because the items were arranged based on specific events in 1997, which most Waingapu people did not suffer from.

The weakness in this research is that the sampling only included the criteria for residence as a cluster. Simultaneously, the external validity will be more substantial if the sampling considers other criteria such as religion, gender, and education level in each cluster.

In the future, further research is encouraged to test the validity of the construct using the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) approach. CFA will uncover how well the cohesion and internal attribution factors can represent the variable of Interreligious Harmony. The CFA test should be conducted in two places: Waingapu and other parts of Indonesia with different cultural dimensions. The goal is that the CFA test can discover whether the Cohesion and Internal Attribution factors are cultural-free or cultural-bound.

CONCLUSION

Thus, it can be determined that the 26 items on the Interreligious Harmony scale are valid in respect to content. However, at the EFA stage, there are only seven items that can make up theoretical factors. The seven theoretical factors form two theoretical factors on the interreligious harmony scale: Cohesion and Internal Attribution.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, M. R. T. L., Al-Amin, M. N., Yusoff, A., Baharuddin, A., Khir, F. A., & Talib, A. T. (2016). Socio-religious harmony index instrument indicators for Malaysia. *Journal of Al-Tamaddun*, 11(2), 29–44. <https://doi.org/10.22452/jat.vol11no2.3>
- Aiken, L. R. (1985). Three coefficients for analyzing the reliability and validity of ratings. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 45(1), 131–142. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0013164485451012>
- Ali, A. M. (1975). *Agama dan pembangunan di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Biro hukum dan humas departemen agama.
- American Academy of Arts and Sciences. (2021). Michael Laban Walzer. *amacad.org*. Retrieved from <https://www.amacad.org/person/michael-laban-walzer>

- Ancok, D. (2005). *Psikologi terapan: Mengupas dinamika kehidupan umat manusia*. Yogyakarta: Darussalam.
- Anshory, N. (2008). *Dekonstruksi kekuasaan: Konsolidasi semangat kebangsaan*. Yogyakarta: LKiS.
- Azwar, S. (2011). *Reliabilitas dan validitas*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Azwar, S. (2017). *Penyusunan skala psikologi*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Sumba Timur. (2018). Kota Waingapu dalam angka 2018. *Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Sumba Timur*. Retrieved from <https://sumbatimurkab.bps.go.id/publication/2018/09/26/42276403cdff9e99cf03714b/kecamatan-kota-waingapu-dalam-angka-2018.html>
- Finch, J. F., & West, S. G. (1997). The investigation of personality structure: Statistical models. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 31(4), 439–485. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.1997.2194>
- Fonseca, X., Lukosch, S., & Brazier, F. (2019). Social cohesion revisited: A new definition and how to characterize it. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 32(2), 231–253. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13511610.2018.1497480>
- Forsyth, D. R. (2012). *Group dynamics* (5th ed.). Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Ghozali, I. (2009). *Aplikasi analisis multivariate dengan program spss*. Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
- Hackett, C., & Grim, B. J. (2012). The global religious landscape. *Pew Research Center Report*. Retrieved from <https://www.pewforum.org/2012/12/18/global-religious-landscape-exec/>
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J. & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hossain, M. I. (2018). Interfaith in India among Muslim and Hindu. *Studies in Interreligious Studies*, 28(2), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.2143/SID.28.2.3285636>
- Huang, F., Wang, C., Shi, K., Halike, A., & Li, L. (2019). Do more contacts bring stronger contact intention? It depends on valence and efficacy. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*, 51(11), 1256–1269. <https://doi.org/10.3724/SP.J.1041.2019.01256>
- Huda, D. (2017). Peran budaya masyarakat Islam Jawa terhadap kerukunan umat beragama. *Asketik*, 1(2), 45–55. Retrieved from <https://ojs.iainkediri.ac.id/index.php/asketik/article/download/523/337>
- Ismail, F. (2014). *Dinamika kerukunan antar umat beragama : Konflik, rekonsiliasi, dan harmoni*. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Kahn, M. (2011). Ten questions with Diana L. Eck. *The megazine of Harvard Crimson*. Retrieved from <https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2011/12/1/diana-eck-interview/>
- Lauritzen, S. M. (2016). Building peace through education in a post-conflict environment: A case study exploring perceptions of best practices. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 51, 77–83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2016.09.001>

- Lawson, R. B., Anderson, E. D., & Cepeda-Benito, A. (2017). *A history of psychology*. New York: Routledge.
- Li, S., & Xu, S. (2021). Study on christian belief and cultural exchange of chinese in northern Thailand: The case of the Manchu Village of Chiang Rai. *International Journal of Sino-Western Studies*, 20, 121–131. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12424/4047961>
- Lisovskaya, E. (2016). Religious education in Russia: Inter-faith harmony or neo-imperial toleration? *Social Inclusion*, 4(2), 117–132. <https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v4i2.509>
- Lovrić, I. (2017). How the Catholic schools in Bosnia and Herzegovina are helping to build inter-faith harmony and understanding after years of conflict. *International Studies in Catholic Education*, 9(2), 192–205. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19422539.2017.1360611>
- Neo, J. L. (2019). Dimensions of religious harmony as constitutional practice: Beyond state control. *German Law Journal*, 20, 966–985. <https://doi.org/10.1017/glj.2019.78>
- Norris, M., & Lecavalier, L. (2010). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in developmental disability psychological research. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 40(1), 8–20. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-009-0816-2>
- Obateru, A. (2020). Most dominant religions around the world. *Arcgis*. Retrieved from <https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/688a45e4908748d8b3a894d3d6b30dcc>
- Permadi, A. S., Ismail, R., & Kasim, A. B. C. (2020). Respect, internal attribution, and corfing as muslims' cultural-psychological strategies in fostering interreligious harmony in Waingapu. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, 24(1), 1468–1486. <https://doi.org/10.37200/IJPR/V24I1/PR200245>
- Rambe, T. (2020). Mukti Ali's contributions to interreligious harmony in Indonesia. *al-Lubb: Journal of Islamic Thought and Muslim Culture*, 2(1), 34–47. Retrieved from <http://jurnal.uinsu.ac.id/index.php/lubb/article/view/8588>
- Saprillah, S. (2016). Mengukur indeks kerukunan antar umat beragama di kabupaten Konawe Selatan. *Al-Qalam*, 20(2), 269-280. <https://doi.org/10.31969/alq.v20i2.196>
- Shabdenova, A. B., & Alimbekova, G. T. (2019). Religious harmony and tolerance of the urban residents of Kazakhstan: Result of sociological result. *Rudn Journal of Sociology*, 19(2), 302–312. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2272-2019-19-2-302-312>
- Shweder, R. A. (1991). *Thinking through culture*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Sila, M. A., & Fakhruddin. (2020). Indeks kerukunan umat beragama 2019. *Badan Litbang dan Diklat Kementerian Agama RI*. Retrieved from https://simlitbangdiklat.kemenag.go.id/simlitbang/spdata/upload/dokumen-penelitian/1586237704Exsum_Penelitian_KUB_2019.pdf
- Stevens, J. (1999). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (3rd ed.). United States: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Suseno, F. M. (1991). *Etika Jawa*. Jakarta: Gramedia.

-
- Susilo, T. H. (2020). *Pengantah falsafah bhineka tunggal ika*. Bogor: Halaman Moeka Publishing.
- Tan, C. (2008). Creating “good citizens” and maintaining religious harmony in Singapore. *British Journal of Religious Education*, 30(2), 133–142. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01416200701830921>
- Tim Legality. (2018). *KUHP & KUHPA*. Yogyakarta: Anak Hebat Indonesia.
- Toffler, A. (1980). *The third wave*. New York: Bantam Book.
- United Nation. (2021). World inter-faith harmony week 1-7 february. *United Nation*. Retrieved from <https://worldinterfaithharmonyweek.com/>
- van der jagt-jelsma, W., De Vries-Schot, M., De Jong, R., Verhulst, F. C., Ormel, J., Veenstra, R., Swinkels, S., & Buitelaar, J. (2011). The relationship between parental religiosity and mental health of pre-adolescents in a community sample: The trails study. *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 20(5), 253–260. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-011-0171-7>
- Yap-Tan, P. M. E. H., & Foo, M. T. S. (2020). Clients’ perspectives on therapists who build family and personal harmony. *Journal of Family Therapy*, 42(2), 271–290. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6427.12265>