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Abstract
Religious intolerance is spreading within the Indonesian institution of education. Previous studies have shown that the growth of intolerance is due to the state’s regulation and pedagogical apparatus. In contrast to the previous studies, I argue that the intolerance is related to a hidden curriculum applied by the institution of education. Normatively, the hidden curriculum contains the value of religious tolerance. However, factually, I found evidence of practices of intolerance, through both the formal and informal spheres within the school structure, in a hidden curriculum. This article is written based on a qualitative approach with a mixed-method research strategy to analyze data collected from students, teachers, and alumni through field observation, in-depth interviews, and surveys.
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INTRODUCTION

Recent studies have shown the rise of religious violence in Indonesia. In 2014, there were 158 cases of religious rights violations effectually caused by both state and non-state actors. And it seems that religious intolerance is also strengthened from within Indonesia’s educational institutions. A study conducted by the Institute of Peace and Islamic
Studies (Lembaga Kajian Islam dan Perdamaian) in major urban cities (Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, Bekasi) discovered that almost 50% of 993 students agree to do violence under the name of religion. Damaging and closing places of worship is one such example. These findings imply that a model of holistic tolerance education urgently needs to be discussed (INFID 2013; Komnas HAM 2015; Maarif, Geovanie, and Sukma 2013:7; Pew Research Center 2016; Wahid Institute 2014). Based on these findings, this article explores the role of the hidden curriculum in tolerance education with these questions: 1. How do public school students perceive the idea of religious tolerance? 2. How does the hidden curriculum socialize the idea of religious tolerance?

Religious intolerance is permitted by the state through the weak emphasis on tolerance education. According to Raihani (2017), this compromise for religious tolerance is related to the Islamization of the state and its educational institutions. In addition, several studies have argued that the state’s focus on tolerance education is quite benign; the state has only operated its educational purposes through formal school bureaucracy, but it has not fostered religious tolerance in the informal sphere, such as in school cultural environments and student communities. Without an inclusive atmosphere, I argue, tolerance education would just remain anomic (Basedau 2015; Bowen 2010; Hasyim 2015; Hoon 2016; Mashuri 2016; Schafer 2015; Ysseldyk 2011).

On the contrary, religious intolerance also falls under the responsibility of pedagogical apparatus. I found that cases of intolerance are not regulated through structural basis; however, they are directed through individual persons whom have obtained managerial and teaching positions. Actors who took managerial positions have the access and opportunity to frame social norms which may rely on or lean toward certain cultural values; in this case, Islamism. The teaching role, on the other hand, allows teachers to interpret, direct, and socialize the meaning of religious tolerance with the students in class. The school environment and the class have eventually become an ideological arena where different values contest with one another (Appleby 2000; Brosnan and Turner 2009; Dillon 2013:161; Ecklund 2017; Ecklund and Scheitle 2007; Ghosh 2010:28; Hefner 2009:77; Johnson et al. 2015; Keddie 2014; Laksana 2014; Lahouari 2009; Oppong 2013:14; Saroglou 2012).

I would like to argue that the practice of intolerance is related to a hidden curriculum. On a normative basis, studies propose that the hidden curriculum supports the value of religious tolerance through
school policy and managerial conduct. In reality, however, I discovered practices of intolerance among the networks of school components, including both formal and informal spheres (Azimpour and Khalilzade 2015; Bayanfar 2013; Mossop 2013). This article will explain the phenomenon of tolerance education as perceived by students and the degree of its practice within the hidden curriculum.

RESEARCH METHOD

This article is written based on a qualitative approach with a mixed-method research strategy, combining both qualitative and quantitative data for analysis (Creswell 2014). The analysis emphasizes the qualitative data (observation, document study, and in-depth interviews) on students’ opinions and the hidden curriculum. The quantitative data is used to describe the general pattern of students’ attitudes toward “Rights and Religious Freedom” (Suadey 2010:71). This survey measures the student attitudes on universal (global), macro (state and religious group relation), meso (interreligious community), and micro (personal attitude) levels of analysis (Dane 2007; Davis 2000; Doorn 2014; Golebiowska 2009; Rungson 2010).

This article is written based on my study in an Indonesian public school in Depok (Ritchie and Lewis 2003). There are several reasons why research should be conducted on a public institution such as this. First, education in public schools reflects the degree of state intervention in the socialization of religious tolerance. Second, that particular geographical region has shown signs of religious radicalism; thus, tolerance education is a relevant topic to be explored (INFID 2013; Komnas HAM 2015; SetaraF 2015; Wahid Institute 2014).

HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF TOLERANCE EDUCATION

To understand tolerance education, we should begin with the concept of multiculturalism. In the West, “multiculturalism” was coined by Kymlicka; it is understood as the idea which defines citizenship rights between different racial groups (Almagor 2000:89-107). However, as the topic further evolves in the Eastern hemisphere, Bowen (in Kymlicka 2005) has replied suggesting a different type of intercultural category. He argued that Indonesian pluralism cannot be narrowed into a single category because it includes the complexity of racial, cultural, and religious factors.
Furthermore, Ng and Bloemraad (2015) and Smith (2007) also stated that pluralism alone is insufficient for achieving social harmony. The state requires an ideological apparatus to orchestrate unity among differing social groups. In Indonesia, Pancasila is the ideological system which synergizes religious values and democracy; thus, it is the common ground which magnetizes different socio-religious groups into a single national community (Hefner 2009; Menchik 2014; Sadan 2015). And still, the same cornerstone which became the blueprint to construct the national identity has been resisted, reinterpreted, and exploited by intolerant groups in order to construct Islamism as an alternative ideology. Religious intolerance has become denser in the societal atmosphere as these groups showed hostility toward the ideas of tolerance and democracy and attempted to gain power through socio-political means and Islamism (Andersen and Fetner 2008; Hidayat 2012; Kauff 2013; Kanas 2015; Kymlicka 2012; Modood and Ahmad 2007; Mudhoffir 2014; Tadjoeddin 2016; Putra 2013:70; Widya 2010).

Indonesia’s citizenship education heavily relies on the state’s ideology (Pancasila) and national constitution (UUD 1945) (Ministry of Education and Culture 2012; Laksana 2014). However, if the state does not resolve the ideological tension, the same tension will be mirrored in its educational institutions; what happens in the state is applied in school. This statement is supported by various studies which discovered that the two opposing values of Islamism and Religious Tolerance were negotiated and even contested to achieve a more dominant position within the schools’ public sphere (Abdurakhman 2013:103; Goplen and Plant 2015; Hasan 2010; Khalikin 2012; Maarif 2013:7; Munip 2012; Rokhamad 2012). Unfortunately, the fragmentation caused by these conflicts of values eventually caused vulnerability among students, exposing them to the literal interpretation of religious text propagated by conservative groups (Almond 2010; Hunter 2012; Shoaib 2013; Rahman and Khamali 2013; Mink 2015; Vala and Lopes 2010).

THE HIDDEN CURRICULUM: THE MEANS FOR TOLERANCE EDUCATION

Religion describes a set of values embraced by a certain religious group (Berger 1967). David Little (in Fuad 2007:101) stated that religious tolerance is the forbearance of physical coercion or violence toward different religious groups. I would like to reinterpret the underlying meaning of
“tolerance” as an inclusive attitude toward the recognition of rights and religious freedom (Hanum 2013; Mirchandani and Tastsoglu 2000; Parillo in Mather and Tranby 2014).

Bretherton (2004) explained that there are three basic points on the literal meaning of tolerance: 1. a disagreement toward the value and its religious activities; 2. disapproval of the use of coercion or violence toward religious activities; 3. the issue of tolerance should be relevant for the subject; if the subject is not interested or the idea of an interreligious relationship is not relevant to him/her, we cannot say that the subject is tolerant or intolerant. As a deeper meaning, Bretherton argued that the “more ideal” form of tolerance should come with the individuals’ willingness to accept and live in a plural society. Tolerance is no longer a passive attitude for forbearing coercion, but it is also an active attitude for fostering mutual respect.

Tolerance education is a crucial element and is required to counter the notion of intolerance (Baidhawy in Syamsiyatun 2013; Caliskan and Sагlam 2012). With a higher level of education on tolerance, civic education, and intercultural values, students were expected to internalize the idea of inclusive religious tolerance to build and enhance social harmony among religious groups (Bahari 2010; Coleman and White 2011; Chzhen 2013; Ciftci 2010; Esther 2015; Kihkham 2016; Kiwan 2007; Leeman 2008; Martin 2013; Raihani 2016; Rosenblith 2008; Tan 2007; Verkuyten and Slooter 2007). The school is an agent of socialization. It is responsible for the process of religious tolerance (Abdhullah 2011; Okon 2012). In this context, schools act as a means to transmit cultural values to students (Brisko 2012). Values can be found in the school’s ideological level or vision and mission which have been institutionalized as the long-term objective (Damsar 2011). The process of unintended learning is determined by a school’s formal policy and informal community. Although the dynamic and “appealing-informal” method of learning is not fully recognized by the institution’s formal structure, it provides unique everyday experiences which have a significant impact on students’ perception of religious tolerance.

The term “Hidden Curriculum” was introduced by Philip Jackson (Portelli 2007). This type of curriculum can communicate social values implicitly through formal school policies and the informal school community (Alsubaie 2015; Kentli 2009; Ruff 2013). The Hidden Curriculum relies heavily on social context (Asbeck 2010:20; Berger and Kellner 1981:63). In general, studies on the hidden curriculum have been
researched by medical institutions. Medical training is taught through the learning environment; professional values are practiced through the implicit learning process (Hafferty 2015; Mossop 2013). There are several components of the hidden curriculum which regulate social control, social interaction, and the teachers’ figures as role models (Cubukcu 2012; Hopman et al. 2014; Nobile et al. 2015; Rahmawati 2015; Sabe 2007; Seda 1987). In addition, several studies have found that tolerance education is better operated in a heterogeneous school population; it is an ideal ground on which to construct a multireligious community (Janmaat and Mons 2011; Khareng and Awang 2012; Keddie 2014; Jati 2014; Verkuyten and Thijs 2010).

Figure 1. Components of the Hidden Curriculum.

The Whole-School Approach is a pedagogical method for tolerance education. This approach emphasizes many aspects of school components that refer to the non-written curriculum, otherwise known as the hidden curriculum. Raihani (2011) differentiates six components related to tolerance education:

1. Vision and policies: the school’s long-term objectives are first defined in this principal component. The socialization of certain
values such as religious values and tolerance are reflected in the school’s vision and policies.

2. Leadership and management: this component is about the implementation of formal authority through the school’s social actors. The exercise of social control and collective decision-making reflects the degree of democratic values and religious tolerance.

3. Curriculum and teaching: access to religious education by various religious groups reflects a school’s commitment to promoting religious tolerance. The process of communicative learning and role-modeling through the educator figures indirectly shapes students’ perceptions on multiculturalism.

4. Capacity and cultures: this component represents the manifestation of the school’s vision and policy through symbolic objects and informal activities. In this component, the role of peer groups becomes part of the individual’s everyday experiences with understanding religious tolerance.

5. Student activities: this component describes students’ activities that are facilitated by the students’ formal organization. Various organizations, such as extracurricular activities and student communities, are also included in this section, any of which include certain elements of multireligious interaction.

6. Collaboration with the wider community: the school’s commitment to provide religious education for every religious group reflects multicultural values. The commitment is reinforced through the school’s collaboration with various religious institutions such as the Catholic Church, Confucian and Hindu houses of worship. Besides that, alumni influence tolerance education by facilitating intercultural opinions through extracurricular activities.

The core argument of the whole-school approach is religious tolerance, and it is not conveyed only in the classroom, but it is communicated implicitly through other components. Each component has a role in the process of socialization, but these components are dependent on the school’s core vision and policies, which determine the course of implicit education.

THE IDEA OF TOLERANCE AS SEEN FROM VARIOUS RELIGIOUS VIEWS

To understand how far the hidden curriculum has effectively socialized religious tolerance, I should first portray student opinions
on religious tolerance. In this section, the author attempts to answer the first research question, “How do public school students perceive the idea of religious tolerance?” To address this question, the author utilized both qualitative and quantitative methods. Qualitative data was obtained through interviews, while quantitate data was obtained through surveys. Bretherton (2004) provided a literal and ideal interpretation of the idea of religious tolerance. In the literal sense, tolerance is the act of forbearance toward different or even opposing religious groups. In the ideal sense, tolerance is the act of recognizing the rights and freedom of religious practice; it is built on mutual respect existing between different multireligious groups.

Table 1. Students’ Opinions on Religious Tolerance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informants</th>
<th>Religious Affiliation</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student F</td>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>There are some misunderstandings among the majority. I think the function of religion is to build solidarity in the society. (Interview with Student F, 8 November 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student DK</td>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>In my opinion, tolerance is important. Diversity is not to differentiate religious groups, or to justify that my religion is right, and others are wrong... since there is a singular God who made various religions, and the purpose of that is so we can understand tolerance. (Interview with Student DK, 15 November 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Y</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Religious tolerance can be understood as the respect we give to every human being, to give love, to not hate, and the most important one for me, is to respect God’s creations. (Interview with Student Y, 8 November 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student S</td>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>In Hinduism, we are taught the principle of Karma. If we do good to others, God will provide goodness to us. If do evil, there will be consequences. For example, if we are kind toward other human beings, God will provide protection for us. (Interview with Student S, 15 November 2016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the students’ opinions noted in Table 1, I found that religious tolerance is perceived in both the literal and the ideal sense. Religious tolerance is interpreted by some respondents as a form of forbearance against the use of verbal or physical violence toward religious groups. For others, religious tolerance is perceived as the recognition of religious rights and freedom. These findings prove that public school students recognize the basic elements of religious tolerance, but also that they understand the relationship between the value of tolerance and democratic rights.

If we observe more closely, we see that these opinions on religious tolerance came from students from various religious groups; this confirms that religious tolerance is taught within many respective religious norms. For example, the literal meaning of “tolerance” is related to “Karma” (Student F). In addition, students DK and W explained that the act of tolerance means avoiding both verbal and physical coercion. On the other hand, students F and Y see religious tolerance from a more ideal sense; to them, tolerance is about building harmonious interreligious relationships. From these interviews, it appears that most students hold a “tolerant” view toward religious differences.

I also collected quantitative data to measure students’ perceptions on “Religious Rights and Freedom” (Suaedy 2010:71). The survey was distributed among 70 respondents to measure students’ attitudes toward religious tolerance. The survey consisted of 20 questions and each question had six different possible answers ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree”. This method allowed us to observe how each respondent characterized their opinions on religious rights while avoiding “Neutral Answers” (Dane 2007; Rungson 2010). This survey attempted to measure respondents’ attitudes toward religious tolerance on various levels: universal (Global Citizenship Rights on Religious Freedom), macro (Relationship between the State and Religious Groups), meso (Interreli-
gious Relationship), and micro (Personal View on Religious Tolerance) (Davis 2000; Doorn 2014; Golebiowska 2009).

Table 2. Survey Result: Students’ Perceptions on Religious Freedom and Rights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Intolerance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20–40</td>
<td>Intolerant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41–60</td>
<td>Less Tolerant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61–80</td>
<td>Quite Tolerant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81–100</td>
<td>Tolerant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101–120</td>
<td>Very Tolerant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Findings

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>98.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest Score</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Score</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s survey 2016

In line with the qualitative data, the author found that the students’ ability to comprehend religious tolerance in both the literal and ideal sense is reflected in the survey results. The average score from 70 respondents was 98.91/120, labeling the students’ attitudes as “tolerant.” The lowest score answered by a student was 66/120 (quite tolerant) while the highest score was 117/120 (very tolerant).

Now, if we dissect the various components within the survey, it appears that there are varying attitudes toward religious tolerance when viewed from a different level of analysis. The students reported different “weights of tolerance” on the universal, macro, meso, and micro platforms of religious freedom and rights. Since liberal open-mindedness toward religious rights may contradict religious conservatism, this analysis provides the opportunity to describe which dimensions of religious freedom are “easier or harder” to tolerate.

Based on Graphic 1, it appears that the highest tolerance was emphasized at the meso level of social relationships, having the highest score of 28.01/30. The respondents reported having almost no difficulty socializing with individuals from other religious groups. This also implies that religious conflict would be avoided because individuals are promoting mutual respect toward one another.
On the macro level, the relationship between the state and religious groups had the second strongest scale of tolerance, with a numeric score of 26.46/30. In this part, students do agree with the thesis that the state should promote pluralism and religious tolerance, protection toward both majority and minority religious groups, and the freedom for every individual to participate in governance regardless of his or her religious background.

As we move on toward the universal or global level, it appears that there is a weaker attitude toward tolerance, with a score of 24.07/30. The respondents do not have any problem answering normative questions such as the basic rights of worship and adhering to religious groups and norms. But, they had trouble agreeing about the global situation if every single individual were free to proselytize or marry someone from another religious group. The respondents appear to project their religious views when defining global rights for religious tolerance. In these questions, the author would like to point out that an inclusive attitude toward all individuals, even “theologically deviant” ones, is an important measurement of religious tolerance.

This “less tolerant” attitude appears to be consistent with and magnified by opinions reported for the micro section. The lowest scores came
from answers to the questions on a personal or micro level: only 20.37/30. I found that tolerance at its weakest when students responded to sensitive questions about religious freedom. Respondents appeared reluctant to learn more about other religious norms, to take part in religious conversations when different parties come to a point of disagreement, and to accept family members who have taken part in proselytization or interreligious marriage. In short, this survey shows that students emphasize various levels of tolerance within different social contexts. Religious tolerance is easier to display in public social relationships, such as between friends or between state and religious groups, as compared to domestic relationships within the social circles of family members.

THE ROLE OF THE HIDDEN CURRICULUM

In this section, I attempt to answer the second research question: “How does the hidden curriculum socialize the value of religious tolerance?” On a theoretical level, the hidden curriculum is comprised of six components, each differing but all focused on the school’s vision & policy as its central component (Raihani 2011). From an empirical standpoint, however, I found a more complex relationship between each component of the school’s hidden curriculum, as described in graphic 2. Certain components such as Vision & Policies and Leadership & Management tend to have stronger roles in determining the course of tolerance education as compared to other aspects of the hidden curriculum. The interrelated hidden curriculum components should not be overlooked as they construct the overall anatomy and system of the whole-school approach toward educating religious tolerance.

To simplify my findings, the whole-school approach can be further divided into three general components: value, formal curricula, and informal curricula (Mossop 2013). Value is the social value or norms communicated by the school; in this case, it is both religious tolerance and Islamic values. These values are found within the school’s vision and policy, and are “networked” through the other components. Formal curricula comprise the “formal” components of the school structure such as leadership and management, curriculum and teaching, and the school’s collaboration with wider community. The informal curricula are made up of student activities and capacity and Cultures. The school imposes a structural current toward informal curricula; yet, the informal curricula also influence the formal curricula. The analysis will be divided into three
Graphic 2. The Dynamic of the School’s Hidden Curriculum Components
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Source: Author
parts: one part on the conflict of value, one on the formal curricula, and one on the informal curricula.

On the Conflict of Value

Values are the long-term objectives of education. These objectives are formulated by the state and later adopted by public schools. Currently, there are two intertwining values within the public school’s vision and policies; the first value is religious tolerance, and the second is Islamism. The school’s public sphere does not have a clear separation between religious and secular values. This social phenomenon originated from the ongoing trend of Islamisation within the state’s institution (Raihani 2011). The Ministry of Education and Culture formalized religiosity/spirituality and social-emotional intelligence as inseparable values (Berita Daerah Kota Depok 2015; Keast 2006; Kemendikbud 2015; Kemendiknas 2010).

Figure 2. Religious Tolerance and Islamisation in the Institution of Education

| Government Policy: “To produce intellectual and competitive individuals; to socialize spiritual (religiosity) and social-emotional (tolerance) intelligence.” |
| School’s Vision & Mission: “To become a leading educational institution with a global perspective on social environmental issues, and to be religious.” |
| The Hidden Curriculum: The Whole-School Approach portrays how religious tolerance and Islamic values are conveyed through the formal and informal curricula. |

Source: Author

Bruce (Furseth and Repstad 2006:99) argued that religious values cannot be synergized with religious tolerance. On the contrary, Hefner (2009) appears to be more positive about how religious values can go along with democracy. During the research process, the author found an ongoing negotiation between religious tolerance and Islamic values within the school’s hidden curriculum. Although religious tolerance is
part of the school’s agenda, the normative notion of multicultural learning tends to face various obstacles, and at times, it is overlaid by religious conservatism.

The Formal Curricula

As we proceed into the formal curricula, we can see in Graphic 2 that the component leadership and management has a significant role in determining the course of tolerance education. The decisions made by authorities within the school’s formal structure have the capacity to collaborate with the wider community, and also to design the process of tolerance learning through curriculum and teaching.

Together with the Catholic teacher, our school collaborates with the Catholic church. We also collaborate with the Hindu dan Buddhist houses of worship to provide religious education for our students. The students receive their grades from their respective house of worships, and they hand out their grades to the school as we facilitate their administrative requirements. (Interview with Teacher R, Civic Education Teacher, 29 November 2016)

In the curriculum and teaching component, the research revealed that the capacity to provide religious education reflects the school’s commitment to appreciate and include every social group. Although the public schools do not have sufficient human resources to provide religious education for every religious group, they have collaborated with the wider community such as houses of worship (Catholic Church, Buddhist Temple, Hindu Temple, Confucian Temple, etc) to provide the respective religious education. This statement was given by the school’s civics education teacher, who organizes various appointments and collaborations with external social institutions.

I also participated in class observation. To some extent, I found that teachers are able to convey ideas without affiliating or over-idealizing one’s religious beliefs. For example, one of the students reported that in history class, a muslim teacher was able to communicate the history of the church and Christian tradition from a neutral stance. Meanwhile, another muslim teacher taught an inclusive notion of tolerance in civics education, stating that: “It is us (the majority) who should first understand them (the minority)."
Structural regulation also impacts religious tolerance. The process of selecting new students is based on academic prestige, and not on one’s religious or ethnic background. I have also observed the school’s written regulation on student uniforms and social conflict. It appears that jilbabisation (the wearing of a headscarf) and the wearing of other religious uniforms for worship have become mandatory only for Muslims; the same rules do not apply to non-Muslims. Furthermore, the regulation has also discouraged verbal and non-verbal attitudes that could lead to interreligious conflicts.

In contrast, I also noticed some discriminative elements that could lead to religious intolerance. Since religious education is compulsory in the Indonesian public curriculum, students who are not registered in one of the six religions admitted by the public school (Islam, Protestant, Catholic, Hinduism, Buddhism, and Confucianism) cannot continue further in their studies. There is a case when the school’s administration rejected a student who admitted being an adherent of a local belief. The school was unable to facilitate the student’s religious education according to his/her religious beliefs. By claiming that the student’s belief was incompatible with the current curriculum, it essentially “expelled” the student.

In another case, I also found that religious community may have an impact on the school’s interreligious atmosphere. The public school facilitates students’ religious community in the form of student organizations: Islamic religious curricula’s and Christian religious curricula’s. These student organizations take part in the school’s religious holidays such as Idul Qurban, Christmas, etc. Although the public school appears to be “tolerant” in its commitment to facilitate such student organizations, I noted several opinions in my interviews which indicate the possibility of religious conflict arising around this issue.

The existence of both religious organizations reflects a multireligious community. However, the activities carried out by the Islamic and Christian communities may have sparked some potential conflicts. Both communities are in close proximity when they exercise their religious activities because the two communities agreed that their respective activities disturb one another, the Christian community proposed moving to another location to exercise their freedom of worship.

The school’s senior instructor of Islamic education also agreed and supports the Christian community. However, the arbitrary policy announced by the vice-principal does not support such a requirement.
Christian students are not able to “move places” but also must “wait until their turn of worship” after the majority has finished their rituals; this is a disadvantage for the minority. In this example, I found that actors in the formal structure Leadership & Management have taken a dominant part in determining the course of education, whether it is to promote or to undermine religious tolerance.

The Informal Curricula

As we bring the discussion to the informal curricula, we can observe the implementation of tolerance education at the grassroots level. While teachers, vice-principals, and school staff facilitate religious tolerance through the form of legal authority, tolerance education is negotiated primarily by the student community. In this part, I argue how the two values of religious tolerance and Islamization are conveyed through two hidden curriculum components: Student Activities and Capacity & Cultures. Focusing on the role of peer groups, various student activities and experiences have defined tolerance education in the informal scene.

In the Student Activities component, I found that extracurricular activities are the basis for interreligious interaction. For the nonreligious extracurricular activities, some informants explained that students are able to gather with other students of various religious backgrounds as they participate in the same activities. For religious extracurricular activities, I found that the existence of Islamic and Christian student communities maintained by the school have become symbols or representation of religious tolerance. Also, some informants explained their peer group relationships, particularly between differing religious communities. There are cases when students from various religious backgrounds gather for meals on religious events; for example, on the Buddhist holiday of Vesak, or on the Islamic breaking of the fast in the evening during the month of Ramadan. These practices reveal how religious events are not bound to just one particular community, but are shared collectively by the school students, thus cultivating tolerance.

Student activities are also interrelated with the wider community. Most extracurricular activities depend on individual facilitators. These facilitators include parents and alumni as leaders of the student activities components. Through the school’s collaborative work, the whole-school approach appears to be inclusive to receiving actors from the external environment. Although the inclusion of external actors may not have
direct impact on religious tolerance, I found cases where some students (informants) learned tolerance through understanding alumni opinions on religious diversity, or role-modeling. As alumni facilitate and teach extracurricular subjects, it has also become an opportunity to communicate religious tolerance.

While student activities is the hidden curriculum component that has the closest connection with the formal structure, the capacity and culture components consists of the more informal currents within the students’ circle of interaction. Several informants reported that they have friends from other religious backgrounds, and some also reported that they have built interreligious friendships through personal dialogs. Besides this, groups of students have also taken part in building interreligious relationships through academic support and discussion; that is, by doing homework together, for example. In the interviews, I also discovered that religious tolerance is has even been built with the Ahmadiyah community (“Ahmadiyah” is a denomination within the Islamic community; this sect is known to be prohibited by that religious group). The student community is not only inclusive toward interreligious groups as admitted by the state, but they are also open to students who are adherents of the religious group that is seen as deviant.

Compared to other public schools, our Christian community has received a lot of benefit. We do not find any evidence of systemic discrimination against us; however, there are still several policies that weaken social tolerance. Although they do not intend to cause such tensions, the school’s over-emphasis on Islamic religiosity sometimes causes a disadvantage to minority groups. (Interview with Alumni C, 28 November 2016)

As tolerant as it may seem, I also found several cases which account for discriminative conduct or actions within the informal curricula. In line with Raihani’s argument, there is a new trend of Islamisation in public school; there is a definite shift taking place toward Islamic culture. This is not to say that religious education should be abolished. However, when a certain religious or cultural value becomes more dominant within the school’s public sphere, it creates awareness that the majority group’s social status is superior. The process of Islamisation has inevitably impeded better opportunities for tolerance education. To support this argument, I have gathered opinions from both muslim and nonmuslim alumni who
commented that although the public school welcomes various forms of multireligious activities and discourages systematic discrimination, the emphasis on Islamic values is still disadvantageous toward student minority groups.

As we observe Graphic 2, I would like to present that the capacity and culture component or the school’s social atmosphere is regulated as Islamic. First, the Islamic culture is produced by student activities and leadership and management. The extracurricular coordinator supports the Islamic student organization or Islamic student community in carrying out mandatory programs. These semiformal programs are meant to socialize Islamic cultures with the new muslim students, and to continuously monitor their religious activities throughout the year. This example shows that the Islamic culture is a result of student-teacher cooperation in the form of a formal or informal agreement.

The second example which I would like to present is that the school’s capacity & culture is regulated by the formal structure itself. The formal structure consists of teachers’ participation in regulating school policies. The formal curricula enforce muslim students’ wearing of Islamic attire, including the headscarf and other religious attributes. It also regulates religious rituals (Islamic prayers) in the public sphere during classes and during student discussions and debates. Students are encouraged to be religious; specifically, they are encouraged to be Islamic, and this informal attitude is capable of reinforcing formal policies that flow along with the current trends of Islamisation.

Although such regulations are one means of achieving spiritual values as they are already formalized by the Indonesian Ministry of Education, the same factor has undermined social-emotional values such as religious tolerance which the state is also attempting to promote. It is unfortunate to note that the Islamic capacity and culture has prohibited nonmuslims from even participating in the student presidency debate, let alone from holding such a position in student government. I do not find any written or formal evidence that the student president “must be a muslim.”

Based on my observations, I find it to be a certain possibility that religious intolerance is in fact enforced by the formal curricula, such as teachers’ authoritative preference on student presidency selection, and the informal curricula, such as the students’ internalized preference to have an Islamic student president. Thus, even if religious tolerance is agreed upon by students and the hidden curriculum, some discriminative elements in the Indonesian public schools still exist.
RETHINKING TOLERANCE AND SOCIAL INCLUSION

One question that remains unanswered in this paper is: “If one is tolerant, why are there implicit clues of discriminative conduct?” Based on the research, tolerance alone is insufficient for realizing social inclusion. The act of forbearance against physical violence unfortunately retains some room for symbolic violence to occur. David Little (Fuad 2007:101) argued that tolerance is an attitude which denies the act of physical coercion. Bretherton (2004) is not satisfied with such a literal meaning of tolerance; he adds that tolerance should move further and recognize religious rights and freedom, as well as cultivate mutual respect in order to live with others who follow different religions.

Individuals who are tolerant may not agree to recognize religious rights; instead they may nurse the seed of prejudice (Varadi 2014). This latent attitude could eventually bring forth a new and implicit form of offense: symbolic violence. Bourdieu defines symbolic violence as a form of superordinate dominance toward subordinate groups without the use of physical coercion; it is regulated by agents and structures that promote a certain set of cultural values (Connoly and Healy 2004; Schubert 2002).

Also, I would like to argue that simple recognition of religious rights and freedom may not result in an inclusive multireligious community. As proposed by Marshall, the concept of citizenship explains that every individual has a set of rights and obligations (Jones and Gaventa 2002; Marshall 1950); one cannot separate an individual’s rights from his or her obligations. In the past, this concept was only relevant to social-economic rights and obligations. In the context of tolerance education, however, intercultural citizenship is the “new ideal type” used to explain how every individual has the right to protect in-group’s religious freedom, but also has the obligation to protect the same right for the outgroup (Barbalet 2010; Leeuwen 2010; Weithman 2002:16). Every individual should participate in protecting religious rights and freedom for every group, not only one’s own (Dean 2014; Kiwan 2007); it is a continuous process of inclusion which cannot remain stagnant or satisfied with the current condition of social tolerance.

In other words, we should reinterpret the meaning of tolerance education. Levinas (Best 2016) argued that inclusion should be done both formally and informally: formally through the social-political aspect, and informally through the social-cultural aspect. The recognition of rights must be manifested through concrete and meaningful social actions.
Giddens (Sewell 1992) commented that “agency” is a social action which attempts to combine the two aspects—the structure (formal) and the agent (informal). Agency is a reflective and intended social action that has the capability to cause changes in the social structure.

I would like to propose that tolerance education should shift further toward inclusive multicultural education under the notion of relational agency. Relational agency requires the notion of interdependence in the community. That is, a social conscience that is aware of an individual religious in-group requires the existence of an outgroup to construct an inclusive multireligious society, even with the risk that one could still encounter religious conservatism (Burkitt 2016). This form of agency demands cultural involvement among students, which in turn would bring the formal structure into effect.

Through this lens of understanding, I see that religious communities do not “forbear” each other because of social-theological disagreements; rather, they “need” and “want to include” each other because they are recognizing and protecting religious rights and freedom. This social conscience can be formed through personal or informal interactions among students during everyday activities in the hidden curriculum (Quick and Feldman, 2011; Yukich 2010). If religious symbolic violence can attack tolerance education through formal policies and cultural denominators, inclusion can also be generated through symbolic means through the multireligious community, through individuals’ participation that demands and dialectically generates democratic policies. Relational agency is therefore crucial because a multicultural policy would remain ineffective if the students’ collective conscience is still intolerant.

Even so, I recognize the limitation of the research which took place only in a public school. First, the research unable to represent tolerance education on a regional or national level. This school which I visited facilitates a broader degree of social tolerance as compared to other educational institutions in that region. Second, the hidden curriculum is unable to detect the historical development of tolerance education; it can only portray how tolerance is socialized implicitly through the ongoing features of the school’s components. Its ahistorical weakness cannot visualize its dynamic transition in chronological terms; further research should be conducted on this issue.
CONCLUSION

Tolerance education is an attempt to counter the rising trend of religious radicalism among students. Previous studies have explored the growth of intolerance within the Indonesian institution of education. This article is written to describe how religious tolerance is socialized within a hidden curriculum. The hidden curriculum conveys religious tolerance implicitly through the school’s formal policies and the informal community. In Indonesia, religious tolerance continues to negotiate with the process of Islamization in public schools. This is due to the state’s vision on education (macro) affecting public school policies (meso), and later interpreted by the students through everyday experiences in school (micro).

I discovered that most of the student informants in this study perceive tolerance as an act of forbearing violence and accepting religious rights and freedom. The survey, which was distributed among 70 respondents, returned results showing a “tolerant” attitude, describing how students have no difficulty building interreligious connections with their friends. And yet, I have discovered that religious tolerance is still vulnerable to symbolic violence. Although I do not find any clear evidence of systematic discrimination by the school’s structure, the process of Islamization provides a conscious “superior-majority above inferior-minority” relationship within the student community.

Multicultural education should be reinterpreted on a continual basis in order to pursue an ideal state of multireligious community. Every individual’s status is associated with the right to be included and the obligation to include others. The process of multicultural education should socialize students about the importance of interdependence among religious communities. Since everyday action symbolically retains the potential to express religious interdependence, every individual is considered an agent within the community. Relational agency is a collective human action which reflects on the notion of interdependence as the basic grounds for religious tolerance and social inclusion, providing the capability of reshaping the formal structure and producing a more inclusive approach to tolerance education.
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