



The Religious Moderation Scale: Development and Testing of A Measuring Instrument on a Cross-Religious Sample In Indonesia

Achmad Syahid^{1*}, Ilmi Amalia¹, Ikhwan Luthfi¹, Bobby Suwandi², Moh. Irvan¹

¹*Faculty of Psychology, UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta, Indonesia

²*Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Pancasila, Jakarta, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: Achmad Syahid

*Faculty of Psychology, UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta, Indonesia

Citation: Achmad Syahid et Al. (2024), The Religious Moderation Scale: Development and Testing of A Measuring Instrument on a Cross-Religious Sample In Indonesia, *Educational Administration: Theory And Practice*, 30(4), 3811-3825
Doi: 10.53555/kuey.v30i4.2130

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

The type and character of a moderate religion not merely influences the religious concept of its adherents personally and the institutions where they gather, but also impacts human character, educational institutions, political atmosphere, investment attractiveness, cultural environment, national resilience, ecology, etc. Despite the existence of fanatical and extreme attitudes, views and actions which are the seeds for radical action, the inner religious atmosphere of the world is moving towards moderate religious attitudes, views and practices. As a country with the largest Muslim population in the world, the Indonesian government has adopted a policy to strengthen religious moderation, produce cadres and design religious moderation villages, to achieve family resilience and prosperity, increase religious literacy, tolerance, mutual respect, mutual respect so that cooperation can be built in all areas of life. Unfortunately, a tool for measuring religious moderation is not yet available, and this article presents a tool for measuring religious moderation in the Indonesian context. After carry out testing the factor structure using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) statistical analysis of empirical facts from 1,557 respondents, out of 73 items, only 48 items remained that could be declared valid. The remaining 48 items have also been proven to be valid for people using measurement invariance, starting from configural, metric, and scalar invariance. All dimensions, indicators and measuring instrument items are ready to be used for scientific research.

Keywords: religious moderation scale, preparation of measuring instruments, sample of adherents of all Indonesian religions.

Introduction

The disproportionate strengthening of fanaticism and excessive extremism has an impact on radicalism and triggers an increase in the number of religiously motivated violence which destroys the foundations of inclusive and pluralistic living together (Knuth, 2006). In various parts of the world, fanaticism that exceeds normal levels, extremism, radicalism, and even terrorism, have become issues as an indication of weakening cultural religious moderation. A new path to religious moderation is needed, because moderate religion is reflected in personal life and the character of the institution where the person concerned is based, but also has an impact on the political environment, investment, culture, national security, ecology, psychology, national personality, etc. (Ul Haq, 2024). Two world-class religious figures, the Grand Imam of Al-Azhar, Sheikh Ahmad el-Tayyeb and Pope Francis, were concerned and called to lay down a blueprint for dialogue and collaboration, then signed the Document on Human Fraternity for World Peace and Living Together (Tp, 2019) on February 4, 2019 in Abu Dhabi, The United Arab Emirates (Tornielli, 2019). The essence of the discussion between the two figures was to minimize the common enemy of religious communities in the form of fanatical extremism, the desire to destroy each other, war, intolerance and hateful attitudes between fellow human beings, in the name of religious understanding and views. Namely exclusive religious views, attitudes and ways that tend to attract

and fortify oneself which ultimately gives birth to various practices of religious intolerance and violence which sever the relationship between religion and modernity (Yousif, 2015; Syahid, 2016; Iqbal & Mabud, 2019).

Religious adherents have great capital that their religion, which is considered to have dangerous tendencies because it encourages violence, has proven to be a mere myth because it is constructed from the conventional wisdom of Western society which tends to be resistant to other religions (Cavanaugh, 2009; Trip et al., 2019). Accusations of extremism and radicalism against other believers, because they are placed on the fulcrum of the myth of religious fundamentalism, the fundamental values of society, glorifying racial, religious, political, economic and social supremacy which infects certain groups of Western society besides having no historical basis but are also seen as no longer feasible for modern human civilization. It is important for a civilized religious society to balance proportionally the messages of religious treatises and the findings in scientific treatises (Syahid, 2016). Stollznow (2020) writes that although terrorism, fanaticism and extremism are language full of prejudice that is anti-Muslim, it is important to pay attention to several socio-religious conflicts and acts of terrorism in various regions of Indonesia from 1998 to 2018, which are actually a form of resistance against pressure from liberal ideology. From the compression of historical data, the dimension of religious moderation (*wasatīyah al-Islām*) is a characteristic of great human civilizations throughout history, since the Greek, Persian, Chinese and Islamic times, especially because it originates from the ethical values of the Koran (Adeel, 2015), is also a diverse characteristic in Turkey (Wilkinson, 2015), Malaysia (El-Muhammady, 2015), and throughout Muslim societies in the contemporary era (Alagha, 2015), including the Muhammadiyah organizational movement in Indonesia (Baidhawiy, 2015).

The horizon that shows the mutually triggered relationship between attitudes of fanaticism and religious exclusivism that are consolidated with the trajectory of religious-racial sentiment and acts of intolerance is actually not permanent. In the political context, for example, religious fanaticism and exclusivism contributed to increasing conflict tensions in the Election of Head of the Special Capital Region of Jakarta, Indonesia in 2017 and in the 2019 General Election in the form of politicization of religion (Mietzner & Muhtadi, 2019). It is evident that similar horizons and spectrums will no longer appear in the 2024 General Election. The spread of fake news, hate speech, insinuations, etc., did not color political polarization in the last general election but was colored by issues of ethics and morality. On the other hand, it must be underlined that parties who feel they are treated unfairly in a competition for resources (Marković, Nicović, & Živanović, 2021) also triggers the strengthening of extremism and radicalism, let alone being fueled by fanaticism and religious fundamentalism (CSIS, 2012; PPIM, 2018; Setara Institute, 2019; Arifinsyah et al., 2020). From the various research findings, it is clear that someone who understands religious messages in a textual way will give rise to religious tendencies with certain ideas, goals and activities that can be classified as formalistic, conservative and exclusive compared to a contextualist who gives birth to a religion characterized by ideas, goals and activities, which leads to substantive matters. Various irrational beliefs born from religious understanding meet certain personality types influencing psychological mechanisms that influence extremist and radical thought patterns (Trip, et al., 2019). In line with religious attitudes in the research findings, the percentage of students and students in Indonesia who show radical ideas, goals, attitudes and actions is more dominant than their tolerant attitude (PPIM, 2018).

Taking lessons from what is happening in other countries, the socio-political atmosphere is not conducive to relations and cooperation between communities, nations and states, which is triggered by intolerance, mutual hatred and religious exclusivism. It has something to do with radicalization (Borum, 2012) by extreme and terrorist groups who exploit the situation, such as what was done by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS), and the al-Qaeda group, Boko Haram and Jihadists in Mali, etc. (Special Report, 2016). The shadow of concern that religion has the potential to become a disintegrating force and a polarizing factor between adherents of different religions (Durkheim, 1995) also emerges in the inner religious atmosphere in Indonesia. Moreover, the scores and indices of family education patterns as milestones and initial habits for the dimension of religious tolerance, the dimension of religious equality and the dimension of cooperation between religious communities in the religious harmony index variable between 2015-2022 are not very encouraging (Balitbang, 2022). This argument also became the basis for the issuance of a policy to strengthen religious moderation in Indonesia (RPJMN, 2020-2024). The issuance of Presidential Regulation No. 58/2023 further strengthens the institutionalization process of strengthening religious moderation in Indonesia which underlies the behavior of citizens who occupy important and strategic positions in the life of the nation and state in Indonesia in order to increase tolerance, harmony and cooperation within religious communities.

The important role of religious moderation for Indonesian national life can be called an imperative policy (Bahri, 2012). From top to bottom, emphasizing and prioritizing the argument that it is important for religious adherents to be the middle group who prioritize the attitudes of moderate (*tawasut*), balanced (*tawāzun*), tolerant (*tasāmuh*), and straightening out (*i'tidāl*) in religious life in Indonesia (Syahid, 2019). Emphasizing the attitude of *tawāzun* is synonymous with "the golden mean", an attitude of avoiding two unfavorable extreme poles, while trying to find a common ground to combine them (al-Faruqi, 1986). A balanced attitude means avoiding absolute selfishness on the one hand, and absolute selfishness on the other hand; pursuing personal happiness on the one hand and maintaining collective happiness on the other (Kamali 2015: 31). Various program plans and daily activities are built and inspired by the spirit to develop and strengthen religious moderation (PMA, 93/2020), starting from the establishment of moderation houses, training, workshops,

networking, dissemination, book creation and publishing, research and index measurement. Various studies have mushroomed on strengthening religious moderation, especially with a qualitative approach, while quantitative approaches are still rarely used (Zulkifli & Sa'diyah, 2020). Within the qualitative research cluster, there is a group of studies whose main aim is to develop an instrument for measuring religious moderation using an attitude scale (Pratama, 2020; Ali, 2020; Natanael & Ramdani, 2021; Latifa et al, 2022). Generally, the instruments that are built and compiled have the same theme, namely in the form of an attitude scale. Pratama (2020) developed a moderation attitude scale, which uses Thurstone's measurement base. Except for Natanael and Ramdani (2021), both Ali (2020) and Latifa et al, (2022) built a religious moderation scale, where the latter's research was based on a Likert scale with three dimensions, ideas, emotions and behavior therein. However, the theory they use is different from the definition and dimensions of religious moderation designed by the Ministry of Religion for the purpose of strengthening religious moderation in Indonesia.

A crucial note from the preparation of the religious moderation scale can be identified that the theoretical basis or construct and concept of religious moderation as presented by Natanael and Ramdani (2021) and Tim Penyusun (2019) within the Indonesian Ministry of Religion itself has not been used as the basis for preparing a scale that has validity and reliability the good one. Even though a measuring instrument has been prepared by the Ministry of Religious Affairs on Religious Moderation Working Group team, it has been named a measuring instrument called religious moderation, which seems to be mixed together into one variable with a scale of professionalism. So it is not clear what the purpose of this measuring instrument is, whether as an exam or survey test instrument, even though this measuring instrument has been used as a kind of inquisition for all employees of this ministry in the end of 2022.

The scientific problem that arises then is that if this measuring tool is prepared as a mapping tool that must be filled in by all Ministry of Religion employees on a massive scale, it will give the impression of an inquisition, even though this measuring tool was built with reference to the meaning and dimensions of religious moderation, as well as the indicators and items. Moreover, if the measuring instrument prepared is not based on the concept of religious moderation, then the measurement results certainly cannot describe how the religious moderation program is actually progressing. Another thing that needs serious attention is the importance of measuring instruments for religious moderation that meet scientific standards, with validity, reliability and applicability to find out the true picture of religious moderation in society as a portrait or picture, a real picture, a natural movement after efforts to strengthen it. comprehensive for five years. The religious moderation scale has the benefit of being used to evaluate programs that have been carried out in the context of improving, maintaining, socializing and mainstreaming religious moderation, including establishing madrasas, regional offices, districts/cities, to religious affairs offices (Kantor Urusan Agama, KUA) after comprehensive strengthening, including religious universities as a keeper unit of harmony and balance, strong in right, standing for inclusive public services, as an incubation center for public services with a religious moderation perspective. Based on this background, the preparation of measuring instruments and empirical testing through this research was carried out.

Religius Moderation

The term religious moderation is known in various scientific traditions. The term is formed from the words "moderation" and "religion". Moderation, refers to "reducing the use of violence" and "avoiding extremes/too much" (*Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia* [KBBI], Kemendikbud.go.id, 2019). Moderation is synonymous with *moderatio* (Latin) which means "neither excess nor deficiency", self-control in the form of behavior or attitude. In English, moderation means showing behavior that prioritizes balance, average, core, standard or non-aligned in terms of beliefs, morals and character, both when treating other people as individuals or when dealing with formal institutions/institutions, such as the state.

In Arabic glossary the term "moderation" is synonymous with *al-wasatiyyah* (Shihab, 2020), literally comes from the word *wasat*, which means "the best", "chosen", "fair", "humble", "middle", "istiqamah"; in the attitude domain it can take the form of *tawasut* (moderate), *tawazun* (balanced), *i'tidāl* or *ta'adul* (just straightening out), and *istiqamah* (al-Qaradawī, 1989; Mufid, 2019) religion in the context of attitudes, behavior and implementation. Moderation began to be recognized in scientific discourse when al-Asfahanī (2009) wrote that the word *wasat* was synonymous with the word *sawā'un*; namely "equal", "the middle between two limits", "with justice", "the middle", "the standard" or "the mediocre". The word *wasatan* in the context of attitudes, behavior and implementation of religious life, for al-Asfahanī (2009), also means "to guard against being uncompromising and even abandoning the line of religious truth". The principles of balance and justice in the concept of moderation (*wasatiyyah*) mean that in religion, a person must not be extreme in his views, but must always look for common ground (Kamali, 2015). The term of *wasatiyyah* is an important aspect of Islam which is often forgotten by its followers, even though *wasatiyyah* is the essence not only of Islamic teachings, but also other religions (Kamali, 2015). Furthermore, moderation is a virtue that encourages the creation of social harmony and balance in personal life, family and society as well as broader human relations. These two values, fairness and balance, will be more easily formed if a person has three main characters within himself: wisdom, sincerity and courage.

The word *wasat* also means “everything that is good according to its object” (Shihab, 2020), such as “generous” means a moderate attitude between stinginess and wastefulness, the word “brave” (*al-sajā'ah*) means an attitude between cowardly (*al-jubn*) and reckless (*tahawur*) mentality. The word *wasit* was absorbed into Indonesian to become *wasit* which one of the meaning is “leader in a fair game” not biased. In the glossary of Arabic scientific language, the opposite of moderation is “excessive” (*taṭarruf*) which is synonymous with extreme by going too far and going beyond limits, radical by taking the opposite action/path, and excessive because it has a widespread impact, not because fueled by a lack of justice. In the Arabic glossary, two words that are synonymous with the word extreme are *al-guluw* (hyperbole) and *tasyaddud* – the derivative words *syadid*, *syidad*, and *asyadd* – being harsh.

Religious moderation means not only showing a lack of violence, but also showing it as a picture of a person who has a moderate and not extreme attitude, namely a person who is able to display normal and appropriate behavior, which is ordinary and not excessive. Someone who is able to put everything according to portion and proportion. Don't overdo it in supporting or rejecting it, even if it doesn't match your views or values. Understanding that takes the middle path, neither extreme right nor extreme left (el Fadl, 2009), always encourages efforts to realize social justice which in religion is known as *akhlak* and *al-maslahah al-'ammah* (Wahid, 2009; Wahid & Ikeda, 2015; Muhtarom, Fuad & Latief, 2020), especially as a foundation for public policy as a form of high moral responsibility for every leader who is more democratic, supports human rights including gender equality and the right to worship and practice one's beliefs, mutually respect differences and oppose acts of terror and other forms of violence (American Policy Research Center, in Mansor et al, 2017; Aljunied, 2018).

Religious moderation shows understanding as a view or attitude that always tries to take a middle position between two opposing and excessive attitudes so that one of the two attitudes in question does not dominate a person's thoughts and attitudes (Saifuddin, 2022). In this context, religious moderation does not call for extreme attitudes, whether in terms of leaning towards the spiritual realm or being passionate about the worldly (Hanapi, 2014). Religious moderation is a balanced religious attitude between practicing one's own religion and respecting the practice of other religious teachings (Sutrisno, 2019), as well as maintaining togetherness with those who are different through an attitude of tolerance (Akhmadi, 2019). Hilmy (in Futaqi, 2018) states that the concept of religious moderation has characteristics including: a non-violent ideology in spreading the Islamic religion; adopting the modern way of life with all its derivatives, including science and technology, human rights, and the like; use of rational thinking; contextual approach in understanding Islam; and the use of *ijtihad*. These five characteristics can then be expanded into several other characteristics such as tolerance, peace, harmony and cooperation between groups and religious believers. A moderate position also refers to a balance between commitment to the religion one believes in and respect for other people's beliefs. From the various definitions above, this article uses the definition of religious moderation as a perspective, attitude, and behavior, which takes a position in the middle, always acting fairly, balanced, and not extreme in religion (Tim Penyusun, 2019).

There are four dimensions of religious moderation agreed upon by experts, namely national commitment, tolerance, non-violence and acceptance of local culture (Tim Pelaksana Redaksi, 2018; Syahid, 2019; Sihombing, et al, 2019; Ali, 2020; Saifuddin, 2019, 2022). First, national commitment has several forms which can be called indicators: acceptance of the statehood status that currently applies, acceptance of the principles of nationhood and statehood as stated in the state constitution, and recognition and acceptance of the four pillars of nationality; Pancasila, the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (UUD NRI 1945), the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (Negara Kesatuan Republik Indonesia, NKRI), and the principle of *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika*. The acceptance of Pancasila as the ideology and basis of the state is final, so there is no longer any debate about the validity of Pancasila's position as the foundation of society, nation and state for the Indonesian people. Pancasila is the philosophical basis, legal basis and ideology which is the basis for a way of life, world view (*welstanchauung*), expression and embodiment of citizenship as a behavior in social, national and state life to achieve national ideals. The pillars that support the strength of national and state life in Indonesia are the four basic consensuses above, including the principles contained in the opening text of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, the body, and all articles and verses as derivatives of the opening text, which serve as a guideline in the administration of the nation and state (Tim Pelaksana Redaksi, 2018).

Willingness followed by voluntarism in accepting the Republic of Indonesia as the final form of state constitutes a category of tolerant attitude in accepting the concept of a nation-state. The idea of maintaining the form of a unitary state with a democratic system is a challenge that must be answered by strengthening the operation of the system and the form of the state which has become the nation's consensus. History has proven that the Republic of Indonesia is the best choice, especially by paying very serious attention and consideration to the characteristics of the Indonesian nation. Within the Republic of Indonesia, *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* is a pillar as well as a motto in managing interpersonal relations in social, national and state life. Is different but still one. Different backgrounds, including religion, ethnicity, economics, language, culture and so on, but have common ground in the same Indonesian identity (Tim Pelaksana Redaksi, 2018).

Tolerance is the second dimension, which refers to respect for differences as well as the willingness to give other people space to believe, express their beliefs, and express views and opinions in accordance with their

religion and beliefs. Respect equality and be ready to work together with people who are different, even if it is different from what we believe, whether from different beliefs, ethnic and economic backgrounds. Tolerance refers to an open, open-minded, voluntary and gentle attitude in accepting differences. Tolerance is always accompanied by an attitude of respect, accepting different people as part of ourselves, and positive thinking. As an attitude in dealing with differences, tolerance is the most important foundation in democracy, because democracy can only work when someone is able to hold back their opinions and then accept the opinions of others. The aspect of tolerance is actually not only related to religious beliefs, but can be related to differences in race, gender, ethnicity, culture, and so on. If drawn from national and state life, the democratic maturity of a nation, among other things, can be measured by the extent and level of that nation's tolerance. The greater and higher a nation's tolerance for differences, the more democratic it tends to be, and vice versa (Tim Pelaksana Redaksi, 2018).

What is emphasized here is tolerance of religion and belief, both in the form of inter-religious tolerance and intra-religious tolerance, whether related to tolerance in religious, social, cultural and political life. Through interreligious relations, we can see attitudes towards adherents of other religions, willingness to dialogue, harmony, peace, cooperation, establishment of places of worship, as well as experiences interacting with adherents of other religions. Meanwhile, intra-religious tolerance can be used to respond to minority sects that are considered to deviate from the mainstream of that religion. Meanwhile, fanaticism and radicalism, which have the potential to lead to violence, in the context of religious moderation are understood as an ideology idea and understanding that wants to make changes to the social and political system by using violent and extreme methods in the name of God or religion, either verbal, physical and mental violence (el Fadl, 2001; Tim Pelaksana Redaksi, 2018).

The third dimension is anti-violence which contains the rejection of all acts of violence committed by a particular person or group, even based on religious reasons. Efforts to achieve goals, whether the right goals or wrong goals, that use violent methods, both physical and verbal, to bring about the desired changes are unacceptable. Not only is it unacceptable, it must be rejected. The non-violence dimension is based on the principle of justice in assessing consideration and balance between two contradictory things, but in religious moderation it is placed, viewed, addressed and practiced as a paired concept. For example, between reason and revelation, between physical and spiritual, between rights and obligations, between individual interests and communal benefit, between necessity and volunteerism, between religious texts and *ijtihad*, between ideal ideas and reality, and between past and future (Tim Pelaksana Redaksi, 2018).

The dimension of respect for local culture, where this dimension places local culture not as an opponent that must be defeated, but something that can add goodness (*ḥasanah*). The behavior that emerges is friendly in accepting local traditions and culture in religious behavior, as long as it does not conflict with the main religious teachings. Culture that has taken root in society does not have to be eliminated, removed or discarded, but culture can be used as a strengthening element for faith and religion. Concrete forms of religious practices and behavior that are accommodating to local culture can be seen from the extent of a person's willingness to accept religious practices that accommodate local culture and traditions. People who have a high level of moderation mean they have a tendency to be more friendly in accepting local traditions and culture in their religious behavior, as long as it does not conflict with the main teachings of the religion. Flexibility in religious practice is based on the ability to separate basic and basic teachings in religion from religious teachings that are not basic teachings (Tim Pelaksana Redaksi, 2018; Syahid, 2019).

Non-rigid religious traditions, among other things, are characterized by a willingness to accept religious practices and behavior that do not solely emphasize normative truths, but also accept religious practices that are based on primacy in society, of course, once again, as long as those practices do not conflict with with the principles of religious teachings. On the other hand, there are also groups who tend not to be accommodating to traditions and culture, because practicing traditions and culture in religion would be considered an act that pollutes religious purity. However, this religious practice cannot necessarily reflect the moderation of the perpetrator. This can only be used to see general trends. The view that someone who is more accommodating to local traditions will be more moderate in religion still has to be proven. It could be that there is no positive correlation between moderate attitudes in religion and accommodation to local traditions in religion (Tim Pelaksana Redaksi, 2018).

Religious moderation is a balanced attitude, view and behavior of religious practice (Sabet, 2015) between practicing one's own religion and respecting the practice of other religious teachings (Sutrisno, 2019), as well as maintaining togetherness with those who are different through an attitude of tolerance (Akhmadi, 2019). Hilmy (in Futaqi, 2018: 523) states that the concept of religious moderation has characteristics including: a non-violent ideology in spreading the Islamic religion; adopting the modern way of life with all its derivatives, including science and technology, human rights, and the like; use of rational thinking; contextual approach in understanding Islam; and the use of *ijtihad*. These five characteristics can then be expanded into several other characteristics such as tolerance, harmony and cooperation between religious groups. Religious Moderation is a perspective, attitude and behavior that takes a position in the middle, always acting fairly, balanced and not extreme in religion. A moderate position also refers to a balance between commitment to the religion one believes in and respect for other people's beliefs. Based on the spirit of the narrative above, religious moderation has nine keys that can be placed as indicators of this measuring tool, namely, humanity, public

benefit, fairness, balance, obedience to the constitution, national commitment, tolerance, non-violence, and respect for tradition (Tim Penyusun, 2019).

Methods

The stages of this study start from identifying theoretical concepts and then prominent dimensions, examining items from existing scales, to be used as material for compiling a blueprint for writing item sets for new instruments, and validating the instrument through field testing (Clark & Watson, 1995) then testing person fit. The first stage aims to conceptualize the construct of religious moderation and identify prominent dimensions. The author does two things simultaneously: inviting experts to a limited seminar and conducting a literature study to review the history, spirit and meaning of religious moderation as a construct of religious moderation. In the second stage, from the results of the literature study, a collection of items for the religious moderation scale was created, so that 73 items were collected, based on definitions, dimensions and nine key words. The third stage, distributing the questionnaire online, where the data collection aims to test the factor structure of the religious moderation scale and convergent validity, then carry out invariance measurement. The subject criteria are Indonesian citizens aged 17 years or over. The total number of respondents included in this research was 1,567, however, of that number of respondents there were 10 respondents who were not willing to have their responses used. So the remaining number of respondents who entered the analysis stage was 1,557 respondents. Of the 1,557 respondents whose data were willing to be used in this research, there were 756 men (48.6%) and 801 women (51.4%). In this study, the youngest respondent was 17 years old and the youngest was 75 years old. The average age of respondents was 34.50 years (SD = 13,477). If the ages of research subjects are mapped using developmental theory or generational group categories, then the research sample consists of boomers (born 1945-1964), generation X (born 1965-1980), millennials (born 1981-1996), and generation Z (born 1997-2012).

Based on education level, 493 respondents (31.66%) graduated from SMA/SMK equivalent, 591 respondents (37.96%) graduated from D-III/D-IV/S-1 as the largest group, then 332 graduated from Masters (S2). 21.32%, and 141 respondents (9.06%) graduated from S-3, which is the smallest group of respondents. In terms of religious background, Muslims (934 respondents; 59.99%) are the largest group, Christians (288 respondents; 18.5%), Catholics (13 respondents; 0.83%), Confucians (19 respondents; 1.22%), Buddhists (281 respondents ; 18.05%), Hindus (18 respondents; 1.16%), and Beliefs (4 respondents; 0.26%), as the least numerous groups. Based on the activities of religious organizations, the majority were Nahdlatul Ulama activist subjects, followed by Buddhist Council activists. Nahdlatul Ulama member respondents were 300 respondents (19.27%), Muhammadiyah (64; 4.11%), Indonesian Ulama Council (47; 3.02%), Christian Religious Council/Synod (125; 8.03%), Catholic Religious Council (4; 0.26%), Hindu Religious Council (2; 0.13%), Buddhist Religious Council (211; 13.55%), and others (804; 51.64%).

Results

To examine the factor structure of the religious moderation scale in this study, confirmatory factor analysis was used statistical analysis (CFA) multifactor in which there is more than one latent variable is theorized to measure religious moderation. In the context of this research, there are seven latent variables which are theorized to measure the 73 constructed items. The estimation method used in this analysis is MLM or known as the Satorra-Bentler Estimator (1994). The model fit indices used in this research are Chi-square, RMSEA, 90% C.I RMSEA, Probability RMSEA < 0.05, CFI, TLI, and SRMR. And the fit criteria used in this analysis are Chi-square value close to 0, p-value > 0.05, RMSEA < 0.05, C.I. RMSEA < 0.05, Probability RMSEA > 0.05, CFI > 0.95, TLI > 0.95, and SRMR < 0.08. The results of the first stage analysis can be seen in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Test goodness of fit analysis, stage 1

Indext	Value	Fit Criteria
Chi-Square	11512.410	Closer to Zero
DF	2534	
P-Value	0.0000	> 0.050
RMSEA	0.048	< 0.050
90% C.I RMSEA	0.047 – 0.049	< 0.050
Probability RMSEA <= 0.05	0.999	> 0.050
CFI	0.797	> 0.950
TLI	0.788	> 0.950
SRMR	0.058	< 0.080

The empirical data analysis was carried out in several stages. The first is a model with 73 items that is theorized to measure seven latent variables or factors. Then, the results of the analysis produced a Chi-square value = 11512.410, $df = 2534$, $p\text{-value} = 0.0000$, $RMSEA = 0.048$, $90\% \text{ C.I. } RMSEA = 0.047-0.049$, $\text{Probability } RMSEA < 0.05 = 1.000$, $CFI = 0.769$, $TLI = 0.760$, and $SRMR = 0.061$. It can be seen that the resulting Chi-square value is very large, namely 11512.410. Meanwhile, the ideal Chi-square value is getting smaller and closer to 0. However, this Chi-square index has a weakness, namely that it is very sensitive to sample size. This means that no matter how good a model is, it will tend to be unfit if the research sample size is large. And in this study the sample size was relatively large, namely 1,557 respondents. To overcome this, other model fit indices are used that are not too affected by sample size such as RMSEA, CFI, TLI, and SRMR. According to the criteria of Hu & Bentler (1999), the model above can be said to be fit. There is sufficient statistical evidence to state that the theoretical model tested is supported by adequate empirical data.

After the model was confirmed to be fit, the analysis continued at the item level. In the item level analysis, one item was found to have a negative (-) factor loading coefficient. This item is an unfavorable item with the code X6OR (I think transnational movements or ideas are interesting things to try) which is theorized to measure balanced dimensions. Item X6OR has a factor loading coefficient of -0.047 with a $p\text{-value} = 0.110$. These results indicate that item X6OR should be discarded and should not be included in subsequent analyses. And of the 73 items in the first stage of analysis, 72 items remained.

Table 2: Test goodness of fit analysis, stage 2

Indext	Value	Fit Criteria
Chi-Square	11058.717	Closer to Zero
DF	2463	
P-Value	0.0000	> 0.050
RMSEA	0.047	< 0.050
90% C.I RMSEA	0.046 – 0.048	< 0.050
Probability RMSEA <= 0.05	1.000	> 0.050
CFI	0.776	> 0.950
TLI	0.768	> 0.950
SRMR	0.061	< 0.080

In the second stage of analysis, researchers analyzed 72 items that were theorized to measure seven dimensions of religious moderation. Then, the resulting Chi-square value = 11058.717, $df = 2463$, $p\text{-value} = 0.0000$, $RMSEA = 0.047$, $90\% \text{ C.I. } RMSEA = 0.046-0.048$, $\text{Probability } RMSEA < 0.05 = 1.000$, $CFI = 0.776$, $TLI = 0.768$, and $SRMR = 0.061$. And based on the criteria from Hu & Bentler (1999), the model above can be said to be fit. In other words, the null hypothesis which states "there is no difference between the theoretical model and empirical data" is not rejected. This means that there is sufficient statistical evidence to state that the theoretical model being tested is supported by empirical data. The results of the second stage of analysis can be seen in Table 2 above.

The analysis continued by testing the assumption of normality of response patterns for each item. It should be noted that one of the assumptions of CFA is that each item has a normally distributed response pattern (Muthen & Kaplan, 1985). To test this assumption, it can be seen from the skewness value for each item. The range of accepted skewness values is -1 to +1. In other words, items that have skewness values outside that range can be stated as items whose response patterns are not normally distributed.

Based on the rule of thumb above (skewness -1 to +1) the researchers found 11 items that violated the normality assumption. The items that violate the assumption of normality of response are items with the following code (In parentheses are the skewness values): X1 (-1.079), X2 (-1.152), X4 (-1.114), X18 (-2,082), X21 (-1,926), X22R (-1,152), X23 (-1,294), X25 (-1,536). Based on these findings, the researcher had to discard these 11 items and they were not allowed to continue in the next analysis.

Table 3: Test goodness of fit analysis, stage 3

Indext	Value	Fit Criteria
Chi-Square	8031.594*	Closer to Zero
DF	1748	
P-Value	0.0000	> 0.050
RMSEA	0.048	< 0.050
90% C.I RMSEA	0.047 – 0.049	< 0.050

Probability RMSEA \leq 0.05	0.999	> 0.050
CFI	0.797	> 0.950
TLI	0.788	> 0.950
SRMR	0.058	< 0.080

In the third stage of analysis, researchers analyzed 61 items which were theorized to measure seven latent variables or factors. Then, the resulting Chi-square value = 8031.594, $df = 1748$, $p\text{-value} = 0.0000$, $RMSEA = 0.048$, $90\% \text{ C.I. } RMSEA = 0.047\text{--}0.049$, $\text{Probability } RMSEA < 0.05 = 0.999$, $CFI = 0.797$, $TLI = 0.788$, and $SRMR = 0.058$. And based on the criteria from Hu & Bentler (1999), the model above can be said to be fit. In other words, the null hypothesis which states "there is no difference between the theoretical model and empirical data" is not rejected. This means that there is sufficient statistical evidence to state that the model is empirical data. The results of the analysis can be seen in Table 3 above.

The analysis then continues at the item level, namely determining which items are valid and invalid. Some of the valid item criteria used are as follows. First, it has a positive factor loading coefficient (+). Second, it has a factor loading coefficient above 0.5. Third, have a Z value greater than 1.96 ($Z > 1.96$). Fourth, it has a p-value < 0.05 ($p < 0.05$). Fifth, there is no residual correlation between items (See Umar & Nisa, 2020; Comrey & Lee, 1992). Tables 4 to Table 10 are the results of item analysis per dimension.

Table 4: Coefficients of the national commitment dimensions

National Commitment	Factor Loading	S.E	Z	P-value	
X3	0.615	0.019	32.016	0.000	Valid
X5	0.513	0.02	25.981	0.000	Valid
X6R	0.183	0.028	6.472	0.000	Invalid
X7	0.815	0.011	70.922	0.000	Valid
X8	0.777	0.015	50.218	0.000	Valid
X9	0.596	0.019	31.816	0.000	Valid
X10	0.638	0.019	34.368	0.000	Valid

Table 5: Coefficients of the tolerance dimension factors

Tolerance	Factor Loading	S.E	Z	P-value	
X11	0.595	0.02	29.876	0.000	Valid
X12	0.687	0.015	44.876	0.000	Valid
X13	0.571	0.016	34.884	0.000	Valid
X14	0.622	0.016	39.244	0.000	Valid
X16	0.678	0.019	35.973	0.000	Valid
X17	0.578	0.018	32.224	0.000	Valid
X19	0.595	0.022	27.156	0.000	Valid
X20	0.545	0.02	26.775	0.000	Valid

Table 6: Coefficients of the anti-violence dimension

Anti-Violence	Factor Loading	S.E	Z	P-value	
X24	0.558	0.028	20.012	0.000	Valid
X28R	0.184	0.027	6.907	0.000	Invalid
X29	0.574	0.025	22.853	0.000	Valid
X30R	0.216	0.029	7.565	0.000	Invalid

Table 7: Coefficient of the cultural accommodation dimension

Cultural Accommodation	Factor Loading	S.E	Z	P-value	
X31	0.713	0.016	44.021	0.000	Valid
X32	0.724	0.016	45.822	0.000	Valid
X33R	0.487	0.026	18.745	0.000	Invalid
X34	0.686	0.019	36.87	0.000	Valid
X35	0.656	0.02	32.294	0.000	Valid
X36	0.735	0.016	45.1	0.000	Valid
X37R	0.423	0.03	14.077	0.000	Ivalid

Table 8: Coefficient of the just/fair dimension

Just/Fair	Factor Loading	S.E	Z	P-value	
X38	0.760	0.015	50.768	0.000	Valid
X39	0.752	0.016	47.366	0.000	Valid
X40	0.795	0.012	66.995	0.000	Valid
X41	0.721	0.015	47.787	0.000	Valid
X42	0.265	0.025	10.753	0.000	Invalid
X43	0.564	0.019	29.448	0.000	Valid
X44	0.692	0.014	48.001	0.000	Valid
X45	0.692	0.017	41.736	0.000	Valid
X46	0.681	0.021	33.077	0.000	Valid
X47	0.610	0.018	33.532	0.000	Valid
X48	0.690	0.019	36.851	0.000	Valid

Table 9: Coefficients of the balance dimensions

Balance	Factor Loading	S.E	Z	P-value	
X49	0.511	0.027	19.171	0.000	Valid
X50	0.521	0.025	21.035	0.000	Valid
X51	0.541	0.025	21.323	0.000	Valid
X52	0.577	0.022	26.799	0.000	Valid
X53	0.159	0.032	5.017	0.000	Invalid
X54	0.459	0.025	18.252	0.000	Invalid
X55	0.494	0.025	19.409	0.000	Invalid
X56	0.142	0.03	4.78	0.000	Invalid
X57	0.615	0.021	28.824	0.000	Valid
X58	0.646	0.017	38.948	0.000	Valid
X59	0.129	0.032	4.024	0.000	Invalid
X61R	0.076	0.03	2.513	0.012	Invalid

Table 10: Coefficient of public benefit

Public Benefit	Factor Loading	S.E	Z	P-value	
X62	0.641	0.018	35.405	0.000	Valid
X63	0.609	0.017	36.72	0.000	Valid
X64	0.618	0.017	37.289	0.000	Valid
X65	0.236	0.028	8.421	0.000	Invalid
X66	0.643	0.015	43.144	0.000	Valid
X67	0.645	0.017	37.045	0.000	Valid
X68	0.710	0.016	44.309	0.000	Valid
X69	0.591	0.021	27.603	0.000	Valid
X70	0.732	0.013	54.891	0.000	Valid
X71	0.553	0.022	25.355	0.000	Valid
X72	0.695	0.014	49.722	0.000	Valid
X73	0.670	0.017	40.546	0.000	Valid

Based on the results of the analysis, it was found that all items met four of the five criteria used to determine valid items, such as items having a positive factor loading coefficient (+), Z value > 1.96, p-value < 0.005, and no residual correlation between items. However, there are 13 items that have a factor loading coefficient whose value is below 0.5. Some of these items are X6R (0.183), X28R (0.184), X30R (0.216), X33R (0.487), X37R (0.423), (0.142), X59 (0.129), X61R (0.076), and X65 (0.236). Based on these findings, researchers had to discard these 13 items because they had too small a contribution in measuring religious moderation. And of the 61 items analyzed, only 48 items remained at the end of the third stage of analysis. Table 11 below shows the comparison of items per dimension during the first, second and third analysis.

Table 11: Comparison of items in the initial and final analysis

Dimension	First Analysis	Second Analysis
National commitment	10	6
Tolerance	10	8
Anti-Violence	10	2
Cultural accommodations	7	5
Just/Fair	11	10
Balance	13	6
Public	12	11
Total	73	48

It can be seen from the summary in table 11 above that of the 73 items involved in the initial analysis, only 48 items remained that met the valid item criteria. The detailed explanation is as follows. The dimension of national commitment which originally consisted of 10 items, in the final analysis only 6 items remained. The tolerance dimension which originally consisted of 10 items, in the final analysis only 8 items remained. The anti-violence dimension which originally consisted of 10 items, in the final analysis only 2 items remained. The dimension of accommodation to culture which originally consisted of 7 items, in the final analysis only 5 items remained. The fairness dimension originally consisted of 11 items, in the final analysis only 10 items remained. The balanced dimension which originally consisted of 13 items, in the final analysis only 6 items remained. The general benefit dimension which originally consisted of 12 items, in the final analysis only 11 items remained.

Korelasi Antar Dimensi Moderasi Beragama

In order to make it easier for us to read the correlation between dimensions in the construct of religious moderation, a matrix has been prepared as can be seen in Table 12 below.

Table 12: Correlation matrix between dimensions of religious moderation

	National commitment	Tolerance	Anti-Violence	Cultural accommodation	Just/Fair Balance	Public Benefit
National Commitment	1					
Tolerance	0.714	1				
Anti-Violence	0.814	0.829	1			
Cultural Accommodation	0.668	0.747	0.819	1		
Just/Fair Balance	0.562	0.811	0.866	0.651	1	
Public Benefit	0.658	0.834	0.755	0.775	0.779	1
Public Benefit	0.674	0.831	0.840	0.770	0.836	0.879

In Table 12 above we can clearly see the intercorrelation map between the dimensions of the religious moderation construct, which can be called the inter-dimensional correlation matrix. The correlation matrix has a diagonal which always has a value of 1 and the part above the diagonal is always left blank. The diagonal of the correlation matrix always has a value of 1 because when a variable is correlated with itself it always produces a perfect correlation, in this case it is symbolized by the number 1. And the part above the diagonal of the correlation matrix is always left blank because the correlation between tolerance and national commitment will be exactly the same as the correlation between national commitment and tolerance ($A*B=B*A$). This is why the correlation matrix only needs to be written below the diagonal.

When we look carefully, in the correlation matrix in Table 12 above there are 28 pairs of correlations. This is obtained from the formula $P*(P+1)/2$, where P is the number of factors or dimensions. In the context of this research, there are 7 dimensions or factors, so they can be written as $7*(7+1)/2=28$. And you can see that the correlation range in the correlation matrix above is between 0.562 – 0.879. Where the lowest correlation was produced between the justice dimension and national commitment ($r=0.562$). Meanwhile, the highest correlation is produced between the dimensions of general benefit and balance.

Measurement Invariance Test

After carrying out CFA analysis and obtaining a fit model for the items based on empirical data. In the next step, we continue the analysis of this measuring instrument by carrying out a person fit to determine the similarity of samples from various groups, which is called the measurement invariance test, which includes three stages: configural, metric, and scalar. The configural invariance test is used to determine whether the latent factor structure described in the CFA test is the same in various sample groups. Meanwhile, the metric invariance test functions to determine whether the factor loading coefficients described in the CFA test are the same in various groups. Then the scalar invariance test can be used to determine whether the intercept, namely the original value, described in the CFA test is the same in various groups. The level of invariance testing is met if after the parameter values are forced to be the same, then the goodness of fit index does not get worse significantly. The limits for decreasing goodness fit results or the indices used are CFI, RMSEA, and SRMR (Chen, 2007). The recommendations of Chen (2007) are based on a Monte Carlo simulation of the cut off values for each model and the fit index as follows.

Table 13: Measurement invariance test fit index criteria

Index Fit	N<=300			N>=300		
	Factor Loading	Intercept	Residual	Factor Loading	Intercept	Residual
CFI	≤ -0.005	≤ -0.005	≤ -0.005	≤ -0.01	≤ -0.01	≤ -0.01
RMSEA	≤ 0.01	≤ 0.01	≤ 0.01	≤ 0.015	≤ 0.015	≤ 0.015
SRMR	≤ 0.025	≤ 0.005	≤ 0.005	≤ 0.030	≤ 0.01	≤ 0.01

The next step is for us to test the invariance of the research subjects on two demographic variables, namely the sex category (gender) and the residence category (domicile). The numbers for research subjects in these two categories are not paired. For the gender category, the data is relatively balanced: namely men = 756 while women = 801, while for the domicile category it is very unbalanced, living in cities = 1160 and those living in villages = 397 respondents.

Table 14: Results of invariance analysis between gender (male, female) and domicile (city, village)

Group	Model	χ^2	df	p-value	CFI	RMSEA	SRMR	Δ CFI	Δ RMSEA	Δ SRMR
Gender	Configural model	6477.162	2118	< 0.000	0.834	0.051	0.059	-	-	-
	Metric model	6555.834	2159	< 0.000	0.832	0.051	0.061	0.002	0	0.002
	Scalar model	6720.093	2200	< 0.000	0.828	0.051	0.061	0.004	0	0
Domisili	Configural model	6548.146	2118	< 0.000	0.839	0.052	0.058	-	-	-
	Metric model	6613.648	2159	< 0.000	0.838	0.051	0.059	0.001	-0.001	0.001
	Scalar model	6760.322	2200	< 0.000	0.834	0.052	0.059	0.004	0.001	0

Based on table 14 above, the results of the invariance test for the χ^2 value and the probability of getting the χ^2 value (p-value) will be reported. The first stage in the invariance test is the configural invariance test. The results of the model fit index for configural invariance specifically for gender groups obtained a value of χ^2 (2118) = 6477.162, p-value < 0.000, CFI = 0.834, RMSEA = 0.051, and SRMR = 0.059 (Hu and Bentler, 1999; Marsh et al., 2005), shows that the theorized model fits the empirical data relatively well. Except for the CFI value index (<0.90), the model does not fit the empirical data. Meanwhile, the results of the model fit index for configural invariance specifically for domicile groups obtained values χ^2 (2118)=6548.146, p-value <0.000, CFI = 0.839, RMSEA = 0.052, and SRMR = 0.058 indicating that the theorized model fits the data relatively well. empirical. Except for the CFI value index (<0.90), the model does not fit the data.

The next measurement invariance test is the metric invariance test, where in this model test the factor loading coefficient values are forced to be the same in all groups. In this case, the results of the metric invariance test for the gender group, the theorized model fits the empirical data (CFI= 0.832, RMSEA=0.051, and SRMR= 0.061). The change in model fit in the metric invariance test is suggested to be not much worse than configural invariance. In fact, the performance of the CFI and SRMR index values has decreased, while the RMSEA value is still the same. However, the changes in these three index values still meet the cut off values based on the measurement invariance test criteria (Δ CFI= -0.002 < -0.01, Δ RMSEA=0 < 0.015, and Δ SRMR= 0.002 < 0.030). therefore, the metric invariance test is met. The implication is that it is possible to compare regression coefficients and/or unstandardized covariance across gender groups. Furthermore, from the results of the metric invariance test for the domicile group, the model was found to be fit to the empirical data (CFI= 0.839, RMSEA=0.051, and SRMR= 0.059). The results show that the performance of the CFI and SRMR index values has decreased, while the RMSEA value is relatively better. However, the changes in these three index values still meet the cut off values based on the measurement invariance test criteria (Δ CFI= -0.001 < -0.01, Δ RMSEA= -0.001 < 0.015, and Δ SRMR= 0.001 < 0.030). Therefore, the metric invariance test is met. The implication is that it is possible to compare regression coefficients and/or unstandardized covariance across domicile group.

Furthermore, in the scalar invariance test where the factor loading coefficient and intercept values are forced to be the same in the groups. Then for the gender group, the scalar invariance test fits the empirical data (CFI= 0.828, RMSEA=0.051, and SRMR= 0.061). Furthermore, the change in model fit shown in the scalar invariance test is not significantly different compared to the metric invariance test. The changes in these three index values still meet the cut off values based on the measurement invariance test criteria (Δ CFI= -0.004 < -0.01, Δ RMSEA=0 < 0.015, and Δ SRMR= 0 < 0.030). The implication is that latent mean comparisons can be carried out meaningfully in gender groups. Meanwhile, the results of the scalar invariance test for the domicile group, the model fits the empirical data (CFI= 0.834, RMSEA=0.053, and SRMR= 0.059). Then the model fit changes shown in the scalar invariance test are not significantly different compared to the metric invariance test. The changes in these three index values still meet the cut off values based on the measurement invariance test criteria (Δ CFI= -0.004 < -0.01, Δ RMSEA=0.001 < 0.015, and Δ SRMR= 0 < 0.030). The implication is that latent mean comparisons can be carried out meaningfully in domicile groups.

Discussion.

There are several points that can be used as material for discussion in this research. First, in the final analysis it was found that the theorized 61-item theoretical model measuring seven dimensions fit the empirical data. This is proven by the values RMSEA=0.048, 90% C.I RMSEA=0.047–0.049, Probability RMSEA <0.05=0.999, and SRMR=0.058. However, there are sufficient model fit index values that should be given more attention, namely CFI=0.797 & TLI=0.788. In the previous section, it was noted that the fit criteria for CFI/TLI is a value greater than 0.950 (CFI/TLI > 0.950). And the CFI/TLI results in this model show indications that are not very good. In several literature studies, poor CFI/TLI values can indicate theoretical misspecification that occurs in the model. Theoretical misspecification itself is one source of error in social science research (Umar, 2014). Theoretical misspecification is when researchers make mistakes in determining or building the theoretical model to be tested (Umar, 2014).

Second, Comrey & Lee (1992) stated that there are four categories of item quality based on the magnitude of the factor loading coefficient, namely the poor category (0 – 0.3), fair (0.3 – 0.5), good (0.5-0.7), and very good (> 0.7). And in this study it was found that around 13 items had factor loading coefficients below 0.5, so these items were declared invalid. This does not mean that these items are completely bad, but that the contribution of these items in measuring religious moderation is too small. So it is very important to look again at the editorials of these items to check the quality of the items.

Third, there are two dimensions for which too few items remain, for example, anti-violence and accommodating to culture. Respectively, each dimension only leaves 2 and 5 items. This issue can be a problem because if there are too few items, it is feared that the sample of behavior theorized in measuring that dimension will be too small, which in turn will affect the validity of the measuring instrument.

Fourth, the sample size in this study is quite large with a sample size of 1557 respondents. However, it is important to increase the sample size so that the analysis and parameter estimation process becomes more stable. Because by using a larger sample size, the analysis results become more reliable because they are closer to the original values in the population.

Fifth, although the percentage of respondents based on gender is quite balanced, the participation of respondents from certain religions is still very low. For example, Catholicism, Hinduism, Confucianism and local beliefs (*Aliran Kepercayaan*) whose participation is still below 2%. This is of course an important issue because it is closely related to group representation. Where each religious group must be represented proportionally. Future research must pay attention to this issue so that the designed tool for measuring religious moderation can be proven to be usable by all religions in Indonesia.

Sixth, further analysis in this research is no longer limited to development and validity testing alone. But take it one step further, by analyzing the validity of measurement bias, to find out whether an item applies equally across population groups. For example, in terms of gender, religion, or even domicile. This analysis is especially important in relation to fairness and so that the resulting scores can be compared, in addition to ensuring that the measuring tool does not harm or favor one particular demographic group. The purpose of this measurement invariance test is to test the performance of the religious moderation measurement scale in groups of two categories, namely gender and domicile, where the results of the configural, metric and scalar invariance tests are met. However, the actual invariance test results on the CFI index do not actually meet the model fit criteria and the RMSEA and SRMR indices comply with the model fit criteria. Meanwhile, to test invariance in groups of more than two categories, such as religious groups (Islam, Protestant, Catholic, Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, and local beliefs), we have not been able to do so due to the limited amount of data for each group, which is not balanced.

Suggestion

In the interest of continuously improving similar research, the following suggestions can be taken into account.

1. Carefully and thoroughly reopen the item grid from conceptual, operational definitions, to indicators on the item. Low CFI/TLI values indicate theory misspecification. Then, check again whether the number of dimensions theorized as seven dimensions is correct. Because too many dimensions will result in analytical difficulties, which is called the curse of dimensionality (Cai, 2010).
2. Future research should re-examine the sound and articulation of the items created. Especially items that have a positive factor loading coefficient (+) but have a factor loading coefficient <0.5. This is a very critical issue because it is very important to ensure that the items on the measuring instrument have a clear, straightforward and unambiguous articulation.
3. Future research must be able to add new items to the religious moderation measuring instrument. Especially adding new items in dimensions where a lot of items have fallen in order to have a sufficient number of items. For example, items in dimensions that have relatively few items such as the dimensions of anti-violence and accommodating to culture, of which only 2 items & 5 items remain respectively. These two dimensions still leave problems and disagreements between scientists and regional leadership elites. Additional issues that can be considered, for example, are friendliness and the desire to make friends, non-violence, as well as accommodating culture with culinary, small and medium businesses, tourism, etc.

Conclusion

In this sub-chapter the research conclusions will be presented as follows:

1. The instrument for measuring religious moderation has been empirically proven to be supported by empirical data. This can be seen from the various model fit indices used such as RMSEA, 90% C.I. RMSEA, Probability RMSEA < 0.05, and SRMR.
2. Of the 73 items in the initial stage of analysis, 48 items remained in the final stage of analysis. The details are that of the 73 items in the initial analysis, 1 item was dropped because it had a negative factor loading coefficient (-). In the subsequent analysis, of the 72 items analyzed, around 11 items were dropped because they violated the assumption of response normality. And of the 61 items analyzed in the final stage, 13 items were dropped because they had factor loading coefficient values below 0.5. So the remaining items at the end of the analysis are 48 items. The remaining 48 items met the criteria when analyzed using invariance measurement consisting of configurational, metric and scalar.
3. The range of correlation coefficient values between dimensions of the religious moderation measuring instrument ranges from 0.562 – 0.879. The lowest correlation is between the fairness dimension and the national commitment dimension of 0.562. Meanwhile, the highest correlation was produced between the general benefit dimension and the balanced dimension of 0.879.

Bibliography

1. Adeel, M. A., (2015), Moderation in Greek and Islamic Traditions, and a Virtue Ethics of the Qur'an. *The American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences* 32: 3, 1-28. DOI <https://doi.org/10.35632/ajis.v32i3.268>
2. Akhmadi, A., (2019), Moderasi beragama dalam keragaman Indonesia. *Jurnal Diklat Keagamaan*, 13(2), 45–55. <https://bdksurabaya.e-journal.id/bdksurabaya/article/download/82/45>
3. Alagha, J., (2015), Moderation and the Performing Arts in Contemporary Muslim Societies. *The American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences* 32: 3. 44-68. DOI <https://doi.org/10.35632/ajis.v32i3.270>
4. Al-Asfahani, A. (2009). *Mufrādāt Al-Fāz Al-Qur'ān*. Dar al-Fikr
5. Al-Faruqi, I. R. (1986). *Toward Islamic English* (No. 3). International Institute of Islamic Thought (IIIT).
6. Ali, N., (2020), Measuring religious moderation among muslim students at public colleges in Kalimantan facing disruption era. *INFERENSI: Jurnal Penelitian Sosial Keagamaan*, 14(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.18326/infsl3.v14i1.1-24>
7. Aljunied, K., (2018), In Praise of Moderation. In *Hamka and Islam: Cosmopolitan Reform in the Malay World*. pp. 35–52. Cornell University Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7591/j.ctt21h4vvo.7>
8. al-Qaradawī, Yusuf, (1989), *Al-Khasa'is al-'Ammah fi al-Islām*. Muassasah al-Risalah
9. Arifinsyah, Andy, S., & Damanik, A., (2020), The urgency of religious moderation in preveneting radicalism in Indonesia. *Essensia: Jurnal Ilmu-Ilmu Ushuluddin*, Vol 21, No 1. 91–107. <https://ejournal.uin-suka.ac.id/ushuluddin/esensia/article/view/2199>
10. Bahri, T. bin R. N. (2012). Understanding Islamic Moderation: The *Wasatiyya* Imperative. *Counter Terrorist Trends and Analyses*, 4(9), 18–20. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/26351088>
11. Baidhawiy, Z., (2015), The Muhammadiyah's Promotion of Moderation. *The American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences* 32: 3, 69-91. DOI <https://doi.org/10.35632/ajis.v32i3.271>
12. Borum, R., (2012), Radicalization into Violent Extremism I: A Review of Social Science Theories. *Journal of Strategic Security*. Vol. 4, No. 4. 7-36. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5038/1944-0472.4.4.1>
13. Cai, Y. (2019). Computational methods in environmental and resource economics. *Annual Review of Resource Economics*, 11, 59-82.
14. Cavanaugh, W.T., (2009), *The Myth of Religious Violence: Secular Ideology and the Roots of Modern Conflict*. Oxford University Press
15. Centre fo Strategic and International Studies, (2012). <https://www.csis.org/analysis/critical-issues-2012>
16. Chen, F. F. (2007). Sensitivity of goodness of fit indexes to lack of measurement invariance. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 14, 464–504. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10705510701301834>.
17. Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (1995). Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale development. *Psychological Assessment*, 7(3), 309–319. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.7.3.309>
18. Comrey, A. L., & Lee, H. B. (1992). *A first course in factor analysis* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
19. Durkheim, E., (1995), *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. Free Press
20. El Fadl, K. M. A., (2001), *Speaking In God's Name: Islamic Law, Authority And Women*. Oneworld
21. El Fadl, K. M. A., (2009), *The Great Theft: Wrestling Islam from the Extremists*. Harper Collins
22. El-Muhammady, A., (2015), Applying *Wasatiyyah* within the Malaysian Religio-Political Context. *The American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences* 32:3. 134-140. DOI <https://doi.org/10.35632/ajis.v32i3.1000>
23. Futaqi, S., (2018), Konstruksi Moderasi Islam (*Wasathiyyah*) dalam Kurikulum Pendidikan Islam. *Proceedings of Annual Conference for Muslim Scholars*, (Series 1), 521– 530. <http://proceedings.kopertais4.or.id/index.php/ancoms/article/download/155/155>

24. Hanapi, M. S., (2014), The *wasatiyyah* (moderation) concept in Islamic epistemology: a case study of its implementation in Malaysia. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 4(9), 1, <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=7b7fcf826588b1033def56985160a3ca9d40bf59>
25. Harlanu, M., Suryanto, A., Ramadhan, S., & Wuryandini, E. (2023). Construct validity of the instrument of digital skill literacy. *Cakrawala Pendidikan*, 42(3), 781–790. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v42i3.59703>
26. Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff Criteria for Fit Indexes in Covariance Structure Analysis: Conventional Criteria versus New Alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6, 1-55. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
27. Iqbal, M. A., & Mabud, S. A. (2019). Challenge of Globalisation to the Muslim Ummah: Religious Extremism and the Need for Middle Path (*Wasat*). *Strategic Studies*, 39(3), 73–88. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/48544311>
28. Kamali, M. H. (2015). *The middle path of moderation in Islam: The Qur'anic principle of wasatiyyah*. Oxford University Press.
29. Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia [KBBI], Kemendikbud.go.id., (2019). Doi <https://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id/entri/moderasi>
30. Kismoyo, C. P., Kartowagiran, B., Suyanto, S., & Ramadhan, S. (2023). Analysis of Continuity of Care Research Developments Based on the Scopus Database 20 20-2023: A Bibliometric Study. *International Journal of Membrane Science and Technology*, 10(3), 164–173. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.15379/ijmst.v10i3.1499>
31. Knuth, R., (2006), *Burning Books and Leveling Libraries: Extremist Violence and Cultural Destruction*. Preager
32. Latifa, R., Fahri, M., Mahida, N. F., (2022), Religious Moderation Attitude: Development Scale. *Journal An-Nafs: Kajian Penelitian Psikologi*, 7(2), 135-152. <https://doi.org/10.33367/psi.v7i2.2298>
33. Mansor, M. S., Rahim, R. A. A., Ramli, M. A., Razak, M. I. A., & Hassan, P., (2017), Confronting the Religious Extremism in Southeast Asia: A Comparative Study between The Concept of *Wasatiyyah* and Moderate. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 7(12), 2222–6990. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJA RBSS/v7-i12/3601>
34. Marković, M. V., Nicović, A., & Živanović, M., (2021), *Contextual and Psychological Predictors of Militant Extremist Mindset in Youth*, *Frontier Psychology*, Volume 12 - | <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.622571>
35. Marsh, H. W., Hau, K.-T., and Grayson, D. (2005). “Goodness of fit evaluation in structural equation modeling,” in *Contemporary Psychometrics*. eds. A. Maydeu-Olivares and J. McArdle (Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum), 275–340.
36. Mietzner, M. & Muhtadi, B., (2019), The Mobilisation of Intolerance and Its Trajectories: Indonesian Muslims Views of Religious Minorities and Ethnic Chinese. Greg Fealy & Ronit Ricci, *Contentious Belonging: The Place of Minorities in Indonesia*. ISEAS
37. Mufid, (2019), Membentuk Perilaku Beragama Melalui Konsep Wahdat al-Wujud Dan Wahdat Ash Syuhud. *Esoterik: Jurnal Akhlak dan Tasawuf*, 5(1), 145-164. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21043/esoterik.v5i1>
38. Muhtarom, A., Fuad, S., & Latief, T., (2020), *Moderasi Beragama: Konsep, Nilai dan Strategi Pengembangannya di Pesantren*. Yayasan Talibuana Nusantara
39. Muthén, B., & Kaplan, D. (1985). A comparison of some methodologies for the factor analysis of non-normal Likert variables. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 38(2), 171–189. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8317.1985.tb00832.x>
40. Natanael, Y., & Ramdani, R. (2021), Pengembangan Instrumen Dan Pengujian Properti Psikometri Skala Moderasi Beragama Di Perguruan Tinggi, *Tatar Pasundan: Jurnal Diklat Keagamaan*, Volume 15 No 2, 196-208. DOI: [10.38075/tp.v15i2.227](https://doi.org/10.38075/tp.v15i2.227)
41. Peraturan Presiden Nomor 18 Tahun 2020 tentang Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Nasional Tahun 2020-2024.
42. Peraturan Presiden Nomor 58 Tahun 2023 tentang Penguatan Moderasi Beragama
43. PPIM UIN Jakarta dan Convey, (2018), *Api dalam Sekam: Keberagamaan Muslim Gen-Z, Survei nasional tentang Keberagamaan di Sekolah dan Universitas di Indonesia*. PPIM UIN Jakarta and Convey Indonesia
44. Pratama, D., (2020), Pengembangan skala *thurstone metode equal appearing interval* untuk mengukur sikap moderasi beragama siswa Sekolah Menengah Atas. *Jurnal Psikologi Teori dan Terapan*, 11(1), 71. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/2b97/98a221d3cefe3853ab6a51b86bd6162b3bf5.pdf>
45. RPJMN (Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Nasional). (2020-2024). https://ditkumlasibappenas.go.id/download/file/Narasi_RPJMN_2020-2024.pdf
46. Sabet, A. G. E., (2015), Islam in the Balance. *The American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences* 32:3. 123-126. DOI <https://doi.org/10.35632/ajis.v32i3.997>
47. Saifuddin, L. H. (2019). *Moderasi Beragama*. Badan Litbang dan Diklat Kementerian RI.

48. Saifuddin, L. H., (2022), *Moderasi Beragama: Tanggapan atas masalah, Kesalahpahaman, Tuduhan, dan Tantangan yang dihadapinya*. Yayasan Saifuddin Zuhri
49. Setara Institute, (2019), Tipologi keberagamaan mahasiswa: Survei di 10 Perguruan Tinggi Negeri. <http://setara-institute.org/tipologi-keberagamaan-mahasiswa-survei-di-10-perguruan-tinggi-negeri/>
50. Shihab, M. Q., (2020), *Wasatiyyah: Wawasan Islam tentang Moderasi Beragama*. Penerbit Lentera Hati
51. Sihombing, L., et. al. (ed.), (2019), *Gagasan Kinerja Lukman Hakim Saifuddin: Moderasi Beragama dan Transformasi Kelembagaan Pendidikan*. Ditjen Bimas Kristen
52. Special Reports, (2016), Exploiting Disorder: al-Qaeda and the Islamic State. *Crisis Group Report*. <https://www.crisisgroup.org/global/exploiting-disorder-al-qaeda-and-islamic-state>
53. Stollznow, K., (2020), Terrorists, fanatics, and extremists: The language of anti-Muslim prejudice. *Globe: A Journal of Language, Culture and Communication*, 11: 1-25 (2020)
54. Sutrisno, E., (2019), Aktualisasi moderasi beragama di lembaga pendidikan. *Jurnal Bimas Islam*, 12(2), 323–348. <https://doi.org/10.37302/jbi.v12i2.11>
55. Syahid, A., (2016), Harun Nasution: Antara Risalah Ilmiah dan Risalah Diniyyah dalam Pengembangan Islam dan Budaya Muderat”, Suwito & Abdul Ghani Abdullah, et.al, (2016), *Pengembang Islam dan Budaya Moderat*. Young Progressive Muslim
56. Syahid, A., (2019), *Islam Nusantara: Relasi Agama-Budaya dan Tendensi Kuasa Ulama*. Penerbit Raja Grafindo Persada
57. Tim Balitbang dan Diklat, (2019, 2020, 2021, 2022), *Indeks Kerukunan Umat Beragama 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022*. Balitbang dan Diklat Kementerian Agama
58. Tim Pelaksana Redaksi Penyusunan Buku, (2018), *Mozaik Moderasi Beragama Dalam Perspektif Kristen*. Ditjen Bimas Kristen dan BPK Gunung Mulia
59. Tim Penyusun, (2019), *Tanya Jawab Moderasi Beragama*. Badan Litbang dan Diklat Kementerian Agama RI
60. Tornielli, A., (2019), Pope and the Grand Imam: Historic declaration of peace, freedom, women’s rights. <https://www.vaticannews.va/en/pope/news/2019-02/pope-francis-uae-grand-imam-declaration-of-peace.html>;
61. Tp., (2019), A Document on Human Fraternity For World Peace And Living Together. https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/travels/2019/outside/documents/papa-francesco_20190204_documento-fratellanza-umana.html
62. Trip S, Bora CH, Marian M, Halmajan A, Drugas, M. I., (2019), Psychological Mechanisms Involved in Radicalization and Extremism. A Rational Emotive Behavioral Conceptualization. *Front Psychology*. Mar 6;10:437. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00437. PMID: 30894828; PMCID: PMC6414414.
63. Trip, S., Marian, M.I., Halmajan, A., Drugas, M.I., Bora, C.H., Roseanu, G., (2019), Irrational Beliefs and Personality Traits as Psychological Mechanisms Underlying the Adolescents' Extremist Mind-Set. *Front Psychology*. May 22;10:1184. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01184. PMID: 31231270; PMCID: PMC6558417.
64. Ul Haq, F. R., (2024), *Buku Jalan Baru Moderasi Beragama: Mensyukuri 66 Tahun Haedar Nashir*. Penerbit Kompas
65. Umar, J., & Nisa, Y. F. (2020). Uji validitas konstruk dengan CFA dan pelaporannya. *JP3I*. Vol. 9(2), DOI: [10.15408/jp3i.v9i2.16964](https://doi.org/10.15408/jp3i.v9i2.16964)
66. Wahid, A. & Ikeda, D., (2015), *The Wisdom of Tolerance: A Philosophy of Generosity and Peace*. I.B. Tauris
67. Wahid, A., (2009), *Ilusi Negara Islam: Eskpansi Gerakan Islam Transnasional di Indonesia*. The Wahid Institute
68. Wilkinson, T., (2015), Moderation and al-Ghazali in Turkey. *The American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences*. 32: 3. 29-43. DOI <https://doi.org/10.35632/ajis.v32i3.269>
69. Yousif, A.F., (2015), Revisiting Fanaticism in the Context of Wasatīyyah. *The American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences* 32:3. i-xx. <https://doi.org/10.35632/ajis.v32i3.989>
70. Zulkifli, & Sa’diyah, S. (2020). Religiusitas, Moderasi dan Toleransi Beragama Mahasiswa Perguruan Tinggi Keagamaan Islam Negeri. Pusat Penelitian dan Penerbitan (Puslitpen) LP2M UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta, 117.
71. Zuroidah, N., Kumaidi, Hadi, S., Kusaeri, & Ramadhan, S. (2024). The Joint Model of Two-Parameter Logistic and Response Time Model for Computer-Based Tests. *International Journal of Engineering Trends and Technology*, 72(1), 117–129. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.14445/22315381/IJETT-V72I1P112>