

## **Religious Leader (Islam & Christianity) Understanding of Inter-Faith Dialogue Basic Concept in Malaysia and Its Effect to Social Relations.**

**Khairulnizam Mat Karim (Corresponding Author)**  
Universiti Tenaga Nasional, Sultan Hj.Ahmad Shah Campus, 26700  
Muadzam Shah, Pahang, Malaysia  
Tel: +6019-3935245 Emel:KhairulNizam@uniten.edu.my

**Khadijah Mohd Khambali@Hambali**  
Islamic Studies Academy, Universiti Malaya  
Lembah Pantai, 50603, Kuala Lumpur  
Tel: +60192576570 Emel:ijamh@um.edu.my

**Suzy Aziziyana Saili**  
Universiti Tenaga Nasional, Sultan Hj.Ahmad Shah Campus, 26700  
Muadzam Shah, Pahang, Malaysia  
Tel: +6019-6932866 Emel:suzy@uniten.edu.my

### **ABSTRACT**

The objective of this study is to, (1) measure level of understanding of religious leader (Islam and Christianity) on the basic concept of interfaith dialogue, (2) analyse the factors of the understanding developed and (3) analyse its effects on their social relation. This study uses the purposive sampling method in determining the appropriate respondents and total respondents for Islam dan Christianity which are 36 and 37 respectively. The authors use the method of questionnaire in collecting data and Likert Scale (1-5) in measuring the level of understanding and its effect, which is developed as the *Skala Tahap Kefahaman Dialog* (STKD) and *Skala Kesan Hubungan Sosial* (SKHS). The authors also use the Fixed Comparison Method and the Matrix Analysis in analysing the collected data, whereby the results were descriptive in nature. A major conclusion that could be drawn from the study is, (1) the level of understanding between Muslim and Christian Religious Leaders on the basic concept of the interfaith dialogue is equal as both are in the category of “Faham (F)” the fourth level of the *Skala Tahap Kefahaman Dialog* (STKD). (2) The main factors which contribute to this understanding are (a) Factor 1 (F1): level of education/formal education on religion, (b) Factor 2 (F2): past experience in interfaith dialogue activities and (c) Factor 3 (F3): level of respondent religiosity. (3) Even though the level of understanding is equal for both groups of respondents but the Christian Religious Leader has a higher scale “Tinggi(T)” on the effects of the understanding towards social relation in comparison to the Muslim Religious Leader whose level of understanding is in the mid-level of “Sederhana (SD)” based on the *Skala Kesan Hubungan Sosial* (SKHS). Using the Matrix Analysis, the result shows that there is a correlation between the

understandings on the interfaith dialogue basic concepts with the respondents' social relation but it is contributed by different factors for every group of respondents. Thus, this study has found that Factor 4 (F4): Factor of Current Policy (Organization) has a heavy weightage which forms an overall average impact to the Muslim Religious Leader's social relation only in the scale of "Sederhana (SD)". On the other hand, the Christian Religious Leader scored "Tinggi(T)" for their social relation which is contributed by Factor 1 (F1): level of education / formal education on religion and Factor 4 (F4): Factor on the Current Policy (Organization).

**Keywords:** Religious Leader; Interfaith Dialogue; Social Relation; Islam; Christianity.

### **Background of the studies**

The implementation of the inter-faith dialogues in Malaysia has progressed for half a century (Ghazali Basri, 2005; Yusri Mohamad Ramli, 2007; Wan Sabri Wan Yusuf and Arfah Ab Majid, 2012) or 55 years. Meanwhile, the active implementation is 28 years (Khairulnizam Mat Karim and Suzy Aziziyana Saili, 2012). Khairulnizam Mat Karim (2005) states that the implementation of this dialogue is seen as a reconciliation method which contributes to the factor of affiliation other than to avoid disintegration especially involving sensitive issues of religion. However, he has raised an issue- in terms of implementation, in the current reality, will dialogues be able to serve as a platform or method of reconciliation among the communities of multiple religions, races and cultures as Malaysia? Considering the current reality, whereby interfaith issues still arising, suggested that interfaith dialogue fails to resolve conflicts. Among the issues are (1) related to religious administrations, (2) law implementation or government policy that affects religion such as the construction of houses of worship, the civil and Shari'a court systems, religion conversion issue, (3) the use of terminologies from the Quran and Arabic, (4) the funeral of new convert, (5) dakwah (propagation) to other religions directly or indirectly, (6) understanding of religion and custom (Khairulnizam Mat Karim and Suzy Aziziyana Saili, 2012). Most issues occurred mainly involves Islam and Christianity. With issues that are going on, interfaith dialogues are still seen to be vulnerable to become the best platform or method in addressing interfaith conflicts, and to add, the Muslim and Christian religious leader functioning in the context of the dialogue implementation and the relationship among religions at the national level plays no role in solving issues of interfaith relations (Mahathir Mohamad, 2002; Abdullah Ahmad Badawi, 2004; Ghazali Basri, 2005 and Hunt, 2009). Meanwhile, according to Lowndes and Chapman (2005) and Yasril Yazid (2005) there is a high rationality for religious leader involvement in the inter-faith dialogues at the national level.

As the head of religion is very imperative in the inter-faith dialogue execution, they must be *competent, knowledgeable, and committed* to their own religions (Kamar Oniah 2010). Khairulnizam Mat Karim (2005) also adds that the panel selection must be comprehensive and we need not only look at the position held in the organisation represented but more importantly is their knowledge in the inter-faith dialogue itself. This is because the role that they are expected to undertake is not only a self-accountability and a responsibility to the organisations they speak for, but also to the religions they embrace and the community in general if it involves the interests of the country. Also, their success and failure as the dialogue practitioner will definitely give a direct effect to the inter-faith relations. Yasril Yazid (2005) also enlists that one of the factors for the failure in implementing inter-faith dialogues is caused by their inability to understand the inter-faith concept itself. What is implied as the basic concept of the inter-faith dialogue is one developed by

Khairulnizam Mat Karim (2005) which covers (a) definition, (b) objective (c) principle, (d) guideline and (e) dialogue regulations.

There is a study conducted by Khairulnizam Mat Karim and Suzy Aziziyana Sali (2012) on the level of understanding of the basic concept of the dialogue and the impact towards social relations where the respondents are leaders of religious organisations. The study shows that a good understanding on the basic concept of this dialogue contributes to the good social relation among the religious leader. The contributing factors include (1) respondents' level of education (including their level of religious education), (2) occupational background, (3) knowledge resource on the dialogue and (4) experiences in dialogue activities. If we look into research conducted outside Malaysia, there are some additional factors contributing to the success of the dialogue implementation and also the effect of social relations in the dialogue model that they have constructed (1) level of religiosity, (2) political factor, (3) current demand factor (organisations for which the dialogue practitioner serve) and the factor of prestige (Longchar, 2009; Sterland and Beauclerk, 2008; Fitzsimmons, 2008; Doctor, 2008; Halsall and Roebben, 2006; Lowndes and Chapman, 2005; United State Institute of Peace, 2004; Moberg, 2003; and Mohamad Abu Nimer, 2001). Thus, the authors has combined all of the factors to be used in the framework of studies - Factor 1 (F1): Level of Education/Religious Education, (2) Factor 2 (F2): Experience in Dialogue Activities, Factor 3 (F3): Level of Religiosity, Factor 4 (F4): Current Demand (organisations represented by the religious leader), Factor 5 (F5): Political Factor and Factor 6 (F6): Prestige.

Thus, a study needs to be done to determine the level of readiness of the dialogue practitioner like the religious leader of Islam and Christianity in Malaysia in their understanding and the effect of their social relations, and further leave an impact to the pluralistic society of Malaysia. With these pieces of information, a model framework or planning will be able to be formed to overcome the shortcomings still prevalent in the process of inter-faith dialogue implementation in Malaysia, and to further bring success to the 1Malaysia vision introduced by our sixth Prime Minister Datuk Seri Najib Tun Razak, one that stays to be within the scope of this study.

## **Objectives of the studies**

The objectives of this studies are (1) to measure the level of understanding of religious leader of Islam and Christianity on the basic concept of inter-faith dialogue, guideline and regulation of dialogue, (2) measuring the level of understanding of religious leader of Islam and Christianity towards social relationships in the themes of Social Interactions, Exclusive Attitude, Altruistic Attitude, Cooperation in addressing conflicts and effects in Dakwah (propagation) and Missionary Affairs, and (3) to analyse factors influencing the understanding and effect of both religious leader on the basic concept of the dialogues between religion and social relations.

## **Research Methodology**

### **(a) Sample of Study.**

As this study focuses on two religions namely Islam and Christianity, the groups of respondents selected by the authors represent the leaders of the Islamic and Christianity groups. They are (1) National Council Fatwa Committee for Islamic Affairs in Malaysia comprising of the Mufti from every state, appointed member who is an expert in religious affairs and selected fields and (2) State Dakwah Religious Officers for Muslim respondents. Meanwhile, for the Christian respondents, they are (1) Highest Committee Member of Council of Churches of Malaysia (CCM) comprising of Priests and (2) Affiliated Members and the Combination of Council of Churches of Malaysia

(CCM) comprising of priests and leaders of the organisations. Council of Churches of Malaysia (CCM) is also the member of the Christian Federation of Malaysia where its highest-rank members become Committee Members of the Christian Federation of Malaysia at the national level. For research purposes, the procedure is categorised as *Purposive Sampling* (Chua, 2006a; Berg, 2009; and Merriam, 1998) which refers to a group of subjects who have particular characteristics and factors to be selected as respondents.

Table 1 shows that the population of the actual sample and sample population obtained during the data collection through questionnaire.

Respondents	Category of Respondents	Total Population by Categories	Total Population of Respondents	Total sample findings by categories	Total Sample Findings	Percentage of Sample Findings
Muslim Respondents	National Fatwa Committee	22	36	22	36	100 %
	State Dakwah Religious Officer	14		14		
Christian respondents	Priest (Highest Committee Member of CCM and members of CCM)	24	37	15	28	76 %
	Head, Members of affiliation & Combination of the CCM	13		13		
<b>TOTAL</b>			73		64	88 %

Table 1: Table of Population and the Sample of Study on Muslim and Christian religious leader

Referring to Table 1 on the sample obtained from the respondents comprising of Muslim and Christian leaders (36 and 28 respectively) and the whole population of respondents are 64. Based on the calculation of the sample population, Krejcie and Morgan as elaborated by Chua (2006a) in “Table of sample size determination by Krejcie and Morgan (1970)”, if (1) the studied population is 70 then the best sample is 59. Meanwhile, if the population is 75 then the best sample is 63 respondents. Therefore from the total population of the studies and the sample collected by the authors which is 73 – 64 then it is in the middle of the table of the sample size determination and this total has high validity of 88% (64 respondents out of 73 total number of population) for the data to be analysed.

(b) Collection of surveyed data.

Before the questionnaire was distributed, the authors had obtained a Support Letter from the National Unity and Integration Department Director, acting as Chairman for the Committee To Promote Understanding Among Religious Adherents or *Jawatankuasa Mempromosikan Persefahaman dan Keharmonian Antara Penganut Agama* (JKMPKA) Y.Bhg. Dato’ Azman Amin Hasan. This is because issues concerning the interfaith relationship is under the authority of the above mentioned department of the Prime Minister’s Office.

(i) Survey data for Muslim religious leaders: questionnaires was distributed with the assistance of Puan Nor Safina bt. Zainal, Senior Assistant Director, Fatwa Management Section. With the cooperation given by the Fatwa Management Section, the authors had successfully distributed the intended questionnaire on 5-6 May 2012 as respondents attended the 99th Muzakarah in JAKIM

Putrajaya. Meanwhile, the mailing approach was adopted for the respondents who were the religious officers of the State Dakwah Section.

(ii) Survey data for Christian leaders: questionnaire were distributed to respondent via mail to the respondents' addresses obtained from the website of the Council of Churches of Malaysia. To justify the distributing of those questionnaire, the authors had also attached the supporting letter from the JPNIN Director.

## Data Analysis

Data Analysis (descriptive): According to Chua (2006b), there are ten methods of data analysis for the qualitative studies. Thus, in this study, we will use two of the methods listed namely, (1) Fixed Comparative Method and (2) Matrix Analysis Method which is very appropriate to the study whereby this method was previously employed by Khairulnizam Mat Karim and Suzy Aziziyana Sali (2012), Jeanne Bee-Tin Lian (2010) and Ghazali Basri (1988).

(1) Fixed Comparative Method: This study is comparative in nature, hence the primary method employed is comparative data analysis. The focus of this comparison is to contrast respondents' level of understanding namely between Muslim's and Christian religious leader, as well as its influencing factors. The next is a comparison in terms of the impact on social relations between the two groups of respondents. The distinctive line between this social relations comprises of (1) Social interaction for respondents' in interfaith dialogue, (2) Exclusiveness (3) Altruistic Attitude, (4) Cooperation in dealing with conflict and (5) Cooperation in matters of and Dakwah (propagation) and Missionary.

(2) Matrix Analysis Method: Also known as Logical Analysis Method. Since the qualitative nature of this study cannot be generalized (to all religious leader in Malaysia) and does not find the significance of relationship between the two variables (understanding - effects) as in quantitative studies, the logical analysis / preliminary description should be implemented on a conditioned relationship, factors, and the effects of all matters gathered. Thus a rough or general picture will be reported based on respondents' focus namely understanding of both Islam and Christianity religious leader on the basis of interfaith dialogue and its effect to the social relations. Results obtained will be used as a guideline for other target groups such as the head of the other religions in Malaysia.

## Research Findings: Understanding the Basic Concepts of Interfaith Dialogue

(a) Muslim religious leader level of understanding towards the overall basic concept of inter-faith dialogue.

To determine or measure the level of understanding of Islam and Christian religious leaders towards the basic concept of interfaith dialogue, the authors has built a scale of understanding identified as "Level of Dialogue Understanding Scale/ *Skala Tahap Kefahaman Dialog (SKTD)*" based on the Level of Dialogue Understanding Scale/ *Skala Tahap Kefahaman Dialog (STKD)* developed previously by Khairulnizam Mat Karim and Suzy Aziziyana (2012). This scale was constructed based on the total score in each category of the basic concept of interfaith dialogue expected from a respondent. If a respondent gets high marks then they have a high understanding on the basic concept of interfaith dialogue and if the score is low then their understanding is also low.

No.	Category	Level of Understanding X Respondent	Total Level of Dialogue Understanding
1.	Highly Understand/ <i>Sangat Faham</i> (SF)	120X 22	2113 - 2640
2.	Understand / <i>Faham</i> (F)	96 X 22	<b>1585 – 2112 (1849)</b>
3.	Unsure / <i>Tidak Pasti</i> (TP)	72 X 22	1057 - 1584
4.	Low Understanding / <i>Rendah Kefahaman</i> (RF)	48 X 22	529 - 1056
5.	Very Low Understanding / <i>Sangat Rendah Kefahaman</i> (SRF)	24 X 22	0 - 528

Table 2: Level of Dialogue Understanding for National Fatwa Council Committee Members.

No.	Category	Level of Understanding X Respondent	Total Level of Dialogue Understanding
1.	Highly Understand / <i>Sangat Faham</i> (SF)	120X 14	1345 - 1680
2.	Understand / <i>Faham</i> (F)	96 X 14	<b>1009 – 1344(1243)</b>
3.	Unsure / <i>Tidak Pasti</i> (TP)	72 X 14	673 - 1008
4.	Low Understanding / <i>Rendah Kefahaman</i> (RF)	48 X 14	337 - 672
5.	Very Low Understanding / <i>Sangat Rendah Kefahaman</i> (SRF)	24 X 14	0 - 336

Table 3: Level of Dialogue Understanding for State's Dakwah Religious Officers

No.	Category	Level of Understanding X Respondent	Total Level of Dialogue Understanding
1.	Highly Understand / <i>Sangat Faham</i> (SF)	120X 36	3457 – 4320
2.	Understand / <i>Faham</i> (F)	96 X 36	<b>2593 – 3456 (3092)</b>
3.	Unsure / <i>Tidak Pasti</i> (TP)	72 X 36	1729 – 2592
4.	Low Understanding / <i>Rendah Kefahaman</i> (RF)	48 X 36	864 – 1728
5.	Very Low Understanding / <i>Sangat Rendah Kefahaman</i> (SRF)	24 X 36	0 – 864

Table 4: Level of Dialogue Understanding for the total Muslim Religious Leaders

Following Table 2, data shows that the level of understanding among National Fatwa Council Committee Members towards the Basic Concept of Interfaith Dialogue is at the category of “Understand / Faham (F)” which correspond to a total score of 1849. Whereas for State’s Dakwah Religious Officer, as reflected by total score of 1243 in Table 3 shown that they were also at the level of “Understand / Faham (F)”. Overall, the total score for these two groups of Muslim religious leaders is  $1849 + 1243 = 3092$ . Thus, by referring to Table 4, Level of Dialogue Understanding Scale / *Skala Tahap Kefahaman Dialog* (STKD) for the Muslim Religious Leaders as a whole reflects that they belong to “Understand / Faham (F)” level, scaling between 2593 to 3456. Accordingly, this finding shows that the level of understanding among Muslim Religious Leaders in Malaysia towards the Basic Concept of Interfaith Dialogue falls under the second category of “Understand / Faham (F)”.

(b) Level of Understanding among Christian Religious Leaders towards the basic concept of interfaith dialogue as a whole.

No.	Category Level	Level of Understanding Scale X Respondent	Total Level of Dialogue Understanding Scale
	Highly Understand / <i>Sangat Faham</i> (SF)	120X 15	<b>1441 – 1800(1633)</b>
	Understand/ <i>Faham</i> (F)	96 X 15	1081 - 1440
	Unsure / <i>Tidak Pasti</i> (TP)	72 X 15	721 - 1080
	Low Understanding / <i>Rendah Kefahaman</i> (RF)	48 X 15	361 - 720
	Very Low Understanding / <i>Sangat Rendah Kefahaman</i> (SRF)	24 X 15	0 - 360

Table 5: Level of Dialogue Understanding for Priests (CCM members)



No.	Category Level	Level of Understanding Scale X Respondent	Total Level of Dialogue Understanding Scale
	Highly Understand / <i>Sangat Faham</i> (SF)	120 X 13	1249 - 1560
	Understand / <i>Faham</i> (F)	96 X 13	937 - 1248
	Unsure / <i>Tidak Pasti</i> (TP)	72 X 13	<b>625 – 936(772)</b>
	Low Understanding / <i>Rendah Kefahaman</i> (RF)	48 X 13	313 - 624
	Very Low Understanding / <i>Sangat Rendah Kefahaman</i> (SRF)	24 X 13	0 - 312

Table 6: Level of Dialogue Understanding for Head of Organization (CCM Associates &amp; Affiliates)

No.	Category Level	Level of Understanding Scale X Respondent	Total Level of Dialogue Understanding Scale
	Highly Understand / <i>Sangat Faham</i> (SF)	120 X 28	2689 - 3360
	Understand / <i>Faham</i> (F)	96 X 28	<b>2017 – 2688 (2405)</b>
	Unsure / <i>Tidak Pasti</i> (TP)	72 X 28	1345 - 2016
	Low Understanding / <i>Rendah Kefahaman</i> (RF)	48 X 28	673 - 1344
	Very Low Understanding / <i>Sangat Rendah Kefahaman</i> (SRF)	24 X 28	0 - 672

Table 7: Level of Dialogue Understanding for the total Christian Religious Leaders

Data presented in Table 5 shows that the level of understanding among Christian Priests (CCM Members) towards the Basic Concept of Interfaith Dialogue falls under the category of “Highly Understand / *Sangat Faham* (SF)” with a total score of 1633. As for the Head of Organization (CCM Associates & Affiliates) reflected by a total score of 772 presented in Table 6, shows that they fall under the level of “Unsure / *Tidak Pasti* (TP)”. Thus the total score for these groups of Christian leaders is (1633+ 772 = 2405). Referring to Table 7, we can conclude that the Level of Dialogue Understanding for Christian Religious Leaders fall under the category of “Understand / *Faham* (F)” namely having score in the range of 2017 – 2688 in the scale.

### Research Findings: The Effect of Inter-faith Dialogue Understanding on Religious Leaders Social Relations

In this section that deals with the effect of the understanding on the basic concept of interfaith dialogue towards social relations, the authors has divided questionnaire into five themes. These themes was previously applied by Ghazali Basri (1988) in measuring religious tolerance among Muslim and Christian community in two countries specifically Malaysia and Nigeria involving respondents from general public to religious leaders consisted of Priests and Imams. This particular theme was also applied by Khairulnizam Mat Karim and Suzy Aziziyana (2012) in measuring the effect of basic inter-faith dialogue understanding towards social relations of the Religion-based NGO Leaders.

The five themes were, (A) Social Relations and Interaction found in question 3, 4, 5, 8, 13 and 17. (B) Exclusive Attitudes found in question 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 22, 23 and 24. (C) Altruistic Attitudes in question 17, 19, 21 and 32. (D) Cooperation in solving conflicts found in question 28, 29, 30, 31 and 33. (E) Cooperation in dakwah (propagation) and missionary matters in question 25, 26, 27, 32 and 34.

Since this research is of qualitative nature, thus to determine the extent of the effect of level of understanding towards social relation themes descriptively would reduce the validity of the results. Therefore in order to increase the level of validity of the effect of level of understanding to the five social relation themes among each Muslim and Christian religious leaders, the authors has developed a means to measure the effect of social relation called “Social Relation Effect Scale / *Skala Kesan Hubungan Sosial 1 dan 2* (SKHS 1 and SKHS 2)” following the *Skala Kesan*

*Hubungan Sosial 1 dan 2* previously applied by Khairulnizam Mat Karim and Suzy Aziziyana (2012). This scale is constructed based on the total of the original scores (highest to lowest) collected based on “Dialogue Understanding Questionnaire” distributed to the intended respondents. If a respondent achieved high marks, then the impact to the social relations theme is also high and if the collected marks is low then the impact on the social relations theme is also low. Question in Section D in matters of Social Relations includes all five themes employing the scale of “Social Relation Effect Scale 1 / *Skala Kesan Hubungan Sosial 1 (SKHS 1)*” found in question, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23 and 25. Whereas for question 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26 and 27 are the corresponding questions, stating the reason as to whether they agree or disagree with the posed question. Therefore for these questions, descriptive explanation based on the percentage will be employed. For question 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33 and 34, the measurement will employ “Social Relation Effect Scale 2 / *Skala Kesan Hubungan Sosial 2 (SKHS 2)*” adjusting the results gathered from Likert Scale as can be found in the Questionnaire. If the collected scores are high ranging from “Strongly Agree / *Sangat Bersetuju*” to “Strongly Disagree / *Sangat Tidak Bersetuju*” therefore the measure of the effect on these themes would be “Very High / *Sangat Tinggi*” to “Very Low / *Sangat Rendah*”. The schedule for each measurement is divided accordingly to every themes.

### Muslim Respondents:

No	Category (%)	Level
1.	80 -100	Very High / <i>Sangat Tinggi (ST)</i>
2.	60-79	High / <i>Tinggi (T)</i>
3.	40 – 59	Moderate / Intermediate / <i>Sederhana (SD/ Pertengahan)</i>
4.	20 -39	Low / <i>Rendah (R)</i>
5.	0 - 19	Very Low / <i>Sangat Rendah (SR)</i>

Table 8: The Scale for Social Relations Effect 1 / *Skala Kesan Hubungan Sosial 1 (SKHS1)*

#### (a) Effect of Social Relationships and Interactions – Muslim Religious Leaders as a whole

Table 8 shows that the effect of social relationships and interactions among National Fatwa Council committee members fall under the level of “Low / *Rendah (R)*” with only 38.6 % with total score of 153 out of 396. The State’s Dakwah Religious Officers also fall under the same level (Low / *Rendah (R)*) which make 35 % with total score of 88 out of 252. Therefore this study shows that Muslim Religious Leaders have “Low / *Rendah (R)*” level of social relations and interaction towards Christian Religious Leaders with an average of 37.2 %.

#### (b) Effect of Exclusiveness - Muslim Religious Leaders as a whole

Based on Table 8, the study shows that both National Fatwa Council committee members and State’s Dakwah Religious Officers showed exclusiveness towards their own religion which fall under the level of “Moderate / *Sederhana (S)*” with a percentage of 42 % and 43 % and total score of 287 out of 682 and 186 out of 434 respectively. Therefore, the results indicate that Muslim Religious Leaders have “Moderate / *Sederhana (S)*” level of exclusiveness with an average percentage of 42.4 %.

#### (c) Effect of Altruistic Attitudes – Muslim Religious Leaders as a whole

By referring to Table 8, it shows that National Fatwa Council committee members have “Moderate / *Sederhana (S)*” level of altruistic attitude or intermediate level with a percentage of 59.2%. This is somewhat different with State’s Dakwah Religious Officers which showed “Very High / *Sangat Tinggi (ST)*” level of altruistic attitude with a percentage of 88 %. However, when



taking the average of these two groups, the authors can conclude that the level of altruistic attitudes for Muslim Religious Leaders fall under the category of “High / Tinggi (T)” with an average percentage of 62.3%.

(d) The effect of Cooperation in Conflict Solving – Muslim Religious Leaders as a whole

No.	Category	Effect Scale X Respondent	Total Scale of Social Relation Effect 2 / Skala Kesan Hubungan Sosial 2 (SKHS 2)
1.	Very High / Sangat Tinggi (ST)	35 x 22	617 - 770
2.	High / Tinggi (T)	28 x 22	463 - 616
3.	Moderate / Intermediate / Sederhana (S) / Pertengahan	21 x 22	<b>309 – 462 (399)</b>
4.	Low / Rendah (R)	14 x 22	155 - 308
5.	Very Low / Sangat Rendah (SR)	7 x 22	0 - 154

Table 9: The Scale for Social Relations Effect 2 / Skala Kesan Hubungan Sosial 2 (SKHS2) for National Fatwa Council committee members

No.	Category	Effect Scale X Respondent	Total Scale of Social Relation Effect 2 / Skala Kesan Hubungan Sosial 2 (SKHS 2)
1.	Very High / Sangat Tinggi (ST)	35 x 14	393 - 490
2.	High / Tinggi (T)	28 x 14	<b>295 – 392 (297)</b>
3.	Moderate / Intermediate / Sederhana (S) / Pertengahan	21 x 14	197 - 294
4.	Low / Rendah (R)	14 x 14	99 - 196
5.	Very Low / Sangat Rendah (SR)	7 x 14	0 - 98

Table 10: The Scale for Social Relations Effect 2 / Skala Kesan Hubungan Sosial 2 (SKHS2) for State’s Dakwah Religious Officers

No.	Category	Effect Scale X Respondent	Total Scale of Social Relation Effect 2 / Skala Kesan Hubungan Sosial 2 (SKHS 2)
1.	Very High (VH) / Sangat Tinggi (ST)	35 x 36	1009 - 1260
2.	High (H) / Tinggi (T)	28 x 36	757 - 1008
3.	Moderate (M) / Intermediate / Sederhana (S) / Pertengahan	21 x 36	<b>505 – 756 (696)</b>
4.	Low (L) / Rendah (R)	14 x 36	253 - 504
5.	Very Low (VL) / Sangat Rendah (SR)	7 x 36	0 - 252

Table 11: The Scale for Social Relations Effect 2 / Skala Kesan Hubungan Sosial 2 (SKHS2) for the whole Muslim Religious Leaders

Table 9 indicates that cooperative effort in conflict solving among National Fatwa Council committee members fall under the level of “Moderate / Sederhana (S)” or at the intermediate level with total score of 399. Whereas for State’s Dakwah Religious Officer as presented in Table 10, attained a total score of 297 which showed “High / Tinggi (T)” level. Thus, the total score for both groups is  $(399 + 297 = 696)$ . Therefore, by referring Table 11, it was found the Scale for Social Relations Effect 2 / Skala Kesan Hubungan Sosial 2 (SKHS 2) for all Muslim Religious Leaders was on “Moderate / Sederhana (S)” level, nailing score between 505 to 756.

(e) Effect of Dakwah (Propagation) and Missionary Matters – Muslim Religious Leaders as a whole.

For Table 8 of the Scale for Social Relations Effect 1 / Skala Kesan Hubungan Sosial 1 (SKHS 1), it is found that the attitudes of National Fatwa Council committee members and State’s Dakwah Religious Officers in propagation and missionary matters are on the “High / Tinggi (T)” level, between 70.5% and 73 %. Therefore the result reflects that, in average the attitudes of Muslim Religious Leaders in dakwah or propagation matters is 71.4 % which is still in the level of “High / Tinggi (T)”.

**Christian Respondents:**

No	Category (%)	Level
1.	80 -100	Very High / <i>Sangat Tinggi</i> (ST)
2.	60-79	High / <i>Tinggi</i> (T)
3.	40 – 59	Moderate / Intermediate / <i>Sederhana</i> (S)/ <i>Pertengahan</i>
4.	20 -39	Low / <i>Rendah</i> (R)
5.	0 - 19	Very Low / <i>Sangat Rendah</i> (SR)

Table 12: The Scale for Social Relations Effect 1 / *Skala Kesan Hubungan Sosial 1* (SKHS 1)

## (a) Effect of Social Relationships and Interactions – Christian Religious Leaders as a whole

Table 12 indicates that the effect of social relations and interactions among Priests (CCM Members) was in the level of “High / *Tinggi* (T)”, with a percentage of 62.2 % and total score of 168 out of 270. As for the Christian Organization Leaders (CCM associates & affiliates) it is on “Very Low / *Sangat Rendah* (SR)” level with a percentage of 18.8 % and a total score of 44 out of 234. Thus, the study reflects that Christian Religious Leaders have “Moderate / *Sederhana* (S)” level in terms of social relations and interactions related to Muslim Religious Leaders with an average of 42.1 %.

## (a) Effect of Exclusiveness - Christian Religious Leaders as a whole

Table 12 shows that both Priest (CCM members) and Christian Organization Leaders (CCM associates & affiliates) groups have exclusive attitudes towards their own religion at the level of “Low / *Rendah* (R)”, with a percentage of 33.8 % and 38 % with total marks of 157 out of 465 and 153 out of 403 respectively. Therefore, the study indicates that Christian Religious Leaders have exclusive attitudes at “Low / *Sederhana* (S)” level, with an average of 35.7 %.

## (a) Effect of Altruistic Attitudes – Christian Religious Leaders as a whole

Following Table 12, the study shows that Priests (CCM members) have altruistic attitude of “Very High / *Sangat Tinggi* (ST)” level with a percentage of 96.1%. This is different with the Christian Organization Leaders (CCM associates & affiliates) which have “High / *Tinggi* (T)” level of altruistic attitudes of 68.1 %. However, if the average of these groups is taken into account, the authors can conclude that the level of altruistic attitudes for Christian Religious Leaders is “Very High / *Sangat Tinggi* (ST)” with an average of 82.8 %.

## (b) The effect of Cooperation in Conflict Solving – Christian Religious Leaders as a whole

No.	Category	Effect Scale X Respondent	Total Scale of Social Relation Effect 2 / <i>Skala Kesan Hubungan Sosial 2</i> (SKHS 2)
1.	Very High / <i>Sangat Tinggi</i> (ST)	35 x 15	421 - 525
2.	High / <i>Tinggi</i> (T)	28 x 15	<b>316 – 420 (359)</b>
3.	Moderate / Intermediate / <i>Sederhana</i> (S) / <i>Pertengahan</i>	21 x 15	211 - 315
4.	Low / <i>Rendah</i> (R)	14 x 15	106 - 210
5.	Very Low / <i>Sangat Rendah</i> (SR)	7 x 15	0 - 105

Table 13: The Scale for Social Relations Effect 2/ *Skala Kesan Hubungan Sosial 2* (SKHS 2) for Priests (CCM members)

No.	Category	Effect Scale X Respondent	Total Scale of Social Relation Effect 2 / <i>Skala Kesan Hubungan Sosial 2</i> (SKHS 2)
1.	Very High / <i>Sangat Tinggi</i> (ST)	35 x 13	365 - 455
2.	High / <i>Tinggi</i> (T)	28 x 13	<b>274 – 364 (292)</b>

3.	Moderate / Intermediate / Sederhana (S) / Pertengahan	21 x 13	183 - 273
4.	Low / Rendah (R)	14 x 13	92 - 182
5.	Very Low / Sangat Rendah (SR)	7 x 13	0 - 91

Table 14: The Scale for Social Relations Effect 2/ *Skala Kesan Hubungan Sosial 2* (SKHS 2) for Head of Christian Organization (CCM associates & affiliates)

No.	Category	Effect Scale X Respondent	Total Scale of Social Relation Effect 2 / <i>Skala Kesan Hubungan Sosial 2</i> (SKHS 2)
1.	Very High / Sangat Tinggi (ST)	35 x 28	785 - 980
2.	High / Tinggi (T)	28 x 28	<b>589 - 784 (651)</b>
3.	Moderate / Intermediate / Sederhana (S) / Pertengahan	21 x 28	393 - 588
4.	Low / Rendah (R)	14 x 28	197 - 392
5.	Very Low / Sangat Rendah (SR)	7 x 28	0 - 196

Table 15: The Scale for Social Relations Effect 2/ *Skala Kesan Hubungan Sosial 2* (SKHS 2) for the whole Christian Religious Leaders

Based on Table 13 and 14, the study indicate that the cooperative attitudes in solving conflicts for Priest (CCM members) and Christian Organization Leaders (CCM associates & affiliates) is in the level of “High / Tinggi (T)” with a total score of 359 and 292. Therefore, the total score for both groups is  $(359 + 292 = 651)$ . Thus, referring to Table 15 of the Effect of Social Relation Scale 2 / *Skala Kesan Hubungan Sosial 2* (SKHS 2) for all Christian Religious Leaders it was found that it is in the level of “High / Tinggi (T)”, nailing score between 589 to 784.

(c) Effect on *Dakwah* (Propagation) and Missionary Activities – Christian Religious Leaders as a whole.

Following Table 12, it shows that the attitudes of the priest (CCM members) and Christian Organization Leaders (CCM associates & affiliates) in *dakwah* or propagation and missionary matters is in the level of “High / Tinggi (T)”, with 77.1% and 77.8 %. Therefore, it reflects that the average for Christian Religious Leaders attitudes in propagation matters is 77.4 % or still in “High / Tinggi (T)” level.

## Discussion

Analysis that can be made following the findings are: (1) the level of understanding among Muslim and Christian Religious Leaders on the basic concepts of interfaith dialogue is equal, which is at the level of “Understand / Faham”. (2) There are three factors influencing the understanding of both Muslim and Christian Religious Leaders on the basic concepts of interfaith dialogue which is First Factor / *Faktor Pertama* (F1): Level of Education/Religious Education/Education Process; Second Factor / *Faktor Kedua* (F2): Experience in interfaith dialogue; and the Third Factor / *Faktor Ketiga* (F3): Level of religiosity. (3) Level of Education, Religious Education and Education Process or formal education is the major platform in obtaining knowledge on interfaith dialogue as it is inter-related, parallel and significantly important in determining the level of understanding among Muslim and Christian Religious Leaders. (4) In comparison, the level of social relations effect among Christian Religious Leaders is better, namely at the category of “High / Tinggi (T)” than the “Moderate / Sederhana (S)” level portrayed by Muslim Religious Leaders. (5) Overall, there are five factors influencing the level of social relations among Muslim and Christian Religious Leaders, First Factor / *Faktor Pertama* (F1): Level of Education/Religious Education/Education Process; Second Factor / *Faktor Kedua* (F2): Involvement in interfaith dialogue; Third Factor / *Faktor*

*Ketiga* (F3): Level of religiosity; Fourth Factor / *Faktor Keempat* (F4): Current demand (Organization); and Fifth Factor / *Faktor Kelima* (F5): Politics. (6) Comparatively, the “Moderate / *Sederhana* (S)” level of social relations effect obtained by Muslim Religious Leaders was mostly influenced by the Fourth Factor / *Faktor Keempat* (F4): Current demand (Organization), whereas the “High / *Tinggi* (T)” level obtained by Christian Religious Leaders was mostly influenced by the First Factor / *Faktor Pertama* (F1): Level of Education, Religious Education and Education Process and the Fourth Factor / *Faktor Keempat* (F4): Current demand (Organization). (7) Overall, the results indicates that there is significant relationship between good level of understanding on the basic concept of interfaith dialogue with the effect of social relations among Muslim and Christian Religious Leaders. (8) From the entire analyses, a model of dialogue agent, especially in conflict solving dialogue within the context of Malaysia can be formulated, called as Model Agent of Interfaith Dialogue)(*MA\_IFD*). This model is developed based on four main characteristics, (1) Knowledgeable, (2) Vast Experience, (3) Good Personality and (4) Building Good Relationship. (9) A new research framework can be developed as well, following the results obtained from this studies, involving two variables which is understanding and social relations together with a diagnosis table concerning Malaysia’s Muslim and Christian Religious Leaders understanding towards the basic concept of interfaith dialogue and its effects to their social relations. This diagnosis is called Diagnostic Understanding of Religious Leader (Islam-Christianity) on Interfaith Dialogue Basic Concept and Effects to Social Relation (Diagnostic Understanding IFD-SR).

## Conclusion

Based on results and findings of this study, it was found that there is significant relationship between good level of understanding on the basic concept of interfaith dialogue with the effect of social relations among Muslim and Christian Religious Leaders. Hence it is very important for every religion to ensure their representatives to interfaith dialogue were equipped with (1) good understanding on the basic concept of interfaith dialogue, (2) good level of formal and religious education (3) good level of religiosity. This is because if good social relations can be formed among religious leaders, aside of only inter-faith dialogue, then most probable would reduce the level of disparity or tension during dialogue process particularly during conflict resolution.

## Reference

Abdullah Ahmad Badawi (2004). Utusan Malaysia. 4 August 2004.

Berg, Bruce L. (2009). *Qualitative Research Method for the Social Sciences*. 7th edn. Boston: Pearson Education Inc.

Chua Yan Piaw. (2006 a). *Kaedah dan Statistik Penyelidikan: Kaedah Penyelidikan Buku 1*. Kuala Lumpur: McGraw- Hill.

\_\_\_\_\_. (2006 b). *Kaedah dan Statistik Penyelidikan: Kaedah Penyelidikan Buku 2*. Kuala Lumpur: McGraw- Hill.

- Doctor, Nicholas. (2008). Multi-Track Diplomacy through Enhancing Interreligious Understanding: A case Study in Abrahamic Trialogue between Jordanian and American Students (dissertation to fulfil the partial requirement for Jordan: Modernization and Social Change School for International Training, University of Tulsa, Amman, Jordan).
- Fitzsimmons, Michael James. (2008). The Christian Practice of Hospitality: A Model for Interfaith Dialogue for Presbyterian & Roman Catholic Youth (working paper to fulfil the requirement for Doctor of Ministry Faculty of Pittsburgh Theological Seminary).
- Ghazali Basri. (1988). A Comparative Study on Religious Tolerance in Post –Independence Malaysia and Nigeria with Special Reference to Christian and Muslim Relation. (PhD Thesis, Aberdeen University).
- Ghazali Basri. (2005). Pengalaman Lalu, Cabaran Semasa dan Prospek, Siri Monograf 9 Dialog Antara Agama di Malaysia. Kuala Lumpur: Civilization Dialogue Centre, Universiti Malaya.
- Halsall, Anna & Roebben, Bert. (2006). Intercultural and Interfaith Dialogue through Education, *Religious Education*. 101(4):443-452.
- Hunt, Robert. (2009). Can Muslim Engage in Interreligious Dialogue? A study of Malay Muslim Identity in Contemporary Malaysia, *The Muslim World*. Vol.99. United Kingdom: Blackwell Published Ltd.
- Jeanne Bee-Tin Lian. (2010). Sense making and Sense giving during Organizational Change: A Case Study of a Singapore Religious Leader (Education PhD Thesis, George Washington University, USA).
- Kamar Oniah Kamaruzaman. (2010). Inter-Faith Dialogue-Moving Forward: Setting Premises and Paradigm. *Religion and Pluralistic Co-Existence: The Muhibbah Perspective (A Collection of Seminar Paper)*, Kuala Lumpur: IIUM Press.
- Khairulnizam Mat Karim & Suzy Aziziyana Saili. (2012). Measuring religious leaders (Muslim – Non Muslim) understanding on Interfaith Dialogue basic concept and its effect to social relation: a preliminary, *The Journal of Islamic Knowledge*, Vol 2. No. 2, March 2012,
- Khairulnizam Mat Karim. (2005). Realiti Aplikasi Dialog Antara Agama di Malaysia:Kajian *Inter-Faith Spiritual Fellowship* (INSaF) dan Pusat Dialog Peradaban, Universiti Malaya (Masters Dissertation in Usuluddin, Aqidah and Islamic Thought Dept., Academy of Islamic Studies, Universiti Malaya).
- Longchar, Wati. (2009). Beyond Four Walled Campuses: Model of Ecumenical Theological Education in Interfaith Issues in India, *International Review of Mission*. Vol. 98. No 1.
- Lowndes, Vivien & Chapman, Racheal. (2005). “Faith, hope and clarity: Developing a model of faith group involvement in civil renewal”, (Main report: Studies conducted for the programme



of the Civil Renewal Research monitored by the Local Governance Research Unit, De Montfort University Leicester , United Kingdom.)

Mahathir Mohamad. (2002). New Straits Time. Wednesday, 27 February 2002.

Merriam, S.B. (1998). *Qualitative Research and Case Study Application in Education*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn, San Francisco: CA Jossey-Bass.

Moberg, Marci. (2009). *Experiential Encounters: New Model of Interfaith Dialogue*, (Thesis submitted for Degree of Master of Science, George Mason University).

Mohammed Abu Nimer. (2001). *Conflict Resolution, Culture and Religion: Towards a Training Model of Interreligious Peacebuilding*, *Journal of Peace Research*. Vol.38. London: Sage Publication (Published for International Peace Research Institute, Oslo, Norway).

Special Report. (2004). *What Works? Evaluating Interfaith Dialogue Programs*. Washington: United States Institute of Peace.

Sterland, Bill & Beauclerk, John. (2008). "Faith Communities as Potential Agents for Peace Building in the Balkans (Analysis of faith-based interventions towards conflict transformation and lasting reconciliation in post-conflict countries of former Yugoslavia) (Full research report sponsored by Norwegian Church Aid, conducted from 1 October – 31 December 2007).

Wan Sabri Wan Yusuf & Arfah Ab Majid. (2012). *Inter-Religious Dialogue Models in Malaysia*, *Global Journal Al Thaqafah*, Vol. 2 No. 1 2012, 7-13.

Yasril Yazid. (2005). *Pro Kontra Dalam Pluralisme Agama: Kajian Terhadap Konflik Sosial Keagamaan dan Sikap Toleransi Beragama di Indonesia*. (PhD Thesis in Usuluddin, Dept. of Aqidah and Islamic Thought, Academy of Islamic Studies, Universiti Malaya, Malaysia).

Yusri Ramli. (2007). *Dialog Antara Agama di Malaysia: Perkembangan Dalam Sejarah Separuh Abad Selepas Merdeka* (Working Paper for the International Seminar of Religion and Development III, organized by Dept. of Usuluddin and Philosophy, Faculty of Islamic Studies, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, Malaysia 6-7 August 2007).