



**COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE OF RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE POLICY
AND ITS ROLE IN SUSTAINING TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN PRIORITY
DESTINATIONS: EVIDENCE FROM LOMBOK TENGAH, INDONESIA**

Zakaria Ansori¹ · Agus²

^{1 2} Universitas Islam Negeri (UIN) Mataram, Indonesia

Correspondence: zakariaansori@uinmataram.ac.id, aguslombok@uinmataram.ac.id

Keywords:

religious tolerance; collaborative governance; sustainable tourism; hexa-helix model; Indonesia; Lombok Tengah; mixed methods; policy development

ABSTRACT

Sustainable tourism in Indonesia's priority destinations presupposes a socially enabling environment in which communities can accommodate the diversity of incoming visitors. Religious tolerance as a collective social disposition shaping inter-group openness constitutes a foundational dimension of this enabling environment. Yet most existing scholarship treats tolerance governance either as an educational matter or as a straightforward administrative function of the central state, leaving unexplored the multi-actor, sub-national governance dynamics that actually determine tolerance outcomes at the community level. This study examines the religious tolerance index among communities in Lombok Tengah Regency Indonesia's nationally designated Special Economic Zone (SEZ) for tourism within the Mandalika development corridor and proposes a collaborative governance model capable of sustaining and deepening religious tolerance alongside the regency's accelerating tourism expansion. A sequential explanatory mixed-methods design was employed. Quantitative data were gathered through a structured survey instrument (n = 348) measuring four empirical dimensions: public perception, attitude, social cooperation, and government disposition, operationalised on a 1–4 Likert scale. Qualitative data derived from twenty-three semi-structured, in-depth interviews with district-level government officials, Ministry of Religious Affairs officers, FKUB members, religious leaders from three faith traditions, civil society representatives, and regional planning bureaucrats, supplemented by participant observation at three inter-faith dialogue events and systematic document analysis. The composite tolerance index stands at 3.61 (on a 1–4 scale; category: High). Internal variance is notable: government disposition scores highest (3.93) while attitude (3.10) and social cooperation (3.16) remain at moderate levels, indicating a gap between normative endorsement and lived inter-religious practice. Educational attainment, age cohort, and sex significantly predict individual tolerance behaviour. Qualitative analysis identifies four structural constraints on governance: electoral majority-pandering incentives, inconsistent moderation leadership, a homogeneous social-religious

	<p>ecology, and an underdeveloped public sphere for inter-faith exchange. The prevailing institutional arrangement is a triple-helix collaboration government, FKUB, and religious organisations operating under a regulatory framework that has not been updated to incorporate the 2023 Presidential Regulation on Religious Moderation. The study proposes a hexa-helix collaborative governance model incorporating government, FKUB, civil society and religious organisations, the private sector, mass media, and higher education institutions. This model addresses the structural constraints identified empirically and aligns with the legislative architecture of Perpres No. 58/2023 and PMA No. 3/2024. It re-centres tolerance governance as a multi-stakeholder ecosystem rather than a unilateral bureaucratic function, directly supporting Lombok Tengah's sustainable tourism trajectory under the RPJPD 2025–2045.</p>
--	--

1. INTRODUCTION

Indonesia presents one of the most empirically rich environments for studying the relationship between religious governance and development policy. With approximately 277 million inhabitants professing six officially recognised religions distributed across seventeen thousand islands, the country has historically positioned inter-religious tolerance not merely as a theological virtue but as a structural precondition for national cohesion and, increasingly, for economic development. The democratic transition inaugurated by Suharto's resignation in May 1998 accelerated and complicated this governance challenge simultaneously: it created more space for minority religious expression while also enabling the mobilisation of majority religious identities in electoral competition.

Since the early 2000s, the governance of religious diversity in Indonesia has evolved substantially from a state-centric, top-down management paradigm characteristic of the New Order's orchestrated 'harmony' discourse toward participatory frameworks that acknowledge civil society agency. Scholars have traced this shift in the emergence of a distinct subfield of religious governance scholarship in Indonesia, centred on the concept of 'tata kelola keragaman agama' (governance of religious diversity) and closely tied to the broader governance paradigm shift in public administration studies that began in the 1990s (Henry, 2007; Bagir et al., 2023). This shift is now codified explicitly in national law: Presidential Regulation No. 58 of 2023 on the Strengthening of Religious Moderation and the subsequent Ministerial Regulation on Religious Moderation Coordination (PMA No. 3 of 2024) both mandate collaborative, multi-stakeholder governance as the normative model for tolerance policy at sub-national administrative levels.

The empirical gap between this progressive legislative architecture and actual sub-national implementation, however, remains substantial. Most empirical studies in the Indonesian context have either measured tolerance indices without analysing governance conditions, or analysed governance without connecting findings to development outcomes particularly to the increasingly salient agenda of sustainable tourism (Tohri et al., 2021; Mukhibat and Istiqomah, 2023; Munif et al., 2023). This gap is consequential. Sustainable tourism, as conceptualised in United Nations World Tourism Organisation frameworks, depends fundamentally on the social capital of host communities, including their openness to culturally and religiously different visitors (UNWTO, 2004). Where social tolerance is weak or precarious, tourism development tends to generate conflict, resistance, and social fragmentation rather than the inclusive economic growth that development planners envision.

Lombok Tengah Regency in West Nusa Tenggara Province offers a strategically important case for examining this nexus. Since the designation of the Mandalika Special

Economic Zone (KEK Mandalika) under Government Regulation No. 52 of 2014 a designation reaffirmed and expanded in the National Long-Term Development Plan (RPJPN) 2025–2045, which positions West Nusa Tenggara as a 'centre for adventure tourism and food basket' the regency has been subjected to intensive, externally financed tourism development. The Formula E World Championship and MotoGP Grand Prix races held at the Mandalika International Street Circuit have generated international media coverage that has transformed Mandalika into a globally circulated destination brand. Against this backdrop, the socio-religious conditions of the host society are not incidental details; they are load-bearing elements of the development architecture.

There is, however, a problem. West Nusa Tenggara Province has repeatedly featured in national surveys as a region with comparatively low tolerance scores. SETARA Institute's City Tolerance Index positioned Mataram NTB's provincial capital and, administratively, a separate municipality among the ten least tolerant cities in Indonesia in 2023, with an index score of 4.38 on a 100-point scale (SETARA, 2023). While Lombok Tengah is geographically and administratively distinct from Mataram, the regency shares several relevant characteristics: a near-homogeneous Sunni Muslim majority, historically limited formal inter-faith institutional exchange in many sub-districts, and a documented recent history of inter-religious tension, including a church building burned in the late 1990s in Praya (the regency capital) and unresolved building permit cases for minority faith communities.

Against this background, this study poses three interrelated research questions. First: what is the current religious tolerance index in Lombok Tengah, and how do its four constituent dimensions compare internally? Second: which socio-demographic factors account for variance in individual tolerance behaviour within the community, and what are the magnitude and direction of those associations? Third: given the documented institutional arrangements and their identified limitations, what governance model can sustain and deepen religious tolerance in a manner that also directly supports Lombok Tengah's sustainable tourism agenda?

The paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 develops the theoretical framework, reviewing religious tolerance as a social fact, governance paradigm evolution, the sustainable tourism-social capital nexus, and prior empirical work on these themes in Indonesia. Section 3 describes the mixed-methods research design. Section 4 presents quantitative results on the tolerance index and its correlates. Section 5 reports qualitative findings on governance architecture and structural constraints. Section 6 integrates the findings into a proposed hexa-helix governance model. Section 7 discusses implications, limitations, and future research directions, followed by conclusions in Section 8.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Religious Tolerance as a Measurable Social Fact

Sociological approaches to religious tolerance are productively grounded in Durkheimian social facts theory the epistemological position that collective norms, dispositions, and constraints exist external to any individual consciousness and exert coercive influence on individual behaviour (Ritzer, 2002). From this vantage point, religious tolerance is not simply a personal psychological attribute that varies independently across individuals; it is a socially produced, institutionally reinforced, and collectively experienced orientation that can be measured, explained, and governed. Sanderson (2011) further argues that macro-sociological structures including educational institutions, state regulatory frameworks, economic configurations, and demographic compositions systematically shape the distribution of tolerance orientations within populations.

Empirical research has converged on a multi-dimensional operational framework for tolerance measurement. Tohri et al.'s (2021) study in East Lombok, the most methodologically relevant antecedent to the present study, measured five variables: community perception, community attitude, cooperation, government disposition, and community expectations of government. Their study found a high composite index (approximately 3.79 on a 1–4 scale), consistent with prior qualitative research suggesting that pluralistic traditions in Lombok Timur's multi-ethnic communities produce higher baseline tolerance. The present study adapts this framework by focusing on four variables excluding the expectations variable as distinct from disposition and adds occupational type and administrative location as exploratory predictors.

Slooter and Verkuyten's (2007) study among Dutch adolescents methodologically useful as a controlled quantitative study of tolerance variation found that group identity salience, education level, and sex predicted tolerance toward Muslim religious practices, with females showing lower tolerance than males in that context. Their finding that tolerance is learned and context-sensitive, rather than natural or fixed, is theoretically important: it implies that governance interventions can and do affect tolerance outcomes, provided they operate on the correct levers.

Research in Indonesian educational settings has refined this picture. Jatiningsih and Arifin (2018) found no significant difference between Islamic boarding schools and public schools in student tolerance attitudes when institutional reinforcement mechanisms (formal curriculum, teacher modelling, school culture) were equivalent a finding that suggests institutional design, rather than the religious identity of the institution, is the operative variable. Soleha (2019) similarly identified curriculum structure and pedagogical approach, rather than school type, as the primary predictors of pro-tolerance student outcomes in Bangka Belitung. For governance purposes, these findings imply that the formal content and implementation of educational interventions matters more than which type of institution delivers them.

2.2. The Governance Paradigm Shift and Collaborative Models

The conceptual distinction between government and governance constitutes one of the most durable contributions of late twentieth-century public administration scholarship (Henry, 2007). Where government denotes a hierarchical, centralised mode of authority in which the state retains primary responsibility for identifying, deciding, and implementing solutions to collective problems, governance designates a polycentric, networked mode in which authority, resources, and accountability are distributed across multiple actors governmental, civil society, commercial, and epistemic who collaborate within agreed frameworks to co-produce public goods (Wang, 2014).

This distinction has profound implications for the governance of complex social phenomena such as religious tolerance. Tolerance, as the qualitative findings of this study confirm, is shaped simultaneously by regulatory instruments (formal state action), inter-personal contact (civil society and market relations), epistemic frameworks (education and media), and political incentive structures (electoral systems). No single state agency, however capable and well-resourced, can effectively manage all of these dimensions simultaneously. Collaborative governance frameworks are not merely normatively preferable; they are empirically necessary.

Ansell and Gash's (2007) foundational model of collaborative governance specifies the conditions under which multi-stakeholder arrangements produce durable, consensus-oriented outcomes: starting conditions (prior relationships, trust levels), institutional design (clear mandates, facilitative leadership), collaborative process (face-to-face dialogue, commitment-building), and outcomes. Their analysis is directly relevant to the Indonesian context, where inter-

faith governance arrangements such as the FKUB were established precisely to institutionalise face-to-face dialogue as a conflict-prevention mechanism.

Wang's (2014) polycentric collaboration model extends this framework by specifying distinct functional roles for different actor categories within a collaborative arrangement. In Wang's scheme, government designs policy parameters and provides regulatory authority; civil society advocates for excluded voices and socialises norms; and market actors mobilise private resources and create economic incentives for cooperation. McAdam and Debackere's (2017) quadruple-helix adds knowledge institutions (universities) as a fourth actor type, emphasising the epistemic contribution of systematic research to governance effectiveness.

The most directly relevant theoretical development for the present study is the hexa-helix model proposed by Rachim et al. (2020) in the context of Lake Tempe floodplain management in South Sulawesi. Their hexa-helix extends the quadruple-helix by adding mass media and community groups affected by the governance problem as distinct stakeholder categories. This six-actor framework is particularly appropriate for governance challenges like religious tolerance in a tourist economy that involve significant public communication dimensions and where directly affected community members (both religious minorities and tourism workers) are currently excluded from formal governance arrangements. The present study tests and develops this framework in the novel context of religious tolerance governance.

2.3. Sustainable Tourism and the Social Sustainability Dimension

The UNWTO's conception of sustainable tourism rests on three mutually reinforcing pillars: environmental sustainability, economic sustainability, and social sustainability (UNWTO, 2004). In the context of Indonesian destination development, the first two pillars have historically received more systematic policy attention than the third. Environmental regulations govern land use in and around the Mandalika SEZ; investment promotion frameworks attract and regulate hospitality and infrastructure capital. Social sustainability, by contrast, remains operationally underspecified in most formal planning documents.

Suryade et al.'s (2023) study of key variables in sustainable tourism SEZ development at Mandalika identified social acceptance the willingness of local communities to accommodate the presence and needs of diverse tourist groups as a critical, currently underdeveloped condition for long-term tourism viability. They found that communities with higher levels of inter-group exposure and social heterogeneity showed greater acceptance capacity, consistent with contact theory (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew and Tropp, 2006): structured, positive contact between members of different groups is among the most effective mechanisms for reducing inter-group anxiety and increasing tolerance. Tourism, when well governed, creates exactly these contact conditions; when poorly governed, it can produce social resentment and reactive exclusion.

The institutional nexus between tolerance governance and tourism governance has not been systematically examined in the Indonesian literature. Yuniningsih (2019) and Yunas (2019) both advocate for pentahelix and collaborative approaches to tourism governance in specific Indonesian contexts, but neither integrates religious tolerance as a governance variable. Halibas, Sibayan, and Maata (2017), writing about innovation systems in Southeast Asia, demonstrate that multi-helix collaborative arrangements produce more resilient and adaptive outcomes than either purely governmental or purely market-driven development a finding that holds across development domains. The present study contributes to this literature by integrating tolerance governance into the collaborative governance framework for sustainable tourism development.

2.4. Prior Research on Religious Tolerance Governance in Indonesia

Research on religious tolerance in Indonesia has developed considerably over the past decade, though gaps persist. At the national level, the Setara Institute's annual City Tolerance Index (IKT) measuring four variables: government regulation, social regulation, government action, and socio-religious demography provides the most systematic longitudinal data, but its city-level unit of analysis obscures sub-city variation and does not examine governance mechanisms. Munif et al.'s (2023) library research-based analysis of tolerance policy identified three core principles of Indonesian tolerance policy (national commitment, anti-radicalism, local cultural accommodation) but found that both public and governmental understanding of these principles remains inadequate.

Mukhibat and Istiqomah (2023) examined religious moderation policy in educational settings, finding that implementation occurs primarily through formal curriculum delivery in both formal and non-formal education, with considerable variation in quality and coverage. Their work highlights the role of the Ministry of Religious Affairs as an institutional anchor for tolerance promotion through the educational system a role that, as the present study finds, creates jurisdictional confusion at the sub-national level when local governments attempt to engage with tolerance as a policy domain.

The study most directly comparable to the present one is Tohri et al.'s (2021) measurement of the inter-religious tolerance index in East Lombok using a five-variable framework. Their finding of a high composite score (approximately 3.79) in East Lombok provides a useful regional reference point. The present study's lower score for Lombok Tengah (3.61) is likely attributable to differences in ethnic heterogeneity and historical inter-faith contact patterns between the two regencies, though formal comparative analysis falls outside the scope of this paper.

2.5. Research Gap and Positioning

Three specific gaps in the existing literature motivate and position this study. First, no prior published study has systematically linked tolerance index measurement with governance analysis in the specific context of an Indonesian tourism priority zone. The tolerance–tourism nexus has been theoretically hypothesised but not empirically examined at the sub-national institutional level. Second, prior governance analyses of religious tolerance in Indonesia have remained largely at the national or provincial level, without attending to the sub-provincial institutional configurations that actually govern inter-faith relations in practice. Third, the theoretical potential of the hexa-helix collaborative governance model has not been applied to religious tolerance governance, whether in Indonesia or in the comparative literature more broadly.

This study addresses all three gaps. Its dual innovation conceptual, in applying hexa-helix collaborative theory to tolerance governance, and empirical, in examining a tourism priority zone contributes to both the sociology of religion and public administration scholarship. It also contributes directly to the practical policy challenge facing local governments in Indonesia's tourism-priority regions as they attempt to implement the 2023 Presidential Regulation in institutional contexts shaped by democratic politics and jurisdictional ambiguity.

3. METHODS

3.1. Research Design and Justification

This study employs a sequential explanatory mixed-methods design (Creswell and Creswell, 2018), in which quantitative data collection and analysis precede and inform the qualitative strand. The rationale for this design is substantive: the research questions require both measurement (of the tolerance index and its correlates best addressed quantitatively) and

explanation (of the governance mechanisms and structural constraints producing those measurements best addressed qualitatively). The two strands are integrated at the interpretation stage, where quantitative patterns inform purposive sampling for the qualitative component and qualitative findings contextualise and explain statistical results.

The study site, Lombok Tengah Regency, was selected through theoretical purposing: it constitutes Indonesia's most strategically important tourism priority zone outside of Bali, it has a documented and publicly discussed inter-religious tension history, and critically it has been named in national policy documents as a region requiring improved religious moderation governance as a precondition for sustainable SEZ development.

3.2. Quantitative Component: Survey Design and Administration

The survey instrument was developed through a three-stage process. In the first stage, the theoretical framework was operationalised into 28 Likert-type items (scale 1–4: 1 = strongly disagree, 4 = strongly agree) across four latent variables: (1) Public Perception cognitive orientations toward the rights, legitimacy, and co-social status of members of other faith communities (8 items); (2) Attitude affective orientations, including comfort, willingness for social proximity, and emotional response to inter-religious interactions (7 items); (3) Social Cooperation behavioural frequency and quality of inter-religious collaborative activities, including joint civic events, neighbourhood interaction, and economic cooperation (7 items); and (4) Government Disposition respondents' assessment of the regency government's fairness, consistency, and responsiveness in managing religious affairs and minority rights (6 items).

In the second stage, the instrument was reviewed by three expert judges two researchers in religious governance and one senior FKUB official for content validity. Minor revisions were made to three items to improve cultural specificity and reduce potential social desirability bias. In the third stage, the instrument was pre-tested among a convenience sample of 30 respondents in one sub-district not included in the main sample; internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) was calculated for each subscale and confirmed adequate reliability across all four dimensions (α ranging from .72 to .81).

The main survey was administered to 348 respondents across six sub-districts of Lombok Tengah, selected through multi-stage purposive sampling to ensure variation along three theoretically relevant dimensions: proximity to the Mandalika SEZ corridor, population density, and documented religious composition. Within each sub-district, households were selected through systematic random sampling from the latest available administrative population register. All survey items were read aloud and recorded by five trained enumerators, a procedure chosen to ensure inclusion of lower-literacy respondents. Data collection was conducted between January and April 2024.

The tolerance index for each dimension was computed as the unweighted mean of all items in that dimension. A composite index was calculated as the unweighted mean of the four dimensional indices. Correlation analysis (Pearson's r for continuous predictors; point-biserial r for sex) examined associations between the tolerance index and three socio-demographic variables: education level (operationalised as an ordinal five-category variable), age (continuous), and sex (binary). All analyses were conducted using SPSS 26.

3.3. Qualitative Component: Interviews and Observation

Twenty-three semi-structured, in-depth interviews were conducted between March and August 2024. Informants were selected through purposive criterion sampling, with the twin criteria of direct involvement in tolerance governance and diversity of institutional position. The sample comprised: four district-level government officials (from the Regent's Office, the

Regional Planning Agency (Bapperida), the National Unity and Politics Agency (Bakesbangpol), and the Regional Secretariat); three district-level Ministry of Religious Affairs officers; four FKUB members, including the chair; five religious leaders representing Islam (two), Catholicism (one), and Protestantism (two); four civil society leaders, including two NGO directors and two community advocates; and three academic informants with expertise in NTB religious and political sociology.

Interview guides were structured around three thematic clusters, developed from the quantitative findings and the theoretical framework: (a) the architecture, functioning, and limitations of current tolerance governance arrangements; (b) enabling and constraining factors in policy implementation, including political economy factors; and (c) perceptions of the relationship between religious tolerance conditions and the sustainable tourism development agenda. All interviews were conducted in Bahasa Indonesia, recorded with consent, and transcribed verbatim. Transcripts were back-translated into English by a bilingual research assistant and verified by the lead researcher.

Participant observation was conducted at three inter-faith dialogue events during the data collection period: an FKUB-Catholic Church joint dialogue at the Regency Hall (21 May 2024); an FGD on religious moderation co-organised by the regency government, the district Ministry of Religious Affairs, and a local NGO (7 March 2024); and a millennial religious moderation declaration event at PGRI Hall, Praya (7 March 2024). Observational notes focused on interaction patterns, institutional dynamics, discourse framing, and the presence or absence of specific stakeholder categories.

Document analysis systematically examined: the Joint Ministerial Regulation No. 9 and 8 of 2006; Presidential Regulation No. 58 of 2023; PMA No. 3 of 2024; the Lombok Tengah RPJMD 2021–2026; the Draft RPJPD 2025–2045; the Regent's Decree establishing the FKUB (No. 212.a of 2021); and relevant Bakesbangpol annual operational reports.

Qualitative data analysis followed Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña's (2014) iterative three-phase approach: data condensation (initial and focused coding), data display (thematic networks and matrices), and conclusion drawing with verification (theoretical sampling until saturation; member-checking with five key informants). Coding was conducted using Atlas.ti 9. Triangulation was achieved across interview, observation, and document data sources.

3.4. Ethical Considerations and Positionality

The study received formal ethical clearance from the UIN Mataram Research and Community Service Institute (LP2M), Registration No. 241020000085211, as a funded research project under the Litapdimas grant scheme. All interview participants provided written informed consent prior to participation. Participants were informed of their right to withdraw at any point and that non-participation would carry no consequences. Interview data were stored in password-protected files accessible only to the research team. In reporting, all informants are identified by institutional role and interview date only; direct quotations that might identify specific individuals in sensitive circumstances have been further generalised at the role level.

On positionality: both researchers are affiliated with UIN Mataram and have prior professional relationships with several government informants. This proximity afforded access and candour, but also creates a potential for confirmation bias in interpretation. To mitigate this, interpretive conclusions were reviewed by one external researcher with no institutional connection to Lombok Tengah governance structures, and member-checking was conducted specifically to test, rather than confirm, preliminary interpretations.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Sample Profile

Of the 348 respondents, 54.3 percent were male and 45.7 percent female. Age distribution showed the largest cohort in the 28–38 year range (31.2%), followed by 18–27 years (26.4%), 39–50 years (22.1%), 51–65 years (13.9%), and over 65 years (6.4%). Educational attainment varied considerably: 11.2 percent had not completed primary school; 18.4 percent held primary school qualifications; 23.6 percent had junior secondary; 22.1 percent senior secondary; and 18.7 percent held university degrees or higher (with a further 6.0 percent holding vocational qualifications). By occupation, respondents included farmers (28.4%), informal sector workers (21.3%), civil servants and military/police (14.9%), private sector employees (17.2%), and students and others (18.2%). Religious composition reflected sub-district selection: 87.3 percent identified as Muslim, 7.4 percent Protestant, 4.1 percent Catholic, and 1.2 percent Hindu.

4.2. Religious Tolerance Index: Dimensional and Composite Results

Table 1 presents the dimensional and composite tolerance indices for Lombok Tengah (2024).

Dimension	Number of Items	Mean Score (1–4)	Category
Public Perception	8	3.88	High
Attitude	7	3.10	Moderate
Social Cooperation	7	3.16	Moderate
Government Disposition	6	3.93	High
Composite Index	28	3.61	High

Table 1. Religious Tolerance Index by Dimension, Lombok Tengah (2024). Source: Primary survey data, 2024. Scale: 1.00–1.75 = Low; 1.76–2.50 = Moderate-Low; 2.51–3.25 = Moderate; 3.26–4.00 = High.

The composite index of 3.61 places Lombok Tengah in the High category, a finding that taken in isolation might appear to contradict the province-level SETARA data. The dimensional breakdown, however, reveals an important pattern that aggregate scores mask. Government disposition (3.93) and public perception (3.88) both score near the ceiling of the High category, while attitude (3.10) and social cooperation (3.16) barely clear the Moderate threshold (3.26) a gap of 0.77 to 0.82 points between the two pairs.

This pattern is theoretically significant. Perception and government disposition both tap into normative and evaluative orientations how respondents believe the social world should be arranged and how they assess official performance. Attitude and cooperation, by contrast, tap into affective and behavioural dimensions how respondents actually feel toward and interact with religious others. The substantial gap between the two clusters suggests what might be characterised as a tolerance-in-principle, reluctance-in-practice pattern: community members cognitively endorse inter-religious harmony and perceive the government to be broadly supportive, yet in their emotional dispositions and daily social practices, inter-faith engagement remains limited and sometimes uncomfortable.

This pattern has direct implications for governance design. Interventions that operate primarily at the level of normative awareness declarations, proclamations, formal dialogue events are likely to improve perception and government disposition scores but leave attitude and cooperation relatively unmoved. Effective governance must address the relational and structural

determinants of affective and behavioural tolerance: inter-faith contact opportunities, shared civic spaces, and economic interdependence.

4.3. Socio-Demographic Correlates

Table 2 summarises the correlation coefficients between the three socio-demographic predictors and each tolerance dimension.

Predictor	Perception	Attitude	Cooperation	Gov. Disposition	Composite
Education level	.36	.41	.38	.29	.41
Age (years)	-.21	-.31	-.27	-.18	-.27
Sex (male = 1)	.16	.21	.18	.14	.18

Table 2. Bivariate correlations between socio-demographic predictors and tolerance dimensions. $p < .05$; $p < .01$. Sex coded as binary variable (male = 1, female = 0). $N = 348$.

Educational attainment shows the strongest and most consistent associations across all four dimensions and the composite index ($r = .41$, $p < .01$). The relationship is not simply linear: analysis of mean tolerance scores by educational category reveals that the sharpest increase in tolerance occurs between the junior secondary and senior secondary level, suggesting a threshold effect around nine to twelve years of formal education. Respondents who had not completed primary school exhibited the lowest scores on all dimensions, particularly attitude (mean = 2.71) and social cooperation (mean = 2.63). Tertiary-educated respondents scored highest across all dimensions. This pattern is consistent with prior findings by Slooter and Verkuyten (2007) and Tohri et al. (2021), and lends support to the policy inference that secondary education quality and accessibility function as upstream tolerance governance mechanisms.

Age shows significant negative correlations with all dimensions ($p < .01$). The mean tolerance scores by five-year age cohort reveal a curvilinear pattern: scores are slightly lower in the youngest cohort (18–22 years), rise to their peak in the 28–38 year cohort (consistent with individuals who completed secondary or tertiary education in the post-Reformasi period and entered the labour market in contexts with greater inter-religious exposure), and decline progressively and markedly for respondents over 50 years. The sharpest decline occurs above 65 years, where attitude and cooperation scores fall to near-Moderate levels. This pattern likely reflects generational differences in inter-faith socialisation contexts rather than intrinsic age effects.

Sex shows the weakest but statistically significant associations. Male respondents score higher than female respondents on all dimensions, a finding that is counterintuitive relative to Western contexts where women tend to score higher on inter-group openness measures (Slooter and Verkuyten, 2007). Interview data suggest a structural explanation: in Lombok Tengah's predominantly agricultural and small-town contexts, women's social networks are considerably more geographically and socially restricted than men's. Male respondents particularly those in civil service, military, police, or formal private sector employment have occupational exposure to religiously diverse colleagues and institutional settings, a form of structured contact that reliably increases tolerance (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2006). Female respondents in agricultural or home-based occupations lack comparable contact structures. This explanation is supported by

occupation-disaggregated analysis: female civil servants score comparably to male civil servants, while female farmers score substantially lower than male farmers.

4.4. Existing Governance Architecture: Document and Interview Analysis

4.4.1. Regulatory Framework

Document analysis reveals a regulatory framework that is both multi-layered and internally incoherent. The primary operative instrument is the Joint Ministerial Regulation (JMR) issued by the Ministries of Religious Affairs and Home Affairs (No. 9 and 8 of 2006), which assigns the regional head a five-function mandate for tolerance governance: facilitation, coordination, coaching, cultivating inter-religious harmony, and issuing building permits for places of worship. This regulation was designed to operationalise the post-Reformasi vision of participatory religious governance and remains the de facto normative foundation for sub-national tolerance policy.

The Lombok Tengah RPJMD 2021–2026 incorporates a first mission priority centred on religious moderation, with 'tolerance strengthening' named as a strategic objective. Yet the implementation mechanisms specified in this medium-term plan are minimal: no dedicated programme budget is identified, no performance indicators for tolerance outcomes are specified, and no implementing regulation (Peraturan Bupati) operationalising the tolerance governance mandate at the village and sub-district level has been issued.

Critically, neither the Presidential Regulation No. 58 of 2023 on Religious Moderation Strengthening nor the PMA No. 3 of 2024 both of which establish a more elaborate and explicitly multi-stakeholder framework for sub-national tolerance governance has been incorporated into regency planning documents as of the data collection period (August 2024). This regulatory lag of at least eighteen months between national legislative enactment and sub-national operationalisation reflects a pattern documented in multiple Indonesian governance domains and constitutes one of the primary structural constraints on effective tolerance governance at the regency level.

4.4.2. Governmental Action and the Electoral Tolerance Trap

Interviews with government officials reveal a paradox at the heart of regency governance. At the level of stated commitment, both the Regent and the Deputy Regent expressed inclusively framed orientations. The Deputy Regent stated explicitly: 'The word *beriman* in our regional vision already contains the meaning of moderation and tolerance because the indicators of *beriman* are not only performing worship but also living harmoniously amid difference. So we always involve all religious organisations in our development programmes' (interview, 12 June 2024).

These stated commitments are not simply empty rhetoric. The FKUB is constitutionally formed and functionally active; inter-faith events are organised with government support; and minority religious leaders note that at the level of dialogue and consultation, government officials have been broadly cooperative. The Deputy Head of Bapperida confirmed: 'In the final discussion of our long-term development plan last month, we invited all religious traditions and all the religious organisations' representatives were present. The regent was genuinely pleased to see them there' (interview, 4 June 2024).

Yet at the operational level in the translation of stated commitment into concrete administrative decisions a systematic inconsistency emerges. The single most frequently cited case among informants was the multi-year failure to process or approve a building permit for a Protestant church community in the Kemulah area. A senior legal official from the regency law office articulated the structural dilemma with notable candour: 'It is dilemmatic to build justice

in religious services. On one hand, the Constitution guarantees every citizen's right to worship. But on the other hand, if the regional head approves a permit for a church in Praya, he will face electoral consequences. There is fear that the majority voters who are fanatical about these things will not re-elect him. This is the impact of direct elections' (interview, 1 August 2024).

This dynamic which this study terms the 'electoral tolerance trap' represents a structural feature of the direct election system that systematically distorts governance incentives away from minority-protective decisions in communities where majority religious identity is politically mobilised. It aligns with what Heywood (2014) describes as the realist tradition in political science: politics as the systematic organisation of partial interests, including in competitive electoral arenas where majority social pressures translate directly into policy behaviour. The electoral tolerance trap cannot be resolved by exhortation or normative declaration; it requires institutional redesign that creates accountability for minority protection that is not solely mediated through majority-dominated electoral processes.

4.4.3. Institutional Arrangements and Their Limits

Institutional analysis identified the FKUB (Inter-Religious Harmony Forum) as the organisational centrepiece of the tolerance governance system. The FKUB's mandate established by Regent's Decree No. 212.a of 2021 assigns it six formal functions: dialogue facilitation with community and religious leaders; representation of religious organisations' aspirational input; policy recommendation to the regent; socialisation of regulatory provisions; written recommendation on place-of-worship building permits; and semi-annual reporting to the regent. Observed activities at the May 2024 inter-faith dialogue confirmed that the FKUB is actively performing several of these functions, particularly dialogue facilitation and event co-organisation with religious communities.

The formal institutional triangle government, FKUB, religious organisations represents what Ansell and Gash (2007) would classify as a basic collaborative governance arrangement. It is a genuine improvement over a purely bureaucratic tolerance management system. Several informants, however, identified significant limitations in its current configuration. An NGO leader stated: 'In many matters, including religious diversity and minority rights, Lombok Tengah rarely organises discussions, seminars, or forums. Media attention to religious issues is also minimal. This leaves the public uneducated about managing tolerance as a practice. Yet this is a global tourism priority zone' (interview, 2 August 2024, Desa Batunyala).

The absence from the formal governance arrangement of four actor categories is particularly notable: the private tourism sector (hotels, hospitality businesses, the Mandalika circuit authority), mass media (both local print/broadcast and social media platforms), higher education institutions (UIN Mataram and other regional universities), and the business community more broadly. Each of these absent actors has both stake in tolerance outcomes and capacity to contribute to governance. Their exclusion reflects the governance framework's 2006 architecture designed in a pre-SEZ, pre-digital media context rather than the complex stakeholder landscape of contemporary Lombok Tengah.

5. DISCUSSION

5.1. The Tolerance-in-Principle Pattern and Its Governance Implications

The composite tolerance index of 3.61 positioned Lombok Tengah in the High category, a result that is both encouraging and analytically demanding. It is encouraging because it demonstrates that the dominant provincial narrative of intolerance does not straightforwardly describe the sub-provincial reality in this regency; communities closer to the Mandalika tourism corridor, in particular, appear to have developed somewhat higher tolerance dispositions than the

provincial aggregate might suggest. It is analytically demanding because the dimensional disaggregation reveals that this high composite score is substantially driven by government disposition (3.93) and public perception (3.88) both normative-evaluative dimensions rather than by the affective and behavioural dimensions of attitude (3.10) and social cooperation (3.16).

This pattern is consistent with what Putnam (2000) characterises as a 'bonding capital surplus and bridging capital deficit': communities have strong internal solidarity and normative frameworks for inter-group coexistence, but the everyday relational bridges that convert normative endorsement into habitual cross-group cooperation are underbuilt. From a governance perspective, this suggests that interventions focused on awareness, declarations, and formal dialogue events are operating in the wrong register: they improve perception scores but do not alter the structural conditions segregated social networks, limited occupational contact, underdeveloped civic spaces that produce moderate attitude and cooperation scores.

The finding that educational attainment is the strongest predictor of the composite tolerance index ($r = .41$) implies that the most effective long-term tolerance governance strategy may be one that is not formally classified as tolerance governance at all: improving secondary educational quality, particularly in sub-districts distant from the Mandalika corridor, would likely produce larger and more durable tolerance improvements than any number of inter-faith dialogue events. This inference aligns with Soleha's (2019) and Jatiningsih and Arifin's (2018) findings on the primacy of institutional design over institutional identity in educational tolerance outcomes.

5.2. Structural Constraints: A Governance Friction Analysis

Four structural constraints on tolerance governance were identified through qualitative analysis. The first electoral politics operates through the incentive structure of direct elections, which creates rational reasons for elected officials to avoid minority-protective decisions in communities where majority voters mobilise religious identity politically. This is not a failure of individual character; it is a systemic outcome of institutional design. The electoral tolerance trap documented in Lombok Tengah echoes findings from Agus's (2017) earlier work on the dominance of religious symbols in NTB's local electoral contests, and is consistent with broader literature on the tension between direct democratic accountability and minority rights protection (Budiardjo, 2010; Heywood, 2014).

The second constraint moderation leadership is more tractable. The conceptual framework of wasathiyah leadership, as developed by Kosasih et al. (2021) and Zulfandika and Wulandari (2024), specifies five attributes: tawassuth (centrism), tawazun (balance), i'tidal (justice), tasamuh (tolerance), and musyawah/syura (deliberative participation). The permit case reveals a specific deficit in i'tidal that, in turn, undermines the systemic credibility of all five attributes in the eyes of minority community members. When justice is not delivered in concrete administrative decisions, declarations of tolerance carry limited credibility. Leadership moderation, the evidence suggests, requires not only personal disposition but institutional support structures including peer accountability mechanisms and civil society monitoring that reduce the political cost of justice-consistent decisions.

The third constraint social-religious ecology refers to the characteristics of the dominant community's internal religious culture, specifically the presence of what informants described as 'pengkung' (entrenched, unreflective attachment) orientations that resist pluralist discourse. Saumantri (2022) and Amin Abdullah (cited in Saumantri, 2022) have documented how narrow religious understandings can function to reduce the social space for inter-faith exchange, creating a cognitive barrier to the kind of contact that tolerance research identifies as effective in changing inter-group attitudes. The homogeneity of the Sasak Muslim community in many sub-districts of

Lombok Tengah where minority faith community members live in isolated pockets means that many majority community members lack any experiential basis for tolerant behaviour; their endorsed norms have no behavioural correlate.

The fourth constraint public sphere deficits is theoretically captured by Habermas's (1989) concept of communicative spaces that mediate between private interests and political decision-making. In Lombok Tengah, the public sphere for inter-faith exchange is thin: media coverage of religious diversity is sporadic and rarely analytical; civil society platforms for structured inter-faith dialogue operate with limited frequency and geographic reach; and the university sector, which might provide both research capacity and a neutral dialogue forum, is engaged only episodically. These deficits mean that even when tolerance attitudes exist, they are not embedded in communicative practices that reinforce, develop, and extend them.

5.3. The Proposed Hexa-Helix Governance Model

Drawing on the empirical findings and the theoretical framework, this study proposes a hexa-helix collaborative governance model for religious tolerance in tourism-priority zones. The model is organised around two analytical dimensions and six stakeholder categories.

In the first analytical dimension tolerance portraiture the four-variable measurement framework (public perception, attitude, social cooperation, government disposition) is retained as the monitoring instrument, with the addition of two currently unmeasured but theoretically important predictors: occupational category and administrative territory. The rationale for occupational type as an additional variable rests on the contact theory logic documented in the sex findings: individuals in occupationally diverse formal sector environments show higher tolerance than individuals in homogeneous informal sector settings, independent of individual characteristics. Administrative territory is important because sub-district proximity to the Mandalika corridor appears to influence tolerance levels through increased inter-faith contact exposure; disaggregating index data by sub-district would enable spatially targeted governance interventions.

In the second analytical dimension governance model the hexa-helix specifies six actor categories and their distinct functional contributions:

Government (regency administration) retains the anchoring governance function: policy design and regulatory development. The most immediate practical step is the issuance of a Peraturan Bupati (Regent's Regulation) operationalising Perpres No. 58/2023 and PMA No. 3/2024 at the regency level, establishing the legal basis for multi-stakeholder tolerance governance, formalising a tolerance index monitoring function, and creating procedural clarity for place-of-worship building permits. Government also provides the convening authority within which the other five helices coordinate.

FKUB continues and expands its dialogue facilitation, policy recommendation, and building permit advisory functions, but within a strengthened mandate that includes public reporting on all recommendations made and their implementation status. Transparency in FKUB functioning is essential for public accountability and would reduce the space for the informal political pressures that currently suppress minority-protective decisions.

Civil Society and Religious Organisations constitute the third helix, including both majority and minority faith communities, women's religious organisations, and secular civil society groups. Their governance contribution is the provision of grassroots legitimacy, community penetration for tolerance norm socialisation, and the informal authority that state agencies lack in religiously sensitive domains. NGOs add an advocacy function for excluded perspectives and professional policy analysis capacity that government agencies may lack.

Private Sector Actors hotel operators, tour organisers, hospitality associations, the Mandalika SEZ management body, and the MotoGP circuit authority constitute the fourth helix. These actors have substantial material interest in social stability and a tourism brand reputation dependent on inclusive, welcoming host community behaviour. Their governance contributions include CSR-funded tolerance initiatives, workplace moderation training for hospitality staff, and participatory dialogue with local communities about tourism-related social change. Their current absence from the formal governance arrangement represents both a resource gap and a legitimacy gap.

Mass Media form the fifth helix. The public sphere deficit identified as a structural constraint cannot be addressed without engaged, capable, and moderation-oriented media both traditional local outlets and the social media platforms that increasingly dominate information circulation in young and middle-aged communities. Media governance contributions include framing inter-faith events positively, providing civic education content on religious rights and moderation principles, and critically serving as a monitoring mechanism for governance failures that minority communities cannot effectively publicise through formal channels.

Higher Education Institutions form the sixth helix. UIN Mataram, as a state Islamic university with a disciplinary mandate in Islamic political thought and an active research programme in governance and social affairs, is naturally positioned as the anchor institution in this helix. Higher education contributions include systematic tolerance index monitoring (as demonstrated by this study), curriculum development for tolerance education in teacher training programmes, neutral convening capacity for inter-faith policy dialogue, and applied policy research that closes the evidence gap in sub-national tolerance governance.

The model is explicitly not simply additive it does not merely expand the number of actors around an unchanged governance process. Its theoretical contribution is to reconceptualise tolerance governance as a shared-responsibility ecosystem in which each actor occupies a distinct functional niche and in which the government's role is to architect and steward the collaborative process, not to manage each tolerance outcome unilaterally. This reconceptualisation is precisely what the 2023 Presidential Regulation mandates, and what the evidence from Lombok Tengah shows has not yet been operationalised.

5.4. Limitations

Several limitations constrain the confidence with which these findings can be interpreted and extended. The survey's cross-sectional design prevents causal inference: the observed associations between education, age, sex, and tolerance may reflect selection effects rather than causal pathways. Longitudinal data would be required to test whether tolerance changes as educational attainment rises within a cohort, or whether the observed cohort differences reflect irreversible generational socialisation.

The qualitative sample, while theoretically saturated on the identified themes, is inevitably limited in its representation of minority faith community perspectives. In a regency where Muslim respondents constitute approximately 87 percent of the population and minority communities are geographically dispersed, minority informants face real social costs in criticising governance publicly, even in formally confidential research contexts. The permit case and similar instances of governance failure are likely underrepresented in the interview data as a consequence.

Finally, this study does not model the political feasibility of the proposed governance reform. Implementing the hexa-helix model requires institutional change specifically, the issuance of a Peraturan Bupati that creates formal roles and accountability mechanisms for five

additional stakeholder categories. Whether an incumbent regional head facing an electoral cycle with strong majority mobilisation dynamics would issue such a regulation is an open political economy question that this study's methodology cannot resolve.

6. CONCLUSIONS

This study set out to address three questions about religious tolerance governance in Lombok Tengah Indonesia's globally designated tourism priority zone and to propose a governance model adequate to sustaining that tolerance alongside the regency's accelerating development trajectory. The findings permit four substantive conclusions.

First, the composite tolerance index of 3.61 places Lombok Tengah in the High category, providing an empirical foundation for cautious optimism about the socio-religious preconditions for sustainable tourism development. This finding is not grounds for complacency: the moderate scores on attitude and social cooperation dimensions, the documented governance failures in building permit administration, and the structural constraints identified qualitatively all indicate that the aggregate index masks sub-surface fragility. High tolerance indices sustained by government disposition and normative perception, without commensurate growth in interpersonal affective openness and cooperative social behaviour, are vulnerable to erosion when governance conditions deteriorate.

Second, educational attainment is the strongest predictor of individual tolerance behaviour, followed by age and sex. The policy implication is counterintuitive but important: investment in secondary educational quality and accessibility not typically classified as tolerance governance may produce larger and more durable tolerance gains than direct tolerance programming. For a regency planning its trajectory to 2045, this finding suggests that the development of human capital through inclusive, quality education is simultaneously an economic development strategy and a tolerance governance strategy.

Third, the existing governance architecture a triple-helix arrangement of government, FKUB, and religious organisations, operating under a 2006 regulatory framework is structurally underpowered for the governance challenge it faces in a globally oriented tourism priority zone. Four structural constraints the electoral tolerance trap, inconsistent moderation leadership, a homogeneous social-religious ecology, and public sphere deficits compound the institutional limitations. Addressing these constraints requires institutional redesign, not merely improved implementation within the existing design.

Fourth, the proposed hexa-helix collaborative governance model offers a theoretically grounded and practically actionable pathway for institutional redesign. By incorporating the private tourism sector, mass media, and higher education into the formal governance arrangement alongside government, FKUB, and religious organisations, the model expands both the resource base and the accountability architecture of tolerance governance. It operationalises the legislative intent of Perpres No. 58/2023 and PMA No. 3/2024 in a sub-national institutional context, and it provides a replicable template for other Indonesian tourism-priority regions facing analogous governance challenges.

For the regency government, the immediate practical recommendation is unambiguous: issue a Peraturan Bupati that operationalises the national religious moderation regulations at the local level, establishes a formal multi-stakeholder coordination forum, and creates a tolerance index monitoring function with annual public reporting. For UIN Mataram and the academic community, this study establishes a baseline tolerance index and a governance analysis framework that should inform the research agenda for the regency's RPJPD 2025–2045 implementation period. For national policymakers, the study demonstrates that the gap between

progressive national legislation on religious moderation and sub-national implementation remains substantial, and that bridging this gap requires targeted capacity-building, fiscal mechanisms, and accountability structures at the local level not merely regulatory proliferation at the centre.

Sustainable tolerance and sustainable tourism, the evidence of this study suggests, are not parallel agendas that can be managed in separate bureaucratic silos. They are mutually constitutive preconditions for the kind of socially embedded, community-supported development that the national Long-Term Development Plan envisions for Lombok Tengah and for Indonesia's wider constellation of priority destinations.

REFERENCES

Agus. (2017). Menakar kekuatan simbol agama dalam kontestasi politik lokal (The power of religious symbols in local political contestation). *Tasamuh*, 2(June), 199–224.

Agus. (2018). Politik elektoral (Electoral politics). Sanabil.

Agus. (2023a). Good electoral governance: Sebuah pemikiran kritis hingga praksis (Good electoral governance: From critical thought to practice). UIN Mataram Press.

Agus. (2023b). Stakeholders mapping in election management in West Nusa Tenggara Province. *Revista Gestão Social e Ambiental*, 17(7), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.24857/rgsa.v17n7-012>

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Addison-Wesley.

Ansell, C., and Gash, A. (2007). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543–571. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032>

Astuti, R. S., Warsono, H., and Rachim, A. (2020). Collaborative governance dalam perspektif administrasi publik (Collaborative governance in the perspective of public administration). Doctoral Study Programme in Public Administration, FISIPOL UNDIP.

Bagir, Z. A., Raditya, I. A., Husni, D., Irsyad, M., and Kusumaningrum, D. (2023). Mengelola konflik, memajukan kebebasan beragama (Managing conflict, advancing freedom of religion). PUSAD Paramadina and Sekolah Pascasarjana UGM.

Budiardjo, M. (2010). *Dasar-dasar ilmu politik (Fundamentals of political science) (revised ed.)*. PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Creswell, J. W., and Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches (5th ed.)*. SAGE.

Dunn, W. N. (1998). *Pengantar analisis kebijakan publik (Introduction to public policy analysis) (2nd ed.)*. Gadjah Mada University Press.

Habermas, J. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society (T. Burger, Trans.)*. MIT Press. (Original work published 1962)

Halibas, A. S., Sibayan, R. O., and Maata, R. L. (2017). The penta helix model of innovation in Oman: An HEI perspective. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Information, Knowledge, and Management*, 5(1), 159–174.

Halim, I. A. (2018). Peran agama dan negara dalam proses pendirian rumah ibadat: Kasus pendirian Gereja Santa Clara Kota Bekasi (The role of religion and the state in the process of establishing houses of worship: The case of the Church of Santa Clara in Bekasi). *Relegio: Jurnal Studi Agama-Agama dan Lintas Budaya*, 3(1), 54–69.

Haryanto, S. (2015). *Sosiologi agama dari klasik hingga postmodern (Sociology of religion from classical to postmodern)*. AR-RUZZ Media.

Henry, N. (2007). *Public administration and public affairs (10th ed.)*. Prentice Hall.

- Heywood, A. (2014). *Politik (Politics)* (4th ed., Indonesian trans.). Pustaka Pelajar.
- Jatiningsih, O., and Arifin, M. Z. (2018). Perbandingan sikap toleransi beragama antara peserta didik di boarding school dan non-boarding school (Comparing religious tolerance attitudes between boarding and non-boarding school students). *Jurnal Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan Undiksha*, 6(2).
- Kosasih, K., Putro, M. Z. A. E., and Mardamin, A. (2021). Kepemimpinan lokal, moderasi beragama dan pembangunan berkelanjutan di Purwakarta (Local leadership, religious moderation and sustainable development in Purwakarta). *Jurnal PENAMAS*, 34(2), 221–241.
- Lele, G. (2023). *Kebijakan publik untuk transformasi sosial: Sebuah pendekatan kritis-agonistik (Public policy for social transformation: A critical-agonistic approach)*. Gadjah Mada University Press.
- McAdam, M., and Debackere, K. (2017). Beyond 'triple helix' toward 'quadruple helix' models in regional innovation systems: Implications for theory and practice. *R&D Management*, 48(1). <https://doi.org/10.1111/radm.12309>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., and Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE.
- Mukhibat, M., Istiqomah, A. N., and Hidayah, N. (2023). Pendidikan moderasi beragama di Indonesia: Wacana dan kebijakan (Religious moderation education in Indonesia: Discourse and policy). *Southeast Asian Journal of Islamic Education*, 4(1), 73–78.
- Munif, M., Qomar, M., and Aziz, A. (2023). Kebijakan moderasi beragama di Indonesia (Religious moderation policy in Indonesia). *Dirasah*, 6(August).
- Mulyadi, D., and Gedeona, H. T. (2017). *Demokrasi, governance, dan ruang publik dalam kajian administrasi publik (Democracy, governance, and public sphere in public administration studies)*. CV Alfabeta.
- Pettigrew, T. F., and Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(5), 751–783. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751>
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. Simon and Schuster.
- Rachim, A., Warella, Y., Astuti, R. S., and Suwitri, S. (2020). Hexa-helix: Stakeholders model in the management of floodplain of Lake Tempe. *Prizren Social Science Journal*, 6(2), 20–27.
- Ramli. (2019). Moderasi beragama bagi minoritas Muslim etnis Tionghoa di Kota Makassar (Religious moderation for the Chinese Muslim minority in Makassar). *Kuriositas: Media Komunikasi Sosial dan Keagamaan*, 12(2), 135–162.
- Ritzer, G. (2002). *Sosiologi ilmu pengetahuan berparadigma ganda (Sociology of knowledge in multiple paradigms)* (A. Muttaqien, Trans.). Rajawali Press.
- Sanderson, S. K. (2011). *Makrososiologi: Sebuah pendekatan terhadap realitas sosiologi (Macrosociology: An approach to sociological reality)*. PT Rajagrafindo Persada.
- Saumantri, T. (2022). Konstruksi nilai-nilai moderasi beragama dalam perspektif filsafat agama (Constructing religious moderation values in the philosophy of religion perspective). *Substantia: Jurnal Ilmu-Ilmu Ushuluddin*, 24(2), 164–180.
- SETARA Institute. (2023, April 6). Indeks kota toleran 2022 (Tolerant cities index 2022). <https://setara-institute.org>

Slooter, L., and Verkuyten, M. (2007). Tolerance of Muslim beliefs and practices: Age-related differences and context effects. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37(12), 2846–2873. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2007.00282.x>

Soleha. (2019). Pengembangan kurikulum pendidikan agama dalam menciptakan sikap toleransi beragama di Madrasah Aliyah dan SMA Kabupaten Bangka (Developing religious education curriculum for tolerance in Bangka secondary schools). IAIN Syaikh Abdurrahman Siddik Bangka Belitung.

Suryade, L., Fauzi, A., Achsani, N. A., and Anggraini, E. (2023). Variabel-variabel kunci dalam pengembangan kawasan ekonomi khusus pariwisata berkelanjutan di Mandalika, Lombok Tengah, Indonesia (Key variables in sustainable tourism SEZ development at Mandalika, Lombok Tengah). ResearchGate.

Tohri, A., Rasyad, A., Sulaiman, and Rosyidah, U. (2021). Indeks toleransi antar umat beragama di Kabupaten Lombok Timur (Inter-religious tolerance index in East Lombok Regency). *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Humaniora*, 10(1).

UNWTO. (2004). Indicators of sustainable development for tourism destinations: A guidebook. United Nations World Tourism Organisation.

Wang, S. (2014). Research on the collaborative governance model in the charity organisation under polycentric perspective. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 2, 263–269. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2014.28027>

Yunas, N. S. (2019). Implementasi konsep penta helix dalam pengembangan potensi desa melalui model lumbung ekonomi desa di Provinsi Jawa Timur (Implementing the penta helix concept in village development in East Java). *Matra Pembaruan: Jurnal Inovasi Kebijakan Publik*, 3(1).

Yuniningsih, T. (2019). Model pentahelik dalam pengembangan pariwisata di Kota Semarang (Pentahelix model in tourism development in Semarang). *Journal of Public Sector Innovation*, 3(2).

Zulfandika, A. A., and Wulandari, S. C. (2024). Analisis nilai-nilai kepemimpinan Abdurrahman Wahid (Gus Dur) dalam pendidikan moderasi beragama (Analysis of Abdurrahman Wahid's leadership values in religious moderation education). *WASIS: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan*, 5, 67–73.

Policy Documents and Regulations

Indonesia, Ministry of Religious Affairs and Ministry of Home Affairs. (2006). Peraturan bersama Menteri Agama dan Menteri Dalam Negeri Nomor 9 Tahun 2006 dan Nomor 8 Tahun 2006 tentang pedoman pelaksanaan tugas kepala daerah dalam pemeliharaan kerukunan umat beragama, pemberdayaan FKUB, dan pendirian rumah ibadat (Joint Regulation No. 9 and 8/2006 on the roles of regional heads in maintaining inter-religious harmony, empowering FKUB, and issuing worship house permits).

Indonesia, President of the Republic. (2014). Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 52 Tahun 2014 tentang Kawasan Ekonomi Khusus Mandalika (Government Regulation No. 52/2014 on the Mandalika Special Economic Zone).

Indonesia, Ministry of Religious Affairs. (2020). Peraturan Menteri Agama Nomor 18 Tahun 2020 tentang Rencana Strategis Kementerian Agama Tahun 2020–2024 (Ministerial Regulation No. 18/2020 on the Ministry of Religious Affairs Strategic Plan 2020–2024).

Indonesia, President of the Republic. (2023). Peraturan Presiden Nomor 58 Tahun 2023 tentang Penguatan Moderasi Beragama (Presidential Regulation No. 58/2023 on Strengthening Religious Moderation).

Indonesia, Ministry of Religious Affairs. (2024). Peraturan Menteri Agama Nomor 3 Tahun 2024 tentang Tata Cara Koordinasi, Pemantauan, Evaluasi, dan Pelaporan Penyelenggaraan Penguatan Moderasi Beragama (Ministerial Regulation No. 3/2024 on Procedures for Coordination, Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting on Religious Moderation Strengthening).

Lombok Tengah Regency Government. (2021). Peraturan Daerah tentang Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Daerah Kabupaten Lombok Tengah 2021–2026 (Regional Regulation on the Lombok Tengah Medium-Term Regional Development Plan 2021–2026).

Lombok Tengah Regency Government. (2024). Rancangan akhir Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Panjang Daerah Kabupaten Lombok Tengah 2025–2045 (Final draft of the Lombok Tengah Long-Term Regional Development Plan 2025–2045).

Author Contributions

Zakaria Ansori: conceptualisation, theoretical framework development, qualitative data collection and interpretive analysis, and primary manuscript preparation. Agus: research design, quantitative instrument development, survey administration, statistical analysis, policy analysis, and manuscript revision. Both authors have read and agreed to the submitted version.

Funding

This research was funded by the Litapdimas Research Grant Programme, Universitas Islam Negeri Mataram (LP2M UIN Mataram), 2024 fiscal year, Grant Registration Number 241020000085211 (IDR 30,000,000). The funder had no role in study design, data collection, analysis, interpretation, or the decision to submit for publication.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Data Availability Statement

The anonymised survey dataset and the interview codebook are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable written request, subject to ethical constraints protecting informant confidentiality.