e-ISSN: 2656-7997
JOURNAL of ASIAN ORIENTATION in THEOLOGY
Vol. 02, No. 02, August 2020 : 119-148

Fostering Religious Education for Transformation in Indonesia: Dialogue with Transformative Learning Theory

Alexander Hendra Dwi Asmara [a,1]

Fordham University, New York
adwiasmara@fordham.edu

Abstract:

This essay attempts to construct a model of religious education for transformation that effectively addresses the growth of "everyday religious conflict" in Indonesia's post-Suharto era. Using the lens of transformative learning theory, this essay emphasizes that the task of religious education should not merely serve as an intra-ecclesial agency of church or religious maintenance but must retrieve its task to reconstruct and to transform social situations. Such a vision emphasizes the task of religious educators to inform and form people to bring them into the fullness of life for themselves and others – to transform the world. This essay draws insights from two scholars in transformative learning theory – Jack Mezirow and Paulo Freire – who point out two foundations for transformation: (1) critical reflection, and (2) dialogue. These two visions can inspire religious educators to introduce critical reflection in their curriculum and to develop interreligious education that nurtures dialogue and collaboration. By focusing on developing critical reflection and interreligious education, religious education can offer transformation in Indonesian society plagued by ongoing conflict.

Keywords:

religious education, transformative learning, everyday religious conflict, Indonesia.

Introduction

Since the beginning of the twentieth century, religious educators worldwide have become more aware of the transformative character embedded in the field of religious education. This transformative vision

DOI: 10.24071/jaot.2020.020201
Web: http://e-journal.usd.ac.id/index.php/JAOT| E: jaot@usd.ac.id

represents the "prophetic" task of religious education, which involves an effort to name social evil and to participate actively in the radical reconstruction of the social order. In this vision, religious education commits not only to educate people to know their core beliefs and values (*to inform*) and to nurture people's identity through a formative pedagogy (*to form*), but more importantly to bring into conversion toward holiness and fullness of life for themselves and for "the life of the world as well" (*to transform*).[1] Thus, looking from the perspective of religious education for transformation, religious educators' task is not only to transmit faith and traditions to the next generations but also to educate persons and communities of faith for participation in public life for the common good:

> … religious educators must be fluent in a native religious education language to sustain and renew their particular religious traditions; fluent in an interreligious education language to engage each other respectfully and reverentially across those traditions; fluent in a public religious education language for native and interreligious conversations in the public square about the economic, political and social forces affecting the lives of people; fluent in the languages of a post-religion religious education to engage in conversation with those who dismiss, critique, or despise religious perspectives and practices, traditions and institutions…[2]

To construct a model of religious education for transformation, scholars draw insights from transformative learning theory – an educational approach based on promoting change whereby educators challenge learners to critically question and assess the integrity of how they relate to the world around them in order to promote deep change.[3] This theory of transformative learning provides an essential window on understanding adult learning, particularly those experiences of adult learning that open new and renewed visions of themselves and their place in the world.

[1] Thomas H. Groome, *Will There Be Faith? A New Vision for Educating and Growing Disciples* (NY: HarperOne, 2011), 12-13.

[2] Charles R. Foster, "Religious Education at the Edge of History," *Religious Education,* 99 (1), 2004: 72-78.

[3] Jack Mezirow, E. W. Taylor, and Associates, *Transformative Learning in Practice* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010), xi.

In light of transformative learning theory, in this essay I will argue that religious education in the Indonesian context can also develop a model of religious education for transformation, particularly to address the issue of "everyday religious conflict" that plagues the nation. By employing on transformative learning theory as a partner of dialogue, I hope to envision a model of religious education that is transformative, namely, religious education that contributes to addressing the social issues and encourages people across religious traditions to work together for the common good.

This essay will be divided into four sections. In the first section, I will discuss the growth of "everyday religious conflict" that becomes one of the pressing social issues in Indonesia. Then, in the second part, I will elaborate on how religious education in Indonesia has been involved in perpetuating this interreligious crisis. These intertwining realities between social and educational crises lead to the need to develop a model of religious education for social transformation. Thus, in the third section, I will discuss the perspective of personal and social transformation developed particularly by Jack Mezirow and Paulo Freire. In the final section, I will reflect on themes that religious education in Indonesia can learn from transformative learning theory.

Indonesian Context: The Growth of "Everyday Religious Conflict" in the Post-Suharto Era

The early years of the twenty-first century, near the end of Suharto's regime in 1998, were "the years of living dangerously" for Indonesians due to internal conflicts of various kinds and in varying intensities. These conflicts occurred on almost all islands in Indonesia which caused the deaths of thousands of people. Gerry van Klinken in his *Communal Violence and Democratization in Indonesia* (2007) describes how this major and large scale conflict has rolled and widely spread over the country during this period of time:

> The first time it happened was in Sambas district, West Borneo. It was January and February 1997. Two years after 'Sambas,' fighting broke out between Muslims and Christians in Ambon in Moluccas Island, the largest urban center east of Makassar. This was even more painful for the Indonesian public. At about the same time, late 1998 and early 1999, communal fighting also erupted in two other places. In Sambas district, West Borneo, it broke out again,

> in a slightly different area but again leading to the expulsion of Madurese, this time perpetrated by indigenous Malays. And in Poso, a small town in Central Celebes, it broke out between Christians and Muslims. The bad news did not seem to stop. A year later, late 1999, escalating tensions exploded in North Moluccas involving multiple theatres, some pitting Muslims against Christians, others Muslims against Muslims.[4]

Based on the data from the United Nations Support Facility for Indonesian Recovery (UNSFIR) supported by the Indonesian Government Central Bureau of Statistics' (BPS) Village Potential series (PODES) religious conflict has cost over 10,000 lives and 4,849 and 9,560 injuries in Indonesia in the period 1990–2003.[5] Given the numerous data from different resources, a rough estimate of the toll of deadly violence associated with Indonesia's religious conflict is that almost 19,000 victims and about 1.3 million people were displaced from their homes.[6]

What has been forgotten in the analysis of religious conflict in Indonesia, however, is the small-scale and low-intensity conflicts that emerge after the large and major conflicts subside and continue to influence the ordinary lives of common people. In the post-Suharto era, "Indonesia has moved to a new, post-conflict phase where large-scale violence is infrequent, yet small-scale violence remains unabated, often taking on new forms despite the aggregate decline of ethno-communal conflicts."[7] This small-scale violence is also known as "everyday religious conflict," where conflict appears to be subtle, small, and part of ordinary people's everyday lives. Everyday religious conflict tends to be low profile and is less likely to produce headlines in the newspaper; yet, it has devastating impacts on people's daily lives:

> It [everyday religious conflict] does not have the explicit political aim of overthrowing the state as in the case of civil war, or of the emasculation of a rival group as in the case of ethno-communal

[4] Gerry van Klinken, *Communal Violence and Democratization in Indonesia: Small Town Wars* (London: Routledge, 2007), 2-7.

[5] Patrick Barron and Joanne Sharpe, "Counting conflicts: using newspaper reports to understand violence in Indonesia," *Social Development Papers: Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction*, Paper No. 25 / May 2005. In http://www.conflictanddevelopment.org/resources/documents/Conflict%20Mapping/200505292249140.WP25_Web.pdf.

[6] van Klinken, 8.

[7] Patrick Barron, Sana Jaffrey, and Ashutosh Varshney, "When Large Conflicts Subside: The Ebbs and Flows of Violence in Post-Suharto Indonesia," *Journal of East Asian Studies* 16 (2016), 3.

> violence. It is also not simply crime, although it may have criminal dimensions. It refers to regular group violence that is not episodic in nature.[8]

The reality of "everyday religious conflict" denotes the hardening divisions between religious communities in every aspect of social life. It is the dynamic of "othering" in the day-to-day experience of ordinary people, such as in the reality of religious segregation in terms of the workplace, housing, and other areas. This situation does not always mean radicalization, but rather, "religio-isation," that is, the isolation of religious groups from one another. "Religio-isation" is marked by "the open expression of religious piety in both private and public space as well as in civil and political life" by means of which people express their specific religious identity, and do not take into account the religious identity of people of other religions.[9] However, at some points, "religio-isation" can become intolerance and even leads to interreligious conflict, especially when it is based on an exclusive way of forming religious identity, that is, when people are nurtured to think of themselves as having a distinctive sense of religious identity by envisioning themselves as standing against or being in opposition to people of other sense of religious identity.

The growth of everyday conflict further indicates a "conservative turn," a situation in which the conservatives became dominant in setting the religious discourse, and to some extent, they have even influenced national and local policy-making, including the enactments of a series of religious laws.[10] Christian Solidarity Worldwide (CSW) released an annual report entitled *Indonesia: Pluralism in Peril* in 2014 that shown the growth of the conservative turn in society symbolized by five factors, namely,

[8] Zulfan Tadjoeddin, "Political Economy of Conflict during Indonesia's Democratic Transition," *Ph.D. Dissertation* (Sydney: University of Western Sydney, 2010), 17.

[9] Although religio-isation is not exclusively attributed to Islam and Muslims since it occurs also in areas where Muslims are in the minority, it cannot be denied that because of the majority status of Muslims, this "religio-isation" has appeared on the surface as Islamization. See. Raihani. *Creating Multicultural Citizens: A Portrayal of Contemporary Indonesian Education* (NY: Routledge, 2014), 139, 224.

[10] Robert W. Hefner argues that Indonesia has developed contrasting developments: on one hand, impressive progress toward the consolidation of a system of free and fair elections, and, on the other, the growth of the conservative turn symbolized by the rise of Islamist paramilitaries and the conservative turn among *ulama* groups like the MUI. See. Hefner, "A Conservative Turn in Indonesian Islam? Genesis and Future," Muslim Politics and Democratization in Indonesia, *Annual Indonesia Lecture Series* 28 (2008), 39-45.

> (1) the spread of extremist ideology, fueled and funded by sources outside Indonesia (notably Saudi Arabia, Yemen and other parts of the Middle East, and Pakistan) as well as domestic organizations, through education, preaching and the dissemination of literature through publishing pamphlets and books, DVDs and CDs, and via the internet; (2) The inaction and at times complicity of the local, provincial and national authorities, including active complicity by senior government ministers who have made statements which contribute to intolerance; (3) The implementation of discriminatory laws and regulations; (4) Weakness in terms of law enforcement on the part of the police and the judiciary, in cases where religious minorities are victims in need of protection and justice; and (5) The unwillingness on the part of the majority of Indonesian Muslims, who make up over 86% of the population, to speak out against intolerance.

The conservative turn has sharpened and allowed for the normalization of intolerance in everyday life. The Centre for Indonesian Law, Islam and Society (CILIS) in 2018 has also revealed that many narratives show the growth of intolerance in society. In these narratives, intolerance has become normal and accepted, and has affected the everyday experiences of people throughout Indonesia that leads to everyday religious conflict.[11] For example, the following stories show how a narrative of broadly discriminatory practices has developed in Indonesia (and such stories rarely make it into civil society reports on intolerance):

> The first comes from a mixed neighborhood in a suburb of Jakarta, where a group of neighbors meets every month, rotating from house to another, in a gathering. A non-Muslim resident decided

[11] The everyday religious conflict cases happen in several provinces, even in a small province like Yogyakarta. Known as a "city of tolerance" because of the level of religious diversity maintained in Yogyakarta society, there were at least 6 cases occurred in 2018. One case happened on December 18, 2018 when some people in the town cut off the cross on a Christian's grave, arguing that the Christian religious symbol was not welcome in the village. The other intolerant cases in Yogyakarta since February 2018 are (1) a man attacked churchgoers with a sword on a Sunday morning at St. Lidwina, a Catholic church in Sleman regency, injuring the priest and several congregation members; (2) hardline Muslims in Jogjakarta protested against the charity work of St. Paul's Pringgolayan Church and accused the church of having the hidden strategy of Christianization or "covert proselytizing";(3) resistance to the construction of a Seventh-day Adventist church in Bantul – Yogyakarta; (4) vandalism at the Bantul District Court building after the court punished a Pemuda Pancasila leader that had disrupted a painting exhibition at the Islamic University of Indonesia; (5) intimidation toward a traditional Javanese ritual and *sedekah laut* (ocean's offering) in Bantul. https://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2018/12/21/6-intolerance-cases-in-yogyakarta-this-year.html.

to leave the group because neighbors were no longer willing to visit her house for the monthly gathering, over concerns that her house was not *halal*. Indonesia has also witnessed shifting practices in the ways in which Muslims conduct business. Following the "marketization of Indonesian Islam," many Muslims have stories of being encouraged by family members to only buy products from Muslim owned businesses. One Jakarta-based member of a co-op, for example, decided to leave after being a member for a decade, because she believed that co-op practice was not in line with the requirements of a sharia-based economy.[12]

The reality of everyday religious conflict has brought my research to the field of religious education. I argue that the government has in fact been proactively complicit in nurturing a culture of intolerance through its educational policy, particularly in religious education policy.

Everyday Religious Conflict and the Role of Religious Education: a Case Study of Religious Education Curriculum in Indonesia

Religious education becomes crucial as the site for nurturing both tolerance and intolerance, especially in a deeply divided society. However, in Indonesia, the decisive factor determining the vision of religious education is in the hand of the political interest of the dominant power that rules the country. This political interest expresses the "hidden" curriculum that influences the model and the goal of religious education in Indonesia.[13]

Since its independence in 1945, Indonesia has gone through several curriculum changes. Before 1965, religious education was an optional subject in Indonesian schools. Parents had the right to choose whether their children ought to have religious education in school or not. Based on the Education Law of 1950, religion classes were to be carried out

[12] Sandra Hamid, "Normalizing Intolerance: Elections, Religion and Everyday Life in Indonesia." *Centre for Indonesian Law, Islam and Society/CILIS, Policy Paper 17* (2018), 25. Online available in http://law.unimelb.edu.au/centres/cilis/research/publications/cilis-policy-papers.

[13] Educational theorists have argued that there is complex and often subtle relationship between dominant ideology and the experience of schooling. Ideology of the dominant regime is embedded and enacted through the explicit and "hidden" curricula, and reproduced in the ways that educational theorists, policy makers, and practitioners come to understand, value, plan, organize, and evaluate educational experiences. See. Michael W. Apple, *Ideology and Curriculum* (3rd Edition) (New York & London, UK: Routledge Falmer, 2004).

selectively, depending on the students' age and intellectual level. Thus, students could elect whether to take religion class or not, and religion was made a non-determining subject in student grade promotion.[14] However, this policy had changed since 1965/1966 when the Suharto regime made it a compulsory lesson from elementary school until university. This policy might be based on the main reason, namely, to prevent students from the influence of communism, a state common enemy. The affirmation of religion as a compulsory subject was contributed by the political rivalry between the military and the communist between 1960 and 1965. The communists wanted to abolish religion classes from schools. The military, in opposing communist ideas, invited Islamists to promote religion as a compulsory subject. The failed communist coup of 1965 gave the military a stronger position in Indonesian politics and the idea of making religion classes compulsory was eventually realized in 1965. The temporary People's General Assembly issued Decree XXVII/MPRS/1966 declaring religion classes compulsory from primary school to university.[15] Thus, it could be said that religious education had been used by Suharto to oppose communism and to show his stance towards religion.

Religion subject continues to be the site of ambiguity in the period of the reformation era during the post-Suharto regime (1998 onward). One of the most controversial and ambiguous policies is the Education Law of 20/2003 (Undang-Undang No. 20 Tahun 2003), particularly in article 12.1 and article 30.2 which say that

> Every student in an educational unit deserves to receive religious education in accordance with his or her religion, imparted by an educator from a similar religious tradition (Article 12.1). Religious education has the function to prepare students to become community members who understand and practice religious values and/or acquire expertise in his or her own religion (Article 30.2).

[14] This law was supported by a decree by the People's Assembly, TAP MPRS No. 1 l/MPRS/1960/Bab II Pasal 3, states that religious education is offered as a subject in public schools from elementary through higher education, with the understanding that students may exercise the right not to participate in this religious education if their parents or guardians object.

[15] For a complete discussion on the history of religious education in Indonesia, see, Raihani, *Creating Multicultural Citizen: A Portrayal of Contemporary Indonesian Education* (NY: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2014), 109; M. Agus Nuryanto, "Religious Education and the Challenge of Pluralism in Indonesia," *Journal Pendidikan Islam* Vol. XXVIII No. 1 (2013), 140-155; Redja Mudyahardjo, *Pengantar Pendidikan: Sebuah Studi Awal tentang Dasar- dasar Pendidikan pada Umumnya dan Pendidikan di Indonesia* (Jakarta: Rajawali Press, 2002), 422.

This law requires that schools (private and public schools) have to provide separate religious education for their pupils according to their own faith.[16] As a result, the school applies a model of "confessional" religious education class where students are grouped in accordance with their religion and receive religious teachings based on their religion. Here, the main objective of religious education is to "internalize the particular religious tradition held by the students to train students to be religiously faithful and have a strong religious commitment in their own religion."[17] This policy was followed by another regulation, namely, the Government Regulation [Peraturan Pemerintah] No. 55/2007 concerning religious education, enacted in October 2007. The exclusive tone is emphasized in article 4.2, which says that: "Every student at every education unit deserves to receive religious education in accordance with his or her religion, imparted by a teacher from a similar religious background." Moreover, article 5.3 of Government Regulation No. 55/2007 also mandates that:

> Religious education encourages students to obey their religious teachings in daily life and utilize religion as the foundation of ethics and morality in their personal lives, families, society, and national life.

The controversy of religious education regulation continued to persist as the government issued Curriculum 2013. In this curriculum, the government allocated more hours of religious teaching as a response to current societal problems—violent ethnic and religious conflicts, juvenile delinquency, drug abuse, and gang fights. Adding more hours and weight to religion in the national curriculum has received mixed responses. Positive responses come from those who believe that the teaching of religion would build young people's mastery of their religion and nurture their faith, which would guard them against misbehavior.[18] However, negative responses express their skepticism that religious education will change student's character. In fact, they underline the danger of religious formalism, where religious education becomes the site for indoctrination.

[16] Nuryanto, "Religious Education and the Challenge of Pluralism in Indonesia," 145; Raihani, *Creating Multicultural Citizen: A Portrayal of Contemporary Indonesian Education*, 218.

[17] Mohamad Yusuf and Carl Sterkens, "Analyzing the State's Laws on Religious Education in Post-New Order Indonesia," *Al-Jāmi'ah: Journal of Islamic Studies* Vol. 53, no. 1 (2015), 114.

[18] Anita Lie, "Religious Education and Character Formation: An Indonesian Context," *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, XXVI (2014), 78.

While some scholars argue that religious education in Indonesia expresses the government's concern to the right of minority to attend religious education, however, it is clear that the "confessional" character in the Education Law of 2003 and its subsequent policies has been perpetuating the growth of everyday religious conflict in society.[19] Raihani, in his research study of several High Schools in Indonesia, observes that religious education class tends to follow a confessional approach that seeks to educate for a pious and religiously committed personality with competences that are heavily oriented to the development of the cognitive domain of learning objectives.[20] He argues that in teaching religion, a great proportion of the textbooks are dedicated to religious dogmas and doctrines and evaluation of religion classes consists of nothing more than measuring students' knowledge and understanding of religious concepts and dogmas, simplified through quantitative measurement. As a consequence, teachers are reluctant to develop students' critical thinking and reflection skills with regards to what they believe in, and in general, they are closed to other possible interpretations of religion.

From curriculum perspective, Zakiyudin Baidhawy, an Indonesian Muslim scholar, also strongly criticizes the curriculum of religious education in Indonesia for generating the *culture of exclusivism* that fails to acknowledge diversity and tolerance. Baidhawy speaks of the "null" curriculum in religious education or "the curriculum that school does not teach," which is, in fact, as important as what they do teach."[21] He delineates six "null" curriculums hidden in the confessional religious education that eventually perpetuates everyday religious conflict:

> (1) it only introduces its own system of religion (narrow system of knowledge); (2) it does not recognize the other religions as genuine and authentic (truth and salvation claim); (3) it ignores the otherness in religions and regards "the other" and inferior

[19] Education Law of 2003, as Raihani points out, "reacts well to the basic human rights of individuals to access religious education."This law thinks of the minority rights to access religious education at the macro level and ensures to grant their rights to do so at the micro-school level. See. Raihani, "Minority Right to Attend Religious Education in Indonesia," *Al-Jāmi'ah: Journal of Islamic Studies* Vol. 53, no. 1 (2015), 8.

[20] Raihani, *Creating Multicultural Citizen: A Portrayal of Contemporary Indonesian Education*, 131.

[21] The "null" curriculum is not neutral; rather, it has important effects on the kinds of options one is able to consider, the alternatives that one can examine, and the perspectives from which one can view a situation or problem. "Null" curriculum are the options students are not afforded, the perspective they may never know about. See. Elliott Eisner, *The Educational Imagination*, 3rd edition (NJ: Merill, Prentice Hall, 2002), 97.

(sense of superiority); (4) it regards the other as without value (prejudices, biases, and stereotypes); (5) it views other religions and the world through its own religion and/or worldview (myopic) which can lead to religious fanaticism and radicalism; (6) its mentality towards conversion and/or mission are very forceful (religion's burden of proselytism).[22]

It can be concluded that the curriculum of religious education in Indonesia needs to be transformed. It means that religious education should no longer be politicized to support the ruling regime, which tries to maintain control over the country and impose the national unity from above. Religious educators need to be aware of the "hidden" curriculum imposed by the government that distracts the public role of religious education as an important element for social transformation, particularly in addressing social issues. Thus, there is a need to undergo a paradigm shift of religious education from confessional to transformative approach in order to construct a model that helps to educate and prepare persons to participate in public life for the general welfare of society.

Religious Education and Transformative Learning Theory: from Personal to Communal Transformation

An increasing number of educational theorists and researchers have argued that transformation should be considered a central, if not *the* central, educational aim. In the framework of transformative learning, education should no longer be thought an act of transferring knowledge from the teacher to student, or of merely in forming students of what they will need to get by in the world, the consensus view claims. Rather, education should transform our relations to others, to ourselves, and the world around us. As one source has it, "our mission in education," should be "transformational rather than informational."[23] There are two overarching approaches in transformative learning: those focusing on personal transformation and socio-cultural transformation. Jack Mezirow's theory represents the perspective of personal transformation, while, Paulo Freire socio-cultural approach.

[22] Zakiyudin Baidhawy, "Building harmony and peace through multiculturalist theology-based religious education: an alternative for contemporary Indonesia," *British Journal of Religious Education Vol. 29*, No. 1, January 2007, pp. 15–30.

[23] T. R. Rosebrough and R. G. Leverett, *Transformational teaching in the information age: Making why and how we teach relevant to students* (Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2011), xi.

Jack Mezirow and Personal Transformation

Jack Mezirow is a seminal theorist of transformative learning. Mezirow based his approach on the constructivist assumption that meaning exists within an individual rather than in external forms such as books. Constructivism maintains that learning is a process of constructing meaning; it is how people make sense of their experiences. Knowledge is acquired through involvement in content rather than through imitation or repetition. Constructivism grew out of the dissatisfaction of educational methods which were transmission-based and focused on rote learning and memorization, the regurgitation of facts and the division of knowledge into different subjects. A person constructs meaning from his or her own experiences and validates it through interaction and communication with others.[24] Mezirow envisioned transformative learning as the process of reconstructing the way a person makes sense of life experience. He argues:

> [Transformative learning is] the process by which we transform our taken-for-granted "frames of reference" to make them more inclusive, discriminating, open, emotionally capable of change, and reflective so that they may generate beliefs and opinions that will prove more true or justified to guide action."[25]

Mezirow believes that transformation occurs when an individual changes his/her "frames of reference," composed of "habit of mind," namely, "a set of assumptions – broad, generalized, orienting predispositions that act as a filter for interpreting the meaning of experience."[26] A habit of mind is a way of seeing the world based on our background, experience, culture, and personality. Habits of mind develop over a lifetime. They are rooted in one's earliest experiences and are shaped through socialization. Habits of mind are uncritically shaped by our families, community, and culture and tend to remain unquestioned unless we encounter an alternative perspective we cannot ignore. They can include a "conservative or liberal orientation; tendency to move toward or away from people; ethnocentricity; tendency to respect or challenge authority; and many

[24] Jack Mezirow, "Learning to Think Like an Adult: Core Concepts of Transformation Theory," In Jack Mezirow & Associates, *Learning as Transformation: Critical Perspectives on a Theory in Progress* (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 2000), 5.

[25] Mezirow, "Learning to Think Like an Adult: Core Concepts of Transformation Theory," 8.

[26] Mezirow, "Learning to Think Like an Adult: Core Concepts of Transformation Theory,", 17.

other orientations and worldviews."[27] These taken-for-granted "habits of mind" can be problematic since they can shape, delimit, and often distort the ways people make meaning of their experiences. They can create a narrow view of reality that can be harmful and destructive to oneself, others, and the world. The process of transformative learning is one of questioning "habits of mind" – the beliefs, assumptions, values, and perspectives that a person has uncritically assimilated and constructing new ones that are more inclusive, open, emotionally capable of change, and better justified. Thus, transformative learning is not primarily about adopting the "right" perspective or even changing one's mind from one thing to another, but about becoming more open and these qualities "generate beliefs and opinions that will prove more true or justified to guide action."[28]

To address and transform the unconscious and problematic habits of mind that have been deeply embedded in one's vision of life, Mezirow suggests that one needs to perform *critical reflection* that involves challenging the validity of one's assumptions about the world, others, and oneself. It is a process of examining experiences in order to analyze and scrutinize underlying beliefs and assumptions, and can include a spiritual awareness that prompts an examination of values and the deeper meaning of an experience. It means critiquing the premises implicit in the posing of a problem. In other words, one asks, "Why have I framed this problem in this way? Is there another way to conceptualize this problem?" To foster critical reflection, Mezirow recommended the use of journaling, role playing and group discussion. Mezirow integrates the practice of critical reflection in his ten-phase transformation:

> (1) A disorienting dilemma; (2) self-examination; (3) a critical assessment of epistemic, sociocultural, or psychic assumptions; (4) recognition that one's discontent and the process of transformation are shared and that others have negotiated a similar change; (5) exploration of options for new roles, relationships, and actions; (6) planning a course of action; (7) acquisition of knowledge and skills for implementing one's plan; (8) provision trying of new roles; (9) building of competence and self-confidence in new roles and relationships; (10) reintegration into one's life on the basis of conditions dictated by one's perspective.

[27] Edward W. Taylor, Patricia Cranton, and Associates. *The Handbook of Transformative Learning* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2012), 83.

[28] P. Cranton and M. Roy, "When the bottom falls out of the bucket: A holistic perspective on transformative learning." *Journal of Transformative Education*, 1, (2003), 86-98.

Mezirow's vision inspires the educational ministry of the Church to give more emphasis on the importance of transformation in faith formation. Transformation within the faith context necessitates the experience of "conversion" or metanoia.[29] Conversion, which etymologically means "turning back," refers to the "inward movement" whereby we are invited to look deeper into our inner selves to find God and to reflect on God's will for our lives. Conversion implies the act of converting, or the experience of having been converted by someone. In specifically religious education, both the active sense of conversion and the more spontaneous, metaphysical sense are important. In the New Testament, metanoia almost always refers to a turning from sin and a new beginning in moral conduct. The Gospels present Jesus as being sent to call people to conversion so that they can turn from sin and turn toward God's Kingdom (Mark 1:15). The conversion story of Paul as he traveled on the road to Damascus (Acts 9:4-9) provides a consummate model of Christian spiritual transformation that resonates with Mezirow's ten-phase transformation. Paul's conversion began with a "disorienting dilemma" when he experienced a personal encounter with Jesus that caused him to examine personal feelings of guilt and shame (Acts 9:1-4). This spiritual experience led Paul to reflect critically on his problematic assumptions and expectations – habits of mind – that have motivated him to persecute Christians (Acts 9:6-8). Paul must have recognized that with his conversion, there would inevitably be a new allegiance with new roles and relationships (Acts 9:13-14). Paul then experienced existential transformation as he received a visit from Ananias who healed and baptized him (Acts 9:17-18). At the end, Paul became Christ's disciple and a powerful preacher in missionary's land. Thus, conversion is a radical transformation of a person at every level of his or her being that leads her or him not only to be a fully human being, but also to be the disciple of Christ who brings the Kingdom to the world.

Inherent in the experience of conversion in the context of faith transformation is the dynamics of "discernment," "a process for making choices, in a context of Christian faith, when the option is not between good and evil, but between several possible courses of action all of which are potentially good." Thus, discernment needs to be understood not only as a virtue developed through formation into a way of life, but also as a method inquiry where persons and communities engage discernment

[29] Jane E Regan. *Toward an Adult Church: A Vision of Faith Formation* (Chicago: Loyola Press, 2002), 97.

in discovering the vision of God and the action of the Holy Spirit within a particular context. As a method of inquiry, discernment is always a "prophetic discernment" which involves critical reflection and engages the social reality in light of theology and ethics for the common good.

Mezirow's personal transformation has been influential in the field of religious education. Nevertheless, his priority on personal transformation needs to be supported with social transformation. Thus, reflecting on the limitation of Mezirow's theory, religious educators turn their attention to Paulo Freire, who offers a model of sociocultural transformation.

Paulo Freire and Social Transformation

Freire's educational approach deepens the theory of transformative learning by focusing on socio-cultural and political issues that have an adverse impact on people's lives. Unlike Mezirow's theory, which is based on the experiences of white, middle-class men and women and concentrates primarily on personal transformation, Freire's theory emerged from his work in Brazil and other South American countries that are plagued by poverty, illiteracy, and oppression, and considers how persons and communities can name oppressive social conditions and work to transform them. The conviction that shaped Freire's work in adult education is that education is never neutral. Freire's claim that "education can never be neutral... its role will always be either in the service of the domestication of men or their liberation."[30]

The basic foundation of Freire's philosophy of education is his anthropology that human being's fundamental vocation is to be subject to history. Freire operates on one basic assumption: that man's ontological vocation is to be a Subject who acts upon and transforms the world, and in so doing moves toward ever new possibilities of fuller and richer life individually and collectively. Freire's educational philosophy is anchored upon his belief in the human capacity for freedom, growth, and effective social action. As Freire declares in *Pedagogy of Freedom*:

> There is no theory of sociopolitical transformation that moves me if it is not grounded in an understanding of the human person as a maker of history and as one made by history. If it does not respect men and women as beings of decision, rupture, option. As ethical beings who in their ethicality are capable of being unethical, of transgressing the ethical code indispensable for human living...I

[30] Paulo Freire "Education: domestication or liberation," in *Prospects UNESCO* 2,2 (1975), 174.

> have affirmed and reaffirmed the extent to which I rejoice in knowing that I am a 'conditioned' being, capable of going beyond my own conditioning.[31]

To foster social transformation, Freire argued that people must become aware of a "culture of silence" that has been perpetuated by a dominant model of education. Freire named this dominant model, "banking pedagogy." He criticized this model because it views students as passive "containers" or "receptacles" that must be "filled" by the teacher's official knowledge, and does not guide them to view social reality from a critical perspective.

As an alternative to banking pedagogy, Freire envisions a liberating model of learning he calls "problem-posing" education. Problem-posing education teaches students to be critical thinkers by developing their power to "perceive critically the way they exist in the world with which and in which they find themselves; [thus], they come to see the world not as static reality, but as a reality in process, in transformation." [32] The ultimate goal of this approach is the liberation that enables teachers and students to become subjects within the educational process. Just as the banking approach epitomizes a transfer of knowledge approach to education, the "problem-posing method" highlights the value of providing students with an opportunity to participate in the search for knowledge. In the "banking concept," students are not called upon to know but to memorize. In the "problem-posing method," students are no longer docile listeners but critical co-investigators in dialogue with the teacher. Problem-posing education is rooted in a commitment to educating for conscientization and dialogue.

Problem-posing education aims of educating for conscientization, an ongoing process by which learners, as knowing subjects, become aware of the socio-cultural reality that shapes their lives, reflect critically on this reality and develop their capacity to transform it. The word "conscientization" has its origin in the word "conscious" and is closely related to the understanding of consciousness as a state of being aware of one's relationship with the world. Freire argued that "conscientization is the method by which any oppressed groups are assisted to comprehend

[31] Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of Freedom: Ethics, Democracy, and Civic Courage*. Trans. Patrick Clarke (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1998), 115-116.

[32] Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Translated by Myra Bergman Ramos (NY: Continuum, 2000), 83.

their conditions and, in a combination of theory and praxis, to be motivated politically for the revolutionary transformation of those conditions." [33]

To educate in a way that encourages conscientization, Freire demands a practice of egalitarian dialogue.[34] This involves an encounter between people focused on the world in order to name and, ultimately, transform it. Through dialogue, "the teacher-of-the-students and the students-of the- teacher cease to exist and a new term emerge: teacher-students with students-teachers. . . . The students–no longer docile listeners–are now critical co-investigators in dialogue with the teacher."[35] Dialogue brings people together to transform the world by a praxis of liberation. To be genuine and egalitarian, Freire argues that dialogue must be motivated by love, practiced with humility, and guided by faith. He states:

> Dialogue cannot exist in the absence of a profound love for the world and for people. Love is at the same time the foundation of dialogue and dialogue itself; love is an act of courage; thus, love is commitment to others…dialogue cannot exist without humility [since] men and women who lack humility cannot come to the people, cannot be their partners in naming the world…Dialogue further requires an intense faith in humankind, faith in their vocation to be more fully human.[36]

Freire's concept of egalitarian dialogue rooted in love, humility, and faith underlines that human beings are not self-sufficient but are rooted in a dialogic relationship with other persons, with the material world, and ultimately, with the loving Creator—the source of life and being.

Freire's perspective on social transformation inspires religious educators worldwide, particularly in the works of Thomas H. Groome. Groome writes closely along the lines of Freire's perspective. Freire inspires him to construct a pedagogical approach for social transformation called Shared Christian Praxis which has a purpose of promoting a dialectic between participants and their social contexts, and between

[33] Paulo Freire, *Education for Critical Consciousness* (New York: The Continuum Publishing Company, 1989), 44.

[34] For a deeper understanding of the role of dialogue in Freire's approach to transformative learning see Ira Shor and Paulo Freire. *A Pedagogy for Liberation: Dialogues on Transforming Education* (South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, 1987).

[35] Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 61-62.

[36] Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 90-91.

their faith community and its socio-cultural situation. He defines Shared Christian Praxis as:

> A participative and dialogical pedagogy in which people reflect critically on their own historical agency in time and place and on their sociocultural reality, have access together to Christian Story/Vision, and personally appropriate it in community with the creative intent of renewed praxis in Christian faith towards God's reign for all creation.[37]

Shared Christian Praxis is a pedagogy that encourages people to bring their lives to their Faith and their Faith to their lives or known as "Life to Faith to Life" movement that consists of five movements:

> (1) Naming/Expressing "Present Praxis": Have people respond to the theme as it pertains to their lives; (2) Critical Reflection on Present Action: Encourage people to reflect critically on the theme in conversation together; (3) Making Accessible the Christian Story and Vision: Share the Story and Vision of Christian faith in ways that are pertinent to the theme and meaningful for this group, context, and occasion; (4) Dialectical Hermeneutic to Appropriate the Christian Story and Vision to Participants' Stories and Visions: Encourage Christian to appropriate and integrate Christian faith with life; (5) Decision/Response for Lived Christian Faith: Invite people to make a decision – cognitive, affective, or behavioral in response to the whole process.

Groome argues that through his shared praxis people are invited to look at and reflect on their lives together, to bring its praxis to encounter, to reflect upon and to learn the wisdom of Christian story (and other religious traditions), and then to make this faith their own, appropriating and choosing to live it as faith alive in the world. The goal of shared praxis is to "live Christian Story and Vision in their socio-cultural situation in ways transforming of the context and that enrich the universal Christian community."[38] Its very dynamics make it capable of nurturing emancipatory vision to renewed praxis of faith that is lived for God's reign of justice and peace. As an educational approach rooted in the dynamics of reflection and action, Groome also believes that Shared Christian Praxis is an inclusive pedagogy that is applicable

[37] Thomas H. Groome, *Sharing Faith: A Comprehensive Approach to Religious Education and Pastoral Ministry* (NY: HarperCollins Publisher, 1991), 135.

[38] Groome, *Sharing Faith,* 154.

outside Christian traditions and even in non-confessional contexts of religious education.

In conclusion, by bringing together Mezirow's and Freire's perspectives, one can develop an approach to transformative learning that incorporates personal change with progressive social change as mutually constitutive of each other. Such a holistic approach to transformative learning includes, but is broader than, an approach that focuses on an individual's cognitive frames of reference, that is, habits of mind. A holistic approach to transformative learning takes contextual into account and, as such, can address the social issues more thoroughly and comprehensively. Thus, a holistic-transformative learning theory that integrates both personal and social transformation can bring insights to construct a model of religious education for transformation in Indonesia.

Fostering Religious Education for Transformation in Indonesia: Dialogue with Transformative Learning Theory

Reflecting on the growth of everyday religious conflict that plagues the nation, as a religious educator, I believe that religious education can offer a transformative perspective. There are two important dimensions that religious education can draw insights from transformative learning to lessen this crisis: (1) the importance of critical reflection as a pedagogical approach and (2) the importance of dialogue that will help to develop interreligious education as a model of religious education for transformation.

Re-Appropriating Critical Reflection as an Approach for Transformation

Transformative learning theory emphasizes the importance of critical reflection in the process of transformation. Mezirow underlines that critical reflection determines how individuals become aware of his or her problematic and unconscious habits of mind and assumptions. Through this dynamic, the learner gains an integral understanding of his or her own experience that helps them to make correct decisions and actions. Freire brings the notion of critical reflection in relation to the effort to nurture conscientization. Freire believed that critical reflection on the material world and the process of historical change gives rise to an awareness of human agency: "Only beings who can reflect upon

the fact that they are determined are capable of freeing themselves." [39] For Freire, critical reflection occurs through problem-posing pedagogy, which invites all participants to engage with each other in the process of study, enrichment, and shared growth. Thus, Mezirow and Freire affirm that critical reflection plays an important role in fostering personal transformation that will lead to social transformation.

In the context of religious education in Indonesia, religious educators can adopt critical reflection as an approach in their curriculum. Applying critical reflection will transform two things. *First of all*, from a pedagogical perspective, critical reflection transforms the method of learning religion by rejecting the banking-method pedagogy. Banking pedagogy rewards memorization and passive acceptance of received truths; it is a mechanical process where participation on the part of the students is limited to receiving, filing, or storing the knowledge, deposited or transferred, by the teacher. As I discussed in the previous section, this banking pedagogy resonates with the confessional model of religious education in Indonesia, where student mainly memorizes religious doctrines or teachings of their own. Confessional religious education in Indonesia has been contributing to perpetuating tensions among religious believers, particularly in its "null" curriculum that implicitly teaches intolerant and hatred towards other religious communities. Thus, nurturing the practice of critical reflection will encourage the student to move inward, reflecting on his or her own faith in order to evaluate and transform it so that it becomes more critically reflective and inclusive. These dynamics are called learning "in" religion or intrareligious dialogue. [40] Through learning "in" religion, student learn to gain insight into *the location from which they speak* and how their particular situation, which is complex and multilayer. Critical reflection helps student to develop self-reflection and self-criticism that leads to self-transformation. I agree with Francis Clooney who says that "if we see our biases and watch them in operation, we can become freer, more vulnerable in [the way we relate to others."[41]

[39] Paulo Freire, "Cultural Action and Conscientization," *Harvard Educational Review* 68.4 (1998), 500.

[40] A. Halsall and B. Roebben, "Intercultural and Interfaith Dialogue through Education." *Religious Education* 101 (4), 2006, 448.

[41] F.X. Clooney, *Comparative Theology: Deep Learning Across Religious Borders* (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 64.

Secondly, from religious education perspective, the practice of critical reflection will transform the aim of religious education in Indonesia. Based on the Education Law of 2003, religious education aims to teach students about religion with the intent to have religious knowledge of their religion. This approach is also known as learning "about" religion, which focuses on nurturing "religious literacy," namely, religious knowledge of what religious adherents believe, what they regard as sacred, and why specific actions may be experienced as such offensives. Although there is value in people knowing about religion and having knowledge of their faith tradition, such visions are limited in what they affect in people's lives and the world at large. What is missing in this approach is the vision to foster students' ability to reflect critically on their social situations by using the lens of their faith to help them be agents of social change. Thus, the rule of religious education is not only to *inform* or educate students to know religious teachings and doctrines but also to *form* them so that they become mature individuals who can contextualize their faith for social transformation (to *transform*).

How can we practice critical reflection in our religious education curriculum? I suggest that we adopt Groome's Shared Christian Praxis. Shared Christian Praxis invites people to look at and critically reflect on their lives together, to bring this praxis to encounter, to reflect upon and to learn the wisdom of Christian story, and then to make this faith their own, appropriating and choosing to live it as faith alive in the world. Shared Christian Praxis encourages students to be self-reflective, self-motivated and empowered to be agents of change.

Nurturing Interreligious Education for Transformation

One of the core elements of transformative learning is "engagement in dialogue" with others. Dialogue is the essential medium through which transformation is promoted and developed. Dialogue fosters a spirit of collaboration among people "to name the world and to change it; thus, dialogue is an existential necessity since through dialogue, people find a way by which they achieve significance as human beings; the dialoguers address the world which is to be transformed." [42]

In the field of religious education, the spirit of dialogue shared by transformative learning theory inspires the construction of "interreligious education." The term "inter" in an interreligious approach means

[42] Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 88.

understanding one's own religious position in relation to other religious possibilities. Interreligious education envisions that conversation between religious traditions should not threaten one's own religious identity. On the contrary, conversation with those of other faith traditions can and should enrich and deepen knowledge and faith of one's own, fostering a deeper awareness that there is one God, one creation, one divine revelation to which Christians, Jews, Muslims, and others respond with their own best lights and faithful lives.[43] Thus, interreligious education fosters an "understanding of one religious tradition in relation to other religious traditions" since "one cannot practice any religion today without an understanding of the other, some backdrop of comparison."[44] The point of such education is not learning *about*, but learning *from* and *with* the other in order to teach the participants skills, knowledge, and attitudes that help them live with other religious people. This point is well described by Sheryl A. Kujawa-Holbrook where she articulates the effects of this education as "[acquiring] the knowledge, the attitudes and skills needed to interact, understand, and communicate with persons from diverse religious traditions."[45] Through this education, participants learn ways in which to function effectively amid religious pluralism and to create pluralistic democratic communities that work for the common good. In sum, interreligious education fosters an educational activity that invites people from different religious backgrounds to learn together, which encourages them to share their religious views, identities, and experiences with one another, thereby helping them learn how to live with one another.

In the Indonesian context, interreligious education for transformation has been proposed and developed by several religious educators. From a Catholic perspective, the late Catholic priest Fr. Jusuf Bilyarta Mangunwijaya, known as Romo Mangun, suggested a "religiosity" education model. Mangun points out that "religiosity," which he claimed is the essence of all authentic religions, refers to "being religious," that is to put faith into action in everyday life. This, he noted, is different

[43] Gabriel Moran, *Missed Opportunities: Rethinking Catholic Tradition* (Bloomington, IN: iUniverse, 2016), 162.

[44] For example, to understand Christianity one must have a background understanding of Judaism, including a sense of the Jewish meaning of faith, Messiah, and Kingdom. Additionally, contemporary Jews could help Christians reflect on the logic and concepts of Christianity by affirming alternative Jewish perspectives about issues of Christian belief and practice. See Moran, *Missed Opportunities: Rethinking Catholic Tradition*, 226-230.

[45] Sheryl A. Kujawa-Holbrook, *God Beyond Borders: Interreligious Learning among Faith Communities* (Eugene, Oregon: Pickwick Publ, 2014), 2.

from "having religion"—simply being a member of a particular religion. In discussing this distinction, he states:

> Religion and religiosity are not identical. Religion is a formal dimension, as manifested in the forms of rituals, customs, organizations, buildings, collectivity, social institutions etc. Whereas religiosity, faith, is the substance, it is universal. Religions are different, but religiosity is essentially the same. What really matters therefore is good work, a real attitude towards fellow human beings, especially those who suffer.[46]

In emphasizing religiosity rather than religion as the foundation of society, Mangun rejects forms of religious formalism that establish a line between "us" and "them" and that, as a result, distort relations between religious communities. As a model of religious education, religiosity education seeks to nurture an inclusive perspective among students by focusing on three transformative aims, namely, (1) to develop an openness among students that enables them to see God in themselves, others, and their environment, (2) to help them find and implement values that all religions and belief systems strive for, and (3) to develop cooperation between religions in the spirit of true brotherhood/sisterhood.[47] Mangun's religiosity education actualizes Freire's problem-posing pedagogy. It facilitates dialogue between a teacher and students and seeks to combat dehumanization in society. In developing his pedagogy, Mangun incorporated a model of conscientisation that would help students to become aware of the socio-cultural reality that shapes their lives. This model of conscientization guides students to become more aware of the concrete situation of their lives, understand how that situation could be changed, and then act to change the situation.

From an Islamic perspective, Zakiyudin Baidhawy has elaborated on the importance of multiculturalism in Indonesian religious education. Responding to the exclusive model of religious education, he proposed "a Multiculturalist Theology-Based Religious Education" (MTBRE), which

[46] Y.B. Mangunwijaya, Saya Ingin Membayar Utang Kepada Rakyat (Yogyakarta: Penerbit Kanisius, 1999), 88-89. For further discussion on the topic of "religiosity" education, see. Y.B. Mangunwijaya, "Komunikasi iman dalam sekolah [Faith communication in schools]', *Berita Komisi Kateketik KWI*, No 1-2/XIV/1994, 55;Y. B. Mangunwijaya, Menumbuhkan Sikap Religius pada Anak-Anak [To Make Children's Religiosity Grow Up] (Jakarta: Gramedia, 1986), 1-7.

[47] Komisi Kateketik Keuskupan Agung Semarang, and Komisi Pendidikan Keuskupan Agung Semarang (2009), *Pendidikan Religiositas: Gagasan, Isi, dan Pelaksanaannya* [*Religiosity Education: Ideas, Content and Implementation*], (Kanisius:Yogyakarta, 2009), 29.

integrates both theology and multicultural education. [48] The MTBRE underlines the" theological shift" from exclusivism to multiculturalism in Indonesian religious education. Without this shift, religious education leans heavily towards dogmatic indoctrination, which teaches their own systems of religion or belief as the truth and the only path to salvation. Further, he places the educational accent on "how to live together *with* others in the collective consciousness of religious diversity." Baidhawy draws upon Islam as a source for these approaches, showing how depth in one tradition can actually turn people into more profound, more respectful relations with people in other traditions.[49] He crystallized his theology into four core values, ten implementation-level values and three goal-level values. For instance, he proposed the Islamic concept of *rahmah* – God as merciful and benevolent – to encourage the spirit of love and care in human interactions, including between religions. Other concepts that Baidhawy drew upon included *ummah* (living together), *tafahum* (mutual understanding), *takrim* (mutual respect), *sulh* (reconciliation), and *salam* (peace).

In the context of everyday religious conflict in Indonesia, interreligious education for transformation developed by Romo Mangun and Zakiyudin Baidhawy is considered a first step in developing a religious education curriculum' that is dialogical, transformative, and relevant for Indonesian contexts. Both religiosity education and "a Multiculturalist Theology-Based Religious Education" (MTBRE) show a model of transformative religious education which address to a particular context of religious conflict in Indonesia.

Concluding Remarks

Religious education for transformation has one single goal: to educate persons and communities of faith for participation in public life for the general welfare of society. Through this approach, religious education takes a public role by accepting responsibility to contribute to the well-being of the human community and to work together with other social institutions in shaping the common good of society. Religious education for transformation believes that persons are more than a product of their society; they also participate in the creation of society. Better persons require a better social order. Thus, education should enable persons, or

[48] Baidhawy, 23.

[49] Baidhawy, 19-27.

collective groups of persons, to take informed responsibility for the social order. Thus, the role of religious education for transformation is not just learning the beliefs of the past or transferring the tradition to another generation, but it includes reconstructing the heritage in light of present and future social goals and formulating new beliefs and values to serve and to transform society.

Within Catholic communities, religious education for transformation seeks to transform identity from exclusive into inclusive identity by educating Catholics in the *particulars* of Catholic Christian faith, but without sectarian bias and in ways that open them to the *universal* – to the universality of God's love that transforms the world. The first responsibility of Catholic religious educators in this and all other Catholic religious education venues is to inform and form Catholics in the beliefs, practices, and traditions of the Catholic Church in order to provide them with a spiritual home. Nurturing a secure sense of Catholic identity is necessary so that Catholics have something to share with people of other religions when they engage in interreligious dialogue. However, Catholic religious educators should be critical of all forms of religious identity based on separatism or on "us-versus-them" mentality. Rather, they should strive to nurture a sense of Catholic identity based on relationality, that is, on people of differing religious traditions sharing their distinctive sense of religious identity with one another. Thus, religious education for transformation in Catholic community nurtures "religious identity that is simultaneously rooted and adaptive – that is one that allows for engagement with the religious other."[50] Those involved in this type of religious education learn to define themselves in the context of other traditions rather than over and against them.

Religious education for transformation can take many forms, depending on the pressing social issues that are happening in a particular context. In the Indonesian context, religious education for transformation finds its best expression in a model of interreligious education, particularly in religiosity education and a Multiculturalist Theology-Based Religious Education (MTBRE). One can conclude that religiosity education and MTBRE introduce transformation in Indonesian society by promoting awareness of the importance of living together within a framework of religious diversity supported by a spirit of equality and equity, mutual trust, mutual understanding and respect for

[50] Mary C. Boys and S.S. Lee, *Christian and Jews in dialogue: Learning in the presence of the other* (Woodstock, ON: Skylight Paths, 2006), 9-10.

the similarities and differences among religions, and a firm belief in the unique insight of each religion.

Bibliography

Apple, Michael W. *Ideology and Curriculum* (3rd Edition). New York & London, UK: RoutledgeFalmer. 2004.

Augustine, "On Christian learning." In B. A. Kimball (Ed.), *The liberal arts tradition: A documentary history* (D. W. Robertson, Trans.) Lanham, MD: University Press of America (2010): 48-54.

Barron, Patrick and Joanne Sharpe. "Counting conflicts: using newspaper reports to understand violence in Indonesia." *Social Development Papers: Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction*, Paper No. 25 / May 2005. Online Available inhttp://www.conflictanddevelopment.org/resources/documents/Conflict%20Mapping/200505292249140.WP25_Web.pdf.

Barron, Patrick, Sana Jaffrey, and Ashutosh Varshney. "When Large Conflicts Subside: The Ebbs and Flows of Violence in Post-Suharto Indonesia." *Journal of East Asian Studies* 16 (2016): 191–217.

Baidhawy, Zakiyudin. "Building harmony and peace through multiculturalist theology-based religious education: an alternative for contemporary Indonesia." *British Journal of Religious Education Vol. 29*, No. 1 (January 2007) 15–30.

Boys Mary C. and Lee, S.S. *Christian and Jews in dialogue: Learning in the presence of the other*. Woodstock, ON: Skylight Paths, 2006.

Clooney, F.X. *Comparative Theology: Deep Learning Across Religious Borders*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

Cranton P. and M. Roy. "When the bottom falls out of the bucket: A holistic perspective on transformative learning." *Journal of Transformative Education*, 1 (2003) 86-98.

Eisner, Elliott. *The Educational Imagination*, 3rd edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merill, Prentice Hall, 2002.

Foster, Charles R. "Religious Education at the Edge of History." *Religious Education*, Volume 99, No. 1 (2004) 72-78.

Freire, Paulo. "Education: domestication or liberation," in *Prospects UNESCO* 2(2) (1975).

Freire, Paulo. *A Pedagogy for Liberation: Dialogues on Transforming Education*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, 1987.

Freire, Paulo. *Education for Critical Consciousness*. New York: The Continuum Publishing Company, 1989.

Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of Freedom: Ethics, Democracy, and Civic Courage*. Trans. Patrick Clarke. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1998.

Freire, Paulo."Cultural Action and Conscientization," *Harvard Educational Review* 68.4 (1998), 499-521.

Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Translated by Myra Bergman Ramos. NY: Continuum, 2000.

Groome, Thomas H. *Sharing Faith: A Comprehensive Approach to Religious Education and Pastoral Ministry*. NY: HarperCollins Publisher, 1991.

Groome, Thomas H. *Will There Be Faith? A New Vision for Educating and Growing Disciples*. NY: HarperOne, 2011.

Halsall, A. and B. Roebben. "Intercultural and Interfaith Dialogue through Education." *Religious Education* Volume 101 (4), (2006) 443-452.

Hamid, Sandra "Normalizing Intolerance: Elections, Religion and Everyday Life in Indonesia." *Centre for Indonesian Law, Islam and Society/CILIS, Policy Paper 17* (2018), 25. Online available in http://law.unimelb.edu.au/centres/cilis/research/publications/cilis-policy-papers.

Hefner, Robert. W. "A Conservative Turn in Indonesian Islam? Genesis and Future." Muslim Politics and Democratization in Indonesia, *Annual Indonesia Lecture Series* 28 (2008), 39-45.

Hull, John M, "Religionism and Religious Education," *Education, Culture and Values: Spiritual and Religious Education*, Vol. 5, eds. Mal Leicester, Celia Modgil, and Sohan Modgil (London: Falmer Press, 2000), 75-85.

Komisi Kateketik Keuskupan Agung Semarang, and Komisi Pendidikan Keuskupan Agung Semarang, *Pendidikan Religiositas: Gagasan, Isi, dan Pelaksanaannya* [*Religiosity Education: Ideas, Content and Implementation*], Kanisius: Yogyakarta, 2009.

Kujawa-Holbrook, Sheryl A. *God Beyond Borders: Interreligious Learning among Faith Communities*. Eugene, Oregon: Pickwick Publ, 2014.

Lie, Anita. "Religious Education and Character Formation: An Indonesian Context." *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, XXVI (2014) 73-94.

Mangunwijaya, Y.B *Menumbuhkan Sikap Religius pada Anak-Anak* [To Make Children's Religiosity Grow Up]. Jakarta: Gramedia, 1986.

Mangunwijaya, Y.B. *Saya Ingin Membayar Utang Kepada Rakyat*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Kanisius, 1999.

Mezirow, Jack. "Learning to Think Like an Adult: Core Concepts of Transformation Theory," *Learning as Transformation: Critical Perspectives on a Theory in Progress,* eds. Jack Mezirow & Associates (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 2000)

Mezirow, Jack, E. W. Taylor, and Associates. *Transformative Learning in Practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010.

Moran, Gabriel. *Missed Opportunities: Rethinking Catholic Tradition*. Bloomington, IN: iUniverse, 2016.

Muryanto, Bambang. *6 intolerance cases in Yogyakarta this year*. Available online https://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2018/12/21/6-intolerance-cases-in-yogyakarta-this-year.html. (Access June 11, 2020). Mudyahardjo, Redja. *Pengantar Pendidikan: Sebuah Studi Awal tentang Dasar- dasar Pendidikan pada Umumnya dan Pendidikan di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Rajawali Press, 2002.

Nuryanto, M. Agus. "Religious Education and the Challenge of Pluralism in Indonesia." *Journal Pendidikan Islam* Vol. XXVIII No. 1 (2013) 140-155.

Osmer, Richard. *Practical Theology: An Introduction*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008.

Raihani. *Creating Multicultural Citizens: A Portrayal of contemporary Indonesian Education*. NY: Routledge, 2014.

Raihani. "Minority Right to Attend Religious Education in Indonesia." *Al-Jāmi'ah: Journal of Islamic Studies* Vol. 53, no. 1 (2015) 1-26.

Regan, Jane E. *Toward an Adult Church: A Vision of Faith Formation*. Chicago: Loyola Press, 2002.

Rosebrough, T. R. and R. G. Leverett, *Transformational teaching in the information age: Making why and how we teach relevant to student*s. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2011.

Tadjoeddin, Zulfan. "Political Economy of Conflict during Indonesia's Democratic Transition," *Ph.D. Dissertation*. Sydney: University of Western Sydney, 2010.

Taylor, Edward W., Patricia Cranton, and Associates. *The Handbook of Transformative Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2012.

van Klinken, Gerry. *Communal Violence and Democratization in Indonesia: Small Town Wars*. London: Routledge, 2007.

Yusuf, Mohamad and Carl Sterkens. "Analyzing the State's Laws on Religious Education in Post-New Order Indonesia." *Al-Jāmi'ah: Journal of Islamic Studies* Vol. 53, no. 1 (2015) 105-130.