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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

The Setting for Conflict Resolution Education

Since the 1997 Asian economic crisis, Indonesia has gone from being a country hailed as an economic development wonder, to a nation suffering from persistent cases of communal violence, sporadic terrorist activity, and devastating natural disasters. Violence marked the beginning and end of President Suharto’s 32 years of rule. During his interim as president, he and his military successfully repressed many incidences of social conflict as they systematically implemented his regime’s less publicized form of state violence, supported by his interpretation of Pancasila, originally a secular state philosophy used to unite the varied religious and ethnic groups as Indonesia became an independent nation.

The five principles of Pancasila can be roughly translated as monotheism, humanitarianism, national unity, representative democracy by consensus, and social justice under the national motto of Bhinneka Tunggal Ika, “various but one; diverse but unified” (Fitch, 1992-3). On the surface, this national philosophy sounds very democratic. However, as “national unity” was enforced by Suharto’s military regime, Bhinneka Tunggal Ika was adapted to mean censorship, forced assimilation, and uncritical acceptance of government dictates enforced by tough anti-sedition laws through a united military and police structure. This legislation was commonly known by the acronym SARA for Suku, Agama, Ras Antara-golongan (ethnic, religious, and racial relations). It basically made it illegal for anyone to publicly confront or report social
problems related to any of these topics by stating that any form of criticism of social problems led to conflict, thus by nature, seditious to national unity.

Since the onset of Indonesia’s independence, uniting such a diverse population under the identity Indonesian has been wrought with conflict. Although the Javanese make up less than half the population, they are the largest ethnic group and have remained the most powerful cultural group in politics and society.

A few other ethnic groups have increasingly moved into powerful positions, but have made these gains either through common religious ties, or under the title *priyumi*, meaning “people of the soil.” Interestingly enough, the various ethnic Indonesian Chinese groups have assimilated primarily through linguistic ties, a shared history, or as economic share holders (Reid, 1997; Suryadinata, 1992; 1997).

Although the Southeast Asian Chinese are a minority, they too have a long history in Indonesia but have primarily been tied to indigenous populations as economic share holders or investors more so than equal citizens with equal rights and claims (Chirot, 1997; Suryadinata, 1992; 1997). Some scholars have even noted Chinese journals that claim there were well-established Muslim Chinese settlements in East Java as far back as the 1400s (Graaf & Pigaud 1984; Levathes, 1994). However, even this long-shared history has not helped the indigenous populations and their longtime fellow citizens, the Indonesian Chinese, to affect more peaceful resolutions when conflicts have emerged. The same is true for other ethnic groups in conflict, such as the indigenous peoples of Kalimantan, and the Madurese in Central Kalimantan, the Muslims and Christians in
Poso and Ambon, and the Balinese and Sasaks in Lombok to name a few (Aditjondro, 2000; Collins, 2002; Shubert, 1999; Winn, 2000).

Typical of repression models, the Suharto style of forced assimilation and anti-sedition policies seemed to have served only to silence disputes, leading to more support for the saying, “that which is repressed is not resolved.” The violent conflicts that emerged across the archipelago since Suharto’s resignation seem to offer proof to this statement (Colombijn & Lindblad, 2002). These contemporary conflicts have led many Indonesian scholars and politicians to search for resolution models to replace Suhartian repressive ones.

Sometimes buttressing the longevity of many of the historical societal conflicts are the cultural scaffolds that remain firmly in place generation after generation. Traditionally, like many collectivistic cultures, Indonesians often defer to authority figures for resolution of conflict. This option potentially has unpredictable and volatile outcomes depending on the leaders’ idiosyncrasies, especially when conflict is between the leaders and the disputants or between different ethnic, religious, and socio-economic groups who follow different leaders (Noel, Shoemake, & Hale, 2006).

Resolution options that have been most looked to and called upon, such as mufaka, musyawarah, and gotong-royong have typically remained a choice between submissive acceptance of the wants and wishes of people of higher status, to forced cooperation and passive avoidance (Bamualim, Helmanita, Fauzia, & Kusnadiningrat, 2002; Collins, 2002; Geertz, 1960). All of this can quite possibly lead to a response of displaced aggression that is embedded in the term and phenomenon known as amuk.
Running amok is a common English phrase many people still use today without knowing that the word is a term directly borrowed from the Malay/Indonesian language. None of the above traditional styles of resolution promote much understanding of conflict as an opportunity for growth, learning, or transformative change, let alone building empathy and peace.

Since 1998, there has been a growing interest on the behalf of the Indonesian government and from many Indonesian scholars to search for programs that might help groups to manage conflict and resolve disputes without violence. One particular group of researchers with whom I became involved in 2001 was the Center for Research on Intergroup Relations & Conflict Resolution [CERIC] (Noel, Shoemake, & Hale, 2006). CERIC was created in 2000 as a partnership between the University of Indonesia and the Southeast Asia Studies program at Ohio University [OU]. At that time, they began to investigate a variety of Western models of conflict resolution which would emphasize communicative efforts in finding common ground between diverse groups, re-building social capital in multi-cultural communities, implementing participatory development projects, and providing mediation training in order to promote empathy, tolerance, and nonviolent resolution. While I assisted CERIC in introducing some of these conflict resolution ideas in 2003, I managed to field test and develop an interest in Conflict Resolution Education [CRE] among a group of Indonesian Teacher Education professors. Concurrently, I began to develop my own questions concerning the viability of such an effort.
Problem Statement and Purpose for the Study

As demonstrated in the following chapters, this study continued the work begun with CERIC in 2001 with the hope that CRE and the teaching methods it espouses might be a way of teaching empathy, promoting pro-social skills, and allowing individuals to learn and live a more democratic way, confronting conflict more effectively and less violently (Noel, Shoemake, & Hale, 2006). The major focus of this research was concentrated in the field of teacher education with strands reaching into international education, cultural studies, curriculum and instruction, and relational communication.

The main purpose was to continue this work by examining the adoption and adaptation of primary elements of conflict resolution education (CRE) by a select group of teacher educators in Indonesia who were participants in the original workshops. The central research question addressed the adaptability by investigating barriers to the diffusion of the essential elements of CRE, primarily, cooperative learning (CL) and noncoercive classroom management (NCCM) in Indonesia.

The Research Questions

Driving this investigation of elements of CRE in Indonesia were seven questions that best mapped the adaptations and meanings the participants were making, as well as shed light on the overarching issues of effective education and democratic educational reforms in an age of globalization. These questions continually surfaced and guided the review of literature. After reviewing the literature and drawing from over eight years experience as both an educational professional and, later, as a researcher working with Indonesian educators and students, these questions remained unanswered and became the
guiding questions that directed the field research comprising this study in Indonesia for over two years from October 2004 to June 2007. The guiding questions were as follows:

1) What if any cultural barriers exist to the adaptation of CRE’s elements and are they bridgeable?; 2) In what ways have participants implemented some of the initiatives they covered in U.S. Department of State sponsored CRE workshops?; 3) What aspects of CRE’s elements do participants consider worthwhile to introduce, what aspects have they ignored, and why?; 4) What are university students’ perceptions of CRE’s elements and do they differ from that of their professors?; 5) Are there specific conflicts present and are they perceived differently in Indonesia’s system of education?; 6) How do professors define the values underlying Western CRE methods, and what do they understand to be the possible conflicts that can arise in introducing CRE in Indonesian schools?, and 7) What influence do macro-level education systems and the university systems have on professors’ abilities to incorporate and teach new methods, and what is hampering their adaptation of certain elements?

Although not a primary objective of this study, questions regarding how curricular changes are being diffused and the barriers to their diffusion influenced, and continue to influence my understanding of this process. To help inform the methodological decisions and structure the analysis of the results, I looked to Everett M. Rogers (1995) and Albert Bandura (1986). From Rogers (1995), two important concepts were used. First, particular attention was paid to his discussions of Homophily [degrees of similarity between individuals] versus Heterophily [degrees of differences among individuals] in communication networks, especially as they apply to opinion leaders and to the selection
of primary informants for this study. As he noted, there are advantages to both. Where as homophilous networks promote ease and frequency of communication about innovations, “heterophilous networks links often connect two cliques, thus spanning two sets of socially dissimilar individuals in a system” (p. 287).

Secondly, Rogers (1995) conceptual model of diffusion was used as a template to help organize the critical analysis of the data (p. 163). In his discussion of the diffusion of innovations, he created a five-stage conceptual model of what he described as the Innovation-Decision Process. The stages utilized in this analysis are Knowledge, Persuasion, Decision, and Implementation.

Another researcher whose influence can be seen in this analysis is Albert Bandura, who was also cited by Rogers (1995). Providing a theoretical perspective for this analysis and a point of orientation for me as I contemplated engaging in cross-cultural research, I was and remain comforted in Bandura’s (1986) statement:

Societies are continuously faced with pressures to change some of their traditional practices in efforts to improve the quality of life. These benefits cannot be accomplished without displacing some entrenched customs and introducing new social organizations and technologies. The benefits of change thus carry costs. The basic processes governing diffusion of innovations within a society operate similarly in the intercultural promulgation of new ideas and practices. There are some notable differences, however. Foreign practices are rarely adoptable in their entirety. Rather, imported elements are usually synthesized with indigenous
patterns into new forms of mixed origins. In many instances, it is functional equivalents rather than exact replicas of foreign ways that are adopted. (p. 158)

This quotation helped to ease my own conscience that, in some indirect way, choosing to investigate and thus promote a western education innovation in another culture could unknowingly be an attempt of some kind of western imperialism on cultures different from my own as some sort of variant phenomenon of an overarching push toward globalization of the south by the north. Yet, as an educator, I hold close to the idea that I should model life-long learning and remain open to new techniques and curricula if they might help my students. If my choice to study the adoption of the functional equivalents of CRE’s essential elements of cooperative learning and non-coercive classroom management in East Java might be construed by some as yet another attempt of foreign hegemony, I hope more readers will consider this study as an attempt to cross cultures for the purpose of sharing and defining best educational practices through different cultural lenses.

Significance of the Study

There are many reasons why this study concerning CRE in Indonesia is of importance besides the interests of Indonesian researchers and institutes like CERIC and my own curiosity. For many people, the number one reason is likely financial. For more than 100 years, both international and national agencies have invested large sums of money into the Indonesian education sector for reforms to be made. As will be demonstrated in the literature review, like the history of many countries, the history of
education reform in Indonesia is one marked by some success at some points in times and, at other times, none.

One such failure was in the universal education initiative begun in the late 1980s. Since the economic crisis in 1997, staggering figures have surfaced showing an increasing rate of students dropping out after primary school, especially during middle school. The belief in education’s ability to make a difference has prompted many of the G-8 countries to increase their funding to help Indonesia improve its education sector. For instance, the U.S., under the Bush administration, has authorized close to 200 million dollars in support for the improvement of teacher education and classroom instructional practices, democratic education, and assisting the government’s de-centralization efforts. However, like past measures, most of the support is going directly to highly bureaucratized national education departments and large international aid agencies. Additionally, most of the focus remains on elementary education with some limited emphasis on junior high schools.

Another important aspect of this research is that there is clearly a gap in the literature regarding Indonesian teacher education programs focusing on middle and secondary educators, especially in regard to Conflict Resolution Education (CRE) initiatives. The literature review highlights that much of the current published research on any of the education practices has been too limited or too narrow in focus. An underlying reason for this focus is likely related to choices made by previous researchers, both Indonesian and international, to choose a quantitative research approach to study the impact of education reforms, practices, and adaptations.
When one speaks of the adaptation of educational innovations, what is actually being investigated is a complex human action complicated by cross-cultural communication and understanding that affects the quality of adaptation of the innovations at various levels, and thereby the quality of the change. In order to adapt and understand any innovation, meaning has to be made of the values that are being proposed and those already present.

Once cultural meaning is established as an objective for study, or for any endeavor, a basic deliberation must begin. How does one study Weick’s (1995) idea of sensemaking between cultures, and what methods must be used to answer the questions how, why, and in what ways do different people make meaning and understand? Addressing these concerns requires something other than a traditional positivist’s approach to research. How does one begin to define, isolate, and then operationalize variables of such a complicated phenomenon of cross-cultural human understanding? The characteristics and conditions for a study of how elements such as CL and NCCM could be adapted in an Indonesian context are too complicated to create variable constructs with precision at this stage and with so few pieces of research written about these elements in exact locations in Indonesia. It seems that for any research project to describe and subsequently explain a process of CRE adaptation with the goal of mapping the conditions that affect the innovation’s success or failure requires a qualitative approach. The freedom in qualitative paradigms allows the researcher to interact with and have extended dialogue with those facing the challenge of change, especially when the site of inquiry is a cultural setting very different from the researcher’s home. For this reason, an
ethnographic method was chosen as the primary framework to map early adaptations and meanings of CRE in two Indonesian teacher education classrooms. The choice of method and setting are not only complimentary to national and international efforts, but perhaps offer a picture of the educational puzzle that is often left out—middle school, secondary education, and teacher education faculties.

The theories and values underlying CRE are a western innovation and not something that can be easily taken out of context and transplanted to another culture without a significant period of adaptation and cultivation. As demonstrated in the following chapter, CRE is firmly rooted in Western humanistic traditions with heavy emphasis on American democratic principles. This study provides a necessary first step of closely observing the adaptation process through qualitative means by conducting a critical ethnography, allowing the researcher and participants the time and space for in-depth dialogues, in order to map the meanings that emerge and trace the pattern of what could be a unique hybridization of CRE in another area of the world.

**Limitations**

The limitations, as with any qualitative study, are that findings can not be generalized across all settings and cultures in Indonesia. However, through careful documentation and description of the participants and their sites, there is a certain amount of transferability to other settings sharing similar conditions. Also, due to the breadth and depth of critical ethnography, it is very likely that certain conditions will be discovered that have not been previously considered. The characteristics and conditions outlined in the following study will likely lead to further qualitative and quantitative research.
The overarching goal of this study was to provide a clearer picture of at least one teacher education facility and describe the challenges that Indonesian professors face as they attempt to educate teachers and reform their environments using constructivist elements of CRE that are deeply ensconced in western ideology. This picture naturally is also limited to the context, the skills, and perspective of the researcher, and the time spent in the field. However, these limitations have been clearly demarcated.

As will be outlined in chapter two, a gap exists in the explanation of why western teaching approaches have failed in Indonesia. Up to this point, there have been no studies conducted with a teacher education faculty. For the past three decades, a great deal of international and national money has been spent on education reform in Indonesia, but the lack of information regarding how teacher educators view these reforms, and the challenges they face, seems to be non-existent. If they are the ones on the front lines of producing Indonesia’s future educators, their voices are important and a study using critical ethnographic methods that places an emphasis on participants’ voices should be an important addition to the academic record.

*Organization of the Study*

In the following chapter, the development of conflict resolution education (CRE) in the West is traced, along with its objectives, essential elements, and why it is viewed as having the potential to help teach empathy and skills for more effective, and less violent resolutions to conflict. After which, a more detailed historical perspective of what occurred during 1998 is provided and some of the relevant historical events in Indonesian history and education are outlined, framing the introduction of CRE in Indonesia.
In Chapter Three, a rationale for the use of critical ethnography for studying this adoption process is provided, in addition to demonstrating the need for, and the context of the current study. Also demonstrated is how the study relates to a larger social project (CERIC) started in 2001 which was designed to provide assistance to a country experiencing a volatile transition to a more participatory democracy. Following this, the process of CRE adaptation is outlined followed by a documentation of how certain elements of CRE are being understood in an Indonesian context in at least one area of the vast Archipelago—East Java.

Chapter Four presents data collected between October 2004 and February 2008 in East Java framed by the first four stages of Rogers’ (1995) conceptual model of diffusion. Within the chapter, the readers are provided with a critical ethnographic analysis of the field research.

The last chapter presents a discussion of the data and analysis in light of the original research questions as well as offers suggestions for further research. These questions are grouped under several important Javanese idiomatic expressions which were offered by one of the participants during my time in the field.
CHAPTER TWO

Review of Literature on Conflict Resolution Education and its Pillars

Conflict Resolution Education: A Historical and Philosophic Overview

Approaching the task of providing the reader with a literature review for the following study, I was faced with a very complex task due to the multi-perspective approach of CRE, and the multicultural context in which this study took place—Indonesia. To do a critical ethnography of CRE within an Indonesian context required an in-depth understanding of both CRE and Indonesia. With this challenge in mind, the following chapter is divided into two main sections. The first section provides a literature review of the development of CRE within a western context, its two primary approaches, and an outline of the philosophical and theoretical underpinnings of the curricular innovation. The second section explores the Indonesian context in which CRE was being introduced, the significance of this attempt, and the critical questions explored during the study.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, conflict resolution education (CRE) is a value-laden curriculum with the goal of educating individuals at a young age in socio-emotional skills. The objective is that when they reach adulthood, they will be more adept at approaching conflict constructively in and outside of school, impacting their school environment and their communities. The premise of CRE is that, just as youth are taught and given sufficient time to practice basic academic subjects in preparation to apply these skills later in life, so too should they be given lessons and practice with vital social and
emotional skills to approach, analyze, and resolve conflicts under tutelage of their teachers before they exit school (Deutsch & Coleman, 2000; Goleman, 1997).

On the surface, one is led to assume that the values underlying CRE are not in opposition to the values of American society. But can the same be said for Indonesia?

Like the United States, Indonesia is a multicultural nation state with a long history of socio-political conflict. Since the downfall of President Suharto in 1998, Indonesia has a renewed interest in searching for educational programs that might increase empathy, tolerance, and cooperation within its society. But, taking an innovation from one cultural context and trying to apply it to another is never simple. Due to CRE’s multi-perspective approach to instruction, educators should not define this innovation by any one program manual. How a CRE program is manifested depends on the specific group that deliberates its use and requires a probing look at the ideology that it purports.

As will be shown, although CRE has mainly evolved in a western context with a heavy emphasis on individual rights, it is not impossible to adapt CRE to other cultures. Collectivistic cultures, such as Indonesia, are faced with an interesting challenge of how to translate the ideology of individual rights along side communal responsibility. This challenge, though, is not just for collectivistic cultures. CRE’s equal emphasis on social responsibility becomes just as problematic for individualistic societies like the United States.

Conflict and conflict resolution practices are always interpreted and approached in culturally specific ways. International educational professionals in CRE accept this as a given. When presented with this assumption on cultural relativity, the task to disseminate
CRE seems daunting. Yet, one universality does exist: to be human is to accept the fact that conflict will occur, and it is through attempting to resolve conflict that learning occurs. If one accepts the premise that the basic schematics of learning exist for every growing individual, then is it also possible to accept that sharing ideas about human learning across cultural boundaries is beneficial. Therefore, framing CRE in a transdisciplinary way is a good start for dialogue about CRE.

By outlining the potential for CRE in Indonesia in a transdisciplinary way, I try honestly to approach the task involved in international education endeavors which cannot be divorced from normative assumptions that are encapsulated in the innovations’ origins. By providing a broad review, readers are presented with a map of the meanings that emerge from this study as well as a map of the principal investigator. These maps can then be evaluated and opinions formed about my integrity and of the project’s worth. To help cross the boundaries of disciplines, I have studied under a multidisciplinary group of intellectuals in the United States and in Indonesia who assisted me along the way.

*Defining CRE through its Historical Development*

Although Isenhart and Spangle (2000) emphasized that the origins of CRE primarily emerge from the writings and research in the field of social justice during the 1960s and 1970s, many other scholars have noted a much longer developmental history of the principles and strategies of CRE that draw from a variety of fields including psychology, philosophy, sociology, social psychology, law, political science, business management, communication, and education (Deutsch & Coleman, 2000; Glasser, 1999;

One of the earliest models of CRE can be traced to New York City’s Resolving Conflict Creatively Programs [RCCP]. In the early 1970s, a Quaker non-violent education program was developed and shared across disciplines in education. By the late 1980s, RCCP made use of this model and began using it in several of New York’s alternative schools (Isenhart & Spangle, 2000; Lantieri & Patti, 1996). Additionally, on the West coast, many elements now common to all CRE programs were developed in peer problem solving cooperative groups used in the Community Boards Program of 1977 in San Francisco. These groups were composed of a mixed group of professionals from the legal and social service departments and community members. They later introduced the idea of peer mediation into the schools (Skiba & Peterson, 2000).

This sharing of ideas across disciplines resembles the concept of a “transdisciplinary approach” that emerged in the field of special education in the 1970s and 1980s as educational professionals sought to streamline the education of children with multiple handicaps, who have multiple needs, and are best educated and served when professionals from various fields (i.e., physical/occupational therapy, speech therapy, psychology, education, medicine), work as a collaborative team with the students and their parents to plan and implement an individual curriculum (Bigge, 1988; Snell, 1993). Similarly with CRE, Burton and Sandole (1986) have called for an “adisciplinary” approach. They described the need for conflict resolution theories to be melded so that “a holistic approach” can be developed to teach conflict resolution skills across subject areas and environments (p. 332). In spite of this need, the same criticism
exists for adisciplinary approaches to CRE as existed with transdisciplinary approaches to special education. “Collaboration” is a very ambiguous term. When it comes to role release and the potential blurring of lines of academic control and disciplines, critics cite liability and lack of expertise. However, if work in CRE is approached carefully with a transdisciplinary team, professionals can share and trade roles to the extent in which they feel comfortable with doing. For example, I as a mediator might only feel comfortable in allowing teachers to facilitate certain discussions until I feel they are ready to mediate on their own. Role release can be controlled by the experts themselves to the extent they feel comfortable and then perhaps egoistic concerns might be thwarted.

Jones (2004) reviewed CRE development over the past 30 years and showed that CRE, as is generally viewed today, is an outgrowth of the development of peer mediation programs. However, the burgeoning of the field in the later 1980s and throughout the 1990s seems to be closely linked to the federal government’s initial funding of new education initiatives to decrease the violence in American schools and the emergence of 24-hour news coverage. The insurgence of CRE training within the field of education continues to grow with the increase of U. S. government monies made available to school districts. For instance, the Drug Free Schools and Communities Act (1986) provided money to train teachers in violence prevention (Casella, 2001), and the Goals 2000: Educate America Act gave school districts even more funds to develop violence prevention programs (Casella, 2001). However, as Casella (2001) noted, these programs were not all conflict resolution programs. To a large extent, they often developed into more punitive programs based on “Zero Tolerance” rhetoric. Casella
(2001) warned, “Too often, zero tolerance treats matters that are best dealt with at the school and family level as criminal offenses to be dealt with at judicial levels” (p. 24). What seems to have occurred with the Zero Tolerance agenda is a reversal of inclusionary approaches to more segregated patterns of specialized classes and schools. Casella (2001) advocated a whole system and societal change to promote effective strategies.

The increase in funding also seems related to the increase in 24-hour news coverage. National media coverage of school shootings that occurred throughout the nation during the late 1980s and 1990s help to emphasize the need for education on how to deal with conflict before such horrendous acts like the school shootings in Columbine occurred. Incidences like Columbine, as it was televised in real time to viewers across the United States, helped the nation as a whole to realize that education on social-emotional issues were just as important as education on academic issues.

Although the increase in federal funding and the ever-growing sensationalism of the U. S. news coverage has not lessened the debate regarding the aims of education, it has provided a public forum to encourage the innovation of holistic education programs, and to at least popularize the term “conflict resolution.” As Jones (2004) noted, 15,000 to 20,000 public schools in the United States have incorporated CRE or at least certain aspects of CRE into their school curriculum. However, CRE is far from becoming a nationally mandated program, and for many, it still needs to be further defined.

For instance, conflict can manifest itself through the passive behaviors of withdrawal and avoidance, as well as through more aggressive acts of shunning,
humiliating, bullying, pushing, threatening, and yelling (Bodine & Crawford, 1998; Capozzoli & McVey, 2000; Juvonen & Graham, 2001). Conflict can be intrapersonal and/or interpersonal. In America, the inability to confront conflict situations constructively could also lead to intrapersonal acts ranging from drug and alcohol abuse to teenage suicide as well as the more publicized interpersonal acts such as school shootings.

Although Capozzoli and McVey’s (2000) review focused on cases of U. S. school shootings and violence from the 1970s to the present, Toshio’s (1997) study shows this issue is a global one. What is clearly revealed in Toshio’s (1997) study is that the “victims and perpetrators of school violence” come from all racial, ethnic, economic groups, genders, and ages (p. 12). Violence does not occur only in the “bad” schools, but throughout different schools across the globe. The increase in violence in the 1990s is baffling. Some have suggested a connection to media, video games, or even the U. S. government’s actions on the international stage (Capozzoli & McVey, 2000; Casella, 2001; Toshio, 1997). However, one also needs to keep in mind that the increase in violence based on statistics and increased media coverage might be polemical, leading some to question if incidences of violence are increasing or if they are just becoming more violent and more publicized (Casella, 2001; Hyman, Weiler, Shonock, & Britton, 1995). Regardless of the final conclusion to this argument, what is apparent is there is a problem with youth and adults resorting to violent means of confronting conflict and evidence has supported that education in conflict resolution seems to offer hope.
Defining CRE through its Curricula and Goals

Most CRE programs across the U. S. take the form of one or a combination of the following four curricular models: 1) self-contained courses that students take in addition to core courses, 2) peer mediation programs assigned or taken as an elective extra-curricular activity, 3) a CRE curriculum infused into a regular class or subject curricula, or 4) a CRE curriculum infused throughout a K-12 school program (Crawford & Bodine 1996; Sandy, 2001). The most popular model is the peer mediation program, primarily due to its cost effectiveness. However, as Baker, French, Trujillo and Wing (2000) and Sandy (2001) suggested, while peer mediators themselves develop better skills at handling conflict, these skills are not always generalized to the whole school population. Therefore, not only the choice of which program to use, but also how it is actualized in the school environment is directly related to the effectiveness of the program.

Most CRE professionals look to infused models of CRE components for real change in how schools try to balance the teaching of academic skills while at the same time strengthening the social-emotional development of the students (Battistich, Watson, Solomon, Lewis & Schaps, 1999; Bodine, Crawford, & Schrumpf, 1994; Deutsch & Coleman, 2000; Stipek, Sota, & Weishaupt, 1999). A plethora of whole-school CRE programs have been developed. Sandy (2001) noted some fairly clear goals for best practices in CRE and what is needed for implementation: “1) a customer orientation, 2) a method to monitor children’s progress, 3) a customized education for each child, 4) greater problem solving capacity throughout the institution, and 5) high motivation for teachers to teach and for students to learn” (p. 244). As can be seen, these generalized
goals would be required for any education program, but for CRE, differentiation is found in the definition.

Sandy’s (2001) reference to customer orientation suggests that CRE models should be tailored to the school and local community. As with most programs, applying national directives without adapting to local cultural contexts would be detrimental. Conflict issues in a borough of New York City are not the same as conflict in rural Appalachia, but the targeted communication skills to confront the conflict might be similar.

As Baker et al. (2000) pointed out, the needs of “privileged groups” and the “disenfranchised groups” are usually very different (p. 67). They emphasized that many times, the first step to resolution is for the dominant group to recognize that a certain issue is a point of conflict for a minority group. Training teachers to be cognizant of framing conflict and identifying groups and issues is a very good starting point.

The second goal is also challenging in that simply monitoring a decrease in school discipline referrals does not accurately monitor the effectiveness of the program either for the school or for individual students. This is especially important if one considers the ramifications of Zero Tolerance policies that allow schools to permanently expel students with behavior problems, thus having a possible effect on future statistical evidence which would not account for students who would have been in schools receiving disciplinary action. Expelling challenging students from school does not expel them from society but often places them in programs or situations where survival requires them to become even more violent.
Sandy’s (2001) goal to monitor student progress suggests individualizing student progress in more qualitative versus quantitative ways. Monitoring student progress in a more holistic way has the potential to create a ripple effect in student grading, student-teacher ratios, teacher-parent interaction, and system evaluation, as it downplays standardized forms of assessment in favor of more in-depth evaluations of the individual student in a real effort to leave no child behind. As of yet, quantifiable assessments of social-emotional progress are still polemical, and in the era of “Leave No Child Behind” federal government policies with their present emphasis on quantitative evaluation, school systems are presented with a significant challenge to improve standardized test scores as well as create safe environments that can be quantified with continued funding used as the dangling carrot and the stick. All the while, the paradox remains that social-emotional learning and intelligence are human characteristics that do not easily lend themselves to variable construction.

If individual educational plans are somehow overlooked under the goal of monitoring progress, the third goal, a customized education for each child, makes careful monitoring a clear necessity. Again when systems begin to individualize education programs, they will soon see that student-teacher ratios will be critical to the development and continued success of the program. The fourth and fifth goals are also very general and would apply to any new program or initiative. However, the fourth goal of teaching more efficient problem-solving skills translates to applying communication skills to be taught to students, and insisting these same skills be used and modeled throughout the school system by the teachers, staff, and administrators.
The fifth goal of increasing the motivation of teachers and students seems to rest on the fourth goal and the premise that more open and democratic systems nurture more motivated individuals in the system. The normative assumption is then a democratic principle: when individuals have a voice, cooperation and ownership of the program develops, increasing motivation.

What surfaces after a review of these general goals is that deciding to adopt CRE might be the first conflict that school systems face, whether they are located in the U. S. or in Indonesia. To confront this challenge, educators need to delve deeper and do more than a simple historical analysis of CRE development. As stated, one cannot define CRE by any one existing model. A comparison of the different CRE programs reveals that each of the components use similar teaching approaches. Analyzing these approaches provides further understanding of CRE as a whole.

*Defining CRE through its Essential Teaching Approaches*

Historical analysis has shown that CRE curricula vary tremendously from location to location in the United States. Perhaps a more relevant analysis of whether cultural barriers exist in Indonesia for CRE adoption would be to look to its pedagogy. What seems apparent is that most western-based CRE programs are based on two primary educational practices—cooperative learning (CL) and non-coercive classroom management (NCCM) that have plenty of evidence as effective teaching approaches opposing the over-reliance on autocratic, expository teaching and punitive, externally controlled, classroom discipline. CL and NCCM can be considered the two pillars of CRE. CRE presupposes a reciprocal communication style in the classroom as does CL
and NCCM. Under close scrutiny, it becomes apparent that each strategy is firmly grounded in humanistic psychology under an overarching constructivist paradigm, very much in line with CRE’s own philosophic foundations and Dewey’s concept of the democratic classroom (Hedeen, 2005).

Although the premise of both CL and NCCM include ideas from many theorists, proposing “something for everyone,” both strategies also present some problems for teachers and school cultures due to a required syncretism of the values of individual determinism and collectivistic social responsibility. A certain amount of cacophony will occur if the normative assumptions underlying these two strategies are not openly addressed, defined, and adapted to suit local contextual situations. The following sections define these two contemporary practices incorporated in CRE and begin to construct a historical map of these approaches in an attempt to delineate their underlying value systems.

The History of Cooperative Learning: The First Pillar

Robert Slavin coined the term cooperative learning in the early 1980s (Slavin, 1980). However, elements of this strategy have been in existence since the late 1800s. According to William Glasser (1986), Colonel Francis Parker pioneered the technique in Quincy, Massachusetts and further developed it in the Laboratory Schools in Chicago where he worked closely with John Dewey. Parker referred to CL as an active learning process and not a cooperative process. However, tracing the roots of CL only to Parker could be erroneous. Elements of CL can just as easily be traced to discovery learning and the Montessori method.
Johnson and Johnson (1994) traced the influence of cooperative and collaborative techniques back to the late 1800s and claim that “the effectiveness of cooperative learning has been confirmed by both theoretical and demonstration research” (p. 16). Interestingly, Johnson and Johnson’s cooperative learning in education crosses into disciplines like business, social psychology, sociology, and economics. The Johnson’s viewed the contemporary form of CL in education emerging from three main schools of thought: Social Interdependence Theory, Cognitive Developmental Theory, and Behavioral Learning Theory.

Under the heading of Social Interdependence Theory, Johnson and Johnson pointed to research by Kurt Kafka, Kurt Lewin, and Morton Deutsch (Johnson & Johnson, 1973; Johnson, Johnson, & Holubec, 1994). Grouped under Cognitive Developmental Theory, the Johnson’s directly connect both Piaget and Vygotsky to cooperative learning when they noted, “…Piaget espoused the premise that when individuals cooperate on the environment, socio-cognitive conflict occurs that creates cognitive disequilibrium, which in turn stimulates their perspective-taking ability and cognitive development” and Vygotsky’s premise that “…knowledge is social, and is constructed from cooperative efforts to learn, understand and solve problems” (p. 14). By including Vygotsky in their review, they made a defining link to the importance of the cultural context of the classroom.

From Behavioral Learning Theory, the Johnson’s drew lines of connection to Skinner, and especially Bandura, but delved very little into Social Cognitive Theory. This
could be because they were marketing this particular source of information to a more general audience; therefore, they focused more on practice rather than theory.

What seems apparent from the literature is that CL is not driven by one single theory but, rather, a combination of theories. The most prominent theory comes from Morton Deutsch’s work on cooperation and competition (Deutsch & Coleman, 2000). Deutsch, a student of Lewin, built upon Lewinian field theory in the same way David Johnson, a student of Deutsch, did. The most influential contemporary researchers driving CL in the United States are Robert Slavin at John Hopkins University, David and Roger Johnson at the University of Minnesota, and Spencer Kagan in San Juan Capistrano, California. Their research lays a pragmatic framework for educators in various areas of the United States and overseas to adapt and use. Criticism still follows the method for lack of empirical evidence regarding its efficacy, but the Johnson brothers have been especially active in attempting to fill this particular gap, which could explain why they quote themselves so often in their writing.
Defining CL can be difficult as it encompasses a wide array of different teaching strategies and grouping procedures. However, some basic elements are vital to any classroom approach for it to be considered CL, as opposed to just group work. CL is built on the premise that students learn more effectively and are more motivated to learn if the educative experience is transmuted through a more reciprocal style among peers versus the more traditional style of authoritarian, teacher-led, expository learning. Since CL is built upon interaction, at a minimum, there has to be at least a group of two students involved before it can be considered CL. However groups can be of any size, with some groups as large as ten to fifteen students; however, most education professionals consider groupings of three to four students optimal (Johnson & Johnson, 1994; Kagan, 1994).

Generally speaking, a cooperative learning structure tries to eliminate, or at least limit, the use of competition in schools and therefore in learning. This emphasis on cooperation versus competition is heavily emphasized in most CRE curricula (Johnson, Johnson, & Holubec, 1994; Nelsen, Lott, & Glenn, 1997). Group members are assigned or allowed to choose specific roles to play. These roles, in particular, differentiate CL from group work. For example, a group of four students in a learning team might be assigned roles as team leader, timekeeper, resource person, and summarizer.

**CL teacher role.** Teachers’ roles help to differentiate CL from just group work. In CL, teachers plan and present learning objectives that are often project-based, student-initiated from interest inventories, cross-curricular, thematic, and entail some constructive
controversy (Johnson, Johnson, & Holubec, 1994). However, CL does not eliminate the need for all expository teaching. In fact, CL can streamline expository teaching, allow time for more small-group instruction, and keep the students actively learning as exemplified by think-pair-share learning. Teachers still establish levels of mastery, set learning goals, and synthesize state-mandated competencies, but do so with the goal of arranging for students to confront and collaboratively work together to set and achieve academic objectives in a more meaningful way.

Within a CL structure, the teacher’s role moves from the traditional authoritarian role of classroom controller to one of an authoritative, classroom facilitator or manager. However, the term “facilitator” has created some problems in definition (Dardjowidjojo, 2001). With CL, a teacher-facilitator is far from passive. The teacher maintains authority by setting parameters, directing small-group instruction, posing critical questions, observing and facilitating small group discussion, teaching and modeling communication skills, conducting informal and formal assessments, and closely monitoring and adjusting curricular and student learning objectives. Similar to a conductor or a film director, the teacher plans, instructs, and challenges students as they proceed through the learning tasks much more independently than in traditional approaches. Glasser (1998) compared this transformation of a teacher’s role to the change that many American business managers have made from using top-down bureaucracy to more collaborative and consensual management techniques touted by W. Edwards Deming in the 1950s, based on his analysis of Japanese industry.
Interdependent learning. Just as teachers’ roles change when using CL, so must students’ roles. Assigning clear and specific roles to each member of a group creates an atmosphere that encourages learners to depend on one another in a positive way. Assigning roles becomes the key to creating the crucial aspect of interdependence among group members, and differentiates CL from other forms of group work. However, interdependence often becomes a problematic issue in individualistic cultures. In planned interdependence, components of an individual student’s grade are spread across the student’s learning group. Elements of the student’s final product will be dependent on members of his/her group. Also certain tasks the student has been assigned have a direct effect on the grades of his/her group members. An important shift in building interdependence among the learners is to form a learning community. Johnson, Johnson, and Holubec (1994) suggested planning lessons so that students depend on one another to complete a learning task and build what they call “positive interdependence” helping to create a “we” instead of “me” mentality in the classroom (p. 27). Within this type of learning structure, effective communication and collaboration are required and are taught, with the practice of these communicative skills monitored by the teacher as well as by students. This adjustment of the role of teacher from an authoritarian leader to one of an authoritative manager of learning is carried over and emphasized in CRE.

A common characteristic in western societies is the thought that being dependent is often seen as negative. However, in CL, what teachers are trying to convey is that due to the complexity of work in this technologically advance era, as adults, people have to depend positively on each other. Positive interdependence is sharing a difficult task and
working collaboratively to complete it. The new buzzword to describe this kind of cooperation and the knowledge it promotes is synergy. As this term has morphed over the centuries from an aspect of human interaction inspired by divine will to the more causal catch phrase for teamwork in business ventures, what should not be lost is the basic idea of the benefits of cooperation versus competition. A more meaningful perspective to take in cross-cultural endeavors might be to look at the theoretical ideas of Habermas’ communicative action.

In practical situations, what needs to be recognized is that staging this type of learning for classroom projects is difficult but not impossible. Teachers divide the tasks proportionally, but then individuals are required to teach others what they have learned and learn the other aspects of their project from their group members. This introduces another necessary element connected to positive interdependence—individual accountability.

Johnson, Johnson, and Holubec (1994) provided a brief outline of four ways interdependence can be incorporated into CL group activities: “positive goal interdependence,” “positive reward/celebration interdependence,” “positive resource interdependence,” and “positive role interdependence” (p. 27-28). For “goal interdependence,” the group, with the assistance of the teacher, sets a goal for each member of a group to achieve a certain level of competency and develops plans for how each will help the others to achieve that goal (p. 27).

In “reward/celebration interdependence,” the grade or reward is equally distributed or extra-credit points are given when students reach group goals (p. 28). In
“resource interdependence,” teachers divide the tasks and resources among members of an individual group or among different small groups and create a plan of how to share and unite individual or group work and resources often called a “jigsaw” method (p. 28). In “role interdependence,” each group is composed of group members who are given teaming roles that incorporate specific duties that naturally depend upon other members’ roles to complete (p. 28). Each of the teaming strategies is ingrained in certain activities that have been used to enhance teambuilding and interdependence and are readily accessible on the Internet.

What is often neglected in implementation is that the teacher must remain active in monitoring groups and providing direct instruction on small-group interpersonal communication skills. Elements such as active listening, paraphrasing, and constructive criticism can and should be taught separately; however, the elements must also be prompted and shaped in situ. An overarching aspect of effective communication skills is the idea of reciprocal communication patterns. Reciprocal should be seen as more than merely a two-way dialogue but rather a dialogue that builds and informs, confirms, or transforms ideas being expressed through the communication act.

It is this idea of effective communication that can be designated as a third, overarching element. Often reciprocal communication is not pin-pointed in the readings but, rather, is assumed. It is the medium for instruction in cooperative learning and becomes pivotal or even primordial for the success of not only CL but of NCCM that will be discussed in more detail in the following section.
CL assessment. Another aspect of CL that is often different from traditional models is assessment. Teachers establish informal and formal alternative assessment procedures to assess group skills and individual gains that emphasize individual accountability. This does not mean traditional testing is never used, but teachers do not rely solely upon traditional multiple choice, short answer, and essay tests to assess achievement. Unlike expository learning, there are many interstices of freedom for the students to discover in order to learn to navigate and practice academic and social skills and to demonstrate they have learned the skills.

Some teachers incorporate peer and individual assessments with teacher evaluations of group performance (i.e., role-plays and group research projects) for a more comprehensive and holistic evaluation. Another form of continuous individual assessment paired with teacher evaluations are portfolios. Alternative assessments such as these seem to open up what are generally discrete academic skills to be monitored and evaluated. These alternative approaches are often used in combination with traditional testing methods.

Targeting social and relational communication skills as well as providing training and evaluation of these skills to enhance student intellect and social-emotional development through more holistic assessment procedures is another characteristic that differentiates CL from more traditional expository methods that might only target academic achievement for training and assessment. However, alternative assessments can be time consuming and under the current emphasis on standardized testing designed
to monitor and report achievement in both Indonesia and the United States, a very real paradox becomes apparent.

It is important to keep in mind that, although CL is a pillar of CRE, CL is not, in itself, the only approach used to teach CRE. CL provides a forum for students to practice effective communication skills that are vitally important to confront conflict, whether that conflict is interpersonal or intrapersonal. CL also provides students with a safe environment, the school classroom, to use, practice, receive direct instruction, and improve communication skills as they confront conflict as they learn academic and social lessons. Much of the instruction comes from the constructive criticism given by the teacher regarding the groups’ processes.

At times, direct expository teaching is required to explain the steps and method. But most importantly, it is the teacher’s own modeling of the reciprocal communication skills that teaches students, highlighting the need for the inclusion of this pedagogical practice at the teacher preparation level in higher education. When CL is paired with more traditional approaches, small learning teams provide students with the needed repetition for pro-social skill development and academic skills. Direct instruction actually increases through more effective teacher-student contact and pro-social student-student contact.

*The History of Non-coercive Classroom Management: The Second Pillar*

Moving from teacher-led expository methods to more collaborative cooperative learning structures creates a need for an appropriate classroom behavior management practice that supports and promotes the collaborative values central to cooperative
learning. For practical reasons, cooperative learning changes the physical structure of the classroom, moving the teacher from the overseer position at the head of a class of students seated in rows, to a teacher moving from one small cooperative group to another. The teacher-facilitator is no longer in a strategic position to visually monitor and keep surveillance of a whole class from an apex position. The responsibility is diffused democratically among the whole classroom community.

The change in the teacher’s physical position is very symbolic of the change in the teacher’s role when it comes to monitoring, and classroom management. No longer the Foucaultian overseer, the teacher, now the model of cooperation, must also establish different methods of classroom behavior management and diffuse this new role democratically to the class.

Non-coercive classroom management (NCCM) approaches often emphasize that coercion in any guise is eventually detrimental for students as they develop pro-social skills either through lessons directly learned from the teacher, or indirectly as teachers dole out punishments by authoritarian means. Bolstering the need for NCCM is the fact that, over the past two decades, almost every state has outlawed the use of corporal punishment. However, the goal of eliminating all coercion from classroom management might not be a realistic goal without the inclusion of an in-depth study of classroom management procedures in teacher training programs. Although I was trained and worked as a inclusion teacher (special education teacher co-teaching with a general education teacher), I learned the wisdom embedded in the idea of least restrictive environments and the knowledge that most ideas and services are best viewed as a continuum with
transitory stages that promote more degrees of freedom and more life-long learning. To insist on one ideal situation is no better than to continue to depend on outdated traditional strategies. It is in the scope of what is possible that appropriate transitions are able to be planned and achieved for each unique individual.

NCCM programs are heavily influenced by humanistic psychology that arose in the U. S. as a supposed third force in psychological perspectives in the 1950s. Like other contemporary teaching strategies, the development of the theory behind NCCM programs is not linear. NCCM programs contain elements of many theories developed during the 20th Century. The theoretical influences of NCCM include elements of the Adlerian social psychological view of psychoanalytic theory in the 1930s as well as behaviorism of the 1950s and 1960s. The idea that NCCM programs encompass elements of behaviorism might sound contradictory, but the power of reinforcement, especially through social interaction, is clearly a primary rationale developed by Skinner and elaborated on by Bandura (1986) in his Social Cognitive Theory. Yet many NCCM programs continue to make use of Time-Out which is a form of coercion, albeit natural consequence of society.

A line of philosophical thought traced in NCCM programs encompasses the importance of needs-based classroom management systems and their impact on social interaction. In CRE programs, communicative interactions are considered to be primary forces behind the development of personal identity, socialization, and motivation as the interactions shape individual behavior. The role of social interaction as a tracing source
helps identify Adler versus Freud and serves to concentrate more on Vygotsky than on Piaget.

However, Youniss (1980) leads one to reconsider Piaget and Sullivan’s contribution to the impact of peer relations on the socialization of children. This reconsideration lends additional support for both cooperative learning and non-coercive classroom management strategies in their emphasis on relational communications within small group exercises. Youniss reviewed the role social communicative interactions play as children begin to determine their own identities and boundaries of social norms through a process which he notes as “cooperatively constructing” (p. 3), and which Piaget calls “mutual engagement” (p. 16). The power of social reinforcement and modeling is also what highlights Bandura’s contributions above Skinner’s to the overall philosophical and psychological paradigm of CRE classroom management systems.

Although Glasser (1999), whose work is the most heavily quoted in most CRE guides, emphasizes the individual and his/her ultimate power of choice in determining behavior, one could argue that, after the choice is made, social forces either reinforce or punish, and help maintain behaviors or mutate them. Choice Theory, that Glasser once called Control Theory, emerged from the practice of Reality Therapy developed in the mid 1960s. This particular method of theory building led to a great deal of criticism. However, as Howatt (2001) noted, Glasser’s theory is well grounded in Adlerian and Humanistic psychological theories. Glasser (1999) made some mention of his alliance to “Albert Ellis’s rational emotive behavior therapy” (p. 10). Yet, Ellis and Glasser are both criticized for being too pragmatic and relying too much on grounded theory (Choice
Glasser’s failure to reference his sources could be attributed to the intended audience of his work, general educational practitioners. However, providing a general map of his intellectual path would not have detracted from his frank and anecdotal style. In fact, such a map could have provided credence to his ideas and informed his readers to a greater degree. Particularly, the most annoying part of Glasser’s (1999) work is the somewhat salesperson and advertisement-like quality of his writing that does damage to his argument. After providing an abundance of anecdotal evidence about how and why his approach works, the reader is then given this blatant sales pitch:

Our experience so far has been that unless schools are staffed by teachers and principles who hold these certificates, we will never have more than a few quality schools. The William Glasser Institute does the training that is needed and awards these certificates. It is prepared to cooperate with schools of education that want to educate prospective teachers in this specialty. (Further information on how training is done is presented in the appendix.) (p. 254-255)

Types of NCCM Programs

A review of several classroom management programs promoting self-discipline leads to the difficult task of deciding on a general term that best describes all of them, but does not delineate one as better than the others. Bodine, Crawford, and Schrumpf (1994) offered a qualifying description by stating, “as a framework for managing learner
behavior without coercion, a discipline program includes educational strategies for promoting responsible behavior and intervention strategies for helping individual learners achieve quality behavior” (p. 23). Bodine and Crawford (1999) have written a complimentary classroom management plan that describes a quality classroom behavior management program that teaches students self-discipline as well as emotional intelligence. Their program encompasses several techniques Glasser wrote about in his books on choice theory that emerged from his therapeutic practice known as Reality Therapy (Glasser, 1986; 1998; 1999).

Other researchers and educational professionals, such as Nelsen, Lott, and Glenn (1997), referred to their non-coercive programs as “positive discipline.” Gossen (1993) used Glasser’s suggestions and focused on what she called “restitution plans.” All of these share several common techniques and practices and are heavily influenced by humanistic psychology, specifically Maslow’s hierarchy of needs. These strategies are quite different from other contemporary types of behavior management programs recently reviewed by Safran and Oswald (2003) — Positive Behavioral Supports [PBS]. By contrast, the key element to CRE classroom management programs is that they are student-centered, non-coercive, self-discipline programs that focus as much attention on teaching effective problem solving and conflict resolution skills as they do on providing support for responsible student behavior. Additionally, they are geared to internal versus external controls of behavior. Many PBS programs would not fit this category due to their emphasis on external sources of behavior control and continued emphasis of seeing classroom behavior management programs within a behaviorist paradigm.
For CRE programs, the source or motivation behind behavior is based on meeting internal needs such as safety, love/belonging, power, freedom, and fun. Though different programs might say this in different ways, they all can be distilled to address these specific needs. It is the humanistic orientation toward unobservable needs and insistence on a democratic approach that distinguishes CRE discipline programs from more traditional behavioral-oriented programs.

In non-coercive classroom management (NCCM) programs, several of the following variables are addressed: 1) students are educated on the relationship between basic needs motivational behavior, 2) information is presented side-by-side with more cooperative learning approaches, 3) students play a more crucial role in choosing, negotiating, and mediating their own as well as their peers’ behaviors, and 3) administrative supports are also available (Bodine & Crawford, 1999; Gossen, 1993; Nelsen et al., 1997). As can be seen, this becomes an education in metacognition.

In NCCM programs, students become full citizens of a classroom community by establishing and adjusting classroom rules, providing feedback, devising resolution plans, and confronting behavioral problems as individuals and as part of a learning community. There are contingency plans for behaviors that threaten or endanger other students, but even these are written and agreed upon by the class, for the members of the class, and the school. NCCM programs incorporate some behaviorists techniques, such as time out, but important questions that must be addressed before incorporating them into management plans are: who chooses the rules, what are the rules really teaching, and are the
consequences focused to teach self-discipline via natural consequences and empathy versus punishment and guilt?

Although Deutsch and Coleman (2000) suggested otherwise, further review of the literature regarding the long term efficacy of NCCM is needed. However, there is a lack of quantitative support for the success of these programs for several reasons. First, the questions that emerge from inquiring into social-emotional growth are difficult to quantify. Second, schools and researchers following this paradigm might not be skilled or interested in doing quantitative research, and third, many schools that implement CRE programs are also implementing zero tolerance and are therefore mandated to report quantifiable outcomes. Although some programs have been reported as successful in quantifiable terms, the success measured by NCCM disciplinary records might be questionable due to the fact that many students with discipline problems might no longer be attending the school (Batton, 2003; Stevahn, Johnson, Johnson, Oberle, & Wahl, 2000).

**Philosophic and Theoretical Underpinnings of CRE**

As, Dardjowidjojo (2001), an Indonesian educator stated, in an Eastern society…where the yardsticks for good behavior are the principles of total obedience, the unquestioning mind, the concept of elders-know-all, and the belief that teachers can do no wrong, the implementation of such teaching activities [student-centered] is not without problems. (p. 309)

This speaks to the need to question whether any constructivist American educational innovations or teaching approaches are adaptable within the Indonesian Education
What elements in the current Indonesian educational system are in place to suggest that adoption of the CRE and its strategies of cooperative learning and non-coercive student self-discipline can be successful?

As stated in the introduction, before the adaptation and adoption of CRE could begin, Indonesian teachers, in collaboration with a CRE trainer, needed to explore the possible philosophic challenges that CRE presents. In this portion of the review, it is demonstrated that, although CRE and its pillars are multidisciplinary innovations, they are well-grounded in two philosophical traditions—American Humanism and American Pragmatism. At first glance, CRE can be seen as stressing freedom of choice and individual responsibility. Individual choice precipitates action. CRE seems to posit that choices are often made in an attempt to fulfill basic needs. Bad behavior or lack of self-discipline is then attributed to the individual making poor choices or not understanding what choices are available to them at a given point in time. CRE is grounded in the basic notion that conflict is not only natural, but is inevitable and that the choices of response are based on interests and needs.

Conflict is simply defined as a dispute or disagreement between at least two individuals. However, that definition can be expanded to include self-conflict based on Piaget’s ideas of cognitive disequilibrium, which is analogous to Dewey’s (1938) definition of problems that arise naturally from experience and that are pivotal to learning.

---

1 Granted lumping over 350 ethnic groups into one category will lead to erroneous statements if too specific comments are made about values. There are differences across the archipelago but the values I point to are general, and for the most part, representative of the majority of Indonesians according to my personal belief, which is founded on living in Indonesia for 41/2 years and graduate studies I have pursued in the Southeast Asian studies program. I do recognize that any general statements applied across the whole population are arguable, but feel that I could argue in favor of the very general comments I offered here.
and maintaining learner interests. Nevertheless, if conflict is looked at narrowly as a dispute between two separate entities, CRE recognizes both parties equally. CRE does not assume one side is more equal than the other; thus, at its core, one can say that CRE promotes individualism and liberal sentiments of civil rights as they are defined in American society today and can be considered foundational to the American brand of Existentialism, often called American Humanism. In the following sections these terms will be used synonymously.

**CRE as an Existential Paradigm**

Central to most CRE programs is respect for the individual who confronts conflict and learns to make rational choices. As egoistic as this might seem, choices are weighed against the responsibility of and to the group. It is important to note that Existentialism does not necessitate atheism or nihilism. As Gutek (2004) noted, many leading Existentialist like Kierkegaard, Marcel, and Buber maintained “a religious orientation” (p. 88). A brief scan of the works of May, Allport, Rogers, and Kneller will show a substantial vein of social responsibility written into their text and therapies that would also parallel many societies where religious instruction makes up the bulk of its civic and ethics training. As Gutek (2004) noted, emphasizing the existential paradox, “I make no difference, but I can make a difference” is a leading educational goal of the never-ending potential of the individual embedded in curricula oriented to American Humanistic educational programs (p. 90). A very telling statement, if one agrees with Gutek’s (2004) summation, is “Philosophically, Existentialism refers to a person being involved in, and concerned with, the shaping of her or his own destiny, or modes of existing, with respect
to the rest of the world” (p. 86). This is an axiom that could be used to draw lines of common ground with societies heavily influenced by religious doctrines, but also a possible barrier to more fatalistic cultures.

As a philosophy, Existentialism presupposes that “truth is subjective and personal” (p. 87). Likewise, CRE assumes that any two disputants are equal. CRE emphasizes that only through some act of perspective taking can any two people, or groups begin to comprehend each other. The reality of social phenomena, depending on which existential sources serve as the basis for one’s opinion, is perceived and thus necessitates some sort of communication so that one’s perceptions are mediated and can be perceived by another individual or group. Each comes to a debate, dialogue, or deliberation with a truth to be proposed and meted out. CRE does not presuppose one reality or position being more right or even more successful but, instead, offers a space for two disputing parties to meet, negotiate, mediate, or if necessary, have conflicts arbitrated. This also becomes the point of contention for many CRE scholars when faced with the potential negative effects of neutrality on victims of violent conflict or within societies that maintain a very hierarchical structure of authority (Harvey, 2002; O’Hear, 2003).

Yet at the same time, it is this idea of equity that is similar to how Benhabib (2002) suggested the art of contestation should evolve if the goal is to increase skills in understanding or democratic deliberation. In a similar sense, CRE can also be viewed as one way for students to practice what Bohm (1996) considered the essentials of dialogue, such as suspension of reactions, and attempts at building self-awareness of thought or, as
he suggested, the “proprioception of thought,” in-line with Constructivist assumptions on learning (p. 79). However, this apparent paradox of individuation with an eye toward social responsibility could be the pivotal aspect of whether CRE is adaptable to a collectivistic society.

**CRE as a Pragmatist’s Practice**

CRE also lends itself to be interpreted as evolving from the philosophy of Pragmatism, and one could argue that Pragmatism incorporates many elements of Existentialism and American Humanism. Several components exist that are in line with Dewey’s ideas of the “Great Community.” As Gutek (2004) suggested, Dewey viewed the teacher and students as forming a small community within each classroom. Each individual is on a quest. The teacher, as the leader, provides the initial map and the parameters for students to follow. However, depending on the class, deciding which turn to take and whether uncharted territories will need to be added is dependent upon all of the individuals who make up the classroom’s learning community and the choices they make (Rogoff, Matusov, & White, 1996; Prawat, 1992).

The elements of Pragmatism, especially as developed from Dewey, illuminated in CRE, are the ideas of a mutable universe, the dialectic of thought and action, the importance of group decision-making as a democratic practice of deliberation and democratic action, and the idea that truth is grounded in experience which is often heavily framed in scientific experimentation (Dewey, 1922; Gutek, 2004).

In the first tenet, although CRE assumes that conflict does and will always exist, the attempt to resolve conflict will continually affect and change the lives of the people
involved in the conflict, thus building a history of experience for individuals to use as they cope with new conflicts and situations. Furthermore, the resolutions themselves will often change over time.

As for the second tenet concerning the purpose of thought being action, CRE places a heavy emphasis on the actions of the whole classroom community. CRE requires all individuals in the classroom to actively participate in learning and classroom management activities. Knowledge, both academic and social, is not something to be given or dispensed, but constructed through dialogue, group work, and classroom meetings.

The third tenet, concerning the act of deliberation, is best illustrated in Dewey’s (1922) “The Nature of Aims” argument for, as he proposed, it is not so easily understood that the ends are what justify the means, but in all actuality, pre-conceived ends are only the impetus to the means, or the processes that justify the actual ends or products. The process is the most significant action to be focused on if truly innovative and creative products are to be realized. CRE’s emphasis on framing conflict and brainstorming new and creative solutions can be seen as focusing on what Dewey would consider “…the examination of consequences and the intelligent creation of purpose…” (p. 232-233). It is both Pragmatism’s and CRE’s emphasis on the process that holds promise for its adaptability in collectivist cultures where the process is often as important as if not more than eventual outcome.

The last tenet, regarding the relativity of truth, is best illustrated in how different classes interpret and practice specific NCCM programs. CRE’s emphasis, that all things
are relative to the individual classroom, suggests a loose connection to Postmodernism. If actualized as intended, each class develops guiding principles on how the class is ordered and maintained. Since each class is culturally and socially situated in different contexts, these programs will most assuredly be slightly different. But since all classes are also situated in macro-cultural settings, many of the rules will end up fairly similar, arising from the process and not imposed from the start. During the first week of school and then on an as-needed basis, the CRE teacher models and guides students through classroom meetings and individual interventions to practice group decision-making about choices, rules, and consequences. In the beginning, the goals are not known, but the action and the methods are, making truth for any specific class relative and dependent on the socio-cultural settings which the teachers and students are embedded.

CRE does not propose any specific a priori concepts about what outcomes are meant to be achieved from conflict resolution through negotiation, mediation, or arbitration. However, CRE does propose the objective of targeting win-win solutions, suggesting a goal should not be confused with assuming an outcome. All that is suggested is that conflicts need to be brought to the public space of the classroom and mediated through acts of communication. Dewey (1916) stated, “Consensus demands communication” (p. 5). The guidelines for the dialogue are subject to the agreement of the group. In this way, CRE can be viewed as pragmatic.

Highlighting these specific aspects of CRE shows that, through its development, CRE has become a classroom practice of democratic principles with Pragmatism and existential American Humanism remaining as it most salient philosophies. Yet, contained
within these perspectives are the seeds of relativity that could enhance CRE’s adaptability across cultures. As the next section will show, the theories that drive the practice of CRE present a similar synergy.

*Driving Theories of CRE*

For Gutek (2004), theories become the “bridge” from the abstract principles of philosophy and ideology to directions of practice (p. 255). As he noted, theories become the “if-then” propositions educators use to plan their teaching strategy (p. 253). The emphasis within CRE programs is to build critical thinking skills that lead to the identification of three philosophical theories present in on-going CRE programs: Constructivism, Progressivism, and Critical Theory. In the preface to his short treatise entitled *Experience & Education*, Dewey (1938) stated,

> It is the business of an intelligent theory of education to ascertain the causes for the conflicts that exist and then, instead of taking one side or the other, to indicate a plan of operations proceeding from a level deeper and more inclusive than is represented by the practices and ideas of the contending parties. (p. 5)

Dewey’s call for a firm philosophical foundation to drive an active constructivist theory is synonymous with CRE’s active focus. Constructivism is CRE’s most clearly identifiable theory. Elements of Constructivism are found in CRE’s insistence that knowledge is discovered through natural and teacher-facilitated experiences in the classroom. CRE places conflict at the center of learning and accepts it as not only a naturally occurring phenomenon, but a necessity of learning.
CRE calls for a change from disciplined environments to ones that promote self-control without coercion. Glasser (1999), a psychiatrist interested in educational reform and repeatedly quoted in many CRE programs, has posited that, for each classroom, the rules should be relative to the students’ learning needs. CRE suggests abstract rules such as freedom from fear, freedom from ridicule, and freedom of choice. However, depending on the class, how these abstract notions materialize into classroom rules will depend on the individuals who are part of the classroom meetings that create the rules. It is this dependence on the local context and the specific classroom that leads one to consider CRE analogous to Constructivism.

Progressivism is seen in CRE’s insistence that instruction in the classroom should be student-centered versus teacher-directed. As Gutek (2004) noted, “Progressive educators follow a three-pronged agenda: (1) remove the formalism, routine, and bureaucracy that devitalized learning in many schools; (2) devise and implement innovative methods of instruction that focus on the children’s needs and interests; and (3) professionalize teaching and school administration” (p. 296).

Through CRE, teachers structure the environment and curriculum around the students’ interests, experiences, and choices and facilitate their search for knowledge and problem solving. Teachers retain authority by acting as the main resource for students, directing their search, and assisting in their question formation. Like Progressive educators, CRE educators use active learning methods and focus on group problem-solving and deliberation. CRE also puts a heavy emphasis on educating teachers and
administers as well as the students in CRE practices. In this way, CRE attempts to deconstruct and change ill effects of traditional, authoritarian classrooms.

Although not directly driven by Critical Theory, CRE does not oppose its incorporation as a driving force in instruction. Critical Theory can be linked to Social-reconstructivists, a branch of Progressivism that viewed schools as communities rife with conflict. (Gutek, 2004). CRE’s emphasis on teaching perspective-taking to students is one way to raise their consciousness of the “other.” In practical CRE situations, the other could be a classmate who might or might not be of the same ethnic group, gender, sexual orientation, economic class, or religion. The other might also be the teacher, school administrators, or perhaps other groups outside the classroom with whom students experience conflict and learn to practice the art of negotiation and mediation.

CRE’s focus on action can also lead some to consider loose ties with Criticalists. CRE’s emphasis on the components of student-centeredness, active learning, and specifically cooperative learning, leads one to consider the idea of praxis, as Hoffman (1976) defined it, as an emphasis on action between the theoretical and the practical.

Where positivism preaches resignation and acceptance, praxis demands commitment and change: for conformity, it puts criticism, for passivity, it demands action, and hence instead of theorizing in the abstract, it calls for concrete practice. (p. 16)

Defining praxis in this way suggests an affinity with Friere’s Liberation Pedagogy as well as many efforts in action research conducted by followers of the Frankfurt school and now Giddens and Habermas. The deliberateness of CRE is in line with the idea of
action versus contemplative work. However, there is no underlying initiative to uncover hidden curricula or focus on oppressed minorities, a point of contention for many CRE programs, due to minority voices being waxed over by more dominate cultures that create classrooms that follow and practice a narrow version of the American form of democracy of majority rule (Baker, French, Trujillo, & Wing, 2000; Jones, 2004). Persistent absence of an emphasis on liberation does not mean the topics can not be approached. CRE’s stress on the usefulness of conflict and the practicality of the classroom being a public sphere to practice the art of contestation and teaching through controversy, allows room for teachers to present other voices and other ideas if they are aware enough to do so. This emphasis is closely aligned with Critical Theory, but differs for it does not uniformly present an outline to accomplish this task. However, the potential resides in its openness.

CRE’s open-ended approach links to the tenets of Critical Theory and has the potential for raising the consciousness of the marginalized and disempowered. By teaching the art of dialogue and perspective taking, CRE teaches the art of democratic deliberation. Through continuous awareness of the other, critical theory helps CRE to address problematic areas such as neutrality and empowerment of minority voices.

In the previous analysis, it was suggested that CRE can be seen as emerging primarily from the existential American Humanism and Pragmatism and offer an example of praxis using the theories of Progressivism, Constructivism, and Critical Theory that together combine to drive teacher-student interactions as they try to build community in the classroom. CRE is often thought of as an idealistic innovation but as
will be demonstrated, CRE is based on an idea of teaching democratic dialogue, necessary for democratic societies if those societies want to further develop democracy. CRE’s emphasis on building a communicative learning community in each classroom emphasizes its adaptability to various classroom cultures, for it incorporates and gives equal decision-making power to any group that decides to use it.

**CRE Conclusion**

In the preceding section, the philosophical and theoretical underpinnings of CRE were described in order for a historical analysis to reveal what value claims present day CRE programs and their teaching approaches are purporting, a necessary step before beginning to examine any educational innovation within a different cultural context. However, this step is often neglected when introducing CRE to school systems inside and outside the U. S. For many, if CRE is introduced as something new, crucial aspects about the historically proven methods might be glossed over and subsequently dismissed as a new innovation without proof of effectiveness.

Bodine, Crawford, and Schrumpf (1994) asserted that conflict is “a natural and vital part of life” (p. 99). In addition, Crawford and Bodine (1996) insisted that, before an educational system begins CRE programs, a more in-depth understanding of the causes of conflict should be obtained. Like many CRE program advocates, the authors repeated the humanistic principle that all humans are motivated by the basic needs for belonging, power, freedom, and fun. The source of conflict is then related to two individuals’ or two groups’ inability to obtain these goods, either because of limited resources, conflicting
values, or lack of access. Understanding these realities provides a basis for constructing a curriculum that challenges students to learn to frame and manage conflict.

Central to CRE is the idea that conflict gives a person the impetus to problem solve. This understanding of conflict as a learning experience is imperative before developing CRE curricula. The objective is to teach children, early in their formative years, the skills to handle conflict in a constructive, non-violent way, improving their social-emotional development as well as the acquisition of analytical skills. This process is interactive and communicative and analogous to Bandura’s (1986) social cognitive theory and the advancement of self-efficacy. As children practice and learn how to solve problems by communicating more effectively, they gain a deeper understanding of their rights as human beings, and empathy for the life and thoughts of others (Bodine & Crawford, 1998).

Substantial research demonstrates the effectiveness of CRE programs and the teaching approaches that comprise the pillars for teaching pro-social behaviors and moral reasoning (Batton, 2003; 2004; Deutsch & Coleman, 2000; Heydenberk, Heydenberk, & Bailey, 2003, Johnson & Johnson, 1995; 1996; Jones, Batton, & Carruthers, 2000). The belief is that teachers can improve the academic achievement of students with a subsequent decline in school disciplinary actions.

Crawford and Bodine (1996) identified a variety of developmental skills considered foundational to negotiation and mediation. These include, but are not limited to, the values of fairness, trust, justice, and tolerance; the perceptual abilities of empathizing and self-evaluating; the emotional attributes of managing anger, frustration,
and fear, and the communication abilities of active listening, paraphrasing, reframing, laundering emotionally charged statements, and speaking to be understood.

The importance of early education is widely accepted these days. Selman (1980) and Selman and Schultz (1990) provided one of the more widely acknowledged models of the development of children’s ability to perspective take, manage conflict, and engage in negotiation. Their research provides backing for Janet Reno’s assertion, “we have a juvenile justice system that in many states is bankrupt and is starting too late. You cannot start with a 16-17 year old who has dropped out of school and who was the drug dealer’s gofer when he was 13. You’ve got to start earlier…” (Bodine & Crawford, 1998, p. 3).

However, it is important to note that starting earlier and practicing problem-solving to resolve conflict is not a simple developmental program for grades K-12. As Raviv and colleagues (1999) noted, children’s understanding of peace and higher-level problem-solving skills are not so easily laid out on a developmental scale and taught in sequence. They found that, for many resolution skills, younger children, given guided exposure, actually developed skills previously thought too advanced for their age group. Developing a CRE program that recognizes individual differences in cognitive development becomes an important aspect that seems to further support best practices outlined by Sandy (2001). This seems to be especially important when one notes there still remains inconsistent information about the gains of effective conflict resolution practices at the middle and secondary school levels (Jones, 2004).

CRE and its pillars reaffirm that the social-emotional aspects of human learning are just as important as the traditional academic subjects. Emphasis is placed on learning
how to set rules, determine criteria, self-regulate, and work cooperatively as a way to approach conflict as well as a way to learn traditional academic subjects. CRE does not supplant academics but, rather, tries to give equal attention to the affective areas of human development. As an educational curriculum, CRE balances the importance of individual freedom and choice with teaching respect and responsibility for others through its cooperative learning methodology.

CRE, at its roots, is an education in relational communication skills. Conflict, within CRE, is not a problem-solving exercise, but more similar to what Bohm (1996) called an awareness exercise of paradox. CRE differs in its purposeful goal for nonviolent resolution. The individual is acknowledged as well as the group, and CRE provides a set of procedures that allows both the individual and the group to meet, dialogue, and develop resolutions. Bohm (1996) provided an excellent deconstruction of the word “communication” by focusing on the Latin origins and ending with a definition of communication meaning “to make something common” (p. 2). In a similar fashion, Dewey (1916) stated, “There is more than a verbal tie between the words common, community, and communication” (p. 4). However CRE is secular, overriding any one religion, with the possibility of overriding national borders.

Classrooms are places where students can practice negotiating authority and learn the difference between authoritative social justice and authoritarian fascism and learn that authority does not equal authoritarianism. Bohm (1996) offered an interesting assertion about the nature of authority in this sense and how authority affects dialogue. He noted, “The family is a very authoritative structure, based on obligation, and that sort of thing. It
has its value, but it is a structure within which it might be difficult to get dialogue going….because there is no place in the dialogue for the principle of authority and hierarchy” (p. 42). He is clearly stating that, if dialogue is to be free, each person must have equal authority to speak. He is not suggesting doing away with family or obligations, but is insisting that, if we want to confront the paradox of conflict, then we must have a free space to do this.

Although a change from authoritarian to more democratic classrooms has universal appeal, at least for the title of education reform packages, it has become a point of confusion for teachers in all cultures. Traditional teaching approaches lay responsibility for the learning process and classroom management completely on teachers’ shoulders. The teacher is the head of the classroom, leader of the students, and the authority of knowledge. It is a change in the teacher’s place both physically and ideologically that seems to have caused the faulty perception of a lack of teacher authority when using CL and NCCM learning strategies.

Dardjowidjojo (2001) spoke about this same sort of skepticism regarding the teacher facilitator role in Indonesia. He suggested Indonesian teachers will reject any student-oriented approach that appears to lessen the authority of the teacher. Granted, he was not looking at CL but at equivalent elements incorporated in the Teaching English as a Second and Other Language (TESOL) technique known as Community Language Learning (CLL). One would suspect that many more teachers overseas have been exposed to this technique and have formed some inaccurate perceptions of CL that need to be addressed when introducing CL.
The main difference between CLL and CL is that CLL lets students dictate the curriculum. It would also be useful to frame the teachers’ facilitator role more as Freire stated to Macedo, “…always teach to facilitate” (Freire & Macedo, 1999, p. 200). Friere explained that facilitating learning does not lessen teachers’ importance or their institutional power. As he noted, “the facilitator still grades, and still has certain control over the curriculum” (p. 201). He surmised that many people conceive of the role of facilitator incorrectly because they have confused authoritarianism with authority. As he clearly stated, “Teachers maintain…authority through the depth and breadth of knowledge of the subject matter that they teach. The teacher who claims to be a facilitator [only] and not a teacher is renouncing…the task of teaching and, hence the task of dialogue” (p. 201).

Following a review of CRE, its curricula, goals, approaches, and underlying philosophical orientations, it is necessary to look at Indonesia from a broader historical prospective before an initial analysis of the possible barriers that exist to the introduction of CRE in the Indonesian educational system can take place. The next sections provide a brief look at Indonesia’s approach to the social conflict that provided the impetus for this study, followed by a sketch of the history of the Indonesian educational system and past education reform attempts, concluding with an analysis of the potential of CRE’s value of syncretism.

Review of Literature on Indonesian Conflict, Education, and Reform

Indonesia is incorporated into a region known as Southeast Asia and lies between the continents of Australia and Asia and has a population of close to 235 million
inhabitants. It is formed from over 17,000 islands with over 300 ethnic groups and over 700 spoken languages and dialects. It has been, and continues to be, of strategic and global importance. Its resources have been used to fatten the economies of the world since long before the middle-ages, and it has been the site of incredulous treatment from the western world for over four centuries. Its wealth of natural resources and huge tracts of rainforest continue to supply the world with spices, precious metals, gems, fossil fuels, luxury timber, and even oxygen. Like the Amazon, much is still left to be discovered in its forests and seas which could offer the world new medicines, new forms of food, and new forms of energy.

Studying and working with its citizens could offer the world better ways to cooperate, alternative ways to come to consensus, and help to develop new perspectives on old world religions to promote dialogue. Indonesia was colonized for over 300 years, and fought a very long battle to remain an integrated democratic state. Like a phoenix, it has emerged from the ashes of revolutions, reformations, and failed democratic experiments. At present, with its new president Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, it is steering yet another path toward a more democratic society while continuing to face age-old internal conflicts, religious fundamentalism, and pressures of globalizing external forces. The past decade has brought many social, economic, and natural disasters; yet Indonesia continues to survive. This is the turbulent, yet remarkable, place chosen for this study.
Indonesia and Conflict

In June 1998, President Suharto stepped down from 32 years of rule after a tragic year of economic collapse and six months of vicious ethnic rioting. May 13, 1998 saw some of the worst violence since the 1965 coup that brought him to power, and in which thousands of Indonesians are thought to have perished (Mackie, 1976; Steinberg, 1987). May 1998 marks some of the most publicized accounts of violence against the ethnic Chinese minority in Indonesian history. Although hundreds of Indonesian Chinese businesses and homes were destroyed across the archipelago and many Indonesian Chinese were killed, what especially garnered global attention was the claim that hundreds of ethnic Chinese women and young girls were raped and brutalized during the riots (Siegel, 1998). The claim that there had been widespread, racially-inspired rapes, and the attention they have received is of historical consequence for Indonesia and, more importantly, for native pribumi (middle-class Indonesians) who generally preferred to think that racism was a thing of the past and something they were victims to under Dutch rule. In the months and years that followed, Indonesians were forced to recognize that ethnic violence is an Indonesian problem (Siegel, 1998).

The most apparent antecedent to the violence of May 1998 seems to have been a year of worsening economic conditions. In mid-1997, the national currency started to lose value due to the Asian economic crisis. President Suharto decided to allow the rupiah (the Indonesian currency) to float on the market. However, by the end of 1997, it became apparent that Indonesia was heading for even worse economic conditions. Suharto contemplated pegging the rupiah to control its continuing devaluation but, in the end,
decided against it and went to the World Bank and the IMF for relief. In November 1997, the IMF approved a loan package that required Indonesia to begin major banking reforms and lift many subsidies, especially those on fuel, pesticides, and cooking oil.

Sporadic violence and demonstrations occurred throughout the year in reaction to the increasing economic crisis, but in December 1997 and January 1998, violence against the ethnic Chinese minority began to intensify. The Indonesian rupiah fell further, reaching an exchange rate of 17,000 Indonesian rupiah to $1.00 U. S. in January. By comparison, the previous year the exchange rate had been 2,500 to one U.S. dollar. The rapid devaluation of the currency helped to incite riots across Indonesia. A Human Rights report dated February 1998 documents 35 riots occurring between January 5th and February 16th (Human Rights Watch- Incidents, 1998).

Another antecedent to the May 1998 riot was the student political protests. Protests calling for political reform and leadership change started in late March 1998, but remained non-violent until May. During that time, there had been hope for peaceful political change without violence. But on May 4th in Medan, Indonesia’s third largest city, the student protests prompted violent riots that lasted 3 days (Tesoro, 1998). Many businesses were burned. The Chinese community protected itself by hiring a local paramilitary group, largely made up of young adults, to protect much of the ethnic Chinese portions of the city.

In Jakarta, university students were staging political protests at their universities and at the Indonesian Parliament for the removal of the Suharto regime, for more freedom of speech, and for government action to alleviate the severe economic hardships
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caused by the IMF demand that fuel and food subsidies be eliminated. However, these political protests quickly grew into more than just student demonstrations.

On May 12th, four Indonesian Trisakti University students, mostly from the pribumi middle class, were shot dead during a protest rally on campus (Siegel, 1998). Police were supposed to have used rubber bullets; yet, these four students were killed with live ammunition. Groups of rioters soon gathered on the streets and began to vandalize, loot, burn, and kill. Although there were no Chinese hands on the guns or Chinese police or military officers who might have ordered the shooting, the Indonesian ethnic Chinese became the target for brutal attacks, rapes, and murders over the course of two to three weeks following the shootings at Trisaki University (Human Rights Watch, 1998, Marzuki, 1998; Siegel, 1998; Tesoro, 1998; Volunteers, 1998).

Suharto stepped down at the end of May, but violent conflicts did not stop. In January 1999, conflicts began in the Maluku province (more widely known as the Spice Islands) as Ramadan was about to end. In the southern island of Ambon from that time on, violent outbreaks have continued to sporadically occur and have spread to other nearby islands such as Ternate, Halamahera, and Sulawesi. Most often these conflicts are reported as religious in origin, yet in these areas, religion is closely tied to ethnicity and political parties (Aditjondro, 2000; Bamualim et al., 2002; Collins, 2002; Colombijn & Lindblad, 2002).

In Kalimantan, violent clashes took place between the Malay and Dayak groups against the Madurese beginning in late 1997 and culminating in the most gruesome clash in Sampit in February 2001. Dispersed among these violent clashes were military
atrocities against the East Timorese at the end of August 1999, sporadic killings in West Papua, and military actions against the Achenese rebels in North Sumatra. If internal religious and ethnic turmoil was not enough, October 2002 saw the beginning of globally inspired terrorist bombings in Bali and Jakarta.

The Indonesian press that was once so heavily censored has become almost too sensational. The average citizen is bombarded with stories and conspiracies theories. Over time, the word “conflict” has been transliterated as meaning communal conflict, *konflik*. As an Indonesian term, *konflik* has a history of being matched with other terms such as violence, death, and killing in Indonesia. Also, embedded in the dominant cultural group’s feelings (the Javanese) is the reaction that *konflik* should be avoided at all costs. For the Javanese, the largest ethnic group, conflict equates with disharmony and unbalance; therefore, in order to promote and achieve harmony, traditionally one should accept, submit, avoid, or acquiesce. This tradition is nowhere better illustrated than by one of Indonesia’s premiere writers, Pramoedya Ananta Toer, in his short story *Acceptance*. As the story unfolds of the protagonist’s life in an East Java village during Indonesia’s early years of nation building, Pramoedya clearly shows how the traditional values of deference, passivity, and submitting, culminate in an overall belief that one should just accept the rules of those in authority so as to maintain harmony and to survive.

Although the traditional belief in harmony at all cost is still very much present in daily interactions, especially with the Javanese since 1998, there has been a push for increases in civil rights and social justice. Indonesia’s first president, Sukarno, is said to
have emphasized the last principle of *Pancasila*, social justice and *gotong royong* (an Indonesian term for cooperation) in his promotion of a secular government (Schumann, 2002). However until the *reformasi* period, *Pancasila* remained in the realm of symbols, or as during Suharto’s regime, a prescribed political ideological course. With the last three presidencies, the symbols have slowly started to be translated into social action.

One striking characteristic of many of the conflicts in Indonesia, whether based on identity, religion, ethnicity, or limited resources, has been that many involved young adults as the perpetrators of violence. Both nationally and internationally, there has been an onslaught of articles published to discover “the roots.” Regrettably, what generally happens is that the roots are too many and the causes multiple. The use of the “roots” metaphor suggests that, like a bad weed, they can be pulled-up and the situation ended.

Conflict Resolution is not the study of how to stop and solve, but how to approach and manage. CRE and its primary elements of cooperative learning and non-coercive classroom management could very well provide future Indonesians a supervised public sphere to practice the skills necessary to frame, dialogue, and develop non-violent resolutions for conflict. Classrooms could become places where CRE skills are learned through the art of nonviolent contestation or through what Benhabib (2002) called deliberative democracy disseminated into the communities. It is with this specific goal in mind that the following looks specifically at Indonesian classrooms as they exist today, embedded in a historical context.
The Indonesian Education System

Similar to the education system in the U.S., Indonesia has a wide array of education institutions. There are pre-schools, kindergartens, primary schools serving grades 1-6, middle schools (grades 7 - 9), and secondary schools (grades 10 – 12). Indonesia also has a system of vocational schools, two-year higher education institutes, colleges, and universities. Unlike the U.S., education is a constitutional right; however, none of the education is absolutely free, although recent legislation and laws have stated that, for public primary schools, school fees should be waived in cases of poverty.

Historically, the education system has been centralized, however over the past two decades, more efforts have been made to decentralize it.

There is still a national curriculum that has developed into more national standards. The vast majority of the populace attends public schools; however, along side this system is also a very large Islamic school system. Many other religious affiliated and private schools also exist, especially in the urban centers of Indonesia.

The history of Indonesian education goes as far back as the Majapahit kingdom before 1300. According to Embree, Simon and Mumford (1934), education during this period seemed primarily only for the members of aristocracy or for a select few lower class who garnered patrons for the arts. Education took place in the kratons or courtly palaces.

Education for the populace really did not begin until the colonial era. After the 1300s with the introduction of Islam, Islamic boarding schools, called pesantren or pondok schools, were established. The prevalence of this type of education mainly sprang
up in the rural centers of Sumatra and Java and seemed to gain in numbers during the 1700s. Although these schools do pre-date colonial schools, curriculum was centered on religious studies and Islamic philosophy. The schools were, and some continue to be, very laid back with optional attendance and pedagogy consisting of lecturing and recital-memorization of texts (Embree, Simon, & Mumford, 1934; Geertz, 1960). Few, if any, course offerings existed in reading or writing in vernacular languages, mathematics, or science in these institutions until the turn of the century (Geertz, 1960).

Although the Dutch East Indies Company wrestled much of the political control of Indonesia by the early 1800s, besides a few basic schools built in urban centers, and a few out-croppings of European missionary schools, the education concerns of the inhabitants were not considered very important until Indonesia officially fell under the governmental control of the Netherlands in the early 1800s. Even then, attention was not given to the masses until the late 1800s. At that time, a real emphasis was placed on building educational institutions for the native inhabitants (Purwadi & Muljoatmodjo, 2000).

From the late 1800s until today, one can see the greatest similarity with the development of the public education system in the United States. The predecessors of Indonesia’s modern public education system can be found in this part of the colonial system (Purwadi & Muljoatmodjo, 2000). Similar to the U. S., one can connect many of the underlying educational values to 19th century Europe. As the U. S. looked to Prussia, Germany, and England for educational initiatives during our development, Indonesia modeled their public school system on early Dutch schools and after the 1950s, on
American schools. Under Suharto’s regime in the 1970s, education officials in Jakarta began to also look to England and Australia to model educational and teacher training reforms (Shaeffer, 1990).

Alongside the steady growth and development of the public education sector was a new type of modern Islamic school which is known as the madrassa. Madrassa education differed from the more traditional pesantren education, focusing a majority of the curriculum on academic subjects similar to public education. As they grew in popularity, many pesantren schools began to change and offer more modern courses (Geertz, 1960; Purwadi & Muljoatmodjo, 2000).

Today, Indonesia’s public school system is supplemented by an extensive network of religious schools and secular private schools. All schools are required to provide religious education in one of the five recognized religions: Islam, Protestantism, Catholicism, Buddhism, and Hinduism. The education system is mainly under the control of the Ministry of Education and Culture, but the Ministry of Religious Affairs is in control of the Islamic school system and coordinates many of the educational aspects of their schools in cooperation with the Ministry of Education and Culture. The Ministry of Home Affairs works with the Ministry of Education and Culture at the local level and its role is steadily increasing with the new push for regional autonomy (Purwadi & Muljoatmodjo, 2000, p. 92). Questions begin to arise as to who dictates the “religious” curriculum and how points of contention are discussed and mediated.

Indonesia, like the U. S., has a variety of public and private education institutions. Similarly, the vast majority of its youth are educated in the public school system.
However, unlike the United States, the majority of the public school systems in Indonesia still follow very traditional, expository instructional strategies paired with a strict, authoritarian discipline style versus more interactive, hands-on, collaborative approaches. Granted, a closer look at the U. S. public school system might show that many American teachers also rely heavily on expository methods and authoritarian approaches, but over the past four decades, most American teachers have been educated to use a mixture of active and expository methods. This could very well be due to the fact that, until the past decade, local school districts were free to introduce and change instructional approaches fairly easily since they were autonomous and not controlled by a centralized state or federal authority, something that might be forgotten as more and more mandates and federal funding eclipse local school authority in the form of “No Child Left Behind” legislation.

Curricular Content

All schools in Indonesia, except those that claim to be international schools, follow the Ministry of Education’s national curriculum. The Indonesia National Curriculum is a quite extensive curriculum that requires the same subjects that western curricula do but include courses in religion and civics known as Pancasila. From 1975 until 1998, the national civics education courses began to change and meld civics, moral education, and a Suharto style of political ideology. The Civics education course was required for grades K-through the last year of university when the course change its name to Pancasila Moral Education, or its Indonesian acronym PMP.
Since the early 1970s, all civil servants, including teachers, were required to attend workshops on PMP (Bork, 2003). Interestingly, throughout the 1980s, many other public and private organizations also began attending PMP workshops as a show of support for the national call of patriotism under the Suharto regime (Bjork, 2003; Steinburg, 1987). In 1997, PMP changed its name and became known as Pendidikan Pancasila dan Kewarganegaraan (PKKn) in an effort to promote a unified national identity and continue to propagate the New Order’s regime ideology (Fitch, 1992-93). However with Suharto’s fall from power in 1998, PKKn/PMP fell under harsh criticism. Since then, there has been an effort to find a civic curricula to replace the New Order’s PKKn. The New Order’s version of PKKn has since been dropped from schools and universities, and replaced at least in name, and with some changes in course material, to continue to provide an education on the original ideas of Pancasila and to promote the national ethics of monotheism, humanitarianism, national unity (often noted as pluralism), democracy, and social justice.

**Education Reforms**

At the turn of the twentieth century, the Dutch colonial government began instituting an Ethical Policy in Indonesia, a dubious initiative started in Holland by social activists promoting social reforms sweeping across newly industrialized Western Europe. Although prejudiced by nature, the initiative included a policy for educating the “natives” in the Dutch East Indies. The Ethical Policy can be viewed as a sort of protestant ethic developed in part to ameliorate the guilt of the Dutch nation’s rape of another country and bondage of its inhabitants. As with many social reforms, positive development can
emerge from a negative. Many of the most important Indonesian political leaders studied in these early Dutch institutions. The first President Sukarno and his Vice President Hatta emerged out from the Dutch education to lead their country to independence.

Similarities can easily be drawn with other contradictory social movements occurring elsewhere in the world at the time—specifically, the Abolitionists in the United States and the educational reforms by the New England industrialists. It is upon these similarities that one can begin to frame today’s Indonesian school system.

Besides changes in Indonesia’s civics education, other reform efforts targeted the process to decentralize the national education system and improve teacher delivery models. Beginning in 1994, Indonesia’s national curriculum was changed to give more authority to local areas (Bjork, 2000; Purwadi & Muljoatmodjo, 2000). Districts were given the right to adapt approximately 20% of the curriculum to fit local needs and resources. This was in an effort to fulfill international agencies increasing calls for decentralization as well as provide for the Indonesian Education Minister’s wish for a “Link and Match” curriculum to encourage students to stay in school and help ensure continued economic development at the same time (Bjork, 2000; Buchori, 2001; Pongtuluran & Lie, 1998).

After the fall of Suharto, new decentralization laws were passed transferring authority for schools to local administrations. As a result, the national curriculum is slowly becoming a list of standards and competencies. PKKn is no longer mandated as formulated in the Suharto era, but many schools continue to use it. At present, there is no one specific course sanctioned in the national curricula for building tolerance and
teaching democratic values, yet a list of national education standards do. However, many local districts do not have the resources to translate these standards and develop their own curricula, therefore, many continue to use older versions of *PKKn*.

Most private schools also continue to use the *PKKn* course materials developed during the Suharto era, but some have developed new character education courses. Like *PKKn*, these have been criticized for emphasizing rote learning, stressing sympathy versus empathy, and indoctrinating students rather than providing them with a course that educates them to be more tolerant, to practice democratic dialogue, or to learn how to perspective take (Bjork, 2003; Fitch, 1992-93; Schumann, 2002). A fundamental question arises regarding teachers’ perceptions of the necessity for civic education and the exact approach for how to teach it. Also some schools feel religious moral instruction adequately covers the ethics once mandated in *Pancasila*.

*Reforms in Teacher Education*

Although the New Order was regarded as a 32-year rule of an authoritarian regime, there were several positive efforts made to reform education (Dardjowidjojo, 2001; Nielsen, 1998; Shaeffer, 1990). In the 1980s, teacher training was provided for how to use an active learning method known in Indonesia as *Cara Belajar Siswa Aktif* (CBSA). After CBSA was successfully introduced in a few pilot sites in West Java, the innovation was diffused too quickly without providing the necessary inservice and preservice training for teachers. Follow-up studies have shown that the reform failed due to lack of in-depth training on the principles behind the use of CBSA and lack of careful
monitoring and evaluation of the wide dispersion of the programs (Lie, 2003; Shaeffer, 1990).

In 1994, another effort was made to reform the national curriculum by introducing critical teaching methods through post-secondary training of prospective teachers and providing economic incentives to encourage current teachers to update their credentials. This reform was not successful either (Nielsen, 1998). According to Dardjowidjojo (2001),

in an Eastern society…where the yardsticks for good behavior are the principles of total obedience, the unquestioning mind, the concept of elders-know-all, and the belief that teachers can do no wrong, the implementation of such [student-centered] teaching activities is not without problems. (p. 309)

Dardjowidjojo suggested these traditional norms are so intractable that Indonesian teachers would have difficulty adopting student-oriented curricula. However, culture can also be viewed as depicted by Behabib (2002) (i.e., something more fluid and the result of periods of contestation over time and history).

The failure of educational reform in teacher education continues to be evident in many Indonesian classrooms. Most teachers teach from a raised floor space with their students seated in uniform rows in front of them. The teacher/student ratio is generally very high especially in urban settings. In rural settings, many teachers are responsible for more than one grade level within one classroom. Most often, students do not talk unless they are addressed. However, to simply say it is the culture is naïve.
Studies that spend a few weeks in several sites and are based on stop-and-go interviews cannot adequately represent the challenges that Indonesian teachers face, or even begin to report on the nature of Indonesian educators. It is also too simplistic to point to the teachers as the main problem for failed education reform. Throughout my time in Indonesia, many people, both educators and parents, have suggested that teachers are the root of the problem in the Indonesian education system. Some have stated, as Bjork (2003) asserted, that teachers are a product of three decades of nationalist indoctrination under Suharto’s regime requiring, and to use Dr. Claudia Hale’s words, are moving into a period of an “un-disciplining” (C. Hale, personal communication, January 17, 2004). But these reasons alone do not adequately explain why Indonesian teachers have not been able to transition to more student-centered instruction under pressure for three decades to reform.

A review of the literature identifies several factors that might influence teachers’ resistance to change. Some of the most important are a lack of adequate training in basic pedagogy, a lack of experience using student-centered instruction, a lack of supervised practice sessions, and an overly bureaucratic centralized education system (Bjork, 2000; Buchori, 2001; Nelsen, 1998; Purwadi & Muljoatmodjo, 2000; Shaeffer, 1990). Most importantly, the reforms have not really addressed the fact that the teachers live and learn in cultural contexts that are in opposition to the underlying values of student-centered approaches (Dardjowidjojo, 2001). Equally disturbing is the lack of uniform control over classroom enrollment, attention and investment in resource development, and structural maintenance in rural areas. The trickle of reforms has usually been based on a few pilot
sites and then mandated across the Indonesian archipelago without the necessary attention paid to the teachers themselves. Perhaps what has been seen as the passive unchanging nature of teachers could just as easily be seen as a form of active resistance to change without democratic consensus. Bjork (2002) hints to this in his report on Indonesian teacher resistance to imposed government ceremonies.

*Current Attempts to Reform*

For the past seven years, Indonesia has been in a transitory phase. Since President Suharto stepped down from power in May 1998, four presidents have tried to lead the Republic of Indonesia to a more democratic form of government. Sweeping reforms, many IMF imposed, have blanketed the country. The reforms have increased attention on decentralizing the education system and changing how students are educated. This effort has been pursued with even more emphasis because a firm belief that a freer, more democratic government needs to begin to educate their developing youth in a more democratic way.

However, educational reform is nothing new to Indonesia. As Bjork (2003) reported, the effort to decentralize the educational system has been in progress for over two decades. Educational reforms, such as educational decentralization and student-centered active learning, began under the New Order government of Suharto with the increased pressure of globalization under the guise of recommendations from the IMF and World Bank in the 1970s. However, this change from a teacher-directed approach to a student-oriented approach has not met with much success (Bjork, 2000; Buchori, 2001; Dardjowidjojo, 2001; Lie, 2003; Nielsen, 1998; Purwadi & Muljoatmodjo, 2000;
Shaeffer, 1990). Oftentimes, the writers have blamed the culture and the teachers (Bork, 2003; Dardjowidjojo, 2001; Nielsen, 1998). However, others have blamed the troubles on the way the reform was presented and diffused (Lie, 2003).

Although many of the past reforms have not resulted in much success, they still continue. In fact, the work done with a group of educational professionals adapting elements of conflict resolution education, especially cooperative learning, into their teacher training programs, was funded in part as a reform effort. The following is a review of how other programs were initiated and problems they encountered followed by a plan to help diffuse the CRE elements of CL and NCCM.

Traditionally, teacher-student relations in Indonesia are based on respect and obedience (Dardjowidjojo, 2001). When one walks into a typical classroom in Indonesia, the scene is one of absolute deference to the teacher’s authority. Symbolically and physically, the teacher occupies a raised position in the front of the classroom. The students are seated in uniformed rows of desks, and sometimes long narrow tables, from the front to the back of the room. All face the front. Unlike American public schools, Indonesian schools are not free. Although some effort has been focused on providing free education to children from economically depressed families, problems in paperwork still exist. Also unlike American schools, in Indonesia, all schools require students to wear uniforms (not unlike U. S. parochial schools). Students are required to sit, listen, recite, or take notes a practice known by its translated Indonesian acronym “DDCH” (Shaeffer, 1990, p. 67). Students only speak when asked a direct question, in what seems to be an endless routine of lecture and drill. Although this scene sounds out of place in the 21st
century, it is really not so far in America’s educational past and in all actuality, is likely found in some classrooms today.

Researchers first entering this scene might cite this as evidence of the rift between Asian and Western values. Some of the deference to teachers is part of the socialization of cultural values that one reads about and sees in many Eastern cultures, but can also be explained as a remnant of European school tradition of bygone years and more importantly the 32 years of authoritarian rule by President Suharto, a president who received U. S. backing for almost the whole of his tenure. Indonesians are quick to recall the words of their national education founder, Ki Hajar Dewantara who opposed such a style in the 1920s. As Soefijanto (2003) summarizes, Ki Hajar Dewantara held and taught the educational philosophy of a teacher as an example giver, an encourager and an assister.

Over the past three decades, these traditional classroom scenes in the United States have slowly been replaced with students grouped in small clusters and teachers nimbly maneuvering from group to group, facilitating and conducting learning vignettes versus orating from the front of the rooms. Student-centered teaching styles have slowly propagated in the U. S. since the late 1800s with specific emphasis beginning in the 1980s. Similarly over the past three decades, Indonesia has attempted to promote more student-centered and active learning innovations with much less success.

According to Lie (2002), a type of active learning, known in Indonesia as CBSA, was first mandated nationally in the early 1980s by way of the national curriculum after a fairly brief pilot training in West Java. Lie’s view is that the reason CBSA worked so
well in the pilot sites was because a lot of training was provided, and the reason it failed nationally was that the government was too quick to adopt and mandate it across the nation without the necessary training and support following the directive. Teachers were given little if any training in the methodology and the immediate failure caused many teachers to pass judgment, deciding the innovation was not suitable for their schools. Lie also mentioned that the early, successful sites were piloted in West Java, in close proximity to the capital, close to the experts at the Education Ministry in Jakarta. Unfortunately, the resources and training did not accompany the mandate across the archipelago of 13,000 or more islands, which make up the nation of Indonesia.

Shaeffer’s (1990) more in-depth review of CBSA mirrored most of Lie’s (2002) assumptions. Unlike Lie, Shaeffer (1990) noted that CBSA spread very quickly by word of mouth and was more a populist spread rather than a mandated one. However, his evaluation supported Lie’s (2002) position that CBSA diffusion was not followed with enough training. In conclusion, Shaeffer (1990) suggested that teacher training did not include enough emphasis on the principles underlying CBSA, and a lack of monitoring caused CBSA to become very watered down. As a result, CBSA ended up as a didactic approach that called for unstructured group work using standardized worksheets for students to answer, study, and be evaluated on. The principles of small group instruction, constructivist learning, and teacher as facilitating manager, were lost along the path of CBSA’s diffusion. Shaeffer (1990) noted the absence of any coordination with teacher education institutions in CBSA’s diffusion and asserts this exclusion gave rise to the institutions’ growing criticism of the innovation.
Nielsen (1998) specifically reviewed the reforms in teacher education that have taken place since the 1980s. He focused on the change in the teacher education model. A big change that happened in the 1990s was the new certification standards for primary educators. Before the 1970s, teachers could get certified to teach primary school by attending one of the many specialized middle schools. As he noted, “In the beginning, [before the mid-1970s] persons could be certified with scarcely more education than the students they were sent to teach” (p. 11).

However, by the 1970s with help from development sources, teacher training high schools, known as $SPG$, were established, providing at least nine years of regular education with an additional three years of training in a specialized high school. Then, in the early 1990s, new regulations required a high school diploma, plus a two-year degree from a teacher’s college, to earn a certificate to teach primary school. As Nielsen noted, this transition took over thirty years, along with special requirements for up-grading practicing teachers. As Nielson (1998) reviewed, the biggest problem with the new structure was that the colleges put in charge of educating primary school teachers were really not familiar with the primary education methodology and provided the same training for the future elementary instructors as they did for secondary instructors. He ended his review by stating the overall effort directed at improving teacher quality was largely ineffective.

Nielson (1998) blamed the poor success of teacher education programs on excessive bureaucratization, the existence of too many developmental projects with too few experts to oversee them, a mandated course in national ideology that restricted
critical questioning [Pancasila], heavy reliance on foreign developmental aid, and interagency fragmentation. However, he did see some hope, if only in the prevailing attitude favoring bureaucratic reform. Regrettably, even though the New Order was replaced, the bureaucracy remained.

Nielsen’s (1998) review seems to be very much in line with the problems Bolman and Deal (2003) noted with regard to structural barriers to innovation diffusion. As they stated, “if structure is overlooked, an organization often misdirects energy and resources” (p. 67). It seems that if the Indonesian bureaucracy was short of the needed administration to oversee the structural reforms, a more extended search for, and promotion of, local talented leaders could have been more conducive to effectual change.

Bjork’s (2003) study was conducted just prior to and following the fall of the Suharto government in 1998. Interestingly, he never mentioned the turmoil, except in a few footnotes, that preceded and continued to occur after May 1998. This turmoil included ethnic conflicts, an economic crisis, and major rioting in several urban centers and islands around Indonesia. However, in his review of the move to de-centralize education and develop local content curricula, he noted the central ministry created provincial sub-committees to help diffuse the innovation to the district level. Committees were developed to receive training to disseminate information on how to create curriculum to meet local needs, how to use active learning methods, and how to monitor and assist with change in local school districts. Yet, he concluded that the process met with fairly unimpressive results in changing either the local curriculum or the traditional teaching methods.
Unlike Nielsen’s (1998) study, Bjork’s (2000) ethnography looks at a 1994 national mandate for schools to take over control of at least 20 percent of the curriculum so that courses could be created addressing local needs and culture. It was thought this innovation would help decrease the percentage of children who left school during middle and high school. Similar to Nielsen’s (1998) report, Bjork (2000) criticized the fact that the Indonesian government was initiating several educational reforms at the same time. Bjork (2000) focused on an initiative known as the “Local Curriculum Content” (LCC) reform. Bjork echoed Nielsen (1998) in that the LCC reform was in response to international pressure to de-centralize. Bjork (2003) noted this change was based on several pilot studies, however, the exact location of these studies is not mentioned. He did note that, once the pilot studies were assessed as successful, the national education ministry almost immediately gave a directive for all schools to change. What is different between the two reports is that this directive was accompanied by a plan to develop provincial oversight committees composed of district representatives. On first review of this initiative, the element of regional monitoring seems ideal. On further review, even this structural device seems to have been unsuccessful due to either a decline in support, or the natural demise of programs based upon a top-down model.

Bjork (2003) identified the local provinces “handpicked teachers, administrators, and bureaucrats” (p. 196). Regrettably, what he did not say was how teachers, administrators, and bureaucrats were handpicked. Relying on personal knowledge of Indonesia, it is likely they followed a mixture of KKN, an Indonesian acronym that translates as corruption, collusion, and nepotism. During the 1998 reform movement,
KKN was openly used to run and manage private and public organizations. To advance was not so much based on skill but, instead, on a system of favoritism and political or familial affiliation. One could say that it was a modern-day version of a patron-client system that existed during pre- and post-colonial times. KKN was the accepted way to move up the political and social ladder in Suharto’s Indonesia and is still considered a problem. The removal of KKN is major political slogan and initiative used by the current President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono.

Bjork (2000) also suggested that provincial LCC bodies received sparse training and rarely met, suggesting a critical lack of investment from a human resource perspective. His interviews with participants revealed how the teachers were disappointed with the trainings. He also described how the trainings were designed to model active learning, but ended up being informational lecture-type sessions. If one is to consider Bolman and Deal’s (2003) assertion that, “a decision maker’s power also depends on the constituents’ leverage and satisfaction” (p. 196), one could conclude that if participants were in fact handpicked based on KKN and not on skills and prestige in their local teaching communities, it might have severely hampered attempts to diffuse the innovation.

In addition to criticism about the selection of the trainers and trainings, Bjork (2000) comments about the possible lack of working knowledge of the innovation and follow-through by trainers at all levels. He called this lack of understanding and motivation “Rhetorical Commitment.” This can be interpreted as people who talk a good
game, but don’t know how to play. Interestingly the Javanese might understand this as people who are hollow drums (i.e., loud noises come from empty vessels).

Although Bjork (2003) did not note this assumption, he did delineate the following factors to explain the apparent lack of successful diffusion of LCC policy: “…culture, incentive and rewards, and center-local relations” (p. 202). He claimed the Suharto government’s civil service indoctrination of teachers through Pancasila created a passive attitude among teachers and caused teachers to be fearful of criticizing any government initiatives, making them appear to be giving unquestioning support. However, their lack of enthusiasm and ability to spread innovations could just as easily be seen as an active stance of ignoring the centralized authority—an authority that was definitely in question since it fell the same year Bjork engaged in his research.

Although Bjork’s (2000) study gives a fairly clear picture of the microcosm of the schools, the fact that they are a part of a larger, more macroscopic view of the social-political context of the time is for the most part ignored. Bjork himself provided some evidence of resistance in other aspects of teachers’ roles and procedures in private schools. In an article based upon his dissertation research, Bjork touched on this possible link of resistance, but only for one school and only concerning the lack of decorum during an official, mandated flag raising ceremony. However, the conclusions he drew for the teachers’ supposed lack of enthusiasm might not be so much an active resistance to state control, but rather a natural reaction to the state of the society at the time of his observation. These issues fit nicely in the political frame of organizations that Bolman and Deal (2003) reviewed when they suggested diffusion is hampered when sources of
power are ignored and when those who are responsible for the implementation have no real access or control of the agendas that affect their lives.

In addition to the Nielsen (1998) and Bjork (2003) studies, Dardjowidjojo (2001) provides an interesting analysis of the difficulty of diffusing an English as a foreign language (TEFL) instructional approach that is very similar to cooperative learning that he places in the cultural context. Dardjowidjojo (2001) emphasized the cultural constraints to implementing student-oriented and teacher-as-facilitator instructional strategies. He stated, “the concept of learner autonomy…may have worked very well in a society where human relations are not based on culturally bound social hierarchies” (p. 313). He seems to have been suggesting that unless educational reformers address the culture’s imperatives for deference to elders, and those of higher social and educational status, reforms will stall. Deference is shown by strictly obeying, and not questioning or raising controversial subjects with one’s elders, and in requiring the elder never to take back anything that has been said, whether it is right or wrong.

Dardjowidjojo (2001) proposed that cultural behaviors come from four Javanese values that have persisted throughout the centuries and are also mirrored in many other ethnic groups throughout the Indonesian archipelago. The first is called “manut lan miturut”, and can be translated to mean that a child’s good behavior is judged by how well they obey their parents (p. 314). The second group of values is “digugu” and “ditiru” (p. 315). Together these two values denote the idea that a teacher should be unquestioningly modeled and followed by the students. The third value is encompassed in the saying “ewuh pekewuh” (p. 315), roughly translated as a healthy amount of
discomfort and uneasiness. This value recommends the stance an individual should have in front of one’s superiors or elders is avoidance of bringing up controversy.

The last is “sabda pendita ratu” (p. 316) a guideline for rulers, that translated means that a king should weigh his words wisely before speaking, but once a king speaks, he can never take his words back. This phrase was supposed to be a code for kings to be careful not to make quick decisions, but as Djardjowidjodjo (2001) mentioned, it has been corrupted to mean that one’s superiors and teachers should never be questioned, nor should they admit they are ever wrong. As he noted, “two-way communication” in the classroom is next to impossible (p. 316). What he did not address is whether these cultural values are also supported in any of the religious instruction that is mandated in schools, a question that might be revealed in an in-depth ethnography looking for evidence of cultural reproduction. Other sources, particularly Geertz (1961), although dated, suggested a very strong socialization process of children brought up with an appropriate amount of fear and deference for those of higher authority in what he and others have noted as the Javanese concepts of wedi, isin and sungkan (Geertz, 1961; Zeitlin et al., 1995).

Djardjowidjodjo (2001) concluded his analysis by arguing that accepting all the implications of Western innovations is not feasible, but trying to modify them to fit within the culture, while modifying the teachers’ cultural outlook, might be a possible goal. However, this requires much more than is feasible to accomplish during a single workshop session. Therefore an in-depth training period is needed at the university level, perhaps starting with the university professors whose task it is to train future teachers.
Value Conflict or Syncretism of CRE in Indonesia

Key features of Indonesian culture are a strong sense of spirituality and/or mysticism, fatalism, and obeisance, or at least recognition of hierarchical social structures (Geertz, 1960; 1961; 1973; Dardjowidjojo, 2001). Higher status individuals are equated with high power status and symbols of authoritarian power. To some extent, these individuals' statuses are accepted either consciously or subconsciously and, frequently, are not questioned. Reactions to conflict with sources of power are often limited to the behavioral patterns of aggression, avoidance, fatalistic compliance, or a combination of the three (Dardjowidjojo, 2001). Often this power is culturally legitimated for those who are older, have a higher economic status, and/or have obtained and hold title from higher levels of education (Bjork, 2000). Another interesting element is the positioning of those with a higher degree from overseas in relation to those with an equal degree from Indonesian institutions.

With these cultural elements in mind, certain values contained within the CRE pillars could cause considerable intrapersonal conflict. The Humanistic belief that the individual determines his/her own destiny through choices that he/she makes might lead one to question the role of a higher power and authority, the individual’s submission to a higher power, and a recognition that a higher power is in ultimate control. If the CRE trainer focuses on the power of individual choice and individual control, will this be seen as a conflict? One particular value statement that is repeated and alluded to in CRE is “Students are responsible and can solve their own problems” (Resource Guide, 2002, p. 12). Although this statement is very empowering and can be very alluring, it is also a
point of important debate for cultures with strong religious beliefs, obeisance to hierarchical status systems, and a tendency to resort to fatalistic resolution for both interpersonal and intrapersonal conflict.

Perhaps the adherence to individualism, especially as it relates to students being seen as capable of and responsible for solving their own problems could be viewed not as a dichotomy but, rather, as a point on a continuum. By targeting it for constructive controversy within training programs, a general localized point on the continuum could be found, and adaptations and applied practices formulated, minimizing the degree of philosophical and ideological dissonance. Framing CRE as a strategy for providing education in interpersonal communication skills might help. However, if such values are not looked at carefully, they could be pivotal points whereby the whole of the CRE program is either accepted or rejected. This could be especially true if one carelessly assumes that, within the classrooms, reciprocal communication can be engendered while at the same time honoring hierarchical status systems. As with any innovation seeking to bring together extremists, CRE is challenging, but is still considered a worthwhile endeavor.

Clearly, CRE is well grounded in theory and is historically-based. Over the past three decades, CRE has been supported as effective (Deutsch & Coleman, 2000; Jones, 2004). Also demonstrated herein, CRE has underlying values that are in contrast to commonly held ethics in Indonesia. Traditional views of education held by teaching professionals in communal cultures must be considered before introducing CRE in either place and training needs to allow room for educators to address possible value clashes,
providing dialogue about which parts of the program are truly different, and which parts can be adjusted to the local context without losing the foundational premises of cooperation, empathetic perspective-taking, and self-discipline. Monitoring the adaptation process is required to ensure that the final product is still educative while allowing it to fit within local cultures. What is not needed is yet another innovation that becomes merely rhetorical or a scripted version without promoting the civic change that CRE promises to engender.

Regrettably, most philosophical debates on educational innovations are held only in graduate course work and among academicians. However, most teachers working in schools are teachers at the undergraduate level who, for the most part, receive little to no course work or dialogue about the philosophies of education they are supposed to implement and continue to consider in order to be reflective and critical educators. Such a paradox where litigation and policy statements place such demands on teachers, yet provide more technical training, have had real effects on the day-to-day roles of educators working with students in their classrooms. Much of the time, only lip service is paid to this philosophic debate. The result is teachers who might or might not know the terms, who state they are constructivists, but who work within a positivistic paradigm and become even more frustrated and depressed at the failure of their version of a CRE program to provide the promised results.

It is time to bring the debate to the front lines. Ensuring that these issues are taught, or at least introduced, at the undergraduate level and within training workshops in order to allow time for discussions, expansion, and connection from theory to anecdotal
examples could help. Even more so, having researchers conduct studies using more qualitative and critical methodologies could further dialogue and understanding.

Granted, there is a thin line between enough and too much theory, but if professors in teacher education continue to strive for a proper balance of theory and practice, future teachers will leave the institution with the needed concepts to continue developing as educators who make decisions based on theory as well as the impetus to develop a personal praxis that resembles a phoenix more than a dinosaur.

In order to begin a dialogue with Indonesian educators, a review of their history and their approach to conflict was a necessary part of the research process. If the goal of research is to honestly map the meanings that both the researcher and participants are making in order to establish a common ground for practitioners to discuss issues concerning teacher practice and teacher-student roles and educational programs, then answering questions about the conditions and culture that might or might not affect innovation diffusion calls for a qualitative approach. In the next section, the process for examining the characteristics and conditions of Indonesia teacher training programs is described, and how a select group of individuals are reacting to the elements of CRE.
CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

In the following chapter, the method of the study as well as the rationale and choices underlying the method are presented. A more thorough description of the sites, the primary and secondary informants, and the main research tools of this study are provided. In addition to the explanation of the research tools and the analysis employed over the course of this inquiry, the structuring of the final analysis is also outlined.

The actual field work spanned over 36 months from October 24, 2004 until February 2008. However as will be explained, this study is a culmination of several years of previous work, study, and thought about education in Indonesia and specifically in the province of East Java. The foci of the meanings I mapped were primarily in one teacher training department at a private university in Surabaya. To support the data collected from this site, I also conducted research in two other secondary university sites and from a private elementary school in close proximity to the primary site. Both my primary and secondary sites were located in East Java. Additional background and participatory field work was undertaken in East Java and West Java.

One reason I chose to focus this study primarily on Teacher Education professors in a Teacher Education facility versus an elementary or secondary school is due to the potential impact that just one Teacher Education professor can potentially have to affect change. Over the course of one’s career, one Teacher Education professor has the ability to affect hundreds of future and current teachers in their courses. Research has shown that
future teachers teach the way they were taught (Britzman, 1991; Lortie, 1975). Therefore, if just one professor successfully adapts and models a teaching method, there is a much greater chance for that method to be diffused by her/his students.

A review of several studies on research reform reveals a common denominator: a call for more effective communication and reform to occur during teacher preparation (Bjork, 2000; Buchori, 2001; Nielsen, 1998; Pantjastuti, 2000; Shaeffer, 1990).

The central research focus of inquiry for this study was to map the ways cooperative learning (CL) and non-coercive classroom management (NCCM), the essential elements of Conflict Resolution Education (CRE), were used, understood, and adapted by Indonesian university professors in charge of educating future teachers in East Java. To draw this, the following seven questions were developed: 1) What if any cultural barriers exist to the adaptation of CRE’s elements and are they bridgeable?; 2) In what ways have participants implemented some of the initiatives they covered in U.S. Department of State sponsored CRE workshops?; 3) What aspects of CRE’s elements do participants consider worthwhile to introduce, what aspects have they ignored, and why?; 4) What are university students’ perceptions of CRE’s elements and do they differ from that of their professors?; 5) Are there specific conflicts present and are they perceived differently in Indonesia’s system of education?; 6) How do they define the values underlying Western CRE methods and what do they understand to be the possible conflicts that can arise in introducing CRE in Indonesian schools?; and 7) What influence do macro-level education systems and the university systems have on professors’ abilities
to incorporate and teach new methods, and what is hampering their adaptation of certain elements?

All seven questions are crucial to understanding the central issue of CRE’s adaptability in another cultural context. The following sections provide the reader with a description of the design that allowed me to examine the ways a select group of Indonesian teacher education professors translated and adapted the main elements of CRE in their teacher training classes while providing the reader with a more in-depth understanding of the cultural milieu where this adaptation was occurring.

This study is a critical ethnography of a teacher education faculty embedded in one university in East Java. This ethnography is supported by background investigations incorporating observations and conversations with individuals in other teacher education faculties at two universities in East Java and in one private elementary school close to the primary site. All of these sites included other participants in the 2003 CRE workshops who had stated an interest in beginning to incorporate elements of CRE in their pre-existing curricula.

Selection of Method

It has been said that the researcher doesn’t choose the method but, rather, the researcher’s questions do. This study’s focus on understanding change in the cultural context of Indonesia suggested that critical ethnography was the best frame, as it blends elements of both ethnographic and action research. Glesne (1999) explained that critical ethnography is a form of action research that looks at what “could be” and moves towards action (p. 10). She suggests the researcher be a “volunteer researcher,”
emphasizing that one can work cooperatively with the informants in seeking solutions to the identified problems and have the freedom to pull back and just observe at other times. After 36 months, I found this statement to be true, in that most of my more meaningful research activities were accomplished in cooperation with the primary informants as we presented seminars, conducted workshops, and eventually team taught in a variety of educational settings.

CRE has proven to be challenging to implement in the U. S. where, supposedly, the values underlying the program already exist. Trying to implement and map such an innovation in a culture, where deference is honored more than critical questioning, requires an actor from the West as well as an actor from the culture where it is going to be adapted, if true mapping of the process is to take place. Choosing a qualitative paradigm opens up the possibility for such a joint effort, and critical ethnography allows for the time in the field, the inter-subjective access to the participants to develop a shared understanding, and the space to document this understanding through the voices of the participants and the researcher’s own experiences.

From an ethical stand-point, the passivity required in more traditional studies would seriously compromise the search for meaning due to the constraints put on the researcher to ask more in-depth questions and receive clarification from participants using unfamiliar dialects and metaphors. Introducing a western educational innovation in another culture is conditioned by many aspects that at the beginning are unknown and required dialogue between the researcher and the participants if any real attempt is made to map the process.
Considering the purpose of this study, a qualitative methodology was an appropriate choice. Qualitative methodology, in its most general sense, is an interpretive method of inquiry into the actions and sensemaking of human phenomenon using observations, interviewing, document analysis, and most importantly the researcher as its primary tool of investigation in a naturalistic setting (Patton, 2002). The studies reviewed in the previous chapter did not really come close to providing a clear picture of the process of implementing educational techniques like CL or NCCM in Indonesia schools by Indonesian teachers (Bjork, 2000; Dardjowidjojo, 2001; Nielsen, 1998; Purwadi & Muljoatmodjo, 2000; Shaeffer, 1990). They have either tried to summarize too many locations or agencies leaving the educator’s voice silenced or severely muted.

Critical ethnography surfaced as the best match between my questions and method of inquiry. Critical ethnography looks dialectically at human interactions for joint understandings of conditions and characteristics within specific cultural contexts, emphasizing the positive act of change in both the researcher and the informants (Carspecken, 1996; Glesne, 1999; Shotter, 1993). Research with an equal focus on the informants and the researcher questions was lacking in previous studies (Bjork, 2000; Buchori, 2001; Nielsen, 1998; Pantjastuti, 2000; Shaeffer, 1990). Critical ethnography’s potential to describe, question, and record dialogue at the micro-level where understanding is formed, as well as reflect on possible meanings that exist at macrolevel, socio-political conditions seemed more holistic (Carspecken, 1996; Glesne, 1999; Patton, 2002).
At this time in our cultural history, it is unnecessary to include a lengthy section devoted to the *Methodenstreit* debate, nor argue the merits of Naturwissenschaften and Geisteswissenschaften or *Erklären* and *Verstehen*, the two forms of understanding. Both arguments have already been successfully made (Carspecken, 1996; Gitlin, 1994; Giroux, 1997; Morrow, 1994; Weinberg, 2002). However, the following two sections are included for anyone doubting the legitimacy of this methodological choice.

*Choosing Ethnography*

At present, several social scientists and anthropologists are pursuing and emphasizing the benefits of examining social problems in Indonesia Education using qualitative methodology. Ethnography is a multi-elemental method used for scientific inquiry generally falling under the broad category of qualitative or interpretivistic research. It is usually considered a descriptive study of a particular culture, a sub-culture of a human organization. As Patton (2002) noted, “ethnography…is the earliest distinct tradition of qualitative inquiry” (p. 81). Historically, anthropologists and sociologists have used ethnographic tools since the 19th century to study and explain specific cultures. Over the past 100 years, several other social science disciplines such as political psychologists, political scientists, and educational researchers have also begun using ethnography as a research tool (Patton, 2002).

Elements of ethnography include observations conducted by researchers completely immersed in the social setting, the culture, the sub-culture, or the organization of the inquiry. Observations require researchers to take detailed field notes using thick
description. The observational process can be on a continuum from being completely passive to being fully participatory.

A second important tool is interviewing. Researchers conduct a series of multiple, in-depth interviews with persons they consider key informants, and analyze a variety of artifacts of the particular group they are studying. Like the observational processes, interviews also vary dependant on the needs of the research. Ethnographers make use of survey-type interviews as well as completely open interviewing techniques such as active interviewing (Holstein & Gubrium, 2002; Patton, 2002). Depending on the theory driving the research, various forms of document analysis, peer debriefing, member checking, and triangulation occur. Ethnography is a dynamic method that continues to evolve over time and requires a substantial period of time in the field which is crucial for establishing the trustworthiness of a study.

Due to the long history of ethnographic research, the term can generate some ambiguity. Whether one considers it a paradigm or a method of inquiry depends on the classifying writer, and how that writer defines theory, paradigm, and method (Creswell, 1998; Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Patten, 2002). Wengraf (2001) stated, “A theory…is an assertion about reality” (p. 51). A paradigm can be defined as an example, pattern, frame, or model. Yet, one will find that even the use of the word “paradigm” can be polemical. Anderson (1998) grouped most scientific research into two paradigms—“the positivist paradigm and the post-positivist paradigm” (p. 4). So in this sense, some authors note that ethnography is a theoretical paradigm in which some researchers work,
interpret, describe, analyze, and write (Best & Kahn, 1993; Creswell, 1998; Dobbert, 1982; Hughes, 2002; Patton, 2002).

Choosing Critical Ethnography

Although both anthropologists and sociologists have used ethnographic research to study schools over the past five decades, educational researchers’ use of qualitative research was highly debated until the 1980s and 1990s (Anderson, 1998; LeCompte & Preissle, 1993; Masemann, 1982; Morrow, 1994). Decades of positivistic influence on educational research using ethnography, especially critical ethnography, was extremely controversial (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993). However in the 1970s, some of the first critical ethnographies were published from the field of education in Britain (Anderson, 1989). The idea of using ethnographic research to better describe social phenomena was combined with the idea that the description could be paired with methods that encouraged interactions between the researcher and the participants in a more democratic way during a search for understanding.

Critical ethnography departs from traditional ethnographic studies that traditionally used functionalism in their analysis (Masemann, 1982). Researchers wanted to have the potential to shift to other theoretical orientations that helped to further include participants in the research process in order to empower them and help promote social change versus just treating them as steriley as possible to either confirm or fail to confirm some sort of hidden a priori assumption (Apple, 1999; Carspecken, 1996; Morrow, 1994).
Masemann (1982) noted, “Critical ethnography refers to studies which use a basically anthropological, qualitative, participant-observer methodology but which rely on their theoretical formulation on a body of theory deriving from critical sociology and philosophy” (p. 1). Masemann (1982) identified Comte and Marx as founders of the underlying critical theory. Patton (2002) noted that critical theory influences critical ethnography by orienting the researcher not only to the purpose of “critique” but also to “change society” (p. 131). This change could be revolutionary or more in-line with the building of a Freirean critical conscience (Freire, 2000). Similarly, defining ethnography as a methodological scaffold, Simon and Dippo (1986) called critical ethnography a Sartrean “project...as an activity determined both by real and present conditions, and certain conditions still to come which it is trying to bring into being” (p. 196).

As Carspecken (1996) suggested, it is this focus on driving theoretical orientation that has caused concern. He believed ethical apprehension should be put aside with the knowledge that all research, be it quantitative or qualitative, is oriented to the researchers’ epistemological and ontological values. He drew a distinction that “critical epistemology does not lay much upon the idea of ‘windows.’ Visual perception is not in any way, shape, or form the basis for our theory of truth” (p. 17). He explained critical ethnographers use theory only during the final phase of the study. This abstraction, in the ethnographic process, is not less or more than traditional researchers’ abstractions of “social action and human experience” into operationalized variables at the beginning of their research projects (p. 25).
As Masemann (1982) suggested, critical ethnographers have employed several overlapping theories in their studies—conflict theories, structuralism, postmodernism, and neo-Marxism to name a few. Patton (2002) explained, using such approaches allows the researcher to move toward the goal of uncovering hidden power structures with which the group being studied might be in some sort of dialectical relationship. Because it is an oriented approach, the analysis is heavily informed by the theory being used even if the analysis is in the final stage. It is important that researchers disclose this to their readers and recognize it as an influence on how they approach the data before doing the analysis.

Critical theory, like CRE, places emphasis on power structures and how they can be recognized so a more equal voice can be given to students as well as teachers participating in the research. Using a method to describe the adaptation of an innovation that emphasizes voice seems very suitable given the purpose of this study. As for CRE being empowering for teachers, some might disagree by saying that teachers already have voice in an authoritarian classroom. However one might question if there were socially or culturally set parameters for their voices. How much freedom do they have if their roles are imposed by culture, politics, national curricula, standards and standardized tests with no room to contest? The dialogue that critical ethnography allows between the researcher and participants provides some answers to these questions in how they describe the power structures.

Critical ethnography helps educational researchers cross disciplines to reach a wider audience and use different perspectives. Simon and Dippo (1986) argued that “all methods are ways of asking questions which presume an underlying set of assumptions”
Like any other form of research, the researcher has to be honest with the data. Manipulating the facts to prove assumptions is just as unethical in critical ethnography as in any positivist paradigm. Carspecken (1996) admonished claims of too much subjectivity. Through his rendering, criticalists, more than any other type of researcher, base their epistemological truth claims on something other than visual perceptions. As he delineated, epistemological claims must be analyzed according to different “ontological categories” and these must primarily be analyzed based upon “communication structures [that] go to the heart of every human experience capable of becoming knowledge imparting…” (p. 22).

Anderson (1989) also identified validity as a problematic issue in critical ethnographies. He suggested this problem influenced some critical educational researchers to use more standardized and complex procedures in their ethnographic studies. He specifically mentioned “ethnographic semantics and microethnography,” that he seemed to suggest were really vain attempts to polarize work in a more positivistic paradigm (p. 252). For Anderson, critical ethnography’s concern for macrolevel analysis, and goals of developing conscience-raising research should direct educational researchers to approach issues of validity more in line with what he calls “literary’ approaches” than trying to argue the trustworthiness of their research and procedural rigor on the same ground as positivist researchers (p. 252-253).

How one approaches validity is a problematic issue for Anderson. His biggest concern was with reflexivity. He suggested the best possible way to avoid mistakes of reflexivity is by diligently keeping a personal journal that can be used to be true to the
data by incorporating subjectivity and analyzing it openly and honestly with the reader.

As for future challenges, Anderson (1989) predicted that, as educational researchers move from studying school subcultures to the larger, macrolevel, school system, there will need to be changes in “…the locus of analysis, empowering informants, and critiquing the ideology” (p. 259). He suggested moving the final analysis of studies from the microcosm to the macrocosm of school systems, and to use informant narratives so that it is the informant’s voice and not the researcher’s coming to the reader. He also suggested researchers begin to incorporate some of the techniques that feminist scholars have been using in ethnomethodology.

Very much in line with some of the problematic issues discussed and further suggestions for improving critical ethnography is the study design that Carspecken (1996) has developed. His design provides a very nice summary of how to use the tools available to the critical ethnographers in five research stages. Very much in line with the social agenda of critical researchers, Carspecken proposed that the fifth and final stage of critical ethnographic research is where the researcher “…examines the significance of a study in terms of macrolevel social theory” (p. 206). He admitted that many critical researchers would criticize him for alluding to a metanarrative. He noted that, during “the late 1980s and 1990s, critical researchers were treating the issue of social structure much more cautiously….because epistemological issues had been brought to the fore by postmodern and neopragmatist intellectual trends” (p. 173). All of this has led many criticalists to avoid connecting their work to larger social issues or to only allude to those issues.
However, Carspecken (1996) suggested otherwise. He suggested a five-stage ethnographic road map in an attempt to discover the micro- and macro-connected meanings. The search for meanings that underlie actions and statements of participants culminate in the final stage that attempts to make connections to macrolevel systems integration. The four preceding stages provide the foundation and trustworthiness of the study in order to start mapping possible theoretical connections.

Carspecken (1996) stated that the final stage of systems integration is not only important but needed if researchers are keeping true to the goal of doing research to improve society and promote change. He diverged from many constructivists and postmodernists who eschew researchers’ attempts to connect research results to universalisms. He noted “systems analysis must accompany good research and that such analysis is possible without ignoring postmodern insights” (p. 173). Carspecken (1996) did not seem to feel that critical researchers are somehow betraying the relativity of human action that postmodernists and constructivists have posited as a truth in order to combat traditional research’s less than ethical stance of othering or exoticizing the subjects of the research. This method does not posit a new form of universalism that all should be judged accordingly, but searches for “horizons” where researchers and their participants begin to understand one another better (p. 206). As he suggested, it is in the last two stages where the empowering aspect of critical ethnography occurs, as dialogue between researchers and participants helps to expand the analysis of the first three stages from the research site and map connections to larger social issues, discuss validity concerns, and build better understandings with one another. It is during these dialogues
Carspecken (1996) made a point to emphasize that, since the researcher’s abstraction comes after the end of data collection, several techniques, such as reflexivity, peer debriefings, and member checks help to ensure the data itself reveals the most appropriate analysis to be done which might or might not connect to one of these integrating theories. He stressed the fact that a criticalist approaches research with the openness that all good research methods require.

Choosing Carspecken’s Design

Carspecken’s analysis and suggestions for research revealed the most practical and best design to help answer the research questions related to CRE’s adaptation in Indonesia. The guiding questions pointed to an exploration of how the CRE elements of CL and NCCM were interpreted by Indonesian professors, re-interpreted by their students, and what, if any, macrolevel systems helped or hindered their understanding. CRE’s potential clash with prevailing teacher perceptions about their roles, as well as student perceptions of teachers’ roles makes for a complicated look at how tradition, culture and modernity often collide.

Deciding to use Carspecken’s design of critical ethnography is not only about defining and describing the discursive meaning between the researcher and informants, but entails purposeful dialogue and investigation about empowerment in order to identify the macrostructures that condition microstructures. His design also enables the researcher to maintain a more ethical stance by representing knowledge through the voices of the
participants as well as one’s own. By insisting the emerging voices are given demarcation from my own, was the best way to maintain trustworthiness and integrity in the research. Additionally, if social change is supposed to be the main focus of any social science research project, then looking at the elements and participants’ definitions of power and truth must be at the heart of the inquiry, thus Carspecken’s fifth stage allowed me the space to reflect and extrapolate.

Facing this research was the existing criticism that Western ideologies often ride the waves of neo-colonial practices draped in so-called development initiatives (Burbules & Torres, 2000). Keeping those criticisms in mind as I mapped a Western innovation’s affect on educators working toward better pedagogy was necessary, and a critical ethnography helped to shield participants from any hurtful imposition and presented a detailed description of their thoughts and views, while leaving space for my own.

Since CRE is based on a mixture of existentialism and pragmatism with theoretical linkages to constructivism and critical theory, choosing to conduct a critical ethnography seemed the most appropriate method to answer the research questions because of the values that are so intertwined with these philosophies and theories. The underlying theories of the methods and their techniques share many of the same epistemological and ontological foundations. With definitions like these, one might begin to question the rigor and complete subjectivity of such a methodology. However, it is important to consider that a project using critical ethnography is not only about honestly stating what epistemological and ontological grounds are going to be used to discover meaning between the researcher and informants, but also the way one goes
about doing the observations, conducting the interviews, collecting the data, and analyzing the information. The process is not an exercise in theory proving. Critical ethnography is an attempt to honestly document a social phenomenon that clearly shows what the participants and the researcher say and discover on their way to building a mutual understanding of the time, place, and event under study (Carspecken 1996; Glesne, 1999). Any sort of theory extrapolation is saved for the last stage and is driven by what has been found and not the other way around. The following provides a detailed map of the path taken in investigating questions concerning CRE in East Java.

The Researcher and Preliminary Research

Many studies provide an introduction to the research by providing the information gathered from preliminary studies, initial test surveys, sampling test, and arguing the validity, reliability and appropriateness of their testing tools. However, seldom do studies give a clear picture or even a brief analysis of the main research tool—the researcher. The next section provides an account of my qualifications and experiences going into this research project. It is left to the reader to decide if my experiences and background provide an adequate account of not only my limitations and predilections, but also my trustworthiness. Also reviewed are some of the previous experiences where I began to come in contact with the core questions of this study’s inquiry.

The Main Research Tool: The Researcher

My interest in CRE is rooted in my academic and professional work in special education. CRE and special education are both concerned with children’s rights to receive a free and appropriate education in the least restrictive setting. In layman’s terms,
both education paradigms are concerned with defining an appropriate education. Also, both innovations wrestle with the concept of inclusion and confronting cultural exclusionary practices with an end goal of promoting empathy in societies.

During my career I have worked as a special education teacher in the United States, Tunisia, and Malta in both segregated and inclusive settings. Before returning to the U. S. in 2001, I taught and coordinated English language programs in schools in Korea and Indonesia. In all of these countries, I team taught with local teachers and conducted teacher training on more cooperative and inclusive teaching approaches using classroom management practices that promote social-emotional growth with the least amount of coercion necessary.

As for my familiarity within the context of Indonesia, or at least East Java, my own sensitivity was developed by actual time emerged in the culture, working and collaborating with Indonesia educators, and further formal study. I worked in Surabaya, East Java, Indonesia from February 1997 until August 2001, first teaching English as a second or other language (TESOL) and then, developing and coordinating a children’s TESOL program for a private English language school. During that time, I worked with a wide variety of Indonesian students from different ethnic, racial, and religious backgrounds.

Most of the students came from middle to upper socio-economic levels of Indonesian society. Although segregation has not been a legal practice since the Dutch colonial era, over the course of the history of Modern and Contemporary Indonesia, people have continued to segregate themselves along religious and ethnic lines by
applying to and attending the myriad of public and private schools that exist. Granted, some of the reasons are as much for economic reasons as they are for personal choice. The private, extra-curricular school where I first taught was one of the few places where students studied with peers from a variety of religious and ethnic backgrounds; however, the students could still be regarded as segregated due to the cost of the tuition.

I taught a variety of classes--kindergarten through adult. One of the most interesting things I noticed was the way in which students and adults polarized into ethnic groups when they first entered the class. What was also interesting is this did not occur in the elementary classes until around the 6th grade level, which led me to begin to question this social phenomenon. To combat what seemed to be a socio-cultural norm to segregate, I made daily use of cooperative learning techniques in all my classes, either by organizing students to work in pairs or in small groups; therefore, the polarization, at least within the microcosm of my classroom, would soon dissipate after the first week. However outside the classroom, mixed groups of students rarely occurred.

Crucial to my understanding of Indonesian culture was team teaching many classes with Indonesian English teachers. The schools had a diverse group of excellent Indonesian English teachers. Working closely with them over a four year period was an incredibly enriching experience. Not only did we work together to solve program and instructional problems, but it was an intense cross-cultural lesson. With their help, I was able to learn how to live and work successfully in Indonesia. One quickly realizes there are more important things to learn than to avoid using your left hand to eat and pass items. Assertiveness that is so prized in America can be taken as egotism and indicate a
lack of respect in Indonesia. Growing up in a country where being direct in one’s communication about opinions, wants, and ideas is a requirement, in Indonesia often causes requests to be delayed or relational communication to be impaired. One needs to quickly acquire the art of being indirect and to display the appropriate paralinguistic stances in order to be polite and respectful.

In 2001, I returned to the states and the university. Since then, I have completed a second Master’s degree in Southeast Asian Studies with a specific focus on Indonesia and am completing a Ph.D. program in Teacher Education. My advanced studies of Indonesia have helped me to re-interpret and better understand the political upheavals of the 1997-1999 Indonesian regime change I lived through and have given me a greater appreciation of Indonesian history as a multicultural state. In my coursework, I have chosen to research major ethnic and political conflicts that have occurred in Indonesia and Malaysia since their colonial period. Unfortunately, many of these same conflicts still simmer and continue to erupt.

Pilot study

In preparation for the Training of Trainers workshops in CRE to be held in the summer of 2002, I conducted a pilot study that produced contrasting information. This limited inquiry delved into Indonesian educators’ and administrators’ current perceptions of conflict and discipline. Over the course of three months, I conducted nine semi-structured interviews with five elementary school teachers and four principals in East Java, the site of the first planned workshop focusing on CRE. I conduct three of the nine
interviews on-site at three different schools. Two of the schools were located in Surabaya and a third school was located in a rural area about 20 miles south of Surabaya.

While at these sites, I was able to make note of informal, general observations of teacher and student interactions, and school yard activities. The semi-structured interviews revealed educators’ and administrators’ understandings of current curricula in conflict resolution and theories of social-emotional skills training. The study also more clearly focused on revealing participants’ own thoughts and ideas about topics such as discipline, punishment, typical classroom conflict and the relationship of these topics to greater societal problems. The interviews were also designed to uncover participants’ understandings and ideas about cooperative learning, classroom management, and curriculum change. It was my hope that, if I could begin to build an understanding of what Indonesian educators and administrators felt about these issues before beginning a workshop design, the topics and issues to be chosen would then be much more relevant and of interest to them, and hopefully, at least some of learning would be transferable to other Indonesian educators.

The objectives of the initial interviews with principals were to discover what they considered the core values that needed to be taught, and which values listed in American CRE programs might not be suitable for Indonesia. I also wanted to find out what, if any, educational reforms they were currently working on and what their thoughts were on the connection between the educational system and the current crisis and violence in Indonesia.
My interviews with the teachers had a similar focus. I wanted to know what they considered to be the biggest disciplinary problems and how they handled those problems. Additionally, I wanted to determine their teaching experience, educational background, and what they considered their students’ most pressing educational needs. I also wanted to determine their level of understanding of the principles of conflict and their opinions about the relationship of conflict to the students’ ability to obtain social-emotional and academic skills.

After nine semi-structured interviews, a common pattern emerged. The participants felt cooperative learning, or what they knew of it, did not work with large groups. All of them mentioned difficulties encountered in an ability to manage the groups. However, it should be stated they all called cooperative learning “CBSA”, which is an Indonesian acronym for a failed active-learning approach that was diffused haphazardly in the 1980s. For them, cooperative learning, CBSA, and small group work were synonymous. Common to all the teachers was the idea of a growing lack of respect for teachers, that many identified by the casual form of speech used by students to address them and paralinguistic stances taken toward them.

Conflict itself was a matter that took time to define. There are several Indonesian words that mean conflict, but the words that mean interpersonal and intrapersonal conflict do not encompass the terms that mean inter-group and intra-group conflict. The different words used to denote conflict led me to question whether without a general consensus, confusion would continue to arise. For in Indonesia, perhaps the feeling would be that skills to handle one type of conflict in schools would not necessarily help students to
handle conflict in different contextual environments outside of schools. Interestingly enough, this same criticism of a student’s ability to generalize skills for confronting conflict across settings is often proposed for CRE programs in the States where the same word “conflict” is used across different contextual settings.

Like many American educators, the teachers noted a similar general breakdown of the role of family, and the effect of violent shows and video games on their students’ motivation and behavior. In their descriptions, I began to sense that punishment was the only tool teachers used to discipline, though they claim to not employ physical punishment. The informal observations in the schools allowed me to witness a few instances of humiliation and ostracizing as forms of discipline. During guided tours of the schools, I observed instances of children kneeling in front of a classroom, or being made to run around the school building, or being told in a very loud voice, “Kurang ajar!” meaning, “you don’t have any manners.” From my perspective, this is punishment, but interviews at that point in time were time limited, so a clearer description of the teachers’ views of these sorts of punishments could not be ascertained.

The discrepancies in teacher and principal perceptions of the elements of CRE that include cooperative learning, disciplining with non-coercive measures through programs that teach emotional intelligence, and student-centered education seemed to show that CRE would be difficult to introduce without further clarification of terms and ideas. Overall, the respondents were very forthcoming and their answers led to further questions.
The Training of Trainer Workshops in CRE-2003

In 2003, I played a leading role in developing and conducting four workshops introducing CL and NCCM to a group of 74 educational professionals heeding much of the advice given by the Honeyman and Cheldelin (2002) article. The group consisted of Teacher Education professors, university students, primary, middle, and secondary school teachers and school administrators. In cooperation with the Center for Research on Intergroup Relations and Conflict Resolution (CERIC) at the University of Indonesia and the Southeast Asian Studies Program (SEAS) at Ohio University, I was able to broaden my understanding of the challenges that face educators in Indonesia and begin to develop professional relationships with many of the participants for future study. The workshops comprised one section of a multi-disciplinary grant for the training of trainers in conflict resolution which was funded by the U. S. Department of State.

Apparent from the start was that the student-centered pedagogy of conflict resolution education (CRE) would present significant challenges for Indonesian teachers used to working in traditional classrooms with an authoritarian structure (Dardjowidjojo, 2001). However, my experiences working with many Indonesian teachers for over four years, as well as my experiences with Indonesian educators in the CRE workshops, contrast with much of the negative critiques of teachers in earlier studies (i.e., Bjork, 2000; Dardjowidjojo, 2001; Nielsen, 1998; Purwadi & Muljoatmodjo, 2000).

The workshops took place in East Java, South Sumatra, and Southeast Kalimantan during the two semester breaks in 2003. Although there was a healthy amount of criticism that echoed much of the same concerns that emerged in the interviews, many of
the professors, teachers, and administrators have since introduced a few of the elements with some success and have attested to this in subsequent workshops.

In the workshops on CRE, Indonesian and American trainers worked together in presenting the theory and teaching of CRE. Discussion focused on the principles of CRE and how they differ or complement traditional teaching methods used in Indonesia. Particular emphasis was placed on the ways that CL differs from the unstructured group work of CBSA. The presenters showed participants how CL would support the national directive for a competency-based curriculum, known in Indonesia as KBK. An added benefit to using Indonesian professionals already adept at using various elements of CRE such as teaching through cooperative learning, teaching anger management, and managing bullying was that they had begun to see the overarching principles behind CRE. For instance, our cooperative learning expert, Dr. Lie (pronounced Lee), became very interested in CRE and pursued more research in the areas of peer mediation and non-coercive classroom management procedures and began to disseminate information on these elements in addition to cooperative learning. She later incorporated CRE elements of these workshops in her understanding and efforts to promote democratic education.

In addition to receiving direct instruction on cooperative learning, in every workshop, CL groups were used to explore all the topics and to give participants experience in cooperative learning. Sessions were conducted on NCCM, analyzing conflict using conflict framing, bullying, alternative assessments, rubric creation, and peer mediation (Noel, Shoemake, & Hale, 2006). Analysis of communication skills and
what constitutes effective communication in the context of Indonesia was planned to be embedded throughout the sessions. However sessions almost always focused on the how-to skills, leaving out the needed in-depth analysis of communication and the shift that CRE as well as CL and NCCM requires. Interspersed throughout the four workshops were processing sessions. After selected group exercises, the participants analyzed the communication skills used in the groups and discussed how group work could be structured to teach effective communication skills. These often were too short to be really effective.

Yet, the four workshops did establish the direction of this study. It was very apparent after the trainings were all completed that, before one could even begin to address the issues of dissemination of CRE, one must first target the two main supporting teaching methods of CL and NCCM. The workshops made it apparent that these two innovations were problematic. However the workshops were not a useless exercise. Many useful insights emerged throughout the sessions in different areas of CRE.

During a session on specific CL techniques, we found participants were excited about implementing these strategies in their classrooms. During the exercises, attention was called to the fact that engagement in the activity was not a quiet process and that effective learning environments can be noisy, leading the common bystander to possibly incorrectly conclude that the classroom was disorganized or out-of-control.

The most difficult concept for participants in the CRE workshops to appreciate were the sessions on non-coercive classroom management (NCCM), a classroom management approach that involves students in rule-making and deciding on
consequences associated with infractions of rules. To counter the view that teachers lose authority when they switch to more facilitative roles (Dardjowidjojo, 2001), participants were assured that providing students more choice did not undermine a teacher’s authority. Group activities encouraged teachers to ask students meeting in small groups to draw up a set of classroom rules and then have the class debate different rules and come to a consensus on rules. Students could also be asked to recommend consequences for particular infractions.

During the discussion, the teacher’s authority was re-defined as managing groups, facilitating communication, and knowing the content well enough to present it in different ways, which interestingly enough echoes Friere’s (2000) discussion of teacher authority. Trainers suggested that allowing student participation in making classroom rules and deciding on consequences was a strategy for teaching responsibility. At the same time, teachers are freed from being solely responsible for enforcing discipline and can model authoritative leadership. However, when exercises were conducted where different groups selected one teacher’s classroom rules to analyze and re-write in order to establish rules more in line with meeting students’ basic needs, none of the original rules changed. Instead of deleting or limiting the pre-existing rules, they devoted time only to explaining why all of the rules were needed. Attempts at raising critical questions about “no gum chewing” types of rules resulted in teachers spending time explaining how this rule helps to insure clean classrooms and that clean classrooms were a way of showing respect to everyone in the classroom and empathy to others’ needs for cleanliness. Encouraging teachers to develop five rules general enough for teachers and students to
use to create dialogues about responsible behavior and perspective taking was extremely difficult.

As mentioned above workshop time was always too limited to move participants through discussions and brainstorming of specific pre-existing rules to a more democratic process where teachers led dialogues by posing scenarios and questions to students. Similar to other sessions, more time would give the whole group the ability to dialogue about ways in which classroom rules can promote democratic versus autocratic attitudes. At that point, it was not possible to say with any certainty that the impossibility of getting past the specifics to generalized rule setting was due to a societal or just traditional classroom cultural barrier. More time would have provided space for a more in-depth discussion about which basic rules are needed for a constructive, safe classroom and which ones are more for a teacher’s sense of control, which would allow cultural differences to be highlighted and discussed.

Sessions on conflict framing led to exercises in which participants attempted to identify effective versus ineffective communication. It was interesting that the analysis of communication skills showed some Hawthorne effect. For instance, groups listed maintaining eye-contact as an important communication device. To introduce the idea of statuses, participants were asked if maintaining eye contact would be considered appropriate if the two individuals in conversation were from markedly different social status or ages. All stated it would not be appropriate. After further questioning, they clarified that maintaining eye-contact would be appropriate only if the individuals were
equal in status and age. Other questions showed that gender and several other contextual conditions would also influence the way individuals communicate with one another.

This was a very important point to consider when doing future research in Indonesia. Whatever method utilized for further research must be flexible enough to deviate from a close-ended question method of interviewing to provide deeper understanding for the researcher as well as for the participants. This idea was further cemented after reading Bjork’s (2000) dissertation and the emphasis placed on the phenomenon of “Rhetorical Commitment” to ideas, something that could also be a case of rhetorical comprehension.

As with all workshop trainings, there was not enough time to fully map what would be considered appropriate communication skills within an Indonesian context. Limited time hindered the analysis of these skills. It is imperative that when educators are given CRE directives, such as the importance of teaching communication skills, they need to go another step and analyze how these skills are expressed in their culture and how selected skills can be adapted. Though analysis was touched on in each session, by providing participants with content information and limited authentic practice with the content, the analysis and dialogue portion was often abbreviated and left participants with only an initial understanding of this stage. The participants left with a short list of critical questions to answer on their own with their colleagues. However, this type of activity without follow-up might be beneficial only for the most motivated participants.

In the final workshop, a session was added on alternative assessment and grading procedures. Trainers demonstrated how a class could be involved in developing criteria
for assessing and grading student work by co-creating rubrics. Teachers were encouraged to keep examples of superior student work and below average work to use in developing rubrics. Participants found these ideas interesting, but were uncertain how to use them in their classrooms. The idea that rubric evaluation was new to most of the participants pointed to questions concerning how students were guided through project work and evaluated.

At the request of the participants, peer mediation was briefly covered in the fourth workshop. It was apparent after the first training that specific training in mediation could not occur without more training and work in just conflict analysis, NCCM, CL techniques. However once mediation was introduced, participants expressed interest in learning more about the program and receiving more training. They especially liked the idea of sending disputants to peer mediation so that problems with peers are addressed outside the classroom, and that students would “solve their own problems.” Participants watched a mediation role-play and discussed necessary skills for mediation and instances when peer mediation might be appropriate. Though the interest was genuine, it left questions as to the reason for the interest. Was the interest in teaching conflict resolution skills or in lessening the teacher load and responsibility? Overall, the time planning, training, and working with Indonesian counterparts helped to narrow and direct readings and questions for future research. In addition, it provided a pool of teacher educators as possible research informants.
A Critical Ethnography in East Java

I returned to Indonesia in October 2004 as a Fulbright Scholar to begin the present study—a critical ethnography. Following Carspecken’s (1996) suggestions, I conducted a five-staged, critical ethnography until February 2008. Over the period of 40 months in teacher education departments and schools in East Java, the research included passive and participatory observations, individual and focus group interviews, and surveys with over 200 university students in five sites in East Java. (See appendix A for the data collection timeline.).

After ten months as a Fulbright scholar, I obtained a position as a teacher in two institutions connected with the study’s primary informant—Dr. Anita Lie. Part of my teaching took place at Dr. Lie’s university [CUS] in Surabaya, and part at a private, primary school [PES] in Surabaya where she had helped to create and implement the school curriculum. At these sites in 2005-2007, I team-taught with university professors in an English teacher education department, and with K-3rd grade teachers at a private elementary school. These experiences provided me with an opportunity to clarify information gleaned during the first 10 months as an observer and allowed me to complete stages four and five of the analysis.

Over the 40 months in the field, various ethnographic tools were employed, including observations, both participatory and non-participatory, and individual and focus group interviews. A personal journal and field notes were also kept, in addition to archived conversational notes, institutional documents, participant publications, and macrolevel news items.
In the following sections, the course of the ethnography will be outlined, along with the specific tools used in each of the stages and the procedures employed to analyze the data. First, a brief description of the informants and the sites where they live and work is provided.

*Preliminary Steps: Choosing the Social Site*

By October 2004, many of Carspecken’s (1996) preliminary steps had been completed. A general social site, teacher education departments in East Java, was chosen. University professors training middle and high school teachers were specifically targeted. Inquiry was focused on two specific elements of CRE, cooperative learning and non-coercive classroom management procedures. Initial central questions were created that, as Carspecken noted, “…should be general, broad, comprehensive, and flexible” (p. 41). I also continued to explore and note my own “value orientations.” The following steps were completed during the first two months in the field.

With the support of the Center for Research on Intergroup Relations and Conflict Resolution (CERIC), which has centers across Indonesia, and the American Indonesian Exchange Foundation (AMINEF), the organization in charge of Fulbright programs, I sought entry into the country and the universities in Indonesia. As previously mentioned, the 2003 CRE workshops had 74 participants. At that time, the participants were chosen by the first local sponsor, the University of Airlangga using criteria based on personal knowledge of a few educators involved in educational reform and through a series of letters of request sent to various education facilities and departments in the East Java province. A select few were chosen by CERIC from other provinces based on the same
criteria. Workshops held in 2003 and the three other workshops conducted in different areas in Indonesia yielded a total of 74 educational professionals trained in CRE. From this group, I targeted five professors who had shown the most enthusiasm during the workshops, and who had taken the initiative to disseminate CRE material in their home sites, as well as an Indonesian professor who was a local expert on Cooperative Learning. Three of these individuals worked in East Java at universities of teacher education and three others were from three separate islands and regions in Indonesia.

Through repeated conversations, I was able to build professional relationships with these professors and began to focus on their ability to be opinion leaders. From the original six, I chose two primary informants with an extensive background in teaching. Both held positions of power, showed signs of being opinion leaders, and were themselves part of minority ethnic groups.

My selection was guided by Rogers (1995) and his recommendation to choose people for the sake of diffusion of innovations. He noted, “Homophily is the degree to which a pair of individuals who communicate are similar” (p. 286). Heterophily then is the opposite, and both have a direct impact on the effectiveness and rate of innovation adoption in particular societies and cultures. He also stressed the importance of choosing informants by analyzing their potential as opinion leaders and change agents. Choosing leaders who are most similar to the majority of followers might promote more effective communication and quicken the rate of adoption, but similarity also has the ability to limit adoption of the innovation to the greater sphere of society especially in a multicultural state and often “…cause new ideas to spread horizontally, rather than
vertically, within a system” (p. 288). This is especially applicable when one looks at the hierarchical status positions that exist in Indonesian society that cut across gender, ethnic and religious lines. With this in mind, the choice of having two primary informants from a minority group seemed very appropriate for this study.

The Primary Informants

My first primary informant was Dr. Lie who was located in the provincial capital. She is an educational curriculum consultant and adjunct professor in English Teacher Education at one of the large Christian universities in Surabaya (CUS). She has a master’s degree in English from Indonesia and an Ed.D. in curriculum and instruction from the U.S. My initial professional contact with her was in the 2003 CRE workshops where she volunteered to present sessions on cooperative learning. Having published a book on the topic, her role as a local expert was vital to the success of the original workshops. Her involvement in the workshops caused her to become genuinely interested in other aspects of CRE. Additional interests included feminist and minority literature, democratic education, and education reform. She is a respected Indonesian Education Specialist and also is a member of the East Java Department of Education. Her ethnic identity is Indonesian-Chinese. She would be described as peranakan according to Suryadinata’s (1992) work since she does not speak any of the Chinese dialects and identifies herself as Indonesian.

My second primary informant was Professor Arjuna, chair of the Department of Social Studies Education in one of the oldest State Teacher’s Universities in Indonesia (EJSU). He is a professor of social studies education for middle and high school teachers.
He has a master’s degree in history, 12 years of teaching experience at the university level, and over 6 years in middle and secondary schools. In addition to chairing a department and teaching at EJSU, he also teaches civics at another leading state university and is often involved in additional teacher training workshops. His primary research interests are in modern Indonesian history and teacher training, especially in contextual learning. Recently, he has been especially interested in using the jigsaw method of cooperative learning.

I met him at the first CRE workshop in 2003, and had an opportunity to collaborate with him for an on-site dissemination workshop later in 2003. This opportunity allowed me to visit his site and meet several of his colleagues. This particular participant’s interest in the potential for CRE at his university remained high. Another benefit is that he also seemed to be quite influential with his colleagues and students, a fact that suggests an even better potential for future diffusion (Bandura, 1986; Bolman & Deal, 2003). Professor Arjuna is originally from another island and is part of one of the ethnic minorities that make up the Indonesian citizenry.

The Secondary Informants

The first set of secondary informants consisted of the other education professors and instructors who were collaborators with my primary informants. They included colleagues within teacher education departments, deans, and chairs of departments.

The second set of secondary informants was a group of education professionals at a newly established private school where Dr. Lie was a curriculum consultant and teacher trainer. At this site, I worked closely with the two principals and as a participant observer.
I team taught TESOL classes with a group of kindergarten, first, second, and third grade teachers and acted as a special education inclusion teacher for a small group of students with disabilities mainstreamed into general education classes. A majority of these teachers were graduates from Dr. Lie’s university’s English department.

The third set of secondary informants was a small group of professors connected with the opening of a regional CERIC center. This center was located at another state university (STEJ) in one of the most eastern regencies in East Java. At this site, I reconnected with a Social Studies Education professor from the 2003 CRE workshops and with a small group of CERIC affiliates who teach in the Arts and Science department at STEJ. During my time at their site, I had the opportunity to meet and collaborate with representatives from other CERIC centers located in Jakarta in West Java, Banjarmasin in Southeast Kalimantan and Manado in North Sulewesi. For a period of about four weeks stretched over four months, we conducted two other CRE sessions and workshops as part of the founding of a new CERIC center there.

A final set of tertiary informants were education professionals with a leading Islamic institute located in West Jakarta, as well as a professionals leading international education aid agencies. With this group, I actively participated in the creation of two extra-curricular teaching modules on civic education and peer mediation for junior high students. Though limited in duration, this experience provided useful background data for my ethnography at the primary sites and provided insights into some of the macro-level education systems in Indonesia.
With permission of the primary informants, I observed their classes, surveyed, and interviewed their students, and engaged in many conversations and collaborative projects with them over the course of one semester in order to conduct a critical ethnography of their classrooms. Therefore, the choice of site followed the choice of informants. However, as the next section indicates, gaining entry was still problematic, leading to choosing Dr. Lie’s site as the primary site.

_Gaining Entry_

Four months before arriving in East Java and during my first month in Indonesia, I tried to make contact with the six targeted informants. After one month, I had succeeded in only reaching my two primary informants. Both Dr. Lie and Professor Arjuna helped me gain entry into two of the teacher education programs in East Java. The American Indonesian Exchange Foundation (AMINEF) and CERIC assisted me in getting permission to do research in Indonesia and obtaining a research visa through the Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI). Having to accomplish this without their assistance is unimaginable. Gaining official permission is a process that not only requires a plethora of forms and permission letters to be completed in triplicate and processed, but also requires visits to three separate federal agencies, two immigration offices, and three police and security facilities. This was all completed in one month while trying to reconnect with informants in the field. Most of the field institutions do not use e-mail or the Internet on a regular basis. Added to this, my arrival coincided with the Holy month of Ramadan, just before the break that accompanies this holiday.
Initially, I had planned to at least visit several other sites in East Java and in two other islands in Indonesia to complete a few short observations and informational interviews. However, the two months that it took to gain permits, make contact with my two primary informants, and begin visiting their sites made it clear that time would not allow for secondary site visits. In addition, the Ramadan holiday and Christmas breaks left only 4 weeks to observe classes, with many beginning reviews for end of the semester examinations. Although I felt the other sites would have given my study more breadth, I decided that including them would affect the depth of research in the primary site. Instead, I elected to branch out within the departments of my primary informants and gather more in-depth information about the microsystems they inhabited. This led to the secondary sites and secondary informants.

**The Choice of Two Primary Sites**

Both of the primary informants’ sites were located in East Java. East Java lies just under the equator and has a tropical moist climate with about six months of monsoon rains and six months of hot and humid weather with no rain, often referred to as the dry season. Year round there is about 12 hours of sunlight and 12 hours of night which has a slowing effect on one’s perception of time and change. The province of East Java has a population of approximately 34 million people. It is divided into 29 regencies with a great deal of variation in landscape and inhabitants.

The majority of the people in East Java are Javanese and Muslim, but other major minority groups include the Madurese, the Tengger people in and around Bromo, the Samin, the Using, and a large variety of ethnic Chinese, Indians, and Arabs. One can find
all five recognized religions and their places of worship dotted throughout East Java cities, villages, and countryside. East Java is also known for their large population of *kedjawen* adherents so memorably captured by Geertz (1960) and Anderson (1996). East Java has a significant place in Indonesian history that includes being the host to three of the most famous kingdoms of Indonesia’s past—the Singhasari and the Majapahit kingdoms, and the Islamic state of Mataram.

Selecting East Java and the informants from institutions there was not just incidental or based on convenience. My familiarity with the region and cross-cultural skills that would enhance my ability at sensemaking in this part of the archipelago of over 13,000 islands are the main reasons I chose this area to base the research. East Java is also a magnet for students across the Indonesian Archipelago. Having a long history of educational institutions in smaller towns, East Java attracts many students who come from rural places around Indonesia and who either stay with distant relatives, or live in boarding houses to obtain what they believe is a better education.

The cost of living in East Java is much cheaper than in larger urban centers in West Java. And because of the size of many of the towns, East Java often boastsa safer environment. Though the provincial capital is the second largest city in Indonesia, this city is also much cheaper than Jakarta. Though ten months seems a long time, after almost 9 years of contact and travel in East Java, I often feel like a stranger and continually discover new places and understandings. I am most familiar with the dialect in East Java in the Surabaya region. A dialect local people call “bahasa Soroboyo” which also helped me in gaining insight and understanding to stances of the participants. The
time required to map a new location would have required an even lengthier period to gain entry which would have slowed an already slow and expensive process of conducting a critical ethnography.

Professor Arjuna’s site, EJSU, is located in a medium-size town in East Java about 60 kilometers away from the provincial capital. It is a regional capital and has a population of approximately 750,000 people. The town itself is especially known for its abundance of educational institutions. Many students from all over Indonesia go to this town to live and attend one of the many secondary schools, colleges and universities located in and around the city.

Since the early 1950s EJSU has a history of providing teacher education training. The university as a whole is a midsize school that consists of six colleges with a primary focus of producing educators, although most programs offer a non-education degree. However, the numbers of students in the education programs outsize those in the non-education programs. It has a large Faculty of Letters/Arts department that offers 11 undergraduate programs and one associate/diploma program. Of the 12 programs, seven are education degrees including Indonesian Language and Literature Education, English Education, Foreign Language Arabic Education, German Education, Fine Art Education, Performing Arts (Dance) Education, and History Education. Although the university has an Education faculty/college with degrees in Guidance and Counseling, Educational Technology, Informal In-Community Education, Educational Administration, Elementary School Teacher Education, Sport and Health Education, Civics Education, Pre-School Teacher Education, Psychology, and Sport Science. I chose the History department in the
Faculty of Letters for several reasons. First, in my review of the literature, a notion emerged that active learning strategies had been more readily adopted in Indonesian elementary classrooms than in middle and secondary programs. Second, large encompassing international programs have already researched and provided assistance to elementary educators (in fact the Education department had already partnered a project with Ohio State University). Third, my own teaching experience at Ohio University has shown me the challenge of working with future secondary educators whose primary experiences are in course content classes that generally utilize traditional expository teaching methods, and finally, none of the attendees in the CRE 2003 workshops were from the education faculty.

According to administrators, this particular university is mainly composed of Javanese and Madurese students from the lower-middle class of the socio-economic continuum. However, during my time there, I spoke with students from several different islands across Indonesia. There are nearly 300 students in the social studies department where they receive courses in social studies, curriculum development, and pedagogy. The student population is overwhelmingly Muslim, but there are a few students from other religions.

I observed classes during two semesters of the 2004-2005 school year. However due to a slow start in gaining entry, I did not begin to completely embed myself until the beginning of the second semester in January 2005. Since my second research site was in the capital, I would spend four days in the region followed by three days in the capital. This broke up my momentum and left me feeling that I was only scratching the surface of
EJSU. Another confounding factor was that the dialect of the region was significantly different, making understanding more difficult and leaving more room for possible misinterpretation. I continued going back and forth to EJSU until May, but in March, I started going less frequently and began concentrating more on Dr. Lie’s site.

Dr. Lie’s site, the Christian University (CUS), is located in the provincial capital in East Java, the second largest city in Indonesia. Though it is a very large city, it has retained a very town-like appearance. It has few high-rise apartments or towering office buildings. Despite it being the largest commercial port with over 4 million people, it is more cosmopolitan than the capital of Indonesia--Jakarta. It is a very old city and is becoming a megapolis with little indication of any boundaries between Surabaya and the neighboring towns of Sidoarjo or Gresik.

The Christian University (CUS) offered another perspective on teacher education. Dr. Lie teaches in the English education department. The student body is primarily Indonesian-Chinese, but other ethnic groups from East Java are in attendance. Most students come from the lower to upper middle class of the socio-economic continuum. The term “Christian” is used in a general sense, not to be translated in the Indonesian sense of Protestant Christians. The ethnography concentrated on Dr. Lie and the English Department at this site where another instructor who attended the original CRE workshop taught.

At CUS, I engaged in a number of dialogues with Dr. Lie and her colleagues about teaching practices and their understanding of CRE curricular elements. I observed
Dr. Lie’s courses from February 2005 until June 2005 and followed her to other sites where she conducted consultations and trainings.

There are nearly 500 students in the English education department. Like EJSU, students from around Indonesia attend school here. The majority of students are Catholic and from various ethnic Chinese communities, but there is representation of Protestant, Hindu, Buddhist, and Muslim students. There is more ethnic diversity represented at CUS than at EJSU. After 10 months as a Fulbright scholar, I was accepted for a one-year contract in the teacher education department where I teamed with 11 other professors and instructors until October 2006. It was during this period that the most in-depth data was collected and meanings made.

A few reasons made this site the most appropriate choice as my primary site for this ethnography. Primarily among those reasons was a language issue. Not only was English the means of communication between students and teachers, but the language spoken in around the campus was in the Indonesian dialect with which I was most familiar. As a region with a distinct dialect, there are some distinct paralinguistic codes of conduct that were also familiar to me.

Two Secondary Sites

The main informants and host institution led me to two secondary sites: a private primary program (PES) in the provincial capital and STEJ University in a far eastern region of East Java. Both of these sites were used to triangulate information gleaned from the primary sites that allowed me additional settings to view my primary informants.
Dr. Lie’s consultancy with the primary school offered me views of her teaching and training philosophy as it is translated from the university setting to the private school system. While participating as a TESOL team teacher in 2005-2006, I was able to embed myself as a researcher and a colleague and have enough time for more empathy and understanding to emerge as I worked along side educators and principals as they tried to implement national standards and student-oriented pedagogy.

At the workshop in STEJ, I was able to observe and attend additional presentations by Professor Arjuna as he taught other teacher education professors as well as professors and students of various fields within arts and sciences from other institutions of higher learning. This provided me with insights into his own understandings of CL and NCCM. I was particularly interested in which aspects he felt were most important to diffuse and the ways in which he adapted CL and NCCM to his own context. These out-of-town trainings also provided a space and time for him to discuss and ask more in-depth questions and dialogue with me and others who were interested in CRE.

*Stage One: Developing the Primary Record*

The primary record is a culmination of over six months of observations in two separate teacher education institutions in East Java. This consists of 29 observations at EJSU and seven observations at CUS. Following Carspecken’s (1996) suggestion, the first stage is one of passive observation and the creation of a primary record written using thick description.
I started to build what he calls the “primary record” in November 2004. In two days, Mr. Arjuna was able to arrange official visits and requests to do research with the dean of his college and the rector of the university. I began observing classes in his department the following week. During this stage, I noted in thick description all that was seen and heard in Mr. Arjuna’s classes and three of his fellow lecturers in addition to interactions that occurred outside of class.

I shadowed Mr. Arjuna in and around the school for at little over three weeks, interrupted only by the Christmas holidays. After the holidays, the students began studying for finals, and it was not until the second week of February that school was back in session to resume classroom observations.

Due to delays in gaining entry, and the ensuing holidays, I was only able to complete eight classroom observations and only one in Mr. Arjuna’s class. I did not observe at the EJSU site until the end of November, again being interrupted by school holidays. Another unanticipated complication was that professors teach 3 to 4 separate classes a week, meaning that each class only meets once a week. Since Mr. Arjuna is also the chair of his department, his class load was only two courses per semester, with only one meeting during the portion of the week I was at his site.

Carspecken (1996) suggested that one, “… continue with stage one until you find yourself recording the same basic routines over and over again” (p. 49). By December, I still had not achieved this level of satiation. I did conduct a total of 16 university observations in different settings in the form of meetings between administration and
students, faculty meetings, student seminar proposal meetings, and informal teacher meetings in the department office.

As a result, I decided to extend the first stage into the next semester. I observed in Mr. Arjuna and three of his colleagues’ classes until May 2005, completing 10 formal class observations with five occurring during Mr. Arjuna’s classes. During the second semester, I observed two of Mr. Arjuna’s colleagues, conducted two informal observations in the office setting, and performed a participatory observation during a presentation I was asked to make on competency-based education.

I did not begin to observe at the second primary site with Dr. Lie at CUS until the start of a new semester during the first week of February 2005. Over the course of three months, I performed six passive observations of Dr. Lie’s class and one participatory observation after she requested I lead a session about Conflict Resolution Education.

CUS is on a different schedule with classes ending in late November, so it was practical to wait until the beginning of the new semester which started for them at the end of January to begin a primary record at CUS. As previously mentioned, Dr. Lie only teaches one class at CUS and during the second semester taught Early Childhood Education. Although I didn’t begin to observe her university class until the first week of February 2005, I was able to collect field and journal notes on her work at a private primary school in January.

At the end of April, I also went to STEJ, a third university in East Java. I made the necessary arrangements to return at the end of May for two days to conduct two more
observations in the social studies teacher education facility and survey two classes of undergraduate students.

During the first stage at the two primary sites, the normal routine was recorded, in addition to the culture of the school, the communication patterns, and any evidence of CRE elements. During this period, written records were kept of the events using thick description. During classroom observation periods, notes on what was seen and heard were recorded on one side of the page of the journal with commentary notes made on the other. This is in line with Carspecken’s (1996) suggestion of making “low-inference vocabulary” notes either within the primary record or in the field journal (p. 89). Carspecken stated that these notes should be written at the time in order to get at the “normative-evaluative and subjective-referenced connotations” that occur at the time of recording (p. 89). These notes were elaborated upon in the second stage of reconstructive analysis. The reconstructive notes were written in a style different from the primary record to differentiate between observations and information considered “multiple access” versus “privileged access” which is how the researcher can keep true to the data and build trustworthiness by “differentiating between ontological categories” (p. 20).

Carspecken (1996) stated “Different kinds of truth claims (subjective, objective, normative-evaluative) require different kinds of support to win the consent of others” (p. 20). The first stage of passive observation is thought to be the most objective, but still requires several techniques that “support objective validity claims” (p. 88-89). As a result, I used peer debriefings and a prolonged engagement in the field to discourage a Hawthorne effect.
In addition to field notes, I drew diagrams and seating patterns in the primary record to detail the different physical structures, seating arrangements, and conditions that could be referred to during different stages of the analysis. In addition to the primary record of passive observations, an electronic journal of personal thoughts about what I was feeling and sensing during the time was kept. This included all e-mails sent to my family and reviewing and saving the messages that detailed the progress of my research and the personal episodes I faced. These notes and thoughts triangulated with impressions built from reading over the primary record and making connections to changes in my own understanding during the time I spent in the field.

I was very careful to collect and save any notable news items about the political and social conditions that occurred during my time there as well as collecting and archiving any institutional material given to me by my informants about their programs, educational initiatives, classroom syllabi, and student documents such as proposals, classroom presentations, and university newsletters. These items were used in the triangulation process at different stages in the process for the purpose of formulating better interview questions or making comparisons with observational records.

During the observation period, I intended to locate graduate students to work as peer debriefers. Unfortunately, I was unable to do this. Instead I relied on a key informant to recommend a graduate student to assist with the transcription and translation of interviews. Besides a salary, the student was offered help with her own research paper. She was unable to accompany me on interviews, and I had to rely on the main informants as debriefers for my own impressions gathered during interviews and analysis.
Surveys were another form of information gathering utilized. During the course of the observations, the central questions were narrowed and put into the form of a survey to gain student insights and to develop more meaningful focus group questions. (See appendix B and C for the survey.) With the help of the primary and secondary informants, survey questions were translated from English into Indonesian and the survey was piloted.

Students in the classes I observed were surveyed. In total, 153 students were surveyed between May and June 2005. Then after I further embedded myself by taking a position at CUS additional were also conducted. By February 2008, 259 surveys had been completed. The survey was composed of eleven semi-open-ended questions allowing students to include choices other than the predetermined ones created by the researcher.

Stage Two: Reconstructive Analysis

After a substantial amount of the primary data had been collected, or as Carspecken (1996) suggested, “[when] you find yourself recording the same basic routines over and over again,” I moved on to stage two (p. 40). Stage two is the initial coding phase. Carspecken suggested the primary documents, which at this point are the field notes, field journal, and any curricular and classroom documents that show the culture of the school and any CRE elements, be read over repeatedly in an attempt to start to discover patterns he calls “pragmatic horizons.”

After reading the documents, field notes, and survey results, the research begins to outline different “meaning fields” he defined as possible meanings for the actions and statements the research recorded (p. 95). As he stated, “you cannot know for certain what
an actor intended with her act, you cannot know for certain what impressions of meaning were received by those witnessing the act or directly addressed by the act, but you can specify possibilities” (p. 96). Therefore, as he suggested, reading over the observations began the analysis of some possible meanings coming through the data. This was done by not only looking at the speech, but noting gestures, and several possible understandings the participants came to during the observation periods.

My initial observation plans included both the interactions occurring during class and those occurring outside (e.g., on campus, in the teacher’s office, and community). I looked for interaction patterns between students and teachers, students and students, teachers and teachers, and interactions involving students, teachers, and administrators. All of these were grouped under general codes and triangulated with the document analyses of official university program documents. The patterns that emerged from the triangulation became the basis of the questions for the interviews and further observations in stage three, which Carspecken called “dialogical data generation,” that assisted in the development of the first round of semi-structured in-depth interviews.

*Stage Three: Interviewing*

During the observation period, there was some interview-like information noted in the primary record. Although stage two was not completely finished, enough had been completed for the most important questions to emerge. The intent of stage three was to implement a mixture of semi-structured and open interviews with individual professors and small groups at the university. (See appendix D for interview questions.) Before
beginning, I secured written or recorded permission after sharing the consent form with the participants. The consent also allowed for the audio recording of the interviews.

At both of the primary sites, I conducted focus group interviews with students. By March, informal discussions with both the primary informants were being held on a regular basis allowing for on-going data collection and note-taking. Three months later, formal in-depth interviews with Mr. Arjuna and several of his colleagues took place. The following month, I held another focus group interview with Mr. Arjuna and members from CERIC. In October 2003, a formal semi-structured in-depth interview with Dr. Lie ended the stage three interviews.

Utilizing observations, informal, and formal interactions with students and instructors permitted me to have the unique perspective of an insider, while remaining an outsider. For most Western researchers, especially white male researchers, the chance of ever becoming close enough to cross the barriers that centuries of colonial repression have placed between us and our informants is slim (Smith, 1999; Collins, 1996). Just our visual appearance might create problems, raise stereotypes, and set limits. But I pose that extended time in the field, creating relationships, and conducting participatory observations helped me to cross many of these barriers. However not all barriers could realistically be removed. So, as Carspecken (1996) suggested, this stage was an appropriate time to start member checks of not just the written records, but of some of the analysis. At this point, dialogue became part of the interviews with the primary informants. All interviews were transcribed, with most being translated into English by a graduate student from CUS. These were double checked for any vague areas in the
translation with the translator and at times with the informants if any confusion remained. The points of confusion were discussed and translated with the translator and informants as clearly as possible, as well as noted as a point of contention and included in interviews.

**Stage Four: Extrapolation to Systems Theory**

October 2005 signaled the beginning of stage four and continued for six months until the end of April 2006. Carspecken (1996) suggested stage four be used for “describing system relations” (p. 194). The researcher has already completed a full analysis of the microculture of the school setting and begins to draw connections between the observations, interviews, and documents with an eye to the types of relationships that exist and are maintained by the participants. Carspecken (1996) suggested “that three categories cover most conditions of action: the distribution of cultural milieu, economic relations, political relations” (p. 190). Using these categories helps to draw connections to larger social, economic, and political systems that affect the microsystem of the ethnography.

However, after more than ten months of data collection, it seemed as though meanings were just surfacing on my newly etched map. I still questioned whether my main informants had arrived at subtle understandings or a “rhetorical commitment” (Bjork, 2000) to CRE’s potential use with their students, their colleagues, and their nation’s schools.

At this point in time, with the need for employment looming, and not having the time or finances to apply for positions state-side, I began making inquiries into possible employment in Indonesia. Within five minutes of sending a text message to informants
and friends, one of the main informants responded, saying that, if I was willing, she could find me a part-time position at the university and international primary school I had used as research sites. She was able to negotiate contracts shared between the two sites which lasted until February 2008. Two days a week I worked as an instructor in the University Teacher Education English department and three days a week as a team teacher and teacher trainer at the international primary school. As a result, I was able to gain an insider view of the day-to-day struggles that teacher educators and teachers face in East Java, Indonesia. Though my teaching contracts allowed me to stay until February 2008, I only used the first six months’ experiences to help bring clarity to my map and provide a more in-depth understanding of the context of Indonesian educators’ lives and work. The additional time allowed me to complete a more detailed cartography of sensemaking regarding the use of elements of conflict resolution education in Indonesia. Working more fully as a participant observer, and listening to what other professors, their colleagues, students, and institutions did, helped me to draw a more detailed context for analysis and conclusions.

During the first six months at the university in Surabaya, I continued to keep a field journal. I also re-read the transcripts and the primary record to identify emerging patterns and began to write the analysis. I also met with the primary informants to discuss the analysis and gather and record their opinion. Over the following two years, instead of moving in a linear fashion, I would often go back to stage one observations of my co-teachers, move to stage two interviews and then go on to more macrosystem analysis. It
was impossible to work in a linear fashion. At times, as trust was built with my co-teachers, I found myself moving into stage five conversations.

**Stage Five: The Critical Dialogue**

Stage five examines the findings of stage four and attempts to explain them in terms of “macrolevel social theories” (Carspecken, 1996, p. 202). Carspecken suggested that member checks be made and more in-depth critical dialogue with participants occur. Critical discussions were held in the summer of 2005 with the primary EJSU informant and with other CERIC participants and trainers. The conversations focused on the findings and interpretations of those findings, and were recorded, transcribed, and translated. And, as mentioned in the previous section, dialogues occurred often with the CUS teachers while planning and reflecting on classes we co-taught. During the last two months of data collection in 2008, final interviews were held with key informants from CUS and PES where the preliminary analysis was shared and dialogues were noted in field notes and concurrent e-mails. Dr. Lie was given the final analysis and provided feedback which was noted and incorporated in the final draft. These not only increased the trustworthiness of observations, interviews, and conversations that were done throughout the period of time in the field, but also helped to create the “fusion of horizons” that Carspecken considered an ideal result (p. 206).

Being a teacher educator helped me establish a professional partnership with professors and teachers in Indonesia and helped me gain entry as an observer and often as “participant researcher” (Glesne, 1999; Patton, 2002). During times when I acted as a passive observer, my understanding was limited to the languages of English and
Indonesian. Yet, frequently speakers in East Java, whether they were instructing in Indonesian or English, often use Javanese and other even more local dialects. This presented challenges during data collection and analysis. With this in mind, passive observations were focused on the topology of the communication being used and the form of questions used. I also focused on the paralinguistic stances taken by the professors and their students and described how this affected the direction of communication between the students and their professors.

In order to be in a situation that allowed me to have a more meaningful experience, my role as a participant researcher became one in which I team-taught to varying degrees at the university and early childhood levels. Participant research was mainly conducted in English or Indonesian and allowed me the time and control to minimize language drift. If unfamiliar Javanese terms were used, I could directly question their meaning in my attempt to sense make.

My interviews and passive observations remained challenging. In order to avoid misquoting and to minimize the cross-cultural rift, I employed two kinds of member checks and participant verification procedures. One was to hire a Indonesian graduate student fluent in Javanese to transcribe and with whom I could discuss the observation and interview tapes that I chose for my study. The other was doing stage five analysis reviews with primary informants. The analysis and conclusion sections of this study reveal the discrepancies in understanding and sensemaking that occurred and remain. It was these final exit interviews where I felt that I came close to the critical ethnographer’s goal of making research a democratic procedure and helped encourage the most
democratic dialogues throughout the time period of the study. As an outsider, these member checks and dialogues were also important in assisting me to cross the cultural barriers to understanding.

*Structuring the Final Analysis*

As mentioned in Chapter One, this study was not designed as an inquiry into diffusion theory. However, Rogers’ (1995) discussion of the diffusion of innovations and conceptual model of the “Innovation-Decision Process” is a useful template to organize the analysis of CRE’s primary elements of Cooperative Learning (CL) and Non-coercive Classroom Management (NCCM) in an Indonesian context. In the following chapter, the data is organized by the first four stages of Rogers’ model. The stages utilized are Knowledge, Persuasion, Decision, and Implementation. Although the stages suggest a linear approach to adoption of any particular innovation, the following analysis is not based on a linear collection of data. Similar to a learning cycle, the following analysis was based on periods of data collecting loops that required me to return to critical reflection of observations in order to better understand some of the information gleaned from interviews as well as conversations which took place over the three years I spent as a researcher and team teacher in Indonesia. Passive observations of the implementation stage led to further investigation of the knowledge and persuasion stages.

Rogers (1995) suggested the central intellectual conflict in the Knowledge stage for the so-called “decision unit,” or in the context of this study, the educator is to answer three important questions about the innovation—“What is the innovation?, How does it work?, and Why does it work?” (p. 165). As Rogers explained, these key questions, that
each individual or group must contemplate, relate to three areas of ontological and epistemological searchings. He named them as “awareness-knowledge, how-to knowledge, [and] principles knowledge” (p. 165-166). In the next chapter, the informants’ understanding of these epistemological and ontological questions about the primary elements of CRE are presented. The interviews and conversations make up the primary data set, but supporting archival material composed by the informants provided additional insight. Field notes and observations triangulated with these sources, to confirm or question the interpretations as well as to describe an emerging phenomena being termed “rhetorical comprehension.”

Persuasion follows the knowledge section. Rogers (1995) described this stage as the decision maker’s “feeling” of the innovation’s feasibility and usefulness (p. 168). In the next chapter, data included in this section presents how the informants talked about CL and NCCM in the context of their classrooms and within the prevailing education environments in which they worked. Again interviews and conversations were the most useful sources of data. However, the observations often contradicted what was being said—a characteristic that could either lend itself to support Bjork’s (2000) interpretation of a “rhetorical commitment” or this researcher’s view of rhetorical comprehension. Additional data collected from student surveys also helped to widen the perspective to include students’ feelings about the CL and NCCM.

Following persuasion is the Decision stage. In this stage Rogers (1995) referred to the point in time when decision-makers choose when and how much to use any particular innovation. He noted, “most individuals will not adopt an innovation without trying it
first on a probationary basis in order to determine its usefulness in their own situation” (p.171). Some of the data presented in the next chapter that falls into this section was gathered during participatory observations which were often completed as informants and I co-taught classes at the university and in an elementary school. However much of the data comes from times where I was designated the lead teacher using variations of CL and NCCM. During these times, the informants often stopped being team teachers and moved into more passive, on-looker roles. This too is in line with Rogers’ (1995) assertion of types of innovation trials done in this decision stage for, as he noted, “this ‘trial-by-others’ provides a kind of vicarious trial for an individual” (p.171). Throughout this section, data will be triangulated with data from reflective classroom notes, conversations, and class documents produced during this period. The triangulation provided a clearer picture of the microcosm of the primary informants’ classrooms and of their attitudes and decisions within the broader context of their cultural worlds in which they work and live.

The analysis ends with a description of the ways informants have implemented the elements of CRE. As Rogers (1995) noted “until the implementation stage, the innovation-decision process has been a strictly mental exercise” (p. 172). The pivotal data for this section presented in the next chapter comes from the reconstructed analysis of the passive observations triangulated with field notes and in-depth interviews conducted with the primary and secondary informants, as well as university students. This section reveals what Bandura (1986) has called the “synthesized” and the “functional equivalents” of the CRE elements targeted for this study (p. 158).
CHAPTER FOUR
The Analysis

Although this study was not designed as an inquiry into diffusion theory, Rogers’ (1995) conceptual model of the diffusion process was a useful framework for beginning to think about the data. Rogers posited that dissemination of any innovation progresses through five stages: Knowledge, Persuasion, Decision, Implementation, and Confirmation. In the following chapter, the data is organized in three sections, encompassing four of Rogers’ stages of the “Innovation-Decision Process” model: Knowledge, Persuasion, Decision, and Implementation. The data did not support two distinct sections for Implementation and Confirmation, as so little evidence was found of sustained implementation of either cooperative learning (CL) or non-coercive classroom management (NCCM) in any of the sites.

Within each stage, the data has been organized under themes that emerged uniquely from the data, rather than those suggested by Rogers (1995). In the Knowledge stage, the following themes surfaced—fear, obedience and control. Fear manifested in two main forms. First was a fear of the unknown that caused a sense of role confusion. This confusion was seen in the way that new regulations, meant to provide teachers more autonomy, created a sense of not having the luxury of following prescribed rules or regulations. This confusion related to uncertainties and role confusion which were linked to the traditional cultural values of status and identity. Closely related to feelings of role confusion were perceptions that the innovations conflicted with traditional standards of obedience and control.
Within the Persuasion stage, most data centered around a theme of cultural challenges with two specific sub-themes—barriers to implementation and bridges to implementation. Under each sub-theme, issues related to self-efficacy, unwanted consequences, and notions of feasibility were raised. Finally, the Decision/Implementation stage was comprised of six sub-themes which were connected to the struggle education professionals were facing in teaching from an authoritative stance. These six points of conflict were concentrated around the techniques of scaffolding, modeling learning, grouping, monitoring, providing feedback, and facilitating learning through critical questioning. All these sub-themes pointed to concerns about maintaining authority and understanding the teacher’s role as a facilitator.

Although the stages suggest a linear process, the following analysis was not based on a linear collection of data, but based on periods of data collecting loops that Carspecken (1996) suggested are necessary for critical reflection. Observations, informational conversations, surveys, document analyses and interviews were conducted and then revisited to gain further understanding of the information gleaned over the three years spent in the field as a researcher in Indonesia.

In each of the three sections, the voices of the informants are presented. Most of the views come from informants at the primary site, the Christian University of Surabaya [CUS]. Their insights provided much of the evidence for Rogers’ (1995) first stage, “Knowledge”. Additional examples of “knowledge of the key principles” of CL and NCCM were reflected in the voices of other informants from the East Java State University [EJSU] and the Private Elementary School [PES] in Surabaya, providing
support for or contrast with the information gathered in the primary setting of CUS. To begin, this analysis addresses the levels of participant knowledge of CL and NCCM.

**Knowledge**

“Students are more active in cooperative learning. They help each other. They have a shared goal to finish the task.”

(Male CUS instructor with over ten year’s experience. His response to the three important differences between cooperative learning and just group work.)

Before any innovation is implemented, knowledge about it must be obtained. Questioning what it is and is not helps to define an innovation and gives rise to differences in the definition. This exercise is especially important if questions are asked and answered cross-culturally about innovations that have not emerged from the local context. Rogers (1995) suggested the central intellectual conflict in the Knowledge stage for the so-called “decision unit,” or in the context of this study, the educator, is to answer questions about what the innovation is, how it works, and why it works (p. 165). As the so-called deciders answer these questions, their knowledge of the innovation is revealed. Each of the three questions corresponds to different levels of understanding. He termed these levels as “awareness-knowledge,” “how-to knowledge,” and “principles-knowledge” (p. 165-166). These levels correspond to epistemological and ontological understandings of the methods and theories that provide the foundation for the innovations.

For CL and NCCM techniques, the answers to what, how, and why ultimately support the purpose of education proposed by constructivist and humanistic theories.
which are bound to ideas of individualism. The informants’ understandings revealed their own personal aims of education which often times stood in contrast to those of CL and NCCM as well as some of the “functional equivalents” which Bandura (1986) stated were the possible products of cross-cultural diffusions (p. 158).

As previously noted, the pilot study showed a dissonance between Indonesian educators’ definitions of CL and NCCM, even at the awareness level. At that time definitions were primarily a simple comparison to a particular student-centered method known as *Cara Belajar Siswa Aktif* [CBSA] which is most often translated as “active student learning methods.” In the current study, such was not the case. Although their definitions of CL and NCCM were varied, most of the informants at CUS had a basic awareness of the innovations of CL. Most could discuss basic ideas and techniques emphasizing student-centered approaches. As for NCCM techniques, few had even an awareness level of knowledge, but after some conversations about NCCM, the innovation was equated to the general term of democratic classroom practices. However, the use of NCCM or democratic classroom practices was rarely observed at any of the sites (CUS, EJSU, or PES).

Interestingly, even with CL, the most familiar innovation, informants often left out specifics and few included the idea of interdependence, with the notable exception of the one informant whose quote appeared at the beginning of this section. Noticeably absent was the required shift of traditional classrooms with unilateral communication patterns to reciprocal communicative environments necessary for both CL and NCCM. Therefore, the depth of the participants’ how-to knowledge and principles knowledge
concerning these two innovations was questionable, leading to questions about the educators’ rhetorical comprehension. The exception was Dr. Lie.

Although no definitive answers emerged during observations as to what traditional values could be in conflict with to the adaptation and implementation of the primary elements of CRE, during workshop interviews and informal conversations some insights surfaced. One theme to emerge was that a culture of hierarchy where deference to superiors is problematic to reciprocal communication, directly impacting the learning processes and procedures engrained in the techniques of CL and NCCM. In interviews with teachers and students, a good student was described as one who listens well. Observations at least provided the physical appearance of this happening. In one interview with an EJSU student, I complemented her and her classes’ ability to sit still for their two or three hour courses with eyes focused on the teacher and pencils in hand, especially since it was not the custom to have any breaks. She stated that even though she looked as if she were listening, she often was not doing so. This deference impacted the ability to construct knowledge via intra- and inter-group learning for students and professors, and was not limited to age or experience, as both junior and senior lecturers exhibited this trait. In observations, it was clear that both levels of professors continued using low-level questioning and one-way communication patterns. Therefore, age did not seem to be a determining characteristic.

Both CL and NCCM require an environment where individual opinions can be asserted to be confronted and contested in a spirit of searching for answers. However, in a hierarchical system where expertise and authority are equated with age and status, the
expectations of both professors and students dictated who has the right to speak and who should speak, who is supposed to listen and how they should listen. If questioning is considered a sign of rudeness, CL and NCCM’s emphasis on questioning and brainstorming answers and solutions stand in direct contrast to a collectivistic culture that espouses muted emotional response, quiet acceptance, fatalistic passive resistance, and deference to one’s superiors.

Overall the data supported the existence of a dichotomy within participants’ beliefs about equality and hierarchical privileges that affected their ability to acknowledge that CL and NCCM could be directly opposed to the tradition of muted opposition and passive resistant to conflict and confrontation. Even after focused discussions on aspects of CL and NCCM, with strong reference materials in their native language, there remained an unwillingness to explore the paradox. Although Dr. Lie’s published works provided a clear summary of CL and NCCM as well as some useful techniques, the lack of theoretical dialogue on the foundations of the innovations reinforced maintaining only a rhetorical comprehension.

*What is it and How does it work?*

Field work began at the East Java State University [EJSU] in the Teacher Education Social Studies Department. After four months of observations, little information was obtained regarding participants’ understanding of either CL or NCCM leading to the conclusions that, aside from a select few, most instructors had little or no experience with CL or NCCM, or they had experience, but had rejected them as unworkable. Contrary to the reports of many professors at both EJSU and CUS, this was
not due to the hold senior lecturers had on replicating the traditional teaching methods. Observations of classes noted consistent one-way or unidirectional communication patterns. Of the six professors observed, only two used any semblance of the innovations of CL and NCCM during the observations. Later interviews provided additional insights into the use of CL and NCCM, with one notable interview occurring with the most prominent senior lecturer in the department—Professor Sabir.

However at CUS, all of the instructors seemed to have a basic awareness of the terms CL and NCCM, but few demonstrated extended or variations of how-to knowledge. They could not go beyond specific examples that were written in the short pieces of text given to them, and most had not reached the stage of applying it to their specific classes. Their ability to use the terms associated with CL was notable. Almost all could provide definitions, but few could describe how or why either CL or NCCM was used in any observable way.

The richest data supporting the assertion that most participants possessed only “awareness” and “how-to knowledge” understandings of CL came from the CUS site. In addition to the longer time period spent at CUS, and the greater number of informal conversations with the CUS professors concerning the innovations, I was given the specific duty of facilitating a two-hour training session on the use of CL with a group of 13 faculty members. I had worked with nine of them during the previous two years as a team teacher and had formed a close, professional relationship with three of them. With six, I had developed a more formal relationship and only spoke with them to share class or school information. With the others, I had no relationship.
With the exception of two professors, the rest were in the previous year’s faculty training session on student-centered strategies. However, all of them had been part of the department’s monthly faculty enrichment sessions where at least two specific CL techniques had been presented. So the focus of the session was to be more of an enhancement session versus an introductory one.

These instructors were responsible for teaching introductory freshman English language courses to 70 incoming students. The professors had already been assigned a text book emphasizing pair and group work. Since it was a very mixed group, the session began with a form asking for some basic biographical information and five general knowledge questions about CL used to structure the conversations for the session.

Nine of the instructors were male and four were female. Of the 13 instructors, four were senior lecturers with over 20 years experience. Five stated they had over 10 years teaching experience, and one had over five years experience. Two professors did not indicate their years of experience. Another lecturer, who was the coordinator, came late and left early without filling out the form. (See appendix E for the form.)

The form itself provided a baseline of the participants’ three levels of knowledge about CL. The five questions required word lists or short answer responses. The first asked what would be two things they would notice as an observer as soon as they walked into a classroom using cooperative learning. The second question asked them to list three important differences between CL and ordinary group work. The third asked them to list three observable role changes CL teachers had to make. In the fourth question, they were asked to write three verbs that described the actions of a facilitator. The final question
asked what they considered the most difficult aspect of using cooperative learning. All five questions were designed to elicit basic awareness knowledge of CL. However, questions 3 and 4 also required how-to-knowledge with a focus on the actions of the teacher. Question 5 required a reflection on the use of the method and was designed to uncover initial knowledge of key principles.

To assess the responses to the five questions, a holistic grading criterion ranging from 0 to 5 was developed. A score of 5 would be awarded if all questions were answered with definitions and examples that resembled accurate interpretations of the innovations. For instance, one professor with over 20 years of experience answered the first question (two things you would notice as soon as you walked into a classroom using a cooperative learning method) by stating, 1) “Students are working in groups,” and 2) “The teacher is walking around and stopping once in awhile at each group.” This response was awarded a full point. However, another professor with over 20 years of experience answered, 1) “Whether the students are grouped/sit in groups,” and 2) “Whether there are more boys or girls.” This response was assigned one half of a point. Only two lecturers earned full points, or a score of 5. Both had more than ten years of experience. The range of scores for the 8 participants with less than 20 years experience was from 1 to 5 with an average score of 3.68. For the four senior lecturers, the scores ranged from 1 to 4.5 with an average of 2.3.

A detailed analysis of the individual questions revealed that, for the first question, seven of the lecturers stated they would see students working in groups, but besides this basic answer, the other responses varied greatly. Only five of the twelve professors
actually noted that students would be active, and only two mentioned a change in the role or physical location of the teacher (from the front of the room). Some of the more unusual answers were that the number of students and number of males versus females would be different.

For the second question (the difference between CL and group work), the answers varied greatly. However, six mentioned the idea that information is shared versus given, and that each student is active. The most obscure responses were “material” and “reward always exists.” Of the many answers, only one mentioned anything about the change in the teacher’s role to a facilitator. As stated earlier, one professor did note the idea of interdependence: “They have a shared goal to finish the task.” However, it is notable that the interdependence mentioned focused just on the completion of a task and not on any achievement level.

The third question (observable teacher role changes), reflective of how-to knowledge, resulted in only four lecturers actually stating the teacher would become a facilitator. Three wrote the teacher “moves around.” Some of the most obscure answers were that teachers listen to students, explain clearly, and change topics if a student “gets stuck.” All of which are examples of any teaching method or technique, and are not specific to CL. Two interesting responses were that the teacher’s focus would be on building self-confidence and on properly grouping the students. These two responses suggested not only a more in-depth knowledge of the basics and how-to understandings, but also pointed to theoretical understandings underlying the techniques.
For the fourth question, designed to reveal insights into their understanding of facilitation and reflective of a “how-to” level of knowledge, the answers were overall very vague. This question did not seem to suit one of the senior lecturers who wrote, “Come on, you know the answer-would you really do it?” Not knowing exactly which participant wrote this comment prevented follow up for further clarification. However, two others also seemed to think the question merited no response. Of the ten who answered, three spoke of the teacher role as “motivating.” Four mentioned the teacher as “helping” and one wrote “questioning.” Again the answers varied. The most obscure were two lecturers who said “facilitating,” and one who wrote “don’t worry”. Only two responded that the teacher “listens” and one responded with the word “monitor.”

The final question, designed to assess their knowledge of key principles of CL, asked participants to state a particular problem with implementing CL. The most common response dealt with managing the groups. Seven either noted class sizes as being too large, or difficulty in keeping the students actively engaged and cooperating with each other. Three noted: sharing information, each person has a positive source, and appreciating and adjusting others’ opinions. One wrote “preparation,” and another did not respond.

After filling out the baseline form, the lecturers were grouped into triads and asked to use a jigsaw technique with a short reading from Dr. Lie’s book on Cooperative Learning. Jigsaw is a cooperative learning technique in which larger groups are divided in to smaller expert groups to learn smaller content pieces and then go back to the larger
groups to share the different content pieces they have learned in their expert groups. The teacher monitors and facilitates the learning in both groups.

Since the session only had one large group, the lecturers were divided into four expert groups of three individuals and given one-page readings in Indonesian on a specific aspect of CL. They had 15 minutes to read the two to three paragraphs and discuss it. They were given 20 minutes to brainstorm a draft of a lesson plan that utilized the element they had read about. Afterwards, they were to present their prepared lesson to their colleagues, explaining the use of the CL element they had reviewed and receive feedback.

During the reading time, all but one group had members who left the room and returned after the allotted time had expired. Only a few participants had legitimate reasons for leaving due to a scheduling conflict between the training and a freshman orientation session. The one group that remained together for the whole time consisted of two senior and one junior lecturer. They were assigned a reading on interdependence. One senior lecturer and the junior spent the entire time arguing about whether interdependence was really possible in a Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) class. The junior lecturer said that the most he could get from his students was to “share the burden” but that objective did not always lead to cooperation. The senior lecturer pontificated on what cooperation really was, and questioned if it required guidance or not. The other senior lecturer tried to speak and redirect the other two back on task but was not successful. Needless to say, this group never finished nor presented any examples.
Only two of the four groups finished a drafted lesson. One group, which contained Professor Tina, an important secondary informant, planned a lesson in detail. Their topic was *Tata Muka* which they translated as group building and grouping. They stated that it was a good idea to do both mixed-ability and same-ability grouping and that each had some practical purposes in their lesson. They went on to mention that, in order to do this with success, they would need an initial list of students based on their grades on their entrance exam. The coordinator agreed and said he would provide them with a copy to use for initial groupings. The list was never distributed.

The coordinator, who was in and out during the session, presented his group’s drafted lesson dealing with *Kumunikasi Antaranggota* that they translated as inter-group communication. Asked if one could also translate it as intra-group communication, they agreed. Their presentation was focused on how to teach a small reading comprehension lesson, and how they would need to directly teach effective communication skills. When questioned about which skills, they stated they would teach about giving praise and encouragement, but they did not provide specific examples. This superficial approach to teaching effective communication is found in many Western texts on CL and CRE as well, but the idea of taking such a culturally-situated skill and applying it in another culture without adaptation is highly questionable.

Participants were then questioned about how they would handle students laughing at each other, a behavior frequently observed in a majority of the Indonesian classrooms and a point noted by students in surveys and interviews as a reason for not engaging in whole class discussion. Instructors nodded their heads in agreement, but offered no
insight as to how they handle this situation. Even after this issue was pursued further with examples of how incidents like this would be handled in a Western classroom, how Western educators would be hesitant to apply these methods in different cultures, followed with a question of how they would tell the difference between laughter that is based in camaraderie versus subjugation, a noticeable silence occurred for several minutes. At that point, the coordinator said thank you for the information and announced that the time was up. The meeting ended before anyone offered an answer.

Of the 13, only two instructors were able to go beyond common text book terms to answer simple awareness questions or use behavioral verbs that exemplified how-to knowledge. These same two lecturers were able to use examples in their presentations showing they could also plan a lesson emphasizing CL strategies. Although two groups actually presented their understanding of a few of the elements from Dr. Lie’s book, they had no response to questions about effective communication or how they would attempt to teach these skills besides praise, memorizing, and compliments. They were able to answer “what is it,” but not “why it works”. This is especially notable when recognizing that CUS has had teaching fellows from the U.S. and partner schools in Canada for many years.

In direct contrast to most of the faculty attending the enhancement session was Dr. Lie, an adjunct professor at CUS. Although Dr. Lie often only skimmed the idea of effective communication in her definitions of CL and NCCM in many of her publications and in her interviews, her description of the innovation of cooperative learning remained the most parallel with that of the one espoused in the West. Even a short preview of her
publication, “Cooperative Learning: Mempraktikkan Cooperative Learning di Ruang-Ruang Kelas” (2002) showed she has very extensive awareness knowledge.

In her publication, she referenced Johnson and Johnson, Kagan, and Anderson. Her book was an attempt to directly translate CL into usable techniques for Indonesian educators to grasp and try to use. She touched on the different structures, techniques and variations of cooperative learning. In the introductory chapters, she addressed the overall need for more cooperative methods to use in Indonesian classes and even provided a connection to Globalisasi [globalization] in an attempt to argue that more cooperation in the classroom is needed in the fight to remain equal and competitive in a global society (p. 11). In the introduction, she connected CL to the Indonesian traditional value of gotong royong [cooperation] in an attempt to bridge these techniques to traditional concepts (p. 17). Direct translations of terms like positive interdependence saling ketergantungan positif, intra-group role assignments/individual accountability tanggung jawab perseorangan and CL alternative assessment evaluasi proses kelompok were presented in a similar attempt (p. 31-37). Short discussion pieces further defined these concepts and offered activities and usable teacher/peer evaluation forms.

Due to the concise and straightforward approach she took in her writing, this work was included as part of the 2003 CRE workshop training packets and why her publication had been chosen as the center piece to the enhancement workshop with the 13 CUS lecturers. Her awareness and how-to knowledge of the innovations were exemplified in this particular publication. Yet, an important aspect remained missing. Her description lacked an in-depth discussion of effective communication skills. The absence
of such an important element created questions about the transference of the theoretical knowledge of constructivism. Granted, this is often a problem with texts used in the West, and it cannot be used as a defining point, but is one that requires more questioning. Dr. Lie did use three paragraphs to discuss relational communication in the section she entitled *komunikasi antaranggota* [inter-group communication], but she did not mention the changes that need to be made in the teacher-student dialectical relationships that are traditional and culturally reproduced in Indonesia. Instead, a relatively short, persuasive paragraph was written for teachers to begin to teach effective communication straight from a Western context. This was further exemplified when she directly translated effective communication strategies as open-ended questions to get students to brainstorm positive and negative feedback, to discuss how others might interpret this feedback differently, and to practice more polite ways to disagree (p. 34-35). Out of context this does not seem odd, but for someone suggesting this use without further discussion of how to get the students to reply to open-ended questions seems out of place. As observed in her classes and discussed in interviews, open-ended questions are often met with silence in Indonesian university classrooms. To use such strategies without also using techniques that give students time to write answers down and randomly call on them to share their answers with the whole class or within pairs could be culturally inappropriate. Granted some might consider that this book was meant only as an introduction to how-to knowledge. As such, leaving out a more detailed discussion of key principles is fine, but I would argue that not at least minimally covering some of the theoretical tenets limits the reader’s ability to adapt the methods to the specific context of his/her classrooms. This is
especially problematic in classrooms that are significantly different from the cultural context from the innovations she is proposing educators to use.

Since Dr. Lie’s book was written for an Indonesian audience, the text was missing a contextual discussion of possible barriers to encouraging Indonesian students to speak in classrooms. There were no suggestions of how to encourage Indonesian students to voice their opinions aloud, to ask questions, or to disagree. Also, there were no strategies provided to confront the ways students are silenced by others in higher status roles. The absence of a contextual discussion about voice makes one question if Dr. Lie assumed the target audience already had a sufficient level of understanding of key principles, that it was just simply overlooked, or if she, herself, had yet to consider the cultural conflict that exists within the principles.

In one small section and in a later newspaper opinion piece, Lie did mention cooperative learning has been a method used to build positive interdependence across ethnic lines in multicultural classrooms (Lie, 2003; 2006). Yet, the short discussions were more in line with presenting supporting evidence for a persuasive argument to change teaching pedagogy in Indonesia in an attempt to promote peace, tolerance, and democracy, but without discussions of how and why this change could achieve those objectives. Again what remained lacking in her work was an analysis of the communication style and the shift that would be required in the teacher’s role as guru [teacher] in the classroom.

Her focus on the awareness and how-to knowledge level is seen in another section of her 2003 cooperative learning manual. The section entitled “Sapaan dan sorak
"kelompok" can be loosely translated as team building (p. 51). But again, she only touched on teaching students to provide positive feedback with their team members. There was no detailed list of ways to ensure that all voices are heard and weighed equally, or plans for prioritizing and ensuring equitable rights to voiced opinions. Also missing were any suggestions for consequences for not honoring free voice between and within cooperative groups or changes in classroom management systems.

To her credit, Dr. Lie did address some cultural issues in a short discussion of Western-Eastern values in a section titled “Barat-Timur” (p. 21) But, her discussion was centered on how the West has looked to Eastern styles of cooperation in the face of technological development and manufacturing competition. She did not go into any specifics of how a culture of individualisme [individualism] impacts the nature of the communication of cooperation (p. 21).

In another publication, a collaborative work on integrating Environmental Science with English Language instruction, Dr. Lie and her co-authors compiled and edited 16 lesson plans that made use of some aspects of CL (Lie, Jacobs, & Amy, 2002). The book was an excellent example of how-to knowledge. Each of the lessons provided teachers with objectives, background on the topic, and step-by-step instructions to give students as they do pair-work or group work. The sample lesson plans went into depth on how to run brainstorming sessions and assign group activities, but the group work element in all but her lesson was not very interdependent nor cooperative.

There were no in-depth discussions of group participant roles, or strategies for conducting reciprocal discussions. In Lie’s lesson plan, she incorporated a peer review
objective on a journal writing assignment and provided a simple rubric. But, in general, she and her collaborators might have been assuming the educators’ understanding of CL innovations were equal to their own. Again, the reader was given many clear descriptions of techniques, without discussion of the required shift that must take place in the communication pattern in the classroom for them to work.

The devil is in the details, and in this case, the devil could be the assumption that practitioners have a good understanding of the epistemological and ontological principles behind the methods. Horizontal democratic classrooms are in direct opposition to the hierarchical power strata that are supported and passed down from one generation to the next in Indonesia.

Although only a small group of informants was showcased representing knowledge of innovations, they were representative of the variety of levels of understanding encountered during the data collection in Indonesia. Dr. Lie stands out among the rest. As noted in Chapter Three, her role as an Indonesian educator who, through personal experience, has crossed cultures to obtain her degrees, might have added to her ability to manage the conflicting cultural attributes of the innovations in her attainment of basic awareness and how-to knowledge.

*Why does it work?*

As seen in the previous section, Dr. Lie’s analysis of CL and NCCM techniques allowed her to form several bridges between them and traditional techniques and concepts. This effort helped to minimize potential cultural barriers to using the techniques. In fact, there are many aspects of the techniques that mirror the values of
Indonesia’s collectivist society. However, what has been highlighted so far is the lack of discussions on principles-knowledge and, specifically, the principle of reciprocal communication. Although cultural barriers can exist at any of the knowledge levels, obstacles to the execution of techniques are more easily adapted as long as the principles behind the techniques are parallel. But if the barriers are at the principles level, further adoption and diffusion are at risk. As Rogers (1995) stated, “Principles-knowledge consists of information dealing with the functioning principles underlying how the innovation works” (p. 166). Understanding the functioning principles behind CL and NCCM is directly related to the educator’s ability to adapt and adjust a particular innovation to his/her class without losing the benefit or the essence of the innovation. This is difficult enough when using an innovation across settings within the same culture, but adaptation and adoption of an innovation becomes nearly impossible across cultural settings without this base.

Principles-knowledge is directly related to Bandura’s (1986) idea of “functional equivalents” (p. 158). As Roger’s (1995) stated,

Most change agents perceive that creation of principles-knowledge is outside the purview of their responsibilities and is a more appropriate task for formal schooling. It is often too complex a task for change agents to teach basic understanding of principles. But when such understanding is lacking, the change agent’s long-run task is often more difficult. (p. 166)
It is for this reason that looking more closely at the informants’ principles-knowledge is important to delineate the cultural barriers in order to begin to search for possible bridges to understanding and adaptation.

As the information was analyzed, themes began to emerge, one of which was fear, which had many facets. A second theme was obedience and control. Of the two, the later is the easiest to tie to cultural values. However fear, if looked at from the perspective of institutional cultures, could also be said to be based and culturally reproduced in response to the standards of obedience and control with each subsequent generation.

Fear. In order to gain further insight into the participants’ levels of principles-knowledge, more direct conversations were needed. An interview with Dr. Lie on theoretical underpinnings of the innovations raised suspicions of many educators having only a rhetorical comprehension that revealed some interesting insights. Throughout my six years working with Dr. Lie, we had enjoyed many informal conversations about CRE and its elements. One topic often discussed was the lack of follow-through by participants in teacher-training workshops and by team teachers in classes. Participants and partner teachers, though attentive and active in CL and NCCM strategies during sessions and lessons, left on their own would often slip back to authoritarian, teacher-dominated methods. This trend highlighted a very important problem that Rogers (1995) emphasized when he stated, “…the competence of individuals to decide whether or not to adopt an innovation is facilitated by principles know-how. If a problem occurs in an individual’s use of an innovation, principles-knowledge may be essential in solving it” (p. 166). This seemed to be one reasonable explanation, but possibly not the only one.
Although some of the informants stated that laziness was a primary reason for the lack of follow-through or an unwillingness to change, the search for a pivotal cultural issue at the root of the problem and specifically how this value was affecting classroom communication was imperative. Laziness did not seem a viable explanation. Observations revealed the teachers were not unprepared or lazy. They were underpaid, worked very long days, and all had set hours to come to the office even when there were no students. They were teaching, but following expository methods. Teaching a good expository lesson is not an easy task. There is a lot of work in preparing a lecture, developing interesting media, and assigning functional work.

A document analysis was undertaken to discover resource texts or articles to find some concept that would provide a perspective to what was being seen and ways to conceptualize day-to-day life in the Indonesian schools and classrooms. A 1960 text by Clifford Geertz provided the most sensible explanation. Relying on such an out-of-date text for an answer to a current problem was unsettling. However, one of his discussions of the priyayi [Javanese aristocracy] ethical system as it related to his observations of the Kawruh Bedja—an East Java religious group—seemed very analogous to what was being observed. In one passage, he noted:

Unlike him [Descartes], they do not work back to discover what the metaphysical base of those ideas might be, but rather try to build an ethical system directly atop them, which ethic turns out, not so surprisingly, to be the usual prijaji one emphasizing rank, politesse, concealment, and muting of feeling. (p. 345)
Although it was written four decades ago and was applied to a religious group and different setting in East Java, it still seemed to explain the communication styles that were occurring daily. Yet, the questioning the fairness of this analysis of the informants and their dynamic culture in an era of globalization remained imperative. To confirm this analysis, Dr. Lie was questioned about the Javanese values of respect for rank and ideas of politesse, to which she responded by divulging more of her own contradictory feelings using personal life examples.

At first, the conversation was focused on the values in schools and possible cultural barriers that might exist within that setting. When asked the three biggest reasons why teachers did not use cooperative learning, she embarked on a conversation about what she called the culture of fear which she felt was prevalent in the Indonesian education system.

Okay, [Let’s] say something broad-[a] culture of fear. I picked that up from that book [a book on critical education she had been reading] but it is so true here in Indonesia. The culture of fear and, of course, this is very broad. Teachers lack a sense of autonomy, [in] that they are autonomous-and then second is the system, the system from the government and third-support by the institution. Ok in our 2004 [national] curriculum, a very, very loose curriculum actually and [it] should give teachers more room [and] more autonomy to develop their own [classroom curricula but] for so many years teachers were suppressed you know. [They] have been limited by the previous curricula [in which] they didn’t have their freedom and so this culture of fear [in their] road of progress [gave them a sense of] you’re
a victim first. You have to be aware first of your fate. You have to have [the] big picture [or] you have to be aware and then after the awareness then you have to have the courage to break out of that culture of fear. And after breaking out from that culture of fear then there will be a very hard struggle. Then, after that, you’re liberated. Now, at this time, some teachers are aware; some are not. But breaking out from this culture of fear is going to take a long time. One example I [can] give you [is from] last week. I went to Flores. I did [a] teacher training in Ende in Flores. There is this school right by the beach, across from a beach, a beautiful, beautiful beach, and I thought great, you know, [a] wonderful learning atmosphere for the students, and maybe for the teachers there. And I asked them, “[Has] anyone here ever taken their students to the beach. No one, no one [had]. And I said “why not” and they said “we can’t because [there] are only 45 minutes per period.” But it was about ten meters away from the beach. But they said it [was] going to take time for [them] to get a class out of the room and then to get them in line and be on the beach. And by the time they come back, the class period would be over. And I said “those limitations are just limitations made by the bureaucrats, but you should not be limited by such limitations. You can, of course, and work a way [around it]. Work around that limitation and coordinate with other teachers.” We are talking about Jr. High. “Yes, you have your own period [e.g.] physics. You can talk with your fellow teachers and work around it some way, so that students can play by the beach.” In fact they were (only) complaining about the shortness of books. They don’t have enough
books....because those resources are plentiful in Java but not in Ende. But there are pluses and minuses. In Surabaya, we don’t have the beach. It is a luxury. That is the culture of fear.

However, what Dr. Lie named as a culture of fear could also be a culture of control and respect for authority. Control in this sense could also be seen as a code of behavior laid down centuries ago by an aristocratic class that set high standards on what they considered good behavior that included respect for rank. Her example is what others have termed an educational culture that is textbook and curriculum-bound (Bork, 2000; Dardjowidjojo, 2001).

This idea of fear and bondage was mentioned by other participants in other settings. The principal at a secondary setting, the private elementary school [PES] where I team-taught English classes for grades pre-school through third grade also echoed this fear. In one correspondence, Ms. Lang was asked her opinion of the three main reasons why teachers did not implement any of the CL or NCCM activities that had been modeled in the classes where I co-taught with them to classes they taught independently. All of the teachers were young and just out of teacher colleges and, therefore, perhaps more willing to try innovations or so-called new ideas enthusiastically. Ms. Lang stated she felt most of the teachers just did not have enough education or experience using cooperative learning, especially with younger students, and second, she suggested it was a matter of laziness. Then she offered the following statement:

Most teachers in Indonesia may not realize that they are "mentally" bound by the curriculum. I think this is cultural because that's the way we've been taught or
educated. You know, it's pretty hard to change unless we ourselves have been "enlightened". I discovered this when I was still the principal. No matter how often I told them to "ignore", skip some parts, or modify the curriculum to adjust to students' needs, some teachers just feel obliged to "obey" the curriculum and finish all given materials. Thus, instead of focusing on the learning experience, they pay more attention to completing the materials. In other words, it's a matter of "thinking outside the box" and changing their paradigm. But this must be done regularly so we could finally and hopefully “wash their brains.”

The bondage Ms. Lang described seemed parallel to Dr. Lie’s comments. Both Dr. Lie and Ms. Lang spoke of teachers as individuals being acted upon (suppressed, limited, bound by). This alluded to a doer of the action, a suppressor, a limiter, a binder which they name as the national curriculum—a document. Since a document has no power in and of itself, the question becomes, what force is behind the document? Is it the author, the government, or the culture? Dr. Lie did go on to name the education system and local school systems, but left out the cultural value of hierarchy as what supported the teachers’ sense of suppression.

Obedience and control. Also of interest were the terms that both Dr. Lie and Ms. Lang used to describe this suppression. They employed popular jargon or so-called buzz words (i.e., culture of fear, thinking outside the box). Although these words and phrases have become clichés, they still are meaningful and are possible impediments to the adoption and adaptation of CL and NCCM. However, the way they used these terms hinted that the barrier was related to the imposing, bureaucratized National Education
Department and not the active engagement of the teachers in following a culture of acceptance and deference. Could these limitations be seen as active reproductions of the traditional values of status and duties left over from a very distant past? Anderson (1996) and Geertz (1960) both pointed to the continuity of such Hindu-Buddhist cultural values through time and great political and religious change in Indonesia. Both have also been criticized for over-emphasizing these values as directly coming from such a distant past (Hefner, 1997). Yet, one can easily perceive the current educational bureaucracy as a template of the historical past—a tiered system with a well defined hierarchy. Experts write books and curricula that are passed down to administrators who pass them on to teachers. Teachers then pass this knowledge and tradition down to the students without much critical questioning.

This system can be seen as akin to a militaristic line of command and control. As Dr. Lie reported, students had to be taken out of class, lined up, and walked to and from an outside area. She noted this was a junior high class, not a kindergarten class. What she termed a culture of fear appears to be a culture of control of status and duty. Dr. Lie’s statements showed how she confronted this mentality with the teachers in Ende who were not Javanese. She called on them to look at the limitations as not their own and to not continue to self-impose them. Again one is left with the idea of teachers who have been trained, but trained to use more than expository teaching scripts. Their reactions and their sense of possibilities have been trained by something larger than just national curricula.

Of additional interest is when Dr. Lie noted that the teachers kept “complaining” about a lack of resources. She did note that money for resources is scarce and that
teachers have to use their own limited salaries to buy materials especially when those teachers work away from the large urban areas of Java. However, as she spoke, her knowledge of what constitutes a resource is much broader than that of the teachers she was training, due to her own principles-knowledge of CL and NCCM. It was this base in constructivism that allowed her to see a beach as a wonderful experiential lab for learning. It was this constructivist base that opened Ms. Lang’s mind from the so-called box and led her to tell teachers to focus on the students’ needs and not on the books and the curriculum. For the teachers, perhaps it is the principles knowledge base that is missing and not the courage. Perhaps it is a paradoxical situation where they are asked to be constructivist, but at the same time, given books that control the content of what is to be learned and how, detailed curricula that controls what is to be taught and when, and national tests that target and reinforce what is worth being identified and not described or applied. All of these conditions might reinforce a culture of control as well as a culture of hierarchy and obedience.

When offered in the form of a question about ethnic culture and barriers to active learning strategies, Dr. Lie responded:

Could be, could be. Because there is a value here. The value that is highly regarded is obedience, [being] obedient [and of] quietness. If you’re quiet in class, you’re a good student. A good student has to be quiet, obedient, sit nicely…in Indonesian as well as in Chinese culture.

Her statements provide an example of a passive recipient acculturated to be passive. In this case, a student is a passive receiver of information. Although she emphasized
obedience, this is not a value that Dr. Lie endorsed or espoused in her writings or
teaching, but using the term obedience is significant. Obedience is the glue that supports
a hierarchy. In the cases of, “That child is obedient” versus “That child is well-behaved,”
the root of obedient is obey. Commonly used synonyms of obey are to mind, do as you
are told, to follow, to comply with, to abide by, and to conform. All are a passive. To
obey requires someone to obey and someone of higher rank whose wishes and
instructions (explicit or implicit) are to be obeyed.

The term “well-behaved” neither denotes nor connotes the same images. The term
is built from the root “behave” which offers very different concepts. Common synonyms
of behave are act, perform, conduct yourself, and work. All are active. It does not require
another person but, in a sense, is reflexive. And as such, to be well-behaved could be seen
as akin to self-discipline. However, one could argue this term was spoken by a person
that is not a native speaker, although Dr. Lie is an English teacher with a BA and MA in
English and an Ed.D. from Baylor University. Obey in Indonesian is one of three words:
mematuhi, patuh, taat. Mematuhi can be translated as to obey something or be faithful
to. Patuh can be translated as obedient or submissive, and taat can be translated as
obedient or loyal. Again, all of these connote very passive actions. Behaved can be
translated as berkelakuan baik or menunjukkan reaksi yang baik. Berkelakuan baik is to
have a good character or behave like someone of good character. Menunjukkan reaksi
yang baik is similarly translated as showing a good reaction. With either term, “good”
would have to be translated culturally and would most likely end up as one who obeys or
one who is disciplined.
It is interesting that Dr. Lie did not use this term when she spoke of the teachers. She stated the teachers have been trained to obey. In another journal article, she highlighted this systemic problem and suggested that teacher trainings begin to address it by engaging teachers at local levels in the development of curriculum and materials (Lie, 2002). This image of passive teachers was not Dr. Lie’s alone. The idea of unquestioning obedience emerged in another conversation as well.

Another important conversation occurred with Professor Ruvi, a CUS instructor, with whom I had team taught with in an Early Childhood Education class and a TEFL class. Professor Ruvi had over 20 years experience as a teacher, first as a high school English teacher in Central Java and later as a professor at CUS. On one occasion, our discussions centered around Teman Siswa schools and the philosophy of the founder Ki Hajar Dewantara, considered the founder of National education in Indonesia. In the literature and document analysis for historical evidence of similar active education methods, three principle statements about a teacher’s role were discovered to be very similar to principles underlying CL and NCCM. These roles can be translated as the teacher’s position should be in front of the room, leading; in the middle of the room, encouraging; and in the back of the room, guiding (Soefijanto, 2003). When presented to Professor Ruvi for comment, she smiled and stated that her father was a teacher at a Teman Siswa school in Central Java. She explained about the meaning of Dewantara codes of behaviour. However, her definition was much different than any previously encountered. Prior explanations were written within the context of a classroom and a teacher leading, encouraging, and monitoring students, but this was absent in her
explanation. She wrote out the philosophy in Javanese and explained the context of rules for teachers in relation to administrators. *Ing ngarsa sung tulada* which she translated as in front/leader, writing and verbally expressing that one should provide a good model. She continued, *Ing madya mangun karsa*, which she translated, wrote, and verbalized as in the middle/employees and staff should support the leader’s policy. Finally she wrote *Tut wuri handayani* that she translated as “following meaningfully.” All three, she stated were based on a *sistem among* which she wrote and translated as “a caring relationship.” Interestingly, she had by-passed the question about teacher-student relationships and explained instead a detailed system of teacher-administrator relationships of modeling, supporting, and following. Her conversation exemplified principles understanding, not of student-centered principles of Dewantara, that were earlier identified as a possible bridge to the principles underlying CL and NCCM, but of obeying *priyayi* ethics and traditional, hierarchal relationships.

Of the many instructors at CUS, Professor Ruvi was the one professor who consistently delivered expository lessons in the classes we taught together and in all other classes observed. Although she could speak of constructivism and student-centered approaches, she was never observed using them and never had a conversation in which she reflected on her classes and critiqued them. This discourse did not seem surprising, as Professor Ruvi is a quintessential Javanese professor, always subdued, always soft spoken, and always agreeable. She is a scholar of Javanese literature and culture as well as an English professor. But, not only Javanese follow these ethics, as the following shows.
This cultural aspect of obedience also came up during the first stage of data collection at EJUS in early 2005 in an interview with Professor Arjuna. In response to what he saw as a possible system of cultural barriers to the implementation and dissemination of CL and NCCM, he pointed to what he termed *budaya malu* which translates to a culture of shyness/shame. This emerged after a discussion about the difficulties professors in his department were having implementing CL and NCCM techniques and maintaining traditional ideas of discipline. Professor Arjuna included the familial culture of the students in both aspects. He stated that children are reared to not question their parents and this silent deference is transferred to teachers. This idea was also confirmed by the Dean of the social studies department. Professor Arjuna noted this has been changing, but the silence in the university classrooms is related to the behaviors taught at home--to listen, not question. He also pointed to teachers’ concerns with maintaining authority and their unwillingness to use other methods that might affect the traditional way they maintain their *otoritas* [authority]. Hence, in later interviews with Arjuna, when the word ‘obey’ emerged, his comments at another campus in another East Java province became even more meaningful.

However, Dr. Lie’s comment about the tradition of hierarchical status was a bit unexpected. She reported, “One Asian value that I still treasure and I apply in my life is hierarchy.” To explain her statement, she used examples from her private sphere. Her first example was of giving seats to elderly family members and giving them proper respect by not emotionally arguing with them or making rude gestures when disagreeing
with them. She then focused on communication styles. She revealed she felt that one can
disagree nicely but not confrontationally.

When probed for an example, she used her mother-in-law as an example. She
stated that her mother-in-law likes to make comparisons between her and her sister-in-
law who is a housewife, or as her mother-in-law stated, “a model wife.” Dr. Lie often just
listens and then releases the stress through conversations with another sister-in-law who
suffers the same insults, thus relying on concealment and a muting of feelings. In another
example, when her mother-in-law brags about the education the “model housewife’s”
children are getting at a different school than the one Dr. Lie sends her child, Dr. Lie
begins by complimenting her nieces and nephews and sister-in-law in what she called
“the spirit of agreeing” and afterward gently states her reasons for sending her daughter
to a different school. This clearly is parallel to the effective communication strategies
espoused by CL and NCCM which are examples of confronting conflict by
acknowledging and paraphrasing the speaker’s words, then clearly communicating and
owning your own feelings without emotional language.

Yet, she did not make the link between the two values of strict obedience and
honorary respect for one’s elders and how the two could support and maintain the
continuity of a hierarchal system of power where dissent and contestation are silenced.
This macro view of the implications of respect for rank and age seems to have formed a
syncretism in her belief system. It is with this paradox in mind that the interview focused
on her understandings of the ontological “why questions” of CL and NCCM techniques.
It appears Dr. Lie had superficially considered communication styles, but the connection between democratic classrooms and the communication patterns that must be taught and promoted to effectively use CL and NCCM was something she was just currently beginning to assess and analyze. In an early part of the interview, Dr. Lie had disagreed with writers who have stated democratic, student-centered educational innovations just wouldn’t work without major cultural changes (Bjork, 2000; Dardjowidjojo, 2001; Nielsen, 1998). In the following, Dr. Lie stated:

I disagree because when we talk about democracy, there are universal values that are in democracy. Yes, there are also particular values in certain cultures. Different cultures have their own values, but it doesn’t mean that democracy can’t be applied in that culture. Like with obedience-the way American kids argue with their parents may not be appropriate here, like talking back to the parents, and also like the gestures, you know, like Americans do. It’s not appropriate here but it doesn’t mean that Asian kids have to suppress - [or that] they can’t challenge. It’s just a way [of] conveying that maybe they, Asian kids, need to learn patient ways of challenging their parents.

She further defined “patient ways” as not using a loud voice, saying things more subtly, and using more polite words.

Further questioning about her family values and beliefs revealed that she considered herself an atypical Indonesian female, and that she had always been a bit of a “rebel.” She expressed her disapproval of her elder brother’s way of rebelling by concealment which she called avoidance and deceit. He would often just agree with
whatever her parents said, but then would do what he wanted. She differed in that she would question and argue. However, even in this aspect, she later revealed her own use of concealment as she told a story of leading a student protest over the mistreatment of a female classmate by a gym teacher in junior high school. When asked how her parents dealt with her situation, she stated that they never found out. She arranged for a friend’s mother to pretend to be her own mother and to intercede in the disciplinary actions with the school. It would have hurt her parents to find out their child was in trouble at school. When asked what they finally said about the situation when she told them as an adult, she laughed because they still did not know.

The conversation about values led to a discussion of culturally appropriate and inappropriate ways to communicate and whether or not patient ways of challenging could/could not support democratic ways of challenging. Dr. Lie believed these patient ways would not hinder a shift to a more democratically run classroom, but her actions toward her parents seemed to offer some contradiction this belief.

Agreeably, notions of effective communication cannot be separated from the culture in which communication occurs. Yet, with both CL and NCCM, reciprocal communication strategies stress that active listening is essential if either innovation is going to be successful. For reciprocal communication to emerge, power, choice, and voice need to be equally distributed among the group horizontally versus vertically controlled by an authoritarian figure or cultural mandate. Rationalizing vertical lines of communication seems at odds with facilitating reciprocal communication and therefore with CL and NCCM, let alone CRE. Understanding this overarching communicative
element is vital to the understanding and transference of the techniques and the ways they can be stretched, adapted, and disseminated and still be considered CL and NCCM, or at least what Bandura (1986) suggests are functional equivalents. The question is if Dr. Lie’s “patient ways of challenging” can exist in hierarchical social systems and if these might be the functional equivalents needed to adapt CL and NCCM in Indonesian classrooms.

In Western schools, educators are similarly challenged to create an effective communication atmosphere that promotes a cooperative environment in individual classrooms where competitive, democratic, and egalitarian principles are espoused. Maintaining such a communication pattern in a classroom where the culture supports cooperation and even dictates a hierarchal social system of who speaks and when, presents a different kind of paradox. If any sort of syncretism is to emerge, an in-depth principles-knowledge is needed. Yet from this small group of informants at three sites, in Indonesia, only Dr. Lie seemed to have enough of the principles understanding to meet this challenge.

**Persuasion**

Indonesian students tend to have difficulties in asking questions. The typical classroom in Indonesia, including English [TESOL] classrooms tend to be quiet in which student[s] only do the teachers’ instructions and answer teachers’ [low level]questions. More active classrooms in which students develop their thinking skills are required by the 2004 Curriculum. However, many teachers still have difficulty in developing the thinking skills of the students. The traditional training
they have already had focused on teaching the subject [only and] centered on the teacher. (Yumarnamto, & Widiyanto, 2005)

According to Rogers (1995), the next step in the adoption of any innovation is the persuasion stage. As he noted, “Whereas the mental activity at the knowledge stage was mainly cognitive (or knowing), the main type of thinking at the persuasion stage is affective (or feeling)” (p. 168). Common sense would dictate, the more positive the attitude about an innovation, the greater the likelihood of its adoption. Yet, as Rogers also emphasized, there is not a one-to-one correlation between a positive attitude and subsequent adoption. Adopters can have a positive attitude about an innovation but still not adopt. Some reasons for what he termed a “KAP-gap” (gap in knowledge-attitude-practice) were unwanted consequences of the innovation, the availability of the innovation, the access to communicate with “near-peer” users of the innovation, and the adopters’ confidence in their ability to use the innovation (p. 168). The following section provides insights into the participants’ feelings about CL and NCCM.

At first, the data seemed to indicate that, in general, many informants held favorable attitudes towards CL and NCCM, seeking to engage students more in classrooms. Yet upon closer analysis of their attitudes about student-centered techniques, several themes emerged in line with Rogers’ (1986) discussion of KAP-Gap. Of the list he proposed, barriers that surfaced from the interviews and observations began to fall into his categories of self-efficacy and unwanted consequences. Both were married to cultural values that were, at times, directly related and at other times indirectly related. Both of these broader KAP-Gap attitudes present implementation challenges that could be
perceived as almost insurmountable and static. Yet, for some, possible bridges to implementation appeared that were reflected in their positive attitudes translating into individual choice and action.

*Barriers to Implementation*

As noted, the two primary barriers to implementation, self-confidence and unwanted consequences, emerged from the data. Both barriers are related to cultural challenges inherent in the educational environment in Indonesia and general cultural values that conflict with the implementation of CL and NCCM. Primarily, the barriers could be characterized by a lack of confidence in the educator’s own ability and how this uncertainty gives rise to a dissonance with culturally proscribed roles. Additionally, other themes related to feasibility emerged that are connected to the larger concept of unwanted consequences. These were directly related to motivational issues in using CL and NCCM despite cultural and institutional constraints.

As the informants spoke of the need for change, they seemed to see the students as the source of the problem, as if their own characteristics were a given and could not be changed. At other times, the impasse was attributed to influential senior teachers and the powerful cultural reproduction control they maintained in positions of power. Finally, the idea of additional work required to initiate change and the lack of financial reward or monetary motivation to proceed with them emerged as barriers..

*Cultural challenges.* At CUS, a continuing issue was determining the best way to assess students’ expressive use of the English language during freshman and sophomore English speaking practice. Discussions about assessment rubrics were often left until the
week before midterm and final assessments. Some teachers used rubrics that often contained vague descriptions of what was exemplary and what was unsatisfactory. One week prior to one midterm assessment, I was asked to assess a speaking test using a rubric. Upon inspection, it became clear the highest possible score was 80 percent. When questioned, Professor Eko stated “only God could get 100 percent.” I jokingly asked, “did God make the rubric?” Thus, a democratic approach of using and collaboratively creating rubrics with students was not planned or completed, and evaluations of class behavior and participation remained under the control of the professor.

Although my off-handed comment could have been seen as a slight to some, I had built a very close working relationship with Professor Eko. I had more informal conversations about teaching methods with him than with any of the others. Our talks often focused on how to make the Intensive Courses more student-centered. He frequently asked me to lead pre-planning sessions on how to promote CL in speaking classes each semester. I interpreted these invitations as a sign of his belief that CL techniques would improve his freshman and sophomore courses.

Though Professor Eko’s attitude about the rubric places him in a category with other junior professors who continued using traditional methods, he did have over 10 years teaching experience and had graduated with a MA from a University in Melbourne, Australia.

His conversations about techniques were almost always insightful, but more importantly, it was during more informal conversations that he described values that might prevent adoption of CL and NCCM. He identified Javanese idiomatic expressions
that were still well known and offered insights into feelings that some teachers and students held about CL and NCCM. If in fact, idioms are metaphors of the values one holds, they can offer insights into the underlying feelings about innovations that might challenge their message.

The first idiom was Mikul dhuwur; mendem jero (Lift up high: bury deeply). The idea is for a person to remember the good things and forget the bad. As he explained, this is especially true in relation to a person’s parents but is also true for others who are of higher status. Professor Eko pointed to a conversation in the days following Presidents Suharto’s death in 2008, as the nation was under a week of mourning for their former dictator. In that instance, the people were encouraged to remember the good things Suharto had done and forget the bad.

The relevance to CL is perhaps the muting of feelings in order to follow the rule implied by this idiom. Overtly expressing dissatisfaction or criticizing an idea of another can be seen as rude. Granted, groups of students should be on an even keel, but higher status is granted to students who are more popular or who possess more advanced speaking skills. Also gender, age, and assigned group roles might establish a hierarchy within the cultural rule that could affect communication within the groups.

A second idiom was Wani ngalah, unggul wekas ane (Let me lose first to make me win later). If not obvious, the effect of this on open, active communication in group work and in a NCCM classroom is very detrimental. This idiom implies that it is better to just remain quiet and wait out the consequences, which is in line with many fatalistic and religious cultures. On the one hand, it could be seen as supporting a temporary
suppression of emotional language called for by most CL and NCCM programs, and at the same time, espouses passive acceptance and maybe even supports suppressive environments.

A third idiom, similar to the second, is *Sing waras ngalah* (The one who is mentally healthy should let others win). Again the attitude that the right will eventually win is an underlying message; however, this idiom is also a mandate to remain passive, to submit, and to accept. Applied across all settings, it would have a fairly deadening effect on any student-centered, active learning initiatives.

A fourth idiom, *Kebo Nyusu Gudel* translates as (The calf nurses the cow). Professor Eko mentioned this in reference to the possible attitudes that students have towards teachers who do not lecture and use traditional expository methods. He stated that students report feeling as if they are the ones providing professors with information in class--they are doing the teaching instead of the professors. This directly influences the roles of teachers and students and directly contrasts with constructivist principles.

These idioms reflected not only Professor Eko’s conflicted feelings towards the innovations, but can be generalized to the greater society whose members know and ascribe to these Javanese sayings. Most travelers to Indonesia are familiar with the frustrating answer of “Yes” to any question that is interpreted as a request. This practice, as well as the idioms discussed, are directly related to saving-face, outward submission, and passive-aggressive forms of dealing with conflict. Expressing anger when confronted with the ever-present “yes” results in active avoidance which is also related to the values expressed in letting others win and live to avoid conflict another day.
In addition to illuminating possible responses, or feelings about the innovations, discussions of the idioms provided insight into the actions and responses of other informants. These discussion on values not only highlighted possible uncertainty that CL and NCCM might cause to hierarchical role positions and the insecurity in role status, but also pointed to feasibility issues when feasibility is seen as a belief that the students are a significant barrier to implementation of CL and NCCM.

Self-efficacy issues. As hinted to in the above discussion of values, changing the role of the teacher can threaten traditional sensibilities of status and self-efficacy. When analyzing the data, the theme of blaming became apparent. Blame seemed to signify not only matter-of-fact feasibility issues but was connected to passive attempts to avoid self-reflection and self-evaluation.

A strong example of “lack of confidence” comes from Professor Tina, from CUS. She was an original participant in the 2003 CRE trainings. After the workshops, she had the opportunity to team teach with an American instructor assigned to the University by the U.S. English Teaching Fellows Program, as well as team teaching with the researcher.

When asked to reflect on potential problems the innovations were facing in Indonesia, her answers were rather evasive. In response to issues with cooperative learning specifically, she explained,

Yeah, so the students are not used to having this kind of, what, new way of learning, right? So they learn from their friends actually. They are expected to learn from their friends. So, yeah, I might say the main problem is actually the
students themselves who are not yet accustomed to having this kind of new way of learning.

In discussing some specific examples that occurred in her classroom, she mentioned the following.

Yeah, first, that probably the students were not responsive. So they just sat and intended to keep silent I suppose. But then because of my encouragement as I came to one group to another group, so I guess at last they were willing to talk to their friends, to share what they got. But I suppose, yeah most of the students, they don’t like this kind of talking or sharing. And they thought that it was a kind of a waste of time. Yeah, in one kind of journal, so I asked them to write, one particular student said that well actually it’s better for you to lecture directly because it seemed, said, that you were wasting our time or something like that. That was what one of the students said.

Her initial comments seemed to place the blame on the students, yet she did emphasize that she changed her role to a group facilitator and encourager. However, her description seemed to suggest the method would not have worked if she hadn’t had thought to encourage them. This seems to point to a possible misunderstanding in the role of a facilitator. It could signify that she sees that the teacher’s role is only as a passive observer while employing CL, pointing to a possible lack of knowledge about the innovation.

Through observations, it was clear that students were just as unresponsive in expository lessons as well. Expository lessons still require that teachers ask questions;
however, observations revealed that when questions remained unanswered by the students, lecturers would often answer their own questions and move on with the lecture, without restructuring their questions or employing CL techniques such as think-pair-share. Occasionally, professors would ask low-level questions directed toward a particular student who most generally answered quickly and seldom elaborated.

When asked if she would continue to try to use CL, Professor Tina stated,

Well, I would probably use cooperative learning again but then probably centering on how students can become…… how can I say that?.....there are core teams, there are expert teams. I would like to know how when they are grouped into expert teams. So I would like to know how they become experts before they go back to the home teams.

It is clear in her response that her understanding of CL was tied directly to the technique of using the jigsaw method. This is similar to Professor Sabir who equated CL to small group discussions. Neither mentioned the array of methods encompassed by CL. Their responses seem to exemplify Rogers’ (1995) discussion of KAP-gap, indicating that, “Someone with relatively low self-efficacy would not possess the self-confidence to think that they could adopt the innovation” (p. 170) or that a lack of principles knowledge limits their ability to adapt.

In response to what she thought were the barriers to using CL in Indonesia, Professor Tina mentioned the following.

First of all, probably, because the teachers are used to lecturing. So the seniors [senior lecturers] I guess [it] will be difficult probably for them to change. But for
juniors, I guess quite a lot of them have started using [it] in fact they did, they apply it, I suppose, in the classroom using cooperative learning. But maybe the essence of the cooperative learning is not yet really applied, so there is a group of students, and then okay. Like others, she placed blame on previous teachers students might have encountered, specifically, the senior educators. She seemed to suggest that CL and NCCM methods face the most scrutiny from senior lecturers and stated that junior lecturers at least try even thought they don’t do it well. Her attitudes about/feelings toward CL were blamed on senior lecturers not wanting to change which affected the implementation of the innovation by junior lecturers. This hinted not only to a possible “KAP-gap” but also to a culture of a hierarchy which, in Indonesia, has been replicated by younger faculty without critical reflection.

Professor Tina echoed negative feelings through the perspective of her children’s own classroom experiences.

My children, so the first child, my daughter, probably because of [being educated under] the old curriculum, so she was not involved much in group work I suppose. But for my son, because it is in the new curriculum which is applied in the classroom, so I don’t know much about how he works in the group, but he said something about, “Yeah..... I like to work alone now. The teacher doesn’t teach me, doesn’t give me the lesson that I have to find it myself and then we have to read ourselves.” That is what he said, but I don’t know how exactly they work
with their friends to come up with a kind of knowledge, to get knowledge from the teacher, no particular answer about that I think.

Again experiences with CL were negative, with blame being placed outside the individual. Although she demonstrated her principle knowledge of CL (i.e., that the innovation is constructivist), at the the same time she questioned its ability to create usable knowledge, or as she stated, “a kind of knowledge.”

At another point in time, she alluded that her own feelings remained unchanged until an American English Fellow team-taught with her. She understood more about how to use CL techniques, like jigsaw and think-pair-share, and that it was only after watching his use of the techniques that she began to feel better about how to maybe use them. However, she still expressed skepticism about the usefulness of CL techniques with extremely passive students or large classes. Her hesitant speech, the use of “maybes” and “mights,” indicated she was unsure about using CL. The data seemed to suggest that Professor Tina might have been experiencing a KAP-gap due to her own lack of self-confidence in using CL, as well as her own inability to ask a near-peer more about the innovation and how to use it.

This same sort of insecurity could be seen at PES. Although elementary principals and teachers never stated their opinions directly, their consistent avoidance of group work was evident. Ms. Lang stated teachers need more training and need to be less curriculum bound. At the kindergarten level, there was no observable resistance towards using small group work. However, in the elementary school, cooperative learning was only utilized by the researcher. The principal, Ms Lang, suggested other teachers try it, but she never
required it. The same was true for the elementary principals with whom I worked. Even though the researcher prepared a rubric for class observations and included the use of cooperative group work, this item was removed in the final edit completed by the principals who replaced Ms. Lang during the last six months in the field.

The main barrier seemed to stem from the teachers’ inability to manage the classrooms and redirect off-task behaviors. In addition, teachers were given little training in classroom management techniques and might have been unskilled in, or unaware of, the need to follow through. Some might have found it easier to resort to a more traditional discipline technique of yelling at the students. For example, although the researcher was asked to complete training sessions at the beginning of each school year, teachers never followed through on any of the suggestions, and although principals would agree to check for follow through, that checking did not occur.

When questioned why they were not using CL, the elementary teachers stated, “I don’t have time to do cooperative group” or “the children will not cooperate.” Regardless of the amount of modeling, and use of cooperative work in classes, teachers were not convinced they could do it. They even expressed skepticism for the relevance of the more engaging activities if the children were going to have to write answers on a test. They felt traditional expository methods would give students the information they needed to memorize for their tests in a more timely fashion.

Although English lessons were taught using CL, the teachers created the tests. The students did as well in English as in the other subjects where they only received traditional expository lessons. The few that did receive lower grades in English also
achieved low marks in Mandarin, Indonesian, and Science. However, this was not enough to convince the teachers to change their methods when they were teaching their own classes. Observations revealed students seated in rows following a lesson plan where the teacher presents the topic, students participated in a round-robin question and answer sessions, and moved on to complete individual seat work either in workbooks or using teacher-made hand outs. This passive style of teaching was also repeated at CUS for the first and second year students. Students were always seated in rows with the teacher either seated or standing in front of the rooms. If pair work was required, they would do this with the student seated next to them.

In general, most of the instructors and teachers would initially state positive attitudes about student-centered approaches, yet over time, many began to reveal their uncertainty of either the utility or the efficacy of using CL and NCCM. Others, such as the Professor Tina, would reveal their negative feelings in their writings and actions. It is unclear if these feelings derive from personal experiences using the method or from their perceptions of extraneous conditions or perceived barriers.

In a professional paper written for the CUS monthly training sessions, Professor Tina combined NCCM techniques with the CL jigsaw approach to set rules for the class. She asserted the activity was a good way to introduce cooperative learning to a new class on its first meeting and showed how it supported the 2004 National Curriculum initiatives of competency-based education and constructivism. The paper was clearly written and cited works by Elliot Aronson and Robert Slavin. But a close reading shows some very interesting contradictions. Professor Tina had taken a method and a philosophy and used
it in a way to get students to complete a classroom activity that allowed them to discover the rules a teacher had already set for the class. Although the description of the jigsaw method was very clear and made a complicated technique very understandable, it was clear she had structured the lesson in such a way as to ask students to reinforce pre-set rules by thinking of their own examples of why her rules were good.

One line in particular demonstrates how the activity supported a maintenance of traditional authoritarian values. “The [existing] classroom rules can be revealed by the teachers actively involving the students in the process, rather than simply by the teachers informing them.” The crucial aspect of having the students brainstorm different rights and responsibilities to cooperatively create appropriate rules for their class was clearly missing. Overall, Professor Tina seemed to indicate that CL and NCCM are questionable innovations. Her actions and words suggested she was suspicious of the functionality of CL and NCCM in Indonesia.

In an interview, Professor Arjuna of East Java State University (EJSU), he provided reasons why teachers and university instructors have not adopted CL and NCCM. First, was that changes in education come from the top down sentralistik, and second, educators themselves must have a chance to understand a new method or curriculum before it changes. This presents another barrier to learning something new, not for monitary reasons, but due to a system in constant change.

As for university instructors, Professor Arjuna suggested three barriers to adopting the innovations. One was related to the authority of the teachers and their ability to simply choose not to use the methods in the classroom. Second, they still really
don’t know or understand the methods, and third, they really didn’t understand the process underlying learning as an individual and active process. He pointed to their lack of theoretical understanding of learning, teaching, and how authority can still be maintained in student-centered instruction.

The opinions of several English faculty at the Christian University (CUS), specifically Professor Eko, Professor Rita, Professor Ruvi and Professor Mathew, regarding the innovations were of interest. All could give fairly textbook-like responses to “what is CL?” while a few were able to suggest how to use it and why.

All four generally stated a positive regard for CL, yet each mentioned the obstacle of passive students. None offered comment when the focus of discussions was on NCCM. Over the course of the years while I was co-teaching, none of them asked any questions about how to implement a CL technique or asked about my experiences or opinions I might hold.

Their syllabi usually included classroom presentations of some kind, but none utilized a CL project in the purest sense of the word, nor were any of them observed using CL or NCCM techniques in their classes. Observations revealed loosely structured group work or pair work. Roles were never assigned, objectives were never cooperatively set, plans for interdependence were not made, nor were rubrics created with the students.

Although none asked specific questions about CL or NCCM, one common issue emerged in pre-semester planning sessions for the freshman and sophomore intensive language courses --- how to group students. Each semester, discussions would occur about how to most appropriately group students based on mixed-ability. All instructors
stated, or at least nodded in agreement, for the need to be more systematic in grouping students with more advanced skills in English with students with fewer skills. Yet, in each planning session, each one would state how more skilled students preferred to be with higher skilled students and would not really help lower skilled students when given the opportunity. Despite the stated interest in mixed-ability grouping, it was never really accomplished. This lack of follow through could be due to lack of self-confidence and/or the lack of a near-peer with whom to discuss failures constructively.

Although Professor Sabir of EJSU was fairly consistent in his positive attitude toward small-group discussions that he felt was an example of CL, he began to compare his practice to other lecturers and teachers. He revealed the paradox in which many Indonesian educators live and work. Like Dr. Lie, his comments describe the syncretism noted by Anderson (1996) so many years ago. In the following quote, Professor Sabir addressed comments about the ever-changing curriculum and student passivity as reasons why most teachers did not use student-centered approaches.

It is also something that is not easy to explain. I want to say that usually new methods still use certain aspects from the old ones. It means the old ones are not always bad to apply. Not all of them are bad. In this case, small group discussion method also uses several aspects from cooperative learning. I think that one similarity is both of them emphasize on the students’ activity. For example, when I am going to apply this method, I have to tell the students the topic to be discussed one or two weeks before the meeting so that they can prepare for it at home. But, not all students have the same view. I am sorry if I reveal my
suspicion of my own students because students here must be forced. If not, they will do nothing. You have been in my class, right? .... [I ask them] Where is the ticket? Where is the material? Even in another class, when you did not observe me, I always ask them. [Then] If they do not bring it, I ask them to go out of the classroom. If they do not bring it, I still ask them, “Did you already learn it?” I asked them some points in this way. If they cannot answer, I ask them to go out. It is actually to convince them that we are going to start new materials so that they can prepare the materials they bring to the classroom, and the materials they [should] learn at home. In this new method [such as CL], we actually can see which students are ready to learn. It is so clear. But, the number of students that are not ready is bigger than those who are ready. The class we entered has 37 students. Only 15 students are active. It is not big number, but it is not bad. Most of them are still left behind. It is quite difficult to support them to improve. I think it is like that.

In his explanation of reasons why other teachers blame students for CL not working, he too began to blame passive students. He admitted that CL might help get students “ready to learn,” but noted the majority are not ready. He used the “passive student” as a basis for his strictness and the consequences he used with them. His comments reveal an interesting melding of the democratic ideals and authoritarian traditions. CL and NCCM would not contradict his views of student responsibilities and natural consequences, but both would emphasize the fact that responsibilities and consequences are developed by the class as a whole, and not only by the teacher.
Granted, the teacher, as a member of the class, can add to the rules, but the group decides on them together. As his statement suggests, he decides the rules and the consequences, and “students here must be forced; if not, they will do nothing.” It is unclear whether he has tried a more democratic approach to deal with the situation of unprepared students in the past and with that approach meeting failure. It is also unclear whether he understood that aspect of CL. It is also unclear whether he considered involving the students as an option since he believed his method has worked and, thus, felt no need to try something new.

In a discussion about democratic classroom management and democratic discipline, he stated the following:

I think discipline has also changed a lot. I am sorry, when you came in, there was a student I asked to go out. Finally they are late. I have applied this discipline since 1980. I hate students who come late. They complain why I do not permit them to join the class, while the other lecturers do. I say this is the way I am. The problem is many other lecturers do not do the same. But, I let it be. That is the way they are.

In this statement, he was apologetic for an incident observed during his class. However, he seemed to be apologizing that it was observed, and not for the fact that it happened. The tone and word choice also revealed his less than positive beliefs in NCCM. Statements like “I hate students who come late,” and “they complain why I do not permit them to join the class, while the other lecturers do,” reflected his belief that discipline has changed, but in his opinion, maybe not for the best. It should be noted
these statements could be translated less actively than they have been. For instance, “I hate students who come late” could be translated as, “I really dislike for students to come late.” The decision to use this translation was that of my translator and not necessarily my own. With more reflection, my personal interpretation is that he promoted a teacher-dominated approach to classroom management which led me to keep this translation.

However, Professor Sabir contradicted this authoritarian stance concerning students’ rights to contest teachers’ opinions on subject matter, when he stated:

I think it can be but it must be started from my own willingness as a teacher or lecturer. It means whether that lecturer wants to change [the] learning atmosphere to be more democratic. Here, the students may disagree with the lecturer and may oppose the lecturer’s explanation. In my class, especially in the preliminary of history of the West, I must apologize because I have not taught American History much, I allowed my students to express their different opinions. And if they have one, it does not mean they will not pass the course. They can [or are able to express an opinion] because, probably, they have read different references than what I have read. The class will [then] be active. I have done this technique when teaching American History. It was good. So, I conditioned the students to be ready to confront ... It seemed some students, even though not all, really prepared the materials to “attack” me. It was really good. I even worked up a sweat. And they got an A because of several aspects.

The problem is not all lecturers are ready to do that similarly. They even get offended easily if the students talk in the class while they are explaining
something. They feel disturbed. It is a part of the tradition as you said – that is, when someone is talking, others must listen to him. It is not funny. People are not always ready to be neglected by others. Whereas, when we try to apply democratization in the class, there will always be situations like that. From the students’ aspect; from their preparation, I think they do not have shortcomings. I always mention this. “You will teach, won’t you? You must speak.” They must have a reference. The reference is not always books. It can be other sources. Students mostly do not have it, so that they do not know what to say or ask in the class. They have nothing in their mind. When I asked them to bring the Junior High School Curriculum, they brought it, but they had not read it at home. When I gave them a chance to ask questions, they do not know what to ask. They have the book, but they do not read it. Even if they ask something, the quality of their question is very poor. Like “What does this word mean?” So, their question is not a problematic question. So, when you ask about the possibility of the implementation of democratization in the classroom, at least I can draw attention to two aspects: lecturer and students. The lecturers are not always ready because of the tradition and students who always do not prepare well for the lesson. They must be forced or they do nothing. If there are students who are not like that, their number is small. If there are 37 students in one class, less than 5 students are active and creative. The ones who ask questions are just the same.

It seems that, at one point, Professor Sabir saw a need for the students to have freedom to express different opinions on subject matter, but not opinions about other
aspects of the class. He used small group discussion as an example of CL and stated very positive effects for using it. However, in a later response, his overall feelings for both CL and NCCM were not so positive. It is unclear whether his negative feelings could be attributed to his own lack of how-to knowledge about CL and NCCM, or his firm belief that, because of the culture, these approaches would not work. It is possible that his impressions that the majority of his students are passive is a side-effect of the culture or, as Professor Echo noted, student’s who expect to nurse from the cow versus nurse the cow. It could also be due to the continued use of expository methods.

Professor Sabir and Professor Tina were not the only ones to point to the passivity of students as a reason why CL and NCCM do not work. Many of the faculty across the three campuses pointed to this. However, in direct contradiction to these views, between 63 to 71% of the 259 undergraduate students I surveyed either noted takut [fear] or malu [shyness] as the reason for not speaking in class. Less than 20 percent said they were passive due to being unprepared for class, and less than 10 percent noted they did not speak because they were confused.

When translated, the Indonesian word malu is shy. However, it is a difficult term to translate because, in English, it can mean shy, shame, or ashamed—all connotatively different terms. This confusion was clarified during individual student interviews where they described experiences of being criticized and yelled at by teachers for giving wrong answers. However, few student interviewees ever had this type of incident happen to them but, rather, to their peers and, more importantly, not at university but rather between 5th and 6th grade through high school. After further questioning about experiences at the
university level, a majority of the students noted that teasing from their peers was the leading cause for not speaking in class. All of these experiences would fall under being shamed or ashamed more than shy.

As for what students disliked about group processes in learning, the majority stated reasons related to conflict. Most cited personality conflicts with group members, and the interpersonal conflicts that emerge when one does group work. This seemed predictable since no direct teaching on how “to do” group work or even assigning clear roles for duties in groups was ever observed, with the exception of Dr. Lie’s classes. When asked what they thought were the worst aspects, they either stated issues related to individual accountability and fairness, issues related to conflict within the groups, or issues related to the limitations in the quality of the work produced by groups and the time expended. Many of these reasons would probably be at the top of the list for students in the U.S. as well.

**Feasibility.** Generally, when one talks about feasibility is often equated with time, space, and money. However in its broadest sense, feasibility could also include culture and individual perceptions of culture. If the teachers felt the students’ silence was only cultural, then perhaps the prior discussion of silent classrooms would be placed in this section. However, as it relates to both themes, feasibility is included under both.

The perceptions of student characteristics were not the only stated reason. For K-12 teachers, the size of classrooms was also mentioned as one reason why CL and NCCM would not work. At the end of a large workshop with the largest and most esteemed Christian, affiliated private school system in Surabaya for all grade levels from pre-
school through university, a feedback form included a question regarding the biggest barrier to using CL. The most frequently mentioned item was how to manage and control individual groups. During the workshop, teachers reported their class sizes ranged from 40 to 60 students. Interestingly, many noted the noise level as a management concern. The second most common response pertained to students’ skills with group work. Student passivity and individual accountability were leading concerns.

Another significant factor mentioned was financial reward, as demonstrated through an occurrence at the end of the Jember 2005 workshop. The workshop was followed by a focus group interview with Professor Arjuna and six other Indonesian educators actively involved in the Center for Research on Intergroup Relations & Conflict Resolution’s (CERIC) mission to disseminate aspects of CRE in Indonesia. Four participants came from different university campuses across Indonesia. The final question asked about the biggest barriers to adopting and adapting CL and NCCM techniques. Five participants, including Professor Arjuna, mentioned money. They stated most of their participants would not attempt dissemination without extra money directed to them or to their programs. Financial rewards, as they noted, were a major consideration for their participants’ motivation to even attempt the CRE initiatives they were trying to infuse across settings.

All of the previously mentioned barriers align with Rogers’ (1995) categories of unwanted consequences and self-efficacy. In the category of unwanted consequences, participants indicated that CL and NCCM are good innovations, but the time and effort in learning more about them, instituting them in their classrooms, and monitoring the
effectiveness for no extra compensation (i.e., money) were all barriers. An additional barrier was that the national assessments are still geared toward expository teaching of facts to be recalled for tests, requiring students to identify versus explain. All of these barriers could point to the overarching barrier of culture challenges. Yet, many of these barriers could also be viewed as dynamic and capable of being bridged much like the examples provided by the following educators.

*Bridges to Implementation*

For some, cultural and institutional obstacles did not present insurmountable barriers to the implementation of CL and NCCM. Their positive attitudes about the possible benefits of using these innovations were not dictated by the state of students or their own experiences under the tutelage of authoritarian teachers. For example, Professor Arjuna from East Java State University (EJSU), one of the 74 participants in the 2003 CRE workshops, remained active and maintained contact after the workshops. Although he had limited experience with CL, his statements indicate he viewed CL as an effective way to educate not merely for the academic subjects which fall in the realm of cognitive development, but for the social-emotional aspect of human development. Professor Arjuna, like Dr. Lie, had implemented CL and NCCM. Although he was not observed using CL and NCCM as frequently as Dr. Lie, he did use them which points to his positive regard for the methods. As with Dr. Lie, he had become a potential resource on the EJSU campus for others who wanted to try NCCM and CL. Therefore, both sites had access to early adopters who could serve as “near peers” which Rogers (1995) felt would help eliminate KAP-Gap (p. 169). But observations and discussions with other lecturers
at both sites revealed that few of their colleagues had incorporated any of the techniques and fewer engaged in positive discussions about the techniques.

In discussions, Professor Arjuna often highlighted the democratizing effect of CL and NCCM, a primary argument he used in the Jember workshop. He emphasized what he called the “mutual learning” method of CL. In his interview, he described how he handled educators’ views that CL was just like the failed curricular approach, CBSA [active student learning methods].

*CBSA dengan Cooperative Learning. Sebenarnya berbeda, dan itu diterangkan.*

*Kalau CBSA, itu sebenarnya upaya-upaya bagaimana siswa, students, itu aktif.*

*Tetapi masih tahapnya pribadi, diri sendiri. Aktifnya diri sendiri, bukan aktif dalam bentuk group. Itu penekannannya. Tetapi kalau Cooperative Learning, itu adalah aktif dalam arti group, bersama-sama. Sehingga, Cooperative Learning itu betul-betul pendidikan yang bersifat toleransi.*

Basically, he stated that convincing educators there was a difference was difficult. As he noted, CBSA was designed to get students engaged in the learning environment, but it was still focused on the individual learners’ actions isolated from the group, and not focused on the individual student’s activity within the group. He emphasized that CL is concerned with the group activity and the cooperative individual actions within a group. Therefore, in his view, CL was actually an education in tolerance.

In his response, in addition to describing the fundamentals of CL and NCCM, Professor Arjuna revealed his understanding of the innovation and his feelings that using CL is a noble way to educate. His positive regard for both CL and NCCM was first seen
in the 2003 workshops and displayed itself in many forms. During the workshop, participants were grouped according to the content they taught or were studying. Professor Arjuna always volunteered to report his group’s discussions, and consistently made very concrete connections between the concepts and what his group of social studies and history teachers were facing in their university classes. Although most of the 72 participants were very active in Dr. Lie’s sessions, few were as active in a very teacher-dominated session on NCCM conducted by an American expatriate teaching in the International schools in Jakarta. However, Professor Arjuna continued to express motivation and led his group’s discussions regarding information reviewed in the session. It was the quality of his insights and his motivation that led the organizers to ask him to host and conduct a dissemination workshop at his university. He agreed enthusiastically, and his workshop in July 2003 was considered by the organizers as one of the best that season. As a co-presenter, he consistently provided examples of connections with CL and NCCM strategies used in the classrooms and in EJSU. Leading discussions regarding some obstacles he faced as well as linking CL and NCCM to overall education reforms again demonstrated his overall positive attitude toward both CL and NCCM.

Besides his initial willingness to engage in the early workshops, another sign of his positive feelings was his enthusiasm for using his site for this research. Besides Dr. Lie, Professor Arjuna was the only participant who actively worked to secure all the needed paperwork for this research to be completed at his site. He took the lead in describing my presence and my research to his dean, the rector, and his colleagues. He often helped by creating connections to more familiar methods and techniques familiar to
his colleagues, such as contextual learning, and aspects of the current national mandate for schools to use competency-based curricula. To be willing to host a foreign researcher at his site and fill out the needed paperwork pointed to his positive regard for, and interest in, the research. He received no financial award for his efforts. In fact, he attended two major seminars away from his town in June and December 2003, organized and conducted a dissemination workshop at his campus in July of 2003, and attended and conducted sessions on NCCM and CL in a workshop in Jember in July 2005 without financial reward.

It is reasonable to assume that, by writing about CL and NCCM, Dr. Lie, from CUS, would feel positively about these innovations. It was because of her enthusiasm and her work with CL and some NCCM issues that she was invited to be the main CL trainer during the 2003 CRE workshops. As a local educator, the initial hope was that she would be an example of Rogers (1995) “early adopter” and “near-peer” for the other participants to meet and with whom to eventually network as they began their own trials into CL and NCCM.

Additionally, she has written opinion pieces and editorials for national newspapers, developed curriculum for several schools in East Java, and conducted numerous teacher training workshops.

Although her writings mainly focused on CL, in one manuscript (Lie, 2002), she stated her feelings about NCCM indirectly. Her stance on NCCM is shown in her emphasis on the need to incorporate, “…ways to create a learning environment in which differences are recognized and accepted while simultaneously providing students with a
common set of norms and values to bind them together” (p. 70). Many of the methods for implementing multicultural education are parsimonious to NCCM which is often created and supported through CL techniques. In a later manuscript entitled, “A Message of Peace from Ubud: Conflict Resolution through Spirituality,” Dr. Lie (2004) again emphasized her belief not only in the potential CL and NCCM strategies hold to promote peace and confront conflict for groups locked in protracted conflict, but as a skills curriculum to use in classrooms with young children. Neither of these two pieces lay out specific techniques but, generally, only speak about curricula that incorporate their use.

In addition to these pieces, she has written on other aspects of schooling that hint at NCCM issues. Her opinion and editorial pieces included arguments against national, high-stakes testing initiatives and educational ability grouping and tracking, while advocating for the use of CL and CRE techniques to enhance multicultural education (Lie, 2003, 2005, 2006).

In addition to advocating for CL and NCCM in her writing, she has been actively involved in writing school curriculum for numerous private secular and religious schools in East Java. For one school, she wrote a strict, non-violence school policy that forbade not only physical violence, but verbal violence as well. In addition to curriculum work, she continues to work extensively providing training for local schools, both public and private, on how to begin to work autonomously while using national standards as a guiding force and not an authoritarian one. During these sessions, she often includes CL and NCCM strategies.
An issue frequently raised by informants during this study and in the pilot study was that large class size was a reason why CL and NCCM would not work in Indonesia. In response to whether, in her role as the Under-Secretary to the Ministry of Education for the province of East Java, she advocated to reduce the number of students in public school classroom (which can be as high as 60), Dr. Lie admitted that her position in the ministry did not have any direct power in influencing policy but, was, instead, more of a consultant.

This claim was also in line with Rogers’ (1995) “KAP-Gap” condition of perceived availability and unwanted side-effects (p. 169). Feelings that large teacher-student ratios impede the teacher’s ability to attempt new student-centered techniques are not completely unfounded, but perhaps overly-generalized. Perceived negative side-effects most often mentioned were noisy rooms and the perceptions that noisy rooms were out-of-control, pressures on class time-management impacting the amount of coverage of the curriculum, and concerns that some students would not work equally. Dr. Lie stated she had received similar feedback. She went on to explain that, in order to counter these excuses, she would often tell teachers in her workshops that she would not expect them to do all of the methods on a daily basis, but to at least attempt some of them at different times throughout the year. This kind of statement, while not addressing the issue of concern, demonstrated her feeling that even using CL occasionally was better than disregarding it.

Another example was her work in developing civil society initiatives, a role in which she stated she felt she had more impact. This role was one of being an active
member of an International NGO which has been targeting development of new
democratic leaders across Indonesia. Within this organization, she crosses all religious
and ethnic lines to monitor and support provincial centers that provide scholarships and
training to young and talented religious and political leaders.

If these written works and concerted training efforts did not show her positive
attitudes enough, informal and formal conversations left no doubt as to her commitment
in reforming education through constructivist practices. In one telling moment regarding
her perceptions of the inadequacies of traditional educational techniques, she identified
possible roots to the silent, passive classrooms in the university.

They are conditioned. I mean [look] now at this level [speaking about and
pointing through the cafeteria window to the elementary school’s 1st and 2nd
graders playing outside]. You know how talkative they are, how active they are,
but over the years through the culture, through schooling, then it’s [going to be]
killing them. So, when they reach the university level, then they become you
know, what you saw [referencing her very quiet university classroom which I
observed the previous week].

She not only makes a fairly condemning statement on the state of the Indonesian
education system, but hints to a real cultural impediment. As noted before, she named
this as a “culture of fear.” But, as can be seen in her comments about obedience, her
statements could be just as easily interpreted as a social reproduction of a culture of
control and respect for rank. This disdain demonstrates not only her understanding of, but
feelings for, the importance of CL and NCCM. Her enthusiasm for them is noted in her
ever willingness to speak and write about them and in her continuing effort to disseminate them by modeling them to her students and in her numerous educational workshops. Yet, this same aspect was pointed to by others, and the innovations were deemed unfeasible due to the prevailing culture in the classrooms.

Few of the faculty at EJSU, besides Professor Arjuna, talked about or attempted to use either CL or NCCM. In fact only one professor, Professor Sabir, use cooperative learning methods. Professor Sabir was a senior lecturer at EJSU with over 20 years experience. Although he was one of the few professors observed using some NCCM and CL techniques, he was one of the most authoritarian teachers observed.

In response to my reflection that, at EJSU, I hadn’t observed any of the professors using CL methods, he responded,

Well, I have to judge others because you mentioned that the other lecturers do not use that method, didn’t you? Coincidently, it deals with tradition. Formerly we, as history lecturers, inherited it from the previous lecturers, our seniors. While there are young lecturers, they still use those old methods because, I think, they do not want to change or maybe they really do not know the advantages and the benefits of the new methods. For example, the use of small group discussion, I personally see that by using small group discussion, I can monitor students’ weaknesses and strengths as individuals or groups. For instance, there are 5 or 4 people in each group. I come to each group to see who are active, for example by asking what their problems are during the discussion. We can evaluate the question. If I stimulate them a little bit, I can evaluate their answers based on my question. By
doing this way, I have notes about students who have strengths in the groups. That is what I think. So, when I have to make the final score, in this process actually, I already have the score. I already have the score. I think the final semester examination is just to fulfill a formality from the university. Actually, the process itself is the important one because, for example, when you have to do the exam, if you have the flu, you cannot prepare well for the test. You, consequently, will get a bad score, right? However, if from the beginning we monitor the students’ activity, I think the evaluation will be more accurate. These are some reasons. In small group discussion, I also can see how students work together.

It is interesting that he used his small group discussion model as not only an example of CL which showed a fairly in-depth principles knowledge, but also a good example of his underlying belief that it was a better way to judge students’ abilities than traditional testing. His argument for this particular method seemed to indicate his positive regard for CL. He recognized that its use allowed for formative rather than summative evaluation purposes hinting that one could satisfy structural imperatives for low level knowledge-based assessments and still strive for more authentic performance-based assessments. Also, his description demonstrates one educator’s way of maintaining autonomy within a highly bureaucratic system.

As the discussion expanded into the failure of the previous student-centered innovation CBSA, he provided very insightful information about how CBSA was used incorrectly.
In the past, when CBSA was applied, there were schools that could apply it well for example Public Junior High number 8 and Public Junior High number 3, because they did it consistently based on the rules or references. However, more other schools did not apply it. There were many factors which affected them. One factor was that too many materials were taught to the students. It made teachers convinced that the materials could not be finished by using CBSA. I think it was the teacher’s mistake since their orientation was how to finish the materials, not how to make the students understand the materials. If CBSA is done correctly, we do not need to think how to finish the materials anymore because students will be used to finishing the materials through CBSA. Since it was already established like that, most teachers keep using the old method. I am sorry if I interpret it incorrectly. For example the teachers give a lecture and assignments with the old techniques like making a summary. For them, it is just the same. The teachers said, “Read this book, chapter 10, page 10 to 30, and make the summary!” This is wrong. It means the teachers have not discussed the materials yet, but they ask the students to make a summary. That is why when CBSA was applied, the result was not satisfying. Then people do not want to use it anymore.

Although the question centered on CBSA, CBSA contains student-centered methods synonymous with CL and NCCM. Professor Sabir continued to state his positive belief in student-centered approaches that CBSA called for, but highlighted what he considered to be the primary problems explaining why it did not work. He pointed to what Rogers (1995) identified as an unwanted side-effect. He noted, teachers “were
convinced” that CBSA methods took too much time which affected the amount of the curriculum they could cover. He also targeted the initial lack of training and its inability to change the teachers’ “orientations.” His statements echoed Dr. Lie’s and Ms. Lang’s comments regarding teachers being bound to the curriculum. Also he hinted that teachers are orientated to expository teaching methods that focus on teaching a large amount of facts to be learned and tested versus a constructivist’s view that concepts need to be delved into and related to previous learning as well as bridged to new learning. Therefore, possible side-effects besides limited curricular coverage would also be possible lower achievement on standardized national tests.

The level of student engagement observed in his class was very similar to the engagement levels in Dr. Lie’s classes. Students were active, discussing the topics with their peers and teachers. They were smiling, debating, and refrained from yelling and screaming. None were sleeping or displaying angry or sad faces. It is interesting that these observations were echoed in the student surveys. From the survey results, students reported reasons why they liked working in groups as 1) having the freedom and ability to speak, 2) having the quality and social aspects of the learning, and 3) having a lack of task-related stress and ease of completion. The majority of 259 students surveyed across three campuses mentioned the ability to listen to their peers’ differing views and working cooperatively as reasons they liked using group work. In addition, participants precisely expressed the freedom to express their opinions and thoughts. This stood in contrast to the professors who pointed to the students’ passivity during group work and their disdain for it.
Decision and Implementation

Professor Rita: “It may work, or you can do that there [in the U.S.], but here [in Indonesia] it can’t. If you knew about our schools you would know.”

Co-Instructor Brett: “Well I could see being able to do this at PES.”

Professor Rita: “Well, ya, maybe there, but no where else.’

Co-Instructor Brett: “Well, I’ve seen some schools in East Java and other places where it may also be possible.”

Professor Rita: “No, it is not possible! Administration would not allow it. Parents aren’t even able to enter the school. Class is over.”

(A rather heated exchange which took place with Professor Rita in front of our University Early Childhood Education class April 26, 2007).

The above exchange used to introduce this section was a rare incident. Generally, conflict is avoided at all cost in Indonesia, and especially when one of the speakers is Javanese. However, Professor Rita and I worked for over two years together and had team taught several classes. Our working relationship had shifted from one of quiet respectfulness to a team effort in helping our shared classes on early childhood education investigate early childhood development and develop curricular and instructional methods for pre-school and kindergarten classes centered around play. The exchange which silenced our class left us both firmly standing on opposite positions. We had been using a Western text on integrating play in early childhood programs and the use of learning centers. Professor Rita prefaced the discussion which ended with the above
exchange by asking students to look at the diagrams and images in the text of ideal preschool and kindergarten classrooms. Then she stated that this is not possible in Indonesia due to the physical classroom space and large class sizes. She used her son’s school as an example and stated that it was a very small room with 45 kindergarten students and one teacher. I then tried to make a point similar to one Dr. Lie had mentioned in my interview with her and echoed that most techniques and methods mentioned in Western texts could not be simply taken as described and then used directly in an Indonesian context without adaptation, but that they, the students, as future teachers shouldn’t look over potential resources that they have on hand and should attempt some of the books suggestions. For example, I mentioned saving one corner for a learning center, insisting on tables versus desks, and recruiting volunteers. When questioning the students about how they might go about using learning centers with larger class sizes while still maintaining appropriate monitoring and supervision levels, some of the more advanced students stated they might enlist more advance students in maintaining control of individual groups. I had stated that could be possible, but at the pre-school level it might not always be feasible. Then they were asked if there were other options. After several minutes of silence, I proffered asking if parents could be enlisted as teacher aids. This began the exchange with Professor Rita. She was visibly upset. Interrupting my questioning of the students and insinuating that I knew little of Indonesian schools and cultures, she stated the above directly to me. As is seen the attempt to convince the students to approach obstacles to creating the ideal constructivists learning environments with creative brainstorming ended up being a small clash of cultures.
Luckily, this exchange did not have any effect on the working relationship with Rita, but it provided a very rare, honest glimpse of how a colleague really viewed the ideas that the students were learning and me. Observed in this incidence was the firmly based belief hierarchical systems and authoritarian rules and how they continue to be culturally reproduced even under the cloak of a course of student-centered education and cooperative learning atmosphere. She, as an education professor, stated that as a parent she was not allowed in school without an appointment and by accepting it, not questioning it, and then teaching it as an unchangeable rule continued support and culturally reproduce the status quo protocols. Teachers are above parents, administrators are above teachers, and the hierarchy is static and unchangeable.

As potential adopter, Professor Rita seemed to fluctuate between the persuasion, decision, and implementation stages. She had been selected by the university to be one of the main implementers of their move to create an early childhood education program. She had already been flown three times to a university in Canada with whom CUS had formed a partnership. Yet as Rogers’ (1995) noted, moving from the persuasion stage entails the potential adopters making decisions as to when and how to implement a teaching innovation. In this stage, Rogers (1995) noted, “most individuals will not adopt an innovation without trying it first on a probationary basis in order to determine its usefulness in their own situation” (p.171). From these attempts, they move into the implementation stage where they become more independent and use the innovation more often.
Over the course of the research, most of the observed instructors seemed to be fluctuating, like Professor Rita. Few instructors or teachers were observed using CL or NCCM. Though all the sites exhibited some student-centered work in the form of project-based performance assessments for the most part these were more examples of just group work and not real examples of CL or NCCM. Only three instructors were observed independently using any forms of the innovations as part of their teaching. The vast majority of the data in which informants were seen confronting CL and NCCM came from instances when the informants were co-teaching with the researcher in classes at the university and at the elementary school level. In these instances, the informants moved out of a team-teaching role, and into an observer role. These indirect attempts are in line with Rogers’ (1995) description of the innovation diffusion phase, during which “this ‘trial-by-others’ provides a kind of vicarious trial for an individual” (p. 171).

The importance of this “trial-by others” was echoed in an interview with Professor Tina. In the following she talks about the experience she had with an American professor who had been placed at CUS for one year by the American Teaching Fellows program. Her statements are in response to a question about the possible barriers to adopting CL and NCCM techniques in Indonesia. She mentioned that change for most educators is a matter of understanding the methods better and motivating them to even attempt changes.

Professor Tina: Okay, probably from my experience (with Thom ESL Fellow) and because of him I suppose—he scheduled meetings for us and he tried to have a kind of report, a kind of gathering and then we share, and then, ya, maybe someone
should I don’t know......someone should be there scheduling probably. And then, after that okay regularly, I suppose. Regular meetings so that we are encouraged to apply it again or to keep that...to go on trying or something like that.

As is seen, she seems to relate her own uncertainty for the methods, and as is shown later, she remained in this on-looker mode even in classes co-taught with her. Interestingly, in December 2007 she found out she was accepted in a doctoral program in the Netherlands and stated that her dissertation inquiry was going to investigate CL methods used in English language acquisition.

During the passive observation stage, it was only in Dr. Lie’s class at CUS that a consistent use of CL and NCCM was interwoven into each class. As for her colleagues, only three attempted CL during small portions of their classes. At EJSU, although all observed classes contained some sort of project-based, performance assessment, only Professor Arjuna implemented NCCM, but he was never observed using any CL techniques for instruction. From all of the observed CUS instructors, Professor Sabir was the only one observed using a CL strategy in his class. At both universities and at the elementary school, traditional classroom practices were seen the most. Observed were the expository methods of lecturing and presentations where listening and note-taking was the dominant form of processing the instruction. Occasionally, this pattern was varied in the elementary school with individual seat work and on certain days a game-like activity was conducted with the use of a white board. Even though all three sites were teaching different content, the teaching styles were basically the same, focusing on teacher-centered, passive learning.
Observations of classroom instruction were characterized by a consistent use of low-level questioning, silent students, and unilateral communication patterns. Reciprocal communication was rarely observed except in Dr. Lie’s classes. This is notable, since the 1984, 1994, and 2004 national curricula mandated the use of student-centered approaches. Again, reasons for this might include the fact that elements of CL and NCCM might have proven to be too challenging, or elements were in direct opposition to values such as *Kebo Nyusu Gudel* (the calf nurses the cow) held by both the students and teachers alike.

An analysis of the data revealed two over-arching themes. First was the struggle to change from authoritarian techniques to authoritative ones, and the second was the struggle to understand and use the teaching strategy of facilitation required of a teacher working from a constructivist framework. With respect to struggling with authoritative versus authoritarian styles of teaching, teachers’ comments and actions revealed their specific areas of concern: scaffolding, modeling learning, and grouping. With respect to the struggle with facilitating lessons, participants seemed to experience difficulty with the strategies of monitoring for classroom management and procedural issues, providing constructive feedback, and leading through critical questioning. Again culture seemed to play an underlying role in these struggles.

*Authoritative Struggles*

As discussed in the literature review, both CL and NCCM are utilized in democratic classrooms where teachers maintain authority through their knowledge of, and experience with structuring learning, understanding the learning process, and
knowing the learners in addition to an expertise in the content being taught. Equally important are educators’ abilities to model and present themselves as lifelong learners who construct knowledge themselves. It is this triangulation of various duties that differs most from more traditional authoritarian teachers where expertise in content alone is the claim to authority. But is this differentiation a relatively known construct?

According to the Oxford Dictionary, *authority* was first used in the 13th century and defined as, 1) “the power or right to give orders and enforce obedience, 2) a person or organization exerting control in a political or administrative sphere, 3) the power to influence others based on recognized knowledge or expertise” (Authority, 2006). The term *authoritative* is noted as emerging in the 17th century and is defined as, “1) reliable because true or accurate: an authoritative source, 2) commanding and self-confident, 3) supported by authority” (Authoritative, 2006). However, *authoritarian* is noted as being defined in 1879 as “favoring or enforcing strict obedience to authority at the expense of personal freedom” (Authoritarian, 1999).

The distinguishing characteristics between authoritative and authoritarian seemed directly related to the struggles with implementing CL and NCCM in Indonesia. The latter using authority in strict ways to command obedience and the former using authority as a means to maintain self-confidence and reliability. So whereas authoritative connotes actions that are supported by truth to claim authority, authoritarian connotes actions that enforce submission without mention of truth. In the context of CL and NCCM, these authoritative actions can be characterized by the teachers’ roles in scaffolding, modeling,
and grouping for learning and maintaining their authority as teachers who not only have indepth understanding the content but an broad understanding of how students learn.

*Scaffolding*. Scaffolding, as Ormrod (2003) translated from the works of Vygotsky, is defined in the ways teachers provide “support mechanisms” to students in order to assist them in connecting prior knowledge to new learning and supporting their practice with new concepts and schemes (p. 39). Struggles with indirect ways to assist students were demonstrated at EJUS in several ways. An instance was observed that occurred at the end of a semester. Groups of three to four students were giving their final presentations. All groups were required to present a final paper that was defended in front of their classmates and professor. Unlike the cooperative atmosphere emphasized in CL, the environment was one of heightened competitiveness. It appeared that the audience of students and teacher took extreme pleasure in challenging the opinions presented by the group, in an attempt to sabotage the presenters, or at least to get them to pause, or look dumbfounded. Also the challenges were often not targeted at overarching concepts but at fact-based specifics which concentrated on questions of where when, and who.

Also conversations with professors revealed that the presentation groups were not assigned roles, nor were they given rubrics to structure their research or presentations. Generally, any advice and guidance the students received was gained from their peers. If they needed help, some would search for the professor, but most often they relied on peers who had already taken the class or were sent as emissaries for the rest of the group. Syllabi at EJUS were generally generic in form and written during prior years. They were basically a two-page limited course description with a statement regarding the
competencies addressed in the course, the materials needed for the class, a small list of the types of assessments that were going to be used, the grading procedure, an extended list of references, and an outline of weekly topics that were going to be discussed. No evidence of detailed project descriptions, rubrics, or samples were found.

The situation was similar at CUS. Detailed rubrics were only included for classes Dr. Lie had co-planned and often written herself. During the period of research which I was as an instructor at CUS, although more authentic, student-centered, and cooperative assessments were already established, there were no rubrics or written descriptions for the students to use in their preparation for class presentations of chapters, observation papers, or teaching demonstrations in co-taught classes until I created them. As was mentioned previously, Professor Echo had created a rubric for speaking tests, but it was not given to the students until the suggestion was made that it would be helpful for students in their preparation.

By contrast, at CUS guidance was only given the week before any activity was due. Professors would spend a portion of a class giving specific guidance verbally. What was noticed was that a few students lingered behind after class to ask further questions and then they would be approached by the rest of the class afterwards. However, since professors were required to stay at the university from given times, such as 7-4, students would often linger outside of the teachers’ offices or venture in to find their instructors and ask more detailed questions either individually or most often in small groups. Official office hours were not listed on syllabi. Rather, it seemed assumed if one needed something, one must go find the instructor and, then, if they were busy, either interrupt
them or wait until they were free. Most often, students were seen just interrupting as long as the professor was not in a formal committee meeting.

For the classes I co-taught, rubrics were made and given to students with their syllabi. On the first class of the semester, time was devoted for students to work in small groups to review the rubrics of the assignment, ask questions about terminology, and suggest changes to the requirements. Time in class was also scheduled at least a week in advance to review each assignment’s rubric again before the due dates. Also, students were required to grade themselves with the rubric and turn it in on the day the assignment was due. What was interesting is few ever followed the rubrics and still relied on the previously mentioned methods of seeking verbal guidance, generally from the Indonesian counterpart or from the elected classmates who were sent to us for information. It seemed that the rubrics provided no help to reduce their uncertainty until verbal confirmation was given. However, the co-teachers always expressed their positive attitudes about the rubrics. Some stated that this helped them to guide the students in private meetings and helped to structure their grading. Yet in the second year as rubrics were given to the co-teachers for input or asked for revisions none were returned with any substantial changes. When new assessments were created and the work of developing rubrics were portioned out, none were developed.

Similarly at EJUS, students were observed waiting or hunting for professors. It was then that the understanding arose of how students’ learning was scaffolded. They received guidance in more informal ways and only provided support if they actively sought out the professors and more or less cornered them. Yet as can be predicted, this
works well for the most assertive students. However, passive students seemed to have the choice of either following along more assertive students, waiting and asking peers who had previously taken the course, or just remaining passive and following the lead of more assertive members in their group. However, like the childhood game where a line of students are formed and a sentence is whispered to the first child and the message is then whispered each to each, by the time the message reaches the last child’s ear, the message is distorted. The same was true for the observed performances of many of the students.

Counter to this were observations of Dr. Lie’s courses. From the very first class guidance was not only given to understanding the course requirements but her expectations. She was the only informant at CUS who implemented NCCM by holding a class meeting. Dr. Lie’s own definition of NCCM, like CL, was observed more in her actions than in her written works. Although she had not previously studied CRE, her involvement with the trainings and in the preparation sessions seemed to have sparked her interests in the NCCM portions of the trainings and the overall emphasis of promoting more democratic classrooms. This cross over seemed most obvious in an observation of her university class of Childhood Education. The following is an excerpt from the class.

- 8:00 Professor asks for group names
- Three of the four groups came up with names
- Professor says that they need to move on and they need to set rules for the class.
  “I don’t want to set the rules for your class” She then asks for some suggestions.
  Students remain silent.
* A clear CRE connection. None of the students seem to react much to this.

- Student from group 2 states “Respect others ideas and opinions”

- Professor asks for an example. Students say they should listen

- Professors says “Great” and writes it on the board

- Student from group three states they should be allowed to eat and drink in the class.

- Professor laughs and states, “It is no problem for drinks or snack, but maybe not for food like soto ayam. (a popular chicken soup).

- Student from group three says “Help each other”

- Prof says, “Good, but how?”

- “If you miss the class, make up for it,” same student adds.

- Professor says, “That sounds good. So during group work or for missed classes, people will help each other, but for some individual work you need to work individually without help for classmates.” She laughs and students laugh out loud.

- Silence

- Professor states, “What about coming late?” She explains that class is officially over at 8:40 so it is important to begin on time. Students agree.

- Professor states “What if someone comes late? What is the penalty? What are the consequences even if I come late.”

- Silence

- Professor states that in past class they paid a small fine, had to sing a song or make a joke.
- Students laugh and say, “5000 rupiah..” (Generally a small meal cost 3000).

- Professor says, “That might be too expensive.”

- Class agrees and one student suggests, “Bring candy on the following class or pay 2000.”

- Another student says, “Turn off cell phones and no text messaging.”

- Professor agrees and states that if there is an exception for something very important let her know (i.e., Someone’s family member is sick and needs to be on call).

- Professor then says the class is an English class and that they need to only speak English during class.

- Class all agrees to pay fine of 500 rupiah (a coin) if they use Indonesian.

- They elect a treasure who will keep the money and at the end of semester they will either use it to go buy something to eat or give it away to charity.

Dr. Lie ran this classroom meeting similarly to the scripted lesson plans written in the resources that were shared at the workshops. However, it is important to note her communication patterns and how she dealt with what was often referred to by other instructors as the “silent students.” Unlike the scripted versions used in CRE text books, she did talk more, but her talk was often in the form of questions or as offering examples of what other classrooms have done. In comparison with other observed classes, the rule setting session was a democratic process. This joint effort to structure the rules of the class was also seen in later classes as they were introduced to the rubrics of class projects and activities. A full class period or at least half of the class time was devoted to going
over what they would need to do and make changes to fit the unique class needs. Although only on campus one day a week, Dr. Lie gave students her home number and address that they later used not only to contact her but to arrange contact with me in later periods of my research collection even though I had given them my e-mail, had office hours and was on campus two days a week.

Also important to distinguish is how this session differed from the proposed classroom rule sessions written by Professor Tina. In her presentation paper, she writes that she handed out pre-written rules to the students to have them go on to justify with examples. Professor Sabir discussed rules with his class, but his consequence for breaking the rule was a simple message to the student, “Out,” thus establishing the classroom as his alone and not a shared space.

At the elementary school, scaffolding was much different. If anything, it was the opposite problem. Students were not given any independence and rarely given projects. When projects were assigned, teachers did most of the work for the students, leading to products that were basically uniformly the same unless different teachers were assigned to assist the students. This over-direction was also observed at CUS when it came to extracurricular activities and school programs. Although students were arranged in committees with a professor or two as advisors, the final program was a product of the professor’s will and driven by either direct commands of what to do and when or through indirect ways of responding to requests for different ideas by either ignoring them or saying that the budget would not allow for it.
Being the only foreign instructor, I was given the task of advising the whole freshman and sophomore class in two cross-cultural events; four staff from the media center were given the responsibility to assist me. At the first meetings of both events, students were given the choice of several committees to join (i.e., budget, decoration, food, entertainment, etc). Then they were given two to three choices and told to include their own ideas. At each event generally one of the given ideas were elected, but with the second event more students did promote and do their own ideas for some sections.

The first event was a spring prom and the other a Halloween carnival. Both events went well and were met within the budget limits. The second event became a service learning project which raised money for supplies for a local program for underprivileged children that was chosen by the university students. The event was stressful and timelines were met with great resistance, but overall, the independence of the students was seen and observed. This observation was proven when the assistant chair addressed me at the second event and complimented me on its success. He stated that it was the best he had seen and that he had felt sure in the initial stages of planning that the events were not going to succeed due to the democratic way I arranged them. He stated that it was his experience that, if the students were not told step-by-step and given specific and easy steps to do, nothing would be accomplished. I walked away with mixed feelings, and tried to focus on the fact that they did succeed even if I was unsure if he or any other staff member or faculty would try to implement such a “democratic” style of a student organized event. It would have been easier to plan the event and then assign students the
responsibilities, but since it was a student event, was it not the advisors’ job to support the students in how to organize and conduct the event?

The second event was less stressful than the first, even though it was bigger and more involved. But the media staff on the second event were more relaxed in allowing students to do the event and more comfortable in their roles of time keepers, idea facilitators, and resource experts. Also, committees were smaller, more manageable, and timelines were dated much earlier than were needed. Something learned was that time management styles were culturally situated. Not meeting a deadline was expected, so just moving timelines up one week before they were actually were needed diminished the stress experienced in the first event. In a way, the timeline served as a scaffold for the students to meet real timelines.

Also with the second event, fewer students requested help from other professors not connected with the event, suggesting that they like the professors were really not use to acting independently. This experience provided another example that both the professors and the students helped to reinforce traditional authoritarian forms of control and reproducing more informal, spontaneous guidance versus building the scaffold first and then supporting as needed.

Modeling Learning. Closely connected to the scaffolding process is the idea that, once a structure is planned in advance, the teacher as well as the students are then freed to look for and make use of teachable moments. The common phrases that many Western students hear educators say such as “Wow! I never thought of it like that before,” or “You know that is interesting because if you look at it like that then this and this and
this,” or “You know I am not sure; I will find out” never occurred in any of the observations except in Dr. Lie’s class and occasionally in a team-taught class where I was the lead teacher. This type of teacher as learner seemed absent. From my first years in Indonesia as an English instructor, I was warned from local administrators and local teachers that saying “I do not know” was questionable culturally because teachers are supposed to know everything in order to keep face. With subsequent teacher trainings, I always included this point and tried to approach it as a teachable moment and told teachers that, rather than ignoring a question or giving wrong information, they could say “That is an excellent question,” and then redirect the question to the class as a whole and ask how they should begin to find out the answer. Use it as a moment to teach students the method of inquiry and still honor their culture and save face. However, what continued to be seen during this period of research at CUS and EJSU were tightly controlled lectures and low-level questions that asked for answers already known by the professor or listed in the textbook. Notes of observations at PES also showed teachers presenting and dictating and not investigating and making enthusiastic statements of discovery.

Yet, modeling learning can also physically take on other forms, like a teacher sitting with students, teaching from the back of the room, asking open-ended questions that do not have a correct or known answer, or planning open-ended investigations. During the whole period of time in the sites, I saw only one professor attempt to and successfully execute such a lesson. During a team-taught class with Professor Sandy, the chair of the English Department at CUS, a comparative analysis was done. For this
particular class, Professor Sandy provided copies of the Indonesian National Science Curriculum for elementary grades 1-6 and Ohio Standards for the equivalent grade levels. In the lesson she divided up the class into six groups and assigned each group a grade level to compare curricula and standards. At the end of the class the students wrote the different benchmarks on the whiteboard and presented the differences. She did not do a pre-analysis, but with the students helped them to analyze the differences. At the end of the session she asked what they could see just in the use of behavioral verbs in the objectives. In a rather Socratic way, she exposed that the Indonesian objectives overwhelmingly used the word identify while the Ohio one used more varied behavioral terms but most often use the word describe.

Besides this particular lesson, the only other teacher observed to guide and learn with students was Dr. Lie, which she did with the majority of her classes. She often incorporated brainstorming sessions, application exercises, and evaluative discussion groups. Some of her most notable assignments were for students to either go to toy stores or visit relatives with children and analyze their toys for the skills that they developed and enhanced, field observations in neighborhood schools, poster presentations of child case studies, etc. All of these techniques were open-ended with results that were not completely preconceived or determined.

Grouping. The third struggle with switching from authoritarian to authoritative classrooms could be seen with the use of grouping students for cooperative learning, group projects, or just small-group discussion and instruction. Grouping forces the
teacher from the center of attention and should even force the teacher from the front of the room. Struggles with this were seen in each of the sites.

As mentioned previously, at the small faculty workshop at CUS the idea of structuring groups for better learning results did arise at the end of the session, when Professor Eko stated that mixed-ability grouping would help in students become more proficient English speakers, but as noted, this never happened. Additionally as noted in the workshop baseline, simply seeing students sit in groups would be seen as a sign of instructors using CL. Over the course of the time in the field at CUS, spot checks of the freshman English courses revealed that rarely were students ever observed even sitting in pairs or groups in classes I did not team-teach. If the first stage, group work is a concerted effort in how to arrange the physical room to accommodate for the groups, then this seemed proof that even this elementary point was not often considered. Similarly at EJSU students were always observed seated in traditional rows facing the front of the room or in one class in a U-shape seating arrangement. This remained seen in all classes except in the two classes observed with Professor Sabir who employed group discussions.

Yet, besides just physically grouping students, also important for the switch of maintaining authority in CL and small-group instruction is the idea that grouping is not just an arbitrary decision just placing students in groups to discuss a question. Establishing oneself as an authority of the learning process would necessitate the manipulation of groups. Deciding if certain tasks would be accomplished better by a heterogeneous group or a homogenous group of learners, selecting the best size, and
position in the class, assigning roles, teaching communication skills, and allotting time for reflection and assessment of the group through such procedures as peer and self-assessments are just a few of the questions that need to be answered. When asked how he grouped his students for their final project presentations, Professor Arjuna stated he never let more than 5 students be in a group but preferred three if possible. Yet he stated he didn’t assign roles or assign members for groups. This was similar to other group projects I saw at EJUS and CUS. Grouping was most often left up to the students to decide and besides Dr. Lie, no instructors assigned roles, instituted peer assessments, or did any of the above mentioned elements of group instruction.

At PES, over the four years I taught and trained, observations during the last 7 months were consistently made that revealed teachers, both the Indonesian and the foreign Mandarin teachers, were having students work in groups. Attention was being paid to group compositions based on abilities, behavior, and assignments. However interdependence and group assessment was still absent from all the classes from kindergarten to third grade.

Facilitation Struggles

As mentioned in the knowledge section above, simply defining what facilitation means is not an easy exercise. As noted few professors were able to include clear and concise behavioral descriptions detailing the actions of a teacher who is facilitating. The most cited actions were motivate, help, listen, and facilitate. All too often, facilitate was described passively or abstractly such as help. As will be shown in actual observed behavior most of the informants were passive. The question as to why they were passive
is sometimes unclear. But it was the absence of important facilitative functions such as monitoring through classroom management and procedures, providing constructive feedback, and asking critical questions which highlighted what could be considered common problematic teaching methods.

**Monitoring.** In each class I observed of Dr. Lie, she almost always included some sort of cooperative learning strategy. There was a point in an observation of her using a jigsaw that I had begun to question her understanding or the so-called principle knowledge, only to be impressed by her adaptation and new name for expert teams. She often used the description that they were being grouped into shops. Each shop, instead of selling specialty items was selling specialty knowledge. The shop owner metaphor was an ingenious impromptu way to connect a jargon term “expert team” to the understanding a class. With these activities, she went from one group to the other. As she stopped at each group, she listened, added comments, or asked guiding questions which were noted being at mixed levels and prompted reciprocal communication patterns. Some questions were low-level, more motivating to get silent or passive students to begin speaking, and then she directed students to facts and ideas that were in need of inclusion. Often she left the group with a higher level question for the group to consider and attempt to answer. This was much different than my experience with Professor Tina.

In courses team taught with Professor Tina, she had to be consistently asked if she had comments or questions for the students. When students were in groups, she often would either just move around silently or sit silently with them. The only comment she
was observed frequently making to the groups was to question if they were finished or
needed more time.

At EJSU, Professor Sabir monitored his groups with questions and comments, but
the other teachers were never observed to employ any group instruction in class and, as
the field notes revealed, maintained a unilateral communication pattern throughout the
period of instruction.

*Feedback.* Also important to facilitation is feedback. To facilitate student centered
learning feedback is critical for individual learning and group processing. During the first
week of the semester in February 2005, Professor Arjuna ran a teacher-student meeting
open to all the students in the social-studies program. When asked if this was something
he routinely did he stated yes. In the meeting he sat in front on the floor with one other
student. A group of about 60 students and four other professors sat on the floor in front of
them. The professors sat intermingled with the students. Though a little formal in the
opening, the meeting became a forum where students brought up questions about the
program, schedules, testing and grading. For the most part, the communication remained
bi-lateral, but at times, it did turn into a more reciprocal type of communication pattern
when students would ask questions and these questions were then built upon and offered
to the group as a whole. The session did utilized some of NCCM techniques highlighted
in 2003 CRE trainings. However, it remained more explanatory than critical. Though the
scene seemed democratic in the physical sense I noted the communication pattern as
primarily unilateral from the instructors to the students and the tone as paternalistic. With
this in mind the question became if Professor Arjuna had moved past a rhetorical comprehension and as Bjork (2000) termed a rhetoric commitment.

While co-teaching with Professor Tina and Professor Sandy in the course Teaching Science in English for Elementary Students, the lack of formal feedback was noticeable in several aspects. Students in these courses were required to write two to three pages in response to chapter readings. The purpose was two-fold. One was to check on their concept understanding and two to improve their acquisition of English reading and writing skills. It was noticed that both Tina and Professor Sandy provided little feedback to the students on the weekly papers. Professor Sandy did occasionally write a word or two about conceptual understandings, but Tina only would correct grammar.

Students in these courses also did chapter presentations in classes. Again, this was for multiple purposes. One was to engage them in the topic as well as to practice the method of inquiry learning they were reading another reason was to improve their spoken English and comfort in instructing. As with the response papers, students were given a detailed rubric at the beginning of the semester to guide and structure their presentations. During class co-taught with Professor Sandy, she would provide as much technical and content feedback as I did. We both graded using the rubric and then combine our scores and gave the graded rubric back to the students with comments.

However, Professor Tina would often question the need for students to read about and learn to do jigsaw techniques, think-pair share techniques, and small group instructions as part of guided discovery learning methods that made use of cooperative learning strategies. When talking about these techniques, she would often call them
theories. Her grouping of techniques under the category of theory left me with the impression that she felt that, like theory, they were abstract and therefore not very useful for students. In our class, I had required students to take turns presenting chapter readings using these different techniques in their 30-45 minute presentations time instead of giving expository presentations. A rubric of the roles they should use and activities that would be considered exemplary was given to them as a scaffold. After each presentation feedback was given to the presenters on what they did well and what they needed to improve. Prof. Tina consistently provided no feedback except when personally asked from me and then she would make a comment about the media they used. She never actually used the rubric to grade the individual students. She used it as a guide but never marked on the rubric instead chose only to assign points based on the rubric. She did not share these rubrics with the students.

As noted in the field journal in an observation of Professor Tina doing a sample lesson for the class, she can do a jigsaw, but her effort orchestrating it led me to believe she doesn’t use it often. Also she made no connection to the method she was using as a strategy that the students should analyze for future use in their own classrooms nor did she state this was a technique that could be used in teaching science. She was extremely preoccupied with the time and monitored the groups without engaging in any small-group instruction. Also she gave no feedback during the group summaries and presentations. She included and directed all the steps of jigsaw noted in any texts describing the method but overlooked the opportunities for direct and indirect teaching that are often implied or assumed.
Feedback in any of the formal ways one might find in the U.S. was very limited in any of the sites. However as noted students, at least the most active ones were seen approaching professors after class or hunting them down on campus. Though not noted, feedback was most often given during these situations. But, the quality and the amount would need further investigation. The quality of the feedback in these sessions was not always good. In an incident reported to me in final stage interviews with the dean and the chair of the CUS English Department, conveyed, in separate interviews, was about a senior teacher yelling and screaming at a student, calling her dumb and lazy. This incident was reported similarly, both the dean and the chair shared their disdain of the way the senior faculty member treated the student and both shared their feelings of conflict when dealing with the professor. Their discussion was an example of how traditional values of hierarchical status were still in place. In the interview with the Chair, she shared how she talked with the teacher and used the more polite and subtle forms of disagreeing with elder faculty members which Dr. Lie noted as used in Indonesia. Professor Sandy relayed how she informed the senior lecturer of how much his opinion meant to the student and the others and then how she told him of the students crying and feelings—as sort of acknowledgement and appeasement to the age and experience status of the professor. She informed me that he then agreed to meet with the student and eventually helped the student finish her thesis project, but noted he never apologized nor was he ever reprimanded.

This particular incident was in stark contrast to reports from former students of Dr. Lie. They consistently reported to me that they had visited her at her home and were
always given good feedback and guidance. In conversations with Dr. Lie about feedback she shared her concern about the lack of feedback students were given in their final thesis projects which is required for students to graduate with a Bachelor’s degree. She hinted to the fact that the lack of feedback, at least for the thesis projects in some universities, was also related to financial benefits and work schedules. She stated that professors often purposely make the process slower because the more students they are advising the higher their pay and for some the less course work they need to teach.

**Questioning.** Closely tied to monitoring strategies, both in overall classroom management and procedural issues, was the role of questioning. The ability to question is probably the main resource a teacher always has on hand. Questioning, while varying the levels from simple requests for facts to asking critical questions, can move a lesson from being dominated by a unilateral communication pattern to one that is more reciprocal. This is especially important as students begin to connect new learning to conceptual understanding and relating theoretical principles to concrete experiences. Questions help not only to motivate but teach students how to process knowledge. The ability to ask questions is not just a tool of the constructivist teacher. Even in expository teaching presenting the different portions of the lectures by leading with thought provoking questions is standard. Yet, throughout the time in the field at all sites, questioning was a strategy rarely used by teachers, and if observed it was primarily the use of low-level questions that were noted.

At EJSU, with each session observed, critical questions were noted, but almost always, they were met with silence or backed quickly by two to three low-level questions
requiring one-word answers or yes/no responses. Only in Professor Sabir’s class were more varied questions noted. At CUS, in content courses, the same was true. For the most part, like at EJUS, the lecture format with no questions or with only low-level questions was the most consistent type of classes observed. And like EJUS, one-way communication patterns were noted as dominating the classes. However, the importance of questioning was not ignored.

In a paper presented at the national conference, two CUS faculty gained recognition for their work. Professor Eko and Professor Mathew (Yumarnamto & Widiyanto (2005) wrote a critical response to the lack of critical questioning in English teaching programs. As they noted,

> Teachers in Indonesia have long experienced the silent classrooms. When they ask the students whether they know the topic being discussed or not, there is hardly an answer. When they invite them to ask questions, there is hardly a question. Even when they answer a question, their answers are usually so short that it lacks elaboration. This phenomenon does not only happen to elementary or high school students. Even university students rarely ask questions. When they are asked why they do not ask questions their answer even puzzle us: they do not know what to ask. (p.1)

At first reading, their statements as to why students do not speak stood in direct contrast to the survey results of students for this research where the majority of over 250 students who noted that they were either shy/shamed, or afraid. However, of even more interest, is the reason these two professors posited for this inability to ask questions. They
state that the reason lay in the students’ ability to think critically and later suggested that this was due to the lack of critical questioning in Indonesian classrooms from elementary to university levels.

Yet, although they could discuss the reasons for the lack of critical questioning in great detail within their classrooms and give possible reasons for the absence of such questioning, observations of their classes and the classes which were co-taught with them showed they rarely used critical questioning in their teaching. What was observed was a complete absence of critical questioning and an over abundance of low-level questioning. A perfect example was a Conflict Resolution class co-taught with Professor Mathew. It was a freshman level course that integrated English reading, writing, and speaking skills with Conflict Resolution skills. It centered around fractured fairy tales. Common Western Tales were first analyzed using a CRE template and then rewritten to highlight either origins of conflict or resolution practices. The first half of the semester students were guided in analyzing Western fairy tales through the lens of conflict resolution. I lead these classes and modeled the analysis process. After each tale, students then wrote scripts choosing either to write a new beginning to the traditional tale which highlighted the origins of conflict using framing theory or to write a different ending showcasing a win-win resolution. After the mid-term, Professor Mathew then took the lead and began an analysis of popular Indonesian fairy tales. What was noted in the participatory observation was his lack of use of critical questioning. Also interesting was the assignment he required of students. Instead of letting them choose what to write, he directed them all to write a script in which the female antagonist was tried and convicted
for the crimes she committed in the fairy tale. The only choice given to the students was
to condemn her to death or a life sentence. He overlooked or ignored clear controversial
political issues contained in the fairy tale which dealt with conflicting patriarchal versus
matriarchal power issues, brainstorming win-win options, and the frames of conflict
analysis which were reviewed in the first half of the class.

As mentioned previously, in co-taught classes with Professor Tina, it was the
absence of any questioning, low or high, which distinguished her teaching from Dr. Lie
who often asked varied-level questions as her students worked in groups, presented, and
during lectures. Yet some notable incidences were seen by young CUS faculty members.
One instructor, Mrs. Rice, who left and went to EJUS to receive her Masters during my
second year of observations, taught grammar courses through questioning. Instead of
presenting a grammar point and then requiring students to do a pair-work or individual
exercises, she wrote the name of the point on the board and then asked students to work
in groups and to present how they would teach the targeted grammar point to a their
future classes. She gave them a couple of minutes to brainstorm examples and then sent
group representatives to the board to give their explanation. In their presentations, she
either gave further examples, asked other questions, or corrected misconceptions. The
lesson was extremely active and successful. Yet besides this one exemplary lesson where
the use of questions guided students and helped them process what typically is a dry
topic, Dr. Lie was the only other professor who I observed using questions consistently
in her mini-lectures, small-group instructions, and in feedback.
The lack of use of questions to promote learning was not just found at the university level. At PES, questions were used, but only low-level ones. To try to increase the variety of questions used, a summer workshop was designed for both the Indonesian and Mandarin elementary teachers. In one session, they reviewed different levels of questions listed in Blooms Taxonomy of questioning. After brainstorming questions they would typically ask in class and then given samples of questions in English that are geared to analysis, synthesis, and evaluative thinking, they then translated these exemplars into both Mandarin and Indonesian language. The product was then a sort of reference list of varied level questions translated into three languages they could have on hand to practice in their classes. Observations during the following school year showed no change in the style of questioning. Again they demonstrated more expository type lessons with low-level questions used to focus students attention on the lesson or textbooks.

As is seen the challenge to move from authoritarian to more authoritative approaches of teaching was present at all sites. Barriers to the switch varied and could be seen as a lack of understanding of the techniques, a lack of knowledge about the techniques, a lack of motivation to use the techniques, or cultural barriers to adopt the techniques. However the latter reason seemed to be the biggest challenge to the adoption and adaptation of CL and NCCM and in turn future adoption and adaptation of CRE. Some professors were observed to be further along in the adoption and adaptation process than others. Most notably, Dr. Lie was the exemplar, yet Professor Arjuna was well ahead of his colleges at his university with the exception of a senior faculty member, Professor
Sabir. Professor Sabir not only demonstrated a keen sense of the “what is it,” and “how-to” knowledge, but also the “why is it important” knowledge. As is discussed in the next chapter these challenges point to some important answers or at least, some interesting understandings of questions that guided this study. The challenges that were revealed also proffer several questions and places to begin future inquiry and reflection for both Indonesian and American teacher educators.
CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusion

Based on the analysis presented in the previous chapter, the question remains, in what ways are cooperative learning (CL) and non-coercive classroom management (NCCM), the essential elements of Conflict Resolution Education, used, understood, and adapted by Indonesian university professors in charge of educating future teachers in East Java. This following chapter attempts to answer this question which was the central research question driving this study for over six years. It is divided into two sections. The first section provides a discussion of the analysis in light of the central and guiding research questions. Most of the views used to answer these questions were primarily from three sites in East Java with the bulk coming from a private Christian university (CUS) in the provincial capital.

The second section presents the implications of the understandings gained and suggests areas for further research and investigations. The answers to these questions continue to remain pertinent due to continuing social conflict caused by natural disasters and socio-political unrest. Interest in CRE training programs continue to be shown and funded, as well as other educational initiatives that rely on CL and NCCM as primary teaching methods in Indonesia. Indonesia, as the fourth largest country in the world, located in the middle of a crucial sea route, and having the largest Muslim population in the world, remains a very important country in geo-political terms.
As highlighted in the previous chapter, several themes emerged from the analysis of the data collected during my time spent in East Java. Using Rogers’ (1995) diffusion process as a template to structure the analysis helped to reveal these themes. In the Knowledge stage, themes of fear, obedience, and control surfaced. In the Persuasion stage, themes centered around cultural barriers, and bridges to implementation which revealed issues related to self-efficacy, unwanted consequences, and notions of feasibility. In the last section that combined two of Rogers’ stages, Decision and Implementation, six sub-themes related to constructivist techniques highlighted points of contention for Indonesian teacher educators in their attempts to move from authoritarian to authoritative stances. These points of conflict were scaffolding, modeling learning, grouping, monitoring, providing constructive feedback, and facilitating learning through critical questioning.

All of these themes helped to point to answers to the research questions which have driven this study from its inception six years ago. Overall, as will be shown, these themes pointed to several barriers, but also possible bridges for cross cultural understanding and mutual learning as answers to the questions continue to come to light.

**Discussion**

To begin this discussion, a review of the framing questions is needed. As noted, the central question concerned the adaptability of CL and NCCM, primary elements of CRE, in an Indonesian context. In order to approach such a broad ranging inquiry, the following research questions guided the observations, interviews, conversations, surveys and document collection: 1) What if any cultural barriers existed to the adaptation of
CRE’s elements and were they bridgeable?, 2) In what ways have participating teacher educators implemented some of the initiatives introduced in the 2003 U.S. Department of State sponsored CRE workshops?, 3) What aspects of CRE’s elements have they considered worthwhile to introduce, what aspects have they ignored, and why?, 4) What were the university students’ perceptions of CRE’s elements and did their perceptions differ from that of their teachers?, 5) Were there specific conflicts present or perceived differently in the Indonesian system of education?, 6) How have they defined the values underlying Western CRE curricula and what have they understood to be the possible conflicts that could arise in introducing CRE in Indonesian schools?, and 7) What influence did macro-level education systems and the university systems have on professors’ abilities to incorporate and teach new methods and what hampered their adaptation of certain elements? This study provided possible answers to six of these questions.

**Question One:** What if any cultural barriers existed to the adaptation of CRE’s elements and were they bridgeable?

Of all the questions, this particular question often became the focus of discussion. As noted in chapter two, culture has been repeatedly pointed to as a primary barrier to past educational innovations (Bjork, 2000; Buchori, 2001; Dardjowidjojo, 2001; Nielsen, 1998; Purwadi & Muljoatmodjo, 2000). Yet with all of their reports, their concluding statements seemed over-generalized and overly pessimistic. As noted, Indonesia is an immense country with varying cultures and subcultures. However, this study also concluded that there were some cultural differences in the East Java sites that made the
adaptation and adoption of CL and NCCM more difficult. Of all of the possible values to affect CL and NCCM adaptation, hierarchical status and proscribed traditional behavior demonstrated the most impact on CL and NCCM adoption, primarily due to their impact on relational communication patterns.

Several idiomatic motifs were noted. *Mikul dhuwur: mendem jero* (Lift up high: bury deeply). *Wani ngalah, unggul wekas ane* (Let me lose first to make me win later). *Sing waras ngalah* (The one who is mentally healthy should let others win). *Kebo Nyusu Gudel* translates as (The calf nurses the cow). It was Professor Eko who first mentioned these idiomatic expressions in informal conversations of Javanese values and possible connections to behaviors seen in East Java. Yet these values were evidenced in many more places and across the different ethnic communities in which I worked in East Java. A closer look at the connotations reveals that the idioms were fairly good predictors of communication patterns.

In a hierarchal society such as Indonesia, higher status results in a power differential that in turn dictates certain communication patterns. Those of high status have the right to talk and be heard. The role of lower status individuals, a category in which students are included, is that of listener. As often observed and reported, a good student sits down well and listens well. For both positions, a show of emotion is considered uncivilized. Idioms support an attitude of acceptance and belief that those who are right will eventually win the conflict with time. As Dr. Lie noted, hierarchy does not negate confrontation, but does dictate how one confronts. She noted this as being “patient ways
of challenging.” Yet, these polite ways were often seen translated in behaviors of submission, avoidance, and subterfuge.

*Mikul dhuwur: mendem jero*, has been applied to children and their duty to their parents, but has also been generalized across settings to dyadic relationships where unequal power positions are present. Power as noted is in age, experience, position, educational level, and socio-economic status. Throughout the analysis, the role of hierarchy and duties continued to emerge. Yet, the word hierarchy was troublesome in that as a noun or adjective it seemed too limited to describe the scope of the structures that existed and the roles maintained by culture. The positions of status could be based on age and experience, and achieved educational credentials. Additionally, degrees obtained overseas are held in higher status than those obtained in Indonesia. A higher status determines who is lifted up high and how much personal opinion to be buried deeply. This particular value was shown to have affected student-professor relations, professor to professor relations, and professor to administration. But unlike previous studies, barriers that were found were not insurmountable.

As Dr. Lie noted, perhaps the key to adaptation lies in “patient ways to challenge.” The next two idioms support her statements and are directed at teaching the value of self-control. Granted it might be just as easy to say that *Wani ngalah, unggul wekas ane* and *Sing waras ngalah* teach submission and passivity. But as reviewed in chapter two, CRE as well as the communication skills necessary for cooperative learning and NCCM suggested a suspension of reaction while actively listening to peers or what Bohm (1996) called practicing “proprioception of thought” (p. 79). To be fair, my own
understanding of the importance of this element when defining CL and NCCM has grown and continually has been redefined as I continued my own study and teaching. As a CRE follower, practitioner and trainer, and especially conducting this research in a non-western context, the pivotal aspect of effective communication continues to challenge me. Even after reciprocal communication is pinpointed as the crucial aspect of both CL and NCCM, trying to nurture this communicative pattern in my classes by teaching utilizing this technique and teaching students how to use it is an on-going process. Added to this is the realization that with each consecutive class the technique must be modified to fit the idiosyncrasies of each specific class.

The question then becomes, if there are more polite ways of disagreeing, as Dr. Lie stated, are these ways being taught directly with the moral directive to mute reactions, control passions, and respect elders. My observations noted silent classes, limited to no feedback, lack of scaffolding and support, and a continuing preference for authoritarian styles of teaching. In short, while the possible bridge existed in the active listening skills of CL and NCCM, the active, democratic participation skills in class are not. What was found was a continued support for the authoritarian teacher to avoid Kebo nyusu gudel. This avoidance could be tied to teachers’ fears of independent actions, professors’ worries about self-efficacy, and possibly misconstrued reasons for the passivity of students. As revealed in the surveys, students overwhelmingly list fear, shame, and shyness as reasons for not speaking. A culturally supported belief that teachers know everything and should know everything reinforces silence. Compounding this culturally supported value with continued use of authoritarian teaching techniques and power
stances also support the dyad which continues to be replicated generation after generation. Hierarchical communication and non-verbal behavior is still valued and for the most part not looked at or understood as silent deference that is vicariously reinforced by peers as well as teachers.

Supporting this hierarchy of power is also how knowledge is defined. Definitions of knowledge are most easily understood if one looks at what is seen as important enough to test. As noted, Professor Sandy’s analysis revealed that the national standards frequently use the verb “identify” as the proof of learning versus describe, analyze, or synthesize. Testing and classroom questions generally utilize an over-abundance of fact-based, low-level questions versus critical questioning. Since learning is equated to the memorization of, and ability to recall facts, teachers and students have no motivation to encourage open reciprocal conversations in an effort to push past what is written text books. As was noted during their analysis of the national science curriculum, standards support a text book and curriculum-bound behavior noted by both Dr. Lie and the principal at the private elementary school.

The present phenomena are supported by a past history of national curricula and national testing, limiting the ability to understand and believe in a constructivist educational model. Understandings, as seen in papers on CL by Professor Tina and critical thinking by Professors Eko and Mathew, presented the “rhetorical commitment” noted by Bjork (2000), but more so a minimal, incomplete or understanding noted as rhetorical comprehension in this study.
Yet to say the barrier to innovation adoption is too large to overcome due to cultural values is also incorrect. As was shown in Dr. Lie’s classes and to a lesser degree in Professor Sabir’s class, cooperative learning methods can work. However, this adoption requires a careful examination of how cooperation is perceived in Indonesia. With more training in what types and ways that facilitation can be done, and a broader perspective in how authority can be understood, professors might begin to see themselves as experts in teaching about learning, as well being content masters. More modeling from professors like Dr. Lie would be needed. As Professor Tina admitted, it wasn’t until she saw the Western teacher use the methods over a period of time that she understood how to use them in her classes. Since most professors in this study have not had much background in pedagogy, the ability to observe others use these methods in classes they are or will be teaching, might be the only way they will gain the experience to elicit enough motivation to change. If Professor Rita’s underlying attitude of Western practitioners’ understanding of the local context can be used as a more generalized belief, having a near-peer to model the methods of CL and NCCM might have the most impact on local educators who use CL and NCCM on a daily basis. To adjust definitions of how to maintain authority in ways other than the traditional professor as content sage lecturing to a whole group, versus a mobile professor doing small-group instruction will take more than workshops and so-called Western experts and Western tomes.

Happily, bridges do exist. The idea of cooperative versus competitive individualist achievement was well established in the sites observed. However the cooperation is substantially different in that educational leaders are looked to as experts and not equals.
This was observed at several levels. Seniors professors were not reprimanded when they breached ethical lines, administrators were not contradicted, more assertive students became the emissaries to retrieve more information about assignments, teachers were rarely challenged, and parents were often left out of the formal education process. The different scenarios that exemplified these values all lent support to the idiom of “the calf nursing the cow.” In order for authority figures to save face, teachers must be viewed as fonts of knowledge, leaders must be correct, followers of both must listen. If not, then both respect and creditability are lost.

As in the West, the constructivist classroom could withstand much more structure than is currently given. CL and NCCM maintain that the teacher is the conductor of the learning environment. Clearly stating this within the Indonesian context might go a long way in preserving the teacher’s role as guru, while at the same time directing learning in a more horizontal versus vertical direction. If as noted in the review of literature and in observations, the Indonesian view of cooperation and signs of learning are to sit down well, listen well, and do your work diligently, then adding focus to the learning act with particular attention to assigning roles, teaching communication skills and further developing and expanding upon existing performance assessments making them more interdependent might be a good next step in teacher training. Remembering that democracy, as Dr. Lie stated, does not always mean one voice, one vote, majority rules, but collective voices, weighted differently to reflect more equitable rights, could be worked into the directives of both CL and NCCM.
Question Two: In what ways have participating teacher educators implemented some of the initiatives introduced in U.S. Department of State sponsored CRE workshops?

Three of the informants of this study participated in the 2003 workshops on CRE—Dr. Lie, Professor Arjuna, and Professor Tina. Dr. Lie was a presenter at the workshop, with her section covering cooperative learning. Professor Arjuna was a participant during the first workshop, but later became a presenter of NCCM methods and CL strategies. Professor Tina attended only the first three day workshop in June 2003. As the order suggests, Dr. Lie was the only informant to consistently use CL in each of her observed classes. However, what was interesting was her use of NCCM that she did not present in a formal lesson but modeled in her classes to set rules, manage the class, and run class meetings.

For Professor Arjuna, only one NCCM session was observed while he was in the role of an administrator. No data was ever recorded where he used either CL or NCCM, however a consistent use of authoritarian lectures with a paternal tone was observed. Unlike Dr. Lie’s class, no reciprocal dialogues occurred and communication patterns remained one way. However, observations of Professor Arjuna at SRE workshops where he presented sessions on CL and NCCM showed his ability not only to talk authentically about both innovations, but incorporated their use with different methods, like jigsaws to introduce information about the innovations. These were sessions where he was speaking with educators and therefore, hierarchically, on the same level and status as himself.

Professor Tina attended the original CRE workshop and had an opportunity to work with an American teaching fellow who used CL methods for over a year. However,
I saw no sign of any of the performance objectives set after the workshops. Like Professor Arjuna, Professor Tina’s communication patterns remained unilateral and often patronizing. Though she demonstrated detailed knowledge in how to use different CL methods and NCCM strategies, observations of her class revealed some critical misunderstanding of why to use the methods. Knowledge was not constructed, but rather dictated by her. She might use all the steps of a jigsaw but ignored opportunities to present critical questions, promote connections to prior or future learning, or just have fun. She was a task master and put her focus on the facts students need to memorize for the test. In interviews, she noted this rhetorical comprehension and often questioned the purpose of the methods that she often referred to as theories. She wrote excellent papers, included some technical approaches, but remained a firm believer and practitioner of teacher-directed learning. Observations showed her more concerned with the pragmatics of how to do it and not the why.

Although co-teaching with Professor Tina was very challenging, she provided the most honest criticism, and many of the best insights into the barriers to implementing CL and NCCM. As noted, she became an exemplar of a university professor struggling with self-efficacy issues and fear, as it relates to using innovations that are not traditional and at times could be seen as being in opposition to maintaining authority for a novice. As she said, being able to see and talk with someone about the use of the innovation was critical. She even went as far as to say having the innovation be targeted for use and then having scheduled meetings for implementers to talk about its use and possible adaptations would be required. As one reads over the observations and interviews she might be seen
as the least likely to ever adopt the method. Though she showed she knew how to use the innovations, it was in her use of them that one could see how much she did not understand. She consistently fell short of the purpose of the innovations which was to allow the students to construct knowledge, to connect to previous learning, to question, and then to practice and adapt the innovations within authentic assessments. However, as she mentioned, she is picking this subject as the focus of her dissertation research in Holland.

With this opportunity, perhaps she will have the time to explore how authority can be maintained through a variety of techniques that are offered by the very broad pedagogical methods of CL and NCCM. Those more comfortable in the traditional position of the expert in front of the room have the think-pair-share technique that gives the professor a central voice, but requires the Socratic skills of guiding students through a mixture of leveled questions to understanding the topics and apply them through verbal examples, as well as modeling how one approaches new content through critical questions. Of all the techniques, this seems most adaptable to the professors’ need to maintain central authority as well as giving students a peer to help confront fears of speaking openly in class.

Question Three: What aspects of CRE’s elements have they considered worthwhile to introduce, what aspects have they ignored, and why?

Closely related to the second question was a question examining which techniques the participants used. Since few were observed using any CL and NCCM techniques, the answer is limited. The most frequent CL method talked about and
observed being used was the jigsaw method. Dr. Lie included it often and used it in several ways. Professor Tina was observed using jigsaw once in a co-taught class, and Professor Arjuna stated he used it, but was only observed using it in CRE workshops with an audience of other professors.

Of all the techniques and methods that could be grouped under the title NCCM, classroom meetings to set classroom rules were only observed being used by Dr. Lie and Professor Arjuna. As mentioned, Professor Tina did write a professional paper and gave a faculty workshop on the technique. Although her rendition went through the steps clearly enough, she had twisted the technique around the traditional idea of pre-set teacher rules. Thus, she used the technique, but maintained the status quo.

Of more interest was what was missing. In all but Dr. Lie’s classes, roles were never observed being assigned, products demonstrating interdependence were not created, questioning that pushed class communication to reciprocal patterns, nor rubrics to guide and evaluate performance. Although performance assessments were in place at all sites, they amounted to what could be considered group work. Sitting in small groups, requiring some pair work, students presenting chapters, and including a student practice demonstration as part of the final grade is not true CL. Leaving the instructions to how to complete the assignments to a week before class or to the most assertive students to inquire about details is not scaffolding learning.

The data show it was not an issue of knowledge, but of understanding the key principles that provide the foundation for the innovations. Although more than one informant stated laziness as a possible cause, observed work patterns did not support that
belief. Specifically, the data pointed to a lack of real practice using the method and a lack of understanding why it should be used. Overlooking the key principles seemed to be the real reason for the absence of elements that distinguish CL from group work and NCCM from merely a friendly teacher.

**Question Four: What were the university students' perceptions of CRE’s elements and did they differ from that of their professors?**

A question was added to the student surveys to determine what they liked and disliked about working in groups; however, a lack of cooperative learning opportunities made this question moot. Although they listed common features, such as it is enjoyable to share and talk with friends, the most common complaint was having students in the group who do not “share the burden” as stated by one of the professors. Again, since students were not truly exposed to CL with all of its elements, they were commenting on group work and not CL. Therefore, this particular line of inquiry must wait until students have more CL experiences.

What did emerge was student reactions—silent classrooms, they noted as being due to fear, shame, or shyness. Students either experienced humiliation for giving incorrect answers, or peer harassment for speaking up at all. All of which points to a classroom management plan that lacks rules for speaking freely, expressing ideas, or strategies for providing feedback. Issues with providing constructive feedback existed in other areas as well, leading one to question if this pattern was culturally dictated or not. Since avoiding conflict is a part of the values expressed, it could work two ways. The first option would be the negative where commenting is suppressed if the comment is
opposed to the view of the authority figure. Second, the avoidance of reactive statements might be positive if the teacher requires other students to withhold responses and laughter, having them instead concentrate on what the speaker is saying and provide feedback that might add to the speaker’s statements or pose questions for more details. Approaching the situation in such a way would seem to fit cultural norms and help to enhance the self-efficacy of the speakers.

*Question Five: Were there specific conflicts present or perceived differently in Indonesia system of education?*

As for this particular question, one might assume the differences would be many. However, as in any institution several conflicts existed, only a few were unique. The most pertinent affecting Indonesian educators, or at least the small group in this study, was the concept that teachers should not make mistakes. Although all teachers should be as prepared as possible to avoid presenting misinformation, the idea that a teacher is always right, combined with the value of saving face presents a significant barrier for innovations that place the teacher in the role of an “advanced peer” in the learning process.

As mentioned in chapter four, classroom observations over three years revealed only a few instances of teachers admitting they did not know something or modeling critical thinking skills for the class as a whole or in small-group instruction. Again, the theme of fear or feelings of self-efficacy seems to be closely tied to the Javanese idiomatic expression of the calves nursing the cows.
Other identified conflicts were low pay, long work hours, high student-teacher ratios, and feelings that changing the system was impossible, all of which would be noted by most teachers, anywhere. However at the elementary and secondary levels, student-teacher ratios are extremely high--generally more than 40:1 which is much different from public schools in the U.S. At the college level, class size at all three universities were similar to what can be observed at most universities in the states, ranging in size from 20 to 35 students.

Another problem, often considered unique to Indonesia, was silent classrooms. Instructors often stated that Indonesian students are passive As exemplified by Professor Sabir’s rationale, and echoed by other professors, as a main reason why CL and NCCM techniques do not work. However, couldn’t most teachers around the world state the same? Noteworthy were the reasons professors gave for the lack of student participation and how their statements stood in direct contrast to what students reported in surveys, individual interviews, and focus group interviews. Professors often pointed to students’ lack of motivation and lack of preparation, but students blamed fear, shyness, and shame. Again, the theme of fear surfaced but in this instance, it was fear of the instructor or peer ridicule; fears based on incidences that happened either directly or indirectly in upper elementary, middle, and secondary school. This experience is not likely to be as comparable to the experiences of students in the West.
Question Six: How have participants defined the values underlying Western CRE curricula and what have they understood to be the possible conflicts that could arise in introducing CRE in Indonesian schools?

Most of the data relevant to this question related to the informants’ understanding of the principles underlying CL and NCCM. Both are firmly based in American Humanism and Pragmatism guided by constructivist perspectives on learning. In an era of globalization they are also very much akin to ideas of critical theory.

Of all the informants, Dr. Lie was the only one to exhibit understandings of the hidden reformist message these innovations offer to teachers. Yet one could argue that resistance to adopting and adapting CL and NCCM could be related to a tacit understanding that these innovations stand in direct opposition to an educational philosophy that has been traditionally considered a process where the guru as sage, bestows knowledge on a passive student. This idea was further cemented by the introduction of traditional Western education models by colonists based on Prussian expository methods. Methods that still continue today in the West though arguably perceived as outdated.

Although other informants did not explicitly state these theories, their skepticism of the methods could point to the understanding that the center of the education process, as dictated by these innovations, is the student, with the teacher serving as the guiding force behind and alongside the student. Professor Sabir showed a clear understanding of many of the principles underscored by the innovations of CL and NCCM as he characterized it as CBSA (student-centered learning). However, he also revealed the
paradox between understanding and believing that these methods are beneficial when he shifted the majority of the blame for why these techniques would not work to negative attributes of Indonesian students. His perspectives were echoed by other educators and professional papers blaming silent students as being unprepared rather than critical learners—statements contradicted by students in surveys and interviews.

As I struggled to approach conversations centered on principle issues, I often referenced an Indonesian model. There is an Indonesian model that exemplifies many of the same principles incorporated in both CL and NCCM. Yet as highlighted in an interview with Professor Ruvi, my simple interpretations of Ki Hajar Dewantara’s (founder of the National Education) principle statements of ‘the teacher in front, along side, and in back of the student’ as parallel to constructivism, was challenged by her understanding of this statement supporting hierarchical positioning and traditional roles.

In the end, the question was answered. Only a tentative understanding of the principles underlying CL and NCCM exist for most of the professors and their current understandings have led many of them to question the feasibility of using either innovation. The importance of this question is stated most succinctly by Roger’s (1995) whom I have quoted throughout Chapter Four. However, the full quote is appropriate here.

What [is the] role of change agents in bringing about the three types of knowledge? Most change agents concentrate their efforts on creating awareness-knowledge, although this goal often can be achieved more efficiently in many client systems by mass media channels. Change agents could perhaps play their
most distinctive and important role in the innovation-decision process if they concentrated on how-to knowledge, which is probably most essential to clients in their trail of an innovation (at the decision stage in the innovation-decision process). Most change agents perceive that creation of principles-knowledge is outside the purview of their responsibilities and is a more appropriate task for formal schooling. It is often too complex a task for change agents to teach basic understanding of principles. But when such understanding is lacking, the change agent’s long-run task is often more difficult. (p. 166)

I would go on to claim, that when this is attempted at a cross-cultural and transnational level, “the long-run task” is impossible without this understanding. This statement is also supported by Bandura (1986), whose insight that only the “functional equivalents” of any foreign innovation will be adopted also emphasizes the importance of understanding key principles. For any innovation requires effort to implement and must be adapted in any context. If one has little to no understanding of the purposes underlying such an innovation, the model’s trial becomes the watermark of its effectiveness. Not knowing the epistemological and ontological purpose could result in either an unwarranted dismissal of all elements and renditions of the innovation or a bastardization of it that only maintains the status quo (i.e., Professor Tina’s manuscript suggesting a lesson based on NCCM styles where she only includes student-centered activities to justify pre-set classroom rules).
Question Seven: What influence did macro-level education systems and the university systems have on professors’ abilities to incorporate and teach new methods and what hampered their adaptation of certain elements?

Although news items related to this question were collected throughout the time in the field, this question remained unanswered for the most part. Interviews were conducted with higher administrators, however, only limited information was gleaned. Of all the informants, Dr. Lie’s interview provided the most voice to this issue. She indicated that for the most part, schools haven’t supported change nor do they support educators’ efforts to change. Other informants hinted at this same intimation, but it is yet to be detailed and triangulated with the limited evidentiary notes and archival information I collected. The first six questions were the primary focus of this study and this final overarching question has yet to be answered to my satisfaction, provides a fitting transition to the next section regarding implications and suggestions for further research.

**Implications and Suggestions for Further Research**

The central research question of this study pertaining to the adaptability of the fundamental elements of CRE, CL and NCCM and their adaptability, pointed to an even broader question: In what ways could CRE be introduced and disseminated in Indonesia? From the above conclusions, several implications can be garnered. First, both CL and NCCM were shown to have various barriers to their adaptation and adoption in the East Java sites where the study took place and Javanese values were dominant. However, these barriers did not seem as impregnable as many of previous research studies have
suggested (Bjork, 2000; Buchori, 2001; Dardjowidjojo, 2001; Nielsen, 1998; Purwadi & Muljoatmodjo, 2000). Therefore, it is perhaps better to consider them as challenges.

Most of the challenges deal with cultural values that continue to be supported and reproduced by educators and students alike. These primarily included feelings of fear and low self-efficacy, in the context of the required paradigm shift from authority based on content mastery to authority based on leaders of learning balanced with content knowledge. The difference lies in the emphasis of becoming a teacher versus a lecturer.

These cultural values have been identified and described, but still present challenges to using these methods and techniques. The most pertinent challenge seems to be participants’ level of understanding, leading to a need for defining effective communication in Indonesia that allows individuals to confront conflict and speak about it openly. This sort of reciprocal communication pattern is required in both CL and NCCM if they are to be successful.

Therefore, more exploration and sense-making needs to be completed in analyzing and teaching effective communication that still honors cultural values. Dr. Lie’s “patient ways of challenging” sounds very similar to CRE’s directive of non-reactive speech dictated for all conflict situations and emphasized in mediation training. Further education and training in learning how to scaffold learning, modeling how to be a learner, classroom management, and procedural issues involved in CL and NCCM as related to small-group instruction and what it means to actively facilitate learning is needed. It is with these challenges in mind, that further research and study is required.
In conclusion, I have attempted to provide a clearer picture of at least one pivotal piece of the Indonesia’s education system—the teacher training institutions in East Java. While presenting the views and challenges a group of teacher educators face as they continue to produce future generations of Indonesian educators, this study also provides a glimpse into what is being modeled to future teachers by their professors. It is my hope that the diffusion of CRE’s foundational, innovative teaching approaches of CL and NCCM within the teacher training colleges, as well as eventually CRE itself, might open up the possibility for teachers to move away from authoritarian teaching approaches, while simultaneously allowing them to maintain authority and their cultural values as they practice the art of democratic deliberation in the classroom.

Following the completion of this study focusing on CRE and its elements for the past six years, an even more encompassing question has surfaced and requires further research. If CRE, a Western educational approach to teach tolerance and promote empathy, firmly built upon the Western teaching techniques of cooperative learning and non-coercive classroom management continues to be promoted in Indonesia, what kind of training would assist professors and educators to adapt the techniques enough to retain Bandura’s (1986) “functional equivalents” (p. 158).

Challenges exist but there are signs that they can be faced and potentially overcome. CRE is not adaptable to an Indonesian context without more time and greater financial commitments for its adaptation. Adaptation and adoption of the main elements must occur before one even begins to look at the principles and other techniques that surround CRE. As Rogers’ (1995) noted, “someone with relatively low self-efficacy
would not possess the self-confidence to think that they could adopt the innovation” (p. 170). CL and NCCM have not been taught or used at the teacher education level at the sites observed in East Java. Although findings cannot be generalized to all programs in Indonesia, I feel fairly confident CL and NCCM are not being utilized or taught. During the study, the only times they were consistently used were either by me or Dr. Lie. Both of us were exposed to the techniques as students in the U.S. and then followed these experiences with using the techniques consistently in classes and seminars. Our experiences as students and teachers gave us the principle-knowledge to experiment with and adapt the techniques in other contexts. Both of us had these experiences outside a collectivist paradigm, thus, “Aye there’s the rub.”

Over the past four years as a researcher and 15 years as a teacher within collectivistic cultures, I still struggle to understand the always invisible but clearly sensible difference between the places I am living and working versus the place I grew up. With considerable study and thought, I have conceptualized a paradigm that has allowed me to begin to build a better understanding of what lies between, and therefore what sort of adaptations must be made in order to promote change.

I have had to admit there is a clear qualitative difference between my colleagues and me. I can not escape the individualistic cultural from where I was reared just as they can not escape their collectivistic culture. Pictorially, the difference between the two cultures would be represented by two letters, “I” and “i” with the larger letter representing the person from the individualist culture, and the smaller representing the person from a collectivistic culture. The difference is in the circles of environments or
experiences and how these circles encapsulate the aforementioned “I.” For the individualist, the “I” has circles of varying sizes that coalesce around the large “I”. Some circles of experience might only touch particular places of the letter while others might surround the letter entirely. For those from a collectivist culture, the circles are concentric. The first circle is small and surrounds the “i” encompassing it. The next surrounds the first circle and so forth. Each circle surrounds the next, similar to Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) conceptual model, or to the much over-used metaphor the onion. The difference is qualitatively different. For individualist the experiences are attached to the individual where as the experiences encompass those in collectivistic cultures. For the Individualist the circles might be affixed, but not with permanence that one might see in the circles that encompass the individual in the collectivistic society. For the individualist, the individual’s ability to add on an experience or detach from it might be easier. A person can try something new, but it does not necessarily change him/her qualitatively. For an individual in a collectivist culture, the decision to adopt something will most likely change them qualitatively. Therefore the persuasion and decision making-stages are crucial and time consuming and are directly tied to issues of self-efficacy.

For the individualist, experiences can be represented by circles of experience far from family, friends, and work, but for the collectivist, one environment is built upon the other. One failure ripples throughout and has much more of a chance affecting the whole “i” versus a particular area. With the added values of hierarchy and the face-saving relational communication which sustains the structures, the more life experiences one
has, the larger the circumference of their influence hinting to the traditional political structure of the Mandala. In such a structure, an innovation that promotes a change in communication styles that challenges traditionally taught ways to relate is something that cannot be accomplished in a few workshops. However, if CL and NCCM are presented as methods that can be adapted and modified in context and given the time and support especially by providing adequately trained near-peers then change is possible. Neither innovation negates authority or respect and thus relational communication can be maintain and the methods then might be more widely diffused.

In conclusion, this is the map of my research. In it are not continents, nations, and states. There are no delineated boundaries or vast oceans and wide rivers separating what I have observed and where the reader sits and reads from now. What is etched upon the pages are descriptions, voices, and experiences of a several years of observations, conversations, and work with Indonesian educators. It presents a group of educators who are life-long learners. And, like most learners, they are continually faced with challenges. Yet, what is shown is that these challenges are not insurmountable. It is an impressionist’s piece of scholarly work from which to review, revise and build upon. As has been shown there are points upon this map that bridges to not only cultural understanding but also transeducational sharing and transformation can be built.
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APPENDIX A: STUDY TIME LINE

1997    February moved to Surabaya to work
1997    Summer Economic Crisis Begins
1998    May Riots and Suharto Steps down
2001    Return to University begin Southeast Asian Studies Program
2002    Enter Ph.D. Program
2002    November Pilot Study
2003    CRE workshops June, July, December
2004    October East Java as Fulbright Scholar
2004    December Tsunami Hits Sumatra
2005    August end initial data collections as researcher
2005    August begin working as CUS as team-teacher with instructors in English Department and with partner private elementary school as team-teacher and teacher trainer.
2008    February return to the U.S.A. for final write-up.
APPENDIX B: STUDENT SURVEY (ENGLISH VERSION)

Course title ___________ Date ______________
Semester ___________ Major _____________
Ethnicity _____________ Age_______________
Gender _______________

1. Do you feel that your absence / presence in this class has a direct effect on everyone in the class?  No  Yes  Unsure

2. Are you going to become a teacher?  No  Yes  Unsure

3. There are many ways in which children and students are disciplined in the classroom and at home, ranging from verbal reprimands, talking it out, using guilt, or physical punishment. What do you consider the most commonly used disciplinary method for each of the age groups below?

   Children 3-6  by parents ________________ by teachers ________________
   Children 7-12 by parents ________________ by teachers ________________
   Adolescents 13-17 by parents ________________ by teachers ________________
   Young Adults 18-22 by parents ________________ by teachers ________________

4. For this class, how often do you work in small groups during class?
   Never  Rarely  Often  Every Class

5. In your opinion why do you think many students in class do not speak up more or participate in classroom discussions?

   Shy  Afraid  Not prepared  Confused  Other reasons

6. What are the best and worst aspects about working in small groups?
   Best____________________________________________________________________
   Worst____________________________________________________________________

7. Tell me about a conflict you have had with either a parent or teacher and how it was handled.

   What was the conflict?

   What did you do? Avoid  Verbal Argue  Talk it through  Let it continue
   Other_________________
8. When a group decision has to be made while working in small groups which decision making process do you think is best?
   Based on majority   Based on the needs of all   Based on the experience
   Other _______________ -

9. Where or with whom do you feel very important?
   1. _____________________________
   2. _____________________________
   3. _____________________________

10. If you and a classmate have a conflict and need to have a mediator, what attributes would you want in a mediator. (Only choose one attribute for each)

   1. Male    /    Female    /    Doesn’t matter
   2. Someone you know    /    Someone you don’t know    /    Doesn’t matter
   3. Someone your same age    /    Someone older    /    Someone younger    /    Doesn’t matter
   4. Someone of same status/ Someone of higher status / Doesn’t matter

11. If you and a classmate have a conflict and need a mediator, what is an attribute you definitely would not want in the chosen mediator?
APPENDIX C: STUDENT SURVEY (INDONESIAN VERSION)

Mata pelajaran pokok ____________
Tanggal ________________
Semester ________________
Agama ________________
Suku ________________
Umur ________________
Jenis kelamin ________________

1. Apakah anda merasa ketidakhadiran atau kehadiran anda di dalam kelas dapat mempengaruhi setiap orang di kelas anda? (Lingkari yang benar)
   Ya / Tidak / Tidak Pasti

2. Aapkah anda akan menjadi seorang guru? (Lingkari yang benar)
   Ya / Tidak / Tidak Pasti

3. Ada beberapa cara mendisiplinkan anak-anak (seperti membicarakan masalah, membuat anak merasa bersalah, bermusyawarah, mempermalukan, mencubit, menampar, d.l.l.) Cara apa yang anda rasa paling sering di gunakan di lingkungan anda utuk setiap kelompok umur.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oleh orang tua</th>
<th>Oleh guru</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anak 3-6th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anak 7-12th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anak Remaja 13-17th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewsa Muda 18-22th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Di kelas ini, berapa seringkah anda berkerja dalam kelompok kecil selama berlangsungnya pelajaran? (Lingkari yang benar)
   Tak pernah / jarang / sering / setiap ada / kelas
5. Menurut anda mengapa banyak mahasiswa diam di dalam kelas dan tidak mau berbicara bebas?

Malu / Takut / Tidak ada persiapan / bingung / lain-lain_______________

Jelaskan pilihan anda

_______________________________________________________________


Terbaik _______________________________________________________

Terburuk _______________________________________________________

7. Konflik apa yang pernah anda alami dengan orang tua atau guru dan bagaimana anda menanganinya?

Konflik apa?

Apa yang anda lakukan?

Menghindar / Berteriak / Bermusyawara / Melanjutkan / Lain-lain _____

8. Apabila sekelompok kecil mempunyai keputusan, jalan mana yang paling adil?

Berdasarkan mayoritas / berdasarkan keperluan / Berdasarkan pengalaman / lain-lain ____________________

9. Dimankah atau dengan siapa anda merasa diri anda penting sekali?

1. ____________________________________________

2. ____________________________________________

3. ____________________________________________

10. Kalau anda dan teman sekolah mempunyai konflik dan memerlukan seorang penengah/ mediator, mediator yang bagaimana yang anda mau? (Pilih satu jawaban dalam setiap nomor)

1. laki / perempuan /tidak masalah

2. seorang yg tak dikenal / seorang yang kalian kenal tidak masalah

3. seumur dengan kalian / umurnya lebih tua / tidak masalah

4. status sama / status lebih tinggi / tidak masalah

11. Kalau anda dan teman sekolah mempunyai konflik dan memerlukan seorang penengah, penengah yang bagaimanyakah yang anda tidak mau?
APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Initial Theoretical Questions

1. What are the professors’ understanding of CRE and its elements?
2. Do professors’ perceptions of conflict differ from American professionals?
3. Are the values underlying CRE acceptable to those of Indonesians?
4. What are professors’ perceptions of cooperative learning, discipline, and good behavior?
5. What are the professors’ perceptions about the relationship between current societal conflict and skills being taught in the pre-existing curricula?
6. What are the professors’ perceptions about the relationship of social-emotional education and violent conflict that takes place in the society?
7. In what ways do professors describe their roles and duties and those of the students’?
8. How do professors describe a democratic classroom?
9. What are the professors’ opinions on how teachers should gain and maintain respect in their classrooms?

Semi-structured Interview Questions

1. What are the biggest challenges you and others face when implementing CL group work in your class?
2. What kind CL methods have you tried?
3. How often do you use CL methods in your class?
4. How do you differentiate CL from CBSA?
5. Why do you think students remain silent and passive in class?
6. What are some of your opinions about discipline programs in Indonesian schools and what changes have you noticed?
7. When and how are rules established in your classroom?
8. How would you define gotong-royong, musyawarah, and berkerja bersama?
9. Why do you think there are still few instructors using CL and NCCM techniques in their classes?
10. What are some of the barriers that exist within the education system which make it difficult for educators to learn and implement CL and NCCM techniques?
APPENDIX E: INSTRUCTOR CL FORM

Male / Female Teaching Experience: <5 years; >10 years; >20 years

1. What would be two things you would notice as an observer as soon as you walked into a classroom using cooperative learning?
   1. ______________________________________________________________
   2. ______________________________________________________________

2. List three important differences between cooperative learning and just group work.
   1. ______________________________________________________________
   2. ______________________________________________________________
   3. ______________________________________________________________

3. List three observable role changes which cooperative learning teachers have to make.
   1. ______________________________________________________________
   2. ______________________________________________________________
   3. ______________________________________________________________

4. Write three verbs which describe the actions of a facilitator.
   1. ______________________________________________________________
   2. ______________________________________________________________
   3. ______________________________________________________________

5. What is the most difficult aspect of using cooperative learning?