Family Education and Culture in Indonesia:
The complex, intermingled, and dynamic phenomena[1]

Yunita T. Winarto[2]

Indonesia: A 'Multicultural' and Dynamic Society? An Introduction

"Cultural diversity", that is the most prominent feature of the Indonesian nation. "A nation of unity in diversity (*Bhinneka Tunggal Ika*)", that is the national slogan established at the time Indonesia proclaimed her independence in 1945. Long before the independence, in 1928, a group of young Indonesians declared the unity of their future nation: "One country, one nation, one language, Indonesia" (*Satu nusa, satu bangsa, satu bahasa, Indonesia*)". It is interesting to note here that *bahasa Indonesia* was cited as the 'national language' at the time Indonesia was still colonized by the Dutch. It is more interesting to know that those young Indonesians consciously chose *bahasa Indonesia* as the lingua franca among the existing hundreds local languages spread over the archipelago. In his article: *Notes on Cultural Diversity in Southeast Asia* (2004), Fox argues for the use of language as a means of indicating diversity in Southeast Asia instead of the concept of 'culture' as used by the earlier anthropologists. I agree that using language as an indicator of diversity is straightforward, though—as also argued by Fox (2004:18)—various dialects can make up one single language as he found among Rotenese in Eastern Indonesia. As Fox (2004:18) says: "Where exactly to divide up the dialects of Rotenese and decide on what constitute separate languages would be both difficult and arbitrary." It is not at all easy to define the demarcation of each language, and so also is the reality with hundreds of cultures in Indonesia. This is only one issue to deal with such a complexity. Various other aspects of people's life, for examples religion, kinship, and economic-social-political system also vary from one group to another.

By considering the total number of languages in larger islands and regions only, excluding the small islands, as many as 701 languages are spread throughout Indonesia (see Fox of his quotation on the number of languages in Sumatra, Kalimantan, Sulawesi, Java and Bali, Nusa Tenggara, Maluku and Papua as quoted from *Ethnologue: Languages of the World* [Grimes 1992 in Fox 2004:15]). If language is used as an indicator of cultural diversity, it means that only from the larger islands and regions, there are seven hundreds cultures in Indonesia. We could thus imagine how enormous the diversity in Indonesia is. In such a situation, if *bahasa Indonesia* can function as the lingua franca, to what extent could the national identity and sense of belongingness function as the 'tie' of more than 200 millions people with their heterogeneous cultural identities and backgrounds? It is not at all a simple and easy thing to realize.

Referring to Furnivall (1948a, 1948b), Suparlan (2000a, 2000b) argues for Furnivall's hypothesis that Indonesia is, in reality, a 'plural society' consisting of a large number of social groups who do not have any intricate relationships one another, nor do they have the same interests as members of a nation. The colonial regime of the Netherlands-Indie forced them to be together under their rule on the basis of economic interests. Economic interests became the means to build up network and relation in and through the market. Again, economic and political interests underlined the rule of the previous old regime of Soeharto where the 'unity' of Indonesian nation was forced strongly above its 'diversity' for the sake of their interests. In 1984 the Soeharto regime issued censorship on some sensitive areas, i.e. ethnicity, race, religion and inter-group issues, locally known as SARA that stands for *Suku* (ethnic group), *Agama* (religion), and *Ras* (race). As Budianta says (2004:21), "The SARA censorship betrayed the underlying tension beneath the State pluralistic motto of "*Bhinneka Tunggal Ika*" (Unity in Diversity)." The reality that we live in diversity with all its consequences should not be raised in public domain for the sake of 'stability' and 'security' issues as one nation. The 'unity' dimension was thus being forced to overcome the real 'diversity'. Moreover, the rights of local communities to live in their own ways and own their properties in peace were neglected for the sake of the central regime's maximum exploitation of natural resources (see Suparlan 2003).

In the wake of Reform (from 1998 onwards), as Budianta (2004:21) argues, the pendulum swang from centralistic unity towards the needs to recognize diversity which further accelerated the resurgence of 'multiculturalism' issue. The euphoria was to turn down the centralistic control and heavy emphasis on unity to give rise towards a greater freedom of the regional and local people to control their own rights and resources in its diversity. Despite such euphoria, the question is, are we, Indonesians, really moving from a pluralistic society—in Furnivall's meaning—towards a 'multicultural' society? Suparlan (2003:31) argues for the meaning of multiculturalism as an ideology that praises cultural differences, or a belief that recognizes and enforces the formation of cultural

pluralism as a form of societal life. How to operationally implement such an ideology in everyday life? How to put into action the praise of differences and the belief to enforce cultural pluralism? Fay (1996:241) argues against a too restrictive and too static a slogan of multiculturalism as only 'recognizing, appreciating, and celebrating difference'. 'Engaging, questioning, and learning' are better captures the synergistic character of genuine multicultural interaction, as well as the dynamic character of social science (Fay 1996:241). Looking at the long history of the development of Indonesia as a nation, I argue that it would be a long way for the Indonesian people to form and reach the genuine multicultural interaction among the very heterogeneous people. This is the great challenge for both the people and the academia. Yet, this is the reality the people face in their everyday life. Like a pendulum, the swing is moving back and forth between the 'forced plural society without any genuine multicultural interaction' to the great interests to form a multicultural society, yet still in the midst of facing various problems, hardships and challenges to reach the other end of the pendulum: the multicultural Indonesia. Such is also a portray of how dynamic the nation is from the period of pre-independence up to this recent modern time through the struggle of sustaining independence, and the unity of the nation amid the very diverse conditions, people, and interests. On the other hand, the Indonesian nation has to struggle of reaching prosperity in the midst of prolonged poverty, while facing vast changes through modernization and globalization. Indonesia is also an archipelago with diverse degrees of contact between and among the people, within and between neighboring islands and foreign countries. The mobility of people within and inter-islands has also been going on since the colonization period up to recent times.

In such a complex society, how do the families sustain their existence? To what extent do the family members exercise their decisions and strategies in transmitting 'cultures' which are so diverse, and by doing that, also sustaining and at the same time, changing 'cultures'? Yet, within one nation having one language as the lingua franca, to what extent do the national language and 'culture' play important role in the ways the family transmit the 'cultures'? In a heterogeneous society like Indonesia, could the genuine multicultural interaction take place where the family members do engage, learn, and question one another and with those belonging to the 'others'? Referring to the main theme of the conference, is this the kind of 'education' the members of a 'family' perform and hence would support, or otherwise, jeopardize the efforts to create a multicultural Indonesia? Yet, what kind of 'cultures' do they, through what is called as 'education', transmit, sustain, and change in the midst of such a complex and dynamic Indonesia? These are not easy questions to answer. I will not be able to provide the answers of all those questions in this brief paper. Yet, a brief examination of the ongoing features of those phenomena will be discussed.

Though the family as a social entity becomes the main focus of this conference, I would pursue my perspective in examining the 'family education' in Indonesia from the agency perspective and the situational and processual approaches instead of the emphasis on the system with the underlying essentialism point of view (see Bourdieu 1977; Giddens 1979; Ortner 1984; Vayda 1986; Ahearn 2001; also see Moore 1987, 1994; Vayda *et al.* 1991). Before examining these issues further, it is urgent to have an understanding of what constitutes a 'family' in a nation like Indonesia and what are the features of 'families' in a heterogeneous Indonesia.

Family in Indonesia: The 'Cultural-intermingled' Entity in a Flux?
What constitutes a 'family'? In a nation like Indonesia, it is not easy to define a 'family' in a Western concept, or in an essentialist point of view.

> The Javanese in the southern part of Yogyakarta (located in the south of Central Java) define the literal word of 'family' (*pamili*) as consisting of their bilateral relatives, or kindred, from both father and mother sides. The close distance family members, siblings from one parent with their couples and children, usually live in one house-yard with several houses built close one to another. Each couple and children staying under one roof are usually called one '*somah'* (*sa-omah* means one house), or one '*keluarga'* referring to the Indonesian word used by the state to identify a 'family, or in anthropological concept: a 'nuclear family'. More often, people refer to those staying in one house (under one roof) as one *rumah tangga*, or household. In government's term, the household is usually referred to *KK* that stands for *Kepala Keluarga,* or translated in English as 'the head of the family'. Officially 'the head of the family' is the husband or, if the husband deceased, the widow in that family. Since the government used this abbreviation to refer to one household for administrative purposes, i.e. to publish the household card (*kartu keluarga,* also in its abbreviation as *KK*), people internalize that word for indicating one household. Listed in the *kk* (*kartu keluarga,* the 'family' card) are all people staying in one roof, not only the members of the nuclear family staying in that house. Translating this term of household into Javanese, then people may say *somah* as similar to one household. In another case, some people use the word '*famili'* to refer to those living in one roof. Moreover, with the out-migration of young generation or spouse to earn a living or to pursue their education in the towns and other regions, the members of one 'nuclear family' or *keluarga* can no longer completely stay in one roof. It has further consequence on the existence of 'female-headed households' instead of the male-headed household as defined by the state. The 'boundary' of a family in its meaning as 'kindred' can also be up to far reaching distance places not only in Java, but also in other islands (Sumatera or Kalimanta); no longer in one house, nor in one house-yard (from my fieldnotes 2005; also see Koentjaraningrat 1984; Koning 2004).

What can we discern from such a case? Firstly, the Javanese have their own taxonomy of what constitutes a 'nuclear family', a 'household', or a 'family'. Yet, the term 'family' in *bahasa Indonesia* and the idiom introduced by the state of what a 'household' and the 'head of household' are, have been internalized by the Javanese people and become part of their daily vocabulary. A mixture of these various terms is cited by the Javanese in explaining what a 'family' is, also with some degree of variability. Secondly, an incomplete and far-reaching 'nuclear family' (in anthropological term) and 'kindred'

(extended family) is a common phenomenon in both rural and urban areas, though a larger number of kindred and close distance of relationship between kindred is found in the rural areas than in the cities. By also referring to the dynamics and variability within a Javanese 'family', Koning (2004:70—79) argues that a family is an unbounded, not isolated unit, always in flux and in motion, with differences of ideas and perspectives along gender's and generations' line. The picture can be more complicated if we look at other ethnic groups such as those living in a 'long house' among the Batak people in North Sumatera with its patrilineal clan, the Minangkabau of West Sumatera with its matrilineal clan, or various Dayak people of Kalimantan based on bilateral descents. The descent system determines who are allowed to live in one long house and own the communal property; also of who has the power to make decisions in family affairs.

Kato (1978:3—6) describes in detail the descent group and the pattern of residence in the rural areas in Minangkabau, West Sumatera as follows:

> A matrilineage is a corporate descent group with a ceremonially instituted male head called the *penghulu.....* A lineage possesses communally owned properties, including agricultural land, houses, fish ponds, heirlooms, and miscellaneous adat titles. In principle, ancestral property (*harta pusaka*) is inalienable, and there is no individually owned property,…. A lineage is further divided into several sublineages (*paruik*). These also have their properly recognized male heads (*tungganai rumah*). Ancestral properties, or, more accurately, rights to their use (*ganggam bauntuak*), are assigned to sublineages for the benefit of their respective members. …. The residential pattern is duolocal. After marriage, a husband moves to or near the house of his wife and stays there at night. But he continues to belong to his mother's house and frequently goes back there during the daytime. …. Authority within a lineage or a sublineage is in the hands of the *mamak,* not of the father. *Mamak* literally means maternal uncle, but the term can also refer to classificatory maternal uncles such as *penghulu* and *tungganai rumah.* The kin term which complements *mamak* is *kemanakan*: it indicates a male ego's sister's children and classificatory kin of the same order. ….These general characterizations will become clearer if we look at how family life was actually organized in traditional Minangkabau society. *...rumah gadang...* The front half is an open space. It functions as living room, dining room, sleeping quarters for children and occasional guests, and a hall for ceremonies and lineage meetings. In contrast, the back half is partitioned off into smaller compartments. These are the sleeping quarters for female members of the house, especially married or marriageable females, and for their smaller children. Each sleeping compartment, called *bilik,* is about three meters wide and four meters long. ….The adat house was the basic economic unit and the major focus of everyday life in traditional Minangkabau society. ... Life in an adat house was strongly communal. … After reaching marriageable age or upon marriage, a woman was given a *bilik* in the house. …It was in the *bilik* that she received her husband at night. … A husband was called (*urang*) *sumando* by his wife's family. *Sumando* is said to originate from the word *sando,* "to pledge",....Usually he visited his wife at night and left her house in the morning.

Such is a feature of how peculiar the 'Minangkabau adat' is in defining the lineage, authority, ownership, residential pattern, household members, and the husband's status as visitor in the adat house. This is a completely different picture from the bilateral Javanese family in rural areas. This is only one facet of the complex pictures of family life in

Indonesia among hundreds of other ethnic groups and cultures. The strict definition of 'family' as developed in the Western concepts of social sciences, thus, cannot be easily used to describe such diversity. Changes are also another dimension of the diverse features of family life.

The Minangkabau people are also well-known as *perantau* (migrants) to various places in Indonesia. Once the Minangkabau *perantau* (migrants) arrive in the urban areas, a modification and adaptation of their cultures to the urban life is a necessity. As a result, changes, yet some persistence, do occur. Marzali (2000:11—14) says that the Minangkabau in Jakarta still recognize some principles of the Minangkabau adat (tradition), but these are no longer functioning. Almost all functions which are held by the lineage corporate descent group and the domestic group are now under the responsibility of the nuclear household family consisting of one father, one mother and children. There are no longer adat houses or *rumah gadang* in Jakarta where the elders play dominant role in decision making and control of the *rumah gadang* members' everyday life. The urban crowded houses compound makes it impossible to build such a house. Now, the household of a single nuclear family is the prominent family unit. The husband or father who has his position as *urang sumando* in Minangkabau region is now the head of the household. He has the right and power to make decisions and control, as well as having the obligation to his own wife and children. Yet, he still has his duty to take care of his nephews and nieces from his sisters' children, though only for social visits and relations. As a further consequence, the Minangkabau migrants in Jakarta do not possess lineage's communal property any longer. Such are the changes experienced and also, created by the Minangkabau migrants in their adaptation to the metropolitan city like Jakarta.

The two cases of the Javanese and Minangkabau represent the dynamics of the families where they have the same ethnic background and identity as members of a particular 'ethnic group', wherever they live, either in the rural or urban areas. It does not mean, however, that they cut-off their relationship with their original places and relatives. The migrants often visited their origin villages or hometowns, pay homage to their ancestors, contribute to their relatives' economics and even participating significantly in the recent regional autonomy era of developing the regions. Regional autonomy, or decentralization, began in early 2000s following the reformation period after the felling-down of Soeharto regime. On the basis of their recent observation, Franz- and Keebet von Benda-Beckmann (2000:21) argue for a remarkable and unintended effect of the regional autonomy in Indonesia of the involvement of Minangkabau *perantau* (migrants) in their original *nagari.*.

> Generally, the return to the *nagari* (a society related to a particular region in Minangkabau land, my definition) and the promise of more autonomy and opportunities for active political and economic involvement has offered them again a home to identify with, which apparently

was not or much less the case during the *desa* (village) period. Some have returned to take up a position in the village or in the district government; others become active as *panghulu* (leader), yet others participate as advisors and contributors to the village budget. Some active village mayors recruit intellectuals living close-by, for instance in Padang, for their think tanks for economic development. And we have seen that this greater involvement seems to reflect a different notion of what constitutes the village community.

The Javanese migrants all over Indonesia would also do their best to return home during *Lebaran*, an Islamic New Year's celebration, or important family matters such as marriage, death, and serious illness of their elderly relatives. On the other hand, those migrants become the destination of young generations to seek place and jobs once they arrive in towns. The distance becomes much closer due to the telecommunication network such as mobile phones. A Javanese wife in south of Yogyakarta told me that she does not feel too far a distance from her husband who is working in the capitol of East Kalimantan in different island. Everyday she can call her husband through mobile-phones. These are examples of a 'borderless' entity of a family, and the 'close' relationship and linkages across places, urban and rural areas, different islands and regions.

Not only the flux between and across spaces among family members of the same background, e.g. ethnicity, are common. Intermarriage across ethnicity and religion is a common phenomenon as well nowadays, in particular, among young generations in the cities.

Siblings of five, the children of an Indonesian Chinese-origin (*Tionghoa* according to local term or *Keturunan Cina* according to Soeharto regime), devoted Catholic followers, married to their spouses of different background in nationality, ethnicity, and religion. The eldest married to a Swedish as Catholics and live in Sweden. The second married to a Manado woman originally from North Sulawesi and he converted to Christian following his wife's religion. The third married to a Betawi girl from Jakarta who was a Moslem converted into Catholic following his husband's religion. The fourth married to a Tionghoa woman, also a Catholic. The youngest one married to a Sundanese man who converted from Islam to Catholic.

The above case reveals how diverse the ethnicity and religious backgrounds of the children's spouses. Religion is a very important aspect in family life in Indonesia. A strong value of the need to have the same religion binding a couple constitutes a significant part of many believers in Indonesia. It is also not easy for a person to convert to another religion without their parents' blessings and permissions. Though religious conversion is increasingly become a common phenomenon, the individuals undergoing such a change have to face an uneasy challenge from their family. The conversion of the Betawi and the Sundanese persons from Islam to Catholic is a case of how the families of those two persons have to struggle to engage and learn of differences, of the reality of their children's choice of life. Sometimes, it took months or years to come to this decision. Sometimes a strategy had to be set up by the couples so as to avoid any conflicts and unhappy feelings, or un-blessed marriage by their parents and close

relatives. This is therefore a case revealing how a genuine multicultural interaction is taking place, since changing beliefs or accepting difference in beliefs and religions is the hardest part of people's life. If the families could accept such a significant change, there should be a condition where all parties agree to perform a high tolerance and have a high degree of acceptance of differences in nationality, ethnicity and religious backgrounds.

I argue that in a vast diverse situation of Indonesian cultures, the family plays a very significant role as the agents of multiculturalism ideology to flourish. It is within the family that differences need to be faced and settled down not only through 'recognition, appreciation, and celebration', but through 'engagement, questioning, and learning' as argued by Fay (1996:241). It is really happening within a family with the same ethnic background, the Toraja from South Sulawesi, where the religion of the mother (Islam) is different from the father (Christian Protestant).

> The couple agreed to stay with his and her religion without converting to the other one, and brought up their children in two different religious beliefs and practices. The father was an activist in church and political party. The mother once helped her husband working in the church's program, but she herself kept practicing the Islamic tradition and prayers and went to Mekah for her pilgrimage. They also allowed their children to choose which religion to follow. As a result, part of their children followed their mother to be Moslems, part of them became Protestant followers, and one converted to Catholic following her husband's religion.

This case reveals the strong effort of the couple to build up the multicultural interaction within their family.

Nevertheless, such a struggle does not always end in a successful story. It is also not a simple and easy path to achieve. Unblessed marriages or run-away marriages are also common if a genuine multicultural interaction fails to take place. The followings are my experience and close observation of how the processes of engaging, questioning and learning took times and how did the agents take decisions and strategies in those processes.

> A devoted Catholic-Javanese couple with five children had to engage with their children's choices of their spouses which sometimes beyond their expectation. The first son decided to marry a Catholic-Tionghoa despite a Javanese one. It was not easy for the mother to accept his eldest son's decision to marry a non-Javanese girl, though from the same religious background. It was not the case with the father, but both of them were absence during the eldest son's wedding, the first in the family. Then, the mother had to face again the choice of her third daughter to marry a Catholic-Tionghoa person. No more great reluctance this time due to her close relationship with the future son-in-law during her prolonged illness. Several years passed by. The mother now had to face another unexpected reality when her fourth daughter chose a Moslem-Javanese person to marry. This was not the case of different ethnic background. Now, the difference in religion was a problem. It was hard for her to accept her future son-in-law, a Moslem. Again, she was reluctant to accept her daughter's choice. Run-away marriage was her daughter's strategy facing her mother's reluctance until the time the father and other siblings helped her to get married as a Catholic. Then, several years later, his youngest son married a Moslem Javanese girl. This time, no conflicting situation happened with the couple's agreement to get married in a Catholic matrimonial ceremony. From

among her five children, only her second daughter married a Javanese who was baptized as a Catholic prior to his marriage. This is the only couple of the same ethnic and religious background. The time laps occurred in years, with the dynamics of reluctance and acceptance, and only after all marriages bore fruits of grandchildren to her, she accepted the reality without any hurt feeling. Surprisingly, more than one decade later after her passing away, again, a conflict emerged when one of her grandchildren from the mixed-marriage (Javanese-Tionghoa) daughter would marry a Manado person from the same religious background. This time, the different ethnic background and other personal matters, not the religion, became the hindrance for the mother's approval. Only through time the problem was then being settled down.

These processes of conflicts, reluctance towards and acceptance of differences at the family level are only a mirror of the real world of larger groups' relationship in a heterogeneous society like Indonesia. Accepting and appreciating differences are hard to practice. How could learning, engagement, questioning become a way of life to solve differences? The real world does not only full of variations and differences. It is a very dynamic world with very rapid changes going on day-to-day. How, in such a situation, do older generations engage with fast changes the children experience? What happen with the families' function in performing education?

Family Education: The Flow of Ideas in a 'Borderless' World?
I agree with Spindler (1955) who says that family is the most important single educational institution. From the cultural perspective, education, argues Spindler (1955:) is the instrument through which cultures perpetuate themselves. It is the process through which the members of a society assure themselves that the behavior necessary to continue their culture is learned.

> The educative process—the who, what, when, where, and how of common-human and culturally variable cultural transmission—furnishes understanding of not only basic processes of education but also cultural dynamics, for education thus broadly conceived is culture in motion. Culture is idealized in the educative process (Spindler 1955:14).

The question is how, in the reality of the complex-intermingled-diverse-dynamic-borderless world, the 'family', or the agencies as members of the family transmit and hence, perpetuate cultures? How do the agencies select which elements of which cultures to transmit, and in what ways? Again, these are not simple questions to answer. The phenomena are complex, not only due to heterogeneity and intermingling nature, but also to the continuity of the incoming flow of ideas originating from elsewhere. As Borofsky (1994) argues, the cultural is always in motion. Yet, the cultural dynamics, the cultural (in Borofsky term, not the 'culture') in motion itself is the educative process as Spindler says (1955). How could we translate these in everyday life of the Indonesian families and of which families and where?

To simplify the feature, I will examine several cases of diverse family conditions in Indonesia and look upon the ways and the context of cultural transmission through the day-to-day activities of the so-called 'family' members.

The rural- farmers: the practitioners in the local-global world

The case of rural-farmers is a good example to see how the local and global world meets in farmers' life through their farming practices besides the intermingled ethnic, religious, and 'national' cultural background. Geertz, H. (1962) says that even though farmers live in large and crowded villages, they are not at all closed and independent communities. Farmers are only part of a wider complex society (see Redfield 1960; Wolf 1966; Kemp 1988). I also agree with Kearney (1996:2) who says that:

> …any genuinely anthropological approach to rural communities must theoretically situate them within global contexts and must attend to the history of the nation-state and to its position within global society.

Therefore, even though farming communities perform a greater uniformity of ethnic and religious background than the urban non-farming people, not only variability in those cultural backgrounds does take place as the case of several migrant villages (see Winarto *et al.* 2000 of the Javanese farming communities in Central Lampung), but also the influx of global knowledge and technology.

As the core unit of transmitting cultures of their cultural backgrounds (both of the ethnic culture and religious belief) as well as farming skills and knowledge, parents play a significant role as the 'educators' of the young generation. The values and norms of a Javanese or Sundanese people with various traditional ceremonies, for example, are transmitted through everyday life of upbringing their children. These include ritual practices in farming. In some farming communities as in Java or Kalimantan, it is not easy to see the clear separation of ritual tradition and religious practices as discovered by Geertz, C. (1960) and Geertz, H. (1982) among the Javanese. The Javanese traditional belief is known as having strong syncretism elements of various beliefs such as Hinduism, Buddhism, animism, Javanese myths, superstitions, cosmology, and Islam (see for example Geertz, C. 1960). The Javanese cosmology of *pranata mangsa* (traditional calendars for planting), the cycle of eight-years (*satu windu*), the belief on spirits and goddess of rice, as well as the Islamic prayers and chanting and the belief on God the Almighty are all mixed in the belief and ritual practices of rice farming. Prior to the introduction of the Green Revolution with high-level inputs of rice technology and the use of machine, various rituals from the time of nurseries up to harvesting were part of the 'traditional ceremonies' the farmers from all generations had to participate. Here, parents and all the elders of the 'family' in the farming community are the significant 'teachers'. However, not all expertise in praying or chanting, for example, could be

transmitted to everybody. Usually, only few elder knowledgeable farmers were able to do that and their knowledge were also gone with their passing away if no 'special training' to the younger generation was taking place. This is not the case with the religious teachers in Islam or Christian/Catholic, for example. The institutions and rules of how to educate their followers have been established well. So, the parents would send their children to *pengajian* (learning to read Qor'an) to special teachers besides asking them to just follow their prayers as in farming ritual practices.

In recent years after the introduction of the high-level-input of technology to intensify farming production which is known as the Green Revolution, there has been a significant decline of the traditional knowledge of farming practices, including rituals. Going away with the introduction of the various high yielding varieties are the traditional local varieties. In my earlier writing (Winarto 1997, 2004), I argue that 'where the seed goes, there the knowledge flows'. Once the seed is gone, the knowledge of that seed is flown away. This is to emphasize the importance of 'practice', including mimesis (observation) and repetition, in knowledge transmission from one generation to the next. In many communities of practitioners, learning by doing and through mimesis instead of verbal explanation is the core mechanism of learning, or in Gatewoods' words: "Action speaks louder than words" (see Gatewood 1985; also see Borofksy 1987; Keller and Keller 1993; Winarto 2004). Without action, how do the young generations learn of how to plant, transplant or broadcast seeds, weed, plow, hoe, fertilize, and harvest crops?

At the time the Indonesian central government decided to boost up rice production by introducing the package of modern high-level inputs with the new skills and technology which were alien to farmers, the reliance on outside 'teachers' was a need. The government recruited the so-called 'extension workers' (*petugas penyuluh lapangan*) to transfer the top-down recommended technological package. They might not have any practical experience of farming as the farmers did. Moreover, the global modern scientific knowledge came into farmers' local domain of knowledge without any intimate understanding of ecological condition and local resources. Nor did the extension workers were taught to also learn from farmers of all the unintended and unexpected consequences. The feed-back loops of learning process were missing here. Yet, the farmers had to rely on them for any recommendations and suggestions. Not only that. Farmers have also become the subjects of various commercial promotions both directly or indirectly from the producers of the high-level-inputs/technology, including chemical substances such as pesticides and fertilizers. In such a condition, parents would still be the main source of learning for young generations through direct participation and practice. However, what did they teach their children of the new technology would depend on what they learned from the outsiders and on their own interpretation and subjective understanding of what they heard, did, and saw of the results of their practices

on the growth of plants, the condition of their field, and the population of pests. What were the objective realities beyond their empirical observation would not be part of their teaching.

When in the early 1990s the government introduced a training in pest management to correct their previous mistakes in controlling pests with injudicious use of pesticides (through the Integrated Pest Management Farmer Field School, IPM FFS), the government had to also rely on the agricultural officials to introduce again the cycle of learning process with the whole package of new knowledge of pest management (see Dilts and Hate 1995; Pontius *et al.* 2002; Winarto 2004). Through Farmer Field School (FFS), the facilitators (the pest observers and extension workers in the early stage of its introduction and the farmer themselves at a later stage) transmitted a new learning strategy on the basis of experiential-discovery-learning process and andragogy method (adult learning method), and novel ideas originating from the scientific domain of entomology and agronomy. This was the time the farmers learned that they were able to take up decision of what would be the best strategy for their fields, and not solely depend on the outsiders' recommendation and promotion. In this arena, the national interest and modification of the global-modern-scientific knowledge meet with farmers' existing knowledge and ways of learning. The latter is entirely based on empirical observation and farmers' subjective interpretation on the basis of their accumulative experience. It is interesting to observe that from such learning, farmer-facilitators, after being specially trained in Training of Trainers facilitated by the organizers of the National IPM Program in Indonesia, have emerged in many places and gradually replaced the role of outside extension workers. Not all farmers who have not been trained in FFS master the new ways of learning. Hence, in that particular sphere of knowledge, their role as parents and main educators of the younger generation in their families is replaced by the farmer-facilitators. The later are now becoming part of the 'expert-knowledgeable' farmers in the community, similar to those of the elder farmers' position prior to the Green Revolution era. An increase of variability in the area of who teaches what within the community of practitioners is happening (see Winarto 2006 for the multicultural interaction among farmers themselves following such a variation and between farmers and those in power).

In short, with the growing body of knowledge and modern technology introduced from outside the farmers' local-world, the families could no longer persist as the sole agents in family education for mastering the skills of farming practices. A sharper distinction between the local and the modern-global knowledge has been gradually emerged in farmers' world. On the other hand, the farmers have also been engaged with continuous dialogue and dialectic between their own existing knowledge and the introduced modern technology and knowledge. This is the intermingling cultures the farmers—who have been exposed intensively to the modern scientific knowledge—have experienced that

would not be the same with their fellow farmers in the remote areas and with the non-community of practitioners in the urban world.

The 'intermingling culture': a mixture of ethnic and/ or religious background
Moving from the rural to the urban areas, we could find a similarity or a variation in the family life. The children of a farmer are socialized into the world of practice: crop cultivation, besides their obligation to join the formal schooling. The children of urban-families whose occupations need their children's involvement as helpers would also be trained—through direct practice and participation—in mastering their parents' jobs. To some extend there is an expectation from the parents that one day in the future, their children would continue their enterprises. It is not the case with children of the families who have professional jobs, either as managers or employees, in various institutions/organizations. A very different career among family members is a reality. Each of them may not be able to communicate one another in relation to their particular job/profession. This is only one kind of variation within a range of other variability, e.g. the parents' cultural backgrounds in ethnicity, locality, nationality, or religion. In such a situation, the main issue to be dealt with is how do parents—coming from different cultural traditions with similar or different religious beliefs—reach an agreement of how would they transmit what 'cultures' they perceive as important to be part of their children's life in the future. In this sub-heading I will only examine the intermingling cultures originating from ethnicity and religion.

First of all, the couples, who have been engaged so far as partners, should come to a stage where they reach the same aspirations of what they perceive as highly valuable in their life disregard what the sources are: either the same belief and faith, cultural values and norms, universal humanities aspirations, etc. These aspirations would reflect in their ways of upbringing their children with the high expectation of what their children would internalize and what should not be part of their personality, talents, beliefs, and social behaviors. Into this arena many older generations were reluctant to have their children marrying those having different beliefs and faiths as the case aforementioned. The underlying perspective was the difficulties they would face in raising their children in different beliefs and faiths. However, if this is the case, the question is: to what extent does the couple agree to finally have one religion? If not, how do they deal with differences? For those who agree to convert to their partners' religion, it is no longer a debatable issue in upbringing their children's religious life. For those who would maintain their each own belief and faith, they would come into an agreement of the kinds of option they provide to their children: following either one's belief, or giving freedom to their children to choose by themselves. In these cases, there should be some degrees of tolerance of either part for not enforcing the upbringing of their children in the same

belief as his/hers. The Torajan Christian-Islamic family as presented before is one example of this situation.

Nevertheless, it is always not the case that their agreement would turn out to be the same over time. Changing in faith and changing in agreement is often the case.

> Referring to the cases of the Javanese couples of Catholic-Islam mixed marriages, at the time they agreed to receive the Catholic Holy Matrimony sacrament, both of them had to officially promise—in front of the priest—that they would raise their children as Catholics. In this case, the Moslem spouse had to come to an agreement to accept that rule. What happened afterwards? In the first case where the wife was a Catholic, the husband decided not to force their children to follow Catholic faith. It further meant that he disagreed to raise his children as Catholics. Let them choose by themselves later, that was his attitude. The wife's 'family' (wife's parents), a devoted Catholic, could hardly receive that attitude which was not in line with their promise. Baptizing the children, bringing them to Catholic schools, raising them as Catholics were the ways the mother, with the help of her parents and siblings, did to her children. Would the father be happy with this? No. As the time passed by, and the movement towards strengthening Islamic belief went stronger lately, the father played a more active role as the decision maker in their children's and also his wife's religion. Converting them all into Islam was the final decision. In the second case where the husband was a Catholic, the children's upbringing was in his wife's hand, also in religious domain. Since she was not converted into Catholic and was still a Moslem, she raised her children in Islamic belief and faith.

Those cases reveal that over time, changes did occur. Over time, what was agreed upon initially and what was in mind and heart resulted in contradictory decision and action at a later stage. Such a change would significantly affect their children's education in developing their belief and faith. In the first case, it would be a peculiar experience for the children undergoing changes in their belief. The option is: whether to follow or to disobey their parents' will. The answers would of course different from case to case. In relation to the aforementioned case, the Javanese value of paying respects to parents, of obeying them, had become the way out of their children's dilemma. Paying respect to the elders and sustaining harmony or being '*rukun*' with the others is highly valued among the Javanese (see Geertz, H. 1982). Into this situation, the cultural values become one of the references the Javanese pay attention to in taking up decisions.

The same cultural value among the family members is an advantageous way out in facing such a conflict. How is the case with spouses coming from different ethnic backgrounds? If no conflict emerges from conflicting faiths, there should be an agreement of the similar cultural values they share as the main reference for educating their children whether those are originating from the 'Indonesian values', the similar cultural values found in different ethnic cultures, or the 'universal values'. However, to deal with 'identity' of who belong to the 'self' and who are the 'others', a reference to language and kinship system is often the case. As mentioned earlier of Fox's argument (2004), language can be used as an indicator of cultural diversity. The question is: what would the spouses agree of which 'language' would they use as the 'mother tongue' for

their children in a heterogeneous society like Indonesia with *bahasa Indonesia* as a lingua franca? The answer would again, vary from one case to another, from one region to another, and from a particular culture to another.

> The Javanese-Tionghoa couple living in Jakarta, the capitol of Indonesia, agreed to use *bahasa Indonesia* as the 'mother tongue', not the father's Javanese language, nor the mother's Melayu-Tionghoa of East Java dialect, the mother's mother tongue. As a result, none of the three children they have can speak Javanese language or their mother's mother tongue. At school, they learned the proper official *bahasa Indonesia* without any difficulties, yet they also learned from the neighborhood's and their school's friends' of the local Jakarta conversation dialect (*bahasa pergaulan Jakarta*). Going to early schooling in Jakarta meant that this Jakarta speaking dialect became their second language. Yet, neither the father nor the mother ever discussed with the children of what their identities are in terms of ethnic background. At the time the family moved to North Sumatera and lived in Medan, a city with a high degree of ethnic diversity, the eldest son raised a question of what his ethnic background was. His friends, each of them could identify their ethnic identity, asked him of his ethnic identity. Not an easy answer for him to reply. What to refer to? Was it Jakarta as the place where he was born? Or part Javanese and part Tionghoa-nese? The mother suggested that he could say to his friends that he is a Jakarta people. Here, a new identity was created that is based on locality of origin. It was a different situation faced by the Javanese couple raising their children in Javanese language as the mother tongue. No other answer instead of being a Javanese. The Tionghoa's children who do not speak either Hokkian or Mandarin any longer, could still identify themselves as the Indonesian-Tionghoa (Indonesian-Chinese origin) from Jakarta, though with a weak tie to the Tionghoa identity than to an Indonesian born citizen.

The case of the ethnic mixed-marriage family reveals that even though the parents were raised in the Javanese environment, including the East-Javanese Tionghoa wife, at a certain point, there is an ambiguity of what the identity of their children are within the context of a heterogeneous society based on ethnicity. A gradual replacement to the identity related to birth-location and childhood residence is happening. In relation to the 'education' issue, it is a case where 'ethnic-cultural identity and the bundle of the values, norms, knowledge, and belief related to that particular cultural tradition' have become gradually weakened. Though the values and norms transmitted by the parents to the children are those internalized and learned by both of them (a Javanese and an East-Javanese Tionghoa), the idioms and terms to name them in Javanese language are no longer exist. In other words: there is a discontinuity of ethnic language, and hence, a lost of ethnic identity; though the 'cultural values' are not being lost altogether. On the other hand, the national language, as well as the universal global values, religious belief and faith have gradually been replacing the local ethnic cultural traditions. Javanese life cycle rituals or the Chinese Confucianism rituals, for example, are no longer being practiced in the family. Over time, English language becomes the third language for the children when they joined their father and later on their mother living abroad in pursuing their studies. Speaking and thinking as a foreigner, an Australian for example, has become part of the children's upbringing at home and at school. These reflect the changes from one

generation to the next not only because of the parents' decision of what language to use and what cultural norms to transmit, but also of their education, as well as theirs and children's adjustment to the open changing world.

Various other cases of the mixed-marriages on the basis of ethnicity would of course have different stories. Those who live in a dominant ethnic culture such as Sundanese in Bandung, the capitol of West Java, could affect the parents' choice in using Sundanese as the 'mother tongue', or a bilingual of Indonesia and Sundanese. Variations in what local language to use, and degree the *bahasa Indonesia* is used as also the mother tongue or only being learned at school, as well as the parents and children's formal education, and exposure to the global world are so prominent from one place to another. How about the kinship system?

Kinship system is another feature of the ethnic cultures in Indonesia as the cases of Javanese and Minangkabau families aforementioned. Kinship, language, identity, and the whole bundle of cultural values and norms are related one another. The Javanese has a bilateral descent. The Tionghoa people inherited the Chinese kinship system, the patrilineal descent system as the case of Batak people of North Sumatera. If two different kinship systems bind a couple, which one would the couple follow? Again, it varies from one case to another. From my field study among the mixed-marriage Tionghoa and native people in a rural area west of Jakarta in early 1970s, the wife, if she was a native people, would follow her husband's kinship rule. Her children inherited their father's clan. In the case of a Tionghoa woman married to a Javanese man, automatically her children would not have any clan's name. The Javanese people follow a bilateral descent. No rule to inherit their father's name as the children's surname. Each child has his/her own personal name and that will be his/her name without any rule to bear his/her father's name. Accordingly, no rights and obligations to follow as the patrilineal clan members do as the case with both the Chinese and the Batak people of North Sumatera. In a mixed-marriage between a Tionghoa woman and a Batak man, then all of their children will be the members of the father's clan. The woman has to be adopted as a member of another clan. As the case of the rural traditional Minangkabau, the inheritance, property, rights and obligations and of course, identity would follow.

An interesting phenomenon was happening in Indonesia as a consequence of Soeharto's decision following the failure of the Communist coup in 1966. He enforced, and made it as a national policy and rule, that all Chinese origin-Indonesian people had to change their Chinese names into Indonesian (see Coppel 2004 on the New Order [Soeharto] regime suppression of the expression of Chineseness). This had a far-reaching implication. Not only their Chinese names were gone, but so also their kinship system and all the consequences, in particular among the *peranakan Tionghoa.* The new generations of *peranakan Tionghoa* people do not have any Chinese name, nor do they

follow the patrilineal descent system any longer. Some *totok* Chinese—though many of them had new Indonesian names—still keep the patrilineal kinship system in practice.[3] In such a suppression policy, the question faced by many *peranakan Tionghoa* was: what kinship principle to follow then? The cases again varied. In Java, many of them just follow their fellow Javanese of recognizing their relatives of both sides of father and mother as their kindred. The kinship terms were also gone, and many of their descendants could not recognize their far distance relatives any longer. A significant change did indeed happen. The Tionghoa families are no longer 'bounded' in term of kinship system. Knowledge of kinship terms, rules, rights and obligations have also been declining as part of the 'family education'.

Such are the diverse conditions of the mixed-marriage families in both ethnic and religious backgrounds. Intermingling cultures originating from diverse sources are the peculiar feature of the 'family education'. What are its further consequences? Some parts of their original cultures were changed, some were sustained, or some new mixed-norms and rules emerged created by the mixed-marriage couple. In a particular situation, they would refer to either one's cultural tradition. In another case, just refer to their beliefs as guidance for solving problems, or their new agreed 'universal' aspirations and values. Throughout these processes, the role of parents in their interaction with their children and relatives, as well as the larger 'kindred' such as grandparents, uncles, aunties, and cousins play an important role. However, peer-groups, surrounding environment, global ideas transmitted through multi-media have become increasingly significant in children's education at home, outside home, and at school.

It has been a reality that the generation gap in aspirations, perspectives, interests, and values has become greater recently due to the younger children's mobility and exposure to outside world more than the older generations do. Koning (2004) describes and explains in detail in her book: *Generations of change* how such a gap is happening between the older and the younger generation in a Javanese village during Soeharto regime. Conflicts between children and parents are often the case. The question is: to what extent could the 'family education' strengthen the children's respect to their parents, and on the other way around, assisting parents to be more tolerant and open mind to their

---

[3] Suryadinata (2004:8) identifies the difference between the term *peranakan Tionghoa* and the *totok* Chinese by referring to their place or birth and the language they use. The term *peranakan Tionghoa* refers to local-born Chinese who speak Indonesian, whereas the *totok* Chinese refers to China-born and Chinese-speaking people in Indonesia. Coppel (2005), however, found that the *totok* Chinese also speak Indonesia fluently. See the discussions on the arguments of the distinction between *peranakan* and *totok* in Coppel (2002, 2005).

children's perspective, thought, and attitude which could be quite different from theirs? This is part of the dynamics of family education in Indonesia nowadays which needs another detailed examination.

Another facet to pay attention to is the role of the nation-state's formal education and how does it affect the family education.

Move-in and move-out: learning at home and at school

The national education through formal schooling plays a very significant role in forming the national identity through learning *bahasa Indonesia.* Not only that. Children from various cultural and religious backgrounds learn the same ideology, ethics, knowledge, values, and norms. This is the prominent means of learning a similar 'schooling-culture' binding children from Aceh in the most northern part of Sumatera to Merauke in the most southern part of Papua. A development of national identity is one of the results. Mastering the lingua franca is another one. The nationality perspective is being stressed. Hence, children from the most western part of Indonesia who have never been out of their own locality would learn that all people from Aceh to Merauke are part of one country: The Republic of Indonesia, one nation: Indonesian with the motto: 'Unity in Diversity' and one ideology: *Pancasila* (Five Pillars of the nation). Yet, the extent to which the national schooling is a vehicle to strengthen multiculturalism in Indonesia is another matter.

Semiawan (2004:37) argues that the philosophy of appreciating dignity, diversity and difference of attitude "…has not always been reflected in the classroom, because the suprasystem requires conformity as directed by the centralized curriculum." Quoting Slamet Imam Santoso in "*Quo Vadis Indonesia's Education"* Semiawan (2004:37—38) states that,

> …the system is much directed by the political will. Education seems to be a vehicle for the transmission of the philosophy of unity, and in many cases sacrisfying diversity. That means a reduction in the educational action, because in this system convergent behavior is required, ignoring or reducing the possibility to express oneself freely and creatively. Basically, matters which are lateral and original, that disturb harmony, uniformity and stability, are abandoned. Divergent thinking, originality and innovation are not priorities, so that there is a status quo in the development of the system.

As also argued by Budianta (2004:30),

> The public space that surrounds educational institutions in Indonesia is filled with political intrigues and power struggles, which are inimical to multiculturalism. The controversy over the National Education System in June 2003 caused polarization between the Christian and Islamic groups, especially concerning the teaching of religion in formal schools. The right for a student to get religious teaching according to his or her belief is seen on one hand as human rights. On the other hand, when the responsibility of providing the appropriate religious teaching falls into schools with specific religious leanings, it is seen as an imposition that

thwarts minority group rights. The controversy brought up majority-minority power relations…

Both Semiawan and Budianta raise a fundamental issue that formal political structures and will play a strong role in defining and determining the basic philosophy of education. Diversity and creativity is being sacrificed in the name of unity, stability, and harmony. Inclusion and exclusion of the majority-minority groups as perceived by the central-state of Soeharto regime underlines the curriculum, for example, the exclusion of Chinese elements from Indonesian history. As a result, the Indonesian government during that era—before the reformation period—adopted what Budianta called as 'selected multiculturalism', a policy that acknowledged selected diversity (see Budianta 2004:30—31). It is only a case of how the complex nature of diverse cultures in Indonesia have not been addressed and taken into account seriously (also see Semiawan 2004:41 for her argument that multicultural contents and curriculum still need to be integrated and developed in the national-central curriculum). The question is: how could the Indonesian young generations improve their multiculturalism understanding and perspective outside their schooling if the formal school's curriculum does not strongly accommodate such an important philosophy?

Returning to the issue of religious teaching at school raised by Budianta (2004), there was a significant change from the earlier policy where schools with specific religious leaning had the freedom and right to provide their religious teaching, e.g. the Catholic schools and Christian schools. In these schools, all students of whatever religious backgrounds had to attend the religious teaching class with the consent of their parents at the time of enrollment. With such a consent and free will of the parents to enroll their children to those schools—which have been well known for their qualified teaching-learning process—they had to obey and adapt to the rule they had agreed upon. What did the parents do then in dealing with their children's religious teaching which was different from what they learned at school? Here the role of parents was significant in providing special teachers or sending their children to special Islamic teaching courses outside school hours. In this case, I perceive the parents' decision and strategy in providing the best schooling for their children on the one hand, and fulfilling the needs of improving their children's religious faith and belief on the other hand as a significant step towards building up high tolerance towards and engagement with differences. The children had also a great opportunity to internalize that tolerance attitude. Throughout the period of schooling, they learn of how to differentiate what they acquired at school as becoming part of their 'knowledge and understanding' of the other religion, and what they learned after school hours as becoming part of their belief and faith. I perceived this as a significant learning process in stimulating the multiculturalism perspective to grow among both sides: the parents and the children. This was not the case when the

government changed the policy in 2003 to enforce the schools with specific religious leaning to also provide appropriate religious teaching classes in line with the students' belief. The opportunity to learn of and engage with differences at school and at home as knowledge and as belief declined.

The Islamic schools, on the other hand, have their particular curriculum where the central state curriculum was mixed with the Islamic teaching/courses. Similar to the state-schools, the grades of their schools are divided into three: *Madrasah Diniyah* for primary school, *Madrasah Tsanawiyah* for junior high school, and *Madrasah Aliyah* for senior high school. Parents then have the options of either sending their children to the state-schools (*sekolah negeri*) only, to the Islamic schools only, or to both. In this case, children learn the same religious teachings at home and at school. Children do not experience any moving-in and out between different religions. They live in one religious atmosphere both at home and at school. Hence, where is the opportunity for them to learn how to engage with different religions? Is it through other kinds of media outside schooling or only through the state text-books?

With such a strong religious teaching as part of the curriculum, the case of non-Islamic parents sending their children to *madrasah* is minimal as compared to the non Christian/Catholic parents enrolling their children to those Christian/Catholic schools. In rural areas or regions without any Christian/Catholic schools, the parents with those religious backgrounds used to send their children to the state-schools. In this case, parents again play a role in enriching their children's faith and belief at home and through parish's activities. However, in both cases (with the same or different religions with the schools' religious leaning), family education in religious domain is still significant.

Yet, I also observed that in the recent decade of modernization and globalization, it is not an easy job for parents to uphold strongly their roles in flourishing their children's religious belief, faith and spiritual life, in particular among the young generations in big cities where consumerism and secular life have become prominent. Conflicting perspectives between those two generations of what is more important to pursue in their life, the spiritual or secular life, have been more common. The enlargement of generation gap does not stop on this religious domain. The development of science and technology, and the improvement of learning-teaching method at schools which had not been experienced by the parents' generation increased their confusion, ignorance, and problems in following the progress of their children's schooling. Many parents cannot follow their children's ways of learning, especially those who did not accomplish their schooling in their childhood. Though as parents they have to perform their tasks in assisting children in their learning at home, they could not provide much help with the nitty-gritty of the lessons. In urban areas, 'special teachers and learning institutions' outside school-hours have gradually been replacing the parents' role here. This is a

similar situation as experienced by farmers who have to rely more on outsiders' assistant. Yet, it is not the case with parents in rural areas with limited access to such privilege institutions. Family education has its constraints in supporting this domain of learning.

In such a constraining situation of formal education in Indonesia and the increasing problems the parents have to face recently, what would be the best solution and strategy in strengthening the synergy of all parties dealing with 'education' in the near future, in particular in moving towards the multicultural society in a flux and dynamics of the global world today? A serious study is necessary.

'Family Education' in a Changing-Heterogeneous World: A Conclusion
Whatever the form of family is in a heterogeneous society like Indonesia, parents, older generations and/or close relatives play important roles in planting the 'seeds' for cultural transmission and perpetuation. The similar their cultural and religious backgrounds are the easier the parents' jobs—supported by their kindred/relatives—in transmitting their values and norms to the children. Nevertheless, the reality of cultural transmission, or what is called as 'family education' is not simple. Not only cultural heterogeneity affecting how parents/older generations in each culture transmit the cultural values, norms, and rules, but also how do they cope with the intermingled cultures they themselves carry in responding to the ever changing world of their children's growth with the influx of knowledge and ideas coming from elsewhere. In such a situation, the parents, children and other 'family' members are caught in a continuous dialogue and negotiation with the ups and downs in their relationships one another, with the modification, adjustment and adaptation of what beliefs, aspirations, and values are to transmit to the younger generations. Examining some cases of how the mixed-marriage couples of nationality, ethnicity, and/or religions backgrounds were negotiating of their differences, I argue that within the so-called 'family', a genuine multicultural interaction is taking place. The agents have to engage, question, and learn of any differences each of them has. Accepting and appreciating differences were 'old stories' at the time a couple agreed to formalize their relationships in a wedding ritual. However, the 'multicultural interaction' is a never ending process with failures, successes, and continuous struggles between the members of the family, also with the older generations and other relatives. Here, the intended, unintended, expected, and/or unexpected consequences of their continuous dialogue and negotiation on the existing cultures and kinship relations are common phenomena. These consequences, whatever they are, would further stimulate any readjustment through again, an engagement, questioning, and learning. Such an ongoing interaction constitutes the very basis of the family education to take place. If such a genuine multicultural interaction in the private domain can be the basis for a 'lessons-learned' of the larger level of people's interaction in the public domain, I feel convince

that we would be able to overcome any problems, tensions, and conflicts of not being able to learn from the others. For a very diverse society like Indonesia, I argue therefore that all parties should learn from how the 'family' members 'educate' one another via differences. Yet, it is far from reality. Various interests and power relations play a significant role in determining people's life in the public domain. The question is: could we move towards establishing a genuine multicultural interaction? How could the formal education outside the 'family' unit contribute to the creation and perpetuation of a multicultural society?

Another 'lessons-learned' can be discerned from the experience of those living in a community of practitioners such as farmers in the rural area, or crafts-producers in the urban area. They have to struggle to survive in an 'open dynamic environment' with the continuous influx of modern knowledge, skills, and technology which could improve, or otherwise, jeopardize the sustainability of their professions and environments. To enable the family enterprise to survive, the agents have to engage themselves in a continuous dialectic process of their own 'traditional' knowledge/culture and the incoming modern scientific ideas. Moreover, they also need to encounter those in power and authority, and those dominating the market. Their struggles constitute a significant part of 'family education', in how, as parents, they have to perform well by also involving the younger generations to master their professions. Here, again, they face constraints. First, the modern world may attract the younger generations more into various other professions different from their parents'. Second, the parents and older generations may not be able to become both 'masters' and 'teachers' any longer by not mastering the 'modern scientific knowledge and technology' with all its implications and consequences. A 'cultural gap' emerges between them and the experts. A kind of reliance and dependence on the latter is taking place. This is another challenge to face. Could we assist the 'traditional experts' to stay survive by also assisting them to be the 'scientists', and by doing so, keeping the 'traditional family education' to survive? A detailed examination and further study is indeed necessary.

References

Ahearn, L.M.
    2001   'Language and Agency,' *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30:109—37.

Borofsky, R.
    1987   *Making History: Pukapukan and Anthropological Constructions of Knowledge.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
    1994   'The Cultural in Motion,' in R. Borofsky (ed.) *Asssessing Cultural Anthropology.* New York: McGraw-Hill. Pp.313—19.

Bourdieu, P.
    1977   *Outline of a Theory of Practice.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Budianta, M.
    2004   'Multiculturalism: In Search of a Critical Framework for Assessing Diversity in Indonesia,' in K. Sunarto, R. Hiang-Khng Heng, and A.F. Saifuddin (eds) *Multicultural Education in Indonesia and Southeast Asia: Stepping into the Unfamiliar.* Depok: Jurnal Antropologi Indonesia. Pp.21—35.

Coppel, C.A.
    2002   *Studying Ethnic Chinese in Indonesia.* Singapore: Singapore Society of Asian Studies.
    2004   'Historical Impediments to the Acceptance of Ethnic Chinese in a Multicultural Indonesia,' in L. Suryadinata (ed.) *Chinese Indonesians: State Policy, Monoculture and Multiculture.* Singapore: Eastern University Press by Marshall Cavendish. Pp.17—28.
    2005   'Introduction: Researching the Margins,' in T. Lindsey and H. Pausacker (eds) *Chinese Indonesian: Remembering, Distorting, Forgetting.* Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies and Clayton: Monash of Southeast Asian Studies. Pp.1—9.

Dilts, D. and S. Hate
    1996   'IPM Farmer Field Schools: Changing Paradigms and Scaling-up', *Agricultural Research & Extension Network* 59b:1-4.

Fay, B.
    1996   *Contemporary Philosophy of Social Science.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Fox, J.J.
    2004   'Notes on Cultural Diversity in Southeast Asia,' in K. Sunarto, R. Hiang-Khng Heng, and A.F. Saifuddin (eds) *Multicultural Education in Indonesia and Southeast Asia: Stepping into the Unfamiliar.* Depok: Jurnal Antropologi Indonesia. Pp.11—20.

Furnivall,
    1948a   *Colonial Policy and Practice: A Comparative Study of Burma and the Netherlands India.* New York: New York University Press.
    1948b   *Netherlands India: A Study of Plural Economy.* London: Cambridge University Press.

Gatewood, J.B.
　1985　'Actions Speak Louder than Words.' in J.W.D. Dougherty (ed.) *Direction in Cognitive Anthropology.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, pp.199—219.

Geertz, C.
　1960　*The Religion of Java.* London, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Geertz, H.
　1982　*Keluarga Jawa.* Jakarta: Grafitti Pers.

Giddens, A.
　1979　*Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kato, T.
　1978　'Change and Continuity in the Minangkabau Matrilineal System,' *Indonesia* (25):1—15.

Kearney, M.
　1996　*Reconceptualizing the Peasantry.* Jakarta: PT Ichtiar Baru—Van Hoeve.

Keller, C. and J.D. Keller
　1993　'Thinking and Acting with Iron,' in S. Chaiklin and J. Lave (eds) *Understanding Practice: Perspectives on Activity and Context.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kemp, J.
　1988　*Seductive Mirage: The Search for the Village Community in Southeast Asia.* Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Koentjaraningrat
　1984　*Kebudayaan Jawa.* Seri Etnografi No.2. Jakarta: PN Balai Pustaka.

Koning, J.
　2004　*Generations of Change: Integration, Family Life, and Identity Formation in a Javanese Village during the New Order.* Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.

Marzali, A.
　2000　'Dapatkah Sistem Matrilineal Bertahan Hidup di Kota Metropolitan?' *Journal Antropologi Indonesia* 24(61):1—15.

Moore, S.F.
　1987　'Explaining the Present: Theoretical Dilemmas in Processual Ethnography,' *American Ethnologist* 14(4):727—36.
　1994　'The Ethnography of the Present and the Analysis of Process,' in R. Borofsky (ed.) *Assessing Cultural Anthropology.* New York: McGraw-Hill. Pp.362—76.

Ortner, S.B.
　1984　'Theory in Anthropology since the Sixties,' *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 26:126—66.

Pontius, J., R. Dilts, and A. Bartlett.
　2002　*From Farmer Field School to Community IPM.* Bangkok: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific.

Redfield, R.
　1960　*The Little Community and Peasant Society and Culture.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Semiawan, C.
　2004　'The Challenge of a Multicultural Education in a Pluralistic Society: The Indonesian Case,' in K. Sunarto, R. Hiang-Khng Heng, and A.F. Saifuddin (eds) *Multicultural*

Education in Indonesia and Southeast Asia: Stepping into the Unfamiliar. Depok: Jurnal Antropologi Indonesia. Pp.36—44.

Spindler, G.D.
  1955   *Education and Anthropology.* California: Stanford University Press.
Suparlan, P.
  2000a   'Bhinneka Tunggal Ika, Masih Mungkinkah?' *Jurnal Antropologi Indonesia* 24(62):129—134..
  2000b   'Masyarakat Majemuk dan Perawatannya,' *Jurnal Antropologi Indonesia* 24(63):1—14.
  2003   'Bhinneka Tunggal Ika: Keanekaragaman Sukubangsa atau Kebudayaan?' *Jurnal Antropologi Indonesia* 24(72):24—37.
Suryadinata, L.
  2004   'Indonesian State Policy towards Ethnic Chinese: From Assimilation to Multiculturalism?' in L. Suryadinata (ed.) *Chinese Indonesians: State Policy, Monoculture and Multiculture.* Singapore: Eastern University Press by Marshall Cavendish. Pp.1—16.
Vayda, A.P.
  1986   'Holism and Individualism in Ecological Anthropology,' *Reviews in Anthropology* 13:295—313.
Vayda, A.P., B.J. McCay, and C. Eghenter
  1991   'Concepts of Process in Social Science Explanation,' *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 21(3):318—31.
Winarto, Y.T.
  1997   'Maintaining Seed Diversity during the Green Revolution Era,' *Knowledge and Development Monitor* 12(4):47—57.
  2004   *Seeds of Knowledge: The Beginning of Integrated Pest Management in Java.* Yale: Yale Southeast Asian Council, Monograph Series vol.53.
  2006   'Self Governance and Conflicting Interests in Farm Resource Management,' *Masyarakat Indonesia: Majalah Ilmu-ilmu Sosial Indonesia* 32(1):22—37.
Winarto, Y.T., E.M. Choesin, Fadli, A.S.H. Ningsih, dan S. Darmono
  2000   Satu Dasa Warsa Pengendalian Hama Terpadu: Berjuang Menggapai Kemandirian dan Kesejahteraan. Manuskrip. Jakarta: Indonesian FAO - Inter Country Program.
Wolf, E.R.
  1966   *Peasants.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.