

# Human Value in the Disruption Era: Analysis of the Paulo Freire Education Philosophy and Genesis 1:26,27

Noh Ibrahim Boiliu<sup>1</sup>, Christina Metallica Samosir<sup>2</sup>, Andreas Eko Nugroho<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Christian Religious Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education,-Universitas Kristen Indonesia, Jakarta Timur, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup> Christian Religious Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Kristen Indonesia, Jakarta Timur, Indonesia

<sup>3</sup> Bethel Theological Seminary, Jakarta Barat, Indonesia

boiliunoh@gmail.com, metha.samosir@yahoo.co.id, andreasnugroho68@gmail.com

**Abstract.** The purpose of this paper is to look at human value in the context of Christian education in the disruption era. The approach is to synthesize between the philosophy of education of Paulo Freire and human value in Genesis 1: 26,27. Freire presents a liberating pedagogy. Liberation pedagogy emphasizes human value as a basis. Humanizing and liberating pedagogy is transformative and permanent. Problem Posing Method (PPM), is an educational method that is not oppressive and aims to raise awareness of reality. PPM is based on assumptions, humans as an 'exist' awareness and consciousness as consciousness in the world. In the perspective of Genesis 1:26,27, humans as free (in his will) and valuable beings in the presence of creator and other creatures. The synthesis of Freire's human philosophy as the basis of his educational philosophy with Genesis 1: 26,27 is that Freire moves from the Bible as the basis of his human philosophy to fight for eroded human values. This era as an era of disruption, human values should not be eroded in the education process.

**Keywords:** Human Value, Disruption Era, Paulo Freire, Education Philosophy, Genesis 1:26,27.

## 1 Introduction

Disruption era is known as era or era with fundamental changes. Disruption is seen as an innovation that will be played throughout the old system in new ways. Disruption also supports old players with new ones; disruption uses old technology that is completely physical with digital technology that produces something completely new and more efficient, also more useful. In the field of education, education is also confronted with the reality of fundamental changes with new innovations. These changes require education to adjust to the rapidly changing era. This reality also demands a change in the learning approach. The approach to learning in the 21st century has experienced change and transition. Change because the learning concept changes, from teacher to student. Transition because there are demands where the curriculum developed by schools must change. These changes are changes in teacher centered learning to student centered learning. Student centered learning is different from educator centered learning.

Paulo Freire as a figure who fights for liberating education (Brazil) has criticized the education that took place in Brazil. Freire criticized education that took place in Brazil as a bank style education rather than liberating. Freire offers education on problems as an antithesis of bank style education (Banking Method). Through this paper, the author wants to see something different from previous papers on the Freire education model or make the Freire education model the basis of criticism of education that takes place in various parts of the world.

Tiainen (et.al) through the paper Democratic Education for Hope: Contesting the Neoliberal commonsense reinterpreted Freire's "hope" philosophy to challenge the common sense neoliberal. The aim is to revive the transformative political dimension of education [1]. Ireland from Freire's other view, namely "dialogue" as an approach to understanding the relationship between development and education as a meeting point between progressive liberalism and classical neoliberalism [2]. Giroux based on Freire's critical pedagogy views education as a practice of liberation. Education as a liberating approach (human)[3]. Freire's works show that Freire views humans as dignified and valuable beings. Tiainen (et.al), Ireland, and Giroux also looked at the same perspective.

The author departs from Freire's human philosophy, that humans are in the world and exist with the world, and humans have historicity (cats do not have historicity). Freire's human philosophy requires that humans are not oppressed, demeaned, transformed into spectators, and others. On the other hand, the book of Genesis 1: 26,27 as the Old Testament text which first records the creation of man, views mankind as a creation in the image and likeness of God. The term "image and likeness" of God as not leaving this paper and at the same time differentiating with other papers [4]. Philosophically, Genesis 1: 26,27 becomes the basis for humans to see themselves and actualize themselves. In self-actualization, the other party tries to reduce the self-actualization by oppressing, demeaning, and marginalizing.

## **2 Method**

The method used in writing this article is that the writer will first explain Paulo Freire's educational philosophy. Second, explain Genesis 1: 26,27 as a theological reference about humans in the context of education. After explaining the two main ideas, it will synthesize Paulo Freire's educational philosophy with Genesis 1: 26,27. This step is carried out to see the position of Paulo Freire's educational philosophy whose educational philosophy rests on humans.

## **3 Result and Discussion**

### **3.1 Mankind as the Starting Point to the Philosophy of Education Paulo Freire**

Era 4.0 as the era of digitizing the emphasis and encouragement of using tools in learning is unstoppable. The use of technology in learning is required as evidence and a sign of progress. This is a reality that cannot be denied. Then one question, where are humans positioned and how to view humans is seen in the learning process.

In this situation, I remembered Paulo Freire's criticism of education in Brazil at the time. The concept of education in Brazil which Freire had raised was an oppressive educational concept [5]. Freire criticized the teaching and learning method that is often found in classrooms, Motlhaka[6] as the Banking Concept of Education or BCE[7]. According to Freire, BCE has become a tool to "suppress" awareness of the true reality of an individual and cause a person to be passive and simply accept his existence. Basically what happened to BCE education thus became an act of depositing, in which the students are depositories and the teacher is the depositor[8]. BCE fundamentally has a narrative character, there is a pattern in which the subject (teacher) speaks and the object (student) listens patiently and carefully.

Every reader who reads Freire's work will realize Freire's thoughts which are thick with various philosophical thoughts from various philosophers. Readers will feel Freire's "soul vibrations" contained in his book; will also feel the harshness of the criticism he made; and his anger felt in his writing.

Based on Freire's criticism, Freire placed man as a starting point for his philosophical thinking. For example Veugelers inside, *The Moral in Paulo Freire's educational work: What moral education can learn from Paulo Freire*[9], Veugelers see morals as an important element in Freire's educational work or liberation education and humanization education [10]. That is, humans are the main material subject in Freire's educational philosophy. Freire is a philosopher with his human philosophy, his existentialist philosophy, his phenomenological philosophy, and his humanity. Fuad Hasan saw existence as another point of view of Freire below the main point of human beings. A new human presence is meaningful when its existence is directed at other humans [11]. Freire is a thinker with a deep spiritual level. Freire's spirituality is not captured through the time spent praying or meditating, but spirituality is caught in his mind, namely by placing man as the starting point of his philosophical thinking. Although some people criticize his thoughts, as stated in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed: 50th Anniversary Edition* [12], but Abbott and Badley insisted that Freire's spirit must continue. Freire placed faith in his educational project and that Freire focusing on how his faith shaped his educational philosophy and his pedagogy [13]. As useful as whether a person's thoughts are measured by how humans are viewed and positioned. Humans must be the starting point in thinking so that the end of thinking is humanizing humans. This is what Freire did. In the context of education, the concept of Freire education is humanist education or education that humanizes humans.

The basic point of humanist education is what Freire fought for throughout his career. The main points of thought found in his works confirm the philosophical and Freire struggles, both banking concept education, banking concept education, liberation education, and others. It's all about humans and humanizing humans. Education becomes a way to humanize humans, even though education itself has been politicized and monopolized by the oppressors. The oppressors rationalize their oppressive actions by treating the oppressed with a paternalistic attitude [14].

### **3.2 Humans in the Perspective of Genesis 1: 26,27**

In the two source traditions, the Priest tradition tells us that the world was created by the word of God, human, male and female as the culmination of God's final creation and work on the six days of creation. God created 'dm in the form of God, in the form of God humans were created, male and female (Gen. 1:27). Whereas in the Yahwistic tradition, creation begins by forming

man, `dm from earth, `dmh. While women are built from from Adam(Gen. 2:20-24)[15]. From the two narrative traditions about the creation of Adam and Eve, as also explained by Neusner in his book, Judaism Story of Creation, that the narration of human creation, Adam and Eve shows the existence of two creatures with different genders [16].

In verse 26, God's purpose for creating humans is stated, unlike the acts of creation over other creations, with the first plural verb form *na'aseh* let's make / creation[17]. Although theologians debate the specific use of the cohortative plural for *Elohim* in this verse, that form might be used to emphasize the point that the decision to make man was taken or made by God. The idea of plurality in God is further revealed through the use of plural pronominal suffixes, the phrase *be'almenu*-in the image and *kidmutenu*-in our likeness. Despite this there are also different interpretations of these two terms[18], it is clear that the parallel phrases, "our likeness" and "our image" indicate that man was created by God. It is clear that humans, as God created, are essentially different from all kinds of animals that have been created [19].

Both "male" and female "were created in the image of God. This confirms ontological equality. There is no indication in the story of the creation of ontological superiority or inferiority between "male" and "female." Men and women as individual men and women are equally equal as the image of God before Him. This equality does not mean sexual but similarity in position as a creature created in the same image and likeness [20].

There is emphasis and affirmation in Genesis 1:27, *so God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them*(KJV). In the Hebrew text it read, "wāyyivrā' 'Ēlōhīm 'ēt"-hā'ād'ām b<sup>e</sup>sālmō b<sup>e</sup>sēlēm 'Ēlōhīm bārā' 'ōtō zāk'ār ūn<sup>e</sup>qēvā(h) bārā' 'ōtām,". This text structure is:

God created man (*hā'ād'ām*) in his own image (*b<sup>e</sup>sālmō*)  
in the image of God created he him (*'ōtō*)  
male and female created he them (*'ōtām*)

'*adam Salmo-oto otamis* the effect of poetry parallelism which simultaneously forms the difference between him male and female [21] it also clearly indicates that God consists of both male and female genders [22]

The seven core words combined are: creating, God, human beings in the image, male, female, he / they [23]. The seven core words are spread in three lines, each consisting of four words. The three lines can be divided as follows:

And God created man in his image  
In the image of God He created him:  
He created them male and female

Gordon J. Wenham mentions these three short sentences with three clauses, which are included in the additional information. In verse 27 it notes a very important aspect of human existence that is recorded specifically in three short sentences as an implementation of the Divine provision contained in verse 26. Verse 27, starting with the phrase then God created man in His image.

The words 'to create and shape' from the word *wāyyivrā'*. *Wāyyivrā'* is a single masculine third-person imperfect qal verb that starts with a conjunction *waw*. Literally, *wāyyivrā'* means, and

He created. He is referring to 'Ēlōhīm. Verb *bārā'* appeared throughout 49 times in the Old Testament, with the subject God [24]. The word *bārā* 'in the context of creating does not simply support the doctrine of nonbeing, but what is intended to be emphasized is the novelty of God's action and that only the Almighty can produce such novelty [25]. God's action in creating this is truly unique without comparison [26]. Humans were created in God's creative power [27]. This can also be observed in the act of God's creation. God is creative in His actions [28].

Based on the explanation of Genesis 1: 26,27 above, the two Hebrew terms *tselem* and *demuth* are basically the same meaning. The idea that the two terms are different has been rejected even if by reason of exegesis and theological [29] Even the translation in the Septuagint still gives enough meaning and gives reference to the similarity of meanings of the two terms ". These two terms are used as synonyms, and that the difference between the two words cannot be maintained on the basis of words. The prepositions are used interchangeably, in the word image and likeness (Gen. 1: 26-27; 5: 1-3) [31].

The traditional interpretation interprets human beings as our image as according to his image. God should have created human beings to be His image [32]. Moltman's argument helps us understand humans as creatures that are imaged of their creator. He image of God is expressed in the unique human capacity for self-transcendence, from which, in turn, beauty and the recognition of beauty emerge. God's image can be seen from the outside appearance of humans. God's image is displayed when humans are God's representatives on earth; become God's partner [33] who greet others because relationship, me-you [34]

Being in the image of God gives an understanding of humans as God's creations, unique and valuable [35]. Human value in God's perspective must see it from the sides of *tselem* and *demuth*. Human creation refers to how God is represented in humans, which refers to the operability of the two terms *tselem* and *demuth* by saying when applied to human creation in Genesis 1. The word *tselem* indicates that humans describe God, meaning humans are representations of God [36] or reflect on God [37] or image God [38]. Humans were created according to *tselem* and *demuth*, this is not a basic statement about human life but about the creation of human life by God. The plan of human creation is to stand in relationship with God and God speaks to humans, and humans can respond to God. All human beings, races, religions, and in various world views are created in the image of God [39]. Westerman's argument can be a foothold to view Brueggemann's response to it. Westerman designed the theology of liberation based on the Book of Genesis, which saw God's true work in preserving the everyday existence of human society. Not only that, dialectically we can see the thematic relation between liberation theology with themes of preservation, disorder, preservation and transformation [40].

### **3.3 Human Value in the Praxis of Christian Religious Education: Synthesis of the Philosophy of Education of Paulo Freire and Genesis 1: 26,27**

From etymological studies, we can trace the meaning of words to find the literal meanings of humans. But if we try to examine deeper about the meaning of the word 'human', then we are not just talking about humans to the extent of a literal definition. But can be understood related to its nature. If so, the diversity of views and definitions of humans is because humans are multidimensional creatures, paradoxical creatures and dynamic beings. So humans are formulated as an ethical being, an aesthetic being a metaphysical being, a religious being [41]

From the thoughts above related to humans, we can find the uniqueness of humans as God's creations, of course not only in the context of semantic interpretation but the uniqueness exists in its existence. In its existence, humans show the existence of its creator.

Humans are also creatures that are sharply different from other creatures. Other beings do not exist. Other beings are not aware of themselves, do not take the distortion of the "other", but humans are self-conscious beings because they have the ability (Latin, is called *posse; possum* means I can). Because of that ability humans can make distortion so that they reflect themselves. The difference between humans as self-conscious beings and animals can be seen in the following example "humans are aware that if they do not learn computers, they are called people who do not know how to use computers. It is different from animal who are not aware about learning or are aware and reflect themselves to learn computers and become animals who are not technologically illiterate. Humans as a subject can know about themselves and other subjects as there are special who can think (*cogito*) about other special things including God.

In the perspective of Banking Concept Education, fundamentally has a narrative character, there is a pattern in which the subject (teacher) speaks and the object (student) listens patiently and carefully. BCE gave birth to vengeful humans, rebels, and vandals because the pressing environment created an education model of BCE. This results in humans becoming reactive [42]. In Freire critique, the author sees education in the era of disruption in the philosophy of education of Paulo Freire and Genesis 1:26.27 not done at the level of praxis, technology becomes a tool of new model oppressors. A human's conduct is eroded, disrespected and driven like a machine.

The spirit of the era of disruption and its impact on education is inevitable. Besides adjusting to and using devices 4.0. technology-based learning approaches must be implemented. So in this perspective, Christian religious education as a discipline that concentrates on Christian values still sees humans as the main subject in education. Students are still humans not "robots", still individuals who need "special touches" and "greetings" in the learning process. Artificial intelligence technology does not replace teachers (humans).

Concept of studentcentered learning is because through the student approach as the center of learning, students "are" considered aware of reality, studentcentered learning aims to raise awareness of reality. Paulo Freire assumed, because man as an awareness"exists and consciousness as consciousness in the world [43]. Humans existence means that they are in the process of being unfinished [44]. Its existence as imperfect in and with the endless reality[45]. The implementation of these assumptions is seen in the interaction patterns that are expected to occur in the classroom. Education as a human approach proceeds in its existence towards a better life.

Humans as "there" affirm that humans have values and these values should not be eroded which causes humans to experience degradation in values. In other words "values become a reference in education, especially Christian education [46]. This degradation drags people to the point of no value or worth, not even more than "just tools". Education that is confronted with the reality of disruption that gives a primary place in the tool where education is directed only at "learning to control the tools" not faced with "humans as subjects as educational goals". This too is a "pedagogical criticism"[47]. Paulo Freire thought in theological perspective as a liberating educational theology. Thesis "humans as a starting point of philosophy of education and humans have value in Freire's perspective [48].

That relationship is shown by God. The image of God is in my neighbor because I and you (he/her) were created in the image of God. Pictured statements cover the possibility of

exploitation, intimidation, and pressure. Freire's actions in Brazil must be interpreted as "cleaning the image of God-man" as His creation is similar to Him, or making it all real through humanist pedagogy[49]. This is the Freire freedom (humanist) pedagogy[50].

Freire through education that frees campaigning for human values in the praxis of education in the era of disruption. Education is not only about sharing cognitive knowledge using sophisticated technological devices. Education includes cognitive, affective, and psychomotor elements. Artificial intelligence technology cannot replace the teacher, because it does not teach values to humans. Values that can be accessed through teacher and student interaction in the classroom. Values and moral education must be developed. Value education and moral development both concentrate on the development of values in students, but they differ too. Value education implies quite explicit ideas about the values that are necessary for students; moral development concentrates more on the cognitive processes. In particular, the 'Just Community Approach' [51]. It means, that ultimately the most defensible grounding for values education is in the narrative given to humans by a transcendent being-in the Christian tradition, God[52].

## 4 Conclusion

As useful as whether a person's thoughts are measured by how humans are viewed and placed. Is human being a starting point in thinking so that the end of thinking is humanizing humans. This is what Freire did. Concept of Freire education is humanist education. Pedagogy of the oppressed Freire must see that the pedagogy is humanizing and liberating. Humanizing and liberating pedagogy is transformative and permanent. "Problem Posing Method" (PPM), is an educational method that is not "oppressive" and aims to raise awareness of reality. PPM is based on assumptions, humans as an 'exist' awareness and consciousness as consciousness in the world. Also, asserting humanity as 'existing' or being in the process of being-as unfinished or finished, "its existence as imperfect in and with the endless reality".

Liberation education as an alternative education offered by Freire, was born from his conception of humans. Humans as subjects in problem posing education. Paulo Freire's educational philosophy is in accordance with Genesis 1: 26,27. The image and likeness and demuth in humans are proof and signs of God's gift. As God's partner, humans must be present to greet "other human beings or others". In the context of Christian education, tselem and demuth strengthen human nature as being in the image of His creator.

Man does not exist separately from the world and its reality, but he is in the world and with the world. This pedagogical concept is based on the understanding that humans have the potential to be creative in reality and to free themselves from cultural, economic and political oppression. Awareness grows from struggles over the reality faced and is expected to help students develop values, moral and critical thinking education.

## References

- [1] Tiainen, K., Leiviskä, A., & Brunila, K. (2019). Democratic Education for Hope: Contesting the Neoliberal Common Sense. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 38(6), 641–655. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11217-019-09647-2>
- [2] Ireland, T. D. (2018). The Relevance of Freire for the Post-2015 international debate on development and education and the role of popular education. *Paulo Freire and Transformative Education: Changing Lives and Transforming Communities*, 15–27. [https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-54250-2\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-54250-2_2)
- [3] Giroux, H. A. (2010). Rethinking education as the practice of freedom: Paulo Freire and the promise of critical pedagogy. *Policy Futures in Education*, 8(6), 715–721. <https://doi.org/10.2304/pfie.2010.8.6.715>
- [4] Giroux, H. A. (2010). Rethinking education as the practice of freedom: Paulo Freire and the promise of critical pedagogy. *Policy Futures in Education*, 8(6), 715–721. <https://doi.org/10.2304/pfie.2010.8.6.715>
- [4] Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Continuum International Publishing.
- [5] Motlhaka, H. A. (2017). *Paulo Freire 's Critical Pedagogy in the Classroom : Promotion of Critical Thinking in South African English First Additional Language ( FAL ) Students Paulo Freire ' s Critical Pedagogy in the Classroom : Promotion of Critical Thinking in South African E. 1122*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09751122.2016.11890441>
- [6] Beckett, K. (2018). John Dewey ' s conception of education : Finding common ground with R . S . Peters and Paulo Freire John Dewey ' s conception of education : Finding common ground. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 1857, 1–10.
- [7] Pramudya, W. (2001). Mengenal Filsafat Pendidikan Paulo Freire : Antara Banking Concept of Education, Problem Posing Method, dan Pendidikan Kristen di Indonesia . *Veritas : Jurnal Teologi Dan Pelayanan*, 2(2), 245–255. <https://doi.org/10.36421/veritas.v2i2.63>
- [8] Veugelers, W. (2000). Different ways of teaching values. *Educational Review*, 52(1), 37–46. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131910097397>
- [9] Roberts, P., & Roberts, P. (2019). *Paulo Freire and Utopian Education Paulo Freire and Utopian Education*. 12(3). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10714413.2015.1091256>
- [10] Hasan, F. (1983). *Perkenalan dengan Existensialisme*. Pustaka Jaya.
- [11] Abbott, D., & Badley, K. (2019). Pedagogy of the Oppressed: 50th Anniversary Edition. *International Journal of Christianity & Education*, 205699711983792. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056997119837927>
- [12] Abbott, D., & Badley, K. (2019). Pedagogy of the Oppressed: 50th Anniversary Edition. *International Journal of Christianity & Education*, 205699711983792. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056997119837927>
- [13] Freire, P. (1984). *Pendidikan Pembebasan, perubahan sosial*. Gramedia.
- [14] Noort, E. (2000). *The Creation of Man and Woman. Interpretation of Biblical Narratives in Jewish and Christian Tradition*. Koninklijke.
- [15] Neusner, J. (2000). *Judaism History of Creation: Scripture, Halakhah, Aggadah*. Brill.
- [16] Waltke, B. K. (2001). *Genesis: A Commentary*. Zondervan.
- [17] Gudbergson, T. (2012). God consists of both the male and the female genders: A short note on Gen 1:27. *Vetus Testamentum*, 62(3), 450–453. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156853312X637712>
- [18] (Quine, 2015; Gudbergson, 2012; Towner, 2005).
- [19] (Evans & Flint, 2012;Thompson, 2009).
- [20] (Kronfeld et al., 2010).
- [21] Gudbergson, T. (2012). God consists of both the male and the female genders: A short note on Gen 1:27. *Vetus Testamentum*, 62(3), 450–453. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156853312X637712>



- [22] Karman, Y. (2009). *Bunga Rampai Teologia Perjanjian Lama*. BPK Gunung Mulia.
- [23] Wenham, G. J. (1987). *Word Biblical Commentary Volume I*. Word Books Publisher.
- [24] Karman, Y. (2009). *Bunga Rampai Teologia Perjanjian Lama*. BPK Gunung Mulia.
- [25] Wenham, G. J. (1987). *Word Biblical Commentary Volume I*. Word Books Publisher.
- [26] Quine, C. (2015). Deutero-Isaiah, J and P: Who is in the Image and Likeness of God? Implications for and Theologies of Creation. *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament*, 29(2), 296–306. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09018328.2015.1039831>
- [27] Vermeulen, K. (2017). Verbal creation: From linguistic feature to literary motif in genesis 1-11. *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament*, 31(2), 294–313. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09018328.2017.1333768>
- [28] Davis, J. J. (2001). *Eksposisi Kitab Kejadian*. Gandum Mas.
- [29] Driver, S. . (1906). *The Book of Genesis. Westminster Commentaries*, (1st ed.). Methuen and Co.
- [30] (Berkof, 2004; Hoekema, 2003).
- [31] Moltman, J. (1995). *God in Creation*. Fortress Press. Moltman, J. (1995). *God in Creation*. Fortress Press.
- [32] Towner, W. S. (2005). Clones of God. *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology*, 59(4), 341–356. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002096430505900402>
- [33] Snidjers, A. (2017). *Antropologi Metafisik*. Kanisius.
- [34] Towner, W. S. (2005). Clones of God. *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology*, 59(4), 341–356. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002096430505900402>
- [35] Hoekema, A. A. (2003). *Manusia: Ciptaan Menurut Gambar Allah*. Momentum.
- [36] Johnson, J. (2005). Between Text & Sermon. *Interpretation*, 59(2), 176–178. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002096431106500306>
- [37] Moltman, J. (1995). *God in Creation*. Fortress Press.
- [38] Westerman, C. (1974). *Genesis*.
- [39] Brueggemann, Walter. (2009). *Teologia Perjanjian Lama: Kesaksian, Tangkisan, Pembelaan*. Seminari Tinggi Ledalero.
- [40] Snidjers, A. (2017). *Antropologi Metafisik*. Kanisius.
- [41] Stanford, G., & Roark, A. E. (1974). *Human Interaction in Education*. Allyn and Bacon.
- [42] Freire, P. (2011). *Paulo Freire : Kehidupan, Karya & Pemikirannya*. Pustaka Pelajar.
- [43] Smith, W. A. (2001). *Conscientientizaco Tujuan Pendidikan Paulo Freire*. Pustaka Belajar.
- [44] Smith, W. A. (2001). *Conscientientizaco Tujuan Pendidikan Paulo Freire*. Pustaka Belajar.
- [45] (Wilhelm & Firmin, 2008)
- [46] (Durakoglu et al., 2017)
- [47] Veugelers, W. (2017). The moral in Paulo Freire ' s educational work : What moral education can learn from Paulo Freire The moral in Paulo Freire ' s educational work : What moral. *Journal of Moral Education*, 46(4), 412–421. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240.2017.1363599>
- [48] (Kirylo & Boyd, 2017)
- [49] (Dale & Hislop, 2010).
- [50] Etherington, M. (2013). Values Education: Why the Teaching of Values in Schools is Necessary, But Not Sufficient. *Journal of Research on Christian Education*, 22(2), 189–210. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10656219.2013.808973>
- [51] Veugelers, W. (2017). The moral in Paulo Freire ' s educational work : What moral education can learn from Paulo Freire The moral in Paulo Freire ' s educational work : What moral. *Journal of Moral Education*, 46(4), 412–421. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240.2017.1363599>(Veugelers, 2000).