



USAID | **INDONESIA**
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



Decentralized Basic Education Three (DBE3)

What is being done at the national level to ensure all young people in Indonesia are able to complete basic education?

By
Lorna Power and Dr Yufiarti



This study is made possible by the generous support of the American people through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The contents are the responsibility of the Decentralized Basic Education 3 (DBE3) Project and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government

Contents		Page
Contents		2
Preface		3
1.0 Background		4
2.0 Purpose		6
3.0 Methodology		7
4.0 Educational Data		7
4.1	What Educational data is collected at the National Level	7
4.2	How is Educational data collected at the National Level	9
4.3	What does the Educational data say about drop out?	12
5.0 Causes of drop out		19
5.1	Institutional factors	20
5.2	Contextual factors	24
5.3	Individual factors	27
6.0 Drop Out prevention		31
6.1	Department of Religious Affairs	31
6.2	Ministry of National Education	32
7.0 Conclusion		35
References		38

List of tables and diagrams

Table 1	Start, drop out and completion rates of basic education	5
Table 2	Drop out from MI 1998-2005	12
Table 3	Drop out from MI 2004/5	13
Table 4	Drop out from MT 1998-2005	13
Table 5	Drop out from MT 2004/5	14
Table 6	Drop out from MI in DBE3 target provinces	15
Table 7	Drop out from MT in DBE3 target provinces	15
Table 8	Drop out from SD 1998-2003	16
Table 9	Drop out from SMP 1998-2003	17
Table 10	Drop out from SMP by grade level 1998-2003	17
Table 11	Drop out from SD & SMP in DBE3 target provinces	18
Table 12	Rates of students continuing to Junior High schools 2002/3	19
Table 13	The link between socio-economic background & drop out	26
Table 14	The reasons for drop out from basic education	29
Table 15	Drop out by grade in elementary school 2002/3	30

Preface

The aim of this paper is to examine the issue of drop out from basic education in Indonesia from the national level. Drop out from school has been well researched in developed and less developed countries alike and many of the causes and solutions to drop out are already known. This paper is not intended to be comprehensive account of all issues related to drop out or to introduce new or revolutionary ideas. It has been produced simply in order to summarize what is already known and what is already being done by the largest players in formal education at the national level in Indonesia with the sole purpose of informing the DBE3 drop out prevention strategy. This paper will be complemented by research conducted at the school and district level with youth.

For DBE3, examining the issue of drop out from different perspectives is important. If DBE3 does not **really** know why youth are dropping out and what can be done to help them setting up dropout prevention programs will yield weak results. Furthermore, DBE3 would like to try and find gaps in programs (rather than duplicating what is already being done) to ensure as many young people as possible have the chance to complete basic education.

This paper was written under difficult circumstances where data and literature was lacking or difficult to access and much information was collected from formal interviews and informal discussions with resource people. Therefore, this paper introduces only what was found out by the authors in the limited time frame.

The paper represents research conducted by DBE3 and the content of this paper represents the observations, conclusions and views of the author based on interviews with staff at the Department of National Education, the Ministry of Religious Affairs and a review of current education policies and laws.

1.0 Background

The National Education system of Indonesia is generally aimed at elevating the intellectual life of the Nation and developing the people fully, as people who are devoted to God, have knowledge and skills, are in good physical and spiritual health, are independent and fair, feel responsible for their countrymen and Nation (National Coordination Forum: Education for All: 2003)

The Education system is organized into three different paths, formal, non formal and informal. Formal education is organized into schools (both public and private and religious and general) through teaching and learning activities that are gradual, hierarchical and continuous. However, each level of education is only available to graduates from the previous level.

A complex collection of institutions provides and delivers formal education in Indonesia. The largest player is the Ministry of National Education (MONE) which administers formal public and private schools and Universities. The second largest is the Department of Religious Affairs (MORA) which manages the formal Islamic religious schools called Madrasah. However, religious education is provided in general schools and general education is provided in Madrasah.

National Law 3 of 2003 states that basic education (made up of elementary - age 6 to 12 -and junior high school – age 12 to 16 - is compulsory. The goal of basic education is to provide young people with fundamental knowledge and skills and develop them as individuals, members of society, citizens and members of mankind.

Despite being compulsory, statistics show that many young people in Indonesia do not complete basic education. According to the data presented in table 1, most children start elementary school and most finish it. However, a much lower proportion starts junior high school and finish basic education at the end.

Table One: Start, Drop Out, and Completion rates in basic education

Educational Level	Start	Drop Out	Complete
Elementary School	94.5 %	3.3 %	91.2 %
Junior High School	55.7 %	3.6 %	52.1 %

The figures show that 91.2% of all school aged children who start actually finish elementary school meaning only slightly over 2% drop out during the years of elementary education. However, only 55.7% of all children who finish elementary school start junior high school. Therefore, 35.5% of young people drop out between elementary and junior high school. This is the largest drop out rate at any one time during the years of basic education.

Part of the reason for this large number of drop out is that many young people fail to pass the national examination and therefore, are not eligible to enroll in junior high school, but this does not account for the complete 35.5% and may only account for less than 15%. A report from the World Bank (2005) estimates that 20% of young people who should be attending junior high school do not

This extent of drop out suggests that are a number of obstacles facing young people in Indonesia which prevent them from completing their basic education. The aim of this paper is to look at what is being done at the national level by the largest players in formal education MONE and MORA to ensure that all young people can complete basic education.

2.0 Purpose

This paper will aim to answer the following key question:

“What is being done at the national level to ensure that all young people in Indonesia are able to complete the basic education?”

This paper will only focus on the **national level** and will look at what actions MONE and MORA are taking to address the issue of drop out. Additional research will be conducted with youth, teachers and communities at the school and district level to gain their perspectives and to supplement this paper.

To ensure that young people are able to complete basic education, amongst other things the national level should:

- ▣ Collect accurate and reliable data to understand the nature and extent of the problem of drop out from basic education
- ▣ Have access to clear research and literature to understand the reasons why young people drop out of basic education
- ▣ Use the data and literature to inform the development of appropriate and effective drop out prevention strategies and activities

Therefore, these main topics will be investigated in this paper to provide some answers to the key question.

- ▣ What educational data is collected at the national level (MONE and MORA) and how.
- ▣ The extent to which the issue of drop out from basic education has already been researched at the national level and how much is currently understood about why young people drop out.
- ▣ Whether the research and data available is being used at the national level to inform the development of effective strategies and activities to support young people to complete basic education?

3.0 Methodology

The methods used to complete this paper were:

- ▣ **Literature Review:** The main purpose of the review of documents was to understand how well the issue of drop out from basic education has already been researched and to elicit what is currently understood about why so many young people drop out of basic education. The researchers tried to find as many documents as possible from multiple sources. However, this proved very challenging.
- ▣ **Interviews:** The researchers conducted interviews with key personnel from the Ministry of National Education and Department of Religious Affairs as well as from other donor projects. The purpose of the interviews was to understand the definitions of education terms used in Indonesia, to understand how educational data was collected and used, key perceptions on the causes of drop out and to understand the policies and actions taken by these institutions to prevent youth from dropping out of basic education.
- ▣ **Review of data:** The researchers conducted a review of all education related data that was accessible. However, data was found to be difficult to access, often out of date and very limited. Nevertheless, the report contains as much current data as possible.

4.0 Educational data

The collection and use of timely, accurate, reliable, relevant and accessible educational data is very important for the management of the education system as a whole. It supports management and development activities and decisions on planning, budgeting, policy making and performance monitoring.

4.1 What educational data is collected at the national level?

Before looking at how data is collected, this paper will look at the sort of educational data is collected and the working definitions used in Indonesia. These are limited to the data collected in relation to children's progress through school and dropout. Both MONE and MORA use same definitions. All following definitions were obtained from the Ministry of National Education: Indicators of Education in Indonesia 2002-2003; 2003

Net Enrollment Rate (NER)

Net enrollment rate (NER) is the percentage of the school aged population actually enrolled in school. For example, the NER for elementary schools would be the number of students aged 7 to 12 actually in elementary school compared to the total number of children in the elementary school age population aged 7 to 12.

Gross Enrollment Rate (GER)

Gross Enrollment Rate (GER) is the percentage of the total number of pupils enrolled at a certain level of education compared to the official school age group population. For example, the GER for Junior High School would be the total number of students in Junior High school compared to total population of the official Junior High school aged group 13 – 15

Completion Rate (CR)

In Indonesia, the completion rate is the percentage of pupils who graduate from the highest grade in the education level they are in, it is not the percentage of young people who finish the level cycle. For example, between the academic years 1992/3 and 2000/01 48.8% of students who started elementary school actually finished junior high school 09 years later, the full 09 years basic education but only 45.6% graduated junior high education and therefore, this is the official completion rate (National Coordination Forum: Education for All: 2003)

Drop out Rate (DR)

Indicators of Education in Indonesia (2003) defines the dropout rate as the percentage of pupils who leave one level of formal education before they progress to the next level this can be from one grade to another or one school to another. For example, the drop out rate from elementary school would be calculated as the total number of children who started elementary education minus the number who completed elementary education. To calculate the drop out rate by grade, the same formula is used. For example the dropout rate from grade 8 in junior high school would be the total number of students who started grade 8 minus the total number who completed grade 8.

Continuation/Transition Rate

The transition rate is the total number of new entrants to a particular grade compared to the total number of students who completed the previous grade and should be enrolled as new entrants. For example, in basic education, the transition rate is calculated as the total number of new entrants into grade 7 (the first level of junior secondary) compared to the total number of students who completed (graduated) grade 6 (the final year of elementary school).

Repetition Rate

The repetition rate is the percentage of pupils who repeat the same grade because they fail or do not complete and therefore, can not make the transition to the next grade. For example, in elementary school the repetition rate is the number of students who fail to graduate in grade 6 and decide to repeat grade 6 grade compared to total pupils of elementary school in previous academic year.

Year Study per Graduate (YSG)

Year study per graduate is the estimated average student years¹ spent by students from a given cohort who graduate from a particular level of education taking into account years wastage due to drop out or repetition. It is one of the calculations used to assess the extent of internal efficiency of the education system

4.2 How is educational data collected at the national level?

As education in Indonesia is provided and delivered by different institutions, multiple systems of data and information collection exist at different level and serving different purposes. There seems there is little coordination and sharing between them.

This section will look at the two main data collection systems employed by the two key players in education in Indonesia MONE and MORA.

¹ One year spent in a grade is equivalent to one student year

The Department of Religious Affairs education data collection system

MORA has an EMIS for collecting and analyzing educational data. MORA sees the main purpose of the EMIS to provide information to be used in the policy and decision making concerning the planning, activities development and budgeting of education and to map the strengths and weaknesses of education in regional and local areas and governments so that they can decide the right decisions and plans.

The MORA EMIS was originally set up in 1996 through the JSEP (Junior Secondary Education Project) which was funded with an ADB loan and continued by the BEP (Basic Education Project) also funded by ADB loan. The EMIS is managed by the Directorate General for Islamic Institutions.

Data is collected from all religious education institutions including Islamic kindergartens, elementary schools, junior high schools, senior high schools, religious boarding schools (*pesantren*), and Islamic higher education institutions. Forms are distributed annually to all Islamic education institutions to be completed during the months of August and September. The forms are then collected by the sub district level MORA (*Kandep*) then sent to Provincial level MORA (*Kanwil*) to be delivered to the central EMIS in Jakarta.

The data is processed and analyzed at the national level to be retrieved later. The data in the EMIS is used to create and publish the Statistics of Religious Education for the Academic School year every December. The data is also distributed back to the Regional and Local Government, but it is not clear whether the data is sent back to individual institution and how it is used at the regional and district level.

According to staff at MORA, there are some continuing problems with the EMIS. These include both the lack of human resources to collect and verify the data leading to inaccuracy of some data and the vast area to be covered and the diverse nature of the institutions, which makes it difficult to ensure that all data is collected.

The Ministry of National Education data collection system

The Ministry of National Education has a National Office of Research and Development (*Balitbang*) and within this office there is a Center for Educational Statistics (*Pusat Statistik Pendidikan*). It is this center which is mainly responsible for collecting and analyzing educational data.

For the past number of years, the main method of education data collection for MONE has been *Sidiknas* (school data collection). In this system schools would receive a questionnaire from MONE by August 31st and had to return it either through the district or the province within one month. The data is be analyzed at the central level and be used to publish the Indicators of Education in Indonesia. However, the data would take more than year to process and analyze and therefore, would e too late for it to be of much use to districts.

According to staff at the center for statistics, before the process of decentralization the rate of return for the questionnaires was approximately 95% but since decentralization, it has fallen to below 70% (Ade Cahayna: August 2006) and in order to collect the data, staff had to go into the field and many schools had to be offered a subsidy to actually complete the forms. Not only is the rate of return low, but the flow of accurate data from the school to the center is not assured. Staff at the Center of Statistics estimate there is as much as a 30 variance in the data and the real situation (ibid.)

The Center for Statistics in Education are in the process of piloting a new system of data collection called *Padati Web*. In this data collection system, schools will download an e-questionnaire and enter data at the school level and once the data is completed it will be uploaded onto the website. The vocational schools (SMK) will be the centre of the data collection (not district education offices) and although data entry can be offline, other schools will have to cooperate with SMK to have access to Padati web.

It is intended that the data collected will be used by the districts and one of the advantages of the Padati system is that districts can immediately access reports and use them for planning. It is not intended to provide data to schools or to develop a profile for individual schools

To ensure that the data is as accurate as possible, MONE will train educational staff at the provincial and district level to work in teams (*Forum Kelompok Kerja Pendataan Pendidikan*) to support schools in entering data and to visit schools to verify data.

Padati system will be piloted in 5 districts in Indonesia during 2006 and MONE plans that it will be extended to all districts in August 2007. However, Sidiknas and Padati will work together for the foreseeable future.

4.2 What does the data say about drop out?

The following section presents data on drop out published as a result of the MORA and MONE data collection systems described above and draws some conclusions about the extent and nature of drop out from basic education from the data. However, taking into account the challenges mentioned above with regards to how comprehensive and accurate the data is there is no guarantee that this data is precise and reliable and reflecting a true and current picture of drop out. It is simply a presentation of the data that is available.

Drop Out from Religious basic education schools (MI and MT)

Unless stated, all data relating to formal religious education is taken from Statistics of Religious Education for the Academic school year 2004/5 from the Department of Religious Affairs (2005).

The number of young people enrolled in basic education in religious schools (MI and MT) is less than in the general schools (SD and SMP). In 2005 the number of students enrolled in MI was 3,152,665 (2.1%) of the total elementary school aged population and 2,129,564 or (15.9 %) of the total 13 –15 Junior High school aged population was enrolled in MT.

Of these young people in religious basic education the majority were enrolled in private MI or MT as there are far more private than public Madrasah in Indonesia.

Table 2 below shows the trend in drop out from MI between 1999 and 2005.

Table 2 Dropout from MI 1999/0 to 2004/5

Year	99/00	00/01	01/02	02/03	03/04	04/05
Status	%	%	%	%	%	%
Public	0.78	1.04 ↑	0.69 ↓	0.5 ↓	0.46 ↓	0.42 ↓
Private	1.10	1.20 ↑	0.75 ↓	0.7 ↓	0.64 ↓	0.75 ↑
Total	1.88	2.24 ↑	1.44 ↓	1.2 ↓	1.1 ↓	0.71 ↓

The figures illustrates that the total dropout rate from MI is not high and in fact has been declining in recent years and the latest figure in academic year (2004/5) is only 0.71 which is less than half of the 1.88% 1999/0 figure.

The more detailed data on the latest academic year shown in table 3 demonstrates that not only that the overall drop out rate is low, but that it is lower for females than males. Both sets of data show that more young people drop out from private MI than public MI and this is constant a trend.

Table 3: Dropout MI in 2004/2005

MI	Total number of dropouts	Male	Female	% of dropouts
Public	1,380	744	636	0.42
Private	21,109	11,244	9,865	0.75
Total	22,489	11,988	10,501	0.71

As with MI, the number of youth dropping out of MT has been declining since the academic year 1998/9 as illustrated by data in the following table.

Table 4 Drop out from MT 1998/9 to 2004/5

Status	98/99	99/00	00/01	02/03	03/04	04/05
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Public	1.36	1.27 ↓	1.05 ↓	0.9 ↓	0.87 ↓	0.86 ↓
Private	2.03	1.76 ↓	1.49 ↓	1.6 ↑	1.81 ↑	1.52 ↓
Total	1.85	1.63 ↓	1.37 ↓	1.4 ↑	1.57 ↑	1.36 ↓

The figures show that the total dropout rate declined by almost 5% between 1998/9 and 2004/5. However, the overall rate of decline was not constant as there was a slight increase in the in 2003/04 primarily due to an increase in the number of dropouts from private MT.

The most recent data (2004/5) shows that drop out from MT was relatively low. The total drop out rate was only 28.866 (1.36 %) with a 4.479 (0.86%) dropping out of public MT before completing and 24.387 (1.52 %) dropping out of private MT. Once again, the number of females dropping out was lower than the number of males.

Table 5 Dropout MT 2004/2005

MT	Total number of dropouts	Male	Female
Public	4.479	2.645	1.834
Private	24.387	13.674	10.713
Total	28.866	16.319	12.547

Both sets of data for drop out from basic education show that more young people drop out of private Madrasah than public. This suggests that there are particular issues with private Madrasah that seem to deter young people from continuing their education.

In terms of transition approximately 88.7% of students who graduated from MI continued to junior high school: 49.3% to MT, 29.5% to SMP, and 9.9% to Pesantren. MORA does not have data for the remaining 10.45% of elementary school completers who continued their education.

Drop out from religious schools in DBE3 target provinces

In terms of drop out in DBE3 target provinces, the data in tables 6 and 7 shows that South Sulawesi has the biggest problem with drop out **across** the basic education range of 7 to 15. As table 6 shows, although South Sulawesi has managed to reduce the drop our rate from MI between 2002/3 and 2004/5, it is still higher than almost all other DBE3 target provinces, with the exception of Banten. In Banten the drop out rate from MI has increased consistently year by year and is now the only one of DBE3 target provinces with a drop out rate of more than 1%. The DBE3 target province with the lowest drop out rate from MI is Central Java.

Table 6: Drop out from MI in DBE3 Target Provinces

Provincial Level	Total 02/03	% 02/03	Total 03/04	% 03/04	Total 04/05	% 04/05
South Sulawesi	607	1.1	457	0.90	500	0.88
North Sumatra	726	0.9	569	0.75	484	0.61
East Java	5,974	0.6	4,877	0.50	6,262	0.59
West Java	2,533	0.5	2,680	0.58	3,148	0.66
Central Java	1,550	0.3	2,053	0.40	1,700	0.34
Aceh	784	0.7	472	0.42	195	0.16
Banten	1,128	0.8	1,422	1.10	1,301	1.01
Papua	8	0.2	17	0.40	1	0.03

Although the drop out rate from MI in Banten is higher than all other DBE3 target provinces, this is not the case for drop out from MT and the drop out rate for MT in Banten is lower than almost all other DBE3 target provinces.

Table 7 Drop out from MT in DBE3 Target Provinces

Provincial Level	Total 02/03	% 02/03	Total 03/04	% 03/04	Total 04/05	% 04/05
South Sulawesi	714	1.4	1,305	2.66	722	1.54
North Sumatra	3,298	2.2	3,830	2.57	588	0.38
East Java	5,626	1.4	5,193	1.34	5,395	1.28
West Java	4,059	1.2	5,366	1.62	5,465	1.50
Central Java	4,253	1.2	4,731	1.37	5,036	1.48
Aceh	426	0.7	379	0.59	256	0.38
Banten	1,167	1.1	1,344	1.22	1,672	1.37
Papua	8	0.3	5	0.22	5	0.51

It is South Sulawesi which has the highest number of drop out from MT with a total percentage of 1.54 in 2004/5. Of the DBE3 target provinces, it is North Sumatra with the lowest number of drop outs from MT in the year 2004/5. What is interesting is that North Sumatra had the highest rate of drop out from MT in 2002/3 and was the only province with more than 2% of drop outs. This is a substantial reduction.

From the data available from the MORA EMIS, we can generally conclude the following about drop out from the formal religious education sector:

- ▣ Drop out from Madrasah has been declining in recent years
- ▣ In general the drop out from Madrasah is not high
- ▣ More males than females drop out of Madrasah
- ▣ More youth drop out of private Madrasah than public
- ▣ Of the DBE3 target provinces, South Sulawesi seems to have a problem with drop out from both MI (ranking 2nd) and MT (ranking 1st).

Drop Out from general Schools (SD and SMP)

The most recent data available from MONE is the 'Indicator of Education in Indonesia 2002/2003 (2003) which includes data from general schools and religious schools (MI and MT). Data used here is for secular schools. All data in this paper is taken from this source unless stated otherwise.

Data from presented in table 8 suggests that dropout from formal general elementary schools is an increasing problem. The table below shows dropout from school year 1998/9 to 2002/3.

Table 8: Drop out from SD 1998/9-2002/3

Status	98/99 %	99/00 %	00/01 %	01/02 %	02/03 %
Elementary School	2.93	2.23 ↓	2.62 ↑	2.66 ↑	2.97 ↑
Male	1.86	3.03 ↑	3.33 ↑	3.21 ↓	3.37 ↑
Female	4.08	3.77 ↓	1.86 ↓	2.07 ↑	2.55 ↑

The figures show that whereas the dropout rate decreased from 1998/9 to 1999/00 it then started to increase and has been increasing each year until 2002/3 (the last year of available data). The drop out rate for both males and females is increasing although the overall rate is higher for males the rate of drop out for females is increasing faster than for males with an increase of 0.16% for males between 2001/2 and 2002/3 and 0.45% for females in the same period.

Dropout during the years of junior high school has decreased in recent years although it remains a problem. The table below shows junior high school dropout for school years 1998/9 to 2002/3.

Table 9: Dropout from SMP 1998/9 to 2002/3

Year	98/99 %	99/00 %	00/01 %	01/02 %	02/03 %
Males	5.04	3.91 ↓	3.96 ↑	3.15 ↓	2.77 ↓
Females	2.13	3.98 ↑	3.27 ↓	2.46 ↓	2.05 ↓
Total	3.64	3.94 ↑	3.63 ↓	2.81 ↓	2.42 ↓

With the exception of the academic year 1999/00 a higher percentage of males than females drop out of junior high school every year.

Table 10: Dropout from SMP by Grade Level 1998/9 to 2002/3

Academic Year	98/99 %	99/00 %	00/01 %	01/02 %	02/03 %
1	2.13	1.99 ↓	1.51 ↓	0.99 ↓	0.97 ↓
2	4.97	1.55 ↓	2.20 ↓	2.04 ↓	2.06 ↑
3	3.83	9.03 ↑	7.32 ↓	5.59 ↓	4.32 ↓

Data on drop out for each grade of junior high schools show that time of the highest rate of dropout is in grade 3. In recent years, from 1999/00 this has been a constant trend and in some years, the number of young people who drop out during grade 3 is substantially higher than for other grades. In 1999/00 for example, the drop out rate for grade 3 was more than 9% whereas it was less than 2% in both other grades. Although In 2002/03 the drop out rate from grade 3 had declined to just over 4%, the rate in both other grades had also declined and so it was still more than twice that in other grades. These figures suggest that there are particular circumstances that young people face in the final grade of junior high school which cause more to drop out.

It is difficult to find data on continuation/transition rates for general schools SD to SMP only. It has been possible to access data for SD/MI and SMP/MT combined however. The data shows that the number of SD/MI graduates continuing to SMP/MT has increased quite significantly in recent years.

☐ In 1994/5, the rate was 66.84%

☐ In 1999/200 the rate was 71.83

☐ In 2001/2 the rate became 74.35%

National Plan of Action: Indonesia's Education for All (2003)

This is still a relatively low rate and indicates that in 2001/2 25.65% of graduates either did not have access to junior high education and if they did not continue their basic education in an alternative educational institution (such as Pesentren or Paket B) they would have terminated their education (National Coordination Forum: Education for All: 2003)

Drop out from general schools in DBE3 target provinces

The table below shows elementary and junior high school dropout in DBE3 target provinces for the year 2002/3.

Table 11: Drop out from SD and SMP in DBE3 target provinces 2002/3

Provincial Level	Elementary School	Junior High School
South Sulawesi	1.68 %	1.83%
North Sumatra	1.19%	2.51%
East Java	0.81%	1.37%
West Java	0.71%	1.40%
Central Java	0.78%	0.57%
Banten	0.83%	0.94%
Papua	2.71%	2.55%

Source: *Overview of National Education. Survey Result of National Basic Education 2003. Research and Development National Education Department 2005*

The table shows that South Sulawesi is facing problems in retention in general schools as well as in religious schools. For the number of drop outs from elementary school, in the academic year 2002/3 South Sulawesi had more young people drop out than any other DBE3 target province (1.68%). However, in junior high school the DBE3 target province with the highest number of drop out was North Sumatra which was the only DBE3 target province with a rate of more than 2%. It is interesting to note that of all DBE3 target provinces, North Sumatra had the lowest rate of drop out from MT and yet the highest rate from general schools.

The data on students continuing to junior high schools (SMP/MT) among DBE3 target provinces indicate that most of DBE3 target provinces have continuation rates above the national average with the exception of West Java and Banten. In fact Banten has the lowest number of young people continuing to SMP/MT of all provinces. DKI Jakarta has a rate above 100% primarily because it is a major destination for graduates from other provinces to

continue their schooling. This may in part explain the lower rates for West Java and Banten (National Coordination Forum: Education for All: 2003)

Table 12: Rates of Students Continuing to Junior High Schools in DBE3 target provinces (2001/2)

Province	Above National Average	National Average 70.52%	Below National Average
DKI Jakarta	106.63	70.52%	
West Java		70.52%	61.31
Banten		70.52%	52.17
Central Java	72.28	70.52%	
East Java	75.07	70.52%	
North Sumatra	76.44	70.52%	
South Sulawesi	71.16	70.52%	
Aceh	75.28	70.52%	
Papua	87.68	70.52%	
North Maluku		70.52%	61.08

(National Coordination Forum: Education for All: 2003)

The data available from the Ministry of National Education tells us the following about drop out.

- ▣ The drop out rate from general elementary school has increased in recent years, whereas it has been declining in general junior high schools
- ▣ The drop out rate from general schools is higher than for Madrasah
- ▣ More males than females drop out at both levels of general basic education
- ▣ A higher number of young people drop out in the final grade of basic education than in any other grade
- ▣ Continuation rates from SD/MI to SMP/MT are quite low with at least 25% of young people not continuing their education after grade 6
- ▣ Of the DBE3 target provinces, South Sulawesi and Banten have the most problems with retention in general schools.

5.0 Causes of drop out

A review of literature on education and a number of key interviews suggests there are numerous reasons why so many young people do not complete their basic education in Indonesia. These factors can be grouped into three main themes although all issues are clearly interrelated. This section only covers those factors which were mentioned in the limited number of documents reviewed

▣ **Institutional:** These are factors existing in the school and include teachers, curriculum, relevance and quality, management and low achievement.

▣ **Contextual:** These are factors relating to how and where young people live and include location and family background.

▣ **Individual:** These are factors which connect to the young people themselves and include academic performance, gender and age.

5.1 Institutional

Basic education within the formal education system in Indonesia faces many challenges². As in many less developed countries, these challenges include issues with input and process³. The quality and relevance of basic education in Indonesia is generally low which affects retention of young people.

Teachers

One of the key factors causing drop out is teachers (Semiawan et al: 2001). There is an uneven distribution of teachers in Indonesia, leading to a shortage of teachers in some areas, especially at the elementary level. Approximately 55% of schools have an over supply of teachers whilst 34% are undersupplied.⁴ This means that many young people may attend school but do not have a teacher. Some areas have tried to compensate by creating multi grade classes, but generally teachers of multi grade classes have not been trained to teach young people of a variety of ages and abilities and often conduct uninteresting lessons and are unable to guide students.

Indonesia has a large number of under and unqualified teachers. Teacher preparation is inadequate and Indonesia allows all graduates of teacher training institutes to become

² Summarized from National Plan of Action: Indonesia's Education for All, 2003-2015: National Coordination Forum, Education for All

³ In Indonesia, education is viewed within the input, process, and output framework

⁴ Recent study by the World Bank, as quoted in the Jakarta Post 17 November 2006, the study was recently completed and not available at the time this paper was completed

teachers without carefully checking their preparedness to teach in difficult circumstances. It is also difficult to remove poor teachers (World Bank: 2005).

The World Bank (2005) revealed that elementary school teachers generally have inadequate mastery of basic concepts in mathematics and science and are deficient in their educational knowledge, particularly those which would assist them in solving the problems they encounter in applying students active learning strategies. The research states that students learning achievements has not reached the expected level and this is partly attributed to teacher's lack of quality teaching.

The current qualification and competencies of the teachers for Junior high school teacher is fall far short of the new national standards. Of teachers serving in 2002/3 in SMP 57. 7% did not meet the S1 standard and 47 % of MT teachers did not meet this requirement in 2003/4 (Power: 2005)

Teachers generally have low motivation. Salaries are low and in some locations, the school situation very difficult. Teacher attendance is a problem. A survey done for the World Development Report in 2004 found that 20% of Indonesia's teachers were absent at the time of a random spot check in a representative number of schools (cited in World Bank 2005)

Another cause of drop out mentioned in research is violence in schools (Semiawan et al 2001). Corporal punishment is acceptable and teachers often beat children in schools and sometimes the punishment may relate to a young persons ability to learn (e.g. being hit for answering a question incorrectly). The result is that some children and young people become afraid and attend infrequently and may stop going to school altogether.

With poorly qualified teachers with low motivation and attendance, many young people are not motivated to continue investing in school.

Curriculum, methods and relevance

The relevance of education provided is also poor. Basic education is intended to provide young people with the basic skills needed for life but in reality in the past⁵, the curriculum (or **what** young people learn in school) has been content driven and has not been linked to

⁵ The curriculum has recently been revised to be competency based

real life situations. Consequently, students are not able to implement what they have studied at school to solve problems that they are facing or will face in their daily lives so they see little value in financing an irrelevant education (Ministry of National Education: 2003c). Findings from a recent school to work transition survey revealed that the main obstacle young people face in finding their first job is inadequate education and skills. Whilst much has changed in the work force little has changed in schools. The importance of a relevant education is also the biggest concern for employers and managers as 61% referred to the inadequate education and training of applicants as the biggest problem in recruiting young workers (MoMT and ILO: 2003). The lack of relevance of education is a major cause of drop out. In the same survey a significant proportion of the respondents who were young employees gave their main reason for abandoning school as being that they did not see the purpose of continuing their education in the face of low quality and inappropriateness of the skills acquired.

Other reasons given for youth drop out from basic education in the literature include boredom and young people simply not enjoying school. Young people are bored not only by what they learn but by how they learn. If you look into most classrooms in most schools in Indonesia, you are likely see a teacher standing at the front of the class writing on the blackboard with young people sitting in rows, textbook and pen in hand (if textbooks are in fact available) copying down what the teachers is writing at the blackboard. In the School to Work Transition survey and report (MoMT and ILO: 2003), 47% of young employees gave as the main reason for abandoning school, the fact that they simply did not enjoy their school experience and dissatisfaction with curriculum was common.

Student Achievement

Problems with the quality of education in Indonesia can be seen by the output⁶ of the educational system. Evidence suggests that the learning outcomes from basic education in Indonesia are poor when compared to other countries with low capability of reading, writing and counting as illustrated by the following:

▣ The Political Economic Risk Consultation (PERC)'s survey reported that Indonesia is ranked 12 out of 12 countries in Asia. (National Commission on Education: 2001)

⁶ Assessment of educational output includes students capabilities that can be analyzed by identifying students achievements

- ▣ Performance in the area of mathematics, based on the Third International Mathematics and Science Study-Repeat (TIMSS-R) study in 1999 reported that Indonesia's Junior High School students are ranked at 32 for natural science and 34 for mathematics out of 38 countries from Asia, Australia and Africa in the survey. (National Coordination Forum: Education for All: 2003)
- ▣ The World Bank states that reading ability (assessed through reading tests given to fourth grade students) ranked Indonesia lowest in East Asia with Hong Kong top with 75.5% and Indonesia with only 51.7%. The same reports also states that Indonesian students have difficulty answering questions of comprehension categories and in answering descriptions of problems requiring logic (cited in (National Coordination Forum: Education for All: 2003)

Such low achievement indicates an inadequate quality and badly implemented system of formal basic education. Young people in Indonesia are the same as young people all over the world and see education as a means to improve their situation. Yet for many of them when they attend school, they have teachers of inadequate quality, often absent and maybe violent, the learning is boring, not linked to the real world they have to enter when they complete school and the learning outcomes are low. These are all factors contributing to the high rate of drop out from basic education.

Management

Some literature links drop out to weak management of schools. School budgets are not well prepared, accounts are not transparent and school plans are rarely linked to improving the teaching and learning process for young people. Jalal and Mustafa (Educational reform in the context of regional autonomy: 2001) state that poor management of education and schools in Indonesia is a major cause of drop out. Poor management of school influences the climate and ethos of a school, poor management can influence teachers' motivation, commitment and attitude to their duties. Lack of teacher motivation and commitment can cause students to drop out.

5.2 Contextual

A review of available literature has shown that whether a young person in Indonesia continues and completes basic education or not can be determined by **where** (location) and **how** (home circumstances) they live.

Location

There is widespread inequity in education in Indonesia. All of the challenges mentioned above in terms of the quality and relevance of education are faced by many schools and affect many young people in Indonesia, but not to the same extent. Education provision, quality and relevance differs greatly from province to province and disparity can be observed across geographical areas, urban and rural, between western and eastern parts of Indonesia. This is shown in the quality of teachers and achievement of young people.

Whilst the quality of teachers is considered low, in some areas of Indonesia, it is lower than in others. In the academic year 2000/01 DKI Jakarta was found to have 71.11% of qualified elementary teachers with South Sulawesi having 26% and North Sulawesi having the lowest percentage with only 5.29% (National Coordination Forum: Education for All: 2003). In terms of Junior high school, Papua had only 27% of adequately qualified Mathematics teachers, where as East and Central Java both had 64% (ibid.).

Therefore, young people living in certain locations and provinces such as Papua and North Sulawesi will face greater challenges in accessing quality education and finding school relevant, interesting, engaging and useful and therefore finding reason to stay.

As student performance is one measurement used in Indonesia to evaluate the quality of education, the distribution of achievement internally to Indonesia clearly illustrates the different quality of education provided in different provinces. The total average of the net exit examination index of Junior high school students in the academic year 200/01 was 5.11. The highest net exit examination was achieved by DIY Yogyakarta province (5.85) and the lowest total average was in West Nusa Tenggara (4.21). Only seven provinces in total were identified to have achieved the net examination index above average (National Coordination Forum: Education for All: 2003).

Therefore, if the lack of quality and relevance of basic education is one of the factors causing drop out in Indonesia, we can conclude that in areas where the quality is worse young people are more vulnerable to drop out.

In Indonesia is one of the most diverse country in the world and there are particular regional issues which may influence whether young people remain in and complete basic education. According to the researchers from the on-going research on drop out from Madrasah conducted by the Department of Religious Affairs⁷, there are factors causing drop out which are specific to particular locations: The following are examples:

☐ In **Ambon**, many students have been found to drop out of school as they are alcoholic.

This may be related to the specific communal conflict situation.

☐ In **Bogor** and **Jambi** many students (especially male) drop out to work as there are many new industries in these areas and it is easy for them to find work and make money at an early age.

☐ In **North Sumatra** many students dropped out of school because they wanted to go to nearby Malaysia to work.

In addition to where young people live in Indonesia having an impact on their ability and motivation to stay in school, how they live will also have an impact. Poverty and socio-economic status, economic activity, educational level of parents

Family Background

Indonesia ranked 111 of 177 countries in the human development report of 2002 with 52.45 of the population living on less than US\$ 2 per day (UNDP: 2004). Although by law, basic education is supposed to be free, in reality, it is not and poverty (the inability to pay for education and the need to support the family) prohibits many young people from completing education⁸. A survey and report from the ILO found that 28% of self employed youth had no elementary education and 60% of self employed youth and 40% of job seekers left school because of financial constraints and the need to support their family (MOMT and

⁷ MORA has been conducting research of drop out were from July 2006 and it is due for completion in November 2006. This research has included 14 provinces in Indonesia and a sample size of 289 young people. The aim of the study is to better understand the factors that influence of youth to drop out of Madrasah. The study is currently on going but some of the early available information from the research

⁸ A report from the ILO found that this reason for drop out ranked second to young people's dislike of school. (*Report of Survey on School to Work Transition in Indonesia: G, Szjraczki and A, Reerink: ILO*)

ILO: 2003). This is also confirmed by the Susenas (National Bureau of Statistics: 2003) which concluded that one of the elementary reasons for drop out is the inability to pay the direct costs of education such as fees, transportation costs, costs of equipment for school and uniforms.

This opinion is supported by initial findings from the ongoing research on drop out from Madrasah conducted by the Department of Religious Affairs in 2006. The study found that young people who drop out of Madrasah are more likely to come from low income families as the following data illustrates.

Table 13: The link between socio-economic background and drop out from Madrasah

No	Socio- Economic Background ⁹	%
1	High	1,04 %
2	Moderate	38,75 %
3	Low	60,21 %
	Total	100 %

The table shows that the large majority of drop outs (60.21 %) are from a low socio economic background whereas 38.75 % from a moderate socio economic background and only 1.04% from a high socio economic background. The link between poverty and drop out is clear.

Figures for the overall education system show the same pattern and show that economics affects young people in junior high school more than in elementary. Whilst there is little different in enrollment rates in elementary school between the richest and poorest quintile and most children enter grade 1 of those who belong to the poorer income groups, a large percentage drop out after grade 6. In 2002 the junior high enrollment rate of the richest quintile was 69% higher than the poorest quintile (Susenas staff estimates cited in World Bank: 2005)

Staff at the Ministry of Education considers that it is the inability to pay transport costs which causes most youth from the poorest quintile to drop out of junior high school. Whilst

⁹ High, moderate and low categories of socio economic background were determined by a review of employment and work status, level of income and level of education

elementary schools tend to be close to the homes of children, there are fewer Junior High schools and therefore, they are further away. Transport costs are a daily economic burden. School fees are paid every month and can be saved up over a number of weeks, but money for transport to schools has to be found every day. MONE believe that many poor families are so preoccupied with daily survival rather than to think about sending their children to school (Didik Suhardi:2005)

In some cases the family educational background also plays an important part in whether a young person continues and completes basic education. The Model of Paket B in ILO by Nunu (2001) discusses a number of factors which influenced drop out including the parent's level of education. This study found that if parents had low levels of education or were illiterate they were less likely to guide their children to be successful in school or to value schooling.

Economic activity

As a result of poverty and the need to support their family, many young people in Indonesia are already economically active. According to a 1998 Labour survey (cited in Hendriati and Hestyanti: IIEP: 2001) 7.7% of the total working age population was aged between 5 and 14. Although the majority was working with the families in the agricultural sector (64.5%) many were working in the manufacturing (14.7%) and services (20.9%). Of these children who work 31.5% worked more than 25 hours and week and 10.6% worked more than 44 hours a week. To date, the researchers have not been able to access any analyses on how economic activity contributes to drop out from school, but for these young people it is almost impossible to combine schooling and work and schooling is almost certainly disrupted increasing their vulnerability to drop out.

5.3 Individual

Individual characteristics have been found to influence whether young people remain in and complete basic education in Indonesia. The individual characteristics include age, gender and ability

Age

The ongoing research from MORA has found that age can play an important factor in causing drop out from Madrasah. Youth who are older than their peers tend to drop out more frequently than their classmates (MORA: 2006)

Gender

In general, the participation rates of males and females aged between 13 and 15 do not reflect big differences therefore, it can not be concluded that females are more likely to drop out than males or vice versa simply because of gender.

Nevertheless, the reason why a young person might drop out can be influenced by their gender. The Ministry of National Education (2003a) looks at the reasons why young people drop out of education from elementary school onwards. The table below is a summary.

Table 14: The reasons for drop out from basic education

Reason	Males		Females	
	Elementary	Junior Secondary	Elementary School	Junior Secondary
Economic	46.31%	52.2%	45.97%	48.10%
Low motivation (bored)	22.99%	21.08%	19.16%	13.14%
Early Marriage	1.07%	1.78%	5.13%	16.72%

From this data we make conclude that females are more likely to drop out of basic education than males because of early marriage and whilst economic necessity and boredom affect both males and females, males are more likely to drop out of basic education for these reasons. According to Rosyidi, U & Rachmawan (2005). Economic necessity is the most important cause for drop out amongst young males. They conclude that it is the males in the family who are expected to leave school to engage in economic activity with financial rewards and not the females.

Gender interrelates strongly with location in determining whether males and females complete basic education. Statistic illustrating the percentages of males and females in SMP per province in the academic year 2000/01 shows that males were relatively more than females in most provinces but that there were several provinces where females were more than males. The statistics show that a female in West Nusa Tenggara is more not to complete basic education than a male in the same location. On the other hand a male in Central Sulawesi may be more vulnerable to dropping out of basic education than a female in the same location or a male in

Academic Performance

There is a link between the academic performance of a young person and their vulnerability to drop out. The ongoing research from the Department of Religious Affairs 2006 has found that young people in Madrasah with lower scores on measures of cognitive ability are more likely to drop out than young people with higher scores. According to staff at the Ministry of National Education, young people of less intellectual ability are more likely to find school challenging and get left behind making them shy or find the continuing costs of education and repetition prohibitive (Didik Suhardi: November 2006).

Although basic education is intended to be compulsory in Indonesia, an automatic selection process is employed at the end of elementary level through the national examination system which employs a clear academic ability bias. Only young people who pass the national examination can continue to Junior High school, those who do not pass can either repeat the grade and take the examination again or discontinue their education – effectively dropping out of basic education. Those that do decide to repeat the grade are more vulnerable to dropping out at a later stage, due to their age as the research from the Department of Religious Affairs (2006) has found (above).

An analysis of data of drop out in different grades of basic education would suggest that the national examination may cause young people to drop out prematurely. Data on drop out from elementary school in the academic year 2002/3 shows that more students dropped out in the final grade of elementary school (the year of the national examination) than any other grade (see table 14). The same pattern can be seen in Junior High school as described

previously. According to figures from MONE¹⁰, substantially more students drop out during the final grade of junior high school (grade 9) than during grades 7 and 8 and this appears to be a consistent trend.

Table 15: Drop out by grade from elementary school

Year 2002-03	
Grade	Drop Out
1	2.2
2	1.88
3	2.17
4	4.09
5	3.23
6	4.69

These figures suggest there must be some critical factors causing youth to drop out of basic education in the final year of each school level and the common factor would seem to be the national examination. Although no analyses have been done on the connection between the national examination and drop out from basic education, it would be a worthwhile study for the Ministry of National Education to undertake.

Therefore, it can be concluded that type of method used to assess the academic performance of young people during basic education as it stands at present is one factors contributing to the high rate of drop out from basic education.

To return to the original question posed at the start of this section, it would appear that a lot is currently understood about drop out at the national level and both the Ministry of National Education and the Department of Religious Affairs have clear opinions on the primary causes of drop out as follows: Based on the research of drop out from MORA the dominant factors in order are:

- ▣ Parents socio economic status and poverty (17.4%)
- ▣ Students' lack of ability and low performance (14.7%)
- ▣ Bad perceptions of the value of education (11.8 %),
- ▣ The environment in the school (9. 3%)
- ▣ Students' motivation to stay in school (5.2%).

¹⁰ Data on formal and non-formal education in Indonesia 2003/4 to 210/11 from *Badan Penelitian Dan Pengembangan: Pusat Data dan Informasi Pendidikan* 2004; details only refer to MONE schools

According to the staff of MONE, the main causes of the dropout in order are:

- ▣ Students feeling bored and not liking with school
- ▣ Students' lack of ability and low performance
- ▣ Students being afraid of teachers
- ▣ Students do not have enough money to go to school every day

6.0 Drop out prevention

From an analysis literature and interview with key personnel, the following have been established as some of the chief causes of drop out from basic education:

- ▣ Teachers
- ▣ Curriculum, methods and relevance
- ▣ Location
- ▣ The high costs of education
- ▣ Academic performance

Therefore, it can be assumed that if these are seen as the main causes of drop out at the national level, then these are the factors which national policies and strategies would aim to address. The following section will briefly describe some of the main drop out prevention activities of both MONE and MORA and see if and how they connect to the issues identified as causing most young people to drop out.

6.1 The Department of Religious Affairs

Teachers

All teachers in formal religious schools will be subject to the same standards as teachers in formal general schools (see below).

Starting in 2006, MoRA also plans to give scholarships to superintendents in basic education to enable them to obtain masters degrees in education. While not directly targeted at the causes of dropout, MoRA feels that more qualified personnel will support the effort to improve the overall quality and relevance of education in Madrasah.

High costs of education

In order to address the high costs of education as a cause of drop out, MORA has developed a scholarship program targeted at poor students in Madrasah which has been implemented since 2002. The name of the program is BKM (Bantuan Khusus Murid).

MORA also has a program called “Orang Tua Asuh”. In this program more wealthy parents are expected to contribute some additional funds to cover the costs of poorer students.

MORA will provide BOM (Bantuan Operasional Madrasah) to Madrasahs. This program is similar to BOS (see below) where Madrasah where schools are given a grant to cover the operational costs of the Madrasah and reduce or eliminate fees.

Academic performance

Many religious formal education schools provide remedial programs for young people who are under achieving. However, this is not a national program and its operation seems to depend on decisions of individual institutions and teachers. Teachers often do not receive incentives for conducting remedial programs and the programs are often provided for core subjects and usually at MT level the national examination subjects (ADB: 2005)

6.2 The Ministry of National Education

MONE has a number of programs which may reduce the drop out rate from basic education. Some of these are aimed at improving the quality and relevance of education (not directly aimed at preventing drop out) and others directly focused on drop out. The following is a brief summary.

Teachers

The Ministry of National Education has made many efforts in the past to raise the quality of education. The most recent effort is with the introduction of the national standards.

Teachers are now expected to meet a minimum standard of competence before they are eligible to teach (including a minimum academic qualification and a certification). MONE hopes to start this process in 2206.

Curriculum and methods

MONE has also introduced minimum standards for curriculum and teaching methodology. The curriculum has become a competency based curriculum and more localized.

Through the national standards, MONE has also defined the principles of the teaching and learning process which teachers will be expected to use. According to this principal, the teaching and learning process should be implemented in an interactive, inspirational, pleasing, challenging manner, motivating the students, to actively participate and providing sufficient space for the initiative, creativity and independence to conform with the talents, interests and physical.

Relevance

The new curriculum is simply a set of minimum standards and teachers and schools are now free to develop a locally relevant curriculum and syllabi for each subject. The aim is to make what young people learn in school as locally relevant as possible.

In an effort to make school more relevant as direct intervention to reduce drop out, MONE has developed and implemented a Life Skills Program as part of the broad based education initiative.

The Life Skills program focuses on teaching pre vocational skills in junior high school. A team within MONE selects Junior High schools, which have a high drop out rate and low transition rate (transition high school) and the school receives a substantial grant of around 30,000,000 IDR to establish a vocational training program (including training teachers and buying equipment) related to local need. The program intends to keep young people who would otherwise be vulnerable to dropping out ..

The costs of education

MONE has introduced a new school funding system called BOS (Bantuan Operasional Sekolah). This fund will provide schools which are intended to reduce or eliminate school fees and to cover other direct educational costs for poor students, such as transport. This may address some of the key economic/financial issues which cause some students to drop out.

DBO (Operational Budget grant) is a program, which started in 1998. DBO is a fund provided to selected schools in order to enable them to maintain a level of service. The program was started during the worst period of the economic crisis but is now also aimed at supporting schools to achieve the Nine-Year Compulsory Education Program. DBO is a block grant given to schools to fund their operational expenses so they do not have to request young people to pay school fees.

MONE also has a program designed to provide some small scholarships to support young people to complete their basic education. The retrieval program has been implemented since 2001. The aim of the program is to find drop out and non-transition students and support them so they can return to Junior high school until they graduate by providing a scholarship of one million rupiah a year until they graduate. This programs currently only focuses on those youth who drop out junior high school during the first year of study.

One-roof schools combine both elementary and junior high school education under one roof and are intended to address the issue of the costs of transport to school. To establish these schools, MONE has identified elementary schools with very low transition rates from elementary into junior high school. Rather than building a new junior high school within reach of the elementary school, three additional classrooms have been added to the existing elementary school building.

To address the issue of young people for whom it is necessary to engage in economic activity, MONE has established the Open schools (ST). Open schools have been operating since 1996 and provide a flexible way for young people to complete their basic education. Students can join a satellite school based at the community level and linked to a general SMP and received support from a teaching assistant and teachers from the mother school, which is one of the government junior high schools . The aim of the open junior high school is to minimize the amount of direct teaching and maximize the amount of independent learning. The content and certification at the end is the same as for SMP.

Academic Performance

As with Madrasah, many general schools have remedial programs or extra lessons to support students with their learning, but it depends on the teachers and the schools, it is not an organized program from MONE and often only focuses on national examination subjects. Moreover, young people are often expected to pay for extra classes.

8.0 Conclusions

The purpose of the study was to answer the following research question:

“What is being done at the national level to ensure that all young people in Indonesia are able to complete the basic education?”

To answer this question the paper examined three key areas. The following are some brief conclusions on each of the issues:

What educational data is collected at the national level (MONE and MORA), how it is collected and what are the problems with it?

Both MONE and MORA are collecting relevant educational data through their systems and are trying to update their systems and address some of the critical issues with collecting data from schools.

However, MONE and MORA are not collecting data together and moreover the latest data from MORA (2004/5) is more up to date than the last data from MONE (2002/3). The data included in this report had to be pieced together from different sources and includes data from different times.

The accuracy of the data is also very questionable. Both MONE and MORA admit that it is difficult to collect accurate data on education, as they do not collect all information from all educational institutions and the data that they do collect may not be correct. They do not have the human and financial resources to verify the data.

How accurate the data that MONE and MORA collect depends on the quality of the data collected at the school level and both suggest that the quality is low and data often inaccurate. In terms of the number of young people that drop out schools do not collect

exact data and some schools do not even collect statistics. Enumerators for DBE1 found that 20% of all target elementary schools had no records on drop out at all! Perhaps schools do not know how to collect accurate data.

Additionally, schools may only see themselves as data providers rather than data users (as they are never given back the data) therefore, they may not understand about the importance of data for decision making and may not feel motivated to collect it.

To what extent has the issue of drop out from basic education been researched at the national level and how much is currently understood about why young people drop out?

Through a review of review of research, documents and interviews it was possible to establish a number of concrete reasons why young people fail to complete basic education in Indonesia. Nevertheless, it was not easy to piece together this information, as it had to be gathered from a wide range of sources most of which focused on issues relating to but not specifically about the causes of drop out. It proved challenging and ultimately impossible to find research or literature focusing solely on the causes of drop out from basic education in Indonesia (with the exception of the ongoing research from the Department of Religious Affairs).

That is not to say that such literature it does not exist, it is understood papers have been completed by the Ministry of National Education, but these were difficult and ultimately not possible to locate. There are many issues which perhaps need to be followed up with further research such as the link between the national examination and school drop out and the effect of part time work on education.

Is the research and data being used at the national level to inform the development of effective strategies and activities to support young people to complete basic education?

On the whole, both MONE and MORA are using the information to develop some strategies and activities targeted specifically at supporting young people to complete their basic education. Both MONE and MORA are trying to address the critical issues of:

▣ Costs of education through retrieval programs, scholarships and BOS

- ☐ Distance through one roof schools
- ☐ Academic performance through remedial programs
- ☐ Need to engage in economic activity through the flexible open school system

However, it is difficult to ascertain at the national level (which this paper is focused on) how widespread and well these programs are implemented at the local level and how effective they actually are at supporting young people to remain in and complete basic education.

MONE and MORA are also working hard to improve the overall quality and relevance of basic education in Indonesia through the national standards which will impact on teachers, curriculum and methods and may mean more young people remain in and complete basic education. However, it remains to be seen what impact this improvement in standards of quality has on the numbers of young people dropping out of basic education.

In conclusion from the research presented in this paper, it does appear that the national level is doing some essential things to enable young people to complete basic education, but it is not being done in a comprehensive and coordinated manner and this has made it quite challenging to establish an accurate and comprehensive picture of the current situation of drop out from basic education in Indonesia.

Indonesia has a program of nine years compulsory basic education, which should be fully realized by the year 2008. Indonesia has given its commitment to this in the Dakar Accord on Education for All. However, if nothing is done about the drop out rate from basic education it will continue to have a great impact on the accomplishment of *wajib belajar* (compulsory education).

References

Asian Development Bank: Analysis of the current situation of Madrasah Education (Snowy Mountain Engineering Corporation for the Asian Development Bank: (2005)

Hendriati and Hestyanti: Alternative Education for Disadvantaged youth in Indonesia: IIEP: 2001)

Jakarta Post: World Bank urges more spending on Junior highs (Monday November 20th 2006)

Jalal Fasli & Musthafa Bachrudin: Education Reform: In the Context of Regional Autonomy: The Case of Indonesia. The Ministry of National Education & The National Agency for Development and Planning & The World Bank. Jakarta (2001)

National Coordination Forum: Education for All National Plan of Action: Indonesia's Education for All 2003-2015: (2003)

National Bureau of Statistics: National Social Economic Survey (2003)

Nunu. H: Tracer study of Non-Formal Education Instruction Module (Packet A and Packet B) for child laborers in Purwakarta: Swandragogja Foundation, Purwakarta. (2001).

Power, Lorna. (2005). Analysis of the Current situation of Formal Education at the Junior Secondary School Level (DBE3: 2005)

Rosyidi, U & Rachmawan: Drop-out School, Dark Picture of Our Education Education: Research of Journal Religious Education, Volume 3, No. 4, October – December 2005. (2005)

Semiawan, et .al. Teachers and Teacher professional Education In Southeast Asia In An Era of Global Change, the case of Indonesia (2006)

Sziraczki, G and Reerink, A: School to Work Transition survey and report: ILO (2003)

The Ministry of National Education: Department of Research and Development, Center for Statistics in Education: Indicators of Education in Indonesia 2002/2003:(2003a)

The Directorate General for Islamic Institutions: Department of Religious Affairs
Statistics of Religious Education for the Academic School year 2004 – 2005 (2005)

The National Commission on Education National Education Department: Achieving Quality and Equal Basic Education (2001):

The Ministry of National Education: Overview of National Education: Survey Result of National Basic Education Research and Development: (2003b)

The Ministry of National Education: The Concept of Life Skills: (2003c)

The Ministry of National Education: The Strategic plan for 2005-2009: (2005)

UNDP: Human Development Report: 2004)

The World Bank: Improving Education Quality: Policy brief (2005)

The World Bank: Education in Indonesia: Making the Transition to Decentralization (2005)

Other References include various power point presentations from MONE and MORA and interviews with the following resource people:

Ade Cahayna: Director of Center for Education Statistics: Ministry of National Education (August 2006)

Pak Didik Suhardi, Deputy Director for Planning, Directorate of Junior High Education, Ministry of National Education (November 2005)

Pak Fasli Jalal: Director General, Directorate General for Quality of Education Personnel, Ministry of National Education (November 2005)

Ibu Sumiati, Head of Mathematics and Science Division [formerly responsible for local content], Curriculum Development Center, Ministry of National Education (November 2005)

Pak M. Hamid: Director of Junior High Education, Directorate General for Basic and Intermediate Education, Ministry of National Education (November 2005)

Pak Firdaus, Director of Mapenda, Ministry of Religious Affairs (November 2005)

Pak Azahri: Head of Sub Directorate for Teaching Personnel, Mapenda, Ministry of Religious Affairs

Ibu Ella Yulaelawati: Director of Equivalency Education, Directorate General for Non-Formal Education, Ministry of National Education