



University of
Massachusetts
Amherst

Case Study of Post-Literacy Program in Indonesia

Item Type	openaccess;article
Authors	Pribudhiana, Ryke
Download date	2026-03-12 08:47:32
Link to Item	https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14394/7694

Case Study of Post-Literacy Program in Indonesia

A Master's Project Presented

By

RYKE PRIBUDHIANA

Submitted to the Graduate School of Education
University of Massachusetts Amherst in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

DECEMBER 2013

Department of Educational Policy, Research and Administration
Center for International Education

Case Study of Post-Literacy Program in Indonesia

A Master's Project Presented

By

RYKE PRIBUDHIANA

Approved as to style and content by:

BJORN HARALD NORDTVEIT: ADVISOR

DEDICATION

First, I would like to be thankful to my Almighty God who is giving bless of life, school opportunity in the US, having a nice family and finishing this study. I dedicate this study to my late father who took care of me when he was alive.

I am also thankful to my mother, who never stops supporting us with everything she has; to my beloved wife, who always waits for me and tolerates my absence; and to my children, Arsy, Rara and Ozi. I would like to gratitude to my sisters and brothers-in-law, who are taking care of my mother and supporting my family when I am away from home. Thank you all for the part of our big lovely family.

Finally, this work is also dedicated to the memory of my sister, Renny Kathliana (1962-2013.)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to first thank my academic advisor, Bjorn Harald Nordtveit, for his time, feedback and suggestions throughout this project; Jacqueline Mosselson for her support in my research method class; and David Evans, Director of the Center of International Education, and the CIE community for their teaching and inspiration.

Second, I am grateful to my sponsor, U.S. Agency for International Development, who provided the scholarship for me to pursue a master's degree at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. My studies would be impossible without their support. I also thank the Ministry of Education and Culture's Directorate of Community Education Development for their permission to study in the United States and their constant support throughout.

Third, I owe thanks to all of research study respondents (students, tutors, head of CLCs and educational officers) in Jakarta, Bandung, West Bandung and Garut, who provided their time and energy to take part in my study. I am greatly thankful to Edward who helped in proofreading and editing my work.

ABSTRACT

This study aims at analyzing a post-literacy program run by the Ministry of Education and Culture in Indonesia. This program, operating since 2009, provides public resources in the form of grant money to educational institutions and community learning centers (CLCs), not only to preserve literacy but also to help poor and illiterate people achieve economic independence. This study examined students' achievements in literacy and life skills, and explored the program's economic impact on communities. The interviewees who participated in the study included adult students, tutors, heads of CLCs, and senior education officers at the district, provincial, and Ministerial level. A significant amount of primarily qualitative data was gathered through document review, observation and interviews with 29 participants.

The study's findings reveal that the program, as implemented, has significantly mixed results. As a social and educational program, it maintains students' literacy and teaches life skills quite successfully. As an economic program, however, it has been markedly less successful. The results also illustrate that for the majority of students, completing the program did not directly correspond to economic advancement.

How the economic side of the program could be improved is beyond the scope of this study. The data gathered in this study, however, suggests areas in which the program can be improved, including teacher and tutor education, better managerial and administrative training, revisions of program evaluation policy, and closer stakeholder partnerships.

Glossary of Indonesian Terminology

Bindikmas: *Direktorat Pembinaan Pendidikan Masyarakat* (Directorate of Community Education Development.) A directorate of PAUDNI (q.v.), responsible for KF and post-literacy programs, including KUM (q.v.)

Binkursus: *Direktorat Pembinaan Kursus dan Pelatihan* (Directorate of Course and Training Development.) Since 2005, a directorate of PAUDNI (q.v.) responsible for specific course programs, such as accounting, computer science, English, and welding.

Binpaud: *Direktorat Pembinaan Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini* (Directorate of Early Childhood Education Development.) Since 2001, a directorate of PAUDNI (q.v.) responsible for kindergarten and similar programs.

BPS: *Badan Pusat Statistik* (Indonesia National Statistical Agency.) Indonesia's official research company, responsible for census, economic information, etc.

Ditjen PLS: *Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Luar Sekolah* (Directorate General of Out-of-School Education.) A previous name of Ditjen PNFI (q.v.)

Ditjen PNFI: *Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Non Formal dan Informal* (Directorate General of Non-Formal and Informal Education.) The previous name of PAUDNI (q.v.)

Ditjen PAUDNI, *see* PAUDNI.

Depdikbud: *Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan* (Department of Education and Culture). The former name of Kemdikbud (q.v.) from the Suharto era to Gus Dur, when it was renamed Depdiknas (q.v.)

Depdiknas: *Departemen Pendidikan Nasional* (Department of National Education); The former name of Kemdikbud (q.v.) from 2003 to 2010.

Dikmas (*Pendidikan Masyarakat*)

1. The previous name of Bindikmas (q.v.)
2. The current name for division at the provincial, district, and municipal level.

Kemdikbud: *Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan* (Ministry of Education and Culture.) The current name for Indonesia's cabinet-level education office.

KF: *Keaksaraan Fungsional* (Functional Literacy.) Indonesia's non-formal literacy program. In Indonesian, "Functional" connotes contextuality and practical application. While this program has had different names in the past, "KF" is the most recognized.

KUM: *Keaksaraan Usaha Mandiri* (Entrepreneurship Literacy.)

P&K: *Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan* (pronounced *Pedanka*): Shorthand for Depdikbud (q.v.); still in common use.

PAUDNI: *Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini, Non Formal dan Informal* (Directorate General of Early Childhood, Non-Formal and Informal Education.) Since Indonesia's authority on non-formal education; responsible for Binpaud, Binkursus, and Bindikmas (q.v.)

PKH Perempuan: *Pendidikan Kecakapan Hidup Perempuan* (Life Skills Education for Women.) The primary women's education program run by Bindikmas.

PKBM: Pusat Kegiatan Belajar Masyarakat, see CLC.

SKB: *Sanggar Kegiatan Belajar* (Municipality/District Technical Office for Early Childhood, Non-Formal and Informal Education)

SKK: *Standar Kompetensi Keaksaraan* (Literacy Competency Standard.) Bindikmas guidelines for educational programs, especially literacy and post-literacy programs.

SUKMA: *Surat Melek Aksara* (Certificate of literacy.) The diploma for KF alumni.

STSB: *Surat Tanda Selesai Belajar* (Certificate of Learning Process Completion.) The standard Bindikmas diploma for non-KF programs, including KUM.

UU 45: *Undang-Undang 1945*. The Republic of Indonesia's 1945 Constitution.

UURI: *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia* (The Republic of Indonesia Law)

Other Indonesian Terms Mentioned

air dingin: cold water

air panas: hot water

Aksara: alphabet or literacy

bahasa Indonesia: Indonesian

bupati: mayor in the municipality

bina usaha: a division in CLC to manage and invest its resources

calistung: literacy skills

kabupaten: municipality

Keaksaraan Cerita Rakyat: Folklore Literacy; one of the programs operated by Bindikmas.

keterampilan: skills

kecakapan hidup: life skills

kerupuk dendeng daun singkong: cassava-leaf crackers

kerupuk rebung: bamboo-shoot crackers

kodi: a count of 20 objects

kopi luwak: civet coffee

kota: district/city

lembaga keterampilan: skills institution

lembaga kursus: courses institutes/institution

lembaga pendidikan: educational institution

penilik: sub-district non-formal education employees

pesantren: Islamic boarding schools, nominally run by the Ministry of Religious Affairs.

ranginang: rice cracker

sanggar: traditional art education institution

sosialisasi: "socialization." The annual Bindikmas publicity campaign for programs at the beginning of the fiscal year.

Subdit Pembelajaran dan Peserta Didik: the Sub-directorate of Learning and Learners. Responsible for reviewing budget proposals for KF and postliteracy programs, including KUM.

surat keputusan KUM: KUM letters of certification

sapu ijuk: a traditional broom made of local fibers.

wajit: rice cookies

walikota: mayor in the district/city

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
Post-Literacy Project “KUM”	1
A Brief History of Education in Indonesia.....	6
Rationale of the Study.....	9
The Context of the Study.....	11
Problem Statement.....	13
Research Objectives.....	14
Research Questions.....	14
The Significance of the Study.....	15
Organization of Study.....	15
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	18
Definition of Life Skills.....	18
Definition of Post-Literacy.....	20
Literacy as a Form of Empowerment.....	22
Women and Literacy Education.....	27
Non-Formal Literacy and Post-Literacy in Indonesia.....	28
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	35
Research Design.....	35
Sampling and Study Population.....	37
Instrument.....	40
Interview.....	41
Observation.....	41
Document Review.....	42
Analysis of Report Data.....	43
Ethical Issues.....	45
Limitations of Study.....	45
RESULT AND DISCUSSION.....	47
KUM as Post-Literacy Program.....	48
KUM as Life Skills Program.....	50
Commonly Reported Difficulties.....	53
Income Generation.....	55
KUM’s Secondary Social Impact.....	59
RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS.....	64
KUM as Successful Financial Model.....	64
Reporting and Documentation.....	67
Possibilities for Municipal-Level KUM Supervision.....	69
Improve KUM Training.....	70
Empowerment and Contextuality.....	72
Integrate KUM with Related Ministries.....	75
Conclusions.....	76

REFERENCES.....	80
ANNEXES.....	85
Annex 1. Questions for the Head of the Sub-directorate.....	85
Annex 2. Questions for West Java Education Official.....	87
Annex 3. Questions for Municipal Education Officials.....	88
Annex 4. Questions for the Heads of CLCs.....	89
Annex 5. Questions for tutors.....	90
Annex 6. Questions for KUM students.....	91
Annex 7. Human Subject Review Approval.....	92
Annex 8. Consent Form.....	94
Annex 9. Proposal Abstract.....	96

INTRODUCTION

Post-Literacy Project “KUM”

Keaksaraan Fungsional is a “Functional Literacy” program in Indonesia, commonly referred to as KF. Kemdikbud (Indonesia’s Ministry of Education and Culture) ran KF to end adult illiteracy from 2000, targeting those who are unable to read, write and calculate in the Indonesian language. In 2009, KF was supplemented with a post-literacy program, KUM (*Keaksaraan Usaha Mandiri*, literally “Entrepreneurship Literacy.”) KUM was implemented to help primarily poor people with low literacy skills; especially those having graduated from the KF, to further develop their literacy skills. Above and beyond this, KUM was also intended to teach students’ skills to produce saleable goods and the business skills to sell them.

Any discussion of KUM must begin with an explanation of the structure of Indonesia's Ministry of Education and Culture (*Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan*, hereafter referred to by the official acronym Kemdikbud). Education programs in Indonesia are divided by Kemdikbud into four categories: primary education; middle education; higher education; and, last but most importantly for this paper, early childhood, non-formal and informal education. This last category, comprising early childhood, non-formal and informal education, is the responsibility of the Directorate-General of Childhood, Non-Formal and Informal Education (*Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini, Nonformal dan Informal*; hereafter referred to by its official acronym, PAUDNI). Formerly, PAUDNI was known as Ditjen PLS, and later Ditjen PNFI. PAUDNI is in turn divided into several directorates, including the Directorate of Early Childhood Education Development (Binpaud), the Directorate of Course and Training Development (*Binkursus*), the Directorate of Community Education Development (*Direktorat Pembinaan Pendidikan Masyarakat*, hereafter Bindikmas) is responsible for the administration of KUM.

KUM provides financial support to NGOs and other organizations, including community-learning centers (*pusat kegiatan belajar masyarakat*; hereafter referred to by the English equivalent, CLCs.) in the form of grant money. Nowadays there are thousands of CLCs in Indonesia, most of which are privately owned and operated. (All public CLCs are located in Jakarta, the capital city of Indonesia.)

Structurally, a CLC is required to have administrative personnel including a head, secretary and treasurer. CLCs also have facilitators, who teach programs such as the KUM. (It bears mentioning that facilitators in Indonesian literacy education are commonly known as “tutors.”) The target for the post literacy project is alumni who graduated or joined literacy education/KF, or economically disadvantaged students with weak literacy skills. The funding aims to facilitate the implementation of KUM by institutions that fulfill a set of administrative and content-related requirements; so the students who are joining the program can get access to continued education and life skills training.

KUM has operated since 2009, and institutions all over the country can access this funding by submitting their proposals. Two types of funding are available. The first part of the funding is centrally delivered by Bindikmas. In 2009, institutions were able to access KUM funding from three distinct institutions: Bindikmas, the eight regional offices, and provincial education offices. This process requires many steps: administrative screening based on required criteria mentioned in KUM guidelines, evaluations and scoring of proposal content, deciding who are planned to get the funding, verifying the institutions in the field and finally making an official letter informing the institutions that get funding. These later should complete their proposal with a recommendation letter from district/municipality educational office. Attaching a recommendation letter in the proposal protects the project from irresponsible stakeholders. It means that only institutions that get verification from district/municipality educational office can get access to the funding.

The second form of funding is Kemdikbud's distributed funding in the 33 provinces, widely known as deconcentration (*dekonsentrasi*) funding. The overall process is quite similar to receiving funds from Bindikmas, following standard Bindikmas guidelines, but applications and funding proposals are submitted to the provincial education office. Provincial offices, before publishing their official budget, commonly split deconcentration funding between districts and municipalities, based on perceived need; this means that West Java, for example, might not provide funds to institutions from districts that *claimed* to have no illiterate people in their areas, such as Bandung or Bogor districts, regardless of whether this was actually the case. (This is not a hypothetical situation. Because Kemdikbud rewards districts that report improvements in literacy, local leaders have been known to underreport local illiteracy rates.) The institutions that submit a proposal should attach a recommendation letter from the district/municipality educational office on their proposal.

Kemdikbud gives most of its money to Indonesia's 33 provinces, and a comparably small budget to Bindikmas. (Because of how provincial funding is distributed, these numbers can be deceptive; in any given year, Bindikmas may receive more money than some provinces.) In 2009, for instance, the provinces received 19,350,000,000 Rp (\$1.74 million) for 43,000 students.¹ According to Bindikmas official sources, KUM was allocated 30,150,000,000 rupiahs (\$2.7 million) that year for 67,000 students. Bindikmas was allocated 9.09 billion Rp (\$815,000) for 20,200 students, and PAUDNI's eight regional technical offices

¹ \$1 US = 11,155 Indonesian rupiahs.

received 1.71 billion Rp (\$153,000) for 3,800 students. In 2010, Bindikmas allocated 4.6 billion Rp (\$412,000) for 10,000 students, while the 33 provinces received 34.5 billion Rp (\$3 million) for 70,000. In 2011, Bindikmas allocated 2,999,200,000 rupiahs (\$269,000) for 6,520 students. Provinces received 82.47 billion Rp (\$7.4 million) for 179,280 students. Last year, Bindikmas allocated 6.9 billion Rp (\$619,000) for 15,000 students. Provinces received 131.1 billion Rp (\$11.75 million) for 285,000 students. From 2009 to the present, the nominal allocation for each student has remained a constant 460,000 rupiahs (\$41.24).

In theory, there is budget sharing between the central government, provinces and districts. However, many districts do not specifically fund post-literacy programs, and Bindikmas money is not able to provide for every program on its own. Before Bindikmas delivers funds to a provincial administration, they measure both the scope and priority of its projects: how many students is the program expected to cover? This means that every province will receive a different amount of money, based on how many illiterate students each area has, and the priority provinces (including several provinces in Java) receive most of the funding.

At the beginning of the fiscal year, Bindikmas has a nationwide campaigning season, introducing all of the year's programs to the public. This begins with Bindikmas holding a national meeting, attended by the 33 provincial education offices and some municipalities on an ad hoc basis. This meeting is held to announce the distribution of national budget money, and to distribute the program guidelines for all projects, including KUM. (Historically this was provided

in printed format, although since 2009 this has become increasingly digital.) Bindikmas posts the relevant information on all of its websites; in this way, every institution can make informed choices about which programs they will run. After this national meeting, provincial education offices hold similar meetings with their districts and municipalities, meant to distribute this information down the administrative hierarchy.

Grant proposals begin soon after these meetings are held; Bindikmas usually receives them first, as the provincial-level money is often delayed. KUM policy forbids beneficiaries from receiving KUM money from both Bindikmas and the province, although they may receive funding from similar programs run by the province independent of KUM. (An example of this will be discussed at greater length in Chapter 5.)

A Brief History of Education in Indonesia

The Republic of Indonesia has guaranteed education as a national right since its first constitution in 1945. Chapter XIII, Article 31 of the Constitution states:

- (1) Every citizen has the right to receive education.
- (2) Every citizen has the obligation to undertake basic education, and the government has the obligation to fund this.
- (3) The government shall manage and organize one system of national education, which shall increase the level of spiritual belief, devoutness and moral character in the context of developing the life of the nation and shall be regulated by law.
- (4) The state shall prioritize the budget for education to a minimum of 20% of the State Budget and of the Regional Budgets to fulfill the needs of implementation of national education.
- (5) The government shall advance science and technology with the highest respect for religious values and national unity for the advancement of civilization and prosperity of humankind.

“National education systems should be affordable to provide equal opportunity and quality of education, and relevant and efficient education management to face challenges on local, national and global dynamics” (Sudjana, Kuntoro, Faisal, Sumarno, Suryono, Ekosiswoyo, Kamil & Olim, 2008, p. 1-3; my translation.)

During the Suharto era (1966-1998), what was then the Department of Education and Culture (*Depdikbud*, also known by the unofficial shorthand *P&K*) began to distinguish between “in-school” and “out-of-school” educational programs. During the 1980s, the community learning centers were developed as part of out-of-school education, created by the Director-General of Out-of-School Education (*Ditjen PLS*.)

The collapse of Suharto’s regime, in the wake of the 1997 economic crisis and rioting in Jakarta, began the next period of Indonesia’s political history, marking the return to multi-party coalition government (Ricklefs, 2001). Since 2004, Indonesia’s general elections have been dominated by coalition governments formed by Susilo Bambang Yudoyono’s Democrat Party. This era has seen substantial changes for Kemdikbud (which received its current name in 2011, after only a few years as *Depdiknas*.)

In 2001, Ditjen PLS changed PAUD from a sub-directorate of Bindikmas (then confusingly called Dikmas) to a directorate in its own right; Binkursus (then Kursus) received the same treatment in 2005 (Bindikmas, 2009). More significantly, in 2006 the taxonomy of education was revised, distinguishing formal, informal and non-formal education as mutually distinct activities, each of

which is meant to supplement the others. (The actual distinction between non-formal and informal education is rather vague.) An official government definition of non-formal education is provided in the Republic of Indonesia Law of National Education System (UU no 20/2003), Article 26, sections 1-7 [my translation]:

(1) Non-formal education is organized for citizens who require educational services to replace, supplement, and/or complement formal education in order to support lifelong education.

(2) Non-formal education is a medium to develop the individual potential of students, with an emphasis on the acquisition of knowledge and functional skills as well as personality development and professional attitude.

(3) Non-formal education includes life skills education, early childhood and youth education, women's empowerment, literacy education, vocational education and job training, educational equality, as well as other education aimed at developing the abilities of learners.

(4) The non-formal education unit consists of non-formal education courses institutes [*lembaga kursus*], training institutes, study groups, activity centers, community learning centers, parochial and religious education, and similar educational units.

(5) Courses and training are organized for communities who require knowledge, skills, life skills, and character development and professional, occupational and entrepreneurial skills and/or to continue to higher education.

(6) The results of non-formal education can be rewarded equivalent to the results of a formal education program after an equivalency assessment process by agencies appointed by the Government or the Local Government and that are based on national standards of education.

(7) The provisions on non-formal education as referred to in the paragraphs 1-6 shall be further regulated by Government Regulation.

These reforms led to a variety of other educational entities (the *sanggar*, primarily focusing on traditional art education; “educational institutions” [*lembaga pendidikan*]; “course institutions” [*lembaga kursus*] and “vocational institutions” [*lembaga keterampilan*], with a single focus such as mathematics, English, or welding; and others) being folded into the purview of non-formal education. Despite this new competition for resources, at this point in time CLCs began to proliferate on a national scale.

Deconcentration [*dekonsentras*] began early in the 21st century. During the Suharto era, Indonesia's education system was extremely centralized; deconcentration is intended to be a change in direction, with more responsibility entrusted to the local levels of government. In practice, this means that every year the money Kemdikbud allots to provincial offices will increase. This trend can be seen both at the directorate level - in 2012 PAUDNI spent 64.6% for this budget (PAUDNI, 2012) - and at the program level, as in the case of KUM project. The majority of Kemdikbud's money (86%) goes toward formal education. In 2013, by comparison, PAUDNI was allocated 2.4 billion Rp (\$215.9 million), most of which will go to the provincial education offices (Kemdikbud, 2013.)

Rationale of the Study

Broadly speaking, literacy skills are a foundation of learning and supporting people's success. Working with the definition of human capital as "the present value of past investments in the skills of people" (Blaug, 1970, p. 19), it cannot be denied that literacy represents a significant form of human capital formation: a literate people is a people significantly better equipped to operate within their social environment, participate in the economy, and access information for further self-improvement.

Illiteracy, however, is a pervasive problem throughout the world, especially in the Global South (Abadzi, 2003, p. 9.) Of the indicators used to calculate the Human Development Index (HDI) ranking of a nation; illiteracy has been linked to poverty, underdevelopment, dependence and disability. Realizing this, international organizations - including UNESCO, UNICEF, UNDP, WHO, and the World Bank - are promoting the eradication of illiteracy around the world. Moreover, the World Declaration on Education for All (originally signed in in Jomtien, Thailand in 1990, and reemphasized in the Dakar Action Plan in Senegal 2000) committed to reach a target of 50% literacy for adults, particularly women, by 2015. This will have a multigenerational impact, as literate women are more likely to send their children to primary school and encourage them to make use of continuing education services (Levine, Lloyd, Greene, & Grown, 2008).

Literacy education is essential not only for children but also adult students, as a crucial form of human capital investment guaranteed by the Indonesian constitution.

The Government believes that literacy plays an essential role in improving the lives of individuals by enabling economic security and good health and enriches societies by building human capital, fostering cultural identity and tolerance, and promoting civic participation (Jalal, & Sardjunani 2006, p. 2.)

The Indonesian government's medium-term plan for 2009-2014 (primarily set by the Ministry of National Development Planning) emphasizes four programs: food security, public works and "social protection," including health and education program. The last of these four programs is the responsibility of the Ministry of Education and Culture. (It should be noted that some significant related areas fall

outside of Kemdikbud's administrative purview; in particular, Indonesia's religious school system, the *Pesantren*, is run by the Ministry of Religious Affairs, with Kemdikbud in a purely supportive role. This, however, falls significantly outside the scope of this paper.) Kemdikbud offers scholarships and operational financial aids. Literacy and post-literacy are the part of operational financial aids for the non-formal education sector.

Indonesia is home to around 300 different native groups, speaking no less than 669 different languages and dialects among them; Kalimantan and Papua in particular are noted for their many languages and dialects. Indonesia's major ethnic groups include the Javanese, Sundanese, Batakese, Padangnese, Malay and Madurese; of these, the Javanese comprise a plurality (45%) of Indonesia's total population, and around 70 million people speak Javanese as their native language (Kuipers 1993, p. 96-100, 354-356). Indonesia is also extremely religiously diverse; according to the 2000 census 86.1% of its population is Muslim, but it also has considerable populations of Protestant (5.7%) and Catholic (3%) Christians, Hindus (1.8%, primarily living in Bali), and other religions (3.4%) (CIA, 2013). Because of this diversity, fluency and literacy in the official language, Bahasa Indonesia, is a crucially important element in the formation of a universally shared national identity. Moreover, because Bahasa Indonesia is officially the language used in schools, Indonesian literacy is necessary for students to pursue their education further.

In 2012, UNESCO awarded Indonesia the King Sejong Literacy Prize, in recognition of the government's work in improving literacy education through

entrepreneurship, reading culture and tutor training (UNESCO, 2012). Although the effort from Indonesia's government has markedly reduced adult illiteracy, however, it remains a significant issue: in a UNDP report released the same year, Indonesia's Human Development Index was ranked 121st of 186 countries and categorized as a medium human development country. According to the 2010 national census information gathered by Statistics Indonesia (*Badan Pusat Statistik*, hereafter BPS), the number of illiterate people in Indonesia aged 15 and above is 13,927,843, of whom 9,180,639 are women.

The Context of the Study

Seven of Indonesia's 33 provinces are located on the island of Java, the smallest of Indonesia's major islands. Java is also the most heavily populated island in Indonesia, with 136.6 million people, representing 57.4% of the total population (BPS, 2010). Java is also the most densely populated area in the world, with a population density of 980 people/km². Jakarta, the center of government and Indonesia's capital city, is situated on this island. Java is also home to a majority of Indonesia's illiterate population: 60.4% of the illiterate population (8,423,568 people) lives in its seven provinces.

The study itself was conducted in the province of West Java. Since the separation of Banten province in 2008, administratively West Java has consisted of 17 municipalities (*Kabupaten*) and nine districts (*Kota*), with 625 sub-districts and 5,559 villages; according to BPS, the population of West Java was just over 43 million people in 2010.

West Java has beautiful scenery for traveler to visit. A major feature of the land is its mountains; West Java has more mountains and volcanoes than any other part of the Indonesian archipelago, producing a formidable landscape of spectacular mountains and valleys. More significantly for the sake of this study, however, the province of West Java is home to the third largest illiterate population in Indonesia: 1.46 million people, accounting for 10% of Indonesia's total and 17.3% of Java's. The three areas studied in this study - Bandung, West Bandung and Garut - are all located in West Java, whose illiterate population (a slight majority of which lives in rural areas) is divided and diverse enough to make the province ideal for study.

Of the three areas selected for this study, two of them - Bandung and West Bandung - are part of the Bandung metropolitan area; according to 2011 BPS statistics, they account for around five million (3.23 million in Bandung, 1.54 million in West Bandung) of the Bandung metropolitan area's total population of 7.4 million. The third, Garut municipality, lies approximately 75km of the first two, with a population of 2.44 million. Geographically Garut is the most diverse of the three districts, ranging from high-altitude mountains in the north to its southern coastline on the Indian Ocean.

The locations for this study were selected for several reasons. Foremost among them is their government involvement: these CLCs are specifically documented by the Kemdikbud as receiving national, as distinct from provincial, funding. After an extensive selection process (discussed at length in Chapter 3), my study focused observe three CLCs in three different municipalities. They are

PKBM Alkaromah in West Bandung, PKBM Bina Cipta Mandiri in Bandung, and PKBM Sadina in Garut. Although these three CLCs cannot be statistically representative of West Java, the diversity of their locations and situations makes it possible to generalize results from them to West Java as a whole.

Problem Statement

What factors are responsible for illiteracy in West Java's districts? Poverty, gender disparity, and a number of secondary factors related to dropping out of formal education have all been cited in the past, and programs have been created in light of them. This study aims to explore the impact of one such program, KUM, a program dedicated to "improving quality of literacy education through entrepreneurship literacy, that integrates life skills and basic literacy training" (UNESCO, 2012.)

Since the creation of the CLC during the Suharto era, Kemdikbud has always been confident about their place as the premier model of non-formal education. A great deal is being asked of CLCs, however, and accountability and oversight remain thorny and problematic issues. This study attempts to answer a fundamental question: to what extent, and in what ways, are local CLCs actually able to perform to the expectations of the national government?

Research Objectives

This study examines the application of a post-literacy program at three CLCs in Indonesia in 2012. The program itself integrates literacy and life skills; students

study both to obtain the expected purposes set by Kemdikbud. Therefore, the main objectives of this study are as follows:

1. To describe literacy learning in three CLCs in Bandung, West Bandung and Garut municipality.
2. To gather data on life skills learning in the areas mentioned above.
3. To report on the program's benefit to students, especially after program completion.
4. To explore the program's economic impact in students' community, and its implications for KUM's economic objectives.

Research Questions

The research objectives of the study are addressed by four key research questions as follows:

1. How are the students' performances in literacy skills after completing the post-literacy program?
2. What are the advantages of learning life skills and how are their performance in this life skills?
3. What impact does this program have on students' income generation?
4. How does this program impact the students' community?

The Significance of the Study

The study will be significant for educational stakeholders, especially those directly involved with post-literacy programs such as policy makers, CLC leadership, literacy tutors and educators. Although KF has been studied in the past, my study of KUM represents the first study of Indonesian post-literacy education by a Bindikmas employee. This study will encourage greater consciousness of how post-literacy programs are implemented in the field. Furthermore, my exploration and analysis will hopefully allow stakeholders

(especially policy makers and educators) to better analyze, develop and improve similar programs in the future.

Last but not least, this study hopes to inspire and encourage communities to greater participation in post-literacy programs, to promote and maintain public literacy as a means of empowering the community itself, and to constructively support government efforts to this end. Community empowerment means to expand and increase human resources for greater productivity and competitiveness. Indonesia should have a well-educated population to compete with other countries, both globally and regionally in Southeast Asia.

Organization of Study

I have organized this work in five parts. The first chapter provides basic and foundational information underlying the study, a case study of post-literacy education. This not only includes background explanation of post-literacy itself, but my reasoning for selecting the topic, geographic conditions in Indonesia, the focus of the study, and the phenomenon of illiteracy in Indonesia, and specifically West Java.

Chapter Two begins with a definition of life skills, literacy and post-literacy as the terms are used in Indonesia, and a discussion of the reviewed literature. It will provide some theories that underlie some point in this chapter, presenting views from both individual authors, such as Brolin and Freire, and ideas from institutions such as WHO and UNICEF. It continues with a discussion of the implementation of literacy and post-literacy education in Indonesia, where the

national Ministry of Education and Culture is not only pursuing universal literacy but also the maintenance and retention of previously-taught literacy. The data explored in this chapter illustrates the background of the program, especially the textbook guidelines used by the Ministry's Sub-directorate of Learning and Learners, BPS data, curriculum samples, competency standards, and students' certificates. This digest and compilation of data concludes with my field materials, foremost of which are the reports from the CLCs themselves.

Chapter Three is devoted to the methodology itself. It begins with a discussion of sampling and study population, the designing of the research methodology, and a discussion of the ethical issues related to the research. It continues by exploring in depth the data that was gathered in the field through interviews, observation and related documents.

Where Chapter Three describes the methodology, Chapter Four is dedicated to the results of the research. Fundamentally it is an exploration of the research findings, and a discussion of the program's actual societal impact in terms of maintaining literacy, promoting life skills, and ameliorating poverty for its participants. This chapter marks the encounter of theory with my experience and field research.

The study concludes with Chapter Five, my recommendations based on the data gathered in the field. Integrating the data that has been gathered and analyzed, this chapter finalizes the study and translates its conclusions into concrete proposals, which I hope will be useful for all participant stakeholders. It

also encourages further research of this program, both to support the prior study and the hitherto unexplored results of post-literacy itself.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter is devoted to exploring the literature and theory related to KUM.

This chapter is divided into four interrelated sections. This chapter provides some thoughts from theorist or international agency for backing up this KUM study. In this chapter, there are some parts that comprise definitions of life skills, literacy, post-literacy, empowerment, and the activities of Bindikmas in terms of these categories.

The first section discusses the definitions of life skills from Osa D. Coffey, John F. Knoll, and Donn E. Brolin, as well as international bodies such as UNICEF and the WTO. The second section explores definitions of literacy and post-literacy from Adama Ouane, H.S. Bhola, Alain Rogers and other theorists. Afterwards, the third section expands this review to discuss literacy as a form of empowerment, exploring connections between women's education and literacy education. The fourth and final section is an overview of Indonesia's non-formal literacy and post-literacy programs, situating KUM in context as part of Indonesia's broader effort for universal literacy.

Definition of Life Skills

Literacy is a crucial life skill, which enables individuals to participate more fully in the practice of their community (Abadzi 1995 *in* Durgunoglu *et al* 2003.)

According to its official regulations, KUM "is meant to strengthen literacy skills of those who graduated from basic literacy programs... by emphasizing skills [*keterampilan*] or entrepreneurships in order to have occupations and earn

money for improving their living standards” (Bindikmas 2012, p. 4.) An evaluation of KUM, therefore, must begin with an understanding of “life skills.”

Definitions of “life skills” vary, based not only on the interests and needs of the learners but on the needs of the writers defining it.² UNICEF, for instance, defines life skills as “a behavior change or behavior development approach designed to address a balance of three areas: knowledge, attitude and skills.” The World Health Organization, meanwhile, defines life skills as “the abilities for adaptive and positive behavior that enable individuals to deal effectively with the demands and challenges of everyday life.”

Writing in 1998, Osa Coffey and John Knoll observed that the US Department of Education defined “life skills” as “including ‘self-development, communication skills, job and financial skills development, education, interpersonal and family relationships development, and stress and anger management” (Coffey and Knoll 1998, p. 8.) They continue:

For the purposes of this guide, the concept of "life skills" is defined in terms of outcomes, i.e., it is the general purpose of life skills programming to help persons live more successfully and function better in their multiple roles as members of a family, community, and workforce. Obviously, all education programs and treatment programs contribute toward meeting such outcomes; nevertheless, we see life skills as complementing academic, vocational, and treatment programs rather than being composed of these (Coffey & Knoll 1998, p. 8)

Related to the scope of life skills, a life skills learning process should include several things: life skills program covers occupational, personal-social skills, as well as daily living skills (Brolin, 1978). Those skills are designed to guide, train and teach people to learn to be well equipped in facing their future, not only

² Official Indonesian sources use two distinct terms for discussing life skills: *kecakapan hidup*, which more closely corresponds to the above definitions, and *keterampilan*, whose definition can be much broader; these two terms are similar but not equivalent.

related to work but also interact with others as a human. Life skills education is adhering to the principle of learning to know, learning to do and learning to live together in their communities. There are some reasons why the implementation of life skills program for illiterate people can be implemented in Indonesia. The reasons are: first, the availability of human resources, secondly, motivation and awareness is high enough to change lives, thirdly, with big population especially in Java, the potential market to absorb the result of their work is quite extensive.

Definition of Post-Literacy

“Post-literacy,” writes Adama Ouane, “is a segment along the continuum of lifelong education which plays a pivotal role in whether the learner will be able to continue learning and attain independence, or will relapse into illiteracy.” He then proceeds to define post-literacy as “an integrating learning process to assist literates to *retain*, improve and *apply* their basic knowledge attitudes and skills for the satisfaction of their needs, and to permit them to *continue* education through a self-directed process for the improvement of their quality of life” (Ouane 1989, p.13.)

In his discussion of India’s post-literacy program, the National Literacy Mission, H. S. Bhola described its objectives as

[T]he consolidation of literacy learning to prevent relapse into illiteracy; remediation to enable non-achievers to upgrade their skills and to enroll dropouts from schools for yet another chance to learn; continuation to improve and expand literacy skills to the level of self-reliant learning; application to enable learners to use literacy skills in their day-to-day life in economic, social, and political settings: skill development to enable learners to acquire skills particularly for economic self-reliance and to overcome poverty; and institutionalization to promote collective action and facilitate take-off to continuing education (Bhola 2002, p. 286).

Within these broad parameters, however, definitions of post-literacy can be very diverse. The aforementioned National Literacy Mission, for example, struggled with problems caused by radically divergent understandings of what its program was meant to be. Some of these differences included whether post-literacy was meant to serve local or national goals; how centralized it was required to be; and whether it was meant to be preservative (maintaining literacy) or supplementary (expanding the curriculum.)

A third uncertainty concerns the nature of the future that post-literacy leads to — whether it is *social transformation* or a programme of *further directed learning*. On the one hand are those practitioners who see the goal of post-literacy as being a process of social transformation along Freirean lines. Some of these view it as *controlled* development through linking literacy groups to existing development programmes, especially the Integrated Rural Development Programme. Others see it as the process of forming new social action groups that will *determine their own developmental goals*. The development of critical literacies, which Freireans have argued for over many years, is on the agenda for many literacy practitioners in India in both government and NGO agencies. On the other hand are those practitioners who suggest that the future that post-literacy leads to is further planned learning, a formalised curriculum, often equivalent to formal schooling. The aim of all post-literacy programmes for them then is to prepare the participants for this further study stage (Rogers 2002, 155-6.)

Post-literacy is continuing education context that comprises all of the learning chances for adult, as they require outside of basic literacy education. It can be defined as educational adult program that purpose to retain and develop basic literacy, numeracy and problem-solving skills, to giving individuals sufficient general basic work skills that are enabling them to function effectively in their community. It is simply that post-literacy is next program for continuing basic literacy.

The dynamic of literacy meaning keeps moving, people will be called literate if they can take advantage from their literacy skills. They can use reading,

writing and numeracy skills to face their own surrounding and solve daily life problem. Those skills are really used to increase life standard, seek natural potency within their environment. Furthermore, they will also involve in developing community into betterment and give new understanding to their next generation. Any discussion of post-literacy is incomplete, however, without a discussion of literacy, not only in terms of definition but the philosophy behind it.

Literacy as a Form of Empowerment

Education is a learning process, directly and indirectly, between a person or group that intentionally or unintentionally adds knowledge to someone without it. Education is a process attached in every individual life with others (people) and it goes along with human being life and story. John Dewey emphasized the importance of education as people's necessity of life: "The continuity of any experience, through renewing of social group, is a literal fact. Education, in its broadest sense, is the means of this social continuity of life" (Dewey 1966, p. 2). Education is the conscious effort of people to develop their potential ability through learning process, and that effort might be known and recognized by community. He also mentioned that education is for human life formation. "All education forms character, mental, and moral, but formation consists in the selection and coordination of native activities so that they may utilize the subject matter of social environment. Moreover, the formation is not only a formation of native activities, but it takes place through them" (Dewey 1966, p. 72.)

People need education throughout their lives; a proper education is directly reflected in their daily lives, by helping people understand the context of

their problems and address them more effectively. “Literacy works as a cultural amplifier in very specific ways. Literacy amplifies people’s power to think, imagine and act on the different elements of their experience” (Bernardo 1998, p. 6.) Teaching literacy is meant to provide students with tools to understand their lives, as an empowering instrument that can be used by the learners to plan, direct and pursue their own further education and self-development. Literacy education, in short, is a form of empowerment.

“Empowerment,” states John Dew, “is not a thing. The people I have worked with in creating empowering organizations will state that empowerment is a state of being. In the state of being, people know the boundaries within which they are free to work, and the boundaries are appropriate to their experience and maturity” (Dew, 1997. p. 3). Dew’s definition of empowerment involves five features: people are involved in making decisions, able to set appropriate boundaries, track their own performance, have a sense of ownership of their work, and are proud of their accomplishments and their organization (Dew 1997, p. 3-4.)

In her study of non-formal education in Thailand and Indonesia, Suzanne Kindervatter defines empowerment as “People gaining an understanding of and control over social, economic, and/or political forces in order to improve their standing in society” (Kindervatter, 1979, p.62). Her work emphasizes the final result from community empowerment. It reflects that a person, as a member of a community, obtains the understanding and can afford to control and manage social, economic, and political resources to improve their position within the

community. Besides that, she also states that in non-formal education, the empowering process is marked by eight characteristics and patterns, described as follows:

[Non-formal education] begins with a *small group structure* for learners and an *agent as facilitator*, rather than an instructor or teacher. Over the course of the group's activities, the facilitator encourages *participant leadership*; gradually, a major *transfer of responsibility* from the facilitator to learners occurs. The transfer is also made possible by the program's *democratic and non-hierarchical processes and relationships*. Determining what and how they want to learn, group members develop some of the confidence and skills needed for collective action taking. They acquire additional capabilities by participating in activities that strive for integration of *reflection and action*, and from *methods, which promote self-reliance*. All the characteristics described above set the process of empowering into motion and sustain its momentum. Eventually, through collective action for meeting needs and solving problems, learners experience certain *improvements of social, economic, and/or political standing* (Kindervatter, 1979, p. 245-246.)

“The roots of empowerment spread far, and intertwine. They are linked by their grounding in ideals of freedom, self-emancipation, equity, democratic participation, self-control and responsibility for self and others” (Stein 1997, p. 62.) From the definition, it can be concluded that empowerment is the effort to enable marginalized people to have better skills related in their status and role in social system. Marginalized people here can be farmers, labor, students and other parts of community, as individuals or as a group, while social system can be organization, community, factory, religious places, and so on. The way can be done to carry empowering process is giving opportunity to them to participate in making decision and based on their authority. Post literacy is not fix solution, but it can be one of them. Community empowerment is the effort to prepare the community itself to be able to pursue independence, self-reliance, and wealth. Increasing their skills and self-confidence through literacy education can do this

thing. Everybody has potential source within him/ herself. Community then should be awareness about their potency.

Paulo Freire develops an attractive and deep philosophy of literacy in his book, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Freire takes a radical approach to learning, viewing it as a method that learners can use for change in their social and political environments. He assumes that educator is a facilitator of the learning process, while learning is an active process of change, in which the facilitator does not directly control the learning process. In Freire's philosophy, facilitators must bridge the gap between themselves and their students to create real dialogue, talking and speaking the same language as the learners, who are urged to actively participate in dialog and find what they are facing in order to set them free from the problem. Freire views facilitators and learners as subjects with similar roles: while the facilitator is teaching learners, the learners should be a learning medium for the facilitator. Therefore, both should plan learning activities and learn from each other, so that the curriculum is both relevant and accommodates the learners' actual needs.

Another of Paulo Freire's ideas, which is connected with literacy, is conscientization [*conscientização*]. "Here, no one teaches another, nor is anyone self-taught. People teach each other, mediated by the world, by the cognizable objects which in banking education are 'owned' by the teacher" (Freire, 1970, p. 80.) He says:

Humankind *emerge* from their *submersion* and acquires the ability to *intervene* in reality, as it is unveiled. *Intervention* in reality—historical awareness itself—thus represents a step from *emergence*, and results from the *conscientização* of the situation. *Conscientização* is the

deepening of the attitude of awareness characteristic of all emergence.
(Freire, 1970, p. 109)

This word connotes the power of adults, through learning, to develop the potential to think and act in the world and life. Conscientization is a process of understanding the current situations related to economic, political and social matters. Someone analyzes their own problems, observes the cause, sets their priorities and then acquires new knowledge to act. Conscientization cannot be imposed from outside; the implementation of learning that goes in vertical patterns has to be changed into the implementation of horizontal dialogue.

For Freire, literacy is significantly more than merely being able to read, write and calculate. Literacy entails the ability to analyze results and causes, and understand the values that lead to social and political action. Literacy is not just simple technical skills, but the development of mentality that can lead to social and political consequences; through literacy education, learners reflect on their experiences within social and cultural environment. Freire uses the technique of consciousness-raising by the use of pictures reflecting the actual problems of the students; another favored technique is unpacking vocabulary taken directly from the learners, serve as a starting point to utilize literacy and critical reflection.

Women and Literacy Education

Empowering women through literacy education is one of the most effective ways of nation investment. "There is a strong relationship," Stein observes, "between the benefit of education to women as described in the literature and the goals of empowerment" (Stein 1997, p. 190). Literacy education can provide skills that will

help them to be more empowered in meeting daily life problem. It is generally observed that while educating men provides educational services to an individual, educating women has an impact on all family members, especially her children:

The importance of education – particularly of the mother – has been well established and widely accepted for nearly a decade: better education for women is now a familiar health slogan. Yet understanding of the mechanism of influence remains no better today than ten years ago (Cleland and van Ginneken 1989 *in* Stein 1997.)

Of the 1,459,671 illiterate people in West Java as of the 2010 census, just short of a million (999,471) are women, 68% of the total illiterate population. This educational disparity between men and women influences a significant number of other disparities in Indonesia, not only in occupation, social status and role in community, but also social conventions regulating when they voice their ideas. It is also supported by textual religious values and traditional and cultural norm.

This is impacting women to be illiterate.

The degree of women's access to (and control over) *material* resources (including food, income, land and other forms of wealth) and to *social* resources (including knowledge, power, and prestige) within the family, in the community, and in society at large" (Dixon 1978 *in* Stein 1997.)

The ranking, in terms of prestige, power, or esteem, according to the position of women in comparison with, relative to, the ranking – also term of prestige, power, or esteem – given to the position of men.' (Buvinic 1976 *in* Stein 1997.)

Illiteracy leaves large numbers of women minimally access to interact with their social environments and pursue employment; they can only be able to have occupation as farmer, servant and other less educated jobs. This situation then causes poverty. Literacy as a part of education is an established right (even the 1945 Constitution of Indonesia does not mention of and difference in rights in

education), and literacy and post-literacy programs like KUM can have a role in promoting equality between women and men.

Non-Formal Literacy and Post-Literacy in Indonesia

In Indonesia, the popular assumption is that “literacy” is restricted to the ability to read and write. It should be noted that Kemdikbud defines illiteracy specifically as illiteracy in Bahasa Indonesia, distinct from “pure illiteracy” in any language: according to PAUDNI, a 2013 study of *pesantren* students in East Java found many “illiterate” students were functionally literate in Arabic (Kemdikbud, 2013).

The head of PKBM Baitul Ilmi, discussing the experiences of his CLC, mentioned that “If we began with activities of reading and writing, they [prospective students] would leave immediately” (*Aksara* magazine no.19, July-August 2009.) A PAUDNI official, speaking earlier that year, said similarly:

To attract people aged over 40 back to reading, writing and math, we have launched an entrepreneurship program [KUM]. This activity will create the need for writing, reading and calculating. Step by step, it will be given literacy content (*Aksara* no. 18, May-June 2009.)

KUM is neither the only non-formal literacy program nor the primary one. It is, rather, one of a number of programs run by Bindikmas.

Family Literacy Education: Kemdikbud’s basic non-formal literacy program, Family Literacy Education empowers families to train communicating ability through spoken text, letters and numbers in Bahasa Indonesia. This funding program provides operating cost of learning and advocacy geared toward social and economic empowerment in the family. The program’s primary beneficiaries are semi-literate or partially literate families with children ages 15

and above. Ideally family members or neighbors should do the teaching, but in practice CLCs are known to provide facilitators, who either visit the house or invite several household members to learn together (Bindikmas, 2011.)

Folklore Literacy [Keaksaraan Cerita Rakyat] aims not only to foster community literacy skills and empowerment, but also to preserve local history in transcribed oral history, written text and other media. As part of this program, students and CLCs (the program's target beneficiaries often overlap with KUM's) are encouraged to research, read and record local history, folklore about significant events (eclipses, earthquakes, floods, etc.), and life stories. The primary objective of this program is to offer graduates of literacy programs an environment in which they can retain, use and develop their skills, but Folklore Literacy also dovetails with Kemdikbud's work as a ministry of culture. Its ancillary goals are to promote the preservation of local folklore; to enrich Indonesia's literary heritage by revitalizing folklore as a dynamic and complex part of modern life; to use folklore to familiarize younger generations with Indonesian tradition; and to promote folklore as a national medium for creativity and entertainment (Bindikmas, 2013.)

Mother Newspaper is oriented toward women 18 and older, especially graduates of basic literacy programs; it especially focuses on those recovering from drug addiction or human trafficking, which are concerns in some parts of Indonesia. This project uses its newspaper to promote a culture of women's literacy, both reading and (by offering journalistic training) writing. The program itself focuses on operational financing; Mother Newspaper's writing and

production is done primarily by women. The objectives of this program are to provide women with materials they can use to strengthen their literacy; to offer a medium in which newly literate women can develop their literacy through written text; to promote a culture of literacy; and to improve life skills to strengthen women's independence (Bindikmas, 2013.)

Children Newspaper is structurally very similar to Mother newspaper, but its beneficiaries are children under 18, especially marginalized or vulnerable children. The objectives of this program are: first, to increase awareness of the danger of human trafficking, sexual exploitation, domestic violence, drug addiction or HIV/AIDS; secondly, to increase children ability of writing their experiences and stories on newspaper; thirdly; to promote reading culture (Bindikmas, 2013.)

Life Skills Education for Women [PKH Perempuan] is Kemdikbud's official women's empowerment program, directed primarily at poor or unemployed women ages 18-45, especially from social groups vulnerable to human trafficking, sexual and violent harassment, and discrimination. This program's aims to improve their quality of life by subsidizing life skills [*kecakapan hidup*] training, character education, and maternal and prenatal health education. The objectives of this program are: first, to improve women's life skills in implementing character education in the family; to improve understanding of risk prevention education about prenatal and maternal health, drug and HIV/AIDS awareness; thirdly, to improve the vocational skills of women so that they can pursue employment and promote their standard of living (Bindikmas, 2013.)

Most recently, 2013 has seen the introduction of “*Entrepreneurial Literacy*” [*Rintisan Aksara Kewirausahaan*; too new to have an acronym], resembling a follow-up program to KUM. The beneficiaries of the program are people aged 15-59, who have been certified as already attending basic literacy programs (as evidenced with a program diploma [*SUKMA*]) and/or KUM (with a STSB.) Unusually for Kemdikbud, program guidelines dictate that classes should involve no less than 20 people, 25% of whom already have small businesses of their own. The objective of this program are: first, to form or develop business incubator and institution capacity as the incubator of business development center based on their own potential; secondly, to create opportunity to have financial support for the institution itself from the profit of that business; thirdly; to promote students’ entrepreneurial literacy skill by increasing knowledge, attitude, skills, and entrepreneurship courage individually or in group (Bindikmas, 2013.)

KUM (Keaksaraan Usaha Mandiri) enhance learning activities for adult people, who already attended, or graduated KF or achieved basic literacy competencies, through learning entrepreneurship skills that can improve the productivity individually or in a group that is expected to have occupation and income generation in order to improve their living standard.

KUM’s three objectives as follows:

1. Students should be able to maintain and improve their literacy skills, and avoid losing them;
2. Students should be able to learn life skills and promote their new skills as a foundation for generating income or improving their standards of living;
3. Providing alternative education services that can empower people and their environments.

While its indicator is every educational institution that got funding should achieve:

1. Minimally 80% of students are able to increase their literacy competency which covers listening, talking, reading, writing calculating in Indonesia, life skills for entrepreneurships based on SKK (Literacy Competency Standard).
2. Minimally 80% of students pass the evolution and get the certificate.

Minimally 60% of students are able to foster their life skills [*kecakapan hidup*] by having practical skills [*keterampilan*] that support them to generate their income.

This program should be implemented based on competency standard of KUM.

The learning process should reach 66 learning hours (each of which has a duration of 60 minutes). The process itself contains literacy integrated with life skills.

KUM's official Standards of Competency (*SKK*) is seven-points list. Students are expected:

1. To identify business opportunities to be developed based on local resources and market;
2. To write and communicate for business startups;
3. Mastery of production skills for the chosen business;
4. To sell products;
5. To measure and analyze business profit and losses;
6. To establish a network in order to develop business; and
7. To preserve and enhance literacy skills and communication in Bahasa Indonesia in a business environment.

Additionally, KUM has a twelve-point list of what are described as "Standard Competencies and Basic Competencies," (Bindikmas, 2012) as described in the following table:

No.	Standard competencies	Basic competencies
1	Describing or illustrating desires and goals for business based on interests and capabilities.	1. Exploring businesses based on skills [<i>keterampilan</i>] and interests. 2. Choosing a business.
2.	To practice one potential business skill [<i>keterampilan</i>] based on interests and capabilities.	1. Identifying materials and procedures of production. 2. Demonstrating skills [<i>keterampilan</i>] supporting the business.
3.	To identify natural and human resources within the student's environment, based on their chosen business.	1. Identifying natural resources within the student's environment. 2. Identifying potential human resources within the student's environment.
4.	To identify needs and demands for services and goods based on their chosen business.	1. Analyzing market conditions; 2. Identifying unfulfilled needs and services. 3. Understanding supply and demand.
5	To arrange and manage a startup business.	To arrange a business startup.
6.	To plan and manage business expenses.	1. Identifying types of business expenditures. 2. Identifying capital resources. 3. Identifying income, profit and loss. 4. Elementary accounting.
7.	To identify possible risk factors influencing profit and loss	1. Identifying business risks and their impact on the business. 2. Anticipating business risks.
8.	To interact with customers.	1. Marketing. 2. Presentation for business.
9.	To understand a sales strategy.	1. Setting product prices. 2. Effective product promotion. 3. Product packaging and display.
10.	To analyze competition.	1. Recognizing similar marketed products. 2. Recognizing competitors.
11.	To network for business.	1. Networking with related stakeholders
12.	To maintain the business.	1. Identifying capital and revenue. 2. Maintaining customer confidence. 3. Understanding government rules and regulations for business. 4. Producing innovative products.

Beside those literacy programs, Kemdikbud also have some program related to community libraries that have objective to increase reading culture, as well as a place for new literate people to find and read books, newspaper and other written texts.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

Are CLCs able to achieve the objectives described in KUM guidelines? This is a simple question, but remarkably difficult to answer. By law, all CLCs are required to submit two annual reports (one to Bindikmas, the other to the provincial education office) for each program that funds them. In practice, however, this reporting is less than useful, and Bindikmas has significant problems digesting and analyzing KUM's raw data. The sheer volume of reporting (hundreds of CLCs exist in West Java alone, and KUM is only one program of many) requires warehouses for storage, which makes much of the documentation extremely difficult to access, and attempts to shift reporting to digital format have been resisted by Kemdikbud's Inspectorate-General. A comprehensive study would literally be too massive for the manpower available to Bindikmas. The quality of reporting varies considerably, and is oriented toward financial accountability rather than educational performance. Questions about the performance of CLCs may be easy to answer, but they are nearly impossible to prove.

When I left Indonesia to study abroad, I was part of the Sub-directorate of Learning and Learners (*Subdit Pembelajaran & Peserta Didik*), responsible for literacy and post-literacy programs. The required annual reports from KF and KUM (albeit briefly; KUM was only a year old in 2010) passed through my office, and reviewing them was a significant part of my duties. My initial plan was to select CLCs for their diversity based on their reporting, to optimally reflect the experiences of KUM's beneficiaries in the field. (One intended aspect of this was

a certain number of interviews with male students, which will be discussed in subsequent chapters.) I also hoped to observe an ongoing KUM program in 2013, but this this proved impossible; KUM was still reviewing proposals for its 2013 program, and by the time classes were forecast to begin, attending one would cause significant scheduling problems.

In my absence, however, the office was restructured, and I was assigned to a different sub-directorate of Bindikmas without this access to reports, which forced a change of plans. Without prior access to CLC reports, a quantitative component to this study (part of my initial hope) would be significantly delayed. Technical support for a quantitative study was not forthcoming, and time and distance would be significant obstacles; finding CLCs that could be studied for specific quantitative variables would take much more time than was available.

Given the scope of the problem and the resources available, a qualitative study would be both more feasible and more likely to generate useful data.

Sharan B. Merriam defines qualitative research by these characteristics:

1. Qualitative researchers are concerned primarily with **process**, rather than outcomes or products.
2. Qualitative researchers are interested in **meaning**-how people make sense of their lives, experiences, and their structures of the world.
3. The qualitative researcher is the **primary instrument** for data collection and analysis. Data are mediated through this human instrument, rather than through inventories, questionnaires, or machines.
4. Qualitative research involves **fieldwork**. The researcher physically goes to the people, setting, site, or institution to observe or record behavior in its natural setting.
5. Qualitative research is **descriptive** in that the researcher is interested in process, meaning, and understanding gained through words or pictures.
6. The process of qualitative research is **inductive** in that the researcher builds abstractions, concepts, hypotheses, and theories from details. (Merriam, 1988, pp.19-20)

Because this study was qualitative, it began with no specific causal explanation. The research plan was to gather data, “identifying *unanticipated* phenomena and influences,” and only then proposing a causal explanation (Maxwell, 1996, pp. 17-20.) Drawing data from interviews and documents, an overarching theory would be formed to accurately explain its parts, which could offer a true insight into the KUM program.

Sampling and Study Population

The plan for this research was to go to various stakeholders at all levels of KUM, using interviewing as a means to capture their experiences. Because this study was intended as an inductive study, interviewed stakeholders were asked questions tailored to them, to better engage them.

Initially, finding CLCs interested in participating in the research proved to be challenging. While West Java has hundreds of CLCs, not all of them receive KUM funds; my initial plan to study Subang municipality, one of the least literate in West Java, had to be abandoned after finding that it had no CLCs participating in KUM. Beyond these limitations, CLC leaders were extremely reluctant to interact with a perceived outsider. In some cases, they never responded at all. After receiving letters of introduction, CLC heads became more willing to answer the phone, but although they never explicitly denied an interview, many of them (after positive initial responses) withdrew, citing convenient difficulties. CLCs also do not necessarily make their contact information available to the public, and while Bindikmas records CLC addresses, many CLC offices were purely

administrative; classes are often held in separate locations. In some cases I was unable to find the classroom spaces; in others, the classes were either inaccessible (private houses) or extremely remote (mountain villages.) Despite these difficulties, however, several CLCs had already been identified as strong candidates for further research; this list eventually narrowed itself down to three.

The interviewing, therefore, began at the top of KUM's administration, with a Bindikmas official. While at the Bindikmas office, I communicated with staff responsible for the non-financial aspects of CLC administration, who provided official letters of certification for CLCs that received KUM funding in 2012, budget reports, and other information about KUM and related literacy and post-literacy programs. (They later provided a number of other pertinent documents, some of which have never been available to the public before. The resources provided by these secondary respondents were crucially important for this study, and are discussed in greater detail below.) After the initial interview, Bindikmas supplied introduction letters and official lists of contact information, which allowed me to expand my search.

The Bindikmas interview suggested another source of secondary material: the annual reports written by the CLCs themselves. Because the 2012 reports had already been archived and warehoused, I was unable to retrieve them myself, but the CLCs were willing to provide copies of these upon request.

As KUM money is distributed at the provincial and district levels, the next stage of the interviewing process took place in the West Java provincial education office, with a Dikmas official. This was primarily an exploration of

funding matters. This was followed by interviews at municipal education offices in Bandung, West Bandung and Garut. Although the CLCs participating in this study had already been identified, this level of interviewing saw education officers recommend several CLCs that they felt were notable. (These recommendations, however, had no impact on the study. PKBM Sadina was one of the CLCs suggested, but I had already arranged the visit for unrelated reasons.) Although I did not discuss my research plans in detail, the education officers deduced it; after this round of interviews, two of them wanted to provide me with official accompaniment for the interviewing. (For a number of reasons, not least to avoid skewing the interviewees' responses, I politely declined.)

With the educational bureaucracy accounted for, the next and most important stage of the interviewing was conducted at, and with, the CLCs themselves.

The first CLC that I visited was PKBM Cipta Mandiri. This CLC is located in the mountainous southern part of Bandung district; some of the students are tea plantation farmers, and Cipta Mandiri holds KUM classes 3-6 km away from the CLC office. At PKBM Cipta Mandiri, I interviewed the head of the CLC, three tutors and five students. (Because I am familiar with the area, I also hoped to interview students in their own homes. This, however, proved unfeasible.)

The second CLC visited was PKBM Alkaromah, in the southwestern part of Bandung city. Classes are held in a valley far from Alkaromah's office; on both visits, I found the travel to be dangerous, as it is inaccessible by car. During these two visits, I interviewed the head of the CLC, three tutors and three

students. (To better reflect PKBM Alkaromah, I hoped to interview more students, specifically male students; the dangers of traveling made this impossible.)

The third and last CLC visited was in Garut: PKBM Sadina, where I interviewed the head of the CLC, two tutors and five students. Uniquely among the CLCs mentioned, I was actually able to interview some of its students in their homes during my stay, which provided some significant and relevant data.

In total, the research involved interviews with 29 people, organized like so:

Name	People interviewed	Notes
Educational Officials	5	1 Bindikmas officer 1 West Java educational officer 3 municipality officers, from Garut, Bandung and West Bandung
Heads of CLCs	3	PKBM Cipta Mandiri, PKBM Alkaroma, and PKBM Sadina
Tutors	8	3 tutors from Cipta Mandiri, 3 from Alkaromah and 2 from Sadina
Students	13	5 from Cipta Mandiri, 3 from Alkaromah, and 5 from Sadina

Instruments

In interviewing it is imperative to keep a record so the report you write will be based on accurate renditions of what was said (Rubin and Rubin, 1995, p. 125.)

This study used three data collection instruments to take data from students, head of CLCs, tutors, and educational officers. They are interviews, observation and document review. All interviews were recorded on tape recordings to capture their responses. The tape recording will help me to remember the response look like.

Interviews

In total, I interviewed 29 primary respondents, falling into three basic categories: students, CLC personnel, and government officials affiliated with KUM at the national, provincial, and district levels. Interview questions were thematically organized around these categories.

At the administrative level, the questions for policy makers were fairly similar, revolving around matters of program financing and sustainability (See annex 1). Of the various interviews, the provincial and district officials had the most overlapping questions, both because their areas of expertise and because they are administratively close enough that differences in opinion would be significant (See annex 2 and 3).

CLC personnel, for their part, came in three distinct varieties: CLC administrators, literacy tutors, and their students. Each called for a separate set of questions. CLC heads were asked questions more focused on administrative concerns, specifically KUM management and the attainability of the goals according to its guidelines (See annex 4). Tutors, by contrast, focused much more on the teaching process: their experience with the program and learning process, their students' performance and the educational outcomes (See annex 5). Last and most importantly, student interviews focused on their experience of participation with KUM (See annex 6).

Observation

Observation entails the systematic description of events, behaviors, and artifact in the social setting chosen (Marshall and Gretchen, 1989, p. 79.)

To explore any possible differences between what participants reported in interviews, I closely observed both the dynamics of the conversation and the environment in which it took place. On a number of occasions this led to further spontaneous questions. This was best illustrated in an exchange with the head of PKBM Alkaromah, which will be discussed in Chapter 4.

Office visits were an important aspect of observation. Part of this is a function of training as a Kemdikbud supervisor; office visitations are at least an annual part of work with both PAUDNI and Bindikmas. I noted the signboards outside their office, as well as what was on display inside their offices - lists of programs that they run, attendance charts, educational awards, bookshelves, official certifications, and photographs with various note worthies. Where it was possible and permitted, I also took pictures of the above. I also closely observed the guest books, which provided useful portraits of recent activity at the CLC.

I also paid attention to the context in which students spoke, especially on financial matters. This is especially important for KUM, whose financial impact (as is seen in Chapter 4) is extremely difficult to measure quantitatively. While I was interviewing some students in their house in PKBM Sadina, I had a chance to watch them making brooms, providing an important qualitative component.

Document Reviews

The first and most important document was from the Sub-directorate of Learning and Learners at Bindikmas: an unpublished spreadsheet related to “KUM Letters of Certification” [*Surat Keputusan KUM*], the official Bindikmas list of CLCs and educational institutions that received KUM funding in 2012. (This document is

unavailable to the public, being confidential and intended for administrative and legal use only.) Because CLCs do not as a rule operate post-literacy programs without government support, especially Kemdikbud, this document proved to be all-important during project planning. It shortened the list of CLCs significantly; in particular, it revealed that no CLCs in Subang municipality had received KUM funding, leading me to explore Garut municipality instead.

The second class of documents was provided by the CLCs themselves. When I went to Alkaromah, Cipta Mandiri and Sadina, I asked the head of each CLC to provide copies of the 2012 reports sent to both Bindikmas and the provincial education office. These reports proved invaluable for contextualizing data gathered through interviewing and observation. More than that, the reports offer insight into the mind of an institution. Each illustrate how each CLC defines and understands official terminology, and more broadly its mission and activity.

Analysis of Report Data

KUM provides an outline for official reporting. This outline has two sections - focusing on financial and “substantial” (educational) matters - with examples provided as a template to follow. The example provided for a table of contents includes sections for a mission statement, the target program, facility and teaching method, a discussion of their results, their stakeholders, and plans for follow-up activities, as well as an appendix. Reports generally follow this outline, although often depart from it (Bindikmas, 2012).

PKBM Cipta Mandiri, for instance, just illustrates the learning process in general, not in detail. It also includes tutor and student attendance lists, literacy

learning and activity schedules, and list of students' scores at the end of the program, STSB certificates and a number of photographs. It does not discuss financial data, plans for activities after the program, evaluation standards, class activities, or scores in STSB that represent the evaluation of literacy and life skills learning process. "After the program ends," the report states, "the CLC personnel will accompany students so they can maintain their literacy and continue with skills [*keterampilan*]," but what this means is not explained (PKBM Cipta Mandiri, 2012, p. 20.)

PKBM Alkaromah's report was the shortest of the three; its report does not illustrate the learning process. It also does not include any discussion of follow-up activity, example of in-class activities, description of its teaching method, evaluation standards, or STSB scores. It just consists of tutor and student attendance list, tutor and students list, learning schedule, life skills learning attendance list, students' activity and production pictures and STSB certificate. The report provides examples of life skills taught, such as like wood- and found-item crafts, bamboo weaving, sewing and cookery. The appendix, however, includes examples of ten students' handwriting, which provide examples of both their functional literacy and their concerns with the program (PKBM Alkaromah, 2012).

PKBM Sadina's report, the best and longest of the three reports, is vague about its class organization and gender breakdown. The report includes a description of the CLC's learning process (not quite detailed), two months of follow-up activities after the program ends, samples of classroom materials, a

complete course schedule, and STSB certificates with scores. The appendix includes example evaluations, although without an explanation for how they were graded, and a ledger in the appendix includes a line for “continuing financial capital” after the program (although what this means is unclear.) The same ledger, incidentally, allocates money to clothing and transportation, which is not done by the other CLCs (PKBM Sadina, 2012).

Ethical Issues

I endeavored to conduct my research in accordance with common academic practice. My foremost concern as a researcher was “to respect the rights, needs, values, and desire of the informant(s)” (Creswell 1994, p. 165). Before the start of the interviewing process, I had a standard consent form, which all participants signed before their formal interviews. Before the interviews, I described my intentions and the purpose of my study, and promised not to identify them in my paper work except with their permission. (Although I do not mention their names, the three CLC heads all gave me permission to use their names in this paper.)

Limitations of Study

There are some limitations in this study as follows.

This research took place while 2013 funding was being negotiated, so classes were not in session. If time had permitted, the study could have been conducted while classes were in session, which would provide broader information.

In the field, it was challenging to keep my two professional roles (as a Bindikmas employee and a researcher) distinct. This position may influence the process of the study.

Most importantly, however, the study is limited by the vagueness of official standards. Often they seem to be suggestions instead of rules; definitions of official terminology can vary a great deal, which complicates specific and concrete analyses. This vagueness was a factor in choosing a qualitative approach, and will continue to be a problem until it is addressed in the future.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

“The term adult education,” according to UNESCO,

denotes the entire body of organized educational processes... whereby persons regarded as adult by the society to which they belong develop their abilities, enrich their knowledge, improve their technical or professional qualifications, or turn them in a new direction and bring out changes in their attitudes or behavior in the two-fold perspective of full personal development and participation in balanced and independent social, economic, and cultural development (UNESCO, 1997.)

This chapter is devoted to exploring the way in which KUM, by this definition, performs as a program.

The process of interviews with students, tutors, heads of CLCs and education officers resulted in more than 20 hours of recording. To this was added the documents made available for review, including several hundred pages of CLC reports and BPS information. In this chapter, this body of data is integrated and organized to present in a form that can address the four research questions of this study.

The first part talks about the study participants' opinions on KUM as a their program for the purpose of research. The second part discusses KUM as a life skills program. It also provides field observations related to KUM's performance, such as my interviews of PKBM Sadina students in their own houses, and outlines critiques of the KUM program. The third part explores KUM's actual benefits for its beneficiaries, especially in using their education to generate income and help their family economies. The fourth part expands on this to discuss KUM's social and economic impact on the students' communities.

KUM as Post-literacy Program

We see then, that the PL [post-literacy] stage becomes crucial to the neo-literate because it is only this that introduces him to certain dimensions which are vital for independent learning. The PL stage.... allows the neo-literate to become aware of the need to continue to develop his talents and thereby make contribution to his family, his community and to society as a whole (Ouane, 1989, p. 17-18).

While an activity is ongoing, researchers are able to observe it directly. For the sake of gathering data, they can perform field visits at any point in the program, or even directly participate. Studying a completed program, however, is totally different. The most effective research techniques in this case are indirect and inferential, and I made extensive use of document analysis, drawing on my experience as a literacy technical officer.

Two of the three CLCs provided evaluation and test scores in their reports, which proved to be relevant. PKBM Cipta Mandiri scored students based on their listening, speaking, reading, writing and calculating. PKBM Sadina, meanwhile, provided a single combined score for “literacy skills” [*calistung*] without any such distinction, although the supplementary information (discussed below) went into much greater detail.

PKBM Alkaromah did not include any classroom scores, only copies of students’ STSB certificates. Alkaromah’s KUM report, however, provided a much more concrete demonstration of participant literacy: writing samples by the students themselves. KUM reports are required to document “substantial” information (non-financial matters pertaining to the program’s operation), which may include syllabi, class materials, or almost anything else (KUM’s regulations being vague on the matter.) Unique among the three CLCs, PKBM Alkaromah’s

documents included photocopies of their final class assignment. Because the assignment was handwritten, these ten photocopies offer insight into the actual literacy skills of the students, and show a wide range of written literacy, which varies from basic capitals to a cursive that is no longer taught in formal education. While students have a visible range of ability, this could be expected given the diverse educational backgrounds of an adult post-literacy program's students.

Based on both this visual observation and the reports of the interviewees, KUM can be judged effective as a post-literacy program. When I interviewed the head of PKBM Sadina and asked about his personal thoughts of what KUM is, he said:

KUM as a program is a government effort for increasing literacy skills of people through illiteracy elimination activities integrated with business startup. It is expected that joining this program will improve not only the literacy skills of students, but also their economic ability.

This statement was echoed by the head of PKBM Alkaromah:

KUM is an educational program especially in literacy field for community, people are required to be able to read, write and calculate in Indonesian. Those who are dropouts from primary school can be literate after completing this program.

Many of the interviewed students graduated from KF in 2011; some of them had also completed primary school in the past. (These two groups are not exclusive.)

Alkaromah student said this:

I was a dropout from primary school in fourth grade because my parents asked me to get married. In KUM class, my friends and I learned how to distinguish and read phrases like *air panas* (hot water) and *air dingin* (cold water), then we wrote them in our books, and one by one we went to the front and wrote on the blackboard... Now I can read!

Comprehensively measuring the literacy skills of KUM alumni is not easy. While the CLCs recorded the students' scores at the end of the program, none of them reported or documented any initial evaluations, making it exceedingly hard to measure the students' improvement. Because no KUM program was ongoing during the study, students could not be directly observed. The extent to which KUM helps students develop their literacy skills cannot be measured with the data available.

I can, however, speak more conclusively about KUM's performance as a literacy *retention* program. All three CLCs received funds for KF in 2011; as a general rule, truly illiterate students would have been directed into KF first. A significant number of the interviewees did in fact graduate from KF at that time, and explicitly said so; others reported completing primary school. Given KF's extended program length (114 class-hours, compared to KUM's 66), KF alumni would have had no more than six months to lose their proficiency, which allows us to roughly gauge the functional literacy of KUM classes. KUM serves as a follow-up study of KF's performance, and to the extent measurable by this study - or the students themselves - it does so very well.

KUM as Life Skills Program

Good general education forms the foundation for increased rural productivity, both on and off the farm. But farmers, the self-employed, and individuals who occupy more specialized jobs in the rural economy all need additional skills (Middleton, Ziderman & Adams, 1993, p. 220).

As mentioned before, I could not attend an ongoing KUM class, so I am trying to find information related to this matter. At least there are three sources to prove

that KUM can promote life skills for students. First source is from the observation. When I initially carried out field visit in Cilawu Garut, I interviewed the head of PKBM Sadina, two tutors and two students. I felt that I still needed other interviewees to get more information, however, and asked the head of the CLC if he could arrange interviews with more students. He was happy to do so, and although it involved leaving PKBM Sadina's office to reach students, I was glad that I could finally visit students' houses.

When we arrived there, I watched that some of them were making brooms. Although the program was over, they are still using the skills that they learned from their class. During the interview, the KUM alumna reported:

I am quite familiar with how people make *sapu ijuk* [brooms], but I could not know how to embroider broom fibers. My tutor demonstrated how to do it and I practice it. I can make average thirty brooms a day.

The second source is from KUM reports. All CLCs are required to include pictures of their students practicing life skills. Additionally, they are required to provide photocopies of their student certificates (*STSBs*.) *STSBs* follow a basic template adapted from those used in KF, which includes the student's final literacy class scores. The only CLC that did not follow this template was PKBM Sadina: besides literacy skills score, Sadina provided a life skills score, divided into three categories covering entrepreneurs practice and team building. Sadina's report also provided three examples of evaluation papers that students had to answer at the final evaluation; these test papers cover literacy, entrepreneurs and practicum.

Interviews were another important source. A great deal of information came from educational officials such as the Bindikmas official, who said:

KUM is a good program in the field, and educational institution and related stakeholders [local government in province and district] are always waiting for this program. KUM is good because of a direct program for the newly literate to continue their learning. They also learn about business startups, such as business types, revenue and loss, understanding markets, etc.

Later, the district officer in Garut said similarly:

KUM program can help people in terms of learning life skills. There are some CLCs in Garut that already run basic literacy and then continued to KUM. For instance, one PKBM in Cilawu [PKBM Sadina] runs these two literacy programs. Their students are able to use their skills to produce something worth selling.

From CLC personnel, I asked the head of PKBM Sadina about life skills learning.

His response was this:

KUM contains not only literacy skills, but also the development of business startup and skills. In the beginning of KUM, we identified potential based on local resources, including material availability and local markets. From this identification, we decided on three forms of skills, namely traditional brooms [*sapu ijuk*], bamboo-shoot crackers [*kerupuk rebung bambu*] and cassava leaf crackers [*kerupuk dendeng daun singkong*].

The head of PKBM Cipta Mandiri said something different:

In this program we are trying to help people by improving their literacy and providing life skills. In life skills class they can practice how to make potato crackers, and also to count revenue and loss. Previously, they did not know how to cook it and it is quite useful...

A tutor from PKBM Sadina says:

There's plenty of pine debris here because this village is close to the forest, so the skill that I taught was how utilize that material for pine souvenirs. I taught students how to make wooden crafts, such as key chains and other souvenirs...

Students themselves also support these responses. One of the students at

PKBM Cipta Mandiri reported this in her interview:

Our group learned to make cakes, potato crackers and cheese sticks. We learned to measure how much money we should prepare for buying any cooking materials... and also figure out how much we can get if we can sell it.

A student at PKBM Sadina said this in her interview:

I only finished fifth grade in primary school. I learned in KF in 2011 and KUM in 2012. I learned a,b,c,d, consonants and much more. I also learned how to make brooms and cook crackers.

KUM's life skills curriculum is original; the life skills component of the KUM program is not meant as a refresher program, but is new information. I found that reports vary widely in terms of delivering any score from students' performance. Neither Cipta Mandiri nor Alkaromah evaluated students' performance in this regard at all; only Sadina provided scores for it, under the heading of "practice."

Because CLC tutors do most of the work designing the curriculum, they have the most responsibility for KUM's performance as a life-skills program. KUM has two distinct missions, and how the tutors balance and divide their attention between literacy and life skills is a significant factor in KUM's effectiveness as a life-skills program. (Both PKBM Cipta Mandiri and PKBM Alkaromah placed their primary focus on literacy; in contrast, Sadina balanced the two.)

Based on the student interviews, I can conclude that KUM is able to promote life skills for students. How well it does so can vary widely, depending on both the content of the curriculum and the time spent in practice. In this regard, the cost of materials and resources are a considerable limiting factor.

Commonly Reported Difficulties

As an educational program, KUM also had certain perennial problems that affected its performance. The first is a lack of tutor training. None of the three CLC reports indicate that any preparation for tutors took place, and from the activities listed, it was clear that none of them offered tutor training while their

KUM programs were underway either. This was also supported by some tutors, who mentioned it during interviews, such as this one from Alkaromah:

I worked as a village official... I taught KUM students how to make wooden crafts, like keychains from pine or pinecone souvenirs based on my own experience. I just could teach them a simple and traditional motif of souvenir. I never got any training.

A tutor in PKBM Cipta Mandiri reported a similar experience: "Literacy education was my undergraduate research study and I graduated from the university. I received KF tutor training, but I did not have KUM tutor training."

A tutor in PKBM Sadina also says, "I work as a primary school teacher. I did not get any training before teaching literacy in KUM program." It seems that no CLC head thought that training, as a part of program preparation, was essential for supporting students' performance and achieving better program results. Although most tutors had no training before running KUM, PKBM Sadina invited a tutor from Garut's municipal industrial office to teach students in class. (Changes within Bindikmas may solve this, but under current KUM guidelines there are no requirements to train tutors for KUM projects.)

Secondly, as mentioned above, there is no standard of managerial skills among CLC leaders. The head of a CLC has a crucial role play in fostering the success of the program. Whether the program is optimally successful or not depends their ability to manage the program itself. This lack of ability might result from educational background, educational interest, or (much as with the tutors) a lack of training; understanding this phenomenon calls for further research on a much larger scale. (As mentioned in Chapter 2, there are thousands of CLCs in Indonesia, and most of them run non-formal education. At

this scale, the top-down structure of KUM has several difficulties which make performing up to KUM's high standards extremely challenging.)

When I interviewed the tutors at Cipta Mandiri and Sadina, I asked if they could provide an example of the syllabus they used in class. Although both CLCs claimed to have syllabi available, neither was able to deliver it to me until the last minute. The Cipta Mandiri tutor promised to email it; at PKBM Sadina, the tutor claimed to have one at home, but would provide it through the head of the CLC. In the end, neither happened.

Thirdly, one of KUM objectives required student to generate income by selling what they made; this, apparently, was not easy. The Garut educational official mentioned this:

The main obstacle of this program is selling the products that the students made. Those products are just sold to their neighbors or local traditional stores. They can't put their products in souvenir centers, like tourist facilities; only a few can afford to do it.

This difficulty has many causes and explanations. The students at Cipta Mandiri, for instance, focused on making products that were already available in local markets; Alkaromah's life skills teachers, as mentioned above, were amateurs; and even PKBM Sadina's students struggled with packaging, presentation and marketing. Most significant of all, however, only one of the CLCs (PKBM Sadina) provided any concrete help with either producing their students' products or supporting their attempts at business startup.

Income Generation

Income generation takes many forms. Originally it was a term used only by economists to explain the intricacies of a nation's economy. However, it is now quite widely used to cover a range of productive activities by

people in the community. Income generation simply means gaining or increasing income (UNESCO, 1993, p.3)

One of KUM's defining objectives is for students to generate income with their education. "This activity is not just for learning life skills," Garut's educational officer said. "They [students] can also sell what they are doing... for additional income for their families." Bindikmas, however, has surprisingly little information about KUM's performance in the field; their reporting focuses on financial accountability more than financial outcomes. My primary source of information on this, therefore, came from interviewing, with depressing results: Of the 13 students interviewed, *none* of the students from Alkaromah or Cipta Mandiri had turned their skills into earned income. If KUM as a program is meant to provide a primary source of income, it is clearly not working as planned.

Asked for success stories from specific CLCs, the municipality officials gave very similar answers. In part this is because Bindikmas has another program, mentioned in Chapter 2, more purely oriented towards business startups. KUM-specific success stories, however, were few and vague. During our interview, the Garut educational officer said, "Although the money that the students earn from selling their product is not quite sufficient, at least they earned some money from what they were doing." The head of PKBM Cipta Mandiri explained:

This program is important, although it can't offer students economic independence. Its importance is teaching something that the students did not know before and then they can do it after finishing the program. In practice, products they made are being sold to their neighbors, small local kiosks, or their own group mates.

“There are no students,” she concluded, “who have business startups after completing the program.” (The head of PKBM Sadina, whose KUM program was much more successful, was almost as pessimistic. “From 100 KUM students, there are only 10-20 students who have strong commitments to learn and start businesses.”

I found similar responses from students. One Alkaromah student said:

Besides learning how to read, write and calculate, I learned to make cookies and cake; even I can make brownies now. There is no cookie kiosk here; I am hoping my neighbors will order from me in the near future. However, I need financial capital to make it. I can't generate income yet because of it.

A student in PKBM Cipta Mandiri related her experience of cooking class:

We learned from recipes. My classmates and I cooked many cakes and fried bananas. Those products were purchased by ourselves at low prices. We saved money that we got from purchasing and the end of the program we shared that savings with all group members.

PKBM Sadina, responsible for all the limited success stories, also provided the most illustrations of what students are doing to earn money. One student noted this in her interview:

I am making rice crackers [*ranginang*]. It really depends on how the sun shines because the process needs to be sunbathed. In one week, I can make crackers from 10 kg of rice. I sell them in local kiosks, or directly to customers. I have to walk several kilometers for meeting my customers. For 10 kg of rice, I get 50,000 rupiahs...

Another student described her conditions, and those of three classmates:

I am working with my husband to make brooms. In a week we can produce three *kodi* (60 pieces.) We sold a *kodi* for 65,000 rupiahs... Sometimes we made good quality brooms, in which the price is Rp 120,000 per *kodi*. A distributor comes to our house and buys them. Our production really depends on the availability of broom materials like broom fibers, strings, bamboo, rattan or nut tree handles and clasps.

Although all the interviewed students in PKBM Sadina are able to generate income, some respondents said that they were still far from a decent standard of

living. Even the head of PKBM Sadina acknowledged as much. “That is right that they can make that broom and get money from selling it, but it is far from adequate revenue for a better living standard.”

The interview with the provincial official raised an interesting point: some CLCs have established cooperatives to provide financial support for their students. “These indirectly give income to KUM alumni who have business startups, although it’s not individual but as a group. This group, of course, is supervised by the CLC.”

In the case of PKBM Cipta Mandiri, all of the participants reported that the skills learning did not result in any increased income. From my observation, Cipta Mandiri’s curriculum tended to focus on literacy skills. PKBM Cipta Mandiri is located in an agricultural area, with ready access to cabbage, carrots, potatoes, tea and other agricultural products, but its life-skills curriculum was too focused and limited in scope to allow students to optimally use all of these resources.

PKBM Alkaromah’s situation is very different; many students live far from nearby towns, and while some students’ products are meant to be sold outside the village, shipping arrangements were a serious difficulty. (The village is most accessible by motorcycle, which limits how much can be transported to markets.) The students making clothing struggled with equipment maintenance; keeping the sewing and hemming machines working was their primary operating expense. This made it difficult to improve the quality of their materials, preventing them from either raising their prices or expanding their markets. PKBM

Alkaromah was also the most conscious of tutor limitations, as even one tutor admitted:

There is a quality range of the products [key chains] made by my students. I had to choose the good ones, because most of them are not good. Because one of my students works in a tourist facility, I tried to sell it by putting those key chains there.... I just taught my students something based on my own experience.

Of the three CLCs, PKBM Sadina is demonstrably the most successful at helping its students generate income. Part of this is due to the balanced curriculum.

Another part is that PKBM Sadina has exceptional leadership; the head of the CLC teaches administration at a local college, and PKBM Sadina had a division called [*bina usaha*] to manage and invest its resources before receiving KUM funds. This meant that not only did PKBM Sadina have more money to invest in the program, but also it was able to offer low-interest loans to the most promising students.

With his head capacity and the balance of learning process (literacy and life skills), PKBM Sadina has the most potential of the three CLCs to meet KUM's stated goal of helping alumni generate income. In general, however, it can be said that life skills education does not directly translate to income, and while students can and do use their skills to earn money; KUM alone is insufficient to improve their quality of life.

KUM's Secondary Social Impact

During our interview, the West Bandung municipal education officer mentioned something similar: "PKBM Alkaromah has already cooperated to produce and sell *wajit* [rice cookies]." (Coincidentally, I visited the *wajit* store, where there was

indeed a PKBM Alkaromah banner.) When I asked the head of PKBM Alkaromah about it, however, he replied “We put Alkaromah in that banner to make it well known.” More recently, PKBM Alkaromah has gone into waste management, asking people to sell plastic to them for recycle.

To a greater or lesser extent, many CLCs participate in activities like those of PKBM Alkaromah. Resources can be unreliable, and extracurricular business programs are often necessary for a CLC to remain operating from one year to the next. KUM, by allowing CLCs an opportunity to be directly involved with entrepreneurial activities, is having the unexpected effect of helping CLCs develop brand identities. The head of PKBM Sadina showed me one of their products, green tea, packaged with the Sadina logo, and remarked that he did not have the money to establish it as a registered trademark. He also mentioned that the municipal industry and trade office had invited his CLC to a Garut development exhibition, to introduce the CLC to people and exhibit their products (such as rice crackers and tea.) He was quite serious about developing his *bina usaha* in order to further his CLC’s economic independence.

The most significant social effect of KUM, however, is the side effect of a recurring difficulty: KUM has trouble enrolling men. At all three CLCs, women formed the overwhelming majority of KUM students; PKBM Sadina had 11 men in a class of 100 students. Cipta Mandiri had only four in a class of 50; Alkaromah, also with 50 students, had seven men in its 2012 KUM program.

Some of this lopsidedness can be attributed to demographics. As mentioned earlier, women comprise 68% of West Java’s illiterate population.

(This was borne out by a tutor at Cipta Mandiri: “This PKBM has data on illiterate people in this area. The ratio between women and men is 7:3.”) Historically, women were more likely to leave school to marry young or support their families. This is reflected in the available records; the KF alumni’s average age was around 40 years old, suggesting that they went to school during the Suharto era, when compulsory education was shorter. (With Indonesia’s change to a compulsory nine-year education, this is changing; in recent years BPS has reported that Indonesia’s educational gender gap has been closed.)

Based on demographics, however, men appear to be underrepresented in KUM, and CLCs were very conscious of this. All of them reported the existence of illiterate men who were not being served by KUM, and mentioned that attracting men into the program was difficult. The aforementioned Cipta Mandiri tutor continued:

I am pessimistic about asking most of [the men] to join programs like KUM. We might ask village leaders to ask them to participate in this kind of program. Maybe they are ashamed to join this literacy class, because there is a stigma from the community; or they may be shy being with their wives in the same class.

The head of PKBM Sadina also mentioned recruiting difficulties: “It is difficult to ask men to join this program, and we are trying to provide some kind of life skills for them.” Discussing his experiences with an earlier pre-KUM program, he also mentioned, “Illiterate men protested that we did not accommodate their interests in skills that they wanted.” The CLC’s decision to teach broom making as was most likely an attempt to create a unisex program

(Interestingly, another CLC in Garut *did* report a significant body of male students, and taught welding as their life-skills curriculum. This is an extremely

gendered decision on their part, reflecting a conscious attempt to attract male students. I hoped to visit that CLC to study men's participation in KUM; unfortunately this was impossible to arrange.)

The head of PKBM Sadina also explored economic considerations for the gender discrepancy in his class:

There are some reasons behind this issue; it might be they work, so they do not have enough time to join. I also observe that many men from this village work outside the village. The class time seems to interfere with their timetable. It is a bit easier for us to ask women to join. They may have enough time to do because all of them spend their entire time at home.

The lack of men's interest in KUM, however, is to some extent offset by female enthusiasm. Describing his students, the head of PKBM Alkaromah said, "They are enthusiastic, especially learning life skills. I think they are kind of bored learning literacy, because they feel it is not very useful." The Garut education officer, describing his visit to PKBM Sadina, remembered this:

I could see the students, who were women ages 30-50, were enthusiastic in learning. They seemed to be enjoying practicing life skills. This activity was not only for learning life skills, but also for recreation, because most of them spent all their time at home.

One of the tutors at Cipta Mandiri provided a significant description of her experience:

I taught how to read, write and calculate... after several class meetings, my students were actively in discussion and communicating with other classmates. It seems to me that literacy classes and being with their neighbors are encouraging them to speak more.

This description closely matches Suzanne Kindervatter's description of non-formal education as an empowerment activity, especially in its early stages (Kindervatter 1979: 245.)

In practice, women are also responsible for a great deal of KUM's recruiting. Garut is a fairly religious area; in addition to the five daily prayers, the mosque has regular religious speakers once or twice a month. The head of PKBM Sadina added that some students in the KUM program are from the mosque. These events are attended almost exclusively by women, and PKBM Sadina used the mosque heavily for recruiting students.

Because of its lopsided enrollment, KUM has a significant and totally unplanned impact on society: it unofficially serves as a women's empowerment program. The classes made available by KUM allow its (primarily female) participants to create a space of their own, in which they can express personal agency within the constraints of their domestic and social position.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Although this study is limited in its sample size and scope, especially compared to the illiterate population of Indonesia, it remains the first of its kind to research and represent KUM alumni, CLC personnel and policy makers.

KUM is likely to continue running for at least the remainder of the Susilo era, however, and even if it is discontinued any successor program will face similar challenges. These recommendations are based on field findings, including input from the participants themselves. This chapter is intended to offer suggestions to improve KUM not only as an educational program, but also an empowering one.

KUM as Successful Financial Model

Indonesia's non-formal education (including KUM) receives much less attention than formal education. Kemdikbud's budget arrangements with local government are a significant factor; unlike the formal education sector, non-formal education has a large number of programs in operation at once, many of which effectively compete for finances. In recent years, a majority of non-formal education funding has been dedicated to early childhood education, which is currently prestigious. (During our interview, the Bindikmas official complained, "Our budget recently shrank because more money is going to early childhood education. Actually, this can be seen in our name change, from PNFI to PAUDNI.")³ Non-formal education is also more vulnerable to political vagaries arising from deconcentration. From

³ PAUDNI is literally "Early Childhood, Non-Formal and Informal Education."

my prior experience as a Bindikmas employee, some local leaders are unconcerned with non-formal education, or see it as a remedial supplementary program. At least in theory, local government should be paying for an increasing amount of literacy and post-literacy programs, but in the past it has been downplayed by local government officials for political reasons.

For this reason, one of my questions for the educational officers was whether programs similar to KUM existed at the provincial or district level. Any possibility to compare similar programs could shed light on issues related to budget sharing, program design and responsibility issues. The provincial officer said that West Java did, in fact, have a KUM-like provincial program in 2010 and 2013.

Instead of creating its own program guidelines, however, West Java's equivalent program adopted KUM regulations almost exactly; the one change was an instruction to discourage CLCs from running the 66-hour program in as short a time as possible. In 2010 it also followed the Bindikmas student allocation standards closely, although in 2013 the provincial KUM's budget added an additional Rp 1 million (\$90)⁴ per student, to provide financial capital for business startups. Confusingly, the provincial program even copied KUM's name. (KF, by contrast, has a number of names in the field.) The provincial KUM's scope was quite limited; from the three municipalities included in this study, only Bandung ran the provincial KUM-like program in 2010, and this was almost accidental. (Bandung was initially allocated money for KF, but in 2010 Bandung's mayor

⁴ \$ 1 US = 11,155 rupiahs

claimed to have no illiterate people in the area, making KF officially unnecessary. For political reasons, Bandung redirected its funds to the provincial KUM-like program, using it as a substitute for KF that year.)

In short, it can be conclusively said that provincial-level programs cannot serve as a replacement for KUM on their own; while provinces do arrange them, simply maintaining a year-to-year existence can be a struggle. More importantly, however, KUM effectively serves as a model program for Indonesian post-literacy, and provincial-level programs created as a result of deconcentration may very simply copy it word for word. Comparing the relative merits of provincial programs against KUM as a national program is meaningless when one program is so derivative of the other.

The most substantial differences between KUM and West Java's KUM-like program relate to funding. KUM is a competitive national program, receiving grant proposals from across Indonesia, and once proposals are approved a branch of the National Bank directly transfers funds to the CLC's bank account. West Java's provincial program, by contrast, is much more local and top-down. Instead of CLCs applying to the program, the municipality has a hand in suggesting and selecting which CLCs receive program funds.

Asked about their preferred source of funding - the central government, the provincial government, and district or municipal government - the CLC leaders were unanimous in favoring Bindikmas. In particular, they praised KUM's reliability: the application process is resolved quickly, and money goes directly to the CLC bank accounts. Local government funds, by contrast, were often subject

to what the head of PKBM Sadina euphemistically called “dynamic conditions.” (PKBM Sadina’s early childhood education program, for instance, once received the resources allotted to it in the form of books and classroom supplies.) Funding delays and partisanship in grant allocation were also drawbacks of local funding.

The CLCs, however, also hoped for supporting programs from the local government (especially the municipality.) The primary reason for this was accessibility. National funds from Kemdikbud, or even from the provincial level, tend to come with a fairly remote management style; upper administrators expect problems to be handled by local leaders. While this is unfortunately optimistic at present, the CLC leaders did hope for this to change, as municipal education offices (at least in theory) are better equipped for troubleshooting in the field.

The bottom line is that in the field, Kemdikbud’s funding system works very well, while funding from the district or provincial levels remain problematic. As long as this remains the case, KUM will remain the most effective funding model for post-literacy education. As a program, KUM is also more influential than previously imagined, because it serves as a universal template for similar programs at the provincial, district, and municipal levels. Because KUM is considered normative - local programs may very well copy KUM to the letter - fairly simple changes in its examples and guidelines may have far-reaching repercussions in Indonesia’s quest for universal literacy.

Reporting and Documentation

Before beginning this study, my responsibilities involved serving as evaluation staff. Every year, I conducted program evaluations not only for Bindikmas, but for

all the other PAUDNI programs as well. This experience provided a foundational familiarity with how CLCs work, both in terms of administration and education. The course of this research, however, also revealed limitations in how CLCs operate. H.S. Bhola, in his writing about the National Literacy Movement, set down these parameters:

Evaluation must generate information. This information must be defensible. There should be a method to its collection. Thus, evaluation should be organized. As far as possible, information should have the quality of being exact and precise. Most importantly, the information must be usable in the improvement of some developmental, educational or training program (Bhola 1990, p. 11-12.)

KUM reporting, unfortunately, does not live up to Bhola's ideal.

The KUM guidelines provide examples to follow, but in the field interpretations of these standards are quite different. It is common to see that CLCs do not have proper preparation and evaluation when they implement non-formal education programs. The three KUM reports provided by the CLCs are extremely different in their content and their format; for evaluation matters, only PKBM Sadina provided clear explanations of their evaluation standards. Even Sadina's standards could be judged insufficient by Kemdikbud, because their evaluation reporting was confined to the end of the program; the ideal is that both student and program evaluation should occur, and be documented, from the program's beginning.

While no two CLCs will run KUM programs exactly the same way, KUM reports should be as standardized as possible. The report should cover almost everything in a KUM program, and while Bindikmas has exhaustively defined what financial information needs reporting, additional definition and focus should

be placed on performance records. Most STSBs, for instance, are based on KUM's provided example.

Another significant concern lies in the continuing activities and follow-up aspect of KUM. Almost all Bindikmas programs call for activity after a program ends; however, what this activity is (or whether it happens) is unclear. Once a program's final evaluations are over and students receive their certificates, CLCs often have no further interactions with their beneficiaries. In part this is because "follow-up activity" is left undefined. Following the example set in KUM guidelines (Bindikmas 2013, p. 9), many CLCs list follow-up activities as a line-item expense in their financial reports, but there is no consensus on what follow-up activities are for and what purpose they serve, and the suggestions in the KUM guidelines, which include "formulating a plan of assistance," "setting approaches, strategies and technical assistance," and "carrying out evaluation and reflection" (Bindikmas 2013, p. 16) are extremely vague.

Possibilities for Municipal-Level KUM Supervision

At present, KUM is a large enough program that Bindikmas would overstretch its resources trying to provide oversight and technical support for every CLC that receives its funding. One suggestion, therefore, is to devolve some supervisory responsibility to the municipal level. By law, CLCs exist and operate at the municipal level, and almost all municipalities have SKBs (*sanggar kegiatan belajar*, non-formal education technical offices) that interact with CLCs. While the head of PKBM Sadina did mention, "We never interact with the SKB," this was less a matter of principle than familiarity: it had simply never occurred to ask.

One difficulty the SKBs may encounter in this role is manpower. The size of a municipality can vary considerably; even after West Bandung was divided into its own municipality and given its own SKB, the Bandung SKB is understaffed for this responsibility. Geography is another concern; Garut's SKB, for example, is three hours from PBKM Sadina, which does nothing to make their relationship any easier. Another solution, therefore, is to make use of the sub-district non-formal education employees (*penilik*), responsible for monitoring every non-formal program in their area. Although *penilik* work at the sub-district level, they are accountable directly to the municipal education office, allowing for a clear chain of command, and at present their responsibilities can be fairly nebulous. *Penilik* are at least in theory meant to be field workers, and are in the right position to handle much of the day-to-day oversight and monitoring of KUM programs.

Improve KUM Training

Because CLC leaders have considerable amount of power to set procedures for themselves, including recruiting tutors and students, they have a direct impact on the quality of education - and from my observations from three head of CLCs, the quality of CLC leadership can vary widely. At present, KUM has no programs for training CLC leadership, and improvement in this regard is much in order.

The directors of CLCs can also be problematic because, despite the name "community learning centers," many of them have effectively no accountability to the communities they serve. In some cases (such as PKBM Alkaromah, due to its geography) this may be more or less understandable, but it still results in a

number of problems relating to KUM's economic goals. It should be made clear that CLCs belong to the communities they serve, and that the community should have a voice in the planning of the program's implementation and leadership.

"Post-literacy," writes Adama Ouane, "is to be well planned in advance in its own right, with as much attention paid to its implementation as is paid to initial literacy campaigns" (Ouane 1989, p. 15.) Training programs for tutors are no less crucial. Although some of the tutors were certified for KF and had received tutor training there, none of the interviewed KUM tutors received any KUM-specific training during the program. Although some were primary school teachers (it is common in Indonesia for educators to serve in both formal and non-formal capacities), there are significant differences between children's and adult education. There is a need to offer training for tutors specifically for their role in non-formal education, which operates differently from the formal education system that many tutors are used to working in.

One simple solution might be to include "tutor training" as a line-item expense to KUM's example budget report. As currently written, KUM's guidelines do not mention tutor training in the example budget, which effectively serves as the minimum standard for CLC reporting. This would be straightforward to implement, and would significantly change KUM's operation by making a certain amount of tutor training normative.

In keeping with the proposal to devolve oversight to the municipal level, training could also be conducted by the municipality. Before deconcentration began, the eight regional offices often collaborated with SKBs; many of these

arrangements are still in place, and there is no reason Bindikmas could not draw on them. Municipal education offices seldom make use of SKBs for training non-formal education tutors, despite their history of being close to the regional offices. However, at present many municipalities lack the resources to offer training courses entirely by themselves. The regional offices, by contrast, were created to design and provide course programs and training, and are capable of doing so. As long as they continue to exist, their inclusion in KUM training programs would be intuitive and obvious.

Empowerment and Contextuality

The vast majority of governmental programs are top-down in both form and content. Because so much of its work is non-formal, however, the policy makers of Bindikmas are uniquely equipped to design programs that can be adapted to their localities and run from below. KUM so far is notable for its attempts to accommodate local context, in terms of what kind of life skills are taught in class for students. However, decision-making often remains top-down, in the hands of CLC heads that may set the curriculum with no thought to the students' interest.

This arrangement is by no means mandatory, and presenting alternative arrangements would allow Bindikmas to fund and monitor an extremely adaptable program with significant involvement from its stakeholders and the community. This adaptability, however, also makes contextuality extremely important. Bjorn Nordtveit writes, "It is important that projects and programs offering vocational training use the proper methodology to undertake a market survey before designing the training" (Nordtveit 2010, p. 30.) This form of market

surveying did not occur at the CLCs studied, which directly caused some of KUM's difficulties as a program for economic advancement.

One of the areas in which contextuality is most important is the follow-up activity Bindikmas calls for after completing the KUM program. KUM as a program is only 66 course-hours long, but (following Bindikmas standard procedures) recommends two to three months of follow-up activities. In the case of KUM, this presents serious problems. For the post-literacy aspect of KUM, this could amount to significantly increasing the actual running time of the program. For KUM's entrepreneurial elements, however, "follow-up activities" are extremely vague. Market surveying may be a necessary post-program activity, to avoid situations (such as that of PKBM Cipta Mandiri) in which students find themselves competing against other alumni. It should also be considered that three months might be too short to measure meaningful economic advancement. Any attempt to quantify KUM's performance should bear in mind the experiences reported with a Nepalese literacy program: "Sometimes, the smartest decision a family can make to improve their livelihood is to expand or improve an existing activity that just puts food in their mouths for a full 12 months" (Smith, Sherpa and Civins, 2012.)

This quote also highlights that contextuality is important for both planning and measuring KUM's performance as an economic program. KUM cannot work miracles, and without considering the financial conditions of its students, KUM's economic objectives can easily be set unachievably high. Bindikmas policy makers should also keep in mind that KUM is generally a women's program in

the field, meaning that most of its students must balance their entrepreneurial work with domestic responsibilities, and life skills training is oriented toward skills with low initial investment (such as traditional brooms, crackers, baked goods, wooden craft, shirts and clothing) but limited economic returns.

One suggestion would be to allow for KUM programs to teach livelihood skills, focusing on expanding domestic production (raising chickens, vegetable or fruit gardens, cottage industry, etc.) In this context “livelihood skills” could be a range of skills that directly relate to domestic economy but are not necessarily income generation. For a number of circumstantial reasons, students had difficulties making a profit with the skills they were taught in KUM classes. There is no reason CLCs cannot plan their life skills courses to build on both this basic foundation of knowledge and the resources of the students, especially in rural areas where students are often involved in agriculture, fish farming, and poultry-raising. The teaching of livelihood skills would allow KUM participants to have a more hands-on role in the teaching process. It could also help KUM engage male participants.

PKBM Cipta Mandiri provides a useful case study of what livelihood skills might look like. Because it is located in an agricultural area, its students have home gardens. A number of corporations (most notably Indofood) will buy farm products, especially potatoes, from local farms that meet their quality standards, and the South Bandung Milk Corporation has purchased milk similarly since the Suharto era. Furthermore, South Bandung is also a major center of *kopi luwak* production, and North Bandung house one of PAUDNI’s eight regional training

offices, which specifically has experience with agricultural education programs. A curriculum that explored participation in this local economy (meeting Indofood potato standards, for instance) would allow students to optimize their current economic activity.

It also has the potential to serve as a non-formal economic program in its own right; while payment in kind is less common than it used to be, it remains common in more rural parts of Indonesia. This makes contextualization necessary not only for program design but also program evaluation, as the economic impact of such a course would be measured differently from a startup business.

Integrate KUM with Related Ministries

During the 1980s, Indonesia's Ministry of Agriculture organized an extremely successful teaching program. As part of this program, technical staff were sent to the fields to teach farmers improved harvesting techniques. This resulted in a surplus of rice for the entire country, and an award from the FAO for this achievement (BBC Indonesia, 2009.)

"It is important," writes the ILO, "to analyze the role of vocational training in strategies to improve productivity, the latter being understood as the relationship between production obtained by a system of production or services and the resources used to obtain it." For budgetary reasons, KUM alone has limits to what it can do. This is especially true with KUM's life-skills component. "Usually, vocational training is more expensive than other forms of education. This is because it requires more materials, and it should also ideally provide startup kits

to ensure the transition of the students into a gainful work life” (Nordveit 2010, p. 31.) As seen in Alkaromah’s writing samples, KUM is unable to provide adequate startup kits.

However, many of these difficulties could be overcome if KUM could be designed as a more holistic program that synergizes with related ministries and departments. At present, many ministries have fairly specific programs for their own needs. The Ministry of Cooperatives and Small and Medium Enterprises, for example, operates a low-interest loan program specifically for new entrepreneurs and cooperatives that would be extremely relevant to many KUM alumni. A number of subsidies also exist; the Ministry of Agriculture has a fertilizer subsidy relevant for an agriculturally focused CLC, such as the hypothetical PKBM Cipta Mandiri curriculum described above. These programs have no awareness of each other, however, which leads to observed redundancies and inefficiency.

Collaboration between these programs would allow them to effectively coordinate resources and avoid redundancy. As importantly, it would allow for sharing experience; Indonesia has a number of fairly new programs, often without adequate pilot programming. The Ministries of Commerce, Finance, Industry, and Agriculture are all potential stakeholders in an integrated inter-departmental KUM, which would be far more able to pursue ambitious goals.

Conclusions

As a program for economic independence, KUM is unsuccessful for a number of reasons. Some of these reasons are situational (most KUM alumni are women, whose domestic responsibilities may compete with the time they have available

to earn income); others are the result of curriculum deficiencies (e.g. product presentation and marketing.) The most significant and frequently cited reason, however, is the absence of necessary seed capital. KUM alumni often have the practical skills for entrepreneurship, but lack the resources to actually do so. While many programs could provide these resources, KUM does not presently interact with or make use of them. KUM's disappointing performance as an economic program, therefore, is due less to its own weaknesses than to the lack of coordination between ministries and programs.

Secondly, tutors and CLC heads have significant roles to play in the KUM project. Interviewed students admitted that CLC personnel encouraged them to retain and expand both their literacy and life skills. (The latter is especially important to Bindikmas, which sees KUM primarily as a literacy program.) The objectives set in KUM guidelines could become much more attainable if tutors and CLC heads can receive appropriate training, which is currently not supported.

Third, field research revealed that, although KUM guidelines have clearly specified goals, different stakeholders interpret them very differently. From interviews with officials at all levels of the policy-making process, the expectations nominally follow those mentioned in KUM guidelines. However, after the program has been in existence and operation for four years, it seems that Bindikmas has no interest in actually measuring its economic performance. In their opinion - but not the opinion of the CLCs - KUM is purely a post-literacy program, and the fact that (due to the resource constraints mentioned above)

KUM does not significantly improve its alumni living standards is not a pressing concern; Kemdikbud sees social advancement as the responsibility of other ministries. Actively engaging with these ministries is likely to yield much better results than simple calls for an increase in KUM.

Fourthly, KUM - unlike many specific programs that have flourished since the end of the Suharto era - is accidentally a women's program. In West Java, women (especially married women) ordinarily spend most of their time at home. Because men are such a minority within KUM, the classroom creates a space outside of household duties in which women are the primary participants, able to interact and work on their own terms. Attending class gives them an opportunity to meet their friends and neighbors, serving both a recreational and a social function, allowing them to maintain their relationships and invest in their community status. "Being assured of and recognized for one's worthiness as an individual and a member of a social group sharing similar interests and resources not only provides emotional support but also public acknowledgment of one's claim to certain resources" (Lin 2001, p. 20), and KUM provides women an environment in which this form of social capital can be developed. They also enjoy practicing life skills, and have more motivation learning life skills than literacy. In the immediate future, KUM officials should be conscious about these dynamics within the program, which have heretofore not been studied, and explore how they relate to recruiting male students.

Lastly, and most importantly, this study found that despite the serious problems mentioned above, there remains considerable popular demand for

literacy and post-literacy programs. At the most basic level, students find that participating in KUM empowers and enriches their daily lives, almost independently of its performance as a program. This enthusiasm is an extremely important resource - and one that Bindikmas does not presently recognize or make use of.

REFERENCES

- Abadzi, H. (2003). *Improving Adult Literacy Outcomes: Lessons from Cognitive Research for Developing Countries*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- BBC Indonesia. (2009). *Indonesia dan Swasembada Pangan (Indonesia and Food Self-Sufficiency)*. Retrieved Nov 14, 2013 from http://www.bbc.co.uk/indonesia/laporan_khusus/2009/11/091126_rice_six.shtml
- Bernardo, A. B. I. (1998). *Literacy and the Mind: The Contexts and Cognitive Consequences of Literacy Practice*. Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for Education.
- Bhola, H.S. (2002). *A Model and Method of Evaluative: Development Impact of the National Literacy Mission (NLM) of India*. *Studies in Educational Evaluation* 28 (20002) 273-296. Elsevier Science Ltd.
- Bhola, H.S. (1990). *Evaluating "Literacy for Development" Projects, Programs and Campaign*. German: UNESCO Institute for Education and German Foundation for International Development.
- Bindikmas. (2009). *Pendidikan untuk Pemberdayaan (Education for Empowerment)*. Senayan, Jakarta: Bindikmas Kemdikbud.
- Bindikmas. (2012). *Petunjuk Teknis Pendidikan Keaksaraan Usaha Mandiri (KUM Guidelines)*. Jakarta: Bindikmas Kemdikbud.
- Bindikmas. (2009). *Aksara (Literacy Magazine)* no 19, July-August 2009. Jakarta: Bindikmas Kemdikbud.
- Bindikmas. (2009). *Aksara (Literacy Magazine)* no 19, May-June 2009. Jakarta: Bindikmas Kemdikbud.
- Bindikmas. (2011). *Petunjuk Teknis Pendidikan Keaksaraan Keluarga (Family Literacy Education Guidelines)*. Jakarta: Bindikmas Kemdikbud.
- Bindikmas. (2012). *Petunjuk Teknis Keaksaraan Usaha Mandiri (Entrepreneurship Literacy Guidelines)*. Jakarta: Bindikmas Kemdikbud.
- Bindikmas. (2013). *Petunjuk Teknis Pendidikan Keaksaraan Cerita Rakyat (Folklore Literacy Guidelines)*. Jakarta: Bindikmas Kemdikbud
- Bindikmas. (2013). *Petunjuk Teknis Pendidikan Kecakapan Hidup Perempuan (Life Skills Education for Women Guidelines)*. Jakarta: Bindikmas Kemdikbud.

- Bindikmas. (2013). *Petunjuk Teknis Koran Ibu (Mother Newspaper Guidelines)*. Jakarta: Bindikmas Kemdikbud.
- Bindikmas. (2013). *Petunjuk Teknis Koran Anak (Children Newspaper Guidelines)*. Jakarta: Bindikmas Kemdikbud.
- Bindikmas. (2013). *Petunjuk Teknis Rintisan Aksara Kewirausahaan (Entrepreneurial Literacy Guidelines)*. Jakarta: Bindikmas Kemdikbud.
- Blaug, M. (1970). *An Introduction to the Economics of Education*. London: Penguin.
- BPS. (2010). *The Number and Percentage of Illiterate People by Aged and Sex Group*. Jakarta: Kemdikbud and BPS.
- BPS. (2013). *The Population by Provinces*. Retrieved Sept 17, 2013 from http://www.bps.go.id/tab_sub/view.php?kat=1&tabel=1&daftar=1&id_subyek=12¬ab=1
- BPS. (2013). *Jumlah Penduduk Jawa Barat Berdasarkan Jenis Kelamin Tahun 2011 (West Java Population by Sex in 2011)*. Retrieved Nov 1, 2013 from <http://jabar.bps.go.id/subyek/penduduk-jawa-barat-berdasarkan-jenis-kelamin-tahun-2011>
- BPS. (2013). *School Enrollment Rate (ESR) of Population Aged 7-18 Year by Urban-Rural Classification, Sex and Age Group, 2009-2011*. Retrieved Nov 25, 2013 from http://www.bps.go.id/eng/tab_sub/view.php?kat=1&tabel=1&daftar=1&id_subyek=40¬ab=13
- Brolin, D.E. (1978). *Life Centered Career Education: A Competency Based Approach*. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.
- CIA. (2013). *The World Fact Book*. Retrieved Oct 24, 2013 from <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/id.html>
- Coffey, O.D., & Knoll, J. F. (1998). *Choosing Life Skills: A Guide for Selecting Life Skills Programs for Adult and Juvenile Offenders*. Washington, DC: Office of Correctional Education.
- Creswell, J.W. (1994). *Research Design: Qualitative & Quantitative Approach*. Thousand Oak, California: Sage Publication, Inc.
- Dew, J.R. (1997). *Empowerment and Democracy in the Workplace: Applying Adult Education Theory and Practice for Cultivating Empowerment*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books

- Dewey, J. (1966). *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. New York, NY: The Free Press, A Division of Macmillan, Inc.
- Durgunoglu, A.Y. et al. (2003). Development and Evaluation of an Adult Literacy Program in Turkey. *International Journal of Educational Development* 23 (2003) 17-36. Elsevier Science Ltd.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York, NY: The Continuum International Publishing Group Inc.
- ILO. (2004). The New ILO Recommendation 195 Human Resources Development: Education, Training and Lifelong Learning. Retrieved Nov 14, 2014 from www.oitcinterfor.org/sites/default/files/file_evento/recom195_en.pdf
- Jalal, F., & Sardjunani, N. (2006). *Increasing Literacy in Indonesia*. Jakarta: UNESCO.
- Kemdikbud. Program Pemberantasan Tuna aksara Dorong Peningkatan Kualitas Hidup Masyarakat (*Literacy Programs Promote Communities Living Standard*) Retrieved at October 8, 2013 at <http://www.kemdikbud.go.id/berita/1714.html>
- Kemdikbud. (2013). *Kemdikbud Budget*. PDF file retrieved Oct 24, 2013 from <http://118.98.236.181/kemdikbud/sites/default/files/Pagu-Kemdikbud-2013.pdf>
- Kindervatter, S. (1979). *Non-Formal Education as an Empowering Process*. Amherst, MA: Center for International Education University of Massachusetts.
- Kuipers, J. C. (1993). *Indonesia A Country Study: The Society and Its Environment*. Washington, D.C: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Levine, R., Llyod, C., Greene, M., & Grown, C. (2008) *Girls Count A Global Investment & Action Agenda*. Washington, DC: Center for Global Development.
- Li, N. (2001). *Social Capital: A Theory of Social Structure and Action*. Port Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Marshall, C. & Rossman, G.B. (1989). *Designing Qualitative Research*. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publication, Inc.

- Maxwell, J. A. (1996). *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publication, Inc.
- Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case Study Research in Education: A Qualitative Approach*. San Francisco; Jossey-Bass.
- Middleton, J., Zideman, A., & Adams, A.V. (1993). *Skills for Productivity: Vocational Education and Training in Developing Countries*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nordtveit, B.H. (2010). *Vocational Training for Children and Youth: Transitioning Toward Non-Exploitive Employment*. United States Department of Labor.
- Ouane, A. (1989). *Handbook on Learning Strategies for Post-Literacy and Continuing Education*. Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for Education.
- PAUDNI. (2013). Anggaran PAUDNI 2012 (2012 PAUDNI Budget). Retrieved Oct 24, 2013 from <http://www.paudni.kemdikbud.go.id/>
- PDF file retrieved Oct 27, 2013 from www.unodc.org/pdf/youthnet/action/message/escap_peers_07.pdf
- PKBM Alkaromah (2012). Laporan: Program Bantuan Pendidikan Keaksaraan Usaha Mandiri dari Dana APBN Tahun 2012 (*KUM Report*). Cililin, West Bandung: PKBM Alkaromah.
- PKBM Cipta Mandiri (2012.) Laporan Pertanggungjawaban: Dana Operasional Program Keaksaraan Usaha Mandiri APBN Tahun 2012 (*KUM Report*). Pangalengan, Bandung: PKBM Cipta Mandiri.
- PKBM Sadina (2012). Laporan Kegiatan: Pengelolaan Penyelenggaraan Keaksaraan Usaha Mandiri (*KUM Report*). Cilawu, Garut: PKBM Sadina
- Ricklefs, M.C. (2001). *A History of Modern Indonesia since c. 1200*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rodgers, A. (2002). Post Literacy and Second-Stage Adult Learning in India. *A Journal Comparative Education* Vol. 32, No. 2 (2002),149-179. Carfax Publishing Company.
- Rubin, H.J., & Rubin, I.S. (1995). *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publication, Inc.

- Smith, C., Sherpa, H., & Civins, P. (2002). *The Story of the Women's Economic Empowerment and Literacy (WEEL) Program in Nepal*. Boston: World Education.
- Stein, J. (1997). *Empowerment and Women's Health: Theory, Methods, and Practice*. London & New Jersey: Zed Books Ltd.
- Sudjana, D., Kuntoro, S.A., Faisal, S., Sumarno, Suryono, Y., Ekosiswoyo, R., Kamil, M., & Olim, A., (2008). *Naskah Akademik Pengembangan Pendidikan NonFormal ke Depan (Academic Textbook of Non-Formal Education Development in the Future)*. Senayan, Jakarta: Bindikmas, Kemdikbud.
- UNDP. (2013). Human Development Reports. Retrieved Sep 17, 2013 from <http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/>
- UNESCO. (2012). Programmes in Bhutan, Colombia, Indonesia and Rwanda Awarded UNESCO International Literacy Prizes. Retrieved Sept 17, 2013 from http://www.unesco.org/new/en/media-services/single-view/news/programmes_in_bhutan_colombia_indonesia_and_rwanda_awarded_unesco_international_literacy_prizes/#.Ujh71BZDyMM
- UNESCO. (1993). *ATLP-CE Volume V: Income-Generating Programmes*. Bangkok: UNESCO Principal Regional Office for Asia & the Pacific
- UNESCO. (1997). The General Conference Adopts a Recommendation on Adults Education (*Adult Education Information Notes*, no. 1 1997, p.2)

ANNEXES

Annex 1:

Questions for the head of the Sub-directorate of Learning and Learners

1. Do you think that KUM's program fund distribution system has been working well, according to the technical instructions?
2. Is directly funding KUM by Bindikmas, instead of through deconcentration, effective?
3. Are there any annual/regular evaluations of KUM? Evaluation of administrative distribution? Evaluation of the substance [the learning process, etc.] and impact of the program's implementation?
4. If yes, is there any physical evidence, such as documents of evaluation results?
5. What kind of supervision/monitoring have you been doing?
6. Do you provide any guidelines/references for supervision?
7. Is there any official district/municipality involvement in the monitoring? If so, what form does this involvement take?
8. How can the municipality assist and support Bindikmas in the success of the KUM program?
9. Are there any obstacles that you have encountered in campaigning for KUM's guideline textbook? Getting funding proposals accepted? Coaching and management programs for recipients? Monitoring and evaluation? Responsiveness in KUM reporting? End-of-year financial analysis?

10. Do you think the KUM program is worth continuing in coming years? If yes, why do you think that the program is still worthwhile?

Annex 2:

**Question for Official from West Java Provincial Education Office,
Community Education Division**

1. What do you know about KUM?
2. Since 2009, Bindikmas has distributed funds through the provincial education office (deconcentration funding.) What are your thoughts on this?
3. Has your office ever allocated funds for a program like KUM?
4. If yes, does it operate similarly to the version of Bindikmas, or you create a technical manual yourselves?
5. How supervision/monitoring do you do? How much planning? Implementation? Assessment?
6. Is there are problems, when you conduct monitoring of CLCs?
7. In your opinion, who is most appropriate to be responsible for funding KUM? Is the pattern of Bindikmas directly funding CLCs effective?
8. What do you think about the KUM program's implementation?
9. How much is the deconcentration funding for districts and municipalities coordinated with the central government in KUM?
10. How sustainable do you think the KUM program is?
11. What are your expectations for the implementation of KUM next year?

**Annex 3:
Questions for Officials from Municipal Educational Offices**

1. What do you know about KUM?
2. Has your office ever allocated funds for a program like KUM?
3. How supervision/monitoring do you do? How much planning? Implementation?
Assessment?
4. Is there are problems, when you conduct monitoring of CLCs?
5. In your opinion, who is most appropriate to be responsible for funding KUM? Is the pattern of Bindikmas directly funding CLCs effective?
6. Are there any success stories from this program?
7. What are your thoughts on the KUM program 's implementation?
8. How much is the deconcentration funding for districts and municipalities coordinated with the central government in KUM?
9. How sustainable do you think the KUM program is?
10. What are your expectations for the implementation of KUM next year?

Annex 4:

Questions for the heads of CLCs

1. What do you know about KUM? Do you think KUM important?
2. Is the presence of the KUM program really necessary?
3. Has the implementation of KUM been able to increase your students' life skills?
4. How are students' knowledge, attitudes, and skills overall after completing the KUM program?
5. Do KUM alumni become economically empowered? Can they generate income for their families?
6. What economic impact does the KUM program have on the surrounding community?

Annex 5:

Questions for tutors

1. According to you, what is KUM? Do you think KUM is important?
2. How can KUM's learning method improve students' literacy and life skills?
3. How do you experience teaching students as part of KUM?
4. Do you find that KUM guidelines help you to achieve its learning objectives?
5. What are the obstacles that you have encountered in the KUM learning process?
6. Do you notice any significant changes in students after participating in KUM?
7. Could students follow learning process throughout the program?
8. Are there any factors that are interfering with students attending the class?
9. Do KUM alumni become economically empowered?
10. Is there any impact of KUM on the surrounding community?

**Annex 6:
Questions for KUM students**

1. What year did you join the KUM program?
2. What was your motivation to join this program? Following someone else? The CLC personnel? Your own desire to learn and improve family economy?
3. Where did you learn about the CLC that runs KUM?
4. Did you enroll in the KUM through a tutor, or directly through the CLC?
5. How has the KUM program benefited you in terms of literacy and life skills? Income generation? The formation of business startup?
7. From the economic side, has there any change in your family's income after participating in KUM?
8. Do you feel that you need further skills training?
9. Do you think that KUM is still worth holding in your community?
10. What barriers have you faced attending KUM?
11. In order to make KUM more useful, do you have any expectations or suggestions for the government? The head of the CLC? Your tutors?

Annex 7:

HUMAN SUBJECT REVIEW APPROVAL FOR NON-FUNDED RESEARCH BY FACULTY OR STUDENT

Please Print or Type:

Ryke Pribudhiana

26439263

Principal Investigator

SPIRE ID#

Faculty _____

* **Student** _____

rpribudh@educ.umass.edu

E-Mail address

International Education

413 306 0212

Concentration

Local/Cell Phone

Bjorn Harald Nordtveit

Faculty Sponsor _____

* NOTE: If you are a student you need a faculty sponsor

Proposed Research Title:

Case Study of Post-Literacy Program in Indonesia

Please answer the following questions:

1. How will human participants be used?

I will interview participants, using open-ended questions about literacy program. The participants should be at least 18 years of age to make sure that they are mature enough to participate.

2. How have you ensured that the rights and welfare of the human participants will be adequately protected?

I believe there are no risks associated with this research study; however, a possible inconvenience may be the time it takes to accomplish the study. If any questions make participants uncomfortable, they may skip them and/or end their participation at any time during the research without consequence. Government officials interviewed will not have their titles or positions used in the report,

allowing them to speak in an informal capacity.

3. How will you provide information about your research methodology to the participants involved?

There will be a written explanation, etc. Because this may present difficulties for some participants in the research project, a verbal explanation of the methodology will be provided. The applicants are free to ask questions and have them answered before deciding to participate.

4. How will you obtain the informed voluntary consent of the human participants or their legal guardians? **Please attach a copy your consent form.**

Human participants will be approached and asked for their consent directly. Because the participants will be adults, legal guardianship is not expected to be an issue.

5. How will you protect the identity and/or confidentiality of your participants?

No information outside the purview of the program will be asked of the participants, and any such information volunteered will be excluded from the report. I will use the related information for my research study completely anonymous and no personal information (names, national ID numbers, etc.) will be released.

Attach an abstract of your proposal.

Consent Form for Participation in a Research Study
University of Massachusetts Amherst

Researcher: Ryke Pribudhiana

Study Title: Case Study of Post-Literacy Program in Indonesia

I am a University of Massachusetts Amherst graduate student, conducting research assessing/observing the achievement of post literacy program for a study project. Your participation in this research is **fully voluntary** and your responses will remain **completely anonymous** (no personal information will be released.) You must be 18 years of age to participate.

The research involves questionnaires, surveys and/or interviews at community learning centers in West Java, over a period of two months. Your completion of the research represents your consent to participate. If any questions make you feel uncomfortable, you may skip them and/or end your participation at any time during the research without consequence. We believe there are no known risks associated with this research study; however, a possible inconvenience may be the time it takes to accomplish the study. Your participation will help us to further understand the sustainability of literacy education programs. You may not directly benefit from this research; we hope your participation in the study will help policy makers to design better literacy programs in the near future.

If you have further questions about this project or you have a research-related problem, you may contact the researcher, Ryke Pribudhiana at (022) 5940769 or rpribudh@educ.umass.edu. If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research subject, you may contact the university of Massachusetts Amherst Human Research Protection Office (HRPO) at (413) 545-3428 or humansubjects@ora.umass.edu.

When signing this form I am agreeing to voluntarily participate this study. I have had a chance to read/understand this consent form, and it was explained to me in

Indonesia that I use and understand. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have received satisfactory answer. I understand that I can withdraw at any time. A copy of this signed Informed Consent Form has been given to me.

Participant Signature

Print Name

Date

By signing below I indicate that the participant has read and, to the best of my knowledge, understands the details contained in this document and has been given a copy.

Signature of Person
Obtaining Consent

Print Name:

Date:

Proposal Abstract

I am planning to conduct a research study about Literacy for Economic Independence (*Keaksaraan Usaha Mandiri*; hereafter KUM) a post-literacy programs in my country, Indonesia. This program, operating since 2009, provides public resources in the form of grant money to educational institutes and community learning centers (CLCs), not only to preserve literacy but also to help poor and illiterate people achieve economic independence. It is a technically complex program. The Ministry of Education and Culture, through the Directorate of Community Education Development, has arranged strategies described program, grant and technical activities that are conducted at all levels. All those things must be synchronized and coordinative, in terms of both substance and management. This program has involved many parties and stakeholders: educational institutions and community learning centers providing post literacy.

The largest illiterate populations in the country are located in the provinces of East, Central and West Java. This post literacy program has been implemented in these provinces, and for this reasons the investigator will conduct the research study in one of them (tentatively West Java).

I am planning to interview several stakeholders, involved at different points of the program. The first interviews will take place in Jakarta, within the Ministry of Education and Culture; they will discuss public policy as it relates to the program's design, execution and evaluation. The next interviewees will be officials responsible for literacy programs within the provincial educational office. Their interviews will focus on their implementation of the Ministry's policy, in particular financial matters: their experiences with province-level managing of Ministry budget money, and the planning of provincial budgets. The third round of interviews will be at district educational offices in Bandung, West Bandung and Subang, responsible for local CLCs. The questions here will focus on issues of oversight and accountability. The last body of interviewees will be community-level stakeholders in three districts, such as CLC leaders, tutors and illiterate learners, who will be asked about their experiences and outcomes.