

Fulfilling Individual Right to and Need of Education

A Note to Remember for Indonesian Educational Leaders

Cecep Somantri¹ and Sardin Sardin²

¹*School of Education, The University of Nottingham, United Kingdom (UK)*

²*Faculty of Educational Science, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia*
ttxs57@nottingham.ac.uk, sardin@upi.edu

Keywords: Non-formal education, orthodoxy.

Abstract: There is a global orthodoxy viewing education as a fundamental human right. However, data show that there remain millions of out of school and illiterate population worldwide. Even when enrolled at school, millions of children are not learning. This signifies that schools cannot be the only “vehicle” to provide quality education for all. It is obvious for at least two reasons: first, education is a lifelong learning process that does not equate with schooling; and second, there are other categories of education from where people could learn throughout life. Non-formal education is a learning pathway that could be an alternative for people at all background and ages to gain access to education. Although conceptually and terminologically non-formal education is contested, literature show that it has been part of all cultures throughout human history, and its practices work and exist until today. Literature from the last four decades suggest that the significance of non-formal education lies on the heart that it can function as a complement, supplement and replacement/alternative to formal education. By employing the framework of Bell and Stevenson (2013) in Indonesian context, it is suggested that non-formal education is a worth-considering educational policy to boost the country’s educational improvement.

1 INTRODUCTION

It is widely believed that education is a top priority investment for all countries across the globe. Education is perceived as ‘an investment in human-capital...that will become the key to economic, and so to social advance for a country’ (Simon, 1985, p.15). In accordance with this view, Bell and Stevenson (2007, p.xxiv) argue that in this globalisation era there is a “global orthodoxy” assuming that ‘...investment in education [is] seen as the key factor in determining the ability of nation states to hold their own in a globalised world.’ Besides viewing it as an investment, the global orthodoxy is somehow also portrayed in how countries around the world recognise education as one of the most basic human rights documented in various agreement.

A number of documents and commitments have been legalised and agreed among countries to support and guarantee that everybody regardless of their socio-cultural and religious background could have access to and gain benefits from education. For example, there are the Universal Declaration of

Human Rights proclaimed in 1948 with the focus of education as one of the fundamental human rights, UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in Education (1960) urging UNESCO Member States to implement the right to education in their respective country, the European Social Charter (ESC, adopted 1961, revised 1996) guaranteeing social and economic human rights including free primary and secondary education, World Declaration on Education For All (EFA) and Framework For Action to Meet Basic Learning Needs (1990) with the emphasis to make primary education accessible to all children and to massively reduce illiteracy before year 2000, the Dakar Framework for Action, EFA (2000) reaffirming the continuation of efforts to achieve EFA targets by the year 2015, and the latest one (2015), Incheon Declaration Education 2030 emphasising on education as a lifelong learning process as well as another opportunity for UNESCO Member States to fulfil EFA Targets by 2030. These commitments, agreed by many different countries, signify a “global orthodoxy” in viewing the importance of education for each country’s development.

Despite the common understanding on the significance of education, unfortunately, many recognise education as a process which is bounded strictly by time and location (Faure's report 1972; Romi and Schmida, 2009). Allied to this idea is Coombs and Ahmed (1973) arguing that there is a view that equates education with schooling. In addition, Graham-Brown (1991, p.64) mentions that 'most people associate education with schools, colleges and universities,' or what Coombs and Ahmed (1973), Coombs, Prosser and Ahmed (1973), and Coles (1982) regard as the "formal sector." As a result, schools as well as colleges and universities, to a certain extent, are recognised as 'the only institutions which specialise in education' (Illich, 1971).

Today, however, it is increasingly recognised that many schools fail to provide some of the basic skills, such as literacy, to a significant number of students, and even "stupefy" some talented ones with boredom (LeCompte and Dworkin, 1991). In line with it, Yasunaga (2014, p.4) believes that schools alone cannot provide quality education for "all", and different learning pathways are to be provided. In this context, 'any learning and training which takes place outside recognised educational institutions,' commonly called "non-formal education" is such a pathway (Tight, 1996; 2001).

Given the notion that schools could not be "the best vehicle" to fully satisfy some specific needs of learners (children, youth and adults), and undertake most of the educational tasks (Evans, 1981; Rogers, 2004), this paper seeks to answer three main questions by referring to international literature. The questions are: (i) why is non-formal education a worth-considering pathway?; (ii) residing to Indonesian context, why is non-formal education significant to support the country's educational improvement?; and finally, (iii) what are the implications for Indonesian educational leaders? Where appropriate and available, the paper will also take into account relevant Indonesian educational data, statistics and practices to enrich the discussions.

2 OUT-OF-SCHOOL POPULATION

At the World Education Forum (WEF) 2000 in Dakar-Senegal, UNESCO Member States made a "promise" to realise six wide-ranging goals of Education for All (EFA) to be met by the end of 2015. The promise represents global goals in education,

such as: (i) comprehensive early childhood care and education; (ii) free and compulsory primary education of good quality; (iii) appropriate learning and life skills programmes for young people and adults; (iv) improvement by at least 50 per cent of adult literacy; (v) gender equality in education; and, (vi) quality of education through the recognition and measurement of learning outcomes from every aspect (UNESCO, 2000).

By the end of 2015, UNESCO published a report that provides comprehensive assessment and analysis on the achievement of EFA goals among 164 countries in the world. Some of its key findings mention that: (i) there has been tremendous progress in educational attainment across the world since 2000; (ii) governments, civil society and the international community have shown great efforts by halving almost 50 per cent of children and adolescents who were out of school since 2000; and, (iii) despite all of this progress, it is unfortunate that the world has not been able to achieve what has been promised in the EFA goals (UNESCO, 2015).

Further statistics, released by UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) and UNICEF in 2015, discover that 58 million children of primary school age (aged roughly 6 to 11 years) and 63 million adolescents of lower secondary school age are out of school worldwide. When viewed geographically, the number of out-of-school population exists in all continents and countries. However, across geographical regions and age groups, the report points out that girls are still more likely to be out of school than boys. Furthermore, the 58 million out-of-school children are likely to encounter great difficulties in the future, and will lead them to illiteracy and unemployment (UIS and UNICEF, 2015).

A report published by UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning (UIL) in 2016 aggravates the statistics above. The report shows that currently there are around 757 million youth and adults worldwide, two third of whom are women and 115 million of them are aged between 15 and 24 years old, who still cannot read or write a simple sentence. Again, in this context, many countries around the world fail to meet the EFA target in halving the number of adult illiterate population by 2015, and not to mention, in realising gender equality and equity in education as well as quality education for all (UIL, 2016).

What do these alarming statistics signify? Despite the fact that many countries broke their "promise" to achieve quality EFA, one common thread that many countries around the world face is, 'education systems and the environment that surrounds them often put particular population at a disadvantage: the

most disadvantaged population continue to be marginalised' (UIS and UNICEF, 2015, p.8). In other words, to some extent, this common finding relates back to what Bourdieu claimed more than three decades ago about how education helps to reproduce social inequality and social exclusion (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977).

Another big questions to follow are: what is next? How can the problems be solved? These are some of the questions that educational leaders around the world, especially from developing countries, have been trying to solve (Bukova, 2014; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2014; OECD, 2015).

3 NON-FORMAL EDUCATION: AN EVOLVING CONCEPT

Since the early 1970s, three forms of education: formal, non-formal and informal education have been widely accepted as the typology of education or learning (Coombs and Ahmed, 1973; European Commission, 2001; UIS, 2012). The discourse of non-formal education, specifically, came to prominence based on the view that equates education with learning, regardless of where, when and how the learning occurs (Faure's report 1972; Coombs et al, 1973; Romi and Schmida, 2009). However, when it comes to a universally accepted definition, the term is contested (Evans, 1981; Hoppers, 2006; Romi and Schmida, 2009, Rogers, 2004). Oftentimes it is instead being contrasted with formal education as part of three categorisations of education – formal, non-formal and informal education (Rogers, 2004; Yasunaga, 2014).

Coombs and Ahmed (1973, p.10) view 'education as a learning process starting from earliest infancy through adulthood that entails a variety of methods and sources of learning.' They group these methods and sources of learning into three categories: (i) formal education: 'the hierarchically structured, chronologically graded educational system, running from primary school through the university and including, in addition to general academic studies, a variety of specialised programmes and institutions for full-time technical and professional training'; (ii) non-formal education: 'any organised educational activity outside the established formal system-whether operating separately or as an important feature of some broader activity-that is intended to serve identifiable learning clientele and learning objectives'; and, (iii) informal education: 'the truly

lifelong process whereby every individual acquires attitudes, values, skills and knowledge from daily experience and the educative influences and resources in his or her environment-from family and neighbours, from work and play, from the marketplace, the library and the mass media.'

This education typology remains accepted in definition and practice up to this present time. However, some have re-conceptualised the notion of non-formal education, showing a change in understanding "education" and "learning". Colley, Hodkinson, and Malcolm (2003) mention that conceiving formality and informality as attributes of learning is more accurate than thinking learning to be formal, non-formal or informal, because learning has no discrete categories. Farrell and Hartwell (2008, p.29) further argue that since the distinction between formal and non-formal education is often blurred, it is better to see that 'there are very strong school-community linkages, with parents and other community members actively supporting the work of the school, but they take different organisational forms in the different locations.' Rogers (2004) believes that recent diverse forms of educational provision, especially flexible schooling, have caused the terms "formal" and "non-formal" become almost meaningless. Rogers (2004, p.265) suggests an alternative model that stresses on "contextualisation context" by viewing 'formal education as highly decontextualised, which does not change with changes of participants, while the highly contextualised education, where the framing, the subject matter and the processes change with each new group which is enrolled, might be called informal education.' Finally, Robinson-Pant (2016, p.25) suggests to term 'learning processes depending on the activities and processes, and see informal, non-formal and/or formal learning as a continuum rather than polarised approaches'.

All of the reconceptualisations of non-formal education above signify how education and learning are understood from time to time. However, when it comes to critically appreciate non-formal education as a concept, the reconceptualisations discount the idea that: (i) non-formal education emerges as a response towards the fact that human beings learn not only in schools and other formal institutions; (ii) education is not confined to schools or universities; and, (iii) flexibility of learning is one of its important features and hence, flexible schooling is indeed non-formal. Meanwhile, at practical level, successful practices of non-formal education exist until today as shown by Robinson-Pant (2016) through country studies of learning knowledge and skills for

agriculture to improve rural livelihoods in Cambodia, Egypt and Ethiopia.

Besides being continuously re-conceptualised, the terminology “non-formal education” is also contested. Coombs et al. (1973) explain that some prefer other terms such as, out-of-school education, flexible learning, and alternative learning, to mention a few. However, ‘the best of them come down to saying the same thing in different ways’ (Coombs et al., 1973). What is more important to emphasise is that any educational activity could be categorised non-formal when it is organised to: (i) increase access to education for those who have been excluded from schooling (UNESCO, 2015); (ii) establish alternative forms of education (Yasunaga, 2014); and (iii) empower communities and individuals through educational activities that are not an integral part of the formal education system (Coombs et al., 1973; Graham-Brown, 1991; Robinson-Pant 2016). Therefore, despite being contested, non-formal education remains exist and accepted both as a concept and practice up to this present day.

A major problem in seeking an adequate concept of non-formal education, as argued by Brennan (1997, p.185), is due to the fact that while ‘it appears to be a social phenomenon, it is also culture and nation specific.’ Coombs (1985) and Brennan (1997) explain that the discourses of non-formal and informal education emerged with particular reference to the problems of developing countries. Nonetheless, they are also applicable to developed countries, though they are more likely to have another label, such as “community education”, “adult learning and education”, etc. (UIL, 2016).

Since it is culture and country specific, the meaning and significance of non-formal education vary from country to country, and region to region. For example, in some developed countries like England and Germany, the term non-formal education is best represented with adult and continuing education or adult education and training (Tight, 2002), while in Latin America and Eastern Europe, the term is well-known as popular education and folk education (Graham-Brown, 1991), and in Asian and African countries, the term is widely known as non-formal education (Coles, 1982). Whichever the term is, Yasunaga (2014) argues that they came to stronger prominence after Faure’s report in 1972 introduced the concept of lifelong learning that expanded the understanding of education being not limited solely to formal schooling.

International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) marked the final evolving concept of non-formal education by adopting a more recent definition

in 2011. The difference between ISCED’s definition and the one proposed by Coombs et al’s in 1973 is that, the former is formulated to compare educational statistics and indicators across countries through non-formal education as a policy and educational activity (Yasunaga, 2014), while the latter emphasises more on educational programmers held outside schools, but at the same time could also function as a feature of formal education. ISCED (UIS, 2012, p.11) explain that ‘non-formal education is often provided to guarantee the right of access to education for population at any age and background that may or may not lead to formal or equivalent to formal qualifications, and it can be carried out in a short duration and low intensity in the forms of short courses, workshops or seminars, and does not necessarily apply a continuous pathway-structure.’ Some of its activities may cover literacy education, life skills, work skills, and social or cultural development programmers.

For its comprehensive inclusion in reaching all out-of-school population at all ages and background, despite it is culture and country specific, this paper stands to use the notion of non-formal education than other similar terms saying almost the same thing. Furthermore, as Coles (1982) explains, ‘there is no point to indulge in semantic argument over terminology as the most important thing is to demonstrate that non-formal education works.’

4 THE SIGNIFICANCE OF NON-FORMAL EDUCATION

Non-formal education is obviously not a new phenomenon. It has been part of all cultures throughout human history even far before the era of Aristotle and Plato (Evans, 1981; Frith and Reed, 1982; Coles, 1982). Also, it has clear linkages with the practices of educators, such as Freire and Illich, in the way that both figures criticised how the formal system of education became a “virus” leading to all kinds of social ills (Fordham, 1980; Rogers, 2004). As a matter of fact, Coles (1982) explains that ‘it is only since the break-up of the monasteries in developed countries that schools as special institutions of learning have become the accepted way of imparting knowledge in which gradually, school and the formal education became a natural part of the landscape.’

In both developed and developing countries, however, there is a growing awareness that in some ways the formal educational systems alone cannot

respond to the challenges of modern society (Rogers, 2004) and, to a certain extent, the limits of formal education have been reached since schools fail to carry out some of educational goals (Evans, 1981). Allied this idea, Illich (1971) argues that ‘many students, especially those who are poor, intuitively know what the schools do for them: confusing teaching with learning, grade advancement with education, a diploma with competence, and fluency with the ability to say something new.’ In line with it, Carnie (2003) argues that, schools have made students see “non-tested” activities such as sport, music, drama and environmental projects and school trips “non-essential”. It is all because many students understand learning as spending a large part of their day sitting at a table receiving “knowledge”, or what Apple (1993) calls “the official knowledge”, in preparation for standardised tests (Carnie, 2003).

UNESCO (2015) confirm these claims with data showing that there were 250 million children enrolled at school in the world, but not learning the basics in reading and mathematics (UNESCO, 2015). Combined together, Illich and Carnie’s arguments, supported with data from UNESCO (2015), explain the “why” and “how” schools “stupefy” a number of students as claimed by LeCompte and Dworkin (1991). However, these arguments, if not criticisms, also come to prominence by no surprise since, as explained by Ball (2003, p.215), a new mode of “performativity” in the formal education sector ‘requires individual practitioners to focus on targets, indicators and evaluations as “real” academic work or “proper” learning.’

With increasing “complaints” toward schools and formal education, it causes no surprise that non-formal education is regarded as the “Maverick” in the education family (Coles, 1982) or what Rogers (2004) calls the “panacea” for all educational ills. Moreover, with a rigid formal schooling system that has little compromise and measure of reform as complained by Freire (1972), an educational system which is non-formal will be needed to remedy such characteristics (Rogers, 2004). However, it is important to prove how and why non-formal education is significant as a solution towards what schools and formal education fail to carry out. By referring to Coombs and Ahmed (1973), Coombs, et al. (1973), Evans (1981), La Belle (1981), Coles (1982), Brennan (1997), and Yasunaga (2014), the significance of non-formal education could be seen from the three categories it has in its relationship with formal education: (i) as a complement; (ii) as a supplement; and, (iii) as a replacement/alternative.

Complementary education. This category functions to complement the formal school system. It enacts as part of “deschooling education movement” that sees the importance of involving schools more directly in the community. The main beneficiaries of this programmer are generally primary or secondary education students. Some examples of its activities are sports clubs, art groups, hobby societies, drama groups, and the like. These activities are usually school-based and school-supervised, but they incorporate non-classroom component.

Supplementary education. This second category commonly emerges later in one’s life. It exists after a person has accomplished some amount of formal education, and decides to supplement his learning with activities to develop his skills. The learning activities could be in the forms of apprenticeships, skill-training courses, entrepreneurship training, and income-generating programmers. Supplementary education is also oftentimes useful for school drop-outs and those who have completed secondary school but need to find employment.

Replacement/alternative education. This last category aims to replace or substitute formal education dedicated to both children and adults with no access to schools. Some of its activities are literacy classes and equivalency education programmers attended by non-schooling children and adults as well as school-leavers. The beneficiaries of the category are mainly people who are marginalised because they are poor, nomadic, live in remote and underdeveloped areas, and belong to a specific ethnic group. In some developing countries, this category of non-formal education functions as a stepping-stone for all learners moving into the formal system.

In addition to these three categories, Coles (1982) explains that there are other principal justifications why it is important to take non-formal education seriously. With its universal application, non-formal education is able to see that: (i) learning is a continuing process throughout life; (ii) learning is to prepare people for change and eventually help men and women to become willing and understanding partners in the process; and, (iii) education lies in the belief that each and every person is a unique being whose right it is to be enabled, and develop and use their talents.

In the context of fulfilling the EFA global goals, on the other hand, Yasunaga (2014) claims that non-formal education’s flexible and context-specific approaches are powerful to meet the right to education of those who are marginalised and have specific learning needs. The emphasis of the claim lies on the idea that as a strategy for a country to

accomplish its promise to “the global pressures on education” (Rogers, 2004), non-formal education has an important role alongside schooling system to provide, at least, basic education to population with lack access to or cannot complete the full pathway of formal education. Although non-formal education in this context may simply mean an alternative of basic education (Rogers, 2004), the message here is that it could be used by educational policy-makers as a lens to formulate a wide range of educational activities for out-of-school population to meet the EFA goals.

Meanwhile, Fordham (1980) and Robinson-Pant (2016) put emphasis on the significance non-formal education as a development strategy, especially for rural areas. Non-formal education is seen to be more relevant to the needs of the population in rural areas working in the agricultural sector, since it aims at improving their basic level of self-sufficiency farming and their standards of nutrition and general health (Fordham, 1980; Robinson-Pant 2016). Furthermore, rural areas will receive more benefits from non-formal education because in the great majority of developing countries, they represent the “pockets” of under-development with a large number of out-of-school population (Coombs et al., 1973; UNESCO, 2015).

From gender perspectives, it is also important to note that non-formal education could function as a means of empowering disadvantaged women. For example, a case study in Ghana (Badu-Nyarko and Zumakpeh, 2013) found that after participating in non-formal education programmers, 180 women in Nowodli district admit to have better self-esteem, self-confidence and courage to stand up against domestic violence. Meanwhile, effective literacy programmers for women in 18 countries point out to a common understanding that literacy is the foundation of lifelong learning, especially for marginalised women, that may lead to influence children’s education, economic development, health and civic engagement (UIL, 2013).

Taking Indonesia as an example, the paper explores why and how non-formal education is able to support its educational improvement.

5 INDONESIA AND NON-FORMAL EDUCATION

Indonesia is the biggest archipelagic country in the world with more than 17 thousand islands scattered throughout over both sides of the equator (MoEC, 2015). Indonesia is inhabited by more than 255

million people, making it become the fourth most populous country in the world after China, India and the U.S.A (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2016a). The country has 34 provinces, 514 cities/municipalities and 81,626 villages, enriched with over 300 ethnic groups and 680 native languages spoken throughout the nation (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2016b).

In the education sector, today, Indonesia is ranked as having the fourth largest public school system in the world with the learner coverage of close to 50 million from primary to secondary education (MoEC, 2015). In addition, by 2015, Indonesia has been successful in reaching more than 90 per cent threshold of literacy rate, turning it from approximately 3 per cent in 1945 (MoEC, 2015; UNESCO, 2016). The success led the country to receive *UNESCO King Sejong Literacy Award* in 2012, an international recognition for high commitment and efforts in fighting against illiteracy (UNESCO, 2012). By these achievements, Indonesian government claim that the country has met the EFA and Millennium Development Goals (MDGs’) targets for primary and literacy education. Also, it is claimed that gender equality in all types and levels of education is close to be accomplished (MoEC, 2011).

Despite its significant progress, it turns out that there are at least 200 thousand pupils who drop out of school every year in Indonesia (MoEC, 2015; UNESCO, 2015). Although the primary and junior secondary education Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) have shown significant improvement, 108 per cent for the former and 100.72 per cent for the latter (MoEC, 2015), unfortunately there are over 4.4 million out of school population in Indonesia who remain excluded from education for the last 6 years (TNP2K, 2016).

Other international reports continue to exacerbate the disappointing educational statistics in Indonesia. UIS literacy database (2016) mentions that despite being able to reach 90 per cent threshold in literacy rate, the number of illiterate population in Indonesia remains high by reaching more than 8 million youth and adults. In contrast, the Indonesian government claim that by the end of 2014 the country only has 5.9 million illiterate population or equal to 3.7 per cent illiteracy rate (MoEC, 2015). Both statistics are precise, yet the age group used by the Indonesian government is 15-59 years old, while UIS use 15+ years.

Another international report, *Progress International Reading Literacy Study* (PIRLS) in 2011, shows that Indonesian students’ reading competence is low. Indonesia ranks 45 out of 48 countries on reading skills (IEA, 2012). In line with

this finding, a recent study in 2016, *The World's Most Literate Nations*, places Indonesia third from the bottom of 61 countries for its “literate behavior characteristics” (Miller, 2016). Finally, the latest *Programmed for International Student Assessment* (PISA) 2015, shows that Indonesia ranks 66 out of 72 countries in reading as well as one of the low 9 countries from the bottom in Mathematics and science (OECD, 2016); a result which is not much different from the last achievement in PISA 2012 (OECD, 2014).

Besides the poor statistics as shown by several international reports above, Indonesia also continues to face geographic and socio-cultural barriers in increasing its educational advancement. For example, approximately 108 miles away to the west of Jakarta, the Capital of Indonesia, there is a tribe called *Baduy* or *Badui* with more than 11 thousand members who firmly hold to ten traditional values *Pikukuh Sapuluh* (Yulaelawati, 2012a). The values stressing on the importance of living in harmony with the environment are preserved from one generation to another, and forbid the *Baduy* to practice “modern lifestyles,” such as using chemical fertilisers for farming, using transportation for commuting, and attending schools to receive education (Yulaelawati, 2012a; Iskandar and Ellen, 2000). Yulaelawati (2012a) explains that the *Baduy* believe that ‘school or formal education for their children is against their *adat* or traditional customs.’

There are other indigenous communities throughout Indonesia with low access to as well as interest in school. For instance, there are the nomadic *Bajo* tribe in Sulawesi island who live based on cultural beliefs and their former ancestors’ social practices (Pilgrim, Cullen, Smith and Pretty, 2006), the *Kombay* or *Korowai* tribe in West Papua Province who live in tree houses with strong way of life to live in harmony with the nature (Stasch, 2011), and the *Kajang* tribe in Makassar city who are committed to the ways of life and oral traditions of their ancestors (Tyson, 2009). In addition to these tribes, by geographical reason, a number of Indonesian people also become indigenous. In total, there are 165 underprivileged, outer-front and border areas in Indonesia with low access to education and high illiteracy rate (BAPPENAS, 2015).

With its nature as a developing country, non-formal education is a worth-considering learning alternative to support Indonesian educational improvement. Non-formal education offers flexibility and various learning needs for people at any age and background (Coombs and Ahmed, 1973; Romi and Schmida, 2009; Yasunaga, 2014). In developing

countries, it also serves children and youth who never had the opportunity to attend school, dropped out or did not continue to the next level of education, and in many occasions, has to start from teaching three R’s: reading, writing and basic arithmetic (Coombs et al, 1973; Evans, 1981). Furthermore, in its implementation, Yasunaga (2014) explains that non-formal education activities could be adapted to the learners’ needs in a wide range of conditions. In fact, in Indonesian context, Yulaelawati (2012a) shows that the experience in providing basic literacy education to the *Baduy* tribe, who have strong objection against schooling provision, was carried out in “persuasive and non-confrontational” approach in which non-formal education has that characteristic. It is both persuasive and non-confrontational in the way that, as Fordham (1980) and Romi and Schmida (2009) put it, the process requires the learners to be involved in determining the nature and content of the educational activities based on their needs and priorities.

Meanwhile in its organisation, non-formal education is open to various stakeholders: religious organisations, non-governmental organisations, private enterprises, and public agencies (La Belle, 1981; UNESCO, 2015). In fact, Evans (1981) and UNESCO (2015) confirm that non-formal education activities have been mainly developed, provided and sponsored by non-governmental sector. As an asset for the organisation and delivery of non-formal education activities throughout the country, Indonesia has various community-based learning institutions. For example, Community Learning Centres (CLCs) – institutions providing mostly free-of-charge learning activities for all ages – have increased significantly in quantity from time to time: 815 units in 1999 to 9,800 units in 2015 (MoEC, 2015). There are also 19,969 courses and training institutions catering at least 3.5 million unemployed youth through professional-work training and courses, such as language, tourism, handicraft, electronics, automotive, etc. (*ibid*). Besides, Indonesia has a wide range of non-governmental and religious organisations that have cadres at the grass-root level and have expertise in providing voluntary activities to marginalised and disadvantaged population (MoEC, 2011).

The educational statistics, the nature of Indonesia as a developing country, and experience in catering the underprivileged lead to the final question: what are the implications for Indonesian educational leaders?

6 IMPLICATIONS FOR INDONESIAN EDUCATIONAL LEADERS

It is widely believed that leadership plays a significant role in creating change to educational institutions and learning outcomes. Leithwood (2007, p.46) states that 'leadership serves as a catalyst for unleashing the potential capacities that already exist in the organisations,' including pupil learning. In the same way, a meta-analysis of a published research carried out by Robinson in 2007 shows that, 'the closer leaders are to the core business of teaching and learning, the more likely they are to make a difference to students' (Robinson 2007, p.21). However, since there is an orthodoxy that equates education with school as mentioned in advance, there exists what Hodgkinson (1993, p.21 in Day, Harris, Hadfield, Tolley and Beresford 2000, p.7) refers to as 'a swamp of literature in [school] leadership.' As a result, literature addressing effective leadership in non-formal education settings is scarce (Etling, 1994; 1998).

In order to provide succinct explanation on the implications of non-formal education towards Indonesian educational leaders, the notion of non-formal education needs to be viewed as a policy in addition to the three categories of its function explained earlier. By seeing it as a policy, the paper will be able to see educational leaders in the broad context and layered settings, and hence, avoid equating educational leadership with principalship. In examining non-formal education as a policy, this paper adapts Bell and Stevenson's framework for policy analysis (2006), and puts it into practice in Indonesian context. The framework consists of four dimensions as follows:

- socio-political environment: the context in which policy begins to be framed by key ideological debates and policy issues;
- governance and strategic direction: policy begins to emerge with more clarity through policy parameters and priorities;
- organisational principles: policy is articulated in organisational context; and,
- operational practices and procedure: policy is enacted in the daily activities of those who work in educational institutions.

In Indonesian context, the first dimension is best represented by the academics. By law and as a profession, academics refer to 'the professional

educators and scholars whose tasks are to transform, develop and disseminate science, technology, and arts through education, research, and community service' (Law Number 14/2005 on Teachers and Academics; Government Regulation Number 37/2009 on Academics). By referring to their professional duty as mandated by the laws, as well as the number of academics reaching more than 241 thousand people with 3,496 higher education institutions spread across the country (Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education, 2016), it is safe to say that when the academics do complete their tasks in education, research and community service effectively, they could play an important role in raising ideological debates and policy issues of non-formal education on the basis of robust academic- and evidence-based research.

On the second dimension, governments at both national and local levels are the ones responsible for governance and strategic direction. Indonesian governments are mandated to provide educational services and guarantee the provision of quality education for all Indonesian citizens without any discrimination (Law Number 20/2003 on National Education System). In order to realise this mandate, since 2008, the Indonesian governments have allocated education funding by at least 20 per cent from the national/local budget (Constitutional Court Decree Number 013/PUU-VI/2008). Unfortunately, from year to year, the budget allocation dedicated to serve out-of-school population, including the drop outs, illiterates, indigenous communities, and job seekers, or in this context the "non-formal education sector", receives less than 3 per cent out of the total education budget managed by the MoEC, Republic of Indonesia (MoEC, 2015).

Other than budgeting, Law Number 20/2003 on National Education System states that the governments are responsible to create a recognition framework for all types of learning. Unfortunately, up to this present moment, Indonesia does not have any policy or framework to recognise, validate and accredit 'any learning gained through vocational or other experience, usually through the award of credit' like the one in the United Kingdom (UK) that is known as "Recognition of Prior Experiential (or informal) Learning" (The University of Nottingham, 2016). The framework is essential as there is a growing awareness that much knowledge, skills and traits are evidently learned more through non-formal and informal means (Singh, 2016). Through such framework, Singh (2016) argues that prior out-of-school learning will be able to be recognised, validated and accredited for many purposes:

licensing, employment, or credit in formal education, and certification.

Educational institution leaders represent the third dimension of the framework in Indonesian context. They can be either school principals or non-formal education administrators. School principals in Indonesia are likely to face what Stevenson (2007) regards as “right versus right” dilemmas. Stevenson (2007, p.380) explains that, in English schools, but not confined to, ‘school principals are faced with the difficulty of creating caring and inclusive learning environments in a context of high stakes testing and the publication of school performance data.’ In this context, principals’ personal and professional values in formulating schools’ internal policy regarding accepting all students regardless their social and academic background versus selecting economically stable and academically well-performed students is in dilemma. In addition, since there are groups of population in Indonesia that have culture specific needs and characteristics, it is important for school principals to have greater conceptual clarity in respect of “culture” in order to exercise effective school leadership (Dimmock and Walker, 2005). Although there is no universal agreement on what it means, the underlying idea of culture is that it portrays heterogeneous values, norms and beliefs expressed through thoughts and behaviours (Dimmock and Walker, 2005, p.200). In relation to this, to be effective, school principals need to take this understanding into account, since there will be probability for them to face students with both culture specific needs and non-formal education background.

Etling (1994; 1998), on the other hand, argues that ‘effective leadership for non-formal education is not the same as formal education.’ In non-formal education settings, the staff are often people from diverse formal training (oftentimes minimal), while the learners are varied in age, learning objectives, and understanding of curriculum (Frith and Reed 1982; Etling, 1994). Considering these dimensions, Etling (1994; 1998) suggests that authoritarian leadership approach may cause problem, and in order to be effective, leaders in non-formal education institutions should be able to perform facilitator leadership: being democratic, non-directive and ready to relinquish leadership to the group.

On the last dimension, teachers are the ones carrying out the operational practices and procedure of the policy. To some extent, for those who have worked as school teachers for a certain time with experience in handling rather homogenous school-age students, catering learners with non-formal education background could be challenging. Romi

and Schmida (2009) explain that non-formal education learners are used to: (i) flexibility in changing the learning according to their needs; (ii) learning process that is not restricted neither by time nor location; (iii) learning that is carried out as a two-way communication among participants; and, (iv) learning for immediate application. Bearing this diversity in mind, Etling (1994) explains that it is important for teachers to have a consideration on the learning approach and the importance of knowing both “pedagogy” and “andragogy.”

Defined broadly, pedagogy represents “the science of teaching” (Simon, 1999), while andragogy refers to “the theory of adult learning” (Knowles, 1984). Simon (1999, p.39) explains that ‘the term “pedagogy” itself implies structure... the elaboration or definition of specific means adapted to produce the desired effect – such-and-such learning on the part of the child. From the start of the use of the term, pedagogy has been concerned to relate the process of teaching to that of learning on the part of the child.’ Meanwhile, Knowles (1984) argues that there is a need to develop a theory for adult learning, since adults are self-directed and need to know why they are learning something as they have experience as well as readiness, orientation and motivation to learn. Therefore, it is safe to say that in catering learners in non-formal education settings, teachers need to consider combining pedagogical and andragogical approaches depending on the heterogeneity of learners’ age.

7 CONCLUSIONS

There is a global orthodoxy that views education as a fundamental human right. Voluminous documents and agreement have been signed by educational leaders across the globe as a symbol of legitimate commitment that each person shall receive their right in education. However, data show that there are millions of out of school population and illiterate youth and adults worldwide. Even when enrolled at school, there are millions of children who are not learning. Therefore, it is safe to say that schools alone cannot be the only “vehicle” to provide quality education for all. This is obvious because of at least two reasons: first, education is a lifelong learning process that does not equate with schooling; and second, there are other categories of education from where people could learn throughout life. Non-formal education is a learning pathway that could be an alternative for people at all background and ages to gain access to education.

Although, as a concept and terminology, non-formal education is contested, literature shows that it has been part of all cultures throughout human history, and its practices work and exist until today. With no intention to compare and contrast, the significance of non-formal education lies on the heart that it can function as a complement, supplement and replacement/alternative to formal education. Based on these categories, it could be safely argued that non-formal education could play an important role as a means and strategy to fulfil individual right to and need of education, develop and empower disadvantaged population, including women, and achieve the global goals in education.

Meanwhile, when referred to Indonesian context, the country's socio-cultural diversity, experience in serving marginalised population, and educational statistics show that non-formal education is a worth-considering educational policy to boost its educational improvement. After analysed with Bell and Stevenson's framework for policy analysis, it turns out that it would take a collective effort from Indonesian educational leaders in broad context and different layers to provide research-based policy discourses, academic-based policy parameters and priorities, effective educational leadership, and successful implementation of non-formal education.

REFERENCES

- Apple, M. 1993. The Politics of Official Knowledge: Does a National Curriculum Make Sense? *Teachers College Record*, 95 2.: pp.222-241.
- Badu-Nyarko, S., K., Zumakpeh, A., S., K. 2013. Non-Formal Education for Change: The Case of Nadowli Women in Ghana. *American International Journal of Social Science*, [online] 2 2., pp.178-191.
- Ball, S., J. 2003. The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity, *Journal of Education Policy*, 18:2, 215-228.
- BAPPENAS Indonesian Ministry of National Development Planning. 2015. *Daftar Daerah 3T 2015 List of Underprivileged, Outer-Front and Border Areas*. [online]. Jakarta: BAPPENAS.
- Bell, B., Stevenson, H. 2006. Editors' Introduction: Organizing Public Education. In Bell, B., Stevenson, H. Eds. *Organizing Public Education*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. pp.xxiii-lxii.
- Bourdieu, P., Passeron, J. C. 1977. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. 2nd Edition. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications Inc.
- Brian, S. 1999. Why No Pedagogy in England? In Leach, J., Moon, B. Eds. *Learners and Pedagogy*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, pp.34-44.
- Brennan, B. 1997. Reconceptualizing non-formal education. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, [online] 16 3.: pp.185-200.
- Bukova, I. 2014. *The Right to Education for all Children* [online]. Bulgaria: UNICEF Bulgaria.
- Central Bureau of Statistics 2016a. *Statistics Yearbook of Indonesia 2015* [online]. Jakarta: BPS.
- Central Bureau of Statistics 2016b. *Population Projection by Single Age and Specific Age Group 2010 -2035* [online]. Jakarta: Indonesia.
- Colley, H., Hodkinson, P., Malcolm, J. 2003. *Informality and Formality in Learning*. c London: Learning and Skills Research Centre.
- Coombs, P. H. 1985. *The World Educational Crisis: the view from the eighties*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Coombs, P., Ahmed, M. 1973. *Attacking Rural Poverty: how nonformal education can help*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Coombs, P. H., Prosser, C., Ahmed, M. 1973. *New Paths to Learning for Rural Children and Youth*. New York: International Council for Educational Development.
- Coombs, P. H. 1968. *The World Educational Crisis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Day, C., Harris, A., Hadfield, M., Tolley, H., Beresford, J. 2000. The changing face of headship, in K. Leithwood, C. Day Eds.. *Leading Schools in Times of Change* Toronto: Springer., pp.6-24.
- Dimmock, C., Walker, A. 2005. *Educational Leadership: Culture and Change*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Council of Europe 2006. *The Right to Education Under the European Social Charter* [online]. London: Council of Europe.
- Etling, A. 1994.. Leadership For Nonformal Education. *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education*, Vol. 11., pp. 16-24. DOI:10.5191/jiaee.1994.01103.
- Etling, A. 1998.. Building A Paradigm Of Nonformal Education Administration: Focus On Competencies. *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education*, Vol. 53., pp. 61-64. DOI:10.5191/jiaee.1998.05308.
- European Commission 2001. *Communication: making a European area of lifelong learning a reality* [online]. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.
- Farrell, J., Hartwell, A. 2008. *Planning for successful alternative schooling: A possible route to Education for All*. Planning for successful alternative schooling: A possible route to Education for All. Paris: IIEP.
- Freire, P. 1972. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Fordham, P. 1980. *Participation, Learning and Change: Commonwealth approaches to non-formal education*. London: Commonwealth Secretariat.
- Frith, M., Reed, H.B. 1982. *Lifelong learning manual: Training for effective education in organizations*. Amherst, MA: Community Education Resource Center, School of Education, University of Massachusetts.
- Government Regulation Number 37/2009 on Academics. Jakarta: the Government of Indonesia.

- Graham-Brown, S. 1991. *Education in the Developing World*. Harlow: Longman.
- Hoppers, W. 2006. *Non-Formal Education and Basic Education Reform: a conceptual review*. [Online]. Paris: UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning.
- Illich, I. D. 1971. *Deschooling Society*. London: Calders and Boyar.
- International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement IEA. 2012. PIRLS 2011 International Results in Reading [online]. MA and Amsterdam: USA and the Netherlands. Iskandar, J. and Ellen, R.F. 2000. The Contribution of Parasarianthes Albizia. falcataria to Sustainable Swidden Management Practices among The Baduy of West Java. *Human Ecology*, [online] 281., pp.1–17.
- Knowles, M. 1984.. *Andragogy in Action*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- La Belle, T.J. 1981. An introduction to the non-formal education of children and youth. *Comparative Education Review*, [online] 253., pp.313–329.
- Law Number 14/2005 on Teachers and Academics. Jakarta: the Government of Indonesia.
- Law Number 20/2003 on National Education System. Jakarta: the Government of Indonesia.
- LeCompte, M. D., Dworkin, A. G. 1991. *Giving up on School: Student Dropouts and Teacher Burnouts*. California: Corwin Press.
- Leithwood, K. 2007. What We Know About Educational Leadership. In Burger, J.M., Webber, C.F., Kleinck, P. Eds. *Intelligent Leadership: Constructs for Thinking Educational Leaders* pp. 41-66.. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Miller, J. W. 2016. *The World's Most Literate Nations*. Connecticut: USA.
- Ministry of Education and Culture MoEC., Republic of Indonesia 2015. *Indonesia: Educational Statistics in Brief*. Jakarta: Centre for Educational Data and Statistics.
- Ministry of National Education, Republic of Indonesia 2010. *Improving literacy for all: A national movement for empowering Indonesian community*. Jakarta: Indonesia.
- Ministry of Education and Culture, Republic of Indonesia 2011. *Empowering Women NGOs' in Improving Adult Female Literacy*. [Online]. Jakarta: Ministry of National Education.
- Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education, Republic of Indonesia 2016. *Pangkalan Data Pendidikan Tinggi Higher Education Data Portal..* [Online]. Jakarta: MRTHE.
- OECD 2015. *PISA 2015 Results in Focus* [online]. PISA: OECD Publishing.
- OECD 2014. *PISA 2012 Results: What Students Know and Can Do – Student Performance in Mathematics, Reading and Science Volume I*, Revised edition, February 2014. [online]. PISA: OECD Publishing.
- Robinson-Pant, A. 2016. *Learning knowledge and skills for agriculture and improving rural livelihoods: Reviewing the Field*. [Online]. Paris: UNESCO.
- Rogers, A. 2004. *Non-Formal Education: Flexible Schooling or Participatory Education?*. Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong.
- Romi, S., Schmida, M. 2009. Non-formal education: a major educational force in the postmodern era. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, [online] 39 2., pp.257-273.
- Simon, B. 1985. *Does Education Matter?* London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Singh, M. 2016. Global perspectives on recognising non-formal and informal learning: Why recognition matters. *Technical and Vocational Education and Training: Issues, Concerns and Prospects*, [online] Vol. 21.
- Stasch, R. 2011. The Camera and the House: The Semiotics of New Guinea “Treehouses” in Global Visual Culture. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, [online] 531., pp.75–112.
- Stevenson, H. 2007. A Case Study in Leading Schools for Social Justice: When Morals and Markets Collide. In Bell, B., Stevenson, H. Eds. *Organizing Public Education*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. pp.371-385.
- The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. The Preamble to the Constitution p.1.
- The University of Nottingham 2016. *Recognition of Other Learning previously APL..* [Online]. [Accessed 16 November 2016]. Available from: <https://www.nottingham.ac.uk/academicservices/qualitymanual/studiesawayfromtheuniversity/recognitionoftherlearning.aspx>
- Tight, M. 1996. *Key Concepts in Adult Education and Training*. London, Routledge.
- Tight, M. 2001. *Key Concepts in Adult Education and Training*. 2nd Edition. London: Routledge.
- Tim Nasional Percepatan Penanggulangan Kemiskinan National Team for the Acceleration of Poverty Reduction. TNP2K. 2016. Data dan Indikator Pendidikan Educational Data and Indicators.. [Online]. [Accessed 12 July 2013]. Available at: <http://www.tnp2k.go.id/id/data-indikator/mengenal-data-indikator/> [Accessed 14 November 2016].
- Tyson, A. D. 2009. Still Striving for Modesty: Land, Spirits, and Rubber Production in Kajang, Indonesia. *The Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology*, [online] 103., pp.200–2015.
- UNESCO 2016. *Implementing the Right to Education* [online]. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO 2015. *Education For All Global Monitoring Report 2015* [online]. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO 2015. *Incheon Declaration Education 2030: Towards inclusive and equitable quality education and lifelong learning for all* [online]. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO 2012. *The winners of the UNESCO International Literacy Prizes 2012* [online]. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO 2000. *The Dakar Framework for Action, Education for All: Meeting our Collective Commitments* [online]. Paris: UNESCO.

- UNESCO 1990. *World Declaration on Education For All and Framework For Action to Meet Basic Learning Needs* [online]. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO 1972. *Learning to be: The World of Education today and tomorrow, a report submitted by the International Commission on the Development of Education chaired by Edgar Faure* [online]. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning UIL. 2016. *The Third Global Report on Adult Education and Learning GRALE III*. [online]. Hamburg: UIL.
- UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning UIL. 2013. *Literacy Programmes with a focus on women to reduce gender disparities: Case studies from UNESCO Effective Literacy and Numeracy Practices Database LitBase*. [online]. Hamburg: UIL.
- UNESCO Institute for Statistics UIS. 2016. *UIS literacy database for SDG 4.6*. [Online]. [Accessed 12 December 2016]. Available from: <http://uis.unesco.org/country/id>
- UNESCO Institute for Statistics and Education for All Global Monitoring Report EFA GMR. 2014. *Progress in getting all children to school stalls, but some countries show the way forward* [online]. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO Institute for Statistics UIS. 2012. *The International Standard Classification of Education 2011* [online]. Montreal: UNESCO Institute for Statistics.
- UNESCO Institute for Statistics UIS., United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund UNICEF. 2015. *Fixing the Broken Promise of Education for All: Findings from the Global Initiative on Out-of-School Children* [online]. Montreal: UIS.
- UNESCO Institute for Statistics UIS. 2012. *The International Standard Classification of Education 2011* [online]. Montreal: UNESCO Institute for Statistics.
- Universal Declaration of Human Rights. 1948. [Online]. *proclaimed by the United Nations General Assembly in Paris on 10 December 1948 General Assembly resolution 217 A..* Available at: http://www.ohchr.org/EN/UDHR/Documents/UDHR_Translations/eng.pdf [Accessed 16 October 2016].
- Yulaelawati, E. 2012a. *Literacy and Peace Education: Persuasive and Non-Confrontational Approach of Literacy for Baduy Ethnic*. [Online]. Jakarta: Ministry of Education and Culture.
- Yulaelawati, E. 2012b. *Policy, Legislation and Implementation of Community Learning Centres in Indonesia*. [Online]. Jakarta: Ministry of Education and Culture.
- Yasunaga, M. 2014. *Non-Formal Education as a Means to Meet Learning Needs of Out-of-School Children and Adolescents*. [Online]. Paris: UNESCO.