Research report : a study on the drop-out situation of basic education in DKI Jakarta

Research Report:

A STUDY ON THE DROP-OUT SITUATION OF BASIC EDUCATION IN DKI JAKARTA

Submitted to:

Japan International Corporation Agencies
Jakarta, Indonesia

JICA LIBRARY
J1165713[7]

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE
THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA
THE INSTITUTE FOR TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION
(IKIP)
JAKARTA
1998

JICA
108
24.2
INO
BRARY

INO
J R

ABSTRACT

The survey is conducted with the intention to have a detailed picture about the dropout situation of basic education in DKI Jakarta due to the present monetary crisis that strikes Indonesia.

This study is aimed at calculating the rate of dropout and the decrease number of pupils continuing to higher level of education, estimating the decrease in parents' purchasing power, and estimating the amount of household expenditure for basic needs and educational costs. This study also aims at estimating the grant needed to support students' education as well as to obtain information on the management of grant allocation.

The population of the study is the Primary and Junior High Schools in DKI Jakarta. It consists of state, private, and Islamic schools. A sample of 30 Primary and 24 Junior High Schools has been chosen randomly from the five regions of Jakarta; taking into consideration the areas of living (central, peripheral and the area between the two areas). From these sample schools , 54 headmasters, 252 teachers and 504 parents have been involved as respondents. Data were gathered by means of questionnaires and interviews.

The results of data analysis reveal as the following:

1. Dropout rate at both Primary and Junior High Schools increases throughout the academic year. The average DO rate of in Primary School level is 0.7% and the highest is 1.3%. For the Junior High School level, the average DO rate is 0.5% and the highest is 0.7%.
2. The rate of DO is not as high as it has been expected since schools as well as parents have done many efforts to enable children to continue their education.
3. The highest percentage of schools with DO and potential DO pupils, both at Primary and Junior High School levels, occurs in the peripheral area of the regions.


1165713[7]

4. The transitional DO rate increases in the year 1997/1998 for both levels of education. The highest number of Primary and Junior High School graduates who continue to higher level of education is decreasing over the years, particularly in the area between central and peripheral areas.
5. Most parents at both levels of education suffer from the decrease of their purchasing power, particularly for basic needs and pupils educational costs, as there is a significant difference in the family income before and during the monetary crisis.
6. At the Primary School level, the average family expenditure is Rp. 587.000 per month, whereas at the Junior High School level the average is Rp. 755.000 per month.
7. Grant needs to be given to pupils of Primary and Junior High Schools , particularly those in the peripheral areas of the five regions, in the form of money via schools. The grant should be distributed to the needees with open management and by involving PTA (Parent-Teacher Association) in the distribution.
8. Grant / aid needs also to be allocated for schools and teachers to enhance the teaching and learning process at schools.
9. Grant/aid in form food, especially milk, needs to be taken into consideration as most pupils/ students seem to suffer from malnutrition.

PREFACE

It was God's bless that we could finally complete this report writing of our **Study on the Dropout Situation of Basic Education in DKI Jakarta** over the monetary crisis that strikes Indonesia.

This report is the result of a study conducted upon the request of JICA on behalf of the Japanese government. It will be used as the basis of considerations in extending assistance to schools with many dropout and potentially dropout pupils/students.

On this occasion, in my capacity as the research team leader as well as the Rector of IKIP Jakarta, I would like to express my gratitude to the Japanese government, represented here by JICA, who has demonstrated their concern in the education of Indonesian children who suffer from the present monetary crisis, particularly those in DKI Jakarta.

We would also like to extend our gratitude to JICA, as the sponsor; the headmasters, teachers, parents of the pupils and students of the primary and junior high schools chosen as objects of the study; and the students of IKIP Jakarta who have assisted us in the data collection.

It is hoped that this report can fulfil JICA's expectations and be useful in determining educational assistance for the needy pupils and students in the Primary and Junior High School levels of education.

Jakarta, December 23, 1998
IKIP Jakarta Research Team Leader

Sutjipto

Team

Coordinator	:	Dr. Sutjipto
Consultants	:	Prof. Dr. Toeti Soekamto
		Suriani, SH., M.A.
Members	:	Ir. Muzayanah Sutikno., M.Pd.
		Dra. Rahma Boedi, M.Pd.
		Dra. Ilza Mayuni, M.A.
		Dra. Sri Zulaihati, M.Si.
		Drs. Tjipto Sumadi, M Si, M.Pd
		Dra. Sri Sulastini, MA.
		Drs. Dwi Atmanto, M Si

LIST OF CONTENT

LIST OF TABLE

A STUDY ON THE DROPOUT SITUATION OF BASIC EDUCATION DUE TO THE LATEST MONETARY CRISIS IN INDONESIA

A. Background of the Study

Since July 1997 Indonesia is suffering from a severe monetary crisis which badly affects its economic and social sectors. Many people are loosing their jobs; dramatic increase of inflation rate has caused a decrease in the real value of people's income that consequently, increased their expenditures. More money must be spent to fulfill the basic needs, especially household expenses. One immediate impact of the monetary crisis on basic education in DKI Jakarta is the decreasing number of pupils who can continue their education, due to their parents' lock of ability to afford the cost of their education.

In Jakarta, there are 3.446 Primary Schools. They consist of 2.524 public, 808 private, and 114 Islamic schools (Madrasah Ibtidaiyah). There are also 1200 Junior High Schools, i.e. 280 publics, 694 privates, and 226 Madrasah Tsanawiyahs.

Results from a preliminary visit to 3 Primary Schools and 2 SLTPs in 3 districts of Jakarta, representing central area and outskirts, (Grogol Petamburan: SD Tunas Harapan & SLTPN 89, Kepulauan Seribu: SDN Pulau Tidung & SLTPN 133, and Johar Baru: MIN Johar Baru), indicated that the number of dropout pupils in Primary Schools increased between nine to ten percent. As with the Junior High Schools, the number increases between ten to eleven percent. This number will likely increase in the following year by 3.03% for Primary Schools and 3.46% for Junior High Schools of the total number of pupils registered in the 1998/1999 academic year (data of the Balitbang, Information Center, Ministry of Education and Culture).

The following phenomena can be observed:

1. There has been a decrease in parents' ability to bear the cost of their children's education which results in the increase of non-participation as well as the number of school-termination of the children.
2. A sharp decrease in the number of pupils continuing to higher level education exists; in this case from primary to Junior High Schools,

3. A Sharp decrease in the quality of education occurs due to:
   a. a decrease in the operational cost (the abolishment of student fees for Junior High Schools), and the inability of the local government to fulfill their part in sharing the operational cost of primary education,
   b. a decrease in the real value of income of the teachers that forces them to seek additional income. This has reduced the amount of time, energy and efforts they usually spend for the teaching and learning process at school,
   c. the increasing price of educational supplies like stationery, text-books, etc.,
   d. the abolishment of registration fee and contribution for school's educational operation and textbook cost that makes the school's income decreased. Fortunately, the contribution from the PTA (BP3) is still allowed as long as the amount does not exceed the latest amount of SPP.

The above phenomena indicate the quantitative aspects of the monetary crisis impact on the educational system in Indonesia.

Analyses of these phenomena have been done so far; however, they are not comprehensive enough. Therefore, further inquiry is needed, especially one that includes the analysis of factors underlying the drop-out rate of pupils in the basic education sector.

B. Aims of the Study

The study is conducted with the following aims:

1. To calculate the rate of drop-outs and the decrease in the number of pupils continuing to higher level education i.e. from primary to Junior High Schools;
2. To estimate the decrease in parents purchasing power due to the monetary crisis which influences their ability to bear the cost of their children is education;
3. To estimate the amount of household expenditures spent for basic needs and educational cost;
4. To estimate the grant needed to support pupils at each educational level (limited to basic education only);
5. To study the management of grant allocation that can reach the target group efficiently.

C. Research Questions

In order to meet the aims stated, a survey has been carried out to the following research questions;

1. What is the real drop-out figure related directly to the effect of the monetary crisis in Indonesia?
2. What are the underlying factors of this drop-outs?

These two question is elaborated in more details, i e :

1. What is the condition of schools being chosen as sample? (location, status, condition of teachers, equipment, and operational cost).
2. What is the drop-out rate in these schools?
3. What major factors have caused the drop-outs?
4. What is the condition of parents, especially those of dropout pupils and those potential to dropout (housing, occupation, educational background, average income, and average household expenditure)?
5. What is the decrease of parents' functioning power, as the impact of the monetary crisis which influences their ability to bear the cost of their children education?
6. What can be done to support pupils' education in the primary and Junior High Schools?

Questions number 1-5 are answered by the Data obtained through the survey questionnaire.
Results of analysis and interpretation of the data form the answer to question 6.

D. Research Methodology

The research is conducted in the form of a survey in Jakarta, representing the urban area.

1. Population and Sample

The population of the study is the Primary and Junior High Schools. The sample of the study is chosen using the following procedure:

a. From each of the five region in Jakarta, one to two kecamatan or subdistricts

were chosen randomly to represent the central, peripheral, and between central and peripheral areas of the region.

b. From the chosen subdistrict/kecamatan of each region, at least four schools were chosen randomly to represent the primary education level. This group consists of two to six public, one to two private and one to two Islamic schools. At least four schools were chosen randomly to represent the Junior High level of education. This group consists of two to three public, one private and one Islamic schools. Table 1 represents the distribution of sample schools. (For more details on schools and theirname/adresses see Appendix 1)

Table 1: Schools as Sample of the Study

No	Region	Primary Schools			Junior High Schools		
		Govern-ment	Private	Madrasah Ibtidaiyah	Govern-ment	Private	Madrasah Tsana-wiyah
1	Jakarta Utara	2	1	1	4	-	-
2	Jakarta Barat	3	1	1	1	1	1
3	Jakarta Pusat	4	1	2	2	2	1
4	Jakarta Selatan	6	2	2	4	1	3
5	Jakarta Timur	3	1	-	2	-	2
Total		18	6	6	13	4	7
Grand Total		30			24		

c. From each of the school parents of two pupils of each grade was chosen randomly represent the groups of potentially dropouts and dropouts. So, there were in addition, the headmaster and one teacher from each grade (six of primary and three of Junior High Schools) were also involved as respondents thus, the total respondents of the study were 810 as is explained in table 2 twelve parent-respondents from each primary school and six from each JH school.

Table 2: Respondents of the Study

Respon-dent	Primary School				Sub Total	Junior High School				Sub Total	Total
	Unit	Class	Type	Kec.		Unit	Class	Type	Kec.		
Head-master	1	1	5	6	30	1	1	4	6	24	54
Teacher	1	6	5	6	180	1	3	4	6	72	252
Parent	2	6	5	6	360	2	3	4	6	144	504
Total					570					240	810

2. Instruments

The instruments used for this study were questionnaires which were given to (a) parents of dropout and potentially dropout pupils/students, (b) headmasters, and (c) teachers.

3. Data of the study

The data obtained from the survey covers the following

a. A general description of school condition (location, condition of teachers, equipment, operational cost).
b. A quantitative description of the economic background of the parents (age, educational background, occupation, income, household expenditure of basic needs and alteration in household expenditure before the crisis and now).
c. The total number of dropout pupils/students and students having severe financial problems in continuing their study to a higher level
d. The grant/aid received by pupils/students and the method of allocation of grant/aid.
e. Suggestions from teachers and parents about the allocation of grant/aid to pupils/students.

4. **Data gathering technique**

The data/information needed for this study were gathered by:

a. analyzing existing documents in the schools;
b. sending questionnaires to headmasters, teachers, and parents (see Appendix 1, 2 and 3); and
c. interviewing parents, pupils, and teachers/headmasters for supporting and cross-checking the data obtained.

5. **Data analysis**

The data obtained were cross-tabulated and analyzed further. Results of the analysis are displayed in the form of frequencies and percentages. Unique data/information are displayed narratively.

F. Findings of the Study

1. Data Obtained from Teachers /Headmasters

a. Schools with Dropout Pupils

1) Data obtained from the Primary School headmasters indicate that most of the schools with DO pupils (23.3%) are located in Area II. Fifty six classes (31.1%) of the 180 schools have 85 D.O pupils (see Table 43, Appendix 2b and 2c). On the contrary, for the Junior Secondary School level, the fewest schools with D.O students are in this area. Meanwhile, in the central and peripheral areas, the of Primary School and Junior High Schools with D.O pupils is about the same (see Table 3, Appendix 2a).

There has been a decline in the number of Junior High School students which occurs differently in different areas. In the central area, the number of students of the sample schools were 3624 students in 1995/1996. That number decreased by 8.6% in 1996/1997 that there were only 3309 students left. Then, in 1997/1998, another decrease occurred that reached 19.6% or 2869

students remained. Meanwhile, in areas between central and peripheral, the decreases are relatively slight compared to those occurred in area I. In 1995/1996. The number of students was 4225. It became 4114 students in 1996/1997 which signifies a decline of 2.6%. And in the year 1997/1998 the figure became 4114 students. In the following year, however, an insignificant decline occurred as there were about 4085 students remained in the school or there was almost no reduction. On the other hand, in the peripheral area, there were 9042 students registered in 1995/1996, 9041 students in 1996/1997, and 8946 students in 1997/1998. It means that, the decrease between the previous year and the last is only about 1%; which is very insignificant (see table 7, Appendix 3a). The reduced number of students in the central area may be due to the increasing number of people moving from central area to the peripheral where new residential areas are kept on developing.

2). different pattern about D.O pupils is revealed by the data obtained from Primary School and Junior High School teachers. It suggests that the highest percentage of dropouts occurs in schools located in Area III (the peripheral area) and the lowest is in Area I (central area) schools (see Table 4, Appendix 2b).

Data form headmasters indicates that, of the 30 Primary schools in the sample group, nine schools (30 %) have dropout pupils (see Table 3 App. 2a) and seven others (23,3%) has potential dropouts (see Table 6 App. 2d). Meanwhile, data from teachers suggested that, of the 180 classes in the thirty observed schools, fifty-six classes (31,1%) have droput pupils. (see Table 4 App. 26). In all, there are eighty-five dropout pupils. (see Table 5 App. 2c) with an average number of 36 pupils per class (see Table 43). Hence, the rate of dropouts in classes is 4,2 % This condition is mostly found in Area II & III. However, since parallel classes were not observed, bigger figures can be expected. On the other hand, of the 360 parent respondents,

27,8 % (100 parents) admits that they have dropout children. This is clearly seen in the data from the peripheral area (see Table 28 App. 5j).
To sum pu, data from headmasters and teachers give, almost the same average number of dropout pupils. That is, the schools with dropout pupils have one to two dropouts in their classes. This is supported also by data obtained from parents.

3) Further information about the number of DO pupils/students in the class has been given by the teachers of primary and Junior High Schools.
At the Primary School level, the rate of DO pupils in classes is one to two persons (4.2%) with most instances occurs in Area III (peripheral) followed by Area II. However, it was assumed that the total of DO pupils/students may be greater since parallel classes were not included in the data collection. There is, however one teacher reporting that he has 11 persons dropping out from his class (in Area II).

4) In the Junior High Schools, the most cases of DO in class are with one person, which is reported by teachers in Area III and II. Following next is a frequency of two and five persons/class. In general, the number of students dropping out out from classes in Area III is the largest for the Junior High School level (see Table 5, Appendix 2c).
In general, the number of students dropping out in Area III is the largest for he Junior High School level (see Table 5, Appendix 2c). Eight (30 %) of the observed schools are reported by the headmasters to have dropout students (Table 3, Appendix 2 a). The teachers informed that thirty-two classes of these schools have a total dropout of seventy-seven students. The average dropout in the classes is two to three students with the assumption that there are forty students in each class, therefore, the rate of dropout is 6,2 % for the classes. Meanwhile, of the 140 parent-respondents, thirty nine (27,1 %) of them admit that they have dropout children.

To sum up, there is a difference in the number of students dropout reported by headmasters, teachers and parents. The difference may be due to the fact that headmasters' data is based on the number of classes in their schools where as parents' and students' are based on the levels of students.

b. School with Potential Drop-out Pupils

Data from Primary School headmasters revealed that schools with the highest rate of potential drop-out (33.3%) are located in Area III, whereas the lowest rate (16.7%) are in Area I schools. Similarly, the highest percentage of Junior High Schools with potential dropouts is found in the peripheral area (45.8 %) while the lowest (12%) is in the central area. (see Table 6, Appendix 2d).

c. Rate of Dropout Pupils According to Academic Year, Level of Education and. Location of School.

1) The data obtained indicated that D.O rate in Primary Schools increased by the academic year. The highest percentage is in 1997/1998, that is 1.35%, occurred particularly in Area II. Among the three areas, the lowest percentage occurred in the central area.
2) For the Junior High School level, the highest rate of dropout is 0.79%, occurs in the year 1996/1997, especially in the central area. In Area II, the dropout rate increased by the year with the most occurrences exist in the year 1997/1998.
3) In general, it can be said that the rate of dropouts in Primary Schools as well as Junior High Schools increased by the year with the highest increase occur in the year 1997/1998 (see Table 7, Appendix 3 a).

d. Rate of Potential Dropouts According to Level of Education and Location of School.

1) The highest rate of potential dropouts in Primary Schools is 9.79%, occurred in schools located in Area I. The lowest rate is obtained by schools located in the peripheral area of the regions.

2) At the Junior High School level, the highest rate of potential dropouts is 9.34%, found in the peripheral area, whereas the lowest rate is in Area II.
3) In general, it can be said that the level of potential D.O rate is about the same in both Primary and Junior High Schools (see Table 8, Appendix 3b).

e. Number of Pupils Continuing to Higher Level of Education According to Year, Level of Education, and Location of Schools.

1) Data on the number of Primary School pupils continuing to higher level of Education (Junior High School) revealed an irregular pattern. In 1996/1997, 100% of Primary School graduates in Area I, central area, continued their study to Junior High School. However, the number decreased in 1997/1998.
Meanwhile, in Area II the number of Primary School graduates continuing to Junior High Schools decreased from year to year. Whereas in the peripheral area the number decreased in 1996/1997 but then increased slightly in 1997/1998.
2) At the Junior High School level, the number of continuing students remained about the same in the central areas but decreased slightly in the other two areas.
3) In general, it can be said that the number of Primary School and Junior High School graduates who continue to higher level of education is the least in 1997/1998 (see Table 9, Appendix 3c).

f. Grant/Aid

1) Pupils/Students Receiving Grant/Aid

Data obtained from teachers of Primary and Junior High Schools revealed that some of pupils/students have already received grant/aid. The highest number of teachers reporting this matter is in Area III, followed by Area II; and the least is in the Area I (see Table 10, Appendix 4a). The data suggest that in most cases only one students in the classes received the grant/aid (13.5% of the respondents). Following next are cases with 2 (11.9 %), and 3 and 4 persons (4.0 %) per class. More detailed information about the number of pupils receiving grants/aids can be seen in Table 11, Appendix 4 b.

2) **Form of Received Grant/Aid**

From the data obtained for Primary and Junior High School teachers, it can be seen that, so far, the grant/aid given to pupils/students is in the form of money. At the Primary School level, most money allocated as grant/aid has been given to pupils in Area II (20%) and Area III (19.4%). However, in the Junior High School level, the students living in Area III received most of the money (37.5%). Whereas for those living in Area II and I the frequency is about the same (15.3%). See table 12, Appendix 4c.

3) **Amount of Money Received as Grant/Aid**

According to the Primary School teachers, the amount of money received by pupils as grant/aid varies. Almost thirty percent (28.9%) of the teachers said that pupils receive about Rp. 15.000 – Rp. 19.500/ person / month, mostly in Area III (15%) and Area II (10%). It is also stated that 13.9% of the pupils receive Rp. 30.000 – Rp. 39.500 in Area II (9.4%) and Area III (3.9%). Only 2.8% of the pupils received Rp. 40.000 – Rp. 45.500.

At the Junior High School level, 56.9% of the teachers, mostly in Area III, stated that the amount of money monthly received by the students is Rp. 20.000 – 29.500. Some of the teachers (12.5%) explained that their students received as much money as Rp. 10.000 – Rp. 19.500 every month and 5.6% of them said that the students received about Rp. 40.000 – Rp. 45.500. (see Table 13, Appendix 4d

4) **Method of grant/aids distribution**

From the data obtained, most of grant is distributed directly to the pupils (20.6%) or via the respective schools (2.0%). Only a few have been distributed via the post office or bank, especially for those living in Area III.

For students of Junior High School, most teachers (33,3%) said that the money as grant/aid is received via the post office (33.3%) or directly to the students especially for those living in the Area III. (More detailed information can be seen in Table 14 Appendix 4e)

b Parents' Occupation

According to the data obtained, parents' occupation (mostly fathers) varies from civil servant to entrepreneurs. ***Services*** is the most frequently mentioned one (24.4 % of the parents at the primary school and 19.4 % of the junior high school level).

Other parents' occupations are classified as ***others*** (without further explanation). 24.4 % of parents at the primary school and 22.9 % at the junior high school level identify themselves in this category. (For further details see Table 20, Appendix 5b)

c Family Size

The number of dependants in the family varies from one to ten people. The highest frequency of occurrence at the primary school level is five persons (20.3%) and six persons (20.1 %) at the junior high school level. Parents living in Area II and III usually have bigger family. (For further details see Table 21, Appendix 5d).

d. Family Income

1) **Before Monetary Crisis**

(1) Most of the families (40.3 %) at the primary school level have a monthly income of about Rp. 100,000 – Rp. 249,500, followed by those with Rp. 250,000 - Rp. 499,000. Yet, there is a significant number of families whose earning is less than Rp. 100,000. Only very few families can earn $\geq$ Rp. 500,000.

(2) At the junior high school level, 33.3% of the parents has a monthly income of about Rp. 250,000 – Rp. 499,000, and 28.5% has Rp. 100,000 – Rp. 245,000. Only very few families can earn $\geq$ Rp.500,000, while 25 % of the sample families reveals that their income is less than Rp. 100,000 per month (For further details see Table 22 Appendix 5d)

2) **During the monetary crisis**

It can be observed from the data, that there is a shift in the amount of family income during the monetary crisis, both at the primary and the junior high school level. The number of families earning less than Rp. 100,000, for example, increases (36.1% for the primary school level and 31.9% for the junior high school level) and so is the case with other categories. (for further information see Table 23 Appendix 5e)

3) **Differences in Income Before and After the Monetary Crisis**

70.6 % of parents at the primary school and 66.7% at the junior high school explain that there are differences in their income between the time before and after the monetary crisis. Families suffering the most from the situation are those living in the peripheral area (Area III), while the least affected ones are those living in the central areas (For further details see Table 24 Appendix 5f).

e. Expenditures of the family

1) **Before the Monetary Crisis**

At the primary school level, the average family expenditures for facilities before the monetary crisis ranges between Rp. 430,000 – Rp. 377,000 with the highest expenditures spent by families living in the central areas. At the junior high school level, the average expenditure ranges between Rp. 400,000 – Rp. 660,000. Again, the highest expenditures is spent by families living in the central areas. (Care should be taken in interpreting this data since the standard deviation is very large. For further details see Table 25 Appendix 5g).

2) **During the monetary crisis**

At the primary school level, the average family expenditures is Rp. 587,000 per month, with the largest expenditure spent by families living in the central areas (± Rp. 674,000). Whereas in the peripheral area, the amount is about Rp. 570,000,- per month. Families living in Area III spend the least amount of money.

At junior high school level, most families spend about Rp. 755,000 per month. The highest monthly expenditures is spent by families living in central areas (Rp. 970,000) and the least by those living in Area II (RP. 530,000). (For further details see Table 26, Appendix 5h).

3) **Differences in Expenditures**

Nearly all families in both levels of education say that there are differences in their expenditures before and during the monetary crisis; i.e. 94.7 % of families in the primary school level and 96.5 % in the junior high school one. Families have the largest differences in their expenditures are those living in the peripheral areas; while families living in the central area have the least. (For further details see Table 27 Appendix 5i)

f. Number of DO Children in the Family

At the primary school level, 27.8% of the parents state that there are DO children in their families. The largest number of DO occurs in Area III (peripheral), and the least is in Area I (0.6%).

At the junior high school level, 27.1% of the parents state that there are DO children in their families. Families having the most DOs are those living in the peripheral area while the least ones are living in the central area. (For further details see Table 28 appendix 5j)

g. Reasons for DO

1) Ten percent of the parents at the primary school level explain that the reason for their children DO is their having lost their jobs. The largest number of parents in this condition is found in Area II. About 7% of parents at Junior High school gave the same reason. (For further details see Table 29a Appendix 5k).
2) Twenty percent of parents of primary school children explain that the reason for their children DO is their decreasing income. About the same number of parents of junior high school children give the same reason. Most of the

families with such reason live in the peripheral areas. (For further details see Table 29b Appendix 5k).

3) Almost 10 % of parents of primary school children state that the reason for their children DO is that the children have to help them in earning money for the family. This is particularly true with families living in the peripheral area. About the same number of parents of Junior High school children give the same reason. (For further details see Table 29c Appendix 5k).
4) At the primary school level, 13.6% of parents with DO children say that their children have to leave school since priority is given to food. This occurs especially with parents living in the peripheral areas. At the junior high school level, 6.3% of the parents give the same reason. Most of the families of this category also live in the peripheral area. (For further details see Table 29d Appendix 5k).
5) At the primary school level, 4.2% of the parents say that their children loosing interest in schooling becomes the reason of their children DO. At the junior high school level, 5.6 % of parents give the same reason. Most of them live in the peripheral area and the least live in Area I. (For further details see Table 29e Appendix 5k).
6) At the primary school level, 2.5% of the parents explain that their children left school because they do not think that they are intelligent enough. Two percent of the parents at junior high school level gave the same response The largest number of such type of children live in the peripheral area (For further details see Table 29f, Appendix 5k).
7) That priority of schooling is given to boys is not a significant reason since only 1,7 % of the parents of the primary school pupils and 2.1 % of the junior high school students use it to explain their children DO. None of the parents living in the central areas gave such reason. (For further details see Table 29g, Appendix 5k).
8) Only 2.5 % of parents of primary school children and 1.4 % of junior high school students gave reasons other than those mentioned above (Not specified further). (For further details see Table 29h, Appendix 5k).

h. Expected Type of Grant/Aid

1) Nearly all parents expect money as grant/aid for their children (92.8 % at the primary school level and 94.4 % at the junior high school level). Those expecting money as grant are families living in the peripheral area. Only a small portion of parents (5.6 % at primary school level and 4.2 % at junior high school level) expects articles (For further details see Table 30, Appendix 5k).
2) If grant is to be given in the form of articles, some of the parents expect them to come in the form of learning aids (21.9 % of primary school pupils and 11.1 % of the junior high school students). Only a very small number of parents expect books as grant. (For further details see Table 31, Appendix 5l).
3) If money is to be given as grant, there is 40% of parents at the primary and 45.1 % at the junior high school levels who expect a sum of Rp.40,000 – Rp.45,000 from the grant. The largest number of parents of this category lives in the peripheral area. Less money, Rp.30,000 – Rp.39,500, is expected by 29.2% of parents at junior high school students and 21.9% of the primary school pupils. (Further details see Table 32, Appendix 5m).
4) Most parents of primary school children (56.1%) expected the grant to be given via schools. Meanwhile, 35.6 % of them suggests that the grant be distributed directly to the children. About 46.5% of the junior high school parents suggests that the grant be given directly to students; 37.5% prefers it to be distributed via the respective schools. (Further details see Table 33, Appendix 5n).

i. Relationship between Income and Potential DO

There is a negative relationship between the amount of income during the monetary crisis and the number of potential DO in primary and junior high schools. Parents with less than Rp.100,000 income have the most chances for having potential DO children in the primary school level. The same pattern occurs in data about parents at the Junior High schools (further details see Table 34, Appendix 5o).

j. **Relationship Between Parents' Educational Background and the Rate of Student's DO**

The highest rate of dropouts occurred in families with father having primary education, both at primary and junior high school levels. (Further details see Table 35a, Appendix 5p).

k. **Relationship Between Fathers' Educational Background and Potential DO Students**

The result of data analysis reveals that fathers with primary school educational background have the most potential DO children compared to other ones. No specific pattern can be observed about this relationship (For further details see Table 35b, Appendix 5q).

3. **Data Obtained from Teachers**

a **Educational Background**

The data signifies that most of the teachers in primary school level are of D2 educational background, which is in agreement with the government regulations. Most of the junior high school teachers are graduates of universities (S1) and only very few of them are graduated from SPG (Senior Secondary Teacher Training School). (For further details see Table 36, Appendix 6a).

b. **Rank/Position**

The rank/position of the primary school teachers varies from II-a to III-d. Rank III-a is the most frequently found. At the Junior High school level, 19.4% of teachers are ranked III-b, the rest hold in several positions. The rank varies from II-a to IV-a. (For further details see Table 37, Appendix 6b).

c. **Function**

Most teachers at the primary schools function as classroom teachers (60.6%). Some of them are vice headmasters (13.9%). On the other hand, 47.2% of the Junior High

School teachers function as classroom teachers (47.2%) and 27.8% are vice headmasters. (see table 38, Appendix 6c)

d. Years of Experience

About 36.1% of primary school teachers have about 11 to 15 years teaching experience. While the rest varies from < 5 years to 20 years. Twenty two percent of the Junior high school teachers have about 11 to 15 years of teaching experience and the rest varies from ≤ 5 years (11.1%) to >20 years (6.9%). (see Table 39, Appendix 6d)

F. Discussion

The following is the discussion of the findings to answer the research questions.

1. The rate of DO and Potential DO

a. The rate of DO at both levels of education increases by the year with the highest increase occurs in the year 1997/1998, particularly in the peripheral area of the five regions. However the increase is relatively smaller than is expected and compared to the results of the preliminary visit (9 to 10 percent at Primary School and 10 to 10 percent at Junior High School levels. See page 1), that is, 4.2% at Primary School and 5.5% at the Junior High School levels. This may be due to the fact that parents and schools have tried to do several efforts to prevent their pupils/children from DO. School administrators, for example, have been given several dispensations for the pupils to succeed in the Nine Year Basic Education National program (*Program Wajib Belajar Pendidikan Dasar*). Meanwhile, parents cut down their limited budget for food to pay for their children's educational fees.

Most parents stated that despite their financial problems, they still sent their children to school. They have done several efforts to secure the sustainability of their children's education; like:

a. Asking for financial support from relatives who have better financial condition

b. Asking for grant/aid from the GNOTA or other institutions
c. Asking a reduction in their children's education/school fee
d. Asking for a dispensation for their children to escape extra-curricular activities
e. Asking for a dispensation to pay their children's educational fee of paying in installments.

This is also supported by the data obtained from several headmasters during the interview. They stated e.g :

> *"... kita tetap memberikan kesempatan kepada anak-anak untuk terus belajar dan melanjutkan pendidikannya, meskipun tidak membayar uang sekolah, kasihan. Bahkan ada yang sudah lebih setengah tahun tidak membayar. Kalau tidak demikian, tentu sudah banyak murid yang DO."*
> ("... we allow pupils to keep on attending school though they can not pay their educational fee. There are some of them who have not paid it for more than half a year. If not, then there must have been many pupils dropping out from school.")

The data showed negative relationship between the income of the family during the monetary crisis and the rate of DO children in the family. The less income the family has, the higher the rate of DO children is. However, no regular pattern can be observed concerning the relationship between fathers' educational background and the rate of DO or potential DO pupils/students. The data suggested that fathers with primary school background have the most DO or potential DO children.

2. **Parents' Purchasing Power**

There are differences in the family income before and during the monetary crisis. This is due to the unstable economic situations resulting in many people losing their job, a decrease of activities in factories, offices, etc, and the increasing prices of goods, especially that of food, drugs, and other basic needs.

Data obtained from teachers also revealed that the monetary crisis has a severe impact on their life; i.e. there is almost no increase in their income but a very abundant increase in their expenditures does exist. This will eventually affect their performance in the classroom. Therefore, special attention needs also to be given to them aiming at improving the teaching and learning process at schools.

Result of the data analysis signifies that families who suffer the most from the monetary crisis are those living in the peripheral area. The explanation for this situation is that, considering the characteristics of the people living in the area, it is hard for the people to earn extra money by *moonlighting*. The data obtained also supports this matter as it indicates that, in all aspects, families living in the central area of the regions do not suffer as much. Hence, more attention should be given to families living in the peripheral area.

If should be kept in mind that it is not only parents and teachers who suffer the impact of the monetary crisis, but also the schools caused by of the abolishment of educational fee, the decreasing ability of the local government to fulfil their part in sharing the operation cost of primary education, and the inability of some parents to pay their children's educational fee can be identified as the reasons for such situation. The operation cost of the schools is; therefore, much declined, and a high level of creativity is required from school administrators, headmasters and teachers, to ensure the sustainability of the teaching and learning process at schools.

3. Household Expenditures

There are observable differences in parents' and teachers' expenditures before and during the monetary crisis caused by the increasing living expenses especially that for food, medical, and other basic needs. Eventually, these differences definitely affect pupils/students' education and the teaching learning process.

Nearly all teacher and parent respondents, find it difficult to specify their monthly expenditure in details. That they can only give a rough about it. This may be due to the fact that most parents (mostly with low level of educational background) are not used to sum up their monthly expenditure and some others being reluctant to tell strangers about their actual financial situations.

The unfavourable financial problems has forced many parents to give priority on food. In the monetary crisis time more money has to be spent for food despite its lower quality. This can be identified in the responses given by parents like:

> *"...banyak macam makanan yang telah saya kurangi seperti daging, telur dan lain-lain, yang penting asal makan meskipun seadanya"*
> ("...there are many kinds of food that I have cut down such as meat, eggs and others; the most important thing is that we still have food to eat even thogh it's of poor quality").

From the data obtained, it can be understood then that the younger generation does not have sufficient supply of nutritious food to support their healthy grow. This will, in turn, affect their ability to learn.

4. Grant Needed

Considering the results obtained in this survey, it seems that money, as a form of grant/aid, is more expected than articles. This is understandable since money can be spent for buying things the pupils/students really need, while articles like books, uniform, learning aids etc. are sometimes not that much needed; It should be kept in mind , however, that the government has already distributed books for free, the so called *Buku Paket*, which can be borrowed from school. Nevertheless, allowing money as grant can also bring problems. It is possible that the severe pressure of the crisis will lead the family to spend the grant money for other, unintended purposes; especially when the sum of money is quite something for them.

The findings signifies that money needed as grant ranges from Rp. 10,000 to Rp. 30,000 per person per month for primary school level, and Rp. 20,000 to Rp. 40,000 for Junior High School level. However, as the school demands a great deal of money for its operational cost, a greater amount of money allocate on needs to be extended in order to help the schools to sustain their educational activities.

5. Grant Management

From the interview with headmasters and teachers, it is expected that grant is distributed via school. This kind of distribution is also suggested by many parents; although some of them expect their children to receive it directly. With this type of management, a part of the grant can be allocated for the operational cost of the representative educational institution and another can be distributed to the pupils/students in need. The proportion can be previously discussed among the PTA (Parent-Teacher Association) members. Furthermore the management of this grant money should be transparent to everybody involved.

Grant also needs to be allocated for teachers of the representative schools to fulfill their essential needs. By doing so, it can be expected that the quality of the teaching and learning process will be significantly enhanced.

G. Conclusion and Suggestions

1. The rate of DO in basic education in DKI Jakarta is increasing. At the Primary School level, there is an increase of 0.5% from 1995/1996 to 1996/1997 and 0.75% from 1996/1997 to 1997/1998. The highest increase is 1.35% and occurs in the peripheral, that's area and the lowest is in the central area. This increase, however, can be considered as relatively smaller than is expected. At the Junior High School level, the increase is 0.52% from 1995/1996 and 0.51% from 1996/1997. The highest increase is 0.79% and occur in the Area I

The rate of potentially dropout pupils and students is also increasing from year to year. At the Primary School level, there is an increase of 8.71% in 1997/1998 academic year with the highest increase in the central area. At the Junior High School level, the increase is 7.04% in the year, with the highest increase is 9.34% in the peripheral area. Compared to the dropout rate, the rate of potentially dropouts is much higher. The explanation lies on the fact that school administrations tend to do their best to prevent their pupils or students from droppingout school. They allow delays and installments of school fee payment as well as look for grant/aid from various institutions to help sustaining the pupil's or students' education.

On the other hand, the rate of pupils and students continuing to higher level education tend to decrease by the academic year. The rate for both level of the basic education in 1997/1998 decreases by 0.75 % and 0.51%, respectively at Primary School and Junior High School levels, from the previous year.

This information allows us to conclude that the rate of potential dropout and the rate of transitional dropout will likely increase in the 1998/1999 academic year.

The increasing rate of dropouts and potential dropouts and the decreasing rate of primary school graduates continuing to Junior High School are mostly caused by the decreasing parents' ability to support their children's education. The present monetary crisis has severely affected their financial condition either in the form of decreasing amount of income or purchasing power.

2. A precise figure of the decrease in parents' purchasing power can not be obtained here. However, relevant data from the study shows that the decrease is quite alarming. It can be seen from the fact that, before the crisis, the largest part of the group (40.3%) at the Primary School level could earn a monthly income of about Rp. 100,000 to Rp.249,000. There is 19.4% of the group who earned less than Rp.100.000. Before the crisis, the average income is Rp. 273.400.
   This pattern has changes presently. The average income of the parents in the

present monetary crisis is Rp. 210.780. Those whose income ranges from Rp. 100,000 to Rp. 249,000 from the largest group which takes 35.8% of the respondents. And those who eam less than Rp. 100,000 now constitute 36.1% of the sample group. From this data, it can be concluded that the decrease in parent purchasing power is 22.94%.

At the Junior High level, before the crisis the largest part of the group (33.3%) could earn a monthly income of about Rp. 250.000 to Rp. 499.000, whereas, during the crisis the largest number of the group (34.7%) could only earn from Rp. 100.000to Rp.249.000. The decrease in their purchasing power

The obtained data suggests that money is the most expected form of grant/aid. This is supported by the responses obtained from the parents, teachers, as well as headmasters. (Over 90% of parents and over 68% of teachers at both levels of education). This grant is not only needed by the pupils and students, but the schools and teachers as well. Another type of assistance seems to be needed by the pupils and students is food supplement. Their parents' poor financial condition has prevented them from being able to provide sufficient food for their children; both in terms of quality and quantity. Ignoring such situation may result in an even worse situation since it can defect the children's health and ability to learn.

3. The amount of household expenditure spent by parent respondents for basic needs and educational cost, particularly for school fee, can be classified into 3 categories. Category I, in the central area, range from Rp.2.000 to Rp.11.500 at the Primary School level, and from Rp. 20.000 to Rp. 27.000 at the Junior High School level. Category II, in the area beteen the central and the peripheral area is from Rp. 2.000 to Rp. 10.500 at the Primary School level and from Rp. 20.000 to Rp. 25.000 at the Junior High School level. Category III, in the peripheral area, range from Rp.1.500 to Rp. 7.100 at the Primary School level, and from Rp. 12.000 to Rp.22.100 at the Junior High School level The highest rate of dropout and potential dropouts is found in families whose income belongs to category III, most of them are found in the peripheral area. The lowest rate, on the other hand, is found in families from category I who mostly exist in the central

4. Most respondents express that distributing the grant/aid through/via school will be the best. Regarding the sum of grant money expected, teachers and headmasters have different opinion from parents. Most of the Primary School teachers and headmasters (22,2%) suggest a range of Rp. 10,000 to Rp. 20,000. Meanwhile, most of the teachers and headmasters in the Junior High School (29,2%). Mention a range of Rp. 30,000 – Rp. 40,000.

   Most parents in both level of education, on the other hand, view that a range of Rp. 40,000 to Rp. 45,000 will be the most appropriate for their children (40% in Primary Schools and 45.1% in Junior High Schools). All the above mentioned sums of money is understood as the grant allocation for each pupil/student to be received monthly.

   In deciding on the allocation of the grant, therefore, it is recommended that financial assistance for teachers and schools and supplement aid for pupils and students be taken into consideration.

5. To ensure that the grant money reaches the target group efficiently, 55,6% of Primary School teachers and headmasters and 41,7% of Junior High School's suggests that the grant be distributed via banks. 40% of Primary School parents suggests that the distribution be via school and 45,1% of the Junior High School's expects the grant to be distributed directly to students. However when decisions on the management of grant are going to be made, it is recommended that recommendation in the previous section be included as it is significantly related to this matter.

Appendix Ia

SCHOOLS AND LOCATION

PRIMARY SCHOOLS

Area		No	Nomor	Address
I (K)*	Pb.	1.	SDN Pisangan Timur 09	Jl.Pisangan Lama Dalam I, Jakarta Timur
		2.	SDN Jatinegara 05	Jl. Raya Bekasi Km. 17, Jakarta Timur
		3.	SDN Tanah Tinggi 07	Jl. Tanah Tinggi II No.8 Kec. Johar Baru, Jakarta Pusat
		4.	SDN Menteng Dalam 01	JL. X Menteng Dalam, Jakarta Selatan
	Pv.	1.	SD Islam Perguruan Ma'arif	Jl. RS Fatmawati No. 45, Kel. Cipete Selatan, Jakarta Selatan
	Isl.		-	
Sub-total		5		

II (T)*	Pb	1.	SDN Johar Baru 32	Jl. Mardani Raya No. 12A Johar Baru, Jakarta Pusat
		2.	SDN Jelambar Baru	Jl. Suka Jaya I Rt.008/01 Jelambar Baru, Jakarta Barat
		3.	SDN Bukit Duri 01	Jl. Bukit Duri Tanjakan Kel. Bukit Duri Tebet, Jakarta Selatan
		4.	SDN Kelapa Gading 04	Jl. Komplek PTHII Kelapa Gading, Jakarta Timur
		5.	SDN Kalideres 10	Jl. Daan Mogot Km.15,6 Kec. Kalideres, Jakarta Barat
		6.	SDN Ciracas 09	Jl. Centex Rt.010/03 Cijantung, Jakarta Timur
		7.	SDN Pondok Bambu 04	Jl. Cipinang Muara II Pondok Bambu, Jakarta Timur
	Pv.	1.	SD Pembangunan Al-Hikmah	Jl. Jati Barang V No.40 Jakarta Timur
		2.	SD Darussa'adah	Jl. Daan Mogot Komp. Deppen No.IB Jakarta Barat
	Isl.	1.	MI Al-Kenaniyah	Jl. Perintis Kemerdekaan Pulo Nangka Barat I/14, Jakarta Timur
		2.	MIN Pondok Pinang	Jl. Pupan No. 3A Pondok Pinang, Jakarta Selatan
		3.	MI Al-Hawi	Jl. Raya Condet No.5 Cililitan Kramat Jati, Jakarta Timur
Sub-total		12		

Appendix Ib

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

Area		No	Nomor	Address
I (K)*	Pb.	1.	SMP Negeri 28	Jl . Mardani Raya No. 17 Johar Baru, Jakarta Pusat
		2.	SMP Negeri 104	Jl. Mampang Prapatan XIII, Jakarta Selatan
	Pv.	1.	SMP Makarya	Jl. Harun Tanah Kusir, Jakarta Selatan
		2.	SMP Bina Pangudi Luhur	Jl. Kramat Asem 54 Utan Kayu Selatan Matraman, Jakarta Timur
	Isl.	1.	MTs Negeri Jakarta	Jl. Perdana Raya 10 Kel. Wijaya Kusuma Grogol, Jakarta Pusat
Sub-total		5		
II (T)*	Pb.	1.	SMP Negeri 130	Jl. KS Tubun I Kota Bambu Utara, Jakarta Utara
		2.	SMP Negeri 38	Jl. Karet Pasar Baru Barat I No. 14 Klender, Jakarta Timur
		3.	SMP Negeri 10	Jl. Sumur Batu Raya, Kec. Kemayoran, Jakarta Pusat
		4	SMP Negeri 92	Jl. Perhubungan XII Jatirawamangun, Jakarta Timur
	Pv.			
	Isl.	1.	MTs Negeri 16	Jl. Gading Raya I Pulo Gadung, Jakarta Timur
		2.	MTs Negeri 10	Jl. Perdana No. 10 Jelambar, Jakarta Barat
Sub-total		6		

III (P)*	Pb.	1.	SMP Negeri 100	Jl. Obsidian Pedongkelan Kapuk, Jakarta Barat
		2.	SMP Negeri 131	Jl. RM Kakafi I Cipedak, Jagakarsa, Jakarta Selatan
		3.	SMP Negeri 113	Jl. Kampung Bandan, Ancol, Jakarta Utara
		4.	SMP Negeri 112	Jl. A1 Teluk Gong Kel. Pejagalan Jakarta Utara
		5.	SMP Negeri 257	Jl. Kel. Rambutan Kp. Rambutan, Jakarta Timur
		6.	SMP Negeri 162	Jl. Marunda Baru IV No. 1 Kel. Marunda Kec. Cilincing, Jakarta Utara
		7.	SMP Negeri 256	Jl. Balai Rakyat Kel. Cakung Timur, Jakarta Timur
	Pv.	1.	SMP PGRI 3	Jl. Srengseng Sawah, Jakarta Selatan
		2.	SMP Yapindo II	Jl. Duri Kosambi Raya Cengkareng, Jakarta Barat
	Isl.	1.	MTs Al-Muddatsiriah	Jl. Bendungan Jago No.K-444A, Jakarta Pusat
		2.	MTs. Al-Wathonoyah I	Jl. Madrasah I/II Cilungup Indah Duren Sawit, Jakarta Timur
		3.	Mts. Manarawatul Islam	Jl. Madrasah No. 12 Gandaria Selatan, Jakarta Selatan
		4.	MTs Negeri 5	Jl. Sungai Landak No. 1 Kel. Cilincing, Jakarta Timur
Sub-total		13		
TOTAL		24		

Notes: *) (I)K = Centre area of the region; (II)T = Area between centre and peripheric; (III)P = Peripheric area of the region; Pb = Public School; Pv = Private School, and Isl = Islamic School.

Appendix Ic

SCHOOL DISTRIBUTION BY REGION

Primary					Secondary					Total
Area	Pub-lic	Pri-vate	Is-lamic	Sub total	Area	Pu-blic	Pri-vate	Is-lamic	Sub total	
I (K)	4	1	-	5	I (K)	2	2	1	5	10
II (T)	7	2	3	12	II (T)	4	-	2	6	18
III (P)	7	3	3	13	III (P)	7	2	4	13	26
Total	18	6	6	30	Total	13	4	7	24	54

Appendix 2b

Teachers

Table 4. Number of classes with DO pupils

LEVEL				Dropout in classes		Total
				None	Yes	
SD	LOKASI	I (K)	Count	25	5	30
			% of Total	13.9%	2.8%	16.7%
		II (T)	Count	44	24	68
			% of Total	24.4%	13.3%	37.8%
		III (P)	Count	55	27	82
			% of Total	30.6%	15.0%	45.6%
	Total		Count	124	56	180
			% of Total	68.9%	31.1%	100.0%
SLTP	LOKASI	I (K)	Count	10	5	15
			% of Total	13.9%	6.9%	20.8%
		II (T)	Count	7	11	18
			% of Total	9.7%	15.3%	25.0%
		III (P)	Count	23	16	39
			% of Total	31.9%	22.2%	54.2%
	Total		Count	40	32	72
			% of Total	55.6%	44.4%	100.0%

Appendix 2c

Table 5. Number of DO pupils in teacher's classroom

Count

LEVEL			Amount of DO in classroom									Total
			0	1	2	3	4	5	10	11	15	
SD	LOKASI	I (K)	25	3	1		1					30
		II (T)	44	17	3	1	2			1		68
		III (P)	58	20	2	1	1					82
	Total		127	40	6	2	4			1		180
SLTP	LOKASI	I (K)	11		2			1				14
		II (T)	7	6	4			1				18
		III (P)	23	10	2			2	1		1	39
	Total		41	16	8			4	1		1	71

Appendix 2d

Headmasters

Table 6. Schools with potential DO-s

LEVEL				Potential DO None	Potential DO Yes	Total
PRIMARY SCHOOL (SD)	LOCATION	I (K)	Count	5	–	5
			% of Total	16.7%		16.7%
		II (T)	Count	8	4	12
			% of Total	26.7%	13.3%	40.0%
		III (P)	Count	10	3	13
			% of Total	33.3%	10.0%	43.3%
	Total		Count	23	7	30
			% of Total	76.7%	23.3%	100.0%
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL (SLTP)	LOCATION	I (K)	Count	3	2	5
			% of Total	12.5%	8.3%	20.8%
		II (T)	Count	6	–	6
			% of Total	25.0%		25.0%
		III (P)	Count	11	2	13
			% of Total	45.8%	8.3%	54.2%
	Total		Count	20	4	24
			% of Total	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%

Appendix 3a

Table 7. Pattern of Drop Out According to Year, Level of Education, and Location of School

LEVEL	LOCATION		TAHUN 95/96	TAHUN 96/97	TAHUN 97/98
PRIMARY SCHOOL (SD)	I (K)	Mean	9 901E-02	0000	.4762
		N	5	5	5
		Std Deviation	.2214	0000	1 0648
		Minimum	00	.00	00
		Maximum	.50	.00	2.38
	II (T)	Mean	9704	6289	1 3457
		N	12	12	12
		Std. Deviation	1 6845	1 2346	2 7636
		Minimum	00	00	00
		Maximum	5 66	3 88	9 60
	III (P)	Mean	.2299	3 885E-02	.2959
		N	13	13	13
		Std Deviation	.5621	.1401	1 0667
		Minimum	00	00	00
		Maximum	1 57	51	3 85
	Total	Mean	.5043	.3484	7459
		N	30	30	30
		Std. Deviation	1 1687	8635	1 9542
		Minimum	00	00	00
		Maximum	5 66	3 88	9 60
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL (SLTP)	I (K)	Mean	.3162	1 0130	7683
		N	5	5	5
		Std. Deviation	.3600	9396	1 7387
		Minimum	00	00	00
		Maximum	.77	2 56	2 83
	II (T)	Mean	6 083E-02	4553	6122
		N	6	6	6
		Std. Deviation	.1490	.5098	6048
		Minimum	00	00	00
		Maximum	.36	.95	1.31
	III (P)	Mean	.2461	3627	3591
		N	13	13	13
		Std Deviation	.5683	.4699	4473
		Minimum	00	00	00
		Maximum	2 07	1 24	1 31
	Total	Mean	.2155	.5238	5118
		N	24	24	24
		Std Deviation	.4527	6256	.6951
		Minimum	00	00	.00
		Maximum	2.07	2.56	2.83
Total	I (K)	Mean	.2076	5065	6372
		N	10	10	10
		Std Deviation	.3041	.8231	1 1013
		Minimum	00	00	00
		Maximum	77	2.56	2 83
	II (T)	Mean	6672	.7077	1 1012
		N	18	18	18
		Std. Deviation	1 4273	1 0459	2 2910
		Minimum	00	00	.00
		Maximum	5 66	3 88	9 60
	III (P)	Mean	.2390	.2006	.3273
		N	26	26	26
		Std Deviation	.5539	.3777	6020
		Minimum	.00	00	00
		Maximum	2 07	1.24	3 85
	Total	Mean	.3759	4264	6418
		N	54	54	54
		Std Deviation	.9259	.7657	1 5209
		Minimum	00	00	00
		Maximum	5 66	3 88	9 60

Appendix 3b.

Table 8. Potential Drop Out Rate of Pupils According to Level of Education and Location of School

POTENSIAL DROPOUT			
PRIMARY SCHOOL (SD)	I (K)	Mean	9 7649
		N	5
		Std. Deviation	10.0788
		Minimum	00
		Maximum	21 43
	II (T)	Mean	9.5032
		N	12
		Std. Deviation	12 5990
		Minimum	00
		Maximum	44 12
	III (P)	Mean	7.5001
		N	13
		Std. Deviation	8 7304
		Minimum	00
		Maximum	22.44
	Total	Mean	8 7098
		N	30
		Std. Deviation	10.3352
		Minimum	00
		Maximum	44 12
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL (SLTP)	I (K)	Mean	5 5568
		N	5
		Std Deviation	6 3026
		Minimum	00
		Maximum	15.20
	II (T)	Mean	3 1979
		N	6
		Std Deviation	3.5208
		Minimum	00
		Maximum	7 45
	III (P)	Mean	9.3867
		N	13
		Std Deviation	20.6749
		Minimum	.00
		Maximum	76.53
	Total	Mean	7 0420
		N	24
		Std Deviation	15 6332
		Minimum	.00
		Maximum	76.53
Total	I (K)	Mean	7 6768
		N	10
		Std. Deviation	8.7333
		Minimum	00
		Maximum	21 43
	II (T)	Mean	7.4014
		N	18
		Std. Deviation	10 7569
		Minimum	00
		Maximum	44 12
	III (P)	Mean	8 4734
		N	26
		Std Deviation	15 7041
		Minimum	.00
		Maximum	76.53
	Total	Mean	7 9566
		N	54
		Std. Deviation	12 6532
		Minimum	00
		Maximum	76 53

Appendix 3c

Table 9. Number of Pupils Continuing to Higher Level Education According to Year, Level of Education, and Location of School

LEVEL	LOCATION		Year 95/96	Year 96/97	Year 97/98
PRIMARY SCHOOL (SD)	I (K)	Mean	25.25	26.25	33.60
		N	4	4	5
		Std Deviation	4.79	4.72	20.62
		Minimum	21	23	18
		Maximum	32	33	69
	II (T)	Mean	39.42	36.75	37.50
		N	12	12	12
		Std. Deviation	15.61	16.60	14.44
		Minimum	20	18	15
		Maximum	74	76	64
	III (P)	Mean	38.08	40.08	40.46
		N	13	13	13
		Std. Deviation	13.03	13.98	17.21
		Minimum	19	20	18
		Maximum	55	73	76
	Total	Mean	36.69	36.79	38.13
		N	29	29	30
		Std Deviation	14.01	14.76	16.32
		Minimum	19	18	15
		Maximum	74	76	76
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL (SLTP)	I (K)	Mean	194.40	179.20	161.40
		N	5	5	5
		Std Deviation	120.03	129.56	115.35
		Minimum	70	36	42
		Maximum	355	355	337
	II (T)	Mean	193.50	224.83	208.17
		N	6	6	6
		Std. Deviation	116.58	132.95	103.26
		Minimum	73	90	107
		Maximum	358	417	344
	III (P)	Mean	252.00	227.38	219.69
		N	13	13	13
		Std Deviation	92.31	113.59	110.12
		Minimum	62	52	43
		Maximum	351	404	383
	Total	Mean	225.88	216.71	204.67
		N	24	24	24
		Std Deviation	103.87	117.35	110.47
		Minimum	62	38	42
		Maximum	358	417	383
Total	I (K)	Mean	119.22	111.22	97.50
		N	9	9	10
		Std Deviation	123.12	120.48	103.15
		Minimum	21	23	18
		Maximum	355	355	337
	II (T)	Mean	91.44	90.44	94.39
		N	18	18	18
		Std. Deviation	99.46	117.07	100.62
		Minimum	20	18	15
		Maximum	358	417	344
	III (P)	Mean	143.04	133.73	130.08
		N	26	26	26
		Std Deviation	129.77	124.13	122.34
		Minimum	19	20	18
		Maximum	351	404	383
	Total	Mean	122.45	118.26	112.15
		N	53	53	54
		Std Deviation	117.82	110.69	111.44
		Minimum	19	18	15
		Maximum	358	417	383

Appendix 4a

Table 10. Pupils receiving aids / grants

LEVEL				Pupils receiving grants / aids				Total
				Omit	None	Yes	Do not know	
Primary School (SD)	LOCATION	I (K)	Count	6	8	16		30
			% of Total	3.3%	4.4%	8.9%		16.7%
		II (T)	Count	7	12	39	10	68
			% of Total	3.9%	6.7%	21.7%	5.6%	37.8%
		III (P)	Count	12	20	46	4	82
			% of Total	6.7%	11.1%	25.6%	2.2%	45.6%
	Total		Count	25	40	101	14	180
			% of Total	13.9%	22.2%	56.1%	7.8%	100.0%
Junior High School (SLTP)	LOCATION	I (K)	Count	1	2	12		15
			% of Total	1.4%	2.8%	16.7%		20.8%
		II (T)	Count	1		16	1	18
			% of Total	1.4%		22.2%	1.4%	25.0%
		III (P)	Count	2	2	35		39
			% of Total	2.8%	2.8%	48.6%		54.2%
	Total		Count	4	4	63	1	72
			% of Total	5.6%	5.6%	87.5%	1.4%	100.0%

Appendix 4b

Table 11. Number of Pupils Receiving Grant/Aid

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	0	109	43.3
	1	34	13.5
	2	30	11.9
	3	10	4.0
	4	10	4.0
	5	2	.8
	6	7	2.8
	7	2	.8
	9	1	.4
	10	2	.8
	12	1	.4
	14	6	2.4
	16	2	.8
	17	3	1.2
	19	6	2.4
	20	4	1.6
	21	3	1.2
	25	2	.8
	26	3	1.2
	30	3	1.2
	70	1	.4
	77	1	.4
	79	3	1.2
	82	3	1.2
	99	4	1.6
	Total	252	100 0

Appendix 4c

Table 12. Form of Received Grant/Aids

LEVEL				Form of Grant / Aids			Total
				Money	Material	Omit	
Primary School (SD)	LOCATION	I (K)	Count	15	1	14	30
			% of Total	8.3%	.6%	7.8%	16.7%
		II (T)	Count	36	2	30	68
			% of Total	20.0%	1.1%	16.7%	37.8%
		III (P)	Count	35	5	42	82
			% of Total	19.4%	2.8%	23.3%	45.6%
	Total		Count	86	8	86	180
			% of Total	47.8%	4.4%	47.8%	100.0%
Junior High School (SLTP)	LOCATION	I (K)	Count	11	1	3	15
			% of Total	15.3%	1.4%	4.2%	20.8%
		II (T)	Count	11		7	18
			% of Total	15.3%		9.7%	25.0%
		III (P)	Count	27	2	10	39
			% of Total	37.5%	2.8%	13.9%	54.2%
	Total		Count	49	3	20	72
			% of Total	68.1%	4.2%	27.8%	100.0%

Appendix 4d

Table 13. Amount of Grant money received by pupils/moth

LEVEL				Amount of money					Total
				10.000 - 19.500	20.000 - 29.500	30.000 - 39.500	40.000 - 45.000	Omit	
Primary School (SD)	LOCATION	I (K)	Count	7	4	1	2	16	30
			% of Total	3.9%	2.2%	.6%	1.1%	8.9%	16.7%
		II (T)	Count	18	3	17	2	28	68
			% of Total	10.0%	1.7%	9.4%	1.1%	15.6%	37.8%
		III (P)	Count	27		7	1	47	82
			% of Total	15.0%		3.9%	.6%	26.1%	45.6%
	Total		Count	52	7	25	5	91	180
			% of Total	28.9%	3.9%	13.9%	2.8%	50.6%	100.0%
SLTP	LOCATION	I (K)	Count		10			5	15
			% of Total		13.9%			6.9%	20.8%
		II (T)	Count	2	10		3	3	18
			% of Total	2.8%	13.9%		4.2%	4.2%	25.0%
		III (P)	Count	7	21	1	1	9	39
			% of Total	9.7%	29.2%	1.4%	1.4%	12.5%	54.2%
	Total		Count	9	41	1	4	17	72
			% of Total	12.5%	56.9%	1.4%	5.6%	23.6%	100.0%

Appendix 4e

Table 14. Location - level - method of grant / aids allocation - crosstabulation

LEVEL				Method of grant / aids: Direction to pupils	BANK	Via School	Post Office	Others	Omit	Total
Primary School (SD)	LOCATION	I (K)	Count	1	3	5	2		19	30
			% of Total	.6%	1.7%	2.8%	1.1%		10.6%	16.7%
		II (T)	Count	14	6	19	2	2	25	68
			% of Total	7.8%	3.3%	10.6%	1.1%	1.1%	13.9%	37.8%
		III (P)	Count	22		12	8		40	82
			% of Total	12.2%		6.7%	4.4%		22.2%	45.6%
	Total		Count	37	9	36	12	2	84	180
			% of Total	20.6%	5.0%	20.0%	6.7%	1.1%	46.7%	100.0%
Junior High School (SLTP)	LOCATION	I (K)	Count	1		5	6		3	15
			% of Total	1.4%		6.9%	8.3%		4.2%	20.8%
		II (T)	Count	6	3		5		4	18
			% of Total	8.3%	4.2%		6.9%		5.6%	25.0%
		III (P)	Count	9	2	6	13	1	8	39
			% of Total	12.5%	2.8%	8.3%	18.1%	1.4%	11.1%	54.2%
	Total		Count	16	5	11	24	1	15	72
			% of Total	22.2%	6.9%	15 3%	33 3%	1.4%	20 8%	100.0%

Appendix 4f

Table 15. Suggestion for the type of grants/aids to be given

LEVEL				Suggestion of grants: Money	Articles	Money and Material	Omit	Total
Primary School (SD)	LOCATION	I (K)	Count	16	6		8	30
			% of Total	8.9%	3.3%		4.4%	16.7%
		II (T)	Count	52	1	2	13	68
			% of Total	28.9%	.6%	1.1%	7.2%	37.8%
		III (P)	Count	56	11		15	82
			% of Total	31.1%	6.1%		8.3%	45.6%
	Total		Count	124	18	2	36	180
			% of Total	68.9%	10.0%	1.1%	20.0%	100.0%
Junior High School (SLTP)	LOCATION	I (K)	Count	13	1		1	15
			% of Total	18.1%	1.4%		1.4%	20.8%
		II (T)	Count	8	1	5	4	18
			% of Total	11.1%	1.4%	6.9%	5.6%	25.0%
		III (P)	Count	30	2	1	6	39
			% of Total	41.7%	2.8%	1.4%	8.3%	54.2%
	Total		Count	51	4	6	11	72
			% of Total	70 8%	5.6%	8 3%	15.3%	100.0%

Appendix 4g

Table 16. Suggestion on the amount of grant money

LEVEL				Money as suggested: 10.000 - 19.500	20.000 - 29.500	30.000 - 39.500	40.000 - 45.500	Omit	Total
Primary School (SD)	LOCATION	I (K)	Count	8	4	1	4	13	30
			% of Total	4.4%	2.2%	.6%	2.2%	7.2%	16.7%
		II (T)	Count	12	11	15	11	19	68
			% of Total	6.7%	6.1%	8.3%	6.1%	10.6%	37.8%
		III (P)	Count	20	6	14	16	26	82
			% of Total	11.1%	3.3%	7.8%	8.9%	14.4%	45.6%
	Total		Count	40	21	30	31	58	180
			% of Total	22.2%	11.7%	16.7%	17.2%	32.2%	100.0%
Junior High School (SLTP)	LOCATION	I (K)	Count	1	6	4	3	1	15
			% of Total	1.4%	8.3%	5.6%	4.2%	1.4%	20.8%
		II (T)	Count		1	3	4	10	18
			% of Total		1.4%	4.2%	5.6%	13.9%	25.0%
		III (P)	Count		7	14	10	8	39
			% of Total		9.7%	19.4%	13.9%	11.1%	54.2%
	Total		Count	1	14	21	17	19	72
			% of Total	1.4%	19.4%	29.2%	23.6%	26.4%	100 0%

Appendix 4h

Table 17. Suggestion on the type of articles as grants/aids

LEVEL				Articles						Total
				Books	Equipment	Learning Aids	Uniforms	Others	Omit	
SD	LOKASI	I (K)	Count		1	4		12	13	30
			% of Total		.6%	2.2%		6.7%	7.2%	16.7%
		II (T)	Count	1	1	14	1	18	33	68
			% of Total	.6%	.6%	7.8%	.6%	10.0%	18.3%	37.8%
		III (P)	Count	3	4	23	1	22	29	82
			% of Total	1.7%	2.2%	12.8%	.6%	12.2%	16.1%	45.6%
	Total		Count	4	6	41	2	52	75	180
			% of Total	2.2%	3.3%	22.8%	1.1%	28.9%	41.7%	100.0%
SLTP	LOKASI	I (K)	Count	1		3		3	8	15
			% of Total	1.4%		4.2%		4.2%	11.1%	20.8%
		II (T)	Count	3		3	1	7	4	18
			% of Total	4.2%		4.2%	1.4%	9.7%	5.6%	25.0%
		III (P)	Count	4		6	1	11	17	39
			% of Total	5.6%		8.3%	1.4%	15.3%	23.6%	54.2%
	Total		Count	8		12	2	21	29	72
			% of Total	11.1%		16.7%	2.8%	29.2%	40.3%	100.0%

Appendix 4i

Table 18. Suggestions on the management of grants/aids

LEVEL				Grant Allocation					Total
				Directly to pupils	Via school	BANK	Post Office	Omit	
Primary School (SD)	LOCATION	I (K)	Count	3	1	19		7	30
			% of Total	1.7%	.6%	10.6%		3.9%	16.7%
		II (T)	Count	12		37		19	68
			% of Total	6.7%		20.6%		10.6%	37.8%
		III (P)	Count	12	1	44	1	24	82
			% of Total	6.7%	.6%	24.4%	.6%	13.3%	45.6%
	Total		Count	27	2	100	1	50	180
			% of Total	15.0%	1.1%	55.6%	.6%	27.8%	100.0%
Junior High School (SLTP)	LOCATION	I (K)	Count	6	1	7		1	15
			% of Total	8.3%	1.4%	9.7%		1.4%	20.8%
		II (T)	Count	1		9		8	18
			% of Total	1.4%		12.5%		11.1%	25.0%
		III (P)	Count	9		14	9	7	39
			% of Total	12.5%		19.4%	12.5%	9.7%	54.2%
	Total		Count	16	1	30	9	16	72
			% of Total	22.2%	1 4%	41.7%	12.5%	22.2%	100.0%

Appendix 5a

Table 19. Educational background of parents / father

JENJANG				Educational Background												Total
				None	Primary School (DO)	Primary School (Grad)	JHS/MTs (DO)	JHS/MTs (Grad)	Senior High School (DO)	Senior High School (Grad)	D1	D2	D3	S1	Omit	
Primary School (SD)	LOKASI	I(K)	Count		4	14	4	2	6	19	1	1	1	4	2	58
			% of Total		1.1%	3.9%	1.1%	.6%	1.7%	5.3%	.3%	.3%	.3%	1%	.6%	16.1%
		II(T)	Count	3	29	32	11	17	18	20		1		2	7	140
			% of Total	.8%	8.1%	8.9%	3.1%	4.7%	5.0%	5.6%		.3%		.6%	1.9%	38.9%
		III(P)	Count	12	40	33	6	23	10	21					17	162
			% of Total	3.3%	11.1%	9.2%	1.7%	6.4%	2.8%	5.8%					4.7%	45.0%
	Total		Count	15	73	79	21	42	34	60	1	2	1	6	26	360
			% of Total	4.2%	20.3%	21.9%	5.8%	11.7%	9.4%	16.7%	.3%	.6%	.3%	2%	7.2%	100%
Junior High School (SLTP)	LOKASI	I(K)	Count		5	5	2	3	3	4	1		1	1	5	30
			% of Total		3.5%	3.5%	1.4%	2.1%	2.1%	2.8%	.7%		.7%	.7%	3.5%	20.8%
		II(T)	Count	3	7	9	2	2	4	5	1				3	36
			% of Total	2.1%	4.9%	6.3%	1.4%	1.4%	2.8%	3.5%	.7%				2 1%	25.0%
		III(P)	Count	2	19	14	6	6	3	19	1			2	6	78
			% of Total	1.4%	13.2%	9.7%	4.2%	4.2%	2.1%	13.2%	.7%			1%	4.2%	54.2%
	Total		Count	5	31	28	10	11	10	28	3		1	3	14	144
			% of Total	3.5%	21.5%	19.4%	6.9%	7.6%	6.9%	19.4%	2%		.7%	2%	9.7%	100%

Appendix 5b

Table 20. Father's Occupation

Level				Occupation											Total
				Civil Service	Private Employee	ABRI	Retired	Mercha nt	Farmer	Fisher	Entrepr e-nur	Service	Others	Omit	
Primary School (SD/MI)	LOKASI	I(K)	Count	7	6			6			5	11	11	12	58
			% of Total	1.9%	1.7%			1.7%			1.4%	3.1%	3.1%	3.3%	16.1%
		II(T)	Count	6	22	1	3	14		2	19	36	20	17	140
			% of Total	1.7%	6.1%	.3%	.8%	3.9%		.6%	5.3%	10.0%	5.6%	4.7%	38.9%
		III(P)	Count	6	14		1	13	3	2	16	41	46	20	162
			% of Total	1.7%	3.9%		.3%	3.6%	.8%	.6%	4.4%	11.4%	12.8%	5.6%	45.0%
	Total		Count	19	42	1	4	33	3	4	40	88	77	49	360
			% of Total	5.3%	11.7%	.3%	1.1%	9.2%	.8%	1.1%	11.1%	24.4%	21.4%	13.6%	100.0%
Junior High School (SLTP/ MTs)	LOKASI	I(K)	Count	5	5	1		4			1	6	3	5	30
			% of Total	3.5%	3.5%	.7%		2.8%			.7%	4.2%	2.1%	3 5%	20.8%
		II(T)	Count	1	4		3	3	2		2	9	7	4	36
			% of Total	.7%	2.8%		2.1%	2.1%	1.4%		1.4%	6.3%	4.9%	2.8%	25.0%
		III(P)	Count	12	6	1		3	1	2	7	13	23	10	78
			% of Total	8.3%	4.2%	.7%		2.1%	.7%	1.4%	4.9%	9.0%	16.0%	6.9%	54.2%
	Total		Count	18	15	2	3	10	3	2	10	28	33	19	144
			% of Total	12.5%	10.4%	1.4%	2.1%	6.9%	2.1%	1.4%	6 9%	19.4%	22.9%	13.2%	100 0%

Appendix 5c

Table 21. Family Size

Level				Amount of children / other persons										Total
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Primary School (SD/MI)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count		3	10	8	18	12	4	1	2		58
			% of Total		.8%	2.8%	2.2%	5.0%	3.3%	1.1%	.3%	.6%		16.1%
		II(T)	Count	2	10	20	24	28	19	16	10	11		140
			% of Total	.6%	2.8%	5.6%	6.7%	7.8%	5.3%	4.4%	2.8%	3.1%		38.9%
		III(P)	Count		11	20	34	27	26	16	14	14		162
			% of Total		3.1%	5.6%	9.4%	7.5%	7.2%	4.4%	3.9%	3.9%		45.0%
	Total		Count	2	24	50	66	73	57	36	25	27		360
			% of Total	.6%	6 7%	13.9%	18%	20%	15.8%	10%	6.9%	7.5%		100.0%
Junior High School (SLTP/MTs)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count		3	2	5	4	8	5	2	1		30
			% of Total		2.1%	1.4%	3.5%	2.8%	5.6%	3.5%	1.4%	.7%		20.8%
		II(T)	Count	1	1	2	8	8	5	5	4	2		36
			% of Total	.7%	.7%	1.4%	5.6%	5.6%	3.5%	3.5%	2.8%	1.4%		25.0%
		III(P)	Count		6	12	14	16	16	7	2	4	1	78
			% of Total		4.2%	8.3%	9.7%	11%	11.1%	4.9%	1.4%	2.8%	.7%	54.2%
	Total		Count	1	10	16	27	28	29	17	8	7	1	144
			% of Total	7%	6 9%	11.1%	19%	19%	20.1%	12%	5.6%	4.9%	.7%	100.0%

Appendix 5d

Table 22. Family income before the monetary crisis

Level				PENGHASILAN RUMAH TANGGA SEBELUM KRISMON						Total
				< 100.000	100.000 - 249.500	250.000 - 499.000	500.000 - 749.500	> 750.000	TIDAK MENJAWAB	
Primary School (SD/MI)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count	6	22	19	4	7		58
			% of Total	1.7%	6.1%	5.3%	1.1%	1.9%		16.1%
		II(T)	Count	19	58	43	8	4	8	140
			% of Total	5.3%	16.1%	11.9%	2.2%	1.1%	2.2%	38.9%
		III(P)	Count	45	65	39	9	2	2	162
			% of Total	12.5%	18.1%	10.8%	2.5%	.6%	.6%	45.0%
	Total		Count	70	145	101	21	13	10	360
			% of Total	19.4%	40.3%	28.1%	5.8%	3.6%	2.8%	100%
Junior High School (SLTP/MTs)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count	10	5	12	1	2		30
			% of Total	6.9%	3.5%	8.3%	.7%	1.4%		20.8%
		II(T)	Count	11	13	7	2	1	2	36
			% of Total	7.6%	9.0%	4.9%	1.4%	.7%	1.4%	25.0%
		III(P)	Count	15	23	29	11			78
			% of Total	10.4%	16.0%	20.1%	7.6%			54.2%
	Total		Count	36	41	48	14	3	2	144
			% of Total	25.0%	28.5%	33.3%	9.7%	2.1%	1.4%	100%

Appendix 5e

Table 23. Family income during the monetary crisis

Level				PENGHASILAN RUMAH TANGGA SAAT KRISMON						Total
				< 100.000	100.000 - 249.500	250.000 - 499.000	500.000 - 749.500	> 750.000	Omit	
Primary School (SD/MI)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count	19	17	12	2	6	2	58
			% of Total	5.3%	4.7%	3.3%	.6%	1.7%	.6%	16.1%
		II(T)	Count	40	55	23	3	4	15	140
			% of Total	11.1%	15.3%	6.4%	.8%	1.1%	4.2%	38.9%
		III(P)	Count	71	57	23	2		9	162
			% of Total	19.7%	15.8%	6.4%	.6%		2.5%	45.0%
	Total		Count	130	129	58	7	10	26	360
			% of Total	36.1%	35.8%	16.1%	1.9%	2.8%	7.2%	100.0%
Junior High School (SLTP/MTs)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count	10	11	6	2		1	30
			% of Total	6.9%	7.6%	4.2%	1.4%		.7%	20.8%
		II(T)	Count	19	12	4			1	36
			% of Total	13.2%	8.3%	2.8%			.7%	25.0%
		III(P)	Count	17	27	24	6		4	78
			% of Total	11.8%	18.8%	16.7%	4.2%		2.8%	54.2%
	Total		Count	46	50	34	8		6	144
			% of Total	31.9%	34.7%	23.6%	5.6%		4 2%	100.0%

Appendix 5f:

Table 24. Differences in income before and during the monetary crisis

Level				Difference in income			Total
				None	Yes	Omit	
Primary School (SD/MI)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count	24	33	1	58
			% of Total	6.7%	9.2%	.3%	16.1%
		II(T)	Count	32	105	3	140
			% of Total	8.9%	29.2%	.8%	38.9%
		III(P)	Count	45	116	1	162
			% of Total	12.5%	32.2%	.3%	45.0%
	Total		Count	101	254	5	360
			% of Total	28.1%	70.6%	1.4%	100.0%
Junior High School (SLTP/MTs)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count	9	21		30
			% of Total	6.3%	14.6%		20.8%
		II(T)	Count	8	27	1	36
			% of Total	5.6%	18.8%	.7%	25.0%
		III(P)	Count	30	48		78
			% of Total	20.8%	33.3%		54.2%
	Total		Count	47	96	1	144
			% of Total	32.6%	66.7%	.7%	100.0%

Appendix 5g

Table 25. Expenditure before the monetary crisis

Primary School (SD/MI)	I(K)	Mean	432376.7
		N	58
		Std. Deviation	252368.0
	II(T)	Mean	377543.9
		N	140
		Std. Deviation	230401.0
	III(P)	Mean	410847.7
		N	162
		Std. Deviation	354510.1
	Total	Mean	401364.8
		N	360
		Std. Deviation	295711.8
Junior High School (SLTP/MTs)	I(K)	Mean	660125.0
		N	30
		Std. Deviation	478113.3
	II(T)	Mean	400892.1
		N	36
		Std. Deviation	267234.0
	III(P)	Mean	498936.4
		N	77
		Std. Deviation	495152.0
	Total	Mean	508069.7
		N	143
		Std. Deviation	450942.6
Total	I(K)	Mean	510018.2
		N	88
		Std. Deviation	360157.7
	II(T)	Mean	382319.7
		N	176
		Std. Deviation	237773.8
	III(P)	Mean	439227.7
		N	239
		Std. Deviation	406214.3
	Total	Mean	431700.4
		N	503
		Std. Deviation	349825.8

Appendix 5h

Table 26. Expenditure during the monetary crisis

Primary School (SD/MI)	I(K)	Mean	673866.4
		N	58
		Std. Deviation	385826.4
	II(T)	Mean	561678.9
		N	140
		Std. Deviation	409838.7
	III(P)	Mean	577761.0
		N	162
		Std. Deviation	385199.1
	Total	Mean	586990.5
		N	360
		Std. Deviation	395879.9
Junior High School (SLTP/MTs)	I(K)	Mean	970386.7
		N	30
		Std. Deviation	718251.0
	II(T)	Mean	530159.2
		N	36
		Std. Deviation	279564.6
	III(P)	Mean	776964.3
		N	77
		Std. Deviation	880326.7
	Total	Mean	755409.7
		N	143
		Std. Deviation	749849.9
Total	I(K)	Mean	774952 8
		N	88
		Std. Deviation	538028.4
	II(T)	Mean	555231.7
		N	176
		Std. Deviation	386274.8
	III(P)	Mean	641939.4
		N	239
		Std. Deviation	597115.3
	Total	Mean	634871.1
		N	503
		Std. Deviation	526222.5

Appendix 5j.

Table 28. Dropout children in the family

Level				Dropout children		Total
				None	Yes	
Primary School (SD/MI)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count	56	2	58
			% of Total	15.6%	.6%	16.1%
		II(T)	Count	105	35	140
			% of Total	29.2%	9.7%	38.9%
		III(P)	Count	99	63	162
			% of Total	27.5%	17.5%	45.0%
	Total		Count	260	100	360
			% of Total	72.2%	27.8%	100.0%
Junior High School (SLTP/MTs)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count	23	7	30
			% of Total	16.0%	4.9%	20.8%
		II(T)	Count	28	8	36
			% of Total	19.4%	5.6%	25.0%
		III(P)	Count	54	24	78
			% of Total	37.5%	16.7%	54.2%
	Total		Count	105	39	144
			% of Total	72.9%	27.1%	100.0%

Appendix 5k

Table 29a. Reasons for DO (parents' loosing jobs)

Level				Reason		Total
				PHK	0	
Primary School (SD/MI)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count	1	57	58
			% of Total	.3%	15.8%	16.1%
		II(T)	Count	18	122	140
			% of Total	5.0%	33.9%	38.9%
		III(P)	Count	17	145	162
			% of Total	4.7%	40.3%	45.0%
	Total		Count	36	324	360
			% of Total	10.0%	90.0%	100.0%
Junior High School (SLTP/MTs)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count	3	27	30
			% of Total	2 1%	18.8%	20.8%
		II(T)	Count	3	33	36
			% of Total	2 1%	22.9%	25.0%
		III(P)	Count	4	74	78
			% of Total	2.8%	51.4%	54.2%
	Total		Count	10	134	144
			% of Total	6.9%	93.1%	100.0%

Table 29b. Reason for DO (decrease of income)

Level				Reason		Total
				Decrease of income	0	
Primary School (SD/MI)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count	2	56	58
			% of Total	.6%	15.6%	16.1%
		II(T)	Count	22	118	140
			% of Total	6.1%	32.8%	38.9%
		III(P)	Count	47	115	162
			% of Total	13.1%	31.9%	45.0%
	Total		Count	71	289	360
			% of Total	19.7%	80.3%	100.0%
Junior High School (SLTP/MTs)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count	5	25	30
			% of Total	3.5%	17.4%	20.8%
		II(T)	Count	4	32	36
			% of Total	2.8%	22.2%	25.0%
		III(P)	Count	19	59	78
			% of Total	13.2%	41.0%	54.2%
	Total		Count	28	116	144
			% of Total	19.4%	80.6%	100.0%

Table 29c. Reason for DO (helping in earning money)

Level				Reason		Total
				Helping earning money	0	
Primary School (SD/MI)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count	1	57	58
			% of Total	.3%	15.8%	16.1%
		II(T)	Count	14	126	140
			% of Total	3 9%	35.0%	38.9%
		III(P)	Count	18	144	162
			% of Total	5.0%	40.0%	45.0%
	Total		Count	33	327	360
			% of Total	9.2%	90.8%	100.0%
Junior High School (SLTP/MTs)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count	4	26	30
			% of Total	2.8%	18.1%	20.8%
		II(T)	Count	4	32	36
			% of Total	2.8%	22.2%	25.0%
		III(P)	Count	6	72	78
			% of Total	4.2%	50.0%	54.2%
	Total		Count	14	130	144
			% of Total	9.7%	90.3%	100.0%

Table 29d. Reason for DO (priority for food)

Level				Reason		Total
				Priority for food	0	
Primary School (SD/MI)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count	1	57	58
			% of Total	.3%	15.8%	16.1%
		II(T)	Count	15	125	140
			% of Total	4.2%	34.7%	38.9%
		III(P)	Count	33	129	162
			% of Total	9.2%	35.8%	45.0%
	Total		Count	49	311	360
			% of Total	13.6%	86.4%	100.0%
Junior High School (SLTP/MTs)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count	2	28	30
			% of Total	1.4%	19.4%	20.8%
		II(T)	Count	4	32	36
			% of Total	2.8%	22.2%	25.0%
		III(P)	Count	9	69	78
			% of Total	6.3%	47.9%	54.2%
	Total		Count	15	129	144
			% of Total	10.4%	89.6%	100.0%

Table 29e. Reasons for DO (lack of interest in schooling)

Level				Reason: No interest in school	Reason: 0	Total
Primary School (SD/MI)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count	1	57	58
			% of Total	.3%	15.8%	16.1%
		II(T)	Count	6	134	140
			% of Total	1.7%	37.2%	38.9%
		III(P)	Count	8	154	162
			% of Total	2.2%	42.8%	45.0%
	Total		Count	15	345	360
			% of Total	4.2%	95.8%	100.0%
Junior High School (SLTP/MTs)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count	1	29	30
			% of Total	.7%	20.1%	20.8%
		II(T)	Count	1	35	36
			% of Total	.7%	24.3%	25.0%
		III(P)	Count	6	72	78
			% of Total	4.2%	50.0%	54.2%
	Total		Count	8	136	144
			% of Total	5.6%	94.4%	100.0%

Table 29f. Reason for DO (Less smart)

Level				Reason: Less Capable	Reason: 0	Total
Primary School (SD/MI)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count		58	58
			% of Total		16.1%	16.1%
		II(T)	Count	5	135	140
			% of Total	1.4%	37.5%	38.9%
		III(P)	Count	4	158	162
			% of Total	1.1%	43.9%	45.0%
	Total		Count	9	351	360
			% of Total	2.5%	97.5%	100.0%
Junior High School (SLTP/MTs)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count	1	29	30
			% of Total	.7%	20.1%	20.8%
		II(T)	Count		36	36
			% of Total		25.0%	25.0%
		III(P)	Count	3	75	78
			% of Total	2.1%	52.1%	54.2%
	Total		Count	4	140	144
			% of Total	2.8%	97.2%	100.0%

Table 29g. Reason for DO (Priority to boys)

Level				Reason		Total
				Priority to boys	0	
Primary School (SD/MI)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count		58	58
			% of Total		16.1%	16.1%
		II(T)	Count	2	138	140
			% of Total	.6%	38 3%	38.9%
		III(P)	Count	4	158	162
			% of Total	1.1%	43.9%	45.0%
	Total		Count	6	354	360
			% of Total	1.7%	98.3%	100.0%
Junior High School (SLTP/MTs)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count	1	29	30
			% of Total	.7%	20.1%	20.8%
		II(T)	Count		36	36
			% of Total		25.0%	25.0%
		III(P)	Count	3	75	78
			% of Total	2.1%	52.1%	54.2%
	Total		Count	4	140	144
			% of Total	2.8%	97.2%	100.0%

Table 29h. Reason for DO (others)

Level				Reason		Total
				Others	0	
Primary School (SD/MI)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count		58	58
			% of Total		16.1%	16.1%
		II(T)	Count	6	134	140
			% of Total	1.7%	37.2%	38.9%
		III(P)	Count	3	159	162
			% of Total	.8%	44.2%	45.0%
	Total		Count	9	351	360
			% of Total	2 5%	97.5%	100.0%
Junior High School (SLTP/MTs)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count	1	29	30
			% of Total	.7%	20.1%	20.8%
		II(T)	Count	1	35	36
			% of Total	.7%	24.3%	25.0%
		III(P)	Count		78	78
			% of Total		54.2%	54.2%
	Total		Count	2	142	144
			% of Total	1.4%	98.6%	100.0%

Appendix 5k

Table 30. Type of grant / aid expected

Level				Type of grant / aid			Total
				Money	Article	Omit	
Primary School (SD/MI)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count	53	4	1	58
			% of Total	14.7%	1.1%	.3%	16.1%
		II(T)	Count	125	11	4	140
			% of Total	34.7%	3.1%	1.1%	38.9%
		III(P)	Count	156	5	1	162
			% of Total	43.3%	1.4%	.3%	45.0%
	Total		Count	334	20	6	360
			% of Total	92.8%	5.6%	1.7%	100.0%
Junior High School (SLTP/MTs)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count	27	2	1	30
			% of Total	18.8%	1.4%	.7%	20.8%
		II(T)	Count	36			36
			% of Total	25.0%			25.0%
		III(P)	Count	73	4	1	78
			% of Total	50.7%	2.8%	.7%	54.2%
	Total		Count	136	6	2	144
			% of Total	94.4%	4.2%	1.4%	100.0%

Appendix 5l

Table 31. Articles expected as grant

Level				Articles Expected						Total
				Books	Equipment	Learning Aids	Uniforms	Mixture	Omit	
Primary School (SD/MI)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count		1	11			46	58
			% of Total		.3%	3.1%			12.8%	16.1%
		II(T)	Count	1		24		2	113	140
			% of Total	.3%		6.7%		.6%	31.4%	38.9%
		III(P)	Count	2	4	44	2	1	109	162
			% of Total	.6%	1.1%	12.2%	.6%	.3%	30.3%	45.0%
	Total		Count	3	5	79	2	3	268	360
			% of Total	.8%	1.4%	21.9%	.6%	.8%	74.4%	100.0%
Junior High School (SLTP/MTs)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count	2		4		1	23	30
			% of Total	1.4%		2.8%		.7%	16.0%	20.8%
		II(T)	Count	1	2	2			31	36
			% of Total	.7%	1.4%	1.4%			21.5%	25.0%
		III(P)	Count	2	1	10			65	78
			% of Total	1.4%	.7%	6.9%			45.1%	54.2%
	Total		Count	5	3	16		1	119	144
			% of Total	3.5%	2.1%	11.1%		.7%	82.6%	100.0%

Appendix 5m

Table 31. Amount of money suggested as grant

Level				Amount of money / grant suggested					Total
				10.000 - 19.500	20.000 - 29.500	30.000 - 39.500	40.000 - 45.500	5	
Primary School (SD/MI)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count	3	8	22	20	5	58
			% of Total	.8%	2.2%	6.1%	5.6%	1.4%	16.1%
		II(T)	Count	26	25	34	39	16	140
			% of Total	7.2%	6.9%	9.4%	10.8%	4.4%	38.9%
		III(P)	Count	34	15	23	85	5	162
			% of Total	9.4%	4.2%	6.4%	23.6%	1.4%	45.0%
	Total		Count	63	48	79	144	26	360
			% of Total	17.5%	13.3%	21.9%	40.0%	7.2%	100.0%
Junior High School (SLTP/MTs)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count	1	3	5	19	2	30
			% of Total	.7%	2.1%	3.5%	13.2%	1.4%	20.8%
		II(T)	Count		8	11	17		36
			% of Total		5.6%	7.6%	11.8%		25.0%
		III(P)	Count	4	13	26	29	6	78
			% of Total	2.8%	9.0%	18.1%	20.1%	4.2%	54.2%
	Total		Count	5	24	42	65	8	144
			% of Total	3.5%	16.7%	29.2%	45.1%	5.6%	100 0%

Appendix 5n

Table 32. Method of grant / aid allocation

Level				Method of allocation of grant					Total
				Directly to pupils	Via School	BANK	Post Offices	Others	
Primary School (SD/MI)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count	25	25	2	4	2	58
			% of Total	6.9%	6.9%	.6%	1.1%	.6%	16.1%
		II(T)	Count	44	86	6		4	140
			% of Total	12.2%	23.9%	1.7%		1.1%	38.9%
		III(P)	Count	59	91	8	1	3	162
			% of Total	16.4%	25.3%	2.2%	.3%	.8%	45.0%
	Total		Count	128	202	16	5	9	360
			% of Total	35.6%	56.1%	4.4%	1.4%	2.5%	100.0%
Junior High School (SLTP/MTs)	LOCATION	I(K)	Count	13	9	4	2	2	30
			% of Total	9.0%	6.3%	2.8%	1.4%	1.4%	20.8%
		II(T)	Count	16	14	1	4	1	36
			% of Total	11.1%	9.7%	.7%	2.8%	.7%	25.0%
		III(P)	Count	38	31	3	5	1	78
			% of Total	26.4%	21.5%	2.1%	3.5%	.7%	54.2%
	Total		Count	67	54	8	11	4	144
			% of Total	46.5%	37.5%	5.6%	7.6%	2.8%	100.0%

Appendix 5o

Table 33. Relatinship between family income and poetential DO of children

Level				Potential DO		Total
				No	Yes	
Primary School (SD/MI)	Family income	< 100.000	Count	57	73	130
			% of Total	15.8%	20.3%	36.1%
		100.000 - 249.500	Count	64	65	129
			% of Total	17.8%	18.1%	35.8%
		250.000 - 499.000	Count	34	24	58
			% of Total	9.4%	6.7%	16.1%
		500 000 - 749.500	Count	5	2	7
			% of Total	1.4%	.6%	1.9%
		> 750.000	Count	7	3	10
			% of Total	1.9%	.8%	2.8%
		TIDAK MENJAWAB	Count	19	7	26
			% of Total	5.3%	1.9%	7.2%
	Total		Count	186	174	360
			% of Total	51.7%	48.3%	100.0%
Junior High Schc ol (SLTP/MTs)	Family income	< 100.000	Count	21	25	46
			% of Total	14.6%	17.4%	31.9%
		100.000 - 249.500	Count	22	28	50
			% of Total	15.3%	19.4%	34.7%
		250.000 - 499.000	Count	23	11	34
			% of Total	16.0%	7.6%	23.6%
		500.000 - 749.500	Count	7	1	8
			% of Total	4.9%	.7%	5.6%
		TIDAK MENJAWAB	Count	3	3	6
			% of Total	2.1%	2.1%	4.2%
	Total		Count	76	68	144
			% of Total	52 8%	47.2%	100.0%

Table 34a. Relationship between fathers' educational background and DO in the family

Level				DO		Total
				None	Yes	
Primary School (SD/MI)	Family Income	< 100.000	Count	90	40	130
			% of Total	25.0%	11.1%	36 1%
		100.000 - 249.500	Count	95	34	129
			% of Total	26.4%	9 4%	35.8%
		250.000 - 499.000	Count	43	15	58
			% of Total	11.9%	4.2%	16.1%
		500.000 - 749.500	Count	7		7
			% of Total	1.9%		1.9%
		> 750.000	Count	8	2	10
			% of Total	2.2%	.6%	2.8%
		Out	Count	17	9	26
			% of Total	4.7%	2.5%	7.2%
	Total		Count	260	100	360
			% of Total	72.2%	27.8%	100.0%
Junior High School (SLTP/MTs)	Family Income	< 100.000	Count	26	20	46
			% of Total	18.1%	13.9%	31.9%
		100.000 - 249.500	Count	40	10	50
			% of Total	27.8%	6.9%	34.7%
		250.000 - 499.000	Count	30	4	34
			% of Total	20.8%	2.8%	23.6%
		500.000 - 749.500	Count	7	1	8
			% of Total	4.9%	.7%	5.6%
		out	Count	2	4	6
			% of Total	1.4%	2.8%	4.2%
	Total		Count	105	39	144
			% of Total	72.9%	27.1%	100.0%

Appendix 5q

Table 35b. Relationship between Fathers educational background potential DO in the Family

Level				Potential DO		Total
				no	yes	
Primary School (SD/MI)	Educational Background	NO SCHOLING	Count	5	10	15
			% of Total	1.4%	2.8%	4.2%
		DROPOUT	Count	30	43	73
			% of Total	8.3%	11.9%	20.3%
		GRADE	Count	38	41	79
			% of Total	10.6%	11.4%	21.9%
		DROPOUT	Count	11	10	21
			% of Total	3.1%	2.8%	5.8%
		GRADE	Count	17	25	42
			% of Total	4.7%	6.9%	11.7%
		DROPOUT	Count	20	14	34
			% of Total	5.6%	3.9%	9 4%
		GRADE	Count	42	18	60
			% of Total	11.7%	5.0%	16.7%
		D1	Count	1		1
			% of Total	.3%		.3%
		D2	Count	2		2
			% of Total	.6%		.6%
		D3	Count	1		1
			% of Total	.3%		.3%
		S1	Count	6		6
			% of Total	1.7%		1.7%
		Out	Count	13	13	26
			% of Total	3.6%	3.6%	7.2%
	Total		Count	186	174	360
			% of Total	51.7%	48.3%	100.0%
Junior High School (SLTP/MTs)	Educational Background	NO SCHOLING	Count	1	4	5
			% of Total	.7%	2.8%	3.5%
		DROPOUT	Count	14	17	31
			% of Total	9.7%	11.8%	21.5%
		GRADE	Count	10	18	28
			% of Total	6.9%	12.5%	19.4%
		DROPOUT	Count	5	5	10
			% of Total	3 5%	3.5%	6.9%
		GRADE	Count	4	7	11
			% of Total	2.8%	4.9%	7.6%
		DROPOUT	Count	5	5	10
			% of Total	3.5%	3.5%	6.9%
		GRADE	Count	24	4	28
			% of Total	16.7%	2.8%	19.4%
		D1	Count	2	1	3
			% of Total	1.4%	.7%	2.1%
		D3	Count	1		1
			% of Total	.7%		.7%
		S1	Count	3		3
			% of Total	2.1%		2.1%
		Out	Count	7	7	14
			% of Total	4.9%	4.9%	9.7%
	Total		Count	76	68	144
			% of Total	52.8%	47.2%	100.0%

Appendix 6a

Table 36. Teacher's educational background

LEVEL				Educational Background									Total
				SPG	PGA	ALIYAH	SMU / SMK	D-1	D-2	D-3	S-1	Omit	
Primary School (SD)	LOCATION	I (K)	Count	5					18	3	4		30
			% of Total	2.8%					10.0%	1.7%	2.2%		16.7%
		II (T)	Count	18		1	2	5	24	4	13	1	68
			% of Total	10.0%		.6%	1.1%	2.8%	13.3%	2.2%	7.2%	.6%	37.8%
		III (P)	Count	17	2	10		1	30	7	4	11	82
			% of Total	9.4%	1.1%	5 6%		.6%	16.7%	3.9%	2.2%	6.1%	45.6%
	Total		Count	40	2	11	2	6	72	14	21	12	180
			% of Total	22.2%	1.1%	6.1%	1.1%	3.3%	40.0%	7.8%	11.7%	6.7%	100.0%
Junior High School (SLTP)	LOCATION	I (K)	Count					2	3	3	7		15
			% of Total					2.8%	4.2%	4.2%	9.7%		20.8%
		II (T)	Count					1	5	4	8		18
			% of Total					1.4%	6.9%	5.6%	11.1%		25.0%
		III (P)	Count	1		1	3	6	3	10	15		39
			% of Total	1.4%		1.4%	4.2%	8.3%	4.2%	13 9%	20.8%		54.2%
	Total		Count	1		1	3	9	11	17	30		72
			% of Total	1.4%		1.4%	4 2%	12.5%	15.3%	23 6%	41.7%		100.0%

Appendix 6b

Table 37. Teacher's rank – position

LEVEL				Rank										Total
				IIa	IIb	IIc	IId	IIIa	IIIb	IIIc	IIId	IVa	Omit	
Primary School (SD)	LOCATION	I (K)	Count			1	3	11	3	4	1		7	30
			% of Total			.6%	1.7%	6.1%	1.7%	2.2%	.6%		3.9%	16.7%
		II (T)	Count	1	3	6	7	13	10	6	2		20	68
			% of Total	.6%	1.7%	3.3%	3.9%	7.2%	5.6%	3.3%	1.1%		11.1%	37.8%
		III (P)	Count	7	4	7	5	11	14	8	3		23	82
			% of Total	3.9%	2.2%	3.9%	2.8%	6.1%	7.8%	4.4%	1.7%		12.8%	45.6%
	Total		Count	8	7	14	15	35	27	18	6		50	180
			% of Total	4.4%	3.9%	7.8%	8.3%	19%	15.0%	10%	3.3%		27.8%	100.0%
Junior High School (SLTP)	LOCATION	I (K)	Count					1	4	1		2	7	15
			% of Total					1.4%	5.6%	1.4%		2 8%	9.7%	20.8%
		II (T)	Count	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	5	18
			% of Total	1.4%	1.4%	2.8%	1.4%	1.4%	2.8%	2.8%	2.8%	1.4%	6.9%	25.0%
		III (P)	Count		2	3	4	7	8	6	1	2	6	39
			% of Total		2.8%	4.2%	5.6%	9.7%	11.1%	8.3%	1.4%	2.8%	8.3%	54.2%
	Total		Count	1	3	5	5	9	14	9	3	5	18	72
			% of Total	1.4%	4.2%	6.9%	6.9%	13%	19.4%	13%	4.2%	6.9%	25.0%	100.0%

Appendix 6c

Table 38. Function of teacher

LEVEL				Function				Total
				Vice Headmaster	Coordinator	Ordinary Teacher	Omit	
SD	LOKASI	I (K)	Count		1	20	9	30
			% of Total		.6%	11.1%	5.0%	16 7%
		II (T)	Count	13		43	12	68
			% of Total	7.2%		23.9%	6.7%	37.8%
		III (P)	Count	12	4	46	17	82
			% of Total	6.7%	2.2%	25.6%	9.4%	45.6%
	Total		Count	25	5	109	38	180
			% of Total	13.9%	2.8%	60 6%	21.1%	100.0%
SLTP	LOKASI	I (K)	Count	1	1	10	3	15
			% of Total	1.4%	1.4%	13.9%	4.2%	20.8%
		II (T)	Count	6	1	7	4	18
			% of Total	8.3%	1.4%	9.7%	5.6%	25.0%
		III (P)	Count	13		17	9	39
			% of Total	18.1%		23.6%	12.5%	54.2%
	Total		Count	20	2	34	16	72
			% of Total	27 8%	2.8%	47.2%	22.2%	100.0%

Appendix 6d

Table.39 Years of Experience

LEVEL				Years of Experience						Total
				< 5	5 - 10	11 - 15	16 - 20	20 or longer	Omit	
Primary School (SD)	LOCATION	I (K)	Count	2	4	9	6	1	8	30
			% of Total	1.1%	2.2%	5.0%	3.3%	.6%	4.4%	16.7%
		II (T)	Count	7	7	28	6	12	8	68
			% of Total	3.9%	3.9%	15.6%	3.3%	6.7%	4.4%	37.8%
		III (P)	Count	10	7	28	13	10	14	82
			% of Total	5.6%	3.9%	15.6%	7.2%	5.6%	7.8%	45.6%
	Total		Count	19	18	65	25	23	30	180
			% of Total	10.6%	10.0%	36.1%	13.9%	12.8%	16.7%	100.0%
Junior High School	LOCATION	I (K)	Count	3	2	3	3	2	2	15
			% of Total	4.2%	2.8%	4.2%	4.2%	2.8%	2.8%	20.8%
		II (T)	Count	1	5	5	3	1	3	18
			% of Total	1.4%	6.9%	6.9%	4.2%	1.4%	4.2%	25.0%
		III (P)	Count	4	8	8	9	2	8	39
			% of Total	5.6%	11.1%	11.1%	12.5%	2.8%	11.1%	54.2%
	Total		Count	8	15	16	15	5	13	72
			% of Total	11.1%	20.8%	22 2%	20 8%	6.9%	18.1%	100.0%

Appendix 6e

Table 40: Level - Teacher's Income before monetary crisis - crostab

Location				Income before monetary crisis						Total
				< 100.000	100.000 - 249.500	250.000 - 499.500	500.000 - 749.500	> 750.000	06	
I (K)	LEVEL	Primary School (SD)	Count		1	11	11	7		30
			% of Total		2.2%	24.4%	24.4%	15.6%		66.7%
		Junior High School (SLTP)	Count		1	7	3	4		15
			% of Total		2.2%	15.6%	6.7%	8.9%		33.3%
	Total		Count		2	18	14	11		45
			% of Total		4.4%	40.0%	31.1%	24.4%		100.0%
II (T)	LEVEL	Primary School (SD)	Count	5	7	34	16	5	1	68
			% of Total	5.8%	8.1%	39.5%	18.6%	5.8%	1.2%	79.1%
		Junior High School (SLTP)	Count		2	8	8			18
			% of Total		2.3%	9.3%	9.3%			20.9%
	Total		Count	5	9	42	24	5	1	86
			% of Total	5.8%	10.5%	48.8%	27.9%	5.8%	1.2%	100.0%
III (P)	LEVEL	Primary School (SD)	Count	17	9	26	17	11	2	82
			% of Total	14.0%	7.4%	21.5%	14.0%	9.1%	1.7%	67.8%
		Junior High School (SLTP)	Count			22	13	4		39
			% of Total			18.2%	10.7%	3.3%		32.2%
	Total		Count	17	9	48	30	15	2	121
			% of Total	14.0%	7.4%	39.7%	24.8%	12.4%	1.7%	100 0%

Appendix 6f

Table 41.-Level - Teacher's income before monetary crisis - crostab

Location				Income before monetary crisis						Total
				< 100.000	100.000 - 249.500	250.000 - 499.500	500.000 - 749.500	> 750.000	06	
I (K)	LEVEL	Primary School (SD)	Count		1	11	11	7		30
			% of Total		2.2%	24.4%	24.4%	15.6%		66.7%
		Junior High School (SLTP)	Count		1	7	3	4		15
			% of Total		2.2%	15.6%	6.7%	8.9%		33.3%
	Total		Count		2	18	14	11		45
			% of Total		4.4%	40.0%	31.1%	24.4%		100.0%
II (T)	LEVEL	Primary School (SD)	Count	5	7	34	16	5	1	68
			% of Total	5.8%	8.1%	39.5%	18.6%	5.8%	1.2%	79.1%
		Junior High School (SLTP)	Count		2	8	8			18
			% of Total		2.3%	9.3%	9.3%			20.9%
	Total		Count	5	9	42	24	5	1	86
			% of Total	5.8%	10.5%	48.8%	27.9%	5.8%	1.2%	100.0%
III (P)	LEVEL	Primary School (SD)	Count	17	9	26	17	11	2	82
			% of Total	14.0%	7.4%	21.5%	14.0%	9.1%	1.7%	67.8%
		Junior High School (SLTP)	Count			22	13	4		39
			% of Total			18.2%	10.7%	3.3%		32.2%
	Total		Count	17	9	48	30	15	2	121
			% of Total	14.0%	7.4%	39.7%	24.8%	12.4%	1.7%	100.0%

Appendix 6g

Table 42 Comparison of teachers' expenses

LEVEL	LOCATION		Before monetary crisis	During monetary crisis
Primary School (SD)	I (K)	Mean	628938.33	1012942
		N	30	30
		Std. Deviation	232322.99	410712.2
	II (T)	Mean	726615.97	799046.6
		N	67	68
		Std. Deviation	400642.07	650978.2
	III (P)	Mean	665747.86	758366.5
		N	77	77
		Std. Deviation	389922.60	742467.9
	Total	Mean	682839.11	817815.1
		N	174	175
		Std. Deviation	372091.71	663578.7
Junior High School (SLTP)	I (K)	Mean	854873.33	1297967
		N	15	15
		Std. Deviation	340723.58	651162 6
	II (T)	Mean	859055.56	612839.2
		N	18	18
		Std. Deviation	534075.21	800259.8
	III (P)	Mean	725738.46	908683.9
		N	39	39
		Std. Deviation	391761.04	703914.5
	Total	Mean	785970.83	915823.3
		N	72	72
		Std. Deviation	421520.99	745852 0
Total	I (K)	Mean	704250.00	1107950
		N	45	45
		Std. Deviation	290023.79	514349.1
	II (T)	Mean	754662.00	760073.0
		N	85	86
		Std. Deviation	432212.08	684047.9
	III (P)	Mean	685917.11	808904.2
		N	116	116
		Std. Deviation	389875.06	730154.4
	Total	Mean	713024.00	846384.3
		N	246	247
		Std. Deviation	389186.38	688481.2

Tabel 43. Number of Primary Schools Pupils
During 1995/1996, 1996/1997 and 1997/1998

PRIMARY SCHOOL PUPILS																	
Code : K																	
YEAR	1995/1996																
	1L	1P	2L	2P	3L	3P	4L	4P	5L	5P	6L	6P	Sum.L	Sum.P	L+P	Average	
KS052	4	17	6	4	9	9	9	6	8	10	12	11	48	57	105	17.5	
KS048	26	19	28	16	32	24	26	16	27	15	22	22	161	112	273	45.5	
KS024	10	10	22	13	23	19	15	21	17	18	19	15	106	96	202	33.7	
KS009	20	18	15	19	17	20	11	12	14	16	17	8	94	93	187	31.2	
KS041	10	12	10	3	19	7	17	10	10	12	6	15	72	59	131	21.8	
Sub-Total	70	76	81	13	100	26	78	65	76	71	76	71	481	417	898	150	29.933
Total of area		146		94		126		143		147		147		898			
Code : K																	
1996/1997	1L	1P	2L	2P	3L	3P	4L	4P	5L	5P	6L	6P	Sum.L	Sum.P	L+P	Average	
KS052	10	6	3	11	8	6	9	6	9	7	7	12	46	48	94	15.7	
KS048	28	18	24	18	26	16	28	16	23	16	23	13	152	97	249	41.5	
KS024	20	16	12	11	25	12	22	15	15	20	16	17	110	91	201	33.5	
KS009	12	15	15	12	17	12	15	16	10	12	12	11	81	78	159	26.5	
KS041	11	12	8	7	10	12	13	4	16	6	13	10	71	51	122	20.3	
Sub-Total	81	67	62	59	86	58	87	57	73	61	71	63	460	365	825	138	27.5
Total of area		148		121		144		144		134		134		825			
Code : K																	
YEAR : 1997/1998																	
	1L	1P	2L	2P	3L	3P	4L	4P	5L	5P	6L	6P	Sum.L	Sum.P	L+P	Average	
KS052	4	3	8	7	2	9	7	7	12	6	10	6	43	38	81	13.5	
KS048	33	19	24	18	25	16	25	13	28	16	20	15	155	97	252	42	
KS024	22	16	19	17	15	11	26	11	22	16	15	20	119	91	210	35	
KS009	11	19	14	10	15	6	16	10	13	11	13	5	82	61	143	23.8	
KS041	9	11	10	12	8	7	11	9	15	3	15	8	68	50	118	19.7	
Sub-Total	79	68	75	64	65	49	85	50	90	52	73	54	467	337	804	134	26.8
Total of area		147		139		114		135		142		127		804			

1995/1996	(P)																
Code	1L	1P	2L	2P	3L	3P	4L	4P	5L	5P	6L	6P	Sum.L	Sum.P	L+P	Average	
KS027	33	20	22	25	31	13	29	26	28	16	30	31	173	131	304	50.667	
KS023	28	27	31	28	28	30	21	23	24	23	27	21	159	152	311	51.833	
KS039	24	26	17	15	24	14	17	22	19	21	19	15	120	113	233	38 833	
KS049	25	19	23	19	23	24	30	19	17	23	28	21	146	125	271	45.167	
KS042	39	42	44	48	43	55	40	42	42	42	11	30	219	259	478	79.667	
KS004	32	23	17	17	26	16	23	17	30	25	27	17	155	115	270	45	
KS001	19	22	31	28	16	31	21	24	25	37	34	37	146	179	325	54.167	
KS033	11	11	12	13	14	10	14	16	18	12	19	13	88	75	163	27.167	
KS012	15	16	9	14	13	7	10	14	12	11	13	7	72	69	141	23.5	
KS053	5	5	9	14	14	7	14	11	9	8	10	13	61	58	119	19.833	
KS034	48	51	33	31	36	42	42	41	35	39	30	44	224	248	472	78.667	
KS029	12	21	8	22	23	13	23	23	23	35	18	28	107	142	249	41.5	
KS038	15	12	15	15	11	14	21	22	15	27	18	10	95	100	195	32.5	
Sub-Total	306	295	271	289	302	276	305	300	297	319	284	287	1765	1766	3531	588.5	45.27
Total of area		601		560		578		605		616		571		3531			
1996/1997	(P)																
Code	1L	1P	2L	2P	3L	3P	4L	4P	5L	5P	6L	6P	Sum.L	Sum.P	L+P	Average	
KS027	32	20	28	17	23	23	35	14	26	26	29	16	173	116	289	48.167	
KS023	30	31	27	25	30	26	26	23	19	22	24	25	156	152	308	51.333	
KS039	35	23	22	24	16	15	24	14	15	20	18	22	130	118	248	41.333	
KS049	20	34	23	15	20	16	18	25	29	16	17	23	127	129	256	42.667	
KS042	50	50	45	50	42	48	44	43	10	30	21	29	212	250	462	77	
KS004	25	15	26	21	17	17	26	18	20	17	24	27	138	115	253	42.167	
KS001	17	22	32	28	16	31	22	24	25	37	34	35	146	177	323	53 833	
KS033	10	10	9	11	11	9	10	16	18	10	14	10	72	66	138	23	
KS012	21	9	15	15	11	12	11	7	10	15	12	11	80	69	149	24.833	
KS053	5	5	9	15	14	7	15	11	9	8	10	13	62	59	121	20.167	
KS034	73	45	49	47	31	31	41	38	38	38	29	35	261	234	495	82.5	
KS029	26	16	11	17	10	23	24	13	22	22	23	32	116	123	239	39.833	
KS038	14	16	15	12	15	15	17	19	18	19	13	25	92	106	198	33	
Sub-Total	358	296	311	297	256	273	313	265	259	280	268	303	1765	1714	3479	579.83	44.6
Total of area		654		608		529		578		539		571		3479			
1997/1998	(P)																
Code	1L	1P	2L	2P	3L	3P	4L	4P	5L	5P	6L	6P	Sum.L	Sum.P	L+P	Average	
KS027	32	25	29	33	32	21	21	13	23	22	28	13	165	127	292	48 667	
KS023	29	23	31	29	27	25	31	25	25	27	19	22	162	151	313	52.167	
KS039	32	23	20	26	12	15	24	16	13	19	19	21	120	120	240	40	
KS049	38	25	15	28	21	11	19	15	16	23	29	16	138	118	256	42.667	
KS042	40	42	45	48	44	55	40	42	42	43	11	30	222	260	482	80.333	
KS004	21	16	23	18	27	20	20	18	25	18	19	16	135	106	241	40.167	
KS001	17	21	31	28	15	30	21	24	25	36	33	36	142	175	317	52.833	
KS033	14	10	10	10	9	11	10	9	12	12	10	15	65	67	132	22	
KS012	11	8	21	7	14	14	12	11	11	7	11	13	80	60	140	23.333	
KS053	10	9	7	4	10	13	14	6	13	9	9	9	63	50	113	18 833	
KS034	52	39	65	41	44	41	30	26	30	37	39	32	260	216	476	79.333	
KS029	20	23	26	14	8	19	10	18	24	11	22	21	110	106	216	36	
KS038	20	11	13	14	11	9	14	11	10	12	15	14	83	71	154	25.667	
Sub-Total	336	275	336	300	274	284	266	234	269	276	264	258	1745	1627	3372	562	43.23
Total of area		611		636		558		500		545		522		3372			

Table 44. Number of Junior High Schools Pupils
During 1995/1996, 1996/1997 and 1997/1998

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL PUPILS												
YEAR: 1995/1996												
"K"	CODE	1L	1P	2L	2P	3L	3P	Sum L	Sum P	L+P	AVERAGE	
	O14	18	30	21	19	29	42	68	91	159	8.8333333	
	O10	84	63	159	96	101	85	344	244	588	32.666667	
	O19	198	171	188	165	159	201	545	537	1082	60.111111	
	O36	177	183	222	225	166	160	565	568	1133	62.944444	
	O44	73	107	111	93	131	147	315	347	662	36.777778	
Sub-Total		550	554	701	598	586	635	1837	1787	3624	201.33333	40.266667
Total of Area			1104		1299		1221					
YEAR; 1996/1997												
	Code	1L	1P	2L	2P	3L	3P	Sum L	Sum P	L+P	AVERAGE	
"K"	O14	14	21	15	29	19	19	48	69	117	6.5	
	O10	49	37	78	61	100	96	227	194	421	23.388889	
	O19	199	170	191	163	158	202	548	535	1083	60.166667	
	O36	200	184	163	182	207	220	570	586	1156	64.222222	
	O44	76	80	77	104	102	93	255	277	532	29.555556	
Sub-Total		538	492	524	539	586	630	1648	1661	3309	183.83333	36.766667
Total of Area												
YEAR:1997/1998												
	CODE	1L	1P	2L	2P	3L	3P	Sum L	Sum P	L+P	AVERAGE	
"K"	O14	19	13	11	21	14	28	44	62	106	5.8888889	
	O10	44	46	38	33	69	64	151	143	294	16.333333	
	O19	165	148	176	161	125	165	466	474	940	52.222222	
	O36	176	205	202	167	154	177	532	549	1081	60.055556	
	O44	57	69	70	76	74	102	201	247	448	24.888889	
Sub-Total		461	481	497	458	436	536	1394	1475	2869	159.38889	31.877778
Total of Area			942		955		972					

YEAR; 1995/1996												
"T"	CODE	1L	1P	2L	2P	3L	3P	Sum L	Sum P	L+P	AVERAGE	
	O16	109	127	114	156	121	155	344	438	782	43.444	
	O50	181	194	176	187	173	185	530	566	1096	60.889	
	O51	46	90	53	90	40	117	139	297	436	24.222	
	OO6	148	154	130	136	144	163	422	453	875	48.611	
	O15	75	112	87	95	109	119	271	326	597	33.167	
	O18	76	89	61	91	47	75	184	255	439	24.389	
Sub-Total		526	639	507	599	513	659	1546	1897	3443	234.72	39.12
Total of Area			1165		1106		1172		3443			
YEAR:1996/1997												
	CODE	1L	1P	2L	2P	3L	3P	Sum L	Sum P	L+P	AVERAGE	
"T"	O16	154	176	109	121	90	146	353	443	796	44.2222	
	O50	158	183	172	188	171	181	501	552	1053	58.5	
	O51	62	97	53	82	51	89	166	268	434	24.1111	
	OO6	149	169	111	147	109	137	369	453	822	45.6667	
	O15	118	119	74	110	87	96	279	325	604	33.5556	
	O18	59	61	72	82	46	85	177	228	405	22.5	
Sub-Total		546	629	482	609	454	588	1492	1826	3318	228.556	38.0926
Total of Area			1175		1091		1052		3318			
YEAR 1997/1998												
	CODE	1L	1P	2L	2P	3L	3P	Sum L	Sum P	L+P	AVERAGE	
"T"	O16	148	186	150	172	96	114	394	472	866	48.1111	
	O50	152	176	144	176	159	185	455	537	992	55.1111	
	O51	62	96	55	92	44	78	161	266	427	23.7222	
	OO6	111	168	128	156	94	137	333	461	794	44.1111	
	O15	95	97	118	116	74	108	287	321	608	33.7778	
	O18	70	75	46	60	69	78	185	213	398	22.1111	
Sub-Total		490	612	491	600	440	586	1421	1798	3219	226.944	37.8241
Total of Area			1102		1091		1026		3219			

YEAR:1995/1996												
	CODE	1L	1P	2L	2P	3L	3P	Sum L	Sum P	L+P	AVERAGE	
"P"	O11	51	62	30	50	35	60	116	172	288	16	
	OO2	112	73	63	29	47	26	222	128	350	19.444	
	O31	211	207	190	183	180	191	581	581	1162	64.556	
	OO8	144	124	122	111	126	137	392	372	764	42.444	
	O28	25	24	47	36	93	86	165	146	311	17.278	
	O46	60	127	89	89	51	124	200	340	540	30	
	O32	247	207	219	225	200	186	666	618	1284	71.333	
	O40	159	177	170	166	180	156	509	499	1008	56	
	O21	31	37	25	39	24	44	80	120	200	11.111	
	O43	60	75	49	58	44	93	153	226	379	21.056	
	O45	166	131	191	155	144	111	501	397	898	49.889	
	OO5	214	236	204	197	176	178	594	611	1205	66.944	
	O22	88	151	88	145	86	95	262	391	653	36.278	
Sub-total		1568	1631	1487	1483	1386	1487	4441	4601	9042	502.33	38.641
Total			3199		2970		2873		9042			
YEAR:1996/1997												
	CODE	1L	1P	2L	2P	3L	3P	Sum L	Sum P	L+P	AVERAGE	
"P"	O11	24	47	41	61	30	50	95	158	253	14.056	
	OO2	168	104	102	69	65	27	335	200	535	29.722	
	O31	202	205	209	201	182	182	593	588	1181	65.611	
	OO8	137	137	144	124	118	108	399	369	768	42.667	
	O28	10	11	25	23	47	35	82	69	151	8.3889	
	O46	83	109	69	120	74	85	226	314	540	30	
	O32	244	203	220	204	219	203	683	610	1293	71.833	
	O40	146	185	161	175	175	158	482	518	1000	55.556	
	O21	27	24	29	33	25	37	81	94	175	9.7222	
	O43	52	78	55	70	53	78	160	226	386	21.444	
	O45	174	125	151	117	173	155	498	397	895	49.722	
	OO5	211	193	185	231	180	212	576	636	1212	67.333	
	O22	86	104	87	144	88	143	261	391	652	36.222	
Sub-Total		1564	1525	1478	1572	1429	1473	4471	4570	9041	502.28	38.637
Total of Area			3089		3050		2902		9041			
YEAR:1997/1998												
	CODE	1L	1P	2L	2P	3L	3P	Sum L	Sum P	L+P	AVERAGE	
"P"	O11	24	22	20	43	40	55	84	120	204	11.333	
	OO2	143	94	135	97	93	69	371	260	631	35.056	
	O31	200	212	194	204	201	200	595	616	1211	67.278	
	OO8	158	124	126	125	118	117	402	366	768	42.667	
	O28	18	12	12	10	25	21	55	43	98	5.4444	
	O46	77	120	76	100	71	111	224	331	555	30.833	
	O32	244	200	238	194	199	205	681	599	1280	71.111	
	O40	181	202	147	185	160	175	488	562	1050	58.333	
	O21	22	23	27	36	29	28	78	87	165	9.1667	
	O43	51	64	52	77	48	65	151	206	357	19.833	
	O45	185	133	152	118	134	114	471	365	836	46.444	
	OO5	187	209	178	181	163	226	528	616	1144	63.556	
	O22	113	127	84	98	86	139	283	364	647	35.944	
Sub-Total		1603	1542	1441	1468	1367	1525	4411	4535	8946	497	38.231
Total of Area			3145		2909		2892		8946			

Table 45. School Fee Before Monetery Crisis and During Monetery Crisis

Area Code	School	School Fee	Before (Rp.)	During (Rp.)
I (K)	Primary School	Minimum Maximum Average	1,000 20,000 8,500	2,000 25,000 11,500
	Junior High School	Minimum Maximum Average	12,000 23,000 17,300	20.000 50.000 27,000
II (T)	Primary School	Minimum Maximum Average	1,500 17,500 9,400	2,000 20,000 10,500
	Junior High School	Minimum Maximum Average	11,000 20,000 15,200	20,000 30,000 25,000
III (P)	Primary School	Minimum Maximum Average	500 8,000 4,900	1,500 10,000 7,100
	Junior High School	Minimum Maximum Average	10,000 30,000 15,800	12,000 38,000 22,100

Appendix – 7

CONDITION OF STUDENT OF SD, MI, SMP, AND MTS WHO ARE DROP OUT AND POTENTIAL TO DROP OUT IN DKI JAKARTA

FOR THE HEAD MASTER

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE
INSTITUTE FOR TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATIONAL SCINCES
1998

PREFACE

In relation to the research conducted by the IKIP Jakarta team we would like to ask you to complete this questionnaire for collection purposes.

The research aims at obtaining information regarding the condition of SD, MI, SMP, and MTs students who are dropouts and potential to dropout as an effect of the presently existing monetary crisis. Information obtained from this study will be used for the setting up of policies related to assistance program for students in deed.

Therefore, we do hope that you can assist us by answering the questions correctly and honestly. Your answers will be treated in strict confident and be used as is necessary.

We thank you ffor the time and attention you give us in this data collection activities.

Jakarta, . November 1998

Research team leader,

Dr. Sutjipto

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE HEAD MASTER

Negeri			Swasta		
I	II	III	I	II	III

Directions:

1. Answer the questions according to your one
2. Put a check (✓) in the box provided

List of questions

Location of research :

School Name :

School Address :

Home Address :

1. Latest Education

Explanation	SLTP				Higher Education				
	SPG	PGA	Aliyah	SMU	D-1	D-2	D-3	S-1	S-2
Latest education									

2. Rank / Position / Category

Explanation	Category										Service time				
	II				III				IV						
Rank	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	A	≥ B	< 5	5 - 10	11-15	16-20	≥ 20

3. Condition of Students

a. Total of SD/MI pupils

Explanation	Grade												Total		
	I		II		III		IV		V		VI				
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M+F
1995/1996															
1996/1997															
1997/1998															
Total															

b. Total of SMP / MTS Students

Academis tear	Year						Total		
	I		II		III				
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M+F
1995/1996									
1996/1997									
1997/1998									
Total									

c. Total Number of pupil transfers in SD/MI

Academ ic year	Grade																			
	I				II				III				IV				V				VI			
	in		out		in		out		in		Out		in		out		in		out		in		out	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
1995/1996																								
1996/1997																								
1997/1998																								
Total																								

d. Total number student transfors in SMP/MTs

Academic year	Kelas												Total	
	I				II				III					
	in		out		In		Out		in		out		in	out
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
1995/1996														
1996/1997														
1997/1998														
Total														

e. Total number of retained (RET) and dropped out (DO) pupils ini SD / MI

Aca-demic year	Grade																		Total			
	I				II				III				IV				V				VI			
	Ret		DO		Ret		DO		Ret		DO		Ret		DO		Ret		DO		Ret		DO	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
1995/1996																								
1996/1997																								
1997/1998																								
Total																								

f. Total number of retained (RET) and dropped out (DO) students ins SMP / MTs

Academic year	Year												Total	
	I				II				III					
	In		Out		in		out		in		out		in	out
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
1995/1996														
1996/1997														
1997/1998														
Total														

g. What is the main reason for their drop ands from school ?

Economic ☐ non-economic ☐

h. Is there any of your students who are almost dropped out ?

Yes ☐ No ☐

(1). It yes, how many are there ?

a) SD / MI

Grade	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Number						

b) SMP/ MTS

Year	I	II	III
Number			

(2) What is the main reason for their doing almost dropped out ?

Economic ☐ non-economic ☐

i. Total number of SD/MI graduates who continue to higher level of education

Academic year	Graduates			Continuing			Total	
	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F
1995/1996								
1996/1997								
1997/1998								
Total								

j. Total number of SMP/MTs graduates who continue to higher level of education

Academic year	Graduates			Continuing			Total	
	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F
1995/1996								
1996/1997								
1997/1998								
Total								

4. **According to you, percentage of the potentially dropped out students to wants to Keep on studying and continuing their school to higher level of education ?**

5. **School finances**
   a. Sources of Finance

Sources of finance	Operational cast in percentage		
	1995/1996 (%)	1996/1997 (5)	1997/1998 (%)
a. Government (per year)			
b. Tuition fee (per year)			
c. Board of Parents (per year)			
d. Other sources per year (mention) 1. . . . 2. . . . . 3.			

   b. Total average of student who cannot pay their schooling cost:

   SD / MI [ ] pupil

   SLTP / MTs [ ] student

   c. What is the Common reason for students' inability to pay their schooling cost ?

   d. What does the school do to overcome shortage of operational fund?

6. **What does the school do to help the potentially dropped out students ?**

No	Types of action	Y / N
1	Relieve students from school fee	
2	Grant reduction in school	
3	Assist in searching scholarships	
4	Others	

NB : Y = Yes
N = No

7. Aid received by students / school

a. Who has given the received financial aid and how much ?

Sour of aids	Academic year			Types of aids (code)	Amount/ student/ month	Number of receivers	Others
	1995/1996	1996/1997	1997/1998				
Board of parents							
Government							
Private institutions							
People in Private							
Others (mention)							

Codes : (1) scholarship
(2) free school fee
(3) reduction in school fee

Is the financial aid considered as sufficient ?

Yes ☐ No ☐

b. Who has givens the received aid in goods and how many ?

Kinds of aid	Academic year			Sources of aid
	1995/1996	1996/1997	1997/1998	
Text books				
Books + stationery				
School uniform + Shoes				
Others (mention)				

Is the aid considered as sufficient ?

Yes ☐ No ☐

c. If there were, aid for students, in would it be more

Money ☐ Goods ☐

d. What has the received financial been mainly used for ? (you can choose more than one)

school tuition ☐ Food ☐ School uniform ☐

Text book ☐ Stationery ☐ Transportation ☐

e. So yes, explain the mechanism

Yes ☐ No ☐

f. So for, has the school being involved in monitoring the distribution of the aid ?

8. **According to you, if there is aid provided by one particular institution or country, in what form will it be more suitable ? choose one.**

Money ☐ Goods ☐

a. Money per month per student amounting to

Money	(Rp) 10.000-19.500	(Rp) 20.000-29.500	(Rp) 30.000-39.500	(Rp) 40.000-45.500
Total				

b. Goods per students or school in form of ....

Tex Books	Stationary	School equipment's	Uniform	Otters

c. According to you, if there is and provided, though which institution should it be distributed ?

Direct to Student	School	Bank	Post office	Kelurahan	Others (mention)
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

d. What is your reason ?

9. **How is the condition of learning resources at your school ?**

Learning resources	Condition		
Text books	Good	Moderate	Unsatisfactory
Visual aids			
Sports equipment			
Laboratory equipment			
Others			

10. **What have you done so for to overcome limitations in your learning resources ?**

11. **How is the condition of your school facilities ??**

Facilities	Condition		
	Good	Moderate	Unsatisfactory
Classrooms			
Teacher room			
Head Master room			
Administration room			
School Heath Unit room			
Canteen			
Lavatories			
Others			

12. **What have you done so for to overcome problems related to the condition of your school learning facilities ?**

Date collector identity :

N a m e :

Department/Study Program :

Faculty :

Jakarta, November 1998

Head Master of SD/MI/SLTP/MTs

(.....)

Appendix – 8

CONDITION OF STUDENT OF SD, MI, SMP, AND MTS WHO ARE DROP OUT AND POTENTIAL TO DROP OUT IN DKI JAKARTA

FOR TEACHER

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE
INSTITUTE FOR TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATIONAL SCINCES
1998

PREFACE

In relation to the research conducted by the IKIP Jakarta team we would like to ask you to complete this questionnaire for collection purposes.

The research aims at obtaining information regarding the condition of SD, MI, SMP, and MTs students who are dropouts and potential to dropout as an effect of the presently existing monetary crisis. Information obtained from this study will be used for the setting up of policies related to assistance program for students in deed.

Therefore, we do hope that you can assist us by answering the questions correctly and honestly. Your answers will be treated in strict confident and be used as is necessary.

We thank you ffor the time and attention you give us in this data collection activities.

Jakarta, November 1998

Research team leader,

Dr. Sutjipto

QUESTIONER FOR TEACHER

State			Private		
I	II	III	I	II	III

Directions:

1. Answer these questions according to your situation
2. Put a check mark (v) in the box provider

List of Questions

Locations :
School Name :
School Address :
Parents' Address :

1. Highest level of education attended

Explanation	SHS				HE			
	SPG	PGA	Aliyah	SMU	D-1	D-2	D-3	S-1
Latest of Education								

2. Rank / Position / Category

Explanation	Category.										Service time (year)				
	II				III				IV						
Rank	A	B	C	D	A	B	C	D	A	≥ B	< 5	5 - 10	11-15	16-20	≥ 20
Explanation	Vices head-master				Co-ordinate Subject Matter						Class room teacher				
Position															

3. Teacher Status

Explanation	Permanent teacher	Non-permanent teacher	Government Employee	Private Employee
Work status				

4. Teaching Status

Explanation	Class room teacher	Subject matter teacher	Specialist teacher
Responsibility			

5. Household income (total average per-month)

Explanation	(Rp) < 100.000	(Rp) 100.000-249.500	(Rp) 250.000-499.500	(Rp) 500.000-749.500	(Rp) > 750.000
Before MC					
During MC					

NB. : (MC): Monetary crisis

6. Difference in income before and during MC

a. Is there any differences in income between before and during MC?

Yes ☐ No ☐

b. If yes, in which sector does the difference occur?

c. What do you to overcome the difference?

7. Household Expenditure

a. Food (daily average)

Explanation	Before MC (Rp)	During MC (RP)
Staple food (grain, corn, cassava, bred, noodles, flour, etc)		
Main dishes (meat, poultry, fish, egg, tempe, tofu, etc)		
Vegetables (kangkung, spinach, soup vegetables, etc)		
Fruits (manggo, orange, banana, papaya, guava. etc)		
Beverages (tea,. Coffee, sugar, coke, etc)		
Snack (cookies, candles, fried banana, partridge, etc)		
Total per-day		
Total average per-month : 30 x Rp.		

b. Housing (total average per month)

Explanation	Before MC (Rp)	During MC (Rp)
House instalment		
House rent		
Electricity		
Water		
Telephone		
Fees (security, rubbish, etc)		
Other (newspaper, magazine, comic books, etc)		
Total		

c. Cleaning/Health (total average per-month)

Explanation	Before MC (Rp)	During MC (Rp)
Vitamin/Mineral (Vitacimin, Enervon, engran, etc)		
Medicine (Panadol, Neozep, cough syrop, Norit, etc)		
Cleaning (Shampo, tooth paste, face cleaner, etc)		
Insecticide (mosquito killer, room deodoriser, etc)		
Washing stuff (detergent, softeners, etc)		
Cleaning kit (brush, mop, etc)		
Health care (public health centre, hospital, medicineman)		
Medical specialist (paediatrician, dentist, general doctor)		
Other		
Total		

d. Children Education (total average per-month)

Explanation	Before MC		During MC	
	PS	JHS	PS	JHS
School fees (BP3, savings, etc)				
Allowance/pocket money				
Transportation				
Books				
Uniform, shoes, socks				
Extracurricular fee				
Others				
Total				

e. Recreation, tax, savings, clothing, reading materials, household needs (total average per-moth)

Kinds	Before MC	During MC
Recreation		
Tax		
Saving		
Clothing		
Reading materials (newspaper, magazine, etc)		
Household needs		
Others		

f. Total average of expenditure per month

Expenditure	Before MC	During MC
a+b+c+d+e		

g. Is there any difference in expenditures before and during MC?

Yes ☐ No ☐

h. If, yes, in which sector does the difference occur?

8. Total of dependence

Explanation	Total	USA	KG	PS/MI	JHS/Mts	SHS/Aliyah	HE
Wife/husband							
Children							
Parents							
Others							

9. Drop-out of children

a. Is there any drop-out child in your family?

Yes ☐ No ☐

b. If yes, at which level of program did they drop-out?

PR ☐ Grade ☐ JHS ☐ Grade ☐

c. Reason for the child drop-out

Explanation	Before MC	During MC
Parent lost job		
Parents income decreased/working hour decreased		
Child helps parents earning income		
Food expenditure is more important		
Child is not interested in schooling		
Child feels the lack of intelligence		
Boys receives better priority than girls		
Others		

10. Potential for child to drop-out

a. Is there any children in your family who is potential to drop-out from school in the near future?

Yes ☐ No ☐

b. If yes, at which level of program will they drop-out?

PR ☐ Grade ☐ JHS ☐ Grade ☐

c. Reason for the child drop-out

Explanation	Before MC	During MC
Parent lost job		
Parents income decreased/working hour decreased		
Child helps parents earning income		
Food expenditure is more important		
Child is not interested in schooling		
Child feels the lack of intelligence		
Boys receives better priority than girls		
Others		

d. What do you do to prevent the child from dropping out school?

11. Condition of students in the class

a. Is there any drop-out student in your class?

Yes ☐ No ☐

b. If yes, how many are there?

PR ☐ Grade ☐ JHSI ☐ Grade ☐

c. What is the main reason for their drop-out?

b. What is your reason ?

Data collector identity :

N a m e :

Department /study program :

Faculty :

Jakarta, November 1998

Head Master of SD/MI/SMP/MTS

(.....)

PREFACE

In relation to the research conducted by the IKIP Jakarta team we would like to ask you to complete this questionnaire for collection purposes.

The research aims at obtaining information regarding the condition of SD, MI, SMP, and MTs students who are dropouts and potential to dropout as an effect of the presently existing monetary crisis. Information obtained from this study will be used for the setting up of policies related to assistance program for students in deed.

Therefore, we do hope that you can assist us by answering the questions correctly and honestly. Your answers will be treated in strict confident and be used as is necessary.

We thank you ffor the time and attention you give us in this data collection activities.

Jakarta, November 1998

Research team leader,

Dr. Sutjipto

3. Occupation

Explanation	CS	PE	Army	Retired	Vendor	Farmer	Freshmen	Services	Other
Husband									
Wife									

NB : (CS) : Civil Servant; (PE) : Private Employee

4. Household income (total average per-moth)

Explanation	< 100.000	100.000-249.500	250.000-499.500	500.000-749.500	> 750.000
Before MC					
During MC					

NB : (MC) : Monetary Crisis

5. Difference in income before MC and During MC

a. Is there any differences in income before MC and during MC?

Yes ☐ No ☐

b. If yes, in Which sector does the difference occur?

c. What do you do to improve your income during the monetary crisis?

6. Household Expenditure

a. Food (daily average)

Explanation	Before MC (Rp)	During MC (RP)
Staple food (grain, corn, cassava, bred, noodles, flour, etc)		
Main dishes (meat, poultry, fish, egg, tempe, tofu, etc)		
Vegetables (kangkung, spinach, soup vegetables, etc)		
Fruits (mango, orange, banana, papaya, guava. etc)		
Beverages (tea,. Coffee, sugar, coke, etc)		
Snack (cookies, candles, fried banana, partridge, etc)		
Total per-day		
Total average per-month.: 30 x Rp.		

b. Housing (total average per month)

Explanation	Before MC (Rp)	During MC (Rp)
House instalment		
House rent		
Electricity		
Water		
Telephone		
Fees (security, rubbish, etc)		
Other (newspaper, magazine, comic books, etc)		
Total		

c. Cleaning/Health (total average per-month)

Explanation	Before MC (Rp)	During MC (Rp)
Vitamin/Mineral (Vitacimin, Enervon, engran, etc)		
Medicine (Panadol, Neozep, cough syrop, Norit, etc)		
Cleaning (Shampoo, tooth paste, face cleaner, etc)		
Insecticide (mosquito killer, room deodoriser, etc)		
Washing stuff (detergent, softeners, etc)		
Cleaning kit (brush, mop, etc)		
Health care (public health centre, hospital, medicineman)		
Medical specialist (paediatrician, dentist, general doctor)		
Other		
Total		

d. Children Education (total average per-month)

Explanation	Before MC		During MC	
	PS	JHS	PS	JHS
School fees (BP3, savings, etc)				
Allowance/pocket money				
Transportation				
Books				
Uniform, shoes, socks				
Extracurricular fee				
Others				
Total				

e. Recreation, tax, savings, clothing, reading materials, household needs (total average per-moth)

Kinds	Before MC	During MC
Recreation		
Tax		
Saving		
Clothing		
Reading materials (newspaper, magazine, etc)		
Household needs		
Others		

Total average of expenditure per month

Expenditure	Before MC	During MC
a+b+c+d+e		

7. Is there any differences in expenditures before and during MC?

   Yes ☐ No ☐

8. If yes, in which sector does the difference occur?

   ☐

9. **Drop-out of children**

   a. **Is there any drop-out child in your family**

   Yes ☐ No ☐

   b. **If yes, at which level of program did they drop-out?**

   PR ☐ Grade ☐ JHS ☐ Grade ☐

   c. **Reason for the child drop-out**

Explanation	Before MC	During MC
Parent lost job		
Parents income decreased/working hour decreased		
Child helps parents earning income		
Food expenditure is more important		
Child is not interested in schooling		
Child feels the lack of intelligence		
Boys receives better priority than girls		
Others		

10. **Potential for child to drop-out**

   a. Is there any children in your family who is potential to drop-out from school in the near future?

   Yes ☐ No ☐

   b. If yes, at which level of program will they drop-out?

   PR ☐ Grade ☐ JHS ☐ Grade ☐

c. Reason for the child drop-out

Explanation	Before MC	During MC
Parent lost job		
Parents income decreased/working hour decreased		
Child helps parents earning income		
Food expenditure is more important		
Child is not interested in schooling		
Child feels the lack of intelligence		
Boys receives better priority than girls		
Others		

d. What do you do to prevent the child from dropping out school?

11. **According to you, if there is aid provided by one particular institution or country, in what form will it more suitable? Choose one**

Money ☐ Goods ☐

a. Money per-month per- student amounting to .....

	(RP) 10.000-20.000	(RP) 20.000-30.000	(RP) 30.000-40.000	(RP) 40.000-50.000
Money				

b. Goods per student or school in the form of .....

Books	School supplies	School Uniform	Scholl equipment	Other

12. According to you, if there is aid provided, through which institution should it be distributed?

a. Direct School ☐ School ☐ Bank ☐ Post office ☐ Kelurahan ☐ Kakancam ☐ Others ☐

b. What your reason?

Data collector identity

N a m e :

Department/Study program :

Faculty :

Jakarta, November 1998

Headmaster PR/MI/JHS/MTs

(.....)

JICA

JAPAN INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AGENCY

Jl M.H. Thamrin No.59, Jakarta - Indonesia

Tel. : (021) 3907533 (Hunting)
Fax. : (021) 3907536

No. 630/JICA/10/98

Jakarta, October 19th, 1998

Institute for Teacher Training and Education
IKIP Jakarta

Dear Sir/Madam,

The Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) Jakarta Office, gladly announce that your proposal for the:

STUDY ON THE DROP OUT SITUATION ON THE BASIC SITUATION DUE TO THE LATEST MONETARY CRISIS IN INDONESIA has been selected for implementation.

Since your institution only propose the study for the DKI Jakarta area we ask you to kindly cooperate with IKIP BANDUNG, who will conduct the study for the Central Java region.

To obtain comparable result of this study, we would like to ask you to integrate your questionnaires with the questionnaires prepared by IKIP Bandung. The JICA advisor (Mr. Oetomo D.) will facilitate the coordination effort.

Thank you very much for your attention on this matter.

Sincerely Yours,

Japan International Cooperation Agency JICA INDONESIA

SAHARA Takayuki
Deputy Resident Representative
Japan International Cooperation Agency

DEPARTEMEN PENDIDIKAN DAN KEBUDAYAAN
INSTITUT KEGURUAN DAN ILMU PENDIDIKAN
I K I P JAKARTA
Kompleks IKIP Jakarta, Rawamangun Jakarta 13220 Telp. 4897927, 4895130, 4893818, 4892926, 4897535, 4892350

Nomor : 1577/PT.26.H/I/98 27 Oktober 1998
Lamp. : 3 (tiga lembar)
Hal : Ijin Penelitian

Kepada.
Yth. Kepala Kantor Wilayah Depdikbud
Daerah Khusus Ibu Kota Jakarta
di -
J a k a r t a

Dengan hormat,

Dengan ini kami sampaikan bahwa IKIP Jakarta akan melaksanakan penelitian tentang keadaan siswa SD, MI, SLTP dan MTs di wilayah DKI Jakarta Raya, bekerjasama dengan pihak Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) Hasil penelitian ini akan digunakan sebagai informasi untuk program bantuan bagi anak yang mengalami atau diduga akan putus sekolah sebagai salah satu dampak krisis moneter yang terjadi di Indonesia.

Sehubungan dengan itu, kami mohon ijin untuk pelaksanaan penelitian tersebut dalam pengumpulan data melalui angket ke sekolah-sekolah yang dipilih sebagai objek penelitian yang akan dilakukan pada awal bulan November 1998. Bersama surat ini kami lampirkan angket dan daftar nama sekolah.

Atas perhatian dan kerjasama yang baik, kami menyampaikan terima kasih

a.n. Rektor,

Dr. Sutjipto
NIP. 130 353 251

DEPARTEMEN PENDIDIKAN DAN KEBUDAYAAN
INSTITUT KEGURUAN DAN ILMU PENDIDIKAN
I K I P JAKARTA
Kompleks IKIP Jakarta, Rawamangun Jakarta 13220 Telp. 4897927, 4895130, 4893818, 4892926, 4897535, 4892350

Nomor : 1577/PT.26.H/I/98
Lamp. : 3 (tiga lembar)
Hal : Ijin Penelitian

27 Oktober 1998

Kepada.
Yth. Kepala Dinas Pendidikan dan Pengajaran
Daerah Khusus Ibu Kota Jakarta
di -
Jakarta

Dengan hormat,

Dengan ini kami sampaikan bahwa IKIP Jakarta akan melaksanakan penelitian tentang keadaan siswa SD, MI, SLTP dan MTs di wilayah DKI Jakarta Raya, bekerjasama dengan pihak Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA). Hasil penelitian ini akan digunakan sebagai informasi untuk program bantuan bagi anak yang mengalami atau diduga akan putus sekolah sebagai salah satu dampak krisis moneter yang terjadi di Indonesia.

Sehubungan dengan itu, kami mohon ijin untuk pelaksanaan penelitian tersebut dalam pengumpulan data melalui angket ke sekolah-sekolah yang dipilih sebagai objek penelitian yang akan dilakukan pada awal bulan November 1998. Bersama surat ini kami lampirkan angket dan daftar nama sekolah.

Atas perhatian dan kerjasama yang baik, kami menyampaikan terima kasih

Rektor,

Dr. Sutjipto
NIP. 130 353 251