

**EDUCATION SECTOR ANALYTICAL AND CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP
(ACDP - 006)**

**FREE BASIC EDUCATION
STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT**

**SURVEY OF PARENTAL CONTRIBUTIONS IN
BASIC EDUCATION**

May 2013

EDUCATION SECTOR ANALYTICAL AND CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP (ACDP):

The Government of Indonesia (represented by the Ministry of Education and Culture, the Ministry of Religious Affairs and the Ministry of National Development Planning/ *BAPPENAS*, the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID), the European Union (EU) and the Asian Development Bank (ADB) have established the Analytical and Capacity Development Partnership (ACDP) as a facility to promote policy dialogue and institutional and organizational reform of the education sector to underpin policy implementation and help reduce disparities in provincial and district education performance. The facility is an integral part of the Education Sector Support Program (ESSP) which consists of EU sector budget support with agreed arrangements for results-led grant disbursement, and earmarked policy and program-led AusAID sector development grant support consisting of a school infrastructure program, a nationwide district and school management development program and a program to accelerate the GOI's accreditation of private Islamic schools. This report has been prepared with grant support provided by AusAID and the EU through ACDP.

CONSULTING FIRMS:

The two consulting firms responsible for preparation of this Survey of Parental Contributions in Basic Education Report (ver. 2013-05-13) are: **PT. Trans Intra Asia (TIA)**, Indonesia and the **Institute of Public Administration of Canada (IPAC)**. These firms are part of a consortium which includes five (5) associate partners - two (2) from Canada (**Queens University** and **Dalhousie University**) and three (3) from Indonesia (**Bogor Agricultural University, Faculty of Law-University of Padjadjaran**, and **The Institution for Development of Economics and Finance**).

THE CONSULTANTS WHO PREPARED THIS REPORT ARE:

1. **Chris Majewski**, Team Leader/Basic Education Policy and Governance Expert
2. **Achmadi Ringoringo**, Education Finance Expert
3. **Robertus Soeharno**, PFM & Decentralization Expert
4. **Umaedi**, Capacity Development Expert
5. **I Made Sumertajaya**, Data Analyst
6. **Jeffry Fanciscus Haloho**, Research Assistant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	I
LIST OF TABLES.....	III
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.....	IV
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	V
1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT	1
2. SAMPLING	1
2.1. Structure Of The Sampel	1
2.2. Comment On The Sample.....	3
3. MAIN FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY	4
3.1. Total Parent Contributions To Basic Education	4
3.2. Parent Contributions To School/Madrasah Budgets	6
3.3. Details Of Parental Contributions As Reported By Schools/Madrasahs.....	7
3.4. Difference Between Parents' And Schools'/Madrasahs' Reporting Of Level Of Parental Contributions	8
3.5. Use Made Of Parental Contributions By Schools/Madrasahs.....	9
3.6. Relationship Between Parental Contributions And Per-Student Cost	9
3.7. Willingness Of Parents To Make Contributions To Basic Education	10
3.8. Impact Of Bos Funds And Policy On Free Basic Education On Parental Contributions To Basic Education	12
3.9. Principals' Perceptions Of Impact Of No Fees On Education Quality	17
3.10. Relationship Between School Budgets, Parent Funding And Student Learning Outcomes	18
4. CONCLUSIONS.....	19
APPENDIX 1 IMPLEMENTATION OF SURVEY ACTIVITIES	21
ATTACHMENTS (IN CD)	
1. DATA	
a. Parent Survey Data	
b. School Survey Data	
c. Susenas Education Module Data	
d. Field Label for Susenas Data	
e. Variable Label for School Survey Data	
f. Variable Label for Parent Survey Data	
2. REPORT	
a. Draft Parent Survey Report (Indonesian)	
b. Final Survey Report	
c. Final Parent Survey (English)	
3. OTHER SURVEY DOCUMENTS	
a. Notice to participants	
b. List of sample schools	
c. Sample distribution	
d. Parent Questionnaire, SD/MI	
e. Parent Questionnaire, SMP/MTs	
f. School questionnaire SD/MI	
g. School Questionnaire SMP/MTs	

- h. Field work guidelines
- i. Activity Implementation Guidelines
- j. Guidelines for Completion of Parent Questionnaires

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Distribution of the sample: area and type of school/madrasah.....	1
Table 2. Sample of schools: government and private	2
Table 3. Distribution of schools by standard of accreditation	2
Table 4. Distribution of parents in the sample	3
Table 5. Total parent expenses per student for basic education 2010-2011 (madrasahs).....	4
Table 6. Total parent expenses per student for basic education 2010-2011(schools)	5
Table 7. Proportion of parent expenditure on education as school/madrasah fees	6
Table 8. Average total budgets for and sources of funding for schools/madrasahs	6
Table 9. Parent contributions as a percentage of school/madrasah budgets	7
Table 10. Detailed parent contributions as reported by schools/madrasahs	7
Table 11. Total payments to schools/madrasahs for the 2010-2011 school year as reported by parents and schools/madrasahs.	8
Table 12. Relationship between per-student cost and parental contributions	10
Table 13. Willingness of parents to make a contribution to the cost of educating their children, in order to improve the quality of education offered.....	10
Table 14. Size of contribution to basic education parents are willing to make.....	11
Table 15. Average total parents' costs for basic education per student per year 2003 - 2009 (values in nominal and constant Rp 2011)	12
Table 16. Percentage of parents not paying any school/madrasah fees 2003 - 2011 Data 2003-2009 from Susenas, data 2011 from ACDP survey.....	13
Table 17. Average total parents' costs for basic education by are 2003 - 2009 (values in constant 2011)	14
Table 18. Principals' perception of the impact of elimination of parental contributions on the quality of education	17
Table 19. Percentage of principals' identifying a negative impact on education quality of elimination of parental contributions to education, by area of negative impact (principals able to nominate more than one area of impact).....	17
Table 20. Relationship between increasing per-student cost and learning outcomes	18
Table 21. List of Provinces and Districts/Municipalities in the Sample	23
Table 22. Amount of sample schools and parents in each selected province and district	24
Table 23. Details of Supervisor Training Activity	25
Table 24. List of survey areas for each supervisor	26
Table 25. Schedule of Field Survey Implementation	27
Table 26. Type of data collected from each respondent	28
Table 27. Details of Assignment for Each Areal Supervisor	29
Table 28. Details of Assignment for Each Field Surveyor	29
Table 29. List of Supervised Survey Areas	30
Table 30. Details of Assignment for Each Data Entry Personnel	31

LIST OF ILLUSTRATION

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Illustration 1.	Total Parent Expenses for Basic Education	5
Illustration 2.	Average Parent Expenditure on Basic Education by Area	14
Illustration 3.	Major Parent Expenses by Category, Primary schools, Susenas 2003 - 2009.	15
Illustration 4.	Major parent expenses by category, primary madrasahs, Susenas 2003 - 2009.....	15
Illustration 5.	Major Parent Expenses by Category, Junior Secondary Schools, Susenas 2003 - 2009.....	16
Illustration 6.	Major Parent Expenses by Category, Junior Secondary Madrasahs,Susenas 2003 - 2009.....	16
Illustration 7.	Sampling in the selection of provinces and districts/municipalities	22
Illustration 8.	Sampling of schools and parents' selection	24

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ACDP	Analytical and Capacity Development Partnership
ADB	Asian Development Bank
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
Bappeda	Regional Agency for Development Planning (Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Daerah)
Bappenas	National Agency for Development Planning (Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional)
BOS	School Operations Funds (Bantuan Operasional Sekolah)
BSM	Scholarships for Poor Students (Bantuan Siswa Miskin)
EMIS	Education Management Information System
FBE	Free Basic Education
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
Gol	Government of Indonesia
HLTWG	High Level Technical Working Group
MI	Primary Madrasah (Madrasah Ibtidaiyah)
MoEC	Ministry of Education and Culture
MoF	Ministry of Finance
MoHA	Ministry of Home Affairs
MoRA	Ministry of Religious Affairs
MSS	Minimum Service Standards
MTs	Junior Secondary Madrasah (Madrasah Tsanawiyah)
NES	National Education Standard
SD	Primary School (Sekolah Dasar)
SMP	Junior Secondary School (Sekolah Menengah Pertama)
SNP	National Education Standards (Standar Nasional Pendidikan)
SUSENAS	National Socio-Economic Survey (Survei Sosial Ekonomi Nasional)
TNP2K	National Team for Accelerating Measures for Countering Poverty
ToR	Terms of Reference

MAIN TEXT

1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The Survey of Parent Contributions to Basic Education was required as a deliverable of ACDP 6, *Free Basic Education Strategy*. Its draft methodology and instruments were approved as a part of the project's Inception Report. Documents outlining the survey's methodology and instruments are provided as Appendices 1 - 8. The sample size of the survey, as proposed in the Inception Report, was to include 4,032 parents from 336 schools/madrasahs in 14 districts/cities. Budgetary constraints resulted in the sample having to be reduced to 2,781 parents in 228 schools/madrasahs in 10 districts/cities.

The study was carried out to establish the education-related costs borne by parents of children in basic education. In addition, data gathered from the schools/madrasahs in the sample included information about their total budgets and total contributions received from parents during the 2010/2011 school year, as well as information about how these funds were used.

By utilising data from the Education and Social Module of the National Economic and Social Survey (Susenas), the study was also able to analyse the trends in parental contributions over time, and the effect of the provision of School Operational Funding (BOS) on parents' expenditure in educating their children. The Education and Social Module is administered every three years, with the most recent one administered in 2009. Data for years 2003, 2006, and 2009 were analysed to determine overall trends in parents' contributions over time including an analysis of the change in sub-sets of the expenses such as fees, uniforms, snacks and transport.

2. SAMPLING

2.1. Structure of the Sampel

The methodology used to design the sample was *multi stage stratified random sampling*. The survey provinces were chosen first on the basis of broad geographical coverage, and then on their degree of development as determined on the basis of a range of factors including gross domestic product and education participation rates. The selection of districts/cities was similarly made on the basis of degree of development.

The selection of schools was made to ensure representation of each of the main kinds of education institutions delivering basic education: schools and madrasahs, primary and junior secondary, government and private. See Tables 1 and 2, below.



Table 1. Distribution of the sample: area and type of school/madrasah

Province	Dist/City	Schools/Madrasahs				Total
		MI	MTs	SD	SMP	
Bali	Buleleng	2	5	10	7	24
Bengkulu	Bengkulu Utara	4	3	8	9	24
Jawa Timur	Kota Surabaya	6	1	3	3	13
	Lamongan	5	8	5	5	23
Kalimantan Selatan	Banjar	6	6	6	6	24
Maluku	Kota Tual	3	1	13	7	24
Sulawesi Selatan	Bantaeng	4	6	8	6	24
	Bone	6	6	6	6	24
Sumatera Barat	Kep. Mentawai	-	1	20	3	24
	Kota Padang	4	6	8	6	24

Province	Dist/City	Schools/Madrasahs				Total
		MI	MTs	SD	SMP	
Total		40	43	87	58	228

Table 2. Sample of schools: government and private


	Schools/madrasahs				Total
	MI	MTs	SD	SMP	
Government	17	11	69	33	130
Private	23	32	18	25	98
Total	40	43	87	58	228



The schools/madrasahs were also chosen on the basis of their level of accreditation, taken to be an indirect indicator of quality.

Table 3. Distribution of schools by standard of accreditation

Accreditation	Schools/madrasahs				Total
	MI	MTs	SD	SMP	
A	11	10	12	15	48
B	16	16	42	27	101
C	8	8	26	9	51
Not accredited	5	9	7	7	28
Total	40	43	87	58	228



The survey targeted 12 parents from each of the schools/madrasahs as per Table 4, below.

Table 4. Distribution of parents in the sample

Province	Dist/City	Type of sch/mad				Total
		MI	MTs	SD	SMP	
Bali	Buleleng	24	60	120	84	288
Bengkulu	Bengkulu Utara	48	36	96	108	288
Jawa Timur	Kota Surabaya	66	24	48	84	222
	Lamongan	49	96	59	60	264
Kalimantan Selatan	Banjar	72	72	72	72	288
Maluku	Kota Tual	36	12	156	84	288
Sulawesi Selatan	Bantaeng	48	72	96	76	292
	Bone	72	72	72	72	288
Sumatera Barat	Kep. Mentawai	-	11	233	33	277
	Kota Padang	45	72	97	72	286
Total		460	527	1,049	745	2,781

2.2. Comment on the sample

The parent sample was structured to cover a range of socio-economic status and educational background. Economic status was measured by self-reported level of income and by the wattage of electricity supply connected to the homes, which in Indonesia correlates strongly with income levels. The average self-reported income level of families in the survey was Rp. 1,569,346 per month, with a median of Rp 1,000,000. Of the parents in the sample, one third had not finished junior secondary school. Some form of post-secondary qualification including diplomas and degrees was held by 17.1% of parents indicating that the sample was skewed towards those with better than average educational qualifications.

The limitations of the sample size mean that the data generated are illustrative only, and are not representative of Indonesia. They are also not able to be compared directly with the data generated by Susenas which is much more representative.

3. MAIN FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY

3.1. Total parent contributions to basic education

The survey found that parents in all types of schools/madrasahs made substantial contributions to the cost of providing basic education to their children (Tables 5 and 6, below). Costs of junior secondary students were generally higher than those of primary students, except for students in private MTs's, who tend to come from the lowest socio-economic strata of Indonesian society.

The highest categories of cost incurred by all parents were pocket money, student transport and uniforms. School fees were a major expenditure item in secondary schools/madrasahs, with those in private SMPs being the highest, followed by government MTs. The cost of pocket money may appear high, but it is common in Indonesia for parents to give children money to buy a "snack" on a school day. There is no mandated number of days on which Indonesian children have to attend school, but given an average of around 200 effective school days in a year, the average value of pocket money given to a student on a school day ranges from approximately Rp 4,900 in government MTs to Rp 2,200 in private MIs.


Table 5. Total parent expenses per student for basic education 2010-2011 (madrasahs)

Total payments(Rp/year)	Madrasah			
	MIN	MIS	MTsN	MTsS
Text books	58,528	39,966	35,877	13,409
Work sheets	45,194	44,021	126,398	59,701
Exercise books + stationery	172,948	122,590	164,399	126,227
Uniform	300,787	219,453	350,227	246,128
Transport	399,868	259,866	211,010	100,358
Additional courses	118,807	68,479	62,592	57,151
Supplementary books	46,041	28,935	39,347	34,717
Excursions	22,513	7,130	37,902	31,010
Pocket money	672,923	433,513	979,317	540,664
Other	67,693	23,369	103,706	27,583
School fees	82,509	154,159	437,358	376,120
Total	1,987,811	1,401,489	2,548,133	1,613,095

Table 6. Total parent expenses per student for basic education 2010-2011(schools)

Total payments(Rp/year)	School			
	SDN	SDS	SMPN	SMPS
Text books	22,219	70,399	35,269	41,901
Work sheets	58,633	80,070	90,478	65,931
Exercise books + stationery	180,502	211,682	186,477	160,997
Uniform	257,160	288,144	257,030	286,536
Transport	343,347	498,364	266,535	150,682
Additional courses	85,304	163,972	124,069	88,631
Supplementary books	30,052	73,246	72,577	60,588
Excursions	10,860	11,221	28,296	17,699
Pocket money	494,886	590,558	829,750	698,300
Other	12,127	35,007	83,686	91,693
School fees	54,043	173,857	352,565	628,410
Total	1,554,133	2,196,520	2,326,732	2,288,368

Illustration 1. Total Parent Expenses for Basic Education



The proportion of parental expenditure on education consumed by schools fees, defined as any contribution paid directly to the schools or school committees, varies substantially, being only 3.5% for government SDs, but 27.5% for private SMPs and 23.3% for private MTs's (Table 7, below). It can be noted that, for comparison, the recently completed ACDP study on Madrasah Funding found that in the five provinces where the study was conducted, the average parent contribution to the budgets of private MTS's was 31%.

It should be noted that the ACDP survey was initially planned to be administered in April 2012. In order to have data for a full school year, the questionnaires focused on the 2010-2011 school year. Delays related to finalising the budget for the survey, and associated discussions about the size of the sample, meant that a significant proportion of the parent surveys were administered during the period of end-of-

year examinations. It is therefore possible that some of the parents tended to report costs related to 2011-2012 rather than 2010-2011.

Table 7. Proportion of parent expenditure on education as school/madrasah fees

Type of school/mdrs.	Gov/ private	% percentage of expenditure as school/madrasah fees
MI	Gov	4.1%
	Private	11.0%
MTs	Gov	17.2%
	Private	23.3%
SD	Gov	3.5%
	Private	7.9%
SMP	Gov	15.2%
	Private	27.5%

3.2. Parent contributions to school/madrasah budgets

Average total budgets of the school/madrasahs in the survey are provided in Table 8, below. The table, sourced from school annual reports for the 2010-11 school year, also identifies the sources of funding including governments, parents and foundations.

Table 8. Average total budgets for and sources of funding for schools/madrasahs

Schools/ Madrs	Govt/ private	National Govt (Rp/year)	Local Govt (Rp/year)	Parental contributions (Rp/year)	Foundation contributions (Rp./year)	Other sources (Rp/year)	Total receipts (Rp/year)
		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
MI	Govt	1,169,079,029	11,547,294	3,766,406	-	320,588	1,184,713,318
	Private	68,851,007	6,949,636	17,148,568	136,364	45,455	93,131,030
MTs	Govt	2,385,735,874	9,050,036	17,303,409	-	-	2,412,089,320
	Private	87,562,882	9,819,129	34,723,255	1,402,037	17,898,548	151,405,851
SD	Govt	41,909,982	277,168,576	5,415,287	-	239,754	324,733,599
	Private	150,475,920	13,000,400	32,151,250	40,015,800	333,333	235,976,703
SMP	Govt	224,687,518	1,272,595,106	115,698,939	977,576	-	1,613,959,139
	Private	101,182,632	13,709,100	55,249,720	57,166,440	1,962,600	229,270,492
All		293,451,978	279,870,597	34,812,948	9,453,458	2,833,691	620,422,671

There is a substantial difference in the proportions of the budgets of the schools/madrasahs which are funded from parent contributions, as illustrated in Table 9, below. Parent contributions make up a larger part of the budgets of private schools and madrasahs, with private SMPs reporting the largest proportion of their budgets as coming from parental contributions at 24.1% The lowest percentage in this category relates to government madrasahs, at 0.3%.

Table 9. Parent contributions as a percentage of school/madrasah budgets

Schools/ Madrasahs	Gov/ private	% of budget from parent contributions
MI	Gov	0.3%
	Private	18.4%
MTs	Gov	0.7%
	Private	22.9%
SD	Gov	1.7%
	Private	13.6%
SMP	Gov	7.2%
	Private	24.1%

It is of concern that parental contributions to school budgets are particularly high in the private madrasah sector. It is generally accepted that the school communities served by these madrasahs tend to be the poorest. A recent study of madrasah financing in eight district completed by ACDP also shows that parent contributions constituted more than 25% of the budgets of private madrasahs.

Another concern is that schools and madrasahs with a low accreditation status, or with no accreditation to date, tend to have the highest percentage of their budgets funded from parental contributions. Non-accredited private MTs's and SMPs have the highest levels of parental contributions, at 27% and 28.2% respectively.

3.3. Details of parental contributions as reported by schools/madrasahs

Table 10. Detailed parent contributions as reported by schools/madrasahs

	SCHOOLS/MADRASAHS							
	MI		MTs		SD		SMP	
	Govt	Private	Govt	Private	Govt	Private	Govt	Private
Initial yearly payment (excluding registration)	-	-	3,704	20,648	3,486	13,490	49,154	43,496
Monthly fees	-	-	16,160	81,803	9,868	41,308	147,833	178,695
Initial student registration	-	4,232	312	2,906	91	936	1,180	3,868
Annual re-registration	-	2,839	4,385	439	-	-	-	7,936
Practicum fees	-	122	1,885	366	706	-	-	-
Annual class exams	-	-	-	13,405	668	2,173	2,814	8,723
School exams	-	4,625	-	3,213	252	4,227	2,347	-
Additional lessons	-	922	-	12,354	94	490	33,640	28,143
Remedial lessons	-	412	-	353	-	-	307	520
Compulsory extracurricular activities	-	7,140	-	3,845	-	1,044	-	9,157
Voluntary extracurricular activities	-	-	-	274	-	2,350	-	963
Excursions	2,491	4,350	1,134	6,844	188	435	573	6,998
End-of-school celebration	416	4,414	-	31,457	178	1,523	486	10,192
Social contributions	244	2,465	-	4,504	409	22	326	11,044
Other fees	-	1,868	-	6,816	-	-	-	-
Other contributions	12,503	81,773	8,394	91,971	16,610	36,935	18,831	49,589
TOTAL	15,655	115,161	35,974	281,197	32,551	104,932	257,490	359,324

The data shows that parents of secondary students tend to make larger contributions than do parents of primary students, with the exception of government MTs, which report their parents making low average contributions, averaging only Rp 35,974 per year. Both private SDs and private MIs report parent contributions larger than those of their government equivalents.

3.4. Difference between parents' and schools'/madrasahs' reporting of level of parental contributions

Parents report higher payments to schools/madrasahs than the parent payments identified in school annual reports. The difference between these two sets of reports is provided in Table 11, below.

Table 11. Total payments to schools/madrasahs for the 2010-2011 school year as reported by parents and schools/madrasahs.

	Gov MI	Private MI	Gov MTs	Private MTs	Gov SD	Private SD	Gov SMP	Private SMP
Parent Data (Rp per year)	82,509	154,159	437,358	376,120	54,043	173,857	352,565	628,410
Madrasah data (Rp per year)	15,655	115,161	35,174	281,197	32,551	104,932	257,490	359,324
Difference (parents - school)	66,854	38,998	401,384	94,923	21,492	68,925	95,075	269,086

It is striking that for each kind of school/madrasah delivering basic education, parents report making significantly larger payments than are recorded in the schools'/madrasahs' financial reports. There are several possible explanations for this phenomenon:

1. the payments which parents report making to schools/madrasahs are exaggerated;
2. the parent sample is unrepresentative of the parents of the schools/madrasahs in the sample;
3. administrators of the schools/madrasahs, in particular the principals, under-report the receipts from parents;
4. some payments made by parents are made to the school committees rather than to school accounts, and some, like payments for science practical activities are paid directly to teachers, and are not reported by the school; and
5. payment for additional courses offered by schools/madrasahs may not be included in their reports.

It is accepted that the parent sample for each school/madrasah is not representative of Indonesian parents, since 17.1% had a post-secondary qualification as opposed to 5.2% as identified by the 2010 census. It is also possible that it is not representative of the parent bodies in the sample schools. The survey data shows that among parents who made payments to schools/madrasahs, the median payment of those with post-secondary qualifications, at Rp 240,000 per year, was 145% of the Rp 165,000 paid by parents without such qualifications.

The explanation for the difference between the contributions reported by parents and schools/madrasahs is also likely to be found in a combination of factors 2 - 5, above. There is anecdotal evidence to support the presumption that these practices can be found in the Indonesian education system. In addition, research undertaken by Decentralised Basic Education (DBE) demonstrates that with the strengthening of free education policies at national and local level, schools/madrasahs, especially those in the government sector, have moved away from charging formal fees but have

replaced some of these with other forms of payments. A 2011 paper published by the Institute for Development Studies of the University of Sussex also reports that the practice of soliciting funds from parents and not reporting on those funds is not unusual in the Indonesian education system. A 2010 study undertaken for the Australian Indonesian Basic Education Partnership found that even in the most remote and poor schools, around one-third of school committees engaged in fund-raising.

As documented in Illustrations 1 - 4 (below), Susenas data shows that between 2003 and 2009, payment for courses offered by schools increased markedly. In 2006, these payments had risen to an average of around Rp 100,000 per student in SDs and MIs, and just over Rp 160,000 per student in SMPs and MTs's. Table 10 (above) shows that schools/madrasahs report only small amounts of parent contributions which could be assigned to this category.

In addition to collecting copies of the 2010/11 school/madrasah budgets, the ACDP survey also obtained copies of their reports on the use of BOS funding. It is a formal requirement that this report identifies and reports on all sources of funding, but only less than 10% reported on any sources of funding other than BOS, strengthening the presumption that money raised from parents by school committees and parent associations is frequently not reported by schools/madrasahs. It is important that this practice be addressed and remedied.

A detailed examination of the differences between what the parents report to have paid to the schools/madrasahs and what those institutions report to have received shows that there are two other items of expenditure which stand out in particular. The parents of all schools/madrasahs report much higher charges for registration costs, both for new and returning students. Those in private schools and in government madrasahs, both primary and junior secondary, report substantially higher monthly fees than are reported by the schools/madrasahs.

3.5. Use made of parental contributions by schools/madrasahs

An examination of the use which schools and madrasahs make of parental contributions reveals that there is a worrying lack of transparency in how the use of these funds is reported. On average, 42% of the expenditure of parents' contributions is assigned to the category of "other". Of the other 16 categories of expenditure only one is substantial, with 35% assigned to teacher salaries and other teacher allowances. The next highest expenditure item reported relates to facilities, which consumed 5% of the contributions. There is a clear need for fuller reporting of the use of parental contributions, and for demonstrating the relationship between such expenditure and the schools'/madrasahs' educational or developmental priorities.

3.6. Relationship between parental contributions and per-student cost

Average per-student costs in the surveyed schools/madrasahs show a wide variation, ranging from a high of Rp 6,696,000 in government MIs to a low of Rp 966,000 in private MIs. The relationship between per-student cost and the proportion of parental contributions is demonstrated in Table 12, below.

Table 12. Relationship between per-student cost and parental contributions

Schools/ Madrasahs	Government / private	Per-student cost (1000 Rp/year/student)	Percentage of per- student costs from parent contributions.
		Mean	
MI	Govt	6,696	0.3%
	Private	966	18.4%
MTs	Govt	6,577	0.7%
	Private	1,420	22.9%
SD	Govt	2,164	1.7%
	Private	1,198	13.6%
SMP	Govt	3,638	7.2%
	Private	1,236	24.1%

The data in Table 12 shows that there is an inverse relationship between per-student costs and parent contributions. Where the cost is higher, the proportion of government contribution is high and the parent contribution low, and where the per-student cost is low the government contribution is proportionally low and the parent contribution high. It is very noticeable that government madrasahs, both primary and junior secondary, have a particularly high per-student cost, but receive a proportionally small parent contribution.

3.7. Willingness of parents to make contributions to basic education

Parents participating in the survey were asked whether they were willing to make a contribution to the operations of their children's schools/madrasahs in order to improve the quality of education offered. Table 11, below, summarises their responses.

Table 13. Willingness of parents to make a contribution to the cost of educating their children, in order to improve the quality of education offered.

School/ Madrasah	Gov/ private	Willingness to make a contribution to improve quality of education				Total	
		Yes		No		N	%
		N	%	N	%		
MI	Gov	111	56.3	86	43.7	197	100
	Private	172	65.4	91	34.6	263	100
MTs	Gov	84	58.7	59	41.3	143	100
	Private	254	66.1	130	33.9	384	100
SD	Gov	486	58.1	350	41.9	836	100
	Private	153	71.8	60	28.2	213	100
SMP	Gov	299	73.6	107	26.4	406	100
	Private	267	78.8	72	21.2	339	100

As illustrated above, most parents in each kind of school/madrasah indicated a willingness to make contributions. Those associated with government MIs were the least willing (56.3%) and those associated with private SMPs most willing (78.8%), closely followed by parents of students in government SMPs (73.6%). It should be noted that some parents were not willing to make a

contribution because they did not believe any funds provided by them would be used to improve the quality of education.

Willingness of parents to make contributions was highest among schools/madrasahs with highest level of national accreditation (A), and lowest among those with lowest accreditation (C), probably indicating that the perceived quality of a school/madrasah has an impact in this regard.

Parents from all schools/madrasahs indicated that among budget items to which they were prepared to contribute, teacher wages and incentives rated very highly. The only items rated more highly were laboratories for SMPs. These also rated highly among parents of MTs's, both private and government. Student excursions and books for libraries generally rated lowest.

The amount of contribution parents were willing to make ranged from Rp 1,000 to Rp 700,000 per month, with an average between Rp 19,571 and Rp 57,255 depending on the kind of school/madrasah, as per Table 12, below.

Table 14. Size of contribution to basic education parents are willing to make

Schools/ Madrasahs	govt/ private	Size of contribution (Rp/month)		
		Minimum	Average	Maximum
MI	Gov	1,000	25,768	500,000
	Private	1,000	19,571	150,000
MTs	Gov	5,000	57,255	700,000
	Private	1,000	29,553	200,000
SD	Gov	1,000	17,729	250,000
	Private	1,000	21,833	200,000
SMP	Gov	1,000	42,113	500,000
	Private	1,000	53,554	500,000

There is a notable difference in the size of contribution parents are willing to make to the operations of government and private junior secondary schools/madrasahs, indicating parent awareness that costs of education per student can be expected to be higher in the junior secondary sector.

Parents of students in government MTs's are most willing to make a large contribution, and parents in government MIs offered the largest average contribution at primary education level. As noted above, these madrasahs appear to be the most generously government-funded institutions in basic education. Parents from private MTs's want to make the lowest level of donation among all parents of junior secondary students. This may be indicative of that group's low socio-economic capacity.

Parents of SD and SMP students were willing to make the largest contributions for schools with the highest level of accreditation, and smallest contributions for schools with lowest accreditation, but in MIs and MTs's, the highest level of contribution was offered for madrasahs with the middle level of accreditation (B).

It is recognised that the data relating to parents' willingness to make contributions can be questioned. It is possible that parents expressed a willingness to make a contribution which in reality they would not be willing to make. The data was checked to identify the relationship between parents' capacity to pay, as indicated by their reported income level and the size of the electricity supply connected to their

homes, and the size of the contribution they report being willing to make. The analysis showed a positive relationship between rising levels of economic capacity and rising levels of contributions offered. The richer the parents were, the larger the contribution that they were on average willing to make. The parents who reported the lowest level of family income and who had a small electricity supply offered an average of Rp 18,573, while the richest group with a large electricity supply offered on average Rp 133,336. Only a small proportion of parents indicated a willingness to make a contribution which appeared to be disproportionate to their means.

3.8. Impact of BOS funds and policy on free basic education on parental contributions to basic education

This analysis makes use of Susenas data for the years 2003, 2006, and 2009. Susenas collected this set of data from interviews with parents in which they were asked to estimate their out of pocket costs to send their children to basic education level schools/madrasahs. The costs include both contributions provided directly to schools/madrasahs such as fees, and personal costs such as transport and uniforms. For 2003, Susenas data did not separate government and private schools/madrasahs.

Table 15 (below) shows that parents' costs have increased over the six years between 2006 and 2009 in each category of school/madrasah. Parents of students in SD and MI saw particularly steep increases over this period. The only parents who experienced a reduction in costs were those whose children attended MTs between 2003 and 2006, but the reduction was slight and was followed by a significant rise between 2006 and 2009. The cost displayed in Table 15 uses constant value rupiah for 2011, to allow ready comparison with costs of the ACDP survey.

Table 15. Average total parents' costs for basic education per student per year 2003 - 2009 (values in nominal and constant Rp 2011)

Schools/madrasahs	Average Total Parents' Costs/Year		
	2003	2006	2009
Government SD	294,864 (2003)	444,482 (2006)	829,708 (2009)
		418,810 (2011)	655,580 (2011)
Private SD	366,426 (2011)	976,676 (2006)	1,387,040 (2009)
		923,094 (2011)	1,095,058 (2011)
Government MI	273,234 (2003)	538,976 (2006)	841,750 (2009)
		507,864 (2011)	665,102 (2011)
Private MI	339,546 (2011)	509,474 (2006)	892,392 (2009)
		480,048 (2011)	705,120 (2011)
Government SMP	758,876 (2003)	988,314 (2006)	1,310,782 (2009)
		931,230 (2011)	1,035,700 (2011)
Private SMP	943,060 (2011)	1,581,266 (2006)	1,768,982 (2009)
		1,489,132 (2011)	1,397,740 (2011)
Government MTs	600,172 (2003)	774,932 (2006)	1,270,802 (2009)

Schools/madrasahs	Average Total Parents' Costs/Year		
	2003	2006	2009
	745,834 (2011)	730,172 (2011)	1,004,112 (2011)
Private MTs		776,182 (2006)	1,261,060 (2009)
		731,352 (2011)	996,414 (2011)

Data from Table 15 (above) appears to indicate that the introduction of BOS funding did not result in a reduction of parental contributions to education. But as evidenced by Table 16, below, the Susenas data shows that the percentage of parents who paid no school/madrasah fees at all rose dramatically between 2003 and 2006, and then dropped dramatically between 2006 and 2009. It appears that the initial impact of the provision of BOS funding was very strong, raising parental expectations that they would be freed from paying fees. The change between 2006 and 2009 may indicate that parents were persuaded by schools/madrasahs that despite the provision of BOS funding, the total school/madrasah resources were not sufficient, and that parental contributions were still required.

Data from the ACDP survey shows that the proportion of parents not paying fees rose again in 2011 (see Tables 5 and 6 above), although it must be borne in mind that this survey's sample was too small to be representative of Indonesia. The per-student allocation of BOS funding did not change between 2009 and 2011. A possible explanation for the change is the strengthening of national and local policies relating to free basic education, and the increasing publicity about and enforcement of this policy.

Table 16. Percentage of parents not paying any school/madrasah fees 2003 - 2011 Data 2003-2009 from Susenas, data 2011 from ACDP survey

Schools/madrasahs	Percentage of parents not paying fees			
	2003-2009 Susenas, 2011 ACDP survey			
	2003	2006	2009	2011
Government SD	6.9%	61.9%	17.7%	61.9%
Private SD		30.2%	9.2%	75.3%
Government MI	4.0%	59%	15.5%	58%
Private MI		42.9%	11.8%	59.4%
Government SMP	1.7%	32.8%	0%	82.7%
Private SMP		11.8%	0%	47.9%
Government MTs	1.2%	38.2%	0%	64.5%
Private MTs		28.8%	0%	29.2%


Analysis for parents' cost by urban and rural locations demonstrates that costs for urban areas were considerably greater than those in rural areas for 2003 and 2006. The difference was sharply reduced in 2009 because rural costs rose sharply while urban costs did not. It is not clear why the change was so marked in rural areas between 2006 and 2009, but not between 2003 and 2006.

Table 17. Average total parents' costs for basic education by are 2003 - 2009 (values in constant 2011)

Level of Education	Average Total Parents' Costs/Semester/Year					
	2003		2006		2009	
	Status Desa		Status Desa		Status Desa	
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural
SD	279,052	114,703	359,336	157,431	354,935	336,428
MI	233,977	136,190	391,916	171,594	341,486	336,060
SMP	600,669	334,226	717,463	366,932	629,355	489,230
MTs	432,203	342,730	474,769	321,924	550,633	481,205

There is also a variation in costs according to regions, as demonstrated in Illustration 1 (below). The data is presented in constant 2011 rupiahs to facilitate comparison.

Illustration 2. Average Parent Expenditure on Basic Education by Area



The data shows that the biggest variation in costs by region occurs at the level of private SMPs and private SDs, with Maluku - Papua having the lowest parent contributions and Jawa and Kalimantan the highest. While parent costs in other categories of schools/madrasahs do show some regional variability, the variability is not of the order seen among private SDs and SMPs. The cost borne by parents of students in government-provided basic education, both in schools and madrasahs, generally shows a good level of consistency across regions.

The Susenas data were also analysed by category of the parents' expenses. The largest expenses for both state and private elementary and junior secondary were for school uniforms and transportation, which in 2009 accounted for 32% and 24% of total expenditures, respectively. Student enrolment and

monthly fees were also significant items of expenditure, particularly in private schools and madrasahs. The major categories of expenses for 2009 are shown in Illustrations 2 - 5.

Illustration 3. Major Parent Expenses by Category, Primary schools, Susenas 2003 - 2009.




Illustration 4. Major parent expenses by category, primary madrasahs, Susenas 2003 - 2009.




Illustration 5. Major Parent Expenses by Category, Junior Secondary Schools, Susenas 2003 - 2009.





Illustration 6. Major Parent Expenses by Category, Junior Secondary Madrasahs, Susenas 2003 - 2009.



The Susenas data provides information about the difference in costs borne by parents in urban and rural areas.

3.9. Principals' perceptions of impact of no fees on education quality

The principals were asked about the impact on quality of the education offered in their schools/madrasahs which would result from the elimination of all parental contributions. Table 18, below, provides the summary of their responses.

Table 18. Principals' perception of the impact of elimination of parental contributions on the quality of education

Schools/Madrasah	Govt/private	Negative impact of elimination of compulsory contributions on quality of education					All	
		No response	None/very small	Small	Medium	Large		
		(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	n	PctN
MI	Govt	11.8	35.3	11.8	29.4	11.8	17	100.0
	Private		34.8	21.7	26.1	17.4	23	100.0
MTs	Govt	36.4	9.1		36.4	18.2	11	100.0
	Private	15.6	15.6	6.3	28.1	34.4	32	100.0
SD	Govt	7.3	24.6	5.8	21.7	40.6	69	100.0
	Private	16.7	5.6	5.6	5.6	66.7	18	100.0
SMP	Govt	18.2	15.2	9.1	30.3	27.3	33	100.0
	Private	20.0	4.0	12.0	20.0	44.0	25	100.0
All		13.2	19.3	8.8	24.1	34.7	228	100.0

Overall, 58.8% of principals report that if parents are not required to contribute to the cost of education, the negative effect on the quality of education they can offer will be medium or large. The highest level of concern was expressed by principals of private primary schools of whom 66.7% thought that the impact would be large. Concern that the impact would be large was also found among principals of private SMPs (44%) and government SDs (40.6%). Principals of government MTs's were most likely (36.4%) to say that the impact would be little or none. It should be noted that a significant percentage of principals chose not to provide a response to this question.

The most negative impact was thought to be on the standard of school facilities, incentive payment for teachers, extra-curricular activities and reduction in the quantity of educational activities offered.

Table 19. Percentage of principals' identifying a negative impact on education quality of elimination of parental contributions to education, by area of negative impact (principals able to nominate more than one area of impact)

Schools/ madrasahs	Govt/ private	Facilities	Teacher honorarium	Books	No of teachers	Less instruction	Fewer extracurricular offerings	Other
		Percentage of principals identifying the area						
MI	Govt	52.9%	23.5%	17.6%	5.9%	29.4%	41.2%	5.9%
	Private	56.5%	43.5%	21.7%	13.0%	30.4%	17.4%	0.0%

MTs	Govt	45.5%	27.3%	9.1%	0.0%	18.2%	27.3%	9.1%
	Private	56.3%	37.5%	21.9%	9.4%	18.8%	31.3%	15.6%
SD	Govt	66.7%	29.0%	27.5%	13.0%	26.1%	36.2%	1.4%
	Private	66.7%	55.6%	16.7%	27.8%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%
SMP	Govt	63.6%	18.2%	18.2%	12.1%	39.4%	36.4%	3.0%
	Private	64.0%	60.0%	28.0%	16.0%	36.0%	36.0%	4.0%
All		61.4%	35.1%	22.4%	12.7	27.6%	33.3%	4.4%

The principals of all schools/madrasahs report significant negative impact on areas such as facilities, but private schools and madrasahs appear to be much more affected in their ability to pay teacher honorariums. These principals also report a greater impact on their ability to employ teachers than do principals of government schools/madrasahs, though the level of impact on this area is not as severe, indicating that reduction of teacher remuneration rather than reducing the total number of teachers is the strategy more likely to be used by them.

3.10. Relationship between school budgets, parent funding and student learning outcomes

The study attempted to analyse the relationship between total per-student school funding, parental contributions, and student learning outcomes as represented by results of national examinations for class 6 of primary education, and class 3 of junior secondary education.

A regression analysis was undertaken to study the relationship, with schools/madrasahs divided into three groups according to achievement of learning outcomes: low, medium and high. The results show that there is a positive relationship between increasing per-student cost and improved learning outcomes for the two higher-scoring groups of schools/madrasahs, but not for the low-scoring group, as per Table 20, below. This means that schools/madrasahs which perform badly on national examinations can have low, medium or high per-student costs.

Table 20. Relationship between increasing per-student cost and learning outcomes

	Low national examination results	Medium national examination results	High national examination results
Relationship between higher per student cost and higher results	No discernible relationship	Positive relationship	Positive relationships

It is not possible to conclude that the higher per-student cost is a causal factor of better outcomes in schools/madrasahs with medium and high examination results. Better-funded schools/madrasahs are generally attended by students from richer and better-educated families. International literature identifies level of parental education and socio-economic status as the strongest predictors of student learning outcomes. It is highly likely that the higher total budgets and higher parental contributions in better performing schools/madrasahs in this study are indicators of better educated and wealthier families associated with those schools/madrasahs. It should also be noted that there is a "ceiling effect", or the operation of the law of diminishing returns in the relationship between higher per-student cost and better results. Where the relationship is a causal one, it is likely to be more powerful in the mid-range of per-student costs, rather than at the top of the cost range.

The analysis was unable to identify a differential impact of government or parental funding of education on student learning outcomes. There was no discernible difference between schools/madrasahs which got a higher proportion of funds from parents and those with a similar total budget but with a larger proportion of non-parent funding.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Parents of children in Indonesia's basic education institutions make a significant contribution to the cost of educating their children, when both school contributions and personal costs are taken into account. Data from the national census shows that the trend since 2003 has been for these costs to increase in real terms, in every kind of school/madrasah, even though the national government introduced and then increased school operational funding through the provision of BOS funding. It is not clear why the rate of increase has been higher in rural than urban schools/madrasahs.

The rising cost of the personal items paid for by parents is likely to increase, probably at a rate higher than inflation. With the predicted growing average income levels, Indonesian parents are likely to be providing both more and better quality of education-related items for their children, including stationery books and clothing. It can also be expected that there will be increased participation in non-compulsory extra-curricular activities and excursions. Cost of transport is also likely to rise. For poor parents this situation will provide increased challenges, which will need a government policy response. ACDP 006 is working on this issue and will produce a paper on Pro-Poor Policies.

Over the last decade, there has been significant fluctuation in the proportion of parents who have paid school/madrasah fees. Before the introduction of BOS funding, nearly all parents paid school fees. In 2006, the year after the introduction of this funding, the proportion of parents paying fees dropped dramatically, only to rise again in 2009. The data from 2011 indicates that the proportion of parents paying fees has dropped again.

The volatility in this pattern is likely to have been caused by the impact of government policy. The initial introduction of BOS appears to have led many parents to believe that the schools/madrasahs no longer needed their contributions to operating costs. By 2009, they appear to have been convinced that their contributions were still needed, but by 2011-2012, with governments at all levels actively promoting "free basic education" policies, many have again stopped paying fees.

It should be noted that despite the changes in the proportion of parents paying fees, the average cost of parent contributions has continued to rise, indicating that those who have been paying have been paying significantly more.

The ACDP survey shows that there is a major discrepancy between what the parents report as paying to schools/madrasahs, and what those institutions report to have received. The survey data is broadly consistent with the data from Susenas, with the increase reported in 2011 total parent payments being in line with the trend of increasing parental contributions since 2003. This raises the presumption that schools/madrasahs are not reporting accurately the full measure of contributions received from parents.

It is also the case that at present, schools/madrasahs are not effectively reporting what use they make of parent contributions. Nearly half of the funds which they report receiving from parents are reported to be spent on "other" activities.

The regulatory requirement for schools/madrasahs to record all contributions received from parents is already in place, as is the requirement to report how contributions are used, but these requirements are

not being enforced. In the Indonesian context, it is important that all parent payments, regardless of the channel used, are recorded and reported on. These channels include payments made to school committees and directly to class teachers.

It is difficult to predict what the pattern of payments to schools/madrasahs will be in the future. The policy context is currently clear for government schools - it is governed by Ministerial Regulation 44/2012 which determines that government schools providing basic education should not charge fees. The implications for the madrasah system are yet to be clarified, but government madrasahs are likely to follow the example of government schools. This means that in the government system, schools and madrasahs will rely only on voluntary parental contributions. How large these voluntary contributions are will depend on several factors. Key among these will be:

- parent confidence that their contributions will be well used'
- increased transparency in schools/madrasahs reporting receipts and expenditure of parent funds; and
- effectiveness of school administrations in demonstrating to parents the need for funding additional to that provided by government.

It should also be noted that schools/madrasahs already have methods of persuading some parents to make contributions which while formally "voluntary", are in effect highly pressured. The longer-term policy objective should be to replace these with more transparent and accountable strategies for seeking parent support.

Private schools are allowed by Ministerial Regulation 44/2012 to charge fees, with restrictions as to what they can be used for. The fees can be used to fund salaries of teachers who are not public servants and to provide essential operational goods and services where the schools/madrasahs do not yet meet the National Education Standard. The regulation requires full reporting of the receipts and utilisation of the parents' funds. Poor parents are to be exempted. In practice, almost no schools/madrasahs yet meet all criteria of the National Education Standard, and fees are likely to be set at a level which the school administration considers appropriate for their communities, probably close to current levels.

LAMPIRAN 1
IMPLEMENTASI KEGIATAN SURVEY

APPENDIX 1 IMPLEMENTATION OF SURVEY ACTIVITIES

Survey activities on parental contribution to basic education were conducted in several stages, as follows :

- Preparation
- Questionnaire trial
- Selection of survey objects
- Supervisor/Surveyor training
- Administration and permits
- Execution of field survey
- Document handling and data entry

Each sub-activity is elaborated in the sub-sections below.

1. Preparation Stage

Activities conducted in the preparation stage were, among others

- a. Collection of school data (Diknas), regional characteristic data and susenas data (BPS),
- b. Coordination with relevant institutions (MONE, MORA and Bappenas),
- c. Structuring of survey instruments (questionnaire and guidelines on questionnaire completion).

There were two types of survey questionnaires:

a. Questionnaire for parents

This aimed to collect data/information about parental contributions, particularly their financial contributions, over the last calendar year. Instruments used were open- ended and closed questionnaires.

b. Questionnaire for schools

Questionnaire for schools aimed to collect data /information about the kind and amount of parental contribution received by schools in the last calendar year (Jan-Dec 2011). Its main focus was to identify how much financial support was gained from the students' parents, and how this money was used by the schools. Instruments used were open- ended and closed questionnaires.

The draft of these two types of questionnaire is presented in Appendices A and B.

The activities were conducted in parallel during the period of December 2011-March 2012, under the coordination of Mr. Chris Majewski.

2. Questionnaire Trial

To find out about the questionnaire's validity and reliability levels, a trial was conducted. Jakarta and an area nearby were selected as the locations of trial, with respondents consisting of 30-50 parents. In the trial, respondents' understanding of the questions posed in the questionnaire was

also evaluated. Apart from testing the questionnaire, the trial was also used to train the master trainer candidates who subsequently trained district/sub-district surveyors, all of whom had previous experience in conducting real field surveys.


Trial activity for the parent questionnaire was conducted by the research team (Mr. Majewski, Mr. Robert Suharno and Mr. I Made Sumertajaya) in Jakarta and Bogor. This activity was conducted during 1-7 April 2012.

The trial of the school questionnaire was performed in 6 schools/madrasahs in the Jabodetabek area, conducted on 10 April 2012 at the ACDP office, Kompleks Lotte Mart Blok G No 32, Jalan Fatmawati, Jakarta. This activity was coordinated by I Made Sumertajaya, with the support of Mr Chris Majewski and Amril Muhammad (Universitas Negeri Jakarta).

3. Selection of Survey Objects

Survey objects in this activity were the regional government (education offices and religious affair offices), schools and students' parents. Sampling method used was multi stage stratified random sampling. Stages of sample selection were as follows: (1) selection of provinces, (2) selection of districts/municipalities of the selected provinces, (3) selection of schools in each selected district/municipality, and (4) selection of parents in each selected school. To avoid bias in the samples collected, sample selection took into account the characteristics of targeted population. Some considerations needed to be taken into account in each stage of sampling, as per the following:

Illustration 7. Sampling in the selection of provinces and districts/municipalities



1. Province selection was conducted in each area (Sumatera, Jawa, Bali & Nusa Tenggara, Kalimantan, Sulawesi, Maluku & Papua). In each area, 1-2 provinces were selected randomly and proportionally.
2. In each selected province, 1-2 districts/municipalities were then selected randomly. Factors important in the selection included the area status (district/municipality) and the

representativeness of strata based on economic background and the quantity of basic education services available.

Based on the above methodology, the provinces and districts/municipalities selected as survey locations are presented in Table 1.


Table 21. List of Provinces and Districts/Municipalities in the Sample

Area	Prov Code	Province	Dist./Muni. Code	District/Municipality
SUMATERA	13	SUMATERA BARAT	1371	PADANG
			1301	KEPULAUAN MENTAWAI
	17	BENGKULU	1703	BENGKULU UTARA
JAWA	35	JAWA TIMUR	3578	SURABAYA
BALI AND NUSA TENGGARA	51	B A L I	5108	BULELENG
KALIMANTAN	63	KALIMANTAN SELATAN	6303	BANJAR
SULAWESI	73	SULAWESI SELATAN	7311	BONE
			7303	BANTAENG
MALUKU&PAPUA	81	M A L U K U	8103	MALUKU TENGAH

3. School selection in each selected district/municipality took into account features such as school type (school and madrasah), school level (SD or equivalent, SMP or equivalent), school status (government, private), school quality (accreditation A, B, C), schools/madrasahs in urban, rural, remote areas, as well as islands, and rich or poor schools.
4. Sampling of students' parents in each school too into consideration economic and educational background of parents, as well as parents whose child does not go to the selected school but lives around the area of the school.

In summary, stages of survey objects' selection points (3) and (4) are presented in the following Figure 2:

Illustration 8. Sampling of schools and parents' selection



Sample Size

Determining the sample size in each stage was done by quotas, taking into account the representativeness of each stratum, time and funding available. The distribution of sample for each type of the survey objects is as follows:

Table 22. Amount of sample schools and parents in each selected province and district

Prov. Code	Province	Dist. Code	District/Municipality	Number of sample schools	Number of sample parents
01	SUMATERA BARAT	01	KOTA PADANG	24	288
		02	KAB. KEPULAUAN MENTAWAI	24	288
02	BENGKULU	03	KAB. BENGKULU UTARA	24	288
03	JAWA TIMUR	04	KOTA SURABAYA	24	288
		05	KAB. LAMONGAN	24	288
04	BALI	06	KAB. BULELENG	24	288
05	KALIMANTAN SELATAN	07	KAB. BANJAR	24	288
06	SULAWESI SELATAN	08	KAB. BONE	24	288
		09	KAB. BANTAENG	24	288
07	MALUKU	10	KOTA TUAL	24	288
			TOTAL	240	2880

Note: *) There are 24 school strata and 1 school is selected in each stratum

***) There are 6 parent strata and 2 parents are selected in each stratum

4. Training of Supervisors and Surveyors

Training activity aims to standardize the perception toward the technical implementation of survey and its output.

Training is conducted in 2 stages: (1) training of areal coordinators and (2) training of field surveyors.

Areal coordinator training is performed in Jakarta. Seven areal coordinators are invited to Jakarta, representing 7 selected provinces. Training of field surveyor is then conducted in each province, where participants are trained by the areal coordinators having been trained in Jakarta. Two surveyors from each area participate in the training.

In the training, an in-depth familiarization is performed for the surveyors, which involves among others the general description of survey activity, the legal framework of activity, data collection/questionnaire completion method, and interview ethics/procedures. To increase participants' level of understanding towards the material presented, trial on questionnaire completion is conducted. For maximum results, surveyors are expected to be able to perform interviews with regard to interview procedure. Data collection from selected survey objects is performed through face-to-face interview between the surveyors and respondents.

Supervisor training activity was conducted on 13 April 2012 at Golden Plaza Office Complex, Lotte Mart Blok G-32, Jakarta.

Table 23. Details of Supervisor Training Activity

SESSION	TIME	ACTIVITY	PERSON IN CHARGE
I	09.00-09.15	REGISTRATION OF SUPERVISORS	APRIANI WULANDARI
	09.15-09.45	INTRODUCTION TO PARENTAL CONTRIBUTION SURVEY	CHRIS MAJEWSKI
	09.45-10.30	IMPLEMENTATION STAGES OF SURVEY ACTIVITY	CHRIS MAJEWSKI/I MADE SUMERTAJAYA
	10.30-11.30	DISCUSSION: COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARENTS	CHRIS MAJEWSKI/I MADE SUMERTAJAYA
	11.30-13.00	BREAK	
II	13.00-14.00	DISCUSSION: COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SCHOOLS	CHRIS MAJEWSKI/ I MADE SUMERTAJAYA
	14.00-15.00	DISCUSSION	CHRIS MAJEWSKI/ I MADE SUMERTAJAYA
	15.00-16.00	DISCUSSION: ADMINISTRATION	ARI AGUNG

Task allocation for each field supervisor can be found in the below table. Amount of schools visited in each district/municipality is 24 with particular school characteristics, and in each school, there are 12 parents listed as having certain characteristics.

Table 24. List of survey areas for each supervisor

No	Location	Name & Contacts.	Number of Survey Objects
1	Kota Padang, Kab. Kep. Mentawai – Sumatera Barat	Asep Ahmad Satori (081326800968)	48 schools, 576 parents
2	Kab. Bone, Kab. Bantaeng – Sulawesi Selatan	Triswanto Nuratmodjo (082179003388)	48 schools, 576 parents
3	Kota Surabaya, Kab. Lamongan – Jawa Timur	Fahmi Hasan Bakran (085724163456)	48 schools, 576 parents
4	Kab. Buleleng - Bali	Boy Ishak (081280500299)	24 schools, 288 parents
5	Kab. Bengkulu Utara – Bengkulu	TB Sastra Mulyana (085218360603)	24 schools, 288 parents
6	Kota Tual – Maluku	Jajat Sudrajat (085693333312)	24 schools, 288 parents
7	Kab. Banjar - Kalimantan Selatan	Dede Sopyandi (081219018086)	24 schools, 288 parents

5. Administration and Permits

Permits are crucial to make activities run smoothly. Permits required include:

a. Central Level Permits (Diknas, MORA, Office of Internal Affairs)

Permits from the central level had to be obtained to support the activity. The central authority then appoints a level below it to produce a permit letter for the activity. This permit is significant as a base for the survey activity.

b. District/Municipality Level of Permits

Peremission at the district/municipality level were manifested in the form of cooperation and coordination with the district/municipal government.

c. Permits from Relevant Stakeholders

Several survey objects in this activity were partners from particular institutions such as religious organizations NU and Muhammadiyah.

6. Implementation of Field Survey

Field survey was conducted for 12 days between 11-23 May 2012.

Table 25. Schedule of Field Survey Implementation

DATE	ACTIVITY	PERSON IN CHARGE
7-8 May 2012	Survey Preparation	
	a. Letter of Introduction/Appointment	Dety/Wulan
	b. Lists of surveyed schools and backup schools	I Made Sumertajaya
	c. Questionnaire duplication (Form A1, Form A2, Form B1, Form B2)	TIA (Ela/Ari/Wulan)
	d. Procurement of departure tickets for supervisors to the field (departure was scheduled to be on 10 May 2012)	TIA (Ela/Ari/Wulan)
	d. Procurement of departure tickets for counterpart team to the field (departure was scheduled to be on 13-18 May 2012)	TIA (Ela/Ari/Wulan)
	e. Funding for the implementation of survey	TIA (Ela/Ari/Wulan)
	f. Souvenirs for survey objects	TIA (Ela/Ari/Wulan)
8 May 2012	Inviting the counterpart teams to the ACDP office at D'Best Complex Lotte Mart	Dety/Wulan
9 Mei 2012	Inviting the supervisors to the ACDP office at D'Best Complex Lotte Mart to get the equipment and supplies for the survey	TIA (Ela/Ari/Wulan)
10 Mei 2012	Supervisors depart to each survey area	Supervisor
	Supervisors collect and train the surveyors	Supervisor
11 May 2012	Supervisors together with the surveyors visit the education offices and the religious affairs offices in the province and district/municipality levels	Supervisor
11-23 May 2012	Survey Implementation	Supervisor
	a. Surveyors conduct data collecting in schools	Surveyor
	b. Surveyors collect data from students' parents	Surveyor
	c. Supervisors perform mentoring on the first day of visits to schools and to parents	Supervisor
	d. Supervisors perform quality control on the implementation of survey (periodical visits to survey objects)	Supervisor
	e. Collection of completed questionnaires and validation of questionnaire responses	Supervisor
	f. Coordinating the data entry	Supervisor
	g. Accompanying the counterpart teams performing field supervision	Supervisor
13-20 May 2012	Counterpart team's field supervision	Dety/Wulan

DATE	ACTIVITY	PERSON IN CHARGE
24 May 2012	Supervisors are back to Jakarta	Supervisor
	a. Submission of policy documents	
	b. Submission of completed school questionnaires and their supporting documents	
	c. Submission of completed parent questionnaires	
	d. Submission of school and parent database softcopy	
	e. Submission of administrative documents	

Guidelines for data collection in the field are shown in the table below. Basically, there were 3 main activities performed in the field, i.e. collection of regulations/policies on the delivery of education in each area, data collection at schools (Questionnaire A) and data collection of parental participation in education (Questionnaire B).

Table 26. Type of data collected from each respondent

Data	Respondent	Communication Approach	Instrument	Interviewer
Regional regulations and policies on delivery of education	-Provincial Education Office (7), District Education Office (10), District MORA Office (10)	Documentation/Inventory	Guidelines on Documentation	Provincial Supervisor (7)
Sources, types and usage of fund managed by schools	240 schools, representing some school characteristics such as school type (School, Madrasah), status (Government, Private), Level of basic education (SD/equivalent, SMP/equivalent) and school quality (low, medium, high)	Posing questions and observation	Open- and close-ended questionnaires	Provincial supervisor (7), Surveyor (20)
Parental contribution comprising type, nature, period and amount of contribution donated to schools	4.032 parents (12 people per school)	Posing questions and observation	Open- ended and closed questionnaires	Surveyor (28)

List of assignment and responsibility of each supervisor and surveyor is presented in the below table.

Table 27. Details of Assignment for Each Areal Supervisor

NO	DETAILS OF ACTIVITY
1	Training on survey methodology in Jakarta
2	Training of district/municipal supervisors and field surveyors
3	Collection of regional policy/regulation documents related with the delivery of education, conducted in Education Offices and MORA Offices in the provincial level
4	Collection of regional policy/regulation documents related with the delivery of education, conducted in Education Offices and MORA Offices in the district/municipal level
5	Mentoring of surveyors in the field on the first day
6	Collection of school and parent questionnaires which surveyors have completed periodically
7	Quality control: - Checking complete documentation from the district/municipal level - Random testing: making calls to 10% of respondents
8	Data Validation: - Checking the completion and validation of questionnaires' response
9	Data Entry: - Checking the consistency of questionnaires' response with data entry
10	Dispatching the documents and data entry to Jakarta

Table 28. Details of Assignment for Each Field Surveyor

NO	DETAILS OF ACTIVITY
1	Training on survey methodology in provinces
2	Conducting the survey in 24 schools and 12 parents per school.
3	Collecting documents and handing them in to the provincial supervisors

7. Handling of the Survey Result Document

Handling of documents involves organizing the distribution of documents and of data of the survey result. Documents produced from data collection and survey are a collection of lists and completed survey forms which need further handling, so that the quality of data gathered directly from the field is good. Thus, verification and validation of documents is necessary to ensure complete responses in the questionnaire forms and the validity of the data gathered. Document handling is also significant to expedite data entry processing.

Quality Assurance (QA) and Quality Control(QC)

QA/QC activity is a form of control of the quality of data gathered from the field. The scope of QA/QC involves random testing and data validation.

Random Testing

The implementation of random testing focuses on school and parental contribution survey activities. The scale of each random testing object is decided using a sampling method. The number of samples per object is 15% of the targeted objects in each district. In the implementation, random testing was performed per surveyor/verifier on 15% of the total work completed.

Random testing methods performed in this work, among others, were:

1. RecTotal by Phone: a random test performed by making phone calls to the respondents, asking them about the process they have undergone with a surveyor/verifier in the data collection phase. Questions posed can be about the appearance, manners or attitudes of the surveyor/verifier. Along with those, several questions in the questionnaire are re-asked to cross-check answers provided by the respondents.
2. Check on the Spot: a random test performed by making an unannounced visit to the surveyor at work. After the surveyor completed the data collection, the completed forms are reviewed to see whether s/he has done it correctly (all sections of the form are filled out) and to ensure that there is no cheating by, for instance, filling out the forms without conducting any interviews.
3. Check in the field: a random test performed by revisiting the respondents who have been interviewed by the surveyors. QC personnel ask them about the appearance, manners or attitudes of the surveyors/verifiers. Along with those, several questions in the questionnaire are re-asked to cross-check answers provided by the respondents.

Random testing was performed by field supervisors/coordinators depending on relevant circumstances. Additionally, the expert team from headquarter performed supervision in several areas. This supervision by the expert team was done in the period of 14-24 May 2012.

Table 29. List of Supervised Survey Areas

No	Area	Expert Team Member	Date
1	Jawa Timur	Chris Majewski	14-16 May 2012
2	Sumatera Barat	Robert Suharno	14-16 May 2012
3	Bali	I Made Sumertajaya	16-18 May 2012

Should there be an indication that a surveyor cheats or does not perform her/his task according to the agreed SOP, the coordinator and the QC personnel would perform the random testing together. It is the coordinator who has the authority to pose questions to respondents. Respondents' answers in the random test become the base to decide whether a surveyor/verifier makes mistakes or a respondent incorrectly provides answers.

If a wrong answer is caused by the respondent's mistake, data is still usable provided that it is corrected according to the respondent's actual answer, and the surveyor/verifier receives an oral warning to be more careful and thorough in the data collecting process. If it is known that a mistake is on the part of the surveyor/verifier and cheating or self-filling out of forms is proven, data is then unusable and the surveyor/verifier is discharged from any survey/verification activities.

Data Validation

Results of data collection from schools and parents in the selected districts/municipalities were validated in the district/municipal level to ensure all forms about schools and parents were completed according to the form filling-out guidelines. Upon validation, data was sent to headquarter to begin the process of data entry.

If a problem regarding the questionnaire responses was found during the validation process, QC returned the survey form to the surveyor coordinator to be forwarded to the relevant surveyor for correction.

Corrected data is then resubmitted to the coordinator by the surveyor, and is revalidated until it is free from problem. If no further problem is found, the data is then accepted and included into the next phase of process.

Document Handling

Document handling involves a range of document dispatching from the field (the surveyor level) to the central management in headquarters. Movement process of documents is accompanied by QC and validation processes. Documents considered as valid in the checking process will be forwarded to the next phase. The objective of document handling is so that the documents are consistently controlled and selected according to good data quality.

Verified and validated documents from the surveyor level will be passed on to the lead surveyor level. Once regarded as suitable, documents are once again passed on to the areal/district validators. In the QC process, data will be grouped according to particular categories by the areal validators. Document dispatch to headquarter QC will be accompanied by proof that QC has been performed in the area level. QC in headquarter will be performed on the valid documents with the same standard. Once they are found to be suitable, control cards will be written as data validation proof. Control cards are used to manage document quality. Documents considered valid will be categorized into three groups: school data, parent data and regional regulation/policy document in education.

To differentiate document types, valid documents are grouped in batches of different colors. Designation is done through coloring and naming on the cover of document batch for each document group.

Data Entry

Data entry is performed in each survey area, coordinated by the supervisor. Entried data will then be sent to headquarter passing through several phases of QC and according to the data validity.

Table 30. Details of Assignment for Each Data Entry Personnel

NO	URAIAN KEGIATAN
1	Data coding for several open-ended questions
2	Data entry on school forms (240) and parent form (2880)