



PT KRESNA ACITYA  
NUSANTARA MEDIATAMA  
Offering the Greatest Impact on Your Research



# Certificate

No: 011/WCOSPILED/X/2020

This is to certify that:

**Khaerul Umam Noer**

have/has participated in

“Virtual Conference on Social Science in Law,  
Political Issue and Economic Development”

as

**PARTICIPANT**

15 October 2020

Chief Executive Officer,

**KRESNA**  
NUSANTARA  
Mochammad Tanzil Multazam, M.Kn.

Scientific Committee,

Dr. Siska Diana Sari, S.H., M.H.

Chair Committee,

Andista Candra Yusro, M.Pd.



© Pubbeazy by PT Kresna Acitya Nusanantara Mediatama

kresnanusantara

kresna\_nusantara

@AcityaKresna

# Discipline, Punishment, and the Question of Child-Friendly School Policy

Khaerul Umam Noer<sup>1</sup>, Abdul Aziz<sup>2</sup>, Dhea Ariesta Khairunnisa<sup>3</sup>, Fairus Dwi Putri<sup>4</sup>  
{umam.noer@umj.ac.id<sup>1</sup>, abdul.aziz@gmail.com<sup>2</sup>, dheaaariesta@gmail.com<sup>3</sup>}

Department of Public Policy University of Muhammadiyah Jakarta,  
Jl. KH. Ahmad Dahlan, Ciputat, South Jakarta<sup>1234</sup>

**Abstract.** Since 2014 Indonesia has entered a new phase to fulfill children's rights, especially the protection in schools through Child-Friendly Schools policy. Until May 2019, there were 16,880 Child-Friendly School throughout Indonesia. There are six indicators of Child-Friendly School, one of them is the application of discipline without violence. This paper focuses on how schools implement child-friendly school programs by eliminating all forms of violence against students. Using a mixed research method, through a survey of 3272 students in 75 schools in Bekasi, Depok and Bandung, and interviews with the Principal and School Committee. This research shows that the Child-Friendly School policy in schools is still not running. Violence, in the name of discipline, continues at school. Students are still physically punished, and there is no mechanism to convert sentences to assignments, to the absence of a mechanism for complaints and prosecution of cases of sexual harassment. It is indeed worrying, because Child-Friendly School is not just a school claim, but must manifest and implement in school's policy.

**Keywords:** Child-Friendly Schools, Child Rights Convention, Education, Violence, Discipline.

## 1 Introduction

Regulation of the Ministry of Women's Empowerment And Child Protection (MoWECPP) Number 8/2014 concerning Child-Friendly School (hereinafter will be abbreviated as CFS) Policy requires Child-Friendly School (Sekolah Ramah Anak/CFS) as an integral part of Child-Friendly Cities (Kota Layak Anak/KLA) [1][6]. In line with the Convention on the Rights of Children, ratified by the State in 1990, especially on the right to develop and the right to participation, the government issues a Law 23/2002, later revised to Law 35/2014 Regarding Child Protection. The Constitution and the Law mandate that the state must guarantee the fulfillment of children's fundamental rights and needs, so every children can grow and develop healthily and reasonably. The existence of the CFS is essential because Indonesia already has several legal and policy instruments that mandate the protection of children [2][3][4][5]. This policy was received in various educational institutions. From the CFS's National Secretariat data, that until May 2019, 16,880 schools declared themselves as Child-Friendly Schools, spread in 243 Regencies and Cities in Indonesia [7].

The problem is, even though it has been conceived for a long time, CFS has not been seriously studied. Studies on CFS are more focused on the implementation of policies, accurately how CFSs should be carried out by education units [8][9], CFS's innovative learning models [10], and how CFS is associated with children dealing with Law [11]. These studies do

not see how the CFS as part of efforts to prevent acts of violence in educational institutions, even though data on violence against children in educational institutions continues to increase every year [12]. This paper focuses on two questions. *First*, it maps out how the implementation of CFS's policies in school, primarily related to the non-violent discipline model, as one of the leading indicators of CFS. *Second*, by conducting a survey, this study provides data that the school has not yet implemented the CFS policy, as will be explained later, that there are still many acts of violence against children in schools.

## **2 Research Method**

Using a mixed research method, conducted in three cities: Bandung City, Bekasi, and Depok from January to May 2020. In the initial stage, the research team used a multi-stage random sampling. The first stage was a survey of 3750 respondents - 23 people refused to participate, bringing the final number to 3,727 secondary students from 75 schools, with an error threshold of 3%. After obtaining preliminary data, the team conducted a second phase of deepening with interviews with 90 students, who came from thirty schools. In addition to sending surveys to students, we interviewed Principals, School Committees, school counseling body, and parents of students who take as the second stage of sample. All targeted schools are Senior High School, both under the Ministry of Education and Culture and the Ministry of Religion.

## **3 The implementation of CFS Policy**

The CFS's policy is very multistakeholder, including central and regional governments, schools, business entities, communities, and other stakeholders. These various parties were directly involved in preparation, planning, and implementation of the CFS. At the policy level, there are five main principles in the development of the CFS including: (a) guarantee opportunities for every child to enjoy their right to education without discrimination based on disability, gender, ethnicity, religion, and parental background; (b) the primary consideration in all decision making at school is the best interests of the child; (c) creating an environment that respects the dignity of children and ensures the holistic and integrated development of each child; (d) respect for the right of children to express their views in all matters affecting children in the school environment; and (e) transparency, accountability, participation, information disclosure, and the rule of law in education units.

Schools, in order to recognize as CFS, three stages must be carried out, starting from preparation, planning, and implementation. In the preparation stage, schools must conduct socialization of fulfillment of rights and protection of children in collaboration with the City's Child-Friendly City Task Force. Later, the school must consult with the student to map the needs and fulfillment of student's rights and protection. After that, the School Principals, Committees, Parents, and students declared the CFS in school.

The school must also create an CFS Implementation Team, which is made by the Principal together with the School Committee and students. The role of the CFS Implementation Team in schools is crucial because it is in the hands of the Implementation Team that the planning and implementation of the CFS is carryout. The team main task is coordinating various development efforts, socializing, developing and implementing plans, monitoring the development process,

and evaluating. Furthermore, the CFS Implementation Team identified the potential, capacity, vulnerability, and threats to develop CFS in schools.

At the planning level, the CFS Implementation Team has the authority to integrate policies, programs, and activities that are already in schools. Various programs and activities such as School Health Enterprises, School Food for Children, Inclusion Schools, Disaster Safe Schools/Madrasas, Honesty Canteens, Child-Friendly Islamic Boarding Schools, Drug-Free School, and others are essential components in planning CFS development into the School Activity and Budget Plan (Rencana Kerja dan Anggaran Sekolah/RKAS). The implementation of the School Activity and Budget Plan is under the team's responsibility by optimizing all school resources and partnerships with the government, local government, the community, the business, and other stakeholders.

There are six indicators developed to measure the achievements in school: (a) CFS policy, (b) curriculum implementation, (c) teachers and education personnel trained in child rights, (d) facilities and infrastructure, (e) student participation and (f) the participation of parents, community institutions, the business community, stakeholders and alumni. This paper only focuses on CFS policy points, mainly in the availability of anti-violence policies and the implementation of anti-violence policies.

#### **4 Discipline and Punishment**

The CFS policy on student, at least in the formal stages, can be seen from two arenas: *First*, the policy prepare jointly involving all school stakeholders, from students, teachers, education staff, employees, and parents. *Second*, the existence of an anti-violence policy and its implementation includes three criteria: (a) the prohibition of acts of violence, (b) enforcement of discipline without violence and degrading, and (c) the existence of a mechanism for complaints and handling cases of violence. The non-violence policy for students is prepared together with all stakeholders, especially in the involvement of students. So we ask students four questions: (a) are they involved in making non-violence policies in schools, (b) do they know the policy, (c) whether the policy is always socialized, and (d) whether students care about the policy.

Although some students, around 23% of respondents, admitted that they were involved in creating non-violence policies in school; however, their involvement was limited just to signing the consent sheet to comply with the school rules. Almost all of the schools gave a kind of integrity pact that students must able and willing to comply with all regulations and policies that apply in the school. Even worse, the party who signed the pact were students' parents, not the students themselves. Furthermore, knowledge of school rules is more widely known after the student accepted by the school. Very few, only 27% of schools openly provide a copy of the rules to prospective students who register, meaning 73% of schools provide information about the rules when new students re-register. Not a single school provides clauses for rejecting signatures and/or providing opportunities to add or subtract the regulations.

More than half of students do not know the school rules, especially those concerning the prohibition of verbal or non-verbal violence, both among fellow students, as well as between teacher and/or education staff to students. Two things may cause this ignorance: *First*, from observations, only very few schools clearly put down written school rules that can be read by all academias. Schools usually place a regulation board near the teacher's office or the Principal's office. This is further complicated by the large number of rules resulting in smaller font sizes,

which impact the increasing unreadability of regulations. *Secondly*, this ignorance is more due to the fact that schools rarely socialize, especially about violence, to students.

It was confirmed by the majority of respondents' answers, around 74%, stated that they had never been socialized the school regulations governing the prohibition of acts of violence in schools. The policy prohibits acts of violence, verbal and non-verbal, becomes a crucial point in itself. From direct observation in 75 schools, only 44 schools clearly stated that all forms of violence were prohibited in schools, either posted on the bulletin board or in the form of a rule book distributed to students. Even schools that explicitly state that violence is prohibited have no details the forms of violence, nor do acts of violence only focus on physical violence. In contrast, non-physical violence and even sexual violence are not regulated, not to say no called at all.

Another problem is that the prohibition on violence in some schools is more focused on the prohibition against non-violence among students. Act of violence like hazing of new students, the prohibition of forming exclusive groups, the prohibition on harassing students with special needs, to the prohibition of brawls - both inside and outside of school. Only four schools explicitly stated that the prohibition on committing acts of violence was also intended for teachers and education personnel. On the other hand, the problem of ignorance is not only institutional but also individual students. Only 14% of respondents said they were concerned about anti-violence policies in schools, compared to 86% who chose not to care about regulations and anti-violence policies in schools. It is interesting to explore further why students tend to be ignorant of anti-violence policies in schools that incidentally benefit them.

When it comes to discipline, we divide discipline into two categories: inside and outside the classroom. The data shows, that the enforcement of discipline, both inside and outside is equally worrying. Of 3,727 respondents, 891 (24%) stated that the disciplinary model occurred in the classroom did not use violence and/or was degrading, while the rest stated otherwise. We asked whether students who claimed never experienced the following violence: (a) the teacher always brought up mistakes, (b) was punished standing outside the classroom or next to the blackboard, (c) was hit with a broom handle, eraser, or ruler, (d) is shouted at or teased by a friend while being punished and the teacher does not forbid, and (e) is yelled at by the teacher with dirty words in public

The data shows that disciplinary actions carried out by teachers still use many models of violence, both verbal and physical violence. Such as standing in front of class, beating with a broom handle, to running in the school field, and verbal violence such as always bringing up mistakes so that educators did not forbid when classmates abused children who were punished both with mockery to harsh words.

There is a connection between the causes of punishment with the type of punishment given. The most common causes are students not listening to learning material, noisy in class, sleepy, chatting with friends, not doing assignments, skipping during class hours, to cheating during exams. In interviews with teachers and school Principals, for students who do not listen or noisy, the punishment is usually only to be warned or read the material in front of class, while students who do not do assignments until they skip class will usually be reported to the homeclass teacher and counseling teacher. There are stories of how students were punished by teachers by being told to stand outside the classroom or next to the blackboard during class hours because they were noisy and sleepy, or hit using a broom handle or ran around the field for not doing their work.

Models of disciplining with violence are also found outside the classroom. In contrast to discipline in the classroom that occurs due to student behavior that is considered to violate the classroom rules, discipline outside the classroom occurs mainly because violations by students

committed outside the classroom. Such as being late to school, being found out smoking in school, or caught red-handed carrying pornography and/or sharp weapons. Some of violations occur outside the school environment, such as engaging in fights, brawls, to reporting smoking or other immoral acts.

The model of punishment carried out by schools is a violation of the CFS regulation, due to policy explicitly stated that schools are required to have an anti-violence policy against students. Schools must have rules that prohibit all forms of violence, discrimination and harassment among students, between teachers, education staff and education unit employees. The discipline enforcement model that still focuses on the application of physical sanctions is a violation of the rules of CFS which explains that enforcement of disciplines with non-violence through three criteria: (a) the application of positive discipline, (b) monitoring, supervision and recovery implementing positive discipline, and (c) replacing penalties by providing additional academic assignments or skills. There are fundamental differences in perceptions between students and schools related to whether physical punishment is part of positive discipline. Most schools see the form of physical punishment as a part of the application of positive discipline, and indeed stated in the regulations, the provision of physical sanctions is inevitable for students who repeatedly break the rules.

Another interesting fact, although the MoWECP Regulation stipulates that teachers can convert the penalties with additional academic tasks or skills, but this is not done much. Most students stated that the substitution of penalties with academic assignments and/or additional skills as intended in the MoWECP regulation was never implemented. As we confirmed this to the school, several schools recognized that the authority to replace the sentence became additional task is in the hands of teacher or counseling teacher. We interviewed several subject teachers who stated that they rarely turn sentences into additional academic assignments mainly for two reasons: *First*, the academic assignments alone take up more than 40% of the teaching load in class, so that the new assignments are not possible. *Second*, with the teaching burden, many of them felt that they could no longer add the burden by overseeing the implementation of additional tasks as intended in the policy. In the end, when a student violates, the form of discipline is given right away. If it has to be delegated to counseling teacher, generally the additional task is memorizing the Koran or the obligation to attend religious activities in school.

## 5 Conclusion

*First*, there are still many schools that still focus on disciplining their students. Instead of providing positive discipline, many schools choose shortcuts by giving physical punishment to their students. This physical punishment applies to male and female students, although verbal punishment is more often given to female students. Consequently, because schools use more physical punishment, violence in schools never really goes away. Violence is carried out by the school against students and by students to other students. Thus, schools legalize acts of violence in the name of discipline.

*Second*, other crucial issues are in the Permen itself, especially with the mixing of terms of violence and sexual violence, the ambiguity of terms and limits of sexual violence and sexual violence, and the absence of terms of sexual harassment. With conceptual irregularities and norms, all sexual harassment falls into the category of harassment, which would be difficult to prove due to the absence of a clear complaint and prosecution mechanism for schools.

*Third*, the MoWECF regulation is very technocratic and bureaucratic. Verification and validation of various CFS indicators is more on documents than substantial behavior in schools. Schools provide more supporting documents, such as socialization, the availability of anti-violence policies, to the availability of facilities that emphasize physical evidence rather than performance and field implementation. This encourages CFS to be no more than a physical instrument, as is an accreditation instrument that focuses on documents rather than implementation itself. All of the above are joint issues, how can we push the Child Friendly School policy to become a truly child-friendly school.

## 6 Acknowledgment

We would like to thank to the Ministry of Research and Technology/National Research and Innovation Agency, LLDIKTI 3, the UMJ's Rector, the UMJ's Research Center and Community Services, and the Dean of Faculty of Social and Political Sciences for all the assistance and facilities during research.

## References

- [1] Regulation of the Ministry of Women's Empowerment And Child Protection (MoWECF) Number 8/2014 concerning Child-Friendly School
- [2] Presidential Decree 36/1990 on the Convention on the Rights of the Child,
- [3] Law 35/2014 concerning Amendment to Law 23/2002 on Child Protection,
- [4] Presidential Instruction 1/2017 concerning the Healthy Lifestyle Movement,
- [5] Minister of Women Empowerment and Child Protection Regulation Number 8/2014 on Child-Friendly School Guidelines
- [6] Minister of Education and Culture Number 82/2015 Regulation on the Prevention and Management of Violence in the Educational Unit Environment
- [7] National Secretariat of Child-Friendly School: Child Friendly School Data Year 2020. Jakarta: National Secretariat of Child-Friendly School (2019)
- [8] Utami, R., Saputri, M., & Kartikasari, FN: Implementation of the application of Child Friendly Schools in the implementation of primary school education. The 5th URECOL Proceedings, Vol. 1, (2017)
- [9] Utari, RE.: Implementation of the Child Friendly School Program at SMPN 1 Tempuran, Magelang Regency. *Spectrum Analysis of Educational Policy*, 5(7), (2016)
- [10] Sudirjo, E.: Innovative Learning Model Based on the Concept of Child Friendly Schools. *Eduhumaniora: Journal of Basic Education*. 2(1) (2020)
- [11] Artianti, K., & Subowo, A: Implementation of a Child Friendly School (CFS) in a pilot school in SD Pekunden 01, Semarang City as an effort to support the City of Child-Friendly Cities program. *Journal of Public Policy and Management Review*, 6(3) (2017)
- [12] Noer, KU: Preventing Violence Against Children in Educational Institutions. *Sawwa: Journal of Gender Studies*, 14(1) (2019)