

Challenges of implementing child-friendly school model in Surakarta, Indonesia

Siany Indria Liestyasari, Ravik Karsidi, Asrowi, Abdul Rahman

Education Science, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:

Received Aug 6, 2022

Revised Mar 18, 2023

Accepted Apr 3, 2023

Keywords:

Challenge

Child friendly school

Children's rights to education

Surakarta

ABSTRACT

Indonesia adopted the UNICEF's child-friendly school (CFS) model as the attempt protection and fulfillment of children's rights in education. The top-down implementation of child-friendly schools and bureaucratic imperatives have made many schools not ready to implement the model so the child-friendly school program is still far from expectations and reality. Many interests in the implementation of child-friendly schools make students vulnerable to being the victims of education political policies. This article aims to explain school challenges in child-friendly school implementation. Qualitative method with case study approach used through observations, interviews, and focus group discussions at three senior high schools in Surakarta City, Indonesia. The results show that the challenges of implementing child-friendly schools lead to three things, namely mentoring and sustainability, technical implementation, and evaluation mechanism. The simultaneous CFS declarations have not been adapted to the readiness, willingness, and needs of each school. Fulfilling the challenges of implementation is able to make CFS not just a slogan but a school's need to provide protection and fulfillment of children's rights.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](#) license.



Corresponding Author:

Siany Indria Liestyasari

Education Science, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Sebelas Maret

Jl. Ir. Sutami No.36, Kentingan, Surakarta, Indonesia

Email: siany_indria2019@student.uns.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

Schooling is a prominent period involving the beginning, growth, and maturation of human life. Schooling needs special attention and an atmosphere of care, trust, and safety [1]. As a place where children spend most of their time, school is supposed to be one of the safest places for them under the supervision of trained teachers and equipped caregivers to promote and support student wellbeing [2]. Indonesia has a similar wellbeing school management model namely child-friendly school (CFS) policy [3]. However, CFS exist since 2014 but children are still victims of violence especially bullying in the school environment. KPAI data shows that the number of child victims of bullying in schools has fluctuated from 122 (in 2016), 129 (in 2017), 107 (in 2018), 46 (in 2019) and 76 (in 2020) [4]. Meanwhile, The Indonesian Child Protection Commission during 2016-2021 (KPAI) data tabulation for 2021 contained 5,953 cases of complaints and 1,138 children became victims of physical and/or psychological violence [5]. The latest data recording the distribution of the number of victims of child protection cases based on The Indonesian Child Protection Commission during 2016-2021 complaint data from January to June 2022 in Central Java with 116 case [6].

Despite several international and national policies and programs, dealing with child safety has grown to be a significant concern. Children need to be protected, and any action that threatens their wellbeing and safety must be prevented. In this case, schools have a significant role of students' needs for

security. This is the function of education mentioned by Driyarkara [7] not only as a process of hominization but also a process of humanization. If the process of human hominization is taught to behave based on instinctive needs as is done by animals in general, then education also prepares and develops students' potential to humanize, or humanize humans. SRA's effort to minimize bullying is a humanization process.

The existence of the child-friendly school concept initiated by UNICEF aims to ensure that every child gets the fulfillment of rights and protection in education. As stated in the Convention on the Rights of the Child, every child as an individual is guaranteed by the State to get proper protection and education as his/her rights. Many cases hamper children's rights to grow and develop, so the state should protect for them to grow properly and develop as the nation's next generation. UNICEF's CFS model has been implemented in 56 countries until 2007 with various interpretations based on their local wisdom. The CFS framework based on the philosophy of children's rights considers the role of schools to facilitate the full development of children [8]. CFS is also an affirmation movement to fulfill the rights and protection of children in the field of education. The study of Makwarella found an effective policy aims to caring relationships and preventing for the widespread and prevailing incidence of violence against among all learners, educators, parents and community members. This affected hospitality and encourage a learner's fundamental rights to build the human dignity consciousness, physical and psychological integrity through the prevention of all forms of violence, it is essential for promoting the full set of learner rights [9].

The implementation of CFS in Indonesia began in 2015 with the goals of eradicating bullying in schools and improving the students-centered learning process. Additionally, the child-friendly city (CFC) is inextricably linked to the existence of CFS which upholds 31 children's rights. CFS is one of the most important metrics for determining how kid-friendly a city is. As a result, the CFS model is another one of the governments of Indonesia's initiatives to realize children's rights. CFS is described as a program to provide a healthy, safe, loving, and culturally appropriate environment that can ensure that children's rights are upheld and that they are protected from violence, discrimination, and other forms of abuse. Children are encouraged to participate in this program, particularly in planning, policy, education, and monitoring [10].

Numerous studies on the implementation of CFS show varying results. The application of CFS is associated with efforts to minimize bullying behavior in schools. Thomas, Jose, and Kumar [1] relate these efforts to using the CFS model to integrate the child protection model through positive schooling by familiarizing students with equal and fun situations in their learning environment. CFS can be realized if all school components participate in implementing safe schools [11]. This move seeks to create a learning environment based on respect for the rights and dignity of all members of the school community which is a major step forward towards a future nonviolent society for all of us. Makwarella, Adu, and Mammen [12] promoted the CFS model to create security, comfort, and child-friendliness for students through the vital role of teachers in conducting the principles of safety, caring, and child-friendliness at school.

In Indonesia, several studies accommodate how CFS is applied to protect children. Wadhah and Mujiwati [13] explained the correlation between the implementation of CFS and overcoming violence in the school environment through the principles of provision, protection, and participation. KUSDARYANI, Purnamasari, and Damayani [14] proposed strengthening school culture in the form of school cultural capital (rules, school vision and mission, teacher discipline culture, and student shame culture) to realize child-friendly education through various positive activities in schools. In the facilities building aspect, The Indonesian Child Protection Commission (KPAI) mentions five aspects that be a solution of CFS problems. There are safety, health, convenience, comfort, and security aspects. It requires coordinate and evaluate the implementation of the child friendly school policy [15]. Prior studies pointed out that creating good learning environment affects student learning [10], [16], [17]. Furthermore, the learning environment makes students more motivated, which, in turn, increases their learning outcomes [18], [19]. In the case of CFS, several researchers [20], [21] suggested that the students required to taught and recognized that mistakes can become material learning and assisted students to formulate and live amid either the classroom or the rules of community system that promote responsibility, respect, and self-discipline.

Subur, Nugroho, and Qasim [22] explained the importance of implementing Islamic culture in schools as a factor that supports and realizes CFS. Rangkuti and Maksum [23] also stated that the successful implementation of CFS is reinforced by cooperation and commitment among school members, the community and the role of parents. Yosada and Kurniati [24] highlight the obligation to fulfill children's rights by the community and the state as components that play an active role in supporting CFS.

CFS has six indicators that are used to conduct assessments and evaluate their implementation in schools, namely school policies, educators, and education personnel who are trained in child rights, facilities and infrastructure, child-friendly learning, child participation, participation of parents, alumni, and the community [10]. The extensive scope of the CFS indicators implies the readiness of schools including teachers and other components in implementing the program. The implementation of CFS in Indonesia is related to another policy, namely the Child-Friendly City program. The city of Surakarta has been one of the cities used as a piloting project for CFC since 2006 so the existence of CFS is one of the movements to

accelerate the protection of children in schools. Based on the regulation of the Mayor of Surakarta Number 28D of 2014 concerning Child-Friendly Schools, all educational units at all levels must implement the CFS program. This has implications for how the implementation of the SRA program runs in each school with different conditions of readiness. This article explains how the challenges and obstacles faced by schools in implementing the CFS program are seen from the six CFS indicators. This article examines the problem around applying CFS program and recommend the effective formula to embody children friendly neighborhood and many possibilities assessment tool to ensure CFS program.

2. STUDY ON CHILD-FRIENDLY SCHOOLS

Quality education for all children is the most difficult challenge and a critical issue in education. Every child has the right to obtain a proper education without exception, and this is the spirit of the implementation of the concept of education for all (EFA). Buchert explains that the origins of this concept are attributed to the World Conference in Jomtien Thailand in 1990 which resulted in the Declaration on Education for All and the Framework for Action to Meet Basic Learning Needs. The result of the Jomtien agreement, which was deemed insufficient to accommodate children's needs, was strengthened by the Salamanca Statement in 1994 which specifically included the element of disability in fulfilling access to education for children. Along with this, the emergence of the Convention on the Rights of the Child which was ratified in 1989 by the United Nations made the world community think about the issue of children's rights and protection in various fields, including education. In these various international policy contexts, the CFS concept or model from UNICEF was initiated [25].

The CFS concept emerged in the 1990s in Asia was a response to the framework for a rights-based child friendly concept developed by UNICEF. The framework encourages all social systems and agencies which affect children to operate within the principles of the convention on the rights of the child of which Indonesia is a signatory. The model is simple and encourages the following: i) Schools that operate in the best interest of the child, respecting the child's unique background and circumstances; ii) Safe, healthy, and protective educational environments; iii) Schools that are empowered with trained teachers, adequate resources, and appropriate physical, emotional, and social conditions for learning; and iv) Schools that affirm children's rights and make their voice heard. [26].

Meanwhile, Cobanoglu and Sevim [27] defined CFS as a democratic environment based on children's rights, where all students are accepted without discrimination. The teaching and learning process is organized according to the children's interests, health, safety, and protective measures taken for children and is free from gender discrimination. Furthermore, CFS unites the basic rights of children in the following ways: i) CFS is child-centered; ii) CFS is inclusive; iii) CFS is gender-equitable and respects all cultural and linguistic backgrounds; iv) CFS is effective where children get learning and education; v) CFS is a safe, protective, and healthy environment; vi) CFS is characterized by participatory democracy.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

This qualitative research used case study approach to explain the research questions. Several types of data typically are gathered for case studies and obtained information on the case school, the school profile and the creation process of the profile from meetings [28]. Three government schools were taken as samples of the implementation of CFS in the city of Surakarta with consideration of the specificity and uniqueness of each school that represented the needs and challenges of implementing CFS. The name of the school is deliberately disguised as part of research ethics and has obtained permission from the school. Surakarta have eight public school; three of eight school is a representation of three district in Surakarta. Process of involving three of school based on recommendation of local government that ensured by date of CFS declaration.

The data rely more on verbal and observational data as the main data. The data were collected in several ways, namely Focused group discussion (FGD), unstructured in-depth interviews, and observation. The study involved 6 teachers who are members of the CFS team from 3 schools, 3 principals, 2 people from the Surakarta City Women's Empowerment and Child Protection Agency, 2 academics, 6 students from 3 schools. The selection of informants was based on purposive sampling who were clearly involved in the school and CFS implementation.

The data accumulated through FGD which was explored with an unstructured interview process to a number of informants to collect data about the challenges and implementation of CFS. Both of these are also complemented by school observations to see the implementation of CFS in schools. These three techniques play an important role and interactively complement each other. All of these were done interactively with each other. Data analysis was conducted using the Miles, Huberman, and Saldhana [29] interactive analysis technique which was complemented by an analysis of the perspective of children's rights and social sciences.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Implementation of child-friendly school

Based on the regulation of the Mayor of Surakarta Number 28D of 2014 concerning Child-Friendly Schools, all educational units at all levels have been registered as CFS. This indicates that all schools apply the CFS model as a form of protection for children, regardless of the previous school conditions. The implementation of the CFS program simultaneously is due to bureaucratic instructions to be followed by all schools at all levels under various conditions and situations. The formation of CFS must go through a certain mechanism that prepares the school for the formation and development of the CFS called the "T3MU MESRA", namely "TIGA MU" (MAU means willing, MAMPU means able, and MAJU means move forward) towards a child-friendly education unit. The CFS formation is at the MAU stage and the CFS development is at the stage of MAMPU and MAJU [29]. T3MU MESRA requires every school to prepare themselves to adopt and apply the CFS concept to fulfill children's rights through various stages, namely formation and development. These two stages are closely related.

Results of the FGD and interviews with the school's CFS team explained that there were two who were not ready to run the program. However, activities that have long been carried out for children in schools are closely related to CFS principles and for child protection. FGD's result with schools showed that not all schools understood the concept and technical implementation of CFS. However, from the government's bureaucratic political perspective, the CFS declaration was simultaneously carried out to accelerate efforts to protect and fulfill children's rights in the field of education. One of the reasons for the declaration is because the City of Surakarta accelerates child protection in a wider context, namely through the Child Friendly City program. Thus, between CFS and CFC are two government policies related to the protection and fulfillment of children's rights. However, the implications of the CFS declaration in schools can be seen from how schools follow up on the declaration. Table 1 shows the profile of schools and the implementation of CFS in three schools based on the results of observations, interviews and FGDs.

Table 1 Findings of CFS implementations

Bhayangkara school	Dirgantara school	Taruna school
– Favorite schools and Motivator schools (<i>Sekolah Penggerak</i>)	– Not a favorite school and not a Motivator school	– Not a favorite school and not a Motivator school
– Pilot schools for various Government programs	– Adiwiyata School (School with green environment)	– Inclusive schools
– Socio-economic character of middle and high school students	– Socio-economic character of middle and high school students	– Socio-economic character of lower-middle students
– Facilities and infrastructure are very complete and supportive	– Complete and supportive facilities and infrastructure	– Facilities and infrastructure are not complete
– Have an active student groups (Agents of Change) as anti-bullying icons	– student participation in school is limited to co-curricular and student council activities	– Lack of student participation in school
– CFS team teachers are able to grasp the concept of CFS and actively innovate	– Schools simply follow the instructions of the Dinas in the CFS declaration	– Schools simply follow the instructions of the Dinas in the CFS declaration
– have an active CFS team, schools are actively innovating and adapting programs to implementing CFS	– There is no special CFS team	– There is no special CFS team
– Schools are classified as ready, willing, able and advanced	– Schools have not developed innovations, adaptations as a follow-up to the CFS declaration	– The school has not done anything after the CFS declaration
	– Schools are classified as ready but school components still do not understand the conceptual essence of CFS	– Schools are classified as not yet ready to implement CFS due to lack of understanding of CFS conceptualization
		– The declaration was stopped without any follow-up

Table 1 shows that the different conditions of the three schools have an impact on how schools implement CFS. The data summarized in the table is also strengthened by the following interview data which explains that the bureaucratic implementation of CFS must be balanced with the similarity of the CFS concept itself, both between actors (schools) and policy makers (government). Interviews between the stakeholders in charge of CFS and schools as CFS implementers show differences in understanding so that they have an impact on the implementation of this program in the future.

"The declaration must be made, the school follows it but after that there has been no follow-up so it seems like CFS is just a declaration." (Teacher)

"What is stated in the CFS is a good idea for children but it has not been adapted to the conditions of each different school, especially the character of the students." (Teacher)

"The CFS program is broad in scope. Since before there was CFS, schools have also carried out many activities for the protection of children." (Teacher)

“Schools must follow the instructions of the Education Office. Just follow it first, then the implementation will go on.” (School Principal)

“Schools should strive for innovation and program development after making a declaration.” (Stakeholder)

“There should be assistance after declaring the CFS. Do not let the declaration not be followed up so that the implementation of CFS becomes meaningless.” (Academics)

“I know my school is hospitable... It seems from CFS identity board in front of the school. But I don't really understand what that is, maybe a school that doesn't have violence, or a school that has positive vibes.” (Student)

The conflicting understanding between the implementer and the person in charge of CFS has implications for the implementation of CFS that occurs in each school. Not all schools are able to fulfill the six components of the CFS due to the limitations and conditions of each school. In addition, different conditions raise a different needs and problems. In practice, the implementation of CFS has not referred to the provisions of the TEMU M3SRA stages, but politically it has been accelerated through the simultaneous declaration mechanism. The following will briefly describe the data findings based on observations, interviews and FGDs related to the application of CFS indicators in schools which ultimately provides an overview of the challenges of implementing CFS.

The implementation of CFS in this policy commitment indicator still requires the socialization of school elements as an effort to institutionalize CFS and child-friendly principles. The table illustrates that students' knowledge about the implementation of CFS has not been maximized even though the implementation at the school level has met the requirements of the CFS indicator. CFS's written commitment puts forward the issue of protecting students at school from violent behavior and bullying, considering that school is a second home for children. The CFS developed by UNICEF serves as a model for promoting rights-based education by helping schools become places of student learning that meet all aspects of child development while providing quality education. This school commitment refers to efforts to minimize bullying behavior in schools by forming a special team, a vision and mission for violence prevention, and regulations to overcome bullying behavior. On the other hand, this commitment has not been followed by the development of student's abilities and understanding of CFS. Many students have not received socialization of children's rights, prevention, and protection of children from violence in schools and their ignorance of school policy commitments. Written commitment is important to form a child-friendly learning environment while fostering a positive environment that protects children at school [1].

The findings from the indicators are prerequisites for the realization of the CFS and are very influential in its implementation to accommodate every goal of CFS. They are committed to becoming CFS by creating written rules or policies that forbid violence against children committed in the school environment, CFS Policy indicators are mandatory. This policy serves as the formal justification for the school's commitment to CFS [30]. Educators and education staff who have a CFC and CFS perspective are still indicators that require further strengthening. The pandemic that makes schools conduct online learning breaks the chain of interaction between students and teachers. In addition, schools focus more on activities to prepare and organize online learning so that socialization about CFS and CFC is forgotten or stopped. This indicator is significant for realizing CFS considering that teachers are the spearhead of CFS implementation in schools, especially in classroom. Teachers who have a good child rights perspective at least have sensitivity to children's problems that arise in school, so that they can provide solutions to these problems.

Student participation is an indicator that has considerable weight in the evaluation of CFS. Table 1 explains that the various forms of student participation are still not much involved in preparation of rules and budgeting in schools but have been involved in many opportunities to define themselves in the context of school activities. Student involvement is also still focused on their participation in various programs at school. According to the Regulation of the Minister of Women's Empowerment and Child Protection of the Republic of Indonesia Number 3 of 2011 Article 1 Paragraph 2, child participation is the involvement of children in the decision-making process on everything related to themselves and is conducted on awareness, understanding, and mutual will so that children can enjoy the results or benefit from the decision.

Many things must be fulfilled as a form of achieving the CFS program including involving children to decide what school policies they need, such as preparing school rules or sanctions if they are violated. Facilities and infrastructure in schools must also be met. Educators also have a significant role because they must be friendly to children and be good facilitators. They must provide a sense of security to every student who undergoes learning. Thus, the child is no longer an object in education but a subject. Children have the freedom to be creative in learning in a loving educational environment.

Implementation is a stage of the public policy process as well as a crucial study. It is crucial because the best policy is, if it is not well prepared for its implementation, the policy target will not be realized.

Policy implementation will be effective if it runs according to the standards set [31]. Viewed from the context of public policy, according to Dye [32] the implementation of CFS is what is stated and done or not done by the government which can be stipulated in laws and regulations or in policy statements in the form of speeches and discourses expressed by political officials and government officials which are immediately followed up with government programs and actions. Policy analysis that can be conducted in the context of CFS refers more to the application of an incremental model policy where this policy is made based on slight changes from the existing policies. Thus, the old policies are used as the basis or guidelines for making new policies [33]. CFS implementation is incrementally related to and supports other policies, namely CFC.

4.2. Challenges of implementing child-friendly school

The ongoing implementation of CFS in Surakarta cannot be separated from the various challenges that arise in schools. The condition of each school makes readiness in implementing CFS very different from one another. Each school has different potentials and problems. The results indicate that there are three main themes of major challenges to be followed up in implementing a sustainable CFS program (Table 2).

Table 2 shows explains that the CFS formation includes five aspects, namely i) socialization; ii) requests to schools for MAU to become CFS both top-down and bottom-up; iii) determination of CFS decrees; iv) CFS declaration; and v) installation CFS nameplate [34]. This step prepares schools with sufficient provisions to apply CFS principles and conduct development in the next stage. CFS is a concept that includes several variables such as school buildings, regulatory environment, teaching and learning process, resources and materials, teachers, principals, health, security, democratic participation, and gender sensitivity. All these variables can influence the quality of education either directly or indirectly [34]. The school committee of is highly needed in monitoring the activity of the learning process toward the quality of school life and in bridging the communication between schools and students' parents, particularly in promoting the model of child-friendly school [21].

Table 2. Challenges of CFS implementation

No.	Challenges of CFS	School conditions
1.	Mentoring and sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The school does not know the next step after making the declaration – Students do not fully understand the CFS program – Teachers do not understand the specific outcomes of CFS – It is necessary to strengthen the understanding of children's rights in students and teachers to respond to and deal with bullying behavior
2.	Implementation technical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Socialization/impact on all elements of the school is hampered by the pandemic – Schools must have the CFS direction that specifically characterizes CFS compared to other programs – CFS should elaborate more on the character of the students to be formed (related to the minimization of bullying) – The pandemic has made schools focus on the learning process, instead of the CFS program – Not all teachers have the same perspective on children's rights – Pilot activities are needed to increase the capacity of students and teachers in developing a CFS environment
3.	Evaluation mechanism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The majority evaluation checklist is physical – Evaluation points have not referred to efforts to strengthen CFS actors in schools – The filling of the checklist is technical in nature – High school level is not significant about thorny plants around the school (although important) – The table technique with the right angle has implications for the procurement budget and is not easy – Evaluation is more on the mechanism to create a child-friendly environment

The implementation of CFS still requires assistance for continuous fulfillment of children's rights and protection, considering that the bureaucratic implementation of CFS has not considered the readiness and willingness of schools. The consequences of this bureaucratic instruction make schools do adaptations and innovations from existing school programs into CFS programs. This also results in different understandings of CFS among school components, both teachers, principals, students, and parents. Mentoring is needed to help schools find the specific problems of children that occur in their schools by considering the conditions of each school and the potential to solve them. Methods of engagement students to participate in planning and design of child-friendly neighborhood is intervention can adopt sustained integration of children into municipal planning processes public spaces [35], [36].

The evaluation mechanism is also a significant challenge in the implementation of CFS. Based on the evaluation mechanism implemented by the Ministry, the evaluation is comprehensive, technical, and applies to all levels. This article showed that every level and even every school has different problems, needs, and achievements so the evaluation mechanism should also be adapted to these conditions. The problems of elementary school students are different from those of high school students, which require different

evaluation mechanisms. Implementing CFS in high school level have problems and needs, it requires involving many actors in school to solve with SWOT schema and arrange many activities to habituate CFS in school. The mentoring and evaluation of CFS program could be adopting Adiwiyata school policy, so that this article emphasize CFS require promoting by government not only in declaration policy but also the consciousness of education for all toward SDG's agenda.

5. CONCLUSION

The implementation of CFS still encounters many problems, both technical and non-technical. From the application of the six CFS indicators, schools can meet technical indicators (fulfillment of facilities, infrastructure, and student learning needs), but there are still many shortcomings in the context of understanding, institutionalization, and socialization related to CFS in all school components. This is because the formation of CFS is based on bureaucratic instructions and has not gone through the T3MU MESRA scheme compiled by the Ministry of Education and Culture. Therefore, schools have various challenges in implementing CFS, namely the challenges of mentoring and sustainability, implementation, and evaluation mechanism. It is recommended that schools integrate children's rights as a mainstreaming pattern that complements all policy-making in schools so that CFS is not just a motto but the main goal in the implementation of protection and realization of children's rights in schools.




REFERENCES

- [1] S. Thomas, K. Alphonsa Jose, and P. Aneesh Kumar, "Child friendly schools: Challenges and issues in creating a positive and protective school environment," in *Positive Schooling and Child Development: International Perspectives*, Springer, Singapore, 2018, pp. 233–248. doi: 10.1007/978-981-13-0077-6_12.
- [2] M. A. Powell, A. Graham, R. Fitzgerald, N. Thomas, and N. E. White, "Wellbeing in schools: what do students tell us?" *Australian Educational Researcher*, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 515–531, 2018, doi: 10.1007/s13384-018-0273-z.
- [3] M. Marno and N. Fitriah, "Total transformative learning model in child-friendly school," *AL-TANZIM: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 856–867, 2022, doi: 10.33650/al-tanzim.v6i3.3472.
- [4] The Indonesian Child Protection Commission, "The Indonesian Child Protection Commission Report during 2016-2021," 2018.
- [5] The Indonesian Child Protection Commission, "The Indonesian Child Protection Commission Report in 2021," 2021.
- [6] The Indonesian Child Protection Commission, "The Indonesian Child Protection Commission Report in 2022," 2022.
- [7] N. Driyarkara, *Philosophy essays of thinkers who are fully involved in the struggle of their nation*. Jakarta: Gramedia, 2006.
- [8] E. B. Godfrey *et al.*, "Cross-national measurement of school learning environments: Creating indicators for evaluating UNICEF's Child Friendly Schools Initiative," *Children and Youth Services Review*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 546–557, 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.childyouth.2011.10.015.
- [9] M. C. Makwabela, K. J. Mammen, and E. O. Adu, "An Assessment of the Implementation of DoE and UNICEF Guidelines for Creating Safe, Caring and Child-friendly Schools: A South African Case Study," *Journal of Social Sciences*, vol. 50, no. 1–3, pp. 1–7, Sep. 2017, doi: 10.1080/09718923.2017.1311720.
- [10] Deputy for Child Development, *The Guidance of Child Friendly School*. Jakarta: Ministry Of Women Empowerment and Child Protection, 2015.
- [11] S. J. Miske, "Child-Friendly Schools - Safe Schools," *International Symposium on Children at Risk and in Need of Protection in Turkey*, 2010.
- [12] M. C. Makwabela, E. O. Adu, and K. J. Mammen, "The Intervention of Safe, Caring and Child-friendly School Policies on Social Construction of Violence in South African Secondary Schools," *Journal of Social Sciences*, vol. 50, no. 1–3, pp. 8–13, Sep. 2017, doi: 10.1080/09718923.2017.1311731.
- [13] M. Wahdah and Y. Mujiwati, "The countermeasures violence in the school environment through the implementation of child friendly school programs," (in Indonesian), *Jurnal Pendidikan Edutama*, vol. 7, no. 1, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.30734/jpe.v7i1.598.
- [14] W. Kusdaryani, I. Purnamasari, and A. Tika Damayani, "Promoting school culture to child friendly school," (in Indonesian), *Jurnal Cakrawala Pendidikan*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 125–133, 2016, doi: 10.21831/cp.v1i1.8383.
- [15] D. M. Pada, B. Sakina, and J. F. B. Saragih, "Implementation of child-friendly school concept in elementary school as early education environment," in *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 2021, vol. 794, no. 1, pp. 1–10. doi: 10.1088/1755-1315/794/1/012209.
- [16] B. J. Fraser, "Classroom Environment. Barry J. Fraser. London: Croom Helm, 1986, pp. 226," *South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 57–70, Nov. 1988, doi: 10.1080/0311213880160206.
- [17] B. J. Fraser, "Classroom Learning Environments," in *Handbook of Research on Science Education*, Routledge, 2015, pp. 463–464. doi: 10.4324/9780203097267.ch6.
- [18] L. Vermeulen and H. G. Schmidt, "Learning environment, learning process, academic outcomes and career success of university graduates," *Studies in Higher Education*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 431–451, 2008, doi: 10.1080/03075070802211810.
- [19] S. Fitriani, Istaryatiningtias, and L. Qodariah, "A child-friendly school: How the school implements the model," *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 273–284, 2021, doi: 10.11591/ijere.v10i1.20765.
- [20] R. L. Curwin, *Making good choices: Developing responsibility, respect, and self-discipline in grades*. Corwin Press, 2003.
- [21] S. Fitriani and Istaryatiningtias, "Promoting child-friendly school model through school committee as parents' participation," *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 1025–1034, 2020, doi: 10.11591/ijere.v9i4.20615.
- [22] S. Subur, I. Nugroho, and M. Nanang Qasim, "CFS concept to built Islamic culture in elementary school," (in Indonesian), *Jurnal Tarbiyatuna*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 128–136, 2019, doi: 10.31603/tarbiyatuna.v10i2.3120.
- [23] S. R. Rangkuti and I. R. Maksum, "Analysis of children's friendly school policy implementation in SMP Negeri 6 Depok," *JPSI (Journal of Public Sector Innovations)*, vol. 4, no. 1, p. 8, 2019, doi: 10.26740/jpsi.v4n1.p8-19.




- [24] K. R. Yosada and A. Kurniati, "Creating child friendly school," (in Indonesian), *JURNAL PENDIDIKAN DASAR PERKHASA: Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Dasar*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 145–154, 2019, doi: 10.31932/jpdp.v5i2.480.
- [25] L. Buchert, "The concept of Education for All: What has happened after Jomtien?" *International Review of Education*, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 537–549, 1995, doi: 10.1007/BF01263146.
- [26] M. A. Senaman, "The Concept of Child Friendly Schools," *Academia Edu*, 2019, [Online]. Available: https://www.academia.edu/3768699/THE_CONCEPT_OF_CHILD_FRIENDLY_SCHOOL
- [27] F. Cobanoglu and S. Sevim, "Child-Friendly Schools: An Assessment of Kindergartens," *International Journal of Educational Methodology*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 637–650, Nov. 2019, doi: 10.12973/ijem.5.4.637.
- [28] L. Cohen, L. Manion, and K. Morrison, *Research Methods in Education*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2011.
- [29] M. B. Miles, A. M. Huberman, and J. Saldana, *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Method Sourcebook*, 3rd ed. Arizona: Arizona State University, 2014.
- [30] R. N. Erdianti and S. Al-Fatih, "Children Friendly School as the Legal Protection for Children in Indonesia," *Varia Justicia*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 137–155, 2020.
- [31] R. Nugroho, *Public Policy*. Jakarta: Elex Media Komputindo (in Indonesian), 2014.
- [32] T. R. Dye, *Understanding Public Policy*. USA: Pearson, 2016.
- [33] A. Y. Abdoellah and Y. Rusfiana, *The theory and analysis of public policy*. Bandung: Alfabetha (in Indonesian), 2016.
- [34] F. Cobanoglu, Z. Ayvaz-Tuncel, and A. Ordu, "Child-friendly schools: An assessment of secondary schools," *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 466–477, 2018, doi: 10.13189/ujer.2018.060313.
- [35] V. Derr and E. Tarantini, "'Because we are all people': outcomes and reflections from young people's participation in the planning and design of child-friendly public spaces," *Local Environment*, vol. 21, no. 12, pp. 1534–1556, 2016, doi: 10.1080/13549839.2016.1145643.
- [36] D. Cross and A. Barnes, "Using Systems Theory to Understand and Respond to Family Influences on Children's Bullying Behavior: Friendly Schools Friendly Families Program," *Theory Into Practice*, vol. 53, no. 4, pp. 293–299, Oct. 2014, doi: 10.1080/00405841.2014.947223.

BIOGRAPHIES OF AUTHORS






Siany Indria Liestyasari    is a doctoral student in Education Science Department at the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Indonesia. She focuses on gender, children, and education study. She teaches Anthropology and Sociology Department in Universitas Sebelas Maret, Indonesia. She can be contacted at email: siany_indria2019@student.uns.ac.id.






Ravik Karsidi    is a professor in the Education Science Department at the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education. He has been researching the Sociology of Education, arts and humanities, social sciences and education. He can be contacted at email: ravikkarsidi@gmail.com.



Asrowi    is a professor in the Education Science Department at the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education. His research interest includes inclusive education topic, special educational needs issues and psychological practice. He can be contacted at email: asrowi@gmail.com.



Abdul Rahman    is a lecturer in the Education Science Department at the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education. His interest includes Philosophy, social-humanities problems, and education issues. He can be contacted at email: abdulrahman@staff.uns.ac.id.