Social Justice Across Indonesian Schooling

By
Sugiono Sugiono, SS, M.Ed.

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Deakin University

May, 2016
I am the author of the thesis entitled:

Social Justice Across Indonesian Schooling

submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

This thesis may be made available for consultation, loan and limited copying in accordance with the Copyright Act 1968.

'I certify that I am the student named below and that the information provided in the form is correct'.

Full Name: Sugiono Sugiono

Signed: [Signature Redacted by Library]

Date: 13 October 2016
DEAKIN UNIVERSITY

CANDIDATE DECLARATION

I certify the following about the thesis entitled:

Social Justice Across Indonesian Schooling

submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

a. I am the creator of all or part of the whole work(s) (including content and layout) and that where reference is made to the work of others, due acknowledgment is given.

b. The work(s) are not in any way a violation or infringement of any copyright, trademark, patent, or other rights whatsoever of any person.

c. That if the work(s) have been commissioned, sponsored or supported by any organisation, I have fulfilled all of the obligations required by such contract or agreement.

I also certify that any material in the thesis which has been accepted for a degree or diploma by any university or institution is identified in the text.

'I certify that I am the student named below and that the information provided in the form is correct'.

Full Name: Sugiono Sugiono

Signed: [Signature Redacted by Library]

Date: 13 October 2016
Acknowledgments

I wish to express my gratitude to a number of people for their patience, guidance, and assistance, making it possible for me to conduct this research and to present it in its current form. My first and foremost gratitude goes to all of my supervisors who have been with me at various points through this journey. First to Dr Andrew Skourdoumbis and Dr Emma Charlton. Your guidance has been invaluable. To Professor Trevor Gale and Dr Stephen Parker, thank you in getting me started. All of you have been in one way or another a constant source of knowledge, strong encouragement and sustained critical support for the duration of this research project.

I am especially grateful to my principal supervisor, Dr Andrew Skourdoumbis, and my associate supervisor, Dr Emma Charlton, who helped shape the direction of this thesis at critical stages and supported me in completing the thesis.

I am also extremely grateful to Professor Trevor Gale, my first principal supervisor, and Dr Stephen Parker, my previous associate supervisor, for their concerted efforts to help me review draft chapters and provide useful direction and insights in reviewing draft chapters, from which I drew great and valuable contributions. Further, I thank Floriana Badalotti for proofreading and editing some chapters of my thesis. This was done by the support of Deakin University, to which my gratitude is also extended.

In spite of remaining anonymous, I am thankful to the school teachers who participated in this research. My work with them was informative, rewarding and enjoyable, and without their contribution, this research would not have been possible. I also thank staff and colleagues at the Faculty of Arts and Education, Deakin University, Indonesian Community in Geelong, colleagues in Indonesia and local authorities for their support during my study.
My heartfelt gratitude goes to my parents, brothers, sisters and others, who, in different but equal ways, have contributed to my study immeasurably, for their sincere love and prayers.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge a special debt of gratitude to my family: to my wife, Nurul Hidayati (Ida), and to my children, Tasnim Anifah (Ifa), Tasnim Atsaniah (Nia), Masykuri Abdurrahman (Masdur) and Masykuri Abdurrohim (Oim) for their great support as a husband and a father whose mind was not always free to give the attention they needed. It is with pleasure that to them all I dedicate this thesis.
# Table of Contents

Acknowledgments ........................................................................................................ iii

Table of Contents ........................................................................................................ v

Abstract ......................................................................................................................... ix

Chapter 1......................................................................................................................... 1

Exploring Socially Just Teaching in Indonesia ............................................................. 1

1.1 Introduction ............................................................................................................ 1

1.2 Research Question ............................................................................................... 2

1.3 Statement of the Problem ..................................................................................... 2

1.4 A Personal Reference .......................................................................................... 5

1.5 Significance of the Study ..................................................................................... 8

1.6 A Brief Outline of the Study ............................................................................... 12

1.7 Chapter Outline ................................................................................................... 13

Chapter 2......................................................................................................................... 17

Schooling in Indonesia ................................................................................................. 17

2.1 Introduction ............................................................................................................ 17

2.2 Pursuit of Social Justice in Indonesia .................................................................. 18

2.3 Indonesia’s Schooling System ............................................................................. 27

  Figure 1: Map of Indonesia .................................................................................. 28

2.4 Teaching in Indonesia’s Remote Rural Probolinggo Regency ............................ 37

  Figure 2: Map of Probolinggo Regency .................................................................. 39

  Table 1: Indonesia’s Teacher Employment Status ................................................. 40

2.5 Conclusion ............................................................................................................. 42

Chapter 3......................................................................................................................... 44

Social Justice in Education and Schooling ................................................................. 44

3.1 Introduction ............................................................................................................ 44
3.2 Justice as Fairness (John Rawls) ........................................................... 45
3.3 Relational Conception of Justice (Iris Marion Young) ....................... 53
3.4 Justice as Redistribution, Recognition and Representation (Nancy Fraser) ................................................................................................. 57
3.5 Justice as Distributive, Retributive and Recognitive (Trevor Gale and Kathleen Densmore) .......................................................... 62
3.6 Conclusion ........................................................................................... 65
Chapter 4 ............................................................................................................ 70
The Capabilities Approach ................................................................................ 70
4.1 Introduction .......................................................................................... 70
4.2 The Capabilities Approach and Human Wellbeing ............................. 71
4.3 A Justification for the Capabilities Approach to Social Justice .......... 77
4.4 The Capabilities Approach and Its Relevance for Education and Schooling ............................................................................................. 83
Table 2: Sample Capabilities ................................................................ 88
4.5 Conclusion ........................................................................................... 93
Chapter 5 ............................................................................................................ 95
A Qualitative Case Study of Teacher Capabilities ......................................... 95
5.1 Introduction .......................................................................................... 95
5.2 A Qualitative Research Approach – Critical Inquiry ......................... 95
5.3 Research Design: A Case Study Approach ....................................... 104
5.4 Techniques for Data Generation ......................................................... 106
5.5 Data Analysis: Qualitative Content Analysis .................................... 109
Table 3: Main Categories and Subcategories Constructed ..................... 112
5.6 Ethical Issues ...................................................................................... 113
5.7 Conclusion ........................................................................................... 115
Chapter 6 .......................................................................................................... 118
Social Inclusivity in Teaching ....................................................................... 118
Abstract

The thesis examines the capabilities of Indonesian teachers to engage in socially just curriculum and teaching practices. The term capabilities refers to substantive freedom or opportunities that a person holds to do and to be a certain thing that he or she considers valuable. The key issue under investigation is what capabilities teachers in Indonesia’s Probolinggo regency need in order to teach in socially just ways. The study suggests that socially just curriculum and teaching practices can entail changes in society, and thus the integration of social justice issues into teaching is crucial. Socially just teaching goes beyond academic achievements, skills and competencies; it deals with the principles of social justice that encourage inclusivity and connectedness. Socially just teachers have potential abilities to: (1) embrace student diversity, (2) enable student agency and voice, (3) establish deliberative democracy in the classroom, (4) connect curriculum with student life experiences and (5) teach for a good life. To explore the phenomenon of teachers’ engagement with socially just teaching, a qualitative case study within the philosophical stance of critical inquiry was employed. The stance of critical inquiry deals with issues of power and justice, and attempts to confront any form of injustice(s) that might occur in social institutions like schools or in a particular society.

Data for the study were generated through semi-structured interviews with eight remote rural primary school teachers in Indonesia’s Probolinggo regency. Teachers were asked to comment on issues of social justice within education and schooling based on their knowledge and understandings of these issues. Further data were obtained from classroom observations and analysis of curricular documents, which include the national curriculum framework of Indonesia, teachers’ syllabi and lesson plans. To analyse the data, a qualitative content analysis that involves a manual coding and categorising strategy was used. This was to explore large amounts of textual data by identifying patterns of words, structures and discourses of communication centred on the perceptions and experiences of teacher participants to engage in socially just teaching practices.
The study found that local teachers have attempted to be socially just to their students. This is generally reflected in their curricular documents. However, some lesson plans and comments of teacher participants suggest teaching practice that focuses more on students’ academic skills and competencies, and that potentially constrains the development of students’ capabilities. In other words, implementation of social justice teaching in the regency of Probolinggo is still problematic, particularly in view of observed classroom teaching, which was centred on traditional didactic and teacher-directed modes of delivery. This indicates that local teachers are not effectively engaged in socially just teaching in spite of their concerted efforts to do so.

In addition, the thesis has identified some social justice approaches, which help provide a basis for a conception of what constitutes good (socially just) teaching. The study concludes by highlighting the importance of educating for social change as well as presenting a list of capabilities required by remote rural teachers in Indonesia’s Probolinggo regency to enhance their engagement with socially just teaching practices.
Chapter 1
Exploring Socially Just Teaching in Indonesia

1.1 Introduction

This thesis explores the capabilities of remote rural teachers in Indonesia’s Probolinggo regency to engage in socially just curriculum and teaching practices. The term capabilities in this thesis draws on the capabilities approach developed by Amartya Sen (1980) to provide a basis for a conception of what constitutes socially just teaching, and for investigating the development of teacher capabilities in order to develop student capabilities (see Chapter 4). Capabilities is a person’s substantive freedom or actual opportunities to do and to be a thing that they have reason to value (Sen 1980). The thesis argues that socially just curriculum and teaching practices potentially lead to the expansion of students’ capabilities and their engagement in learning as well as entail affirmative changes in society.

Teaching in socially just ways within a capability perspective is not just related to the enhancement of students’ academic achievement or mastery of curricular content, satisfaction with test results, the attainment of employment or economic growth. Rather, it involves preparations for students to become agents of change and responsible members of society. The achievement of this ideal requires teachers who are capable of providing opportunities for students to engage in socio-cultural diversity and establishing strong connections between schools and students’ homes and communities. Teachers can contribute to changes in society if they have sufficient capabilities to be socially inclusive of all students. This means that teachers are able to bring as much of the family and community as they can into the classroom, encourage students to affirmatively respond to diverse cultures and confront students with possible options and alternatives as to what they want to do and to be.
CHAPTER ONE

The Chapter begins with the articulation of the research question and sub-research questions, followed by statement of the problem and a personal reference in relation to this study, which deals with a reflection on subjectivity that may influence the development of this study. The significance of the study is sketched, followed by a brief outline before finishing by describing the features of each Chapter.

1.2 Research Question

This study asks, ‘In Indonesia’s decentralised schooling system, what capabilities do teachers in Indonesia’s Probolinggo regency need in order to teach in socially just ways?’ The research question represents a key guide as to how the study will progress. On the basis of the research question, this thesis explores the process of teaching and learning in remote rural primary schools in the regency of Probolinggo, Indonesia. The study identifies the participating teachers’ perceptions of good and socially just teaching, as well as the intersecting factors that potentially lead to teachers’ professional learning and development of capabilities to teach in socially just ways.

From the umbrella (main) research question, the focus of the study is represented in the following sub-research questions:
1. How is social justice embedded in the curricular documents?
2. How do teachers in this study perceive and implement social justice in their classroom teaching practices?
3. What barriers do teachers in this study face to teach in socially just ways?

1.3 Statement of the Problem

All national activities in Indonesia, including education, must be based on Pancasila, the philosophical ideology of the state (Romano 2003; see also Chapter 2). Fearnley-Sander and Yulaelawati (2008, pp. 111-112) conducted research on citizenship discourse in the context of decentralisation in Indonesia, and note that the aim of Indonesian education is ‘to develop the capability, character, and civilisation of the nation by enhancing intellectual capacity’. Indonesian education
aims to develop the learners’ potential to be persons who uphold human values and have good morals, noble character, knowledge, competence, creativity, independence and, as citizens, democratic and responsible attitudes (Fearnley-Sander & Yulaelawati 2008). The implication is that an individual’s rights must be developed without neglecting the principles of social justice embodied in Pancasila. That is, the perspective of social justice in Indonesian education is to maintain inclusivity in schools, supported by inclusive practices, an inclusive curriculum and preferential treatment or affirmative action to achieve unity in diversity (Fearnley-Sander & Yulaelawati 2008).

In this view, curricular practices can be part of multicultural education, which integrates students’ understanding of pluralistic values, tolerance and national unity into subject competencies as well as processes of learning (Budiningsih 2006). Therefore, curriculum constructions in Indonesia should conform to the fundamental elements of social justice as implied by Pancasila. Indonesia’s Ministry of Education and Culture (2015) has stipulated that ‘Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan [merupakan] Gerakan Pencerdasan dan Pembentukan Generasi Berjiwa Pancasila’ (education and culture is an intellectual movement and formation of generations who have Pancasila character). To attain this, school curriculum must include Pendidikan Pancasila dan Kewarganegaraan (Civics and Pancasila Education) as a compulsory subject for all grades (see Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan 2012).

In addition, Indonesia’s Curriculum Framework suggests that teachers need to enable students to participate fully in their society and succeed academically and socially (Budiningsih 2006). Thus, teachers need to provide learning experiences that prepare students for excellence in performance in a range of spaces that move beyond academic achievement. It is important for teachers to think that social justice across the curriculum could entail the enhancement of students’ learning and opportunities to develop their performance. Noddings (2003) argues that inclusive curriculum enhances students’ perspectives on socio-cultural issues, and so enable them to construct new knowledge of social and cultural values. This idea is also indicated in the 2013 Regulation of Indonesia’s Ministry of Education and Culture:
it suggests that an inclusive system of schooling empowers students to actively participate in establishing a democratic society accepting, respecting and celebrating people’s diverse cultural identities.

In classrooms, the philosophical notion of social justice can be an important focus of teaching in a democratic society, where teachers embrace student cultural diversity, respect student voices and advocate social change. According to Keddie (2012b), teachers’ valuing of student cultural identities and voices must be explicit so as to enable inclusive schooling environments and enhanced connections between school and community. In this respect, the role of teachers is to empower and provide students with excellent education processes. Thus, the integration of social justice into curricular practices implies the maximization of students’ engagement in learning and respect for the full range of students’ talents (Noddings 2003). Drawing on Egbert and Roe (2014), teaching practice highlighting a wide range of students’ performances can be a prerequisite for socially just teaching and, further, changes in society.

While it has been one of the philosophical foundations of national education in Indonesia, the notion of social justice has traditionally been overlooked in classroom teaching practices (Fearnley-Sander et al. 2007). Alwasilah (2002) notes that conventional approaches to teaching and learning still persist in most Indonesian schools, where teachers stand in front of a class and steer their students through a set series of pre-configured topics in a prescribed interval of time. They implement learning by rote aimed at maximising students’ academic performance on curricular content rather than enhancing students’ knowledge of diverse cultural issues within the range of schooling activities (see Leigh 1999). When teaching practice does not focus attention on democracy and social justice or undermines cultural diversity, a possible effect could be the disengagement of students in learning, thus ignoring a core aspect of Indonesian society, the national slogan unity in diversity (Degeng 1999). As Walker (2007) and Couldry (2010) outline, teaching practices of the stand and deliver kind potentially elevate passivity and disconnection and perpetuate exclusion rather than inclusion. In addition, the traditional didactic approach to teaching provides few opportunities for students to
develop their creativity and higher-order thinking abilities. Danandjaya (2013) argues that teaching practices heavily relying on academic achievement and rudimentary task completion cannot let students' reflective ideas grow, and this may impede their creativity to reflect on any socio-cultural issues occurring in society.

Socially just teaching instead requires a more progressive approach that enables students to seek gaps or inequitable viewpoints in particular contexts and take multiple perspectives (Giroux 2009; Shor 1992). In other words, teachers need to emphasise a need to listen to and respect those whose opinions, voices, experiences and cultures are different. This value of accepting diversity is relevant to Indonesia, which consists of diverse tribes (ethnic groups) and religions, and plays an essential role in nourishing democracy and social justice in the classroom. Teachers also need to be aware of the premise that socially just teaching can serve as a powerful tool for assisting individual students to read the world around them and make knowledge more meaningful and relevant to them.

1.4 A Personal Reference

When I was a student in Indonesia between 1975 and 1987, learning was solely about memorising and task completion, and was mainly focused on academic achievement. I had to memorise some short chapters in our holy book, the Koran, as well as the basic principles of multiplication, the five principles in Pancasila, the names of our presidents and their ministers, and even all the chapters and articles in the 1945 National Constitution (Undang-Undang Dasar 1945). Some of my teachers were inclined to giving corporal punishment such as hitting or pinching to students who failed to memorise or complete tasks. I was one of the students who was not very good at memorising. I found examinations and the recalling of facts and knowledge extremely difficult. At the end of each semester, my classroom teacher handed a report of my academic achievement to my parents. My parents were unhappy that I did not gain a school ranking of any significance in any semester, despite my attempt to do so. My father was a teacher, and from his
perspective, success in learning meant excellence in academic achievement and a top ranking position in school.

In 1987, I was admitted to studying in a state university (undergraduate degree) in East Java, Indonesia. I was majoring in English literature. Even if my lecturers did not apply corporal punishment to change students’ behaviour and performance, the focus was still on learning mainly in terms of the advancement of academic performance, economic growth and employment. In many respects, learning was an attempt to realise the motto of Indonesia’s Ministry of Education and Culture: Better Education, Better Life. This motto reflected the perspectives of Indonesia’s education policy makers and ideal expectations of most parents in Indonesia, including my father, that with better (academic) skills, students could pursue better paying jobs and outstanding long-term (lifetime) earnings.

I finished my undergraduate degree in 1994, and then I applied for an English teaching position in a private secondary school in Indonesia. At the beginning of my career as a teacher, I taught in ways that my teachers had taught me, minus the application of corporal punishment. My teaching strategy centred on the delivery of curricular content and maximising students’ academic competence, skills and performance, particularly in the final year of high school. I taught mostly to the test and hardly employed interactive discussions or brought socio-cultural issues into the classroom. My teaching involved a lot of teacher talk – lecturing, assigning and test practice – with students listening and participating as instructed. I was delighted when the class was quiet and all students were listening to my explanation. To my perception at that time, this was what might constitute good (effective) teaching and learning.

From 2006 to 2008, I was enrolled in postgraduate school in Australia to pursue my master’s degree in social justice education, funded by the ADS (Australian Development Scholarships). In those studies, I reviewed literature on social justice education, and as a result, my teaching perspective has gradually changed: my understanding of what constitutes good teaching has shifted significantly. I now perceive that teaching is not static but is dynamic and interrelated. I am mindful of
the classroom reality comprising students with diverse cultures, backgrounds, experiences, characteristics, voices and aspirations, in which all of these have to be embraced properly. My mission then has turned to creating a connected classroom by considering student diversity in my instructional design and revising my role to be more of a facilitator of student learning. This means that students’ personal (cultural) identities are foundational elements in supplementing curricular topics to pursue dialogic, interactive and collaborative learning, not only between teachers and students or students and their peers, but also teachers and students’ parents and the wider community.

Teaching as such is a social process, which is central to minimising injustices and/or maximising opportunities. I also realise that a teachers’ responsibility is more about the enhancement of students’ socio-cultural literacy as opposed to the notion of conventional teaching. The latter involves teachers whose roles are too dominant in the classrooms and take into account only students’ academic achievement. In other words, teachers with a strong commitment to socio-cultural issues tend to challenge students in democratic ways and open up spaces to advance students’ capabilities to read between the lines regarding, for instance, who might be socio-culturally advantaged or disadvantaged by particular groups of society.

In approaching this study, I am mindful that my background and experiences inevitably affect the process of investigation. My research interest in exploring remote rural teachers’ capabilities to teach in socially just ways essentially derives from my personal background and experiences as a person from a rural Indonesian background. Having obtained a master’s degree in social justice education, I have a stronger commitment to the dissemination and implementation of socially just teaching across schools in Probolinggo regency. Teachers in the regency are mindful of social justice as a foundation of Indonesian education, yet struggle to implement it in their daily classroom practice. This might be due to the following reasons: (1) a collective conception and/or the ongoing resonance of epistemologies of knowledge and learning that inform the population about how people learn and what is important in education; and (2) no specific training on how to teach in socially just ways, or they might have done so but they are unaware of it.
Informed by literature on social justice, particularly Sen’s capabilities approach, I am curious to explore what capabilities remote rural teachers in the regency of Probolinggo require in order to teach in socially just ways, and how they critically reflect on their own teaching. Exploring the issue of how teachers perceive the notion of good (just) teaching and factors that may influence their perceptions is worthwhile to guide the development of this study. In other words, I am interested in exploring the dynamics of teachers’ engagement with socially just teaching practices in more depth in that it can be a way to talk with teachers, observe classroom practices and analyse more of the resources they use in their teaching. Multiple perspectives from the teachers participating in this study regarding (socially just) teaching are of great importance to assess the extent to which social justice is embedded in the curriculum and implemented in teaching practices.

As it is my own background and experiences that have driven me to explore teachers’ engagement with socially just curriculum and teaching, I find it very stimulating and rewarding to investigate Indonesian teachers’ perceptions and experiences of social justice instances that I recall experiencing myself. On one hand, it offers a glimpse into myself by contributing to the developmental needs of students that I teach. On the other hand, it is about developing a better understanding of how teachers and students work together to develop an appreciation of diverse cultures as being equal and as assets in pursuit of affirmative social change. Developing a more balanced role connecting the self to others openly and equally is crucial to strengthening social cohesion and harmony, which is an extremely important attribute and is much needed in a multicultural and diverse state like Indonesia.

1.5 Significance of the Study

In the course of history since 1945 (Independence Year), the national curriculum of Indonesia has undergone 11 changes (Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan 2012). The latest Indonesian Curriculum of 2013 (Kurikulum 2013), which is currently being introduced to Indonesian schools, is expected to bring significant changes to students’ performances. These changes incorporate an emphasis on
religious and socio-cultural values and on the importance of higher order thinking abilities, which makes my study timely and important for Indonesian education. Even prior to this, little research has been conducted investigating the social justice teaching practices of Indonesian teachers. In the 2000s, an Indonesian scholar, Muthali’in, conducted research centred on gender bias within Indonesian schooling (Muthali’in 2001). This research considered the ways in which gender bias prevails in Indonesian schooling. Nevertheless, gender bias constitutes only one indication of (in)justice, which is insufficient to determine the extent of whether or not teaching is socially just. In addition, there have been significant curriculum changes from 2000 to 2013, and thus results of this early study might be no longer relevant to today’s Indonesian education context.

As opposed to the previous perspective of teaching that tends to be by rote and is teacher-centred, and emphasises memorising and task completion, the latest Curriculum of 2013 highlights the notion of teaching that encompasses penalaran (the development of thinking) and kreatifitas (creativity) of students (Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan 2012). Hence, teachers in Indonesia are now required to have not only ‘personal, professional and pedagogic competence’ but also ‘social competence’ (Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan 2012, p. 16). In many respects, teachers are expected to be capable of creating a learning environment that facilitates students’ developed inquiry and reasoning abilities toward a wide range of problematic socio-cultural issues. It is stipulated that teaching as such helps engender the generation of responsible citizens that advocate tolerance and understanding of diverse aspirations and human nature (see Kementerian dan Kebudayaan 2015).

Moreover, in May 1998, the Reform Era movement in Indonesia began with the resignation of the second president, Soeharto. During the 32 years of his regime, the majority of Indonesians were prevented from criticising his authority. Even though Soeharto had over time made the Indonesian economy one of the strongest in Asia, his government remained closed to public scrutiny. The Reform Era saw a huge demand for transparency in all public sectors, including education (Dananjaya 2013). Since the Reform Era, the governance of education has shifted from a
centralised, bureaucratic model to a decentralised, democratic and inclusive mode of operation. In this period there has been a system of transferring the governance of education from the central government to the provincial and regency levels of local government. Thus, the Reform Era has opened the way for a socially just curriculum and the promotion of democratic and inclusive education, yet for Indonesian teachers, this might be a big task on account of their long experiences of being culturally constrained and not questioning authority during Soeharto’s reign.

Along with the high demand for democratisation in Indonesia, particularly in the education sector, modifications and reconstructions of curriculum are required to meet changing needs. The decentralisation of governance and management to schools in 1998 and the introduction of the first Indonesian curriculum framework in 2002 and the latest one (National Curriculum of 2013), are major factors that shape the operation of *Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP)* (school-based curriculum development) in Indonesian schools. All teachers, including those in remote rural areas, have been given greater autonomy in the construction and modification of school curriculum and teaching materials based on the national curriculum framework. The education authorities of Indonesia believe that teachers with the freedom to design their own curriculum will be more responsive to the needs of students and more accountable to the local communities (Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan 2006). Drawing on Carl (2005), p. 228), this phenomenon of teachers’ involvement in curriculum development potentially leads to gaining ‘access to and [taking] ownership of the curriculum in a more significant way’, by which they will be more engaged in teaching.

In many cases, Indonesia is also moving forward, committed to promoting a clean and strong government, and is striving to take the education system to a level that takes into account social and cultural values. This is reflected in Indonesia’s *Peraturan Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan No. 65/2013* (Regulation of Indonesia’s Ministry of Education and Culture No. 65/2013), a document which suggests that teachers have a greater job and role than merely transferring knowledge to students. This document suggests that teachers need to not only
recognise diverse characteristics of students but also play an active role in managing this diversity in the classroom. Given this background, there is a need to nourish socio-culturally responsive teaching practices so that students can have opportunities to critically engage with a variety of knowledge and demonstrate an ability to think in a creative and reflective manner.

Geographically, Indonesia is one of the most heterogeneous countries in the world. It covers an area of 1,919,444 square kilometres, being 5,150 kilometres from West to East and 1,930 kilometres from North to South. Recent data (2014) from Indonesia’s Badan Pusat Statistik (Central Agency for Statistics) note that Indonesia encompasses 34 provinces, 416 regencies, 93 municipalities, 6,793 districts and 79,075 villages. In terms of languages, tribes (ethnic groups) and religions, Indonesia is also various. It has more than 700 different native languages, 300 ethnic groups and 6 official religions. In view of these circumstances, Indonesia can have the potential to face separatism and/or horizontal social conflicts and disharmony. To prevent this, at schools, teachers need to encourage students to be accustomed to respecting others’ diverse socio-cultural perspectives, voices and aspirations. In addition, the geography of Indonesia in itself presents its own unique challenges to the provision of education and unique set of logistical issues when seeking improvements to the skills and knowledge of the teaching workforce. This task seems to be greatest for teachers in remote rural areas. Due to the remote locations, teachers in these areas have limited access to resources and less opportunity to upgrade their teaching skills and knowledge.

This study is useful for teachers, particularly those in remote rural areas, in constructing, modifying and implementing their school-based curriculum and unit plans, as well as managing their classrooms. It may also help teachers develop a deeper understanding of the capabilities they need to teach in socially just ways. As Brady and Kennedy (2003) state, diversity and opportunities in the classroom should be well-maintained, and this demands a pedagogical response to ensure that the needs of all students are met, in that the ‘inclusion of all students is important’ (p. 27). To the central and local governments, the results of this study can be used as a guide in conducting a national supervision of teaching practices and evaluation
1.6 A Brief Outline of the Study

As previously stated, a key philosophical foundation of Indonesian education is to provide students with opportunities to become members of society that uphold tolerance and socio-cultural diversity. Hence, teachers need to prepare students in Indonesia for a life in an increasingly multicultural and diverse society. In addition, teachers need to help them understand the importance of democratic principles for their lives and society. This qualitative case study seeks to research Indonesian teachers’ perceptions of social justice teaching principles, and of their capabilities to teach in socially just ways. An aspect of the research is to identify how remote rural primary school teachers in Indonesia’s Probolinggo regency engage in social justice issues in their curriculum and teaching practices.

To generate data, this study employs semi-structured interviews, classroom observations and curricular document analysis. Eight teachers from six different primary schools in the regency were interviewed. The interview themes and questions were on the basis of the literature on social justice, particularly the capabilities approach. Classroom observations and curricular document analysis in this study were utilised as triangulation toward the emerging findings. To interpret the data, this study applies qualitative content analysis through a systematic coding and categorising strategy to determine parts of the data that are pertinent to the research question and the major goal of this study.

An analysis of participating teachers’ curricular documents, perceptions and classroom practices point to aspects that potentially advance or constrain their capabilities to teach in socially just ways. With an approach to social justice which puts an emphasis on human development within a capability dimension, a subsequent analysis is used (see Chapters 6 and 7) to formulate a pedagogical response to any problematic issue of engagement in socially just teaching practices.
Identifying the limits on teachers’ capabilities, which further potentially impede advancement of students’ capabilities (see part 1.7 of this Chapter and Chapter 7), this study suggests a list of capabilities that can become a prominent framework of teaching in socially just ways (see part 1.7 of this Chapter and Chapter 8), by which students’ capabilities could be expanded.

In essence, teaching in socially just ways is challenging at the best of times and is a complex professional challenge for classroom teachers in Indonesia’s Probolinggo regency. Their performance in the classroom is juxtaposed not only with their comments in the interviews, but also with the major expectation to accommodate student cultural diversity, which is suggested in the Peraturan Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan No. 65/2013 (Regulation of Indonesia’s Ministry of Education and Culture No. 65/2013). In other words, I perceive a complex relationship between their teaching practice in the classroom and the major conception of social justice within capability perspectives. I examine this inter-relationship, and then identify particular capabilities required to advance teaching practice in socially just ways. This constitutes the primary focus of this thesis and is reflected in the research question of the study.

1.7 Thesis Outline

This part provides a brief overview of the thesis, which consists of eight Chapters in its entirety. This introduction Chapter includes the construction of the major research question and sub-research questions that guides the research process, statement of the problem, a personal reference, significance of the study, and a brief outline of the study.

Chapter 2 describes schooling in Indonesia. The Chapter begins with a historical review of Indonesia’s struggle for social justice, and problems in pursuit of social justice in teaching that have prompted this research. This is necessary to highlight aspects of how schooling practices are conducted in Indonesia, particularly in remote rural areas in Indonesia’s Probolinggo regency. Some of the aspects mentioned incorporate past experiences of Indonesian people in seeking equality.
and justice, and the historical evolution of the schooling system in Indonesia and how this affects teachers’ work.

Chapters 3 and 4 explore and review relevant literature, particularly studies related to different perspectives of social justice and how they are conceived within education and schooling. Chapter 3 discusses some contemporary theories of social justice which, in many respects, underpin conceptions of what constitutes socially just. These include: justice as fairness (John Rawls), relational conceptions of justice (Iris Marion Young), justice as redistribution, recognition and representation (Nancy Fraser) and justice as distributive, retributive and recognitive (Trevor Gale and Kathleen Densmore). These theories are included as they potentially draw out key themes that are central to conceptualising social justice in education. In addition, they can lay the foundations for subsequent assessments of the extent to which curricular documents and teaching practices represent the conceptual framework of social justice highlighted in the work of these theorists. Nevertheless, reliance only on those theories is insufficient to address complex issues of education in remote rural areas in Indonesia. In other words, another approach is required.

Chapter 4 specifically details the capabilities approach and its prominent position as the philosophical foundation of human wellbeing and social justice in relation to education. This study is informed by the capabilities approach rather than other approaches because the primary interest is in examining the issue of social justice in education from the perspective of potential abilities viz. capabilities. Unlike other approaches centred more on achieved functionings, the capabilities approach is focused on people’s freedoms (opportunities) to achieve valuable functionings and/or to choose a particular life that they have reason to value. This approach offers synergies with the other approaches and accommodates human diversity in the promotion of social justice, which is relevant to the reality of socio-cultural diversity in Indonesia.

A more detailed outline of this thesis as a research project is presented in Chapter 5, which relates to key aspects of qualitative research methodology and its
relevance for this study, a philosophical stance that informs the methodology, how
the research is designed, and explains the techniques for data generation and data
analyses. The study adopts a qualitative research approach within the philosophical
stance of critical inquiry. Seeking a detailed account of a phenomenon, this study
is not only associated with prediction or interpretation of the phenomenon, but also
provision of recommendations for change.

Chapters 6 and 7 include data analysis of teacher participants’ perceptions of social
justice embedded in their curriculum and teaching practices. These rich data
provide detailed insights into the extent to which teacher participants are engaged
in social justice teaching, which are summarised into two major categories: social
inclusivity in teaching (Chapter 6) and bridging homes and classrooms (Chapter 7).
Chapter 6 aims to critically examine teacher participant responses around the issues
of social inclusivity integrated into teaching and learning, which include teachers’
capabilities to embrace student diversity, enable student agency and voice and
establish deliberative democracy in the classroom. Chapter 7 holds a critical
investigation of local teachers’ perceptions and responses to the notion of
connectedness in their classroom teaching practices, which involves connecting
curriculum with student life experiences and teaching for a good life. The findings
indicate the juxtaposition of what participants say and what they practice in the
classroom. Apart from this, identifying the limits on capability development is also
discussed in this Chapter, which includes (1) the lack of school facilities and
adequately credentialed teachers in remote rural areas, (2) the restrictive nature of
government school education policy, (3) the issue of bribery in the recruitment of
government teachers, and (4) the problem of inadequate nutritional food supplies
in many of the areas where the study was undertaken.

Chapter 8 concludes the thesis by proposing an alternative solution to the
problematic implementation of socially just teaching connected to educating for
social change. Pedagogical implications emerging from the findings and
recommendations for further research are also outlined in this Chapter. The major
findings of this research suggest the problematic implementation of socially just
teaching in remote rural schools in Indonesia’s Probolinggo regency. In response
to this, the Chapter presents a list of capabilities that local teachers require to advance their teaching in socially just ways, namely: pedagogic integrity, connectedness, access and technology, and social networking.
Chapter 2  
Schooling in Indonesia

2.1 Introduction

This Chapter describes Indonesia’s schooling system. This is necessary in order to highlight aspects of how school education is practiced in Indonesia, particularly in remote rural areas in Probolinggo regency. Some of the aspects that need elaboration include the historical evolution of the schooling system in Indonesia and its effect on how teachers work. Some writers (e.g. Kristiansen & Pratikno 2006, Raihani 2007 and Luschei & Zubaidah 2012) have acknowledged the goal of Indonesia’s contemporary education system, which Bjork (2013) suggests is rooted in the past. This has ramifications for the role of teachers in Indonesia to re-construct and re-conceptualise their teaching. In most cases, teachers still experience difficulties adapting to curricular changes, so that their teaching strategy remains conventional and centred on mastering rudimentary facts. The Indonesian political situation prior to and after independence has exerted considerable influence on the structure of the schooling system and how teachers work.

Between the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Indonesia experienced a series of struggles for equality and justice against all kinds of adversity during colonial rule (see part 2.2 of this Chapter). These experiences have presented particular challenges to the people attached to the education system (Bjork 2005). Teachers are inseparable from the social and political situation of nations (Leigh 1991; Bangay 2005). Therefore, to fully understand teachers’ conceptions of their roles and responsibilities as educators in schools, it is of great importance to examine broader social and political contexts that may shape their current behaviours.

The Chapter is in three parts. Part one begins with a discussion centred on Indonesia’s struggle in the pursuit of social justice. This is important in that socially just teaching in Indonesia is inseparable from social justice principles embodied in
Pancasila. Pancasila is the official philosophical and political ideology of the Indonesian state, which articulates past experiences of Indonesian people in seeking equality and justice against the colonial ruling powers. Part two discusses the historical context of Indonesia’s schooling system. This part elaborates the process of establishing the Indonesian education system including the historical development of education in Indonesia. Part three will elaborate local conditions of remote rural teachers in Indonesia’s Probolinggo regency in relation to changes in curricular and teaching practices.

2.2 Pursuit of Social Justice in Indonesia

The struggle in the pursuit of social justice in Indonesia has its own great historical moment, which, according to Abdullah (2009), is not only ‘a treasure to be contested, but also an epoch to be reflected upon’ (p. 3). The struggle began with the rise of the nationalist movement in the early 1900s. This nationalist movement (pergerakan kebangsaan) launched protests against the Dutch policy that was contrary to belief in equality and justice. This rise could be regarded as both part of national awareness and resistance to the colonial situation prevalent in Indonesia at the time. During the colonial reign, the indigenous people of Indonesia (known as pribumi) had been experiencing a loss of self-respect in which their identities, voices, aspirations and desires were not honoured nor heard (Kartodirjo 1978). The colonial rule of the time had imposed an inferior status on the indigenous people and blocked any pathway to social mobility in all aspects of social life (Kartodirjo 1978; Abdullah 2009). The most obvious social change by the nineteenth century was race discrimination (Abeyasekere 1976). In this respect, one’s social, legal and political status was determined by the racial groupings to which one belonged. This phenomenon aroused the longing for freedom and human rights amongst native Indonesians (Abeyasekere 1976). As a consequence of this, the intelligentsia in the country turned to associate themselves with the people and initiated a leadership role highlighting their struggle for emancipation and justice. Through the nationalist movement, they projected a revolutionary ideal of a new republic that enabled an image of future national unity.
The nationalist movement began with the emergence of Boedi Oetomo (literally meaning: noble conduct) on 20th of May, 1908. This organisation was founded by Dr Soetomo, a student of STOVIA (a school for the training of Indonesian physicians at that time), and was comprised of Indonesian intellectuals. Initially, it was established for the purpose of education despite later turning to politics. In some respect, the rise of Boedi Oetomo was also inspired by Japan’s victory over Russia in 1901, which gave impetus to further nationalist movements in Indonesia (Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia 2003).

In 1912, Haji Samanhudi founded Sarekat Dagang Islam (Association of Moslem Merchants), in which the initial objective was to promote the interest of Indonesian business in the Dutch East Indies. This association was renamed Sarekat Islam (Association of Moslem) after it became a political party under the leadership of HOS Tjokroaminoto and Haji Agoes Salim. In the same year, two other movement organisations emerged, namely Muhammadiyah and Partai Indonesia (Indonesian Party) (Drakeley 2005). Muhammadiyah was a progressive Moslem organisation founded by Kyai Haji Akhmad Dahlan in Yogyakarta, Central Java, which aimed to embark on social and economic reforms. Partai Indonesia was set up by Dr Douwes Dekker (Dr Danudirja Setiabudi), Dr Tjipto Mangunkusumo and Ki Hajar Dewantoro with the main purpose of striving for freedom and the independence of Indonesia.

In 1916, Sarekat Islam held its first conference in Bandung, West Java, voicing the demand for equality of representation from the indigenous people of Indonesia (pribumi) in the Dutch legislative body. In response to this, in 1918, the Dutch established a people's council named Volksraad (Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia 2003). In the official opening of the Volksraad in 1918, the Dutch promised a new colonial rule that would make the Volksraad a body for the whole people of Indonesia to freely express their aspirations (Drakeley 2005). The Volksraad comprised 38 appointed members, 10 of whom were Indonesians. Even though some nationalists responded positively to the Volksraad, many of them viewed this body as not fulfilling nationalist expectations. This was because
Indonesian representatives were a minority and most of the members elected were predominantly defenders of the status quo. Abdullah (2009) states:

…it was obvious from the beginning that the Volksraad was not meant for the sake of [democracy] but aimed instead at fulfilling the demand of the Europeans in the colony, the possibility that it might play an important role was not rejected (p. 27).

In other words, the promise remained unfulfilled. This means that the Volksraad did not mark the beginning of democratisation in Indonesia as it had no significant impact on the Dutch colonial policy, which was continuously minimising and restricting the delegation and voices of the indigenous people of Indonesia.

In 1923, a decline in the economic sector occurred, which increased labour strikes against the colonial government. This circumstance prompted the colonial government to amend the rules to put more restrictions on Indonesian civil liberties, particularly on freedom of speech and expression in writing (Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia 2003). Nevertheless, these political restrictions did not preclude further growth of Indonesian nationalist movement organisations. On 3rd of July, 1922, Ki Hajar Dewantoro, who is currently known as the Father of Indonesian education, founded *Taman Siswa* (literally meaning: *garden of students*), which was an organisation to promote national education. In 1924, *Perhimpunan Mahasiswa Indonesia* (Indonesian University Students Association) was established by Drs Mohammad Hatta and Dr Sukiman. This association became a driving force of the nationalist movement to gain Indonesia’s independence (Drakeley 2005; Abdullah 2009).

Moreover, in July 1927, Soekarno set up *Partai Nasionalis Indonesia* (Indonesian Nationalist Party), which adopted *Bahasa Indonesia* (Indonesian Language) as the official language. This organisation implemented a *non-cooperation* policy with the Dutch colonial government due to a fundamental conflict of interest between Indonesian nationalism and Dutch colonialism (Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia 2003). In the following year, on 28th of October 1928, all Indonesian nationalist youth gathered in Jakarta, which is now the capital city of Indonesia, to hold *Kongres Pemuda Indonesia* (Indonesian Youth Congress). In the Congress, they articulated *Sumpah Pemuda* (Youth Pledge) to acknowledge: (1) one
motherland, Indonesia; (2) one nation, the nation of Indonesia; and (3) one language of unity, Bahasa Indonesia (Museum Sumpah Pemuda 2014).

The Dutch was uncomfortable with the birth of Sumpah Pemuda (Youth Pledge). Taylor (2003, p. 279) suggests that to the Dutch, Sumpah Pemuda was a threat to their authorities as it could ‘break [Indonesia’s] dependence on foreign powers’ and strengthen national awareness of freedom and liberties amongst Indonesians. Hence, in 1929, the Dutch arrested the initiators of Partai Nasionalis Indonesia, Soekarno, Gatot Mangkupradja and Maskun Supriadinata, and tried them in court for provocation against the Dutch colonial government. This circumstance led to great protests from Indonesian nationalists. Soekarno was released in September 1931 yet re-expelled in August 1933. He remained in Dutch custody until the Japanese invasion in 1942 (Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia 2003). In 1933, revolts against the Dutch authorities increased, of which Indonesian nationalists were accused of being responsible. Consequently, one year later, Sutan Syahrir, Mohammad Hatta and other nationalist initiators were arrested and banished until 1942, and their organisations were banned. In 1935, Dr Soetomo formed Partai Indonesia Raya (Indonesian Great Party), whose fundamental goal was the independence of Great Indonesia.

Decades of pursuing equality and justice and anti-colonial nationalism in Indonesia came to a climax with the Japanese invasion and occupation from 1942 to 1945. Abdullah (2009) states:

A Japanese victory over the Dutch colonial power [had] an enormous psychological impact on the Indonesian people. A Japanese victory instantly [destroyed] the myth that the Western colonial power could not be defeated (p. 101).

After the Netherlands were occupied by Germany and their military weakened, they surrendered to the Japanese authorities without physical confrontation (Taylor 2003; Christano & Cummings 2007). As the new ruling power over Indonesian archipelago, Japan claimed to be ‘the leader of Asia, the protector of Asia, the light of Asia’ (Christano & Cummings 2007, p. 125). The Japanese colonial government at the time frequently used propaganda campaigns about working together with the indigenous people of Indonesia for a better and stronger Asia, whereas their actual
purpose (like the Dutch colonial reign) was simply to monopolise Indonesia’s oil and other natural resources to fund their wars (Abdullah 2009).

The Japanese occupation caused hardships in the life of Indonesians, the worst of which was the mobilisation of approximately 10 million *romusha* (manual workers recruited from the indigenous people) to work on defence construction projects in Java (Frederick & Worden 2011). In addition, the Japanese rules allowed for the confiscation of food and other primary necessities, which brought about great starvation and misery amongst the indigenous population of Indonesia. In this circumstance, the nationalists’ passion to gain freedom and independence got stronger, and thus they put up a military and ideological rebellion against the Japanese rulers. On 14th of August, 1945, the Allied Forces defeated the Japanese armed forces, which marked the end of Japanese occupation in Indonesia.

The image of a new republic emerged in the life of Indonesian people on 17th of August, 1945 through the proclamation of independence. Intellectual generations of that period established a set of proposals for nationhood within a democratic perspective, which had never been practiced under colonial state structures. Gungwu (2009) argues that those involved in the proposal demanded no Western democracy but a democracy that referred to social justice principles, which were not only concerned with political equality, but also equality in the economic sector to guarantee social welfare and prosperity for all. *Undang-undang Dasar 1945* (the 1945 National Constitution) was then established as a ruling guideline for the government of Indonesia; this realised the idea of democracy by reflecting just principles and re-establishing self-respect, which had been lost during the colonial era (see Kartodirdjo 1978).

The preamble to the 1945 National Constitution set out *Pancasila*, which was formulated by Soekarno, the nationalist leader and first president of Indonesia. *Pancasila* was first articulated on 1st of June, 1945 in Soekarno’s speech delivered to the Panitia Persiapan Kemerdekaan Indonesia (PPKI) (Preparatory Committee for Indonesia’s Independence). Originally from the Sanskrit, meaning *five*
principles, Pancasila states the five principles that together constitute national life in Indonesia. These principles include:

- *Ketuhanan Yang Maha Esa* (Belief in the Only One God), which suggests religious tolerance and freedom for all Indonesian citizens to attach themselves to a particular religion as well as respect each other’s belief (faith) in order to achieve harmony and peace in society;

- *Kemanusiaan Yang Adil dan Beradab* (Just and Civilised Humanity), which deals with individuals’ rights and freedoms and their obligations toward state and society, and highlights social relationships based on just and civilised morality;

- *Persatuan Indonesia* (the Unity of Indonesia), which embodies the notion of nationalism, envisages the need to foster national unity and integrity and demands every citizen of Indonesia to avoid a feeling of superiority over others on ethical grounds or for reasons of skin colour and lineage;

- *Kerakyatan Yang Dipimpin oleh Hikmat Kebijaksanaan Dalam Permusyawaratan/Perwakilan* (Democracy Guided by the Inner Wisdom in the Unanimity Arising Out of Deliberations Amongst Representatives), which suggests a system of democracy within a deliberative process of making decisions and reaching consensus; this is widely known throughout the state as *musyawarah untuk mufakat* (deliberations for consensus); and

- *Keadilan Sosial Bagi Seluruh Rakyat Indonesia* (Social Justice for the Whole of the People of Indonesia), which points to a common endeavour in the provision of conditions necessary for all Indonesian citizens to attain a secure and prosperous life both materially and spiritually.

These principles were designed to unify the nation’s multicultural society and diverse religious, political and ethnic aspirations. This is articulated within the national slogan *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika*, which is an old Javanese phrase meaning *they are many but one* or more commonly translated as *unity in diversity* (Hellwig & Tagliacozzo 2009). The diversity of Indonesia is in many ways the result of geographical isolation – despite many underlying geographical similarities among the various islands in Indonesia, there are considerable differences that have developed between their people due to the isolation they experienced. Hence, the
The passion for and consciousness of being one unitary nation within diversity needs to be cultivated into the mind of every Indonesian citizen and interwoven into their way of thinking and acting. Hartawan (2011) argues that society can grow healthily if Indonesia remains a unitary state, meaning that it does not fragment. Since every region in Indonesia has its own unique characteristics, the maintenance of a unitary state needs to take into account flexibility in the delegation of authority, and accommodate unique and diverse features of each region (Hartawan 2011).

According to Leimena (2013), the implementation of the national slogan *unity in diversity* should be balanced, in the sense that the *diversity* ought to be reinforced by the *unity*, in order for this slogan to be applied appropriately. Leimena (2013) adds that in the Indonesian context, a mere emphasis on *diversity* may potentially arouse the symptom of *provincialism* or *regionalism*, and a sole focus on *unity* can raise a tendency to *centralism*. Hence, a provincial or regional sense in the promotion of a better life at a regional level is only allowed as far as it does not overlook the national interests of the whole of Indonesia (Hellwig & Tagliacozzo 2009). In addition, as an archipelagic country, Indonesia requires a powerful central authority, yet this power needs to enable regional authorities to have sufficient autonomy in developing their own areas.

Moreover, *Pancasila* constitutes the official philosophical ideology of the Indonesian state in the establishment of justice within a governance system aimed at protecting the entire Indonesian nation and land, advancing people’s welfare and developing the intellectual life of the nation (Gungwu 2009). *Pancasila* demands the management of Indonesia’s resources and potentials in a dynamic and progressive way, so that they can provide the greatest possible good and happiness for all people. It has been acknowledged in Article 33 of the 1945 National Constitution that (1) all national potentials and natural resources therein are to be controlled by the state and utilised for the greatest benefit of all citizens; and (2)
CHAPTER TWO

national economy should be based on economic democracy, which upholds the principles of solidarity and efficiency along with fairness, sustainability and self-sufficiency, and which shows concern for balanced progress and the unity of a national economy.

The statements from the Article imply that Pancasila holds a social justice perspective which does not entirely ignore individual people’s rights and claims to equality. Social justice as articulated in Pancasila offers protection and empowerment to the weak or forsaken groups of people (locally known as terbelakang), so that these people are able to develop their capacities to chase or catch up with those who are already in good living conditions. According to Banos and Utama (2013), Indonesian social justice is apparently dependent on the Indonesian value of social harmony and on maintaining a commonality perspective, where individuals’ rights and responsibilities are inherently linked to the whole population’s capacities and resources. In this regard, individual citizens and the state are always connected. This is likened to two sides of a coin, different but inseparable. In regard to social justice, Pancasila demands close cooperation between individuals, community and the state, and urges all citizens to make a strong commitment to the pursuit of changes in society according to their skills and capacities (Tampubolon 2003).

One important characteristic of Pancasila is ‘its orientation toward time and its assessment of the significance of the past’ (Morfit 1981, p. 841). In other words, Pancasila is an articulation of present perspectives and an aspiration for the future as well as a crystallisation of the historical (past) experiences of Indonesian people. In many respects, Pancasila embraces the past, present and future accounts of people’s experiences as it provides the teachings of a traditional philosophy reflecting the life of Indonesian people rather than the imposition of foreign doctrines. This means that rather than indoctrinating, Pancasila draws out perspectives that are already immanent within Indonesian society. The government suggests that a correct understanding of Pancasila is required for the future development of the nation, for the state ideology inherently provides the criteria on which a vision of a just and humane society is to be achieved. It is suggested that
restoration of a just and humane society is enabled if Pancasila is interpreted properly and placed as a philosophical reference to the diversity of Indonesia and internalisation of norms and values in daily life applications (Amir 2013; see also Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan 2015). According to Pancasila, human beings must be treated with regard to their dignity as God’s creatures. This means that the democratic rights of individuals need to be always in accordance with a sense of responsibility to God and respect for human values and dignity within an ideal view to maintaining and strengthening unity and integrity. In other words, the Indonesian people should not tolerate any form of colonisation, imperialism, oppression and domination towards human beings. Rather, all of these, as explicitly acknowledged in the Undang-undang Dasar 1945 (1945 National Constitution), must be abolished on Earth as they do not conform to humanitarian and justice principles.

The Pancasila has not always been used as a force for social justice. The second President of Indonesia, Soeharto, who ruled between 1966 and 1998, used the Pancasila as a propaganda tool (Kusumohamidjojo 2013; see also part 2.3 of this Chapter). It was used to indoctrinate the people to instill unrealistic loyalty and obedience to his hegemonic power. However, the Pancasila remains the unifying force and basis for socio-political activities in Indonesia and as such, is used a founding document in this regard. In other words, any activity which is in harmony with Pancasila can be understood as an articulation of the Pancasila and its founding principles. According to Pancasila, all Indonesians are to act justly towards their fellow people. It advocates equal rights and obligations between individuals. Banos and Utama (2013) state:

As unity is of paramount importance, [Pancasila] social justice obligates individuals, society, and country as a whole, not to share burdens and blessing unequally but fairly and proportionally based on the individual’s capacity to contribute to achieve social solidarity in which there are differences in unity and unity in differences (pp. 46-47).

This idea places the life of the entire Indonesian citizenship within a perspective of social justice which protects human rights and freedoms. According to Wahab (2008) and Banos and Utama (2013), the notion of social justice taking account of people’s rights and freedoms can provide basic opportunities for individuals to achieve their potential and contribute fully to a better life in society and to social wellbeing. Pancasila promotes the idea that social justice will be achieved if
individuals are intrinsically valued for themselves and their culture. As Morfit (1981) suggests, this commitment to social justice implies a commitment to deliberative democracy and equity, which has an important place in the understanding of Pancasila.

Since Pancasila is viewed as an articulation of Indonesian people’s historical experience rejecting Western liberalism, ‘it would be a great mistake simply to translate [the] commitment to Western liberal democracy’ (Morfit 1981, p. 8; see also Feith & Castles 1970). This signifies that the conception of democracy and equity embodied in Pancasila has its own sense. According to Pancasila, democracy is based on deliberation amongst members of society, and does not hold the ideas of minority rights and/or majority rules (Feith 1962). Meanwhile, equity attributes to assurance that national development does not simply privilege particular groups of people (Morfit 1981). The prominent purpose of Pancasila is to foster democracy and equity, provide the same status to every citizen and share national burdens equally. In other words, Pancasila encourages mutual cooperation that reinforces traditional values such as gotong royong, silih asah, silih asih dan silih asuh (help, teach, love and care to each other) (Kusmayati 1994). These features, as Kusmayati also suggests, form the foundation of an education and schooling system to maintain unity, and to achieve prosperity and social harmony and peace in Indonesia.

2.3 Indonesia’s Schooling System

Like the rest of Indonesian society, the Indonesian schooling is required to be based on the principles of Pancasila. The Indonesian national school system has been established based on the nationalist view of education as a means of uniting people within the diversity of languages, cultures and religions (Leigh 1991). Thus, education in Indonesia has been characterised by a struggle for a national identity. As outlined in the introduction (Chapter 1), Indonesia is an archipelagic state which, according to the Coordinating Ministry of Maritime Affairs, comprises approximately 17,500 islands and over 300 ethnic groups and more than 700 local languages (see Figure 1 for a map of Indonesia).
A major obstacle facing education and the school system in Indonesia relates to resource allocation. Article 31 of the 1945 National Constitution of Indonesia (locally known as Undang-undang Dasar 1945) stipulates that the government assures freedom of society to develop cultural values and preserve local languages as national cultural treasures. The Article also contends that all citizens have legal rights and are entitled to obtaining education, and that the government has responsibility to provide one national education system and budget to provide an education for all. Through managing and organising one system of national education, the government increases the level of spiritual belief, devoutness and moral character for the sake of national unity, the advancement of civilisation and the prosperity of the nation (Article 31 of the 1945 National Constitution).

Nonetheless, Indonesia’s notable geographic, socio-cultural and economic heterogeneity presents logistical, access and cost challenges to educational delivery throughout the archipelago. A majority (80%) of Indonesian territory is rural, and a report from the Centre for International Environment Law (CIEL) has acknowledged the failure of Indonesia’s government to fairly distribute educational resources to rural citizens. Consequently, rural people in Indonesia often lack access to important resources required to improve their education.

Historically speaking, the evolution of education in Indonesia stands between indigenous expectation and foreign influence (Bangay 2005). In other words, the development of Indonesian education is inseparable from the historical context of the past, combining local schooling systems developed over centuries and those
imposed by Dutch and Japanese colonial rule. Education and learning had not gained much attention until the coming of Islam in the 1300s. During this pre-colonial period, Islamic boarding schools named pesantren grew rapidly, particularly in Java. These schools aimed to educate local indigenous youths to become individuals with moral values such as simplicity, sincerity and solidarity, based on Islamic principles. The quality of pesantren was varied (relatively low) as they were private schools that were unregulated (Kell & Kell 2014). Yet, from a contemporary view, pesantren have contributed to the development of Indonesian schooling for over 400 years. Since the middle of the twentieth century, many pesantren have begun offering non-religious subjects on the basis of government curriculum, from which they are to come under government scrutiny and supervision (Kell & Kell 2014).

Another form of religious education emerged in the Maluku islands when Portuguese spice traders came in the sixteenth century (Bjork 2005). It was introduced by Roman Catholic priests frequently following these traders to the islands. To gain support for spreading out their religion in these areas, the priests established seminaries to serve children of local communities as well as taught local people the Catholic religion, reading, writing and mathematics (Djojonegoro 1997). The influence of these changes are still noted today (see Bjork 2005).

Public schooling had not existed in Indonesia until the colonial Dutch East Indies Company introduced limited public schooling in the middle of the seventeenth century. In 1906, the colonial government established a community-based system of village schooling accommodating Buddhist, Muslims, Hindu, Christian and ethnic Chinese peoples (Bangay 2005; Kristiansen & Pratikno 2006). Kristiansen and Pratikno note that approximately 3500 public schools were constructed, along with a similar number of private and religious schools amongst a population of 40 million by 1913. However, the Dutch colonial rule prevented most indigenous people of Indonesia from engaging in schooling. As Bjork (2005) states: ‘although a small number of youth continued to study in Pesantren and schools run by missionaries, most Indonesians lacked access to education’ (p. 41). Under the Dutch, schooling was extremely hierarchical, meaning that it was established
merely for the students of the minority Dutch, European families and a few Indonesian aristocrats (*priyayi*). Only Javanese elite groups and very few of Indonesian indigenous population were allowed to attend Dutch schools (Christano & Cummings 2007). The language of instruction used was Dutch, and those upper-class groups of people educated were prepared to work in colonial administration offices.

Kell and Kell (2014) suggest that the colonial rule of the Dutch also created four major legacies of schooling in Indonesia. First, elementary or primary schools were introduced, and by the end of the nineteenth century, folk schools were built to accommodate students of indigenous families, widening Indonesian students’ participation in schooling. Second, the structure of schools which was similar to that of contemporary ones came into existence, namely: primary schools for colonial and indigenous students (segregated), middle school, high school and pre-university. Third, a number of universities were established but restricted to a very few intellectuals of elite Indonesians. According to Sulistiyono (2007), these universities were based on European academic traditions and prepared students to back up the interest of the Dutch East Indies in fulfilling a high demand for skilled professionals in global trade. In 1930, universal primary schools were established in most of Indonesian provinces, catering to more than two million students (Sulistiyono 2007). The consequence of universal but hierarchical education services was the awakening of national awareness of freedom and independence amongst Indonesians, which signalled the rise of nationalist movements and the end of the Dutch colonial era (Kell & Kell 2014).

Moreover, in their three-year occupation between 1942 and 1945, the Japanese transformed the Dutch colonial system of education into a national education system and offered mass education. During this period, a unitary language of education instruction was imposed and a nationalism perspective was emphasised (see Frederick & Worden 2011). As Christano and Cummings (2007) elaborate:

> The Japanese endeavoured to refashion the educational system into a less socially stratified and more equal system. In addition, they began the transition from instruction that was typically provided in Dutch toward a classroom that used Indonesian or Malay (p. 125).
Similarly, Buchori and Malik (2004) suggest that the Japanese also banned the use of Dutch books and brought in a *military training* component to the existing school curriculum. Despite their very brief reign and being viewed as the most ruthless ruler of Indonesia, their major policy regarding education and schooling took account of the promotion of nationalistic interests (Rahman 1997). The education service within this period, as Frederick and Worden (2011) note, also significantly influenced the future development of Indonesia’s schooling system.

Following independence in 1945, 94% of the total population were illiterate due to the failure of the Dutch colonial administration to invest the majority of Indonesians with equal rights and opportunities for basic education (Abdullah 2009; Kell & Kell 2014). This enormous illiteracy problem was the most overwhelming task facing the new government leaders. The country’s new leaders were aware of the impossibility to create a prosperous society when none or a few of the total population had received an adequate education (Christano & Cummings 2007). In response to these circumstances, the new government of Indonesia under its first president, Soekarno, highlighted the paramount importance of education in the development of Indonesia. Hence, they set the development of national education as the highest priority by offering Indigenous Indonesians access to schooling and opportunities to educate their own children (Christano & Cummings 2007; Abdullah 2009).

Sirozi (2004) suggests that along with a continued spirit of nationalism, education in that period served nationalistic purposes, and functioned as the fundamental mechanism for a unified societal diversity in terms of class, race and ethnicity. Christano and Cummings (2007) states: ‘Its major role was to fashion a uniquely Indonesian identity from the range of diversity spanning the archipelago’ (p. 126). Indonesian leaders at this time saw the task of educating the whole population spread over diverse islands as extremely challenging. This was due to the reality that (1) most citizens of Indonesia at that time spoke only their local accents, and hence the idea of using a single language of instruction in schools was extremely challenging; (2) few books were written in the Indonesian language; and (3) this
newly independent state lacked financial resources, adequate school facilities and trained teachers, required to conduct teaching effectively.

Post-independence, that is between 1949 and 1950, the 1950 Basic Education Law was generated and the focus of the Indonesian government turned to the development of a six-year basic education system, which required Indonesian children to obtain education at least at an elementary level. School teaching was intended to instil the moral values of *Pancasila* into all Indonesian students. The government leaders in this era believed that nation-building to create responsible generations with high morality would be achieved if all citizens subscribed to the same principles reflected in *Pancasila* as the state’s philosophical ideology (Buchori & Malik 2004). Due to financial constraints during this period, charitable (religious) foundations were established to meet the growing demands for education provision. The new schools constructed were predominantly private and based on religious teachings. For instance, in Sumatra and Java, classes were mostly given in Islam, while those in the eastern part of Indonesia were Christian (Kristiansen & Pratikno 2006). These schools, as Kristiansen and Pratikno note, also helped to significantly reduce the illiteracy rates amongst the Indonesian population.

Nation-building via education continued to be a central policy in the New Order era (Indonesian: *era Orde Baru*). The New Order governance was introduced by the second president of Indonesia, Soeharto, when he first came to govern in 1966. Soeharto used this term to point out the differences between his regime and that of his predecessor, Soekarno (dubbed as *Orde Lama* or Old Order era). Despite Soeharto’s repressive reign, including practices of *KKN* (corruption, collusion and nepotism) and lack of transparency (Al-Samarrai & Cerdan-Infantes 2013), high rates of economic growth in this era had allowed for great gains in education facilities. From 1973, public primary schooling started to develop under the New Order policy, which ’set aside portions of oil revenues for constructing new primary schools’ and hiring teachers and administrators (Frederick & Worden 2011, p. 150). Through a program named *SD-INPRES* (Presidential Instruction for Primary Schools), the Soeharto government built nearly 61,000 primary schools in the 1980s, which resulted in a significant improvement of literacy rates (Christano &
Cummings 2007; Frederick & Worden 2011; Kell & Kell 2014). In 1989, the Basic Education Law was revised and the compulsory education period was extended from six to nine years (six years at elementary school and three years at lower secondary level). Following this structure, all children aged seven to fifteen, regardless of their social, cultural and economic backgrounds and status, were legally required to attend school. They could choose to attend private or public schools managed by Indonesia’s Ministry of Education and Culture or madrasah (Islamic private or public schools supervised by the Ministry of Religious Affairs). The major distinction between madrasah and public schools was that the former held curricular subjects that focused more on religious knowledge, while the latter put more emphasis on general science materials.

The Indonesian schooling system during the New Order era was centrally administered and allowed for minimal local autonomy. It had one major goal: to teach students basic content knowledge and the principles of participation in society. A key feature of the national curriculum in this era was instruction in Pancasila, the five principles of which were outlined in part 2.2 of this Chapter. As Soekarno, the formulator of Pancasila, argued, the future Indonesian state should be based on these five principles – belief in one God, humanitarianism, national unity, democracy and social justice (see part 2.2 of this Chapter). Nielsen (1998, p. 23) suggests that the New Order government imposed ‘unquestioning loyalty to the state’s ideology [Pancasila]’ on teachers and other government employees and had ‘excessive power and control’ over their roles.

From a contemporary perspective, the New Order is viewed as the most centralised and authoritarian governance model in Indonesia. Under Soeharto, the curricular focus was on the maintenance of national unity and stability, signalling to teachers that their major role was to support any policy set by the central government leaders. Teachers were rated based on their obedience to the central government rather than their commitment to improving curriculum and pedagogical practice in their schools. Anwar (2010) notes that government employees in general felt intimidated and forced to vote Golkar, the state political party. Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia (Indonesian Teachers’ Union) was no longer used as a forum for sharing
ideas to improve teaching but as a system to keep teachers’ actions under surveillance. In this circumstance, teachers understood that strong loyalty to the goals of the country articulated by the national government translated into job security.

Other core concerns of the time included lessons on morality, personality, behaviour, intelligence and creativity (Leigh 1999). This implies that the purpose of education in this era was to change students’ behaviour and life. To perform this task, corporal punishments were frequently applied. Parents largely supported this (Huss & Jarchow 2008). In addition to this, lessons in the New Order system of schooling tended to view knowledge as a binary divide, in the sense that what was learnt was either true or false, right or wrong, correct or incorrect. As a result, students learnt to see the world in black and white rather than shades of grey (Leigh 1999). The task of the students was to learn all the correct answers from textbooks, which were formatted to invest power to maintain the status quo. Textbooks were an ideal instrument to indoctrinate students in the particular interests of the central government. Through textbooks, the idea of national unity and stability was emphasised as an important principle on a daily basis through lessons. Most teachers did not feel that they had a right to criticise alternative points of view that might be present in textbooks or in other government policies. Engaging in activities of this kind would be justified as disloyalty or disobedience against the central government authority.

Between 1997 and 1998, Indonesia underwent a major financial crisis, affecting the lives of many. More than five million workers were exposed to unemployment as an impact of the crisis (Aspinall & Fealy 2010). Government policy in education was also affected due to high inflation. The education budget was cut by the New Order government along with the national currency, rupiah, which lost approximately 85% of its value in a few months after July 1997 (see Oey-Gardiner 2000). These circumstances prompted the people of Indonesia to support the struggle for democratisation. As a result, on 21st of May, 1998, Soeharto resigned from his presidency, thus signalling the collapse of the New Order era, which had lost its bargaining power against university students and local elites who were
outspoken in their demands for political reform, democracy and regional autonomy at all sectors, including education.

After the fall of Soeharto, there was a large devolution of responsibility for nation-building and planning to provincial and regional governments (Tobias et al. 2014). In the education sector, for instance, in 1999, the Indonesian government initiated reforms regarding educational decision making, which then shifted from a highly centralised, bureaucratic and authoritarian model to a decentralised, democratic and inclusive mode of operation. As the initiation of the decentralisation reforms began, education regulations were established, aiming to reduce authority of the central government and increase responsibility and contributions from local governments and schools. This gave local governments and schools considerable freedom towards education services and was intended to shift responsibility for curriculum development closer to a school level. Hence, local education authorities and teachers were able to play a more prominent role in planning, implementing and evaluating the effectiveness of education programs in their localities.

Furthermore, as a remedy to the previous domination of the central authorities, the system of *Manajemen Berbasis Sekolah (MBS)* (school-based management) was enacted and *Komite Sekolah* (school committees) comprised of principals, teachers and communities had to be established across schools. In addition, the process of decentralisation in Indonesia was supported by the *Bantuan Operasional Sekolah (BOS)* (school operational assistance), consisting of grants from the central government to local schools that were aimed to lower school fees for students from poor families, and increase enrolment and completion rates. This implies an effort of the government to improve the quality of the school management system and support greater community participation and accountability, through which relationships between schools and communities are expected to be strengthened. Evidence from the World Bank (2011), conducting a field experiment in Indonesia, suggested that collaboration between school committees and local communities in monitoring the delivery of education services potentially led to a greater engagement from school stakeholders and improved student learning. In other words, schooling could be more effective and accountable if it is associated with an
improved system of management and connections with communities (Weston 2008).

Suggested reforms for organisational systems were also accompanied by efforts to introduce reform in curriculum practice and instruction, attempting to move from: (1) a content-based curriculum to a competency-based one and (2) teacher-centred rote learning to student-centred active methods. Further outcomes of decentralisation were *Kurikulum Berbasis Kompetensi (KBK)* (competency-based curriculum), *Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP)* (school-based curriculum development), and the latest 2013 Curriculum design (*Kurikulum 2013*) offering the promotion of schools’ and teachers’ autonomy in the provision of educational practices. The emphasis of school teaching was no longer on memorising facts and theoretical content knowledge, but on achieving competencies that combine ‘integrated skills, knowledge, attitudes and [moral] values demonstrated by task performance’ (Tobias et al. 2014, pp. 4-5; see also MoEC 2013). Nonetheless, according to Bjork (2003), who undertook research on teachers’ responses to the decentralised curriculum policy in Indonesia, many teachers experienced difficulties adjusting to the new perspective of curricular autonomy. These difficulties included teachers’ lack of ability to develop their own curriculum. Consequently, teachers often retained the same teaching materials that they had drawn on in the past rather than designing new curriculum. Bjork (2003) suggests that a tradition of strong civil-service had developed over many years, and teaching was viewed in a particular way, usually the emphasis being on mastering rudimentary facts.

Recent research, however, suggests that there has been positive change in teachers’ responses to decentralisation and demands for local autonomy. For example, Young’s (2010) study of local curriculum content in Banten, West Java has identified positive responses of teachers in the province to (1) perspectives of localising curriculum and (2) directives from the local education authority to be more actively engaged in teaching and learning processes in classrooms. On this point, Tobias et al. (2014), conducting interviews with District Education Official in Indonesia, assert:
Decentralisation is good because we don’t need to wait for a decision from the central government or Ministry… Furthermore, those who know best are those who are closer (p. 6).

In addition, the analysis of teaching methods and students’ outcomes conducted by Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) indicates that Indonesian students taught using methodologies in line with these reforms perform significantly better in assessments (MoEC 2013; World Bank 2013). This highlights that the decentralisation and devolution of power and autonomy to local schools and teachers has attempted to challenge historically strong traditions and cultures of the New Order in educating students, which may then add more complexity to teachers’ work in Indonesia, particularly those located in (remote) rural areas (Young 2010; Luschei & Zubaidah 2012). Teachers in remote rural Probolinggo regency, for instance, still face difficulties in pursuing curricular objectives due to limited resources and facilities. The following part will elaborate on this point.

### 2.4 Teaching in Indonesia’s Remote Rural Probolinggo Regency

Shifting policy sentiments in Indonesia have impacted all teachers, and rural teachers in the Probolinggo regency are no exception. National educational planners have viewed decentralisation as a key strategy to increase the quality and productivity of schools, especially teaching practice and the nature of the learning activities undertaken in classrooms. National education designers believe that decentralisation enables the involvement of local authorities, teachers, parents and communities in making important decisions about how their local schools should be managed and operated in order to make students more engaged in their learning (Oey-Gardiner 2000; Kristiansen & Pratikno 2006). Decentralisation, in this regard, means the empowerment of local stakeholders, which potentially leads to a more efficient use of resources (Oey-Gardiner 2000). Drawing on Raihani (2007), decentralisation also encourages teachers to utilise their knowledge and creativity in designing their own syllabi that incorporate more inclusive teaching and learner-centred activities in all subjects.

However, in remote rural areas in Indonesia’s Probolinggo regency, there is a mismatch between the central expectations and the local conditions, and this
prevents reforms in teaching practice from being enacted in local schools. This mismatch could potentially act as a block to the reform in three ways: scarcity of resources and quality of school facilities, inadequate training of teachers and remuneration.

The first is a scarcity of resources and school facilities, which are insufficient to carry out the intent of education policy. In these circumstances, local teachers are forced to pursue curricular objectives with limited resources and facilities. Most teacher participants in this study, for instance, have expressed their concern about the lack of sport facilities and learning tools such as textbooks and props for teaching, and in pursuit of their instructional objectives, they utilised whatever relevant sources from their surroundings (see Chapter 7). Evidently, this is not an example of the use of particular contextual teaching materials connecting students with real life, but it is a case of having no other choice due to limited facilities. A lack of financial support from the government has also forced schools and teachers to ask parents for financial contributions to purchase and improve school facilities. This is evidenced by one of the research participants, who asked students to save a particular amount out of their pocket money to buy teaching resources (see Chapter 7). This strategy might be useful, but, in many cases, students’ parents should not be burdened with such financial support because most of them are living in poverty.

Moreover, in sending their children to school, many parents expect that their children will become prosperous, independent and virtuous people. In pursuit of this, a number of teachers in the regency apply the New Order style of punishment, namely corporal punishment, even though government policy prohibits it. Teachers generally consider that corporal punishment is one of the ways to motivate students to have good character and morality. For instance, some of the teachers in this study strongly favour corporal punishment as a deterrent toward students taking drugs, for example (see Chapter 6). Parents in the regency of Probolinggo, who mostly experienced the New Order style of schooling may endorse such a punishment due to its supposed effectiveness in promising good morality and a change in their children’s character, apparently for the better. Parents have never challenged this form of punishment.
The second impediment to reform is that most schools in this region employ untrained or unqualified teachers due to inadequate in-service training for local teachers. All of the teacher participants in this study live in rural mountain areas with deep valleys and flowing rivers, located approximately 150 kilometres away from the provincial capital city of Surabaya, East Java, and about 40 kilometres from the local government centre (see Figure 2 for a map of Probolinggo regency).

Figure 2: Map of Probolinggo Regency

The roads to the sites in this region are narrow, steep and slippery during the rainy season (from Probolinggo to the research locations) so that these locations can only be reached by motorbike or by walking. Remote can be the best categorical term for the locations (Efendi 2012). According to some school principals in these areas, this condition probably affects frequency of visits from government supervisors, whereas their visits are considered important to increase teachers’ engagement in schools.

In addition, rural teachers have limited access to professional development centres and do not receive as much formal education/training as urban teachers (see Chapter 7). Revisions to the curriculum have been done to develop teachers’ abilities to interpret their understanding of curriculum changes and translate it into intended teaching and learning activities, so that learning will be more meaningful and relevant to students’ needs. However, in the rural Probolinggo regency, little professional effort has been invested in advancing local teachers’ understanding of these changes. Consequently, their teaching style in the classroom tends to revert
to the New Order perspective of teaching, which is conventional and dominated by content-based and rote learning, lecturing and assigning. Teachers are didactic in their approach to the learning process and tend to promote the idea of obedience to classroom authority (teachers). Teachers, in this regard, are to be fully respected and play roles as controllers of classrooms rather than learning facilitators. Most classroom activities mainly focus on delivery of content knowledge within a limited time and include very little practice in classrooms or leave practice for students to do as homework. Drawing on Mirza (2012), this strategy does not allow for experiences of new concepts and production of fruitful prospects of learning.

A further issue related to remote rural teachers in Probolinggo regency is their payment. Teachers in this regency receive different salaries, depending on their employment status (see Table 1).

Table 1: Indonesia’s Teacher Employment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning (Type of Teacher)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Certified</td>
<td>Certified by the government to teach; attracts higher pay rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Government School</td>
<td>Teaches in a government school; paid by the government; paid relatively well, especially in combination with certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Local Contract</td>
<td>Teaches in a government school; paid by the government; paid relatively less than government school teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Np</td>
<td>Non-permanent</td>
<td>Employed on a non-permanent basis (government or independent sector)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Employed on a permanent basis (government or independent sector)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pv</td>
<td>Private School</td>
<td>Teaches in a private independent school; paid by the school’s foundation; paid relatively less than government school and local contract teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Take for example, some of the teacher participants in this study. Fatin, Harun and Amir are permanent private school teachers (PPv); Anton is a non-permanent teacher (Np); Rani is a permanent government school teacher (PG); and Nita, Budi and Santi are certified permanent government school teachers (CPG). In terms of payment, PPv and Np teachers are paid much less than PG and CPG teachers, yet they have the same responsibility as PG and CPG teachers. PG and CPG teachers also receive old age pensions from the government while PPv and Np teachers do not. With their very low payment, PPv and Np teachers commonly look for another job after completion of their daily school teaching duties to support themselves. This has obvious effects on teachers, as some participants allude to (see Chapters 6 and 7). Schools employing PPv and Np teachers frequently face problems of teacher absenteeism as they are usually not only teachers, but also farmers who take on teaching to supplement the meagre income that they derive from agriculture. Consequently, they often teach less or only a portion of their load as they find excuses to leave early. In this circumstance, according to some teachers in this study, teaching tends to be ineffective in that one teacher has to handle two classes at the same time (see Chapter 6).

Another issue regarding schools in Indonesia’s rural Probolinggo regency deals with communities’ inappropriate view of schools as shared goods, which allows for those in the neighbourhood to freely take advantage of the school yards. In this respect, schools are regularly used by trespassers for personal profit. It is evident in several schools in this study that some community members utilise school grounds for non-school activities such as grazing areas for their cattle or goats after school time, recreational activities like playing football and storing community tools and equipment. These circumstances not only damage school property, but also make the schools dirty and create unsanitary conditions for students, potentially causing health problems and preventing students from full participation, involvement and engagement in learning.

In addition to this, a number of (remote) rural schools in the regency face theft of school property. According to some participants in this study, these problems are often unreported, and therefore it remains unsafe to keep expensive learning
equipment and materials at schools. Before my visit to those schools, that they are experiencing such challenges was not common knowledge. The schools seem to be helpless in addressing these problems. Bachtiar (2014) categorises issues such as this as conflicts with the community. To resolve this, as Bachtiar suggests, the regional government needs to provide training for school principals and teachers to help them learn the local culture and ways of engaging with the local community. Revitalising Komite Sekolah (school committees) and/or appointing principals who are part of the community may also help ease the problem.

2.5 Conclusion

The construction of education and schooling in Indonesia cannot be set apart from the historical context of struggle in pursuit of freedom, equality and justice against the colonial powers. Despite the fact that learning activities in Indonesia had existed prior to the colonial times, formal schooling only began in the Dutch colonial period and continued up to the years of the Japanese reign. Nonetheless, the nationalists viewed that schooling under the colonial rulers were not inclusive of the indigenous people of Indonesia. It merely benefitted children of the colonial families and operated for the political and economic interests of the colonial invaders. These circumstances drove the Indonesian people towards their fight for freedom and independence.

After the proclamation of Indonesia’s independence in 1945, education was given priority. The Indonesian authorities saw the prominent role of education in establishing the nation. They agreed that the construction of Indonesian education ought to be based on the Pancasila as the state ideology that orients itself to encompass the past, present and future perspectives of Indonesian people. The major goal of education was set for the sake of national identity and unity.

During Soeharto’s centralistic reign, education and schooling grew rapidly along with the rapid growth of the Indonesian economy. Nonetheless, Soeharto utilised schools as a propaganda tool for maintaining the status quo, for instance by forcing teachers to accept and obey all of the central government’s policies (Anwar 2010).
This occurred until the advent of the Reform Era in 1998. The Reform Era was the starting point of decentralisation (democratisation) in education in Indonesia, where educators (teachers) gained their freedom and autonomy to develop their own school (curriculum).

In some respects, however, decentralisation is a challenge for remote rural teachers, particularly in Indonesia’s Probolinggo regency. There are conditions that local teachers find hard to reform, for instance scarce resources, poor school facilities and teachers’ limited access to professional development and low payment (see part 2.4 of this Chapter). In other words, there is a justice issue in terms of the provision of adequate resources required to expand the capabilities of teachers to engage in socially just teaching. Chapters 3 and 4 in part will elaborate on this matter. Apart from this, the notion of social justice embodied in Pancasila is not theorised, and thus an understanding of various social justice approaches is necessary to advance the conception of teaching for social change in Indonesia.
Chapter 3
Social Justice in Education and Schooling

3.1 Introduction

This Chapter explores the idea of social justice from different perspectives within education and schooling. The term social justice is a contested notion and has different interpretations and significance in particular circumstances. There are multiple accounts of social justice due to its various meanings in diverse social and cultural contexts. Differences in perceptions about social justice related to education and schooling can lead to conflicting views of its role. Exploring the different perspectives of social justice in education and schooling constitutes a multi-tasking matter as it not only links the development of society with the roles of education, but also coexists with the expressions of human rights, equality, cultures and identities. In this regard, educational institutions (schools) with a strong commitment to social justice needs to directly reflect or be involved in the social and cultural activities of society. Further, Sturman (1997) acknowledges that different perspectives of social justice attached to education and schooling are likely to be tied to different views of the capacity of education and schooling to tackle the disadvantages that students bring to school and of the innate abilities that exist within students.

Despite these differences, Carlisle et al. (2006) contend that a major educational role is the pursuit of inclusion and equity within school contexts and the wider community. Educating in socially just ways embraces the diversity of student background and school context to enhance the educational outcomes of all students. Similarly, Keddie and Churchill (2009) argue that in line with the goals of democracy, equity and justice, educating for social justice enables schools and teachers to make a difference in terms of connecting pedagogy to social change.
According to Boyd et al. (2007), education for social justice is not only a matter of transforming knowledge, but also of promoting a humanly possible world. This holds the significance of teaching and learning practices for ‘shaping the experiences and trajectories of students’ lives’ (Beaudry 2015, p. 29). Teaching needs to be socially and culturally responsive in order to enable all students to reach high levels of learning and to be prepared for active and full participation in a democratic society (Beaudry 2015). This socio-cultural approach to teaching and learning encourages teachers to take account of such issues as community, diversity and equity in their teaching and provide students with more opportunities to reflect on personal life experiences related to those issues. Moll et al. (1992) acknowledge that teachers should have the ability to explore students’ *funds of knowledge* and socio-cultural structures that exist in the communities where students live.

This thesis is focused on how school teachers engage in socially just curriculum and teaching practices and as such engages with notions of social justice as it is theorised in the extant research literature. Contemporary theories that underpin concepts of social justice are included in this Chapter as they lay the foundations for the subsequent assessment of Indonesian curricular documents and teaching practices. Sturman (1997) argues that reviews of justice theories are worth doing as they can draw out key themes that are central to conceptualising social justice in education. This Chapter begins with discussions of several social justice theories that include: justice as *fairness* (John Rawls), followed by discussions of *relational* conceptions of justice (Iris Marion Young), justice as *redistribution, recognition* and *representation* (Nancy Fraser) and justice as *distributive, retributive and recognitive* (Trevor Gale and Kathleen Densmore).

### 3.2 Justice as *Fairness* (John Rawls)

Rawls’ (1999) theory of social justice is focused on *fairness*. Rawls views social justice from the standpoint of universality, presuming that justice principles are applicable to all. He suggests that a conception of justice as fairness needs to be applied in all practical contexts, particularly in making social decisions about the distribution of resources. Rawls begins from the premise of impartiality, in the
sense that social decisions are not made on the basis of personal attitudes or personal relationships with particular people. It is considered unfair, for instance, if institutional leaders privilege particular persons because these persons are in fact their family members or to ignore particular people due to unpleasantness towards their appearance or accent. Rawls suggests that different groups of people have equal rights and opportunities, and therefore they need to be treated equally as if they were the same despite their differences. This perspective of equality (sameness) can be traced from Rawls’ conception of a veil of ignorance. Drawing on Hayden (2002, pp. 19-20), the veil of ignorance removes all personal accounts that differentiate one person from another and ‘eliminates knowledge of natural and social factors that set persons at odds’. In Rawls’ (1999) vision, all need to be ‘similarly situated’ so that ‘the symmetry of everyone’s relations to each other’ (p. 11) can be maintained.

Rawls’ (1999) notion of justice is institutional rather than individual, in the sense that justice in society is enabled through just institutions. This reflects Rawls’ account of justice that gives priority to the basic structure of society and the key role of institutions in the distribution of primary goods and resources. As Rawls states:

The primary subject of justice is the basic structure of society, that is how social institutions distribute fundamental rights and duties and share benefits accruing from social cooperation (p. 7).

To determine which social institutions would be just, Rawls suggests basic social structure and principles of justice in a society that must be chosen by rational agents through social cooperation, and thus they are free from prejudice and partiality.

Rawls’ (1999) strategy for determining what people would rationally but impartially choose is through a thought experiment; that is imagining people in an original position behind the veil of ignorance. In this experiment, they are to be rid of knowledge of potentially-biased identities such as gender, race, religion, talents, abilities, preferences and so forth. Rawls asserts that with ignorance of their positions in the society, people will tend to work cooperatively to choose what society should be like. This indicates that society has the potential for promoting cooperation and the provision of mutual benefits. People could share the mutual
benefits of social goods through cooperation in producing and gaining social goods. To maintain this, Rawls argues for the enactment of rules and regulations through (social) institutions based on the principles of justice initially agreed upon. In these circumstances, as Rawls suggests, people will cooperate rather than compete in the attainment of social goods and one particular group will not receive more goods and resources than others. This phenomenon highlights the *distributive* nature of justice, which provides moral guidance for any political process and structure that potentially affect the distribution of primary social goods in societies. Rawls has warned that the distribution of social goods is inseparable from the result of human political activities, which constantly change over time and fundamentally affect people’s lives. According to Rawls, the framework of distributions has to be morally preferable so that institutions are able to act properly to guarantee that all people live a decent life.

According to Sturman (1997), Rawls’ conception of *distributive* justice is strictly egalitarian, in the sense that it calls for allocating primary goods equally to all members of society. *Goods*, in this respect, are not only money, food, clothes or shelter, but also rights, liberties and opportunities. In Rawls’ (1999) conception of distributive justice, access to resources and commodities is not determined by one’s race, gender, cultural (family) background or other personal attributes, but by mere capacities to produce social goods and possession of social resources and commodities. According to Rawls, there are two principles of social justice that ought to be considered for the distribution of primary goods:

First, each person is to have equal rights and equal basic liberties; second, social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they [turn out] to be advantages [attachable] to positions and offices open to all (pp. 52-53).

In terms of the first principle, Rawls suggests that an equal liberty can guarantee equal basic or constitutional liberties for all citizens. Rawls assumes that people tend to consider equal liberty as a valuable thing, for not all of them agree to a social system that encourages coercion towards their preferences. Rawls views equal liberty as a primary good that most people want and need, and as an insurance against domination and inequalities in the distribution of and access to resources and commodities. The second principle deals with Rawls’ *difference* principle, which entails the principle of *Fair Equality of Opportunity*. This principle allows
for diverging from strict equality under two conditions: (1) the inequalities are managed to make the least advantaged groups in society materially better than they are under strict equality, and (2) particular groups do not have greater advantages over others. Rawls indicates that these two principles of social justice are applicable to major social institutions in carrying out their duties to equally distribute social and economic benefits. All social institutions, as Rawls suggests, should establish conceptions under the two principles so that the long-term holdings of primary social goods could be maximised, particularly for the least advantaged members of society.

Rawls’ work on distributive justice has contributed to further theories and debates about accounts of distribution, particularly in relation to education. As Kliewer and Zacharakis (2015, p. 39) state, Rawls’ theory has the potential to make major contributions to justice education for two reasons:

First, the theory operates within the contract tradition and is intended to be a strict compliance theory; and second, procedural and deliberative elements of this process ensure claims of justice are linked to public reason and justification.

The former reason refers to a claim that Rawls’ distributive justice is an ideal theory in the provision of principles that can be relatively accepted by rational people within particular conditions. In the meantime, the latter reason deals with Rawls’ (1999) account of justice, which aims to assign rights and duties and to hold the appropriate allocation of advantages. In this regard, Rawls’ framework can be a theoretical foundation for the construction of civic leadership education (Shields 2015). Educators working in the field of civic leadership design education curriculum on the basis of Rawls’ comprehensive theory viewing justice and moral development as public reason. This is to prepare students to critically engage in and reflect on public discourse and seek solutions to complex problems of communities and particular groups who might have been historically disadvantaged due to an unfair system of institutions. In essence, as Kliewer and Zacharakis (2015) claim, Rawls’ theory of justice and its commitment to respecting public reason provide civic leadership education designers with more effective strategies for developing the basic structure of curriculum cultivating the skills of abstract reason and a desire for justice amongst students.
Moreover, Rawls’ perspective of *Fair Equality of Opportunity* has been widely thought of as the most relevant to guiding and assessing the design of educational institutions. Shields (2015) acknowledges that this principle augments the *Careers Open to Talents* perspective, which requires that all students have fair chances to attain advantageous positions in society. To achieve this, Rawls (1999) suggests that all institutions, including schools, must satisfy each person’s claim to have knowledge of his or her own talents and interests. Following this principle, the aim of education and schooling is then to develop a wide range of students’ talents, by which students have sufficient self-knowledge of their skills and interests and are well-prepared for future work. Teaching, in this regard, can be centred on the involvement of students in evaluating institutional leadership. For instance, students are encouraged to identify requirements of justice at an institutional level and learn about the gap between how an institution assigns rights and obligations in the distribution of advantages to all, and the outcomes that the institution generates (Kliwer & Zacharakis 2015). Apart from this, Shields (2015, p. 62) notes that the conception of *Careers Open to Talents* has entailed the construction of comprehensive schooling, which attempts to equalise talent development and fairly provide students ‘with a variety of educational challenges, not just traditional academics’. Hence, all students can take advantage of teaching and learning activities that enable an exploration of skills and talents and a deeper level of thinking.

Rawls’ work regarding justice in education has been used in the development of education to promote social stability and emphasise a well-ordered society based on mutual respect (Beattie 1982; Kliwer and Zacharakis 2015). On this point Kliwer and Zacharakis (2015) states:

> The well-ordered society is the final stage of [Rawls’] theory and incorporates principles of justice to life. For purposes of justice education, a well-ordered society is intended, and will have a consequence of supporting certain types of moral development and learning (p. 40).

In Rawls’ (1999) theory, the achievement of social stability within a well-ordered society can be possible through social justice education, which ensures that all stakeholders accept the same principles of justice, ‘and the [education] institutions satisfy and are known to satisfy these principles’ (p. 400). In this regard, social justice education is a matter of recognising and cultivating a responsibility for
students and community to perceive how principles of justice are formulated, and how learning spaces that prepare students to engage in the institutional issues of justice are designed.

Hatton and Elliot (1998) also note Rawls’ influence in education policy, and highlight particular educational connections with specific conceptions of justice. In this context, education is seen as a significant social resource that must be equally distributed amongst, and for the benefit of, all students and needs to clearly conceive of justice as involving impartiality and fairness. In essence, a social resource such as education should not be allowed to serve only the interests of privileged groups of people on account of personal favour with those groups (Hatton & Elliot 1998). In addition, Jayasuriya (1987) and Matsumoto (2013) indicate that Rawls’ idea of (Fair) Equality of Opportunity can be a possible basis for conceptualising multiculturalism and social justice in education. In this respect, governments should be responsible for the establishment of education policy that underlines equal power relations and distributions of resources in favour of the least advantaged groups, so that all students, regardless of their backgrounds, can have equal opportunity to achieve success.

Nonetheless, according to Rivzi (1998), the use of Rawls’ perspective of (Fair) Equality of Opportunity is insufficient. The reason is that:

Rawls’ theory is an abstraction, an idealized conception which [still] needs to be translated into concrete policies and practices. Abstract principles cannot dictate the way society is to be organized (Rivzi 1998, p. 79).

In other words, a conceptual framework of social justice needs to take a detailed account of social realities that are constantly structured based on differentiation. Apart from this, matters of multiculturalism and social justice are not simply issues for government policy and/or government responsibility; more importantly, they can be school and teacher issues as well (Rivzi 1998). Thus, if school teachers are serious about social change, they should not simply view issues of multiculturalism and justice as a matter of policy externally designed, but as a principle that needs exploring so that it is meaningfully and significantly applicable in practical circumstances.
Likewise, Arneson (1999) argues that in some cases, the *(Fair)* Equality of Opportunity cannot guarantee the distribution of resources to be free from discrimination or oppression. In a society where advantageous positions, such as jobs in schools, are determined through selection according to merit, and educational institutions effectively offer compensations to reduce the advantages of fortunate family groups, the *(Fair)* Equality of Opportunity principle might be perfectly applicable. In this regard, two people with equal talents and skills can have the same opportunities in competition for an advantageous position. Nevertheless, particular characteristics of society do not always allow for this. For instance, in some rural areas in Indonesia, certain positions and jobs are positioned as unladylike and inappropriate for women, and therefore these positions are unlikely to be sought by women, and tend to become the preserve of men.

Despite Rawls’ (1999) ideals that men and women with the same native talents and skills have the same prospects for success in society, the ambitions of individuals (women) can be influenced by constructed barriers. Following the notion of Fair Equality of Opportunity, such a circumstance can be regarded as an unjust practice in that there is considered discrimination against women by unfairly restricting their ambitions. Drawing on Arneson (1999), however, two people with the same native talent and skills can have freedom to express their different ambitions and prospects of success, and this is not necessarily a description of injustice. Thus, the two people articulate their individuality freely in forming different ambitions, and ‘… there is nothing prima facie unfair if [their] different ambitions lead to different levels of competitive success’ (Arneson 1999, p. 2).

Moreover, Costa (2013) argues that in general Rawls’ conception of justice does not offer any specific discussion of the contribution that schools and teachers can make to the creation or maintenance of a just society. This is because it takes less account of diverse cultural backgrounds, race and gender in the distribution of social primary resources, including education. Classrooms are heterogeneous, consisting of individuals with diverse cultural backgrounds and characteristics; sometimes including severe physical or mental impairments and disabilities (Nussbaum 2006). Drawing on Nussbaum (2006), school teachers need to take the complexity of student diversity into account in their teaching; failure to embrace
this is a kind of injustice. Robeyns and Brighouse (2010) suggest that distribution of educational resources as primary goods should adequately account for diversity among individual students’ abilities so that students turn out to be more engaged in learning.

In addition to that, Gewirtz (1998) suggests that the issue of power is not explicitly represented in Rawls’ distributive paradigm, whereas teaching as a socio-cultural process can be characterised by the exclusion and marginalisation of minority groups, and the characterisation of individuals based on particular power and interests. In this sense, school teachers may contribute to inequalities or injustices and oppressive practices by, for instance, intentionally instilling a particular ideology in students rather than focusing on their learning and life experiences (Cohran-Smith et al. 2008). McInerney et al. (1999) support this idea, indicating that diversity and power are significant and distinctive factors that can potentially affect teaching and learning in schools. The aspects of diversity and power can also be added to theories of teaching and learning, teaching styles, assessment strategies, student-teacher relationships and school structures or organisational features to advance students’ learning. Drawing on Giroux, McInerney et al. (1999) thus recommend that classroom teaching practices ought to engage teachers in critical reflection about curriculum and the wider social context, so that schools and classrooms can be places that promote the possibility for equity and justice.

This study focuses on issues of diversity and power regarding pedagogy and schooling, and therefore broader notions of justice other than simply Rawls’ conception of distributive justice or justice as fairness need to be examined. The social justice perspectives of theorists such as Iris Marion Young, Nancy Fraser, Trevor Gale and Kathleen Densmore also need to be considered because they adopt Rawls’ distributive theory as a basis for developing particular perspectives in conceptualising social justice. Young, for instance, takes accounts of power and social relations in her theory, while Fraser concerns herself with the simultaneous instances of socio-economic, cultural and political injustices. It is argued that these matters of justice are overlooked in Rawls’ distributive theory despite their great importance (Young 1990; Fraser 1997). While the work of Young and Fraser has
implications for how education needs to be framed and designed, they do not specifically talk about education. Thus, the perspectives of Gale and Densmore are considered because they are rooted in educational research.

3.3 Relational Conception of Justice (Iris Marion Young)

Young’s (1990) relational conception of social justice emerges from her criticism of Rawls’ (1999) conception of distributive justice. She identifies two problems in Rawls’ distributive paradigm. First:

- a distributive paradigm tends to focus on the possession of material goods and social positions [but] obscures other issues of institutional organization at the same time. [Second,] when the distribution is extended to cover such goods as self-respect, opportunity, power and honor, the logic of distribution treats nonmaterial goods as identifiable things distributed in a static pattern (p. 8).

Hence, Young views Rawls’ distributive justice as a philosophical theory of social justice that is restricted to a mere distribution of material resources in society. Rawls’ theory, as Young argues, foregoes social relationships and the roles of social organisations and institutions that may shape how social goods are distributed. Young’s criticism of Rawls’ theory does not amount to a rejection of the distributive paradigm. Rather, she displaces the distributive paradigm as a philosophical theory that should perceive social justice broadly. Young argues that distributive justice should take into account social context to cover ‘all aspects of institutional rules and relations insofar as they are subject to potential collective action’ (p. 16). Thus, Young’s relational conception of justice has widened the scope of social justice. It highlights the centrality of power and social relations, and the establishment of social rules and procedures to help regulate people’s actions in society, particularly in how they treat each other.

Young’s (1990) argument that follows is that it is unrealistic to merely imagine that social institutions are able to pursue practices that are perfectly just. According to Young, to make assessments of social justice, one should take the ways in which justice is enacted in practice into account. This implies that discussions of what constitutes social justice need to be perceived in relation to real and practical situations, and not just abstract conception. In her analysis of Young’s work, Gewirtz (2006) suggests that justice must be context-dependent as well as context-
specific. Different occupational groups such as teachers, policy makers and managers, for instance, may require different relevant criteria of justice in that ‘there [are] differences in terms of what is possible and/or desirable according to [their] different national, regional, and/or local contexts’ (Gewirtz 2006, p. 70).

This means that the construction of justice needs to consider different histories, social and cultural backgrounds and different existing constraints, so that all of these can contribute to providing particular patterns of success for different people.

For Young (1990), the idea of justice can be perceived by re-conceptualising what constitutes injustice. Hence, Young’s relational conception of justice anticipates two practices that define injustice, namely oppression and domination. These terms emerge from her first consideration of the relationship between justice and core values required for living a good life. Young suggests two major values that are necessary conditions for a good life: self-development and self-determination. Oppression is then understood as an impediment to self-development, while domination is defined as a constraint on self-determination. Young also notes that the concept of oppression and domination has changed over time. Prior to social movements in the 1960s and 1970s, oppression and domination referred to the use of power by a government in its treatment of its people. Yet, post-1970, their meaning has designated ‘the disadvantage and injustice that people suffer not because of a tyrannical power [that] coerces them but because of the everyday practices of a well-intentioned liberal society’ (Young 1990, p. 41). Oppression and domination are now structural concepts, in the sense that they are not related to injustices based on decisions that a few people make. Rather, they refer to how people react to their interactions with others in everyday life. That is, structural oppression and domination are now commonplace in contemporary society, which may have implications for education and schooling.

First (2012) indicates that Young’s conception of oppression and domination is useful for school leaders as warnings to safeguard justice for both individuals and groups. This is due to the potentiality that schools establish procedures which reflect patterns of oppression and domination, so that they become places that reproduce injustice (Shultz & Abdi 2012). Drawing on Mandela (1994), education and
schooling can be a *weapon* of domination to *colonise* and de-value individuals’ rights. In this regard, Young (1990) recommends that any institutionalised actions that lead to *oppression* and *domination* ought to be eliminated. Institutions should allow people to learn to apply their skills in social contexts and encourage people to communicate with each other, to express their thoughts and feelings about social life where others can listen.

Young (1990) identifies five categories connected with *oppression* and *domination*. First is economic exploitation; this occurs due to ‘a steady process of the transfer of the results of the labor of one social group to benefit another’ (p. 49). Second is social marginalisation, which arises out of expelling people from participation in social life ‘and thus potentially subjecting people to severe material deprivation and even extermination’ (p. 53). Third is powerlessness; namely an inability to use power. The powerless people, in this regard, ‘are situated so that they must take orders and rarely have the right to give them’ (p. 56). While the first three categories have more to do with social and economic aspects, the fourth and fifth – imperialism and violence – are connected with cultural ones. Cultural imperialism involves ‘the universalization of a dominant group’s experience and culture, and its establishment as the norm’ (pp. 58-59). Meanwhile, violence incorporates physical violence and other forms such as ‘harassment, intimidation, or ridicule simply for the purpose of degrading, humiliating, or stigmatizing group members’ (p. 61). If all these categories of *oppression* and *domination* are reproduced through institutional processes in a systematic way, ‘we cannot eliminate [them] by [merely] getting rid of the rulers or making some new laws’ (p. 41). Rather, according to Young, eliminating *oppression* and *domination* requires the establishment of a policy that welcomes difference.

More specifically, Young (1990) is committed to the notion of social justice that entails democracy and group representation for disadvantaged groups of people, particularly when existing institutions privilege some groups over others. In this case, there should be talk of an initiative to involve people in collective discussion and decision-making in all settings, such as workplaces, schools, government offices and so forth. This is important to strengthen people’s commitment and
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actions regarding rules and regulations wherever they live and work. Young categorises such representation as a deliberative process and just strategy, which is the best means of promoting just outcomes as well as ensuring that voices, opinions and aspirations of the oppressed or disadvantaged groups of people are accommodated and fully respected.

Young (1990) does not directly apply her concepts to the educational field. However, her ideas lend themselves to considerations of equalising educational opportunities and demands for the elimination of oppression and domination in educational institutions. Curriculum content, teachers and policy makers need to accommodate values of all communities in order that students from minority or disadvantaged groups can achieve as well as those from advantaged or dominant groups. To achieve a less exclusionary social justice paradigm, education and schooling must be viewed as part of a broader system of ongoing processes of inclusion. This means not simply focusing on skills and competencies, but having a commitment to generating citizens who have an empathetic view of the world (Schultz & Abdi 2012; Rodgers 2013). This empathetic view of the world can be generated through education; however, this is not a simple thing to do.

Relating education to the issues of injustices and democracy is a complex matter. Informed by the work of Young (1990) on oppression and domination, Eisenberg (2006) maintains that ‘even the wealthiest countries with highly educated populations do not always guarantee educational systems that offer adequate educational experiences and opportunities for all social groups’ (p. 7). Eisenberg notes that some aboriginal youth in Canada have better chances of being sent to prison than completing university. Eisenberg (2006) also highlights the disparity in the United States between the educational achievement of African American students and white students. Such phenomena may occur worldwide. In Indonesia, for instance, there are noticeable differences between the conditions of urban schools and (remote) rural schools, an issue to which the thesis will turn to in Chapter 7. If phenomena such as these are thought of as representing the failures of developing educational systems, then broader debate about the attainment of equal educational opportunity, the perception of the role of educational systems and the
establishment of strategies in reducing or eliminating any forms of oppression and domination is warranted.

To diminish oppression and domination in school institutions may require a system of education established within Young’s (1990) perspective of participatory democracy. This perspective is pluralistic, and is concerned with the capacities of people from diverse social backgrounds and origins to communicate with each other in an equal manner.

We require real participatory structures in which actual people, with their geographical, ethnic, gender, and occupational differences, assert their perspectives on social issues within institutions that encourage the representation of their distinct voices (Young 1990, p. 116).

In other words, all institutions, including educational institutions, must promote democratic decision-making, accommodate particularities of diverse social backgrounds and listen to the voices from minority, disadvantaged and marginalized social groups of people (Young 1990; Hayes et al. 2006). According to Lingard (2006), teachers need to be socially inclusive to enhance school-community relationships and to ensure that all students are enthusiastic about attending schools, and are actively participating in learning to have any chance of their outcomes improving. This can only happen if school programs enable teachers to move from an authoritative classroom, controlling students’ behaviours and dictating classroom participation, to a more relational and democratic style of teaching, sharing power with students and supporting them in managing their own behaviours. Another theory that is also concerned with democratic arrangement and cultural recognition is Fraser’s work of justice as redistribution, recognition and representation. The next part of the Chapter will elaborate on this.

3.4 Justice as Redistribution, Recognition and Representation (Nancy Fraser)

Fraser (1997) has made contributions to theorising social justice issues in terms of redistribution (of socio-economic resources), recognition (of cultural resources), and representation (of political interests). In her book Justice Interruptus, Fraser (1997) outlines how social justice should be perceived within an era that has posed
the notion of justice as a dilemma, the ‘postsocialist’ era (p. 11). For Fraser, the current era is characterised by:

- an absence of any credible overarching emancipatory project;
- a general decoupling of the cultural politics of recognition from the social politics of redistribution;
- and a decentering of claims for equality in the face of aggressive marketization and sharply rising material inequality (p. 3).

Hence, in theorising social justice, Fraser is concerned with the socio-economic redistribution of resources as well as with the struggle for cultural recognition (see Mills 2013). Fraser (1997) argues that cultural recognition can enhance socio-economic redistribution of resources preventing exploitation and political injustice.

Fraser’s (1997) theory of justice does not view redistribution and recognition as two separated paradigms. Rather, ‘justice requires both redistribution and recognition, and the relation between them’ (p. 12). Hence, according to Fraser, redistributive injustice arises from maldistribution of socio-economic resources, while recognitive injustice emerges from the misrecognition of the value of cultural resources. However, both redistributive (socio-economic) injustice and recognitive (cultural) injustice can occur simultaneously, and to fight against them requires conceptualisation of socio-economic equality and cultural recognition in ways that ‘support rather than undermine one another’ (Fraser 1997, p. 12). In other words, to overcome injustice requires the establishment of a theory that allows for integration of both redistributive and recognitive accounts of justice.

Fraser (1997) acknowledges the logic of the distinction between cultural injustice and socio-economic injustice in which, in practice, both are intertwined. She suggests that there are cultural aspects even in economic institutions because they operate based on cultural norms. Conversely, cultural institutions comprise economic aspects because they have a need for material resources. There is then the potential for a vicious circle of cultural and economic marginalisation, for instance, when cultural norms in economic institutions are biased and economic disadvantage hinders equal participation in public life. Fraser suggests that such cultural and economic injustices could be overcome by two distinct: ‘redistributive remedies and recognitive remedies’ (p.15). She concedes that conceptions of recognition are
likely to be articulated within redistributive remedies and conceptions of redistribution are sometimes expressed in recognitive remedies.

However, Fraser (1997) notes that applying remedies to injustices is more problematic when the case is related to gender and race. Gender injustice, as she points out, can be simultaneously cultural and socio-economic in nature. For this research, take for example, women in remote rural areas in Indonesia; they earn less income than men and, at the same time, can struggle to gain high position(s) in social organisations. In addition, victims of domestic violence and sexual abuse in Indonesia are mostly women. Hence, overcoming injustice against Indonesian women needs to include both redistributive remedies and recognitive remedies. Yet, it is also the case that the two remedies can ‘stand in tension with each other, interfere with, or work against each other’ (Fraser 1997, p. 16), which potentially presents a dilemma.

In response to this dilemma, Fraser (1997, p. 16) offers two approaches: ‘affirmative remedies and transformative remedies’. The former is concerned with rectifying inequities of social arrangements without challenging the framework that produces them, while the latter rectifies inequity by restructuring the framework that produces it. In overcoming cultural injustice, for instance, affirmative remedies involve the notion of ‘mainstream multiculturalism’, which corrects disrespect through the revaluing of unfairly treated groups without disturbing their cultural identities and differentiations (p. 24). Meanwhile, transformative remedies include the notion of ‘deconstruction’, which corrects disrespect through the transformation of the cultural structures that generate it (p. 24). Fraser’s assumption is that destabilisation of the cultural identities and differentiations will arouse self-esteem among disrespected members of the groups and positively influence their perception of self.

Another contribution Fraser (1997) makes to theorising justice is the notion of justice as representation, which is based on her view of social justice in global politics. Representative justice has tended to be understood within nation state boundaries, and relates to equal opportunities in political representation for
minority groups within these boundaries. Fraser suggests that the dimension of representation works on assumptions about who is responsible for making decisions to guarantee that minorities are politically represented. As Cazden (2012) notes, very often minorities are not adequately represented within their own countries and representation practices frequently continue to benefit some groups and harm others (see also Bozalek & Boughey 2012). Political representation is crucial in any conception of justice as it can frame and inform how distributive and recognitive justices are understood. In her later work around social justice Fraser (2005) argues that matters of political representation are not only analytically different from economic redistribution and cultural recognition, but also assigned a privileged place. Fraser’s (2005) argument is that political space or frames can be powerful instruments of injustice as they furnish the stage on which struggles for justice are played out; they establish the criteria of social belonging, and thus determine who and what counts in matters of distributive, recognitive and representative justice.

Fraser’s work, like that of Rawls and Young, does not directly relate to education and schooling. However, her work provides a framework to re-think social justice issues in education and schooling. Cazden (2012, p. 182) argues that the conception of redistributive justice can apply to ‘[educational] resources that require more equitable distribution, such as intellectual matters as well as monetary’. More specifically, redistribution regarding education and schooling should not just be rhetoric or planning. Rather, it needs immediate actions that can give all students an assurance about the intellectual quality of the education they receive through an enriching curriculum (see also Lingard 2006). In addition, Fraser (2000, p. 110) acknowledges that justice as recognition concerns not only the identity of particular groups, but also ‘the status of individual group members as full partners in social interactions’. Similarly, Cazden (2012) interprets the term identity as an aspect that applies to what is taught or the curriculum itself, while status applies to how it is taught or the quality of teaching developed from ongoing interactions between teacher and students.

Following Fraser’s conception of justice as recognition, teaching should not only focus on academic achievement or the achievement of high stakes testing, but also
on developing students’ critical habits of mind through their histories, cultures and life experiences; teaching should prepare them to be active participants in a democratic society (Rodgers 2013). Further, analysing Fraser’s account of justice as representation, McLaughlin et al. (2012) argue that this account is applicable to decision-making in education. Hence, schools need to be autonomous in operation, so as to enable school-community partnership and participation in education. Granting schools autonomy in operation, as McLaughlin et al. suggest, can also advance the capacity to examine the power of decision-making, and hence the removal of pressures of dominance over minority groups.

Keddie (2012a) also draws on Fraser’s theory in the exploration of issues of social justice when researching in a small English language school for refugee students in Queensland. In her interviews with teachers, she uncovers a teacher’s view of a school as a site that should help students overcome obstacles and transform disadvantages. The teacher’s view, as Keddie asserts, is derived from Fraser’s justice principle of participatory parity. This principle encourages social arrangements that enable all to participate as peers in social interaction, and has the potential to overcome barriers that hinder full participation in public life. Drawing on comments from Penny, a teacher in the English language school strongly committed to supporting a more socially just education for disadvantaged students, Keddie states:

Creating social arrangements that foster such [participatory] parity...is about recognising how students are differently positioned in terms of their equity needs and on differential support to address these needs (p. 264).

In this sense, teaching needs to be framed and designed based on recognition of students’ characteristics and cultural backgrounds so that students can take full advantage of the opportunities of education (see also Keddie 2012b). Keddie (2012a) suggests that Fraser’s work is not static as it potentially offers a solution to particular injustices that prevent students from fully participating in schooling.

Another author that applies Fraser’s work in educational research is Mills (2013). Mills is interested in the disproportionate ratio between male and female primary school teachers in some English-speaking countries, and undertakes case studies to explore the features of inequity. He points out that this inequity incorporates
economic injustice in the form of the gender-based maldistribution of wealth, where the teaching staff, who are mostly women, are not well-paid compared to other professions dominated by men, and that this contributes to the feminisation of teaching as a practice and as a profession. These issues, as Mills concludes, can be overcome by employing Fraser’s conception of transformative remedies. He proposes restructuring the economy that disregards differentiations in income for all professions, so that the dominance of one particular gender will not be an indication of income levels.

Mills (2013) suggests that Fraser’s account of transformative remedies is helpful in minimising injustice simultaneously arising from economic and cultural spheres, for it incorporates a bivalent conception of justice. This means that it encompasses both distributive and recognitive paradigms without reducing either of them to the other. The next part of this Chapter will discuss the perspectives of justice as distributive, retributive and recognitive. It is important to include these perspectives of justice as they not only have implications for school education; they also represent key concepts in educational research.

3.5 Justice as Distributive, Retributive and Recognitive (Trevor Gale and Kathleen Densmore)

Gale and Densmore (2000) categorise social justice into distributive, retributive, and recognitive terms. Distributive justice is derived from the concept that individuals have an intrinsic value and worth, and hence the valuing of people is primarily based on the acceptable reasons for distributing goods and services to them. Keddie (2012a, p. 266) contends that distributive justice has framed much equity and schooling policy in western contexts, which recognises that schools do not equitably distribute the benefits of material resources and ‘students are not equitably positioned to take up those benefits’. Thus, distributive justice as the predominant focus within equity and policy and practice continues to be extremely important in pursuing social justice (Keddie 2012a).
According to Gale and Densmore (2000), there are two forms of *distributive* justice. The first of these involves a *liberal-democratic* version, which is based on the assumption of simple equality. It promotes the idea that all individuals have the same basic needs, and hence disadvantaged individuals should be compensated by being provided with basic social goods and material resources. This *liberal-democratic* account differs from a *social-democratic* model of distributive justice, which is based on the notion of complex equality. The *social-democratic* model takes the view that people have different needs and resources that can be used when they want to meet their needs. The *social democratic* model highlights the distribution of different social goods for different people, and it is from this that the term *equity* emerges. Gale and Densmore define *equity* as ‘positive or relevant differentiation’ (p. 13), where different resources are distributed to social groups rather than individuals. *Equity* is a deviation from *equality*, and informed by the view that social justice is different from *sameness*. Groups of people with lower economic income, for instance, may require more financial resources in order to be able to gain access to equality of opportunity for educational benefits. This is in contrast to Rawls’ version of justice as *fairness*, which encourages the distribution of the same amount of resources to all people regardless of their diverse conditions and circumstances.

Gale and Densmore (2000) illustrate ways of understanding *distributive* justice in contexts of education and schooling. They interviewed a secondary/high school teacher, Michelle, in terms of how her appreciation for differences in student behaviour affects her teaching practices. Michelle’s responses indicate that her conception of fairness does not refer to how she sees all students and their backgrounds; rather, any decision she makes needs to consider each student’s individual background. In this respect, she takes into account difference at the level of individuals rather than social groups, indicating her liberal-democratic view of social justice. In addition, Gale and Densmore (2000) argue that from the perspective of liberal-democratic justice, the disadvantaged students are those ‘who lack what society deems to be educational, social and cultural basics’ (p. 255), which can include particular basic skills in reading, writing, mathematics, and skills in terms of behaviour and citizenship.
Gale and Densmore (2000) also conceive of justice in terms of retributive justice. Retributive justice emerges from an underlying interest in liberty and freedom within social interactions and in relation to the distribution of social goods. In this regard, social justice refers to fairness in the competition for social goods rather than the equalization of social goods. From a retributive perspective and in an educational context, students can be individually ranked and should be similarly rewarded according to their academic achievement. Drawing on Nozick (1976), Gale and Densmore argue that retributive justice anticipates the advent of unfair measures that restrict people’s freedoms to use their talents and efforts and limit the rewards that individuals receive for them. Informed by the work of Carr and Hartnett (1996), Gale (2010) thus describes retributive justice as ‘a means of punishing those who illegitimately infringe the rights and freedoms of others’ (p. 257). Schools are full of regulations that might limit students’ activities, yet this is often seen as legitimate in that the purpose is to promote students’ talents and protect their rights and freedom to learn.

Furthermore, Gale and Densmore (2000) identify a third category of social justice, namely recognitive justice. Gale (2010) suggests that recognitive justice is informed by the work of Young and Fraser, and is associated with positive liberty. Recognitive justice involves the recognition of social and cultural differences between groups (Gale & Densmore 2000). It refers to ‘(1) [rethinking] what we mean by social justice and (2) [acknowledging] the place for social groups within this’ (Gale 2010, p. 259). Gale and Densmore (2000) acknowledge that these two meanings for recognition have expanded the broad parameters of what constitutes social justice. From the perspective of recognitive justice, social justice could be achieved under the following circumstances: the enhancement of respect for differences of social and cultural groups through self-identification, the provision of opportunities for self-development and self-expression, and the involvement of social and cultural groups in making decisions that directly concern them (Gale & Densmore 2000, p. 19; see also Gale 2010).

Recognitive justice challenges a purely distributive approach that fails to recognise how matters of cultural disadvantage constrain outcomes. Together with matters of
economic redistribution, matters of cultural recognition should be given priority. In his writing about *the politics of recognition*, Taylor (1997) states:

The demand for recognition is given urgency by the supposed links between recognition and identity, where identity designates an understanding of who we are, of our defining characteristics as human beings (p.98).

Identity is partly shaped by recognition or its absence, in the sense that non-recognition or misrecognition can be a form of oppression and reduce someone’s freedom to develop their potential (see Taylor 1997). Similarly, Fraser (2005) argues that misrecognition and class inequality for particular social groups in society could bring about not only socio-economic injustices but also cultural and political injustices. To avoid this, Fraser (2005) recommends enabling justice for all within these circumstances: (1) the structures of the economy echoing an equitable distribution of material resources, (2) the status order reflecting equitable patterns of cultural recognition and (3) the constitution of political space ensuring equitable representation. In other words, recognition and affirmation of difference is required, in the sense that institutions, including schools, need to create environments that value and appreciate cultural differences (Mills & Gale 2000). Valuing, appreciating and respecting all those involved in education and schooling lay the foundation(s) for mutual and trusted relationships between all members of the school community.

### 3.6 Conclusion

*Social justice* is a contested term and interpreted differently in different contexts. Multiple perspectives of social justice have pointed to a diversity of theories, understandings and uses of social justice as a concept, framework and practice. In relation to education and schooling, this different interpretation has brought about tension as to how socially just teaching is to be framed and designed. The exploration of different theoretical perspectives of justice is of significance in conceptualising social justice in education, and in providing a framework for subsequent assessment of educational policy and curriculum as well as quality of teaching and learning processes. Rawls’ (1999) theory of justice as *fairness*, which assumes that justice principles apply to all, has been a basis for further theories and debates about a distributive account of justice regarding education. Authors such as
Beattie (1982) and Hatton and Elliot (1998) have noted the contributions of Rawls’ account of social justice to education more generally and to the development of education policy. However, from a relational conception of justice, Young’s (1990) criticism is that Rawls’ conception of distributive justice overlooks social relationships and roles of social institutions that may affect the way social resources are distributed. Young’s conception of justice has contributed to anticipating the advent of structural oppression and domination within social organisations and institutions, including schools.

Likewise, Fraser’s (1997) conception of justice as redistribution, recognition and representation emerges from her inherent critique of Rawls’ theory of justice as fairness, which, she argues, foregoes race, gender, family and cultural backgrounds in the distribution of social resources. For Fraser, an injustice is not only social and institutional, but also cultural (see also Young 1990). She argues that to overcome injustice requires the integration of both redistributive and recognitive accounts of justice.

Further, Gale and Densmore’s (2000) conception of justice as distributive, retributive and recognitive is rooted in educational research and derives from the premise that individuals have an intrinsic value and worth, and thus respect for people should be based on acceptable reasons for the distribution of social resources. For the distributive paradigm, Gale and Densmore have presented two forms of distributive justice (liberal-democratic and social-democratic), from which the idea of equity arises. While their recognitive paradigm is informed by the work of Young and Fraser, their retributive conception of justice emerges from theorists re-conceptualising social justice in ways that highlight liberty and freedom within social interactions. In this case, social justice is about equalisation of social resources and anticipation of unfair measures that potentially impede individuals’ freedoms to use their potential rather than fairness in the competition for primary social resources.

The perspectives of social justice described above have provided significant and valuable contributions to the development of social justice theories. Nonetheless,
they are insufficient to address complex issues of education in remote rural areas in Indonesia as they are more focused on achieved functionings and rely on a notion of average groups of people. Briefly, a functioning refers to whatever a person may value doing and being (Walker 2006a). Take, for example, two students in remote rural areas in Indonesia; one student decides to be a farmer despite having the required grades for entering higher education, while the other does not have the required grades, and chooses farming. Evaluating only the functioning (being a farmer), one might see the situation as the same; the two students have decided not to continue their study. Yet, ‘there is something uncomfortable about this kind of conclusion’ (Unterhalter et al. 2007, p. 2). When assessing the determinant of their decision, they are in fact in different circumstances. As Walker (2006a) indicates, the first student has freedom and rationality, while the second has rationality in choosing to be a farmer but not accompanied by freedom. In other words, a mere focus on functionings in the assessment of education quality potentially excludes a wide range of more searching questions with regard to equality and valued educational opportunities (freedom) and choices adapted to people’s diverse circumstances (Unterhalter et al. 2007). Hence, to anticipate such a complex phenomenon in this study, another approach that offers synergies with these theories of social justice, and apply to a wide variety of cases is needed to address aspects of pedagogy in terms of promoting social justice.

In his publications in the 1980s, Amartya Sen presented a perspective of social justice, the capabilities approach (addressed in the next Chapter) which differs from the social justice accounts presented above. The capabilities approach has been an influential normative framework of social justice in recent times, particularly in human development, and it is primarily for reasons such as this that this study is informed by the capabilities approach rather than other approaches to social justice. In other words, this study is interested to approach the issue of social justice in education from a perspective that focuses on potential abilities. In a capability perspective, the design of social policies and institutions, and the evaluation of wellbeing and justice, are primarily based on capabilities to function rather than on achieved functionings. Sen indicates that a capability is a potential functioning, and it represents a person’s real freedom or opportunities to do and to
be what he or she wants. With its focus on capabilities and not functionings that people choose to achieve, the capabilities approach is more flexible than other approaches, for it enables people to create their own life-plan and decide what they choose to do and to be by themselves.

The capabilities approach also works with other elements of justice: redistribution of a variety of resources, recognition and respect for diversity, and equal participation (Walker 2004). The capabilities approach could be a framework for integrative thought(s) of social justice that concerns economic inequalities as well as cultural injustices, and it has wider scope than that of Fraser’s conception of participation parity (Robeyns 2003a; Keddie 2012a). Even though Sen’s account of justice is a criticism to the distributive paradigm, it does not oversimplify this paradigm. Rather, Sen’s conception of justice offers a framework that does distributive justice to the notion of human diversity as well as incorporates an account of recognition. Unlike other approaches, which tend to presuppose a notion of the average person, the capabilities approach covers non-average cases, for example, the physically or intellectually disabled (see Robeyns 2003a). Thus, the capabilities approach is more applicable to assessing equality and people’s quality of life as it enables the inclusion of more cases of justice and the development of justice policies for more people, including children (Robeyns 2003a; Peleg 2013).

The next Chapter will elaborate the capabilities approach. The central point of the capabilities approach is rooted from Sen’s (1992) argument that the assessment of development ought to be centred on human capabilities; what people are able to do and be, personally and in comparison to others (see also Walker 2006a). In this approach, the term capability refers to not only skills, but also achievable choices and a language of opportunities (Gaspar & Staveren 2003), that is to say ‘capabilities are a combination of skills and opportunities’ (Walker 2006a, p. 20). The capabilities approach also points to the limits of approaches that measure human development based on income, wealth and primary resources that a person holds, and highlights the importance of people’s capabilities to convert these resources into functionings. Additionally, even though the capabilities approach does not theorise about education and schooling, this approach has suggested its
relevance to exploring a process to generate a list of capabilities to assess (in)equality and development in teaching and learning (Robeyns 2003b; Walker 2004; Walker & Unterhalter 2007; Terzi 2007).
Chapter 4
The Capabilities Approach

4.1 Introduction

This Chapter focuses on the capabilities approach and its philosophical foundation of human wellbeing, social justice and education. Wellbeing is commonly inseparable from a very basic question: ‘what is it for a life to be good?’ (Moss 2013, p. 62). This includes aspects of an individual’s standard of living, such as independence, health, religious beliefs, freedom, resources, dignity, nutrition, food, happiness, and so forth (Robeyns 2003a; McGillivray & Clarke 2006; Nussbaum 2011). In assessing the quality of life, scholars have different perspectives of wellbeing. Some argue that the determinant of a good life should deal with a list of primary resources and commodities, as it is in the resourcist approach (see Chapter 3). Others argue that the determinant of a good life relates to capabilities and opportunities, as in the capabilities approach. In essence, both of these approaches have their own philosophical assumptions of what is most significant in the assessment of a person’s wellbeing.

In the capabilities approach, the most important aspect of people’s wellbeing and sense of justice is grounded in substantive freedom or actual opportunities to do and to be certain things that they have reason to value (i.e. valuable functionings) and not in primary resources or commodities that they hold. Sen (1999) contends that a focus on possession of primary goods has failed to take account of the distortion of people’s wellbeing. With the capabilities approach, Sen argues that the focus should shift away from people’s means of living toward the actual freedom or opportunities of living. This means that a person should have potential ability to do and to be certain things that he or she has reason to value. With this approach, Sen also wants to focus on how to make society more just rather than making demands for a perfectly just society. In later writing about the capabilities approach, Sen (2006)
argues that the focus of the capabilities approach is more on the ways and means of advancing justice or reducing injustice by remedying inequities in a society.

As stated in Chapter 3, this study is informed by the capabilities approach. In recent times, a number of education scholars have paid attention to the capabilities approach as a way of theorising aspects of practice in education and other related disciplines (see Unterhalter et al. 2007). The capabilities approach offers synergies with other approaches to social justice as well as applying to a wide variety of cases in addressing aspects of pedagogy in terms of promoting social justice. The capabilities approach has also offered a useful way of generally assessing social justice and other particular components of social justice such as equality and inclusivity in teaching (Unterhalter 2003). Unlike other approaches (mentioned in Chapter 3), which are more focused on achieved functionings (resources or outcomes) and a normality perspective, the capabilities approach highlights people’s diversity and their capabilities to convert resources into valuable functionings.

The study undertaken as part of this thesis is interested in exploring capabilities of remote rural teachers in their engagement with socially just curriculum and teaching practices. The study investigates the issue of social justice in education from a perspective of teachers’ potential abilities to convert (education) resources into valuable functionings. Given the complexity of education in remote rural areas in Indonesia, the capabilities approach is more applicable to this study due to its coverage of problematic issues of justice (see Robeyns 2003a; Peleg 2013), for example, the diversity of human beings. This Chapter begins with discussions of the capabilities approach and human wellbeing, followed by a justification for the capabilities approach to social justice and the capabilities approach and its relevance for education and schooling.

4.2 The Capabilities Approach and Human Wellbeing

The capabilities approach has been developed by Sen and Nussbaum in different areas of study; Sen in economics and Nussbaum in political philosophy. It began in
1979, when Sen gave a lecture at Stanford University, known as the Tanner Lecture on Human Values. The lecture title was in the form of a question: *Equality of what?* (Sen 1980). This question was a key foundation for Sen to deliver the best evaluative measures of justice and equality: human capabilities. Sen (1993, p. 30) defines **capabilities** as ‘a person’s potential ability to do valuable things or reach valuable states of being, and it represents a thing a person is able to do or to be’. The capabilities approach does not focus solely on the resources or primary goods that a person holds. Capability is also linked with substantive freedom or actual opportunities that a person has, which encourages a person to do things that he or she values doing or ‘achieves what an individual reflectively considers valuable’ (Walker & Unterhalter 2007, p. 2). Central to the capabilities approach is the view that justice ought to be determined by people’s capabilities to freely ‘decide to live as we would like and to promote the ends that we may want to advance’ (Sen 2009, p. 228). People’s wellbeing, justice and fairness in the distribution of resources are evaluated from people’s freedoms to be able to make valuable decisions and their efforts to overcome obstacles to their freedoms through expansion of their capabilities and increased real opportunities. Ignoring the capabilities and provision of actual opportunities or freedoms, as Sen and Nussbaum indicate, means disrespect for people’s human dignity.

The capabilities approach emerges as a strong criticism of previous inequality measures and approaches used for the evaluation of human wellbeing. It challenges Rawls’ theory and utilitarianism (see Chapter 3) particularly the stance that just and fair distribution of resources should be based on economic growth and possession of commodities and primary resources. Rawls (1999) has categorised (a) certain rights, liberties, and opportunities, (b) income and wealth and (c) the social bases of self-respect as the basic primary resources and means or ‘things that every rational man is presumed to want’ as well as whatever a reasonable person plans to live on (p.54). Both Rawls’ theory and utilitarianism, which refer to the distributive approach to social justice, reflect a narrow understanding of human life and poverty, and arguably do not take into account diversity of individuals in capitalising available resources (Nussbaum 2002; Peleg 2013). Human diversity is associated with natural individual differences in physical or mental characteristics on account
of genetic or self-caused factors (Sen 1999; Oosterlaken 2013). Apart from this, Sen (1999) views human diversity as differences in relational perspectives, variations in social climate and environmental diversities. These include, for instance, concern over ‘the prevalence or absence of crime and violence…, epidemiology and pollution…[and] the nature of community relationships’ (p. 70).

Take, for example, people who live in disadvantaged areas in Indonesia, where (different) resources may be required to be able to do things and be the same as those who stay in advantaged areas. Hence, the capabilities approach provides better measures of justice and equality than resourcist and utilitarian approaches in that it supports the inclusion of personal heterogeneities and social practices as possible sources of advancing justice and/or reducing injustice.

The capabilities approach underlines the enhancement of human development that goes beyond such detached objects as material resources, incomes or commodities, whereas in welfare economics these are the major indicators of people’s wellbeing and human flourishing of life. From the perspective of the capabilities approach, what should be taken into account is not only the basic primary goods and material resources the persons respectively hold and possess, but also the relevant personal accounts that govern the conversion of the goods and resources into a person’s potential ability to achieve flourishing ends. What matters to people is that they are able to achieve actual valuable functionings, that is the actual valuable living that people manage to achieve (Sen 1999). Sen (2008) also argues:

The [capabilities] approach proposes a serious departure from concentrating on the means of living to the actual opportunities of living, and the capability that should be concerned with is a person’s ability to achieve various combinations of functionings that can be compared with each other in terms of what he or she has reason to value. The discipline of comparative assessments thus concentrates on how to make society ‘more just’, rather than speculating about the nature and the demands of ‘the perfectly just society’ (p. 336).

Sen (2006) acknowledges that the identification of fully just social arrangements tends to create the grand partition between just and nonjust, which leaves the society remaining in the nonjust side even after a reform is undertaken. Drawing on Sen (2006), improving a public health service in Indonesia that guarantees a good medical treatment to all, for instance, may be justified as an advancement of justice. Yet, such a reform will not turn Indonesia into a fully just society because there may remain millions from within a population that still need attention.
For Sen (2006), investigation of the ways of enhancing justice and/or reducing injustice in a society or in the world through a comparative assessment is more plausible than demands of a perfectly just society in terms of equal liberties and distribution of resources. In addition, Sen suggests that the capabilities approach does not ignore resourcist or utilitarian efforts to make important contributions to people’s wellbeing, though it assumes that inequalities in resources can bring about inequalities in capabilities. In this regard, Robeyns (2003a) and Kuklys (2005) recommend a complete analysis of inequality, which ought to cover both the inequalities in functionings and capabilities and those in resources that can contribute to inequalities in capabilities and functionings. Such an analysis is essential for the evaluation of a policy in terms of whether or not it can reduce inequalities, for involvement in the distribution of resources commonly tends to influence the distribution of capabilities and wellbeing.

As mentioned earlier in this Chapter, the capabilities approach is associated with the work of Sen and Nussbaum and aspects of both are considered important. However, there are differences between them. Sen uses the capabilities approach to advocate for social justice in the comparative measurement of people’s standard of living, while Nussbaum uses it to provide the philosophical foundation to set up core human entitlements. Nussbaum (2006, p. 70) holds that ‘these entitlements should be respected and implemented by governments of all nations, as a bare minimum of what is required in respecting human dignity’. Sen (2008) and Nussbaum (2006) similarly argue that the best approach to the idea of a basic social minimum is one that focuses on human capabilities. As Nussbaum (2003) states:

> Sen and I both argue that Rawls’ theory would be better able to give an account of the relevant social equalities and inequalities if the list of primary goods were formulated as a list of capabilities rather than as a list of things (pp. 50-51).

Sen’s conception of the flourishing life is deliberately vague in that Sen does not offer particular detailed rules in identifying capabilities. Rather, he puts emphasis on a democratic process or on agents to construct their own capabilities. In contrast, Nussbaum uses an Aristotelian conception of human flourishing as the basis for establishing a detailed list of human core capabilities: (1) life, (2) bodily health, (3) bodily integrity, (4) sense, imagination, and thought, (5) emotions, (6) practical
reason, (7) affiliation, (8) other species, (9) play, and (10) control over one’s political and material environment (Nussbaum 2006, pp. 76-77).

Nussbaum views the ten capabilities as the minimal requirements for human quality of life and essential ingredients of social justice. According to Oosterlaken (2013), Nussbaum adopts the perspective of sufficientarianism in her focus on human capabilities as the metric of justice, for she suggests that justice requires everybody to be brought up to at least a threshold level for all the capabilities on her list. Nussbaum (2006) argues that a life that does not include even a single one of the core capabilities will, to some extent, not meet the standards of a human life. It might be plausible to consider the ten core capabilities as a threshold for establishing public policy that follows concern over a good human life. With regard to each of these, ‘the basic idea is that, by imagining a life without the capability in question, such a life is not a life worthy of the name human dignity’ (p. 78). In addition, the core idea of the capabilities approach is not referred to a particular level of prosperity, but to the assurance that a public policy must guarantee the cultivation of the core capabilities to individuals. Otherwise, it cannot be justified as a just policy.

The capabilities approach, as Nussbaum (2006) argues, is one type of a human rights approach, and human rights are similar to the idea of human dignity. For Nussbaum, the idea of human dignity is intuitive, and therefore human capabilities are implicit within it. Human capabilities ought to be pursued for each individual person, ‘treating each as an end and not as a mere tool of the ends of others’ (Nussbaum 2003, p. 40). Even though the capabilities approach views each human being as an end, it does not promote an individualistic framework. Rather, it embraces ethical individualism, that is a normative framework that stresses that actions should be judged by their effects on individual human beings and that individuals are the primary objects of moral concern (Robeyns 2005).

The notion of capability also refers to the provision of options that a person has to choose to lead a flourishing life. Moss (2013) states that the advantages of the incorporation of both freedom and choice are twofold:
Firstly, including freedom allows us to appreciate the opportunities that a person has to achieve various functionings. Secondly, having the freedom to choose between various sets of functionings acknowledges the important place that choice has in a person’s life (p. 65).

In the capabilities approach, a person is able to flourish when he or she is provided with actual freedom and range of options from which he or she can choose to achieve valuable functionings. Hence, if a person only has one option, or if he or she has less capability and less freedom to choose what kind of life he or she thinks valuable, he or she might be judged to be disadvantaged due to the relative lack of opportunities compared with a person with freedom and more options (Sen 1993). Sen (1985) takes the availability of food as an example to illustrate this point. He suggests that a person can be malnourished due to either of two causes: 1) he or she does not have food to eat, or 2) he or she does have access to food but decides to fast according to his or her religious belief or for other reasons. The former is a matter of lack of capabilities, while the latter is that of freedom and choice. This suggests that the capabilities approach highlights the importance of providing a wide range of options and freedom to choose what a person thinks valuable. Further, Sen (1984) acknowledges that the pursuit of capabilities to function is not just about how people desire or react to their ability or inability to do things, but it is preferable that they have the sense to choose, using information regarding what people can do to achieve their valuable functionings.

Sen (2008, p. 336) argues that ‘capability is a kind of power, and it would be a mistake to see it only as a concept of human advantage’. Sen contrasts happiness with capability as basic essential parts of a framework of justice. Happiness is different in its obligation from capability. Sen (2009) argues that happiness can hardly be the only thing that a person has reason to value, nor the only metric for measuring things that he or she values. For Sen, happiness is one example of functionings and might be a poor measure of people’s wellbeing (see also Peleg 2013). Instead, it is the capability to achieve happiness, not happiness itself, which should be a major aspect of the freedom that a person has good reason to value. In addition, Hasan (2013) acknowledges that despite the significance of happiness as a measure of subjective wellbeing, it remains that happiness cannot exceed Sen’s capabilities. Arguably, capabilities are the most important and stable determinants
of happiness as they offer distinct information that is not covered in happiness indicators (Hasan 2013).

Another characteristic of the capabilities approach is that ‘it is not a fully specified theory’ (Robeyns 2003a, p. 8), in the sense that it is not a complete theory of social justice so that it may not provide complete answers to all normative questions (see also Walker & Unterhalter 2007). ‘It is not like a mathematical algorithm that prescribes how to measure inequality or poverty’ (Robeyns 2003a, p. 64), but ‘it does deal with questions of the balance between freedoms and equality’ (Walker and Unterhalter 2007, p. 3). This means that the evaluative focus of the capabilities approach is on capabilities regardless of which capabilities are necessarily taken for granted and of how different capabilities need to be included in the evaluation. To put the capabilities approach into practice requires identification of relevant capabilities and important indicators of each capability in order to be able to make an overall judgment on any issues of social justice. Apart from this, a justification for the capabilities to be a metric of justice needs to be emphasised to enhance its applicability in practical situation. The next part will elaborate on this point.

4.3 A Justification for the Capabilities Approach to Social Justice

The capabilities approach has been an influential and prominent framework of justice for over twenty years, and its claimed ability to deal with the differences of people has attracted many authors, particularly authors interested in the issue of disability. Take, for example, Thomas Pogge. Pogge (2010) attempts to counter the prominence of the capabilities approach as a metric of justice. He is skeptical about whether the capabilities approach can be justified as a theory of social justice and questions if the capabilities approach is better than welfarist and resourcist approaches in assessing equality and people’s quality of life. Pogge indicates that in spite of its popularity, the capabilities approach has no adequate counter-arguments to challenge Rawlsian theorists. He states:

Neither Sen nor Nussbaum has so far shown that the [capabilities] approach can produce a public criterion of social justice that would be a viable competitor to the more prominent resourcist views (p. 17).
To reach his conclusion, Pogge (2010) attempts to limit the debate between the capabilities approach and resourcist approach by questioning whether alternative feasible institutional schemes [should] be assessed in terms of their participants’ access to valuable resources or in terms of their participants’ capabilities [and] access to valuable functionings (p. 17).

Pogge then argues that despite its useful augmentation to the resourcist approach, the capabilities approach cannot be justified as a self-standing theory of social justice. He challenges capability theorists on demanding compensation for every possible natural difference amongst people. Pogge insists that questions of justice concern only the institutional structure of society. Informed by the work of Rawls (1999), he suggests that the equilibrium of social institutions must be maintained for fairness in the distribution of primary resources. Rawls defines equilibrium as a system that ‘has reached a state that persists indefinitely over time so long as no external forces impinge on it’ (p. 400). According to Rawls, an institution must be operated within the notion of equilibrium so as to be stable and just. In other words, stability and justice can only be achieved by returning the structure of institutions back to an equilibrium perspective.

Pogge’s (2010) argument that follows is that the capabilities approach tends to view human diversity in a vertical manner. This means that it promotes a hierarchical system of assessment by ranking people’s different abilities and attributes giving them a value. Such a system, as Pogge argues, can lead to stigmatising and patronising attitudes towards the disadvantaged by explicitly notifying them of their inferior endowments. To avoid this, Pogge suggests a horizontal perspective of viewing human diversity. He asserts that viewing human diversity horizontally does not rank people’s different abilities and attributes to recognise their diversity, and not stipulate the capabilities that people have for their life; rather, it focuses on the primary resources necessary for a good life.

To refute Pogge’s critique above, Anderson (2010) argues that the capabilities approach does not apply any kind of stigmatisation in measuring justice. Rather, it views people’s capabilities from the perspectives of both their characteristics and access to available resources in their social environments. Take, for example, the following illustration provided by Moss (2013): a person being discriminated due
to his or her natural endowments. Proponents of the capabilities approach may offer ‘a remedy in the form of changing [his or her natural] endowments… [for instance, by providing] an option of plastic surgery’ (p. 67), and therefore the discrimination can be diminished. In essence, the capabilities approach, as Anderson (2010) argues, adopts a horizontal view of people’s endowments and does not incorporate a hierarchical rank of people’s different attributes and abilities.

Another criticism made by Pogge (2010) against the capabilities approach is that capability theorists greatly exaggerate the conceptual differences between the two approaches by narrowing their exploration merely to whether human diversity deserves ‘greater compensatory accommodation’ (p. 18). He also acknowledges that the capabilities approach does not provide an adequate explanation of how demands for compensation are to be managed. Take for example, a person with a higher need of nutritional food. In this case, Pogge assumes that there is a chance for that person to make a claim of justice on the resources that other people have already held. Or as Moss (2013, p. 67) explains: ‘there might be all sorts of moral claims that require the satisfaction of [a] particular need’ between one individual and another. Hence, Pogge (2010) suggests that there is difficulty reaching a compromise agreement on the list of valuable capabilities and on the most efficient tool for measuring achievements in relation to the list of each capability.

Despite Pogge’s (2010) insistence that the capabilities approach does not offer much to the advanced discussion of social justice, the argument remains that:

The findings of the capabilities approach indicate some fundamental weaknesses in the resourcist approach, and that it is not clear these weaknesses can be addressed from within the resourcist approach (Berges 2007, p. 17).

In this regard, Berges (2007) challenges Pogge’s criticism that the capabilities approach and the resourcist approach have the same effective accommodation for diversity, and that the distinction between the capabilities approach and the resourcist approach can merely be viewed from the provision of compensation for human diversity. Anderson (2010) suggests that the resourcist and welfarist approaches cannot give satisfactory answers concerning the reliability of people’s satisfaction with their life. Sen (2009) and Nussbaum (2006) contend that preferences can be adapted, and there is less chance for people to be aware of the
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availability of any options when they are in a disadvantaged condition. With the capabilities approach, Sen and Nussbaum ensure that any preferences are adapted for good and sound reasons, so that they will not be used indiscriminately and thus provide unjust or wrongful information to people.

Moreover, in defending the resourcist approach, Pogge, to some extent, has implicitly adopted the idea of the capabilities approach. Oosterlaken (2013) critically examines Pogge’s work and suggests that Pogge might be a capability theorist in disguise. In an explanatory example around compensatory provision, Pogge talks about the case of the blind and the traffic lights. However, in this example, Pogge has misinterpreted the difference between the resourcist approach and the capabilities approach. Pogge (2010, p. 31) states:

[Proponents] of the capabilities approach may] say to the disabled person: “I understand that you have a lesser capacity to convert resources into valuable functionings. For this reason, we will ensure that you get more resources than others as compensation of your disability. In doing so, our objective is that, by converting your larger bundle of resources, you will be able to reach roughly the same level of capability as the rest of us [and] as able as we are to attain the various valuable functionings”. The resourcist might say instead: “I understand that the present organisation of our society is less appropriate to your mental and physical constitution than to those of most of your fellow citizens. In this sense, our shared institutional order is not affording you genuinely equal treatment. To make for the ways in which we are treating you worse than most others, we propose to treat you better than them in other respects. For example, to make up for the fact that traffic instructions are communicated through visible but inaudible signals, we will provide free guide dogs to the blind”.

In this quote, Pogge suggests capability theorists provide a compensatory solution in terms of giving more resources to the disabled, whereas proponents of the capabilities approach are aware of the limitations of merely providing resources. Pogge has also misinterpreted the problematic situation by suggesting that the capabilities approach is concerned only with the institutional distribution of material resources in the enhancement of people’s capabilities (Keleher 2004). Anderson (2010, p.97) indicates that capability theorists will not provide any compensation for ‘the bare fact of lacking certain innate endowments’, for this is not a sort of a capability deprivation on its own. Capability theorists are instead concerned with an assurance of people’s developed capabilities not only in theoretical abstraction, but also in terms of practical context. In the case of the blind and the traffic lights, capability theorists may offer a more concrete solution by effectively and efficiently calling into question any potential capability deprivation and recommend what Nussbaum (2000) terms as combined capabilities; that is
internal capabilities assembled with suitable external conditions for the exercise of various functionings.

As Sen (1999) suggests, the perspective of the capabilities approach is relational, in the sense that whether or not people’s capabilities develop depends on two things: (1) their specific attributes and (2) physical structures or socio-cultural environments in which they live. For some people, disability or handicap may not be relational, which means that it may just be attached to persons who do not have the necessary physical ability to perform some specified act or function. According to Terzi (2010), however, the extent to which a person’s physical disability might or might not be deprivation of a capability development is dependent on an external factor, like wheelchair availability, to access a building or other places.

Pogge’s view regarding the traffic light phenomenon that follows is that traffic lights constitute part of the basic institutional structure that potentially entails a case of injustice for disabled (blind) people. According to Pogge (2010), ‘resourcist views must avoid analogous complaints by the disabled’ (p. 31), and therefore a fair condition that treats people equally needs to be established. If a resourcist notion of social justice is to ensure that any institutional structure satisfies all of its members with a genuine equal treatment, ‘then its resource metric must take account of the full range of diverse human needs and endowments’ (Pogge 2010, p. 31). In response to this, Anderson (2010) calls into question the ways of satisfying both the standard human needs and full range of diverse human needs at the same time. In that situation, as Anderson claims, one may tend to choose to take account of the latter, meaning that he or she comes close to adopting a capability perspective, which normally emphasises human diversity.

In addition, Oosterlaken (2013) suggests that to know whether or not the traffic light or any other institutional structures is unjustly biased towards the needs of some, one should resort to ‘a capability-like concept as the metric of justice’ (p. 211). In other words, such a phenomenon can be resolved by applying the perspective of a lack of capability to access or achieve valuable functionings amongst the disabled (blind) persons and exploring the interplay between specific
personal attributes and features of the institutional order in question (Oosterlaken 2013). Besides, the capabilities approach is applicable to examine the extent to which a particular design is just and inclusive and to explicitly investigate the implications of the design toward the enhancement of diverse individuals’ capabilities, even in a more complex institution viewing less salient individual characteristics as the most important accounts.

If, to a large extent, the capabilities approach challenges resourcist and welfarist approaches, then for the capabilities approach to be justified as a framework of social justice, it has to provide certain aspects of measuring justice that other approaches do not (Anderson 2010). As discussed earlier, the most prominent characteristics of the capabilities approach are its explicit respect and accommodation for human heterogeneity, which is overlooked in the resourcist and welfarist approaches. Capability theorists argue that converting resources into valuable functionings is different from one person to another. Following Sen’s words (2009, p. 255), undeniably, ‘people have disparate physical characteristics related to disability, illness, age or gender, and these make their needs diverse’. For instance, Sen (1980) argues that people in a wheelchair require more resources to attain the same level of mobility (the capability to be mobile) as those who do not have any kind of physical impairments. The needs of the disabled, as Sen also suggests, cannot be reduced to the needs of able-bodied people. Thus, the capabilities approach needs to be considered as it takes a diverse, plural and multicultural account in the provision of access to available resources. Despite the premise that other approaches already account for actions that the capabilities approach does, it remains that the capabilities approach constitutes a more illuminating framework of social justice, which offers convincing reasons for the promotion of human development and wellbeing and capabilities to expand.

In addition, the capabilities approach can be justified as a framework of social justice due to its consistency in matters of looking to indicators of social justice. In evaluating quality of life, the capabilities approach not only asks about the number of resources a person has, but also whether or not he or she is provided with opportunities or freedoms to convert those resources into valuable functionings. In
this regard, Berges (2007) presents a good illustration of how the capabilities approach should evaluate human nutritional levels. The capability theorists, as Berges notes, do not ask the evaluative subjects of whether a person is well-fed or well-nourished. They also do not ask how much food he or she holds or how much money he or she possesses to purchase food. Rather, the capability theorists would prefer to look at the nutritional quality level as well as indicators of whether he or she has adequate food to live a normal and healthy life. Thus, the capabilities approach offers a conceptual framework of assessing people’s quality of life, not just for survival, but for leading a flourishing life.

4.4 The Capabilities Approach and Its Relevance for Education and Schooling

As discussed earlier in this Chapter, the capabilities approach emerges as a response to the previous assessments restricted to measuring people’s quality of life within the dimensions of satisfaction, resources and outcomes. In education, as Unterhalter et al. (2007) stipulate, most standard evaluation tools are based on what people expect from schooling, which commonly includes: (1) access to resources and (2) academic achievement in the form of test results. From a capability perspective, following either of these leads to narrowing down the essential part of education, which should look further than just access to equal amounts of resources and examination results (Nussbaum 2006).

If the assessment of education is merely focused on resources and learning outcomes, there are substantial points that such standard evaluation may overlook, namely questions with regard to the range of available educational choices and interpersonal comparisons in terms of diverse educational needs of students. As Unterhalter et al. (2007, p. 2) state, ‘the education provided by one type of school may not be suitable or accessible for all students because some students may have different educational needs’. In other words, the capabilities approach proposes an appraisal of education quality that is not simply based on resources, inputs (such as teachers or years of schooling) or satisfaction with test results, but rather on the
extent of students’ genuine capabilities to achieve valued educational functionings (Sen 1999; Unterhalter 2004; Walker & Unterhalter 2007).

The capabilities approach is relevant for education and schooling as it enables the expansion of people’s capabilities to determine a life that they have reason to value, and this can be done through investment in (basic) education (Sen 1999). Similarly, Lozano et al. (2012) argue that the capabilities approach regarding education and schooling enables people to learn how to take decisions and reflect critically on the world where they live. Sen (1993) and Nussbaum (1997) view education not merely for human capital and economic interests, but also for broader instrumental, intrinsic and social values. Education is a powerful tool for redistribution of resources in order that the capabilities of people, particularly those who are politically disadvantaged and marginalised, can be developed (Walker & Unterhalter 2007). In the capabilities approach, the key aspect of equality of education is the heterogeneity of students, which enables connections between individual students’ cultural backgrounds and social arrangements. Walker and Unterhalter (2007) note that it is these social context and social relations that can facilitate or impede the development of students’ capabilities.

The relevance of the capabilities approach for education and schooling practices can also be viewed, for instance, from Nussbaum’s work on higher education in the United States and on schooling in India. Her work reflects ‘the importance of education for women’s empowerment and the importance of public education as crucial to democratic societies’ (Walker & Unterhalter 2007, p. 8). Nussbaum points out three aspects of capabilities related to education: critical thinking, the ideal of the world citizen, and the development of narrative imagination. Human beings can imagine, think and reason in a truly human manner, and to do so can be cultivated by adequate education (Nussbaum 2003).

According to Gale and Molla (2014), there is a two-fold basis to the capabilities approach and its link to education: capability for education and capability through education. The former refers to the provision of individuals’ access to educational resources and opportunities to choose their own education. For example,
individuals’ ability to access more qualified education and training and the availability of adequate facilities to support teaching and learning can be associated with the idea of capability for education. Meanwhile, capability through education deals with the assumption that education is a capability in itself. In this case, capability is associated with beings and doings that are crucial to human wellbeing (Sen 1993). The focus of capability through education is on the ability to exercise the expansion of capabilities and freedoms, which, according to Sen (2003), can directly depend on the education that individuals have received.

Another aspect that makes the capabilities approach applicable to pedagogical and teaching practices is its reputation as the developing ground for participatory human development. Within the perspective of education, a capability can thus be defined as students’ actual opportunities that they are able to do and to be certain things that they have reason to value (Walker & Unterhalter 2007). This suggests that schools and teachers need to provide students with actual opportunities (adequate resources) to achieve their valuable functionings as well as encourage students to critically reflect on their own actions.

Sen (1993) holds that education is an unlimited good that must be designed for human freedom, and is a major consideration that must enable further expansion of human capabilities. The opportunity for education and the development of education for capabilities mean the expansion of human freedoms. In a capability perspective, education is also a basic capability, which ‘potentially fosters the important capability of students’ aspiration’ (Walker 2007, p. 183; see also Terzi 2007). Less opportunity to access education and enable students’ aspiration, and ignorance of capabilities to expand, can impede human development and a flourishing life. Unlike human capital approaches to education, which judge the benefit of education directly from its effect on employability, the capabilities approach assesses the advantages of education from its prominent role as an instrumental social good (Walker 2004, p. 3). In this regard, the purpose of education within a capability dimension is to encourage people to attain interpersonal relationships; that is they are able to be aware of linking the benefits
of education with broader altruistic motives, for example, the willingness to help others and respect diversity (Walker & Unterhalter 2007).

The capabilities approach also suggests that it is of great importance to develop an inclusive process in which voices of students must be heard within the principles of equity and diversity (Walker 2007). Walker states: ‘The capability of voice is one to be exercised in class through the curriculum and pedagogy because it challenges the practices of silencing and passivity’ (p. 183). The capability of voice or the capability to be heard can encourage autonomy and self-confidence among students. In essence, education for capabilities is not only about students’ skills and knowledge, but also involves judgments, values, self-confidence and a commitment to continue to learn from their experiences both as individuals and in association with others in a diverse and changing society (Stephenson & Weil 1992). Lozano et al. (2012) argue that the capabilities approach regarding education contributes not only to the evaluation of skills and knowledge, but also to the enhancement of other critical aspects, in which both crystallise into new practices and lead to the advent of consistent and coherent alternatives.

The goal of education from the perspective of the capabilities approach turns on the extent to which an individuals’ status is empowered in order that they are able to lead their own lives in society. Terzi (2007) argues that the role of education is central to the provision of a means to other valuable goods such as prospects of better education, better life and opportunities. On one hand, education provides individual students with the attainment of important and high levels of knowledge and skills, which plays an important role in the pursuit of wellbeing. On the other hand, education is intrinsically good and valuable in itself, for ‘being educated, other things being equal’ (p. 31) can enhance students’ capabilities to appreciate and engage in a wide range of activities that they do for their own sake.

Furthermore, the aspect in the capabilities approach that becomes a fundamental indicator of justice and an important entitlement to the shaping and expansion of human substantive freedoms or actual opportunities is the capability to be educated. According to Terzi (2007), the capability to be educated, which is broadly perceived
in terms of real opportunities for both informal learning and formal schooling, can be considered a basic capability in two ways:

First, in that the absence or lack of opportunity would essentially harm and disadvantage the individual. Second, since the capability to be educated plays a substantial role in the expansion of other capabilities, as well as future ones, it can be considered basic for further reason that it is fundamental and foundational to the capabilities necessary to wellbeing, and hence to lead a good life (p. 25).

Walker (2004) contends that the concept of the capability to be educated is fundamental to establish a state education policy. In Indonesia, for instance, the capability to be educated is put into practice through a compulsory education and schooling program for all, and a strong commitment to the notion of lifelong learning. In relation to the improvement of education and schooling, it can be argued that each student needs a series of basic capabilities in order to survive and have facilities or opportunities to achieve his or her valuable functionings and expand his or her basic capabilities.

The aim of identifying capabilities in education and schooling is intended to highlight key indicators of the development of students’ capabilities as well as to look at what beings and doings together fulfill basic needs for the enhancement of other doings and beings in education and in a school context (Terzi 2007). Sen (1993) gives substantial weight to notions of empowerment and to the role of agency-freedom in the process of identification and encourages the freedom to reason in the identification of capabilities that are relevant to needs. Sen asserts that the process of identification must be democratic and public in order to be able to define any policies of distribution. In the context of using the capabilities approach for policy work, it is the people affected by the policy that should identify what will count as valuable capabilities in that policy (Robeyns 2003a).

Nevertheless, Sen does not indicate a particular method of identifying capabilities. As stated earlier in this Chapter, this represents a crucial difference between Sen’s approach/use of capabilities and that of Nussbaum in suggesting a list of ten core human entitlements. Robeyns (2005) thus recommends that the capabilities approach should be supplemented with methodological tools in the identification of functionings. She offers several criteria that can be useful in the identification of capabilities:
(1) explicit formulation of a list that can be discussed and defended, (2) justification and scrutiny of the method that has been used to generate the list, (3) differentiation between ideal and pragmatic capabilities, and (4) capabilities that cover all relevant dimensions that are not reducible to each other (p. 204).

There are a number of theorists who have been intensively working on capabilities, and the list of capabilities they have selected can be a valuable reference for school teachers to identify their own capabilities. As a model, Terzi (2007, p. 37) proposes seven basic capabilities for education: (1) literacy, (2) numeracy, (3) sociality and participation, (4) learning disposition, (5) physical activities, (6) science and technology and (7) practical reason. These are selected based on Nussbaum’s (2006) argument that education is central to all human capabilities. Nussbaum has adopted Aristotle’s view of education as a means to develop individuals to be fully human. To do so, Nussbaum (1997) proposes three aspects of capabilities that can be considered in the cultivation of humanity: the capability to critically examine oneself and one’s tradition and culture, the capability to understand oneself not only as a citizen, but also as human beings interrelated with other human beings, and the capability to perceive what it is like to be in the position of a person which is different from another (Nussbaum 1997).

Walker (2004) proposes a list of eight basic capabilities for higher education: (1) practical reason, (2) educational resilience, (3) knowledge and imagination, (4) learning disposition, (5) social relations and social networks, (6) respect, dignity and recognition, (7) emotional integrity, and (8) bodily integrity. Robeyns (2003b) similarly suggests a range of educational capabilities, which include: (1) financing, (2) pupil-teacher ratio, (3) teacher qualification, (4) availability of books and computers, school buildings, curriculum and pedagogy.

Table 2: Sample Capabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Practical reason</td>
<td>1. Financing</td>
<td>1. Literacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Physical activities</td>
<td>5. Physical activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each list of capabilities above is presented at a certain level of generality, and hence it enables the construction of more specific lists drawn from its major list in terms of different contexts, cultures and societies (Terzi 2007). These lists might also imply a hope for any educational process to develop students’ capabilities. If some or all of those lists were absent, there might be no process of education (see Walker 2006a), and some may question whether a school is developing the capability to be educated fundamental to human rights and freedoms. Walker (2004) notes that age-based beings and doings in the capabilities approach is essential, in that the list of adults’ capabilities might be different from young people’s capabilities. Whether or not the list of selected capabilities is of importance can be dependent on the age of learners. The different ages of learners may correspond to selected and valued capabilities (Walker 2004).

Furthermore, education for capabilities views community as a critical dimension of human flourishing and puts an emphasis on the roles of individuals to engage in their social environments. As Sen (2009) holds, the capabilities approach aims to construct people’s ethical principles and leads societal groups to focus on human wellbeing. Likewise, Nussbaum (2011) suggests that the capabilities approach is a theory of humanity that is not only concerned with individuals’ wellbeing, but also ethical evaluation on minimal indicators of a just society. Following this perspective, education for capabilities is focused on the wellbeing of both each individual student and members of the classroom community as a context for mutual interactions. Teaching using the capabilities approach does not merely refers to the provision of opportunities to do and to be for students, but also appraises individual improvement and its effect on social life experiences. It can be challenging for teachers to put the capabilities approach into their teaching practices; they may need to create a learning environment that is not oppressive.
For more practical operationalisation of the capabilities approach within the wider range of teaching activities, capability theorists need to take account of Wood and Deprez’s (2012) proposal regarding four educational aims within the perspective of the capabilities approach: (1) education for individual wellbeing, (2) education for the development of reasoned values, (3) education for leading a good life and (4) education for creating foundational capabilities for agency and freedom. These aspects can be a useful reference for teachers to frame their curricular goals and objectives, and in relation to this study, such a list of educational aims can be valuable to enhance teachers’ perspectives in the exploration of classroom teaching within the notion of the capabilities approach.

The perspective of education for individual wellbeing implies that the wellbeing of individuals need to be primarily embedded as an educational aim within a classroom. As mentioned earlier, wellbeing is a central part of the capabilities approach. In relation to teaching for individual wellbeing, teachers need to provide students with an opportunity to explore cultural identity based on the basic principles and values enacted in society. Teachers ought to ensure that all students have a sense of equal treatment, and that they are emotionally and psychologically safe in the process of learning. In addition, students need to be encouraged to participate as part of a learning community, being able to develop their capabilities to choose a particular way of beings and doings and being able to be convinced that their academic success aligns with their individual values. In this sense, education for capabilities requires teachers to be more innovative and creative, particularly in creating opportunities for the enhancement of critical thinking through a dialogue and conversation concerning individual capabilities and wellbeing. For instance, teachers can bring an issue of social wellbeing into the classroom and encourage students to critically reflect on it. In addition, teaching for capabilities also needs to take account of democratic and feminist educational goals through the lens of individual students’ wellbeing and through the wellbeing of the classroom community (Robeyns 2003a).

Further, the notion of education for the development of reasoned values relates to systematic and deliberate consideration of individual students’ values in the process
of education. Following this conception, teaching for capabilities widens students’ freedoms or opportunities in the critical exploration and assessment of a set of values. In this respect, classroom teaching activities need to review the pre-determined values embedded in curricular contents and to try to make those values explicit and open for critique. In other words, the capabilities approach regarding education and schooling motivates teachers and inspires them to initiate fruitful discussion regarding individual students’ own values and those that are previously embedded in curriculum. Teachers can ask students to think of the possibility to make their values fundamental in choosing what is valuable in their life. The implication of this is that students need to be assessed on the basis of how much they respect and care about what they are learning. Nussbaum (2006) suggests that in evaluating students’ opportunities or freedoms of learning, teaching for capabilities makes teachers determined to create the learning environment that enables students to reflect on the relationship between what they are learning and their real life options. Their classroom activities need to provide them with a freedom to develop their values, and a range of learning experiences that could help them explore what they reason to be and to do in the future.

Wood and Deprez’s (2012) proposal in terms of education for leading an actual life is derived from one aspect of Sen’s (2009) conception of justice that gives considerable attention to the kind of lives a person can actually live. Sen views education as an invaluable tool for the development of people’s capabilities in order that they are able to pursue their flourishing life. For Sen, education must be democratic and embodied within all democratic principles and practices. The contribution of education, as Sen (1993) argues, should not only be judged in economic terms but also in terms of people’s capabilities to participate in democratic life and to choose a life deemed valuable. The most essential standpoint of Sen’s argument is that his conception of justice derives from people’s lived experiences and portrays socially real practices in terms of living and acting justly in the contemporary world. Teaching for capabilities concerns the provision of opportunities for students to reflect on their lives and apply their school learning experiences as well as increase teacher awareness of the importance of making social problems and issues curricular topics. Hence, teachers can reflect on
students’ abilities or inabilities to put their learning into new possible lives, to ponder the curricular topics regarding societal conditions while listening to others’ lived experiences and to explore the relationship between what they are learning and social inequalities. This kind of teacher reflection on teaching and learning may encourage students to break social and cultural barriers to human freedom and wellbeing.

The conception of *education for creating foundational capabilities for agency and freedom* (Sen 1993) is associated with the premise that the ideal of the capabilities approach is based upon an appeal to a reconciliation of the competing values of equality, recognition, and liberty (Otto & Zielger 2010). If teaching for capabilities is to facilitate the *beings and doings* that students value, teachers are then required to create opportunities for students’ authentic autonomy in the choices regarding what they have to learn and how they learn it. In addition, students’ authentic and expressive voices must be heard so that they will have self-confidence in developing their critical capabilities. In this regard, teaching for capabilities can generate an authentic classroom community that has the attributes of being critical, dialogic and inquiring towards changes. It also refers to a context of learning that accommodates students’ perspectives on diverse topics, respects their reasoning and reflection on different opinions and arguments and encourages fairness in response to opposing ideas and respectful strong criticism.

Capability theorists consider student agency as ‘a key dimension of human wellbeing’ (Walker & Unterhalter 2007, p. 6), and hence it is of paramount importance for teachers to focus not only on students’ process of learning, but also on their choosing to lead a life that they have reason to value. These perspectives need to be teachers’ daily practices in everyday classes where they work to enhance social justice in terms of creating opportunities for students to lead a life worth living. In other words, the central perspective of teaching for capabilities is that by means of creating and maximising opportunities for students to achieve their valuable functionings, injustice in classrooms can be minimized, reduced or ideally eliminated.
4.5 Conclusion

Sen and Nussbaum develop the capabilities approach in different fields of study as a strong critique of Rawls’ distributive justice. The capabilities approach is crucial to assessing people’s wellbeing in terms of their capabilities to do and to be certain things that they have reason to value. Both Sen and Nussbaum argue that the determinant of whether people or groups of people are considered advantaged or disadvantaged is not linked with primary resources that they hold, but with substantive freedom or actual opportunities that they have to achieve their valuable functionings. The relationship between capabilities and functionings is that functionings are achieved outcomes, while capabilities are the potential to achieve functionings. In the capabilities approach, it is the potential ability to achieve functionings that becomes a major aspect of freedom and not the achieved functionings themselves.

Despite its prominent position as a framework of justice, a justification for the capabilities approach to social justice is inherently in question. Pogge (2010) is one of the authors who questions whether the capabilities approach can be justified as a theoretical framework of social justice, particularly on the issue of its conformity to human diversity. Pogge’s claim is that the capabilities approach tends to view human diversity in a vertical manner, which potentially arouses a hierarchical stigma towards the disadvantaged. Apart from this, his questioning is also associated with the inability of the capabilities approach to explain how a compensatory demand has to be funded. In response to these concerns, authors such as Berges (2007), Anderson (2010) and Moss (2013) have countered Pogge’s claims, and argue that the capabilities approach is justified as an illuminating framework of social justice as it consistently looks to indicators of social justice and provides convincing reasons for the development of human capabilities and wellbeing.

The capabilities approach is also doubtlessly relevant to education and schooling due to its possibility to educate people to use their reasoning abilities to choose and take particular decisions. Sen and Nussbaum indicate that the role of education is
not for the fulfilment of economic markets and employability, but rather for further expansion of human capabilities and freedoms. Although Sen and Nussbaum do not directly apply the capabilities approach to education and schooling, there are a number of authors who have intensively worked on it in educational research, such as Terzi (2007), Walker (2004), Robeyns (2003b) and Wood and Deprez (2012). While Terzi, Walker and Robeyns propose lists of basic capabilities, Wood and Deprez offer educational goals within the perspective of the capabilities approach. For teachers as well as educational researchers, the lists of basic capabilities and proposed goals of education can be important references and guides to frame and design learning that highlights the notion of capabilities as a social justice framework to use in classrooms and to explore teaching practices. This latter point is covered by the thesis in Chapter 8.

In the next Chapter, the research methodology relevant to this study will be detailed. The study employs a qualitative case study approach within the stance of critical inquiry to explore perceptions and experiences of remote rural teachers in Indonesia’s Probolinggo regency in their engagement with socially just teaching practices. The basis for adopting this approach is the assumption concerning the complexity and dynamics of classroom teaching practices and the possible contribution of teachers to inequalities and injustices.
Chapter 5
A Qualitative Case Study of Teacher Capabilities

5.1 Introduction

In Chapter 4 I outlined the literature informing this study, which includes the notion of the capabilities approach, its contribution to the development of social justice theories and challenges for implementing this approach in education and schooling. This Chapter provides a detailed discussion of the research methodology relevant to the research question and the aim of this study. The study investigates Indonesian teachers’ capabilities to engage in socially just curriculum and teaching practices. It focuses on answering the following research question:

In a decentralised schooling system, what capabilities do teachers in Indonesia’s Probolinggo regency need in order to teach in socially just ways?

The Chapter consists of five parts. Part one specifically deals with the qualitative research approach that frames the study. This part explores the conception of a qualitative approach to researching schooling, and more particularly the capabilities approach and its relevance for studying teachers and student learning. In this part the philosophical stance that informs the methodology, critical inquiry, is also discussed. Part two of the Chapter outlines case study as the project’s research design. Part three is an explication of techniques for data generation, where semi-structured interviews, classroom observations and documentary analysis were applied to generate data. This part also includes the approach taken to the data analysis. The ethical considerations then follow to conclude the Chapter.

5.2 A Qualitative Research Approach – Critical Inquiry

Qualitative research has long become an acceptable research approach in various academic and professional fields, including education, and represents an attractive
and fruitful way of doing research (Yin 2011). In general, the major purpose of qualitative research is to study ‘the meaning of people’s lives, under real-world conditions’ (Yin 2011, p. 8). Qualitative research calls for an independent inquiry into participants’ performance, perspectives and/or documentary artefacts that represent people’s everyday roles. During the research process, participants perform as they are in daily-life roles and/or saying what they want to say. Participants are not limited to answering the pre-established questionnaires and surveys of researchers. Furthermore, the participants’ participation are not reduced down to mere statistical information. One might argue that statistics can provide a more accurate representation of an entire population, yet, by definition, it does not embody real-life events and ideas (Gray 2009; Yin 2011).

Apart from this, in a qualitative research approach, it is important for researchers to explicate their assumptions and beliefs about what knowledge is and how it is generated. This is referred to as paradigm. Denzin and Lincoln (2005) define paradigm as a philosophical stance or worldview that guides the researchers to critically understand their research project, particularly the chosen social phenomena that they investigate. This study adopts the philosophical stance of critical inquiry, assuming that classroom teaching practices are inseparable from issues of power, domination, inequalities and injustices. The following two sections will detail these points.

A Qualitative Research Approach

This project adopts a qualitative approach to research and seeks a detailed account of remote rural teachers’ perceptions and experiences regarding the issues of social justice embedded in their curriculum and teaching practices. Neuman (2003, p. 146) states that in a qualitative approach to research investigations, a researcher tends to use ‘a language of cases and context and look at interpretations or the creation of meaning in specific settings’. Qualitative researchers attempt to investigate social phenomena from various points of view and define how people build identities. In this regard, my research is interested in how teacher participants contribute to the idea of capable teachers, specifically remote rural teachers in Indonesia’s
Probolinggo regency. My role as researcher is to gain a holistic or integrated overview of the study, which incorporates teachers’ perceptions and experiences in their engagement with socially just curriculum and teaching practices, and to understand the ways they (1) act in classrooms and (2) account for their actions (Gray 2009). A qualitative methodology enables me to establish how teacher participants perceive themselves and/or their school settings (Gilham 2000). As such, the methodology is inferential in nature and can produce a rich description of what constitutes good and socially just teaching (Wiersma & Jurs 2005; Merriam 1998). In other words, this research will enable me to make inferences from what participating teachers say, in conjunction with broader research, about the issues around teaching in socially just ways.

In this research, informed by the work of Gewirtz (2006), I see teaching, particularly teaching in socially just ways, has a socio-cultural dimension, in which the aim is to promote inclusivity and empowerment of people. Teaching in this way is interrelated, complex, dynamic and changing as well as socio-culturally constructed. The teacher participants in this research held multiple perspectives about socially just teaching, influenced by many dimensions, including the socio-cultural backgrounds and current contexts in which the teachers were embedded. This ontological and epistemological stance of the nature of teaching in socially just ways encourages me to apply a qualitative research approach, which attempts to capture participants’ ideas and knowledge of the socio-cultural context to gain a deep understanding of how they create meaning (Neuman 2003; Yin 2011). Drawing on Denzin and Lincoln (2005), it is useful to describe the multiple perspectives of participants’ experiences and perceptions regarding social justice issues and to describe their complex understandings of teaching in socially just ways. Describing these perspectives and understandings can also reveal the extent that Indonesian teachers act as advocates for social justice in the classroom. In addition, this process can enhance participants’ overall teaching knowledge and practice.

The notion of knowledge construction within a socio-cultural context has made me take account of (in)justices that might be uncovered during the exploration of
participants’ critical assessment of their own teaching. Mainly inferring from constructivist and/or critical paradigms for understanding social phenomena, a qualitative research approach enables the researcher and participants to explore issues of balanced power, particularly when the topics being discussed move to a focus on marginalised perceptions and experiences. Hence, to realise the potential of qualitative research in seeking a detailed account of social justice issues regarding education and schooling requires not only a developed theoretical knowledge base, but also a fully integrated and supportive commitment to socio-cultural issues and changes in society amongst researchers (Denzin & Lincoln 2005).

Moreover, Gillham (2000) notes that qualitative research facilitates an exploration of complexities that are beyond the ambit of other approaches. For instance, compared to data collection methods often used in quantitative research, open-ended interviews frequently used in qualitative research can generate a greater depth and richness of data through the unfolding of what is being investigated. The products of qualitative studies could be words and/or pictures suggesting what the researcher has learned about a phenomenon, rather than numbers (Merriam 1998). Stake (1995) acknowledges that qualitative research refers to understanding rather than explanation and focuses on the construction of knowledge as opposed to its discovery. To understand a phenomenon, qualitative researchers typically gather data from the views of participants through direct contact with them. This suggests a close personal involvement in data collection aimed at gaining ‘the emic or insider’s perspective’ (Merriam 1998, p. 6), which can thus be open to critique and analysis. Informed by the work of Schwandt (2000), Patton (2002) argues that the focus on gaining an inside understanding is a central concept for perceiving the overall purpose of qualitative inquiry.

In qualitative research, researchers’ subjectivity and values cannot be eliminated as they are a necessary part of human interaction. Rather, as Auerbach and Silverstein (2003) argue, the subjective experiences and insights of researchers can enhance the study and be a source of knowledge about the phenomena under investigation. As a former secondary school teacher in Indonesia with a commitment to social
justice, I have on previous occasions conducted research on social justice across the English curriculum in Indonesian secondary schools. This was done to obtain a master’s degree in social justice education. I am aware that these subjectivities may affect this investigation in that I am the instrument of both data collection and data analysis as well as having personal contact and familiarity with the participants in this study (Patton 2002). Patton (2002) argues that subjectivity is the antithesis of scientific inquiry, and thus reflexivity needs to be undertaken.

Methodological reflexivity is the examination of the ways a researcher’s subjectivity affects his or her research. It is a goal of qualitative research to explicitly name this subjectivity (Auerbach & Silverstein 2003). Grbich (2013, p. 113) views reflexivity as ‘a heightened awareness of the [researcher] in the process of knowledge creation’. Bowen (2009) suggests that reflexivity requires a researcher’s awareness of his or her own contribution to the construction of meanings and the possibility of his or her own influence on research. This is because ‘the reality studied by qualitative research is not a given reality’ but is constructed by individuals or participants in a subjective manner, typically as a result of a social interactive process (Flick 2006, p. 83). In other words, reflexivity is an important attribute of researcher’s scientific account in the research process and is fundamental to generate a truthful account of the phenomena under investigation (Scott & Morrison 2007). Likewise, inserting ‘the notion of reflexivity into research implies that research that is not reflexive [potentially] offers less truthful accounts of the world’ (Scott & Morrison 2007, p. 202).

According to Bourdieu (1990), there are some aspects that ought to be considered for reflexivity in research, namely a researcher’s personal attribute and their position and disposition. These can include, for instance, biography, race, class, gender, sexual identity, socio-cultural, historical and educational backgrounds and intellectual accounts of the researcher. These aspects are potential sources of bias in research in that they can determine the type of knowledge that will be generated. In this regard, Bourdieu recommends a researcher to constantly and systematically monitor and perform self-analysis of his or her own position and disposition. This means that a researcher needs to objectify any of his or her personal accounts,
including his or her own intentional or unintentional bias so that they do not become obstacles to scientific knowledge. Bourdieu also suggests that a researcher ought not to bring his or her own view and perception of the world into the understanding of the phenomena under investigation, for, as Patton (2002) contends, such practices can reduce the credibility of a research project. A researcher’s commitment is not to generate comprehension of the world that is inherently his or hers, or to examine predetermined results or manipulate data, but instead, it is ‘to understand the [phenomena] as [they] unfold, be true to complexities as they emerge, and be balanced in reporting [findings]’ (Patton 2002, p. 51).

The relevance of *reflexivity* to this study is of paramount importance as it enables anticipation of unexpected consequences that arise in the research process as well as control over biases derived from subjective influences during data collection and interpretation (Darawsheh 2014). Houghton et al. (2013) note that both the researcher and participants can bring subjective influences to that process, for it is not easy to determine whether interpretations of the researcher completely represent participants’ vision of the phenomena under study. This suggests that findings in qualitative research can be comprised of the synthesised perspectives of participants, generated by and representing an example of the researcher undeniably affecting the data collection and interpretation. During interviews, for instance, the researcher is frequently required to give naturalistic responses to participants’ comments on particular issues just to disclose in-depth data. In this situation, with *reflexivity*, the researcher can utilise his or her personal attributes, lived experiences and understanding of the intellectual field to further explore participants’ view of the phenomena under study and systematically control his or her subjectivity when interpreting data so as to enhance credibility of the whole project (Jootun et al., 2009). In essence, *reflexivity* in this study is a strategy or a tool for credible data and dependable findings, and an introspective process by which I, as the researcher, am mindful of and transparent about any subjective accounts that potentially bias this study.
Critical Inquiry

Flick (2006) states that qualitative research methodology ‘is not built upon a unified theory’ (p. 16). Qualitative researchers can adopt a particular philosophical stance that informs the methodology to understand their research projects. Merriam (1998) argues that establishing a link between research and philosophical stances can provide an illuminating insight into the special characteristics of different research orientations, and into the nature of reality, knowledge and the production of knowledge. Some researchers, for instance, may take the philosophical stances of phenomenology or symbolic interaction, while others look to constructivism or critical social science, to detail the worldview of qualitative research. This suggests that there are different stances for interpreting a chosen phenomenon. This is because people tend to have assumptions that ‘distinguish fundamentally different belief systems concerning how the world is ordered, what we know about it and how we know about it’ (Hatch 2002, p. 21).

This study is informed by a critical inquiry stance. Crotty (1998) views critical inquiry as spawned by the critical spirit in which a researcher investigates common values and assumptions held in social settings and challenges conventional social structures including that of social action. As Patton (2002) states, critical inquiry is aimed at describing ‘a specific manifestation of already-presumed general patterns…and at confirmation and elucidation rather than discovery’ (p. 131). This is important in education research as it provides a philosophical framework that enables the unfolding of complex social phenomena in the context of education and schooling.

Critical inquiry is different from positivism, which aims toward prediction and interpretivism that lies within understanding. The critical inquiry paradigm is not simply content to predict and interpret the world, but, more importantly, seeks to emancipate and change it (Lather 2006). The assumptions that lie beneath critical inquiry are that:

1. ideas are mediated by power,
2. certain groups in society are privileged over others and exert an oppressive force on subordinate groups,
3. what are presented as ‘facts’ cannot be disentangled from ideology and the self-interest of dominant groups, and
4. mainstream
research practices are implicated, even if unconsciously, in the reproduction of the system of class, race, and gender oppression (Gray 2009, p. 25).

Similarly, it is noted that critical inquiry deals with issues of power and justice and how economy, class, race, gender, education and other socio-cultural institutions interact to construct a social system (see Patton 2002). Hence, research informed by critical inquiry is concerned with the how, namely how sufferings, injustice and subjugation shape people’s experiences and perceptions of social phenomena (Patton 2002; Fay 2015). Such research can also generate knowledge that addresses an ideological critique of power, domination and oppression and an attempt to confront any form of injustice of a particular society (Crotty 1998; Patton 2002).

From the stance of critical inquiry, ‘education is considered to be a social institution designed for social and cultural reproduction and transformation’ (Merriam 1998, p. 4). This is at odds with the aim(s) of education in the capabilities approach, in which an education is not merely for human capital, employability and other economic interests, but also for the development of broader issues such as social change and instrumental, intrinsic and socio-cultural values such as equity and democratic orientation (see Sen 1992; Nussbaum 1997). The capability argument is that education is a powerful tool for enabling people’s capabilities to develop, particularly for those who are socially and politically disadvantaged or marginalised (Walker & Unterhalter 2007). Bates (2007, p. 143) states that ‘capabilities, and the enhancement of individual capabilities through social [institutions], are at the heart of the issue of social justice’. In Sen’s view, social justice is then a matter of social commitments in ways that provide freedom for individuals to choose a life that they have reason to value (Sen 1999).

Moreover, Luyten et al. (2005) suggest that to explain the relationship between teaching and student performance, research informed by critical inquiry needs to take account of the influence of non-educational aspects within the school context, such as family background, social environments, life experiences, and so forth. Denzin and Lincoln (2005) suggest that the use of critical inquiry to inform a qualitative study implies a detailed account of and respect for one’s life-world and daily life. Likewise, in a capability perspective, social context and social relations such as these can potentially facilitate or impede students’ capabilities, depending
on teachers’ capabilities to create spaces for social inclusivity in their teaching and make connections between homes (community) and classrooms (social institutions).

As previously stated, critical inquiry is inseparable from issues of domination and power (see Lather 2006; Gray 2009). Hence, the application of a qualitative methodology informed by critical inquiry in this study is based on the assumption that classroom teaching practices in remote rural schools in Indonesia’s Probolinggo regency can be characterised by the exclusion of valuable information and marginalisation of minority groups, and the characterisation of events and individuals in particular ways is done in accordance with powerful interests. In this sense, teachers may contribute to inequalities and may intentionally indoctrinate students with a particular ideology rather than focusing on students’ learning and life chances (Cohran-Smith et al. 2008). From a capability perspective, if students’ life chances are overlooked or underestimated, this can be associated with forms of inequality, marginalisation and restrictions on students’ freedoms to choose a life that they think valuable (Unterhalter 2012). In other words, like critical inquiry, the capabilities approach places education and schooling within a wider social context and human development perspective. Both are concerned with the complexity and potential of education to enable the reduction of injustice and/or the advancement of justice in society and with the voices of marginalised groups of people who want to be heard.

As professionals in the front line, I believe very strongly that teachers play an important role not only in schools where they teach, but also in the community where they live. Teachers have the potential to effect social change and work toward social justice in society through the work that they do in classrooms. Hence, teachers need to constantly do a critical assessment of their own teaching in terms of whether it has been inclusive of all students or has made students aware that people are different, but without making them feel inferior due to their differences. In a society where particular disadvantaged members are struggling for personal identities, teachers who have a strong vision of social justice (changes in society) are extremely important, for teachers as such tend to accept, rather than reject,
personal accounts of all students and use them to enrich the aspects of the curriculum. Thus, from a critical inquiry perspective, if, to some extent, a teacher intends to take socio-cultural issues away from teaching practices, he or she, in some respect, might be thought as having contributed to framing inequalities in society.

5.3 Research Design: A Case Study Approach

Case study is an approach to research that facilitates the exploration of complex phenomena within their contexts (Yin 2003). Yin (2003) and Stake (1995) evoke a constructivist paradigm in their approach to case study. Constructivism is similarly evoked in this research. This paradigm claims that ‘truth and meaning do not exist in some external world, but are created by the subject’s interactions with the world’ (Gray 2009, p. 18). Constructivism is commonly used to describe a theory of knowledge that emphasises the active process in constructing knowledge, rather than assuming that knowledge cannot be altered and only needs to be memorised to be understood. One of the benefits of case study research is the close relationship between the researcher and the participant, which enables participants to tell their stories (Baxter & Jack 2008). By means of those stories, the participants are able to express their insights of social reality, and this enables the researcher to better understand each participant’s perceptions of reality.

As reflected in the research question, this study explores teachers’ perceptions and experiences of social justice, and the teaching practices and factors that may affect teachers’ capabilities to teach in socially just ways. In doing so, the study seeks to understand the possible effects of, or links between, what teachers perceive and what they experience in terms of the issues of social justice in education and schooling. As discussed in Chapters 3 and 4, the notion of social justice within education and schooling is complex and multi-dimensional. It is inseparable from broader social, cultural, political and economic contexts (Patton 2002). This complexity lends itself to case study, which stresses in-depth research that enables the researcher to examine the case from the inside (Stark & Torrance 2005).
Yin (2003, p. 1) acknowledges that ‘using case studies for research purposes remains one of the most challenging of all social science endeavours’. Case studies are essentially qualitative (Merriam 1998), and hence Stake (1995) suggests that case studies have been one of the most common ways to do qualitative inquiry. They ‘allow investigators to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life events’ (Yin 2003, p. 2). Case studies can be the preferred strategy when:

1. the focus of the study is to answer ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions,
2. the researcher cannot control the behaviour of people involved in the study,
3. the researcher intends to include the contextual conditions that he or she believes to be in relevance to the phenomenon studied and/or
4. the boundaries between the phenomenon and context are unclear (Yin 2003, p. 13).

The phenomenon that I am interested in for the purposes of this study is remote rural teachers’ perceptions and experiences in their engagement with socially just curriculum and teaching practices. This phenomenon cannot be separated from its context, which is geographically and socially situated. Miles and Huberman (1994) suggest that a case constitutes the researcher’s unit of analysis derived from a phenomenon that occurs in a bounded context. A case can be an individual, a group, an institution, a program, an event, intervention, or community (Gillham 2000), although it is usually defined by conceptual and/or structural boundaries more than geographical ones. The case in this study is the various groups of teachers and their capability to teach in socially just ways in remote rural schools in Indonesia’s Probolinggo regency.

Further, Stake (1995) suggests that a case study is defined by the object of the study. The focus of this study is primary school teachers in remote rural areas in Indonesia’s Probolinggo regency, where the term remote rural refers to both the geographical location and distance from formal teacher professional development.

One reason for the selection of Indonesia’s Probolingko regency is that I have more access to the area, can speak the local language and understand the cultural values of the area. This enables participants’ engagement with this research and encourages more explorations of participants’ vision of social justice issues in education. Given these personal connections, I am also interested in what teacher capability means in these areas. Teachers in the study were selected through purposive sampling of a specific population based on seniority and experience; these teachers had teaching experience for more than five years, and hence they
were considered to have adequate pedagogic competence in conducting classroom teaching (Regulation of Indonesian Government No. 74/2008). Conversations with them were ‘information rich and illuminative’, providing deep understandings of the social phenomena under study (Patton 2002, p. 40). This purposive sampling is not aimed at generalisation from the sample to the general teaching population, but merely provides insights about the phenomena under investigation (Patton 2002).

5.4 Techniques for Data Generation

The study is based on data generated through interviews, classroom observations and analysis of curricular documents, which includes a curriculum framework, teacher syllabi and lesson plans. An interview is a purposeful conversation rather than a completely open talk, and it is often a major key mode of data collection in case study research (Merriam 1998; Yin 2003). Fontana and Frey (2005) acknowledge that using an interview as a technique for data collection enables a rich and in-depth exploration of events or phenomena. Similarly, Perakyla (2005) suggests that interviews can reach areas of reality that may otherwise remain inaccessible, such as people’s subjective experiences and attitudes. The interview is also a prominent way of bridging distances in space and time as it can explore the past events or faraway experiences of people. There are two kinds of interviews, structured and semi-structured. Structured interviews usually involve prescribed questions, while semi-structured interviews are guided by focused questions, which allow participants and interviewers to take the discussion in other directions.

This study utilises semi-structured interviews rather than structured ones as they elicit more engagement and interactions with participants. Denzin and Lincoln (2005) indicate that semi-structured interviews stimulate the advent of participants’ multiple perceptions and worldviews of particular phenomena. In other words, semi-structured interviews facilitate a search for meaning derived from various insights of participants. I conducted the interviews after doing classroom observations and reviewing documents. Yin (2011) suggests that examining documents and reviewing observation field notes prior to interviews can give participants more material to reflect on. In addition, it enables the identification of
more strategies in exploring ideas of teacher participants, particularly when their comments were juxtaposed with their practices.

Eight teachers from six different primary schools were interviewed. As previously stated, they were selected on the basis of their seniority and experience; all had been teaching for over five years. It is acknowledged in the Peraturan Pemerintah No. 74/2008 (Regulation of Indonesian Government No. 74/2008) that these (senior and experienced) teachers tend to have sufficient pedagogic competence, particularly in terms of recognising students, planning, implementing and evaluating classroom teaching practices. The questions the participants were asked in the interviews related to issues of social justice in education and schooling, and I intended to keep within the time limits that had been set for our conversations. Most teachers were interviewed twice for approximately 60 minutes, depending on whether all required information had been gathered. Each interview was undertaken separately and conducted in the participants’ workplaces. I paid my greatest attention to the depth and details of each interview, and I allowed for participants to direct the discussions.

Drawing on Spradley (1979), Hatch (2002) identifies three types of questions commonly used in interviews: descriptive, structural, and contrast questions. Descriptive questions are aimed at making participants more engaged in sketching their activities, structural questions are intended to draw the attention of the participants to the social phenomena under investigation, and contrast questions attempt to compare particular situations and particular events experienced by participants (Hatch 2002). Descriptive and structural questions were mostly used in my research, although I also utilised contrast questions. A list of the guiding interview questions can be found in Appendix 1. The questions in the interviews were based on themes constructed from the literature review on social justice, particularly the capabilities approach. The themes include:

- Teachers’ perceptions of good and just teaching;
- Teaching for creating substantive freedoms for students to lead a life worth living;
- Potential barriers in teaching for capabilities;
- Education for people who live in remote rural areas.
For instance, in exploring teachers’ perceptions of good and just teaching, I asked interview participants descriptive, structural and contrast questions such as: Can you describe what good teachers look like? What can they do to aid students in their learning? What difference can they make to help students learn effectively? In essence, I used questions that were centred on participants’ knowledge and understandings of the phenomena under study. My aim was to engage participants in the research process and speak openly about their engagement with socially just curriculum and teaching practices.

Further, classroom observations and curriculum document analysis were two techniques used in this study to triangulate emerging findings; ‘they are used in conjunction with interviewing to substantiate the findings’ (Merriam 2009, p. 119). Triangulation refers to the use of multiple methods or data sources to develop a comprehensive understanding of phenomena (Denzin 1978; Patton 2002). Jonsen and Jehn (2009) note that the systematic use of an interactive triangulation approach can help to minimise subjectivity, offset researcher biases, decrease distortions and increase the validity of findings. The study adopts a critical inquiry perspective which values subjectivity, and thus the use of triangulation is not only for validation and/or verification but also for ensuring that an account of phenomena is rich, robust, comprehensive and well-developed. Patton (2002) suggests that triangulation should be viewed as an opportunity to uncover deeper meaning in the data rather than as weakening the evidence. This is important because a case study can become strong and convincing if various types of data contribute to deep understanding of phenomena under study (Patton 2002; Jonsen & Jehn 2009).

In this study, I conducted eight classroom observations. The eight participating teachers from six different schools (interviewees) were observed of approximately 40 minutes for each participant. A checklist (a sample of the checklist can be found in Appendix 2) was used to monitor how teachers encourage socially just practices in a particular classroom, such as how they create classroom activities that are centred on student wellbeing, show respect for diversity of students, explore links between curricular topics/themes and social practices that support life-choices and human flourishing, demonstrate teaching practices that respectfully listen to
students’ voices and opinions, and so forth. During these activities, I noticed, checked and took notes of contradictory behaviours or incidents that might lead to a greater understanding of participants’ engagement in socially just curriculum and teaching practices, and that were relevant and important for the development of my study.

Based on my observational checklists and notes, it was evident that not all aspects of social justice (as outlined in Chapters 3 and 4) emerged in a participant’s observed classroom. For example, while a participant was implementing a dialogic approach in his or her teaching, this often meant that they did not show respect for students’ voices and opinions, and did not sufficiently encourage connections between students’ homes, classrooms and communities. In other words, teacher practice in the classroom was juxtaposed with the ideas of socially just teaching that suggest connections and accommodation of student agency and voice in a process of learning.

5.5 Data Analysis: Qualitative Content Analysis

Miles and Huberman (1994) argue that ‘the strength of qualitative research rests very centrally on the competence with which the data analysis is carried out’ (p. 10). Conducting semi-structured interviews with eight teachers from six different primary schools, eight classroom observations and given curricular documents of various subjects, I received an abundance of data that had to be analysed in a qualitative oriented manner. Qualitative content analysis is the approach taken in this study. Content analysis is a general term for a practical technique to make deduction by systematically and objectively identifying characteristics of messages or texts (Holsti 1969; Creswell 2007). The major focus of content analysis is on the analytic examination of large amounts of narratives by reducing them into small units of content (Sparker 2005). The study undertaken for this thesis generated a large volume of data, and choosing content analysis as the preferred method of data analysis allowed for cross-checking of data content with aspects of the research question. Content analysis is applied to research analysis where the research question can be directly answered from described attributes of content (Creswell
In this case, the researcher can focus on or code for specific words or patterns that are indicative of the research question (Hsieh & Shannon 2005).

Similiarly, Vaismoradi et al. (2013) suggest that qualitative content analysis incorporates a systematic coding and categorising method aimed to explore textual information to determine patterns of words used and the structures and discourses of communication (see also Kohlbacher 2006; Grbich 2013). Historically speaking, as Glaser and Laudel (2013) note, coding constitutes a very old strategy widely used to structure text. Although coding has been associated with a grounded theory method, it is now the most popular technique for general qualitative data analysis (Mayring 2000). In other words, coding can be an acceptable strategy for qualitative data analysis outside a grounded theory method. Authors like Miles and Huberman (1994) and Patton (2002) also support this point.

The key process of coding refers to indexing raw textual data, in which keywords or phrases that speak to the relevant information are located in segments of the texts. Regarding this, Miles and Huberman (1994, p. 56) elaborates:

> Codes are tags or labels for assigning units of meaning to the descriptive or inferential information compiled during a study. Codes usually are attached to 'chunks' of varying size – words, phrases, sentences, or whole paragraphs, connected or unconnected to a specific setting. They can take the form of a straightforward category label.

In other words, coding is indicative of what has been assigned in segments of textual data, and thus it should ‘support the retrieval of text segments, which in turn can be used to group them according to thematic aspects of the data they contain’ (Glaser & Laudel 2013, p. 11). Coding can be based on theoretical grounds established prior to data analysis and/or on the text itself, and this decision determines one of the important differences amongst various coding strategies (see Glaser & Laudel 2013). Essentially, as Miles and Huberman (1994) suggest, coding itself is an analysis and a preliminary step to frame categories. Hsieh and Shannon (2005, p. 1285) define categories as ‘patterns or themes that are directly expressed in the text or are derived from them through analysis’. Merriam (1998, p. 182) identifies three sources from which names of categories can be derived: the researcher, the participants or sources outside the study such as the research literature.
This study applies a *categories construction* strategy in analysing the data rather than theory building (Merriam 1998; Mayring 2000). The study based the names of categories on themes derived from the literature on capabilities approach while also considering those that come from participants. The interpretation of the generated data was based on the examination of teacher participant responses and comments around the issues of social justice in education and schooling. Drawing on Grbich (2013), my preparation phase in the content analysis generally began with immersing myself in the data to gain a sense of the data as a complete whole. This was carried out prior to determining the type of content – primary content (main ideas of the texts) and latent content (context-based information of the texts). Reading the interview transcripts, I took notes and jotted down comments or queries in the margins. This enabled me to gain a complete understanding of the context, and categorise the data that are potentially relevant to the study. I applied manual coding to identify categories gleaned from the interview transcripts and coloured highlighting pens to code texts that have the related perspectives. Working through all the interview transcripts, I kept reviewing the notes and comments in the margins and classified the comments and notes that could go together accordingly.

I developed the main categories from what I saw reflected in the data and broke these up into subcategories. This was done to establish a concept of what constitutes good and just teaching according to the capabilities approach. Following this approach, seven main categories were constructed from the data, namely: (1) teacher capabilities to be inclusive of all students in the classroom, (2) teacher capabilities to respect students’ diversity and their voices and opinions, (3) teacher capabilities to connect the curriculum with students’ life experiences, (4) teacher capabilities to facilitate deliberative and democratic arrangements in the classroom, (5) teacher capabilities to pursue curricular objectives within boundaries, (6) things that constrain teacher capabilities, and (7) things that enable teacher capabilities. Each of these categories has subcategories. These categories also inform the analysis in Chapters 6 and 7 which follow.
Table 3: Main Categories and Subcategories Constructed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Subcategories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Teacher capabilities to be inclusive of all students in the classroom | • Teacher’s different perceptions of inclusivity  
• Teacher’s draw on prior knowledge of all students  
• Implementing differentiated instruction  
• Encouraging students to reflect on their own actions |
| Teacher capabilities to respect students’ diversity and their voices and opinions | • Recognising students’ different cultural characteristics  
• Embracing students’ different competencies  
• Creating spaces for students’ voices and opinions to be acknowledged |
| Teacher capabilities to connect the curriculum with students’ life experiences | • Implementing contextual teaching and learning  
• Teaching for a good life  
• Linking curricular themes to social and spiritual values |
| Teacher capabilities to facilitate deliberative and democratic arrangements in the classroom | • Accommodating students’ proposal for how the classroom works and runs  
• Extending students’ participation  
• Managing a classroom and student conduct  
• Cultivating (religious) values |
| Teacher capabilities to pursue curricular objectives within boundaries | • Managing a classroom and student conduct  
• Cultivating (religious) values  
• Motivating students  
• Improving the quality of teaching  
• Establishing relationships with students’ parents  
• Accommodating community expectations |
| Things that constrain teacher capabilities | • Teaching focus on results and textbooks  
• Comparison among students  
• Physical and verbal punishments  
• Government and school policy  
• Limited resources  
• Corruption and/or bribery  
• Social, economic and cultural barriers |
In relation to document and observation data, as previously discussed, these were analysed to supplement or augment the interview data. Document data consisted of a curriculum framework, teachers’ syllabi and teachers’ lesson plans of various subjects and grades, and observation data consisted of field notes made during observations of the participant teachers in their classrooms. The curriculum framework was developed by the central government and publically accessible, while teachers’ syllabi and lesson plans were constructed by local teachers and were not publically available. Prior to analysing these data, I did verification to find the key points that may lead to important findings. I undertook manual coding by means of a procedure similar to that applied to the interview transcripts. I coded the observation and document data, and broke them up into two categories: things that potentially develop capabilities and things that potentially restrict capabilities. All relevant information from these observations and curricular documents was intended to enhance the categorical perspectives constructed from the interview data.

5.6 Ethical Issues

Given that the research involves human participants, it inherently presents some risks, particularly during the collection of data and in the dissemination of findings (Merriam 1998). As Stake (1995, p. 24) states, qualitative researchers are guests in private spaces, and ‘their manners should be good and their code of ethics strict’. Ethical issues that needed greater attention in this research included the way of obtaining informed consent from participants and maintaining participants’ privacy and confidentiality in relation to the information given. In addition to this, an assurance that this research did not bring about any type of harm to the participants was also covered.
To gain access to and secure informed consent, I approached my research participants through the primary school supervisor and the school principals. Their involvement in my research was the first time for all participants to be interviewed and observed by a researcher and they appeared unconfident and uneasy, even after the informed consent form was signed. In view of this, I needed to re-explain the purpose of the research, and my interests in it, in a verbal manner and using their local accent. I wanted to affirm that my meeting with them was not to supervise but to learn from them.

At the beginning of the interviews, some participants (particularly those from a private school) looked reluctant to participate in the study. They questioned the benefits of this research in terms of funding or grants for their schools and whether this project had an affiliation with particular funding organisations that could potentially offer financial contributions to the schools. This situation required me to re-affirm that participation in this research was voluntary and I did not provide any funds, gifts, payments or other financial benefits to all participants. I instead indicated that the possible benefit of this research was that it might offer them new perspectives about education and schooling, by which the performance of teachers in remote rural schools could be improved. On a number of occasions, particularly before and after each interview and observation, I kept reminding them of their rights to withdraw from this project and guaranteed that their withdrawal would not jeopardise their position. Eventually, reassured by the explanations given, no teachers chose to withdraw from the study.

During the research process, I was also mindful of the requirements for privacy and confidentiality and of scenarios during data collection, which potentially presented a risk. For example, I did not repeat to particular participants what other participants had told me in individual interviews. On one occasion a teacher participant spoke poorly of a colleague who was also a participant in this study and of educational leaders and institutions in that area and others. I did not divulge this information. I did not tell any of the participants’ stories to other participants in each interview. Instead, I took account of all perspectives as constructed realities that could become valid data. I considered all data based on its merits to the study rather than on a
personal interest. Findings that reflected poorly on a particular participant and were
highly critical of institutional practices or of its leaders and staff were objectively
handled, in the sense that they were not considered less valid just because of their
negativity.

All audio recordings and transcripts of the interviews, curricular documents and
observational notes were coded for my reference only. I substituted pseudonyms
for all participants and have used these throughout the thesis. All data collected are
now securely stored in a personal computer with a password and anti-virus security
system and in a locked filing cabinet. Data are also backed up on other storage
deVICES such as CDs and removable and external hard drives, which are also
password-protected.

As reflected in the research question, this study was relatively non-invasive in
nature as it did not physically hurt participants involved in this study (Miles &
Huberman 1994; Denzin & Lincoln 2005). However, the notion of harm is not only
associated with the physical state of participants, but also their psychological or
emotional one. There was a chance during the interviews that some of my questions
might raise emotional concerns or discomfort among participants, particularly
when I posited questions of a sensitive issue or juxtaposed what they were doing in
the classroom with what they were saying in the interview. In these circumstances,
I managed the questions in a general sense and/or presented an example of the same
issue and asked for their response to it. This was done to provide opportunity for
the participants to reflect on their own actions as well as to keep them engaged in
this research.

5.7 Conclusion

This Chapter has addressed the methodology and research design of the research
conducted for this thesis. This research is a qualitative case study analysis of teacher
capabilities to engage in socially just curriculum and teaching practices. The first
part of the Chapter justified a qualitative research approach informed by the critical
inquiry paradigm. This paradigm is not simply associated with prediction and
interpretation of a phenomenon, but also with a commitment to emancipate and change it. The issues of power and (in)justice occurring in socio-cultural institutions, including education, can be studied using this type of qualitative inquiry as it can provide recommendations for more inclusive forms of social change.

Teachers’ roles are central to changes in society in that teachers are *front-line problem solvers* of students’ problems, and their influence on students’ performance is relatively and arguably greater than an overall school institution policy. This research focuses on teachers because, following a social justice perspective, teachers have a great opportunity to consider the true existence of diverse cultures in society. Thus, the notion of social justice should be the prominent scope of teaching practices in classrooms (Boucher & Kelly 1998). To better teach for social justice, teachers have to recognise students’ socio-cultural backgrounds and identities and be able to explore students’ understandings of social justice embedded in their personal accounts. If teachers do not have sufficient understandings of the differences regarding culture, race or gender, they can harbour resistance to working with diverse students and have little regard for social justice or see any form of change in society.

To analyse and interpret data generated from semi-structured interviews with participating teachers, this study uses qualitative content analysis by coding parts of the data that are specifically relevant to the research question and the aim of this study. This was done to generate a rich description of the key aspects of the data.

The following two Chapters (Chapters 6 and 7) provide an analysis of the data. Chapter 6 deals with analyses of classroom teacher capabilities that incorporate social inclusivity in pedagogical practices, while Chapter 7 examines classroom teachers’ capabilities to make connections between students’ homes and their classrooms. The analysis in both Chapters relates to major beliefs about what *good* (socially just) teachers are. The theoretical resources in this study (see Chapters 3 and 4) indicate that *good* teachers should be socially inclusive of all students and
show their respect for knowledge on the basis of students’ cultures, homes and communities.
Chapter 6
Social Inclusivity in Teaching

6.1 Introduction

This Chapter analyses classroom teacher capabilities that incorporate social inclusivity in pedagogical practices. It analyses interview and classroom observation data with eight teacher participants as well as curricular documents for primary schools in remote rural areas in Indonesia’s Probolinggo Regency. These documents include Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP) (School-based Curriculum Development (SBCD)) (a sample of the document can be found in Appendix 4) and Rencana Pelaksanaan Pembelajaran (RPP) (Teacher Lesson Plans) (a sample of the document can be found in Appendix 5). KTSP (SBCD) constitutes the teacher syllabi, developed by teachers of state and private primary schools in the regency through Kelompok Kerja Guru (KKG) (Teacher Network Association). The construction of KTSP (SBCD) encompasses standard competence (learning goals) and basic competence (learning objectives) of the Curriculum Framework constructed by a team of Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan (National Education Standard Board) at the central level (a sample of the document can be found in Appendix 3). RPP (Teacher Lesson Plans) were constructed by individual teachers at a school level in reference to the KTSP (SBCD). All Indonesian teachers, including those in remote rural areas, are required to have and use these documents to conduct teaching and learning.

For confidentiality, the eight participants are identified under pseudonyms as Fatin, Harun, Amir, Anton, Rani, Nita, Budi and Santi. All the participants are classroom teachers who have been teaching for over five years. Fatin teaches in a private primary school, Harun and Amir in private primary Islamic schools and Nita, Anton, Budi, Rani and Santi in state primary schools. In terms of their employment status, Fatin, Harun and Amir are permanent private school teachers (PPv); Anton
is a non-permanent teacher (Np); Rani is a permanent government school teacher (PG); and Nita, Budi and Santi are certified permanent government school teachers (CPG). PPv and Np teachers are paid much less, yet they have the same responsibilities as PG and CPG teachers. They also do not receive as much formal education/training as PG and CPG teachers. All these teacher participants live in different districts about 150 kilometres from the provincial capital city.

The analysis in this Chapter relates to beliefs about what constitutes good teaching practices. The theoretical resources in this study (see Chapters 3 and 4) indicate that good teaching practices are to be socially inclusive of all students. Singh (2012) contends that socially inclusive teaching practices lead to the enhancement of students’ capabilities and performance; students are exposed to a learning environment that enables them to interact with others having diverse abilities, interests and characteristics. Such perspectives are also represented in the Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan No. 65/2013 (Regulation of Indonesia’s Ministry of Education and Culture No. 65/2013). These include:

- Being a teacher comes together with responsibilities for academic performance and social performance of students. A teacher has a greater job than merely transferring knowledge to students;
- Good teaching practices accommodate the diversity of students, which includes their diverse competence, voices, interests, learning styles and socio-economic and cultural backgrounds. Teachers not only recognise this diversity but they also play an active role in managing the diversity in the classroom;
- Good teaching practices promote students’ active participation in learning. Active participation of students within the classroom is a central concept of democratic pedagogy.
- Good teaching practices are learner-centred rather than teacher-centred and didactic. Learner-centred modes of teaching enable increased motivation, creativity and independence in learning amongst students;
- Good teaching practices accommodate and welcome students with various needs. This inclusive system of schooling empowers students to actively participate in the establishment of a better society accepting, respecting and celebrating diversity.

These perspectives indicate that teachers in Indonesia need to take account of the notion of social inclusivity in teaching in order to be able to respect the basic rights of students and embrace their diverse needs.

A social inclusivity perspective in teaching suggests that teachers are responsible for more than just addressing task completion; they also need to create more opportunities for students to engage in learning activities. To fulfil these responsibilities, teachers need to adapt their instruction to the diverse characteristics
and competencies of all students, accommodate students’ voices and life experiences and use teaching strategies that encourage all students to actively participate in learning. In remote rural areas in Indonesia’s Probolinggo Regency, social inclusivity in teaching is a problematic issue facing classroom teachers. In this Chapter, their concern and efforts to be inclusive of all students are juxtaposed with their observed roles in the classroom that are conventionally teacher-centred. Despite this effort to be socially inclusive, it would seem that some teacher practices potentially oppose the principles of socially inclusive teaching. Nonetheless, the analysis that follows in this Chapter indicates that the diverse needs and rights of all students can be met within inclusive classrooms. In addition, inclusive classrooms are effective to overcome obstacles that potentially minimise opportunities for students to lead a flourishing life.

What follows is an exploration of the ways in which social inclusivity is embedded in curricular documents and implemented in teaching practices. The Chapter aims to critically examine teacher participant responses around social inclusivity incorporated into teaching and learning practices. Inge and Elisabeth (2013) suggest that a critical factor in the success of inclusive schooling is the capabilities of teachers and their responses towards inclusivity. The voices of teachers need to be heard, particularly in terms of their commitment to inclusivity in teaching. The Chapter begins with discussions centred on aspects of social inclusivity, which includes the capability to embrace student diversity, followed by discussions of the capability to enable student agency and voice and the capability to establish deliberative democracy in the classroom.

6.2 The Capability to Embrace Student Diversity

The students who attend schools have diverse characteristics, behaviours and experiences, which may affect their social and academic performance. Teachers need to accommodate the diversity of students by attempting to realise and bridge the cultural worlds of the students’ homes, communities and schools (Taylor & Whittaker 2009). According to Sen (1992, p. xi), ‘human diversity is no secondary compilation (to be ignored, or to be introduced ‘later on’); it is a fundamental aspect
of our interest in equality’. In other words, respect for diversity of students is a condition for the full development of students’ capabilities. Students are not culturally passive; they actively construct their own identities through interactions with their peers, parents and with other people in the community. Celebrating student diversity requires teachers to be aware of cultural issues, directing their efforts towards culturally-oriented pedagogy (Gonzalez 2005). Keddie (2012b) suggests that teachers need to explicitly recognise students’ different cultures, which is central to creating spaces for culturally responsive pedagogy.

Culturally responsive pedagogy emerges from the notion of cultural difference. It is a critique of the cultural deficit paradigm that declares that there is no connection between education and cultures (Taylor & Sobel 2011). According to Gay (2010), culturally responsive pedagogy means ‘using the cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference, and performance styles of culturally diverse students to make learning encounters more relevant to and effective for them’ (p. 31). Such pedagogy is not culturally blind and demands that teachers are culturally responsive to all students preparing them for a life of diversity. Teachers who are culturally responsive are able to use students’ cultural knowledge and prior life experiences as a means of improving their learning outcomes (Hayes et al. 2006; Lingard 2007; Keddie 2012b). When teachers perceive teaching and learning as cultural activities, effective instruction can then integrate students’ cultural backgrounds, identity and life experiences (Lingard & Mills 2007). Teachers who are culturally literate have a greater capability to adapt instruction in a responsive manner and ‘teach like their students’ lives do matter’ (Taylor & Sobel 2011, p. 3), with the prospect of preventing barriers in students’ social lives (Keddie 2012a).

In Probolinggo Regency, Indonesia, embracing student diversity that accounts for students’ cultures and experiences is reflected in the Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP) (School-based Curriculum Development (SBCD)). This syllabus was constructed by a group of teachers of private and state schools at the regency level under Kelompok Kerja Guru (KKG) (Teachers’ Network Association). The Indonesian government’s preface to the document highlights that ‘in developing curriculum, school teachers need to consider the interests and
uniqueness of locality, schools and students’ (KTSP 2008, p. i). According to this document, that the cultural diversity in Indonesia is embodied in the uniqueness and plurality of the ethnic groups and societies; it ought to be recognised and affirmed for the benefit of present and future generations. Hence, government expectations are that classroom teachers need to use students’ different cultural characteristics as the foundation for designing and implementing curriculum and instruction. Taylor and Sobel (2011) argue that a teacher’s effort to recognise students’ uniqueness exemplifies a commitment to develop teaching and learning practices that could reach all students.

My analysis of participant teacher’s syllabi and lesson plans – the documents officially constructed by individual teachers at a school level – indicates instruction that potentially creates opportunities for teachers to value student diversity. The issues of socio-cultural diversity and explorations of students’ life experiences are integrated into the documents as learning objectives and/or topic themes. In the Year 4 Syllabus of Civics, for instance, teachers include a learning objective that encourages students ‘to express local social cultures in the form of an essay’. Likewise, in the Year 4 Syllabus of Indonesian Language and Year 3 Syllabus of Islamic Law, teachers explore students’ life experiences through instruction which asks students to ‘write about their daily life experiences and ideals’, ‘solve simple problems of their daily lives’, and ‘work in groups to share their experiences on performing the obligatory fasting’. The latter is a core feature of life in Indonesia, particularly in the areas where I conducted this research, in which the majority of inhabitants are Muslims. Further, in the Year 4 Lesson Plan of Civics, teachers include a topic theme on ‘nature’s look and social diversity’. In this regard, local teachers are not ignorant of the cultural orientations and values of diverse students. Rather, as reflected in these documents, they attempt to validate students’ cultural issues and prior experiences as the philosophical base for designing curriculum and instruction.

Some teacher participants in this study suggest that a good teacher does not only focus on implementing such documents as syllabi and lesson plans, but also understand students’ backgrounds and characteristics. Fatin (PPv) says:
A good teacher is a teacher who can manage and control the class well. Apart from mastery of teaching materials, where it’s a must for a teacher, a teacher should be able to manage the class and recognise students’ diverse characteristics and competencies in understanding lessons.

Similarly, Anton (Np) states:

A good teacher is a teacher who does his or her duty well and implements administrative things like syllabi and lesson plans well. He or she does the school regulations in terms of the completeness of their teaching administration and tools, and understands students, including the background of students.

Both Fatin and Anton indicate that a teacher has particular duties and responsibilities that relate to the implementation of syllabi and lessons and recognition of diverse characteristics of students. This may suggest Fatin’s and Anton’s belief in the authority of teachers to complete the designated tasks in order to be effective in managing classrooms. Drawing on Sen (1992), in pursuit of changes in society, teaching requires more than just a matter of holding content knowledge or education material resources such as syllabi, lesson plans and textbooks; rather, it needs to incorporate the ways these resources are converted into capabilities with regard to students’ diverse identities. In essence, their comments imply a view that the context of teaching is socio-cultural, which means that it considers the inclusion of community-related issues as a central approach to learning. Beaudry (2015) acknowledges that incorporating cultures into learning could lead to plurality and improve the lives of all students.

Further, Nita, Harun and Budi add that a teacher’s duty is not only related to transferring knowledge, but also ‘changing students’ behaviour’ (Nita, CPG), ‘providing spiritual interactions with students’ (Harun, PPv) and ‘understanding what’s experienced by students’ (Budi, CPG). Hence, while Harun and Budi take account of interactions and experiences of students in teaching, Nita views teaching as being behavioural (Nita). She indicates that in some respect, classroom teaching needs to support and provide for aspects of behaviour. For Nita, behaviour management might be indicative of effective teaching and a necessary skill to create a well-ordered classroom, from which students’ outcomes are improved.

Nonetheless, as Atherton (2013) indicates, in the context of teaching, behaviour management can lead to the dominance of guided instruction by teachers as classroom instruction intensely follows the structure and guidance of teachers. This
kind of teaching practice is referred to as removing students’ agency or tendency to engage with their learning (see Atherton 2013). Hattie (2003) notes that despite its possible necessity, behavioural teaching in itself is insufficient to establish an effective learning environment as it constitutes one aspect in a teacher’s repertoire of practice maintaining that students have to be perfect in how they go about their studies and they cannot afford to make a mistake. This circumstance, as Hattie argues, potentially leads to pressure on students.

Following the notion of the capabilities approach, any pressure on students can restrict their capabilities to expand their knowledge and freedom to choose as well as limiting their worldview. To prevent this, teachers need to facilitate interactive teaching, which devotes classroom activities to the exploration of students’ lived experiences. Hattie (2003) contends that aside from attempting to dominate classroom activities, teachers should instead have a willingness to be receptive to students’ knowledge and understandings of their socio-cultural lives. With this receptive manner, teachers not only demonstrate high respect, care and commitment for students as both learners and people, but also recognise possible constraints to learning and find ways to overcome them. Marzano and Marzano (2003) note that the quality of teacher-student relationships is an important part of all other aspects of student engagement in learning, and this can be characterised by appropriate levels of teacher-student cooperation and awareness of students’ cultural (lived) experiences.

If teachers do not recognise students’ cultural aspects and experiences, they can risk reducing the opportunities students have to achieve their potential (Taylor & Sobel 2011; Wood & Deprez 2012). Fatin, for example, reveals the importance of a teacher’s awareness of student cultural diversity in relation to developing appropriate teaching materials. She suggests that a teacher’s knowledge of the cultural backgrounds of students is interrelated with how he or she treats students in the classroom. On this point Fatin observes:

That’s related to how we are going to teach them. It’s important to understand whether my students come from a broken-home, rich or poor family. That’s important, we can teach them in a different way. For example, the students whose parents are strict also tend to be strict to their friends in class. In my experience, some students are focused and some are even silent. In this respect, I have to teach them differently. If I teach them the same as others, they won’t learn as much.
Fatin’s commentary suggests that students’ backgrounds and life experiences are important aspects for her to recognise their students, and that she is thinking about their improved learning outcomes. In other words, these backgrounds and life experiences are fundamental assets to make students more engaged in their learning. Smyth (2012) suggests that to be socially just, teachers need to intimately recognise the strengths, struggles, aspirations and histories that students and their families bring to schools. In case these should become constraints on the growth of students’ capabilities and learning, it is the responsibility of schools and all teachers to overcome them (Keddie 2012b; Lupton & Hempel-Jorgensen 2012). Hence, in Fatin’s view, equity can involve teachers removing constraints or barriers to students’ learning. Keddie (2012b, p. 13) argues that ‘equity doesn’t mean treating all the kids the same’. Equity in the context of Fatin’s students may mean identifying and then acting to halt what it is that prevents learning. In other words, a teacher acting in this way may improve students’ performance and learning outcomes. Equity is crucial in that it incorporates the provision of reasonable opportunities for students to develop their capacity and to participate fully in society. High-level education is much associated with this, not only with improved employment and earnings but also in helping to establish a person with a healthy and successful life in a democratic society (Levin 2003).

Most participating teachers in this study suggested that embracing student diversity also relates to accommodating their diverse competencies. These teachers make an effort to bridge the gap between lower and higher achieving students. Their strategies for addressing this gap involve utilising a range of teaching methods, for instance, implementing differentiated instruction and carrying out after-school teaching activities. A teacher needs to have various ways of engaging students in their learning and to embrace their diverse competencies. On this point, Amir (PPv) observes that some students do not achieve well, and in response, ‘I’ll change the method, I’ll use combined methods’. Similarly, Anton says, ‘Actually there are various methods to engage students in learning. Now it’s up to teachers; teachers must have various methods’. Interestingly, these teachers refer to the significance of teaching with multiple methods to enhance learning. This strategy may not directly speak to a socially just method, yet it potentially leads to it. As Vondracek
(2009, p. 39) states, ‘using a variety of methods allows the modality of instruction to be appropriately matched to the topics being learned’. Effectively employed, multiple teaching methods enable the recognition of multiple learning preferences amongst students and encourage them to think about the same topics in multiple ways (Vondracek 2009). If students are able to think in multiple ways, they can experience the extent of connections between theory and everyday life, from which their knowledge is robustly developed not only in schools, but also in the course of their lifetime (Willis 2006).

In terms of the implementation of differentiated instruction, Santi (CPG) elaborates:

I ask the students that can’t read and write to come forward. You know, there are two chairs in front of the class. I ask them to come forward. I teach them how to read and write on my own while continuing teaching for the students that already can read and write.

Santi’s commentary implies that she not only recognises students’ marked differences of not reading and writing, but also attempts to manage these differences in order to meet the individual needs of students, particularly those who have learning difficulties with literacy. According to Munro (2012), any problem of literacy has been increasingly viewed as the responsibility of classroom teachers. In this respect, teachers need to employ differentiated instruction to respond constructively to whatever students underachieve in, including literacy. As Munro (2012) claims, differentiated instruction offers access to the most suitable learning opportunities that are in proportion with a student’s capability to learn as well as bridging the gap between higher achieving students and lower ones.

Other participants in this study apply differentiated instruction by giving more complex tasks to higher achieving students. Budi for instance reveals, ‘I think it fair to give more difficult tasks to higher achieving students’. In reference to Gardner (2002), Budi’s commentary may indicate an attempt to make lessons accessible to all students (higher achieving and lower achieving alike), and to provide tasks that encourage achievement and excellence. According to Jesus (2012), teachers should know that every classroom incorporates both some struggling and some advanced students. With differentiated instruction, as Jesus (2012) argues, all students can be exposed to tasks that will assist them to learn more. Tomlinson (2014) adds that
differentiated instruction invites teachers to respond to student differences and maximise the achievement of all students.

Further, in accommodating students’ diverse competencies, Amir states:

…Outside the class, I provide help and conduct after-school teaching activities for lower achieving students, the ones that haven’t achieved well in the classroom. I do this here at school or at home, I mean, I usually go to each student’s home, giving motivation and guidance and studying together.

Amir’s motive for doing this is altruistic, and therefore he is not paid. To some extent, Amir’s commentary implies that he employs a home-visit strategy simply for helping his lower achieving students to learn, not for an additional income. Parents in Indonesia’s remote rural Probolinggo are mostly receptive to teachers visiting their homes, in the sense that they are not suspicious of teacher interest in coming to their houses. This might be due to the perspective of community in this area, which tends to respect a teacher by profession. Faber (2015) argues that home visits can build stronger partnerships between parents and their children’s teachers. Parents and teachers are major stakeholders in the learning process, and know the children/students best. Rather than blaming each other for students not achieving well, for instance, they need to get together, share and support each other in raising and educating the children/students. In addition, as Faber (2015, p. 27) states: ‘students don’t care what you know until they know you care’, and with home visits, school teachers could show students that they indeed care.

The concerns of teacher participants in this study about lower achieving students’ competencies essentially indicate that they care about the needs and rights of their students. As Gardner (2002) suggests, excellent achievement and success in learning constitute a basic need and right of all students. However, teaching for social justice is also about envisioning and then maintaining ‘whole-school change and improved school-community relations’ rather than focusing only on individual student achievements and competencies (Lingard 1998, p. 2). In developing whole school approaches to learning, for instance, the achievement of all is catered for and hopefully improves (see Lingard 1998). Smyth (2012) adds that schools should be places that value students’ diverse cultural backgrounds and life experiences and view them as major and undeniable aspects of students’ strengths rather than as
their deficits. Hence, when a teacher employs a teaching strategy that incorporates a focus merely on students’ achievements and the identifying and labelling of achievements and also, perhaps, of students’ deficits (particularly if this occurs in front of the whole class as well as the physical segregation of particular students from the others), this may enhance the likelihood of student disengagement in learning and disconnection from their peers and community.

While the teachers talked in ways that indicated their commitment to considering and understanding student diversity, this was not always the case in the classroom observations. My observations of particular classrooms indicated that there was very little respect for student diversity amongst teachers in their teaching. Physically, the classrooms were arranged in a traditional manner; the desks were in straight rows facing the front where the teachers normally stood and sat, conducting the instruction. Hence, students might not see the faces of their peers nor might the teachers see all the faces of students. Lofty (2012) and Simmons et al. (2015) suggest that the classroom seats arranged in rows and columns are effective only for behaviour management, not for collaborative and interactive teaching and learning activities.

In the classrooms, I saw no evidence, for instance, that students were learning to read and write about things that encourage the growth of their cultural literacy. Most participating teachers did not provide evidence of teaching within the perspective of culturally responsive pedagogy. Observed teaching was essentially teacher-directed and didactic in mode (delivery and content). For example, in the Natural Science (Anton, Np) and Mathematics (Rani, PG; Nita, CPG) classes, the teachers lectured, and then assigned a piece of work to students. There was no indication of integrating the daily life worlds and non-academic experiences of students into their teaching. In addition, little time was spent to stimulate students’ questions. Students were simply receiving knowledge delivered to them, and were not specifically encouraged to reflect on what they were told in the classroom and what was written in the textbooks. Most of the teacher questions prompted students to recall knowledge rather than engage in dialogical or dialectical reasoning.
As Weimer (2002) states, teacher-centred and didactic modes of learning reinforce strategies that place an emphasis on merely memorising and regurgitating ideas or facts rather than strengthening learning outcomes and developing learning skills. This prevents teachers from using methods and activities that support the productive performance of their students. According to Hayes et al. (2006), *Productive performance* indicates that students achieve from active participation in schooling and is derived from pedagogical practices that work with and value student difference. From a productive performance perspective, teachers need to provide students with opportunities to critically engage with a variety of knowledge and ‘to learn to demonstrate an ability to think in [problematic], collective and creative ways’ (Hayes et al. 2006, p. 147). In other words, central to the attainment of productive performance is the practice of communicating, collaborating and negotiating within classroom activities. Teachers are responsible for creating learning environments that focus on students’ capabilities to share ideas with their peers and that make students’ individual work the product of group processes.

Potential constraints to embracing student diversity are also evident in the comments of teacher participants. Santi (CPG) and Budi (CPG), for example, tend to privilege well-behaved students and appoint them as models for others. In this regard, these teachers decide that certain students are sample figures for their peers in learning and task performance. ‘It’s effective, I mean, their peers relatively change [their behaviour]; but I apply this only to particular students, not to all’ (Budi). Seeing students change their behaviour or perspectives might be an important target of teaching; yet, these strategies can privilege particular groups of students and disregard the diversity of students. When the classroom environment overlooks student diversity, more students can be emotionally distracted in the classroom and reluctant to actively participate in class activities (Birden 2002). Nita states, ‘We have a code of ethics that teachers mustn’t privilege particular students’. Teachers need to be aware of any further consequences of their classroom practices upon the lives of their students moving forward into the future (Birden 2002). By embracing student diversity in teaching, teachers can contribute to creating a space that enables students to voice their ideas and opinions on subject matter as well as personal issues (Hockings et al. 2010). In this respect, the attainment of social
inclusivity in teaching also requires teacher potential ability to respect student agency and voice. The next part of this Chapter explores this point further.

6.3 The Capability to Enable Student Agency and Voice

Drawing on philosopher Judith Butler, Couldry (2010, p. 7) defines the word *voice* as ‘the process of giving an account of one’s life and its conditions; [to] give such an account means telling a story, providing a narrative’. In other words, the aspect of voice deals with people’s practice of narrating the world where they live. In the classroom for instance, various voices are available and waiting to be acknowledged. However, within pedagogical practices, there are two possibilities that arise from relationships between teacher and students, namely the possibility to value student agency and voice and the possibility to devalue them. Walker (2007) suggests that agency and voice overlap and support each other, and both are fundamental to education. Voice is an expression of agency, and both involve students’ aspirations to participate, to debate, to inquire and to narrate experiences (Couldry 2010; Walker 2007). Walker (2007, p. 183) argues that ‘the capabilities of voice and aspiration are something on which other capabilities can all build’. The capability of voice breaks students’ silence and passivity, and hence enhances their autonomy, active participation and self-confidence in learning.

More than an important dimension of classroom practice, some suggest that allowing for student voice in classroom spaces is an ethical and social responsibility. Couldry (2010) challenges frameworks of social organisations that ignore the capacity of human beings to give an account of themselves and their environment. Couldry argues that devaluing people’s voices, including those of students, means treating them as if they were not humans. Walker (2007, p. 184) elaborates:

> Where [students] might be denied a capability for voice at home or in society, or where their aspirations might be cramped outside of school, there is then a particular ethical responsibility for the school to challenge exclusion, not to perpetuate it.

Unterhalter (2012) suggests that overlooking or underplaying the voices of students can be associated with forms of inequality, coercion or restrictions on students’ opportunities for broader social involvement. Hence, schools have a social
responsibility to ensure that all students’ voices do matter and are ethically valued. Creating spaces for students’ agency and voices to be heard is integral to the legitimacy of inclusive classrooms (Couldry 2010). Beaudoin (2013) argues that honouring students’ agency and voices is essential to generate great schooling practices. From the perspective of voice, good schooling will always trust in students’ voices and liberate them to choose a life that they think valuable. Elevating students’ agency and voices could benefit not only individual students, but also schools and the wider community.

My analysis of participating teachers’ syllabi and lesson plans indicates that these documents do not contain explicit themes about elevating students’ agency and voices, yet they offer opportunities for teachers to value them. In the Year 4 Lesson Plan of Arabic Language, for instance, it is stated that ‘a teacher begins a lesson by asking students their personal details (names, addresses, and so forth) and employs a questioning and answering technique’. If, in this respect, the teacher gives students open questions that enable students to have different answers or opinions, the opportunities for dialogic accounts of teaching and learning could be created. Thus, the teacher would have opportunity to listen to student voice and use it as a means of breaking silence commonly associated with shame or cover-up (Unterhalter 2012).

Moreover, the curricular documents already outlined in this Chapter consistently use words that potentially make students active participants in their learning. For example,

Students are able to describe pictures orally [emphasis added] (Year 4 Syllabus of Indonesian Language).
Students are able to discuss the requirements for performing prayers [emphasis added] (Year 3 Syllabus of Islamic Law).
Students are able to demonstrate spoken texts [emphasis added] (Year 4 Syllabus of Arabic Language).

These terms indicate some kind of action; they express things that students can do. To include terms such as these in a lesson plan constitutes an important preliminary step to stimulate students’ performance and creativity, from which teachers could listen to student voices and opinions and honour them as crucial elements in educating for participatory democracy and, more importantly, in securing
capabilities (Beaudoin 2013; Unterhalter 2012;). For instance, ‘students are able to express their response to the content of folklore’ (Year 5 Syllabus of Indonesian Language) and further,

As confirmation of students’ learning, the teacher, together with students, holds discussions, straightens out misunderstandings and improves learning outcomes (Year 5 Lesson Plan of Mathematics).

Specific models of instruction within the syllabus and lesson plan involve reflective discussions of particular matters and expressions of ideas or feelings, which may entail students’ giving narrative accounts of whatever is asked of them. Providing a narrative is a basic feature of human life as well as a potential tool for voice (Couldry 2010). To have a voice requires resources to facilitate practices of narrative (Couldry 2010), and hence in the context of schooling, it is the teacher’s responsibility to provide a venue to make student voice possible (Beaudoin 2013; Walker 2007).

Interviews with participating teachers in this research indicate their awareness of different voices that may be present during teaching and learning. Harun (PPv) for instance states, ‘They [students] usually have different opinions on factual problems. …we explain based on their opinions’. Similarly, Fatin (PPv) states, ‘In my teaching, if their [the student’s] opinion is right, I agree with them, then I provide the enhancement of their understanding’. Fatin qualified this statement about students being ‘right’, stating: ‘I have to be positive about what my students say; what they say might be right’ (Fatin). In addition, Santi (CPG) comments, ‘I accommodate all of their [the student’s] opinions, and I draw a conclusion from them’. Amir (PPv) appears to be very favourable towards the display of student voice(s): ‘Teachers should accept criticism from their students; if it is good criticism, teachers have to accept it’. These comments imply a commitment to valuing student agency and voice, and indeed on occasion acting on them.

Determined efforts have been made by these teachers to empower students through voice. According to Hart (2013), empowering students by listening to their voices, opinions and aspirations is an essential part of achieving social justice through education. Accommodating students’ voices and aspirations can underpin the possibilities for further expansion of students’ capabilities. In addition, by listening
to student voice, faulty assumptions of students’ immaturity and lack of social skills can be avoided (Beaudoin 2013, p.1). Students might be immature, but professional teachers teach them how to be mature persons by valuing their voices. Valuing student voice in this way motivates students to be engaged in school learning and leads them to greater performance.

In the valuing of student voice, some of the participants make general moves to accommodate students’ opinions and aspirations, and recognise the importance of valuing these opinions and aspirations for student development. On this point Harun notes, ‘I’ll accommodate all their [students’] opinions, assuming that all their opinions are good and right’. This could be seen as a strategy Harun takes to engage students and to motivate them to learn more. Santi (CPG) makes a similar comment, arguing:

I have to draw a conclusion from their [students’] opinions.... I say, “OK, this opinion is not clear, not wrong. This opinion is good”. So, don’t say that one particular opinion is wrong, but just say ‘not clear’. “And this opinion is quite right”. I say ‘quite right’. Don’t say ‘wrong’ but ‘not clear’ because we mustn’t think students’ opinions to be wrong. I say, “All your opinions are good”. Afterwards, I conclude all their opinions.

These remarks from Santi and Harun may suggest an effort to increase student self-confidence, to enable the students to talk to teachers and to aspire to excellence. In this regard, students might be aware that their opinions and ideas are respected. Santi’s commentary, for instance, may suggest that choice of words or phrases do matter in motivating or de-motivating students in the classrooms. Santi provides some samples of expressions that can be helpful to maintain student motivation to learn more. In many ways, she is attempting to positively respond to any issue that students are voicing. There is, however, tension in teaching between providing space for student voice and being right.

Santi (CPG) discusses using such words or phrases as not clear or quite right, instead of wrong, to respond to students’ ideas. Similarly, Fatin (PPv) earlier mentioned being ‘right’. Drawing on Weimer (2008), whatever the relative quality of students’ opinions is, a teacher needs to respond in ways that are not exclusively concerned with selected words or phrases, but rather, the response ought to increase the likelihood of participation amongst students. For example, teachers can involve the rest of the class to correct wrong answers or to draw a conclusion from all
contributions. They can also provide positive feedback that acknowledges efforts of students. Paying heed to student voice(s) is not only about hearing opinions or aspirations, ‘it’s all about opportunities’ as well (Beaudoin 2013, p. 31). Hence, by means of student opinions or ideas, teachers can design learning tasks which create opportunities for students to make decisions that lead to commitment, responsibility and autonomy. Hart (2013) suggests that making students more aware of their aspirations and voices fully respected in this way could promote more progressive schooling. In addition, teachers need to develop their capabilities to realise student agency and voices so that they can contribute to their wellbeing and freedom (see Chapter 4 for a definition) without undermining their identities.

Moreover, the valuing of student voice can potentially be integrated into a topic theme. For example, Harun states:

In the Indonesian Language subject, there is a topic called ‘factual problems’. I ask my students to find factual problems at school, home, and in society. Next, I ask them to deliver their opinion on the problems and think of the solution.

These comments by Harun demonstrate implementation of a problem-based learning approach, which can drive students forward by privileging their voice. Problem-based learning potentially affords student voice opportunities for understanding from a student perspective and develops critical thinking (Choi et al. 2014). Students are not only to be given tasks, but their voices need to be heard as well for increased motivation and developed capabilities.

While Harun speaks about the ways he values student voice, Amir seems to be favourable toward using student voice(s) to explore grievances; in this case, the absenteeism of particular teachers. He elaborates:

Such a situation happened. I spoke to my students at that time. Students usually take notes of teachers that don’t teach actively. They note it on their own. That’s the complaint, as usual. Then, we discuss the solution with them, what they recommend regarding this matter.

This comment suggests that Amir is sensitive to the needs and concerns of students, particularly if students feel an injustice has been committed. On this occasion, he respects the concern students have regarding their experiences of poor teachers. Harun also mentions the problem of absent teachers, stating: ‘it happens here, there are teachers who teach only two days or four days, and they only ask students to write down the materials without explaining’. Amir outlines the consequences of
absent teachers: ‘one teacher handles two classes. If so, it won’t be conducive [to good learning], not effective’. This experiential story (of inactive or disinterested teaching) is told by the students of these participants despite a level of discomfort indicating a sharing of ideas or concerns. This story requires a response not only from teachers, but also from the school as an institution because voice in this instance implies a demand to be involved in institutional decision making. As Couldry (2010) suggests, voice can be used as a means of narrating particular experiences of students, and therefore there should be mutual recognition of each voice of students because they are reflexive human agents that could give immediate reaction to what happens.

My observations of particular classrooms in remote rural schools in Indonesia’s Probolinggo Regency indicated that three local teachers (out of eight observed) employed teaching approaches that arguably elevated respect for student agency and voice(s). Santi (CPG), for instance, after explaining a topic in the Mathematics class, requested that students work in groups, and begin discussing aspects of the task as presented. She attended to each group to determine whether the students had difficulties in accomplishing the task. Meanwhile, Fatin (PPv) and Budi (CPG) offered opportunities for students to ask questions in relation to the topic discussed. The students did not look hesitant to ask questions or talk to the teachers. In this situation, a communicative dialogue was established and made obvious between teachers and students. Daniels (2012) states that a dialogue is an important end of education in that it enables the valuing of student agency and voice through the use of social language and dominance in certain forms of interaction to generate meaningful learning. In other words, an interactive dialogue that values student agency and voice could be one of the democratic pathways that leads to socially inclusive teaching.

Nonetheless, my further analysis of interview data notes comments from a number of participants that potentially constrain any of the above efforts for the valuing of student agency and voice. Nita (CPG), Anton (Np) and Santi (CPG), for instance, openly approve of physical or verbal punishment, even though the Indonesian Government prohibits or discourages violence against students. As Nita says:
It [physical punishment] is necessary; physical punishment that is acceptable, like a little pinch or something, I think, doesn’t matter. Students now won’t listen if just told or advised.

Anton and Santi choose to observe government rules, which suggest that ‘Teachers can be in jail if hitting students severely’ (Anton). Instead, ‘[I] speak to them in a loud voice’ (Anton) or ‘I give a warning, but if they still don’t listen, I warn them in a threatening way, verbally’ (Santi). Drawing on Birden (2002), such physical and verbal punishment has the effect of distorting educational opportunities and the psychosocial development of students. Students can be psychologically stressed and emotionally fearful to have a voice. As Dewey (1997) asks: ‘How many students were rendered callous to ideas and how many lost the impetus to learn because of the way [teaching and] learning was experienced by them?’ (p. 26). In other words, Dewey (1997) suggests threats of physical punishment, violence and harassment are anathema to socially just learning experiences. A balance must be found where teachers support and protect student agency and voice, so that learning and broader psycho-social development of students as individuals is nurtured. In elevating the active participation of students in learning, teachers may work toward establishing deliberative democracy in classrooms (Easton 2005; Brough 2012), which is in effect a particular representation of their capability.

6.4 The Capability to Establish Deliberative Democracy in the Classroom

Establishing democratic arrangements in the classroom is central to the provision of instruction that ensures a positive education process for students. Sorensen (1996, p. 87) defines a democratic classroom as ‘the one that promotes freedom, critical thinking, decision-making and group participation’. Senturk and Oyman (2014) suggest that a democratic classroom provides the ideas about things that challenge domination and encourage integration of citizenship and individual students’ creativity. However, at schools, students are not always ready to think critically, to make decisions collaboratively or to actively participate in learning. In this context, a democratic classroom requires a teacher’s creativity, commitment and experience, without which a democratic classroom cannot be created (Sorensen 1996).
Pearl and Knight (1999) argue that to create a democratic classroom, teachers need to understand that:

Knowledge should be universally provided to enable all students to solve generally recognised social and personal problems; students should participate in decisions that affect their lives; clearly specified rights should be made universally available; and equal encouragement should be given (p. 2).

In other words, a democratic classroom should mirror the democratic mores of a society. Opportunities for empowerment are desired (see Sorensen 1996). Sorensen (1996) suggests that teaching practices that promote decision making, critical thinking, reflection and recognition of different points of view are central to the process of empowerment. Through empowerment, students can construct their own knowledge by sharing ideas, information, experiences and values with others. In this respect, students may be more self-confident in pursuing knowledge in that they are no longer treated as passive acquirers of information, and the knowledge generated can become shared property between teacher and students.

In the analysis of local teachers’ curricular documents, indications are that most topics do not specifically address issues of democracy, even in subjects like Civics or Social Science. However, there are a number of topics in these documents that potentially establish democratic practices in the classroom. In the Year 4 Syllabus of Civics, for instance, the standard competence includes ‘recognising State institutions such as House of Representatives, Presidency, Supreme Court, and so forth’ and ‘mentioning government organisations like Presidency, Vice Presidency, Ministry’. In this regard, the learning objectives are hopeful that:

- Students are able to identify government institutions at a central level.
- Students are able to hold discussions about the authority and responsibility of the institutions of society.
- Students create newspaper clippings about government institutions at central level.

Merely recognising, mentioning, identifying, discussing, and creating clippings about State institutions might be insufficient to realise democracy in the classroom. Teachers need to integrate their own experience(s) of real democratic practices in Indonesia into their teaching. For example, members of the People’s Representative Council in Indonesia are elected through the legislative elections once every five years. Teachers, as adult citizens with voting rights, participate in the elections. This experiential story about their involvement in democracy could be an important issue for students to understand. Dewey (1997) confirms that authentic education can be
derived from experience, and therefore teachers need to ensure that one particular experience should promote the growth of further experience.

Analysis of participant teachers’ lesson plans indicates that their teaching methods seem to have relatively repeated patterns and few variations. They revolve around explaining, discussing, questioning-answering and assigning. Despite these repeated patterns and little variation, there are elements in the lesson plan that reveals the teachers’ attempts to pursue a democratic classroom. Most lesson plans list particular character values that are to be integrated into their teaching. These character values are broadly similar to those of democratic values, such as being responsible, independent, active, creative, and persistent. As Cunat (1996) argues, teacher respect for the responsibility and autonomy of individual students in teaching is fundamental to the promotion of democracy in the classroom. While the presence of pedagogical strategies that provide for a democratic classroom were not necessarily explicitly visible in the lesson plans, this was not the case in the interviews with the teachers.

Interviews with the participating teachers indicate that their responses to the matter of deliberative democracy in the classroom cluster around several issues: accommodating students’ proposals for how the classroom works and runs, widening students’ participation, and establishing a relationship with the parents of their students. In terms of allowing students to participate in what they are taught and how, Fatin and Anton state:

First, I don’t teach. I just introduce myself as their new classroom teacher and have negotiations. So, in the class, I play the role of a moderator. We discuss about things like what this class should look like, who the class captain will be. They determine these by themselves. Also, we discuss about what kind of class rules they want. That should be determined from the beginning. If I don’t do this, I mean, I myself determine the rules, they will be less responsible. If they determine by themselves, I can remind them to the rules they propose. …So, the rules are derived from students, and they will be engaged with them (Fatin, PPv).

…we have our own rules, class rules, based on negotiation with students, formation of class captain, introduction, and arrangement of class structures. In terms of the class rules, different classes may have different rules. …I accommodate their proposals and discuss them until we come to a decision (Anton, Np).

These responses illustrate a democratic strategy to involve students in making important decisions. Beyer (1996) argues that involving students in decision making can be the primary avenue to students’ commitment to responsibility, hard
work and diligence. ‘If classroom members cannot arrive at negotiated agreements about issues, they will have a difficult time sharing power’ (Roche 1996, p. 31). In other words, cooperation in making decisions could encourage shared respect and empathy amongst students and teachers within classrooms to promote effective teaching and learning.

The second way that the teachers’ comments indicate deliberative democracy in the classroom is related to the expansion of students’ participation. For example, Harun and Amir elaborate:

As an example, I would like my students to write a poem. Then, in groups or individually I ask them to write it based on the theme that they choose by themselves (Harun, PPv).

I prefer my students …to be active and critical to teachers. With this, students will develop themselves. If they’re just silent, even if they know the answer, their thinking will not develop (Amir, PPv).

These teachers encapsulate the ideals for encouraging students to participate more actively in learning, in this respect, through the provision of freedom to choose and develop critical thinking. Freedom to choose and critical awareness to challenge authority are integral to help maintain the democratic account of a classroom (Schubert & White 1998; Roche 1996). Both enable teachers to explore student creativity and help students become critical viewers of society, viewers who see realities socially and culturally (Schubert & White 1998).

Finally, the teachers also incorporate establishing a relationship with students’ parents to elevate deliberative democracy in the classroom. On this point Rani (PG) notes that:

There’s a meeting with parents at the beginning of semester, and we ask them, we consult with them as to their children. The next semester, we give parents a development report of their children at school and suggestions and recommendations. That’s one of the ways to communicate with students’ parents. Also, if the children are seldom present at school, we call the parents to come to school, asking them the reasons why their children are absent. Whether the children are sick or not, we visit them. Here we have tradition, if students are not present at school over three days, we visit home.

Similarly, Anton states: ‘Here we have a parent association. I use this forum to accommodate and discuss problems of students. I accommodate all the problems’. These statements reflect school and teacher efforts to involve parents in the improvement of students’ learning outcomes. Involvement of the kind presented shows potential for ‘a sense of genuine participation in or ownership of both daily
and monumental decisions’ (Roche 1996, p. 30). Genuine participation or ownership, as Roche (1996) acknowledges, constitutes one of the important elements of democratic vision.

Some of the teachers saw the involvement of parents as a benefit to the school; the benefits of parents’ genuine participation. On this point Nita (CPG) states:

> From their enthusiasm, from the computers we have, people here have high expectations towards education. Regarding the procurement of the computers, it wasn’t entirely the school policy. We held a meeting with students’ parents, and discussed about the ways to improve education. We gave them samples of schools which had already developed. So the computers were the parents’ decision, parents’ wants.

Nita’s commentary suggests a prominent strategy in motivating parents to be involved in school programs. Roche (1996) underlines that such involvement can raise a sense of ownership, which is a foundation element of facilitating democratic arrangements in the classroom. Effective ownership, as Roche (1996) argues, brings about collective educational system, where students, teachers, parents and other stakeholders are responsible for the decisions that they have made. In addition, Kugler (2012) suggests that inviting parents to school can create a space that accommodates their expectations for their children. They will not only learn about school resources, but also become partners in their children’s success. Drawing on Dewey (2010), the involvement of parents in schooling activities encourages the widening of shared concerns about students’ achievements and the enhancement of parent-teacher communication that flows from exchanged experiences of educating students. Dewey contends that it is absurd for teachers to establish aims of teaching and learning without involving students’ parents as stakeholders. A democracy in a classroom, as Dewey argues, primarily revolves around ‘a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experiences’ (p. 114). In other words, creating opportunities for parents to participate in student learning leads to the utilisation of any potential to work together, instead of against one another, for the expansion of students’ capabilities.

In spite of these statements about the promotion of deliberative democracy in the classroom, my classroom observations indicated that more teachers apply a method that involves explaining and giving tasks – put simply, a traditional didactic teacher-centred approach. In the Madurese Language (Harun, PPv) and Islamic Law (Amir,
PPv) classes, for instance, teaching and learning comprised teachers talking and students listening. Even though the teachers occasionally involved the class to answer particular questions, the focus was more on the content of textbooks. Students were simply asked to take notes and accomplish tasks set. There was little evidence of students engaging in productive learning activities such as those suggested by the productive pedagogies approach, for example (see Hayes et al. 2006). Teaching and learning are reduced to the completion of set tasks from textbooks including on occasion introduced student worksheets. Teaching practices of this kind are also revealed in the comments from participating teachers. For example, Budi states, ‘I don’t need to make preparations for teaching…I teach directly from the textbooks’ and by Fatin, ‘I emphasize results rather than process…the most important thing is the result’. Garlock (1996) views such teaching as a barrier to the idea of a democratic classroom. A democratic classroom underpins a process-oriented pedagogy (Pearl & Knight, 1999) although it requires teachers to teach students beyond simple and rudimentary task completion. Teachers need to provide students with more opportunities for sharing knowledge to increase their critical awareness. They need to apply teaching approaches that encourage rich dialogue and promote interactive discussions so that students will perceive knowledge as a socially constructed process.

Dewey (2010) highlights that teachers cannot function as effective teachers if classroom decisions are made on the basis of autocracy or dictatorship. Teachers could be more effective if democratic in their approach to pedagogy, where they concentrate and encourage group interactions and students’ interests rather than simply rely on content delivery. Dewey suggests that democratic classrooms provide resourceful ways of coping with social problems and connect knowledge with social action. According to Dewey, the very foundation of deliberative democracy in the classroom is teachers’ affirmative response to students’ diverse characteristics and intelligences and teachers’ faith in the power of shared and collaborative learning experience.

The conception of collaborative experience-based learning can be traced back from Dewey’s notion of a theory of experience. As Dewey (1997) acknowledges,
experience is gained due to a transactional capability between an individual and his or her environment. In other words, experience incorporates both the process and result of people’s interactions with their environment. Dewey (1997) defines environment as ‘whatever conditions interact with personal needs, desires, purposes, and capacities to create the experience’ (p. 25). Take, for example, books that students are reading or teachers that they are speaking to. Both can create particular experience(s). According to Dewey, experience truly occurs through the combination of an active and receptive aspect of experience. The former relates to the aspect of trying, while the latter to undergoing (Na & Song 2014). Drawing on Dewey, Na and Song (2014) provide a good illustration on this point:

Sticking our fingers in a flame is not experience in itself. Experience occurs when the consequence of the behaviour of sticking our fingers into a flame is connected with the pain which we undergo. A finger being burned by a flame is a mere physical change, like the burning of a wooden stick, if the consequence of an action is not perceived (pp. 1033-1034).

In this case, whereas putting the finger into the flame is the active aspect, being burned is the receptive one. Dewey (1997) indicates that the phenomenon can become a person’s experience if he or she sufficiently understands the consequential relationship between the two combined related aspects. In essence, experiential learning is only enabled within a reflective thinking about the interrelationship between a person’s act and its potential consequence (see Dewey 1997; Na & Song 2014).

In educational settings, the purpose of learning from experience is to make a backward and forward connection between what people do and what they experience as a consequence (Dewey 1997). This means that the process of schooling needs to involve a continuous reconstruction and enlargement of experience in that, according to Dewey, not all experiences have a positive effect on students’ learning. On this point he elaborates:

[Not] all experiences are genuinely or equally educative. Experience and education cannot be directly equated to each other. For some experiences are mis-educative. Any experience is mis-educative that has the effect of arresting or distorting the growth of further experience (p. 11).

In other words, experience is regarded as educative only if it speaks to a continual knowledge that significantly improves students’ general attitude towards life. Hence, a true learning situation needs to be historical, social, well-organised and
dynamic as well as have a longitudinal and lateral perspective; it is a dimension that the capabilities approach and teaching in socially just ways would also reflect.

According to Dewey (1997), there are two aspects that should be considered to determine the extent to which a process of learning is educative: *continuity* and *interaction*. The aspect of *continuity* is applicable to most cases, for one particular experience can have a significant influence on further experiences. As Dewey (1997) states:

> There is some kind of continuity in any case since every experience affects for better or worse the attitudes which help decide the quality of further experiences, by setting up certain preferences and aversion, and making it easier or harder to act for this or that end (p. 20).

Dewey’s statement implies that the difference between an educative experience and a mis-educative one depends on whether the experience affects the quality of further experiences. Dewey (1997) asserts that schools must apply such philosophical principles of experience so as to become educative institutions in society.

Following this perspective, school teachers need to promote educational experiences that involve continual interaction between the learner and what is learnt. They need to take account of students’ prior experience(s) and make better changes in the quality of the further one(s) (Hayes et al. 2006). Take for example, a student’s experience of learning about a plane in the past. This can have a particular effect on the student when later he or she sees a real plane. Dewey associates *interaction* with not just an artificial or casual connection, but rather with a mutual, reciprocal and genuine relationship between an individual student and his or her particular situation in terms of a duration in time and of the spatial context where he or she lives (Dewey 2010). In other words, if a learner’s experience is to be educative, it should not be in a fragmentary interaction. Rather, teachers need to elevate and strengthen an organic interaction between the learner and subject matter, so that his or her current experience can positively influence the growth of further experiences, particularly when he or she already lives his or her adult social life.

Teaching in such a way, as Dewey (1965) holds, is in line with the notion of education as the most fundamental method in achieving progress in social reform
and developing the life of democracy. ‘It is impossible for a proper democracy to be firmly established without the people obtaining good education’ (Tampubolon 2003, p. 227). This suggests that any kind of teaching aimed to change student behaviour that is only based on enforcement and punishment can potentially fail to be a necessary medium of promoting deliberative democracy, not merely in classrooms, but also in society. Social goals of teaching can be achieved if an education program incorporates the dissemination of democratic values to people as a whole, particularly classroom teachers and major school stakeholders including education authorities, principals, students’ parents and the wider community.

Essentially, democratic education constitutes a lifelong process of education, which begins at home, broadens out into society, and continues through the formal processes enacted in schools (Tampubolon 2003). Therefore, educators, in particular, need to have a pattern of democratic life, meaning that they are able to create necessary conditions for a democratic environment and perform their role in the establishment of individual students’ awareness of democratic culture. It is in this circumstance that democratic education can take place, and that school institutions can become the agents of democracy required for changes in society.

6.5 Conclusion

Social inclusivity in teaching can be established when teachers embrace student diversity, value student agency and voice and promote deliberative democracy in the classroom. Teacher awareness of students’ diverse voices, cultures, backgrounds and characteristics and teacher efforts to extend student participation in learning are the building blocks of inclusive practices in classrooms. In this way, teachers and schools can challenge social exclusivity and contribute to reducing inequalities and oppressive learning environments. This can be carried out by encompassing a culturally inclusive teaching and learning space, in which teachers and students alike recognise, appreciate and capitalise on socio-cultural diversity so as to widen participation and enlarge the overall learning experience. Incorporating a culturally responsive pedagogy potentially encourages all learners – regardless of their gender, race or ethnicity – to develop their personal potential and intercultural literacy.
The central question about inclusivity revolves around how students are actively involved in learning activities and an attempt to include all students with the intention that none of them feels excluded. A teacher’s responsibility involves managing student difference appropriately, organising classrooms as flexible learning spaces and where possible, seeking a balance between the academic and social performance of students. To achieve this, teachers ought to establish a useful strategy for establishing a classroom milieu that is characterised by cultural inclusivity, mutual respect and interaction and genuine accommodation of students’ voices and life experiences. Teachers also need to build cohesive and sympathetic classroom practice, which promotes shared experiences and assembles the diverse cultural attributes of students. Such classroom practice can increase students’ awareness that their cultural identities are extremely valued and fully respected in the classroom, by which they will be more engaged in their learning.

Teacher participants in this study expressed their concern to contribute to improved performance for all students. In speaking to them and analysing their curricular documents, efforts are made to be inclusive of all students. Nonetheless, inclusivity is still a problematic issue for some of the participants. Observed classroom teaching in Indonesia’s Probolinggo regency was essentially didactic in style, and the commentary of some of the participants suggest that student capabilities, as a consequence of undeveloped or perhaps under-developed teacher capabilities, are potentially constrained. In some cases, teachers cannot bridge the gap between students’ prior life experiences and the manner in which they should be taught in order to be inclusive of all students. This Chapter suggests that both – prior experiences of students and the strategies for embedding these in teaching – do matter in involving students to a greater extent in aspects of their learning within particular classrooms. Only in this way is the personal (cultural) accounts of students respected, which is a key aspect of teaching in socially just ways. In addition, central to promoting culturally inclusive teaching is the capabilities of teachers to establish a strong relationship between students’ homes and classrooms. This point is covered by the thesis in the next Chapter.
Chapter 7
Bridging Homes and Classrooms

7.1 Introduction

This Chapter analyses the capabilities of teachers to make connections between the homes and classrooms of their students. It includes the analysis of syllabi and lesson plans as well as of interview and observation data. As indicated in Chapter 6, the syllabi and lesson plans were developed by primary school teachers in remote rural areas in Indonesia’s Probolinggo Regency, and are based on standard competencies (learning goals) and basic competencies (learning objectives) of the Indonesian National Curriculum Framework. All school teachers in Indonesia are required to possess and follow these documents. Interview and classroom observation data in the Chapter are derived from eight participating teachers (see Chapter 6 for an overview of these teachers).

The analysis in this Chapter is focused on the notion of good teachers because, as Hayes et al. (2006) suggest, apart from family background, it is good teachers who can make the greatest difference to student outcomes in schools. In order to achieve social justice and generate excellent student performance, teachers need to share ideas and knowledge with each other, and with students and communities (McRae 1988; Hayes et al. 2006; Egbert & Roe 2014). In addition, the relationship between schools, parents and teachers can be strengthened if teachers can have awareness of the knowledge that exists in the homes of students, and of the community more broadly. A strong relationship between schools, parents and teachers can enable students to be more engaged in their learning (Gonzalez 2005; Egbert & Roe 2014). According to Egbert and Roe (2014), student engagement can be a pathway to effective student learning. Parents and teachers need to work together to motivate
students to learn and be engaged in classroom activities (McRae 1988; Taylor & Whittaker 2009; Egbert & Roe 2014). Making connections between homes and classrooms determines the extent to which knowledge is more meaningful and relevant to students, and develops their knowledge and skills in the context of solving real-life issues or problems (McLaren 1998; Hayes et al. 2006). Kamler and Comber (2005) suggest that teachers need to show respect for their students’ cultures, homes and communities demonstrating knowledge of the contextual influences that affect their students’ lives beyond school.

In remote rural areas in Indonesia’s Probolinggo Regency, education that makes connections between homes (communities) and classrooms (schools) is still a challenge to a philosophy of education that makes this connection. While the comments of teachers in this study indicate a strong commitment to the ideals of connections, their practices and some curricular objectives do not reflect this commitment. This Chapter critically investigates the perceptions and responses of local teachers around the issue of connections in their classroom teaching practices. It begins with discussions about aspects of home-school connections, which involves connecting curriculum with student life experience, followed by discussions of teaching for a good life and the limits on developing capabilities.

### 7.2 Connecting Curriculum with Student Life Experiences

Curriculum represents not only a statement of what is to be learnt by students (Connell 1993), but also the introduction to a particular form of life experience (McLaren 1998). Beaudry (2015) acknowledges that developing curriculum that takes serious account of student life experiences can enlarge a knowledge and understanding of students that extends beyond the limited space of a school classroom and enhances the connection between students’ lives and learning. The notion of relating curriculum to student life experiences implies a conceptual framework asserting that students are active agents in a learning process. Students, in this respect, are assumed to be able to create meaning based on their experiences. In addition, Villegas and Lucas (2002) argue that a school curriculum intensely incorporating students’ life-world is central to the improvement of knowledge
necessary to support teachers to teach in socially just ways. An experience-based curriculum provides teachers with substantial opportunities to consider issues related to equity and diversity in ways that raise their strong commitment to the ideals of teaching for social change.

Drawing on Moll et al. (1992), teachers’ primary responsibility is then to design curricular activities that connect students’ learning to the *funds of knowledge* of their life-worlds outside school. Teachers need to make students’ life-worlds and local community knowledge integral to pedagogy and use resources to enhance student learning for democratic reasons (Henderson & Zipin 2010). In addition, Kamler and Comber (2005) suggest a *turn-round* approach to pedagogy, which encourages teachers not only to teach students, but also to *learn* from students. *Turn-around* pedagogy highlights respect for knowledge based on students’ cultures, homes and environments (Kamler & Comber 2005). Moll et al. (1992) state, ‘There is much teachers do not know about their students or families that could be immediately helpful in the classroom’ (p. 136). In other words, teachers need to continue to find effective ways to utilise students’ *funds of knowledge* in classroom teaching practices and demonstrate the validity of knowledge grounded in life-experience to their students (Kamler & Comber 2005).

By making connections between curriculum and student life experience, teachers can make knowledge more meaningful to students. McLaren (1998) indicates that students will be more aware of the centrality of knowledge when it is meaningful. School knowledge needs to be filtered through the ideological and cultural life experiences that students bring to school; ignoring these means a denial of the ground upon which students should learn (McLaren 1998). Devaluing student life experiences can potentially lead to disengaged student learning. Egbert and Roe (2014) state:

> Student disengagement can be a major impediment to effective student learning. When parents and educators cannot provide adequate reasoning to [connect] the value of what is taught at home and in school, students can lose their motivation to learn and to be engaged in classroom activities (p. 251).

Incorporating the life experiences of students in their learning is central to improving student comprehension. It can also provide students with opportunities for achieving social justice inside and outside schools.
One of the reasons why teachers need to make connections between schools and the communities in which they exist is that neither are isolated. Gonzalez et al. (2005) acknowledge that connecting daily life with school is a possibility as both are interrelated. Similarly, Taylor and Adelman (2000, p. 298) states: ‘Properly done, enhanced connections among schools, families and communities [not only] lead to a marked reduction in [students’] problems’ but also resolve a dichotomy between homes and classrooms (see also Gonzalez et al. 2005). When schools become an integral part of homes and communities, students’ involvement in school learning can potentially increase (Taylor & Adelman 2000; Haneda 2006). Hence, as Haneda argues (2006, p. 343), teachers need to show their utmost respect for and appreciation of students’ homes and cultures and attempt ‘to make students’ experiences in both homes and schools coherent and mutually reinforcing’. Making these connections can be incidental, or can be more structured in the classroom.

Teachers need to bring students to a concrete context of learning that facilitates intellectual activity and authentic engagement in productive classroom activities with connections for them beyond the classroom. As an example, teachers can ask students to investigate a particular social problem, find out various opinions about it and synthesise these opinions to establish a set of recommendations for a solution. In practice, teachers can establish an introductory activity that encourages students to gather information about cultural background and diverse experiences of others in the classroom (Andresen et al. 1995). Teachers, for instance, can make a name-exploring activity where they ask students to talk about how their name is given and what it really means. Such an activity can elevate connections between students and their personal experiences and create a space for an exploration of the uniqueness of each student and interactive discussion about cultural diversity (Clarkin-Phillips 2012). While these are some suggestions for the ways that teachers can make connections between school and the home-worlds of their students, in this research very few connections were observed, either in the classroom or in the syllabi the teachers were using.

Analysis of participating teachers’ syllabi indicates that these documents do not explicitly address the idea of connections between curriculum and student life
experience, yet there are a number of teaching objectives and learning activities which provide opportunities for teachers to connect classrooms with students’ real life-world. Take for example,

Students are able to give examples of heroism and patriotism in daily lives (Year 4 Syllabus of Social Science).
Students are able to explain the ways of preventing environmental damage (Year 4 Syllabus of Natural Science).
Students are able to give examples of characters that they like or dislike (Year 4 Syllabus of Indonesian Language).

The issues of heroism and patriotism, environmental damage, and characters that students like or dislike lend to connections between schools, students and home-worlds. Exploring these topics can involve media as TV, newspapers, magazines or from people in the community who may not be represented at schools. If these issues are given space within curriculum, classroom activities and students’ life experiences could be connected by exploring students’ prior knowledge of them.

Another potential space for teachers to make connections between classroom knowledge and real situations outside the classroom is represented in the Year 4 Syllabus of Civics, where ‘Students make a visit to the village or district office’. Such an aim could be achieved through observing the real activities of people in carrying out their responsibility as civil servants of the state. In this context, students are able to explore the implications of the connections, which make abstract or theoretical concepts concrete inside the classroom (Zohir et al. 2012). Mills et al. (2009) suggest that learning abstract concepts connected to practices and students’ various world-view can be a valuable strategy for the development of students’ deep-understanding in worthwhile and meaningful contexts. This requires students to use higher order thinking that moves from simple recall into analysis, synthesis and production of ideas and performances (Mills et al. 2009).

Interviews with participating teachers in Indonesia’s Probolinggo Regency indicate the significance of encouraging connections between curriculum and students’ life experience. On this point, Fatin (PPv) observes:

Teachers, in their teaching should understand the conditions of students in the classroom and apply the concept of learning by doing or practicing, for it will be more useful for students rather than just explaining the materials. In my teaching, I see what’s around us and provide examples that are contextual, things that my students really know.
She adds that to enhance student comprehension, ‘What I often do is adapt the standards’. For instance,

When the standards recommend that students are able to write a poem, I usually use an object around like a flower, and I ask my students to think about things related to it. Then, the combination of these can become sentences of a poem.

From a productive pedagogies perspective, Fatin’s commentary revolves around connectedness in which she attempts to explore students’ background knowledge in relation to the subject matter. Productive pedagogies is a framework for evaluating the richness and complexity of classroom practice as well as an example of pedagogy that reflects the concerns of cultures and traditions of local communities (Hayes et al. 2006; Mills et al. 2009). In productive pedagogies, background knowledge constitutes one of the elements of connectedness. Hayes et al. (2006) suggest that background knowledge – which includes everyday experiences, community knowledge, cultures or media – do matter in the enhancement of students’ skills and competencies and comprehension of new ideas.

For Fatin (PPv) and Amir (PPv), connecting curriculum with students’ lives relates to the integration of social and religious values into curricular topic themes.

It’s beyond the ability to make a poem. It’s more about teaching them [students] respect for their parents. I’d like to teach them to pray for their parents because it’s our parents who take care of us (Fatin).

Fatin’s commentary suggests an effort to encourage students to learn particular social and religious values from a poem; respect and devotion to parents. In Indonesia, the respect, loyalty and devotion to parents are considered the duty of children, and part of religious commands.

In the meantime, Amir is cautiously in favour of displaying examples of ‘things that can break fasting’, which are not only drinking and eating, but also

things like stealing, saying bad things about other people; I say, these can also break your fasting. So, I don’t limit fasting only in terms of eating and drinking, but I relate it to social actions as well.

Amir suggests that by linking the topic of fasting to social actions, he is hopeful that students will become dutiful and pious persons in society, ‘doing what God commands and avoiding what He prohibits’. Fatin and Amir’s comments may reflect an effort to ‘measure the extent to which the class has value and meaning beyond the pedagogical context’ (Hayes et al. 2006, p. 55). However, they may not
fully conform to the idea of *connectedness* (Hayes et al. 2006) and/or *funds of knowledge* (Gonzalez et al. 2005) as they seem to articulate what the teachers would like to teach rather than open up spaces for students to reflect on various forms of cultures in the broader societal context. If these teachers are able to make the integration of social and religious values a starting point to create opportunities for more effective connections between lessons and social life, learning will potentially move from the abstract to an ability to respond to real-life socio-cultural issues and problems (Strehle 1999).

My analysis of teachers’ lesson plans indicates that connecting curriculum with students’ life experiences is not very evident in these documents. Take for example, in the topic of ‘texts of poetry’ of the Year 6 Lesson Plan of Indonesian Language, the learning activities include:

- Students are given opportunities to ask questions about poetry.
- Students listen to a poetry reading.
- Students write the main ideas of a poem.
- Students are assigned to make a poem.

Methods of teaching used in this Plan include ‘lecturing, question and answer, assigning’, and the source of learning is ‘textbook of Indonesian Language and Literature’. Eventually, students are assessed using ‘written tasks’ (students are asked to write main ideas of poetry).

Such teaching and learning activities are represented in most teacher lesson plans. This may indicate that most teachers in the regency of Probolinggo potentially involve traditional teaching strategies focused on rudimentary task completion and recitations of textbooks rather than connections between students’ life-worlds and classrooms. This is an aspect that was also covered to some extent in the previous Chapter. In spite of the inclusion of *discussion* as a teaching method in their lesson plans, for instance, this is limited to mere discussion of lesson content from textbooks, which become major sources of learning in their respective plans. Hayes et al. (2006) suggest that being too reliant on textbook content and undermining its connection with students’ lives can limit students’ intellectual engagement with the subject matter. Drawing on Bourdieu and Passeron (1977), Lingard (2007) argues that teaching and learning practices that are not intellectually demanding tend to misrecognise reproduction of individual students’ ability as well as deny identity
constructions of difference. Bourdieu (2006) indicates that to reduce inequalities derived from cultural inheritance requires an education that promotes intellectual ability to reflect on socio-cultural issues. Hence, it is necessary for teachers to give priority to the enhanced acquisition of knowledge established from homes and schools through connections and processes of learning that are deductive, experimental, historical as well as critical and reflective (see Bourdieu 2006; Lingard 2007).

Likewise, classroom observations indicated that most participating teachers did not attempt to connect curricular content with students’ real world situation. Rather than relating it to students’ background knowledge – either to students’ community knowledge or students’ personal experience – the teacher participants provided instruction which was more lecturing and teacher-directed. In this respect, they generally taught to the whole group of students in a class, showed great concern about whether students were listening and focused mostly on subject-content matter and academic competence. Even if some of them employed a group-discussion method in their teaching, it remained that they were didactic and focused learning on task completion, textbooks and worksheets.

An example of this occurred in the Madurese Language class (Harun, PPv). In my observation, the teacher (Harun) seemed to follow the textbook content and taught students how to write sentences by using the ancient Javanese alphabets. Briefly, Madurese Language is one of the local languages in East Java as well as the daily language of society in Probolinggo’s remote rural areas. The teacher did not provide details about the relevance of this subject-matter to students’ life experiences, particularly in view of the reality that the Madurese Language which is composed of the ancient Javanese alphabets is no longer used in Indonesian society. Thus, students gained knowledge that was less meaningful and applicable to their real life worlds.

Zohir et al. (2012) suggest that such teaching and learning activities can counter students’ deep knowledge of topic themes of curriculum as most of the time they are provided with a superficial understanding of the lesson content. Instead,
according to Alsharif and Atweh (2012), a teacher needs to create a supportive learning environment that offers the improvement of student intellectual reasoning through connections and discussions on authentic and contextual materials, and thus knowledge from schools will be more applicable to students’ real lives. Strehle (1999, p. 213) adds:

When class time is devoted to the connections between learning and students’ life experiences, discussions will not only reflect the students’ knowledge and understanding of a subject but also the ability the student has to respond to issues on a personal level.

Students will learn more easily when new facts or skills are connected with known ones. When teachers actively attempt to bridge students’ homes and classrooms, capability development of students, particularly those in early schooling, can be facilitated (Moll et al. 1992; Duke & Purcell-Gates 2003; Haneda 2006). Hence, teachers can build cultural literacy in the classroom drawing on each student’s home experiences. A lesson that accommodates different knowledge of various topic themes can provide opportunities for students to define the concept of family in many ways (Strehle 1999). Specifically, teachers can ask students to understand their own cultures based on their own experiences and ask them to expand their perspectives by exploring similarities and/or differences of families and of others in their classrooms and communities. Learning to respect others that have different cultures constitutes the major characteristics of schooling which encourages connections between homes and classrooms. Teaching and learning as such is also a foundation aspect of conducting teaching for a good life. The next part will detail this point.

7.3 Teaching for a Good Life

Teaching for a good life or teaching for a life worth living (Sen 1999) is derived from the capabilities approach. As discussed in Chapter 4, the capabilities approach is relevant to education and schooling for social justice for two reasons. First and foremost, it affords people the possibility to act as autonomous agents, giving the freedom to make and take their own decisions. Second, it can enhance people’s abilities to reflect critically on the world so that they can make desirable changes (Lozano et al. 2012). Likewise, Walker and Unterhalter (2007) acknowledge that privileging the notion of reason to value in teaching could encourage students to
value whatever styles of life they choose apart from enabling the expansion of their capabilities. According to Sen (1992, p. 81), the expansion of human capabilities is a possibility through ‘the freedoms [that individuals] actually enjoy to choose the lives that they have reason to value’. Drawing on Sen (1992), teaching and learning in schools need to enable students to make choices that do matter to them for a valuable life.

Adapting the capabilities approach to schooling practices is not merely a matter of what students achieve but also the extent of choices available to them and the value of the best choice they make for a flourishing life (Kelly 2012). Nussbaum (1997) suggests that the goal of teaching for capabilities is referred to as the exploration of students’ capabilities to critically examine their tradition and cultures and understand themselves as both citizens and human beings interrelated with others. Walker (2009, p. 232) states that teaching for capabilities encourages students to become ‘practical reasoners in democratic societies’ by which they could live compassionately in their society with people who are different from themselves.

From a capability perspective, classroom teachers need to be aware of the significance of eliciting from students the social problems and issues that most concern them and potentially affect their lives (Wood & Deprez 2012). They also need to create a context of learning that accommodates students’ perspectives on diverse topics, respects their reasoning and reflection on different opinions and arguments, and encourages fairness in response to opposing ideas and respectful strong criticism. Capability theorists consider student agency as ‘a key dimension of human wellbeing’ (Walker & Unterhalter 2007, p. 6), and hence it is of paramount importance for teachers to focus not only on students’ processes of learning but also on social opportunities to choose a good life that they have reason to value. Sen (1999) states: ‘social opportunities refer to the arrangements that society makes for education, which influence the individual [students’] substantive freedoms to live better’ (p. 39). These perspectives should become embedded in teachers’ daily practices in classrooms in order that teaching and learning can give wider benefits not only to students but to society as well.
Analysis of participating teachers’ syllabi and lesson plans suggests that there are no explicit topics or themes about teaching for a good life in these documents, yet some of the learning goals, learning objectives and activities offer opportunities for teachers to conduct teaching for a good life. For instance, the Year 4 Syllabus of Civics includes the learning goal of ‘giving samples of the impact of globalization on environments’, where students are asked to ‘identify positive and negative impacts of globalization on society’. While the Year 4 Syllabus of Indonesian Language involves learning activities that encourage students to ‘write a short poem of social topic themes such as friendship, diligence, obedience, and so forth’, the Year 4 Syllabus of Social Science incorporates the learning goal of ‘understanding the importance of cooperatives to improve people’s welfare’. These learning activities comprise the following:

- Students observe fishermen’s life.
- Students interview cooperative managers to understand the importance of joint venture through cooperatives.
- Students write a report based on interview results.

Moreover, the documentary evidence which offers opportunities for teachers to design teaching for a good life is also reflected in the Year 4 Syllabus of Sport in which the learning activities motivate students to ‘practice teamwork as well as uphold sportsmanship’, and in teachers’ lesson plans which consistently list values of ‘responsibility’ and ‘respect’ in all units. Learning objectives and activities such as these have the potential to create spaces for teachers to generate sympathetic and critical reflection and communicative reasoning amongst students, and hence their capabilities will expand.

Following the notion of teaching for a good life, the role of teachers is to work with students to provide possibility and hope for the positive future of society. Drawing on Nussbaum (2003), there are three aspects that teachers need to take into account to conduct teaching for a good life: critical thinking, the ideal of the world citizen, and the development of narrative imagination. Human beings can imagine, think and reason in a ‘truly human’ manner, and to do so can be cultivated by adequate education and schooling (Nussbaum 2003, p. 41). In other words, teaching for a good life demands that teachers are innovative in creating opportunities for the enhancement of students’ critical thinking and reasoning abilities through dialogic and interactive discussions concerning socio-cultural problems facing their
community. Teachers need to structure classrooms around this concern as a
curricular topic and encourage students to critically reflect on it. For example, the
Year 4 Syllabus of Natural Science includes the learning goal which has students
‘show their care for pets like cats, fish, birds, and so forth’. This learning goal can
contribute to the growth of students as carers of not only human beings, but also
animals. Likewise, being able to live with concern for and in relation to other
species (both animals and plants) is one of the ten central human capabilities (see
Nussbaum 2006).

Interviews with teachers suggest that their commentary on the theme of teaching
for creating substantive freedoms for students to lead a life worth living clusters
around their perceptions of what constitutes a life worth living and educating for a
better life in the future. On this point Budi (CPG) states, ‘A life worth living is a
life that is not restrained… a life that is balanced. It’s not always related to material
things’. In relation to schooling, Budi states:

Students have to be independent first. We have to cultivate an image towards students that
life is a struggle. Students are encouraged to demonstrate good performance, whatever job
they’ll get. Good performance doesn’t come instantly but requires persistence. [So], I usually
ask them their favourites. After that I encourage them to be persons related to their favourites.
On average, my students have favorites that can be developed, such as from dancing, sports.

Budi indicates that a life worth living relates to the fulfillment of both physical and
spiritual needs in a balanced manner and good performance in workplaces. To
achieve this, as Budi suggests, students are encouraged to be independent,
hardworking and persistent in learning. Likewise, to motivate students to learn for
a better life, Fatin (PPv) and Rani (PG) assure their students that ‘what they’re
learning now will be useful for their future’ (Fatin) and ‘their life in society’ (Rani).

While Fatin and Rani talk about the use of school knowledge for students’ future,
which is not necessarily practical, Nita (CPG) and Anton (Np) appear to speak at a
more practical level. Nita says, ‘Students are not only taught knowledge. I know
that knowledge is important. Only the materials are inadequate. Students should
also be equipped with skills’. On this point, Nita elaborates:

Apart from that, this coming Wednesday, in the subject of Arts, Culture and Skills, my
students will learn how to make salty eggs. By chance, there are many people around here
raising ducks. So, I ask my students to bring eggs to school, and I’ll bring the salt. You know
such a thing can be applied in society. Once the eggs are salty, we’ll cook and eat together.
Similarly, Anton believes that ‘[Students] will be successful if they have creative skills’. Anton adds, ‘I ask my students to embroider clothes and make handicrafts like a whistle rope [a piece of equipment used by Scouts], and I ask them [students] to sell them’.

Comments from these participants refer to developing skills and competencies rather than capabilities and tend to show a concern for the betterment of student life. These teachers are focused on the life they think students should have in the future, not necessarily a life that the students themselves think valuable. Teacher expectations indicate that going to school can help students find good employment, which is crucial to getting a wage that is useful for the improvement of their lives as independent persons.

Teaching for a good life within the perspective of the capabilities approach does consider students’ future wellbeing not only in terms of skills and competencies and employment or economic growth. It can include their substantive freedoms to choose a life that they have reason to value (Walker & Unterhalter 2007). Flores-Crespo (2007) states that:

Being academically trained, employed, and relatively well paid does not necessarily imply development. Although most graduates receive an income, they are still facing particular inequalities (in Sen’s words, “unfreedoms”) such as long and exhausting shifts (in some cases, illegal) and gender discrimination during process of personnel selection and hiring (p. 52).

Hence, maximisation of the positive impact of education requires the simultaneous provision of instrumental freedoms – social opportunities and economic facilities – where a lack of either of these can potentially constrain educational endeavour (Flores-Crespo 2007).

Moreover, observations of particular classroom activities indicated that most teachers were employing models of instruction that Gage (2009, p. 82) categorises as ‘Conventional-Direct-Recitation (CDR)’ teaching. For instance, they began a lesson with a short review of previous lessons prior to continuing the next lesson, provided detailed explanations of the materials and practice for seatwork exercises and, if necessary, monitored students during seatwork exercises. The teaching and learning exhibited was teacher-led and highly structured in which teachers were
dominant in choosing, determining and directing student activities. Students looked passive and less involved in learning. The teaching did not stimulate debate, interactive dialogue or critical reflection. Learning involved only gathering and remembering knowledge, for instance there was no evidence of open-ended questioning. Teachers often asked questions of students to absorb information on content knowledge that they need to reproduce on tests. An example of this occurred in the Islamic Law (Amir, PPv), Natural Science (Anton, Np), Mathematics (Santi, CPG; Rani, PG) and Madurese Language (Harun, PPv) classes. In my observation, these teachers asked students more close-ended questions, which could simply be answered by one word or short phrase from textbooks. Unlike open-ended questions which facilitate the development of students’ thinking, close-ended questions tend to reduce learning to simply memorising facts.

Glasser (1975) acknowledges that learning should be more than just the act of recalling facts but rather, it should emphasise the important use of thinking that leads to inquiry about particular problems or issues. Following the perspective of the capabilities approach, teachers need to take account of the substantive freedoms of each individual student and regard the classroom community as a context for mutual interactions. This involves not only promoting the provision of opportunities to do and to be for students, but also appraising individual improvement and its effect on the various contexts of social life. In addition, teachers need to create a learning environment that enables individual students to reach the maximum development of their capabilities. Following a capability perspective in teaching practices is challenging for teachers in remote rural areas such as Indonesia’s Probolinggo Regency. As some participating teachers suggest, they frequently have to pursue curricular objectives within particular limits. The next part of this Chapter elaborates on this point.

7.4 The Limits on Developing Capabilities

This part of Chapter 7 explores teachers’ attempts to pursue curricular objectives within pedagogical restrictions, which have the potential for limiting the development of students’ capabilities. As stated in the previous part in this Chapter
and in Chapter 4, Sen’s capabilities approach emphasises the importance of opportunities and choice(s) in leading a life that a person has reason to value, yet it does not ignore the importance of material things considered necessary for a valuable life. In the context of schooling, curricular objectives might be necessary for teachers to formulate clear structures of what students are required to learn, eradicate misunderstandings and lead to a higher level of communication between teacher and students (Marsh 2005). Nonetheless, teaching for social justice goes beyond what is covered in curricular objectives (Connell 1993), and issues of access to schooling (Gale & Molla 2014), quality of school buildings and distribution of funding or compensation for poverty and social disadvantage (Lupton & Hempel-Jorgensen 2012). All of these dimensions are insufficient ‘to ensure justice in either opportunity or outcome [if] the process of school-based learning is [not] equally inspiring, enlightening, liberating and knowledge producing for students’ (Lupton & Hempel-Jorgensen 2012, p. 602). In other words, the ways teachers pursue curricular objectives may have the potential for inhibiting or contributing to the development of students’ capabilities and more socially just outcomes.

Teachers need to work hard to constantly nurture changes in and development of students’ capabilities and behaviours. They also need to overcome constraints that potentially limit the pursuit of curricular objectives as well as support the growth of students’ capabilities. Lupton and Hempel-Jorgensen (2012) point out that very often a school structure is based on a social relation informed by a middle-class rather than low-class norm.

They [schools] are not designed to deal with the social and education consequences of material poverty, inadequate housing and poor neighbourhood conditions, labour market exclusion or exploitation, forced migration and other pressures…. Together these [constraints potentially] create ‘the unpredictable school (pp. 610-611).

The achievement of a higher level of capabilities is a possibility when constraints that challenge improved capabilities are fully appreciated and policy design is directed towards overcoming them (Nambiar 2011). Haneda (2006) suggests that constraints should not be ignored but must be paid greater attention, so that they will not become barriers to students’ capability development and their engagement in learning. Constraints inherited from cultural capital can be overcome through the provision of school learning that encourages intellectual inquiry or a sense of wonder and a belief in the power of why or reasoning abilities to make students
Interviews with local teachers in remote rural areas in Indonesia’s Probolinggo Regency indicate the advent of constraints that limit the development of students’ capabilities. These constraints include the lack of school facilities and adequately credentialed teachers in remote rural schools, government policy, the issue of bribery in the recruitment of government teachers and the problem of nutritional food supplies in remote rural areas. In terms of school facilities, Amir (PPv) says:

Structures and infrastructures are required, but we lack of them. For example, we need a space for students to do sports. It’s difficult here to find enough space so that we need to go outside of the school area just to find a wide space for sports. We need to take a far walk. Moreover, the roads in front here are so steep, narrow, not enough space to teach sports.

While Amir talks about the lack of a sport facility, Rani (PG) and Anton (Np) are concerned with the lack of textbooks and tools for teaching, ‘We need such learning tools as textbooks and props for teaching’. Regarding this, Nita (CPG) and Anton come up with alternative solutions, ‘I just use whatever I find’ (Nita). Anton elaborates:

I think learning is not only inside the classroom but also outside the classroom. I use all around us as a means of teaching. We can use our surroundings, particularly in teaching natural science. When the topic is about frogs or worms, we can easily find them in the rice fields. Applying such a method here is effective.

The use of authentic teaching materials which immerse students in the real-world is considered appropriate by some theorists (see Strehle 1999; Hayes et al. 2006; Alsharif & Atweh 2012). However, participant commentary reflects a different story. Teachers in the research felt they had no other choice, that they were forced to utilise their surroundings as the means of learning due to limited facilities. From a capability perspective, this leads to unfreedom that limits their genuine choices and can have a negative impact on capability expansion (Walker 2006a). To draw an analogy from Nussbaum (2006), students in these classrooms are similar to persons who are starving rather than the ones who are fasting. While fasting persons could eat, although they choose not to, the starving persons eat only if they could or if they have food to eat. People can refrain from an accepted and natural human functioning for good reasons if and when they have freedom to choose (Alkire & Deneulin 2009).
The capabilities approach highlights the importance of reasoning abilities of people to freely choose what they consider valuable to achieve their functionings. Sen (1992) acknowledges that it is not the attainment of functionings that becomes the major focus of the capabilities approach, but the actual opportunities or freedoms that people have to achieve the functionings. It is ‘acting freely and being able to choose [that] are directly conducive to [human] wellbeing’ (p. 51). Thus, the conception of capability is essentially freedom to choose a particular option from the range of alternatives that people have in determining what sort of life that they prefer to lead (Sen 1999). In this light, Anton (Np) says:

…When teaching natural science, it’s easy, but what about other subjects? We need props like cubes, cones, maps, globes; Schools [can] allocate some funds from grants to purchase props.

To overcome this constraint, he states:

…I apply this to my students; I ask them to save 100 rupiahs out of their pocket money for the class cash. With this, we could buy dictionaries, books, rulers and other props for teaching from the money collected.

Anton’s commentary suggests that the availability of props for teaching is of great importance to support student learning and comprehension of a particular subject. He decides to ask for students’ financial contributions as he may know that the school does not have enough funds to provide props for teaching.

Apart from this, Anton and Rani concern themselves with the lack of teachers in remote rural schools. ‘We need more teachers here. The number of teachers are not proportional to the number of students. I mean, we lack teachers in government schools’ (Rani, PG). On a similar point Anton adds:

We need more professional teachers. So, schools in remote rural areas need to be provided with professional [government] teachers. Professional [government] teachers should not only be located in urban schools but in remote rural areas as well. …I mean, schools in remote rural areas shouldn’t be marginalized.

Although ‘the government has provided grants and funding for all schools’ (Nita, CPG), Anton believes that the lack of school facilities and staff still occurs because ‘…the distribution of the resources is imbalanced between urban and remote rural schools’.

Anton’s strategy of using props to overcome the constraint of the lack of school facilities might be effective for teaching and in encouraging students to ‘live in a
frugal life’, which is one of the characteristics of (remote) rural society in Indonesia. However, following the notion of the capabilities approach, the lack of school facilities and appropriately qualified staff members due to an unfair distribution of resources can potentially limit the expansion of students’ capabilities. As stated earlier in this part, Sen (2009) is aware of the significance of resources in achieving functionings, despite his view that mere availability of resources does not guarantee achieved functionings. With the capabilities approach, Sen (2009) creates a connection between resources and freedom (opportunities). This connection can be a tool for anticipating possible constraints that are embedded in conversion factors (Sen 2009; Nambiar 2011). Sen (2009) suggests three conversion factors that envisage a possibility to restrict or encourage the conversion of resources into functionings: personal characteristics (e.g. intelligence, physical health, mental handicap), social characteristics (e.g. social norms, cultures, government policy) and environmental characteristics (e.g. the provision of public goods and facilities) (see also Robeyns 2005; Walker 2006b; Nambiar 2011). Hence, comments from the participants indicate constraints which are embedded within the conversion factor of environmental characteristics. If the government does not provide adequate learning facilities and professionals in remote rural schools, there could be constraints impeding the development of students’ capabilities to achieve outcomes they have reason to value.

Moreover, constraints on developing students’ capabilities are also embedded within the conversion factor of social characteristics as they directly arise from government policy. Commentary from local teachers indicates that these constraints are related to the implementation of national examination and low incentives. In terms of the national examination, Budi (CPG) states, ‘This [national examination] is not fair. If we’d really like to implement the KTSP [school-based curriculum development], schools must be given autonomy to construct their own standards’. The national examination also has implications for the ways teachers teach and the focus of their teaching. On this point Budi and Nita (CPG) state:

…I don’t feel free with the national standards. So, I have to do improvisations. The national standards are only a reference for me. I teach beyond the standards. [So], there should be no national exams (Budi, CPG).
It [the national examination] is for grade 6, isn’t it? There’s a formula for this. Previously, only students’ achievements in grade 6 were considered, but now, students’ achievements from grade 4 to grade 6 are considered to pass them. So, in order for them to pass, we do a mark-up to their marks from grade 4 to anticipate [failure] in the final exams (Nita, CPG).

Budi’s comments suggest that the advent of the national examination is a form of government interference in teachers’ assessment of students, whereas the KTSP encourages the development of teacher’s autonomy. Budi may choose to teach beyond the standards to avoid teaching for the national examination (that is teaching to a test and awarding a passing grade, on which Nita seems to focus her teaching).

According to Wiggins (1989), pressure to teach for a test and awarding a passing grade can narrow education and merely encourage fact memorising rather than development of students’ capabilities. In addition, the national examination is administered using a multiple-choice format, and hence it may not stimulate active participation in learning as it does not assess the ability to communicate ideas and will not lead to critical thinking (Wiggins 1989). According to Nussbaum (2006), critical thinking and narrative imagination are crucial to the expansion of students’ capabilities. Drawing on Lansdown, Biggery (2007) states: ‘there is evidence of many issues that even small children are capable of understanding and to which they can contribute thoughtful opinions’ (p. 198). In other words, the exercise regarding the right to become active participants in learning needs to be introduced to students in early schooling. Klasen (2001) argues that any impediment to the development of capabilities during early schooling not only damages students’ wellbeing, but may also have major implications on their future life in society.

While Budi’s and Nita’s commentary is concerned with the implementation of national examinations, Fatin (PPv) and Anton (Np) raise the issue of low salaries:

The government should be more just, especially for myself who hasn’t receive incentives. They should do things that can make us, non-permanent teachers, more motivated to teach, because incentives can influence our performance in the classroom. Non-permanent teachers in remote areas are often overlooked. So far, much of the aid is addressed to government teachers. It’s natural that the government teachers actively teach as they’re already well-paid. The government treats non-permanent teachers and government ones differently. I believe that incentives can give influence to a teachers’ performance. …Sometimes teachers are not present at school because they don’t have enough money to purchase gasoline for their vehicles. This happens at my school, sir. Even, some teachers have to borrow money from the neighbours around the school because they don’t have enough petrol to go home. It often happens here. They don’t lie, they’re forced to do that (Fatin, PPv).

Anton (Np) similarly states:
The central and local government have the same principle, when we’re already in the classroom, we’re all teachers, no more dichotomy between non-permanent teachers and government teachers. That’s true. But in terms of the salary, it’s very different…. With low salaries, non-permanent teachers won’t teach actively. The implication is on students. Students will be affected. This school, in particular, has a limited number of teachers. Once a teacher is absent, classroom teaching is not effective … For me as a non-permanent teacher, I consider twice to work full time because after school, I have to find another job.

Fatin and Anton are non-permanent teachers. Fatin teaches in a private school while Anton in a government school. Their comments are critical of government policy which pays non-permanent teachers much lower than government ones, whereas they do the same jobs as fully fledged government teachers at schools. As Anton states, ‘Now [the payment] is only 325,000 rupiahs [about AUD 32.5] a month’. With a very low salary, they only barely meet their major daily expenses.

In Indonesia, teachers are categorised into non-permanent teachers and government teachers. Non-permanent teachers have the same responsibility as government teachers do, but they are paid much less than and do not get trainings to the extent received by government teachers (see Chapters 2 and 6). While government schools in Indonesia tend to employ government teachers and some non-permanent teachers, private schools tend to employ non-permanent teachers rather than government ones. Non-permanent teachers working in both private and government schools have the opportunity to upgrade their qualifications to get the status of government teachers and/or certified teachers, and hence they get paid much more. Apart from this, the opportunity to be certified teachers is also given to government teachers because not all of them are certified. Once they are professionally certified, they will get additional incentives as much as their basic salary.

To overcome financial restrictions of their roles as non-permanent teachers, some find another job after school. This creates challenges for strong pedagogical practice. As Fatin says, ‘Human beings have primary needs to be fulfilled’ and ‘the improvement of education can be pursued when people’s primary needs have been met’ (Budi, CPG). From a capability perspective, the very low incentive of received salary for non-permanent teachers serves to be a constraint on the development of teachers’ capabilities and, further, on students’ capabilities. Constraints of teachers can potentially become constraints on students. In other words, when capabilities of teachers are not developed, capabilities of students can hardly be expanded.
Thus, if a school has more non-permanent teachers with very little remuneration compared to their cost of living, it has the potential for diminishing capabilities. If, as a consequence of their very low incentives, some school teachers have to find another job to get more income, their capabilities to teach might be decreased in that they cannot afford to spend all their time and energy on making thoughtful preparations for their teaching. Being well-prepared is of great importance as it enables teachers to pursue their instructional roles in a variety of modes and enables them to form positive pedagogic relationships with their students (Triyanto 2012). This is not to say, however, that teaching should be linked to financial incentives.

Debate exists over whether linking financial incentives to performance goals can actually lead to improved performance and productivity in schools (Young et al. 2012). Debate on the merits of performance pay often centres on issues such as colleague competition (see Jones 2013). Nonetheless, according to Muralidharan and Sundararaman (2011), the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of a performance pay program depends much on the way it is designed and framed, not on the program itself. On this point they add:

...incentives that are perceived by workers as a means of exercising control over them and interfering with norms of professional behaviour are more likely to crowd out intrinsic motivation, while those that are seen as reinforcing norms of professional behaviour can enhance intrinsic motivation (p. 396).

Essentially, a performance pay program needs to be transparently and fairly applied so that it could increase teacher motivation and teacher satisfaction, which may then lead to teachers’ feeling comfortable with such a program (Muralidharan & Sundararaman 2011).

In general, further research might be required to make sure whether or not additional incentives or allowances can improve teacher performance. However, some of the non-permanent teachers in remote rural areas in Indonesia’s Probolinggo Regency, where their salary is indeed insufficient for them to live on, are definitely in favour. For example, Rani (PG) states, ‘High salary can surely motivate them. Government teachers, for instance, already have a good income, so they perform better as their life has been better economically’. Lavy (2002) suggests that with a higher payment, these teachers may tend to be more supportive and responsible for significant improvements of students’ performance and learning outcomes. In other
words, adequate financial incentives may have motivational effects for the improvement of performance and quality in teaching amongst non-permanent teachers, by which students’ capabilities could expand.

To develop students’ capabilities necessitates capable teachers. In this context, the growth of teachers’ capabilities is a possibility if the government establishes a remuneration system that equitably rewards any hard work and concerted effort of all teachers, in particular non-permanent teachers. Otherwise, as Kelly (2012) suggests, students will be poorly taught, and consequently they will not have ample opportunities to achieve their valuable functionings, and they will learn to live with underachievement. Sen (1985) states: ‘[they are] seizing joy in merely coping and wanting no more than what is achievable without much effort’ (p. 29). Positioned in this way, students may not reap much advantage or benefit from their schooling. Using the notion of the capabilities approach, an evaluation of advantage or benefit must take into account the maximisation of opportunities or freedoms offered to students, without which students’ capabilities could hardly be expanded.

A further constraint on capability development is the broader political landscape. This is reflected in Harun’s (PPv) following commentary:

> When viewed now, we have to pay [bribe] for being a permanent government teacher. I don’t have enough money to pay [bribe] for it. So, I don’t have an ambition to become a permanent government teacher. But when there’s an opportunity, I just wanted to be a certified teacher, I’ll go through it. If you don’t have 100 million rupiahs [approximately AU $10,000], you cannot be a permanent government teacher. So, it is not based on competence but money.

In Indonesia’s Probolinggo regency, being a permanent government teacher is generally a desired ideal of most non-permanent teachers from either private or government schools in that it relatively guarantees a more fixed and higher income per month and pension. Harun’s commentary suggests the issue of bribery in the recruitment process of becoming permanent government teachers in the region by illegally giving a certain amount of money to a government official.

In addition, with some evidence of corrupt practices, Budi (CPG) shows his pessimism about the advent of social prosperity and education improvement in Indonesia. He states:

> To improve teaching, structures and infrastructures must be completed, there must be no corruption or bribery, there must be parents’ support, and human resources must be improved.
… As long as corruption or bribery still exists, I couldn’t say anything, sir. No way, sir. Never expect prosperous life for all if such corrupt practice is still rampant. The prosperity belongs to particular groups of people only.

Budi’s commentary implies that any form of corruption in the education sector potentially deprives the government of revenue required to provide educational goods and quality or equity in education. Corruption in any form, as Budi indicates, is damaging and detrimental to development and growth (see also Suryadarma 2012).

According to Weber (2008), although, in some parts of the world, bribery might be necessary or at least an expected mechanism for realising ideals, such practice constitutes one form of corruption which is not only costly but also legally wrong, unjust and unfair. In a study investigating the impact of bribery on a society, Fisman and Svensson (2007) suggest that bribery does not have positive social functions and does not benefit society, for the funds paid in bribery are mainly for personal interests and used merely to line the pockets of particular government officials and others demanding or receiving the bribes. Bribery in teacher recruitment in particular can diminish opportunities of people who truly have potential for being credentialed teachers but have less money to pay. Consequently, due to the unfair recruitment, some schools might have less capable (qualified) teachers, by which the growth of students’ capabilities is restricted. In this regard, Dreze and Sen (2002) have acknowledged that one should hold a wider perspective in the assessment of human development or growth, in the sense that they have to take account of any restriction on people’s opportunities to have their capabilities developed. Drawing on Dreze and Sen (2002), corruption (bribery) can cause a discouragement effect or have the implication for low quality of teaching, by which the majority of students at schools might do little work, or choose not to attend school on account of the poor teaching conditions.

Another constraint that can limit the growth of students’ capabilities also revolves around the issue of nutritional food supplies in remote rural areas in Indonesia’s Probolinggo Regency. In this case, Nita (CPG) states, ‘Meanwhile, here, I understand that to obtain perfectly healthy food is difficult here, particularly side dishes’. This constraint is the implication of low economic growth in remote rural
areas and can have a marked impact on the personal conversion factor in terms of students’ physical health. Drawing on Sen (2009), economic barriers could prevent people (students) from converting whatever resources they have into capabilities and functionings. In this light, Budi (CPG) states:

Those who drink milk every day will be fresher that those who don’t. No students here drink milk. None. They eat twice a day on average, with salty fish. For them, the important thing, they’re full. They have less nutrition, so at 9.00 AM, they’re already sleepy.

On spending long hours at school for study without adequate nutrition, students lacked concentration on lessons, from which their capabilities can hardly be developed (Unterhalter et al. 2007). Smith and Barrett (2011) highlight that being well-nourished is of fundamental importance for the expansion of students’ capabilities and the achieving of good learning outcomes.

Likewise, Bevans et al. (2011) acknowledge that the availability of nutritious food can promote students’ wellbeing, growth, development, health and their capacity to attend to learning tasks apart from advocating healthy eating behaviours and attitudes toward food amongst students. On this point Weichselbaum and Buttriss (2014) elaborates:

In the longer term, food patterns in childhood, particularly adolescence, can set the scene for future dietary preferences and eating behaviour in adult life. There is also substantial evidence that poor diet and poor physical activity patterns in childhood can lead to problems that manifest later in life, particularly in relation to heart disease, obesity, diabetes, osteoporosis and some forms of cancer (p. 10).

In other words, the unavailability of nutritional food potentially causes severe and long-lasting effects on students’ capabilities to achieve their flourishing life that they have reason to value. Robeyns (2003a) suggests that ‘the capabilities approach to wellbeing and development thus evaluates policies according to their impact on people’s capabilities’ (p. 7). The capabilities approach will ask not only whether students are well-nourished and have sufficient food supplies, but also whether they have access to nutritional food (Muro & Burchi 2012). Thus, the capabilities approach perceives students’ wellbeing and development in a comprehensive and integrated manner and pays attention to the links between material, mental and social wellbeing or to the economic, social and cultural dimensions of life (Robeyns 2003a). In classroom practice, considering these various dimensions of students’ lives can be one of the important aspects of teaching that highlights the connections needed between aspects of what may constitute a good life for students.
7.5 Conclusion

Teachers’ potential ability to bridge some contextual influences (homes and classrooms) can be identified through the ways they make connections between curriculum and students’ life experiences, teach for a good life and overcome constraints that limit the development of students’ capabilities. Connecting curriculum to students’ real life experiences breaks the faulty assumption that students are passive learners. Effective connections view students as active agents who can become one of the foundations for teaching for a good life or teaching for capabilities. In teaching for capabilities, teachers privilege students’ reasoning abilities and encourage students to value a particular life that they choose. However, teaching is sometimes bounded by things that potentially impede the pursuit of curricular objectives and the growth of students’ learning and capabilities. These obstacles might include curricular practices that do not represent a commitment to the perspective of teaching for capabilities. Hence, teachers need to overcome any impediment in order that this will not become barriers to students’ engagement in learning and capability development.

Teacher participants in this study articulated an attempt to connect homes and classrooms. Furthermore, in the analysis of their syllabus documents, the learning objectives and activities provide potential spaces for teachers to connect homes and classrooms. However, these connections were largely absent in the lesson plans. Likewise, while the teachers made efforts to connect homes and classrooms, some comments indicated that the teachers were more focused on students’ skills and competencies than students’ capabilities. In addition, local teachers also speak about constraints that potentially limit the development of students’ capabilities, which include (1) the lack of school facilities and professionally qualified staff members in remote rural schools, (2) government policy, (3) the issue of bribery in the teacher recruitment process and (4) the problem of nutritional food supplies in remote rural areas in the regency.

In some cases, bridging homes and classrooms in remote rural areas in Indonesia’s Probolinggo Regency is still problematic. Apart from some commentary and lesson
plans that are not completely linked to the perspective of connectedness, observed classroom teaching centred on traditional didactic and teacher-directed modes of delivery. There was no evidence, for instance, that students were learning about culturally-oriented materials within the dimension of connectedness. In essence, local teachers do not effectively bridge students’ homes and classrooms despite their attempt to do so.
Chapter 8

Educating for Social Change

8.1 Introduction

This thesis has investigated how remote rural primary school teachers in Indonesia’s Probolinggo regency engage in socially just teaching practices. In Indonesia, The Pancasila policy – the five principles on national life – encourages social justice within education and schooling. The aim of this policy is to maintain inclusivity in schools and to advocate social change on the basis of the state slogan unity in diversity. It is acknowledged in Indonesia’s curriculum that school teachers need to offer learning experiences that enable students to achieve their potential, and that prepare them to become agents of social change in society. Nonetheless, the notion of social justice in Indonesia is largely superficial and not theorised. This study supports the major thrust of the policy in that, if adequately adopted, Pancasila allows for social justice. This thesis represents a small contribution towards a broader understanding of how socially just teaching can contribute to social change.

As discussed in Chapters 3 and 4, this thesis is informed by the capabilities approach. The capabilities approach accommodates the rich diversity of people and is helpful to establish a particular notion of social justice in relation to education and schooling (Robeyns 2003a; Walker & Unterhalter 2007). Compared to other approaches for social justice that are also associated with notions of human flourishing and development, Walker and Unterhalter (2007) argue that the capabilities approach has offered a newer perspective of social justice. The capabilities approach can link a normative idea of justice with practice both in education and in a wide range of political, economic and socio-cultural fields that bear on education (Walker & Unterhalter 2007). Viewed in this way, the capabilities approach can then provide convincing responses to questions of justice and the distribution of schooling and connections between classrooms (schools) and
student homes, communities and national education policy making. Walker (2006b, p. 62) adds that with its major focus on capability in and through education, the capabilities approach is suggestive of practice that is merged with the three key aspects of social justice, namely ‘redistribution, recognition of diversity and identities, and participation’ (see also Gale & Molla 2014).

This concluding Chapter elaborates on the major findings aligned with the research question proposed in Chapters 1 and 5, that is: In considering the decentralised schooling system of Indonesia, what capabilities do teachers in Indonesia’s Probolinggo regency need in order to teach in socially just ways? In doing so, the concluding Chapter is divided into three main parts: 1) teaching in socially just ways; 2) teacher capabilities and student flourishing; and 3) capabilities and teachers’ professional learning. Pedagogical implications emerging from the findings and recommendations for further research will also be outlined.

The major findings of this study suggest that the implementation of socially just teaching in remote rural schools in Indonesia’s Probolinggo regency is still problematic. In articulating this finding, what local teachers do in the classroom was juxtaposed with their claims in the interviews and with the learning objectives of the official national school curriculum. This finding has implications for education policy and for teacher education, which should prepare teachers to face any challenges and negotiate the complex world of teaching and learning.

8.2 Teaching in Socially Just Ways

Teaching in socially just ways extends beyond individual students’ academic achievement and a view of practices that is result-oriented and engaged with students dutifully attending classes and completing tasks. The aim of teaching in socially just ways is instead located within perspectives of ‘what it means to be an active citizen rather than compliance as a passive [spectator]…[and] to produce democratic relationships in schools and between schools and communities’ (Smyth et al. 2008, p. 5; see also Chapter 6, part 4). In other words, teaching in socially just ways provides opportunities for teachers and students to reflect on the world inside
and outside their classrooms, and actively contribute to establishing a more equitable, multicultural society.

Despite the processes of schooling not always necessarily promoting inclusion, teaching for social change, citizenship and democracy has long been a central purpose of education (Osler & Starkey 2005). Keddie (2012b) acknowledges that socially just teaching could be best maintained through a democratic environment that encourages active participation, interactive dialogue and freedom of expression for both teachers and students. Through teaching in socially just ways, teaching-learning relationships between teacher and students, and between school and community, can be enhanced due to shared respect, collaborative teaching and learning efforts and a reflective approach to teaching which is concerned with social change in society. Such teaching practice requires teachers to recognise and accommodate student cultural backgrounds and identities (Pearl & Knight 1999). Keddie (2012b) acknowledges that the explicit valuing and cognisance of student cultures and identities potentially establishes inclusive schooling environments and can remove barriers to students’ empowerment and autonomisation. This sort of empowerment strategy starts from an assumption that students could be more engaged in learning if they were given greater opportunities to share knowledge with their teachers and peers. The role of teachers, in this respect, is that of a facilitator assisting them to achieve more, not an all-knowing person dominating the classroom and the activities planned.

Much of the teacher talk and student listening in the classroom observations, in the data generated in this study, implicitly suggest teaching centred on domination and passivity. The teachers enacting this pedagogy were not overly interested in bringing socio-cultural issues into classroom activities. As indicated in the analysis in Chapter 7, most teachers talked about their commitment to embrace students’ cultures and experiences; yet on the whole, there was limited evidence of this. According to Dewey (1997), such teaching practice is not educative as it encourages coercion in practice rather than shared aims and values and active participation.
The top-down model of instruction also represents an extremely narrow interpretation of the teaching-learning process. This provides no space for inclusivity, offers no room for connecting classrooms with culturally diverse students and stifles students’ intellectual activity in making sense of their worlds. In that kind of teaching and learning programme, instruction is reduced to a mere technical matter, in the sense that ‘no role is envisaged for teachers or students to invest their [cultural] identities’ (Cummins 2003, p. 56). In addition, a schooling process that is culturally blind can prevent teachers from applying teaching strategies centred on the valuing of difference and the provision of opportunities for students to critically reflect on a variety of knowledge (Chapter 6, part 2). Drawing on Hayes et al. (2006), Gay (2010), Couldry (2010) and Keddie (2012b), non-culturally responsive pedagogy undermines voices, cultural knowledge and prior life experiences of diverse students as a way of enhancing their productive performance.

Teaching in socially just ways, by contrast, incorporates strategies and techniques for cultural identity negotiation between teacher and students. This is rather than a mere focus on content knowledge, cognitive growth and the success or failure of students. Moll et al. (1992) argue that teachers need to take account of funds of knowledge of students outside the classroom context. Gonzalez et al. (2005) define funds of knowledge as students’ households, everyday lives and communities that teachers can use to enhance the educational process. This is a major requisite for cultural negotiation and social relationships. Cummins (2003) suggests that teacher-student interactions that involve cultural identity negotiation are likely to be effective in promoting social change through education, and may provide a basis for an image of the society where students live as an embedded curriculum and teaching component. Gonzalez (2005) acknowledges that students’ life experiences and cultural practices at home ought to be brought to classrooms, so that learning will be more meaningful and relevant to them (see also Chapter 7, part 2). Taking account of socio-cultural aspects of students during classroom activities can be one of the ways to remove barriers from student learning.
Essentially, the findings from this study also highlight the importance of removing barriers to the empowerment of students through modes of teaching practice. Students can be empowered through pedagogy in three ways. Firstly, a shift from knowledge transfer to transactional teaching (Neilsen 1989), secondly, a shift from a traditional didactic approach to a critical dialogic mode of delivery and thirdly, a shift from a banking pedagogy to pedagogies of engagement (Freire 1970; Smyth et al. 2008). In pursuit of these three shifts, teachers need to be responsive to any challenges that potentially impede students’ engagement in learning. For example, the pressure of preparing students for success in national examinations was a challenge mentioned by several of the participants in this research. Gonzalez et al. (2005) acknowledge that such pressure can be a barrier to student engagement in learning. To remove it, as Gonzalez et al. suggest, requires teachers’ interest in learning about and from households and communities. Home and community-based learning can strengthen relationships between homes and classrooms and, further, enable students to flourish.

### 8.3 Teacher Capabilities and Student Flourishing

The focus on capabilities in teaching and learning refers not only to processes of learning, but also to the kind of valued lives that individuals want to lead and how diverse socio-cultural and economic dimensions develop or limit capabilities. As Walker and Unterhalter (2007) indicate, central to teaching in the capabilities approach is ‘equal valuing of diversity along the intersecting axes of gender, social class, race, ethnicity, disability, age, and so on’ (p. 251). Teaching in the capabilities approach suggests that each and every person has the freedom and rights to choose a good life that they have reason to value. Walker and Unterhalter (2007) and this thesis (Chapter 7, part 3) acknowledge that following the notion of *reason to value* in teaching can encourage students to value whatever styles of life they choose. From this perspective, school teachers need to provide opportunities for individual students to bring their *funds of knowledge* into the curriculum, as well as reflect on social and cultural issues potentially affecting their lives. They also need to enable students to make choices that matter to lead a flourishing life. Teachers need to prepare students to have *a sense of diversity* within a democratic lifestyle, and show
their compassion to others different from them (Walker 2009; Chapter 7, part 3). As Degeng (1999) indicates, the effect of teaching practice merely highlighting uniformity rather than diversity potentially generates individuals or members of society that ignore difference.

Based on the data generated by this study (specifically in terms of teaching in the capabilities approach), there is still more work that remote rural primary school teachers in Indonesia’s Probolinggo regency need to do to advance the use of the capabilities approach in their teaching, particularly if they seek to teach in socially just ways. Results of the interviews have indicated the teachers’ efforts to be socially just to their students. Similarly, analyses of the curricular documents reveal opportunities to do so. However, some lesson plans and teacher comments overplay basic academic skills and competencies, potentially constraining capability expansion. In addition, the data from classroom observations suggest that teaching and learning within a capability perspective is given less emphasis. In choosing and directing students, teachers were too dominant, rendering students relatively passive and less critically engaged in learning.

Most indications from this research were that learning for students focused on recalling content knowledge rather than debate, interactive dialogue, inquiry on students’ life experiences and critical reflection on certain social and cultural issues. Drawing on Couldry (2010), focusing on recalling content knowledge ignores individuals’ capacity of voice and, more broadly, their social environments. Voice is an expression of agency, and this allows for students to actively participate and share socio-cultural experiences with their peers (see Couldry 2010; Walker 2007). Walker (2007) acknowledges that the capability of voice and aspiration has the potential to enrich curriculum topics as well as enable the development of other capabilities. In other words, the capability of voice and aspiration can remove students’ silence and passivity, and thus assist in developing their autonomy, independence, self-confidence and engagement in learning.

This thesis has also suggested that socially just teachers should not only be approachable, but also capable of being inclusive of all students, capable of
bridging homes (society) with classrooms (social institutions) and capable of creating spaces for students to practice their reasoning abilities (see Chapters 6 and 7). In this regard, processes of learning need to encourage discussions on social and cultural issues and the development of students’ higher order thinking and deep understanding of knowledge (Walker & Unterhalter 2007). This could lead to students’ critical engagement in learning. It is the contention of this thesis that students’ voices and diverse cultural backgrounds can be ‘conditions of …confidence in learning, of provocation of thinking, of independence in thinking, and of respect and recognition of differences in perspectives and identities’ (Walker 2006b p. 87; see also Couldry 2010). Hence, local teachers need to develop cultural literacy on the basis of students’ life experiences in homes and communities. This is to enable explorations of students’ understanding of their own culture and others in their classrooms and communities, by which the interrelationships between homes, classrooms and communities could be maintained.

Moreover, Unterhalter (2003) indicates that capability in and through education is less centred on what teachers teach and what students learn, but rather, deals with how practices of teaching and learning contribute to human flourishing. As elaborated in Chapters 4 and 7, the conception of flourishing within this perspective is not mainly associated with academic performance, skills, competencies, contribution to economic growth and/or teachers’ expectations that schooling can help students get good employment and high income. As Flores-Crespo (2007) notes, being academically competent or relatively well-paid is not necessarily a guarantee of a thriving life in that individuals may still experience certain inequalities and discrimination in their workplaces or during processes of selection, in employment for example.

In addition, pedagogical contexts need to enable educational opportunity (freedom) for students to develop their reasoning and rationality for both present and future choices. On this point Walker (2006a) suggests that student identity relates to the extent to which the topics students have learnt in schools are valuable, ‘not only for their present lives in schools, but also their futures beyond as lawyers, teachers, researchers, managers, town planners, and so forth’ (p. 87). In other words, the key
aspect of teaching in socially just ways within a capability perspective is to question what human beings need to lead a human life that they value and how education and schooling promote rather than impede their flourishing (Walker & Unterhalter 2007). Thus, to advance the use of the capabilities approach in teaching and learning, remote rural teachers in Indonesia’s Probolinggo regency need to look at pedagogical aspects in terms of how knowledge is to be delivered to students. In this respect, their instruction, curricular content and written or visual teaching materials should reflect what Flores-Crespo (2007) categorises ‘a comprehensive idea for a pedagogy of inclusion’ (p. 57).

8.4 Capabilities and Teachers’ Professional Learning

In response to the problematic implementation of socially just teaching in remote rural schools in Indonesia’s Probolinggo regency, this research has established a list of capabilities. In this regard, Sen (1999) and Nussbaum (2006) have different perspectives in terms of the applicability of capability lists to particular contexts, and the significance of reviewing and revising them according to those contexts. As discussed in Chapter 4, even if Sen’s and Nussbaum’s capabilities approaches are closely related and similarly criticise utilitarianism, both theorists are different in terms of goals and intellectual histories. This difference has implications for how capabilities are to be constructed and identified. While Nussbaum employs an Aristotelian conception of human flourishing as the basis for establishing a detailed list of human core capabilities, Sen refuses to endorse a list of capabilities in that he intends to put emphasis on a democratic process or agents to construct and identify their own capabilities.

Along with that debate, Robeyns (2003a, p. 26) suggests that even though ‘there has not been much discussion on whether that distinction is crucial or not’, some criticisms on Nussbaum’s capabilities approach point out that Nussbaum’s approach gives less attention to agency and freedom. In addition, a number of authors such as Terzi (2007) and Walker (2006a), have also similarly proposed lists of capabilities from different contexts of study. Terzi (2007, p. 37) proposes seven basic capabilities for education: (1) literacy, (2) numeracy, (3) sociality and
participation, (4) learning disposition, (5) physical activities, (6) science and technology and (7) practical reason. Walker (2006a, pp. 128-129) establishes eight capabilities for higher education pedagogies: (1) practical reason, (2) educational resilience, (3) knowledge and imagination, (4) learning disposition, (5) social relations and social networks, (6) respect, dignity and recognition, (7) emotional integrity, emotions and (8) bodily integrity.

The list of capabilities proposed in this thesis represents a contribution to the field in terms of enabling capability development for socially just teaching, from which remote rural teachers in the regency could professionally learn to improve their classroom teaching performance. The suggested list of capabilities may not cover all aspects of the relevant capabilities, yet they are indicative of what local teachers require to advance their teaching, so that students can lead a flourishing life. These are: pedagogic integrity, connectedness, access and technology, and social networking.

Table 4: Proposed List of Capabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Capabilities</th>
<th>Aspects of Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  | Pedagogic Integrity| ▪ Being socially inclusive of all students
▪ Creating a democratic learning environment
▪ Conducting an educative process of learning, minus harassment and/or domination |
| 2  | Connectedness      | ▪ Relating curricular topics to students’ socio-cultural backgrounds and real life worlds
▪ Creating a connected classroom to enhance students’ engagement in learning |
| 3  | Access and Technology| ▪ Converting available resources into valuable functionings
▪ Applying technological tools to improve student learning |
| 4  | Social Networking | ▪ Utilising the local teacher network association to improve the quality of teaching
▪ Evaluating the outputs of education |

Pedagogic Integrity refers to being able to respect student diversity, accommodate student voice(s) and agency, create spaces for democratic arrangements in the classroom, and being able to free students from verbal and physical punishments and violence of any sort. This capability refers to the perspective of social inclusivity in teaching and safety or freedom from any form of harassment and domination.
This capability of pedagogic integrity is derived from my analysis of the interview data that incorporates commentary from a number of participants potentially constraining inclusive practices in the classroom. Nita (CPG), Anton (Np) and Santi, for instance, openly approve of physical or verbal punishment even if the Indonesian Government has discouraged violence against students. As Nita indicates, physical punishment such as a *little pinch* is necessary to make students listen to what is told and advised. While Anton prefers speaking to them in a loud voice to prompt students to listen, Santi warns them verbally and in a threatening way. Such physical and verbal punishment can distort educational opportunities and make students psychologically stressed and emotionally fearful to have a voice (see Birden 2002). Drawing on Dewey (1997), harassment and domination of any type is anathema or opposed to pedagogic integrity. Teachers need to support and protect student agency and voice so that learning and broader psycho-social development of students as individuals is nurtured.

The second capability is *connectedness*, which relates to being able to bridge homes (community) and classrooms (schools), being able to connect curriculum with student life experiences, and being able to teach for a good life. This capability deals with making students’ life-worlds and local community knowledge integral to pedagogy and valuable resources to enhance student learning.

This capability of connectedness is constructed on the basis of my analysis of the teaching strategies of the participants; strategies that include lecturing, asking questions and answering, giving assignments and relying on the textbook as the source of learning. In this regard, classroom teachers in this study demonstrated conventional teaching strategies centred on rudimentary task completion and recitation of textbook material rather than seeking broader connections between students’ life-worlds and classrooms. As an example, in the Madurese Language class, the teacher (Harun, PPv) followed the textbook content and taught students how to write sentences by using the ancient Javanese letters method (see Chapter 7). In this case, the teacher did not provide details about the relevance of this subject-matter to students’ life experiences. Such teaching and learning activities can counter students’ deep knowledge of topic themes of curriculum as most of the
time they are provided with a superficial understanding of the lesson content (Zohir et al. 2012). Moll et al. (1992) suggests that teachers’ primary responsibility is thus to design curricular activities that connect students’ learning to the *funds of knowledge* of their life-worlds outside school.

*Access and Technology* is the third capability, and involves being able to utilise available resources appropriately for learning, being able to pursue curricular objectives within constraints, being knowledgeable about technology, and being able to use technological tools. This capability relates to teachers’ engagement with available resources and their creativity in pursuing curricular objectives within limitations and in the use of technology to improve learning.

The capability of access and technology is established from my analysis of some comments from participants regarding the lack of teaching facilities and resources in remote rural schools, including computers (Amir (PPv) and Rani (PG)) and comments of others suggesting the use of surroundings in teaching. Nita (CPG) and Anton (Np), for instance, think that learning is not only inside the classroom but also outside the classroom, and therefore they use the environment around them as a means of teaching, particularly when the topic is related to natural science. However, from a capability perspective, the utilisation of surroundings for teaching within the context of a lack of facilities and resources can be problematic. Teachers, in this regard, might feel that they had no other choice. This could lead to *unfreedom* that potentially impedes their genuine choices (Walker 2006a).

The fourth and final capability is *social networking*. Social networking involves being able to actively participate in the local *Kelompok Kerja Guru (KKG)* (teacher network association) activities and to learn from others, being able to give and receive social supports, and being able to do *research* (finding information about outputs of education). It refers to establishing good relationships with others to allow for personal and social development.

In the data in this research, the social networking capability is raised by Rani (PG), a teacher participant who highlights the benefits of the KKG (teacher network
association). She suggests that KKG is a place where teachers can share ideas with each other to improve their syllabi, lesson plans and teaching strategies. It has been acknowledged that engagement in teaching and learning is much promoted by social functions such as sharing, cooperating, collaborating, participating and being part of a group (see Terzi 2007).

8.5 Implications for Education Policy

The list of capabilities established from this study are relevant to the recent 2013 Indonesian Curriculum. It is stated in the curriculum that teachers should accommodate student diversity and highlight the importance of higher-order thinking. Hence, provisions of support for the advancement of teacher capabilities need to be a major consideration not only at the introduction but also during the implementation and evaluation process. Drawing on Darling-Hammond (2010), an important aspect in need of change in curricular and teaching practices should be centred on teachers themselves. The findings of this study supports an approach to professional teacher development in Indonesia that encourages teachers’ engagement with social justice issues in education and schooling and promotes teachers’ deep understanding of the complexities of classrooms. The government needs to provide in-service training for all teachers that is specifically focused not only on curricular content and methods of delivery, but also on strategies for teaching in socially just ways.

In-service training committed to teaching for social change can prepare teachers with the intellectual, practical and affective capabilities to sufficiently accommodate students’ cultural diversity and to appropriately connect homes and classrooms. Preparing teachers in this way is also an act of justice. This is not a matter of standard practice, but rather, it is an effort to respond to the realities of classrooms. As discussed in Chapter 6, classrooms consist of students with diverse characteristics, behaviours, backgrounds, learning styles, voices, interests, experiences, and cultures; they are not passive but actively construct their identities through interactions with their peers, parents and with other people in the community. As Sen (1992) suggests, human diversity must not be ignored.
Diversity is a crucial aspect of equality and human dignity as well as a pre-requisite for the full development of capabilities.

Study findings regarding the limits on capability development (see Chapter 7, part 4) also acknowledge that primary school teachers in remote rural areas in Indonesia’s Probolinggo regency need to be given adequate resources such as higher payment, school buildings, books, computers, lower pupil-teacher ratios amongst other things in order to facilitate the expansion of capabilities. According to Walker (2004), such resources matter as access to them enables functionings.

In addition, local teachers should be given the flexibility or freedom to select materials that are suitable for their teaching. Being too dependent on formal curricular contents and textbooks might be inadequate to develop students’ capabilities to critically reflect on social and cultural issues. Teaching in socially just ways requires teachers to have sufficient creativity to bring social and cultural issues into their classrooms and view them as important materials to enrich topics of curriculum.

Smyth (2012) suggests that to be socially just, teachers need to be mindful of the strengths, struggles, aspirations and histories that students and their families bring to schools. Classroom teachers could use these as the foundation for designing and implementing curriculum and instruction. Taylor and Sobel (2011) indicate that teacher commitment to properly utilising students’ cultural uniqueness for instructional design is beneficial to the promotion of teaching practices that potentially reach and include all students. Hence, students’ socio-cultural aspects do matter, and are central to establishing a connected classroom that is socially inclusive of all students.

### 8.6 Recommendations for Future Research

Future research on social justice issues in education and schooling in Indonesia needs to take account of a number of aspects. Similar research that involves constraints on capability development generated by this study (Chapter 7, part 4) is
valuable and should be undertaken in the future. This would identify whether the research project is feasible to generate findings that stimulate resolution of the constraints. This could include observations of and interviews with both teachers and students.

Apart from this, another research project that would take the list of capabilities into account should be conducted in the future to call for professional development of the teachers and to see teachers in Indonesia developing a socially just pedagogical approach. The list of four capabilities proposed by this study are basically researchable. Hence, future research can examine these to identify the extent to which they are applicable to other (remote) rural settings. The list of capabilities can also be used as a basis for undertaking similar research in other regions, for example in more metropolitan regions, to see if the list of capabilities proposed in this study are reflected there as well.

Another point is that future researchers may need to allocate a longer time span in the field in order to help develop and investigate more closely the complex issues of socially just teaching and learning practices in particular classrooms. Research with more longitudinal designs and a wider range of data sources and multiple perspectives will not lend itself to just simple answers and solutions. Hence, it is important to suggest the larger context for future research in that teachers are certainly not free from a system that frequently demands a narrow dimension of measurable outcomes as indicators of success for schools, teachers and students. Such pressure also serves as a constraint on teachers’ capabilities to teach in socially just ways, which, further, restricts the development of students’ capabilities.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Sample Questions for Interviews

Re: Teachers’ perceptions of good and just teaching
Can you describe what good teachers look like?
What can they do to aid students in their learning?
What difference can they make to help students learn effectively?

Re: Teaching for creating substantive freedoms for students to choose a life that they value
How do you describe fair teachers?
What are fair teachers able to do and to be?
How would they prepare for their teaching?
How would you describe an ‘inclusive’ or democratic classroom?
How do you include boys and girls in your teaching? Do you treat both genders the same?
Can you elaborate?
How do you create particular learning opportunities for students in your teaching?
Does the curriculum privilege some students more than others? If so, how?
What kinds of groups do better than other groups in the curriculum? Why?

Re: Potential barriers in teaching for capabilities
Does the decentralised governance of education affect your teaching practice? If so, how?
Do you face barriers in creating opportunities for students to demonstrate their learning?
If so, what are these? How do you challenge or overcome any potential barriers?
What are some of the potential barriers that teachers face in this school/community?

Re: Education for people who live in remote rural areas
What kind of persons does the local community think are good teachers? Why do they think this in your view?
What is the purpose of education for people who live in remote rural areas? Do many go onto other forms of education and/or training?
What would assist you in your teaching at this school? Could the government do more?
What exactly? Could you do more? What exactly?
Appendix 2: Sample Observation Checklist for Classroom Teaching Practices

Date : __________________________
Length of Observation : __________________________
Code : __________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Aspects Observed</th>
<th>Tallies</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Teacher encourages experience of inclusive practices in the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Teacher creates his/her classroom activities that are centred on student wellbeing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Teacher demonstrates his/her respect for diversity of students in the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Teacher explores links between curricular topics/themes and social practices that support life-choices and human flourishing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Teacher implements teaching approaches that highlight critical reflection and dialogic account.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Teacher creates opportunities for students to participate actively in a deliberative and democratic classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Teacher demonstrates teaching practices that respectfully listen to students’ voices and opinions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Notes/Comments:
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
Appendix 3: Sample (Format) of Curriculum Framework (translated as the original document)

Civics for Primary School
Standard Competence (Goals) and Basic Competence (Learner Objectives)

Grade 4, Semester 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Competence (Goals)</th>
<th>Basic Competence (Learner Objectives)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Understanding the governance system of villages and districts</td>
<td>1.1 Recognising institutions within the structural administration of villages and districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Describing the organisational structure of village and district governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Understanding the governance system of regencies, municipalities and provinces</td>
<td>2.1 Recognising institutions within the structural administration of regencies, municipalities and provinces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Describing the organisational structure of regencies, municipalities and provinces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix 4: Sample (Format) of Syllabus

(Translated as the original document)

Subject: Civics  
Grade/Semester: 4/1  
Standard Competence (Goals): Understanding the governance system of villages and districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Competence (Objectives)</th>
<th>Learning Materials</th>
<th>Learning Activities</th>
<th>Learning Experiences</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.1 Recognising institutions within the structural administration of villages and districts | Village and district governance | Students:  
- find information from informants  
- write names of institutions within village and district governance  
- complete information on village and district governance through group discussion  
- present results of the discussion | Students are able to:  
- identify institutions within village and district governance  
- explain the differences between village and district governance  
- explain the different duties and authorities of village and district governance | Technique:  
- Written test  
- Oral test  
- Filling, multiple choice  
- Essay  
- Portfolio Instrument:  
- Interview guide | 18x35 minutes | KTSP Grade 4  
Student books  
Newspapers  
Magazines  
Library sources  
Informants |
| 1.2 Describing the organisational structure of village and district governance | Organisational structure of village and district governance | Students:  
- visit village and district offices  
- create the organisational structure of villages and districts  
- present the organisational structure they have made | Students are able to:  
- make the organisational structure of villages and districts | Technique:  
- Written test  
- Oral test  
- Performance Format:  
- Filling, multiple choice  
- Essay  
- Performance Instrument:  
- Interview guide | 18x35 minutes | Student books  
Village map  
Borderline  
District map |
Appendix 5: Sample (Format) of Lesson Plan (translated as the original document)

Subject : Civics  
Grade/Semester : 4/1  
Time Allotment : 2 x 35 minutes  
Date :

A. Standard Competence (Goals):  
1. Understanding the governance system of villages and districts

B. Basic Competence (Learner Objectives):  
1.1 Recognising institutions within the structural administration of villages and districts

C. Learning Activities:  
- Students identify institutions within village and district governance  
- Students observe and write village and district governance  
- Students discuss (in groups) the governance system of villages and districts

D. Indicators (Learning Experiences)  
After the learning activities, students are able to:  
- identify institutions within village and district governance  
- explain what constitutes village governance  
- refer to the duties and responsibilities of governments toward their people

E. Characters Expected:  
1. Patriotic  
2. Independent  
3. Responsible

F. Learning Materials:  
1. Village governance system

G. Methods:  
1. Lecturing  
2. Discussion  
3. Assigning  
4. Practice  
5. Question-answer

H. Learning Steps:  
1. Pre-activities  
   a. Apperception  
      Invite students to pray  
   b. Motivation  
      Prepare students for lessons  
2. Whilst-activities  
   a. Exploration  
      o Teacher delivers information and holds a discussion on a village governance system.
Teacher delivers information and holds a discussion regarding the tasks and responsibilities of governments toward their people.

Teacher delivers information and holds a discussion on what desa (village) means in some areas.

Teacher delivers information and holds a discussion on the differences between village and district governance.

b. Elaboration

Teacher asks students to do an independent assignment, which is completing tables comprising activities of community institutions of their own village.

c. Confirmation

Teacher holds a question-answer activity as to the matters that students have not understood.

Teacher and students hold a question-answer activity to straighten out misunderstandings and to provide reinforcement and conclusions.

3. Post-activities

Students make summary and/or conclusions.

I. Sources:

Textbook
Other relevant books

J. Assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Final Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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