

AARE Symposium December 2001

Does the Index FOR Inclusion provide a framework for school improvement and professional development for Inclusive education?

The Civic School: Australian-Indonesian professional collaboration to model and audit the development of democratic primary classrooms and teacher language using the Index for Inclusion

Abstract

The study is a pilot project in Australian-Indonesian institutional collaboration for the professional development of primary school teachers in West Sumatra in citizenship education. Senior staff in the department of Pancasila and Citizenship Education at the State University of Padang (UNP), West Sumatra initiated the project. UNP staff sought the collaboration of the Faculty of Education at the University of Tasmania for bringing about and sustaining changes in teacher practice needed to implement the new civic goals in the 1999 Suplemen. The *Index for Inclusion* was used to model and audit the development of democratic primary classrooms and language use in a cluster of Padang schools in West Sumatra. The paper describes the background to the project and how the Index for Inclusion was understood during the initial two-week implementation phase by teachers and school principals. The significance of the study lies in the potential of the Index for Inclusion internationally to citizenship education, a field of education that was not considered in the initial development of the Index project and the contribution of the multiple fields of inquiry to the evolving theoretical understandings of inclusive education.

Dr. Mary Fearnley-Sander Lecturer in SOSE Education has had extensive professional and academic experience in the field of citizenship education, comparative Australia-Indonesia studies in citizenship education, and education about Asia for Australian teachers.

Dr Julianne Moss is Assistant Head of School for the Bachelor of Teaching a graduate pre-service teacher program. She also teaches in the Master of Education program in the Faculty of Education. She has wide consultancy experience in the area of inclusive schooling.

Ms. Lesley Harbon, Lecturer in Languages other than English Curriculum at the University of Tasmania, has worked in the field of Australia-Indonesia relations for almost twenty years, having taught Indonesian at primary, secondary and tertiary levels during that time.

Contact details:

Faculty of Education - University of Tasmania

Box 252 - 66

Tel 03 62262546 Fax 03 62262546

Email: Mary.FearnleySander@utas.edu.au

Julianne.Moss@utas.edu.au

Lesley.Harbon@utas.edu.au

Background

The Civic School project was implemented by Australian teachers and pre-service teachers working with Indonesian staff teams in eight primary schools in Padang, West Sumatra in January and February 2001. Doubling as a language field experience for Australian teachers of Indonesian the Australian team members engaged in improving their Indonesian language proficiencies through homestay experiences with Indonesian families in the north Padang community, language seminars arranged by the State University of Padang, classroom teaching and interaction with staff in the north Padang primary schools as well as deepening the understandings of democratic classroom practices outside of their own cultural context. This initial project and future work in the region has potentially great significance for Australian-Indonesian relations bringing together the two countries closer at the level of their basic civic values. Using the Index for Inclusion as the framework for the project design the paper explores the potential of the instrument for civic education practices and understandings of inclusive education more broadly.

The Indonesian Reform Context and Civic Education

Currently in Indonesia important developments are taking place in citizenship curricula at the school level. In 1998 the People's Consultative Council (MPR) terminated the framework (P-4) for the implementation of Pancasila and citizenship education that had been in place since 1978, leaving the educational implementation of citizenship in Indonesia wide open for reconstruction. In 1999 the Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan (Department of Education and Culture) brought out a *Suplemen GBPP Mata Pelajaran Pendidikan Pancasila Dan Kewarganegaraan (Supplement to the 1994 State Outline for Curriculum for Pancasila and Citizenship Education)*. This *Suplemen* was intended to address the implications for citizenship of developments in post-New Order Indonesia. It saw the task as one of developing a future national community which is "more democratic, more just, more respectful of human rights"; as committed to Pancasila --but not only as a framework of behaviour between individuals, rather also "as regulating the relations between the citizen and the state" (*Suplemen*, p.2).

While the content of the citizenship curriculum was rationalised in these changes, it is on the development of the citizenship classroom as a laboratory for democracy (*laboratorium kehidupan berdemokrasi*) that the emphasis of the *Suplemen* falls. The *Suplemen* exhorts teachers to utilise practices that will enable students to empathise with others, express their

opinions, listen to and value the opinions of others, value themselves, think critically, make decisions, collaboratively develop and support class rules (*Suplemen*, p.24). The field of learning is not just -- not primarily, even -- the headings in the curriculum documents but rather whole school: playground, school and classroom interactions. The teacher mediates these experiential learnings in the citizenship classroom in a relationship with the students that is one of mutual respect (*Suplemen* p.3). Finally, the *Suplemen* addresses the need for teachers to make sufficient provision for difference and the individual needs of the student in teaching and learning.

In Australia over recent years there has also been a revived interest in civility (Cox 1995,) and a renewal of civics and citizenship in the curriculum in the form of the *Discovering Democracy* project (1998). Educational research has contributed to the pursuit of civic renewal studies indicating that a democratic school culture is a better predictor of the civic outcomes of participation and tolerance than the didactic teaching of content (Hahn 1999, Kennedy, 1993). Democratic classroom interactions -- active engagement of students with their own learning, co-operation, practices of respect, recognition of equal worth and entitlements -- is most comprehensively implemented by teachers in Australian schools through the ethic and procedures of inclusion.

Advocates of inclusive education recognise that barriers to learning are constructed from multiple factors within the school and its organisational culture (Ainscow, 1993). Changing school cultures requires a commitment to systemic ways of engaging school planning, setting priorities for change, implementing developments and reviewing progress. It is this model that colleagues at UNP (several of whom have completed research higher degrees at the University of Tasmania) had in mind when thinking about how to prepare primary schools in Indonesia for take-up of the new orientation to citizenship education.

1. The Civic School project:

The aims of the project were conceived to:

- develop and trial a professional development program suitable for primary teachers of the PPKn curriculum in Indonesia drawn from the Index for Inclusion.
- develop the competencies of Australian teachers in Indonesian language and civic culture
- contribute a professionally grounded model of the civic school to the current Indonesian review of citizenship education
- trial an in-country practicum within a framework of institutional collaboration
- contribute to the research and professional literature on cross-cultural educational collaboration in the areas of civics, language, inclusivity and beginning and in-service teacher preparation and
- strengthen and diversify existing institutional collaborations between Australia and Indonesia.

2. Participants

A group of seven pre-service and practising teachers were selected for participation in the project. Selection criteria prioritised University entrance level Indonesian (TCE Stage 4), Indonesian University major or Graduate Certificate in Education (LOTE); willingness to participate in the project as part of a Graduate Certificate/ Masters course in intercultural education, and teachers who also teach in the Studies of Society and Environment learning area, where the Australian civics curriculum is located. Practising teachers were qualified to take supervisory responsibility for a pre-service teacher. Pre-service teachers were students

eligible for the third or fourth practicum of their course. Once selected all the Tasmanian teachers participated in preliminary workshops to become familiar with the project and the nature of the teaching and research they would be undertaking during their Indonesian stay.

3. The Practicum

The focus of the practicum for the Australian teachers was Indonesian. In planning for Languages other than English teacher skills development, the school experience period focused on the teachers' competencies in four areas indicated as key areas in the literature on second language acquisition: grammatical, socio-linguistic, discourse and strategic competencies (Canale & Swain, 1980). Focus on teachers' grammatical competence was facilitated through the UNP seminars provided for teacher language development. Homestays, classroom teaching and field experiences contributed the contextual opportunities for teachers to improve their listening, speaking, reading and writing skills. Classroom experiences especially, with the teaching of the civics curriculum through the 'vehicle' of Indonesian and the need to manage student behaviour, allowed the teachers to improve their language knowledge and competencies. In particular it was the language of democratic classroom interaction around civic values and pedagogical interactions that became the centre of implementing practices in the classroom.

The Indonesian teacher skills development focus was realised particularly through:

- pre-departure provision of authentic texts (lists of Indonesian vocabulary from language required in Indonesian classroom management; Indonesian civic education documents) to be accessed by the Australian teachers This allowed teachers to familiarise themselves with the range of vocabulary and phraseology associated with Indonesian civics classrooms.
- observation of civic education lessons delivered by Padang primary teacher colleagues. The Australian teachers observed mainly civics lessons with topics "saling menghormati"(mutual respect), "tenggang rasa"(consideration of others), "persamaan derajat" (equal worth) and "menjaga ketahanan" (ability to tolerate/bear). As well, the Australian teachers were also able to observe other subject area lessons and made observations about the democratic language utilised for classroom management at the same time.
- analysis and appraisal of civic education textbooks used in schools to deliver the content of the civics curriculum, with particular observation of language use and structures
- group meetings in Padang where the decision was made to focus on democratic language needed for operating within cooperative learning contexts.
- language-specific seminars in Padang for teachers to plan, analyse and practise the language of a democratic classroom with the aim of later demonstrating the language and methods to Indonesian colleagues.
- evaluative discussions undertaken at the Project Final Seminar. At this seminar, teams of Indonesian and Australian teachers devised a list of descriptors for democratic classrooms (See Appendix B).

Lessons demonstrated for the benefit of the Indonesian teachers by the Australians, focused on activities that would have students explore the key civic concepts of "saling menghormati" (mutual respect), "tenggang rasa" (consideration of others) and "persamaan derajat" (equal worth). During a language-specific seminar on 3rd February, the Australian teachers noted their need to become more familiar with vocabulary and expressions for both the content of the lessons they would teach and also for managing cooperative learning strategies such as jigsaws, role-plays and small discussion groups. (See Appendix A for the list of democratic

language of Australian classrooms translated for use in Indonesian).

Outcomes for the Australian participants were significant. Each program participant had the opportunity to develop their listening, speaking, reading and writing skills and this development was measured formally by one of the researchers who is accredited to rate Indonesian teachers' proficiency levels according to the International Second Language Proficiency Rating scale (Wylie & Ingram, 1995). Prior to departure in December 2000, the Australian teachers' general Indonesian language proficiencies were rated. A second rating interview was undertaken with seven of the ten participants within one month of arrival back in Tasmania. All seven participants completing the pre-program and post-program ratings interviews improved in their speaking and reading skills in Indonesian. All students but one made significant improvements in their listening skills. Writing was the area where students made least progress. (See Appendix C). The few demonstrations of participants' improvement in writing skills may be explained by the fact that the tasks undertaken in Padang by these teachers were not writing-based tasks.

Following the return to Australia comments from participants regarding their perceptions about their Indonesian language development included:

- "the program had allowed me to extend my language in a way that it had never been extended before and could never be in Australia" (Participant 7),
- the immersion experience "allowed me to understand so much more about the culture" (Participant 6),
- "My reading skills may have improved a little, due to reading the newspapers, signs, etc whilst in Indonesia" (Participant 3)
- "improved every day because of the purpose for what I'd learned" (Participant 5)
- "If I met Indonesians here, I'd probably choose to use English, but over there, you just want to speak as much as you could" (Participant 4)
- " I probably guess I've improved in the classroom [language] most, not picked-up more vocab. but more adept at using the vocab." (Participant 1).

4. Production of a professional development package

The final project outcome due for completion at the end of 2001 is to produce an *Index for Citizenship Education* (ICE) from an adaptation of the *Index for Inclusion* (IIE) developed by the Centre for Studies of Inclusive Education (Booth & Ainscow 2000). At the time of writing this aspect of the project is work in progress.

The *Index for Inclusion* has been chosen as the model for our professional development package because the approach to professional development that it features in relation to teachers' learning mirrors the democratic practices of civic education theory. The methodology for the *Index for Inclusion* derives from UNESCO projects and related research by Tony Booth, Mel Ainscow of the University of Canterbury Christ College and University of Manchester in collaboration with Mark Vaughan at the Centre for Studies in Inclusive Education at Bristol.

The Index process enables collaborative exploration with members of the school community and can respond to the particular context of the school and of the perceptions and values of teaching and learning held by members of the school community. From the shared knowledge and understanding gained during this first phase of the Index process, the professional development team supports the school in the development of a plan to meet

school aims in the targeted area. Planning is followed by implementation and the setting up of processes for review and support to sustain implementation. In our case the initial two weeks supported the local schools to understand the Index processes and establish the role of the local University as the critical friend network to sustain the pilot project after the Tasmanian team left Padang.

At each phase, the process of professional development occurs through examining existing and projected practices for their conformity to indicators of attainment of targeted goals. Question schedules facilitate this examination of practice. Our adaptation of the phases of the *Index for Inclusion* towards the development of the ICE includes:

Phase 1 Starting the Index process

Raising school awareness about the Civic school project and the Index. Exploring the knowledge of the teachers. Preparing to use the indicators and questions.

Phase 2 Finding out about the context

Exploring the knowledge of students. Deciding priorities for development.

Phase 3 Producing a teaching plan

Putting the Index in to the plan. Putting priorities into the plan.

Phase 4 Implementing development

Putting priorities into practice. Sustaining development. Recording progress.

Phase 5 Reviewing the Index process

Evaluating developments. Reviewing work with the Index. Continuing the Index process.

5. Australian and Indonesian models of citizenship education: uncovering the possibilities for the *Index of Civic Education*

Many of the topics of Pancasila and citizenship education across the six primary grades fit the Australian model of the civic classroom. Some such topics are as follows with their neighbouring Australian classroom value in brackets:

Class 1: Belas kasih (Empathy), Hormat menghormati (Mutual Respect)

Class 2: Kemurahan hati (Sharing), Gotong Royong (Interdependence)

Class 3: Kerjasama (Co-operation) Persamaan derajat (Equal worth) Musyawarah (Deliberativeness)

Class 4: Percaya Diri (Self-worth) Tenggang Rasa (Consideration of others)

Class 5: Persamaan hak dan kewajiban (Equal rights and responsibilities), Kebebasan (Liberty)

Class 6: Lapang Dada (Equanimity; tolerance of others); Pengendalian Diri (self-control)

The substantive content of Pancasila and citizenship education in the primary curriculum is largely moral. That makes it amenable to the inclusion of teacher-student and student-to-student interactions as appropriate fields of learning for PPKn, which also fits the whole school focus of the *Index for Inclusion*. The development of an *Index for Citizenship Education* from this model would involve the following steps:

Selecting the core learnings from the 1999 PPKn Suplemen for primary schools

Mapping the core learnings against relevant indicators of attainment

Generating question schedules for each of the indicators.

Revising the *Index for Citizenship Education* on the basis of the project evaluation

The generation of indicators and question schedules is being done collaboratively by the three Tasmanian researchers and colleagues from the Department of Civics and Citizenship at UNP. The scope of the Index includes the cycle of teacher planning: identification of objectives and intended outcomes for different ability levels and learning styles, and the selection of appropriate teaching and learning activities and forms of assessment. Some of the indicators and question schedules of the *Index for Inclusion* initially identified as potential contributors to the *Index for Citizenship Education* are:

IIE Indicator C.1.3. Teachers are concerned to support the learning and participation of all students. This will serve as ICE Indicator for PPKn topic *Equal Worth*.

Questions:

- i. Do teachers check on the progress of all students during lessons?
- ii. Do all students feel they are fairly treated?
- iii. Are teachers concerned to increase the participation of all students?
- iv. Is stereotyping questioned in curriculum materials and during classroom discussion?

Indicator C.1.4. Students learn collaboratively. This will serve as ICE Indicator for PPKn topic *Co-operation*.

Questions:

- i. Are there established rules for students to take turns in speaking listening and requesting clarification from each other as well as from staff?
- ii. Do group activities allow students to divide up tasks and pool what they have learnt?
- iii. Do students share responsibility for helping to overcome the difficulties experienced by some students lessons?

Indicator C.1.7. Classroom discipline is based on mutual respect. This will serve as ICE Indicator for PPKn topic *Mutual Respect*.

- i. Does the teacher's approach to discipline encourage self-discipline?
- ii. Are students involved in helping to formulate classroom rules?
- iii. Does behaviour support involve reflection on ways to improve teaching and learning

for all students?

Important in the development of indicators and questions around these topics in the Index for Citizenship Education is the integrity of the moral curriculum to which they belong. They need to be understood in a context, which also emphasises attributes of personal development that draw on more hierarchical values such as obedience, respect, orderliness. Reflection with their Indonesian colleagues on the difference between the neighbouring civic values and the Indonesian moral ones provided significant cultural learning for the Australian teachers. The pilot project has provided the project team with sufficient data to recognise that an adaptation of the Index is potentially worthwhile to both systems.

6. Implementation of the Civic School professional development project

The implementation of the project followed the phases of the *Index for Inclusion*. Phase 1 (*Starting the Index process*) and Phase 2 (*Finding out about the context*) were conducted through a series of workshops attended by Australian and Indonesian teachers from the school clusters and academics from UNP. Prior to arrival in Padang, the Australian participants participated in an induction workshop.

The Induction workshop for the Australian teachers covered:

- contextualisation of the teachers in Indonesian primary school culture and in the primary civics curriculum (PKKn).
- exploration of the framework and samples of possible content of the *Index for Citizenship Education*.
- language development for the primary school context.
- skills development for use with the approach of the *Index for Citizenship Education*.

After arrival in Padang the project workshops began involving all the project partners; Indonesian teachers, school principals and academics and the Australian teachers and academics. Phases 3 and 4 occurred on the school sites and were facilitated by our academic colleagues and the Padang school cluster groups.

Phases 1 (*Starting the Index process*) and Phase 2 (*Finding out about the context*): the workshop focus included:

- team-building: Australia teachers, UNP staff and key teacher/s from a primary school in Padang.
- induction of teams in the *Index for Inclusion*.
- exploring knowledge and values of team members about the topics targeted in the PKKn curriculum and about the school organisation and culture.
- Participant observation and videotaping during visits to the school for enculturation in formal and informal school interactions.

Phase 3 (*Producing an inclusive development plan*) and Phase 4 (*Implementing development*)

- development of a plan for inclusive planning approach for target topics in the PKKn curriculum.
- team planning and teaching of a targeted topic in the curriculum
- replaying of videotaped teaching from Indonesian and Australian teachers during workshop sessions
- team evaluation of teaching and learning in the targeted topic during workshop

sessions.

- ongoing mentoring, videotaping and support of Indonesian teachers by UNP staff (weekly school visits for 12 weeks mid February to June 2001).

7. Evaluation

The final evaluation intended to provide analyses of the professional development objectives of the project and the knowledge and competencies acquired in Indonesian language and culture by the Australian teachers. The data produced includes:

- copies of workshop materials (translations and adaptations developed from the Index to locate pedagogical focus under Phase 1 and 2)
- the transcripts of focus group interviews of participant teachers and non-participant teachers including school principals on completion of Phase 3
- the school's curriculum development plan
- a record of a teaching observation made by each of the participating Australian and Indonesian teachers
- video recording focusing on students interactions
- work samples

Conclusion

A team of researchers with diverse academic interests generated the Civic School project. The project at the time of writing has much to complete, however the emergent strands of common understanding of the factors that contribute to the successful curriculum implementation in schools are shared understandings. For example, according to research on language curriculum implementation, language teachers need five factors to be present for them to be able to implement curriculum efficiently and successfully (Gambell, 1994b, pp. 249-251):

- networking, or teachers communicating and co-operating about their teaching;
- options for involvement, that is, choice in the degree and type of their involvement in the language curriculum;
- coaching, or teachers modelling and reflecting with other teachers, developing one-to-one relationships;
- action research, requiring teachers to articulate research questions based on their own teaching, and;
- problem solving, teachers working collaboratively on theory and research.

These principles are evident in the methodology of the *Index for Inclusion* and subsequently will be framed in the development of the *Index for Civic Education*. Further we understand our work as disrupting the remarkable absence of research interest in Indonesian education since the 1970s which may in part be explained by the crisis of confidence in the underpinnings of cross-cultural research and comparative education, produced by post-modern critique of the objectivist paradigm underlying such research. In our final analysis we intend to use critical discourse analysis to understand the discursive structures of domination including the domination of the researcher and his/her theoretical frameworks in understanding the context of reforming Indonesian citizenship education in the primary years. Both features may contribute to the re-legitimation of cross-cultural and comparative education.

Ultimately the project will produce a professional development package for civic practice.

Trained and evaluated in a Indonesian setting with Indonesian participants the research and development will provide a basis for further educational exchange between Indonesia and Australia in citizenship education and give Australia an educational presence in the Indonesia during this period of reform in citizenship education. In the short term opportunities for Australian LOTE teachers to develop personally and professionally, experience authentic language used in context, carry out research, share information with a network of other participants and build 'informed' classroom practice upon return to Australia have been provided. The professional experience was extended to our Indonesian colleagues through a reciprocal visit of four project participants to Tasmania in June 2001.

The opportunity for Australian teachers and academics of civics and citizenship to experience and study the civic culture of Indonesia at a time of transition from the combined disciplinary insights and disciplinary expertise from the fields of civic education theory, curriculum theory, inclusive education, school improvement, socio-linguistic analysis and Indonesian history and political culture frames a multi-dimensional research problem demanding a wide range of knowledge and theory. Our data, much of which is yet to be interrogated offers the richest possibilities. Through the benefit of a core principle of curriculum implementation and inclusive education, the practice of professional collaboration, an understanding of the theorisation of civic education as multiply connected work emerges. The convergence of civic education and inclusive education is an intersection point that we will continue to understand. The *Index for Inclusion* has provided us with this possibility.

References

- Ainscow, M. (1993) "Teacher Education as a strategy for Developing Inclusive Schools" in R. Slee (Editor), *Is there a desk with my name on it: The Politics of Integration*, Falmer Press, London
- Booth, T. & Ainscow, M. (2000) *The Index for Inclusion*, Centre for Studies in Inclusive Education, Bristol.
- Bridge, D. & Moss, J. (1999) *Welcoming Schools* UNESCO Paris.
- Australian Council of Deans, (1998) *National Standards for Initial Teacher Education*, Canberra.
- Canale, M. & Swain, M. 1980. "Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing." *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 1-47.
- Cox, E. (1995) *A truly civil society*, ABC Books, Sydney, NSW .
- Depdikbud (1999) *Kurikulum 1994 Suplemen GBPP Mata Pelajaran Pendidikan Pancasila dan Kewarganegaraan*, Jakarta
- Gambell, T.J. (1994) "Understanding Change" Chapter 12 in M.C. Courtland & T.J. Gambell, (Eds.) *Curriculum planning in the Language Arts K-12: an holistic perspective* Ontario, Canada: Captus Press. pp. 236-254.
- Hahn, C. (1999) *Becoming Political: Comparative Perspectives on Citizenship*

Education State University of New York Press, New York.

Hill, B., Thomas, N. and Cote, J. (1997) *Into Asia: Australian teaching practicums in Asia* Asia Education Foundation.

Kennedy, K. (1993) *Citizenship education for a new age*, Toowoomba, Qld.

Lamb, M. (1995) "The consequences of INSET" *ELT Journal*, Vol. 49, No. 1, January. pp. 72-80.

Stackowski, L.L. & Mahan, J.M. (1998) "Cross-cultural Field Placements: Student Teachers Learning from Schools and Communities". *Theory into Practice*, Vol. 37, No. 2, Spring, pp. 155-162.

Wiest, L.R. (1998) "Using Immersion Experiences to Shake Up Pre-service Teachers' Views About Cultural Differences" *Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 49, No. 5, p. 358ff.

Wylie, E. & Ingram D. (1995) *Australian Second Language Proficiency Ratings (ASLPR): Version for Second Language Teachers*. Commonwealth of Australia. NLLIA, Griffith University, Brisbane.

Verba, S., Schlossman K. & Brady, H. (1996) *Voice and equality: Civic voluntarism in American politics*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Appendix A

Notes taken at Language Seminar, FBSS, UNP, 3 February 2001

Australian teachers required Indonesian vocabulary/phrases for the following list of:

1. behaviours that might be alluded to as being non-democratic behaviours

1. expressions that might be used by persons demonstrating non-democratic behaviours
2. words that describe victims of non-democratic behaviours
3. phrases to control others' behaviour to become more democratic
4. class management phrases for teachers

English	Indonesian
1.	
to snigger	mencemooh
to kick	menendang
to throw	melempari
to throw (ball)	mengoper
to laugh at	menertawakan
to do something wrong	berbuat salah
to disturb/annoy	mengganggu ¹
to (verbally) tease	mengejek
to belittle	meremehkan
to hit	memukul
2.	
You're not my friend.	Kamu bukan kawan saya.
3.	
shy, embarrassed, loss of face	malu
sad	sedih

humiliated, insulted	terhina
sick	sakit
inferior, hurt	rendah diri
angry	marah
crying	menangis
stupid, ignorant	bodoh
hurt, injured	luka
4.	
Pay attention!	Simak baik-baik!
Remember the others haven't finished (yet).	Ingat, yang lain masih belum selesai.
Please, think of others' feelings.	Tolong, jaga perasaan orang lain.
Take turns!	Ingat giliran kalian!
Follow the rules!	Jangan melanggar aturan!
Be respectful!	Hormatilah!
Be kind!	Sayangilah!
Be friendly!	Ramahlah!
5.	
What behaviours do we see in the playground?	Tingkah laku yang mana yang sering kita lihat di lapangan main?
What's the problem?	Apa masalahnya?
Find the problem!	Temukan masalahnya!
Brainstorm!	Sumbang saran!
I don't want to use a loud voice.	Saya tidak mau menggunakan suara keras.
I would like you (children) to listen to me.	Anak-anak harus memperhatikan saya.

If I raise my arm, you should listen.	Kalau saya mengangkat tangan, semua anak memperhatikan saya.
I'll raise my arm if there's a lot of noise.	Saya akan mengangkat tangan jika ada yang ribut.

Appendix B

Notes from Project Evaluation Seminar, 8 February 2001, UNP.

Apa proses belajar-mengajar secara demokratis?

1. Anak dapat mengeluarkan pendapat
2. Anak menghargai pendapat orang lain.
3. Anak tidak membedakan teman dalam belajar.
4. Hubungan guru dengan murid lebih akrab dan guru dapat menghargai pendapat maupun hasil karya murid.
5. Anak dapat bekerja sama dalam memecahkan masalah.
6. Setiap orang merasa dibutuhkan.
7. Keakraban.
8. Tidak merendahkan satu sama lain.
9. Aturan yang berlaku yang jelas dalam kelas.

What is the democratic teaching-learning process?

1. Children are free to give their opinions.
2. Children will respect others' opinions.
3. Children won't differentiate between friends (when studying).
4. The teacher's relationship with students is more friendly and teachers value students' opinions and work.
5. Children can cooperate in solving problems.
6. Everyone feels valued.
7. "Close"ness (friendliness).
8. Don't hurt anyone else's feelings.
9. There are valid rules to be followed in class.

Appendix C

Below are the pre-program and post-program ratings for the language skills of seven participants of the Civic School Program 2000-2001.

Participant	Listening to Indonesian	Speaking Indonesian	Reading Indonesian	Writing Indonesian
	Dec. 2000 & Mar. 2001	Dec. 2000 & Mar. 2001	Dec. 2000 & Mar. 2001	Dec. 2000 & Mar. 2001
1.	2 to 3	1+ to 3	2 to 3	2 to 3
2.	3 to 3	2 to 3	2+ to 3	2 to 3
3.	3 to 3+	3 to 3+	3 to 3+	3 to 3+
4.	1- to 2	1 to 2	1 to 2	1+ to 1+
5.	1 to 1+	1- to 1+	1- to 1+	1 to 1
6.	1 to 1+	1- to 1+	1- to 1+	1 to 1+
7.	2+ to 3	2+ to 3	2+ to 3	2+ to 2+

These general Indonesian language proficiency ratings are based on the International Second Language Proficiency Ratings (ISLPR) scale (Wylie & Ingram, 1995) and are a system of indicating graded levels of achievement for a language speaker. They were developed at the Centre for Applied Linguistics and Languages at Griffith University in Brisbane, Queensland, and certify a speaker's proficiency and knowledge in a language according to scaled levels from zero proficiency (0), through formulaic (0+), minimum "creative" (1-), basic transactional (1), transactional (1+), basic social (2), basic vocational (3), and vocational proficiency (4), to native-like proficiency (5).