

# WORKING PAPERS

EAST-WEST CENTER WORKING PAPERS



EAST-WEST CENTER

---

The U.S. Congress established the East-West Center in 1960 to foster mutual understanding and cooperation among the governments and peoples of the Asia Pacific region including the United States. Funding for the Center comes from the U.S. government with additional support provided by private agencies, individuals, corporations, and Asian and Pacific governments.

*East-West Center Working Papers* are circulated for comment and to inform interested colleagues about work in progress at the Center.

For more information about the Center or to order publications, contact:

Publication Sales Office  
East-West Center  
1601 East-West Road  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96848-1601

Telephone: 808-944-7145

Facsimile: 808-944-7376

Email: [ewcbooks@EastWestCenter.org](mailto:ewcbooks@EastWestCenter.org)

Website: [www.EastWestCenter.org](http://www.EastWestCenter.org)



Population Series

---

No. 108-18, November 2001

## Notes on Youth and Education in Indonesia

**Sulistinah Achmad and Peter Xenos**

**Sulistinah Achmad** is with Lembaga Demografi, University of Indonesia.

**Peter Xenos** is a **Senior Fellow** with the East-West Center's Research Program, Population and Health Studies.

*East-West Center Working Papers: Population Series* are an unreviewed and unedited prepublication series reporting on research in progress. Please direct orders and requests to the East-West Center's Publication Sales Office. The price for Working Papers is \$3.00 each plus postage. For surface mail, add \$3.00 for the first title plus \$0.75 for each additional title or copy sent in the same shipment. For airmail within the U.S. and its territories, add \$4.00 for the first title plus \$0.75 for each additional title or copy in the same shipment. For airmail elsewhere, add \$7.00 for the first title plus \$4.00 for each additional title or copy in the same shipment. Readers in developing countries may request single copies on a complimentary basis.

For more than 30 years, the East-West Center has been a world leader in research and education on population issues in the Asia-Pacific region. More recently, the Center has expanded its activities to examine important health issues facing Asia and the Pacific. The Center conducts basic and applied research, offers professional education and training, and facilitates the exchange of information between policymakers and scholars on critical issues facing the region.

## **AYARR**

### **Asian Young Adult Reproductive Risk Project**

This research is a product of the East-West Center's Asian Young Adult Reproductive Risk (AYARR) project, supported by USAID through its MEASURE Evaluation Project. The AYARR project supports a research network devoted to producing an Asian regional perspective on young adult risk behaviors through secondary and cross-national comparative investigation of large-scale, household-based surveys of youth.

The project presently involves investigators and national surveys in six Asian countries. The government of **Hong Kong** (now the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region) has supported area-wide youth surveys, both household-based and in-school, in 1981, 1986, 1991, and 1996. The 1994 **Philippines'** Young Adult Fertility and Sexuality Survey (YAFS-II) was conducted by the Population Institute, University of the Philippines, with support from the UNFPA. **Thailand's** 1994 Family and Youth Survey (FAYS) was carried out by the Institute for Population and Social Research at Mahidol University, with support from the UNFPA. In **Indonesia**, the 1998 Reproduksi Remaja Sejahtera (RRS) baseline survey was funded by the World Bank and by USAID through Pathfinder International's FOCUS on Young Adults program. The RRS was carried out by the Lembaga Demografi at the University of Indonesia under the supervision of the National Family Planning Coordinating Board (BKKBN). The **Nepal** Adolescent and Young Adult (NAYA) project, which includes the 2000 NAYA youth survey, is being carried out by Family Health International and the Valley Research Group (VaRG) with support from USAID to Family Health International (FHI). The **Taiwan** Young Person Survey (TYPF) of 1994 was carried out by the Taiwan Provincial Institute of Family Planning (now the Bureau for Health Promotion, Department of Health, Taiwan) with support from the government of Taiwan.

# NOTES ON YOUTH AND EDUCATION IN INDONESIA

Sulistinah I. Achmad and Peter Xenos

## INTRODUCTION

Indonesia in the last decades has been experiencing rapid social change from a traditional toward a modern society. These rapid social changes have been strongly influenced by world trends, not the least of which is globalization marked by improved communications and flows of information. The integration of global markets has favorably affected Indonesia's socioeconomic development in such areas as education, welfare and demographic change. But it has also conveyed norms, values and lifestyles alien to Indonesia's society. These disturbing effects are particularly affecting adolescents and young adults, those most vulnerable to ideas and values of all kinds during their transitional period from childhood to adulthood.

Adolescents and young adults constitute a substantial part of the Indonesian population and over time are increasing both in number and as a proportion of the population. The 15 to 24 year old population in 1971 was 19.5 million or 16.4 percent of the population total, but in 1990 was 35.1 million or 19.6 percent of the population. Analysis of youth transitions throughout Asia indicates that Indonesia's youth population maybe peaking just as the 21<sup>st</sup> century begins.

Indonesia, following the examples of Japan, Taiwan and South Korea, has invested in education, endeavoring to expand its formal educational system. Education is expected to benefit not only the individuals who have been educated but also the community at large. A community with a high average level of education will more easily accept new ideas, norms or ways of life.

Ogawa, Jones and Williamson (1993) found that Japan, South Korea and Taiwan were countries which have been able to achieve technological development through the increasing accumulation of human resources. This was achieved primarily through the spread of formal education and informal training in vocational skills. Quoting Uzawa and Lucas, they state that the rate of increase of physical capital is a function of the rate of increase of human capital, and increases in accordance with the increase of human capital. They observe that countries which started with human capital at a level which is relatively high compared to GNP will accumulate more physical capital. Quoting Baumol they also state that it can be shown empirically that countries which started with human capital at a level which is relatively low compared to GNP are less developed.

Educational attainment in Indonesia is relatively underdeveloped as a whole. The 1998 National Social Economic Intercensal Survey showed that 13.9 percent of the population aged 10 or over was illiterate. Only 64.8 percent of this age group had completed primary education or more. About 8.5 percent of the population aged 10 to 39 years had never gone to school, while 36.4 percent was still attending school. Funding difficulties was the main reason for dropping out of school, mentioned by 52.5 percent of the dropouts. About 55.2 percent of those who were still attending school but did not intend to continue mentioned funding difficulties as their reason (Central Bureau of Statistics 1998, 1999a, 1999b). Although the government of Indonesia is endeavoring to bring education to every child, the cost of education is still too expensive for many, and even primary school is not free of school fees.

At the start of the fourth five-year plan in 1984 the president of Indonesia declared six years of education to be "compulsory" in Indonesia. Here the term "compulsory" suggests that a six-year education should be universal; that every Indonesian child should have the right to at least six years of

education. The term compulsory education puts the burden on the government for achieving a universal or general education of six years. Thus the government was made responsible for providing adequate educational facilities so a six-year education could be within easy reach of every child. The government built many schools including in remote areas. Also provided were many primary school teachers to man the primary schools of the six-year compulsory education plan.

Between 1973 and 1983 a building program provided one hundred million classrooms, and one hundred thousand school buildings were rehabilitated. At the same time ninety-six million school books and two hundred million library books were prepared and two million teachers were retrained. Then in 1994, at the start of the sixth five-year plan, nine years of education was declared by the president to be “compulsory,” further expanding the need for many secondary school teachers to man the junior high schools.

The declaration of six and then nine years of compulsory education is a reminder to the government and the society that every child has a right to be educated for at least six years, a right later expanded to nine years. Primary and Junior High school education is not yet free of school fees. The school fees for Primary and Junior High school are still too expensive for some children. The implementation of the six-year compulsory education plan, despite the still-too-high fees, did seem to have an impact on increasing the level of education in the population. The 1980 and the 1990 censuses showed that in 1990 21.9 percent of the population aged 10 year or more had completed Junior High or above as compared to 10.8 percent in 1980. Considering young adults ages 15-24, the 1980 and the 1990 Censuses showed that the proportions that had completed Junior High or above in 1980 and 1990 were 18.3 percent and 41.4 percent, respectively (Central Bureau of Statistics 1983 and 1992; Republic Indonesia, 1994).

This study analyzes the 1998/1999 Indonesia Baseline Survey of Youth Reproductive Welfare (RRS) for more detailed information on the behavior and knowledge of young adults in four provinces of Indonesia. We explore a set of questions on the relationship between age, education and work, marital status and knowledge of reproductive health.

The 1998/1999 Indonesia Baseline Survey of Youth Reproductive Welfare was a study to provide the government with baseline measures of individual, family and community characteristics of young adults aged 15 to 24. The study covered twenty *kabupatens* in each of the following four provinces: East Java, Central Java, West Java and Lampung. The sample was a cross-section sample of 8,080 young adults aged 15 to 24 and was designed to provide a population-based representative sample. About 400 respondents were interviewed in each *kabupaten* adding to around 2,000 respondents in each province. The *kabupatens* selected in East and Central Java were selected as program intervention areas of the BKKBN/World Bank Adolescent Health Project. The *kabupatens* in West Java and Lampung were selected from areas covered by the Service Delivery Expansion Support Project funded by USAID. Among the twenty *kabupatens* these tended to be the more rural, less highly developed, and relatively low performing in terms of family planning use and overall health status of the twenty *kabupatens*. The topics covered in the RRS Survey included education, employment, marriage, childbearing, family characteristics, knowledge of reproductive health, knowledge of family planning methods, and knowledge of STD's including HIV/AIDS.

The study was conducted in collaboration with the NFPCB and was funded by the Focus on Young Adults Project/Pathfinder, USAID/Washington, and the World Bank—with technical support from Population and Health Studies, East-West Center, and Population Communication Services, John Hopkins University.

## **BASIC BACKGROUND**

The RRS sample of 8,080 young adults consisted of 4,220 men and 3,860 women. Of the men 92.3 percent were single and 7.7 percent had ever married (i.e., were currently married, separated or divorced). Of the women 58.2 percent were single and 41.8 percent were ever married. The marital distribution of the female respondents was consistent with other studies in Indonesia, but the marital distribution of the male respondents suggests under enumeration of married male young adults. The marital male young adults enumerated in the household enumeration of the survey presented a distribution rather more consistent with other findings in Indonesia. Many of the married male young adults were not available for interviewing during the time of the interview because most were away from home working in more urban places (Table 1).

The urban-rural distribution of young adults was as follows: 30.1 percent of the RRS young adults lived in urban areas and 69.9 percent lived in rural areas. This is reflected in the proportion of male and female young adults living in urban areas versus living in rural areas. Of the male young adults 29.6 percent lived in urban areas and 70.4 percent lived in rural areas, while 30.6 percent of female young adults lived in urban areas and 69.4 percent lived in rural areas.

Of those young adults living in urban areas 51.4 percent were male and 48.6 percent were female, while these percentages for rural areas were 52.6 percent and 47.4 percent, respectively. Thus there were slightly more male than female young adults in both urban and rural areas.

The proportion of adolescents, the 15 to 19 year olds, was one and a half times the proportion of young adults aged 20 to 24 years. Of the males 63.7 percent were between 15 and 19 years old and 36.3 percent were between 20 and 24 years old, while these percentages for females were 56.3 percent and 43.7 percent. Thus the proportion of the male young adults aged 15 to 19 was 1.75 times the proportion of males aged 20 to 24, and the proportion of female young adults aged 15 to 19 was 1.29 times the proportion of females aged 20 to 24.

### ***Residential Pattern by Marital Status***

The extended family was and is still an important feature of the Indonesian household. Economic conditions and the social norms on whether it is acceptable for a person to live in a his or her own household influence whether a person will live in his or her own household, with his or her parents or parents-in-law or relatives. In the past a single person, especially a single young adult, was expected to live with his or her parents. But urban conditions have forced changes in the living pattern of the single person. Students, to be able to study in other cities, had to leave their parental home and could not always stay with relatives. Many times it was easier or cheaper to live on their own in a rented room. Economic development in the form of working opportunities in factories, offices and shops in urban areas have caused migration of young people to these areas from other places of residence. Many married or single persons who moved from other places to work in these urban areas had to leave their homes and live alone in rented rooms close to their jobs. The urban culture has come to accept that single persons may need to live on their own. There were no general rules concerning married couples. Married couples could live as part of an extended family, especially in the first years of marriage when the couple's earnings are still very small. Married couples could live on their own if the couple could afford it.

The RRS data showed that 79.2 percent or most young adults lived or resided with their parents; 6.2 percent lived with relatives and only 12.2 percent lived in their own households, in which case they were the heads of those households or were the spouses of the heads (Table 2).

About 88.5 percent of the single young adults lived with their parents and almost half or 49.5 percent of married young adult couples lived with their parents or parents-in-law. The significant proportion of married young adult couples living with their parents or parents-in-law showed that economically it was very difficult for a married young adult couple to set up a household of their own. The reason that half the married young adult couples stayed as part of their parents' households was because their income was too small to cover all household expenses. It was more feasible to stay in their parent's household at least for the early years of their marriage. Only 47.9 percent of the married young adults were heads of their households or spouses of the heads of their households. Thus only half of the married young adult couples could afford to set up their own households.

That a small income was the reason why almost half the married young adult couples stayed at their parents' household instead of starting their own household can be seen when we compare the residence pattern of the urban and rural married young adult couples. The RRS data showed that 52.4 percent of the urban married young adult couples were living in their own household, as compared to 46.9 percent of the rural young adult couples who were living in their own household. While 43.9 percent of the urban married young adult couples were living in their parents' household, as compared to 50.6 percent of the rural young adult couples who were living in their parents' household.

Compared to the rural area it is relatively easy to earn an income in the urban areas. In urban areas there are more earning opportunities both for men and women. Women in the urban areas of Indonesia have more earning opportunities because they can work in offices, sales, and services. Women can be their own boss as they earn through catering, sewing, selling cookies, selling health draughts etc. For young mothers being one's own boss could solve the problem of taking care of their small children while they keep on working. All these opportunities where a person receives payment for work are scarce in the rural areas. In the urban areas both the husband and the wife can work so that the family earnings come from two sources.

The urban resident is a versatile consumer and producer of consumption goods and can access funds more easily. In the urban areas whatever a person produces or wants to sell, there always are people willing to buy these products. In the rural areas on the other hand it is very difficult to find customers, neither services (such as sewing and cooking) nor consumption goods are easy to sell because people very rarely have any spare cash. The opportunities for sales jobs or working in offices are also scarce in rural areas.

This means that urban women, compared to rural women, can relatively more easily have jobs and earn income. Urban women can share equally with their husbands the responsibilities of the breadwinner of the family. The urban young couple can have two breadwinners and the couple may set up their own household much earlier than the rural young couple which generally has only one breadwinner.

Indonesian parents traditionally like living together with their children. A very well known Javanese aphorism states: "mangan ora mangan asal kumpul" Which literally translates into: "Whether we eat or not as long as we are together". It means that even if we are poor the most important thing is that we stay or live together. A Javanese would like his children to live at his home and especially his daughters where he does not have to worry about their well being.

The RRS data showed that 88.5 percent of the single young adults lived with their parents, 88.9 percent of the single male young adults and 87.9 percent of the single female young adults. Slightly more rural young adults reside with their parents than do urban young adults. About 85.7 percent of the urban single male young adults compared to 90.3 percent of the rural single male young adults live with their parents. About 82.0 percent of the urban single female young adults compared to 92.0 percent of the rural single female young adults live with their parents. That less urban single females (and males) live with their parents compared to rural single females (and males) who do shows that the urban single females (and males) were a little less bound by tradition as compared to their rural counterparts. It shows that urban communities are beginning to accept that single people have a right or may need to live by themselves and need not keep to the protection of their parent's household even if they are single. That it's all right for single people to live on their own was also beginning to be accepted by rural communities although at a lower level of acceptance than that of urban communities.

## TOPICS ON EDUCATION

Education is expected to open up employment opportunities outside agriculture, such as in sales, services and production, where earnings are much higher than in agriculture. Education exposes people to other cultures, norms and values, to other ways of life and behavior. Increasing the capacities of men and women can be achieved through formal and informal education. Formal education encompasses primary, secondary and higher education. (Harbison and Meyers, 1964).

Psacharopoulos and Woodhall (1985) maintained that:

- Education increases labor force participation, which in turn increases a person's income and reduces the absolute poverty level.
- Public education reduces income inequality.
- Education provides opportunities to children of the indigent and allows for social mobility.
- Public education funded with tax funds redistributes income from the taxpayers to the poor.

The root of an individual's outlook regarding education depends on whether he or she perceives education as a tool which can provide opportunities profitable to the individual such as better jobs. Parents who believe that education can provide their children with opportunities leading to ways of life very much esteemed by their social environment will encourage their children to attain the highest education their child can achieve.

A serious problem in attaining a level of education as high as possible and in accordance with an individual's aptitude and needs is that educational achievement does not depend solely on an individual's capacity and willingness for learning, but many times also on the availability of educational facilities and on the individual's ability to pay. An educational facility consistent with the individual's needs and aptitudes may not be available at a convenient location. The cost of learning may consist of school fees, costs of learning materials (books, pens and paper), transportation and housing. Other costs may include related outside activities such as swimming and other sport activities and also student clubs in which the students of a school are expected to participate.

School facilities are more easily accessed in urban areas than in rural areas. In urban areas transportation covering long distances is more readily available relatively cheaper. Universities in general are established in the provincial capitals. The Higher Secondary Schools in general are located in the regency capitals, while the Lower Secondary Schools in general are seated in the in the sub-regency capitals. The Elementary or Primary Schools in general can be found in most villages, although some remote rural villages may not have even an elementary school.

To understand the levels of access to the different levels of educational facilities observe the following levels of administrative units of Indonesia. The levels of the administrative units of Indonesia are as follows: the highest administrative unit is the province; there are 26 provinces. The two provinces specified as special provinces are DKI Jakarta, the capitol of the nation, and DI Yogyakarta. Each province is divided in regencies (*kabupatens*). The *kabupaten* in which the regency capitol is situated is called *Kota Madya*. A *kabupaten* or *kota madya* is divided into sub-regencies called *Kecamatan*. A *kecamatan* is divided in villages called *desas* or *kelurahan*. A *kelurahan* is an urban village.

A young child who wants to continue its education at a secondary school or junior high school but who lives in a village which is not the *kecamatan* capitol may have to commute each day or move to the *kecamatan* capitol. The child will commute if transportation is available to carry this child the distance to and from home and school, and the travel time between home and school is reasonable. The situation is similar if the child wants to continue at a Higher Secondary School or Senior High, or to a College or University. The cost of education is proportionate to the availability of transportation to the educational facility and its cost in time and money. The longer the time, the more difficult the travel and the higher the cost to reach the educational facility the higher the cost of education to the individual.

Informal education is much more available in urban areas than in rural areas. Informal education encompasses courses in arithmetic, mathematics, English, computer skills, training in taking National Final School Exams and training in taking National University Entry Exams. Here it needs to be explained that the Department of Education and Culture at the end of the school year produces, executes and conducts simultaneously the same uniform Exams for entry to all government universities. The Department of Education assigns a person who passes this entry exam to a government university or college based on his or her performance in the subjects examined.

From the moment they are accepted into an elementary school, children can start participating in informal educational courses to supplement their understanding and increase their achievement levels in their official school subjects. Some people believe that the quality of education in urban areas is better than the quality of education in rural areas. This perception may actually be false because it may be that urban students are simply better qualified. The better qualifications of urban students may be the result of the urban student's tendency to participate in (non-formal educational) courses which are supportive of his or her formal education. The content of the non-formal educational courses could be similar to that of the formal education courses. In fact the teacher of the informal course may also be teaching

the same formal course. An urban student then may get teaching in a particular subject from two sources.

In some communities there may exist a gender preference for providing girls with less access to education. Parents may choose to pay more toward their son's education if the funds available are limited. One reason for doing so that is forwarded by such parents is that in a marriage the husband is the bread winner. Because a son is expected to become his family's bread winner after his marriage, the son needs to be given as many advantages as possible to allow him to obtain a well paying job. Conversely, after marriage a daughter will spend most of her time at home cooking in the kitchen and taking care of the family. To fulfill these responsibilities to the family of her marriage not much education is needed. On the other hand, there are parents who maintain that a daughter has as much right to a good education as a son, because a girl may want to work in an office or shop or become a teacher after she had completed her education and while she is still single. Girls too want to hold down well paying jobs for which they need to be well educated. These parents also maintain that girls after marriage may want to continue working and contribute to their family income.

In our analysis age has been treated in two groups, 15 to 19 years and 20 to 24 years. It is expected that at these ages all young adults had completed or finished with Elementary school which covers six years and is generally attended by children aged 6 to 12 years. Lower secondary education covers three years and is generally attended by children aged 13 to 15 years. Higher secondary education also covers three years and is attended by children aged 16 to 19 years. Both age groups are expected to have finished with (completed or dropped out of ) elementary education. Most of the 15 to 19 age group has finished secondary education, and are expected to continue with Higher Secondary Education. The 20 to 24 age group is expected to have finished with Junior Secondary School, and some may still be attending Senior Secondary School or have continued to or completed college or university.

In what follows completed education will be tabulated by urban versus rural residence, gender and age-group. Completing a school level means having received a diploma for completing that school level, for example completing primary school. School drop-out of a specific school level means not completing and not receiving a diploma for the last school level attended. For example drop-out in Elementary School means that the last school attended was Elementary school but the student stopped attending without participating or passing a final exam and thus without receiving a diploma for having completed Elementary school.

School drop-out is a serious problem, especially if it occurs at the compulsory level. It is costly because it means funds spent without the expected return for the money. The funds wasted are funds from the family income and funds from the community at large. The society then will have more illiterate and under-educated members than planned for, and the overall level of education because of this will be even lower than expected and will retard social and economic development. In addition, a wasted place in school may have cost an other child its opportunity to fill that place and benefit from it. Finally school drop-out wastes the time of the student which perhaps could have been used more efficiently. School drop-out could be affected by the same variables that affect completed educational levels and for much the same

reasons. The variables expected to affect school drop-out are: urban versus rural residence, gender and age-group.

### *Educational Attainment*

The RRS data show that no gender bias is evident in female and male educational attainments. Although male educational attainment was slightly higher than female educational attainment the difference is very small. The only sizeable difference is in urban versus rural educational attainments, where urban educational attainment tends to be significantly higher than rural educational attainment for both sexes.

RRS data show that about 98.8 percent or almost all young adults have ever attended school and only 1.2 percent have never attended school, and that this level is attained by both males and females.

It has been almost fifteen years since the government of Indonesia in 1984 declared six years of education compulsory. With respect to this declaration it would be interesting to know what proportion of the young adults had currently completed Elementary School. Although almost all the young adults had ever attended school, their overall educational attainment is very low. About 11.1 percent of the respondents had not completed elementary level or had no schooling. Thus, 88.9 percent had at least completed Elementary. That percentage consisted of: 41.5 percent who had completed elementary education, 32.1 percent who had completed Junior High, and 14.2 percent who had completed Senior High. Of these, 2.8 percent had continued to college or above (Table 3).

Considering the government's announcement in 1994 that 9 years of education is compulsory it is interesting to know the young adults' current educational attainment in relation to this announced goal. Completion of nine years education means completion of Junior Secondary School. The RRS data show that female young adults had a slightly lower achievement rate than males; 54.6 percent of the young women had only completed elementary education or less compared to 52.9 percent of the young man. The proportion completing Junior High or above was 45.4 percent for the young women and 47.1 percent for the young men.

The difference in educational attainment between urban and rural young adults is sizeable: only 36.9 percent of rural young adults had completed at least lower secondary education compared with 68.2 percent of urban young adults. This pattern is reflected in the urban-rural difference in educational achievement of male and female young adults. About 68.6 percent of urban young men had completed at least lower secondary education compared with only 38.0 percent of rural young men. The comparable percentages for young women was 67.8 percent of urban young women completing at least lower secondary education compared with only 35.7 percent of rural young women. The difference between male and female educational attainments within urban residence was not significant. Similarly the difference between male and female educational attainments within rural residence was not significant.

Comparison of educational achievements of the 15 to 19 age group with the 20 to 24 age group shows a very insignificant difference in the proportions of those who had completed at least lower secondary education. But comparison of percentages completing at least lower secondary education in the two age group of male young adults shows that the young men ages 20-24 were slightly more successful than the young men ages 15-19. The respective percentages were 49.5 and 45.6. This relationship was reversed for females, where 41.5 percent of those ages 20-24 compared with 48.6 percent of those ages 15 to 19 had completed at least lower secondary education.

Comparison of the educational attainments of urban and rural females by age group again shows that in each age group the proportion of urban females who had completed at least lower secondary education was significant greater than that for their rural counterparts. Similarly for the educational achievement of urban and rural males: in each age group the proportion of urban males who had completed at least lower secondary education was significant greater than that of their rural counterparts. This pattern is replicated in the educational achievements of the (total) urban and rural young adults of each age group.

Virtually no gender bias exists, it seems, in providing daughters and sons with opportunities for schooling. The distribution of completed schooling is virtually the same for males and females, whether it is analyzed overall or by age group, by urban-rural residence or a combination of these characteristics.

### ***School Dropout, Attendance and Completion***

More than half of the young adults had completed their education (Primary, Junior High, Senior High, College or above) and did not continue to a higher level. This included 46.5 percent of the 15 to 19 age group and 76.0 percent of the 20 to 24 age group. About half of those who stated that they had completed their education and would not continue had only completed Primary school (55.2 percent of the 15 to 19 year olds and 48.1 percent of the 20 to 24 year olds; see Table 4). Only 27.4 percent of the young adults who had completed their education had completed Junior High. This was 33.1 percent of the 15 to 19 year olds and 22.1 percent of the 20 to 24 year olds. About 21.1 percent had completed Senior High, 11.7 percent of the 15 to 19 year olds and 29.8 percent of the 20 to 24 year olds.

The proportion still attending school was about one in four (24.6 percent) among all young adults. This included 38.3 percent of the 15 to 19 year olds and 3.9 percent of the 20 to 24 year olds. Of the 15 to 19 year old young adults who were still attending school about 34.5 percent were in Junior High and 65.5 percent were in Senior High.

The proportion of RRS young adults who had dropped out of school was quite high at about 17.1 percent. The proportion who had never gone to school has been included in this number as the category no schooling. The largest proportion of drop outs occurred at the Elementary level (64.7 percent of all drop outs). The second largest proportion of drop-outs occurred at the Junior High level which accounted for about 20.3 percent of all drop outs (23.7 percent of the 15 to 19 age group drop outs dropped out of Junior high and 16.7 percent of the 20 to 24 age group drop outs dropped out of Junior high).

### ***A School-Leaving Table***

Table 5 is a single-decrement table showing the school-leaving experience of males and females. This is based on the enrollment information in the RRS cross-section, and therefore describes the experience of an hypothetical cohort experiencing those age and sex-specific enrollment rates. This is the equivalent to the common practice of building life tables from cross-sectional death probabilities. The result of our exercise is a concise summary of the implications of the RRS enrollment patterns, were they to persist over an extended period of time.

The table for each sex begins with the sample numbers, and columns 1-3 and 6-8 reflect these numbers. Columns 4-5 and 9-10 abstract from that into proportions. Column 4 for males (9 for females) indicates proportions in school at each single year of age. It is notable that there is a virtual equivalence between the male and female enrollment proportions. This is certainly a departure from past times in Indonesia. And, of course, all these proportions are much higher than only two decades earlier. About 63 percent of both males and females were in school at age 15. Males develop an advantage over females by age 19 (16 versus 7 percent enrolled). There is also an essential equivalence between males and females in the proportions still in school at any age and leaving during the next single year of age. At age 15 for both sexes 64 percent leave school among those who reached age 15 still in school. This departure rate reaches 70-72 percent by age 18, and is well over 90 percent from age 20 onward.

### ***A Model of School Continuation***

To explore whether the no schooling and school drop out outcomes were affected by urban/rural residence, sex and age group (15 to 19 and 20 to 24), a logistic regression analysis was conducted. This is presented in Table 6.

- A. Logit Regression of urban/rural residence, sex and age group (15 to 19 and 20 to 24) as the independent variables on never going to school as the dependent variable, showed that: never attending school was significantly affected by urban/rural residence, sex and age group.

The odds ratio's showed the following:

1. Not going to school occurred 6.7 times as often to a child from a rural area as to a child from an urban area.
  2. Not going to school occurred 2 times as often to a female child as to a male child.
  3. Not going to school occurred 2.5 times as often to a child of the older age group as to a child from the younger group.
- B. Logit Regression of urban/rural residence and age group as the independent variables on drop-out from elementary school as the dependent variable of those who had ever attended primary school, showed that: drop-out from elementary school was

significantly affected by urban/rural residence and age group. Sex did not significantly affect drop-out from elementary school, and thus was dropped from the regression equation.

The odds ratio's showed the following:

1. Drop-out from elementary school for those who had ever attended primary school occurred 2.4 times as often to a child from a rural area than to a child from an urban area.
2. Drop-out from elementary school for those who had ever attended primary school occurred 1.4 times as often to a child of the older age group than to a child from the younger age group.
- C. Logit Regression of urban/rural residence, sex and age group as the independent variables of those who had ever attended Junior High, showed that: drop-out from Junior High was significantly affected by urban/rural residence, sex and age group.

The odds ratio's showed the following

1. Drop-out from Junior High for those who had ever attended Junior High occurred 2.5 times as often to a child from a rural area as to a child from an urban area.
2. Drop-out from Junior High for those who had ever attended Junior High occurred 1.5 times as often to male child as to a female child.

The three Logit Regressions above suggest that the government should pay special attention to the schooling facilities and opportunities in the rural areas because the likelihood of never attending school, drop-out from Elementary school and drop-out from Secondary school is at least 2.4 times that of the rural areas. In fact the likelihood of never attending school of a rural child is 6.7 times the likelihood of an urban child. The problem is even more serious considering that the 1995 inter census showed that the rural population aged 7 to 15 is two times that of the urban population.

Sex preference seems to exist in the opportunity of attending school, where a the likelihood of never attending school of a female child is two times the likelihood of a male child. Sex preference seems also to occur in Junior High where the likelihood of male child to drop out of Junior High is 1.5 times the likelihood of a female child.

### ***Education and Marriage***

About 53.8 percent of the RRS young adults had completed Elementary or less, and 46.2 percent had completed Junior High or more. The completed education of the ever married was lower than that of the never married. Almost 76.3 percent of the ever married had completed Elementary or less and only 23.7 percent had completed Junior High or more, while 46.7 percent of the never married had completed Elementary or less and almost 53.3 percent had completed Junior High or more.

Comparison of the male and female completed education by status of marriage (ever or never married) shows that the completed education of males and females was similar but that the completed education of the ever married male and female young adults was lower than that of the never married male and female young adults. The proportion of males and females who had completed Elementary or less was 53.0 percent of the males and 54.6 percent of the females. This proportions completing Elementary or less for the ever married was much higher though similar among both males and females (77.7 percent for males and 75.9 percent for females).

The proportion completing Junior High or more among the never married was two to almost three times as great as among the ever married (49.1 percent of the male and 60.7 percent of the female never married as compared to 22.3 percent of the male and 24.1 percent of the female ever married). It deserves notice that the never married female proportion completing Junior High or more was almost 1.5 times the never married male proportion. The proportion completing Junior High or more was 60.7 percent of the female never married as compared to 53.3 percent of the male never married. One would expect the reverse, that is, that the proportion of male young adults completing Junior High or higher would be greater than among females. This unexpected finding may be the result of the observed trait that dropout from Junior High occurred 1.5 times as often to boys as to girls. The unanswered question is why this was so (Table 7).

### ***Education and Work***

About 54.4 percent of the RRS young adults were working, while 45.6 percent were not working (Table 8).

The educational status of working young adults can be classified as follows: completed education and not continuing to a higher level of education, dropped out of school and still attending school.

The completed education of young adults follows an inverted U curve, with the peak at Completed Elementary School. The completed education distribution of working young adults also followed an inverted U curve but where the peak is attained at Completed Elementary. The levels of completed education of working young adults was as follows: 14.7 percent had not completed Elementary, 45.4 percent had completed Elementary, 25.8 percent had completed Junior High, 12.4 percent had completed Senior High and 1.7 percent had completed College or University. Similarly did the distribution of completed education of young adults who were not working follow an inverse U curve with the peak achieved at Junior High. The completed education of not working young adults was as follows: 9.4 percent had not completed Elementary, 36.8 percent had completed Elementary, 39.5 percent had completed Junior High, 10.7 percent had completed Senior High and 3.6 percent had completed College or University (Table 8).

Not only those who had finished completing a higher level of education were working, but also a significant proportion of those who were still going to school were already working. About 20.8 percent of the young adults who were still attending school, 65.8 percent of those

had dropped out of school and 66.0 percent of those who had completed their education were working (Table 9).

The proportion of the young adults working and still attending school by school level was as follows: 6.7 percent of those who were still attending Elementary, 22.9 percent of those who were attending Junior High, 17.7 percent of those who were still attending Senior High and 37.1 percent of those who were still attending college and University were working.

Not all of those who had stopped going to school were working. Less than 60 percent of those who have never attended school, drop outs from elementary school, and drop outs of Junior High were working. And, less than 40 percent of the drop outs from Senior High and the drop outs from College/ University were working.

Opportunities for working do not seem to increase with educational level. The higher the level of completed education the smaller the proportion working. The proportion working was about 65 percent among those who had never attended school, 69 percent among those who had completed Elementary, 67 percent among those who had completed Junior High, and 59 percent among those who had completed Senior High, and only 43 percent among those who had completed College/University.

### **Marriage**

The RRS found that about 24 percent of the young adults were ever married, 7.7 percent of male and 41.7 percent of female young adults (Table 10). The proportion married was almost the same for urban and rural males (94.7 percent and 91.3 percent respectively), but more urban female young adults were single (76.0 percent) compared with rural female young adults (50.4 percent). This last suggests that urban female young adults are changing the general custom of getting married as early as possible, and staying single much longer. This may be because they have more opportunities to study and built their careers before marrying. Overall the proportion of ever married urban young adults was only half that of their rural counterparts, 14.4 percent compared with 28.1 percent .

Abdulah (1977) found that education affects age at first marriage. The higher the educational level the later the age at first marriage. He explained that most people who want to attain higher levels of education will delay their marriages until they have finished their education and begun to earn incomes based on their schooling.

Most ever married female young adults are still married (at least 95 percent), but a significant proportion of male young adults (13.3 percent) were separated, widowed or divorced. This large proportion separated, widowed or divorced is exceeded the even bigger proportion separated, widowed or divorced among rural male young adults, 16.3 percent.

*Age at marriage.* In Indonesia norms and values with respect to marriage, although in transition to values more in accordance with current levels of mortality and fertility and the influences of globalization, in some areas and especially rural areas are still favor early marriage and relatively large numbers of children. Jones (1997) found that age at marriage for females had traditionally been very young in most of the countries of the ESCAP region.

Age at first marriage was determined by custom and social awareness, which in Indonesia varies between the provinces and also between rural and urban areas. The provinces differ in their cultural mixture depending on the province's sub-populations' ethnic blending and mix of religions.

Past history and experience when the mortality rate was high have caused early marriage and giving birth to many children to be accepted as norms. Some of the reasons for the acceptance of early marriage and the birth of many children in the past were: the need for many children who were to share the burden of taking care of their parents when these parents had become elderly; the need for children to help support the family as family workers or wage earners contributing towards the family income and welfare. To ensure that a woman would have enough time to bear as many children as possible who would survive the high mortality rates of the past, girls were married at very early ages.

To ensure that most members of a community would marry early, which would guarantee enough time for giving birth to as many children as possible, a high value was placed on the status of being married and a negative value on the status of being single. For example, a girl who is not yet married after a certain age has been attained (for instance age 16) will be called "old maid". Some parents may marry off their daughters at very early ages, 13 years or younger after the girl had reached menarche and if a reasonably well off and acceptable husband can be found, because they want to avoid having an "old maid" daughter in the future. An added advantage to parents of having daughters married early is that they were relieved from the burden of providing for unmarried daughters. McDonald and Abdurahman (1974) reported that West Java was renowned for its child marriages (marriage of girls before age 10). Although child marriages had become rare events by 1974, at that time most girls had married for the first time before age 18 so that they would not become known as an "old maid".

Most parents were not cognizant of the fact that they placed their daughters at grave risk of maternal deaths and serious morbidity by having these daughters marry at such young ages. Because pregnancy and giving birth are natural biological female functions, many parents, husbands and wives are not aware that pregnancy and childbirth to young women carry high maternal mortality and morbidity risks.

To ensure that enough members of a community survive to fulfill the different responsibilities of children with respect to their parents a high value was placed on being married and fertile. The birth of a large number of children proved a person's fertility. In reverse a negative value is placed on infertility. This last causes many newly wedded couples to worry if they do not have a child within one year of the time when the marriage contract was signed.

People living in urban areas are much more receptive to proven scientific findings and outside influences (good and bad) as compared to those living in rural areas. One good outside influence is the scientific finding that: it is not necessary anymore to ensure the survival of children with as many children as possible because mortality has been much reduced, thus reducing the need for a large number of children. Moreover, children now are costly commodities because providing food, clothing, school fees and school related expenses is expensive. The increasing cost of caring for one's children may be an added reason for some parents to force their daughters into early marriage after the daughters had experienced menarche if an eligible man is willing to marry their daughter. The marriage of this daughter relieves these parents from the financial duty of taking further care of her.

In Indonesia the cost of education is high because even elementary school is not tuition free. Many parents in urban areas try to provide their children with as high levels of education as possible hoping that higher levels of education increase their children opportunities for getting better paid jobs with higher social status. It is a pity that knowledge that the cost of having children is expensive comes too late to parents to change the number of children they want, because this understanding comes at a time when the children are already born and entering schools at increasingly high cost. This realization did not occur before or when the children were conceived, carried by the mother and were born because the cost of the pregnancy and the cost of birth is relatively insignificant to the cost of bringing up a child, especially if the couple is not aware that a pregnant woman is at risk of maternal mortality and morbidity and needs health care to give birth to a healthy child and to keep herself healthy.

In urban areas the realization that children are costly and should be kept at a number they could afford comes at an earlier time in the childbearing stage of the married couple. Also more realize that pregnant woman need health care. Furthermore the ability to pay for contraception is much more favorable in the urban area as compared to the rural area. It is thus likely that the average number of children a woman bears and its concomitant early age at marriage differ by province and urban/rural residence.

The RRS data shows that rural young adults tend to marry earlier than urban young adults. Moreover the four provinces differ in their pattern of age at first marriage.

In the following we will see that the marriage law ratified in 1974 has not been well socialized. In 1998, 24 years after the legal age at marriage had been set at 16 years for women and 18 years for men (Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat, Sekneg, 1974), a significant proportion of women were still being married at ages younger than 16. The RRS data show (c.f. Table 11) that in 1998 the proportion of the ever married young adults married at ages 15 years or before was 22.9 percent, 27.0 percent of female and 2.8 percent of male ever married young adults. Early marriage is thus was influenced strongly by gender.

It is also influenced by urban/rural residence. Some 10 percent of ever married urban young adults were married before age 15 as compared to 25.7 percent of rural ever married urban young adults. This is none of the urban but 3.5 percent of rural male ever married young adults.

The early marriage pattern is also different by province. Of ever married young adults the proportion married at age 15 or before was 20.3 percent for Lampung ; 26.3 percent for West Java; 17.1 percent for Central Java and 21.4 percent for East Java. The pattern did not differ much for the male ever married, which was between 2.6 and 3.3 percent, although it was 0 percent for East Java. The female pattern was as follows: of ever married female young adults the proportion married at age 15 or before was 22.5 percent for Lampung; 32.6 percent for West Java, 18.8 percent for Central Java and 25.1 percent for East Java.

*Married more than once.* It seemed that marriages are not very stable (Table 12). Of ever married young adults about 6.8 percent had married more than once. This was 8.4 percent of ever married males and 6.5 percent of ever married females who had married at least two times before they reached the age of 25 years.

The number of marriages experienced is affected by urban rural residence: None of the urban ever married male young adults had married more than once, but 10.5 percent of the rural ever married male young adults had married at least two times. Both urban and rural ever married female young adults experienced more than one marriage, although the proportion married at least twice was

somewhat larger for rural ever married female young adults than for urban ones, respectively 4.9 percent of the urban ever married and 6.9 percent of the rural.

## References

- Abdullah, Koranii. 1977. "Marriage Patterns in Indonesia" Cairo : U.N. A.R.E. .Cairo Demographic Center.
- Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat, .Sekneg. 1974 "Undang-Undang Perkawinan No 1 Tahun 1974" (Marriage Laws No 1 Year 1974 ). CV. Aneka Ilmu. Semarang.
- Central Bureau of Statistics. 1983. "Results of the 1980 Population Census"
- Central Bureau of Statistics. 1992. "Results of the 1990 Population Census"
- Central Bureau of Statistics. 1998. "Statistics of Education. 1998"
- Central Bureau of Statistics. 1999a. "1999 Environmental Statistics of Indonesia"
- Central Bureau of Statistics. 1999b. "1999 Statistical Yearbook of Indonesia"
- Harbison, Frederick K. and Meyers, Charles A. 1964. *Education, Manpower and Economic Growth*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Jones, Gavin W. 1997. "Population Dynamics and their Impact on Adolescents" Asia-Pacific Journal, September.
- Jones, Gavin W. 2002 . "Which Indonesian Women Marry Younger and Why?" in *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* " (Forthcoming).
- McDonald, Peter and Edeng Abdurahman. 1974. "Marriage and Divorce in West Java: an Example of the Effective Use of Marital Histories" LDFEUI.
- Ogawa, Naohiro; Gavin W. Jones and Jeffrey G. Williamson. 1993. *Human Resources in Development along the Asia-Pacific Rim*. Singapore. Oxford University Press.
- Psacharopoulos, George and Maureen Woodhall. 1985. *Education for Development: An analysis of Investment Choices*. New York. The World Bank Publication.
- Republic of Indonesia, 1994. *The Sixth Five Year Development Plan*. Jakarta. Percetakan Negara RI.

**Table 1**  
**Sex Percentage of Young Adults by Marital Status,**  
**Urban-Rural Residence and Age Group**

A. Marital Status by Sex

Marital Status	Sex		Both Sexes
	Male	Female	
Never Married			
ROW%	51.4	36.6	100.0
COL%	29.6	58.2	30.1
Ever Married			
ROW%	16.7	83.3	100.0
COL%	7.7	41.8	24.0

B. Urban-Rural Residence by Sex

Urban-Rural Residence	Sex		Both Sexes
	Male	Female	
Urban			
ROW%	51.4	48.6	100.0
COL%	29.6	30.6	30.1
Rural			
ROW%	52.6	47.4	100.0
COL%	70.3	69.3	69.8
Total			
ROW%	52.2	47.8	100.0
COL%	100.0	100.0	100.0
Count	4,221	3,860	8,081

C. Age Group by Sex

Age Group	Sex		Both Sexes
	Male	Female	
Age 15 to 19			
ROW%	55.3	44.7	100.0
COL%	66.7	56.3	60.1
Age 20 to 24			
ROW%	47.6	52.4	100.0
COL%	36.3	43.7	39.9
Total			
ROW%	52.2	47.8	100.0
COL%	100.0	100.0	100.0
Count	4,220	3,860	8,080

Source: "1998-1999 Survey of Young Adult Reproductive Welfare."  
Demographic Institute, Economic Faculty, University of Indonesia.

**Table 2**  
**Percentage of Young Adults by Sex, Head of Household, Urban-Rural Residence**  
**and Marital Status**

<b>Male</b>									
Urban – Rural Residence									
	Urban			Rural			Urban + Rural		
Head of Household	Marital Status			Marital Status			Marital Status		
	EM	Singl e	EM+ S	EM	Singl e	EM+ S	EM	Singl e	EM+ S
Self	47.8	1.4	3.9	32.7	1.0	3.7	35.8	1.1	3.8
Parent	43.3	85.8	83.5	61.9	90.3	87.8	58.0	88.9	86.5
Relative	1.5	7.1	6.8	4.7	7.9	7.6	4.0	7.6	7.4
Other	7.4	5.7	5.8	0.7	0.8	0.9	2.2	2.4	2.3
<b>TOTAL</b>	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
	67	1184	1251	257	2710	2967	324	3897	4221
<b>Female</b>									
Urban – Rural Residence									
	Urban			Rural			Urban + Rural		
Head of Household	Marital Status			Marital Status			Marital Status		
	EM	Singl e	EM+ S	EM	Singl e	EM+ S	EM	Singl e	EM+ S
Self	53.5	1.8	14.2	49.7	0.1	24.7	50.3	0.8	21.5
Parent	43.7	82.0	72.8	48.5	92.0	70.4	47.7	87.9	71.1
Relative	2.5	9.0	7.4	1.7	6.0	3.9	1.8	7.2	4.9
Other	0.3	7.2	5.6	0.1	1.9	1	2.2	4.1	2.5
<b>TOTAL</b>	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
	284	899	1183	1325	1346	2671	1611	2248	3859
<b>Male + Female</b>									
Urban – Rural Residence									
	Urban			Rural			Urban + Rural		
Head of Household	Marital Status			Marital Status			Marital Status		
	EM	Singl e	EM+ S	EM	Singl e	EM+ S	EM	Singl e	EM+ S
Self	1.6	52.4	8.9	46.9	0.7	13.7	47.9	1.0	12.2
Parent	84.1	43.9	78.3	50.6	90.8	80.0	49.5	88.5	79.2
Relative	7.9	2.0	7.1	2.3	7.3	5.9	2.2	7.5	6.2
Other	6.4	1.7	5.7	0.2	1.3	1.0	0.4	3.0	2.4
<b>TOTAL</b>	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
	351	2083	2434	1584	4060	5644	1935	6146	8080

**Table 3**  
**Percentage of Young Adults by Sex, Completed Education, Age Group**  
**and Urban-Rural Residence**

<b>Male</b>									
	<b>Age Group</b>								
	15 to 19			20 to 24			15 to 24		
	Urb-Rur Residence			Urb-Rur Residence			Urb-Rur Residence		
Completed Education	Urban	Rural	Ur+Rr	Urban	Rural	Ur+Rr	Urban	Rural	Ur+Rr
No School	0.1	0.8	0.6	0.0	1.5	1.0	0.1	1.0	0.8
Elem NC	5.8	12.9	11.0	8.6	14.2	12.4	6.9	13.4	11.4
Elem. Com.	26.6	49.2	42.9	20.7	44.6	37.0	24.4	47.6	40.7
Jun HI Cm	56.4	33.9	40.2	20.5	20.5	20.4	42.4	29.1	33.1
Sen Hi Cm	8.8	3	4.6	37.5	16.7	23.3	19.9	7.9	11.4
Coleg D1+	2.2	0.2	0.8	12.7	2.5	5.8	6.3	1.0	2.6
<b>TOTAL</b>	100	100	100	488	100	100	100	100	100
	762	1923	2686	100	1045	1534	1250	2968	4220

<b>Female</b>									
	<b>Age group</b>								
	15 to 19			20 to 24			15 to 24		
	Urb-Rur Residence			Urb-Rur Residence			Urb-Rur Residence		
Completed Education	Urban	Rural	Ur+Rr	Urban	Rural	Ur+Rr	Urban	Rural	Ur+Rr
No School	0.3	1.1	0.8	0.6	3.4	2.5	0.4	2.1	1.6
Elem NC	3	10.9	8.5	8.1	15.8	13.5	5.2	13.0	10.7
Elem. Com.	28.7	48.1	42.2	23.8	50.6	42.6	26.6	49.3	42.3
Jun HI Cm	54.5	35.7	41.6	21.2	15.9	17.4	40.1	27.0	31.0
Sen Hi Cm	11	4.1	6.2	30.5	12.6	18.0	19.3	7.9	11.4
Coleg D1+	2.5	1	0.8	15.9	1.8	6.0	8.4	0.8	3.1
<b>TOTAL</b>	673	100	100	509	100	100	100	100	100
	100	1498	2173	100	1178	1686	1185	2675	3859

<b>Male + Female</b>									
	<b>Age group</b>								
	15 to 19			20 to 24			15 to 24		
	Urb-Rur Residence			Urb-Rur Residence			Urb-Rur Residence		
Completed Education	Urban	Rural	Ur+Rr	Urban	Rural	Ur+Rr	Urban	Rural	Ur+Rr
No School	0.2	0.9	0.7	0.3	2.5	1.8	0.2	1.5	1.1
Elem NC	4.5	12.1	9.8	8.3	15.0	13.0	6.1	13.2	11.1
Elem. Com.	27.6	48.8	42.5	22.3	47.8	40.0	25.5	48.4	41.5
Jun HI Cm	55.5	34.7	40.8	20.9	18.0	18.8	41.3	28.1	32.1
Sen Hi Cm	9.8	3.4	5.3	33.9	14.6	20.6	19.6	7.9	11.4
Coleg D1+	2.4	0.1	0.8	14.3	2.1	5.9	7.3	0.9	2.8
<b>TOTAL</b>	100	100	100	997	100	100	100	100	100
	1435	3421	4859	100	2223	3220	2435	5643	8079

**Table 4a****Percentage of Young Adults by School Status, Level of Schooling and Age Groups****School Status****STILL ATTENDING**

Level of Schooling	AGE GROUP		
	15 – 19	20 – 24	
Junior High	34.5	0.8	32.4
Senior High	63.8	15.1	60.7
College +	1.7	84.1	6.9
<b>Total</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0
	1863	126	1989

**DROP-OUT OF SCHOOL**

Level of Schooling	AGE GROUP		
	15 – 19	20 – 24	
No Schooling	4.7	9.0	6.7
Primary	64.7	64.7	64.7
Junior High	23.7	16.3	20.3
Senior High	6.4	7.4	6.9
College +	0.4	2.6	1.4
<b>Total</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0
	737	645	1382

**COMPLETED**

Level of Schooling	AGE GROUP		
	15 - 19	20 - 24	
Primary	55.2	48.1	51.5
Junior High	33.1	22.1	27.4
Senior High and above	11.7	29.8	21.1
<b>Total</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0
	2261	2447	4708

**Table 4b****Percentage of Young Adults by School Status and Age Group**

School Status	AGE GROUP		
	15 - 19	20 - 24	
DROP OUT OF SCHOOL	15.2	20.0	17.1
STILL ATTENDING	38.3	3.9	24.6
SCHOOL COMPLETED SCOOING	46.5	76.0	58.3
<b>TOTAL</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0
	4860	3219	8079

**Table 5. The Schooling Experience of Youth, by Age and Sex: Indonesia 1998/1999**

(Based on Weighted Cross-Section Sample and Current Enrollment Information)

age (x)	Male					Female				
	No. of persons at age x to x+n	No. leaving school during age x to x+n	no. of youth who were in school at age x to x+n	Proportion of youth in school at age x to x+n	Proportion entering age x in school and leaving during age x to x+n	No. of persons at age x to x+n	No. leaving school during age x to x+n	no. of youth who were in school at age x to x+n	Proportion of youth in school at age x to x+n	Proportion entering age x in school and leaving during age x to x+n
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
<b>n=1</b>										
15	592	218	374	63.2	36.8	537	196	341	63.5	36.5
16	616	309	307	49.8	50.2	554	273	281	50.7	49.3
17	506	282	224	44.3	55.7	458	243	215	46.9	53.1
18	509	358	151	29.7	70.3	429	308	121	28.2	71.8
19	354	299	55	15.5	84.5	339	315	24	7.1	92.9
20	395	369	26	6.6	93.4	388	369	19	4.9	95.1
21	314	298	16	5.1	94.9	324	306	18	5.6	94.4
22	267	259	8	3.0	97.0	331	323	8	2.4	97.6
23	288	277	11	3.8	96.2	279	271	8	2.9	97.1
24	228	224	4	1.8	98.2	257	250	7	2.7	97.3
<b>n=2</b>										
15-16	1208	527	681	56.4	43.6	1091	469	622	57.0	43.0
17-18	1015	640	375	36.9	63.1	887	551	336	37.9	62.1
19-20	749	668	81	10.8	89.2	727	684	43	5.9	94.1
21-22	581	557	24	56.4	43.6	655	629	26	57.0	43.0
23-24	516	501	15	36.9	63.1	536	521	15	37.9	62.1
<b>n=5</b>										
15-24	4069	2893	1176	28.9	71.1	3896	2854	1042	26.7	73.3
15-19	2577	1466	1111	43.1	56.9	2317	1335	982	42.4	57.6
20-24	1492	1427	65	4.4	95.6	1579	1519	60	3.8	96.2

Source: Baseline Survey Reproduksi Remaja Sejahtera in Indonesia, 1998/1999

Number of male cases = 4,106; number of female case=3,976

**Table 6**  
**Logit Regression for Independent Variables Affecting:**  
**(A) Never Attending School**  
**(B) Drop-out of Elementary School**  
**(C) Drop-out of Lower Secondary School**

**Table 6A. NEVER ATTENDING ANY SCHOOL**

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES (omitted category in parentheses)	COEFFICIENTS	ODD RATIOS
URBAN- RURAL RESIDEN CE (Rural)	1.904	6.71
SEX (Female)	-0.648	0.52
AGE (20- 24)	0.899	2.46
CONSTANT	-6.227	

**Table 6B. DROP OUT FROM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (D1)**

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES (omitted category in parentheses)	COEFFICIENTS	ODD RATIOS
URBAN- RURAL RESIDEN CE (Rural)RE GION	0.88	2.41
AGE (20-24)	0.343	1.41
CONSTANT	-2.889	

**Table 6C. DROP OUT FROM JUNIOR HIGH**

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES (omitted category in parentheses)	COEFFICIENTS	ODD RATIOS
URBAN- RURAL RESIDEN CE (Rural)	0.887	2.46
SEX (Female)	0.427	1.53
CONSTANT	-3.617	

Note: All logit coefficients are highly significant  $\text{pr}(|z|) = 0.000$

**Table 7**  
**Ever/Never Married by Completed Education and Sex**

SEX	COMPLETED EDUCATION	EVER /NEVER MARRIED		Total
		EVER MARRIED	NEVER MARRIED	
MALE				
	ELEMENTARY / LESS	77.7	50.9	53.0
	JUNIOR HIGH / MORE	22.3	49.1	47.0
	SUBTOTAL	100	100	100
FEMALE				
	ELEMENTARY -	75.9	39.3	54.6
	JUNIOR HIGH +	24.1	60.7	45.4
	SUBTOTAL	100	100	100
ALL				
	ELEMENTARY -	76.3	46.7	53.8
	JUNIOR HIGH +	23.7	53.3	46.2
	SUBTOTAL	100	100	100

**Table 8**  
**Completed Education by Work**

COMPLETED LEVEL OF SCHOOLING	WORK		Total	
	Yes	No	Col %	Col %
N. C. ELEMENTARY	14.7	9.4	12.3	
Row %	65.0	35.0	100.0	
ELEMENTARY	45.4	36.8	41.5	
Row %	59.5	40.5	100.0	
JUNIOR HIGH	25.8	39.5	32.0	
Row %	43.8	56.2	100.0	
SENIOR HIGH	12.4	10.7	11.7	
Row %	58.0	42.0	100.0	
COLLEGE/UNIVER S.	1.7	3.6	2.5	
Row %	36.4	63.6	100.0	
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	
Row %	54.4	45.6	100.0	

**Table 9**  
**Proportion Working by Level of Education and Status of Schooling**

LEVEL OF EDUCATION	STATUS OF SCHOOLING		
	Still Attending	Drop Out	Completed Not Continuing
NEVER			65.0
ATT.SCHOOL			
ELEMENTARY	22.9	65.0	68.9
JUNIOR HIGH	17.7	63.5	67.0
SENIOR HIGH	50	37.5	58.6
COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY	32.5	33.3	43.2
TOTAL	20.8	65.8	66.0

<b>TABLE 10A: PROPORTION OF EVER MARRIED YOUNG ADULTS BY MARITAL STATUS, SEX AND URBAN/RURAL RESIDENCE</b>									
Marital Status	Male			Female			Total		
	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural	Total
Married	98.5	83.7	86.7	96.1	95.4	95.6	96.6	93.5	94.1
S/D/W	1.5	16.3	13.3	3.9	4.6	4.4	3.4	6.5	5.9
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Count	281	43	324	1541	71	1612	1822	114	1936

<b>TABLE 10B: PROPORTION OF YOUNG ADULTS BY EVER MARITAL STATE, SEX AND URBAN/RURAL RESIDENCE</b>									
Ever Marital State	Male			Female			Total		
	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural	Total
Ever Married	5.3	8.7	7.7	24.0	49.6	41.7	14.4	28.1	23.9
Single	94.7	91.3	92.3	76.0	50.4	58.3	85.6	71.9	76.1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Count	1249	2970	4221	1183	2676	3859	2432	5646	8080

**TABLE 11A: PROPORTION OF EVER MARRIED BY  
SEX AND AGE OF FIRST MARRIAGE MARRIED**

AGE AT FIRST MARRIAGE	Sex		Total
	Male	Female	
15 OR LESS	2.8	27.0	22.9
16 OR MORE	97.2	73.0	77.1
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0
% of Total Count	16.8	83.2	1917

**TABLE 11B: PROPORTION OF EVER MARRIED BY SEX  
AGE OF FIRST MARRIAGE AND URBAN/RURAL  
RESIDENCE**

URBAN		Sex		Total
AGE AT FIRST MARRIAGE	Male	Female		
15 OR LESS	0.0	12.7		10.3
16 OR MORE	100	87.3		89.7
TOTAL	100	100		100
% of Total Count	18.9	81.1		350

RURAL		Sex		Total
AGE AT FIRST MARRIAGE	Male	Female		
15 OR LESS	3.5	30.1		25.7
16 OR MORE	96.5	69.9		74.3
TOTAL	100	100		100
% of Total Count	16.3	83.7		1567

**TABLE 11C: PROPORTION OF EVER MARRIED BY SEX  
AGE OF FIRST MARRIAGE AND PROVINCE**

LAMPUNG		Sex		
AGE AT FIRST MARRIAGE	Male	Female	Total	
15 OR LESS	2.9	22.5	20.3	
16 OR MORE	97.1	77.5	79.7	
TOTAL	100	100	100	
	% of	11.1	88.9	100
	Total			
	Count			315

WEST JAVA		Sex		
AGE AT FIRST MARRIAGE	Male	Female	Total	
15 OR LESS	3.3	32.6	26.3	
16 OR MORE	96.7	67.4	73.7	
TOTAL	100	100	100	
	% of	21.	78.5	100
	Total			
	Count			978

CENTRAL JAVA		Sex		
AGE AT FIRST MARRIAGE	Male	Female	Total	
15 OR LESS	2.6	18.8	17.1	
16 OR MORE	97.4	81.2	82.9	
TOTAL	100	100	100	
		10.7	89.3	100
				363

EAST JAVA		Sex		
AGE AT FIRST MARRIAGE	Male	Female	Total	
15 OR LESS		25.1	21.4	
16 OR MORE	100	74.9	78.6	
TOTAL	100	100	100	
		14.9	85.1	100
				262

**TABLE12A MARRIED MORE THAN ONCE**

	Yes	No	Total
%	6.8	93.2	100.0
Count	131	1805	1936

**TABLE 12B: MARRIED MORE THAN ONCE  
BY SEX**

SEX	Yes	No	Total
Male	8.4	91.6	100.0
Count			323
Female	6.5	93.5	100.0
Count			1611

**TABLE 12C MARRIED MORE THAN ONCE BY  
SEX AND URBAN/RURAL**

SEX	URBAN/RURAL	Yes	No	Total
Male	Urban	0.0	100.0	100.0
	Count	0	66	66
Male	Rural	10.5	89.5	100.0
	Count			257
Female	Urban	4.2	95.8	100.0
	Count			285
Female	Rural	6.9	93.1	100.0
	Count			1328