Increasingly urban Indonesian fathers are taking on many of the domestic tasks that were regarded as women’s work by previous generations. Young middle class fathers are seen pushing their baby’s stroller or carrying their baby in front-packs at shopping malls. Lower class families stay closer to home, but even there the sight of a father looking after babies and young children is common though both fathers and mothers encounter difficulties juggling work schedules, so childcare may often mean that grandparents, including grandfathers, care for children. But we cannot casually observe the share of domestic tasks performed by fathers inside their homes. Using data from the 2010 Indonesian Gender and Reproductive Health Survey conducted in Jakarta, West Java, West Nusa Tenggara and South Sulawesi, we asked Year 6 (n=1,722) and Year 12 (n=6,555) students who does what in the household. This includes all types of domestic tasks including paying electricity bills and fixing the roof. We combined this survey data with our previous content analysis of gender depiction in primary and secondary school textbooks (Utomo and McDonald, 2011) then mapped and contrasted the prevailing parental gender role socialisation in the home with attitudes to gender roles among Year 6 and Year 12 respondents.

The purpose of this policy brief is to examine how gender role socialization at home and through formal schooling influences the degree of egalitarian attitudes among students. The attitude maps of gender roles among children and an understanding how these attitudes are shaped are useful for policy makers seeking to design effective strategies to achieve gender equity.
The Indonesian Gender Norms: the State, Home and School

Regardless of the progressive gender laws, policies and programs, and dramatic changes in assigning female ministers by Presidents Soesilo Bambang Yudhoyono – SBY (Kompas, 2009) and Joko Widodo, the Indonesian education system still uses school textbooks that strongly promote gender stereotyping and the male breadwinner model. Women and the girl child are depicted to be doing all the domestic work like cleaning the house, cooking, washing, looking after the children and caring for the sick. Rarely are women pictured as working outside the home not to mention having prestigious work in a non-stereotypical women’s job like scientist, engineer or manager. Men and boys sometimes are depicted doing housework, but these are chores outside the house for example cleaning the garden, washing cars and bikes or participating in an organized neighbourhood cleanup (kerja bakti). Most striking is how school textbooks depict men as the sole financial provider for the family, though in reality more and more women work outside the home.

In their homes, most Indonesians parents are frequently not aware that they are socialising stereotypical gender roles and gender norms to their children. The home also may not provide good gender role models. Instead, they tend to demonstrate the male breadwinner model and identify women solely as domestic managers and care givers to the family and extended family. The girl child is trained to conform to such feminine gender roles in their school and play. She is expected to play with dolls and soft toys, dress in pink and laces and engage with toys related to “house play” (main rumah-rumahan) including toy kitchen utensils. These toys and role plays reinforce skills in the domestic sphere as compared to the public sphere. Girls are also taught to “nrimo”, that is, to accept their fate whatever it may be (Utomo, 2005: 70).

Boys on the other hand start their training early using toys that are linked to stereotypical masculine pursuits such as cars; bikes; weapons and army; jungle and animal kingdom; kites; and specific sports activities like football. From an early age, the girl child is trained to stay close and play around the house. Boys can explore the world outside the house while playing with friends in sport and warring games (main perang-perangan) as well as riding bikes.

To create a society that values gender equity and rights, the understanding of progressive gender roles must start very early in the home and education system including religious teaching. The state can play a significant role by enforcing that schools provide gender progressive curricula, textbooks and teachers who promote gender equity.

The promotion of progressive gender roles aims to foster gender equity. This means that both women and men would share opportunities and responsibilities equitably in both domestic duties and child rearing and in education and work. An equitable household division of work makes it easier to foster equal rights to leadership in bureaucracy, society, religious activities and politics. Advocates of gender equity call for women and men to be treated equally in all aspects of life. Progressive gender roles also mean that women and girls are not treated as subordinates to men in any way and not abused as sexual objects.

The root cause of gender role construction in the family is the widespread call by religious and social leaders to preserve “traditions and
cultural values”. Contrary to the common belief that tradition should be preserved, a progressive agenda would call for tradition to be interrogated for signs of gender inequity, and where found such roles and values should be challenged. The state regulates the education system and the schools that reinforce gender socialisation of children. Thus the state must reform the curriculum to promote gender equity through laws and regulations. In addition, the state has the responsibility to undertake legal reform to promote gender equity.

The two important agents that form the gender role attitudes of children are family and schools-education system. The authors believe that gender equity can be achieved through an understanding that women and men deserve the same opportunities, responsibilities and rights. This needs to be taught from the beginning of primary school, but even before school, young children need to see gender-equitable behaviour in their own homes.

Children’s impressions of roles of men and women are formed early in life by observing the gendered division of activities and behaviour within their own home (Evertsson 2006). The aim of this policy brief is to examine how Indonesian gender roles are socialized at home and through formal schooling and how this influences the degree of egalitarian attitudes among students.

**The Analysis**

The analysis in this policy brief refers only to students whose parents were both alive at the time of the survey. The student questionnaire from the 2010 Indonesian Gender and Reproductive Health Survey includes a series of questions on students’ attitudes to gender roles and on division of domestic duties in their home. We begin our analysis by using descriptive statistics to examine the prevailing patterns of gender role socialisation in the students’ families. Students were given a list containing 12 tasks and were asked whether their father or mother performed each of the specified tasks.

Based on the response to these series of statements, each respondent was then assigned a parental role score. The higher the score, the more egalitarian is the socialisation environment in the home. An egalitarian home environment is for example when the student reports that the father performs non-conventional tasks for males such as cooking, looking after children, or looking after sick family members. The parental role score ranges from 0 to 13.

Once we map the prevailing patterns of parental allocation of domestic tasks, we tabulate the students’ responses to a series of questions aimed to reflect their own attitudes to gender roles. The responses are agree, disagree, and don’t know. Here, we use 17 items from 19 statements listed to generate a gender role attitudes score for each respondent. A higher score reflects a more egalitarian outlook. The attitudes to gender role score has a possible range from -17 to 17.

**Results**

**Gender Role Attitudes of Year 6 and Year 12 Students**

Table 1 shows the percentage of students agreeing to the 19 statements on gender roles and gender bias. Seventeen of these statements were intended to measure the students’ perceptions of and attitudes to gender roles and were subsequently used to construct attitudes to gender role scores for each respondent. Two of the statements measure the respondents’ perceptions of gender bias in school textbooks.
### Table 1. Percentage of respondents agreeing to selected statements by sex and school year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Year 6 (%)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Year 12 (%)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Ref.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Ref.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A father's job is to earn money for the family, and a mother's job is to</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>76.5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>run the household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the field of technology, men are better than women</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>30.8&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>29.4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the field of the arts, women are better than men</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>58.0&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>28.6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men should also participate in doing housework (like cooking and cleaning)</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>46.8&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>71.6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my opinion, having a male or a female principal makes no difference</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>76.6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In difficult financial situations, boys are prioritised over girls to</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>10.0&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>16.4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>receive further education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In employment, more attractive women get better chances than those who</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>8.1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are clever</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesians prefer to work with a male boss than a female boss</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>17.4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>22.3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The world will be a better place when women become leaders</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>16.7&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A wife does not need to work if her husband is working</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>34.8&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>21.7&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men should also be good in caring for their children</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>96.2&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious leaders must be males</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>29.7&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>30.6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leaders can include women</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>78.4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>80.1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Head of Student Council must be a boy</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>20.8&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>18.9&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A housewife should not need the permission of her husband if she wants</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>11.9&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to go out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A housewife should not need the permission of her husband if she wants</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>18.4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>8.8&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to do a women's health check up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A housewife should not need the permission of her husband if she wants</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>9.2&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.8&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to purchase furniture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks in Indonesia talk more about boys than girls*</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>13.8&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>8.3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks in Indonesia contain more pictures of boys than girls*</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>10.9&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>10.7&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: * Statement not used to construct attitudes to gender role scores; a: p<0.001; b: p<0.01; c: p<0.05
Source: The 2010 Indonesian Gender and Reproductive Health Survey

Four interesting patterns emerged from the table. The first one is that at both levels of schooling, girls are more egalitarian than boys in their responses. For example, 41 per cent of the Year 6 and 35 per cent of the Year 12 boys agreed that the head of the student council must be a boy. The corresponding percentages for girls were 21 per cent and 19 per cent respectively. More than half of boys while only a third of girls agreed that “In the field of technology, men are better than women” and that “Religious leaders must be males”. Boys were twice as likely as girls to agree to “Indonesians prefer to work with a male boss than a female boss”. And girls were twice as likely as boys to agree that “The world will be a better place when women become leaders”. Further examination of the data also supported this finding as the mean of the attitudes of gender role score is found to be higher for girls compared to boys.

Second, the Year 12 students are relatively more egalitarian in their outlook than the Year 6 group. This could be explained by the assumption that as they are more aware of alternatives to the traditional stereotypes, older students tend to be less ‘naive’ in their gender
roles outlook, for example, as indicated in responses to “Men should also be good in caring for their children” and “Men should also participate in doing housework”. Third, the male breadwinner model remains supported by the majority of the respondents. Here, the support for married women’s employment is highest among Year 12 female students, in contrast to almost half of the Year 6 male respondents and Year 12 male respondents. Fourth, the majority of the respondents do not feel that there is a bias in terms of the frequency of representation of either sex in textbook discussions and pictures even though our content analysis of the primary and secondary school textbooks strongly revealed the opposite: that both description and pictures of the school textbooks demonstrate traditional gender roles.

**Egalitarian Index: Predictors of Attitudes to Gender Roles**

In our analysis, we construct an egalitarian index as a summary measure of each respondent’s attitude to gender roles based on his or her responses to 17 of the statements listed in Table 1. The range of the egalitarian index is from -17 to +17, the higher the score, the more egalitarian are the respondent’s attitudes to gender roles. Figure 1 shows the histograms of scores for both Year 6 and Year 12 students. The histograms indicate that attitudes to gender roles vary greatly from one student to another. Some students were very ‘traditional’ in their responses (having a score in the minus range), while other students scored relatively highly, hence being more egalitarian in their responses.

**Figure 1. Distribution of egalitarian index among Year 6 and Year 12 students**

Further analysis of the egalitarian index score by gender and type of school across provinces for Year 6 and Year 12 was conducted. Generally, for Year 6 and 12, the differences in egalitarian scores across provinces were insignificant for both males and females, except for Jakarta and West Java. The mean (SD) egalitarian index score for both boys and girls in Jakarta was higher compared to those in West Java. In addition, girls in West Nusa Tenggara had a lower egalitarian index than those in Jakarta. The results indicate that students in Jakarta are more egalitarian than those in West Java and West Nusa Tenggara.
The egalitarian indexes of students in public schools were higher than those of students in Islamic Religious School. However, for both Year 6 and Year 12 students, the mean (SD) egalitarian scores for boys in public and Islamic school were lower than those for girls in both type of schools.

Figure 2. Distribution of domestic tasks within household-Year 6

![Figure 2](source: The 2010 Indonesian Gender and Reproductive Health Survey)

Figure 3. Distribution of domestic tasks within household-Year 12

![Figure 3](source: The 2010 Indonesian Gender and Reproductive Health Survey)
**Who Does What in Your home? Mother’s and Father’s Gender Roles**

Figure 2 (Year 6) and Figure 3 (Year 12) depict the prevailing parental gender roles in the respondents’ homes. The left figure indicates separate roles for each parent while the right figure shows the percentage of each task that mothers and fathers shared. The findings for the tasks that mothers and fathers did separately (the left figures) indicate a notable presence of gender segregation of household responsibilities embedded within the male breadwinner ideals.

It appears that the male breadwinner model remains a strong force in gender role socialisation for both Year 6 and Year 12 students. The proportion of mothers in paid employment is higher for the Year 12 compared to Year 6, perhaps due to the possibility that mothers of the Year 12 respondents had older children and were less likely to be constrained by child caring responsibilities.

Overall, the parental sharing of household responsibilities remains somewhat conventional. While the fathers and mothers tend to maintain family relations together, the students’ reports on who does the rest of the tasks are reflective of the stereotypical gender division of household labour.

Fathers are more likely than mothers to do tasks such as working in paid employment, fixing broken tiles, paying for bills, cleaning the garden, and participating in neighbourhood meetings. In contrast, mothers are more likely than fathers to do tasks such as looking after sick family members, cleaning the house, shopping for daily needs, maintaining neighbourhood relations and cooking. Among all the listed activities, cooking is the activity that a father is least likely to perform. On the other hand, fixing broken roof tiles is the activity that a mother is least likely to perform.

Initial comparisons of the Year 6 and Year 12 responses seem to suggest that the parents of the Year 12 students are more ‘egalitarian’.

For example, 43 per cent of the Year 12 sample reported that their fathers looked after the children in contrast to only 22 per cent of the Year 6 sample. However, it may be that 17 year olds are more perceptive of what is going on around them at home than the younger Year 6 students.

The right figures (Figure 2b (Year 6) and Figure 3b (Year 12)) shows the percentages of each task that both parents shared. Parents of Year 6 students shared the following tasks together: developing neighbor relationships, developing family relationships, caring when someone is sick, looking after children and working to earn a living were the top five tasks that parents shared. In contrast, cooking, shopping (traditional roles of mothers), fixing broken roof tiles (traditional role of fathers) were less likely to be a shared tasks between parents. The exact pattern of the top five parents’ tasks sharing found in Year 6 was also found among Year 12 students, except the degree of parents’ tasks sharing is higher among Year 12 students.

**Regression results**

Using Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) and logistic regression analyses, we predict egalitarian attitudes among students using three dependent variables: egalitarian attitude scores; private sphere attitude - *Men should also participate in doing housework*; and public sphere attitude - *Community leaders can include women*. The most important result for both Year 6 and Year 12 students was that the child’s egalitarian attitudes score increased as the number of tasks in which both parents cooperated increased. In other words, children’s attitudes were heavily influenced by what they observed at home. Female students were more egalitarian than male students and the same also applied for students from general schools compared to Islamic Religious Schools. Students from Jakarta as expected are more egalitarian compared to students from
other provinces. There is no difference in egalitarian outlook between students from top ranking schools (Sekolah Unggulan) compared to average performing schools.

Discussion and Policy Input

Our findings suggest that both the dominant discourse of gender roles in school textbooks and the prevailing family environment where school students are raised reflect the male breadwinner ideals. Controlling for school types, province, sex, and religion in a multivariate framework, the family home environment is a significant predictor of students’ degrees of egalitarian outlook. In particular, we found that the reported number of domestic tasks shared by father and mother was positively associated with a child’s egalitarian outlook. Such results are supportive of the proposition that while Indonesian women are making progress in their public participation, they continue to face the less malleable traditional division of labour within the family. Such findings, coupled with the results indicating divergent attitudes to gender roles among the boys and girls in the sample, are suggestive of future conflicts in gender relations. Policies designed to promote egalitarianism among school students should strive to promote changes in gender role socialisation in the home, and investigate ways to particularly promote gender equity among boys and within the religious school curriculum.

In general students’ attitudes to gender roles are still demonstrating traditional gender roles. Female students are more egalitarian than male students in both Year 6 and Year 12 and Year 12 students as expected hold more egalitarian attitudes than Year 6 students. In the family environment, students reported that their parents mainly follow the traditional gender division of labour, though it is less so for Year 12 students’ families.

In the homes, fathers are more likely than mothers to do tasks such as working in paid employment, fixing broken tiles, paying bills, cleaning the garden, and participating in neighbourhood meetings. In contrast, mothers are more likely than fathers to do tasks such as looking after sick family members, cleaning the house, shopping for daily needs, maintaining neighbourhood relations and cooking. The least likely household chores that mothers and fathers do is fixing broken tiles and cooking respectively. This is strongly consistent with the traditional gender depiction found in the textbooks analysis.

The household tasks most likely to be shared by mother and father include: maintaining neighbourhood and family relations; caring of the sick; working to earn a living; looking after children; and paying household bills, though participation of shared parent’s domestic task is higher for Year 12 compared to Year 6. These roles can be labelled as egalitarian gender roles in the students’ home environment. The most important finding, however was that the more egalitarian were the gender roles performed by parents, the more likely it was for the students to have egalitarian gender values.

In short, the survey results showed that female students and Year 12 students are more likely to have an egalitarian gender outlook compared to male and Year 6 students. The same pattern is also observed for general schools compared to Islamic Religious Schools and for Jakarta and West Java compared to West Nusa Tenggara and South Sulawesi.

The study concludes that both the school environment as an extension of the state and
the home environment where children spend the majority of their time continue to reflect powerful male breadwinner ideals.
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Description of the Study:
Integrating Gender and Reproductive Health Issues in the Indonesian National School Curricula.

In the first stage of this two-stage study, content analysis of more than 300 primary and secondary school textbooks was undertaken on issues relating to reproductive and sexual health education and gender. The second stage was a school-based survey conducted in Jakarta, West Java, West Nusa Tenggara and South Sulawesi.

For the content analysis the team analysed the National Curriculum to see if reproductive health was specifically mentioned and searched for relevant words that indicating content relevant to reproductive health issues. After identifying in grades, subjects and semesters where reproductive and sexual health information is given, textbooks based on the curriculum from various publishers were selected. School textbooks analysed included: Sport and Healthy Living (*PENJASKES*); Science and Biology; Social Sciences and Islamic Religion.

An evaluation module was developed for the analysis of 13 fields of reproductive and sexual health. These were:

- Genital hygiene; STDs; HIV and AIDS; female reproductive problems; male reproductive health problems; pregnancy and delivery; human growth and development; reproductive technology; social aspects of reproductive health; moving towards liberal culture and its consequences; family institution; violence and sexual crimes and religious aspects of reproductive health. The coverage of each topic and the accuracy of the materials provided in the textbook were evaluated by the team.

A content analysis was also performed using a gender content analysis. Areas evaluated included: public and domestic spheres; education and gender; social leadership roles; arts; technology; roles in environmental sustainability; violence and photos or pictures used in the textbooks. All fields were evaluated according to whether the material was male or female dominated; mostly male or female content; and degree of equality between males and females.

Gender analysis was conducted by evaluating the text and pictures used in Sport and Healthy Living (*PENJASKES*); Science and Biology; Social Sciences and Islamic Religion, Bahasa Indonesia and English Language school textbooks for year 1, 6, 9 and 12.

In the second stage, a survey of Year 6 (N=1837) and Year 12 students (N=6555), teachers (N=521) and school principals (N=59) in Jakarta, West Java, West Nusa Tenggara and South Sulawesi was conducted (N=8972) to evaluate respondents’ understanding regarding reproductive health and gender. The sampling of schools was performed in several stages. First, in every province two districts were selected, one urban and one rural. Two public schools and two religious schools were selected in each selected district that represented the best school and a medium performing school. Thus in every province, 16 schools were selected. In the selected schools, all students in Years 6 and 12 participated in the survey and filled in the self administered questionnaire in class. The research team gave instructions and stayed in class so that students may ask questions if they don’t understand. Following the survey, qualitative in depth interviews were conducted among school teachers and principals, local religious leaders and policy makers. A series of policy briefs will be developed from this study. The research team was led by Dr. Iwu Dwisetyani Utomo and Prof. Peter McDonald.
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