

EXPLORING YOUTH LEADERSHIP AND CIVIC ENGAGEMENT IN *WAHANA VISI*
FORUM ANAK DA'BAJAY (WAHANA VISI'S DA'BAJAY CHILDREN FORUM) IN
SURABAYA, INDONESIA

by

Dian Mitrayani

A Dissertation Submitted in
Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in Urban Education

at

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

August 2020

ABSTRACT

EXPLORING YOUTH LEADERSHIP AND CIVIC ENGAGEMENT IN *WAHANA VISI FORUM ANAK DA'BAJAY* (WAHANA VISI'S DA'BAJAY CHILDREN FORUM) IN SURABAYA, INDONESIA

by

Dian Mitrayani

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 2020

Under the Supervision of Professors Rajeswari Swaminathan and Aaron Schultz

This dissertation research interprets the result of a qualitative, single case study of youth participation and leadership of disadvantaged youth leaders inside *Wahana Visi Forum Anak da'Bajay* (Wahana Visi's da'Bajay Children Forum), a youth organization with children's rights orientation located in Surabaya, Indonesia. The purpose of this study is to learn how urban youth in FAB, a youth organization with a children's rights orientation, engage in civil society and exercise leadership at local and citywide levels. Drawing on youth participation, leadership theories, and the Indonesian context, the findings revealed that the youth leaders defined and practiced their own version of youth leadership. The youth leaders defined youth leadership as an act of leading oneself, then extending towards leading others using positive leadership. They also had bipolar view of leadership, where on one end, there was a belief that every youth could be a leader, while on the other end, a leader was seen as someone with a leadership title or a person authorized as leader. The youth leaders perceived their leadership practice as a form of youth identity where they relied on direct mentoring, personal example, and opening up the Forum to multiple perspectives learning as their practice strategies. The youth leaders also had different leadership challenges when they practiced leadership inside the Forum and in the community.

Specific for young women leaders, there were unique leadership experiences and challenges due to the intersection between leadership practice and gender identities/role.

© Copyright by Dian Mitrayani, 2020
All Rights Reserved

To my life foundation:
my parents & siblings,
my life partner,
and my daughter,

Thank you for your love and support in this journey.

We did it!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	II
DEDICATION.....	V
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	VIII
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	IX
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Problem Statement.....	3
Research Questions.....	7
Significance of Study.....	8
CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW	10
Theme 1: Youth Participation.....	10
Theme Synthesis.....	17
Theme 2: Leadership.....	18
Youth Leadership Theories.....	27
Theme Synthesis.....	31
Theme 3: The Indonesian Context.....	35
Youth Participation as Children’s Rights in Indonesia.....	38
Theme Synthesis.....	51
Leadership Practices in Indonesia.....	53
Theme synthesis.....	56
Conclusions of the Literature Review.....	57
Limitation of Existing Literature	61
Contribution of This Study	63
CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY	66
Research Purpose and Questions	66
Critical Youth Studies Framework	66
Methodological Approach	68
Case Study Method.....	68
Data Collection Strategies.....	70
Interview	74
Qualitative documents	75
Data Analysis Strategies	76
Trustworthiness.....	77
Limitations	78

CHAPTER 4. THE DEFINITION OF FAB YOUTH LEADERS AND YOUTH LEADERSHIP	80
What is a Youth Leader: An Overview.....	80
Leadership as Leading Oneself and Extending Towards Leading Others Using Positive Leadership.....	81
Understanding the Bipolarity of Youth Leadership: Everybody Can Be a Leader Vs. Having a Leadership Title or a Person Authorized as Leader.....	87
Influencing Factors Supported Youth Leadership Development in FAB.....	90
CHAPTER 5. PRACTICING YOUTH LEADERSHIP AND NEGOTIATING POWER.....	95
Leadership Practice as a Form of Youth Identity	95
The Impact of Leadership Practice as a Youth Identity Outside FAB	111
Leadership Practice as a Gender Identity.....	117
CHAPTER 6. DISCUSSION.....	131
Introduction.....	131
Reviews of Findings	133
Conclusion	139
Implication of Study	141
Implications of Research.....	141
Implications for Practice.....	143
Future Research	145
REFERENCES	147
APPENDICES	164
Appendix A: Interview Protocol for FAB Youth Leader	164
Appendix B: Interview Protocol for <i>Wahana Visi</i> Staff.....	166
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	168

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CRC	The United Nations Convention of the Rights of the Child
CYS	Critical Youth Studies
FAB	<i>Forum Anak da'Bajay's</i> (da'Bajay Children Forum)
Gerwani	<i>Gerakan Wanita Indonesia</i> (Indonesian Women's Movement)
PKI	<i>Partai Komunis Indonesia</i> (Communist Party of Indonesia)
RC	Registered Child
RT	<i>Rukun Tetangga</i> (Neighborhood Association, a local government agencies in Indonesia)
RW	<i>Rukun Warga</i> (Community Association, a local government agencies in Indonesia)
WVI	<i>Wahana Visi Indonesia</i>

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my parents who have been very supportive throughout my long journey in academia. They are the inspiration of hard work, persistence, care, and love, in addition to being the embodiment of lifelong learners. I would like to thank my husband who gives his unconditional love, support, and encouragement. You are an amazing partner in life and I am very blessed to have you in my life. I also would like to thank my daughter, who is my inspiration and motivation to always be the best version of myself. You are a leader and I hope I can always inspire you in life. I would like to thank my parents-in-law, whose love and support help me navigate both my academia and life journey.

I would like to thank *Forum Anak da'Bajay* (FAB) youth leaders, mentors, and staffs who welcomed me to the Forum with open arms. Specifically to FAB youth leaders, I deeply respect and very grateful for your kindness in allowing me to learn and amplify your voices. You are strong and amazing young people who show me the power of Indonesian youth. You show me the bright future that Indonesia can have when it taps into the power of young people. I am very lucky to have you all as my friends.

I would like to thank my amazing dissertator co-advisors, Dr. Raji Swaminathan and Dr. Aaron Schutz. To Dr. Raji Swaminathan, thank you for your mentorship and support both in my academia and personal life journey. Everything you shared about being an immigrant woman and a scholar has influenced me and I am very grateful for this life lesson. To Dr. Aaron Schutz, thank you for being a powerful mentor who always pushes, questions, and challenges me intellectually. Your guidance and support has made me stronger in academic journey.

To members of my dissertation committee, Dr. Marie Sandy and Dr. Cynthia Taines, Dr. Marie Sandy, thank you for being a wonderful professor who has guided me since my first year

in UWM. Dr. Cynthia Taines, your guidance started in Northern Illinois University. You have been a great mentor, advisor, and I am very grateful to have you in my Ph.D. journey.

I would like to thank all my friends in Milwaukee, Evanston, and DeKalb, you are all amazing friends! Thank you to Don, the Boss in Canada, who without him I will not be here. I am forever grateful for your amazing support. Thank you as well to Dr. Razia Azen, who gave me support and trust through my assistantship in Consulting Office of Research and Evaluation (CORE). Finally, thank you very much to all my CORE friends, who share the up and down of Ph.D. life in our little office. I am thankful for all the friendship and support.

Finally, I am finishing this dissertation in the midst of COVID-19 pandemic. Without everyone's support and God's grace, I will not be able to finish this. Thank you! *Terima Kasih!*

Chapter I. Introduction

“Young people matter. They matter because an unprecedented 1.8 billion youth are alive today, and because they are the shapers and leaders of our global future. They matter because they have inherent human rights that must be fulfilled. Yet, in a world of adult concerns, young people are often overlooked. This tendency cries out for urgent correction, because it imperils youth as well as economies and societies at large”

The power of 1.8 billion: adolescents, youth and the transformation of the future
UNFPA State of the World Population 2014
(Das Gupta et al., 2014)

Active participation and leadership of young people in civic society play extensive key roles in global development and democracy. The sheer power of young people comes from its number. The numbers of people of ages between 10 and 24 make up approximately one quarter of world population, with India, China, Indonesia, the United States, and Pakistan the top five countries with the highest population of young people (Das Gupta et al., 2014). The topics of young people “participation” and “leadership” position this young generation as important human resources and agents for social change, economic growth, and technological innovation. In most scenarios, young people are usually discussed in the context of a future orientation. Young people are seen as the future of family, community, and nation, including, being the carrier of tradition and culture to the next generation. This future oriented perspective often discredits the role and impact of young people in present days. The portrayal of young people also often focuses on the negative aspect such as gangs, school dropout, or drug and alcohol abuse (Golombek, 2002). The topics of young people participation and leadership pulls the discussion back into the present day and focuses on the contribution and positive influence that they make in their communities.

As the fourth most populous country in the world, Indonesia has a large population of young urbanites. Half of approximately 249 million Indonesians live in urban areas and more

than a third of that population is under 18 years old (UNICEF, 2014). The Indonesian government defines a youth in Law no. 40 of 2009 as a person between the ages of 16 to 30 years old. This definition overlaps with the definition of children, as anyone from birth to the age of 18 years old, as stated in Law no. 23 of 2002 on Child Protection. For this study, the terminology of young people and youth will be used interchangeably. As a new democratic country, there is an enormous public support for democracy in Indonesia, especially through civil society groups (Freedman & Tiburzi, 2012). Strong civil society serves as an important contributor in sustaining democracy for the new democratic Country (Antlov, Brinkerhoff, & Rapp, 2010). Civil society in a new democracy connects the relationship between state and civil society through participation, representation, and accountability (Carothers & Ottaway, 2000). The large population of youth, often referred to as a demographic bonus, represents opportunity and an asset of development for the prosperity of a country through economic, social, and political contribution (Goodwin & Martam, 2014). The power of Indonesian youth is important to be harness through civic participation in order to support the continuation of democracy in Indonesia. Indonesia's youth are seen as the key actors and partners in building peace, eradicating poverty, transforming to sustainable development, and conducting intercultural dialogue through participation in outreach, volunteerism and bureaucracy (UNESCO, 2013). However, when the basic needs of the youth population are not met, especially in the areas of education and employment, peace, progress, and prosperity will be compromised (Goodwin & Martam, 2014).

The topic of youth participation connects closely with the topic of youth leadership. "Youth leadership" often appears through a youth-led participation format, where youth play the main role in leading participation process and adult play the supportive role or partner role.

Youth leadership can also appear as one of the goals of youth participation process, where youth gain leadership skills and experience through their participation. The result of youth participation and leadership can create a spectrum that range between tokenism to genuine experience. This study is an in-depth, qualitative analysis of civic participation and leadership of youth leaders with disadvantages inside a youth organization with children's rights orientation that located in an urban setting in Indonesia. This study will explore the experience of *Forum Anak da'Bajay's* or da'Bajay Children's Forum ("FAB") young adults in exercising participation and leadership both inside their youth organization and in the adult oriented world.

Problem Statement

Historically young people in Indonesia have always played important roles. Young people were the fighters during wars for independence, pioneers in developing indigenous youth organizations during colonial and early independence era, and social movers towards political reformation in the beginning of 21st century (Husni, 1998; Parker & Nilan, 2013). Despite these historical contributions, present day Indonesian youth continually experience negative stereotype portrayal of young people. They are perceived to be influenced by the Western world by actively participating in consumerism, secularism, and sexualization (Parker & Nilan, 2013). There is also a negative stigma of Indonesian youth that stemmed from the usage of violence as self-expression such as rioting during protest, despite the riot being started by paid political actors, not young people, to create public chaos (Innovations in Civic Participation, 2008). The literature of young people often explores youth from the deficiency and disengagement perspectives rather than highlighting youth as resources (Checkoway, Allison, & Montoya, 2005). This negative lens in understanding youth participation and leadership opens up an opportunity to explore those concepts through a positive lens, especially by integrating the youths' voices. The scholarship on

youth conceptualization of leadership is still limited and needs more empirical studies (Mortensen et al., 2014; Roach et al., 1999). Culp and Kohlhaugen (2000) showed there were differences in defining the concept of leadership between youth and adults. Adult defined leadership as skills learned through observation and following examples of effective leaders. Youth on the other hand perceive leadership as skills learned through active participation. This difference of leadership concepts needs further exploration to understand more about youth leadership in general.

Present day Indonesian youth are the most educated generation in the history of Indonesia and the most engaged in the world beyond Indonesia (Parker & Nilan, 2013). Ramadhan (2013) described Indonesian youth as active members of society, especially in civil engagement. Unfortunately, there is an unequal opportunity for young people participation in terms of younger and older youth. Youth who are younger than 18 years old have less opportunity to participate and lead civic engagement in comparison to older youth. Older youth, such as university age students, actively express their voices through various civil engagement organizations in and outside education institutions. University students actively lead protests, negotiate power with authorities, or become advocates for the less fortunate groups. These older youth are not afraid to use intercampus organizations as means to create change in the larger political realm (Lussier & Fish, 2012).

Leadership learning happens when youth are actively involved in opportunities to practice the skills through experiment and real leadership roles (Close & Lechman, 1997; Macneil & McClean, 2006). Younger youth are still seen as the leaders of tomorrow or leaders in training and have more limited opportunity to practice in real leadership situation. Viewing younger youth as future leaders often prevents them from expressing their voice, experiencing

authentic leadership roles, and exercising their power. Currently, there is a missing component in the reformed civic education for younger youth in middle and high school setting (Levinson & Sutton, 2008). The missing component requires a new pedagogy that includes previously forbidden subjects such as human rights, multiculturalism, and democracy practice.

FAB as a youth organization provides a venue for young people between the ages of 13 to 21 to participate in various youth developmental activities. FAB was formed in November 2005 by *Wahana Visi* Indonesia (“WVI”) under World Vision International, a Christian nonprofit organization focuses on children, family, and community issues. The name of *da’Bajay* is an acronym of its geographical borders, which are: *Banyu Urip* and *Putat Jaya* neighborhoods. The membership of FAB catered almost exclusively to youth in these two neighborhoods. FAB is located on the west side of Surabaya, one of the most rapidly growing areas in the city. Despite its strategic location, the neighborhoods look different from the glamorous portrayal of West Surabaya. The neighborhoods consist of dense housing complexes with high risk of fire, flood, and public health problems. The vision of FAB is to be a pioneer in youth organizations that support the development of creative, innovative, sociable, and talented young people; while its mission is to develop young people through life skill activities, character building, participation in both local and regional government and development, youth partnership action, and the implementation of children’s rights. FAB strives to provide a healthy and safe environment for young people to exercise leadership skills, take part in development activities, be engaged in civic action, and actively participate in school-age youth association organization (Wahana Visi, 2009). The activities in FAB consist of youth leadership training, peer education, and children’s rights oriented creative activities (e.g. theater, music, multimedia, catfish farming).

FAB also serves as a youth civic organization that actively works on children's rights. FAB is located near Dolly Lane, the biggest red-light districts in Southeast Asia. Dolly Lane was officially closed in 2014, but the prostitution still continues underground. FAB continues to provide a safe haven for young people from the influence of prostitution and violence against children. The youth leaders have worked together with surrounding communities and local government leaders in children's rights issues and young people's wellbeing. A majority of FAB youth leaders and members were youth with disadvantages. In this study, I use the term youth with disadvantages or placed in disadvantaged situations to move away from a deficit lens that inadvertently or otherwise places the blame on the individual youth. To clarify, youth leaders and members in FAB are at a disadvantage in society due to systemic challenges that result from class, gender, and education disparities. The first systemic disadvantage is class. Many FAB youth come from lower-middle class families, where several parents are day laborers, working either in construction projects or in domestic economic settings. The neighborhoods where they live are located close to a prostitution complex, with dense, lower income-housing complexes. The second systemic disadvantage is education opportunity and equity in educational settings. The youth participants enrolled in local high schools or technical schools received lower education quality and limited resources to support youth civic life.

In its 13 year period (2005-2018), FAB has had multiple youth leaders and mentors and has gone through organizational growth and decline. FAB is fully led by a group of youth leaders who serve two years as administrators. Each member has an equal chance to run as an officer and get elected through a democratic election. Youth leaders can become youth mentors after serving their two years in administrative duties. But youth leadership and participation in FAB come with their own obstacles. Stereotyping the youth as leaders of tomorrow is still strong. Adults in

surrounding communities, including local government leaders, still perceive youth leaders in FAB as children whose voices and knowledge hold little merit. Youth must negotiate for power to participate and lead genuinely, especially in the adult oriented environment outside FAB. This study explores the youths' voices in negotiating power towards joining civic participation and playing leadership roles in their surrounding communities, especially regarding children's rights. This study also looks into the interaction and relationship of FAB youth leaders with adult mentors and adult community members.

Research Questions

The following are the main research questions that guided this qualitative, case study of FAB youth leaders:

1. How do youth leaders define and exercise leadership in FAB?
2. How do youth leaders define and exercise children's rights in FAB?
3. How do youth leaders negotiate power through their civic engagement and leadership role in FAB?

To answer these research questions, I used the critical youth studies (CYS) framework as a more expansive lens to understand youth from the protagonist's perspective, along with the intersectionality of gender and class on youth participation and leadership in FAB (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Ibrahim, 2014; Steinberg, 2014). This framework also allowed me to examine youth power in relation to adultism despite the dominant representation of youth in everyday sociocultural practice and institution (Cerecer, Cahill, & Bradley, 2013).

In the findings chapters of this dissertation, I addressed parts of research questions 1 and 2 related to how youth leaders defined leadership and its relation to children's rights in chapter 4. I continued to address parts of research question 1, 2, and 3 related to how the youth leaders

practiced leadership and negotiated powers inside and outside FAB in chapter 5. In chapter 5, I explored the intersectionality of youth leadership & power and gender role to understand the experience of young women leaders in FAB.

Significance of Study

The research on youth participation and youth leadership on a local level with focus on children's rights has not reached their maturity in academic research. Torney-Purta and Barber (2011) described the early stage of research and theoretical model for the development of young people's civic engagement and support for human rights in everyday settings. FAB in Surabaya, Indonesia provided a venue for youth to learn and exercise leadership, expand power in adult oriented world as well as advocating children's rights. FAB extended the leadership exercise through direct involvement as citizen and advisory boards in both local and city government's policy meetings. This direct involvement in local and city government became a space for the younger youth to practice democratic right as citizen of Indonesia. The previous study conducted on FAB centered on the children development aspect. There were many youth testimonials about their direct involvement in city and national wide children's forums as well as local government collaboration. But there was little analysis on the topic of youth struggle for power and leadership in connection to children's rights issue. FAB used its organization to become one of the most active, youth led *Forum Anak* (Children's Forums) on the local and city government board. FAB had a degree of genuine participation for children, instead of common tokenism approach.

Another gap focused on the topic of democracy development. Since the late 20th century, Indonesia is one of the emerging countries striving for establishing a democratic governance system. Through this transition to democracy, Indonesia has become the most open polity in

Southeast Asia. Indonesia was able to reach this accomplishment because of its distinct advantage of extraordinary levels of civic engagement and a high level of interpersonal sociability (Lussier & Fish, 2012). There is a robust participation in association organizations, which is crucial for developing civic skills. Youth participation and leadership is actively visible by college age youth. These college age student groups impart leadership and organizational skills to their members through their activities in campus organizations. Youth also build power by join organizations for nonpolitical reasons, but are swayed into political action through their involvement. Unfortunately there are very few opportunities to be involved in association organizations for younger youth in non-higher education setting. This dissertation provides a deep analysis on the early civic opportunity and the development of youth power for younger Indonesian and its impact on democratic society.

Chapter II. Literature Review

This study examined youth participation and leadership of youth leaders with disadvantages inside a youth organization, orientated by children's rights and located in an urban setting in Indonesia. The youth in this study consisted of both younger youth between the ages of 13 to 18 and college age youth. The study also looked at the youth's role in implementing children's rights through their participation and leadership. This chapter is a review of the literature on the theories of youth participation and leadership in general and in Indonesia. This chapter also explores youth participation as part of the key component of children's rights practices.

Theme 1: Youth Participation

The terminologies of civic participation, engagement, or involvement are often used interchangeably to generally describe attitudes, behaviors, knowledge, and skills aimed to benefit the wellbeing of communities and the overall greater good (Amna, 2012; Checkoway & Aldana, 2013; Innovations in Civic Participation, 2010; Lenzi et al., 2012). Civic attitudes grow from feelings of responsibility towards the surrounding communities and the concept that every person has her/his own role in affecting the wellbeing of society. "Participation" has been an ongoing buzzword in the political, civic, and policy arenas. The main premises of "participation" came from the need to have a more active form of citizenship, especially for marginalized groups from multiple stakeholders. Youth are categorized as a marginalized group based on inexperience because of their young age, including their membership in excluded demographic groups such as females, migrants, LGBTQ, and the disabled (Offerdahl, Evangelides, & Powers, 2014). Youth in an excluded demographic group will experience layered marginalization due to their combined social oppressed background and age discrimination.

The ideal aspect of “participation” in a democratic environment is built upon voice, equality, and trust in governmental institutions (Levin-Waldman, 2013; Torney-Purta, Richardson, & Barber, 2004). Both the motivation and capacity to “participate” must be voluntary (Verba, Schlozman, & Brady, 1995). Participants must show interest and join the civil societal life without any coercion in order to have a real civic participation experience. Participation in its idealistic core wants to challenge power and seek control through collective voices. The process of participation aims to build wider ownership and accountability of decisions and projects among multiple stakeholders (Gaventa & Pettit, 2010; Levin-Waldman, 2013). This theoretical and ideal concept of “participation” serves as an opening for youth civic opportunity where youth can exercise their citizen rights and share their voices. Youth as a marginalized group can receive support and opportunity through the participation process. But in practice, youth as a diverse marginalized group also can experience layered inequality and power imbalance that impacts their participation experience.

Despite being popular, it is important to acknowledge that the concept of participation itself is value-laden and a contested concept (Gaventa & Pettit, 2010; Shaw, Brady, McGrath, Brennan, & Dolan, 2014). “Participation” comes up frequently in relationship to a democratic environment and is often highly praised as the heart of democracy (Levin-Waldman, 2013; Putnam, Leonardi, & Nanetti, 1993; Syvertsen, Wray-Lake, Flanagan, Osgood, & Briddell, 2011). Civic participation also serves as an indicator of democratic strength and socioeconomic health of both local communities and nationwide (Kassimir & Flanagan, 2010). This democratic oriented terminology shows that participation is more accessible in countries that are deemed as a stable democracy, in comparison to new or unstable democratic countries. Torney-Purta et al. (2004) warned us of the challenges to instill trust among youth to participate and engage in civic

life in new or unstable democracies, where civic institutions and government agencies are perceived as non-trusted entities. In new or unstable democracies, youth have more trust in institutions that they participate regularly, such as schools. The challenge of participation in new or unstable democracies shows us that there is a threshold of trust that youth must see to actively participate in civic life. Safe participation for youth is especially important for new or unstable democratic environments. This threshold of trust highlights the active nature of “participation” and democracy. Civic institutions must actively support the “participation” practice in order to increase the threshold trust among its citizenship, especially youth. Newly formed democratic countries have more benefits than unstable democracies by establishing an environment to practice the element of democracy through civic participation. New democratic countries need to practice what they preach by encouraging active participation where citizens can learn and engage civil life safely. The threshold of trust to various civic institutions is also necessary for stable democracy to ensure ongoing active civic engagement (Torney-Purta et al., 2004). Youth in a stable democracy needs to see that their participation will create results and not be a waste of time. This demand for trust shows us the ongoing need to maintain democracy through a robust civil life.

Another contested perspective on the concept of “participation” comes from whether participation alone can be counted as act of democracy when people can participate, but have limited control on the final decisions (Polletta, 2014). “Participation” in this situation is a manipulable act that serves as a smoke screen to carry the decision making to a predetermined outcome. Cooke and Kothari (2001) warned the pitfall of “participation” by calling it “new tyranny” that can override legitimate decision-making processes, reinforce the interest of powerful groups, and eliminate other methods of decision-making. This pitfall of “participation”

can happen in any civic participation. Youth, as a marginalized group, have more vulnerability of manipulation during the civic participation process. Adults, as the usual power holders and decision makers, can guide more than the participation process to achieve an intended or preconceived outcome.

Motivation for participation usually stems from self-interest. In general, youth are more likely to participate and lead social change when they see their future and interest at stake (Youniss et al., 2002). Despite being motivated by self-interest, the goal of youth participation is connected closely to the need and commonwealth of the broader public (Flanagan, Bowes, Jonsson, Csapo, & Sheblanova, 1998; Putnam et al., 1993). Issues close to youths' heart can motivate youth to participate and start addressing the broader manifestation of those issues in their surrounding communities. Having youth related issues is only a starting point to motivate youth participation. People who participate in civic participation desire to create change in the issues that they work on. Youth participation also relies on the youth's confidence on whether they can make a difference in their communities or believe they have a responsibility to get involved in the communities (Andolina, Jenkins, Zukin, & Keeter, 2003; Bandura, 1997; Checkoway, 2011; Torney-Purta et al., 2004). Without the confidence to affect change, civic participation can backfire and create disillusionment, cynicism, and demoralization (Somerville, 2011).

There are many benefits of youth participation. In a larger scale, youth participation in civil society serves as an important instrument in strengthening democracy and democratic society (Amna, 2012; Checkoway & Aldana, 2013). On a smaller scale, the aspects of youth participation is often associated with youth development (Sherrod, Torney-Purta, & Flanagan, 2010). Civic engagement with people outside close social cliques (i.e. family and close friends)

is an important factor in increasing youth's identification with the public interest around them (Amna, 2012; Erikson, 1968; Flanagan et al., 1998). The opportunity to learn public interests can help youth in disadvantaged environments or new democratic countries identify issues in their communities and what they can do to address them. Youth engagement also builds the foundation of identity formation and adulthood civic & political engagement (Erikson, 1968; Flanagan & Sherrod, 1998). In this process, youth use the participation opportunity to reflect on both political and moral ideologies to understand their impact on personal lives and the broader society (Yates & Youniss, 1998). Critically learning about personal impact on society is essential for youth, as a marginalized group because it shows the power that youth have collectively, despite their marginal status.

The trend in youth participation shows a growth in cynicism and a decrease in formal civic participation such as active campaigning, becoming a party member, and electoral politics (Putnam, 2000). Youth often see formal civic participation as unreliable to the youth's deeper idealism, slow, and ineffectual (Galston, 2003). At the same time, there is an increase in community-based participation such as voluntarism in local communities among youth (Scott & Serek, 2015; Syvertsen et al., 2011). This community-based participation is beneficial for youth who are younger and not eligible to vote. The rise of community-oriented participation helps younger youth to actively be involved as citizens at the local level. I argue that this community-oriented focus of participation connects closely with the exclusion or marginalized status of youth in civic society. Excluded groups, such as youth, have used their group's history and struggle of joining civic culture to become focused on their own group's interest (Sánchez-Jankowski, 2002). At the same time, youth as an excluded group, focus more on helping the betterment of their own communities in comparison to the betterment of general public. This

perspective and motivation to do civic engagement came from a sense of responsibility in improving other excluded group members (Jensen, 2008).

There are many institutions that help youth learn “participation.” Family is the traditional institution where civic socialization begins (Youniss et al., 2002; Zukin, 2006). Parents and family members provide critical role models for civic behaviors (Andolina et al., 2003). Parents, especially from a higher socioeconomic status, have more access to various civic engagement opportunities for their children (Lenzi et al., 2012). This unequal access to civic skill in the family setting opens up an opportunity to use other institutions as supplement for civic participation and development. Education institutions, such as school, serve as a major arena for civic competency through civic curriculum and democratic practices inside classroom (Youniss et al., 2002). School serves as a training ground for civic engagement, especially through the use of open discussion and service work. School also provides volunteer and service opportunities for young people. Youth who actively volunteer in high school and college are more likely to engage in volunteering, community activities, and other forms of civic life as adults (Andolina et al., 2003).

Civic organizations, such as youth-based organizations, are important to extend civic lessons outside school and family settings, where participation is motivated by the interest and passions of the individual. Non-formal programs through civic organizations are being used to capture the most vulnerable population of young people into mainstream social activities (Institute of Medicine National Research Council, 2005). The content of civic organization is important to nurture youth engagement. Political oriented activity is considered to be more important in nurturing youth leadership and civic engagement than the activities of sport or religious organizations (Andolina et al., 2003). In civic organizations, youth see political

activity as a more inclusive form than traditional action of political activity such as voting or being a political party member. An example can be seen through protest or civil disobedience for issues that are close to young people's hearts such as education or the wellbeing of young people.

Youth participation comes with its many challenges. Tokenism is a common challenge in youth participation. Tokenism happens when youth appear to have voice in decision-making or participation, but in reality youth have little or no choice about how they participate. (Apathy is Boring, 2004; Hart, 1992). Tokenism is often used in youth work and research areas to attract attention, increase the possibility to obtain funding, or portray community relevance with the latest youth work buzzword (Funk et al., 2012). The tokenism challenge shows us the importance of participation quality during the practice of youth participation. The quality of youth participation is measured by looking at the real effect of youth participation on larger society (Checkoway, 2011). Adultism also often comes up as a challenge and goes hand-in-hand with tokenism. The main idea of adultism is the discrimination based on age with the assumption that adult have more knowledge and have the right to act upon young people without their agreement because of age (Checkoway, 2011). Adults often view young people through two different lenses, which are young people as "human beings" and young people as "human becomings" (Lee, 1999). As "beings," young people are seen as active, independent, competent agents, while as "becomings," young people are seen as passive and not yet competent people who need adults' control actions or direction (Lee, 2001; Qvortrup, 1994; Warming, 2011). When young people are seen as "humans becoming," the interaction between adult and young people often ends in silencing the young people's voice (Lee, 1999).

Theme Synthesis

In the youth participation theme, the contradiction aspects come from the status of youth as both the future of a democracy and a marginalized group in the present. Youth serve as a group whose role is crucial in maintaining a healthy democratic society through active civic life. But at the same time, these youth are marginalized groups that are often excluded from active civic life. Participation in theory evokes the sense of trust, equality, collective power, and ownership. In the youth group, participation is prone to become an extension of status quo through tokenism and adultism. Equality and collective power can become a scarce commodity among youth participation, where adults play the role of power holder. This contradiction can create larger tension among youth who live in new democratic countries, where participation is needed as practice of democracy. Without trust, equality, and collective power, “participation” becomes a smoke screen for the supposedly new democracy. Disappointment towards participation can affect the health of democracy both in a stable and new democratic environment.

The key areas that need further study, focus on how youth challenge and adapt to the participation obstacles while mitigating their layered marginal group status. The diverse background of youth marginalization shows the need to analyze youth participation through multiple lenses, in order to understand its nuance correctly. There is also a need to look at youth participation in new democratic countries and their contexts. The new democratic countries can provide a glimpse of democracy development and the challenges to support “participation”, especially youth participation.

Theme 2: Leadership

Youth leadership has similar theoretical and practical concepts with youth participation. Youth leadership serves as an extension of youth participation by providing youth an environment to lead and negotiate power with multiple stakeholders. The scholarship of youth leadership is still growing and new. Leadership theory has been a budding research focus that initially related to the adult realm; however, as the recognition of youth participation heightens the influence of adult leadership theories is inevitable in youth leadership. I will highlight some of the applicable adult leadership theories before moving to youth leadership theories.

Adult Leadership Theories

Leadership itself has been examined, discussed, and debated regularly in social science. The definition of leadership itself continues to develop. Bass and Bass (2008a) described there are many ways to define leadership, but the key point is its definition should depend on the purposes to be served. Leadership in broader definition has two defining characteristics which are: a) the process and outcome of influencing between the leader and the follower, and b) the dispositional attribution of a leader, the perception and attribution from followers to a leader, and the context of leadership situation (Dansereau, Seitz, Chiu, Shaughnessy, & Yammarino, 2013; Day & Antonakis, 2012). Leadership is “an interaction between two or more members of a group that often involves a structuring or restructuring of the situation and of perceptions and expectations of the members,” and leadership happens when “one group member modifies the motivation or competencies of others in the group.” (Bass & Bass, 2008a, p. 25). The goal of leadership is to move towards collective goals (Judge & Long, 2012; Locke, 2003). Leaders are seen as agents of change because an act of leadership has a significant effect on other people. Leaders direct members to goals and pathways to achieve them (Bass & Bass, 2008a).

The theories of leadership and their popularity have changed along with the times. We can split leadership theories into traditional and new/ contemporary theories. Traditional leadership emphasized the concept of a leader and why she/he is influential. One of the earliest leadership research started in 1900s through the trait school of leadership (Day & Antonakis, 2012). Trait leadership theories examine leadership by understanding individual differences of a leader in comparison to others. Early trait leadership theorists in the 19th-early 20th century believed that personal traits such as height, weight, education, and health, correlated closely with leadership traits (Bass & Bass, 2008b, 2008c; DeRue, Nahrgang, Wellman, & Humphrey, 2011; Hernandez, Eberly, Avolio, & Johnson, 2011). Most research on leaders and leadership, until the 1940s, focused closely on individual traits that made each leader different from non-leaders (Bass & Bass, 2008b; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991). The trait school of leadership is inspired by the Great Man theory, which was popularized by Thomas Carlyle in 1840s. The Great Man theory believes that a leader is born with certain traits or personal qualities that make him a good leader. The trait school of leadership expanded its inclusivity outside just a few heroic, great men into anyone who has personal qualities of a leader (Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002). In 1948, Ralph Stogdill challenged the early trait theorists by defining that personal traits and situation or context must be counted together as influential factors of leadership. Stogdill (1948) described that no universal traits could be associated with leadership effectiveness, because leadership effectiveness varied based on the situation or context where leadership practice happened.

Despite its critics, trait leadership theories still continue but in an altered form. A popular trait leadership in the mid-20th century is the Big Five Factor Structure of Personality, where each personality factor consists of six traits. The Big Five, which consists of Emotional

Adjustment/ Neuroticism, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Openness to Experience, and Conscientiousness, combined personality psychology and traits to predict leadership (Hernandez et al., 2011; Judge & Bono, 2000). The Big Five Factor model showed a strong positive correlation of .53 with leadership emergence and .39 with leadership effectiveness, which suggested that the five-factor model is a fruitful model to predict leadership (Judge et al., 2002). New trait theorists continually believe that successful leaders are different from other people, but traits alone are seen as antecedents or precondition of leader behaviors. A person with leadership traits must take action or have certain leadership behavior in order to be successful (Bass & Bass, 2008d; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991). This connection between traits and behaviors bridge the continuation of leadership theories from trait centric to behavior theories.

The second group of leadership theory focuses on behavioral theories. Behavioral leadership focuses on what leaders do when conducting tasks and build relationships in order to influence others. This shows a departure from trait leadership that focuses on who leaders are (Northouse, 2007). Early behavior theorists divided leadership styles based on leader behaviors, which are: authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire (Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1939). Behavior leadership research continued and advanced during 1940s through the development of Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire by Ohio State University and the leader's centric research by University of Michigan. Ohio State University analyzed more than 1,000 behavioral dimensions into two categories (Judge & Long, 2001). The first category is initiating structure, which focuses on the extent a leader defined both by the leader and follower's roles. The second category, consideration, focuses on the extent a leader cares, respects, supports, and appreciates followers. University of Michigan also analyzed the distinction between leadership styles with employee-centered and production-centered behaviors (Hernandez et al., 2011). Employee-

centered leadership focuses on human relations, while production-centered focuses on the technical aspect of the task or goal. Despite its ongoing usage in the present day leadership research, leadership behavior has greater impact than traits in predicting leadership effectiveness. DeRue et al. (2011) explained this conclusion that leadership behaviors are more proximal to the act of leadership than traits and traits often reflected in behaviors differently based on each person's situation. The strength of behavior theory in leadership is the flexibility of behavior because it can be learned and developed (DeRue et al., 2011). This flexibility can help future researchers to develop leadership ability through various behavior practices. The weakness of behavior theory came from the overlapping in defining leadership behaviors. There are various definitions and conceptions for leadership behaviors that require integration between leadership behavior researchers.

The third group of leadership theory started in the early 60s to early 70s was called contingency leadership. This leadership theory showed a shift to actively include situation or context as an influencer or barrier of leadership effectiveness (Northouse, 2007). Fiedler who looked for a match between leader's style and situation or context popularized this theory. Fiedler suggested that leaders are not expected to be effective in all situations because different situations require different leader's styles (Fiedler, 1963, 1973). Another contingency leadership theory came from path-goal theory, where leadership effectiveness depends on leader's behavior, the characteristics of follower, and the task. Path-goal leadership focuses on the leader's behavior to select the most suitable leadership styles that help the followers reaching the goal of task.

Contingency leadership theories serve as segue towards new or contemporary leadership theories that focus more on the relationship between the leader and follower. The new or

contemporary leadership emphasized the drivers and active role of followers during the leadership process (Hannah, Sumanth, Lester, & Cavarretta, 2014). In new leadership theories, leaders and followers actively engaged with each other during the leadership process. New leadership theories guide how leaders and followers should interact or engage throughout the leadership process. The new leadership theories were developed and tested to determine the forms of leader behavior that actively engage with followers and build positive effects beyond task completion. The research also explored charismatic and affective elements of leadership (Northouse, 2007). Major leadership scholars and schools of thought that came up in this era were House's Charismatic Leadership in 1977, Burns' transformational leadership in 1978, and Bass' transformational and transactional leadership in 1985. The new leadership school extended the responsibility of a leader to account for follower's needs for sense of purpose and idealized mission (Day & Antonakis, 2012). Charismatic leadership centered on leader's persuasive skill to influence and lead followers through extraordinary and heroic action (House, 1977). Followers see a charismatic leader as a role model who aspires them to grow in similar manner with the leader. Charismatic leaders must display self-confidence, pro-social assertiveness and also moral conviction. Transforming leaders expanded the role of a leader to inspire followers through a shared and meaningful vision. Transforming leaders must not focus on her/his self-interest but on the greater good. In the process, a transforming leader must raise followers' critical consciousness and serve as a role model who mentors followers in developing each person's potential (Burns, 1978). Bernard Bass in 1985 used Burns' transforming leadership as a foundation for his transformational leadership, which shared similar elements including the moral and ethical aspect of leadership (Antonakis, 2012). Both transformational and charismatic

leadership were the dominant forms of scholarly interest in the new millennium leadership research (Dinh et al., 2014).

More recent new leadership theories expanded around the ideological model that focuses on ethical behavior and moral elements in leadership. Ethical leadership was introduced as a response to the need of normatively appropriate conduct in personal and interpersonal relationships during leadership (Brown & Trevino, 2006). An ethical leader is both a moral person and a moral manager. As a moral person, an ethical leader is honest and caring. As a moral manager, this leader also makes fair and balance decisions, communicates ethics with followers, and most importantly practices ethics and serves as role model. Authentic leadership has a similar moral foundation of leadership but pushes a leader to intimately know oneself especially one's core values, beliefs, strength and weaknesses in order to express each unique leadership identity and style (Gardner, Coglisier, Davis, & Dickens, 2011). Authentic leaders also put the concern of others on top of self-interest. Authentic leaders can analyze ethical issues from multiple perspectives and make decisions based on moral values (Brown & Trevino, 2006). Critics of the ideological model came from its tendency to focus a set of absolute standards for leader behavior (Mumford & Fried, 2014).

The strength of leadership theories lies on its fluidity and socially constructed definition based on people's perception, action, and reaction to other (Ashford & DeRue, 2012). This fluidity gives opportunity for different groups of people, in defining leadership that fits with a different context. The strength of leadership theories also relies on the collective objective of leadership. Leadership does not focus on fulfilling one individual goal but focuses on reaching the collective goal of a group. The strength of leadership theories shows us the dynamic and

collective aspect of leadership. Unfortunately, this strength often has been used only in theory with limited application throughout the history of adult leadership theories.

The primary criticism for adult leadership theories highlights the lack of integration between theories of leadership, especially between the traditional theorists and new theorists. Leadership scholars created new theories without attempting to compare and contrast the validity of existing theories (DeRue et al., 2011). There is a strong desire to create original leadership theories that are distinctly different from existing theories. This desire can boost the growth of new leadership theories while overlooking similarities or contribution from previous existing leadership theories. Marion and Uhl-Bien (2001) criticized leadership scholarship as affected by reductionism and determinism. Reductionism starts by drawing conclusions about a whole from parts of a system. Determinism believes that preceding variables can predict the future with certainty. There is a lack of a holistic approach in observing leadership. Leadership is not static, but dynamic and affected closely with surrounding context and emergent structures. Modern leadership theories must use a multidisciplinary, multicomponent, and multilevel research for leadership to create a holistic leadership research (Avolio, 2007).

Another criticism on adult leadership theories is its narrow concept of a leader, while ignoring other inter-influencing aspects such as context, time, history, relevant actors (Avolio, 2007; Zaccaro & Klimoski, 2001). Traditionally, leadership has been seen as an individual-level skill, where development happens primarily through individual trainings in leadership skills and abilities (Day, 2000). The leadership process happens in an environment with sharp distinction between leaders and followers. This traditional lens puts emphasis on individual training of leadership skills while ignoring the complex interaction between leader, follower, and various contextual aspects. Focusing on individual-level skill provides the opportunity of leadership

development to certain individuals who have promising leadership characteristics. Other people with limited or no leadership characteristics are not included as future leaders. New or contemporary leadership theories provide people a sense of community of practice on leadership. Community of practice is united by membership in certain groups and involved in each other action (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Follower, leader, culture, and other social contexts are being dissected as part of influential components in leadership. But new leadership theories also still put emphasis on individual leadership skills, despite counting the follower as an important aspect of leadership process. Individual leadership skills are visible through the importance of charisma and other affective characteristics such as transformative, authentic, ethical behaviors. Followers are seen as supporting actors that help leaders to become these charismatic and affective people. There is also limited exploration on the concept of collective leadership with shared power in adult leadership theories. Working together collaboratively is an important aspect in promoting successful leadership, but the idea of sharing leadership power is still limited throughout these adult leadership theories.

Despite expanding the inclusivity of leadership development to broader audience, adult leadership is still rigid in its expectation towards the concept of a leader. Potential adult leaders are expected to have the basic leadership skills and characteristics in order to become outstanding leaders in their community despite only learning leadership development through seminars or group training over a limited period of time. This rigid expectation to hit the ground running in adult leadership, can limit leadership development of people with limited leadership experience and skill. This rigid expectation also focuses more on adults with visible leadership potential while leaving the others behind. There is limited opportunity to perform collective leadership where the less strong leaders can practice leadership together with stronger potential

leaders. These weaknesses and trends in adult leadership theories are highly influential on the development and practice of youth leadership theories.

One of the outliers in leadership theories comes from servant leadership theory. Robert Greenleaf in 1970 was the main scholar who introduced the concept of servant leadership. The main idea of servant leadership focuses on serving followers and meeting the needs of other. Servant leaders also put follower skill and leadership development at its primary objective (Robert & Stone, 2002). Servant leadership sees non-selfishness and care towards persons, organizations, and society in general, as a core characteristic of servant leadership (Greenleaf & Spears, 2002). The motivation of servant leadership is not just power but using that power to serve other (van Dierendonck, 2011). This more holistic perspective of leadership shows that leader and follower must work collaboratively with a balance of autonomy and direction in building consensus. This paradigm is very different with the adult leadership norms that put emphasis on organizational development as the main goal. Both follower and leader are active actors in learning leadership through serving others.

The challenges of servant leadership center around the idealistic nature of this theory (Whetstone, 2002). Servant leadership exists, but it requires a paradigm shift in embracing the power of responsible relationship with oneself and others in contrast to the egocentric and assertive power dominant norms (DiStefano & Greenleaf, 1988; Smith, 1995). Another limitation referred to the perceived passiveness of servant leadership and its risk of manipulation by followers (Bowie, 2000). However, these challenges highlight the strength of servant leadership norm in comparison to typical leadership norm. The practice and implementation of servant leadership in adult leadership world need the commitment from both leaders and followers to focus on the wellbeing of others first. This part challenges adult leaders to see the

bigger picture on how their leadership affect the larger communities. Another challenge of servant leadership came from how Greenleaf put his focus on dissecting the motivation and outcome of servant leader, while provided limited analysis on the process of leadership in between (van Dierendonck & Patterson, 2015). This limitation can be a strength also because it opens up chances for leadership scholars to examine the process of servant leadership in practice. Servant leadership can become the connector between adult and youth leadership theories that bring the practice in youth leadership into adult leadership world.

Youth Leadership Theories

The adolescence period is a prime time to build the foundation of optimal leadership development (Murphy & Johnson, 2011; Reichard et al., 2011). This belief sprouted from the developmental perspective in recognizing the leadership potential of every youth (Astin & Astin, 1996; Fertman & van Linden, 1999). Youth leadership development programs help to build and strengthen the roots of adult leadership (Reichard et al., 2011). Leadership in its simplest form is the application of social influence (Murphy, 2011). Youth build networks for social influence through interaction with multiple individuals, such as leaders, followers, or peers (Day, Fleenor, Atwater, Sturm, & McKee, 2014). The conceptualization of youth leadership is more open and flexible to cater towards any youth's diverse background (Conner & Strobel, 2007). This inclusiveness is the strength of youth leadership in contrast to the more rigid expectation of adult leadership. Youth leadership is hampered by the exclusion of youth from civil society participation. This exclusion can perpetuate power imbalance between youth and adults, and foster disengagement from civic engagement (MacNeil, 2006; Mortensen et al., 2014).

The foundation of youth leadership relies on the belief that leadership skills can be taught, learned, and developed (Fertman & van Linden, 1999). The development of leadership

starts early in life. Early developmental factors such as early influences, parenting styles, and early learning experiences, shape young people's leadership ability. During this leadership development period, youth experience a self-enforcing process that shape their leadership efficacy. An increase in leadership efficacy helps young people gain more confidence in day-to-day leadership engagement (Murphy & Johnson, 2011). Parental modeling also plays an important role in leadership development during adolescence period (Zacharatos, Barling, & Kelloway, 2000). Youth who perceived their parents were demonstrating transformational leadership behaviors, are more likely to exhibit similar leadership behaviors. Modeling parental transformational leadership behaviors help youth to gain praises from their peers and adults as more satisfying, effective, and effort-evoking leaders. Unfortunately, in practice, parental modeling for leadership is not always available. Youth from a disadvantaged background are often exposed to unskilled mentors and models within their social network (Jessor, 1993). This unavailability of skilled mentors and models in a family setting, open up opportunity to supplement leadership development outside family setting. Wade (1997) described that the responsibility to introduce leadership skill has shifted and increasingly fallen on societal institutions and organizations (as cited in Culp and Kohlhagen, 2000). This shifted role for youth leadership development brings the opportunity to civic institutions, such as schools or youth organizations. These civic institutions now play a major role as supplemental, or even as the main source of leadership development for youth with disadvantages.

Youth leadership programs can fall into the same trap of other youth programs, which relies on a traditional program structure where adults serve as the provider and youth as the receivers in a hierarchal orientation (Jones & Perkins, 2006). This replication of traditional roles of youth programs perpetuates adult authority while ignoring youth curiosity, lesser biased view,

and motivation. An ideal role of adults in youth leadership is collectively constructed leadership through an understanding of a partnership of equality between adults and youth (Mitra, Lewis, & Sanders, 2013; Zeldin, Christens, & Powers, 2013). Youth-adult partnerships is a continuum that moves dynamically between different levels of engagement between adult and youth when multiple youth and adults deliberate and act together in learning and decision making processes (Jones & Perkins, 2006). The role of adult mentors is to guide and help youth move forward in leadership development. The method of guiding must reflect the elements of leadership itself. The adult mentor must act the leadership action that they want to share to youth. Gentle nudging, high expectation, providing authentic choices, and incorporation of reflection and recognition are necessary tools in guiding youth leadership (Zeldin et al., 2013).

Sharing responsibilities from planning to implementation of activities, is also important in maintaining youth-adult partnership (Mitra, 2009). A successful youth adult partnership relies on authentic collaborative work, meaningful role delegation during work, and ensuring trust and safety for both adult and youth (Mitra, 2009). The reality of adult youth partnership in leadership is not as perfect as theory. The limitations of youth leadership align similarly with youth participation, which shows us the overlap world between these two subjects. The role of adults can be problematic when adult mentors perpetuate the power imbalance and hierarchical relationship between adult and youth, while limiting youth's opportunity to conduct meaningful leadership activities (Camino, 2005; Fertman & van Linden, 1999; Mitra, 2005). Adults who work specifically with youth with disadvantages have more power that can perpetuate the power imbalance that youth with disadvantages experience in their everyday life. If there is a continuation of the power imbalance between adults and youth, leadership learning processes will remain as theoretical learning where youth learn with limited opportunity of practice.

Another challenge also comes from how adults use traditional leadership traits such as communication and academic achievement (Manning, 2012). This form of leader identifier (trait) is very exclusive and hampers youth with disadvantages or non-“natural leader” youth from becoming leaders. Inclusiveness is essential to invite youth, especially youth with disadvantages into leadership activities. This exclusive perception also creates self-manifestation where young people often do not give credit to their own leadership potential (Owen, 2012). Youth from a disadvantaged background or non-“natural leader” youth often identify leaders as people who have official leadership positions. This lens of exclusivity feeds the negative self-manifestation where the youth see themselves as subservient to official leaders. This exclusive lens also supports the stereotypical definition of a leader as a person born with natural leadership traits.

Currently, there is a sense of urgency in youth leadership development because of the spreading concern and crisis of confidence on the practice of leadership at a global scale (World Economic Forum, 2014). The crisis of leadership challenges everyone to focus on leadership development in every phase of human life and being open to leadership potential of young adults. In order to cast a wide net for potential leaders, youth leadership literature has analyzed more diverse samples of youth population beyond the typical “good” youth population. Youth leadership development programs are especially needed for youth who are not seen as “natural leaders” and youth with disadvantages. Viewing through the lens of youth with disadvantages at leadership is an important addition to understand their leadership activities. Despite their disadvantaged status, there are similar assumptions that transcend across contextual differences in the development of youth leadership. The importance of collectiveness for power is highlighted as an important element for youth with disadvantages. Homeless youth described finding their agency through collectiveness (Ferguson, Kim, & McCoy, 2011). Ownership of

decision is also seen as important aspect of leadership. Homeless youth described the lack of voice on decision making when they were living on the street. Being in a youth council helped homeless youth to build their voices and power.

More nuanced similarities and differences can be seen through the perceived lack of power in voicing opinion and creating change. Youth with disadvantages live their life with limited power, which often translates in less youth leadership opportunities. They can feel that there is limited power to share their opinion or make change (Ferguson et al., 2011). Power for youth with disadvantages needs to be built in clear way. Leveling the power between adult and youth can help youth with disadvantages build a sense of community through equal participation. Homeless youth described how they felt uncomfortable approaching administrative people with their concern without formal permission and power to do that. More affluent youth have the tool and knowledge to navigate social situations and channel their concern to adult power holders, while youth with disadvantages rarely have the same skills compared to their more affluent peers. Theoretically, leadership for youth with disadvantages is beneficial for challenging the stereotype of the group youth and provide a place to share voice about their group (Carter, Swedeen, Walter, Moss, & Hsin, 2011). Leadership for youth with disadvantages becomes the mean to take back their power and challenge dominant narrative of youth and dis-advantaged. In practice, leadership among youth with disadvantages needs more diverse and non-conventional strategies to tackle the multilayered of disadvantages during leadership process.

Theme Synthesis

The characteristics of youth leadership theories share some similarities and differences with adult leadership theories. The first similarity is the fluidity and socially constructed definition of leadership base on context. Both adult and youth leadership theories see context as

important influence for leadership. This fluidity shows that it is impossible to analyze leadership without putting background context into the equation.

The second similarity, youth leadership echoes the positive leadership sentiment in a similar manner with adult leadership. Leaders must use their influence in ethical and responsible ways (Fertman & van Linden, 1999). The positive leadership sentiment is strong in youth leadership because of its connection to the youth development objective.

The third similarity, the goal of leadership in both adult and youth theories focus on collective goals or group growth, not the objective of one individual. But this is where the differences between adult and youth leadership theories begin. The strategy in reaching collective goal in adult leadership often relies on individual leader's ability. An individual leader plays the leadership role by helping followers reaching collective goals together. Adult leadership focuses on individual leadership activity and rarely explores a power-sharing option. In youth leadership, leadership role centers on collaboration as group. Youth leadership is also very collaborative and encourages sharing leadership power (Gaventa & Pettit, 2010; Ho, Clarke, & Dougherty, 2015; Walker, 2011). The underlying perspective for this collective leadership and power sharing is rooted in how youth are considered as "less experienced" than adults in becoming leaders. Co-leading with youth peers is commonly encouraged in various environments to promote collaboration. Adults commonly serve as mentors during youth leadership activity.

Another difference between adult and youth leadership comes from the openness in defining the concept of a leader and leadership skills. Adult leadership is rigid in its expectation of a leader. Adult leaders are expected to be able to lead individually and have the basic leadership skills despite their diverse background. Youth leadership, on the other hand, has its

core leadership skill development through teamwork (Zeldin & Camino, 1999). Youth leadership emphasizes the group process and consensus building which embodies the ability to listen, empathize, and cooperate (Social Policy Research Associates for the Innovation Center for Community and Youth Development, 2003). Youth leadership allows youth with diverse leadership backgrounds to work together and co-learn through the practice. Collaborative oriented leadership is also connected to the needs of building intercultural sensitivity, dialogue and social change objectives into the concept of youth leadership (Ungerleider, 2012). This leadership perspective becomes a place to understand other's background and problems, while working together towards solution.

The focus on the collaborative aspects in youth leadership does not mean that developing individual elements is discouraged in youth leadership. The composition of youth leadership relies on a combination of personal development such as: communication and interpersonal skills, analytic and critical reflection, and positive community involvement (Conner & Strobel, 2007). But these individual achievements and personal interests are directed to the collaboration dimension of leadership and the betterment of all. This aspect of continuously focusing on the development and growth of youth as a group shares similarity with servant leadership. Servant leadership challenges leaders to see the bigger pictures of how leadership affects larger communities. These similarities bring both youth and servant leaders to focus on the betterment of the whole group or even larger communities as part of the final objective.

Another difference between adult and youth leadership is that youth leadership theories have a more inclusive characteristic for who can be leader and the attached expectation (Libby, Rosen, & Sedonaen, 2005). Youth leadership opens its door to any young people who are interested to explore and learn leadership development (Mortensen et al., 2014). In youth

leadership, anyone is seen as a potential leader. This contrast of inclusivity between adult and youth leadership theories shows the underlying perspective in looking at the adolescence period as a developmental period where young people can learn while making mistakes. At the same time, there is also an underlying perspective in looking at adulthood as the end goal of youth development. During adulthood, the adolescence leadership the development process is finished and he/she is now ready to practice leadership skill with certain mastery. This lack of continuity between youth and adult's leadership expectation creates a burden for both young people and adults who do not have the opportunity or means to practice leadership and exercise power.

Youth leadership plays a key role in supporting healthy youth development through collective action and social causes (Zeldin & Camino, 1999). This shows us a difference with adult leadership that rarely explicitly defines a social cause as the root of leadership programs. Youth development orientation of youth leadership always tries to connect leadership to bigger picture change. Adult leadership often focuses on the capability in task and the social relation aspect. Social causes in adult leadership serves as one aspect of a problem that can be tackled through leadership skills. The exclusion and marginalized status of youth also influence the collective action strategy in battling a social cause. Power by numbers once again serves as a useful strategy in building power and voices in leadership positioning.

Adult leadership theories continue to influence youth leadership theories, but youth leadership differentiates itself by focusing on leadership development processes, inclusiveness, and collective leadership with shared power. The connection between adult and youth leadership theories gives rise to further exploration of the relationship between youth and adult leadership practices, including the impact of youth leadership practices on adult leadership. There is a need

to study how youth use the concept of youth leadership inside adult oriented leadership opportunities.

Theme 3: The Indonesian Context

Youth Participation in Indonesia

Despite the large number of young people in Indonesia, youth representation in the democratic process is still limited (UNDP, 2014). Indonesia was categorized as a strong state with a developing democratic and emerging civil society, based on the characteristics of government, civil society, and the state of youth civic engagement. (Innovations in Civic Participation, 2008). The countries in this category started with authoritarian government traditions that shifted into more democratic form. Both the authoritarian culture and an ethnic religious difference played influential aspects in the state of youth civic engagement. The authoritarian culture influences the level of meaningful participation and power that youth practice in daily life. The ethnic religious difference is a common divisive issue that exists in Indonesia. This divisiveness tends to diminish the opportunity of inclusivity for youth in participation.

Innovations in Civic Participation (2008) highlighted specific challenges in youth civic engagement in Indonesia, consisting of a negative youth stereotype and the prevalent problem of government centralization, bureaucracy, and corruption. The recent negative stereotype of Indonesian youth sprung out after the 1998 *Reformasi*. Youth in Indonesia prefer to use large protests or mass demonstrations as the main strategy to challenge political or social issues (Lee, 2011b). Mass demonstrations worked well during 1998 *Reformasi* movement or 1998 Reformed Movement when large groups of university students all over Indonesia mobilized and protested for months to end the dictatorship of the second Indonesian president, Suharto. The 1998 protest

intensified into bloody riots when three university students were killed by the Indonesian military. In the end, the university students in Jakarta successfully took over the parliament for three days. Suharto resigned from his 31 years dictatorship on May 21, 1998.

The 1998 *Reformasi* experience created a new model of citizenship where political participation is both desirable and accessible for youth (Lee, 2011a). The image of the youth as political protesters is visible in television, feature films, and newspapers. Unfortunately, the mass demonstration strategy often ends in violence, such as burning tires, rioting against police, and destroying surrounding residencies and businesses. The perpetrators of violence often have the appearance of youth participants, but often are paid demonstrators that join the protest in order to create chaos. The violence leaves a bitter feeling in the public community and leads to the association of youth with destructive participation and violence. At the same time, there is a lack of alternative positive channels to exercise youth's rights and express themselves. Youth's civic life focuses mostly on the school environment where civic participation opportunities are not always available and at the same time have limited support from non-school civic organizations.

Another obstacle for youth participation in Indonesia is the negative perception towards the government. The youth perceive that their government hasn't done anything for them, which prompts a similar lack of sentiment to 'give back' to society (Innovations in Civic Participation, 2008; Tanu, 2014). This sentiment is stronger for youth with disadvantages because of the limited support that they get from the government. An example of limited support can be seen through the schooling experience for Indonesian youth with disadvantages. Schools for young people with disadvantages have a reputation of poor quality of teachers, lesson planning, and extracurricular activities. However, youth civic engagement in Indonesia still has government policy support. One example is the integration of youth engagement into school curriculum.

Indonesia has a National Youth Policy that requires university students to participate in volunteer or service learning activities called *Kuliah Kerja Nyata* (Innovations in Civic Participation, 2008). The same requirements are also imposed on students at technical high schools as part of the internship requirement. In reality, the policy support from Indonesian government only exists on paper with limited implementation being put into practice. These implementation challenges require youth to take the active role in standing up for their participatory rights through local and national youth organization. The power by number that youth have through becoming united can benefit them in challenging the government to implement the youth participation policies in a meaningful way.

Youth in Indonesia placed second among 12 Southeast and East Asian countries for percentage participation in activism at 46% (UNDP, 2014). Activism is defined as diverse activities ranging from collectively trying to resolve local problems to protesting in demonstrations. Indonesian youth are active in elections but still have lower rates of voter turnout (74%) compared to adults (96%) and senior (96%). These records show us that Indonesian youth can be active in civic life through traditional and activism participation methods. The number involved in civic activism is not high, but it is a promising start that shows the youth's wiliness and desire in creating social change.

Unfortunately, Indonesia has the largest gap between men's and women's activism engagement (31% versus 16%), while there is almost equal participation the electoral process (79% versus 76%) (UNDP, 2014). The assumption from these numbers is women are more empowered to take part in formally institutionalized processes with less risk, such as the electoral process. Activism among Indonesian youth is still highly associated with the urban male youth (Baker & Lindquist, 2013). Male youth are perceived to have more rights to

participate than female youth (Innovations in Civic Participation, 2008). Women are seen as incapable of being brave and committed on the frontline of student movements (Lee, 2011b). This gap in youth participation also reflects on the gender gap in sense of empowerment. 46.6% of Indonesian males feel a sense of empowerment through democratic processes, where they have the capacity to make choices and transform them into action and outcomes. On the other hand, only 27.4% of Indonesian women felt that sense of empowerment (UNDP, 2014).

Youth Participation as Children's Rights in Indonesia

Despite the challenge of gaining government support for young people participation, Indonesia has a short yet still progressing history of supporting the wellbeing of young people through legislative processes. In 1990, Indonesia showed direct recognition and support for young people participation through the ratification of The United Nations Convention of the Rights of the Child. Ratification. This was just the beginning of legislative support for youth participation in Indonesia. The implementation process has met challenges from its inception. I will look into the history of children welfare in Indonesia and the influence of The United Nations Convention of the Rights of the Child on youth participation.

Policy of Child Welfare before Convention of The Rights of The Child in Indonesia.

Indonesia first piece of legislation on children welfare is Law No. 4/1979. This law underlined the importance in fulfilling the basic needs of all non-married person under the age of 21 years old (Bessell, 2007). This law only referred to the rights of children in form of provision of basic care and services for the development of future citizen.

Children are the potential successors of the nation's ideals, which were laid form by the former generation; In order that every child be able to bear the abovementioned responsibility, it is deemed necessary to obtain the best opportunities for them to grow

and develop normally: spiritually, physically, and socially. (The Opening Paragraph of Law No. 4/1979)

Bessell (2007) argued that this law only focused on the preparation of children in becoming an adult human being and citizen of the future. Since the end goal is to create a good future citizen, children is largely seen through the deficit lens as vulnerable, incompetent person that can't actively participate in present day society. This law also neglected the issue of child labor and juvenile justice system. Currently, there is limited data about the practice of this law.

Convention of the Rights of the Child in Indonesia. The United Nations (UN) Convention of the Rights of the Child (“CRC”) was established in 1989 as by-product of long historical context. Establishing a set of protection standard for children was always part of the UN or the League of Nations since the late of 19th century (OHCHR, 2007). The first international instrument with explicit focus on children’s rights is the 1924 Declaration of the Rights of the Child or the Geneva Declaration. The Geneva Declaration unfortunately did not impose any obligation on countries to ratify the children’s rights. The language of this declaration also put children as object of protection, not a holder of rights.

The World War II and its impact on children influenced the newly established United Nations to create a revision of the Geneva Declaration. The UN developed a non-binding declaration called the 1959 UN Declaration of the Rights of the Child (OHCHR, 2007). Despite serving as an update of the Geneva Declaration, the 1959 Declaration was still focused mostly on wellbeing and welfare of children through adult’s provision of caretaking (Fass, 2011). This point of view was common among the Western world. World War I and II showed the severity of war and the necessity to protect children from violence. Acting on behalf of children became the “it” word of the 19th century in the Western country, but this view was challenged through the

image of global children (Fass, 2011). War-torn children from other parts of the world, such as South Africa and Central America, were also victims of war but they were able to act on their own behalf (Fass, 2007)F.

The UN established International Year of the Child in December 21, 1976, which paved the pathway toward the establishment of CRC (OHCHR, 2007). CRC itself served as a revision of the 1959 Declaration of the Rights of the Child. CRC became an international treaty on children's rights or a person up to the age of 18 years. CRC consists of 53 articles with four guiding principles that are: non-discrimination; best interests of the child; right to life, survival and development; respects for the views of the child. (Save the Children, 2010; UN General Assembly, 20 November 1989). There are 196 countries that ratified CRC. This number is larger than any other human rights treaty in history (UNICEF, 2015). United States is the only countries that did not ratify CRC. Each country who signed the ratification also included various declarations and reservations based on the legal system of each country. These declarations and reservations helps each country to fit CRC to its own law but at the same time it also creates a diverse level of CRC implementation. Some countries did not rectified parts of CRC because of religious law in their country, while some were willing to only make small adjustment to CRC itself.

The level of CRC implementation of CRC in the Indonesia is gradually increasing. Indonesia signed the ratification in 1990 and implemented CRC piece by piece in its process. There are three periods of CRC implantation in Indonesia.

First Period-1990 to 1993. The first period started from 1990 to 1997 and it focused on fitting CRC into the Indonesian legal, political, and sociocultural system. Indonesia signed CRC on January 26, 1990 and ratified it on September 5, 1990 (International Bureau for Children's,

2006; UNICEF Indonesia, 2015; United Nations, 1990). Ratification of CRC means that Indonesia is bound by international law to protect, fulfill, respect, and promote children's rights that are recognized in CRC. Implementation of CRC must be adopted in legislative, administrative, and programmatic measures. Indonesia must ratify other international human rights instrument in relation to CRC (Save the Children, 2010).

In the beginning, the Government of Indonesia made reservation upon the ratification of CRC. The reservation stated that the ratification of CRC "does not imply the acceptance of obligations going beyond the Constitutional limits nor the acceptance of any obligation to introduce any right beyond those prescribed under the Constitution" and Indonesia will apply certain articles of CRC "in conformity with its Constitution." (United Nations, 1990).

The first specific legal document that addresses the ratification of CRC in Indonesia was the Presidential Decree No. 36/1990. The document was established as a follow up judicial action that gives CRC domestic legal authority in Indonesia. Unfortunately, Presidential Decree does not have much legal power to enforce CRC implementation. At this period, the Government of Indonesia only acknowledged the Constitution as the only legally binding law on children's rights. The Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia guarantees the fundamental rights of the child regardless of their sex, ethnicity or race. There was no description of what constituted as fundamental rights and its alignment to CRC. The Presidential Decree became more of a formal suggestion with no teeth to enforce CRC.

This first period focused around the concern about CRC as foreign values and norm imposed on children and family (UNICEF Indonesia, 2015). In this period, the CRC was seen as a form of cultural imperialism from the United Nations on Indonesian sets of value on children wellbeing. At this time, the general perception on the cause of children's problems was based on

a polarizing view of both victim blaming and the inescapable structure of poverty (UNICEF Indonesia, 2015). At one end, this perception viewed a lack of parental responsibilities as the source of children's problems. Parents were often blamed for not monitoring their children closely but these parents had to work two or three jobs to support the financial need of their family. At the other end, poverty was seen as inescapable structure that contributed to children's problems. Poor children had a higher chance to dropout from school in order to work and support their family. This polarizing perception of children's problems emphasis on both victim blaming and structural barrier but unfortunately the perception on victim blaming played a bigger role and influenced the limited effort of CRC implementation during the early part of the first period.

The limitation of the first period came from the foreign aspect of CRC itself. The process of CRC implementation required a strenuous education practice about the concept of children's rights and CRC to general public. The first period focused on dissemination of CRC concept but didn't tie it into the local Indonesian context. Tying CRC to local context is essential to help general public to critically analyze the existing sociocultural view of children's rights and problems. Without the education process with critical thinking, fear of CRC as foreign imposed norms continued to exist in the first period as well as limited critical thinking on the current understanding of children's rights and problems.

Second Period-1995 to 1997. Despite the slow start in the first period, support toward the implementation of CRC grew slowly but significantly. The Ministry of National Development Planning or BAPPENAS included a paragraph on children in difficult circumstances into the Five-year National Plan VII or REPELITA VII in 1995. BAPPENAS focused the portion of CRC on the issue of child labor, child discrimination, and children judicial system (BAPPENAS, 1995). There was an increased number of government officials' involvement in global movement

against child labor and sexual exploitation of children. The major event that was attended was the First World Congress against Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children on August 1996. After the Congress, Indonesian Planned Parenthood Association and the Social Concern Foundation hosted a workshop of sexual abuse children and adolescents. This workshop was attended by government officials, police departments, various non-profit organization, and national media (ECPAT, 1997).

Despite its short span of time, the second period focused on dissemination of CRC to some public groups beyond government such as non-profit organization and national media. The focus was building awareness of children's problems that needed to be address immediately. The wellbeing of children could not be fulfilled just by supporting their basic needs. Children, especially children in difficult circumstances, were prone to problems of discrimination, child labor, and sexual exploitation. There were steps to shift away from the victim blaming perspective and more effort to reduce the impact of poverty on the wellbeing of children. There was a growth of understanding that poverty influences the decision to drop out from school, which can lead to the growth of child labor or child prostitution. Poverty also put children in disadvantaged category who are easily discriminated against their rights. The second period started to shine some light on the impact of structure, such as poverty, on children wellbeing.

The second period's limitation came from the limited target in CRC dissemination. Only government officials, police, non-profit organizations, and some part of general public were the ones who became more aware on the concept of CRC. Overall, general public were still in the dark because there was limited localized, easy to understand CRC education process information. Another limitation came from the follow up action after dissemination process. Awareness on children's rights did not always translate to action for children's rights. There was no children

rights law that was established or amended to the Constitution and legally support the Presidential Decree No. 36/1990.

Third Period-1997 to 2004. The third period became a robust period of ratification of international human rights instruments through legislation (Save the Children, 2010). This period was intensified by a monetary crisis and political transformation, which opened up opportunity towards democratization and decentralization. In 1997, a financial crisis hit Asia hard, especially Indonesia. The value of Rupiah as the monetary currency, decreased to a point that created inflation and economic turmoil. The impact of this financial crisis on family life was devastating. Mass unemployment was spreading. Many development projects and industries were closing down. Public health expenditure, including social protection for children decreased substantially (Waters, Saadah, & Pradhan, 2003). Food prices, including rice as staple food, were doubled up. The overall poverty level increased to 18 – 20% from 11.3% (Waters et al., 2003). This monetary crisis affected the poor family and children the hardest. The existing government support such as food price subsidy and public health support, crumbled rapidly during the most needed period of time. Poor families became more susceptible to the violation of children's rights especially on issue of child labor.

The second hit came in form of civil rights restlessness. The financial crisis put the spotlight on the weakness of a centralized financial structure within the corruption, collusion, and nepotism culture. Indonesia reluctantly opened its door for financial assistance from the IMF and the World Bank (Green, 2005; Miller, 2013). Both institutions demanded on governance reforms to receive the financial assistance. Protests for economic reform appeared and spread rapidly in urban areas. One of the demands was the resignation of Suharto, the dictator-style, second president of Indonesia. The Suharto administration or the New Order era

was associated closely to various human rights violations through act of kidnapping, murder, rape, and terror for any vocal opponent of the administration. This long period of human rights violation with strict centralized governance reached its boiling points and broke down in 1998 civil society protest. The protests against the Suharto administration escalated in number through strong alliances with university students in Jakarta. The protest turned into a bloody riot in 1998, which forced Suharto out of his 31-year presidency and began the decentralization process of Indonesian government. The civil rights restlessness highlighted many forms of human rights violations that happened in Indonesia, despite its ratification of CRC and related human rights law.

This third period of CRC ratification was essential in building policies that support children's resiliency and human rights practices. The financial crisis and civil society restlessness helped through the establishment of the Human Rights Commission and the Ministry of Women Empowerment. There were an increased number of legislative policies that support the safety of a child such as Law No. 20/1999 on the abolition of forced labor and minimum age of employment, Law No. 1/2000 on the worst forms of child labor and Law No. 23/2004 on the elimination of domestic violence (Save the Children, 2010; SMERU Research Institute & UNICEF, 2012). Legislative policies on human rights also increased in number such as Law No. 5/1998, a ratification of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, and Law No. 29/1999 on elimination of all forms of racial discrimination (Save the Children, 2010). Indonesia also added four amendments in the 1945 Constitution on human rights provisions and principles in 1999, 2000, 2001 and 2002. The amendments included the recognition that every child "shall have the right to live, to grow and to develop, and shall have the right to protection from violence and discrimination." (International

Bureau for Children's, 2006, p. 31). The amendments also enlisted civil, cultural, economic, political, and social rights for every person including children. The 2002 amendment specifically recognizes children as citizens with a role, value, and contribution in the present day environment. The amendment to the Constitution unfortunately did not include children's right to be heard and the best interest of the child. The reduction from the Constitution put those two rights in lesser judicial power than the rights to live, grow, develop, and be protected from violence and discrimination (Nugroho & Smith, 2010).

Indonesia also established the Law on Child Protection no. 23/2002, which incorporate CRC into the legal system. This law appointed the Commission of Indonesian Child Protection or *Komisi Perlindungan Anak Indonesia* as the monitoring and reporting body. The Law on Child Protection provided safety nets for children in times of crisis but it only incorporates CRC's basic principles of non-discrimination, children's best interest, and principles of participation in its legal language. The Child Protection law used the words "decency" and "propriety" to describe the expected condition for any children participation. This adaptation is a reduced version of CRC that respect children participation in all process and decision that affect their lives (Save the Children, 2010). Despite its reductionist implementation, Bessell (2007) described the Child Protection law as an extension of democratic values in expression and representation for every Indonesian citizen of all ages.

The limitation of the third period centered on Indonesian's reservation of CRC. Indonesia hadn't redacted the reservation on the ratification of CRC since the first period. The reservation only acknowledged the implementation of CRC "in conformity with its Constitution." (UN Treaty Collection, 2015). Despite having many sets of laws on children's rights and human rights, Indonesia only had the legal obligation to recognize rights inside the Constitution. The

Constitution of Indonesia only recognized part of CRC that led to a weak system in supporting CRC implementation in Indonesia. New laws on children's rights and human rights were great start in legal system reformation after the Suharto administration. But they were not enough if their implementation was limited to a certain degree. These laws once again became toothless in its real life practice.

Limitation of the third period also came as a result of the new decentralization status of Indonesian government. Decentralization itself is highly praised as a form of democracy in the new era of Indonesia. Local regulation has stronger value in contrast to the Constitution of the national laws. These local regulations were often not compatible with CRC. Two example were South Lampung District Regulation No. 4/ 2004 and Bandar Lampung Municipal Regulation No. 15/ 2002 on prostitution and morality. These two local laws regulated women's clothing and criminalized their sex as cause of social immorality. These laws are violations to CRC but there was no action from central government to override these laws.

Another limitation of this period is associated with the limited power of the Commission of Indonesian Child Protection or *Komisi Perlindungan Anak Indonesia*. The Commission did not have judicial power to address violence against children directly as well as addressed the House of Representative (Save the Children, 2010). This lack of power brought into question the implementation power of the Law on Child Protection no. 23/2002 as one of the closest legal mean of CRC ratification in Indonesia.

Fourth Period-2005 to 2009. The fourth period started in 2005 and continued until 2010. The tsunami disaster hit Aceh province and Nias Island in December 26, 2004. There were approximately 167,000 people vanished, 190,000 homeless, and 67,000 people lived in barracks and tents (Hestyanti, 2006). Children in the tsunami disaster were separated from their parents,

lived in temporary settlements, and experienced psychological trauma. The dire situation of tsunami affected children pushed the Government's reservation towards CRC ratification out of the picture. The withdrawal of reservation stated that the Government of Indonesia would rectified the entire article of CRC but it still does not imply the acceptance of obligations going beyond the Constitutional limits nor the acceptance of any obligation to introduce any right beyond those prescribed under the Constitution (United Nations, 1990).

Limitation of the fourth period focuses on the withdrawal of reservations of CRC. Despite removing its reservation, the exclusion of some CRC principles from the Constitution serves as a stronger reservation of CRC implementation process. The exclusion also showed that Indonesia did not have to implement the entire CRC principles into action. Decentralization in Indonesia also requires a local level action plan with continuous coordination with local government (Save the Children, 2010). Unfortunately in the fourth period, this kind of coordination had not been established. FAB was formed in 2005 during the fourth period. The formation of FAB was started as method to mitigate the negative impacts from the nearby red light district in the community. The active involvement of *Wahana Visi* in building FAB showed how non-profits took up the challenge to support youth participation and children's rights at the local level. But it also shows the limitation of CRC's implementation at the local level by government agency. The implementation showed us a lag period between policy and practice to support children's rights and youth participation.

Fifth Period-2010-Present Day. The fifth period started in 2010 and was characterized as a period of critical reflection of child protection issue (UNICEF Indonesia, 2015). In this period, there is a growing awareness to mainstream CRC into national legislation and policies. Children related issue was assigned to its own ministry, the Ministry of Women Empowerment and Child

Protection. The government also put the child protection issue into the priorities of national development. Indonesia also continued its human rights legislative journey through the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Person with Disabilities in 2011. The critical reflection aspect came from the awareness to address children's related problem through systemic approach. Addressing the underlying factors of problem must be included in order to protect Indonesian children (UNICEF Indonesia, 2015). The Ministry of National Development Planning or BAPPENAS also critically analyzed issue and policy on children's vulnerabilities into the National Medium-term Development Plan 2015-2019.

The influence of decentralization on uncoordinated CRC implementation still exists in the fifth period. The UN Committee on the Rights of the Child requested Indonesia to provide a coordinated approach to ensure consistency in implementation and monitoring of CRC across national, regional, and local level on their 2014 recommendation. The committee urged Indonesia to put the Ministry for Women Empowerment and Child Protection as the main authority to ensure alignment of CRC implementation in all level (Committee on the Rights of the Child, 2014). In the global practice of CRC, this centralized authority requires a coordinated, localized support from local government. Decades after CRC, various countries decided to move "away from Geneva" and focus on local "lower level" such as municipalities (Veerman & Levine, 2000). This global trend in shifting to local focus is beneficial because it creates places and spaces that are more likely to have positive influences on the everyday lives of children (Torney-Purta & Amadeo, 2011). Kassimir & Flanagan described the effort of African youth in taking up the slack of inefficient, corrupted, adult run political institutions by creating organizations that directly help their surrounding community (as cited in Torney-Purta & Amadeo, 2011, p. 185).

The local level also serves as the main ground where CRC is implemented (Veerman & Levine, 2000). Focusing on local level implementation is meant to help reducing the fear of foreign influence on children's wellbeing policy and practice, which happened in the first period of CRC ratification in Indonesia. Boyden stated that it is important to strengthen CRC at the local level in order to reinforce Geneva and to avoid rejection of the implementation of universal standard for children's rights (as cited in Veerman & Levine, 2000, p. 373). Boyden also argued that CRC must be implemented within cultural boundaries of a community and avoid dictatorial uniformity (as cited in Veerman & Levine, 2000, p. 374). This localized CRC relies on everyday settings and actors such as teachers, parents, and other adults as key role players in shaping the local contexts of participatory human rights attitudes (Torney-Purta & Barber, 2011).

The existence of FAB shows its role as local influencer that support youth participation and leadership. The ongoing involvement of adult mentors and local youth highlights the interest in civic participation in local community. During the fifth period, CRC implementation in Surabaya, Indonesia received a moral boost from the new mayor, Tri Rismaharini. The new mayor brought fresh air to CRC implementation through her active support on young people's wellbeing. One of her initiatives was to make Surabaya a Child Friendly City. Child Friendly City initiative is a CRC implementation strategy that is conducted at local and national levels in Indonesia. Child Friendly Cities Initiative was launched in 1996 as a localized act of the second UN Conference on Human Settlement and Convention of the Rights of the Child (UNICEF National Committees and Country Offices, 2009). A child friendly city is built upon nine building blocks that "ensure children's participation, have a child friendly legal framework, develop a city-wide children's rights strategy, create a children's right unit/ have a coordinating mechanism, ensure a child impact assessment and evaluation, have an appropriate children's

budget, ensure a regular state of the city's children report, make children's right known among adults and children, and support independent advocacy for children" (UNICEF National Committees and Country Offices, 2009, p.2).

The Child Friendly City initiative relies on local government agency, but the popularity of this initiative can create an opening for a nationwide initiative. Surabaya joined this initiative and actively encouraged local municipalities to work with local young people in creating a child friendly city. Surabaya repeatedly won the Child Friendly City award, with its latest achievement in 2019 (Armenia, 2015, August 11; Melani, 2019, November 15). Youth participation through collaboration between young people and local government was quoted as one of key success points in becoming the Child Friendly City (Hubungan Masyarakat Surabaya, 2013, July 23). FAB's close location to the Dolly Lane red district was the key element in connection to Child Friendly City initiative. FAB wanted to create a safe and child friendly environment in the neighborhood close to Dolly lane, the largest red district in Southeast Asia. FAB's initiative in here helped the Government of Surabaya implemented the Child Friendly City initiative in local setting.

Theme Synthesis

The first tension of youth participation in Indonesia literature came from the relation between youth participation and democracy. As a new democracy, Indonesia is being challenged to practice and support democratic elements such as civic participation. Indonesia is described as a strong state with a developing democratic and emerging civil society. This current condition of Indonesian civil society is promising but it also shows some challenges in its daily practice. Indonesian youth carry a negative stereotype of being violent during their participation process. Violent participation usually happens during mass protesting but is often conducted by non-

youth perpetrators who take advantage of the youth movement. But protesting also shows how Indonesian youth rely on collective mass powers as a method of youth civic engagement. This can be a promising yet concerning beginning for the development of youth participation.

Promising because mass protesting shows that youth in Indonesia actively share their voices, and concerning because of the infiltration of violence in the practice. The results of mass protesting usually are temporary and do not lead to institutional change. Youth can only put pressure for temporary change through protesting, but there is still limited youth participation that continually pushes the sustainability of the change. This shows us the need to study and explore various venues of youth participation and how it creates changes at the local or national levels.

Despite this limitation, the Indonesian government has a history of supporting children wellbeing through legislative policies and the ratification of The United Nations Convention of the Rights of the Child (CRC). CRC built young people's participation into its main rights and required ratified countries to implement it in their own country's policies. The implementation of CRC in Indonesia is gradual and still continues to the present day. Unfortunately, there are no legislative and judicial policies that specifically guaranteed young people participation in Indonesia. This lack of legislative and judicial support can lead into the negative perception of Indonesian youth on their government for being not supportive to youth development. On the other hand, there is more diverse government support on city or local levels in implementing youth participation in governance practices. Surabaya is one example of a city that successfully joined and implemented The United Nations Child Friendly Cities policies at the local and city levels. The Child Friendly Cities policies explicitly enlist youth participation as one of the main indicators. Surabaya established youth councils and consultation at both local and city levels as a way to promote youth participation. Surabaya serves an example of how young people can be a

source of knowledge to support their local government through the participation process. But the challenge of tokenism and adultism is still visible in some cases and needs to be addressed. This strength of government support on youth participation in some cities such as Surabaya, shows the need to look closer at various youth participation practices in order to learn more about their strategies and practices.

Leadership Practices in Indonesia

I chose to analyze leadership in Indonesia as a general concept because the literature of youth leadership in Indonesia is very limited. A search through Web of Science in July 2020 came back with 8 results for topic of “youth leadership” and “Asia.” The results were even smaller (three results) for “youth leadership” and “Indonesia.”

Culture is one of the influential contexts in leadership. Two important researches on the influence of culture on organizational leadership were conducted by Hofstede & Hofstede in 1980 and R. J. House and GLOBE (Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness) in 2004. The cultural characteristics of leadership in Indonesia are described as short term and unstructured oriented but actively work towards harmonious relationships through the value of collectivism (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010; House & Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness Research Program, 2004; Irawanto, 2009). The short term and unstructured orientation can create problems in tackling big, long-term issues such as youth civic participation and leadership. This means there is a need to have sustained programs on youth participation and leadership to make sure the continuation of the progress. Unstructured preference also means that Indonesians have a tendency to “work with the flow” with less initiative to act and move forward. This unstructured challenge can open more opportunity for youth leadership in pushing change by taking a lead and create initiatives. Youth become the

active actors who must tirelessly challenge adult or power holder through participation and leadership action. But on the other hand, Indonesia has the strength of collectivism, which means there is high possibility of gaining communal support in youth participation and leadership area. Indonesian cultural characteristics of leadership are also assertive and closely connected with masculinity traits. These masculinity and assertive traits can create problems for young women who already are underrepresented in civic participation and activism. Another characteristic of leadership is that rewards and praises are expected and given to a main leader despite being done in group work. These characteristics can become a challenge in youth leadership context because adults can easily take over the rewards and praise from youth work. It also shows the unbalance of power between leader and followers.

Indonesia is a multiethnic and multicultural country, with more than 200 ethnic groups among its 215 million population. The biggest and most dominant ethnic group in Indonesia is the Javanese (Irawanto, Ramsey, & Ryan, 2011; Suryadinata, Arifin, & Ananta, 2003). Javanese leadership principles, such as trust in God, merit, obligation, patriarchal, and respect to older leaders, permeated directly into the contemporary leadership characteristics (Irawanto et al., 2011; Suryani, Van de Vijver, Poortinga, & Setiadi, 2012). Indonesia was also colonized for centuries by the Spaniards, the Portuguese, the British, the Dutch, and the Japanese. During the colonial era, leadership power in political and economic sector was associated with only the royalty families or *priyayi*, who served as local rulers under the colonizers (Irawanto et al., 2011). The royalty or *priyayi* played the role of benevolent protector who made decisions on the behalf of all the citizens. The followers will repay the with gratitude, obedience, respect, and identification (Irawanto, 2009). This long-term colonization continually shapes and influences the culture and traits of leadership in present day Indonesia. Despite gained independence from

the colonizer, colonialism continues to spread its residue on people's nature of being, consciousness, identity, and epistemological framework (Jaramillo, 2012). The real objective of colonialism extended beyond just controlling wealth to dominate the mental universe through culture, people's self-perception and their relationship to the world (Ngũgĩ wa, 1986).

Indonesia's second president, Suharto, who was not from *priyayi* family, built strong alliances with royalty families by placing them in military, cabinet, and governmental sectors to support his dictatorship (Irawanto et al., 2011). Indonesia has gone through political reformation and ousted Suharto from presidency in 1998. But leaders in Indonesia continually exhibit paternalistic oriented leadership with autocratic benevolent behavior. A leader has all the invested power, immune to criticism, while the followers are expected to have lack of interest to disagree with the leader because it is considered morally improper (Irawanto et al., 2011). Gani (2004) expanded the manifestation of colonization in Indonesian leadership by identifying contemporary leadership traits such as: lack in orientation towards achievement, avoid reality by focusing on mystical world, past oriented, depend on fate and destiny, compromiser and conformist, well-mannered only to superior or ruler, do not believe in quality, breakthrough or cross cut mentality, confused and uncertain of oneself, undisciplined, and likely to neglect responsibility. This leadership manifestation of the colonization legacy is the most visible and influential on youth participation and leadership. The paternalistic "*priyayi*" perspective gives all the leadership support towards the leaders who come from the "right" class or background. Youth with disadvantages will not have the same support and opportunity in participation and leadership. Challenging "right" leaders is also discouraged as it discourages youth's interest in participation and leadership because of the limited social change that they can accomplish.

Theme synthesis

Leadership in Indonesia closely influenced by culture and history elements. Javanese culture such as trust in God, merit, obligation, patriarchal, and respect to older leaders, permeated directly into the present day leadership characteristics. Colonization legacy such as the benevolent role of leader is still strongly applicable in modern day. Leader in Indonesia still adapt to this benevolent figure with full authority while the followers still adapt to submissive behavior. Indonesian leadership also relies on collectivism but give praise only to the main leader in group leadership setting. These characteristics of Indonesian leadership have both positive and negative impact on youth leadership. Positive impacts focus on the collectivism aspect where youth have the opportunity to join leadership through the spirit of harmony. Negative impacts focus on the paternalistic and patriarchal aspects where leaders are built from people with the “correct” background and socioeconomic factors. These aspects are especially negatively influential for youth with disadvantages who experience layered marginalization. I also argued that female youth leaders would experience harder acceptance in youth leadership world because of the patriarchal perspective that exist in leadership in Indonesia.

Lastly, currently there is very limited literature on the impact of culture and history on youth leadership in Indonesia. This limitation in literature requires further exploration and analysis on the concept and practice of youth leadership in Indonesia. There is also a need to explore youth leadership in Indonesia through the intersectionality lens, such as looking at how various marginalization (i.e. gender, class, race, religion) influence the practice and impact of youth leadership.

Conclusions of the Literature Review

As youth participation and leadership have recently become widely recognized as key factors in global development and achieving a democratic society, coupled with Indonesia's recent move to democracy (in 1998), the literature review could be narrowed down to focus on these three themes, in addition to researching any literature relating to an Indonesian context (includes literature written in Indonesian). Therefore, this chapter is a review the literature of youth participation and leadership in general and specifically related to Indonesia, which provides a framework to conduct the research of this study in a critical and focused manner.

There are three themes that emerged from the overview of literature. The first theme is youth participation extracted from various studies that included the concepts of civic engagement, participation, and involvement. The second theme is leadership, which consists of both adult and youth leadership theories. Adult leadership theories initiated this theme through adult leadership characteristics, strengths, and challenges. Youth leadership could then be critically reviewed by exploring the influences of adult leadership on youth leadership theories. I also explored the different characteristics of youth leadership. In the last theme, I connected the youth participation and leadership theories in the Indonesian context. As the setting of this study is in Surabaya, Indonesia, the Indonesian context helped to understand the relationship and impact of the implementation of participation and leadership theories in Indonesia.

The first theme, youth participation, opened up by following the diversity of terminology used to describe "participation." Different scholars used different names such as "engagement" or "involvement" to describe the similar concept of "participation." Despite the name diversity, they described similar attitudes, behaviors, knowledge, and skills aimed to benefit the wellbeing of communities and the overall greater good. "Participation" is often used in conjunction with

marginalized populations as a method to increase active citizenship and ownership. Learning about youth participation starts in a family setting, but it expands to broader civic institutions such as schools and youth organizations.

From examining the ideal forms of “participation” focused on democracy, equality, trust, and voluntary involvement and examining a more nuance aspect of “participatory” practice, I was able to conclude that “participatory” in its essence is closely connected to democracy and democratic values. This core value can be problematic to analyze “participation” in countries that are new to democracy or have unstable democracies. Trust and safety are two main issues for youth participation in new or unstable democracy. There is a threshold of trust and safety that countries must reach to support youth participation. This threshold of trust and safety must be acknowledged in youth participation analysis for new/ unstable democracies.

Another question that came from the concept of “participation” is whether participation alone can be counted as act of democracy when people have limited control on the final decisions. This problem connects closely with the concept of power, where adults usually have more power than youth in participation processes. This problem is also amplified by tokenism and adultism during participation process. The concept of youth participation is still very popular despite all of the challenges because of the benefits youth participation promises. The benefit on smaller scale focuses on youth development while on larger scale, youth participation supports stronger democracy.

The second theme, leadership, started with a review of the chronological development of adult leadership theories. The review concluded that adult leadership can be separated into two periods, which are: traditional and new/ contemporary periods. The traditional period began with trait theories where leadership behaviors were connected to certain personal traits. Then there

was a shift into behavioral theories that focused on leader behaviors during the leadership process. The context or situation where the leadership process happens came into adult leadership theories as part of contingency theories. The usage of context or situation in leadership brings up the importance of seeing leadership as a socially constructed process. New/ contemporary theories focus on both leaders and followers along with their interaction during the leadership process. New/ contemporary leadership also includes ethics and moral elements into the practice of leadership. Another development in new/ contemporary leadership is servant leadership that focuses on care, non-selfish behavior, and collaboration to ensure follower development. In this theme, I developed a critical perspective of adult leadership for its narrow and rigid concept of a leader. Adult leadership still focuses on individual skills of leaders to ensure successful leadership for both the leader and the followers. There is limited exploration on collective leadership and power sharing despite promoting collaborative between leaders and followers. Adult leaders are also expected to have basic leadership skills, which can limit leadership development for adults with limited leadership experience and skill.

On this second theme, I continued by analyzing youth leadership theories. Contrary to the adult leadership theories of born leaders, scholars see leadership potential in every youth and believe that leadership skills can be taught, which prompts the growth of youth leadership programs. Collective leadership and collaboration are important aspects that support leadership development for every youth. I also noted similarities between the concept of youth participation and youth leadership, which focuses on the large influence of family and civic institutions. The similarities also extended to the challenge of tokenism and adultism, especially their influences in creating a power imbalance and hierarchical relationship between adults and youth while limiting meaningful leadership activities for youth. The challenge of youth

leadership also sprouted from the usage of traditional leadership traits to define a leader.

Traditional leadership traits, such as academic achievement, create exclusivity and are damaging for youth with disadvantages or youth perceived as not possessing the traits of a “natural leader”.

The third theme, the Indonesian context, explored the setting of this study in Indonesia and its influence on youth participation and youth leadership. The exploration of literature related to Indonesian context revealed some of the literature is conveyed in Indonesian, although there are some English articles in print. As a native Indonesian, I have the privilege to find and understand these Indonesian articles. I added them to the existing English language literature to create more holistic literature review. Indonesia, as a new democratic country, was praised for its emerging civil society and youth civic engagement. Indonesian youth are active in activism and mass protesting. But at the same time, Indonesian youth must eliminate being associated with the violent version of youth participation. The violence mostly happened during mass protesting and often came from demonstrators who were paid to create chaos. In this theme, I also connected youth participation as a form of CRC implementation in Indonesia. I analyzed CRC through a chronological lens and split them into five periods from 1990 to present day, in addition to exposed both the strength and challenges in each period. CRC has gone through a gradual expansion and development, where it started as a national policy only, then continued into a more localized implementation. I also became aware of the lack of legislative and judicial policies on youth participation in the present day setting. But I also found localized examples of youth participation practices in local municipalities in Surabaya. I chose Surabaya, as an example because of its role as my dissertation’s location and my familiarity of this city. Despite various challenges, Surabaya successfully reaches the Child Friendly Cities status, which includes youth participation as one of the indicators. However, despite Surabaya’s achievement,

the challenge of youth participation and leadership in Surabaya still exists and must be analyzed closer to see its impact on youth.

On this third theme, I examined general leadership practices in Indonesia, as I discovered there is very limited literature on youth leadership in Indonesia. By analyzing the characteristics of leadership in Indonesia as collectivism, short term orientation, unstructured, paternalistic, and patriarchal, I concluded these characteristics could become both strength and challenges in the practice of youth leadership. Collectivism and unstructured leadership open up doors for youth to join and participate in leadership. An unstructured setting creates more fluidity for youth to insert themselves into a leadership structure. But paternalistic and patriarchal leadership styles build obstacles to youth leadership. Paternalistic diminishes the youth's voices to support the supposedly older and respected official leaders. Youth also have limited ability to lead in a meaningful matter because leadership positions usually are assigned to "natural and paternal figure" leaders. Patriarchal leadership is especially a challenge for females; first, to attain leadership positions; and second, to gain equality with their male counterparts.

Limitation of Existing Literature

I concurred with the literature conveying the limitations of the existing research due to the severely lacking number of research publications about the nature of civic development and leadership in non-Western countries with active democracies (Lenzi et al., 2012; Youniss et al., 2002). Most of civic engagement and leadership research in the past half century came from the Western world (United States, Canada, and Western Europe). This unbalanced past research creates a North American bias in leadership theories, models, and measurement (Den Hartog & Dickson, 2012). The second limitation conveyed comes from civic engagement and leadership literature where there is limited research on the role of minority and youth with disadvantages

(Checkoway & Aldana, 2013). I argued these limitations could create an imbalance in understanding youth who are not naturally seen as leader.

For the third limitation, Ho et al. (2015) suggested the need to expand advantages and disadvantages of different institutional types on youth-led activities and strategy to access power by youth of different cultures, including measurement of impact of youth-led initiatives on society. This lack of research can limit the knowledge base about participation and leadership that helps future youth and societies, especially in the area of the influence of different cultural contexts on the development of civic engagement. Lenzi et al. (2012) suggested on adding qualitative method for a better and detailed understanding on the process of how social contexts influence civic engagement development in adolescents.

The scholarship of youth leadership is also still growing with an ongoing demand to expand the scope and context of research samples. Day et al. (2014) challenged academia and scholars to answer and expand the research on how to develop leaders and leadership as effectively and efficiency as possible for future research. Another challenge for future research is to focus on the collective aspect of leadership, such as shared leadership. This challenge to explore collective aspect of leadership shows the need to view youth leadership as a method of learning through collaboration.

Since leadership development happens in between or after any leadership related program, workshop, or seminar, there is a lack of understanding how people practice in becoming leaders outside leadership program (Day et al., 2014). There is a need to focus on what happens during leadership practice and development in everyday setting. This limitation is more challenging for researcher because it takes more extensive time to observe and follow youth leadership activities outside leadership program such as family setting. This requirement needs

extensive hours of research that might not be available for all youth participation and leadership research.

Contribution of This Study

An obvious conclusion of some of these limitations becomes the added value towards the contribution of this study. First, this study explores civic development and leadership in Surabaya, Indonesia. Surabaya is the second largest city in Indonesia, a new democracy country with a flourishing civil society. This study offers a unique research opportunity to analyze youth participation and leadership in a non-western context of youth with disadvantages (i.e. family poverty, lack of parental support, and lack of high quality education).

This study expands the horizon for the literature of youth participation and leadership in an active, new democratic country. Youth participation and leadership rely on trust and confidence in institutionalized groups in order to participate safely (Torney-Purta et al., 2004). Safe participation for youth is especially important for new or unstable democratic environments. Currently, the Indonesian civil society is flourishing and building strength (Ambyo, 2014, July 9). Many Indonesian citizens, especially young adults, actively participate in voicing their opinions and needs on various issues such as: corruption, urbanization, and economic development, through a diverse form of civic organizations at the national level. (Taylor, 2016, January 21). This strong trend in participation serves as an important foundation in building trust and encouragement for civic life in Indonesia. The main question, now, focuses on whether this strong environment of “participation” in Indonesia translates to local level. This dissertation provides an analysis on how youth built their trust on local civic organization institution through their participation and leadership process in FAB.

This study explores youth participation and leadership in a youth organizational setting. As a youth organization, FAB provides an opportunity for civic participation and leadership experience that might not be accessible in family and school settings. This study looks at how youth with disadvantages address problems surrounding their communities.

This study analyzes collective aspect of youth leadership through an Indonesian context. Indonesia places high value on democracy that emphasizes deliberation and unanimous agreement. The Indonesian tradition of collectiveness can be seen in daily usage of the idea of familiarization (“*kekeluargaan*”) and mutual aid (“*gotong royong*”). In Indonesian tradition, oneness can be found through interdependence and mutual assistance in everyday life. But this collectiveness is also influenced by paternalistic and patriarchal styles of leadership. This influence can transform into weaknesses where youth can be manipulated through collective leadership to enhance paternal leaders. This study explores how FAB youth integrate collectiveness tradition through their leadership experiences and at the same time deal with paternalistic and patriarchal aspects of Indonesian leadership.

In this study, I could not provide extensive observation of youth participation and leadership outside the leadership program because of time constraints. However I critically analyze the challenge of tokenism and adultism in youth participation and leadership process. Adult leaders habitually make decisions single handedly without any input from youth constituents. Both adultism and tokenism are common in youth work in the Indonesian context as being a paternalistic and patriarchal community. This study analyzes different levels of tokenism and adultism both inside and outside FAB setting. FAB itself, as a youth civic organization, has adult and older youth mentors, who are prone to fall into tokenism and

adultism. This study explores the subtlety and nuance of both participation challenges. I also critically assess the extent of control that the youth had on decision-making process.

Overall, this study come at a highly significant time when youth participation and leadership are being globally recognized as a much needed addition to policy development at all levels of decision making (local to global). Youth are seen as catalyst of innovation towards shifting from failing economic driven paradigm to a “sustainable development” paradigm, now being promoted internationally. With Indonesia focuses on strengthening a newly formed democratic society, this study has the potential to contribute towards giving a voice to youth with disadvantages, leading to an increased potential for establishing equality across Indonesian class distinctions. I hope this study could empower the marginalized, yet majority group of Indonesian youth in becoming a force contributing to the new democracy life in Indonesia.

Chapter III. Methodology

Research Purpose and Questions

This chapter specifies the methodological approaches that I use to carry out this study. This study is a case study of youth leaders within a youth organization in Surabaya, Indonesia focused on children's rights orientation. The purpose of this study is to learn how urban youth in FAB, a youth organization with a children's rights orientation, engage in civil society and exercise leadership at local and citywide levels. FAB was formed by *Wahana Visi* Indonesia, a Christian nonprofit organization focuses on children, family, and community issues. Specifically, I examine how the previous and current youth leaders negotiate power through civic engagement and leadership in issues connected to children's rights. This study addressed the following research questions:

1. How do youth leaders define and exercise leadership in FAB?
2. How do youth leaders define and exercise children's rights in FAB?
3. How do youth leaders negotiate power through their civic engagement and leadership role in FAB?

Critical Youth Studies Framework

Specifically, for this research, I use Critical Youth Studies (CYS) as my qualitative research paradigm. The critical framework looks at the world and life events as a socially constructed knowledge. Each society has its own feeling, thoughts and interpretation of the world (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). The youth concept itself is socially and culturally constructed, which changes continuously based on the youth's surrounding environment and period of history (Steinberg, 2014). Surabaya, as an urban city in Indonesia, serves as a context that helps

construct the concept of youth participation and leadership for this study. CYS provides a framework to assess this context and critically analyze its impact on FAB youth.

Youth are often seen through a negative lens, such as slackers, narcissistic, confused, and ignorant (Kellner, 2014). Recently, the protagonist perspective of youth is increasing. The young protagonist's perspective views youth as actors with active participation, increased autonomy, and social responsibility (Schwertner & Fisher, 2014). CYS provides me with a lens to see youth from the protagonist's perspective, which challenges the mainstream negative perspective of youth in urban Indonesia. CYS challenges researchers to question what they can do with youth or what youth can do for themselves (Ibrahim, 2014). CYS also explores the intersectionality of gender, class, race, sexuality, and ability on social structure of the youth's life. As a research method, CYS must examine the complexities of and the connection between power, knowledge, and exploitation, as well as put empowerment of youth into the research objective (Best, 2007). The complexity of various intersections of CYS will provide a more holistic approach to analyze youth leaders with disadvantages in FAB. CYS will also an open door to look at gender influence on youth participation and leadership in Indonesia.

CYS criticizes the normality of adultism and the dominant representation of youth in everyday sociocultural practice and institution (Cerecer et al., 2013). The critic of adultism also extends directly to the role of adult researcher with her/his power and authority. CYS prompts researchers to examine their role and find the best way to engage youth in research. Power in CYS is porous, complex, and fluid, where power can shift continuously between researcher, other adults, and youth themselves (Ruby, 2007). In the end, the critical framework focuses on empowerment of a person above her/his racial, class, and gender constraints through examination of the existing living condition (Creswell, 2007; Marshall & Rossman, 2011).

Methodological Approach

I utilized qualitative research as my main method of inquiry to gain a critical knowledge on this topic. Qualitative research is beneficial in exploring meanings that an individual or a group ascribes to a certain social problem. Qualitative research is also useful to hear the usually silenced voices of the marginalized community, as well as develop a complex knowledge of the research topic (Creswell, 2007). A qualitative researcher conducts the study in the subject's natural setting and interprets the meaning behind daily world practice (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). The qualitative researcher also explores the social world as a holistic and complex world through systemic reflection while staying aware of her/his own social identity as a researcher (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). The definition and practice of qualitative research is fluid and ever changing to align with the complexity of the historical background. Qualitative research is considered entering its eight historical moment, which is the future period (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). During this period, qualitative research becomes a method to conduct critical discourse on democracy, race, gender, class, nation-states, globalization, freedom and community. Qualitative research also allows the researcher to exercise politically oriented research with radical, democratic and interventionist values (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011).

Case Study Method

Case study research is beneficial to understand complex, contemporary social phenomena while at the same time retain a holistic and real-world perspective (Yin, 2014a). The case study method is a good fit because this research is a study of youth leadership and civic engagement in relation to children's rights through one case, which is youth leaders of FAB, within a bounded system, which is *Wahana Visi* Surabaya. The case study approach also retains a unique context of each case during the interpretation process (Maxwell, 2012). The case study approach is

using multiple sources of information to support the analysis. My data sources consisted of interviews and qualitative documents. I used interviews to collect data from the youth and staff. I also explored qualitative documents such as publications, reports, children's writings and drawings as additional sources of information. These multiple sources will help creating a holistic analysis of the case study (Creswell, 2007).

Case study has its own challenges in the process. The first challenge is deciding the boundaries of a case (Creswell, 2007). The researcher must decide what case, in a bounded system, will serve well in answering the research questions. This challenge appeared when I had to choose a youth-based organization that works the best in actualizing youth leadership. It took me extensive hours of meetings, networking, and long conversations with both youth and staff from various youth-based organizations to see which group had the most robust youth participation and leadership in its day-to-day operation. I also searched for an organization that actively is involved in the aspect of practicing children's rights. Children's rights practice is an important component in my dissertation, because I want to understand the concept of youth leadership in a human rights oriented setting.

The second challenge comes from case study's characteristics, which is very unique to its own context. This uniqueness will create a challenge because the results can't be generalized to other contexts (Creswell, 2007; Maxwell, 2012; Thomas, 2003). The qualitative case study is often atypical, but can provide insight into a larger class of similar units (Gerring, 2007; Kumar, 2011). Qualitative case studies have the benefit of offering a holistic understanding of a group through extensive exploration. This qualitative case also provides an in-depth study of the youth leaders of FAB through vivid and detailed analyses for the reader (Marshall & Rossman, 2011).

Data Collection Strategies

Invitation

I conducted my study on site in the summer of 2015 and 2016, and continued through online communication in 2017 to 2018. I received an IRB approval in 2015, and successfully renewed it yearly up to 2020. I used a purposive sampling to find youth leaders in FAB and *Wahana Visi*' staff. Purposive sampling is beneficial in selecting subjects with specific characteristics (Patton, 2002). I targeted youth with the following criteria: had held a form of official leadership role in FAB (either in the past or in the present), and had been member for at least 3 months. My rationale for doing so was to maintain recruitment consistency among youth participants and capture the perspectives of youth who self-selected themselves to become FAB youth leaders. I also targeted *Wahana Visi*' staff to give another perspective on FAB youth leaders. In order to provide perspectives on youth leaders, I chose any staff members who have been involved in FAB programs. I chose these youth and staff individuals because I saw them as the most knowledgeable and experienced sources who could help answering the research's objectives.

For youth, I shared the participation invitation verbally in FAB's monthly meeting as well as during daily group activities. I also used the Blackberry Messenger group to invite youth into this research, as Blackberry messenger is the one of most common used apps in the region. The invitation described the main goal of this project and the purposive sampling criteria. 12 youth leaders agreed to join this research. Seven young women joined the research. They were: Elok, Jessica, Nanda, Nina, Sari. Vero, and Wati. There were also five young men, who were: Adam, Joko, Budi, Jerry, and Sugi. For staff, I gave verbal invitation when I met them during FAB events. Mr. Peter, a FAB adult mentor, agreed to join the research. All the names used in this dissertation are pseudonyms.

After gaining 12 youth participants, I held an orientation day. During orientation, I explained the background of this study. I explained my objective, personal reasoning, and method of conducting this research. I highlighted the voluntary aspect of research participation as well as the level of commitment needed. I asked the interested youth to sign an assent form for anyone below the age of 18 years old and a consent form signed by their parents. The consent form was also distributed to youth 18 years old and above. All youth returned their signed assent and consent form and successfully joined the research. For staff, I verbally asked for preliminary consent and potential interview date. I also explained the objective and reasoning of this research as well as the voluntary aspect of research participation. I brought the staff consent form during the chosen interview dates and will proceed with the interview process.

Next is a brief introduction of each youth participant and adult mentor:

Elok was an 18 year old young woman, who served as a youth mentor for KITES (*Komisi Sosial/ Social Division*). She recently graduated from technical high school with a major in marketing. Elok joined FAB when she was in 7th grade. She is the oldest among five siblings. Elok's father had an unstable employment situation, while her mother worked as a house cleaner for their neighbors. Elok described herself as an active child evidenced through her membership in various school extracurricular activities, such as Girl Scouts, Chinese Mandarin conversation club, and youth Red Cross team.

Jessica was a 19 year old young woman, who served as the FAB secretary between 2014-2016. She joined FAB when she was in 9th grade. After her graduation from a technical high school, Jessica worked full time as an administrative staff in the morning, and actively participated in FAB at nights. Jessica's father worked as a day laborer in construction projects, while her mother worked as a cook in a small restaurant. Jessica described herself as a non-active

child in school. She joined a dance club in her school but quit due to lack of guidance from her dance instructor.

Nanda was an 18 year old young woman who served as the FAB vice-chief between 2014-2016. Nanda joined FAB when she was in 8th grade. Her father worked two jobs, one as a mosque keeper/security guard, and the other as a sales staff in a music instrument store. Nanda's mother was a real estate agent. Nanda was very active youth in her school and college through her participation in different student organizations.

Nina was a 17 year old young woman, who served as the coordinator of the children's rights peer education program in FAB between 2014-2016. Nina joined FAB when she was 13 years old. Her father was a day laborer in construction projects, while her mom is a stay-at-home mother. Despite having both parents in Surabaya, Nina lived with her grandparents. She enjoyed staying with her grandparents because their home helped her focus on schoolwork. She stated that her parents' house was too crowded with her three siblings. Nina was a very active girl in her school. She served as the president of her school student council, while staying active in Girl Scouts and a city level child-mentoring program.

Sari was a 20 year old young woman, who served as a youth mentor for the FAB chief and vice-chief. She was the FAB chief between 2012-2014, and was often hailed as one of the most successful FAB administrators. Sari joined FAB when she was 15 years old. In 2015, she was a college student, majoring in management. She has two sets of parents, her biological and foster parents. However, she chose to live with her grandmother because she did not feel comfortable living with either set of parents. Sari was very active in school life through memberships in many different extracurricular activities, such as the basketball team and the dance troupe.

Vero was a 20 year old young woman who served as a youth mentor in the roles of FAB treasurer and secretary. She served as FAB secretary between 2012-2014 and treasurer between 2014-2016. She started FAB when she was 13 years old. Her father was a day laborer in construction projects, while her mother worked as an hourly massage therapist. She considered herself as having an active student life during her schooling years.

Wati was a 16 year old young woman who served as the FAB vice-chief in the newest administration that started in mid-2016. Wati was an active member of the FAB theater division before her role as a vice-chief. She joined FAB when she was 14 years old. Her father was a day worker in construction projects in the morning and a food seller at night. Her mother was a stay-at-home mother. Wati was also very active in her school's student council.

Adam was a 19 year old young man who served as the FAB chief between 2014-2016. His father was a technician, while his mother was a stay-at-home mom. He joined FAB when he was in 7th grade. He perceived himself as an active student due to his involvement in the school's student council.

Joko was a 21 year old young man who served as the youth mentor for the theater division. He was the FAB vice-chief between 2012-2014. Joko dropped out from college due to his lack of interest in his civil engineering major. His father, a construction worker, pushed him to pursue a degree in civil engineering, despite his interest in art. He joined FAB when he was in the 11th grade.

Budi was a 17 year old young man who served as the FAB chief in the newest administration that started in mid-2016. He was a vocational school student with a major in animation. His parents did not get along well and lived in different cities. His mother lived in Surabaya and sold milk for a living. Budi did not know where his father was currently located.

He was very active in school due to his position as the president of the school's student council.

Jerry was an 18 year old young man who served as the FAB treasurer between 2014-2016. His father was a daily laborer for construction projects, while his mother worked as a factory worker in a local shoe factory. He joined FAB when he was in 8th grade. Jerry considered himself an artist and had won many youth art competitions, including a competition on a children's rights awareness campaign.

Sugi was a 19 year old young man who served as the coordinator of the catfish farming division. His parents divorced and remarried when he was in 3rd grade. His stepfather worked as a freelance hairdresser. Sugi joined FAB when he was in the tenth grade. He did not perceive himself as an active student during his schooling year due to his shyness.

Mr. Peter was the FAB adult mentor. He started his career as a database manager in WVI's monitoring and evaluation team. After a year working as database manager, he chose to become a FAB adult mentor in 2011. Mr. Peter chose this position because he loved the challenge of working with community, especially youth, in the red light district.

Interview

This study consists of two main qualitative methods: interview and qualitative document analysis. I conducted one-on-one interviews with the youth leaders and staff in my purposive sample. The purpose of interviewing was to collect and understand knowledge, beliefs, and opinions from the participants' perspective (Kumar, 2011; Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Yin, 2014a).

I used both unstructured and semi-structured interviews with open-ended questions for the youth and staff. Unstructured interviewing has the strength of being flexible and has the ability to create some depth on the content (Rubin & Rubin, 2012). I used unstructured

interviews with the youth leaders and staffs during day-to-day activities. I asked them open-ended questions based on my observations of that day. The answer provided clarification and also the subject's point of view related to their actions.

I used semi-structured interviewing to explore the youth leaders' own understanding and staff perceptions about youth leadership, civic engagement, implementation of children's rights, and youth power in the Surabaya civil society. I used the same set of open-ended questions with all youth leaders and staff. The open ended questions served as a probing guideline to help me gain some in-depth information (Kumar, 2011). There were six main semi-structured interview categories, which consists of: personal background, involvement in FAB, definition of FAB, youth leadership, children's rights, and future (Appendix A & B). Interviews also provided multiple perspectives on one topic, which developed a holistic description of specific topic (Weiss, 1994). I conducted each interview in person in FAB. Each interview lasted for approximately 60 minutes. I recorded both unstructured and semi-structured interviews for transcription purposes. Recordings were conducted after I gained consent from the youth and staffs. The weaknesses of interviewing came from the response bias and also question bias (Yin, 2014a). An interviewee could also give answers that he/she thinks the interviewer wants to hear. The answer in any interview could also be inaccurate because of erroneous recollection.

Qualitative documents

The second data supplement in this research came from both *Wahana Visi* and FAB documents. These documents provided the background and historical context of this study. I gathered documents such as reports, report minutes, government agreements, newspaper articles, and website information with information pertaining FAB and *Wahana Visi*. The review of qualitative documentation served as an constructive method to understand and portray the value

and beliefs of participants in this study (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). Qualitative documents helped researchers access participants' language and word in written form in convenient timing. But qualitative documents also had weaknesses such as unequal opportunity, inaccuracy, and inauthenticity in capturing people's opinions (Creswell, 2014).

Data Analysis Strategies

I prepared my interview data and qualitative documents for analysis. First, I transcribed and translated the recorded interviews from Indonesian to English with InqScribe, a transcription software. I read the transcription results and qualitative documents several times to gain sense of the data, then I started the data analysis process. An open-coded method is conducted on the transcription notes by assigning thematic themes on the data. Coding is a process of breaking data apart by assigning a category or concept for selected chunks of raw data (Corbin, Strauss, & Strauss, 2008; Rossman & Rallis, 2012). The semi-structured interview questions served as the first code that will aggregate interview data into a category based on questions. Other codes were constructed by categorizing raw data based on the actual language of participants, literature terminology, and my interpretation of the underlying meaning related to my central themes of youth leadership and participation. I also looked for surprising and unusual codes that serve as conceptual interest for other scholars and readers (Creswell, 2014).

I grouped the codes into themes that reviewed the high-level, abstract ideas, and categories and sub-categories that reviewed low-level, more concrete actions. I also defined the meaning that I wanted to convey from my sub-categories. An example from my codebook was this interpretation of Elok's interview, "first of all, this person must be able to lead her/himself." I interpreted Elok's words to fit in sub-category of "youth leadership as leading oneself, then extending towards leading others using positive leadership." One of the meanings I wanted to

convey in this sub-category is that youth leadership starts with the ability to lead oneself, control ego, emotion, and selfishness. I put this sub-category into the category of “youth leadership definitions from the youth perspectives,” which also fitted into the theme of “how youth defined leadership,” a higher-level code that contained several other lower-level codes from the data.

The qualitative documents were also coded with the same codebook in order to connect them to the interviews. I used NVivo, a qualitative computer data analysis program. NVivo is useful in facilitating code comparison of data, such as: the influence of gender of youth leadership in FAB. NVivo was also useful for tabulating frequency of codes, themes, and categories that I assigned to my data. This feature helped me to show the level of agreement that the youth participants had on different themes. I shared themes with high level of agreement by selecting several quotes that I perceived to be the most rich in their definitions. I also included themes with a minority perspective, by sharing all direct quotes related to these themes. The minority quotes might only come from a couple of youth, but they provided different perspectives that could enrich the majority perspective.

Trustworthiness

An important element in a qualitative, case study research method is making a case for trustworthiness (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 2009). There were several strategies that a qualitative researcher could do to achieve trustworthiness. I focused on using (1) triangulation, (2) member check, and (3) rich, thick description.

Triangulation focuses on convergence of data from multiple measurement points. In this study, I utilize multiple methods of data collection ranges from interview and qualitative documents. These multiple methods of data collection helped me to cross check the consistency of data findings collected from different times and place (Denzin, 2017; Patton, 1999). Using

multiple data sources helped me achieve layered findings and confirmed the dependability of different themes that appeared across the data.

In addition to triangulation, I also used member check, a method where I asked feedback from the youth leaders on emerging findings in data analysis process. Member check is essential to prevent misinterpretation of meaning and perspective of what the youth leaders said and did (Maxwell, 2013). I shared my data analysis themes regularly with the youth leaders. I used online chat apps or social media to communicate with the youth leaders regularly when I was not in Indonesia. The youth leaders provided me with additional context and clarification to ensure the correct interpretation of the data analysis.

Lastly, I also committed to use rich, thick description with detailed presentation of the context, setting, and findings of this research (Maxwell, 2013; Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2014b). I utilized the youth leaders' direct quotes and detailed overview of context to maintain level of trustworthiness of the findings. I particularly focused on capturing the youth leaders' voices in the context of intersectionality between their young age and gender.

Limitations

Limitations that influence this study came from several sources. First, this research was constrained by the limitation of time that I could dedicate to observe the FAB youth leaders. As the main student investigator, I only visited Indonesia during summer breaks, which limited my observations to three months. This limitation could limit the amount of primary data that was collected through in person dialogue with FAB youth leaders.

Second, the nature of participant recruitment was only for youth who held some form of a leadership role in FAB and had been member for at least 3 months. These criteria gave me a consistency in participant selection, but it limited me from capturing the experiences of FAB

youth members who did not have any leadership role. For example, youth members who were actively joined FAB but did not have any interest to take upon leadership role. Their perspectives would provide additional perspectives to the youth leaders who participated in this dissertation, and created a more wholesome picture of FAB youth experiences.

The last limitation was generalizability of this research. Being that this was a single case study, the findings of this dissertation cannot be generalized for all youth leaders in Indonesia. Generalizability itself was not a goal of this qualitative research. However, the depth of analysis provided a detailed analysis of the complexity of youth leadership experience inside FAB, a civic organization with children's rights focus, in Surabaya, Indonesia. This detailed picture provided a way to understand other youth leaders' experiences, especially youth leaders from disadvantaged background in Indonesia.

Chapter 4. The Definition of FAB Youth Leaders and Youth Leadership

In this chapter, I will answer the research question referred to in Chapter 3, on how the youth defined and became leaders in FAB. This chapter will explore how youth leadership is defined from the perspective of FAB youth leaders. This definition of youth leadership corresponds with the concept of ideal youth leadership, a concept that FAB youth leaders defined and hoped to see from all youth leaders. The findings in this chapter can be categorized in the following way – first, I will start the chapter with how youth leadership is defined as leading oneself, then extending towards leading others using positive leadership. Second, I will highlight the bipolarity of youth leadership definition, where some youth leaders perceived a leader as someone with a title or a person authorized as leader, while others believed that everyone could be a leader. I will close this chapter with the influencing factors that support youth leadership development in FAB. Finally, the terminology of children, young people, and youth will be used interchangeably based on the intersection between the Indonesian government’s definition of a youth as a person between the ages of 16 to 30 years old and definition of children as anyone from birth to the age of 18 years old.

What is a Youth Leader: An Overview

The current realm of youth leadership development in Indonesia creates a leadership scope that centers on the narrative of developing future leaders, leaving limited opportunity & place for youth leadership practice in the present day. This reality prompted me to ask FAB youth whether and how they self-identified as youth leaders. Some youth acknowledged and claimed a youth leader identity or they saw themselves as on the path to become a youth leader. However, some youth did not have the same confidence to self-identify themselves as a leader. I

wanted to understand how the youth understood and constructed leader identities through their narratives.

Overall, central to the youth's understanding was the claim that the goal of youth leadership, primarily, was to bring positive change and growth for both the leaders and the followers. The definitions of youth leaders that the youth shared were often ideal definitions of youth leadership. This ideal definition was constructed from the expectation of a youth leader as someone who should lead through examples. While this was overall the ideal, there were three main aspects of leadership that the youth wanted to see from a leader as derived from their interviews and narratives. These include leading oneself, extending leading oneself by leading others using positive leadership, and understanding the bipolarity of leadership. These nuances and layers of the ways in which youth described different leadership styles and what they expected from youth leaders are explained below.

Leadership as Leading Oneself and Extending Towards Leading Others Using Positive Leadership

Central to the youth's self-identity of a leader is their own expectation and claim that youth leadership, first and foremost, is about the ability to lead oneself. Eleven out of 12 youth defined the concept of youth leader as a person who is able to lead oneself. As several of them, pointed out, "First of all, this person must be able to lead her/himself; ...there are many meanings of youth leader. It can be leading yourself; ... a leader must be able to lead her/himself first before leading others " (Interviews with Nanda, Sari, Wati, Vero, Joko, Budi, Jerry & Sugi). The youth went on to elaborate on what this meant. Ability to lead oneself could be manifested through different actions, which were: leading oneself action and conducting self-control.

Leadership as leading oneself through action. The first concrete manifestation of leading oneself is doing what you say or that one's actions and speech should be congruent and should align with each other. Seven out of 12 youth saw this alignment as leadership by example that might inspire others (Interview with Nina, Vero Joko, Nanda, Sari, Wati & Adam). Nina, Vero and Joko all agreed with this concept of a good leader and specifically described a youth leader as "a person who can do what s/he preach in her/his own daily life." With regard to leading by example, Vero stated that, "we have to lead by examples then we can bring people in." Leading by example also connects closely to the concept of action-oriented leadership. A leader needs to do the work that s/he asked her/his followers to do. A leader cannot just talk about expected ideal leadership skill, while not doing it in real life. Nina described the importance of action-oriented leadership, which was shared by other youth as well (Interviews with Nanda, Sari, Wati, Vero, Joko & Adam):

A leader must join the work process. A leader cannot speak and tell people to do stuff and not doing anything...there's always action inside youth leadership, real concrete action...Hoping or wishing about something all the time, without doing any action, will not work well. If we have any hope or wish, then we should act upon it.

These participants directly identified the ease of wishful thinking and relying on other people to take action in order to make things better for youth, either in FAB setting or in the community. They challenged youth leaders to act upon their hopes & dreams, and do something to make them into reality. The key aspect of youth leadership is action to fulfill wishes, hopes, and dreams about the betterment of youth and turn them into reality. Talk without action was not considered a good leader's trait. Nanda and Sari articulated the importance for youth leaders to go beyond just acknowledging that there was a problem in the community and move forward to focus on the action part; Nanda said, "We need to act, not just seeing or concerning [about a

problem] but we need to act.” And Sari emphasized, “If you have the desire but you don't want to make the effort, then it is useless.”

Leadership as self-control. The second concrete manifestation of leading oneself is the action of self-control. Self-control happens on many different levels, such as controlling one's ego and negative emotion. Seven out of 12 youth leaders stated that a youth leader's ego should come in second after her/his followers (Interview with Nanda, Jessica, Vero, Joko, Sugi, Jerry & Budi). Controlling ego also means controlling a youth leader's personal interest. Nanda stated a point that was shared by others, “A leader must be able to lead her/himself, by controlling her/his ego and own interest” Or as Vero voiced, “By controlling ego, a youth leader opens her/himself to criticism.” The most important examples of controlling a leader's ego are putting the followers' interest first and listening to followers' aspiration before deciding on an action. Jessica gave an example of putting follower's interest first, “For example, [FAB] members want to do an event, a positive event such as [membership] socialization or *tadarusan* [praying together] or breaking fast together. If this leader has the ability to make this interest into reality, then s/he should support her/his member to conduct it.” In this example, a leader supported the interest of followers and helped with the implementation of the event. Self-control also meant controlling one's negative emotion. These emotions could be anger, being upset, or irritation. A leader was seen as someone who must stay calm and who does not give in to a burst of emotion when making decisions. Sugi described, “When we were emotional or something, we must gain control of our emotion. When we have conflict or problem with others, we must focus to minimize the negative effect of the conflict.”

Leadership as leading others through example. Leading oneself serves as the first step in youth leadership, which comes with the expectation and responsibility to pass on knowledge and

skills by leading others. When a youth starts leading oneself, then s/he should accept the challenge to share her/his new leadership skill with others. Extending leadership by leading others is also beneficial for a leader because it pushes a leader's boundaries beyond their comfort zone and pushes her/him to grow as a youth leader. Three out of 12 youth leaders specifically detailed the connection between leading oneself to leading others (Interview with Nanda, Elok, and Sugi). Nanda stated, "I see that the definition of a leader is interconnected. If we can lead ourselves, then we should challenge ourselves to lead others or even lead an organization. We train and challenge ourselves so we can know our limit and boundaries in leadership." Elok added, "I have to lead my own self then [I can lead] my closest peers, then other people." Sugi echoed this sentiment and stated "The first duty is to manage ourselves then manage others. Not manage, but guide others."

A unifying theme in this vision of youth leadership fits with the bidirectional aspect of leadership, where leadership starts from leading outward from one's inner self to lead well in the external domain (Ledbetter, 2010). Leading oneself stems from life experiences, which means a person has to do leadership activities in life to gain this experience. This concept of bidirectional leadership corresponds closely to the concept that a leader must have followers in order to practice leadership (Gardner, Avolio, & Luthans, 2005; Kress, 2006; Shamir & Eilam, 2005). FAB youth leaders perceived followers as an essential leadership element and challenge that every youth leader must experience in order to practice leadership. Six out of 12 FAB youth leaders talked specifically about the importance of leading followers as part of a youth leader's task. After reflecting on my interview question about what a youth leader is, Wati concluded that, "the role of a leader is to guide her/his followers." Sugi described, "A youth leader is someone who can arrange and guide her/his members." Other youth leaders also echoed similar

sentiments (Interviews with Elok, Nanda, Sari & Vero). Giving direct orders or managing followers is expected from a youth leader. Wati stated, “A leader must be able to navigate her/his followers to left and right, front and back.” But youth leaders also need to go beyond just managerial duties. Corresponding closely to the idea of leading oneself, a youth leader also has the responsibility to help their followers grow. Sugi specifically stated, “A leader must be able to lead and mentor the follower.” Mentoring followers is different from giving orders to followers. Mentoring here means that a youth leader helps followers grow in skills, knowledge, and promotes socioemotional development. Vero specifically defined that a youth leader “must be able to bring the members to progress, instead of the other way around.” She later defined progress in followers as the growing of “positive behavior.” Nanda and Budi also echoed the same description where a youth leader “must be able to guide members” towards “the members’ success.”

Leading others was also influenced by the concept of egalitarian leadership, where a youth leader is not just guiding the followers but also working together with them. Trevor-Roberts, Ashkanasy, and Kennedy (2003) defined the style of egalitarian leadership as generous, compassionate, group-oriented, and collaboration building. Three out of 12 youth leaders specifically described elements of egalitarian leadership as important aspects in youth leadership (Interview with Sari, Nina, Vero). Sari defined youth leadership with a focus on collaboration; she stated that youth leadership is not “hard, as long as we can work together collaboratively. That is the key in youth organization, collaborative work... everyone can do it... If they can’t work together then it will be hard to reach the organization objective.” Nina elaborated more on the importance of working together, side by side, with followers, “I truly believe if we want to build something then we need a leader who guide us and do the work with us. A leader must join

in the work process. A leader cannot just speak and tell people to do stuff and not doing anything.” Egalitarian leadership is important for youth because they perceive youth leadership as a better version of leadership than adult leadership. Adult leadership is perceived to be more hierarchical, where seniority plays a strong role. This hierarchy manifests in power imbalances especially during youth-adult partnerships, where the more senior adult often plays the role of a leader. Egalitarian leadership in the context of youth leadership focuses on peer support. An action oriented leader who is willing to jump into action while also being inclusive to followers is meaningful youth leadership. In egalitarian leadership, leaders support other leaders. Youth leaders also need to actively help their peers without waiting to be asked. Vero gave an example of this action, “We need to help each other, if there is only one structure member that do all the work, then it is not fair and I feel bad for this person. We do not have to ask [for help] directly, “Can you help me please?”...when we see the other member works alone, then the structure members should ask what do you do? Do you need help?”

In this section, we see that overall, youth considered leadership of the self or leading oneself is a first important step in being a leader. By leading oneself they meant taking on a commitment to act as they spoke, while controlling their ego and negative emotions. These characteristics and behaviors were seen as important in good or effective leaders. We also see that the youth extended their ability to lead oneself by leading others. Being a leader for others meant that youth leaders would guide and mentor the followers by working together side-by-side and helping them grow through this nurturing collaboration.

Understanding the Bipolarity of Youth Leadership: Everybody Can Be a Leader Vs. Having a Leadership Title or a Person Authorized as Leader

The definition of youth leader was split, on one end, there was a belief that every youth could be a leader, while on the other end, a leader was seen as someone with a leadership title or a person authorized as leader. In FAB, eight out of 12 youth leaders thought that opportunity to become a leader is a right for everyone (Interview with Elok, Jessica, Sari, Vero, Wati, Joko, Jerry & Budi). This sentiment came from the belief that every child can be a leader. Jerry shared that “all children are born as a leader... We are all leaders.” Budi pointed out, “Every child that goes into FAB has her/his own leadership soul.” Sari shared similar perception that any youth can be leader but the youth must have the desire to be a leader and make the effort to become one, “If you have the desire but you don't want to make the effort, then it is useless.” The premise of leadership opportunity is that it is available for everyone but the first initiative of action must come from youth themselves.

Adding to the sentiment that every child can be a leader, three of eight FAB youth specifically pointed out that a person does not need a specific leadership title or become a member of certain administrative board in order to be considered a leader. Wati believed that “everyone is a leader even though they don't have any position title in an organization.” However, any youth must accompany her/his leadership interest with a responsibility to act, an echo to the youth's own definition of a youth leader early on. Joko summarized his definition of a youth leader and stated, “I believe every children can be leader. A child who is a member and not a structure administrative member is a leader when s/he can lead her/himself, brave to share voices, and open to criticism, not egoistic.” Vero gave an example of leadership action that any youth can do without an official leadership title, “I think everyone is a leader. For example, our

relationship with our siblings. One of us, either the older or the younger sibling, is for sure a leader who tells the other about things, like "do it this way, don't do it like that." It is a leadership behavior; this person already leads others but indirectly because this person does not have any specific leadership title." Another example was from Joko who shared a scenario inside FAB where "everybody will be late for the meeting anyway, so I [a youth] will be late also. This is not a leader." Both examples highlighted an action element in leadership. Vero's example showed that leadership action could happen inside a family or home setting with siblings. Joko's example showed that leadership behavior, like being on time, is enough to prove that one is a youth leader.

At the same time, seven out of 12 youth leaders highlighted a more traditional definition of a leader in Indonesia (Interview with Nina, Nanda, Vero, Wati, Joko, Sugi, Adam). A leader is someone with leadership title or a person authorized as leader, which is seen as a desirable trait and a sign of power (Suryani et al., 2012). When I asked about who they perceived as youth leader in FAB, three youth described the former FAB chiefs and division coordinators as the examples of leaders. The title of FAB chief and coordinator automatically distinguished these youth as leaders. Nanda described, "I also think coordinators of each division are leaders in smaller scale, within their own division. Chief is also a leader within FAB." Nina described a youth leader as someone who has a leadership certificate from the Government. Automatic recognition of leadership title or authorized leadership through credentials/appointments as a sign of youth leadership creates a problematic situation. However, Vero highlighted the problematic nature of leadership titles and how it was not align with her belief that everybody can be leader. Vero gave an example of this problem by saying, "A chief or president is a leader despite they do not do any leadership action. It is all because of their chief or president's title."

This awareness of the problematic definition of a leader came from youth's expectation that a youth leader is a person who led through examples, yet at the same time, recognizing the reality that having a leadership title without doing any action is still perceived as a sign of leadership.

These two polar opposite perceptions of youth leadership shows the influence of Indonesian culture in the definition of youth leadership. The FAB youth strongly emphasized the importance of leadership opportunity for any youth. Inclusiveness is an important element of youth leadership. The narrative where every child has an opportunity to be a leader was profound for FAB youth. Leadership opportunity becomes as a form of children's rights that each child is entitled to. At the same time, some of FAB youth described hierarchical perspectives of youth leadership. A youth leader who has leadership title and does leadership action sits on the highest level of the hierarchy. A youth leader who has leadership title but does not do any leadership action is on the second level, while on the last level, it is any youth who can be lead in any environment without any specific title. These diverse definitions show us different understandings on the concept of youth leadership that the FAB youth leaders had.

In this section, we learned how the youth defined youth leadership in bipolar perspective. At one end, some youth leaders argued that everyone could become a leader, which showed a more inclusive definition of a leader. At another end, some defined a leader as someone with a title or a person authorized as leader, which aligns closer to a more traditional definition of a leader. These bipolarity, nuances, and layers of youth leadership showed us a more complex definition of leadership and served as the foundation that motivated FAB youth in their journey of becoming youth leaders.

Influencing Factors Supported Youth Leadership Development in FAB

All of the youth leaders chose to join FAB because of the skill development opportunity, such as joining music, theater, or social media divisions. These divisions provided the youth with opportunities to learn new skills in a group setting with other youth. Budi shared his expectation when he first came to FAB,

When I first joined FAB, my sole expectation was to learn music. I wanted to sing but apparently, only girls joined as vocal group in the music division. So I joined to learn guitar... I wanted to join music but I want to learn both guitar and vocal exercise

Others echoed this sentiment and shared their expectation “to gain more knowledge” (Interviews with Jessica, Nina, Nanda & Adam). The youth leaders also expected to gain personal development skill such as public speaking and self-confidence. Vero expressed her hope to become less shy, “I was so shy and always afraid when I meet new people. I hope to lose those fears so I can talk when I meet new people.” Sugi also shared similar sentiment, “Those youth in the socialization helped to convince me that I would experience a lot of change when I joined FAB. From shy and quiet to a person who is able to communicate with a lot of people.” The early expectation of FAB focuses on typical outcome from youth development program, such as skill development and personal development growth. The youth did not have any expectation for leadership growth, and focused solely on their personal growth motivation.

However, Wati described her shift of expectation after joining FAB, “At first, I truly wanted to learn theater skills. I never imagine FAB will be like this, socialization about children's rights. I just want to learn about theater at that time.” After joining FAB, Wati started to learn about children’s rights and her role as a youth member was to spread them through FAB. Similarly, Budi described the main difference that he immediately saw in FAB in comparison to other youth programs, “When I first came, there were so many children. There were rows and

rows of children from front to back. When I went here [FAB], I thought gosh, apparently, there is an organization like this where all the members are children. It looks fun. I commit to continue my activities here. I'm still in awe that there is an organization who is led and organized by children." The prominent feature of youth leadership in FAB becomes the first out-of-place experience, in contrast to an experience inside a typical youth development organization. This also served as a cognitive dissonance experience where the new youth members expected an adult-led, skill development oriented organization, but arrived in a place where their peers served as leaders inside the organization.

The second out-of-place experience happened because memberships of youth organizations in Indonesia are often associated with good, well-behaved, serious youth, while FAB opened its doors to diverse youth. Some of the youth leaders joined FAB in order to prove themselves as "good" youth and make their parents proud. Sari described her family as a broken family. Her parents were divorced and lived in Jakarta, while she lived with her foster mother and grandmother in Surabaya. The broken family situation motivated Sari to be perceived as "good" youth, challenging the stereotypical portrayal of broken family children. For her, FAB provides an opportunity to prove her "good" youth image and learn skills that can help protect her from being perceived as "bad" youth.

In my opinion, you can call my family as a disarray family or broken family...I do not have any parental supervision, and my grandma is old so she can't fully supervise me anywhere. I have this parental trust to live with my grandma. I should be living with my biological parents but I do not want to. My parents fully put their trust in me so I have to uphold that trust and do not disappoint my parents. So I have to keep coming to FAB since my intent was joining FAB from the beginning... Sometimes, I want to know how it feels to be a delinquent. I don't have to try to be a delinquent. Some of my friends also do not have enough parental supervision. The result is bad. One of my friends is pregnant, some are drug users. I was afraid I would be like that. What would my family say if I went on that road? I always think like this since I was a kid. When I grow up, I must make many people happy, my biological parents, my foster parents, my grandma. So

many people, so if I were not successful, then how would I make them happy? Somebody told me that I could not expect instant result. I must work hard and organize stuff since I am young. If I want to be successful, I must organize myself. I am not a diligent or smart kid. I like to play and I like to be not serious. But at least I can keep myself safe from bad influence.

Wati shared a similar motivation. Wati wanted to counter her limited ability in the academic world. She tried to be a good youth through non-academic accomplishments and make her parents proud. Wati shared, “I know my weakness is in academics, so I want to find a way to make my mom happy.” The desire to fit into the “good” youth narrative motivated these youth to join FAB in order to create a positive experience that helps enhance their image and make their parents proud.

FAB is located near the Dolly Lane red light district neighborhood. Being a young person from the red light district neighborhood has its own negative stereotype. Sari described examples of negative influences she saw in the surrounding area, “There is gambling in my *kampung*...There is also drug users, some already caught.” Some of the youth leaders joined FAB in order to protect themselves and negate the negative influence from the red light district. Sari described, “So if I don't put my need first, especially since I don't have any parental supervision then I can get into trouble. So every day I come to FAB. I have to fill in my spare time. My friends in *kampung* even told me that I never join their activities. I never *nongkrong* (hanging out without doing anything). I am the type of person who is easily influenced by my friends. I am not getting any bad influences yet so I prefer to keep myself safe. I spend more of my spare time here in FAB than at home.”

The interest to protect oneself from negative influences is beneficial for membership drives because parents and future members saw FAB as a positive place where youth could gain “positive” friends. However, this narrative helped perpetuate the idea that the youth organization

is only accessible for “good” youth, not for every youth. The narrative of “good” and “bad” youth is problematic because it still categorized youth into a good and bad dichotomy, instead of perceiving them as unique individuals. The context of FAB’s location and Indonesian society highly influenced this categorization of youth and the point of view that the youth leaders had. In contrast to Sari and Wati’s journey to be “good” youth, other youth’ narratives emphasized a much more complicated journey for the rights of participation and leadership. These stories highlighted the uniqueness of youth leader as a person, beyond the “good” or “bad” category. Joko, for example, described his drug using experience when he was a youth member in FAB, “I tried several drugs. I used meth and I couldn't stop... I already joined FAB at that time.” Labeled as a “bad” youth, he never had the opportunity to join any youth organization before FAB. School organizations were not accessible for Joko because of his “bad” behaviors. FAB provided him with a place to participate and lead despite his drug using habit. Joko also attributed FAB in helping him quit drugs, “I felt FAB helped me because of its activities. When I craved for meth, I tried to do activities in FAB so I forget about the craving...there are always activities in FAB from day to night, minimum three children are in FAB. There were friends, activities in FAB.”

The youth’s narratives about becoming leaders address factors that influenced them in their leadership journey. They described shifts in their ideas about youth organization. Varied narratives show diverse paths of becoming youth leaders. For some youth, youth organization was a logical place to learn about new skills and knowledge. For others, FAB was a protective place from bad influences from the Dolly Lane red light district. Finally, FAB as youth organization was a unique civic participation opportunity that some youth labeled “bad” youth never experienced in other institutions, such as schools because they were shut out of such

experiences. FAB became a place where they could challenge the labeling of youth and push for a more inclusive opportunity to participate and lead.

FAB youth leaders defined and made meaning of leadership identity around two key features: youth leaders, in their view, were people who could lead themselves and others using positive leadership, and could acknowledge the bipolarity aspect of leadership. Youth leaders should extend their leadership skill and knowledge to others by leading others. Some of the youth in this dissertation perceived youth leadership as an ability that all children could exercise, while others acknowledged that only young people with specific titles and positions were perceived as leaders. This bipolarity of youth leader definitions showed the diverse perception regarding the definition of a youth leader in FAB. In this chapter, the youth leaders also shared influencing factors that support leadership development in FAB. The youth leaders expressed how they internally motivated themselves to become leaders because of their desire to develop youth development skills, to protect oneself from the red light district, to find positive influences, and to gain equal access to participation and leadership rights. In the next chapter, I will explore how FAB youth leaders connect their definition of youth leadership to reality by sharing their own leadership practice through FAB.

Chapter 5. Practicing Youth Leadership and Negotiating Power

In this chapter, I will answer the research question referred to in Chapter 3, on how the youth leaders exercised leadership and negotiated power through their civic engagement and leadership role in FAB. The youth leaders perceived and conducted their leadership practice in various different ways. This diversity prompted me to dissect leadership practice in FAB through two different lenses. The findings in this chapter can be categorized in the following way – first, I will start with how leadership practices intersected with the leaders' young age and then I will continue to analyze the intersection of gender identities on youth leadership practices. Finally, the terminology of children, young people, and youth will be used interchangeably based on the intersection between the Indonesian government's definition of a youth (16 to 30 years old) and definition of children (from birth to 18 years old).

Leadership Practice as a Form of Youth Identity

The first theme that emerged from this chapter was the youth leaders perceived their leadership practice as a form of youth identity through the manifestation of their children's rights, especially participation rights. They relied on two leadership strategies, which were: 1) sharing the knowledge through direct mentoring and by personal example, and 2) opening up FAB as a space for multiple perspective learning. The impact of leadership practices differed based on the location of their practice. Inside FAB environment, some youth leaders developed decision-making power with guidance from adult mentors, while some felt less empowered in their collaboration with adult mentors. Outside the FAB environment, the youth leaders experienced adultism from local community members, which manifested through the lack of acknowledgement of youth's leadership ability & knowledge, and creation of superficial

participation for youth leaders. Below are the detailed analyses on how the youth leaders perceived leadership practice as a form of youth identity.

Creating and Utilizing the Rights to Participate and Join Civic Society

The discourse of FAB youth leaders regarding their leadership practice involved the dynamics of inclusion and exclusion based on age. The main argument against youth leadership is that young people are not to be included in civic participation and leadership opportunity because of their young age (Lee, 1999). This exclusion resulted in unequal treatment and opportunity, in addition to limited access to resources and power. As young people, they have to be creative in finding different mechanisms for both participation and leadership opportunity. All of the FAB youth leaders perceived their leadership action as a form of youth identity through the acknowledgement of their rights as young people, specifically in form of participation rights. All of the youth leaders described FAB as a place where young people could practice participation rights and join civic society in a safe environment. Wahana Visi Indonesia (WVI), the parent organization of FAB, uses the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) as its guideline for children's rights (Tanjung, 2018). Participation rights help children to take an active role in their community and country, including freedom to express opinions, have opinions in matters affecting their own lives, join associations, and assemble peacefully (UNICEF, 2001). Civic participation and leadership opportunities for Indonesian youth are very limited. The most available opportunity for FAB youth leaders comes through *Karang Taruna*, an official government sanction youth organization. Eight out of 12 youth leaders had experience in joining *Karang Taruna* in their communities (Interview with Elok, Nina, Nanda, Sari, Vero, Wati, Joko, and Adam). The concept of *Karang Taruna* as a youth organization itself is problematic because its membership is open for anyone between the ages of 13 to 45, and

leadership positions are open for anyone between the ages of 17 to 45. Elok shared how her mother nudged her to join *Karang Taruna* but she could not join because of her young age at that time (She was an 8th grade student or 15 years old). She joined *Karang Taruna* as unofficial member without any power or opportunity to use her participation rights in a civic organization setting, "...my mom always told me to go somewhere and I always obey her, Elok, there is *Karang Taruna*, then I joined it despite being just an unofficial member because I was just an 8th grade student and I cannot join *Karang Taruna* officially yet."

The broad definition of young people in terms of age range in *Karang Taruna* prompted a feeling of dislike towards the organization. Nanda stated, "I do not want to be in *Karang Taruna* because I don't like the people. I know the type of *Karang Taruna* members, which is uncooperative." The large discrepancy in age also created a very fertile ground for ageism, which limited civic participation and leadership opportunity for youth younger than 13 years old. Wati, Vero, and Adam highlighted how adults often held leadership positions in *Karang Taruna* and ignored any input from younger youth. Wati stated, "There are older adults in *Karang Taruna* and they were seen as having more experience. So the one who became president is that experienced adult" and Vero added, "The ones who have leadership positions are older people, older than me, around 20 something years old." Adam added how the leaders in his *Karang Taruna* "did not accept my opinion and see it as a joke." This obstacle formed non-existence opportunities for both civic participation and leadership for younger youth. In addition, *Karang Taruna* also failed to become an active civic place where young people could participate and lead in day-to-day civic life. *Karang Taruna* became a token civic organization. *Karang Taruna* exists as a government sanctioned youth organization that is supposedly accessible for all young people, yet in reality it only becomes active during special events and then becomes idle during

other times. Nina shared her story,” *Karang Taruna* only active during Independence Day celebration...and they will disappear after that. I have no interest to join them.” Sari, Vero, and Joko also shared a similar sentiment. This lack of regularity for opportunity of youth participation and leadership resulted in fluctuation of membership, where the members “usually left in less than a year” (Interview with Vero).

Based on this lack of opportunity to join and lead in civic society, the youth leaders took advantage of their FAB membership and used it as a tool to attain equality in leadership opportunity, both inside FAB and in the community. Equality here meant having the same access and opportunity to use their rights despite of their age and status as children. FAB became a unifying unit with collective power for young people to participate regularly in civic spaces. There are two strategies that youth leaders used to practice leadership through FAB, which were peer mentoring and acceptance to multiple perspectives. In the next sections, I will describe these two strategies.

Peer Mentoring as the First Strategy in Practicing Youth Leadership

Gaining access and opportunity to equally participate and lead in civic society was a great opportunity for FAB youth leaders. The next step was to share the opportunity with other youth. All of the youth leaders stressed the centrality of peer mentoring or learning from each other as part of their youth leadership practice strategy. Learning about leadership does not mean sitting down and learning about leadership theories. All of the youth leaders perceived themselves as mentors who guided and educated their peers in FAB. All twelve youth leaders embraced peer mentoring as an effective tool in building leadership consciousness. For my analytical framework, I defined leadership consciousness in a similar way with Freire’s critical consciousness (Freire, 2005), which is: a method to understand the current oppressive reality of

youth leadership through dialogue and disruption of oppressive leadership structure in order to create social action and change in the field of youth leadership. Freire's critical consciousness also highlighted the development of the ability to recognize structures that limit marginalized group's inclusion. In this study, leadership consciousness will focus on how the youth leaders developed the ability to understand different structures that limit their inclusion into leadership opportunity and their action to change.

Building leadership consciousness among youth is a fundamental *bidirectional* leadership practice. Activities in FAB were designed to educate and build youth leader identities. FAB has several youth development divisions, such as: music, theater, and multimedia. Youth leaders led and ran these divisions. They organized, managed, and trained members on development skill. Seven out of 12 youth leaders agreed that building leadership consciousness through dialogue and educating others is an important strategy in practicing youth leadership (Interview with Sari, Vero, Sugi, Jerry, Budi, Elok, and Nanda). Sari shared that peer mentoring was natural and an essential approach in FAB because there was a limited budget for hiring professional mentors or teachers. Other youth organizations had the budget and ability to learn and practice leadership under the guidance of professional mentors or teachers. In FAB, hired mentors or teachers were a luxury. As one of the former chiefs, Sari pushed FAB division coordinators to absorb as much knowledge as possible from professional teachers and then built their own curriculum to guide their peers. Sari gave an example when she asked Mr. Peter for a music teacher,

I told Mr. Peter this, I promise if you bring me a teacher, the youth will study hard. In the future you don't need to bring more teachers because these youths will be able to pass the knowledge down the line to the newer members....So at that time I asked Mr. Peter for teacher, like an investment capital. If we learn everything by ourselves then it might not be correct. I don't want the wrong skill and knowledge get pass down to the new generation. I promised Mr. Peter that I would not ask for another teacher. I promise that at least one out the five youth would be able to continue the skill that they gained from

the teacher. Then we develop the coordinator position. We promise from the beginning that we will share knowledge.

Another youth leader, Vero, described how her leadership action always focused on “bring people to join us, teach other people, share stories with them. This is a form of leadership.” Sugi also added that it was the “sole principle is I have to be able to share my knowledge to other people...A good leader is someone who share their knowledge to others.” The important outcome from building leadership consciousness was to ensure that other youth became as knowledgeable and successful as the youth leaders. The youth leaders understood the limitation of learning from professional teachers. That kind of access was accessible only for specific numbers of youth and at a specific time. The youth leaders wanted to open the learning opportunities to everyone. The youth leaders repackaged their knowledge, combined both the professional teacher knowledge with their own wisdom, and then shared them with their peers. This was the way the youth leaders build leadership consciousness. Vero stated, “For me the best thing is to share my knowledge. If I see people is being successful then, for example, a person cannot do something and I teach this person then s/he can do it. It is a great pleasure for me. If we help people too, if the person is happy then I am happy too.”

Raising leadership consciousness among FAB youth could not happen through the traditional pedagogy of leadership learning. The youth leaders viewed leadership learning as a conversation dialogue between young people. Jerry described, “Everyone in here does not lecture others but we share our experience. If somebody can't do it then I will share my knowledge, and vice versa.” The youth leaders perceived sharing knowledge as the best way to educate their peers, because it eliminated hierarchy existed in traditional pedagogy of learning. FAB leaders with skills or knowledge did not want to be seen as master teachers who lectured about leadership. Instead, they wanted to become the conversation starters who shared knowledge with

everyone who wanted to learn. Budi stated, “I also think my peers looked at me as somebody who is more knowledgeable. I don't put that need [to be seen as knowledgeable] up high. I only want to share my knowledge to my peers so it's not just me who understands...Whoever wants to learn, I will let them know.”

Conversation dialogue in leadership learning required active listening in order to create peer-mentoring opportunity. Eight out of 12 youth leaders strongly believed in the importance of active listening in leadership practice (Interview with Elok, Nanda, Sari, Vero, Sugi, Jerry, and Adam). Active listening created space for others to share their thoughts without being defensive or judging. Elok said, “As a leader, people does not always listen to me...but I listen to others and I expect the same in return.” The youth leaders learned to be flexible with their own leadership decisions by listening to other people’s opinion. Nanda shared an example, “I usually asked them what they want. If they feel that I'm bossy, then I will stay quiet. Then they will say, It's ok, just do what you did. Everybody is different...I must be calm and not get angry. I asked what do you want then? Out of nowhere, this person agreed with what I said.” In addition, conversation dialogue helped the youth leaders negotiate their differences. Youth leaders communicated their disagreements with each other; “We had these differences in vision once. I always communicate my idea” (Interview with Sari). Most of the youth leaders understood that not everyone would agree with their choice or decision, and these differences could be enriching for their organizational life. Sari described the importance of maintaining flexibility when building leadership consciousness, “We all reminded FAB members and fellow structure members to tell new potential members that they should try FAB and if it doesn't fit with their interest then we won't force them to stay.”

In this section, building leadership consciousness through peer mentorship was an important objective in youth leadership practice. Through peer mentoring, youth leaders took current leadership practices and custom made them to share with their peers and built leadership consciousness. The youth leaders used every opportunity to absorb as much knowledge as possible, especially from professional adult mentors. In this process, the youth leaders shifted their pedagogy for leadership learning from the traditional format of lecturing to dialogue. The youth leaders started their dialogue pedagogy by actively listening to the concerns and needs of youth members. Through active listening, the youth leaders modeled flexibility and negotiating disagreement as leadership tools to their peers. In the next section, I explore the second strategy in practicing youth leadership, which is accepting multiple perspectives.

Accepting Multiple Perspectives as the Second Strategy in Practicing Youth Leadership

The second strategy needed in practicing leadership is to open up FAB to multiple perspective learning. In chapter 4, eight out of 12 youth leaders thought that opportunity to become a leader is a right for everyone (Interview with Elok, Jessica, Sari, Vero, Wati, Joko, Jerry, and Budi). However, only three out of 12 youth specifically stated the importance of opening FAB to multiple perspective learning. Multiple perspective learning helped ensured FAB as a safe place for diverse youth. Jerry made this point clear when he said,

I learned in FAB, yes, we always think that our own opinion is good but it's not always like that. Our opinion might not be good for others, or even people in general. So I changed my perception, if something is good for me, it might not be good for others. If I force my way, then nothing good will come out of it. I try to be open to others' perception. If my opinion is needed, I will provide it but if it is not accepted, then I am ok. I will go with the flow.

FAB prides itself to be different from other youth organization because of its openness to various youth in the neighborhood to learn and lead. Sari acknowledged the importance of multiple

perspectives by describing how FAB tried to bring in youth whom others considered delinquent and non-leader material,

Many of the new members were youth that are considered as delinquent. They come from broken home, have ear piercing, love to swear, or school dropouts, Parents have these stereotypes of delinquent youth. But these youths came to FAB to study, not to influence others into delinquency... I invited them to study. Should I only invite youth who stay in school into FAB? No, right? I actually want youth who do not go to school to come here. I want them to have activities.

Sari reiterated the importance of multiple perspectives because this perspective helped youth leaders learn from people who were different from them. Sari argued how “delinquent” youth often got left behind in accessing youth leadership opportunities. Their status as youth took precedence over their other identities such as their delinquent status. For Sari, learning about leadership needs to be an inclusive process for any youth.

Not everyone in FAB agreed with the multiple perspective approach. Officially, FAB only served youth from Banyu Urip and Putat Jaya neighborhoods. Youth from outside these neighborhoods were not the target audience. Wahana Visi Indonesia (WVI) developed this rule as part of funding and operational requirements. This geographical boundary requirement created some tensions among the youth leaders because it created a discrepancy on leadership perspectives. Joko, who served as the vice-chief, developed a mentoring program for children in FAB. He called the program KITES (*Komisi Sosial/ Social Division*). KITES was a study group program opened for any child and youth mentor, including the ones from outside the FAB geographical boundary. The purpose of KITES was to help education access for every child especially the one who did not have access to schooling experience. However, this approach was not well received by Mr. Peter, the FAB adult mentor, and Adam, one of FAB youth leaders. Mr. Peter argued that FAB membership, including KITES, must stay within the boundary of Banyu Urip and Putat Jaya neighborhoods. Adam also echoed his argument, “KITES is a part of FAB so

KITES should follow FAB regulation and not develop their own regulation.” However, on a different occasion, a youth member brought a young women friend to join FAB. This new member did not reside within the FAB geographical boundaries. Joko saw this discrepancy regarding regulations and alerted Mr. Peter and Sari who served as chief. In contrast to Adam, Sari did not think it was important where the child was from. She believed that everyone should be given a chance for leadership. Sari put more emphasis on providing support and learning opportunities for all children. She argued that the important part of the youth organization membership was its diversity,

But this person came from outside [geographical boundaries]. This youth had potential. This person already showed accomplishment. If I had to kick this youth out of FAB, then I cut her opportunity to learn and have a learning space. This youth wanted to study, so why couldn't she do it?... I think I am a bad person, if I follow rules and regulations that cut a learning opportunity for this youth. Rules and regulations can be flexible. For example, if I want to go to school, but out of nowhere I can't come to this school, because my neighborhood is not from the school area. This will be unfair and the school principal is mean to me.

Mr. Peter, in this situation, supported Sari’s argument and allowed the new member to join FAB. The discrepancy between Mr. Peter’s support towards Sari and rejection of Joko created a conflict in the leadership among the FAB youth. Joko argued that Mr. Peter’s objection was a personal attack to his leadership. Adam, who shared Mr. Peter’s objection, stated the difference between the two situations. Adam argued that Joko brought in “bad” youth as KITES mentors,

[KITES] brought youth mentors from outside FAB. I am ok with outsider if they actually teach politely. I don't want them to teach wearing shorts, having earrings despite being male. I am ok with long hair but wearing earrings, having tattoo, and then showing them to kids. They were teaching children. If the children followed their behavior, then it would not be their fault.

This discrepancy revealed the multiple perspectives that existed around leadership and who could learn to be a leader. Mr. Peter saw leadership as an opportunity for young people in FAB

geographical boundaries. Sometimes he allowed youth from outside the boundaries, but only if this youth had positive potential. Adam held the perspective of youth leadership as a learning opportunity only for “good” youth. Sari, on the other hand, highly supported the importance of having multiple perspectives in leadership practice and learning. Sari tried to move away from the dichotomy of good and bad youth, and accepted youth as unique individuals who had the right to participate and lead in FAB. Joko felt insulted that he was not supported in bringing youth from outside FAB geographical boundaries, while Sari was supported. The policy on who should or should not be included in FAB was followed for Joko but not for Sari. Joko objected to Sari’s acceptance of the new youth member using the residency argument, the same argument used towards him and KITES “delinquent” youth mentors. Sari stated, “Joko said that I should follow rule and regulation. We should go back to the rules and regulations. Joko even asked me to choose between this youth and him. If you chose this youth, then I would quit FAB [said Joko]. He would quit FAB with his friends too.” Joko defended his action by describing the youth as a person who “wanted to control FAB. She was bossy and liked to tell everybody what to do. Every coordinator hated her.” Unfortunately, Joko blamed the young women, while failed to criticize either FAB policy or the people who were implementing the policy differently at different times. His failure prevented him from seeing different perspectives and knowledge that this young women member could offer.

The demand for multiple perspectives in youth leadership practice is a complicated concept. Youth leaders, such as Sari, perceived multiple perspectives from diverse youth as a necessary step in leadership practice. Sari even argued the need to open FAB to everyone, including youth from outside the neighborhood boundaries and youth who do not fit with traditional definition of a “good” youth leader. At the same time, other youth leaders such as

Adam and Joko, felt that the regulation of youth organization must be consistently enforced. Ironically, Joko, who was reprimanded with the geographical boundary regulation, felt the need to use the same regulation to remove a youth member whom he did not like. Joko's reasoning also echoed the limited perspective on leadership practice, which is accessible only for certain youth. He failed to see the how the rule was used to remove other youth leaders from KITES who were deemed as "bad" influence leaders. In the end, the multiple perspectives and different opinions that the youth leaders shared regarding who should learn from FAB revealed the importance of diversity in leadership practice. The flexibility of youth leadership requires ongoing push and pull from FAB youth leaders themselves. Youth leadership practice is built upon disagreement and discontent, important elements that differ them from adult leadership.

In this section, the youth leaders showed how disagreement and multiple perspectives affect youth leadership practice. Disagreement and multiple perspectives became key elements in dialogue pedagogy of leadership learning because they exposed youth leaders to different opinions and different kinds of youth leaders. Some youth leaders truly supported this diversity, while other did not respond too well. In the next section, I explore the impact of leadership practice as youth identity both inside and outside FAB setting.

The Impact of Leadership Practice as a Youth Identity Inside FAB

Practicing leadership as youth inside FAB went hand-in-hand with collaborative leadership with adult mentors. Adult mentors provided monetary and infrastructure support, guidance on youth related topics and FAB operations. The collaboration between youth leaders and adult mentors required navigation of power and authority that differed for different youth leaders. Seven out of 12 youth leaders stated that they had the ability and authority to make decisions without being obstructed by adult mentors (Interview with Adam, Sugi, Sari, Jerry,

Vero, Nanda, and Nina). These seven youth perceived the FAB adult mentor, such as Mr. Peter, in a supportive role that allowed the youth led, tried new strategies, made mistakes, and experienced failure. Adam described how Mr. Peter “never forces us to do anything. If we fail then he will help us. But if we don't show any awareness of our mistake, then he will let us keep going. He wants us to fall first so we understand deeply from experience about failure and be more careful in the future.” Sugi, as the new coordinator of catfish farming division, shared his example of failure, where “there is a lot of financial loss in catfish farming but Mr. Peter didn't intervene. He only said that it was beginner's step. We can't be successful automatically in any type of business. That was his input.” Mr. Peter let the youth make mistakes and learn from their own process of trial and error. This approach supported the claim of FAB as a children's forum, in contrast to an adult-led children's forum. The youth leaders saw FAB as an organization where young people were the ones in-charge. Making mistakes and learning from trial and error processes are important elements in becoming youth leaders. Sari defined the power that FAB youth leaders had and stated, “WVI only manages FAB. If we fall down, then WVI will help. WVI let us learn both the negative and positive experiences. Every time we have meetings, we always have adult mentors so if there is a mistake, we will receive advise from the adult to help us go through the mistake.” The role of the adult mentor is that of an advisor and not an initiator of action, as shared by Sugi “If you want to ask input from adult mentor, it is ok. Mr. Peter wanted to say that this forum is not his responsibility but it is our job as children to start the initiative. Mr. Peter's duty is to approve it [the youth's initiative].“

The relationship between adult mentor and youth leaders showed how adults in FAB listened to youth as legitimate leaders with authority, skills, and capabilities to make decisions. Sari, a former FAB chief, shared the freedom she had to mold FAB into her vision. She

envisioned building various youth development activities to help attract new members. Sari decided to built various divisions that catered to youth development, such as music, multimedia.

Sari shared,

I created divisions when I became a chief. I asked Mr. Peter whether WVI still had money for FAB. Mr. Peter said, "Yes there is, a lot.: Out of nowhere, I asked if I wanted to create a music studio, could I do it? If I wanted to create a multimedia studio, could I? Mr. Peter said, "Yes you can, as long as your members are able to meet my challenge." He added, "If you want to have a music studio, then you have to create 10 songs." We created 5 or 6 songs but because Mr. Peter and WVI saw our hard work, they built us a music studio.

Sari perceived Mr. Peter as an advisor, but she was the main decision maker in FAB. She took action that she felt benefited FAB the most. Another youth leader, Nina, felt there was an equal partnership between adult mentors and youth leaders in FAB. She shared that when a youth leader started something, an adult mentor served as a helper, and vice versa. Adults and youth took turns in taking the initiative and leading the process, from idea development to implementation.

I believe it is 50-50. Both youth leader and WVI have initiatives in creating events. If WVI has the idea, then we will do the execution. If youth leaders have the initiative, then we will make proposal to WVI. WVI must know everything.

Although some youth leaders felt like they were in charge of FAB with Mr. Peter as supportive role, five out of 12 youth leaders felt they did not have enough power to make meaningful decisions with FAB's adult mentor playing the directive role (Interview with Joko, Sugi, Jerry, Elok, and Budi). Joko, a former vice-chief, argued that youth leaders had the right to challenge and question the adult mentor's advice that they deemed not beneficial to FAB. Joko gave an example of a time when FAB youth wanted to conduct Earth Day celebrations in *Taman Bungkul*, a park in downtown Surabaya. At that time, Mr. Peter advised him to get permit from the police to ensure legality. However, Joko shared the story,

For example, Earth Day in *Taman Bungkul*. [Mr. Peter] said I need permit from many government agencies and there wasn't enough time. I wanted to do it organically and walked from Polisi Istimewa Street to *Taman Bungkul*. I went around to the government agencies and asked for permit. They said I couldn't do it. I said there would be less than 1000 students. The police department said if I want to do it, then do it, but the responsibility will be at my hand. I said OK. We did it [the Earth day walk], nothing happened. Mr. Peter didn't know that we didn't get permit. I lied and I showed him a letter that the police gave me when I visited them...The event was a parade. We walked with green costume. We did park clean up as well.

For Joko, the unavailability of police permit that Mr. Peter asked was a risk he was willing to take. Joko understood that Mr. Peter would cancel the Earth Day parade without the permit. He deemed that decision as not beneficial to FAB youth. In response to that, Joko decided to lie, did his risk assessment, and used his decision making powers to hold the parade event. Joko knew the power of adult mentors in decision-making and decided to bypass it in order to reach his goal and support his peers.

Sugi shared another story regarding how Mr. Peter used both his power and WVI's monetary support to limit the youth's voices,

Joko wanted to create a study group program [KITES] and use FAB facility. But he doesn't want to call it a program within FAB. He wanted to call it his own personal program and did not want it to be a part of FAB at all. Mr. Peter said, "Joko, let's bring this program into FAB first then once you have enough money to support the kids, you can find your own place. But for now, if you still use the FAB members as part of your study group, then you should call it a FAB program."

Sugi argued that this example showed Mr. Peter, as adult mentor, was the one with power in FAB. A similar view on the same example was also shared by Elok, who was one of the youth mentors in the study group program. Mr. Peter used the monetary power from WVI as an advantage to take over the study group program. Elok shared how Mr. Peter stated, "If you feel you have enough money to support your peers then you can get out from FAB. If you can't do it, then we are willing to help, both you and your peers and the children in KITES program." Mr.

Peter asked Joko and other youth leaders to choose between continuing KITES, the study group program, as a FAB program or finding their own gathering place if they wanted to be independent.

The lack of financial independence served as an apparent power imbalance between FAB adult mentor and youth leaders. Jerry shared how he proposed a *buka bersama* (fast breaking during *Ramadhan*, a Moslem holy month) event and requested some funding. Mr. Peter rejected his proposal due to a limited budget. Jerry negotiated and revised his proposal in order to reach a compromise. Budi also shared a similar story of power dynamics. He shared a story of how Mr. Peter must approve all expenses for any division needs, while the youth leaders had limited power to influence it.

Yes, when we send [budget] proposal and it was very expensive. For the catfish farming program, it was very expensive and Mr. Peter didn't allow it. The youth leaders in the catfish program asked the money to be given to them. So they could go shopping for their needs. But Mr. Peter said no, he had to go with them. Finally, the youth leaders said ok. So, Mr. Peter must approve any catfish farming equipment's purchase because the amount of expenses was large.

The youth leaders needed to pull out a creative alternative plan as a negotiation technique with the FAB adult mentor. Jerry chose to negotiate with Mr. Peter by offering cheaper budget options for his *buka bersama* program. He used this counter offer to tap into WVI monetary resources. Budi also understood the need to negotiate his leadership power in the catfish farming program in order to gain financial support from FAB. The desire to have funding without restriction and organize large events without thinking about consequences are the best part of being youth leaders but at the same time it is often regarded as a childish sense of entitlement. This is because youth leaders want to be taken seriously, while simultaneously asking for opportunities and privileges that even adults did not have (Taft, 2011). Leadership practice as youth identity inside FAB required an awareness of the power relationship between youth

leaders and adult mentors. The power relationship was an ongoing negotiation around youth autonomy and financial dependency. The youth leaders needed to prioritize their leadership goals and sometimes compromised their autonomy in order to support their peers in FAB.

In this section, we saw the impact of practicing leadership as part of youth identity inside FAB environment. For leadership practice inside FAB, the youth leaders highlighted their relationship with Mr. Peter, the FAB adult mentor, as a form of leadership practice through their ongoing negotiation for power and authority. Some youth leaders perceived themselves as leaders with adult mentor as supportive partner. Other youth understood they were leaders but they perceived Mr. Peter as directive partner in FAB. In the next section, I explore the impact of leadership practice as youth identity outside FAB setting.

The Impact of Leadership Practice as a Youth Identity Outside FAB

Having the access and ability to practice leadership inside FAB encouraged the youth leaders to expand their leadership boundaries to the local communities. The majority of the time, youth leaders interacted with parents, community members, and government leaders from different levels. Youth interaction with adults in the surrounding communities was more negative in comparison to their experience inside FAB. Youth leaders shared how adults in their communities perceived FAB negatively. Jerry said “It is pretty often to have adult who put us down, they always said, what are those kids doing here? They aren't doing anything, they have no purpose, just hanging out together.” Adults in nearby communities perceived the youth leaders and FAB as a place where youth gathered without any positive purpose. The community adults perceived youth gathering as a danger and sign of negative activity. This also showed how adults did not see the collective power that youth have positively. Collective youth gatherings

became seen as a sign for future delinquents, despite the fact that they were gathering inside a structured youth organization held inside a youth centered space.

In addition, adult leaders and community members in the neighborhood were not sufficiently supporting the youth's desire to expand their space of leadership into community civic spaces. The youth often shared how adult community members saw them as children with limited leadership ability. Seven out of 12 youth leaders stated that the most common obstacle they experienced was adultism, which is characterized by adult's disrespect towards the intelligence, needs and potential of children (Swiderski & Palma, as cited in (Tate & Copas, 2003) (Interview with Elok, Nina, Sari, Vero, Wati, Joko, and Jerry). Adultism is an often subconscious bias regarding the low value of children's opinion, competence, capacity, and leadership (Blanchet-Cohen & Bedeaux, 2014; Hinton, 2008; Matthews & Limb, 2003; Wyness, Harrison, & Buchanan, 2004; Wyse, 2001). The assumption of adultism is that adults are better than young people and are allowed to take action affecting young people without their agreement because of their age (Checkoway, 2011). Adultism manifested in the form of ignoring or not taking young people seriously. Jerry shared that adultism made him "hope adults will respect youth more, to prove themselves. Give us space to be active."

The signs of adultism outside FAB appeared through the lack of acknowledgement of youth's leadership ability and knowledge because of their young age. Sari gave an example of this adultism manifestation, "For example, for *Kampung Layak Anak* (Child-friendly Kampong initiative. Not all *Rukun Tetangga* (RT-Neighborhood Association) and *Rukun Warga* (RW-Community Association, both are local government agencies) cared about youth leaders. I was always invited to these meetings with the *Lurah* (The head of local municipality). But a lot of them underestimated me because of my age." The youth expressed their interest to learn from

adults in the surrounding community, something similar to what they were used to with FAB adult mentors. This desire to learn from adults also needed to be accompanied by adults' willingness to learn from the youth leaders. Unfortunately, four out of 12 youth leaders explicitly felt most of the time adults in the community did not perceive their knowledge to be as valuable as an adult's knowledge (Interview with Wati, Sari, Nina, and Joko). Wati shared a story where parents of FAB children often perceived themselves as the problem solvers and the makers of knowledge, while undermining their children's knowledge. She argued that children's knowledge should be seen as a complement to adult's knowledge because children perceived things from different lenses or perspectives. In addition, children's point of view utilized honesty, calmness, and clarity as the main components.

There are still many parents who undermine children's voices. Even though children's voices are honest voices, especially little kids. These children can think clearly. Adult sometimes think singularly when they do problem solving. They just focus on the problem. Children can think clearly, calmly I think. Especially when we train and educate them... They voice these concerns from the bottom of their heart.

Nina also expressed similar sentiments on how adults undermined youth's knowledge yet at the same time, they did not provide guidance to help them increase their knowledge,

I feel adult often tell us to do stuff, but they just tell us and do not do any action. They said, "We have these good and bad experiences in life, what do you know as youth?" Adult often said that and undermined us. Yes, we do not have experience in life like them but we have knowledge that adults might not know yet. Adult often said, "Oh I know that already." However, the reality is not. If they know these stuff, then they should mentor us. Not just talking, but also actually do something.

Another concrete example of the lack of acknowledgement for youth's knowledge came from Joko during his meeting with the Government's drug committee,

The adults there [in the drug committee] undermined me. I told one member [of the drug committee] an advice, "Don't use the budget for that." The drug committee wanted to line their pocket with the government money. I suggested different activities that we [FAB] would do to raise awareness on drugs. One adult, he was wearing glasses, told me, "Your

opinion is naive. You are just a child." I answered, " First of all, I would like to apologized in advance. I was sent here by WVI because I used to be a drug user. I am proud to talk in here, because I am no longer a user. I am young and I might not be as smart as you. I want to ask you how many types of [illegal] drugs available in Indonesia and also in the world? What is the acronym of NAPZA [*narkotika, psikotropika, dan zat adiktif*/illegal addictive drugs]? How many plants that can be used as NAPZA?" The guy was sweating and was angry...I wanna show [them] that you cannot undermine me even though I am a child...Finally the head of the drug committee said that he would ask the BNN [*Badan Narkotika Nasional*/National Anti-Narcotic Agency] for suggestion and BNN recommended to do elaborate activities, not just drug socialization activities, where the government stipend money will go to each individual's pocket. The [committee] members only care about money. I think it is useless to use the money for corruption. Drug socialization does not need much money, why does the person who does the socialization will get 300,000 Rupiah [\$21]?

Joko highlighted the problem of corruption within the Indonesian government agency. The drug committee invited Joko to share his knowledge on various strategies FAB used for the drug awareness campaign. The drug committee offered 300,000 rupiah (\$21) as monetary stipend for government officials who conducted drug awareness campaigns. The committee wanted to create expensive drug awareness activities for young people, while Joko recommended budget friendly awareness activities that he did through FAB. The committee member dismissed his idea and scolded him citing his young age as a sign of naiveté. Joko challenged the committee member back by utilizing his former drug user identity and his current youth leader identity. He disrupted the adultism he experienced which highlighted his young age by using his past identity as drug user. He also highlighted the youth leader's ability to do the required job of drug awareness campaign with very little money, in comparison to the high monetary incentive that the drug committee suggested.

Adultism also led to the creation of superficial participation in youth leadership opportunities. Superficial participation happened when adults invited youth to participate in leadership opportunity for the sake of appearances and then isolated them from the action part.

This superficial participation happened because of many reasons such as grant requirement or policy requirement only. Superficial participation did not utilize youth to their full potential. Adult community members could become allies who opened access to civic participation for young people, but instead, they rejected young people from the implementation part. Sari shared the story when she was a part of a youth group for BAPPEMAS or Surabaya's Office of Economic and Community Development project. She was representing FAB and she shared a story regarding the plight of child beggars who lived in the Chinese cemetery area. These children did not go to school and worked as beggars to help their family. Sari shared many ways FAB helped the children access education. The Child Protection Agency of Surabaya applauded her input and asked her "to be ready in helping BAPPEMAS when they would take action to tackle the child beggar problem." However, BAPPEMAS officials decided to demolish the Chinese cemetery a few days after Sari's meeting with them. Sari shared her reaction towards the demolition, especially the lack of youth's involvement in the action part,

Nobody asked us to join and see the demolition process. Maybe BAPPEMAS was able to tackle the child beggar problem by themselves. I know that it is not good to build illegal settlement on top of cemetery plot. It was not their land, so there was this demolition. I do not know what happened to the child beggars; maybe BAPPEMAS did something for them. I don't know, usually we, as children, are asked to just share our voices and ideas but we are rarely asked to join in the implementation process.

Sari's story highlighted the utilization of children's voices as part of the civic participation requirement. However, she also highlighted the lack of youth involvement during BAPPEMAS' implementation process. As a youth leader, Sari only gained access to join the youth participation forum and got left behind during the action period. The demolishment action happened regardless of the solution ideas that Sari and other youth provided. Nanda shared a similar story where she got invited to present the state of children in surrounding communities around FAB with the Ministry of Social. However, she stated, " the ministry representation

stated that they would take the recommendation into account. I don't know what they do with that.”

Despite the adultism challenge, the youth leaders continued to insert themselves into any leadership opportunity in the community. Elok shared how she kept sharing her knowledge and opinion with other adult community members despite being ignored. She stated, “I shared some advice with them [adult community members] despite they did not want to hear it. I just kept my focus on my own task.” Jerry stated how some adult community members acknowledged the youth leaders' relentlessness and trusted them to lead, “I showed them what we can do, to get their trust. I received trust to be the organizer for Independence Day's committee in both RW.” The trust to lead became a validation for FAB youth leader's leadership ability in the community.

The youth leaders utilized FAB to create equal access for youth to use their participation rights and join civic society in a safe environment. Their strategy was to share leadership knowledge through direct mentoring & personal example and to open up FAB as a space for multiple perspective learning. The impact of leadership practice differed based on the location of their practice. The impact of leadership practice inside FAB was more positive than leadership practice outside. The youth leaders highlighted their relationship with FAB adult mentors as a form of leadership practice through their ongoing negotiation for power and authority. In this relationship, FAB adult mentors provided guidance and advisory support, in addition to financial support. Some youth leaders perceived themselves as leaders with power while the adult mentors played supportive roles. Other youth leaders perceived FAB adult mentors as directive partners. These youth felt they must constantly negotiate their power and authority with the adult mentor. Their limited power mostly came from the lack of financial independence to run their activities.

The youth leaders had to rely on the adult mentors who influenced the youth leaders' decisions by pulling the financial strings. These youth leaders, however, did not stop negotiating with adult mentors to get what they wanted. They used techniques such as deception or counter offers to gain power inside FAB. All the youth leaders extended their leadership practice to the communities around FAB. The impact of leadership practice outside FAB was more negative. The youth leaders experienced adultism, which manifested through the lack of acknowledgement of their leadership ability and knowledge, and the creation of superficial participation for youth leaders. However, the youth still pushed for both civic participation and leadership opportunities by inserting themselves into any available opportunity, despite the ongoing battle to prove themselves to the adults in the communities. In the next section, I explore how youth leaders in FAB, especially young women leaders, saw their leadership practice as a form of gender identity.

Leadership Practice as a Gender Identity

The second category that emerged from the data was the intersection of leadership practice of young women leaders with their gender role & identity. Participation of young women in FAB leadership was propelled by Indonesian society's main narrative that nighttime and the outside world are dangerous times and places for women. The young women leaders chose to lead to create counter-narrative stories where they took back both nighttime and the outside world as legitimate times and places of civic participation and leadership. They also experienced challenges to their gender identity within FAB through *ibuism* or gendered responsibility of women, which manifested in traditional gender role expectations and patriarchal leadership behavior from FAB young male leaders. However, the impact of leadership practice on the young women leaders was the growth of confidence to pursue leadership positions

through FAB despite the societal barriers. Below are the detailed analyses on how the young women leaders perceived leadership practices as a form of gender identity.

Overview of the Expectation of Indonesian Women Leaders

The experience of leadership for youth came with its own benefits and obstacles. However, the youth leaders in this study showed different leadership experiences based on their gender identity, especially the young women leaders. There were seven young women leaders who shared their experiences related to leadership practices, gender identities, and gender roles. Participation and leadership for Indonesian women in civic society is a constant process of negotiation. Rejection, marginalization, and superficial participation are examples of obstacles that Indonesian women have had to endure throughout history. Women and girls with disadvantages, such as FAB youth leaders, have more challenges including limited opportunities to participate in Indonesia's civic society (Blackburn, 2004). The image of Indonesian young women closely follows Indonesian sociocultural and political history. Both young women and men were fighters during wars for independence, pioneers in developing nationalist youth organizations during colonial and early independence era, and social movers for political reformation in the beginning of 21st century (Husni, 1998; Martyn, 2005; Parker & Nilan, 2013). However, this strong and active image of young women in Indonesia is always contested throughout the history of Indonesia. Before the Indonesian independence in 1945, the first president, Sukarno, argued that women should postpone the talk on women's rights and focus on the need for the nation's independence. Yet after the independence of Indonesia, women were expected to defend the nation against neo-colonial oppressors and most importantly, become service providers for the new nation in the roles of teacher, or caregiver for orphans (Blackburn, 2004).

However, not every woman's organization focused on domestic issues. The Indonesian Women's Movement (Gerwani/ *Gerakan Wanita Indonesia*) became the only women's organization that was active in national politics during the early nationhood period. Gerwani was a left-leaning women's organization that connected closely with the Communist Party of Indonesia (PKI/ *Partai Komunis Indonesia*). In 1965, Suharto, the future second president of Indonesia, led the massacre of all communist related organizations and members. Women's political agency and active civic life became a suspicious and dangerous activity (Nursyahbani & Saskia, 2003). As the second president, Suharto started the New Order era and utilized *ibuisim* or gendered responsibility of women as a method to dull down women's civic rights and voices. The concept of *ibuisim* (Mother of State) defined as women's roles with ranks, where the highest priority was being her husband's companion, then decreasing in order as a mother or procreator, a housekeeper, and finally as a member of society (Suryakusuma, 1996, 2004)

The Challenge and Impact of Leadership Practice as Young Women Leaders Outside FAB

In *ibusim* ideology, women are constricted to time and places that are considered safe (i.e. daytime and home). This limited spatial experience pushed a common narrative in young women's civic life that nighttime is dangerous for women (Beazley, 2008). This narrative was imposed on young women leaders from adults in their family or community members. This imposed perception of danger differs with women's own perception of nighttime danger. Adult in family or community imposed this perception to protect the safety of young women from any danger during nighttime. At the same time, this limited the young women's opportunity to participate in civic life because many civic participation activities happened at night, after work or school time. The danger of nighttime affected how the young women leaders decided to join FAB. Six out of seven young women leaders joined different WVI programs before they became

FAB members (Interview with Sari, Elok, Jessica, Nina, Nanda, and Vero). For example, Sari joined WVI when she was in eighth grade through *Cahaya*, a visual design/photography program. She shared the reasoning behind her involvement in *Cahaya* program, instead of FAB, “I joined *Cahaya* when I was in eight grades. I didn't have any interest to join FAB at that time because its activities are at night. I was a middle-schooler so my grandma allowed me to join activities in early evening but not at night. I did not have bicycle so I had to walk from home. My grandma worried about me.” Elok, Jessica, Nina, Nanda, and Vero also started from the Registered Child (RC) program from WVI. This program connects donors to WVI’s registered children to support their educational need (World Vision, 2019). This program did not require nighttime participation for the young women, which their parents saw as a safer option for them. However, these young women decided to join FAB and started their journey in civic society.

For FAB young women leaders, their leadership journey outside of the FAB environment did not come easy. The narrative of nighttime as a dangerous time connects closely to the stereotype of women who go outside during nighttime are not-for-good women and are looking for problems. Three out of seven young women leaders shared the negative perception that they got specifically from adult community members because of their active civic life (Interview with Elok, Sari, and Wati). Adults from their communities often perceived them as delinquent because they never stayed put at home and were always going out at nighttime. The adult community members then pressured the young women’s parents to keep their daughters safe at home in order to keep their good reputation intact. The community members’ pressure pushed some parents into scolding and limiting their daughters’ participation in nighttime civic life. Wati perceived her home as an extension of FAB civic place. She took the initiative to invite her fellow FAB friends to her home and worked together during nighttime, “My friends usually

come to my place when we already finish our activity in FAB, but we still want to continue. I invite them but sometimes they invite themselves. How could I say no to them? I said no sometimes, but not often.” But her initiative received critique from her neighbors who worried about Wati’s status as a “good girl.” Wati described the pressure her neighbors gave her mother to maintain her image as a good girl,

People nearby my home, well, I have a conflict with my neighbor because I like to invite my friends to our home usually during the night. My mom always cares with our reputation. She said, "You are a girl, your friends are male. These male friends are always in our house at night. People will perceive us negatively." I listened to her in the beginning but after a while, it was my neighbor who told my mom about this specific concern. "Why Wati's friends are in your house at night?" So my mom felt embarrassed and she scolded me for this. She said, “Tell your friends to go home now since it is already late." I also overheard when my dad talked to my mom, he said, “Don’t listen to the neighbors. S/he is not always right."

The neighbor wanted Wati’s mother to keep her secure inside her home during nighttime and away from her FAB peers. Elok and Sari also shared similar obstacles when they stayed late in FAB to make sure every youth member went home at 9 PM after every FAB activity. FAB adult mentors advised all youth leaders to end their activities at 9 PM. This 9 PM regulation served as a middle ground between youth’s desire for nighttime participation and the parents & community’s concern about the danger of nighttime. This nighttime leadership responsibility became the source of criticism from neighbors. The neighbors scolded Elok and Sari’s nighttime activities as a self-indulgent lifestyle and perceived them to be “bad” girls. Sari shared, “My neighbors scolded me and said that I just play around. My neighbors thought I stay late because I just want to have fun...My neighbors thought I played around with these male friends.” Elok added how people commented, “She can’t even lead herself. She told people to go home at 9 PM and she went home late.”

The status of being a good girl is very important in society, which creates the urgent need to warn female youth leaders' families of their daughters' "dangerous" behavior. This good girl concept becomes a priority taking top place over everything, including the young women's rights to participate in and lead civic life. This negative image of Sari affected her leadership practice in the community. She described how her neighbors' negative perception of her became a reason for not acknowledging her when she shared her work on children's rights issue, "They have such a bad image of me already so they won't listen to me when I share children right's stories. My neighborhood' children want to hear my stories though. They know that I serve as mentor in FAB. I don't care much with the parents. I know I don't do anything wrong." However, she chose to continue her work and paid zero attention to the neighborhood gossip. Sari showed her power to challenge the narrative of "bad girl" by sharing her knowledge of children's rights with the neighborhood children. She described the interest that the neighborhood children showed despite her becoming the subject of their parents' gossip. Wati and Elok also chose the same approach in continuing their work. Wati stated, "If there is still some work that needs to be done, it is ok to come to my home. These children in my home usually hang out while doing FAB works. People thought they only hang out doing nothing." Luckily, Elok, Sari, and Wati's families opened their minds, ignored the neighborhood gossips, and gave support to their daughters' leadership roles. Sari specifically stated, "My family members are fine with this gossip. My grandma always said, 'That's ok, that's life, some people will like you, some will hate you. You gotta accept that.' My grandma always advised me not to think about it. One day they will know about it. "

The danger of nighttime narrative applies mostly to young women because they are seen as more fragile and as needing to be protected to maintain the good girl image in public. The narrative also perceives young women as not smart in making decisions for themselves. The fear

focuses on how young women may make decisions that can ruin their good girl image. In reality, the young women leaders chose to use FAB as a place where they could protect themselves from any negative outside influences. This approach aligns with the lens of seeing leadership practice as a form of protection rights. The young women leaders saw the danger of negative influences and did not want to be caged inside the safety of their homes; instead, they built safety protections for themselves through the youth organization. Adult community members perceived nighttime as a dangerous time for young women, while the young women saw nighttime as a time where they could meet and work on their civic participation and youth development. The outside world danger perception came from the youth themselves where they assessed their surrounding danger and calculated the impact on their life. Four out of seven young women leaders understood the danger of prostitution, gambling, drugs, and teenage pregnancy in their neighborhood, which prompted them to protect themselves against them through FAB membership (Interview with Sari, Elok, Nanda, and Wati). Sari specifically chose to counter these negative influences by being active in FAB. She did not want to do nothing, which could lead her to those negative influences, "I come to FAB every day. I have to fill in my spare time. ... One of my friends is pregnant and some are drug users. I was afraid I would be like that. What would my family say if I went on that road?" Elok also shared how she utilized FAB to learn about children's rights and protected herself from negative influences. She clarified that her involvement in FAB went beyond just having fun with friends. She said to her parents, "No, mom, I didn't go there just to find dates/boyfriend, but I learn stuff about children's rights." Similar perspective also shared by Nanda and Wati. These young women leaders showed a similar desire of safety that parents shared. However, their perceptions of safety were different. Their parents wanted to keep young women leaders caged to ensure safety, while the young

women leaders chose to join safe and responsible activities to prevent themselves from being drawn into negative activities in their communities. The goal of achieving safety and protection is the same, however parents and young women leaders saw the process of achieving this goal in different ways.

The Challenge and Impact of Leadership Practice as Young Women Leader Within FAB

The challenge of young women leaders did not just come from outside interactions with adult community members. Challenges also came in from inside FAB through their interaction with young men leaders. Leadership in FAB was fairly equally distributed between young women and men. However, four out of seven young women leaders in FAB experienced power imbalances as a manifestation of traditional gender roles influenced by Indonesian patriarchal and patrimonial leadership culture (Interview with Vero, Elok, Wati, and Nanda). Sexism or *ibusim* towards young women leaders was visible through the unwritten expectation for the young women leaders to do gender role tasks in their leadership practice. The young women leaders were critical of the traditional practice of gender roles they saw in FAB.

Vero mentioned she was expected to clean up after various FAB events, while other leaders, especially young men leaders, did not join to help her. She stated, “I keep trying to look at the bright side. For example, I did a lot of the work myself. People often told me to work and take care of stuff in FAB. I wondered what other leaders did then, why it had to be me. I felt like that. For example, some youth did not want to help cleaning up after events. I am so tired, and nobody helped me.” Elok also experienced similar sexism & *ibusim* challenge when she led a leadership camping retreat outside Surabaya. She served as the main coordinator but she also had to do mothering and cleaning work. Elok expressed her complaint,

The others were so ignorant sometimes. I cooked, I washed dishes, I was like a mother to others...One kid was sick all the time, and she had trouble breathing. I pat her back. I

massaged her. I stood by her all the time. I hug her. I asked, ‘Are you ok? Warmer?’ I served as their mom in this leadership camp. I cooked. I cleaned up. The children were selfish. They said they were sleepy, so they were all sleeping...Nobody told me to do anything but I did it on my own initiative. If we have a lot of garbage, I would be the one who cleaned things up.

Elok highlighted the lack of duty sharing between her and the other young male leaders who joined the retreat. Despite criticizing this version of leadership, both young women leaders reclaimed their gendered action as a form of legitimate leadership. Vero shared she perceived her gendered action as a example of leading through example, “However, back again, why do I need to care much about what other people do or not do? I have to lead by example. If the others want to follow then it is good, if not then well it is ok. I practice my leadership by leading my own self. I do not want to do anything negative so I chose to do positive action. I cleaned up because it is great to see clean environment. Other youth might enjoy it too but I am ok. I am sure that other youth will learn from my action.” She wanted to inspire others through her action despite not receiving help from others. This intrinsic motivation to lead was very critical to show the internalization of leadership behavior in spite of sexism or *ibusim* challenge. These two young women leaders argued that their leadership was an extension of their concern and responsibility for the well being of other youth members in FAB and in the surrounding communities. Caring for others and communities is a gendered expectation of girls and women in Indonesia. The portrayal of care as girls and women’s tasks is strongly shared in Indonesian society from an early age, and strongly emphasized in school textbook settings (Ariyanto, 2018). In addition, the existence of young women leaders from lower income background is rare; the more common reality for them is married life at young age due to lack of knowledge and limited life choices (Goodwin & Martam, 2014). The existence of young women leaders in FAB is a proof of and showcases the possibility of lower income young women becoming leaders. At the same time,

the existence of young women leaders became an example of different paths that young women can take outside domestic, married life. Both young women leaders were proud to have leadership roles and became examples of young women's roles outside domestic setting. They showed the power of youth leadership in connection with caring towards others and towards the community, despite constantly negotiating their power with their male peers.

Another form of *ibuism* appeared through the patriarchal leadership behavior from other young men leaders. Two young women leaders, Nanda and Wati, served as vice chief in FAB administrations. Nanda served as a vice chief for FAB, while Adam served as chief. While Wati served as a vice chief with Budi as chief. As a vice chief, Nanda explained her duty as the person in charge of managing all divisions/programs. This division of labor was an agreed-upon contract between Adam and Nanda. Despite their agreement, Nanda observed power imbalance between their roles. She shared a story where Adam overwrote her decision regarding a Multimedia division event,

My friend invited the Multimedia youth to learn photography in *Tugu Pahlawan* (a national monument park in Surabaya). Adam didn't realize that the Multimedia division was planning to go out from the FAB building. He was worried that parents would ask where their children went. He was worried because these youths would bring FAB asset such as camera...At that time, a Multimedia member asked my permission to do this photography training. I said 'OK, you can go.' In my opinion, we have to go out to find knowledge. I just told them to keep the asset, which was the camera, safe. Managing FAB division was my job as a vice chief. I didn't tell Adam that Multimedia division was planning to go out. I thought the only one who knew about this plan was me. I was the one in charge of FAB divisions. Adam suddenly asked me, 'Why don't you tell me about Multimedia's plan?' I said that managing divisions was my job description. Then we have conflict between Adam and I because of that.

Nanda argued that Adam removed her from having decision-making power because of his own fear of losing the camera. For Nanda, this removal of her power was a violation of their earlier agreement of division of labor and an override on her leadership autonomy. Nanda shared that

after this event, Adam chose to revise the decision-making procedure. Nanda stated that in the new procedure, “The final decision is in the hand of the chief. We need the chief’s signature for any event that takes place outside FAB. So if everyone agrees but in the end the chief disagree, the event will not go on.” The problem of patriarchal leadership was also shared by Wati. Budi, another FAB chief, passed most of his responsibility to Wati as the new vice chief. Wati described how Budi rarely shared important information especially regarding FAB day-to-day operations. Wati just needed to do what Budi told her while having limited understanding regarding the reasoning behind it. Wati described, “Sometimes he just goes silent...I feel ‘jealous’ because if Budi has certain info and I have a role there but he doesn't share info with me. I feel jealous and upset when this happens. I feel why you don't tell me. Do I have to keep asking?”

To overcome the *ibuism* in leadership, the young women leaders refused to see themselves as weak and helpless. They took action to liberate themselves in two ways. They used their confidence to push and get leadership opportunities. Five out of seven young women leaders took the initiatives to nominate themselves as leaders and grabbed any available opportunity to prove themselves (Interview with Nina, Sari, Nanda, Wati, Jessica). Nina decided to “nominated myself as treasury” in the FAB administration, while Nanda “nominated self to be chief of FAB.” Sari also shared similar story of how she “decided to be a [FAB chief] candidate because I wanted to test my leadership ability. If I didn't get elected as a chief, then at least I would be a structure member. I wanted to be a part of the team who created change. The one who could make changes in front are structure members. I wanted to be there.” The courage to nominate oneself as a leader did not stop inside the FAB environment. Wati shared how she nominated herself as a child ambassador for Surabaya’s Child Friendly Kampong initiative. She

competed for the ambassador position through a debate style competition. In this situation, Wati was able to learn from her competitors and excelled among others,

The three people before me talked really fast. So I tried to speak slowly when it was my time. I spoke slowly when I explained about the objective of FAB. Others didn't know that I learned from their weaknesses. I don't know whether they tried to look important when they talked. They talked like they understand the objective of children's forum, well, maybe they do. But I feel when you talk with others; you have to give some pause. The other three spoke really fast like they were debating issue that were familiar to them. I didn't want to lecture other but I just want to share my knowledge. I said that, "Ok, I want to share. This is what my children's forum does bla bla bla." So there were many names being voted including my name. There were 20 names in the end. Then we did another voting, one child one vote. Then it finally went down to 2 names. There were 80 children attended this event. A lot of name has only one vote. I received two votes so I move to the next round.

Another young women leader, Jessica also expressed her achievement in nominating herself and then being elected as team leader for FAB's community education on children's rights. She went around the local communities and led meetings with children, parents, and local adult community members regarding children's rights and the role of FAB in supporting them. She shared how she "was afraid for sure, since I never talked like that." But her decision to become team leader brought her "courage because I see it this opportunity as a chance to share my knowledge...I was ok with speaking in public because I know if they were bored then I could make some joke to keep them happy." Nominating oneself to become a youth leader showed the confidence level that these young women had to liberate themselves and grab any leadership opportunity available out there.

Another method to free oneself from *ibuism* was through mentorship. Four out of seven young women leaders used mentorship to support other FAB young women leaders in their leadership journey (Interview with Elok, Jessica, Sari, and Vero). Mentorship served as a structure that helps other young women leaders in building confidence and confronting *ibuism* in

youth leadership. Mentorship between young women leaders had a different context than regular peer mentorship in FAB. In peer mentorship between young women, Jessica highlighted specifically the topic of solidarity, “We have to do it all together.” Jessica supported other young women leaders to do task related job. For Sari who was a chief, mentorship towards young women leaders was a calling, “I feel I am called to. I must help my younger female members.” Mentorship between young women leaders in FAB became a learning experience and support system in navigating leadership challenge. Elok shared her own experience of mentorship with Sari, “After 6 months, I was asked to join the socialization team. I told Sari I could not do that. However, she supported me and said it is ok, do it as best as I can. She will stand by me...I learned to speak in public through this experience. I was nervous but Sari helped and supported me.” Sari, as a Chief, provided Elok with support to help her grow her confidence and skill in leadership. Elok now passed on the same mentorship structure to other young women leaders. Vero also added the role of mentorship between existing young women leaders as a place of gathering where they talked and support each other positively, “The young women mentors themselves are still hanging out together. Therefore, we often meet with each other...We hang out and chat about the forum development, is there any problem there. We share with each other.”

In this section, leadership practice as a form gender identity revolved around the constant negotiation of Indonesian young women to participate and lead in civic society. Women in Indonesia are subjected to *ibuism* or gendered responsibility of women as a method to dull down women’s civic rights and voices. *Ibuism* ideology manifested in how FAB young women leaders experienced leadership practices through their leadership interaction with 1) community

members outside FAB and 2) young men leaders in FAB. The first manifestation is the constriction of young women to both time and places that are considered safe, which were during daytime and inside house settings. The young women leaders in FAB often received criticism from community members because of their active roles in FAB during nighttime. Active civic participation during nighttime and out of the home setting was often seen as a characteristic of “bad girl” who just wanted to have fun. The young women leaders chose to use FAB as their safe place where they could lead and participate without the community’s scrutiny. The young women chose to ignore the narrative of “bad girl” and continued their leadership practice as a counter narrative action to *ibuism*. The second manifestation appeared in the gendered leadership practice and power imbalance between young men and young women leaders in FAB. Young men leaders often had unwritten expectations for young women leaders to perform traditional gender roles in their leadership practice and passed on patriarchal leadership behavior to their young women peers. The young women leaders perceived it as sexism and demanded equal power and responsibility. Being young women made them act strategically and urgently in capturing any opening in leadership opportunity. The young women leaders nominated themselves and mentored each other in order to nurture the next young women leaders.

Chapter 6. Discussion

“If generation of youth unites, they will have power to bring something good into reality”

Raden Adjeng Kartini (1879 –1904)
Pioneer of Indonesian women’s rights and national hero

In this discussion chapter, I start with an overview of my dissertation purpose and methodology, then I move to review my findings as presented in chapter four and five. I continue with the discussion of what youth civic engagement and leadership experiences in FAB contributed to both theory and practice. I also offer recommendations on youth participation and leadership for youth organizations in Indonesia and in global setting, for young women in Indonesia, and for Indonesian government and policy makers. In the last section, I explore different future research directions that can support the development of youth participation and leadership knowledge and practice, especially for youth leaders in Indonesia.

Introduction

Half of approximately 249 million Indonesians live in urban areas and more than a third of that population is under 18 years old (UNICEF, 2014). This sheer power of Indonesian young people comes from their number and urban location. *Exploring youth leadership and civic engagement in Wahana Visi Forum Anak da’Bajay (Wahana Visi’s da’Bajay Children Forum) in Surabaya, Indonesia* is an exploration and documentation of how youth leaders defined and practiced youth participation and leadership. My dissertation is a qualitative, single case study of youth participation and leadership of youth leaders with disadvantages inside a youth organization with children’s rights orientation located in Surabaya, an urban city in Indonesia. The purpose of this study is to learn how urban youth in FAB engaged in civil society and exercised leadership role related to children’s rights both inside youth organization and in local communities. This dissertation utilizes Critical Youth Studies (CYS) as analytical framework.

CYS explores the intersectionality of gender, class, race, sexuality, and ability on social structure of the youth's life. CYS also criticizes the normality of adultism and the dominant representation of youth. It focuses on empowerment of a person above racial, class, and gender constraints through examination of the existing living condition (Best, 2007; Cerecer et al., 2013; Creswell, 2007; Marshall & Rossman, 2011). My data analysis uses positive lens by integrating youth's voices in present day context and focusing on their contribution & positive influence in their communities. My positive lens approach answers to the calling for methodology that highlighted youth as resources rather than analyzing youth from deficiency and disengagement perspectives (Checkoway et al., 2005).

Throughout this dissertation, I also acknowledged the difficulty of finding the right framework to talk about the youth participants in relation to their placement at a disadvantage in society. I was challenged as a researcher to move away from the deficit perspective of youth at-risk, which could be interpreted as assigning the problem in the individual, thereby blaming the victim (Riele, 2006; Swadener & Lubeck, 1995). This was problematic since many of the participants chose to view youth as 'good' or 'bad' based on prevalent stereotypes of youth behavior in society. I had to navigate my position as a researcher carefully since I wanted to centralize the voices of youth and of the participants some of whom shared the vocabulary that placed youth in stereotypical roles. I chose to use the term 'placed at a disadvantage' or youth with disadvantages to highlight a perspective that youth are not to blame for the circumstances in which they are placed.

Youth with disadvantages are marginalized due to the lack of recognition of their knowledge, ability, and skill. The deficit framing of youth as at-risk creates lower expectations for youth, stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination (Riele, 2006). I relied on the positive lens

of CYS to talk about youth through a strength perspective and move away from a deficit perspective. Through their profile and stories, I wanted to amplify their voices and empathize that the youth are not at fault for the structural barriers and context that place them in disadvantage situations.

Reviews of Findings

In chapter 4, I outlined the definition of a youth leader and leadership from the perspective of FAB youth leaders. First, the youth leaders defined youth leadership as an act of leading oneself, then extending towards leading others using positive leadership. This description shared some similarities and differences with adult leadership theories. New/contemporary adult leadership theories, such as transformational, transactional, authentic, or ethical leadership theories, highlight how a leader should not focus on her/his self-interest, try to raise followers' critical consciousness, and become a role model for others (Bass, 1985; Brown & Trevino, 2006; Burns, 1978; Gardner et al., 2011; House, 1977). However, adult leadership is still rigid in its expectation of a leader. Leaders are expected to be able to lead individually and have the basic leadership skills despite their diverse background. The youth leaders' definition of leadership was progress and action oriented, focused on leading oneself, controlling ego, emotion, and selfishness, before led others. The youth leaders saw leading oneself as an ongoing learning process through action. Learning process would have up and down, struggle, failure, and success. Leading oneself was a process, not skills that a youth must master to be called as a leader. This action and process oriented approach in defining leadership showed the flexibility of youth leadership in contrast to adult leadership.

I also highlighted the bipolarity of leadership in FAB, where the youth defined a leader, as someone with title or is authorized as leader, versus everyone can be a leader. The foundation

of youth leadership relies on the belief that leadership skills can be taught, learned, and developed (Fertman & van Linden, 1999). Majority of FAB youth leaders truly believed that leadership was for everyone who wanted to learn. Others acknowledged the importance of leadership title for a leader, which was in alignment with the manifestation of Indonesia's colonization legacy where leaders were people who came from the "right" class or background with their titles (Gani, 2004; Irawanto et al., 2011).

Finally, I analyzed various influencing factors that supported youth civic engagement and leadership development in FAB. Civic engagement with people outside close social cliques is an important factor in increasing youth's identification with the public interest around them and what they can do to address them (Amna, 2012; Erikson, 1968; Flanagan et al., 1998; Institute of Medicine National Research Council, 2005). In FAB, the youth leaders focused on public issues related to two large topics, which were 1) the influence of Dolly Lane red light district on children's wellbeing and 2) the lack of participation opportunity for young youth in local community. The youth were internally motivated to become leaders because of their desire to develop youth development skill, to be seen as "good youth", to protect themselves from the red light district, and to find positive influences. Leadership by youth with disadvantages challenged the negative stereotype of their youngness and disadvantaged condition by sharing their voices (Carter et al., 2011; Innovations in Civic Participation, 2008; Parker & Nilan, 2013).

In chapter 5, I outlined the practice of youth leadership in FAB. I started with defining leadership practice as a form of youth identity. The youth leaders took pride on their young age and youth identity. Present day Indonesian youth are the most educated generation in the history of Indonesia and the most engaged in the world beyond Indonesia (Parker & Nilan, 2013; Ramadhan, 2013). However, the youth leaders recognized the lack of leadership access and

opportunity for younger youth in civic society. The most common opportunity of civic participation came from the government sanctioned youth organization, *Karang Taruna*. However, the youth leaders disliked and distrusted *Karang Taruna* due to the wide age ranges of its membership from 13 to 45 years old. Inclusion of both older youth and adult into *Karang Taruna* created very limited leadership opportunities for younger youth. There were many challenges and distrust among youth towards government's civic institutions especially in new democratic countries such as Indonesia, due to the unreliable government effort in including young people (Galston, 2003; Innovations in Civic Participation, 2008; Tanu, 2014; Torney-Purta et al., 2004). In order to counter this challenge, the youth leaders utilized FAB to create equal access where youth could participate and join civic society in a safe environment. These youth leaders used the history and struggle of Indonesian youth to create civic society that focused on their own group's interest (Sánchez-Jankowski, 2002).

I outlined how the youth leaders perceived their leadership action as a manifestation of participation rights, one of the rights stated in the United Nations (UN) Convention of the Rights of the Child (CRC). The institutionalization of CRC in Indonesia could be seen through the inclusion of these rights in the amendments of the Indonesian Constitution. The amendments recognized that every child “shall have the right to live, to grow and to develop, and shall have the right to protection from violence and discrimination” (International Bureau for Children's, 2006, p. 31). CRC's amendments to the Constitution unfortunately did not include participation rights. This lack of constitution protection for participation rights put young people as a helpless population in Indonesian civic society. Fortunately, the current period of CRC implementation in Indonesia is focusing on a local level (Veerman & Levine, 2000). This localized CRC implementation uses the everyday setting and local actors to shape the local contexts of

participatory human rights attitudes (Torney-Purta & Barber, 2011). The youth leaders used FAB as a local context and its proximity to the red light district as an implementation of CRC's protection and participation rights at a local level.

I also explored how the youth leaders utilized two strategies in their leadership practice. First, they shared knowledge through direct peer mentoring and examples of personal action. Youth leadership relied on collective action and social causes to support healthy youth development (Zeldin & Camino, 1999). The marginalized status of youth also influenced the collective action strategies used in battling a social cause. Peer mentoring helped the youth leaders to increase the number of leaders and members in FAB. Power through numbers served as a useful strategy in amplifying youth voices. Second, they opened up FAB as a space for learning from multiple perspectives. Some of the youth leaders wanted to bring in youth who were identified as "good" and "bad" youth. The dichotomy of good and bad youth showed the strong need to break down these categories, and encourage the participation and inclusion of all youth without preexisting, selective criteria. By opening FAB for all kind of youth, FAB would truly accepting multiple perspective, which fitted well with the conceptualization of youth leadership as a more open and flexible (Conner & Strobel, 2007).

In chapter 5, I also outlined the relationship between Mr. Peter, an FAB adult mentor, and the youth leaders. The partnership between youth-adult is a continuum that moves dynamically between different levels of engagement, learning, and decision making processes (Jones & Perkins, 2006). The youth leaders perceived the role of Mr. Peter in a continuum between two sides. On one side, some youth leaders saw Mr. Peter as an equal partner who provided them with a space for decision-making on their own or in partnership with him. On the other side, some youth leaders saw Mr. Peter as the power holder who did not provide them with

meaningful decision-making opportunities. The first perception of Mr. Peter was an ideal role for adult in youth leadership. Leadership is collectively constructed through an understanding of a partnership of equality between adults and youth (Mitra et al., 2013; Zeldin et al., 2013). The youth leaders expressed opportunities for authentic collaborative work, meaningful role delegation during work, and trust between adult and youth (Mitra, 2009). The second perception highlighted the trap of youth leadership where adult took the role of provider and youth as the receivers in a hierarchal orientation (Jones & Perkins, 2006). Mr. Peter's power came from his access to WVI's financial support. This financial power created power imbalance and hierarchy, which limited youth's opportunity to conduct meaningful leadership activities (Camino, 2005; Fertman & van Linden, 1999; Mitra, 2005).

I continued to expand on the impact of leadership practice outside FAB setting, especially in the local community. The youth leaders shared more negative leadership experiences in the local community, due to adultism from adult community members. Adultism was manifested in two different forms: 1) lack of acknowledgement of youth's leadership ability & knowledge, and 2) creation of superficial opportunities for participation. Lack of acknowledgement of youth's leadership ability came from the assumption that adult had more knowledge and right to act upon young people without their agreement due to their young age (Checkoway, 2011). Adult community members perceived the youth leaders through "youth as human becoming" lens, where young people were seen as passive and not yet competent people who needed adults' supported actions (Lee, 2001; Qvortrup, 1994; Warming, 2011). As "humans becoming," the interaction between adult and young people often ends in silencing the young people's voice (Lee, 1999). Superficial participation of FAB youth leaders was an example of "participation" pitfall (Cooke & Kothari, 2001; Polletta, 2014), where adult manipulated youth during

participation process to achieve an intended or preconceived outcome. Superficial participation in FAB was often being used to attract attention and increase funding possibility (Funk et al., 2012). The superficial participation overrode legitimate decision-making process, reinforced the interest of adult as powerful group, and eliminated other methods of decision-making.

Lastly, in Chapter 5, I specifically explored the interaction of leadership practice and gender identities/ role. Among 12 East and Southeast Asian societies (Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Japan, the Republic of Korea, Malaysia, Mongolia, the Philippines, Taiwan, Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam), Indonesia has the largest gap between men's and women's activism engagement (31% versus 16%), which showed the important to dissect youth leadership beyond its intersection with age but also gender (UNDP, 2014). FAB young women leaders experienced layered marginalization due to their young age and gender, which resulted in harder acceptance from both male peers and adult community members. Participation of FAB young women in leadership was propelled by society's main narrative that saw nighttime and outside world as dangerous place and time for women. This narrative highlighted one of the reasons behind strong association between urban male youth and activism in Indonesian (Baker & Lindquist, 2013). The narrative also highlighted the privilege that male youth have in relation to civic participation (Innovations in Civic Participation, 2008). FAB young women leaders experienced challenges through sexism or *ibuism*, which manifested in traditional gender role expectation and patriarchal leadership behavior. Both masculinity and patriarchal traits of Indonesian leadership manifested through assertiveness, merit, obligation, and respect to both male and older leaders (Hofstede et al., 2010; Irawanto et al., 2011; Suryani et al., 2012). Despite these leadership challenges, the youth women, who practiced leadership in FAB, grew in confidence to nominate themselves and pursue leadership positions in and outside FAB settings.

This growth of confidence was essential because only 27.4% of Indonesian women felt the sense of empowerment to make choices and transform them into action and outcomes, in contrast to 46.6% of Indonesian males (UNDP, 2014).

Conclusion

I started this dissertation with an overview of the power of Indonesian youth. Indonesian youth at this present time are the most educated generation in the history of Indonesia and the most engaged in the world beyond Indonesia (Parker & Nilan, 2013). Indonesian youth also placed second among 12 Southeast and East Asian countries for percentage participation in activism at 46% (UNDP, 2014). UNESCO (2013) called Indonesia's youth as key actors and partners in building peace, eradicating poverty, transforming to sustainable development, and conducting intercultural dialogue through participation in outreach, volunteerism and bureaucracy. The sheer power of Indonesian youth in combination with active civic participation life is essential for continuation of democracy in Indonesia. However, youth who are younger than 18 years old have unequal opportunity in civic participation and leadership in comparison to older youth. This dissertation responded to the research call to understand this large disparity in civic engagement and leadership opportunities for younger youth through the case study of FAB. FAB is located nearby Dolly Lane, the biggest red light district in Southeast Asia. WVI created FAB as a safe haven for young people from the influence of prostitution and violence against children. In the beginning, the youth joined FAB for youth development purposes. However, they saw the differences between FAB and other youth organizations in Indonesia. FAB gave them opportunities to lead others in genuine manner. The youth leaders defined and practiced leadership both inside and outside FAB environment. There were many benefits of FAB youth participation. On small scale, the youth leaders experienced youth development (Sherrod et al.,

2010). The youth built their leadership portfolio through daily leadership practice and became more confident in pursuing other leadership positions. They joined, exercised their participation rights, and led civic activities in their local communities, especially activities supporting children's wellbeing. The youth leaders experienced growth in skills, knowledge, and abilities related to leadership through their interaction with their peers, adult mentor, and community members.

On a large scale, the youth participation in civil society serves as an important instrument in strengthening democracy and democratic society (Amna, 2012; Checkoway & Aldana, 2013). The difference of FAB, in comparison to other youth development program, was its focus on building collective power and access of participation in Indonesian civic society. The youth leaders focused on teaching and sharing leadership knowledge and skills with their FAB peers. Bringing peers into civic engagement and leadership opportunities was a power-building move. The youth leaders understood the importance of building collective power due to the leadership challenges they regularly met. The key here was building power by numbers. The youth leaders also expanded their participation and leadership circles beyond FAB environment. They actively used their FAB leader identities and experiences to ask for more leadership opportunity available in the community. These experiences could be met with support or dismissal from community members, due to their young age. Young women leaders in FAB, especially took the need to build power very seriously. The patriarchal perception of Indonesian leadership, in addition to the low number of young women leaders with disadvantages, challenged FAB young women leaders to lean on each other and bring other young women into every leadership and participation opportunity they had access to (Sandberg, 2013). Specific to young women leaders, they experienced layered marginalization due to their combined social oppressed background

based on their gender, social class, and young age. The intersectionality of identities created a sense of urgency in creating participation and leadership opportunities. The main premises of “participation” came from the need to have a more active form of citizenship, especially for marginalized groups from multiple stakeholders (Offerdahl et al., 2014). Youth leadership in its core was an answer to create active citizen for everyone, including marginalized youth.

Implication of Study

Implications of Research

There were several important implications that emerged from the findings in this dissertation. First, this study expanded the scholarship of youth leadership, which was still limited and needed more empirical studies in comparison to adult leadership theories (Culp & Kohlhausen, 2000; Mortensen et al., 2014; Roach et al., 1999). This dissertation focused solely on the perspectives of youth leaders in defining and practicing leadership. The youth leaders’ voices served as important sources in constructing youth leadership theories, especially theories exploring the leadership practice of youth with disadvantages. The disadvantaged status for FAB youth came due to their close proximity to Dolly Lane red light district and various socioeconomic aspects such as: family poverty, lack of parental support, and lack of high quality education. I also consciously did not dissect the voices of adults in FAB and local communities and their definition of youth leadership. I made this decision to give the youth leaders an opportunity to build the concept of youth leadership based on their realities; not based on how adults wanted youth leadership to look like.

Second, this study revealed the connection between youth leadership and children’s rights, especially participation rights. The current state of research on youth participation and leadership on a local level, with a focus on children’s rights has not reached their maturity in

academic research (Torney-Purta & Barber, 2011). The FAB youth leaders specifically utilized children's rights in defining what constituted as youth leadership. The leaders perceived their leadership action as a form of participation rights. The focus on participation rights is especially important because FAB youth were younger, non-college age youth. This dissertation demonstrates some of the problems with limited participation rights for younger youth outside education institution setting. The youth leaders used FAB as a tool to implement their participation rights, both inside a civic organization and in local community.

Third, this study explored and expanded the literature of youth participation and leadership in Indonesia as an active, new democratic, non-western country. This study also provided analysis on how the youth leaders built trust, collaboration, and power in a civic organization. Although this study was focused on one youth organization in Surabaya, other Indonesian youth organizations could benefit from better understanding on how youth experienced civic participation and leadership, especially on its long-term impact on the health of Indonesia democracy.

Finally, this study added theories on how multilayered minorities with intersectional identities, such as young women leaders, negotiated power in their leadership role. I specifically reviewed the challenge of *ibuism*/ sexism that came from young male leaders. This finding showed that peers, especially young male, played a role in oppressing young women leaders through unconscious sexism behavior. This dissertation also provided knowledge on how young women leaders took action in becoming youth leaders and challenged the common stereotype of women, as people who were passive, domestic oriented, and had limited role in civic society and leadership.

Implications for Practice

For youth organizations in Indonesia and in global settings, this study showed different ways youth defined successful leaders and leadership practice. The youth leaders defined leadership in a different manner than adults, which showed the importance of asking youth in each youth organization what they wanted and expected to see as the indicators of successful leadership outcome. This study also showed different factors needed to support layered, multiple identity minorities, such as disadvantaged youth or young women, in becoming leaders. For this reason, it is important to move forward in creating diverse support systems for all kinds of youth, not just “good youth” in becoming leaders. Supporting diverse youth in becoming leaders will support the objective of youth development in ensuring growth for everyone.

For young women in Indonesia, this study showed different leadership roles and challenges that young women could take on. Young women in Indonesia could see real life examples of different paths that they could take through being active in civic organizations. Their life roles were not limited as passive society members or married housewives, but they could be active and take charge in society as leaders. This study also showed different power negotiation strategies for young women leaders. Power negotiation required allies from both male & female peers and adult mentors, especially in overcoming the patriarchal manifestation of Indonesian leadership. The support from peers and adults was essential to create genuine leadership practice for young women, without recreating traditional gender role expectation and patriarchal leadership.

For adult community members or adult mentors, this study showed how the youth leaders built collaboration and power through their interaction with adult community members and adult mentors. I showed how adult community members and adult mentor gave trust, shared with or

solely gave the decision-making power to youth leaders. Adults were not the enemy when they served as allies and supporters. The role of adults was beneficial for youth development when they gave youth freedom to make mistakes. It was particularly important for adults not to intervene and let youth learn through trial and error.

For Indonesian government & policy makers, this study provided an example of practice related to the application of CRC's participation rights through youth civic organizations. Positive experience in youth organizations could strengthen Indonesian democracy. I recommend the Indonesian government to amend CRC's participation rights to the Indonesian Constitution in order to bring it to the same level of other CRCs. Policy makers also need to support programs that provide time and place for younger youth to practice participations rights in local settings. This study also showed the limitation of *Karang Taruna* as the official government-sanctioned "youth" organization. *Karang Taruna* opens its door for "youth" up to ages of 45 years old, which created very limited participation and leadership opportunities for younger youth. However this limitation opened up an opportunity to create a different form of youth organization. I recommend the Indonesian government and policy makers to create a different format of government sanctioned youth organization, especially for younger youth. This youth organization would have same credibility as *Karang Taruna*, without the large discrepancy of its members' age. I also recommend the Indonesian government and policy makers to include non-government sanctioned youth organizations as partners in building civic society for youth. This partnership will open doors for localized collaboration opportunities with diverse youth organizations in local communities around Indonesia.

Future Research

In this section, I suggest several potential research topics and methodology for future studies on youth participation and leadership in new democratic countries and in general. My suggestions address the current limitations of this study, and discuss options for expanded scope of inquiry in youth related research.

This study focused on youth's own definitions of leadership and practice to understand the concept of youth leadership in Indonesia as a new democratic society. There are a number of opportunities for future studies to address the limitations of this study and enhance the knowledge of youth leadership. First, this study was limited by time and resources. Future researchers may consider more immersive research to include more youth, especially youth who do not consider themselves as leaders. Conducting interview with more diverse youth may provide additional perspective on youth leadership practice. Additional interview subjects can also be included, for example youth who are not perceived as "good" or labeled as delinquent. These youth may provide insight on their motivations, perceptions, and the obstacles they encounter related to joining youth organizations. Their voices and experiences will expand the current understanding of youth leadership, while challenging the stereotype of leadership only as "good youth" activities.

Another area of research that can be furthered is, research that expands the scope of inquiry by including multiple youth organizations in different settings. The majority of Indonesian youth live in urban areas (UNICEF, 2014). Including multiple youth organizations in Indonesia urban area will add to the knowledge of the youth perspectives and practices of leadership that embody the majority of Indonesian youth. In addition, adding youth from rural areas of Indonesia will also show the impact of location on civic engagement and leadership,

while showing commonalities and differences in youth leadership practice in different settings. In the end, the compilation of both urban and rural scopes of research will create a holistic picture of youth leadership in Indonesia. For more general youth research, multiple youth voices from different youth organization environments will create a rich picture of how environment affects the development and practice of youth leadership. The scope of environment can be distinguished in various parameters such as: within a neighborhood, a city/village, a region, a country, and many more.

FAB was open for youth who lived in Banyu Urip and Putat Jaya areas, which included the Dolly Lane red light district. All of the youth leaders in this study lived in these two areas, but outside the red light district zone. Studies that explore how youth who live inside the red light district would complement this study with different information on participation and leadership opportunities and challenges. On the other end, future research that explores youth leadership from the perspective of youth who are perceived as disadvantaged will help build understanding about how lack of access to resources and disadvantaged situations affect youth participation and leadership practice.

Finally, conducting longitudinal studies on youth leaders in which youth were interviewed during high school, post-secondary education, and workforce period would provide more in depth understanding of the growth of leadership and civic participation outside a youth organization setting, including after the youth graduated from a youth organization and enter adulthood. This longitudinal study would help understanding the impact of youth leadership in creating civic conscious citizen.

References

- Amyby, T. (2014, July 9). Civil society's voice spoke loudest in Indonesia's election. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/jul/10/civil-societys-voice-spoke-loudest-in-indonesias-election>
- Amna, E. (2012). How is civic engagement developed over time? Emerging answers from a multidisciplinary field. *Journal of Adolescence*, 35(3), 611-627.
- Andolina, M. W., Jenkins, K., Zukin, C., & Keeter, S. (2003). Habits from home, lessons from school: Influences on youth civic engagement. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 36(2), 275-280.
- Antlov, H., Brinkerhoff, D. W., & Rapp, E. (2010). Civil society capacity building for democratic reform: Experience and lessons from Indonesia. *Voluntas*, 21(3), 417-439.
- Antonakis, J. (2012). Transformational and charismatic leadership. In D. V. Day & J. Antonakis (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE.
- Apathy is Boring. (2004). *The youth-friendly guide to intergenerational decision making partnerships*. Retrieved from https://www.ndi.org/files/2061_citpart_youth_010104.pdf
- Ariyanto, S. (2018). A portrait of gender bias in the prescribed Indonesian ELT textbook for junior high school students. *Sexuality & Culture*, 22(4), 1054-1076.
- Armenia, R. (2015, August 11). Jokowi beri penghargaan ramah anak untuk Jakarta dan Solo. Retrieved from <http://www.cnnindonesia.com/nasional/20150811144804-20-71410/jokowi-beri-penghargaan-ramah-anak-untuk-jakarta-dan-solo/>
- Ashford, S. J., & DeRue, D. S. (2012). Developing as a leader: The power of mindful engagement. *Organizational Dynamics*, 41(2), 146-154.
- Astin, H. S., & Astin, A. W. (1996). *A social change model of leadership development: Guidebook (Version III)*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Avolio, B. J. (2007). Promoting more integrative strategies for leadership theory-building. *American Psychologist*, 62(1), 25-33.
- Baker, J., & Lindquist, J. (2013). Indonesia. In J. Barker, E. Harms, & J. Lindquist (Eds.), *Figures of Southeast Asian Modernity*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman.
- BAPPENAS. (1995). *Peranan wanita, anak dan remaja, dan pemuda*. Retrieved from https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0ahUKewiPoJOup8PMAhVJzz4KHU93BrAQFggfMAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.bappenas.go.id%2Findex.php%2Fdownload_file%2Fview%2F8999%2F231%2

- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York; London: Free Press; Collier Macmillan.
- Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2008a). Concepts of leadership. In B. M. Bass & R. Bass (Eds.), *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (4th ed., pp. 3-26). New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2008b). Models and theories of leadership. In B. M. Bass & R. Bass (Eds.), *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (4th ed., pp. 46-78). New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2008c). Traits of Leadership (1904-1970). In B. M. Bass & R. Bass (Eds.), *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (4th ed., pp. 81-102). New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2008d). Traits of Leadership (1970-2006). In B. M. Bass & R. Bass (Eds.), *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (4th ed., pp. 103-135). New York: Free Press.
- Beazley, H. (2008). 'I love dugem': Young women's participation in the Indonesian scene. *Intersections: Gender, History & Culture in the Asian Context*(18).
- Bessell, S. (2007). Children, welfare and protection: A new policy framework? In R. H. McLeod & A. J. MacIntyre (Eds.), *Indonesia: Democracy and the promise of good governance* (pp. 138-156). Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Best, A. L. (2007). *Representing youth: Methodological issues in critical youth studies*. New York: New York University Press.
- Blackburn, S. (2004). *Women and the state in modern Indonesia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blanchet-Cohen, N., & Bedeaux, C. (2014). Towards a rights-based approach to youth programs: Duty-bearers' perspectives. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 38, 75-81.
- Bowie, N. E. (2000). Business ethics, philosophy, and the next 25 years. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 10(1), 7-20.
- Brown, M. E., & Trevino, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6), 595-616.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership* (1st ed.). New York: Harper & Row.
- Camino, L. (2005). Pitfalls and promising practices of youth-adult partnerships: An evaluator's reflections. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 33(1), 75-85.

- Carothers, T., & Ottaway, M. (2000). The burgeoning world of civil society aid. In M. Ottaway & T. Carothers (Eds.), *Funding virtue: Civil society aid and democracy promotion* (pp. 3-20). Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Carter, E. W., Swedeen, B., Walter, M. J., Moss, C. K., & Hsin, C.-T. (2011). Perspectives of young adults with disabilities on leadership. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals, 34*(1), 57-67.
- Cerecer, D. A. Q., Cahill, C., & Bradley, M. (2013). Toward a critical youth policy praxis: Critical youth studies and participatory action research. *Theory into Practice, 52*(3), 216-223.
- Checkoway, B. (2011). What is youth participation? *Children and Youth Services Review, 33*(2), 340-345.
- Checkoway, B., & Aldana, A. (2013). Four forms of youth civic engagement for diverse democracy. *Children and Youth Services Review, 35*(11), 1894-1899.
- Checkoway, B., Allison, T., & Montoya, C. (2005). Youth participation in public policy at the municipal level. *Children and Youth Services Review, 27*(10), 1149-1162.
- Close, C. L., & Lechman, K. (1997). Fostering youth leadership: Students train students and adults in conflict resolution. *Theory into Practice, 36*(1), 11-16.
- Committee on the Rights of the Child. (2014). *Concluding observations on the combined third and fourth periodic reports of Indonesia*. Retrieved from <http://docstore.ohchr.org/SelfServices/FilesHandler.ashx?enc=6QkG1d%2fPPRiCAqhKb7yhsojFE9Wic32tm02CjRcUBTBmKPabAgZ7li0nMYRDpozvvgO6Kk9ldi5sHE7D%2fJLQIgxERzDXfrxFiMsl3xlAtLCZEPWRaKo0ZlWrtS1DozTF>
- Conner, J. O., & Strobel, K. (2007). Leadership development: An examination of individual and programmatic growth. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 22*(3), 275-297.
- Cooke, B., & Kothari, U. (2001). *Participation: the new tyranny?* London, New York: Zed Books.
- Corbin, J. M., Strauss, A. L., & Strauss, A. L. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, Calif.: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

- Culp, K., & Kohlhagen, B. (2000). Identifying, defining, applying, analyzing & synthesizing leadership opportunities with adolescents. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 7(2), 50-57.
- Dansereau, F., Seitz, S. R., Chiu, C. Y., Shaughnessy, B., & Yammarino, F. J. (2013). What makes leadership, leadership? Using self-expansion theory to integrate traditional and contemporary approaches. *Leadership Quarterly*, 24(6), 798-821.
- Das Gupta, M., Kollodge, R., Levy, J., Luchsinger, G., Merrick, T., & Rosen, J. E. (2014). *The power of 1.8 billion : Adolescents, youth and the transformation of the future*. Retrieved from <https://eeca.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/pub-pdf/EN-SWOP14-FINAL-web.pdf>
- Day, D. V. (2000). Leadership development: A review in context. *Leadership Quarterly*, 11(4), 581-613.
- Day, D. V., & Antonakis, J. (2012). Leadership: Past, present, and future. In D. V. Day & J. Antonakis (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE.
- Day, D. V., Fleenor, J. W., Atwater, L. E., Sturm, R. E., & McKee, R. A. (2014). Advances in leader and leadership development: A review of 25 years of research and theory. *Leadership Quarterly*, 25(1), 63-82.
- Den Hartog, D. N., & Dickson, M. W. (2012). Leadership and culture. In D. V. Day & J. Antonakis (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE.
- Denzin, N. K. (2017). *Sociological methods: A sourcebook*. New York: Routledge.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed., pp. 1-20). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- DeRue, D. S., Nahrgang, J. D., Wellman, N., & Humphrey, S. E. (2011). Trait and behavioral theories of leadership: An integration and meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(1), 7-52.
- Dinh, J. E., Lord, R. G., Gardner, W. L., Meuser, J. D., Liden, R. C., & Hu, J. Y. (2014). Leadership theory and research in the new millennium: Current theoretical trends and changing perspectives. *Leadership Quarterly*, 25(1), 36-62.
- DiStefano, J. J., & Greenleaf, R. K. (1988). *Tracing the vision and impact of Robert K. Greenleaf*. South Orange, NJ: Robert K. Greenleaf Center.
- ECPAT. (1997). *Commercial sexual exploitation of children: A report of the implementation of the Agenda for Action adopted at the first World Congress against Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children Stockholm, Sweden, 29 August 1996*. Retrieved from Bangkok, Thailand:
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity, youth, and crisis* (1st ed.). New York,: W. W. Norton.

- Fass, P. S. (2007). *Children of a new world: Society, culture, and globalization*. New York: New York University Press.
- Fass, P. S. (2011). A historical context for the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 633, 17-29.
- Ferguson, K., Kim, M., & McCoy, S. (2011). Enhancing empowerment and leadership among homeless youth in agency and community settings: A grounded theory approach. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 28(1), 1-22.
- Fertman, C. I., & van Linden, J. A. (1999). Character education: An essential ingredient for youth leadership development. *NASSP Bulletin*, 83(609), 9-15.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1963). *A contingency model of leadership effectiveness*. Urbana: Group Effectiveness Research Laboratory, University of Illinois.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1973). Predicting the effects of leadership training and experience from the contingency model: A clarification. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57(2), 110-113.
- Flanagan, C. A., Bowes, J. M., Jonsson, B., Csapo, B., & Sheblanova, E. (1998). Ties that bind: Correlates of adolescents' civic commitments in seven countries. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54(3), 457-475.
- Flanagan, C. A., & Sherrod, L. R. (1998). Youth political development: An introduction. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54(3), 447-456.
- Freedman, A., & Tiburzi, R. (2012). Progress and caution: Indonesia's democracy. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 39(3), 131-156.
- Freire, P. (2005). *Education for critical consciousness*. London; New York: Continuum.
- Funk, A., Van Borek, N., Taylor, D., Grewal, P., Tzemis, D., & Buxton, J. A. (2012). Climbing the "Ladder of Participation": Engaging experiential youth in a participatory research project. *Canadian Journal of Public Health-Revue*, 103(4), E288-E292.
- Galston, W. A. (2003). Civic education and political participation. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 85(1), 29-33.
- Gani, D. S. (2004). Leadership in Indonesia: A case for managing relationship within organizations. In D. Tjosvold & K. Leung (Eds.), *Leading in high growth Asia managing relationship for teamwork and change*. New Jersey: World Scientific.
- Gardner, W., Avolio, B., & Luthans, F. (2005). "Can you see the real me?" A self-based model of authentic leader and follower development. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 343-372.
- Gardner, W. L., Cogliser, C. C., Davis, K. M., & Dickens, M. P. (2011). Authentic leadership: A review of the literature and research agenda. *Leadership Quarterly*, 22(6), 1120-1145.

- Gaventa, J., & Pettit, J. (2010). Power and participation. In R. A. Couto (Ed.), *Political and civic leadership: A reference handbook* (pp. 513-523). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE Publications.
- Gerring, J. (2007). *Case study research: Principles and practices*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Golombek, S. (2002). *What works in youth participation: Case studies from around the world*. Retrieved from Baltimore, MD: https://www.iyfnet.org/sites/default/files/WW_Youth_Participation.pdf
- Goodwin, N., & Martam, I. (2014). *Indonesian youth in the 21st century*. Retrieved from Jakarta, Indonesia: https://indonesia.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/pub-pdf/Indonesian_Youth_in_the_21st_Century_%28Youth_Mapping%29.pdf
- Green, K. (2005). *Decentralization and good governance: The case of Indonesia*. Retrieved from https://mpr.aub.uni-muenchen.de/18097/1/MPRA_paper_18097.pdf
- Greenleaf, R. K., & Spears, L. C. (2002). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness* (25th anniversary ed.). New York: Paulist Press.
- Hannah, S. T., Sumanth, J. J., Lester, P., & Cavarretta, F. (2014). Debunking the false dichotomy of leadership idealism and pragmatism: Critical evaluation and support of newer genre leadership theories. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(5), 598-621.
- Hart, R. A. (1992). *Children's participation: From tokenism to citizenship*. Florence, Italy: UNICEF International Child Development Centre.
- Hernandez, M., Eberly, M. B., Avolio, B. J., & Johnson, M. D. (2011). The loci and mechanisms of leadership: Exploring a more comprehensive view of leadership theory. *Leadership Quarterly*, 22(6), 1165-1185.
- Hestyanti, Y. R. (2006). Children survivors of the 2004 tsunami in Aceh, Indonesia: A study of resiliency. *Resilience in Children*, 1094, 303-307.
- Hinton, R. (2008). Children's participation and good governance: Limitations of the theoretical literature. *International Journal of Children's Rights*, 16(3), 285-300.
- Ho, E., Clarke, A., & Dougherty, I. (2015). Youth-led social change: Topics, engagement types, organizational types, strategies, and impacts. *Futures*, 67, 52-62.
- Hofstede, G. H., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations-Software of the mind: Intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

- House, R. J., & Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness Research Program. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Hubungan Masyarakat Surabaya. (2013, July 23). Surabaya raih kota layak anak tiga kali beruntun. Retrieved from <http://humas.surabaya.go.id/index.php?option=news&det=332>
- Husni, D. (1998). *Jong Islamieten Bond : a study of a Muslim youth movement in Indonesia during the Dutch Colonial era, 1924-1942*. (Master), McGill University, Montreal, Canada. Retrieved from http://digitool.library.mcgill.ca/R/?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=21219&local_base=GEN01-MCG02
- Ibrahim, A. (2014). Critical youth studies: An introduction. In A. Ibrahim & S. R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Critical youth studies reader* (pp. xx, 564 pages). New York: Peter Lang.
- Innovations in Civic Participation. (2008). *Young peoples civic engagement in East Asia and the Pacific: A regional study conducted by Innovations in Civic Participation*. Retrieved from http://www.unicef.org/adolescence/cypguide/files/EAPRO_study_by_Innovations_in_Civic_Participation.pdf
- Innovations in Civic Participation. (2010). *Youth civic participation worldwide*. Retrieved from Washington, DC:
- Institute of Medicine National Research Council. (2005). *Growing up global: The changing transitions to adulthood in developing countries*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- International Bureau for Children's, R. (2006). *Making children's rights work : country profiles on Cambodia, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Timor Leste and Viet Nam*. Montreal: International Bureau for Children's Rights.
- Irawanto, D., Ramsey, P., & Ryan, J. (2011). Challenge of leading in Javanese culture. *Asian Ethnicity, 12*(2), 125-139.
- Irawanto, D. W. (2009). An analysis of national culture And leadership practices in Indonesia. *Journal of Diversity Management, 4*(2), 41-48.
- Jaramillo, N. E. (2012). Occupy, recuperate and decolonize. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 10*(1), 67-75.
- Jensen, L. A. (2008). Immigrants' cultural identities as sources of civic engagement. *Applied Developmental Science, 12*(2), 74-83.
- Jessor, R. (1993). Successful adolescent development among youth in high-risk settings. *American Psychologist, 48*(2), 117-126.

- Jones, K. R., & Perkins, D. F. (2006). Youth and adult perceptions of their relationships within community-based youth programs. *Youth & Society*, 38(1), 90-109.
- Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5), 751-765.
- Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 765-780.
- Judge, T. A., & Long, D. M. (2001). The nature of organizational leadership: An introduction. In S. J. Zaccaro & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Nature of organizational leadership : Understanding the performance imperatives confronting today's leaders* (pp. 179-217). Somerset, NJ, USA: Jossey-Bass.
- Judge, T. A., & Long, D. M. (2012). Individual differences in leadership. In D. V. Day & J. Antonakis (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (2nd ed., pp. ix, 597 p.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE.
- Kassimir, R., & Flanagan, C. (2010). Youth civic engagement in the developing world: Challenges and opportunities. In L. R. Sherrod, J. Torney-Purta, & C. A. Flanagan (Eds.), *Handbook of research on civic engagement in youth*. Hoboken, N.J.: Wiley.
- Kellner, D. (2014). Toward a critical theory of youth. In A. Ibrahim & S. R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Critical youth studies reader*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1991). Leadership: Do traits matter? *Academy of Management Executive*, 5(2), 48-60.
- Kress, C. A. (2006). Youth leadership and youth development: Connections and questions. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 2006(109), 45-56.
- Kumar, R. (2011). *Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners* (3rd ed.). London; Thousand Oaks, Calif. : SAGE.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, England; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ledbetter, B. (2010). Leading self. In R. A. Couto (Ed.), *Political and civic leadership: A reference handbook* (pp. 886-894). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Lee, D. (2011a). Images of youth: On the iconography of history and protest in Indonesia. *History and Anthropology*, 22(3), 307-336.
- Lee, D. (2011b). Styling the revolution: Masculinities, youth, and street politics in Jakarta, Indonesia. *Journal of Urban History*, 37(6), 933-951.
- Lee, N. (1999). The challenge of childhood: Distributions of childhood's ambiguity in adult institutions. *Childhood-a Global Journal of Child Research*, 6(4), 455-474.

- Lee, N. (2001). *Childhood and society: Growing up in an age of uncertainty*. Buckingham; Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Lenzi, M., Vieno, A., Perkins, D. D., Santinello, M., Elgar, F. J., Morgan, A., & Mazzardis, S. (2012). Family affluence, school and neighborhood contexts and adolescents' civic engagement: A cross-national study. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 50*(1-2), 197-210.
- Levin-Waldman, O. M. (2013). Income, civic participation and achieving greater democracy. *Journal of Socio-Economics, 43*, 83-92.
- Levinson, B., & Sutton, M. (2008). Civic education reform for democracy: U.S. models in Mexico and Indonesia. In D. Stevick & B. A. Levinson (Eds.), *Advancing democracy through education?: U.S. influence abroad and domestic practices* (pp. 129-158). Charlotte, N.C.: Information Age Publishing.
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *Journal of Social Psychology, 10*(2), 271-271.
- Libby, M., Rosen, M., & Sedonaen, M. (2005). Building youth–adult partnerships for community change: Lessons from the Youth Leadership Institute. *Journal of Community Psychology, 33*(1), 111-120.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park: Sage Publication, Inc.
- Locke, E. A. (2003). Leadership: Starting at the top. In C. L. Pearce & J. A. Conger (Eds.), *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership* (pp. 271–284). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Lussier, D. N., & Fish, M. S. (2012). Indonesia: The benefits of civic engagement. *Journal of Democracy, 23*(1), 70-84.
- MacNeil, C. A. (2006). Bridging generations: applying "adult" leadership theories to youth leadership development. In M. Klau, S. Boyd, L. Luckow, & R. Heifetz (Eds.), *Youth leadership* (pp. 27-43). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Wiley.
- Macneil, C. A., & McClean, J. (2006). Moving from “youth leadership development” to “youth in governance”: Learning leadership by doing leadership. *New Directions for Youth Development, 2006*(109), 99-106.
- Manning, T. (2012). 'I'm not really a leader': The power and impact of implicit leadership theories. In H. Owen (Ed.), *New Thinking on Leadership: A Global Perspective* (67-81 ed.). London: Kogan Page Ltd.
- Marion, R., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2001). Leadership in complex organizations. *Leadership Quarterly, 12*(4), 389-418.

- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2006). *Designing qualitative research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2011). *Designing qualitative research* (5th ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Martyn, E. (2005). *The women's movement in post-colonial Indonesia: Gender and nation in a new democracy*. London; New York: Routledge Curzon.
- Matthews, H., & Limb, M. (2003). Another white elephant? Youth councils as democratic structures. *Space & Polity*, 7(2), 173.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2012). *A realist approach for qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (Third edition. ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE Publications.
- Melani, A. (2019, November 15). Surabaya raih predikat kota ramah anak, apa saja fasilitasnya? *Liputan 6*. Retrieved from [https://surabaya.liputan6.com/read/4111086/surabaya-raih-predikat-kota-ramah-anak-apa-saja-fasilitasnya - ~:text=Liputan6.com%2C%20Jakarta%20%2D%20Surabaya,dianugerahkan%20di%20Makassar%2C%20Sulawesi%20Selatan](https://surabaya.liputan6.com/read/4111086/surabaya-raih-predikat-kota-ramah-anak-apa-saja-fasilitasnya-~:text=Liputan6.com%2C%20Jakarta%20%2D%20Surabaya,dianugerahkan%20di%20Makassar%2C%20Sulawesi%20Selatan).
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, M. A. (2013). Decentralizing Indonesian city spaces as new 'centers'. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 37(3), 834-848.
- Mitra, D. L. (2005). Adults advising youth: Leading while getting out of the way. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 41(3), 520-553.
- Mitra, D. L. (2009). Strengthening student voice initiatives in high schools: An examination of the supports needed for school-based youth-adult partnerships. *Youth & Society*, 40(3), 311-335.
- Mitra, D. L., Lewis, T., & Sanders, F. (2013). Architects, captains, and dreamers: Creating advisor roles that foster youth-adult partnerships. *Journal of Educational Change*, 14(2), 177-201.
- Mortensen, J., Lichty, L., Foster-Fishman, P., Harfst, S., Hockin, S., Warsinske, K., & Abdullah, K. (2014). Leadership through a youth lens: Understanding youth conceptualizations of leadership. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 42(4), 447-462.
- Mumford, M. D., & Fried, Y. (2014). Give them what they want or give them what they need? Ideology in the study of leadership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(5), 622-634.

- Murphy, S. E. (2011). Providing a foundation for leadership development. In S. E. M. R. J. Reichard (Ed.), *Early development and leadership: Building the next generation of leaders* (pp. 3-37). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Murphy, S. E., & Johnson, S. K. (2011). The benefits of a long-lens approach to leader development: Understanding the seeds of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 22(3), 459-470.
- Ngũgĩ wa, T. (1986). *Decolonising the mind: The politics of language in African literature*. London; Portsmouth, N.H.: J. Currey; Heinemann.
- Northouse, P. G. (2007). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Nugroho, S. C., & Smith, E. L. (2010). General measures of implementation. In Save the Children (Ed.), *The Review Report the Implementation of Convention on the Rights of the Child in Indonesia 1997-2009* (pp. 7-17). Jakarta, Indonesia: Save the Children.
- Nursyahbani, K., & Saskia, W. (2003). Sexual politics and reproductive rights in Indonesia. *Development*, 46(2), 63.
- Offerdahl, K., Evangelides, A., & Powers, M. (2014). *Overcoming youth marginalization: Conference report and policy recommendations*. Paper presented at the Towards a Better Understanding of Youth Marginalization, New York City.
- OHCHR. (2007). *Legislative history of the Convention on the Rights of the Child Volume I*. Retrieved from New York and Geneva: <http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/LegislativeHistorycrc1en.pdf>
- Owen, H. (2012). Leadership: A global reality. In H. Owen (Ed.), *New Thinking on Leadership : A Global Perspective* (157-171 ed.). London: Kogan Page Ltd.
- Parker, L., & Nilan, P. (2013). *Adolescents in contemporary Indonesia*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Patton, M. Q. (1999, 1999/12//). Enhancing the quality and credibility of qualitative analysis. *Health Services Research*, 34, 1189.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3 ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Polletta, F. (2014). Is participation without power good enough? Introduction to “Democracy Now: Ethnographies of contemporary participation”. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 55(3), 453-466.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: the collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

- Putnam, R. D., Leonardi, R., & Nanetti, R. (1993). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Qvortrup, J. (1994). Childhood Matters: An Introduction. In J. Qvortrup, Bardy M, Sgritta G, & W. H (Eds.), *Childhood matters: Social theory, practice and politics*. Aldershot: Avebury Press.
- Ramadhan, A. S. (2013). *Youth policies in Indonesia: Activating the role of youth*. Retrieved from http://www.youthpolicy.org/national/Indonesia_2013_Youth_Policy_Review.pdf
- Reichard, R. J., Riggio, R. E., Guerin, D. W., Oliver, P. H., Gottfried, A. W., & Gottfried, A. E. (2011). A longitudinal analysis of relationships between adolescent personality and intelligence with adult leader emergence and transformational leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 22(3), 471-481.
- Riele, K. t. (2006). Youth 'at risk': further marginalizing the marginalized? *Journal of Education Policy*, 21(2), 129-145.
- Roach, A. A., Wyman, L. T., Brookes, H., Chavez, C., Heath, S. B., & Valdes, G. (1999). Leadership giftedness: Models revisited. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 43(1), 13-24.
- Robert, F. R., & Stone, A. G. (2002). A review of servant leadership attributes: Developing a practical model. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 23(3), 145-157.
- Rossmann, G. B., & Rallis, S. F. (2012). *Learning in the field: An introduction to qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE.
- Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. (2012). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE.
- Ruby, R. (2007). *Across a great gulf? Conducting research with adolescents*. New York: New York University Press.
- Sánchez-Jankowski, M. (2002). Minority youth and civic engagement: The impact of group relations. *Applied Developmental Science*, 6(4), 237-245.
- Sandberg, S. (2013). *Lean in: Women, work, and the will to lead* (1st ed.). New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Save the Children. (2010). *The review report the implementation of Convention on the Rights of the Child in Indonesia 1997-2009*. Retrieved from Jakarta, Indonesia: [https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/Treaties/CRC/Shared Documents/IDN/INT_CRC_ICO_IDN_15725_E.pdf](https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/Treaties/CRC/Shared_Documents/IDN/INT_CRC_ICO_IDN_15725_E.pdf)
- Schwertner, S. F., & Fisher, R. M. B. (2014). Youth: Multiple connectivities, new temporalities, and early nostalgia. In A. Ibrahim & S. R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Critical youth studies reader*. New York: Peter Lang.

- Scott, Z., & Serek, J. (2015). Ethnic majority and minority youths' ascription of responsibility for solving current social issues: Links to civic participation. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 30*(2), 180-212.
- Shamir, B., & Eilam, G. (2005). "What's your story?" A life-stories approach to authentic leadership development. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*(3), 395-417.
- Shaw, A., Brady, B., McGrath, B., Brennan, M. A., & Dolan, P. (2014). Understanding youth civic engagement: debates, discourses, and lessons from practice. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15575330.2014.931447>.
- Sherrod, L. R., Torney-Purta, J., & Flanagan, C. A. (2010). Research on the development of citizenship: A field comes of age. In L. R. Sherrod, J. Torney-Purta, & C. A. Flanagan (Eds.), *Handbook of research on civic engagement in youth*. Hoboken, N.J.: Wiley.
- SMERU Research Institute, & UNICEF. (2012). *Child poverty and disparities in Indonesia: Challenges for inclusive growth*. Retrieved from Jakarta: [http://www.irf2015.org/sites/default/files/publications/Child poverty and disparities in Indonesia.pdf](http://www.irf2015.org/sites/default/files/publications/Child%20poverty%20and%20disparities%20in%20Indonesia.pdf)
- Smith, R. W. (1995). Servant-leadership : a pathway to the emerging territory In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Reflections on leadership : how Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant-leadership influenced today's top management thinkers / edited by Larry C. Spears ; and a foreword by Max DePree*: New York : J. Wiley.
- Social Policy Research Associates for the Innovation Center for Community and Youth Development. (2003). *Lessons in leadership: How young people change their communities and themselves*. Retrieved from Chevy Chase, MD:
- Somerville, P. (2011). Democracy and participation. *Policy and Politics, 39*(3), 417-437.
- Steinberg, S. R. (2014). Criticalizing youth, youth criticalizing. In A. Ibrahim & S. R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Critical youth studies reader*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *The Journal of Psychology, 25*(1), 35-71.
- Suryadinata, L., Arifin, E. N., & Ananta, A. (2003). *Indonesia's population: Ethnicity and religion in a changing political landscape*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Suryakusuma, J. I. (1996). The state and sexuality in New Order Indonesia. In L. J. Sears (Ed.), *Fantasizing the feminine in Indonesia*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Suryakusuma, J. I. (2004). *Sex, power, and nation: An anthology of writings, 1979-2003*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Metafor Pub.

- Suryani, A. O., Van de Vijver, F. J. R., Poortinga, Y. H., & Setiadi, B. N. (2012). Indonesian leadership styles: A mixed-methods approach. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 15*(4), 290-303.
- Swadener, B. B., & Lubeck, S. (1995). *Children and families "at promise" : deconstructing the discourse of risk*. Albany: Albany : State University of New York Press.
- Syvertsen, A. K., Wray-Lake, L., Flanagan, C. A., Osgood, D. W., & Briddell, L. (2011). Thirty-year trends in U.S. adolescents' civic engagement: A story of changing participation and educational differences. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 21*(3), 586-594.
- Taft, J. K. (2011). *Rebel girls: Youth activism and social change across the Americas*. New York: University Press.
- Tanjung, R. (2018). Selamatkan generasi penerus bangsa, lindungi 4 hak dasar anak Ini. Retrieved from <https://wahanavisi.org/id/fromfield/detail/selamatkan-generasi-penerus-bangsa-lindungi-4-hak-dasar-anak-ini>
- Tanu, D. (2014). Engaging Indonesia's Youth. In J. Chen, A. Gleason, G. Nabbs-Keller, N. Sambhi, K. Springer, & D. Tanu (Eds.), *New perspectives on Indonesia : understanding Australia's closest Asian neighbour*: Perth, Australia.
- Tate, T. F., & Copas, R. L. (2003). Insist or enlist?: Adulthood versus climates of excellence. *Reclaiming Children and Youth: The Journal of Strength-based Interventions, 12*(1), 40.
- Taylor, J. (2016, January 21). Indonesian civil society discusses its urban future. Retrieved from <http://www.iied.org/indonesian-civil-society-discusses-its-urban-future>
- Thomas, R. M. (2003). *Blending qualitative & quantitative research methods in theses and dissertations*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Corwin Press.
- Torney-Purta, J., & Amadeo, J. A. (2011). Participatory niches for emergent citizenship in early adolescence: An international perspective. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 633*, 180-200.
- Torney-Purta, J., & Barber, C. (2011). Fostering Young People's Support for Participatory Human Rights Through Their Developmental Niches. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 81*(4), 473-481.
- Torney-Purta, J., Richardson, W. K., & Barber, C. H. (2004). *Trust in government-related institutions and civic engagement among adolescents: Analysis of five countries from the IEA civic education study*. Retrieved from College Park, MD: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED484045.pdf>
- Trevor-Roberts, E., Ashkanasy, N. M., & Kennedy, J. C. (2003). The egalitarian leader: A comparison of leadership in Australia and New Zealand. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 20*(4), 517-540.

- UN General Assembly. (20 November 1989). Convention on the Rights of the Child. *Treaty Series*. 1577. Retrieved from <http://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b38f0.html>
- UNDP. (2014). *Youth and democratic citizenship in East and South-East Asia: Exploring political attitudes of East and South-East Asian youth through the Asian barometer survey – summary report*. Retrieved from Bangkok: [https://www.asia-pacific.undp.org/content/dam/rbap/docs/Research & Publications/democratic_governance/RBAP-DG-2014-Youth-n-Democratic-Citizenship-East-n-SE-Asia.pdf](https://www.asia-pacific.undp.org/content/dam/rbap/docs/Research%20&%20Publications/democratic_governance/RBAP-DG-2014-Youth-n-Democratic-Citizenship-East-n-SE-Asia.pdf)
- UNESCO. (2013). *Civic engagement and social inclusion of youth in Indonesia*. Retrieved from Jakarta, Indonesia:
- Ungerleider, J. (2012). Structured youth dialogue to empower peacebuilding and leadership. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 29(4), 381-402.
- UNICEF. (2001). What is the Convention on the Rights of the Child? Retrieved from https://www.unicef.org/teachers/learner/what_crc.htm
- UNICEF. (2014). *The State of the World's Children 2015: Reimagine the future-Innovation for every child*. Retrieved from New York:
- UNICEF. (2015). The 196th nation to ratify the Convention on the Rights of the Child [Press release]. Retrieved from http://www.unicef.org/esaro/5440_som2015_ratifying-crc.html
- UNICEF Indonesia. (2015). Indonesia and UNCRC: 25 years of progress and challenges. Retrieved from <http://unicefindonesia.blogspot.com/2014/11/indonesia-and-uncrc-25-years-of.html>
- UNICEF National Committees and Country Offices. (2009). *Child friendly cities fact sheet*. Retrieved from <https://www.unicef.de/blob/23350/110a3c40ae4874fd9cc452653821ff58/fact-sheet--child-friendly-cities--data.pdf>
- United Nations. (1990). Convention on the rights of the child *Multilateral Treaties Deposited with the Secretary-General* (Vol. 11, pp. 1-28).
- van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 1228-1261.
- van Dierendonck, D., & Patterson, K. (2015). Compassionate love as a cornerstone of servant leadership: An integration of previous theorizing and research. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 128(1), 119-131.
- Veerman, P., & Levine, H. (2000). Implementing children's rights on a local level: Narrowing the gap between Geneva and the grassroots. *The International Journal of Children's Rights*, 8(4), 373-384.

- Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L., & Brady, H. E. (1995). *Voice and equality: Civic voluntarism in American politics*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Wade, R. C. (1997). *Community service-learning a guide to including service in the public school curriculum*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Walker, K. C. (2011). The multiple roles that youth development program leaders adopt with youth. *Youth & Society, 43*(2), 635-655.
- Warming, H. (2011). Children's Participation and Citizenship in a Global Age: Empowerment, Tokenism or Discriminatory Disciplining? *Social Work & Society, 9*(1).
- Waters, H., Saadah, F., & Pradhan, M. (2003). The impact of the 1997-98 East Asian economic crisis on health and health care in Indonesia. *Health Policy and Planning, 18*(2), 172-181.
- Weiss, R. S. (1994). *Learning from strangers: The art and method of qualitative interview studies*. New York: Free Press.
- Whetstone, J. T. (2002). Personalism and moral leadership: The servant leader with a transforming vision. *Business Ethics: A European Review, 11*(4), 385-392.
- World Economic Forum. (2014). *Outlook on the Global Agenda 2015*. Retrieved from Geneva:
- World Vision. (2019). Top 5 sponsorship FAQs. Retrieved from <https://www.worldvision.org/sponsor-a-child/?childItem=8452d6a4-0ae8-49a0-8417-758dbbd31855&backLink=grid>
- Wyness, M., Harrison, L., & Buchanan, I. (2004). Childhood, politics and ambiguity: Towards an agenda for children's political inclusion. *Sociology, 38*(1), 81-99.
- Wyse, D. (2001). Felt tip pens and school councils: Children's participation rights in four English schools. *Children & Society, 15*(4), 209-218.
- Yates, M., & Youniss, J. (1998). Community service and political identity development in adolescence. *Journal of Social Issues, 54*(3), 495-512.
- Yin, R. K. (2014a). *Case study research : design and methods* (Fifth edition. ed.). Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Yin, R. K. (2014b). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th ed.). Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Youniss, J., Bales, S., Christmas-Best, V., Diversi, M., McLaughlin, M., & Silbereisen, R. (2002). Youth civic engagement in the twenty-first century. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 12*(1), 121-148.
- Zaccaro, S. J., & Klimoski, R. J. (2001). The Nature of Organizational Leadership: An Introduction. In S. J. Zaccaro & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Nature of organizational*

leadership: Understanding the performance imperatives confronting today's leaders (pp. 3-41). Somerset, NJ: Jossey-Bass.

Zacharatos, A., Barling, J., & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Development and effects of transformational leadership in adolescents. *Leadership Quarterly, 11*(2), 211-226.

Zeldin, S., & Camino, L. (1999). Youth leadership: Linking research and program theory to exemplary practice. *New Designs for Youth Development, 15*(1), 10-15.

Zeldin, S., Christens, B. D., & Powers, J. L. (2013). The psychology and practice of youth-adult partnership: Bridging generations for youth development and community change. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 51*(3-4), 385-397.

Zukin, C. (2006). *A new engagement?: Political participation, civic life, and the changing American citizen*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Interview Protocol for FAB Youth Leader

Date: _____

Interview ID: _____

Script

Hi, my name is Dian Mitrayani from Social Foundations of Education in University of Wisconsin Milwaukee. I would like to invite you to join in the research on “Exploring youth leadership and civic engagement in Wahana Visi Forum Anak (Wahana Visi’s children forum) in Surabaya, Indonesia.”

The purpose of this study is to learn about how youth in Wahana Visi Forum Anak (Wahana Visi’s children forum) engage in civil society, exercise a leadership role related to children’s rights, at the local and citywide level.

Your participation in this research is voluntary. If you choose to take part in this study, you may withdraw at any time. If you agree to participate, I will interview you for approximately 60 minutes. The interview will be audio recorded for transcription purposes.

There is a minimal risk that you may experience from participating. There are no costs for participating. You can gain personal development through critical reflection on your action with the Forum.

A. Personal background

1. Tell me a little bit about yourself
 - a. How old are you?
 - b. Which neighborhood do you live in?
 - c. How long have you been living in Surabaya?
 - d. What school do you go to?
 - e. What other extracurricular activities are you active in?

B. Involvement in Forum Anak da’Bajay

2. How long have you been a member of the Forum?
 - a. What attracted you to join the Forum?
 - b. How did you learn about the Forum?
 - c. Who introduced you to the Forum?
 - d. What are your expectations of the Forum?

C. Definition of the Forum

3. How do you describe the Forum to your peers?
 - a. How and why do you invite any new people here?

D. Youth Leadership

4. How do you describe a youth leader?
 - a. Who are the leaders of the Forum?
 - b. In what way are you a youth leader?
 - c. What are your expectations of a youth leader?
 - d. Tell me about the leadership training that you have participated in
5. What are the best parts of being a youth leader?
6. What are the worst part or challenges of being a youth leader? How did you push yourself to overcome those challenges?
7. Tell me more about your power as youth leader:
 - a. How do you see and lead adults (i.e. staffs, city government officials)?
 - b. How do you see and lead other youth?
 - c. How do adults perceive you as a youth leader?
 - d. How do you challenge adults during disagreement?
 - e. Who has the most initiative/motivation to lead in the Forum activity, youth or adult? Why?

E. Children's Rights

8. How do you define children's rights?
 - a. To what extent was your familiarity with children's rights before joining the Forum?
9. How are children's rights being used in the Forum?
 - a. What children's right activities do you do?
 - b. What children's rights training did you take?

F. Future

10. What have you learned from participating as a youth leader in the Forum to your personal life?
11. How do you navigate the upcoming separation from *Wahana Visi*?
12. If there was any changes in the Forum program you would like to see, what would they be?

Thank the participant for his/her participation

Appendix B: Interview Protocol for *Wahana Visi* Staff

Date: _____

Interview ID: _____

Script

Hi, my name is Dian Mitrayani from Social Foundations of Education in University of Wisconsin Milwaukee. I would like to invite you to join in the research on “Exploring youth leadership and civic engagement in Wahana Visi Forum Anak (Wahana Visi’s children forum) in Surabaya, Indonesia.”

The purpose of this study is to learn about how youth in Wahana Visi Forum Anak (Wahana Visi’s children forum) engage in civil society, exercise a leadership role related to children’s rights, at the local and citywide level.

Your participation in this research is voluntary. If you choose to take part in this study, you may withdraw at any time. If you agree to participate, I will interview you for approximately 60 minutes. The interview will be audio recorded for transcription purposes.

There is a minimal risk that you may experience from participating. There are no costs for participating. You can gain personal development through critical reflection on your action with the Forum.

A. Personal background

1. Tell me a little bit about yourself
 - a. How long have you been working?
 - b. What is your title and your job responsibility?

B. Involvement in Forum Anak da’Bajay

2. How long have you been a staff of the Forum?
 - a. Why are you interested in working for the Forum?
 - b. How did you learn about the Forum?
 - c. What are your expectations of the Forum?

C. Definition of the Forum

3. How did the Forum begin?
 - a. What is the mission of the Forum?
 - b. Tell me about the programs in the Forum that you have and their goals
 - c. How does the Forum differ from other youth civil organizations?
4. Tell me about the members:
 - a. Describe the socioeconomic background of the youth and their family
 - b. Describe the socioeconomic background of the community around the Forum

D. Youth Leaders

5. How do you describe a youth leader?
 - a. Who are the youth leaders of the Forum?
 - b. In what way are they a youth leader?
 - c. What are the expectations of a youth leader?
 - d. What skills are you trying to teach the youth?
6. What are the benefits of having a youth leadership program?
7. What are the challenges of having a youth leadership program?
8. How do you see your role as adult staff in the context of youth leadership?
9. Tell me more about the power that youth leader has:
 - a. Describe how if and how youth lead adults?
 - b. How do you solve disagreements when youth are in the leadership position?
 - c. Who has the most initiative/motivation to lead in the Forum activity, youth or adult? Why?

E. Children's Rights

10. How are children's rights being used in the Forum?
 - a. What children's right activity is available in the Forum?
 - b. What children's rights training did you provide?
11. Tell me about leadership role in children's rights issues that the youth have carried out in:
 - a. The forum
 - b. The surrounding community
 - c. Surabaya government

F. Future

12. What are your expectation for youth leaders once they leave the Forum?
13. How do you help the youth navigate the upcoming separation from *Wahana Visi*?
14. If there was any changes in the Forum program you would like to see, what would they be?

Thank the participant for his/her participation

Curriculum Vitae

Dian Mitrayani

EDUCATION

- Doctor of Philosophy in Social Foundations of Education** **Summer 2020**
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI
Dissertation: Exploring youth leadership and civic engagement in *Wahana Visi Forum Anak da'Bajay* (Wahana Visi's da'Bajay Children Forum) in Surabaya, Indonesia
Committee Co-chairs: Rajeswari Swaminathan, Ph.D. and Aaron Schutz, Ph.D.
- Master of Science in Education in Foundations of Education** **May 2012**
Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, IL
- Master of Urban and Regional Planning in Urban and Regional Planning** **August 2008**
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu, HI
- Graduate Certification in Leadership** **May 2008**
East-West Center, Honolulu, HI
- Bachelor of Arts in Interior Design** **July 2003**
Petra Christian University, Surabaya, Indonesia

AWARDS AND SCHOLARSHIPS

- 2017 American Education Studies Association (AESA) & Taylor & Francis Past President's Award for Outstanding Graduate Student Research
- 2017 Graduate Student Excellence Fellowship Award, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
- 2017 Chancellor's Graduate Student Award, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
- 2014 Chancellor's Graduate Student Award, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
- 2007 Dr. David W. Chappell Peace Program Essay Contest, First Prize, Chaminade University of Honolulu
- 2006 Asian Development Bank - Japan Scholarship for Postgraduate Studies in University of Hawai'i at Mānoa
- 1999 Best Ten Freshman Award for Outstanding Performance in the Interior Design Department, Petra Christian University, Surabaya, Indonesia

RESEARCH AND TEACHING EXPERIENCES

- Data Operations Manager** **March 2020 – Present**
Clinical & Translational Science Institute, Medical College of Wisconsin
- Support in operationalizing and evaluating the aims and objectives of CTSI functions, programs, and activities

- Develop both quantitative and qualitative instruments for data collection, perform data analysis, and provide timely and accurate reports that reflect the programs' performance and key issues

Research Assistant

September 2015 – March 2020

Consulting Office of Research and Evaluation, University of Wisconsin Milwaukee

- Collaborate with different community and academia clients in designing, developing, analyzing, and reporting education related quantitative and qualitative research and evaluation projects
- Manage and conduct multi-year, multi-level research and evaluation projects related to equity and inclusion, including three National Science Foundation projects with grant worth ranges between \$149,995 to \$1.2 million
- Write, disseminate, and tailor-made project reports to clients utilizing both in academic language and in simple terms
- Share research & evaluation techniques and collaborate with other team members to implement and maintain quality standards across all aspects of the job

Regional Lead

July 2015 – March 2020

Play for Peace, Chicago

- Lead and support a team of five Play for Peace regional coordinators, representing Latin America, South Asia, Europe & the Middle East, Africa, and Southeast Asia, to ensure successful Play for Peace's commitment to peacebuilding through program implementation, monitoring, research, and evaluation.
- Collaborate with different Play for Peace clubs in national and global levels in conducting various Play for Peace curriculum activities
- Cultivate, manage relationship, and counsel volunteers in global level to help with the need of various Play for Peace clubs in program implementation
- Serve as liaison to build new partnership and coalition to advancing Play for Peace goal of peacebuilding with various non-profit organizations, education institutions, and religious institutions
- Develop, manage, and analyze various program evaluation including culturally responsive participatory evaluation tools to assess the impact of Play for Peace club on its stakeholders, especially young people, and surrounding community.
- Assist other global Play for Peace Club members in research & evaluation techniques to implement and maintain quality standards across all aspects of Play for Peace program
- Write, disseminate, and tailor-made research and evaluation reports internally within Play for Peace organization and externally in various national education and evaluation conferences utilizing both in academic and layman's terms

Teaching Assistant

September 2013 - May 2015

Conservation and Environmental Science, University of Wisconsin Milwaukee

- Developed data collection tools, conducted data analysis, and wrote a report for the first Dynamic System Theory Innovation Lab in Sheboygan, WI. The Lab was a community-wide system thinking and complexity science approach on Sheboygan's socioeconomic challenges.

- Served as a liaison to build relationship with various community stakeholders in order to create Sheboygan community map for the first Dynamic System Theory Innovation Lab
- Assisted Dr. Timothy Ehlinger in preparing course material, weekly teaching, grading homework, and advising approximately 150 multidisciplinary students on CES 210- Introduction to Introduction and Environmental Science. This course explores the concept of sustainability and development through a multidisciplinary and comprehensive lens with science, sociocultural, and policy influence

Community Partnership Researcher

May 2008 - May 2009

Global Youth Center; Honolulu, Hawai'i

- Assisted in the organizational development of the Global Youth Center through participatory surveys of Indonesian youth
- Build partnership with various Indonesian youth organizations with aligned objective with the Center

Evaluator Assistant

August 2007 - August 2008

Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Hawaii Manoa

- Co-developed logic models, evaluation tools, and wrote reports for both organizational and program evaluation for Ke Ola Hou, a Native Hawaiian youth mentoring organization
- Led participatory evaluation process with Native Hawaiian youth, board members, and children

PUBLICATIONS

Peer-Reviewed Book Chapter

1. **Mitrayani, D.** (2019). Navigating the ambiguity of mixed identity as Chinese-Indonesian. In E. Hurd (Ed.), *The reflexivity of pain and privilege: Auto-ethnographic collections of mixed identity* (pp. 3-19). Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill | Sense.
2. **Mitrayani, D., & Peel, R. D.** (2017). Youth participation and leadership: Moving together towards peace education and sustainable development. In S. Singh & N. D. Erbe (Eds.), *Creating a Sustainable Vision of Nonviolence in Schools and Society* (pp. 200-221). Hershey, PA: IGI Global

Peer-Reviewed Journal

3. **Mitrayani, D., & Peel, R. D.** (2018). Creating peace across borders: The East-West path to unity. *Journal of International Students*, 8(3), 1398–1407.

Editor-Reviewed Journal

4. **Mitrayani, D.** (2008). The Ke Ola Hou: Empowering Hawaiian youth-at-risk through mentoring. *Transformations in Leadership*, 1(2), 42-44.
5. **Mitrayani, D.** (2007). Disadvantaged youth in Indonesia: Empowerment through alternative education. *Transformations in Leadership*, 1(1), 45-47.

Evaluation Report

6. Swaminathan, R. & **Mitrayani, D.** (2020). Evaluation Report III of the Robert Noyce Scholarship program in Carthage College, Kenosha, WI.

7. Swaminathan, R., **Mitrayani, D.**, & Azen, R. (2019). Evaluation Report II of the Robert Noyce Scholarship program in Carthage College, Kenosha, WI.
8. Azen, R., Swaminathan, R., & **Mitrayani, D.** (2018). Evaluation Report I of the Robert Noyce Scholarship program in Carthage College, Kenosha, WI.
9. Swaminathan, R. & **Mitrayani, D.** (2017). Evaluation Report of the Robert Noyce Scholarship-Community Alliance for STEM Teaching (CAST) program in Carthage College, Kenosha, WI.
10. **Mitrayani, D.** (2016). Evaluation report on the impact of Play for Peace Level 1 and 2 trainings in Denver-USA, Palencia-Guatemala, and Mexico.
11. **Mitrayani, D.** (2008). Program assessment Design for Ke Ola Hou youth mentoring. University of Hawai'i at Mānoa
12. **Mitrayani, D.**, Casen, G. A., Gage, A. N., Ka'uhane, K., & Peel, R. D.(2007). Tightening the riggings before setting sail to new waters: An organizational assessment of Ke Ola Hou. University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

Research Report

13. Reisel, J. R., & Walker, C. M., & Cancado, L., & **Mitrayani, D.** (2016, June). Successful Undergraduate Research Experiences in Engineering: Student, Faculty, and Industrial Perspectives. Paper presented at 2016 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition, New Orleans, Louisiana.
14. Reisel, J. R., & Cancado, L., & Walker, C. M., & **Mitrayani, D.** (2015, June). Defining a Successful Undergraduate Research Experience in Engineering. Paper presented at 2015 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition, Seattle, Washington.
15. Walker, C., Rice, N., Purdy, S., Chan, K. T., Lynch, R., **Mitrayani, D.**, & Westrum, R. (2015). *An exploration of the impact of the Wisconsin specific learning disability of placement rates*. Milwaukee: University of Wisconsin Milwaukee School of Education.

WORKSHOP AND CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

1. Evans, L. M., **Mitrayani, D.**, Burgos, L., & Nass, A. (2019, April 5-9). Disrupting Deficit Literacy Paradigms: Examining English Language Proficiency and Literacy Benchmark Assessment Practices in Kindergarten. Presentation for 2019 American Educational Research Association (AERA) Annual Meeting, Toronto, Canada
2. **Mitrayani, D.** & Gough, S. (2019, March 27-29). Application of intersectionality in a peace education community evaluation in Mumbai. Presentation for 2019 Fifth International Conference of the Center for Culturally Responsive Evaluation and Assessment (CREA), Chicago, IL
3. **Mitrayani, D.** (2017, November 3). Challenging the memory of ibusim: Young women participation and leadership in a children's rights youth organization in Indonesia. Presentation for 2017 American Educational Studies Association Annual Meeting, Pittsburgh, PA.
4. **Mitrayani, D.** & Gough, S. (2017, September 28). Promoting the culture of peace in Play for Peace's program evaluation. Presentation for 2017 Fourth International Conference of the Center for Culturally Responsive Evaluation and Assessment (CREA), Chicago, IL
5. **Mitrayani, D.** (2017, March 31). Navigating *ibusim* and ageism: Indonesian female youth participation and leadership in a children's rights youth organization in Indonesia.

Presentation for the 2017 Wisconsin Institute for Peace and Conflict Studies Conference, Milwaukee, WI.

6. **Mitrayani, D.** & Gough, S. (2017, March 16). Play for Peace: Reflecting and evaluating peace practice. Interactive workshop conducted for the 11th International Conference on Conflict Resolution Education at Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.
7. **Mitrayani, D.** (2012, April 26). The impacts of peace education through the eyes of youth participating in a Play for Peace club, Chicago. Presentation for the 56th Annual Conference of the Comparative & International Education Society, San Juan, Puerto Rico.
8. **Mitrayani, D.** & Peel, R. D. (2011, May). Capitalizing on mainstream initiatives such as Inspiring Education: A dialogue with Albertans to engage academia, government and community collaboration. Presentation for the 55th Annual Conference of the Comparative & International Education Society, Montreal, Canada.
9. **Mitrayani, D.** & Peel, R. D. (2010, November). Inspiring education - a dialogue with Albertans: As a bridge between academia, government and community. Presentation for the 2010 Mount Royal University Centennial Symposium on Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, Banff, Canada.
10. **Mitrayani, D.** (2007, March). Empowering Hawaiian youth in crisis through mentoring. Presentation for the 5th Annual Hawai'i State Service Learning Conference, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu, Hawai'i.
11. **Mitrayani, D.** & Peel, R. D. (2007, February). Creating peace across borders: The east-west path to peace," Presentation as first prize winner in peace essay for Dr. David W. Chappell Peace Program, Chaminade University, Honolulu, Hawai'i.