

**Dipublikasikan dalam Educare : International Journal for Educational Studies Vol.2, Number.2, Pebruary 2010, p. 185-196.**

**RESOCIALIZATION PROGRAM EVALUATION OF STREET CHILDREN  
AT OPEN HOUSE IN BANDUNG CITY, INDONESIA**

**Didin Saripudin  
Indonesia University of Education**

**ABSTRACT**

This research aimed to evaluate resocialization program of street children at open houses in Bandung, Indonesia. Research design in this study was programme evaluation design using both quantitative and qualitative methods. This study used CIPP evaluation model suggested by Stufflebeam et al., (1971) by focusing on three of four components of CIPP evaluation model, which were input, process and product. Systematic random sampling was used to select respondents from 16 open houses in Bandung. The sampel of this study was 522 people consisted of 36 administrators/ managers, 132 fasilitators and 354 street children. The questionnaires data was analyzed using descriptive analysis and inference such as frequency, percentage, min, ANOVA and multiple-regression using SPSS for Windows version 12. Interview and observation data were analyzed using Bogdan and Biklen (1992) analysis. This study found that resocialization program of street children at open houses in Bandung, from the aspect of input, process and product generally in the medium level, still had some weaknesses that should be handled. Therefore, in the effort to reach the goal of street children' resocialization program at open houses, the improvement effort should be taken integratedly by all responsible ones.

**KEY WORDS**

Evaluation, resosialization, street children and open house.

**INTRODUCTION**

**Background of Problem**

Due to economic crisis that hit Indonesia in the early 1997, the population of street children increased rapidly. The number increased year by year, the latest number recorded from census conducted was 150,000 of street children in all big cities around Indonesia Republic (Suara Karya, 2006). In Bandung itself, there were about 4,626 street children (Social Department of Bandung, 2006).

The result of observation conducted by RI-ADB Social Department (1999), the factors causing street children phenomenon could be found out, as described in Table 1. Due to life needs and poverty pressure, most of street children had bear a responsibility to work and earn for their pocket money in their young age and they were frequently exploited by certain groups that gave them low wage. According to Dewi (2004), the money earned was usually for their own needs or to lighten their family burden or to assemble with their friends.

**Table 1. The causes of street children phenomenon**

No	The Causes	Percentage
1.	Help their parents to work	49.9
2.	Earn their pocket money	14.8
3.	Cannot continue their study	11.4
4.	Isolated from their family	5.1
5.	Keciciran and no place to work	4.9
6.	Search for new experience	2.6
7.	Want freedom	2.6
8.	Other causes Forced by their family Oppressed by their parents' attitude Search for some friends	8.7

In slum area occupied by low-economic status people, this phenomenon usually increased and created a new culture in a society, added with the condition of its surrounding. A group of children who did not study, isolated, and were not taken care by their parents would lead to the increase of their number in public places such as bus station, mall, public parks, cinema and other public places to assemble and have fun doing their activities together (Horton & Hunt, 1984). Saripudin (2005) stated that the group of street children usually involved in social deviation and criminality such as stealing, fighting, free-sex, homosexual, destroying, violating the law, creating noise and other disturbing behavior that disturbed public tranquility and violated the courtesy values. Their behavior was done

together with their friends who had similar fate and usually came from poor family (Ertanto, 2003).

According to Silva, supported by UNDP & RI Social Department (1997), the street children should be recovered and given perfect protection in order to make them return to their right way, live normally as other children did, and enjoyed their rights as children through resocialization program. Improvement and protection programs, as Dewi (2004) stated, should be supported by knowledge, self-awareness and self-power in order to be able to face all challenge and obstacles in their daily lives.

In Indonesia Republic, a transit house, commonly called open house, had been built as the effort to handle and take care the street children. Moreover, such open house model had been used in other countries (Silva, 1996). According to UNDP & Social Department (1997), Ishak (2000) and Dewi (2003), the excellence of open house is assumed to be able to do the previous model. Open house was a place of street children to assemble, to be together in happiness and sorrow, to tell story, to seek their fortune and to get affection from the street educators. Because the position of open houses is in the central of City, the street children could be trained to adapt and live with the current development in the city and became the rest of urban people, beside sleeping, having meals and living there. At open houses, they are taught to accept and understand others, became big family and manage all their own needs with societal norm and values. (Silva, 1996; Soetarso, 2001). The purposes of open houses development were to help street children in dealing with their problems and to get the best choice to fulfill their life needs (UNDP & RI Social Department, 1997: 3). The specific purpose of street children resocialization program was to make street children have good and positive life philosophy and behavior, to perform social behavior in line with societal values, to have ability of self-regulating and handle life obstacles.

### **The aim of study**

This study aimed to evaluate the resocialization program of street children at open houses in Bandung, Indonesia from its input, process and product aspects, based on CIPP evaluation model by Stufflebeam et al. (1971). The input evaluation included

resocialization curriculum, facilitator ability, street children, facilities and infrastructure, and learning media aspects. The process evaluation included guiding and learning, the involvement of administrators, the involvement of parents and public (NGO), and program monitoring aspects. Meanwhile, the product evaluation involved the aspect of street children having good and positive attitude and life philosophy, performing social behavior in line with societal values, having the ability of self-regulating and the ability to deal with life obstacles. These evaluations were seen from two aspects. The first was how relevant the program for the street children's needs. The second was to evaluate how far the program reached its goal.

### **The Problem of Study**

The evaluation of resocialization program among street children at open houses would try to answer the following questions of study:

1. How far the relevance of input for the implementation of street children resocialization program at open houses than administrator, facilitator and street children perspectives?
2. How far the process of street children resocialization program implementation at open houses than administrator, facilitator and street children perspectives?
3. How far the street children resocialization program at open houses reached its goal than administrator, facilitator and street children perspectives?
4. What were the factors contributing the process implementation and the output of street children resocialization program at open houses?
5. Were there any problems faced and what recommendation was suggested to deal with those problems in street children resocialization program at open houses?

### **THE METHOD OF STUDY**

This study used CIPP evaluation model stated by Stufflebeam et al. (1971) by focusing on three of four CIPP evaluation model components such as input, process and product. Systematic random sampling was used to select respondents from 16 open houses in

Bandung City. The sample of this study was 522 respondents consisting of 36 administrators, 132 facilitators and 354 street children. The instruments used in this study were questionnaire, interview format and observation list. Three sets of questionnaire were provided in which Set 1 was for administrators, Set 2 for facilitators and Set 3 for street children. The index of Alpha Cronbach reliability for those three sets of questionnaire was between 0.70 to 0.87. The data of questionnaire was analyzed using descriptive and inference analysis such as frequency, percentage, min, ANOVA and multiple regression using SPSS for Windows version 12. The data of interview and observation was analyzed using Bogdan and Biklen analysis (1992).

## THE FINDING OF STUDY

### **The relevance of Input for Street Children Resocialization Program Implementation at Open Houses**

Curriculum, facilitator, street children, facility accessibility and learning media were the variable of input components in this study. Table 2 showed entire min score for curriculum, facilitator, street children, facility accessibility and learning media. Generally administrator, facilitator and street children had positive score, in its basic level, on curriculum, facilitator, street children, facility accessibility and learning media.

**Table 2. Entire Min Score of Street Children Resocialization Program Input Relevance**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Min Score</b>	<b>Standar Deviant</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
Curriculum	3.22	0.60	Average
Facilitator	3.46	0.67	Average
Street children	3.24	0.71	Average
Facility accessibility	2.73	0.75	Average
Learning media	3.18	0.94	Average

Street children had more positive perception than facilitator and administrator. ANOVA was used to explain the difference of administrators', facilitators' and street children' perspectives on curriculum, facilitator, street children, facility accessibility and learning media. It was found that there was significant difference among the perceptions of administrators, facilitators and street children on street children resocialization program input relevance.

### **The Process of Street Children Resocialization Program Implementation at Open Houses**

Guiding and learning, the involvement of administrators, the involvement of parents and public (NGO), and program monitoring were the variables of process components in this study. Table 3 below showed entire min score for guiding and learning, the involvement of administrators, the involvement of parents and NGO, and program monitoring. Generally administrators, facilitators and street children had positive score, in higher level, on the involvement of parents and NGO, and program monitoring, while in basic level, on guiding and learning, and the involvement of administrators.

**Table 3 Entire Min Score of Street Children Resocialization Program Process at Open Houses**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Min Score</b>	<b>Standar Deviant</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
Guiding and learning	3.48	0.65	Average
The involvement of administrators	3.33	0.78	Average
The involvement of parents and NGO	3.73	0.81	High
Program monitoring	3.82	0.68	High

Street children had more positive perception than facilitator and administrator. ANOVA was used to explain the difference of administrators', facilitators' and street children' perspectives on guiding and learning, the involvement of administrators, the

involvement of parents and NGO, and program monitoring. It was found that there was significant difference among the perceptions of administrators, facilitators and street children on the process of street children resocialization program.

### **The product of Street Children Resocialization Program at Open Houses**

The good and positive attitude and life philosophy, performing social behavior in line with societal values, the ability of self-regulating, and the ability to deal with life obstacles were the variables included in the components of this study product. Table 4 below showed entire min score for the good and positive attitude and life philosophy, performing social behavior in line with societal values, the ability of self-regulating, and the ability to deal with life obstacles. Entirely, administrators, facilitators and street children had positive score, in higher level, on performing social behavior in line with societal values, while in its basic level was on the good and positive attitude and life philosophy, the ability of self-regulating, and the ability to deal with life obstacles.

**Table 4. Entire Min Score of Street Children Resocialization Program Product at Open Houses**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Min Score</b>	<b>Standar Deviant</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
The good attitude and life philosophy	3.29	0.60	Average
Performing social behavior in line with societal values	3.71	0.58	High
The ability of self-regulating			
The ability to deal with life obstacles	3.23	0.68	Average
	3.27	0.77	Average

Street children had more positive perception than facilitator and administrator. ANOVA was used to explain the difference of perspectives on the good and positive attitude and life philosophy, performing social behavior in line with societal values, the ability of self-regulating, and the ability to deal with life obstacles. It was found that there

was significant difference among the perceptions of administrators, facilitators and street children on the product of street children resocialization program.

### **The factors contributing the process of implementation and the product of street children resocialization program at open houses**

The multiple regression analysis was used to determine the significance of independent variabel correlation and contribution on standard variable. In determining independent variable contributing the process of program implementation, the independent variable consisted of curriculum, facilitators, street children, facility accessibility and learning media. The variables of program implementation included in dependent variable were guiding and learning, the involvement of administrators, the involvement of parents and NGO and program monitoring.

Independent variables such as curriculum, facilitators, street children, facility accessibility and learning media were the contributing factors with the precision by 34% (0.34) on guiding and learning, precision by 27% (0.27) on the involvement of administrators, precision by 21% (0.21) on the involvement of parents and NGO, precision by 37% (0.37) on program monitoring.

In determining independent variables contributing the product of program, independent variables consisted of curriculum, facilitators, street children, the involvement of administrators, the involvement of parents and public, and program monitoring. The variables of program product included in dependent variables consisted of the good and positive attitude and life philosophy, performing social behavior in line with societal values, the ability of self-regulating, and the ability to deal with life obstacles.

Independent variables such as curriculum, facilitators, street children, the involvement of administrators, the involvement of parents and NGO, and program monitoring were the contributing factors with the precision by 58.40% (0.584) on the good and positive attitude and life philosophy, precision by 43% (0.43) on performing social behavior in line with societal values, precision by 55.50% (0.555) on the ability of self-regulating, precision by 38% (0.38) on the ability to deal with life obstacles.



## **Interview analysis**

### ***The problems of Street Children Resocialization Program***

From the problems faced in implementing the street children resocialization program at open houses, the respondents of interview gave quite different perspectives. The answer stated by administrator 1 was: *'The main problem we faced in this street children resocialization program was the environment of street children that was less conducive and supporting, the internal; factor of n their family which was underprivileged and the lack of tutor to guide the street children'*.

The example of answer stated by facilitator 2 was: *'The main problem we faced in this street children resocialization program was the limited learning facility accessibility, the low interest of program participants in following the activities at open houses and the lack of tutor.'*

The example of answer stated by street children 1 in interview was: *'Sometimes it was boring and stressful so we still followed our friends to walk around or hang out while drinking alcohol, sometimes our older friends forced us to earn money by singing at the street'*.

### ***Recommendation of Street Children Resocialization Program Improvement***

The respondents of interview gave quite different recommendation to deal with the problems in street children resocialization program. The answer stated by administrator 1 in the interview was following here: *'First, developing parents or other family guardian, such as giving the capital for business or giving training of various necessary skills, so that they might have business and got out of the poverty. Second, increasing the cooperation among various parties, especially university and social department to add more tutor'*.

The example of answer stated by facilitator 2 was: *'First was the increase of cooperation with responsible parties in the problem of street children service. Second was the activities at open houses should be more activated and improved, and also more varied'*

*with recreation and art creativity activities. Third was guiding and learning were done based on the condition of street children, did not do learning at the time that was impossible for the street children.'*

The example of answer stated by street children 2 was: *'The activities should be more interesting and varied and based on our needs.'*

Table 5 showed the observation result about facilities and infrastructure. All open houses (100%) had activity room, bedroom, kitchen, toilet and cloth-drying area. Three (60%) open houses had room for saving the goods of street children and playground. From the basic furniture aspect, five open houses (100%) had adequate chair, table and cupboard. From the basic supporting instruments, five open houses (100%) had kitchen utensils, cleaning devices, four open houses (80%) had bathing devices and three open houses (60%) had playing instruments.

**Table 5. The observation analysis of facility and infrastructure accessibility**

Facility and infrastructure accessibility	Document available		No document	
	Number	percentage	Number	percentage
Activity room	5	100	0	0
Bedroom	5	100	0	0
Goods saving room	4	60	1	40
Kitchen	5	100	0	0
Toilet	5	100	0	0
Playground	4	60	1	40
Cloth-drying area	5	100	0	0
Basic furniture				
i) chair	5	100	0	0
ii) table	5	100	0	0
iii) cupboard	5	100	0	0
Supporting instruments				
i) kitchen utensils	5	100	0	0

ii)	cleaning devices	5	100	0	0
iii)	bathing devices	4	80	1	20
iv)	playing instruments	4	60	1	40

Table 6 showed the observation result of learning media which was printed and electronic media. From printed media aspect, all open houses (100%) had textbook and story book. Four open houses (80%) had magazine and picture. From electronic media aspect, four open houses (80%) had television, four open houses (80%) had radio, three open houses (60%) had VCD/ DVD and one open house (20%) had internet access.

**Table 6. The observation analysis of learning media**

Learning media	Document available		No document		
	Number	percentage	Number	percentage	
Printed media					
i)	textbook	5	100	0	0
ii)	story book	5	100	0	0
iii)	magazine	4	80	1	20
iv)	picture	4	80	1	20
Electronic media					
i)	TV	4	80	1	20
ii)	VCD/ DVD	3	60	2	40
iii)	Radio	4	80	1	20
iv)	Internet	1	20	4	80

## DISCUSSION

### **The relevance of Street Children Resocialization program input at open houses**

The study finding showed that the curriculum of street children resocialization program at open houses was done following the guidance from RI Social Department. The curriculum only contained the core of guiding and learning that would be done. Curriculum

should be explained by tutor based on the street children' needs. Therefore, curriculum must be flexible that might contain the street children' needs and wants. According to Sudjana (1996), non-formal education curriculum such as street children resocialization program should be flexible, so that curriculum could fulfill different needs of program participants. From the facilitators' skill aspect, it showed that facilitator of open houses Bandung consisted of knowledgeable and skillful facilitators in the field of street children tutoring. Most of tutors (89%) graduated from Sekolah Menengah Pekerja Sosial (SMPS). It was based on UNDP and RI Social Department that required the minimum education of facilitator at open houses was SMPS graduate. The duty given to facilitator was adequate and in line with practical knowledge they had. But they still needed special and routine training, workshop or seminar to improve tutors' knowledge and skill.

The study finding showed that street children had different background, in which generally they experienced social deviation, either lightly or heavily. Generally they needed resocialization program at open houses. According to Dewi (2002) the effort to return their attitude and behavior to social norm was very important to do through resocialization activity. From the facility and infrastructure accessibility aspects, open houses in Bandung had been adequate in minimum level. Sudjana (1993) stated that facility and infrastructure accessibility would determine the success of process and output than non-formal education program. If facility and infrastructure accessibility was not adequate, it could surely disturb and lessen the success of non-formal education program. From learning media aspect, it showed that media (printed and electronic) at open houses in Bandung city had been adequate in minimum level. This finding was in line with the study finding of Ishak (2000) showing that learning media was still lacking and needed to be added.

### **The process of street children resocialization program implementation at open houses**

The study finding showed that guiding and learning was done through social and mental guidance in which the street children were guided according to their needs. This finding was in line with UNDP and RI Social Department that in resocialization to street children, the facilitators used the equality and friendship principles. Although they were children, their experience at the street had made them mature. Street children were

positioned as subject of the change that had been occurred on them. It was also in line with the approach of Bandura (1969) which developed three approaches to change individual or group attitude such as belief-oriented approach, affection-oriented approach and behavior-oriented approach.

The study finding showed that administrators involved in all levels of street children resocialization program at open houses. The finding was in line with the finding of Dewi's (2004) study in which the function of planning, organization, implementation, monitoring and evaluation were very important to be done by administrators if they want street children resocialization program successful. The involvement of parents was usually by inviting parents and guardian of the children to come to open houses or the responsible people from open houses, usually tutor or administrator, came to the street children' parents' home (home visit). This study supported the study finding of Sulistiati (2001) and Soetarso (2001) showing that the important factor for the success of program was the involvement of parents in the program. The street children guiding was not separated from the effort to guide their family.

The program monitoring was very important to ascertain that street children resocialization program at open houses could be done as what had been planned. West Java Province Social Department (2001) stated the importance of program monitoring in which program monitoring was the activity to guide and direct the implementer of open houses about daily process and duty either in official administration or service administration.

### **The achievement of street children resocialization program goal at open houses**

The study finding showed that there was difference of perceptions among administrators, tutors and street children about the good and positive attitude and life philosophy, performing social behavior in line with societal values, the ability of self-regulating, and the ability to deal with life obstacles. It described that there was still any space to make the responsible ones at open houses to improve the quality of street children resocialization program input and process at open houses. The study finding was quite similar with the finding of Dewi's (2004) study showing that there was a change in most of street children after following the program at open houses on their awareness of the importance of

education for their future, the growth of self-confidence and their courtesy. Supported by the study finding of Ishak (2000) showing that street children who followed the program at open houses were usually able to solve the problems they faced, certainly if they were not able to solve the problems by themselves, the role of parents, relatives, teacher or tutor were needed to help solving the problems they faced.

### **The problems and recommendation to solve the problems in street children resocialization program at open houses**

Street children resocialization program at open houses in Bandung city still faced a lot of problems. The main problems were: first, the limited learning facility accessibility; second, the limited budget available; third, very poor street children family so they forced their children to earn some money; fourth, the lack of facilitator to guide the street children; fifth, the lack of expert who helped solving the problems of street children; and sixth, the follow-up of program participants' positioning for the participant who did not have home at all and family, in order not to make them return to the street. Some of these study finding were in line with the finding of Dewi (2004) that the budget for street children guiding was still lacking and still depended on the budget from RI Social Department, there was still no budget from regional government. In Bandung city, the budget to handle the street children was still low. Sugiarta (2002) also stated his study finding that there were a lot of street children resocialization program that had been implemented, but from human resources and facility and infrastructure accessibility, it was not prepared optimally, so that the program did not run smoothly.

From the main problems faced, some recommendations were suggested: first, increasing the cooperation with various parties than government institution, NGO, group and individual that were allowed to help in completing the facility accessibility and budgeting for the street children resocialization program at open houses. Second, developing parents or other guardian, such as giving them capital for business or giving training of various needed skill, so that they could try to have business and got out of the poverty and did not ask their children to earn for money at the street. Third, increasing the cooperation with various responsible parties especially university and city/ province Social

department to add more tutor and expert. Fourth, increasing the cooperation with transit house and orphanage to send the program participant after completely following the program at open house.

## REFERENCES

- Amir Hasan. 2002. *Pentecorian sosiologi dan pendidikan*. Tanjong Malim: Quantum Books.
- Bandura, A. 1969. *The social learning of deviant behavior: A behavioristic approach to socialization*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Watson.
- Bogdan, R.C. & Biklen, S.K. 1992. *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory & methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc.
- Departemen Sosial RI. 1999a. *Pedoman penyelenggaraan pembinaan anak jalanan melalui rumah singgah*. Jakarta: Depsos RI.
- Departemen Sosial RI. 1999b. *Petunjuk teknis dan pelaksanaan pembinaan kesejahteraan sosial anak terlantar.*, Jakarta : Direktorat KAKLU.
- Departemen Sosial RI. 1999c. *Petunjuk teknis dan pelaksanaan pembinaan kesejahteraan sosial anak jalanan*, Jakarta : Direktorat KAKLU.
- Departemen Sosial RI. 1999d. *Pedoman pembinaan kesejahteraan sosial anak dini usia*. Jakarta : Direktorat KAKLU.
- Departemen Sosial RI & YKAI. 1999. *Modul pelatihan pemberdayaan anak jalanan melalui rumah singgah*. Jakarta : Depsos RI-YKAI.
- Departemen Sosial RI & ADB. 1999. *Citra anak Indonesia*. Jakarta: Depsos RI.
- Dewi, E.A.S. 2004. Efektivitas manajemen sistem pembinaan anak jalanan di kota Bandung. Tesis Master Pendidikan. Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.
- Dinas Sosial Propinsi Jabar. 2001. Pelayanan kesejahteraan sosial anak terlantar dan anak jalanan di Jawa Barat. *Prosiding Seminar Pengentasan Anak Jalanan dan Anaka Terlantar di Jawa Barat*.
- Dinas Sosial Kota Bandung. 2006. *Data Perkembangan Anak Jalanan di Kota Bandung*. Bandung: Dinas Sosial Kota Bandung.
- Ertanto, Kirik. 2003. Anak jalanan dan subkultur: Sebuah pemikiran awal. [http://www.kunci.or.id/esai/misc/kirik\\_anak.htm](http://www.kunci.or.id/esai/misc/kirik_anak.htm) [ 5 Januari 2007]
- Horton, P.B. & Hunt, C.L. 1984. *Sociology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ishak, M. 2000. Perkembangan Model Program Pendidikan Taruna Mandiri: Studi Terfokus pada Kehidupan Anak-anak Jalanan di Bandung. Disertasi Doktor. Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.
- Saripudin, D. 2005. Mobilitas dan perubahan sosial. Bandung: Masagi Foundation.
- Silva, T.L. 1996, Community mobilization for the protection and rehabilitation of street children. *Proceedings International Conference on Street Children*, hlm. 5 - 18.

- Soetarso. 2001. Pendekatan keluarga dalam pengentasan anak jalanan dan anak terlantar di Jawa Barat, Kertas kerja Seminar Pengentasan Anak Jalanan dan Anak Terlantar di Jawa Barat. Anjuran Dinas Sosial Propinsi Jawa Barat. Bandung, 9-10 September.
- Stufflebeam, D.L. 1971. The relevance of the CIPP evaluation model for educational accountability. *Journal of Reserach an Development in Education* 5 (1): 19-25.
- Stufflebeam, D.L. 1983. *The CIPP Model for program evaluation*. Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff.
- Suara Karya. 2006. 27 Nopember.
- Sudjana, D. 1993. *Strategi pembelajaran dalam pendidikan non formal*. Bandung: Nusantara Press.
- Sudjana, D. 1996. *Pendidikan non formal: Wawasan Sejarah perkembangan falsafah & teori pendukung asas*. Bandung: Nusantara Press.
- Sudrajat, T. 1998. Rumah singgah anak jalanan suatu praktek pekerjaan sosial. Kertas kerja Pada Kongres dan Seminar Pekerja Sosial Profesional. Anjuran Departemen Sosial RI. Jakarta, 20-23 Oktober.
- Sugiarta, A.N. 2002. Profil Rumah Singgah dalam Menyiapkan Anak Jalanan yang Produktif dan Mandiri. Tesis Master Pendidikan. Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.
- Sulistiati. 2001. Model pendekatan terpadu untuk memecahkan masalah anak rawan. Disertasi Doktor. Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.
- UNDP & Departemen Sosial RI. 1997. *Pedoman penyelenggaraan rumah singgah program uji coba anak jalanan di 7 propinsi*, Jakarta:UNDP dan Depsos RI.
- UNICEF. 1997. International child health, a digest of current information VIII (1).