Futures Thinking Culture Towards the Achievement of the SDG Is Manifested in the Different Southeast Asia Educational Institutions

Riswan Jaenudin; Umi Chotimah; Farida R Wargadalem; Dedi Irwanto

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education Sriwijaya University, Indonesia

Abstract

This research aims, firstly is to describe the promotion of futures thinking culture of the Southeast Asian Education Institutions in Indonesia, Philipina, Malaysia, Thailand, and Vietnam. Secondly, to describe the futures thinking methods utilized by the Southeast Asian education institutions towards the attainment of SDGs as perceived by the academic administrators and faculty members or lecturers. Thirdly, is to describe the level of integration of active and responsible global citizenship in the curriculum of Southeast Asian education institutions necessary to make the students as partners in the attainment of SDGs. Fouthly, is to describe the level of manifestation of the benefits of integrating the SDGs among the students, lecturers/faculty members and education institutions, and the community in the point of view of academic administrators and faculty members or lecturers.

Keywords: *SDG; Southeast Asia; Culture*

Introduction

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are one of the major world agenda that have been carried out by the United Nation since 2015, namely after the previous Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) program ended (Hák, T., Janoušková, S., & Moldan, B. 2016), at the 2010 UN Summit on MDGs it was held.The post-2015 world development agenda was formulated. The main driving force behind the preparation of the post-2015 development agenda agreed at the United Nations (UN) General Assembly in September 2015 (Allen, C., Metternicht, G., & Wiedmann, T. 2018)), the SDGs aim to maintain a sustainable improvement in the economic welfare of the community, maintain the sustainability of community social life, maintain environmental quality as well as inclusive and sustainable development (Gunawan, J., Permatasari, P., & Tilt, C. 2020). implementation of governance that is able to maintain the improvement of the quality of lifefrom one generation to the next (Zulela,2020).

SDGs are development that maintains sustainable improvement in the economic welfare of the community, a development that maintains the sustainability of community social life, a development that maintains environmental quality (Alamoush, A. S., Ballini, F., & Ölçer, A. I. 2021), and development that ensures justice and the implementation of governance that is able to maintain an increase in the quality of life from one generation to the next or next generation (Angelica, 2020).

The SDGs contain 17 global goals such as and targets for 2030 which were declared by both developed and developing countries (Kumar, S., Kumar, N., & Vivekadhish, S. 2016)). One of them is the issue of quality education. Education is an important issue considering that education will affect the progress and quality of life of a nation. Education is one of the foundations of the progress of a nation.the better the quality of education held by a nation, it will be followed by the better quality of the nation (Wahyuningsih, 2018).

As part of the countries that exist in the world and are members of the United Nations organization, Indonesia and the Philippines are also concerned with the SDGs issue. Indonesia and Philippines have a lot in comman. These equations include a tropical climate, influenced by monsoon winds, agraria countries, high rainfall and hot air temperature, founder of ASEAN and joined on August 8, 1967, located in Southeast Asia region, located between three oceans namely the Indian Ocean and the Bay of Bengal, the South China Sea, and the Pacific Ocean, Austronesian language family, the form of government is the Republic, the head of government is the President, etc (Anggorowati etc, 2020).

As two countries that are good relations and as members of an ASEAN countries, of course, it cannot be separated from the SDGs, its means that both countries are also concerned with the SDGs. However, each country may has a different points of view. For example, in Indonesia, in the context of SDGs implementation which is a global agenda, the government needs to adjust it to the national agenda and interests. Because all nations have their own characteristics, as well as the Indonesian nation. Of course, in this case, the Indonesian government will implement the SDG's mandate, with the provision that the government understands the character and needs of their respective people (Rozhana, 2019).

Because of the importance of a nation's education, this research focuses only on one of the 17 areas of the SDGs, namely quality education. In addition, the scope of this research is not limited to the two countries, Indonesia and the Philippines, but also to several other ASEAN member countries, namely Malaysia, Thailand, Vietnam.

In general, the problem formulation of this research is, "How futures thinking culture towards the achievement of the SDG is manifested in the different Southeast Asia educational institutions?" Here are the speicific questions: To what extent the purpose, format and methodology of futures thinking culture are promoted by Southeast Asian education institutions (in Indonesia, Philipina, Malaysia, Thailand, and Vietnam) as perceived by the academic administrators and faculty members or lecturers?

Method

This research is a collaborative between lecturers in the Social Studies Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education (FTTE), Sriwijaya University (Unsri)- Indonesia and the Faculty of Education and Public Administration, Pangasinan State University (PSU) Philippines. This type of research is a descriptive study using a survey method. Descriptive research is one type of research that aims to describe a complete social phenomenon or to explore and clarify a social reality, by describing the variables related to the formulated problem. Furthermore, the survey research method is intended research in which the main data source and information are obtained from respondents as the research sample using a questionnaire. In this case the questionnaire is the main instrument for data collection. The survey method is also intended as an investigation in obtaining data and facts on the problem that you want to find answers to. In this study the data and facts about futures thinking culture of Southeast Asian education institutions will be sought from academic administrators and faculty members or lecturers in Indonesia, Philippines, Malaysia, Thailand and Vietnam. The academic administrators are the Director for Academics Affairs, Campus Deans, College Deans and Department Chairpersons. Faculty members or lecturers are those with three (3) years teaching experience in the current institution.

Result and Discussion

The implementation of the objectives, formats and methodologies of the culture of future-thinking in Southeast Asian Educational Institutions are divided into three parts and are addressed in this section. Data has been gathered from respondents in 4 Nations.

Objective

Table 1 Question of Objective

No	Profession	Question	score 5	score 4	score 3	score 2	score 1	Total Respondent
1	Lecturer	1. Assess the implications of current trends for the future.	40	35	5	0	0	80
		2. Identify alternatives in the future and create new strategies to lower risk and boost resilience.	50	27	3	0	0	80
		3. Creating a better future while encouraging modifications in the present to create that future.	60	15	4	0	1	80
		4. Encourage a more extensive participatory dialogue by broadening existing perspectives on the future.	55	20	5	0	0	80
		5. Fostering a future literacy and future foresight attitude.	45	30	5	0	0	80
		6. Look for opportunities for innovation.	56	14	10	0	0	80

There are six questions with 80 respondents based on the "Objective" data mentioned above, and each question has an assessment indicator (Indonesian lecturers). The first question, "Assess the implications of current trends for the future," is 13%. The very high answer is 50%, the high answer is 43.75%, the average answer is 6.25%, and 0% for low and very low answers. Then the second question, "Identify alternatives in the future and create new strategies to lower risk and boost resilience," amounted to 16%. The very high answer is 62.5%, the high answer is 33.75%, the average answer is 3.75%, and 0% for low and very low answers. Then the third question, "Creating a better future while encouraging modifications in the present to create that future," is 20%. The very high answer is 75%, the high answer is 18.75%, the average answer is 5%, 0% for low answers, and 1.25% for very low answers. Then the fourth question, "Encourage a more extensive participatory dialogue by broadening existing perspectives on the future," at 18%. The very high answer is 68.75%, the high answer is 25%, the average answer is 6.25%, and 0% for low and very low answers. Then the fifth question, "Fostering a future literacy and future foresight attitude," by 15%. The very high answer is 56.25%, the high answer is 37.5%, the average answer is 6.25%, and 0% for low and very low answers. Then the sixth question, "Look for opportunities for innovation," by 18%. The very high answer is 70%, the high answer is 17.5%, the average answer is 12.5%, and 0% for low and very low answers.

According to the information shown, Indonesian lecturers evaluated the "Objective" by the questions based on the given indicators, such as very high, high, average, low, and very low. Evaluating this knowledge and comprehension, some Indonesian lecturers respond to inquiries in a manner consistent with the country's current educational system in Indonesia.

Format

Table 2 Questions of Format

No	Profession	Question	score 5	score 4	score 3	score 2	score 1	Total Respondent
2	Lecturer	1. Organize several initiatives that can offer feedback on planning, policy, and resource allocation.	44	20	15	1	0	80
		2. Integrate foresight processes into existing strategic planning and policy development methodologies and practices so that foresight becomes a regular function and process.	54	21	4	1	0	80
		3. Organize several activities to support program, project design, or innovation initiatives.	62	12	4	2	0	80
		4. Hold a foresight discussion to create a shared understanding as part of a larger consultative and partnership development process.	55	18	5	1	1	80
		5. Using an online platform for foresight.	35	21	15	9	0	80
		6.Organizeseveral programs for future literacy training and skill development.	0	0	0	0	0	0

There are six questions with 80 respondents based on the "Format" data mentioned above, and each question has an assessment indicator (Indonesian lecturers). The first question, "Organize several initiatives that can offer feedback on planning, policy, and resource allocation," is 17%. The very high answer is 55%, the high answer is 25%, the average answer is 15.75%, the low answer is 1.25%, and the very low answers are 0%. Then the second question, "Integrate foresight processes into existing strategic planning and policy development methodologies and practices so that foresight becomes a regular function and process," amounts to 22%. The very high answer is 67.5%, the high answer is 26.25%, the average answer is 5%, the low answer is 1.25%, and the very low answer is 0%. Then the third question, "Organize several activities to support program, project design, or innovation initiatives," is 25%. The very high answer is 77.5%, the high answer is 15%, the average answer is 5%, the low answer is 2.5%, and the very low answer is 0%. Then the fourth question, "Hold a foresight discussion to create a shared understanding as part of a larger consultative and partnership development process," by 22%. The very high answer is 68.75%, the high answer is 22.5%, the average answer is 6.25%, the low answer is 1.25%, and the very low answer is 1.25%. Then the fifth question, "Using an online platform for foresight," by 14%. The very high answer is 43.75%, the high answer is 26.25%, the average answer is 18.75%, 11.25% for the low

answer, and 0% for the very low answer. Then the sixth question, "Organize several programs for future literacy training and skill development," is 0%. The very high answer is 0%, the high answer is 0%, the average answer is 0%, and 0% for low and very low answers.

According to the information shown, Indonesian lecturers evaluated the "Format" by the questions based on the given indicators, such as very high, high, average, low, and very low. Evaluating this knowledge and comprehension, some Indonesian lecturers respond to inquiries in a manner consistent with the country's current educational system in Indonesia.

Methodology

Table 3 Questions of Methodology

No	Profession	Question	score 5	score 4	score 3	score 2	score 1	Total Respondent
3	Lecturer	1. Combining several methods in implementing activities.	40	24	15	0	1	80
		2. Involve a wide range of stakeholders.	45	27	7	0	1	80
		3. Develop foresight skills.	55	19	5	1	0	80
		4. Making use of an internal facilitator.	35	25	19	1	0	80
		5. Use collaborative methods in planning, policy, innovation, and dialogue.	40	20	19	0	1	80
		6. Provide guidance and self-organization support.	62	10	6	2	0	80

There are six questions with 80 respondents based on the "Methodology" data mentioned above, and each question has an assessment indicator (Indonesian lecturers). The first question, "Combining several methods in implementing activities," is at 15%. The very high answer is 50%, the high answer is 30%, the average answer is 18.75%, 0% for the low answers, and the very low answer is 1.25%. Then the second question, "Involve a wide range of stakeholders," by 16%. The very high answer is 56.25%, the high answer is 33.75%, the average answer is 8.75%, 0% for the low answer, and the very low answer is 1.25%. Then the third question, "Develop foresight skills," at 20%. The very high answer is 68.75%, the high answer is 23.75%, the average answer is 6.25%, 1.25% for the low answer, and the very low answer is 0%. Then the fourth question, "Making use of an internal facilitator," by 13%. The very high answer is 43.75%, the high answer is 31.25%, the average answer is 23.75%, the low answer is 1.25%, and the very low answer is 0%. Then the fifth question, "Use collaborative methods in planning, policy, innovation, and dialogue," amounted to 14%. The very high answer is 50%, the high answer is 25%, the average answer is 23.75%, 0% for the low answer, and the very low answer is 1.25%. Furthermore, finally the sixth question, "Provide guidance and self-organization support," amounted to 22%. The very high answer is 77.5%, the high answer is 12.5%, the average answer is 7.5%, 2.5% for low answers, and 0% for very low answers.

According to the information shown, Indonesian lecturers evaluated the "Methodology" by the questions based on the given indicators, such as very high, high, average, low, and very low. Evaluating this knowledge and comprehension, some Indonesian lecturers respond to inquiries in a manner consistent with the country's current educational system in Indonesia.

Conclusion

It can be inferred from some of the data above that the respondents' countries' educational systems share the same concepts. In terms of a culture of thinking about the future in Southeast Asian Educational Institutions toward achieving Sustainable Development Goals, it is possible to see similarities between these concepts in the development of Southeast Asian Educational Institutions in Indonesia, the Philippines, Malaysia, Thailand, and Vietnam. The lecturers, the students, and every other component of this study share the belief that, particularly in Southeast Asian nations, a culture-based mindset will become the cornerstone of all academic development concepts.

References

Alamoush, A. S., Ballini, F., & Ölçer, A. I. (2021). Revisiting port sustainability as a foundation for the implementation of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (UN SDGs). Journal of Shipping and Trade, 6(1), 1-40.

Allen, C., Metternicht, G., & Wiedmann, T. (2018). Initial progress in implementing the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs):a review of evidence from countries. Sustainability science, 13, 1453-1467.

E. L. Anggorowati, A. A. M. Shinta, E. R. Nafi'ah, and S. Lathif(2020) "Peran Pendidikan Karakter Sebagai Wujud Pendidikan Berkualitas Sesuai Dengan Tujuan Sustainable Development Goals(Sdgs)," *Pros. Semin. Nas. Pendidik. Biol. V 2019*, pp. 354–361.

F. Angelica, K. Tan, A. Lauw, W. Rosalya, Sheerleen, and W. Fitri, "DAMPAK PENYEBARAN COVID-19 TERHADAP DUNIA PENDIDIKAN DAN SANITASI DI INDONESIA," vol. 3, no. 1, p. 6, 2021.

Gunawan, J., Permatasari, P., & Tilt, C. (2020). Sustainable development goal disclosures: Do they support responsible consumption and production?. Journal of Cleaner Production, 246, 118989.

Hák, T., Janoušková, S., & Moldan, B. (2016). Sustainable Development Goals: A need for relevant indicators. Ecological indicators, 60, 565-573.

K. M. Rozhana and N. K. Sari, "Karakter Untuk Menghadapi Era Sustainable Development ofLearning Assessment on Character," *J. Pendidik. Dasar Nusant.*, vol. 4, pp. 119–126, 2019.

Kumar, S., Kumar, N., & Vivekadhish, S. (2016). Millennium development goals (MDGS) to sustainable development goals (SDGS): Addressing unfinished agenda and strengthening sustainable development and partnership. Indian journal of community medicine: official publication of Indian Association of Preventive & Social Medicine, 41(1), 1.

W. Wahyuningsih,(2018) Millenium Develompent Goals (Mdgs) Dan Sustainable Development Goals (Sdgs) Dalam Kesejahteraan Sosial, *Bisma*, vol. 11, no. 3, p. 390, , doi: 10.19184/bisma.v11i3.6479.

Zulela (2020) Transformasi pendidikan dasar di era disrupsi dalam pengembangan karakter," *Semin.Nas. Progr. Stud. Pendidik. Guru Sekol. Dasar*, pp. 1–14, , [Online]. Available: http://www.stkippgribl.ac.id/proceeding/ index.php/ semnas/article/view/42.

Copyrights