The Policy Outcomes and Feasibility of School-Based Management in Aceh

*Burhanuddin Yasin and Yunisrina Qismullah Yusuf**
Study Program of English Language Education, Universitas Syiah Kuala

Abstract

This research investigates the policy outcomes and feasibility of school-based management (SBM) in Aceh, Indonesia. This was done by identifying the constraints encountered in its implementation. A total of 520 respondents were surveyed; they came from different schools, elementary, junior high and high schools, and from various ranks of the provincial and district departments of education in Banda Aceh, Aceh Besar, Pidie and Lhokseumawe. Data was collected through a qualitative approach by using a semi-structured interview. In assessing the data, the constraints put forward by the respondents were categorized based on the four resources that are essential for SBM performance improvement, namely *power*, *knowledge*, *information* and *rewards* (Wohlstetter & Mohrman, 1994). The findings showed that most of the constraints identified in SBM implementation were related to the resource of *power*, such as in decentralization/ autonomy, decision making and leadership. This study also found that no formal written policy regarding the implementation of SBM as a component of national education policy was available at either the provincial or district departments of education. This study suggests that these authorities should demonstrate their commitment to the implementation of SBM in Aceh by issuing written policies to start to resolve the constraints faced in such implementation.

Keywords: school-based management, education in Aceh, problems in managing schools, educational reform, education plan

1 Introduction

School-based management (SBM) programs have been adopted by education authorities from around the world (Robertson & Briggs, 1998). These education management programs result in the decentralization of decision making powers from central government to schools and also from principals and teachers as the school management team to include parents as part of the school governing body (Botha, 2007). They are considered effective as they give school stakeholders the authority to participate and develop their schools with educational planning, personnel management and provision of resources to create proper environments to make improvements in their schools and thereby improve the performance of students (Anderson, 2006). United States, Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and Canada have all introduced SBM into their education systems since as early as the 1980s (Bandur, 2008; Bengoteku & Heyward, 2007; Robertson & Briggs, 1998).

In Indonesia, since independence in 1945, the education system had been centralized at the national government level and as a result, school principals and teachers became implementers of the national government policy (Bjork, 2005). Local communities, parents and students became passive beneficiaries because rights, responsibilities and especially sense of ownership of their local schools were constrained by strong political control from the central government (Indriyanto, 2003). The stakeholders in education had to struggle even more with the quality of national education during the financial crisis in the late 1990s which led to economic and social cutbacks. As a result, SBM was introduced to provide for the participation of school and community members in meeting local educational needs (Bandur, 2008).

However, many schools across Indonesia still need improvement in the implementation of SBM (Bandur, 2012). Accordingly, this paper intends to investigate the feasibility of its implementation in Aceh, one of the provinces in Indonesia that has experienced conflict since the earliest days of the country's independence. Political mayhem not only affected the economic, social and other sectors in the province, but it affected the education sector as well. The disastrous earthquake and tsunami that hit the province in December 2004 triggered a peace agreement in August 2005 to end 30 years of civil conflict. As a result, there was an immediate imperative need to reconstruct and redevelop the education sector. This was essential as education is one of the keys to success of other development sectors, especially for social economy and for politics (Yasin, 2007). Nepal and Vietnam, for instance, are

---

* Corresponding Author: Dr. Yunisrina Qismullah Yusuf (yunisrina@gmail.com)
  Senior Lecturer and Head of the Study Program of English Language Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
  Universitas Syiah Kuala

amongst countries that have prioritized the development of education post-conflict (Asian Development Bank, 2006) to restore and stimulate other development sectors.

Our preliminary findings also showed us that no technical guidelines for implementation of SBM were provided by the provincial education departments for the district areas. This should be their responsibility as this has been instructed by the Ministry of National Education. This has certainly caused problems in the implementation of SBM in schools. These problems have not previously been investigated comprehensively. This is important because Peterson (1991) and Robertson and Briggs (1998) said that the implementation of SBM must be continuously performed and optimized to sustain successful innovations in education. Local governments are responsible for continually assessing the performance of schools in their districts based on predetermined standards. As the building of school management capacity is an important aspect to improve the overall quality of education, it is important to investigate problems in the implementation of SBM in Aceh that need to be resolved to achieve educational goals. Therefore, this study intends to investigate the problems faced by the schools by answering the following research question:

Which resource caused most problems in the implementation of SBM in Aceh?

The resource that we referred to is one of the four resources for a successful SBM implementation proposed by Wohlstetter and Mohrman (1994), which are *power*, *knowledge*, *information* and *rewards*. The findings are expected to assist the provincial education departments to identify the core problems in the implementation of SBM in Aceh and to identify the further actions needed to improve the reform of education in the province.

2   Resources for a Successful SBM Implementation

Wohlstetter and Mohrman (1994, p. 4) indicate that a successful SBM reform requires the decentralization of four resources in an organization (i.e., school), which are *power*, *knowledge*, *information* and *rewards*. *Power* involves the authority of parties whose decisions have an effect on an organization's practices, policies and directions. The experience of implementing SBM in several schools in the United States shows that the district education authority essentially delegates authority to each school (Peterson, 1991). The schools which receive such delegation tend to have good leadership which empowers others involved. In addition, the parties involved become genuinely committed and ready to accept new roles and responsibilities. The teachers also are prepared to take responsibility and

pleased to have the authority to improve the quality of teaching whilst also assuming accountability for their own performance. To demonstrate commitment and positive attitude towards SBM implementation, governments must entrust school principals and school boards with the authority to determine educational goals for their respective schools (Kubick, 1988).

Knowledge is the comprehension, skill and expertise of the organization that set up the employees to contribute to the organization's performance. SBM depends on alliances between various stakeholders (Odden & Wohlstetter, 1995). Therefore, providing professional development and training for teachers and stakeholders is important, especially at the early stage of its implementation. The training should include skills in problem solving, decision making, conflict management, presentation techniques, stress management and interpersonal communication within groups (Kubick, 1988). School leaders, especially principals, need to be equipped with knowledge and training for effective leadership to achieve significant outcomes for their schools and their students (Hui & Cheung, 2007; Msila, 2011).

Information informs the stakeholders about the implementation of the program and other data such as the performance of students, the satisfaction of parents and the community, the schools financial, resources and other educational programs. When participating in any decision making, it is essential for students, parents and communities to have adequate information, which can be provided through effective communications between schools, parents and communities. It has been found that improved stakeholder values, more public participation and greater transparency in school-based management processes also provide opportunities to enhance learning outcomes at school levels (Botha, 2007; Cheung & Kan, 2009). Information is also necessary to build trust and confidence between school leaders and stakeholders for a solid partnership in decision making to implement policies more effectively (Gamage & Zajda, 2005). Written agreements in the form of policies that detail the roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder need to be made and approved together (Kubick, 1988). These agreements should clearly state the standards to be used as the basis for assessing school accountability. Each school needs to develop an annual performance report that conveys its attempts to achieve goals and objectives, the use of available resources, both physical and human, as well as plans for future years.

Rewards acknowledge the performance of the organization, the involvement and contribution of every member involved in the organization and recognizes improvements. Efforts conducted by the members of the organization are to be rewarded and recognized. They can be in the form of extrinsic (e.g., direct praises, prizes

or appreciation notes) or monetary rewards to those who have made accomplishments or who have given extra time to work for better improvement of their organization (Wohlstetter, 1995). Rewards act as motivation for every member to further develop their resources, improve their performance and further bring together members who have different preferences (Wohlstetter & Mohrman, 1994).

2.1 The Development of SBM in Indonesia

Indonesia officially adopted the policy of SBM during its late financial crisis which occurred in the late 1990s (Bandur, 2012). At the time, among the causes of the crisis was that the regional governments in Indonesia did not have much of autonomy to develop their own provinces, including in their educational sector (see Bandur [2012] for the historical development of SBM in Indonesia). Therefore, SBM was seen as the key for a reform for both public and private schools with the passing of a new law to change the national education system, which was the Education Act No. 20/2003 (Bandur, 2008; Indriyanto, 2003). The central government further issued regulations on the roles, rights and responsibilities of governing bodies for schools at the district level including school committees and education boards. A national standard of education was defined, which covered competency, school facilities and equipment, staffing and teacher qualifications, amongst others. This standard was to be tailored to local circumstances and implemented by local governments under their respective departments of education to ensure the involvement of schools in every district. Moreover, this Act directed school committees and local communities to be involved in the planning, supervision and evaluation of educational programs for their respective schools (Bandur, 2008). National and international agencies, such as UNICEF, World Bank, Asian Development Bank, USAID and AusAID (Bengoteku & Heyward, 2007) had aided the government to improve, strengthen and extend basic education delivery through SBM (Pradhan et al., 2011).

Some reports showed encouraging and positive experiences of SBM in Indonesia (Bengoteku & Heyward, 2007; DBE1, 2010). In 2011, the Deputy Minister of National Education, Fasli Jalal, claimed that, 'international research as well as experiences from various areas in Indonesia have demonstrated that SBM is capable of fostering a sense of ownership of schools from both parents as well as students which in turn improves the performance of the students' (Basic Education Capacity Trust Fund [BEC-TF], 2011).

However, some studies showed that the introduction of SBM had not been completely successful across Indonesia. The report by DBE1 (2010) found that SBM implementation was not effective in North Sumatra compared to other provinces in Indonesia (e.g., Java). The less populated provinces apparently received less support from donor-funded programs for SBM implementation. Aceh, specifically amongst other provinces, was found to receive the least funds for the implementation of SBM from the district and other sources (see Heyward, Cannon, & Sarjono, 2011).

Indriyanto (2003) listed various problems in the implementation of SBM in Indonesia in general, namely dependency on the central government, lack of textbooks, lack of quality teachers and inadequate evaluations of the performance of school principals. The latter were typically based on paper evaluations which were centralized at the district level. He further stated that the gradual implementation of SBM could be improved by increasing the quality of SBM features, including preciseness of school budget allocations, discretion in decision making for the principals, a clearly defined explicit and transparent support system for school environment (parents, organizations and communities) and clear roles and responsibilities for both government agencies and community stakeholders. Specifically, some of these issues were also the case in Flores primary schools, where Bandur (2008) mentioned that problems which still required resolution were the lack of appropriate professional development for school leaders, the absence of school facilities and inadequate finances to deal with the process of implementation of SBM.

The guide book for implementation of SBM by Depdiknas (2007) declared that the central officials and agency heads, including their staff, have roles as facilitators in decision making at school levels. Accordingly, departments of education at the central and local government levels are to offer the prospect of applying SBM to every school equipped to implement it. Neglect in doing so may cause the school authorities to remain powerless and to inhibit the ability of teachers to innovate. Moreover, despite the guide book being available, Sumintono (2007) found that previous models and practices of management prior to SBM continued to linger, particularly in the municipality of Mataram on Lombok Island because the SBM policy stated in the decree number 044/U/2002 lacked clarity. It was found that the decree did not set out guidelines for principals, nor distinguish between community involvement at the district and at the school level. Furthermore, the authorities to be entrusted with the implementation of SBM were not clear, in particular the quantity of information and knowledge to be distributed by principals to stakeholders and school committee members in the implementation of SBM.

Marhum et al. (2009) investigated the views of stakeholders on autonomy of both government and non-government schools at all levels in Palu, Makassar and

Gorontalo. They discovered that the regional governments still intervened in the education planning process, allocation of budgets and recruitment of staff and teachers. In addition, a general perception of SBM was still lacking at all levels of government. This resulted in inadequate human resources involvement, insufficient funding and poor communications between the schools and their stakeholders. In conclusion, problems in the implementation of SBM in these three cities were due also to inadequate information from the government.

Article 56 of the 2003 (SBM) Act stated that community members were entitled to participate in achieving and improving the quality of education for their students. However, a case study in Depok by Fitriah (2010) on the parents' involvement revealed that decentralization did not inevitably encourage community participation in education management. After the Free School Program (FSP), which allowed students to get education for free, was introduced by the government in 2009, the parents were found to act as mere beneficiaries and their participation in school management lessened.

Regardless of the shortcomings in the implementation of SBM in Indonesia discovered by these studies, they did claim that the introduction of SBM was a change for the better compared to the past conditions. Back then, education was centralized and the central government used to intercede in all kinds of school management which caused schools all over the country to have no sovereignty to manage their own education programs.

2.2 SBM Implementation in Aceh

Accordingly, this research investigates the policy outcomes from the implementation of School-based Management in Aceh, Indonesia. SBM has been implemented in this province since Indonesia adopted it as a formal education policy in 2003. After the earthquake and tsunami which hit the province in December 2004, the reconstruction of destroyed, damaged, derelict and inadequate schools and the re-establishment of its education sector were aided by various government and non-government programs. Programs which reinforced SBM, such as Decentralized Basic Education (DBE) and Managing Basic Education (MBE) programs (both supported by USAID) had projects running from 2003 until 2007 in 23 provinces, including Aceh. Workshops and seminars were held to provide mentoring and training for teachers and stakeholders in areas such as Banda Aceh and Aceh Besar. These were conducted to encourage provision of resources, education management and funding at the district level. Community participation and training to provide active, creative, joyful and effective learning were initiated at all school levels. Local school supervisors were tutored to become facilitators to assist and develop schools in their districts.

DBE1 (2010) reported there were about 164 schools in Aceh that implemented some programs for decentralizing basic education. However, it was found that these programs did not provide much impact, especially for Banda Aceh. The school programs being performed were mostly not associated with programs for DBE1. One school reported that its foundation did not give any support for the development of their school. The principal was disappointed that the workload in school increased without any compensating equipment or funds. Nonetheless, the strongest impact felt in this province was in school planning because the programs provided a guideline or manual for future planning in schools.

3 Methods

3.1 Respondents

For the selection of research sites, a stratified sampling method was used. Several aspects such as geographical area, school rank and schools that received the most knowledge about SBM (in accordance with the standards from the ministry/department of education) were chosen. Accordingly, the sampling locations were in the districts of Banda Aceh, Aceh Besar, Pidie and Lhokseumawe. Similarly, the sample of respondents came from all school levels: Sekolah Dasar (SD) or elementary schools, Sekolah Menengah Pertama (SMP) or junior high schools and Sekolah Menengah Atas (SMA) or high schools, plus personnel from the provincial and district departments of education. Thirteen schools were sampled in each of the four districts (five SD, five SMP and three SMA). Moreover, at each school, eight stakeholders were surveyed (six internals and two externals). The number of bureaucrats, including supervisors sampled from each district, was nine (one head office, three section heads, two subsection heads and three supervisors). Other stakeholders (such as the education council (Majelis Pendidikan Daerah [MPD]), district parliament (Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Kabupaten [DPRK]) and community organizations) were each represented by sampling one person only. Therefore, the number of respondents who participated in this study was 520 in total. Complete information on the sampling locations and respondents is available in Appendix A.

3.2 Data

To answer the research question, data was collected qualitatively from an open questionnaire that was designed to identify the constraints in SBM implementation in Aceh (see Appendix B). Every respondent was given freedom to express their opinions by writing in the sheets provided.

To stimulate their opinions, keywords related to the management aspect were given: decentralization/autonomy, decision making, knowledge limitation, community care and funding. Additional spaces were also provided in case the respondents had other constraints they wanted to put forward. Their answers were later categorized into the four resources that are important to be distributed to facilitate improvement of SBM performance, namely *power*, *knowledge*, *information* and *rewards* (Wohlstetter & Mohrman, 1994).

4   Findings

In total, eight constraints in SBM implementation in Aceh were presented by the respondents. The keywords for possible constraints provided in the questionnaire were: decentralization/autonomy, decision making, knowledge limitation, community care and funding. They were all agreed and described by the respondents. Furthermore, other additional problems presented by the respondents were: compensation, leadership and campaigns for FSP (Free School Programs). These constraints were further categorized into the problems that were associated with the resources of *power*, *knowledge*, *information* and *rewards* (Wohlstetter & Mohrman, 1994). In each resource, the problems presented by the informants are:

(1) *Power*: decentralization/autonomy, decision making and leadership.
(2) *Knowledge*: knowledge limitation and community care.
(3) *Information*: Free School Program (FSP) and funding.
(4) *Rewards*: compensation.

From the categorization, we found that all respondents identified the nucleus problems in SBM implementation to be related to the resource of *power*. The problems in *knowledge*, *information* and *rewards* were also presented by the respondents, though not all were agreed by them. This answered our research question that *power* caused the most problems in the implementation of SBM in Aceh. To further understand the problems specified in the resource of *power* (e.g., decentralization/autonomy, decision making and leadership) presented by the respondents, they are further elaborated in the next sub-sections.

4.1   *Power* of Decentralization/Autonomy

Some school boards questioned the fact that although the regional autonomy law no. 22 and 25 of 1999 were agreed and approved by the government (updated with law no. 32 of 2004 regarding a paradigm shift from centralized to decentralized government), the local governments in Aceh, in this case the provincial and district departments of education, had not consistently executed decentralization. The respondents further informed us that no written policies

were provided for the schools from the district departments of education (that act as the schools' direct supervisors) on the implementation of SBM following the policies issued by the central government (national ministry/department of education). These led to no specific targets being formulated to ensure successful missions and visions for the schools through the implementation and application of SBM. Consequently, the structure and systematic roles for all school stakeholders were not prepared and formalized.

Furthermore, the problem above becomes the root for vagueness in the principles of democracy, professionalism and accountability that is not transparent from the top management, both within schools and within offices of the education departments. On the other hand, bureaucrats at the district levels claimed that these limitations of competence, capability and distribution of human resources at the district level were not enough (in terms of knowledge and quantity) to apply decentralization in their schools.

4.2   *Power* of Decision Making

As with decision making, the top and middle managers at provincial level felt that the set back in SBM implementation was caused by the lack of decision-making power of the staff at district and school levels. For example, the autonomous decision making authority given to the districts for policy and technical supervision, and there was the division of authority in accordance with the laws and regulations issued by the central government. They deemed that these need to be resolved so that their dependence on the provincial management could gradually be reduced.

The district bureaucrats, however, argued that it was still difficult for them to make decisions on the implementation of SBM in their schools for several reasons. First, technical guidance from the provincial office did not exist and second, training for facilitators was not conducted systematically so that SBM facilitators/trainers were not available at the district level. These problems had implications at the operational levels in schools. Most of them had no instruction manuals or standard guidelines that included the structure of authority for the implementation of SBM. Such guidelines were supposed to be provided by the national department of education and further developed by the provincial departments of education to suit their local needs. As a consequence, the school managers were hesitant to make decisions on the formal administration for its implementation. As a result, the majority of schools still followed traditional management practices. Although some basic principles of SBM were adopted from trainings such as by DBE1 (DBE1, 2010), good decision-making processes related to budgets, personnel and curriculum could not be employed fully according to the patterns and concepts of SBM because most school principals and

school administrators claimed that their training was still limited. They affirmed that behavioral change was difficult to implement without practice, or at least exercises for them in the form of simulations, such as those related to communication practice, interacting with the public practice, stimulating public participation practice and practice in preparation of budgets and school plans -- which would all lead to more effective decision making by them. Furthermore, no training was yet provided for any other stakeholders.

According to the external stakeholders, decision making was still dominated by the school managements, especially those related to projects clearly funded by the government, either from the district, provincial or the national levels. When a school construction or development funding was sourced from the public, a new decision making role was given in full to the internal school committees. Consequently, psychological gaps appeared between the school management and other external stakeholders, and the motivation of these stakeholders, especially the external ones, declined. Their commitment was low due to the imbalance of authority and involvement given to them in the decision-making processes.

4.3 *Power* of Leadership

Bureaucrats at the provincial and district levels alleged that leadership qualities of school principals were insufficient to run SBM concepts in their schools. Recruitment of school principals in this new autonomous era was strongly controlled by the district head, which tended to neglect principles for selection based on performance. School stakeholders (both internal and external) argued that school principals' leadership abilities were still weak and autocratic and the principals showed little managerial skills. Besides, their attitudes and mode of instruction by direction was dominant rather than that of leading by guiding, protecting and facilitating.

School members (school managements, teachers and other internal stakeholders) also indicated that the abilities of school principals in team building, group work and collaboration were low, so that individual activities or decision making was more common than teamwork. Similarly, decision making was dominated by the school management (e.g., school principle) due to the fact that the decision-making process itself was not well structured and systemized. Despite trainings being provided for principals both in country and overseas (such as in Malaysia), some school principals still argued that the training was not enough to implement SBM efficiently. Some of them alleged that the training given to them was still theoretical, not practical. It was just one of the training subjects within the school leadership and teacher training curriculum. A

principal wrote that these trainings were "limited only to the introduction and guidelines to conduct SBM." They believed that if the trainings were more oriented to the practice of SBM, participatory leadership skills could be learnt. One of the school principals wrote, "if we are given the opportunity to carry out a pilot project as a follow-up from the training, we are sure that we can do it successfully." Those from the rural areas were rarely given any training on SBM. One of the principals from a rural area wrote, "we've never learned SBM in any special training program, let alone experienced practicing it in some form of simulation."

5 Discussion and Conclusion

Despite the fact that SBM was officially introduced into education in Indonesia in 2003, it was found to have not been formally implemented in Aceh. Even though some concepts were practiced in some schools, the findings of this study showed that there are still immense problems that require immediate attention and action for them to be resolved to improve SBM implementation and performance. Apparently, these problems were rooted from the resource of *power*. In executing autonomy, a formal written policy for the implementation of SBM in the districts was not available at the provincial department of education. Bureaucrats at the provincial and district levels that had authority for education policy making were found to have never provided any commitment regarding the implementation of SBM in the form of written policies. Previous studies, such as those by Sumintono (2007) and Marhum et al. (2009) also mentioned that one of the problems in SBM implementation was the lack of detail in the decrees from these authorities. In fact, this written agreement in the form of policies is very important to provide details on the roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder in its implementation (Kubick, 1988). Therefore, the Aceh government, in this case the provincial department of education, needs to develop written policies on the implementation of SBM following the policies issued by the central government since those policies are already mandated in the 2003 Act for National Education. These policies must then be the guiding principles for every school in Aceh to implement SBM. With these policies in place, vague roles and problems in decision making in the implementation of SBM by managers in schools, internal and external stakeholders can be avoided.

Lack of leadership by principals for the implementation of SBM was alleged to be due to the lack of training for SBM (especially for principals in the rural areas). Even though some programs, such as DBE and MBE, had conducted projects to train teachers, principals and

stakeholders in areas such as Banda Aceh and Aceh Besar, they claimed that the training was not enough as most was theory-based instead of practical. These common constraints seemed to be faced by schools elsewhere in Indonesia as well (Bandur, 2008; DBE1, 2010; Indriyanto, 2003). For that reason, it is recommended that sufficient funding must be provided for intensive training on the implementation of SBM for all school managements and stakeholders. Regular workshops should be held to find effective solutions to any problems occurring in the implementation of SBM. Seeing that Hui and Cheung (2007) deem the espousal of proper leadership styles may possibly be the key to the success of SBM, therefore appropriate training especially for principals, must be programmed by the district departments of education in Aceh.

As mandated in the 2003 National Education Act, the government's commitment and the attitude of all school stakeholders must ensure the implementation of SBM and the overcoming of any obstacles encountered in its implementation. According to Heyward et al. (2011, p. 10), 'the challenge for Indonesia is to implement the policy across its vast and diverse school system'. Therefore, the government of Indonesia, in particular, should take further steps in making the implementation of SBM possible for all schools in Indonesia. As Bandur (2012, p. 33) further acknowledged, "… the effective implementation of SBM (in Indonesia) requires time management expertise and assistance from the government, educational experts, and foreign aid agencies." The government, especially, should then provide support if any particular school faces difficulties in transforming the national vision to achieve a higher quality in its education programs seeing that many of the constraints in the implementation of SBM in Indonesia are generally similar.

This preliminary study is largely based on data which was gathered entirely through questionnaires. Albeit this study has reported some important issues related to the constraints on the implementation of SBM in Aceh, other methods such as prolonged observation and more in depth interviews should also be used in future studies to generate more information which can reinforce or modify the conclusions drawn above.

Acknowledgments

References

Anderson, W. (2006). Site-based management. In S. C. Smith & P. K. Piele (Eds.), *School leadership: Handbook for excellence in student learning* (pp. 223-244). London, UK: Sage.

Asian Development Bank. (2006). *Education sector development programme ESDP I (2007-2010): From sub-sector wide to a sector-wide approach to effective accountable schools (main report)*. Retrieved September 17, 2012, from http://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/projdocs/2006/35174-NEP-DPTA.pdf

Bandur, A. (2008). *A study of the implementation of school-based management in Flores primary schools in Indonesia*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Newcastle, Callaghan, Australia.

Bandur, A. (2012). Decentralization and school-based management in Indonesia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Educational Development*, *1*(1), 33-47.

Basic Education Capacity Trust Fund. (2011). *School-based management increase BOS funds effective use*. Retrieved September 17, 2012, from http://wapikweb.org/bec/publications/detail/school-based-management-increase-bos-funds-effective-use

Bengoteku, B., & Heyward, M. (2007). *School-based management: Can it work in Indonesia?* Retrieved April 13, 2012, from http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2007/02/03/schoolbased-management-can-it-work-indonesia.html

Bjork, C. (2005). *Indonesian education: Teachers, schools, and central bureaucracy*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Botha, R. N. (2007). School-based management: Stakeholder participation and the impact of stakeholder values. *Africa Education Review*, *4*(1), 28-41.

Cheung, S. M. C., & Kan, F. L. F. (2009). Teachers' perceptions of incorporated management committees as a form of school-based management in Hong Kong. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, *10*, 139-148.

DBE1. (2010). *Implementing school-based management in Indonesia: The DBE1 experience: 2005-2010 impact study (special report)*. Retrieved September 12, 2012, from http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/pdacq711.pdf

Depdiknas. (2007). *Manajemen berbasis sekolah* [School based management]. Jakarta, Indonesia: Departemen Pendidikan Nasional Direktorat Jenderal Manajemen Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah. (In Bahasa Indonesia)

Fitriah, A. (2010). *Community participation in education: Does decentralization matter? An Indonesian case study of parental participation in school management*. Unpublished master's thesis, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.

Gamage, D. T., & Zajda, J. (2005). Decentralization and school-based management: A comparative study of self-governing school models. *Educational Practice and Theory*, *27*(2), 35-58.

Heyward, M., Cannon, R. A., & Sarjono. (2011). *Implementing school-based management in Indonesia*. Retrieved December 14, 2012, from http://www.rti.org/rtipress

Hui, S. K. F., & Cheung, H. Y. (2006). A re-examination of leadership style for Hong Kong school-based management (SBM) schools. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *26*, 173-187.

Indriyanto, B. (2003, September). *School-based management: Issues and hopes toward decentralization in education in Indonesia*. Paper presented at the 3rd International Forum on Education Reform, Bangkok, Thailand.

Kubick, K. (1988). *School-based management*. Retrieved June 12, 2012, from http://www.ericdigests.org/pre-9210/based.htm

Marhum, M., Idris, N. I., Suking, A., Haris, I., Rossetto, M., Falk, I., et al. (2009). *Indonesian educational decentralization and regional autonomy: Provincial case studies ten years on (AIGRP final report 2008-2009)*. Retrieved March 4, 2012, from http://sosialhumaniora.blogspot.tw/2011/05/indonesian-educational-decentralisation.html

Msila, V. (2011). School management and the struggle for effective schools. *Africa Education Review*, *8*, 434-449.

Odden, E. R., & Wohlstetter, P. (1995). Making school-based management work. *Educational Leadership*, *52*(5), 32-36.

Peterson, D. (1991). *School-based management and student performance*. Retrieved June 17, 2012, from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED336845.pdf

Pradhan, M., Suryadarma, D., Beatty, A., Wong, M., Alishjabana, A., Gaduh, A., et al. (2011). *Improving educational quality through enhancing community participation: Results from a randomized field experiment in Indonesia* (Policy Research Working Paper 5795). Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Robertson, P. J., & Briggs, K. L. (1998). Improving schools through school-based management: An examination of the process of change. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement: An International Journal of Research, Policy and Practice*, *9*, 28-57.

Sumintono, B. (2007). *Decentralized centralism: School based management policies and practices at state secondary schools in Mataram, Lombok, Indonesia*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand.

Wohlstetter, P. (1995). Getting school-based management right: What works and what doesn't. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *77*, 22-26.

Wohlstetter, P., & Mohrman, S. A. (1994). *School-based management: Promise and process*. New Brunswick, NJ: CPRE Finance Briefs.

Yasin, B. (2007, December). *Membangun masa depan pendidikan Aceh Barat: Strategi dan kebijakan* [Building the future education of West Aceh: Strategy and policy]. Paper presented at the Seminar Pembangunan Pendidikan Kabupaten Aceh Barat [Seminar of West Aceh Education Development], Universitas Syiah Kuala, Banda Aceh, Indonesia. (In Bahasa Indonesia)

Appendix A

Table A-1 Location, Bureaucracy and Communities at the Provincial Level

Province	Stakeholders			
NAD	Internal Respondents	No.	External Respondents	No.
	Head Office of Provincial Department of Education	1	Assembly of District Education	1
	Chairman of Basic Education and Advanced	1	DPRK Commission of Education	1
	Chairman of Secondary Education	1	LSM/NGO (Education)	1
	Chairman of the SBM Program	1		
	Head of SD/SMP Curriculum Section	1		
	Head of SMA Curriculum Section	1		
	Total	6	Total	3

Note: All of the information provided in Table A-1 have been translated into English from Bahasa Indonesia.

Table A-2 Location, Bureaucracy and Communities at the District/City Level

Location	Stakeholders			
District/City	Internal Respondent	No.	External Respondent	No.
Banda Aceh	Head Office of Dist. Dep. of Education	1	Assembly of District Education	1
	Chairman of Basic Education & Advanced	1	DPRK Commission of Education	1
	Chairman of Secondary Education	1	LSM/NGO (Education)*	1
	Chairman of the Program	1		
	Head SD/SMP Curriculum Section	1		
	Head SMA Curriculum Section	1		
	Supervisor of SDs, Primary Schools	1		
	Supervisor of SMP, Middle Schools	1		
	Supervisor of SMA, High Schools	1		
	Total	9	Total	3
Aceh Besar	Head Office of District Department of Education	1	Assembly of District Education	1
	Chairman of Basic Education and Advanced	1	DPRK Commission of Education	1
	Chairman of Secondary Education	1	LSM/NGO (Education)*	1
	Chairman of the Program	1		
	Head of SD/SMP Curriculum Section	1		
	Head of SMA Curriculum Section	1		
	Supervisor of SD, Primary Schools	1		
	Supervisor of SMP, Middle Schools	1		
	Supervisor of SMA, High Schools	1		
	Total	9	Total	3
Pidie	Head Office of District Department of Education	1	Assembly of District Education	1
	Chairman of Basic Education and Advanced	1	DPRK Commission of Education	1
	Chairman of Secondary Education	1	LSM/NGO (Education)*	1
	Chairman of Program	1		
	Head of SD/SMP Curriculum Section	1		
	Head of SMA Curriculum Section	1		
	Supervisor of SD, Primary Schools	1		
	Supervisor of SMP, Middle Schools	1		

Table A-2 Location, Bureaucracy and Communities at the District/City Level (Continued)

Location				
District/City	Internal Respondent	No.	External Respondent	No.
	Supervisor of SMA, High Schools	1		
	Total	9	Total	3
Lhokseumawe	Head Office of District Department of Education	1	Assembly of District Education	1
	Chairman of Basic Education and Advanced	1	DPRK Commission of Education	1
	Chairman of Secondary Education	1	LSM/NGO (Education)*	1
	Chairman of Program	1		
	Head of SD/SMP Curriculum Section	1		
	Head of SMA Curriculum Section	1		
	Supervisor of SD, Primary Schools	1		
	Supervisor of SMP, Middle Schools	1		
	Supervisor of SMA, High Schools	1		
	Total	9	Total	3
Total in All		36	Total in All	12

Note: All of the information provided in Table 2 have been translated into English from Bahasa Indonesia.
*: except SD.

Location	School Levels				Stakeholders			
District/City	SD	SMP	SMA	No.	Internal Respondents	No.	External Respondents	No.
Banda Aceh	5	5	3	13	Principal	1	Chairman of School Committee	1
					Vice Principal*	1	Student Representative in School Committee	1
					Head of Administration	1		
					Treasurer	1		
					Teacher Rep. in School C'te	1		
					OSIS* Rep in School C'te	1		
Total	5	5	3	13	*52/78	*4/6	Total	2
Aceh Besar	5	5	3	13	Principal	1	Chairman of School Committee	1
					Vice Principal*	1	Student Representative in School Committee	1
					Head of Administration	1		
					Treasurer	1		
					Teacher Rep in School C'te	1		
					OSIS* Rep. in School C'te	1		
Total	5	5	3	13	*52/78	*4/6	Total	2
Pidie	5	5	3	13	Principal	1	Chairman of School Committee	1
					Vice Principal*	1	Student Representative in School Committee	1
					Head of Administration	1		
					Treasurer	1		
					Teacher Rep in School C'te	1		
					OSIS* Rep in School C'te	1		
Total	5	5	3	13	*52/78	*4/6	Total	2
Lhoksemawe	5	5	3	13	Principal	1	Chairman of School Committee	1
					Vice Principal*	1	Student Representative in School Committee	1
					Head of Administration	1		
					Treasurer	1		
					Teacher Rep School C'te	1		
					OSIS* Rep in School C'te	1		
Total	5	5	3	13	*52/78	*4/6	Total	2
Total in All	20	20	12	52	*208/312	*16/24		8

Note: (1) *except SD. Inference: SD = 208 respondents; SMP/SMA = 312 respondents; Total = 520 respondents from 52 schools.

(2) All of the information provided in Table A-3 have been translated into English from Bahasa Indonesia.

Appendix B

Table B-1 Constraints in Implementing SBM in Schools

No.	Constraints
1.	Decentralization / Autonomy?
2.	Decision Making?
3	Knowledge and skills?
4	Community care?
5	Funding?
6	Others?
7	Others?
8	Others?
9	Others?
10	Others?

Note: All of the information provided in Table B-1 have been translated into English from Bahasa Indonesia.