From Bureaucratic-Centralism Management to School Based Management: Managing Human Resources in the Management of Education Program

ASAD*

Abstract

Indonesia's education system used to be a centralized and bureaucratic mode as introduced by the Dutch as the colonial power. However, after the fall of Suharto's administration in May 1998, the Indonesian education policy has significantly transformed from centralization to decentralization - which is popularly known as school-based management (SBM). This change is because of the arrival of the Law No.22/1999 (later reviewed by the Law 32/2004) about "Local Government" (provinces and districts). The purposes of this paper are first to discuss the characteristics of school-based management and the practices of SBM and second, to explore the motives of Indonesian government to apply school-based management in education in the digital era. The orienting question for this study is: Are all school-levels actors and district level actors ready for dealing with the characteristics of school-based management and the practices of SBM? Recommendations for education policy reform in the digital era in Indonesia for good governance are discussed, particularly the motives to move from bureaucratic-centralism management to school-based management.

Keywords
Bureaucratic-centralism management, digital era, school based management

* Associate Professor, UIN Sulthan Thaha Saifuddin Jambi, Indonesia; e-mail: asadisma@uinjambi.ac.id

Introduction

Educational system around the world is managed by various approaches or ways such as a centralized, semi-centralized, and decentralized management. In the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, the concept of decentralization or self-management became a major trend in school reform. The transfer of decision making from higer (the center) to lower authirities in relation to budget and resource allocation, staff and students, and assesment reflects what is called a self-managed school (Caldwell & Spinks, 1992). A number of terms are interchangeably used to refer to the decentralized management including school-based management, school based governance, school self-management, and school site management (De Grauwe, 2005). Although the terms are different in meanings, they are all referring to allow schools to have more autonomy in decision making about their management including the use of their human, material, and financial resources. In the meantime, interest in educational reforms spreads around the world and school-based management (SBM) based on the decentralized method is one of the approaches that is voiced by educators and researchers. According to Oswald (1995), the decentralized management has begun to be applied in schools when educators and researchers detect dissatisfaction with the centralized authority. A dozen of definitions of school-based management (SBM) have been proposed by scholars and researchers. In general, school-based management is defined as the decentralization of decision-making authority to the school level (De Grauwe, 2005). It is one of the most popular strategies that began in the 1980s school reform movement. Particularly, Caldwell (2005) defines school-based management as the decentralization system of authority to make decision on the school level. In school-based management; responsibilities are transmitted to authorities within the schools.

Additionally, school-based management refers to increase in the involvement of parents, students, teachers, officials, principals and beneficiary groups of the community, and local organizations which may increase the independency, responsibility, and accountability of school (Moradi, Hussin, & Barzegar, 2012). School based-management involves the transfer of decision-making power on management in the school level (De Grauwe, 2005). Moreover, Malen et al. (1990) defines school based-management as follows; SBM can be viewed as an alternative of governance, as a decentralization form that identifies the individual school as the primary unit of improvement might be simulated and sustained. This definition mainly focuses on the change of authority of decision making from a central authority to the school site which it indicates of prime importance for the improvement of the school. However, the questions: what kinds of decision-making authority are decentralized or transferred to the school level? In response to the kinds of decision-making authority to school level, Leithwood and Menzies (1998) have proposed four types of decision-making authorityies: (1) administrative control in which every principal is dominant, (2) professional control in which the teacher corps receives the authority, (3) community control where the community or the parents, through a board, receive the authority, and (4) balanced control where the parents and the professionals (teachers and principal) are in balance for having the authority. The purposes of this paper are first to discuss the

characteristics of school-based management and the practices of SBM and second, to explore the motives of Indonesian government to apply school-based management in education. The orienting question for this study is: Are all school-levels actors and district level actors ready for dealing with the characteristics of school-based management and the practices of SBM?

Literature Review

The characteristics of school-based management and the practices of SBM

The characteristics of school-based management (decentralized) are different from the centralized management. The characteristics of SBM vary and depend on the implementation, practices, and processes. Generally, there are six areas or practices of SBM based on the literature related to SBM including (1) effective school leadership, (2) budget allocation, (3) management strategies, (4) staff development, (5) curriculum and instruction, and (6) resources.

The effective school leadership, the roles of the principal and school staff and their relationships are very important in determining the success of SBM. Unlike leaders under a centralized system, leaders in SBM do not perform the same leadership roles at all times. The roles will vary according to the situations, tasks, and individuals that they work with. Accordingly, the new roles and responsibilities within SBM have required the principal to be an effective leader with a strong and positive instructional and administrative competence as well as a collaborative and collegial relationship. Sammons, Hillman, and Mortimore (1995) explain that there are several features of an effective leader. First, a leader develops goal by "taking lead to establish vision and values to develop and set new goals, polices, plans and budgets" (p.13). Second, a leader is a manpower coordinator who "communicates, motivates, trains, supports, and encourages teachers' commitment and initiative to achieve school goals and find appropriate leadership roles for teachers" (p.21). Finally, a leader is a resource developer "acquiring extra resources to promote school development" (p. 19). In this perspective, the leader helps create the conditions within which teachers and students take responsibility for their quality of teaching and learning and engage in leadership activities. Some scholars assert that distributed leadership contributes to a sustainable improvement of schools in terms of achieving higher levels of student achievement and teacher accountability. For example, a study done by Lindberg and Vanyushyn (2013) who examined schools principals' perception of the importance of school-based management (SBM) and instructional leadership tasks and their assessment of the performance of those tasks in Swedish upper secondary schools by surveying 234 principals of all upper secondary schools in Sweden. They found that 80% of administrative tasks were seen as highly important and performed well while 68% of instructional leadership tasks were perceived as of having lower importance and performance.

With regard to the leadership role of the school principals in SBM, Botha (2006) did a case study in selected schools about leadership in school-based management in Gauteng Province, South Africa to conceptualize the important and pivotal leadership role of the school principal in ensuring school improvement via an effective school-based management. The primary goal of the study was to determine whether participants believed or not that

effective leadership in SBM resulted in school improvement. It was also to examine school principals and educators perceptions of the relationship between SBM and school improvement, and the leadership role of the school principal. The study used a qualitative design with a case study approach. The samples for this study were four extremely divergent schools in Gauteng. Open-ended interviews were done in one day in each of the four schools with the school principal and two purposively selected teachers. The finding of the study indicated that schools that were most successful in implementation of SBM and school improvement efforts were those schools with empowered principals in making decision, and also trained for their new roles and provided with information to guide their decision making. The findings indicated that a school principal was the most important and essential stakeholder for an effective SBM. School principals in SBM required being more flexible in creating collaboration, higher level commitment, motivation, trust, ownership, and healthier school climate which would lead to greater productivity and increased student achievement. Additionally, the other important stakeholder in implementing SBM practices is teacher's role. The role of teachers in SBM has a great impact as it empowers teachers at the school to make decisions. SBM provides for better informed teachers and incentives (White, 1992). In SBM, teachers are allowed to share their decisions affecting them by getting teachers and principals to see each other as collaborators in making schools work effectively for students (Maeroff, 1988). However, teacher's participation in SBM requires them to assume duties in addition to usual teaching roles. Weiss, Cambone, and Wyeth (1992) claim that added duties make heavy demands on the teachers' time and call on teachers to undertake a variety of tasks that they have not previously been responsible for. For example, a study done by Yau and Cheng (2014) who examined the perceptions of 83 Hong Kong principals and 239 teachers of the extent to which school-based management (SBM) had been effectively implemented in primary schools. They found that the most adopted elements of school-based management are 'financial planning and control' and 'leadership competence and work relationships'. The moderate adopted element is 'resources and accommodation'. The least adopted element is staff coordination and effectiveness'. In addition, there are significant differences between the perceptions of principals and teachers towards the areas of SBM.

      Budget allocation and management strategies, in SBM, budget allocation is one of the most crucial parts of SBM that should be delegated to school through the decentralization of budget. Budgeting decentralization means the allocation of funds in a lump sum rather than predetermined categories of expenditures (e.g. certain amount for books, a certain amount for salaries). The opportunity to spend money gives a school to achieve its goals (Cheng, 2004). Planning and budget control are the cores of SBM, and providing curriculum and staff is largely related to budget control (Lindelow, 1995). One of the problems of lack of SBM policy's proper implementation in the world is budgeting via schools. In the words of Haderman (1999), there is a weak relationship between budget decentralization performance in SBM and increasing student's progress. In order to support the priorities and programs in SBM, school and staff need to have some degrees of control over budget. According to Cheong (1996), decentralized budgeting may provide an important condition for schools to use resources effectively according to their own characteristics and needs to solve problems in time and pursue their own goals.

The transition to SBM is a profound change, because it entails fundamental changes in people's understanding of the school structure and their roles and responsibilities. According to White (1989), the purpose of SBM is to make changes in traditional structures of authority, with new relationships between teachers and learners, administrators, and parents. It is not simply to reorganize administrative responsibilities. In a centralized system, the function of the ministry of education usually includes the overall planning, program implementation, coordination, personnel supervision, monitoring, and evaluation. However, in a decentralized system like in school-based management, the roles of the central ministry have changed from the implementer to the technical consultant and coordinator responsible for policy formulation, and overall quality assurance, monitoring, and evaluation. The role of the central office is more to consult than to supervise the school. Therefore, the head office is responsible for improving school performance under its supervision; on the other hand, they delegate some strength and authority to the school to make decisions in accordance with the interests of different school.

Staff development, curriculum and instruction, and resources, another important area in SBM is staff development. Schools should be given an authority to select professional development activities that directly address their students' needs and fit in with the school's particular reform agenda. Lee and Smith (2001) claim that a very high priority on professional development which is a line with school's reform agenda will be placed by successful schools, especially in developing knowledge in teaching, learning, curriculum, and assessment.

In a centralized system, the function of the ministry of education usually includes the overall planning, program implementation, coordination, personnel supervision, monitoring, and evaluation, including the content of curriculum. However, in a decentralized one, school has an authority to make their own decision related to curriculum and instruction. When responsibility of curriculum and instruction are at school level, it will be a principal and teachers' duty for determining the changes to provide effective curriculum. In order to design an effective curriculum, teachers and administrators need to consider the interactions with teachers' competence to facilitate teacher's performance. On student's side, it should help students to gain more knowledge that appropriate with their needs so that they can produce expected educational outcome (Cheong, 1996).

The appearance of SBM with its goals is to make better use of available resources at school level. Resources are essential tools for the school for changing teaching and learning practices. Resources may include money, personnel, space, time, building, and equipment. In school-based management, principals and other stakeholders must ensure the allocation and usage of the educational resources to reach the goals, solve the problems and to make a decision that is appropriate with their own school characteristics and needs so that they have a better school.

Methodology

The method used was literature review (documentary work) which was done to systematically search internet resources, abstracts and databases including ERIC, British Library Direct, Academic Search Elite, Libris, Questia and High Beam and journal sources

such as Elsevier, Emerald, Sage, ScienceDirect, and OpenDOAR related to the existing policies and practices, as well as other available literature related to school-based management. The data from documentary work were analyzed qualitatively and categorized to : (1) to find and list every source relevant to the school-based management and its practices, (2) to create clusters of every data from every source by grouping them into themes or meaning units; and (3) to remove or reduce overlapping and repetitive data.

Findings and Discussion

The practices of school-based management in several educational systems

SBM programs have been implemented in many countries. Approximately 800 SBM programs that have been implemented in more than two dozen countries from Australia and the United States to Spain, Mexico, Cambodia, and Mozambique (World Bank, 2007). SBM has increasingly become a movement throughout the world autonomy to seek shared results and partnerships in the school community for the purpose of achieving school improvement. As a movement, SBM is considered as an effective system for empowering local schools in decision making (World Bank, 2007; Anderson, 2006; Vernez, Karam, & Marshal, 2012). There is a tendency to increase autonomy, responsibility for delegation, and encourage responsiveness to local needs with the aim of improving performance level. However, the experience of implementing SBM programs in several countries shows that it's not a quick fix. SBM has been promoted by several educational systems around the world that want to greater local autonomy and control of schools with the aim of increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of their school education. For example, in the mid-1970s, Canada started introducing SBM which is generally known as 'School-site decision-making." Through this policy, in 1980-81, seven pilot schools were involved in the decentralization of the allocation of resources for teaching and non-teaching staff, equipment, supplies and services. 'School-site decision-making" focused on financial delegation of resources to schools through school-based budgets and formula funding. Now, this SBM is now institutionalized.

In Hong Kong, initial educational reforms focused on expanding the system, and on improving the teaching and learning facilities. In 1991, Hong Kong Department of Education initiated School Management Initiative (SMI) which gave schools more flexibility in the use of their resources, while allowing greater involvement by teachers, parents, and former students in decision-making. Reforms to the education system in the UK consisted of several models: a national curriculum, a performance based testing system linked to the national curriculum, student choice of school, and local school management (LSM) that decentralized the bulk of the budget to school sites and provided schools with the authority to recruit and select staff. These systems gave more autonomy and flexibility in decision-making to the local community, leading to more accountability to the parents, employers and the wider community. A similar reform was also introduced in New Zealand which was based on the results of task force made by the Prime Minister (David Lange) to review the administration of education in October 1987. In the USA, the approach to SBM has been more localized as ever state implemented different strategies in improving its educational system. SBM was in some states linked to an accountability system tied to

student performance, but not in others. Two kinds of SBM were (1) 'administrative decentralization', in which the central office of an LEA designates certain tasks that are carried out by school-site teachers and principals and (2) 'site-based management', a structure that empowers parents, teachers, and principals in each school building to set their own priorities, to allocate their budget accordingly, to shape their curriculum, and to hire and fire personnel. Although there are many reform movements in process today in the USA, one of the most rapid developments in recent years is that of the 'charter schools'. The charter was a clear written agreement between a group of teachers and the school district to reorganize some part of the instructional programme. In some non-English-speaking countries, the experiences varied from local control and management delegation to financial delegation and autonomy.

Models and approaches of school-based management

SBM in some educational systems has been adopted to give power for principals and teachers by devolution of authority. This kind of management is used to increase their accountability and commitment to create a better school environment that will improve the school's quality. Under the school-based management, teaching and non-teaching staff play an active part in decision making at the school level which will let them become a part of decision making process. Additionally, school-based management will create such financial control which will let teachers to be likely to accept responsibility for the financial decisions for the schools. SBM program differs on several dimensions: the level of authority delegated to schools, the domains over which school-level decision makers have discretion, the groups of stakeholders involved in decision-making bodies, and the purposes served by school level decision-making bodies (Ogawa & White, 1944). There are several different models to determine who is investing with the power to make decisions in every SBM reform. Some general models are defined by Ogawa and White (1994) as follows: (1) community control which implies school community governance, (2) administrative decentralization which implies a dominant role for teachers and headmaster, (3) main controls where the locus of authority is placed with the principal.

Additionally, Leithwood and Menzies (1998) suggested the following four models: (1) administrative control: SBM transfers the power to the principal. This model aims to make everyone responsible for the district or council office. The benefits of SBM include in increasing efficiency in personnel and curriculum and making one person in each school more responsibility to the central authority. (2) Professional control: SBM transfers the main decision-making authority to the teacher. This model aims to increase teachers' knowledge of what the school needs at the class level. Participating in the decision-making process can also motivate teachers to perform better and can lead to larger customers and effectiveness in teaching. (3) Community control: SBM transfers the main decision-making authority to parents or the community. Under this model, teachers and principals are assumed to be more responsive to the needs of parents. Another benefit is that the curriculum can reflect local needs and preferences. (4) Balanced control: SBM balances decision-making authority between parents and teacher, who are the two main stakeholders in any school. This is the goal to take advantage teacher knowledge about school to improve school management and

make the school more responsible to parents. These school-based management models are used differently in every educational system around the world are collection of these model. In general, in SBM programs, community representatives appear on the school committee. However, in many cases, members of the community are involved in it ways that do not complicate the role of the principal and teacher.

Research on international practices on SBM

SBM programs have been implemented in many countries. In this section, the discussion centers on reviewing research articles that look intothe practices of school-based management around the world. One of the previous studies related to the practices of school-based management in American, Canadian, and Australian done by Wholstetter, Kirk, Robertson, and Mohrman (1997). The study was designed to determine how School-Based Management could work to improve the performance of schools. The study examined American, Canadian, and Australian schools that exhibited a range of success in restructuring curriculum and instruction and improving performance. The study had involved 40 schools that had implemented SBM for at least 3 years. They conducted various interviews with over 400 school-community members. The study presented findings from the interviews and from the archival and survey data collected during site visits. They used an organizational framework as their lens to examine the differences between actively restructuring and struggling schools. They found that certain organizational situations were strongly related to greater organizational learning and integrating processes. They also found that decentralized management operatedbest when the following four organizational resources were available to the decentralized unit: power, knowledge and skills, information, and rewards. Three other organizational situations were also crucialfor explaining the differences between actively restructuring schools and struggling schools: an instructional guidance mechanism, leadership, and resources. Wholstetter, Kirk, Robertson, and Mohrman (1997) concluded that (1) Actively restructuring schools had more of the situationsin place that encourageorganizational learning and integrating processes; (2) the existence of these organizational learning and integrating processes facilitate more innovative teaching practices; and (3) consequently, the existenceof organizational situations facilitate schools to adopt more innovative teaching practices, both directly and indirectly. Finally, the transition to SBM necessitatespervasive and deep changes (change in almost all aspects of the organizations and a fundamental change in people's understanding).

Another study related to school-based management was done by Agyemang (2008) who focused on looking at the formula funding in the UK school Sector. Using the qualitative approach, this study analysed the interview data obtained from eight senior managers, the Director of Education, and three primary school head teacher. The findings of this study revealed that power relations between the users and the providers of funds impact on the extent to which service providers needs are incorporated into the funding formula. In 1995, a qualitative case study was done by Brandao (1995) who looked at the effects of school-based management on the worklife of elementary teachers. This study involved 33 educators in Florida. The results showed that the effects of restructuring were varied and included both positive and negative findings. For some teachers, involvement enhanced

commitment to the organization and spurred them on to further efforts, while for most respondents restructuring activities were perceived as impositions that made it difficult to balance classroom and SBM responsibilities. Respondents also revealed that they doubted the potential of SBM as a means to improve the quality of education at Florida County Schools or as a process for producing significant academic achievements. A qualitative study was done by Cranston (2001) in order to examine some issues; 1) the impact of school-based management on primary principals in Queensland, identifies particular challenges for principals in terms of their skill and capacities in moving to more collaborative and inclusive decision-making regimes. 2) Studying two primary schools operating under SBM that examines how and in what areas of the school (planning, operation, curriculum), parents and teachers are engaging in school-level decisions-making. This study involved 2 or 3 teachers and 2 or 3 parents in each school. Based on the interview, it revealed that the principals should demonstrate leadership skills and capacities that facilitate such involvement. Schools were really going through learning and maturing process in their journey towards greater parents and teacher involvement in decision-making in school. Both teachers and parents acknowledged they needed skill development as part of this process. A quasi-experimental study was done by Umansky and Vegas (2007) who looked at the effect of school-based management in improving students learning. This study involved 3 school-based management reforms in Central America. The analysis result of the three Central American Reforms indicated that school-based management reforms can have varied impacts on students learning. The evidence indicates that all three reforms resulted in substantive changes in management and teacher characteristics and behavior and that these changes explain significant portions of resultant changes in student learning.

The practice of school-based management has been done in some developing countries. Al-Ghefeili, Ghani, & Elham (2014) conducted a study to investigate the views of school community regarding school-based management as a management tool in Oman. A qualitative design with a multiple case study has been distributed to the principal; principal's assist ands, senior teachers, and teachers in selected schools. Based on the interview data, it is found that The school stakeholders especially principals have different view toward the implementation of the SBM, senior teacher perceived that he has more negative about SBM system because he claimed that SBM gave the teacher more work. In addition, the study on the school-based management was also done by Bandur (2012). The study was done in order to examine the SBM policy reform in Indonesia. It emphasized on the impact of shifting authority and responsibility to school level as well as the challenge in the implementation of SBM confronted by the school council members and remedial measures to minimize the problems. This study involved all school primary schools in Ngada Disrtict and 32 schools in rural area. It also involved 42 interviews. The findings indicated that the implementation of SM in Indonesia needs to be shifted adequate power and authority from central government to school councils. Additionally, Blimpo, Evans, and Lahire (2014) conducted study to evaluate the effectiveness of a comprehensive school-based management and capacity building program which is called Whole School Development (WSD). The study used experimental research design with the observation, written literacy and numeracy test, students' interview and oral literacy test, and teacher and headmaster interview. The result indicated that no effect of WSD on learning outcomes and no effect on test scores. In 1995,

a study was conducted by Heck and Brandon to investigate how the purposeful reform of school-decision making responsibilities affects teacher participation and leadership in selecting critical needs to address during the school improvement process. This study is done by involving 151 teachers in nine elementary schools in the first study and 212 teachers in four elementary schools in the second study. As the secondary data, interviews were also conducted with administrators and teachers who had taken leadership roles during the process. The finding indicate that involvement in the process of setting up decision making and selecting the content of school needs affect teacher's agreement with selected needs. Moreover, teacher expertise and leadership opportunities were found as an effect of participation in school decision making. The study about school-based management is also done by Candra (2012) in order to find out the effectiveness of CIPP components (context, input, process, and product) in the implementation of SBM in SMK Negeri 3 Singaraja. The evaluative study used questionnaires, interviews and documentation which involved the principal, staffs and administrators as the participant of the study. The result showed that school-management implementation was effective. David (2015) conducted a study using an exploratory sequential design to paint a holistic picture of a successful aided secondary school which achieves its vision, mission, core value and goals, and most importantly, sustains success for all its students. In depth interview was done to 20 experienced senior teachers and 103 teacher managers in secondary school in Hongkong. The finding indicated that SBM implementation did not improve students' learning outcomes yet, but it had produced various positive impacts on IMC schools. A historical research was conducted by De Grauwe (2005) in order to define SBM and its view of its implementation in different world regions. This study aim in examine the advantages and disadvantages. Particularly, this study explores the strategies in school-based management implementation in order to ensure a positive impact on quality. The finding indicated that school-based management implementation need to be accompanied by strategies to build capacities of schools, head-teacher s and communities, motivated by a clear focus on quality improvement and a concern for equity. Al Kaabi (2015) conducted a study on the evaluation of the school-based management practices in the new school model. 1345 staffs from 17 cycle 1 school and 11 kindergartens participated in this quantitative study. This study also investigated the influence of staff position on the practices of the SBM and identified the main areas of SBM which need improvement. The finding showed that the staffs have authority in decision making especially in in school development plan, another finding related to questions number two indicate that there was no significant difference between the practices of the teacher and another administrators and the teachers should involve in curriculum decision making because they understand more their students and they know what should they improve related to their students.

In addition, a qualitative research was conducted by Karam, Vernes, and Marshall (2012) in order to examine how autonomy and accountability under school-based management implementation in Indonesia at the national and how they are associated with intermediary and students outcomes. This study involved four hundred elementary public schools from among 54 districts in Indonesia. The finding of this study were; 1) Principals' and teachers' lack of knowledge and preparedness about taking risks making independent decisions, 2) Both teachers' and principals' lack of knowledge and preparedness about taking

risk to make independent decisions, 3) Both principals and teachers felt that they didn't receive enough support and training on SBM and how to make school performance improvement. Finally, SBM should be used to improve students' achievement by upgrading principal and teacher capacity so they can make their own operational and instructional decisions by providing them higher quality and comprehensive SBM-related leadership training and professional development. In 2013, a quantitative survey design was done by Kiragu, King'oina, and Migosi (2013).The study was designed toto find out what the principals and teachers perceived were the prospects of school-based management (SBM), the accrued benefits of SBM and challenges schools would experience if SBM was introduced in Murang'a South district. This study involved 16 principals and 64 teachers. The result showed that the principals and teachers perceived that if SBM introduce in secondary school it will give positive impact that many aspects would change and there would be increased accountability and transparency, efficient use of resources, improved decision making, timely syllabus coverage and timely procurement of resources and this also help to improve quality of education. Another quantitative study was done by Lindberg and Vanyushyn (2013) to 234 principals of all upper secondary schools in Sweden. This study sets out to examine schools principals' perception of the importance of school-based management (SBM) and instructional leadership tasks and their assessment of the performance of those tasks in Swedish upper secondary schools. The result showed that analysis of the survey responses from 234 principals shows that 80% of administrative and 75% of fire-fighting tasks were seen as highly important and performed well, while 68% of instructional leadership tasks were perceived as of having lower importance and performance. Levačić (1998) did a study about Local management of schools in England. Aim of this study was to reviews the evidence on the impact of six years of local management of schools in England. The findings of the research on the impact of local management, in particular the lack of firm evidence of consequential improved educational outcomes for pupils, are then interpreted in terms of the theoretical basis of local management.

The application of School-Based Management in Iran's Secondary Schools done by Mehralizadeh, Sepacy, and Atashfeshan (2006).The study was designed to recognize the main barriers of school- based management (SBM) in Iran in general, and in public secondary schools of Ahvaz, in particular. The study examined 40 Secondary school principals, 200 teachers and 40 local education authorities. This study indicated five main factors such as management, information and knowledge, structure and organization, cultural, power and political issues are the main barriers to running the SBM in secondary schools in Iran. They found that the new scheme of SBM compared to the present system of education in secondary schools differs in three main areas: the office of the administrative affairs is now working under the supervision of the school council which has authority over the hiring and firing of the principal; the vetoing power over the principal's sanctions against students, (but they do not have the right and the authority to modify the obligations, rights and sanctions established for the principal, the student and the teacher by the Ministry of Education). Furthermore, the barriers faced in implementation of SBM were management barriers, information and knowledge barriers, structural and organizing barriers, cultural barriers and power and political barriers. While Yau and Cheng (2014) did a quantitative study about

Principals and Teachers' perceptions of School-Based Management in Hong Kong. This study involved 322 respondents; consisting of 83 principals and 239 teachers. The aim of this study was to examine the perceptions of a sample of Hong Kong principals and teachers of the extent to which school-based management (SBM) has been effectively implemented in primary schools. The finding shows that all four features of school-based management are perceived as being implemented in Hong Kong primary schools, but the degree of their implementation is not the same. The most adopted elements of school-based management are 'financial planning and control' and 'leadership competence and work relationships'. The moderate adopted element is 'resources and accommodation'. The least adopted element is 'staff coordination and effectiveness'. In addition, there are significant differences between the perceptions of principals and teachers towards the areas of SBM. Another study related to school-based management was done by Kuncoro (2008).   Who focused on Principal, teachers and administrators also community who understand the role of principal using qualitative interview, documentation and field observation and used the previous studies to support this study. The aim of this study was to know and describe the role of principal in the implementation of SBM in Madrasah Tsanawiyah NegeriPiyungan Yogyakarta. The findings of this study revealed that The principal of MTs n Piyungan less intensive explicit when did the seminar related to the implementation of SBM, the principal did not understand about the SBM and how to implement it, the principal played the important role in extracurricular activity than in regular or curricular activity and the principal less intensive as educator, facilitator, motivator and innovator.

Education policy reform: The motives of Indonesian government to apply school-based management in education

Indonesia's education system used to be a centralized and bureaucratic mode as introduced by the Dutch as the colonial power. In addition, in the Old Order (Sukarno's regime) and in the New Order Regime (a 32 year of Suharto's regime), Indonesian education system was still dominated by a centralized system of administration. However, after the collapse of Suharto's regime in May 1998, the Indonesian education policy has significantly changed from centralization to decentralization - which is popularly known as school-based management (SBM). This change is because of the arrival of the Law No.22/1999 (later reviewed by the Law 32/2004) about "Local Government" (provinces and districts). Both laws describe the key relationship between the central government and local governments in their powers and authorities with regard to education. The terms of decentralization and school-based management are very popular in Indonesia because of educational policy reforms after the downfall of New Order Regime in May 1998. Decentralization means "to disperse away from a central point" (Lauglo, 1996, p.18) and school based management refers to the decentralization of authority from the central government to the school level (Caldwell, 2005). World Bank (2008) notes that school-based management is the strategy to decentralize education decision-making by increasing parental and community involvement in schools. Thus, in school level, decision-making authority and school operations are transferred to principals, teachers, and parents, and sometimes to students and other school community members. Nationally, the central government has introduced the idea of

educational decentralization when the government issued the Law No.22/1999 (later reviewed by the Law No. 32/2004) about "Local Government", which was officially implemented in January 2001. Both laws have logical consequences that educational administration, management and leadership, goals, budgets, personnel, curriculum, and structure should be adapted to the soul and the spirit of autonomy. It means in the era of autonomy," the former bureaucratic notions, based on hierarchical positional powers within a single school system, are now outmoded" (Chapman, 1996). Therefore, the so-called central-based educational management that had been practiced in the Indonesian education system for long time should be changed into school-based management.

The motives of most governments to apply school-based management aim at both improving the financing and delivery of education services and increasing the quality and quantities (enrollment) in education (World Bank, 2008). In Indonesia, the central government wants to give, principals, teachers, parents, and communities broader opportunities to take part in the management of education program and at the same time, it can ease the burdens of the central government financially and operationally by giving more authorities to local governments and schools to arrange their schools to meet local needs (Minister of National Education, 2004). Eliason (1996) says that decentralization refers to have greater citizen participation, influence, and greater local autonomy in order to meet local needs and demands. In other words, Indonesian Government has been decentralizing the control of education systems in an effort to lower costs, overcome unmanageable central bureaucracies, and to provide young people a better education and give local government officials and schools much greater scope to decide how to meet those goals.

However, the success of school-based management practices at school level depends on how ready all school-levels actors and district level actors work on it. As discussed earlier, the centralized education system had been practiced for more than 53 years from the Old Order (Sukarno's regime) to the New Order Regime (Suharto's regime). Hence, it is not considerably easy to change all those actors' mind and work habits. They are still used to working with a centralized system, in particular, principals and educational administrators. For example, principals still depend on the upper actors such as central and provincial governments and district levels to make key decisions and school programs. The second problem is parents and communities are not accustomed to involving in making decisions at school level. In Indonesia, it is common for parents (not in big cities) to come to school every six months when they will take a final report of their children's progress. Teachers are not qualified and competent to teach is also the third major problem to reach the goals of SBM in terms of student achievement. For instance, the total number of elementary school teachers and headmasters as of 2005/2006 was 1,567,157 and 84.70% of elementary school teachers do not meet the education ministry's basic requirement that is completion of bachelor degrees (Ministry of National Education, 2008). This will also influence their ability and capacity of involving in making school programs. The last problem, but not the least, is community participation such as representatives of parents, community members, and education councils is not that high like in western countries.

Conclusions

The purposes of this paper are first to discuss the characteristics of school-based management and the practices of SBM and second, to explore the motives of Indonesian government to apply school-based management in education in the digital era. To conclude, decentralization and school-based management in Indonesia's education system have become the means to decentralize the authority from the central government to the school level (Caldwell, 2005), to improve the financing and delivery of education services and increase the quality and quantities, to give parents and communities broader opportunities to take part in education. At the same time, the success of SBM is overly reliant on how well all school and district actors put it into practices and change their work habits from a centralized to decentralized practice.

Disclosure statement

The author declares no conflict of interest in this study. .

References

Agyemang, G. (2008). Accounting for needs? Formula funding in the UK School Sector. *Working Paper Series.*

Al Kaabi, S. A. A. (2015). *An evaluation of the school-based management practices in the new school model :A study on Al Ain schools. Theses.* United Arab Emirates University.

Al-Ghefeili, A. A., Ghani, M. F. A., & Elham, F. (2014). School-based management in Oman :School community's views and understanding. *Global Business and Economics Research Journal, 3*(1), 55-67.

Anderson, W. (2006). Site-based management. In S. C. Smith, & P. K. Piele*, School Leadership: Handbook for Excellence in Student Learning* (pp. 223-244). London: SAGE Publications.

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

Blimpo, M. P., Evans, D. K.,   & Lahire, N. (2014). School-based management and educational outcomes lessons from a randomized field experiment. *JEL Classification*, *015*, I21, C93.

Botha, N. (2006). Leadership in school-based management: A case study in selected schools. *South African Journal of Education, 26*(3), 341–353.

Brandao, F. R. (1995). The effects of school-based management on the worklife of elementary teachers: a case study. Dissertation, University of North Florida.

Caldwell, B. J. (2005). School-based management. *Education Policy Series.* Paris: The International Institute for Educational Planning.

Caldwell, B. J., & Spinks, J. M. (1992). *Leading the self-managing school.* London: Falmer Press.

Candra , I. W. (2012). Studi evaluatif implementasi penerapan manajemen berbasis sekolah di SMK Negeri 3 Singaraja, Kabupaten Buleleng, Propinsi Bali. Tesis, Administrasi Pendidikan, Program Pascasarjana, Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha.

Chapman, J. (1996). A new agenda for a new society. *In International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration,* pp. 419 – 445. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Cheng, A. [Lai-Fong] (2004). School-based management and quality management in Hong Kong primary schools. University of Leicester.

Cheng, Y. [Cheong] (1996). *School effectiveness & school-based management: A mechanism for development.* London: Flamer Press.

Cranston. N. C. (2001). Collaborative decision making and school-based management: Challenges, rhetoric and reality. *J. Educ. Enquiry, 2*(1), 21-30.

David, W. T. W. (2015). *Investigating school-based management in Hongkong to validate the prerequisites for successful schools using an exploratory sequential design, thesis,* the Hong Kong Institute of Education.

De Grauwe, A. (2005). Improving the quality of education through school-based management: Learning from international experiences. *International Review of Education, 51*(4), 269-287.

Eliason, L. C. (1996). Educational decentralization as a policy strategy in an era of fiscal stress, in Chapman, J. D., Boyd, W. L., Lander, R., and Reynolds, *The Reconstruction of Education, Quality, Equality, and Control.* London: Redwood Books Limited.

Haderman, M. (1999). School-based budgeting: Eric Digest, 131.

Heck, R., & Brandon, P. (1995). Teacher empowerment and the implementation of school-based reform. *Empowerment in Organizations*, *3*(4), 10-19.

Kiragu J. W., King'oina J. O &Migosi J. A (2013). School-based management Prospects and challenges: A case of public secondary schools in Murang'a south district, Kenya. *International Journal of Asian Social Science, 3*(5), 1166-1179.

Kuncoro G. (2008). *Peran kepala sekolah dalam impelementasi manajemen berbasis sekolah di MTs Negeri Piyungan Yogyakarta Indonesia.* Thesis. UIN Sunan Kalijaga.

Lee, V. E., & Smith, J. B. (2001). Restructuring high schools for equity and excellence: What works. *Harvard Educational Review, 71*(4), 766-767.

Levačić R. (1998). Local management of schools in England: Results after six years. *Journal of Education Policy*, *13*(3), 331-350.

Leithwood K., & Menzies T. (1998). A review of research concerning the implementation of site-based management. *School effectiveness and school improvement*, *9*(33), 233-285.

Lindberg, E., & Vanyushyn, V. (2013). School-based management with or without instructional leadership: Experience from Sweden. *Journal of Education and Learning, 2*(3), 39-50.

Lindelow, J. (1995). School-based management. In Murphy, J, and Beak, L. G (Eds.), *school-based management as school reform: Taking stock*, pp.120-135, California: Gornwin.

Lauglo, J. (1996). Forms of decentralization and their implications for education, in Chapman, J. D., Boyd, W. L., Lander, R., and Reynolds, *The Reconstruction of Education, Quality, Equality, and Control.* London: Redwood Books Limited.

Maeroff, G. I. (1988). *The empowerment of teachers.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Malen, B., Ogawa, R.T., Kranz, J., Clune, W.H., & Witte, J.F. (1990). What do we know about school-based management: A case study of the literature—A call for research. *Choice and control in American education*, *2,* 289-342.

Mehralizadeh, Y., Sepacy, H., & Atashfeshan, F. (2004). *Globalization and decentralization of management: A study of the feasibility of application of school-based management in Iran's* secondary schools. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 52*(1), 84-98.

Ministry of National Education. (2008). The number of teachers by level of education and province as of 2005/2006. Jakarta: Ministry of National Education.

Ministry of National Education (2005). *Law for lectures and teachers no. 14/2005*. Jakarta: Ministry of National Education.

Ministry of National Education (2005). *Regulation No.19/2005*. Jakarta: Ministry of National Education.

Ministry of National Education (2004). Country Report-Quality Education for All Young People: Challenges, Trends, and Priorities in Indonesia. Paper presented at 47th International Conference on Education, Geneva, Switzerland, 8-11 September 2004.

Ministry of Home (2004). *Law no.32/2004*. Jakarta: Ministry of Home.

Ministry of National Education (2003). *Law for education No.20/2003*. Jakarta: Ministry of National Education.

Moradi, S., Bin Hussin, S., & Barzegar, N. (2012). School-based management (SBM), opportunity or threat (education systems of Iran). *Procedia -Social and Behavioral Sciences, 69*, 2143 —2150.

Ogawa, R. T., & White, P. A. (1994). School-based management: An overview. In S. A.

Mohrman, P. Wohlstertter, & Associates, *school-based management organizing for high performance.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Oswald, L. J. (1995). School-based management: Rationale and implementation guidelines. Document Resume. *Oregon School Study Council, 7*(38).

Sammons, P., Hillman, J., & Mortimore, P. (1995). *Key Characteristics of Effective Schools: A Review of School Effectiveness Research.* Institute of Education, University of London: London.

Vernez, G., Karam, R., & Marshal, J. H. (2012). *Implementation of school-based management in Indonesia.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

Weiss, C. H., Cambone, J., & Wyeth, A. (1992). Trouble in paradise: Teacher conflicts in shared decision making. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 28*(3), 350-367.

White, P. A. (1989). An overview of school-based management: What does the research say?" *NASSP BULLETIN 73,* 518.

White, P. A. (1992). Teacher empowerment under ideal school-site autonomy. *Educational Evaluation & Policy Analysis, 14,* 69-82.

Wholstetter, P., Kirk, A., Robertson, P., & Mohrman, S. (1997). Organizing for successful school-based management. Alexandria, Virginia, USA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

World Bank Report. (2007). *What do we know about school-based management?* Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Yau, H. K., & Cheng A. L. F. (2014). Principals and teachers' perception of school-based management. *International Education Research, 2*(1), 44-59.

Biographical note
Dr. ASAD is an associate professor at UIN Sulthan Thaha Saifuddin Jambi, Indonesia; e-mail: asadisma@uinjambi.ac.id