



## School Based Management Impact and Its Misperception

Soetam Rizky Wicaksono<sup>1\*</sup>, Abdul Hakim<sup>2</sup>, Kasmudin Mustapa<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Universitas Ma Chung, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia

<sup>3</sup>Universitas Tadulako, Indonesia

\*e-mail : [soetam.rizky@machung.ac.id](mailto:soetam.rizky@machung.ac.id)

**Abstract:** While SBM (School-Based Management) has already been implemented in many countries, including Indonesia, the Education Council has already brought this idea to create a better education act. However, SBM still has the wrong paradigm among principals of schools in Indonesia. Some of them still hardly believe that SBM can leverage their school. This paradigm is based upon their narrow-minded point of view because many of them feel that there is no "real example" that SBM really can do that is leverage from the promise. Therefore, this research tries to give empirical evidence that SBM in Indonesia can give leverage factors to schools. Even though SBM has been proven to leverage schools' achievement, there are still misperceptions among school management, parents, and teachers about how SBM should work. The result of this research is also being socialized to the principals, so they can understand how important SBM is for their school and will be eager to implement SBM in their school (for those who do not implement it yet).

**Keywords:** *School-Based Management, Educational Policy, Indonesia*

**Abstract:** Sementara MBS (Manajemen Berbasis Sekolah) telah diterapkan di banyak negara, termasuk Indonesia, Dewan Pendidikan telah membawa ide ini untuk menciptakan undang-undang pendidikan yang lebih baik. Namun, MBS masih memiliki paradigma yang salah di kalangan kepala sekolah di Indonesia. Beberapa dari mereka masih hampir tidak percaya bahwa MBS dapat memanfaatkan sekolah mereka. Paradigma ini didasarkan pada sudut pandang mereka yang berpikiran sempit karena banyak dari mereka merasa bahwa tidak ada "contoh nyata" yang benar-benar dapat dilakukan oleh MBS yang merupakan pengungkit dari janji. Oleh karena itu, penelitian ini mencoba memberikan bukti empiris bahwa MBS di Indonesia dapat memberikan faktor pengungkit kepada sekolah. Meskipun MBS telah terbukti meningkatkan prestasi sekolah, masih ada mispersepsi di antara manajemen sekolah, orang tua, dan guru tentang bagaimana seharusnya MBS bekerja. Hasil penelitian ini juga sedang disosialisasikan kepada kepala sekolah, sehingga mereka dapat memahami betapa pentingnya MBS bagi sekolahnya dan akan bersemangat untuk menerapkan MBS di sekolahnya (bagi yang belum menerapkannya).

**Kata Kunci:** *Manajemen Berbasis Sekolah, Kebijakan Pendidikan, Indonesia*

Copyright (c) 2023 The Authors. This is an open access article under the CC BY-SA 4.0 license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>)

## INTRODUCTION

The need for a good education in a developing country is not just a government tagline nowadays, especially in Indonesia, which has already released its Education Act in 2003, after the global crisis recovery. However, since many schools in the country are not ready to do the good governance act, the education

act already planned does not happen on the way (Winarti 2011; Shoraku 2009; Jalal 2000; Mawanda, Karta, and Zm 2018).

On the other hand, the Indonesian government tries to find help from other institutions like UNESCO and UNICEF. For UNESCO, which tried to run SBM (School-Based Management) in some Asian countries (Shoraku 2009; Bandur 2012; Muslihah 2015), that based on autonomy and decentralization of schools in managing their own operational (David 1989; Ogawa 1994; Hanson 1997). It should also give freedom and better management in school management, which should create better service and education for students. Research has already empirically proven that SBM in Indonesia can leverage school strength and involve the community and parents in togetherness building better management (Tansiri and Bong 2019; Heyward, Cannon, and Sarjono 2011).

While SBM has already been implemented in many countries, not just in the US (Neal and Richard G 1991) but also in other developing countries, such as Nigeria (Ayeni and Ibukun 2013), Malaysia (Mansor and Suliman 2018) or even in Bangladesh and Philippines (Behrman, Deolalikar, and Soon 2002). Indonesia has already brought this idea to create a better education act through the Education council, even before 2000 (Jalal 2000). However, the spread of Indonesian school, its cultural variety, and the rise of the middle class after a global crisis have become a unique barrier to implementing it.

However, SBM still has the wrong paradigm among principals of schools in Indonesia. While the Education and Cultural Minister of Indonesia has already obliged schools to have Parent Council involved in their management and given decentralization privilege in school management, some headmasters still hardly believe that SBM can leverage their school. This paradigm is based upon their narrow-minded point of view because many of them feel that there is no "real example" that SBM really can do that is leverage from the promise. Even though many journals have already mentioned it, most of them are lazy enough to read it and skeptical of the result.

Therefore, this research tries to give empirical evidence that SBM in Indonesia can give leverage factors to schools. Many principals think their schools' main leverage factor is students' national final exam results. On the other

hand, SBM considers factors for school rather than just that result; thus, there should be a review at the end of this paper. The result of this research is also being socialized to the principals, so they can understand how important SBM is for their school and will be eager to implement SBM in their school (for those who do not implement it yet).

## **METHODS**

This research occurred in East Java, Indonesia, a unique region because of its culture and demographic asset. Thirty-two schools were involved in this research. Half of them are from elementary school, and the rest are from junior high school. The chosen schools are based upon selection from their principals, which have already having educated in SBM implementation by the local government. Thus, it is already assumed that they should have already implemented SBM because of their previous knowledge.

Those schools are named *Bridge School*, which already have authority in governing budget and independency in their SBM. The pre-preliminary data took their budget and their achievement, the SBM process, and responses from staff, teachers, and students. While this data is taken, we also create a *focus group discussion* (FGD), which consists of all headmasters brainstorming the purpose of this research. Therefore, they would have good cooperation in giving their data and responses.

Some steps that have been done in data collection are (1) FGD as a pre-preliminary step, (2) administrative data collection for each school, (3) observation with documentation, and (4) depth interview of the object, and (5) questionnaire for validating previous steps. In addition, while quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive statistics, qualitative data were analyzed using content analysis (Barbour and Morgan 2017).

As mentioned before, researchers have already wandered around 32 schools as part of the job and becoming research steps. While FGD was being held in one big seminar, most headmasters said their approval inside it. Thus, it makes this research easier in the next steps, which need support from the principals and their honesty about each school's data. FGD itself was trying to explain that SBM should become their savior and leverage, not becoming a

burden and more responsibility. We emphasized that SBM is proven for many schools across the country and the world, so they can be convinced that they should increase their SBM levels.

Step two, which collected administrative data for each school, was held simultaneously with step three. Thus, while one of us was trying to collect data as soon as possible and accurately, the other was trying to document our observation as secondary data. Our observation includes (1) classroom conditions, which are directly connected with the budget from the government, (2) students' attitude toward school rules or their discipline, and (3) the learning process as we looked for teachers' creativity (we took random sampling for this one) and (4) students and teacher enthusiasm in doing their daily activities. While these two steps were taken, we tried to summarize them and create a cluster based on the school's achievement during their effort to do SBM. All of the summarized results will be explained in the next part of this paper.

The next step is observing the learning process, which is also done with the fifth step. We took a random sample from all schools, approximately half of them, to observe closely while teachers did their jobs. While their enthusiasm was hardly measured at that time, we spontaneously asked them some questions in random order. For example, how they feel in the learning process with its classroom management. Another example is asking them how teachers feel about their headmaster and its governance at school. Thus, we can get secondary data for quantitative analysis. Last but not least is spreading the questionnaire among stakeholders at school. This questionnaire should be a convincing factor from previous steps because most data-aware getting from observation and data collection steps, rather than hanging on the response from the questionnaire.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Result**

The first result from this evaluation study is that most school with SBM has already increased their input resource. At least 80% of elementary school has already gotten better students from the beginning. This assumption has presumed that most students who come from better economic families chose schools with SBM because of their better infrastructure and learning process. This word of

mouth assumption came from the daily learning process, which we have seen from previous observation, and it is very logical for that reason. While we have mentioned earlier that the region is unique with its culture, the community really cares about infrastructure as their pre-preliminary assumption before they decide to choose the right school for their children.

Thus, with better student intake, it would bring broader chances for schools to develop their infrastructure because of more income ahead. Even though each school has already been given its own fund from the government as school operational funding named BOS (*Bantuan Operasional Sekolah*), they still need an addition for their better development. This statement is supported by interview results from headmasters and educational staff who are responsible for budgeting (commonly named TU or *Tata Usaha*). They can have a better implementation in SBM with their abundant budget rather than just depend on BOS from the government.

A second significant result is the governance model from most participating schools. Most of them (merely three schools are not included) are still doing *the top-down* model in the vital decision for school management. While SBM should involve many parties as local participation in their decision model making (Magfiroh, 2019; Shoraku, 2009), most headmasters still cannot release their old style of leadership. Most teachers and staff still think that SBM merely relies on budget addition rather than participative decision-making. This part of SBM still not be realized by many parties, including headmasters themselves, so it does not apply in their schools.

However, while the questionnaire asks their opinion about the decision-making model, most teachers and staff rather choose the top-down model rather than a participative model. Community, including parents, mostly become a passive side in joint decision making, while teachers mostly focus themselves on their learning process preparation. Thus, it means that SBM is not fully implemented, even though they insisted that SBM is already done. This misperception creates misconduct implementation for most schools in their own interpretation of SBM.

The third significant result from this research is about achievement increase in their final exam grade for their highest class level. For example, in elementary school, their highest class level is in 6th grade, while in junior high school is 9th grade. This increment is not really connected directly with SBM, except for misperception. Many parents think that SBM is about high-quality school and it should create better achievement for their children. On the other hand, many teachers also have the perception that SBM is about creating better final exam grades; thus, they really give their optimum effort for it. This misperception is gotten from our observation and interview with teachers and also the staff. While students also express their point of view from parents, so it makes such a nonsense reason for all of those increment achievements cause. However, this point of view also helps most schools with SBM in maintaining their quality at a high level. This quality was expressed in their good accreditation from the government.

### **Discussion**

As mentioned previously, SBM in Indonesia was initiated in early 2000 by Education and Culture Department with help from UNESCO. The government then emphasized it in 2003 based on Education Act which obliged schools to use SBM thoroughly (Winarti, 2011). This implementation underlined that state school, too, has their independency in governing their resources based on the budget which has been provided.

However, budget is not the only important matter in SBM implementation; there are many factors such as teachers' development, students' final grades, and schools' infrastructure, such as building and classroom management (Shoraku, 2009; Winarti, 2011). The independency, commonly named autonomy, also increases the headmaster's authority and responsibility. It also should increase local participation from the community, teachers, and parents in joint decision-making for schools (Magfiroh, 2019). Thus, SBM is considered a burden for some of them and creates an invisible barrier in its implementation.

On the other hand, SBM needs assistance and experience to be successful, so government help is needed in this case (Bandur, 2012; M. O. Heyward, Cannon, & Sarjono, 2011). However, not all schools can be handled by the

government, so many of them are considered to have a failure because of a lack of data. These facts show us that SBM is having difficulties in Indonesia.

## CONCLUSION

Based on three significant findings which have mentioned previously, we can conclude that SBM implementation still needs to be improved and learned more carefully by the headmaster. While many misperceptions are blurring its achievement, SBM has become a placebo motivation for schools to leverage their pride and degree in the community. Even though this is not the real purpose, it still can support a strong reason for SBM to be implemented wider, especially in Indonesia.

SBM implementation, with its all misperception, has proven can increase schools' infrastructure, and most important of all is their great achievement toward students' final exam results. It also can change the perception of parents about good intentions from schools with SBM implementation. However, this achievement should also be done with the right implementation of SBM from headmasters, school management, and also teachers. In other words, they should bring back the real SBM implementation for their schools.

## REFERENCES

- Ayeni, Adeolu Joshua, and Williams Olusola Ibukun. 2013. "A Conceptual Model for School-Based Management Operation and Quality Assurance in Nigerian Secondary Schools." *Journal of Education and Learning* 2, no. 2: 36–43. <https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v2n2p36>.
- Bandur, Agustinus. 2012. "Decentralization and School-Based Management in Indonesia." *Asia Pacific Journal of Educational Development* 1, no. 1: 33–47. <https://doi.org/10.6228/APJED.01.01.04>.
- Barbour, Rosaline S, and David L Morgan. 2017. *A New Era in Focus Group Research*. Edited by Rosaline S. Barbour and David L. Morgan. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK. <https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-58614-8>.
- Behrman, Jere R., Anil B. Deolalikar, and Lee Ying Soon. 2002. "Promoting Effective Schooling through Education Decentralization in Bangladesh, Indonesia, and Philippines." *ERD Working Paper Series*, no. 23: 56.
- David, Jane L. 1989. "Synthesis of Research on School-Based Management." *Education Leadership*, 45–53.
- Hanson, E Mark. 1997. "Educational Decentralization: Issues and Challenges." *Hemisphere*.

- Heyward, Mark, Robert A Cannon, and Sarjono. 2011. "Implementing School-Based Management in Indonesia." <https://doi.org/10.3768/rtipress.2011.op.0006.1109>.
- Jalal, Fasli. 2000. "School Based Management ( Sbm ) : Indonesia Experiences."
- Mansor, Azlin Norhaini, and Ashairi Suliman. 2018. "The Practice Of School Based- Management : Special Reference To Malaysian Clusters Schools And Uk Autonomous Schools." *Journal of Adv Research Dynamical & Control System* Vol. 10, no. 02-Special Issue: pp-1618-1626.
- Mawanda, Vienta, I Wayan Karta, and Hamidsyukrie Zm. 2018. "Effectiveness of Implementation of School-Based Management In Elementary School 1 Puyung Central Lombok." *IOSR - JRME* 8, no. 3: 55–61. <https://doi.org/10.9790/7388-0803025561>.
- Muslihah, Oleh Eneng. 2015. "Understanding the Relationship between School-Based Management, Emotional Intelligence and Performance of Religious Upper Secondary School Principals in Banten Province." *Higher Education Studies* 5, no. 3: 11–23. <https://doi.org/10.5539/hes.v5n3p11>.
- Neal, and Richard G. 1991. *School Based Management: A Detailed Guide for Successful Implementation*. Bloomington: Natioinal Educational Service. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED436833.pdf>.
- Ogawa, Rodney T. 1994. "The Institutional Sources of Educational Reform: The Case of School-Based Management." *American Educational Research Journal* 31, no. 3: 519–48. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312031003519>.
- Shoraku, Ai. 2009. "Educational Movement toward School-Based Management in East Asia: Cambodia, Indonesia and Thailand." *Background Paper for EFA Global Monitoring Report*. <http://unesco.atlasproject.eu/unesco/file/d0b7b767-9e2b-4e2a-bff0-783b6ae6f15b/c8c7fe00-c770-11e1-9b21-0800200c9a66/178720e.pdf>.
- Tansiri, Irfan Yuda, and You Joum Bong. 2019. "The Analysis of School-Based Management (SBM) Implementation to the Educational Quality Service of State Junior High School." In *2nd International Conference on Research of Educational Administration and Management (ICREAM 2018)*, 258:424–26. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icream-18.2019.89>.
- Winarti, Eny. 2011. "School-Based Management : The Challenges of Its Implementation in Indonesia." *Orientasi Baru* 20, no. 1: 85–106.