

THE SOCIAL INTERACTIONAL PATTERN AMONG EDUCATIONAL BUREAUCRACY, EDUCATOR, AND SCHOOL COMMITTEE IN THE EDUCATIONAL CONDUCT IN MADIUN MUNICIPALITY, EAST JAVA, INDONESIA

PARJI

ABSTRACT: *A change in educational policy has resulted in changing of the old paradigm (centralization) to the new one (autonomy and democratization) in the educational conduct. Educational authority delegation towards the local authority is expected to encourage the local autonomy, which enable the public inclusion within the school programs development of intra-curricular, extra-curricular, and co-curricular constituents. This study tries to elaborate the educational conduct and the role of School Committee in Madiun Municipality, East Java, Indonesia that have not recently implemented the principles of school-based management. It makes the researcher feel interested in to observe the interaction pattern amongst the educational stakeholders. The objectives of this research are to identify the interaction pattern amongst the educational authority, school educational practitioners, and the School Committee board in conducting education and school matters. This research is served under qualitative approach by using the method of acquiring data of: (1) in-depth interview, (2) active-participatory observation, and (3) documentation. The data analysis is carried out by reflective methodology. The reflective method is applied by making use of grounded theory principles, offering the three steps coding procedure, i.e. open coding, axial coding, and selective coding. The research findings show that the interaction pattern amongst educational authority, educational practitioners, and the School Committee are varieties of communication flow which cannot reach the productive outcome.*

KEY WORDS: *Social interaction pattern, educational bureaucracy, educators, school committee, and principles of school-based management.*

INTRODUCTION

The development of educational policy in Indonesia has changed since the application of Regulation No.22 year 1999 about the Local Autonomy, which has now renewed by the Regulation No.32 year 2004 about the Local Government. A change in educational policy has resulted in changing of the old paradigm (centralization) to the new one (autonomy and democratization) in the educational

Dr. H. Parji is a Senior Lecturer at the Study Program of Civic Education, Faculty of Social Sciences Education IKIP PGRI (Institute of Education and Teacher Training, Teachers' Association of the Republic of Indonesia) Madiun, Jalan Dr. Setiabudhi No.85 Madiun, East Java, Indonesia. He can be reached at: parjiikipgri@rocketmail.com

conduct. Educational authority delegation towards the local authority is expected to encourage the local autonomy, which enable the public inclusion within the school programs development of intra-curricular, extra-curricular, and co-curricular constituents.

The need for the educational reform from centralization towards decentralization even proves important in line with the 21th century's global development. William J. Mathis rationally proposes that: (1) the change in the people mindset resulted from the democratization continually penetrates all life aspects, where schools are expected to fairly serve the people need, as they are the stakeholders; (2) the rapid changes of the worldwide business require schools to prepare students to face them; (3) the development of service and industrial sector will inevitably replace the human resource; (4) the decrease of life standard will be resulted from the running out of the natural resources; (5) the development of the global economic development goes on; (6) women will play more role by the extinction of the genre discrimination; (7) the religious doctrines will be more open; and (8) the role of mass media will be stringer (cited by Rosyada, 2004:10).

ON THE SOCIAL INTERACTION IN THE CONTEXT OF SCHOOL COMMITTEE

Under sociological perspectives, the change of educational paradigms from centralization towards decentralization belongs to social change. Himer and Moro proposed three dimensions of social change, i.e. structural, cultural, and interactional dimensions. Structural dimension refers to the societal structural change, ending up in role change, new role emergence, social class, and social institution change. Social change, in cultural dimension, refers to cultural shift, like discovery in knowledge, technology, and cultural interaction which results in diffusion and cultural borrowing. Social change, in interactional dimension, also refers to the change of social relationship which covers frequency, social distance, channel, rules or patterns, and construct of relationship (cited by Zainuddin, 2008).

The common form of social process is social interaction which becomes the main factor that brings in activities. Some other forms of social process are specific forms of social interaction. Social interaction has embodied in the form of dynamic social relationships covering those of individuals against the groups.

Theoretically, there have been at least two conditions for social interaction, namely: (1) social contact; and (2) communication (Syarbaini & Rusdyanto, 2009). Social contact is an effort for a physical and mental touch, primarily or secondarily and positively or negatively. The positive social contact will come to cooperation, while the negative one will end in misconducts or even relation cut-off.

Under the framework of the above conception, the inclusion of society in the school management is not only important but also be badly needed. This atmosphere springs the preconception of *democratic* School-Based Management or

Societal-Based School Management. In line with the educational decentralization, educational democracy, and inclusion of society in the policy making process encourage the inaction of the Decision of Minister of Education No.044/U/2002 dated on April 2, 2002 about Educational Assembly and School Committee.

The decision has become the follow-up by description of the legality of the School Committee under the Regulation No.20 year 2003 about National Educational System, especially verse 57(3) that the School Committee, as an independent body, established and has role in improving the service quality by giving consideration of reference and force support, facilities, and the requirement of educational supervision in educational unit level.

Empirically, the existence and role of the School Committee are ambiguously interpreted by the schools (headmasters, teachers, and students) and the stakeholders like parents, the board of school committee, etc. Accordingly, S. Faisal (2007:2) proposed that most of efforts for the societal participation in the management of SMP (*Sekolah Menengah Pertama* or Junior High School) are not effective yet as expected under the educational autonomy and democracy, where societal participation becomes the core for the SBM (*Sekolah Berbasis Masyarakat* or School-Based Community). The role of the School Committee in the school management has not performed in the areas of educational access, quality, and relevance. As a model of societal participation in the school management, School Committee and School Assembly have not yet performed their advisory, supervisory, mediatory, and support roles.

In Madiun Municipality, East Java, Indonesia, the existence and role of School Committee and School Assembly are still far beyond the school-based management principles. Schools, as educational institution, have not performed their autonomy in terms of human resource, finance, students' recruitment, and program development management. In term of students' recruitment, for example, the schools do not have their authority in deciding the criteria and system of recruitment.

Interaction and communication among the educational stakeholders are still very poor, which are shown through the educational policies which are not synchronically produced to serve the educational representatives, bureaucracy, and even society. For example, in the students' recruitment year 2009/2010, the local authority adds 3% of entry grade for teachers'-children candidates. Miscommunication and lack of coordination entail in problems among the stakeholders (Baharuddin, 2005).

The role and function of the Schools Committee are still focused on the school fund recruitment. Evidently, the School Committee perform just the way the BP3 (*Badan Pembiayaan dan Pembangunan Pendidikan* or Body of Education Development Fund) did; while the School Committee is expected to encourage the educational quality under four roles and functions, i.e. advisory, support, mediatory, and supervisory ones (Pantjastuti *et al.*, 2008)

Under the implementation of School-Based Management, different interpretations against the role and function of School Committee are evidently

found among the schools, School Committee, educational bureaucracy, and representatives. Obvious evidence shows when Student Enrolment Session is conducted every year. The local educational authority wants it is conducted in centralistic manner throughout the Municipality, while the schools hope to hold it respectively at the respective school for the sake of school autonomy.

So, this study tries to elaborate the pattern of social interaction among stakeholders in education, especially in conducting the education, in SMP (*Sekolah Menengah Pertama* or Junior High School) as well as SMA (*Sekolah Menengah Atas* or Senior High School) in Madiun, East Java, Indonesia.

METHOD

This research has used the qualitative approach. The sample is taken under purposive technique in terms of justifying the subjects and social situation in question that can supposedly give the accurate information about elements in observation. The subject is determined under *snowball sampling* technique. Three groups of sample are determined as follows: (1) groups of bureaucrat, covering Head of Educational Office in Municipality level; (2) groups of educational representatives, covering Headmaster, Vice Headmaster, Teacher Staff, and Students Board; (3) society representatives, covering Educational Assembly Board, School Committee, Parents, and Societal Characters.

The data are accumulated under participatory observation technique, in-depth interview, and relevant document overview. The analysis technique is done under A. Strauss and J. Corbin (1990) model with three steps: open coding, axial coding, and selective coding. Operationally, the strategy of data accumulation and analysis goes through the expected procedure coping with the following procedures: (1) Observation is held to obtain the social interactional pattern; (2) In-depth interview is conducted to get information about the societal response against the change of educational conduct in the first order understanding; and (3) On document overview is used to complete the information taken by interview and observation, for the credibility of the data.

The next step is to conduct broad constant comparative analysis to: (1) get conceptual and theoretical saturation for the data advancement; (2) perform the theoretical sampling under snow-ball model; and (3) apply negative case analysis to oppose the concepts drawn from the research field.

The theoretical development process refers to grounded theoretical invention being combined with the principles of double hermeneutics according to Giddens (cited by Baharuddin, 2005; and Faisal, 2007) under the following process: (1) identifying the role and function of School Committee; (2) indentifying the democratization of schools; (3) performing case study to find out the subjects' ideas on the School Committees under their respective typical nature; (4) searching for the interrelationship among cases, then to summarize the first-level interpretation to the concepts/category based on the society's understanding; and (5) formulating second

order understanding at the theoretical level, which becomes a “thesis” of theoretical invention on the meaning of change and rationalities of various sub-groups.

RESEARCH RESULT

The interaction pattern among educational bureaucracy, educational representatives, and School Committee as society representatives are critically developed within the “three-centered education” i.e. family, school, and society. Schools are not regarded as independent social institutions anymore, which should be viewed as integrated with society, locally, regionally, and even nationally. Education is not anymore regarded as inclusive which is conducted only by schools, rather than all of the three (schools, families and social environments) where students will develop themselves.

The interactional pattern among educational representatives, bureaucracy, and School Committee in Madiun Municipality, East Java, Indonesia is identified through the areas of planning, application, and evaluation of the educational management all around Madiun Municipality. The interaction can be seen through the organizational structure of educational bureaucracy of Madiun Municipality. Educational programs and policies have become the important parts of the existing interaction pattern.

In the planning stage, the Office of Education in Municipality level has not arranged the comprehensive educational planning; even priorities are still very weakly identified. It can be seen through the emergence of serious educational problems. The problems include the student enrolment system, the specific allocation fund management, educational quality development, and educational efficiency and relevance improvement.

Socialization process of the educational programs is also not well-performed, resulted from the lack of coordination between Office of Education, Schools, and School Committee in Municipality level. Through coordination, which includes all stakeholders such as educational bureaucrats, representatives, and School committee, has never be held. One of the most disgusting evidence is that the Educational Assembly did not work for the last 3 years, following the political content against the strategic policies, including establishment and empowerment of Educational Assembly (interview with the Head of Educational Assembly, 20/5/2009).

The interaction pattern between the educational bureaucracy and the educational representatives proves to be ill, even schools very often get ambiguous interpretations of the Office of Education’s policies. The communication paths made by the educational bureaucrats cannot effectively encourage the development of educational quality in Madiun Municipality. The following example is an evidence of ill-conduct of education in Madiun in the form of letter from MKKS (*Musyawah Kerja Kepala Sekolah* or Headmaster Working-Dialogue Forum) as the Headmaster of SMAN (*Sekolah Menengah Atas Negeri* or State Senior High

School) 3 in Madiun, No.61/UUI/MKKS/2009 dated on August 18, 2009 to the Major through the Head of the Office of PKPO (*Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Pemuda dan Olahraga* or Education, Culture, Youth and Sport) in Madiun Municipality. The letter stated as follows:

Herewith, we reported that conducting additional tasks as Headmaster, in this case as the Head of UPTD (*Unit Pelaksana Teknis Daerah* or Local Technical Caretaker Unit), we are required to decide fast, accurate, and correct way. Generally, we used reference of law and rules issued by the central government to decrease the probability of mistake in action (interview with Vice Headmaster of SMA, 18/8/2009).

The statement from the educational representative at school also shows that there are many substantial problems which can be held by the educational bureaucrats. It has appeared in the reality as follows:

As a Headmaster, I have not had a sufficient autonomy in conducting the school yet. In the matter of policy to improve the school quality, the support from PKPO (*Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Pemuda dan Olahraga* or Education, Culture, Youth and Sport) Agency at the Municipality level has not been optimal. Besides that, there are some obstacles to improve the school quality, namely law foundation that has not fully accommodated by Local Government yet (interview with Headmaster of SMA, 6/5/2009).

The relevant information is also given by the Vice Headmaster as follows:

To conduct School-Based Management integrally, we need a law umbrella, BHP (*Badan Hukum Pendidikan* or Education Law Body) for example, so that if there is not existing yet, school still has to depend on the decision of Educational Agency in Municipality level. There is an obstacle in improving the educational quality, namely bureaucracy which is rarely confusing (interview with Vice Headmaster, 19/5/2009).

Through the side of the educational bureaucracy, the local government – Local Government Secretary or the Office of Education in Municipality level, make use the bureaucratic pattern of interaction in their efforts of educational quality development. Even in the student recruitment session 2009/2010, serious problems arouse due to an ambiguous policy of the Major which provided 3% of score for teachers' children.

Field observation shows that communication and interaction pattern of the bureaucrats seems obviously arrogant, concealing themselves away from criticisms under the regulation, where power commands the process. In most meetings, the Secretary of the Local Government always proposes as follows:

We all should always obey the prevailed rules, especially related to budget, it should be transparent and can be accounted for. If we cannot adjust it, the Headmaster will be substituted (interview with SEKDA, 7/5/2009).

Meanwhile, the communication and interaction pattern between Schools and School Committee commonly runs well, formally as well as informally. In this

case, Vice Headmaster of SMA (*Sekolah Menengah Atas Negeri* or State Senior High School) in Madiun said as follows:

Recently, the relationship between School and the School Committee has been going smoothly, although its result has not been maximal yet. The School Committee should help to facilitate and give supervision and give fresh ideas to improve the school quality (interview with Vice Headmaster of SMA, 10/6/2009).

Furthermore, the Headmaster of SMAN (*Sekolah Menengah Atas Negeri* or State Senior High School) 3 in Madiun also proposes the same statement as follows:

In SMAN (*Sekolah Menengah Atas Negeri* or State Senior High School) 3 Madiun, the School Committee plays truly well just only as rubber-stamp men. We often hold coordination meeting if there is a problem needs shared-solving. So, till now, it has mutual-trust and mutual-respect process (interview with Vice Headmaster of SMAN 3, 3/6/2009).

The interaction between the educational bureaucracy and the School Committee or between the educational bureaucracy and the Educational Assembly has never met the demand. The intensive communication between the educational bureaucracy and the society has neither well-planned nor conducted. The only interaction attended by all constituents of the stakeholders is the general meeting. Unfortunately this forum is not usually made use of as medium of effective discussion on existing educational problems because the Head of the Office of Education in Municipality level, or person in charge, has usually passed down a very formal speech, then he drifted away from the forum before it discussed a thing (interview with Head of School Committee, 20/5/2009).

While the meeting has originally planned to hold the productive and effective interaction to discuss all existing educational problems, like programs content, policies, and strategies in coping with an educational development. There has not been any such meeting among educational bureaucracy, educational representatives, and the School Committee in spite of the essence to arrange educational programs in synergy.

DISCUSSION

The role of educational bureaucracy, educational representatives, and School Committee is undoubtedly important in developing the educational quality. Developing the school education and educational institution in common needs coordination, synchronization, and deep understanding against the direction and goal of education.

Evidently, the interaction pattern among educational representatives, bureaucracy, and School Committee in Madiun Municipality level is not well-managed, where each constituent gets on its own way. Educational bureaucracy still regards schools as a part of the bureaucracy (local technical support unit). It entails the restriction against the schools' autonomy in the area of funding, educational cooperation, and human resource recruitment to fit the need of qualification.

The relationship between the School Committee, on behalf of the society, and the school has already well-established; but the quality of the interaction needs to be developed, which is still limited in the discussion of the school budget. Outcome of the discussion about the school budget, they do not have broader opportunity to discuss the school program development.

In this context, Suyatno suggests that the quality of education at schools and local area should become the concern of both, the government and society (cited by Pantjastuti *et al.*, 2008). The quality of education in the future depends very much on local government commitment, including parents and society. The statement fits to the preconception of Bruce Joyce that the central role of the school education is to prepare the citizen to build democratic attitude, personally, and socially; and to ensure the establishment of the democratic and productive social structure (cited by Rosyada, 2004:31).

The interaction pattern among the educational representatives, bureaucracy, and School Committee board is spawned by the perception of each constituent towards the others. As it is suggested by D. Mulyana (2007:179) that *perception* is termed as an internal process which enables anyone to choose, organize, and interpret stimuli from the surrounding; and it affects the environment. Furthermore, K.K. Sereno, E.M. Bodaken and P.E. Nelson (in Mulyana, 2007:180) assure also that perception includes three activities, i.e. selection, organization, and interpretation. Selection covers sensation and attention; while organization attaches strictly to interpretation which can be defined as putting stimuli together to make meaningful unity.

The research also shows that the educational bureaucracy tends to conceal the decision making process in regard to the public affairs like students recruitment, the process of budget allocation, and the promotion on the strategic positions in and around the Educational Office in Municipality level. Neither the public representatives, the Educational Assembly nor even the School Committee are included within any discussion to solve the educational problems which eventually take place around the community. The unwillingness of the educational bureaucracy to include all of the societal constituents in such discussions has become contra-productive evidence against the quality development of the educational services which meet the society's demands.

In regard to the inclusion of the societal constituents in the educational conducts, Duhou suggests the arguments as showed below:

First, schools are actually packed to serve the needs of the societal constituents like the government, educational experts, parents, students, and the society which expect for the benefits of schools education. That's why it becomes very natural when they are all included into the development of schools through discussions and ideas to bring about decisions for the sake of the students' development at those schools.

Second, educational reform is set in such a way to serve the democratic educational conduct by broadening the inclusion of the societal constituents within the process of decision making. Schools, then, become more accommodative against

the societal aspirations, where in return they can obtain the positive supports from the society, including societal responsibility against the education matters because they feel that it is needed and included in the educational development.

And finally, *third*, the more grounded the educational management is launched and the broader society is included in it, the more sufficient support the schools can obtain from the society. This will encourage the rapid development of the school education, where more educational activities can be funded by the society. In line with this process, the school management will become more controllable under broader constituents, because those constituents will require the managerial accountability and efficiency of the school (cited by Rosyada, 2007:273).

The educational bureaucracy should have realized that the societal participation has actually become the key to the success of the educational autonomy. Societal participation is basically termed as the inclusion of the society (other constituents) within the planning, executing, benefiting, and supervising the school programs. The implication of the above opinion is that by the inclusion of “other” constituents within the school management will enable them to recognize and understand the school problems, so as to search for alternative resolutions, to make decision, to solve existing educational problems, and to be responsible against the educational development.

Further, A. Ahmadi (2004:80) has also suggested that participation means that the decision maker includes a group or society in gathering opinions, aids, skills, goods, and services. Dhaha also said that participation is a form of inclusion of a constituent in an activity, mentally and emotionally, to serve establishment of decision on one thing and to account for it (cited by Ahmadi, 2004:81).

In regard to the function of manager or educational structural chairman in terms of gathering the societal participation needs special conditions, as follows: (1) Enabling the societal confidence that they have resources such as chance, fund, opinion, etc. to support the school to pursue its objectives; (2) Facilitating the exchange of information by paying attention on what is urgently needed for the school program development; (3) Consulting against some related constituents opaquely to utilize the resources; (4) Collaborating against the related constituents in making needed changes; and (5) Monitoring and giving model for the healthy communication (Ahmadi, 2004; and Rosyada, 2007).

The results of this research show that interaction among the educational representatives, bureaucracy, and the School Committee is still far beyond the rigidity under the collective spirit to build the democratic school management. The Educational Office in Municipality level is to blame for the lack of the healthy interaction among the educational stakeholders, because it has the sufficient infrastructure, human resource, and also fund.

Actually, S. Danim (2006:185) suggests that Educational Office should ideally shift its function from giving command to coordinating and facilitating the school operation. The responsibilities of the Educational Office are summarized as follows: (1) Putting the high educational threshold level, which is relevant under the

interdisciplinary perspectives; (2) Performing good leadership which promotes the students achievement and threshold level; (3) Designing the strategic objectives to develop the students achievement; (4) Showing the visionary, reflective, consistent, and focused leadership; (5) Becoming model for the establishment of creativity, diversity, security, and mutual understanding within the educational process; (6) Establishing initiatives to broaden the societal support for the school development; (7) Supporting and facilitating continuous renewal of all staff; (8) Ensuring the accountability of the school autonomy; (9) Establishing network to develop students achievement; (10) Listening and communicating to schools and society; (11) Performing optimal service orientation; (12) Providing the infrastructure to support the school operation; and (13) Ensuring the stakeholders to build the healthy organization so as to produce “good” schools.

S. Danim (2006:186) finally ensures that the effective and efficient educational management is shown through the sufficient achievement of the graduates as the core of the School-Based Management. The schools, government, and society should continually establish the effective dynamics to pursue the schools objectives. Success is not a status, and excellence is not the objectives. The main point is how to make use of the feedbacks to constantly develop the education.

Based on the result of the research, the lack of warm interaction among the educational constituents is mainly due to the different understanding and the meaning assigned on the educational conduct and School Committee. The attitude, organizational structure, and interests have also influenced the distortion. Hence, J. Murphy (1992) and D.F. Walker and J.F. Soltis (1997) commented that educational reform copes with all educational constituents. Further, for Indonesian context, Rohiat proposes as follows:

The logical consequence and change of educational performance, which is from old management style (centralistic) to new management style (de-centralistic), is the task and function of bureaucracy officials to also be changed. The mindset of old management emphasizes more on subordination, direction, organizing, controlling, and one-man show in deciding a decision should be left and changed into the new mindset of new management that emphasizes more on autonomy giving, facilities provision, motivation growth at school, aids giving, and participative decision making (Rohiat, 2008:77).

Further, S. Faisal (2007:6) also comments that the inclusion of society in the educational management requires willingness of the society to devote themselves in the educational development, because the success of societal movement depends very much on the societal mission and vision. According to the result of the research, the headmasters play the dominant roles in establishing the interaction of stakeholders. It means that headmasters own are the strategic position in assisting the success of the School-Based Management.

Besides, David suggests that Headmaster in the School-Based Management has to be able to: (1) Administrators, school boards, teaches unions, teachers, parents, and communities working together to improve teaching and learning; (2) An improved teaching and learning environment throughout the school and improve

student achievement as measured in a variety of ways; (3) Realistic budgeting and alignment of financial and instructional resources as well as time with instructional goals; and (4) Renewed sense of school ownership and accountability among staff, teachers, students, parents, and the community (cited by Danim, 2006:196).

More specifically, S. Danim (2006:211) ensures that Headmaster must be elected out of teacher staff with qualifications as follows: experienced, skillful, and competent. Other qualifications cover strong leadership, cooperative with the Vice Headmaster, and other staff. They will be possibly elected as the School Committee together with other constituents like: teachers, societal characters, NGOs (Non-Governmental Organizations) of educational proponent, alumni, students, business entities, experts, and other relevant constituents. Organizationally, the Headmaster will lead the school, including designing school strategies and objectives, planning, executing, supervising, and evaluating the school programs.

Headmaster should also be able to establish healthy communication with all educational constituents, to manage the resources, to cooperate with parents, to produce effective working policies and practices, and to develop the students' achievement. While he/she is working operationally with the educational representatives, the Headmaster should also establish the synergic relationship with the Educational Office, Local Government, and other stakeholders.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

The interaction pattern among the educational representatives, bureaucracy, and School Committee has not yet establish the effective communication which covers substantial dimation of it. The educational bureaucracy tends to make use of one-way interaction that functions as the most powerful constituent. Even the school budget must be approved by the Office of Education, Culture, and Sport in the regional level. They have not yet establish the warm two-way interaction either.

The existing interaction pattern among schools, School Committee, and parents has not either made productive result. Such a meeting is only conducted in the beginning of the academic yaer when they are involved in the approval of the school budget. The communication between the School Committee and schools is till also very limited, even internally the communication among the School Committee's board does not effective except being facilitated by the school.

In spite of the application of the School-Based Management, the communication among the educational representatives and the educational bureaucracy is still very rare, even that of educational bureaucracy and society. The Educational Office in Municipality level is still exclusive with its power to determine the human resource management. Although schools are given opportunity to propose their staff promotion, but the process of promotion, mutation, and Headmaster selection belong to the Educational Office in Municipality level, excluding the schools proposal.

The ineffectiveness of the integrated social interaction among the educational representatives, bureaucracy, and School Committee is also affected by the misperception against the understanding and the meaning assigned on the School-Based Management and School Committee. The interview results in conclusion that the educational bureaucracy is still exclusive in decision making process.

The effective pattern of social interaction among the educational representatives, bureaucracy, and School Committee is still far beyond the expected result. This result is also spawned by the absence of societal empowerment programs within the framework of Educational Assembly and School Committee. To pursue the effective interaction among the educational constituents, it needs willingness of all of them to develop the quality of education.

Based on the above conclusion, this research report proposes suggestions as follows: (1) the institutional pattern of interaction, coordination, and communication among the educational representatives, bureaucrats, and School Committee is urgently needed; (2) the dissemination of new paradigms and mindsets should be constantly done in relation to the application of local authorization of education in the form of the School-Based Management, promoting the broad autonomy, participative decision making process, and educational quality development; and (3) this requires a forum which can facilitate the educational stakeholders to have effective discussion, meaningful interaction and communication, and comprehensive policy.

REFERENCES

- Ahmadi, A. (2004). *Sosiologi Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Baharuddin, M. (2005). "Pendidikan pada Era Desentralisasi dalam Perspektif Sosiologis". *Unpublished Dr. Dissertation*. Malang, East Java, Indonesia: Post-Graduate Program UM [Universitas Merdeka].
- Danim, S. (2006). *Visi Baru Manajemen Sekolah*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Faisal, S. (2007). *Partisipasi Masyarakat terhadap Sekolah*. Malang, Indonesia: UM [Universitas Negeri Malang] Press.
- Interview with Headmaster of SMA (*Sekolah Menengah Atas* or Senior High School) in Madiun, East Java, Indonesia: 6 May 2009.
- Interview with SEKDA (*Sekretaris Daerah* or Secretary of Local Government) in Madiun, East Java, Indonesia: 7 May 2009.
- Interview with Vice Headmaster of SMA (*Sekolah Menengah Atas* or Senior High School) in Madiun, East Java, Indonesia: 19 May 2009.
- Interview with the Head of Educational Assembly in Madiun, East Java, Indonesia: 20 May 2009.
- Interview with Head of School Committee in Madiun, East Java, Indonesia: 20 May 2009.
- Interview with Vice Headmaster of SMAN (*Sekolah Menengah Atas Negeri* or State Senior High School) 3 in Madiun, East Java, Indonesia: 3 June 2009.
- Interview with Vice Headmaster of SMA (*Sekolah Menengah Atas* or Senior High School) in Madiun, East Java, Indonesia: 10 June 2009.

- Interview with Vice Headmaster of SMA (*Sekolah Menengah Atas* or Senior High School) in Madiun, East Java, Indonesia: 18 August 2009.
- Mulyana, D. (2007). *Ilmu Komunikasi: Suatu Pengantar*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Murphy, J. (1992). "Restructuring America's School: An Overview" in C.E. Fin & T. Rebarber [eds]. *Education Reform the '90s*. New York: Mc Millan Publising Company.
- Pantjastuti, S.R. *et al.* (2008). *Komite Sekolah: Sejarah dan Prospeknya di Masa Depan*. Yogyakarta: Hikayat Publishing.
- Rohiat. (2008). *Manajemen Sekolah: Teori Dasar dan Praktek*. Bandung: Refika Aditama.
- Rosyada, D. (2004). *Paradigma Pendidikan Demokratis*. Jakarta: Prenada Media.
- Strauss, A. & J. Corbin. (1990). *Basic of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory, Procedures, and Techniques*. London and New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Syarbaini, S. & Rusdyanto. (2009). *Dasar-dasar Sosiologi*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Walker, D.F. & J.F. Soltis. (1997). *Curriculum and Aims*. New York, USA: Teacher College Press.
- Zainuddin, M. (2008). *Reformasi Pendidikan: Kritik Kurikulum dan Manajemen Berbasis Sekolah*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.



A change in educational policy has resulted in changing of the old paradigm (centralization) to the new one (autonomy and democratization) in the educational conduct. Educational authority delegation towards the local authority is expected to encourage the local autonomy, which enable the public inclusion within the school programs development of intra-curricular, extra-curricular, and co-curricular constituents.