

---

# INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF MOSLEM SOCIETY

ISSN 2622-5840, Volume 1, 2016, Pages 24-35

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24090/icms.2016.1823>

## Proceeding on International Conference on Economics, Education and Cultural Development of Moslem Society in ASEAN

---

### Comparing The Principalship of Madrasah and Sekolah in The Decentralization Era

Saefudin A. Syafi'i

State Institute on Islamic Studies Purwokerto, Indonesia

[saef.syafii@gmail.com](mailto:saef.syafii@gmail.com)

---

**Abstract:** The downfall of the New Order Regime in 1998 brought about significant change to Indonesia's public sector. Law number 22 of 1999, further refined by Law 32 of 2004, provide legal bases for district governments to administer the public sector. The central government also introduces the notion of good governance through the promulgation of various regulations. For Madrasah however, decentralization policy failed to provide clear legal bases as to how it relates to district government. Law 32 of 2004 verse 10 article 3 retains the centralized management by the Ministry of Religious Affairs. This however does not exclude Madrasah from public demand of implementing the principle of good governance. This study analyses the dynamics of principal-ship both in the Sekolah and the Madrasah in the era of decentralization. By comparing two research sites, this study sought to create better understanding about the context by which the organization climate of two different schools are shaped, and how principals and teachers perceives the notion of school leadership in the light of most recent policy development. To do this, interviews were undertaken and questionnaire-based data collection was also conducted. The study found that in the ground level implementation of decentralization policy, Sekolah developed more rigorous leadership compared to that in the Madrasah. This research recommends the adoption of stronger regulation regarding principal-ship of Madrasahs in order to create an environment that is more in tune with the spirit of public service reforms.

**Keywords:** *education leadership, decentralization, principal, madrasah, indonesia*

---

#### A. INTRODUCTION

Post Soeharto governments have to deal with serious challenge in developing the nation's human resources. In time when acute poverty is hard to alleviate, lower Human Development Index dominate, and informal sector characterizes the Indonesian workforce, and multidimensional crises prosper due to the failure of education practices to foster social harmony and human character, it's highly imperative to improve the professional capacity of teachers, and school leadership through various policy development (OECD/Asian Development Bank, 2015).

#### B. THE DECENTRALISATION POLICY

The legacy of the New Order government in improving population health, increased life expectancy, reduced adult illiteracy, and improved access to education, and the attainment of 6 years compulsory education, came close to nothing when in reality the education has not yet served the local need and aspiration, performance management has yet to be seen, and capacity to plan, implement, and monitor education reform to improve quality are still to be built. Various Laws and regulation are produced in the context of decentralization and democratization endeavors aimed at ensuring penetration of national policy, promoting administrative capacity of local government in

dealing with education problem, improving efficiently and effectiveness, and nurturing a more innovative and responsive government, and promoting wider public participation in policy making. One of many determining factors of the success or failure of decentralization is on school leadership.

The regulatory package produced by the central government which devolve authority in education management to lower tiers of government, covering wide areas from the allocation of resources to curriculum development in the framework of national education policy, and especially on human resources have made principalship in Indonesia more dynamic and challenging. Since the promulgation of Law 20 of 1999, the newly gained authority to manage teachers have not yet been used in accordance with the principle of good governance. Many defect in the abuse of authority have prompted central government to impose government regulation number 4 of 2005 about teacher and lecturer, and Minister of National Education Decree number 28 of 2010 about appointment of teachers as school principal and also about standard of principal. These have become key determinant factors of the challenge and opportunity of principalship in Indonesia.

### **C. PRINCIPALSHIP OF SEKOLAH AND MADRASAH**

#### 1. Principalship in International Perspective

The task and role of school principals in the globalization era has become more and more complicated (Habegger, 2008). Principals' job is now multitasking covering education aspects that are both tangible and intangible. Principals are now demanded to play a role much more than just a manager or administrator. They are required to function as leaders, who shape a vision of academic success for all students, create a conducive learning environment, nurture leadership in their followers/teachers and staff, and improve the instructional quality. The most challenging one is to manage people, processes and physical and non physical aspect of school improvement (The Wallace Foundation, 2013). The ultimate challenge in this respect is how to nurture a positive school culture (Habegger, 2008). Furthermore, school principals are also expected to play the

role as change agents in the context of the successful educational reform agenda at school level. Research shows that principals with strong leadership capacity have a multitude of positive effects (New Leaders, 2013).

Different countries develop a policy framework to produce high quality school leaders via various means. The US under Obama administration's Race to the Top competition launched state-based reforms that call for tighter principal evaluation and more rigorous training and state licensure standard (DeArmond, 2014). Whilst government of Singapore opened a new initiative called the Leaders in Education Program (LEP). This program was developed on the basic assumption that the old educational leadership concept emphasizing conformity was no longer viable with the new condition of the Singaporean competitiveness demand which requires a paradigm shift in school leadership from competency based to complexity based (Seong, 2007). Similarly, Taiwan also has a very competitive mechanism in the selection, preparation of school principals (Vogel, 2015).

However, the educational improvement agenda, which are translated into agendas like the creation of effective schools, the enhancement of good quality teaching and learning process, could not be implemented only on the basis of state initiated policy. There are a number of factors that have to be taken into account if government does really want to create effective and good quality schools. School as an organization is multifaceted, there are organizational culture, school climate, the relationship between teachers and principal, the development and implementation of principle of good governance.

In relation to decentralization, scholars view school site as an area of conflict for control over jurisdiction between school administrators and teachers as line professional. The conflicts stem from two differing assumption hold by two different interested parties namely school administrators and teachers. School administrators as bureaucrat tend to assume responsiveness, consistency, and efficiency as

very important values that should be implemented by creating certainty and predictability via tight mechanism, rules and written procedure. On the other hand, teachers are much concerned with practical day-to-day school problems and needs. Teachers also hold a belief that bureaucratic mechanism is often an infringement of professional autonomy. Teachers should be given freedom to exercise their professional judgement to make decisions about various school problems and needs (Harison, 1998).

Potential conflicts in a school could partly be controlled by the application of the principles of good governance, for example participatory decision-making could channel the possible clash over teacher assignment. What is very important is how a school could build trust relationship between teachers, and between teacher and principal. The US Department of Education's Comprehensive School Reform Program (CSR), for example, emphasizes that if improvement efforts are to be successful, a school must first have a strong foundation for school-wide reform. Such foundations are characterized by trust among school members, collegial relationship, and shared vision for change. Furthermore, trust could only develop when each party of the overall school members fulfill each party's duty and obligation (Brewster, C. and Railsback, J., 2003). In order for trust to develop in a school there must a mutual fulfillment of obligation by all involved parties. In addition, expectation is not only about the fulfillment of obligation but also expectation about the capabilities to carry out their tasks and duties of all school members. Interpersonal relationship between principal and teachers in turn influence school professional attitude that define the school climate (Price, 2012).

As persons in charge of all school affairs, principals are required to have the ability to influence others, to work effectively in influencing teachers and school staff, to attain the common objective of school and to make the school vision a reality. To sum up, leadership capacity of principals is of paramount importance. School leadership differs with corporate or industrial leadership because school leadership concerns people

who are engaging with each other. Heller and Pautler (1990) state that there are obvious differences between managerial leadership and instructional leadership. They argue that the tension created by two opposing issue of teacher empowerment and the need to hold instructional leadership lead to a question as to what should the selection of principal be based on. (Heller, R.W. and Pautler, A.J., 1990). It is relevant here to underline Leithwood's (1999) meta analysis on school leadership that are categorized into six models, namely: instructional, managerial, transformational, moral, participative, and contingent leadership (Leithwood, 1999).

Instructional leadership concerns with the capacity to affect the growth of students. Hallinger (2012) further propose the instructional management framework, consisting three leadership tasks namely defining the school mission, managing the instructional program, and creating positive school climate (Hallinger, 2012).

Managerial leadership concerns with functions, tasks, and behavior, the proper delivery of which would result in the proper functioning of the school as the place for teaching and learning. Meyer and Murphy (1995) state that managerial leadership stipulates six organizational control mechanisms (Myers, E. and Murphy, J., 1995).

Transformational leadership moves beyond what the leader and the led get what they expect to. This leadership put emphasis more on commitment and capacities of school members to meet the desired goal. In contrast with transactional leadership which focus on extrinsic motives and needs of followers, transformative leadership rely more on the beliefs that higher order of needs such as the accomplishment of duty and obligation are more genuine and authentic as bases for organizational involvement. In order to achieve this, principals should be able to: 'reach the soul of others in fashion which raises human consciousness, build meanings and inspire human intent that is the source of power' (Dillard, 1995, quoted by Leithwood (Leithwood, 1999).

## 2. Principalship in Indonesia

Principals as well as government teachers (*guru PNS*) as civil servants were subject to Law number 8 of 1974 about the main point of civil service and its pertinent government regulation (*PP*) number 10 of 1979 regarding civil servant. Often what was implemented in ground level was not paralleled with what were written in the regulations due to political interests of the ruling regime. As indicated, civil servants were fully controlled by central government. During the New Order government principals were cadre of the ruling *Golongan Karya* Party with the main mission as vote getter in their neighboring environment. As a consequence, principalship during this era was political rather than educational matter. When it comes to promotion, recruitment, appointment and evaluation, and even with the matter of leadership competencies, they were always based solely on political consideration. Appointment were very dominantly characterized by closeness and loyalty to the party leaders in various level.

The launching of Law 20 of 2003 about national education system, *Undang-Undang Guru dan Dosen*, Law 14 of 2005 on teacher and university lecturer, Law 19 of 2005 about national education standard, are bases for education reform through legal approach. For the first time in history, the Parliament also requires the government to allocate at least 20 percent of annual state budget for education, and this requirement applies not only to central but also provincial and district government. In the human resource management, the promulgation of government regulation 74 of 2008 on teachers, and Ministerial Decree number 13 of 2007 about the standard for school principal were a response to the negative impacts of local autonomy in which many teachers and principals were abused by incumbent district government. This practices in early reformation era, between 2000 up to 2005 led the central government to produce these two regulations. The central government also established a new unit (*Satuan Kerja/Satker*) under MoEC with the main mission to provide pre-service and in-service training of school principals. This unit is named *Pusat Pelatihan*

dan Pemberdayaan Kepala Sekolah (P3KS) or the Centre for School Principal Training and Empowerment.

## 3. Principalship in the *Sekolah*

At the time being, there are two regulations produced by the central government in addition to district/mayoral regulation that legalize and control the standard and procedures of recruitment of school principals. MoEC decree number 13 of 2007 stipulate the qualification standard, in which two different qualifications standards are mentioned, the general ones: education background, age, professional experience, and grade of civil servant. The second qualification standard stipulated in this decree is about the status as teacher of pertinent school (for principal of Junior High School (*SMP*), the candidate must be a teacher of *SMP*), should have a teacher certificate issued by *Lembaga Pendidikan Tenaga Kependidikan/LPTK* or government unit that train educational personel. Lastly, a candidate of *Kepala Sekolah* should also have a certificate of *Kepala Sekolah* issued by P3KS. Decree number 13 of 2007 released by MoEC also set up standard of competencies of *Kepala Sekolah*, divided into 5 dimensions, namely personality-related competency (*kompetensi kepribadian*), managerial, entrepreneurial, supervisory, and social competency. This decree is further technically regulated by the National Education Ministry, namely by issuing decree number 28 of 2010. This decree moves further to stipulate the new requirement namely the preparation, the process of recruitment, tenure, professional development, performance evaluation, and transfer and discontinuation. In addition, every district/mayoral government have another *Perbup* or regulation of Bupati upon the assignment of civil servant as school principal applied in relevant District.

Local government, after conducting a test and sending candidate for education and training in P3KS, would make a list of principal candidate for each level of school (primary school/SD, junior secondary school/SMP, senior secondary school/SMA, and vocational school/SMK) (Marwoto, 2016). This list would be published for transparency and accountability purposes. When a school

needs a new principal, *Bupati* would appoint and assign one of the candidates according to the available list. The regulation of *Bupati* also determines a specified term of office (tenure) for four years each. Only principal who pass the yearly and end of term *Penilaian Kinerja Kepala Sekolah (PKKS)* or school principal performance evaluation who will be eligible for another term of office, with minimum score of B (Good). And the third term could only be possible for principal that have achieved grade A (Excellent), or have made extraordinary achievement at least in district, province or national level (*Perbup 33 of 2005 and 4 of 2014*).

PKKS are mandatory for every principal of public school and is carried out regularly every year, and every four years at the end of tenure. The performance evaluation is conducted by *Dinas Pendidikan Kabupaten* using survey instrument in every school level (primary, junior and senior secondary level). The results of PKKS are categorized into four grade from the highest as follows: *Amat Baik* (Excellent), *Baik* (Good), *Cukup* (Adequate), and *Kurang* (Mediocre).

#### 4. Principalship in *Madrasah*

The story for *Kepala Madrasah* is quite different. Indeed, MORA Central Office launched Decree E.101 of 2001 aimed at reforming the way *Madrasah* principals were promoted. But after the rejection by provincial offices and incumbent principals, the Directorate General of Islamic Institution of MORA abrogated the Decree and the *Madrasah* principalship is back to the pre-reform era, meaning there is no new regulatory frameworks until 2014 when Ministerial Decree number 29 of 2014 is declared. However, for incumbent principals this decree has not yet been active because incumbent principals are given three years to continue their tenure. In addition, there is also no routine and pre-programmed comprehensive evaluation for *Madrasah* principals. What is new is the installment of *Komite Madrasah* which tasks and duties are similarly equal with *Komite Sekolah*, being as supporting, mediatory, supportive, and advisory agencies to *Madrasahs*. Under such circumstances, it is understandable if the

*Madrasah* leadership is less dynamic, vigorous and even often rife with internal conflicts between teachers and principals.

#### D. CASE STUDY

##### 1. Research Methods

This research combines two approaches namely data collection using a questionnaire and interviews with principals and teachers. The questionnaire comprises 19 items developed from four aspect of school leadership dimensions namely strategic leadership (4 items), instructional leadership (4 items), managerial/administrative leadership (5 items), and human resource development leadership (6 items). Each respondent was asked to give a score, 20 at the lowest and 70 at the highest for each questionnaire item, the instruction about how to answer the questionnaire was written at the top of the page. Interviews were conducted to solicit more about important issues found in the questionnaire.

##### 2. Research Sites

The research sites for this project were a *Sekolah Menengah Atas/SMA* (State Senior High School) under the control of Banyumas District Government, and a *Madrasah Aliyah Negeri/MAN* (State Senior Secondary Madrasah) under the control of MoRA Provincial Office of Central Java, which was located in the same District. The SMA was one among 34 SMAs in Banyumas District and one among 13 state-run SMAs, whilst the MAN was one among 3 State run MA and one among 18 MA in Banyumas District.

The Office of Education of Banyumas District has to look after 1.068 schools, consisting of 34 SMAs, 69 Vocational Schools (SMK), 147 Junior Secondary Schools (SMP) and 818 Primary Schools. Under that school figure, the Office has to manage 14.706 teachers who teach 259.193 pupils (BPS Kab Banyumas, 2015). This is indeed a very challenging job for an Office with the number of staff less than 100 people. The job of the Office of MoRA Central Java Province is even more challenging because it has to look after 10.223 Islamic schools (*Madrasahs*), among them 526 MAs, both private and public (only 63 MANs or 11.90 percent) (Ministry of Religious Affairs, 2014).

Table 1  
Comparing the Schools Site

Name Schools	Number of Students	Number of Govt. Teachers	Number of Non Govt. Teachers	Number of Staff
SMA Kota Banyumas	1057	74	13	23
MAN Banyumas	1281	46	6	15

### 3. Research participants

Two principals took part in this study, one is a senior principal of SMA Banyumas and another one is a senior principal of MAN Banyumas. Thirty questionnaires were distributed to teachers of SMA and another thirty were also given to teachers of MA. From thirty, 22 questionnaires from SMA teachers and 20 questionnaires from MAN teachers

were returned. All questionnaires were then tabulated and put in table for analysis.

### 4. Presentation of the Study

#### a. Questionnaire Based Data Analysis

Comparing how the MAN principal and the SMAN principal scored themselves is very interesting. Both principals gave equally similar score on four dimensions of leadership. The following table shows the score of both principals:

Table 2  
Self Evaluation Score of Principals

No	Participant	Strategic Leadership	Instructional Leadership	Managerial Leadership	Human Resource Leadership	Average Score
1	SMAN Principals	56	62	64	60	60.5
2	MAN Principal	62	65	62	56	61.25

The above table shows that both principal of SMAN and principal of MAN being surveyed have almost equal self-evaluation score on four dimensions of leadership. Having been serving in four different schools, ultimately gave them rich experience as educational leaders who have managed to cope with different types of personality, education, social and religious affiliation, of so many teachers under their supervision. Both

principals have equal degree of self-confidence as school leaders, succeeded in managing four schools, and indeed there has been an amount of job satisfaction of both. The comparison shows a more interesting finding when teachers came to evaluate their superior. Table 3 below shows the tabulation results of the evaluation by teachers of SMAN upon their principal.

Table 3  
Score of Principal Self Evaluation and Teacher Evaluation  
Toward Principal of SMA

No	Participant	Strategic Leadership	Instructional Leadership	Managerial Leadership	Human Resource Leadership	Average Score
1	SMAN Principals	56	62	64	60	60.5
2	SMAN Teachers	55	59	63	57	58.5

It's interesting to note here that the average score of evaluation on four leadership dimensions given by teachers of SMA to their principal, is all some point lower. All score

given by teachers are lower than the score of the principal's self-evaluation measure. The evaluation gap is as follows: 1 point lower, 3 lower, 1 lower, 3 lower for strategic,

instructional, managerial, and human resource leadership capacity respectively.

The score given by teachers of MAN Porto to their principal, Mr Ali are also lower, but it's

quite interesting that the gap is much wider in all leadership capacity evaluated by teachers as the following table shows:

Table 4  
Score of Principal Self Evaluation and Teacher Evaluation  
Toward Principal of MAN

No	Participant	Strategic Leadership	Instructional Leadership	Managerial Leadership	Human Resource Leadership	Average Score
1	MAN Principal	62	65	62	56	61.25
2	MAN Teachers	35	33	37	30	33.75

The evaluation gap is as follows: 27 point lower, 32 lower, 25 lower, and 26 lower for strategic, instructional, managerial, and human resource leadership capacity respectively. This is a strong indication that teachers have a high degree of dissatisfaction. Perhaps, Mr Ali, as the following presentation of interviews with teachers show, has not yet been rigorous enough in dealing with various issues in day-to-day life of the Madrasahs. The following presentation of the interview data reflects the dynamic of relation between principal and teachers.

#### b. Interview Based data Analysis

Interviews conducted with principals of both SMA and MAN showed a high degree of disillusionment, proposal for decree renewal, and an attitude against centralization among Madrasah teachers, and a number of critique to decentralization practices by SMA teachers. The interview with two principals were further continued and enriched with interview with 5 teachers of SMA and 5 teachers of MAN.

##### 1) Principal and teachers of SMA

Mr Edy argued that the authority of *Bupati* was too strong and there was no control by local house in the matter of principalship. Yearly performance test is too short and too often. The performance evaluation has made principals too busy with testing, and preventing them to think other more strategic issues (Edy, 2016). He also criticized the appointment of the Head of District Education Office of a person who did not have experience in educational field. For him, professionalism currently echoed by politician and district government leaders

should not only for teachers and principals but also for all educational officers in the district (Edy, 2016). The appointment of District Head of Educational Office without seriously considering the educational and professional background was a serious infringement of the principle of good governance by District Head. 'How can you trust such a government?', he protested (Edy, 2016).

Mr Edy also highlighted the misleading interpretation of professionalism of teacher and principal, which was seen in the wrong way. He said that the public always considers professionalism from the point of view of student achievement in National Examination (NE) and the proportion of students continuing to universities. 'We know 99 percent of students of SMA X are taking extra courses from local Bimbingan Test, I dare to swear,..' (Edy, 2016). He considered the result of NE and continuation to university education could not be used to judge the school performance because there was a factor of Bimbingan Test (examination courses available everywhere now).

Teachers of SMA being interviewed have a positive response to the tight regulation regarding principalship of Sekolah in the District. Almost all interviewee argue that the selection, promotion, and appointment of principals have applied principle of justice. Only qualified teachers could apply in the competition. Teachers with no qualifications and competencies would not dare to take part in test. They believe that this mechanism is much better. The regulation is able to: absorb potential conflicts in school, prevent clash

between teachers, or between teacher organizations, and more importantly produce best and most capable candidates.

Regarding mandatory annual performance test for principal, they argued that it has been designed to control and to guarantee the implementation of effective leadership in all area of school management. A teacher cynically said,: 'If you don't want to be evaluated annually by your supervisor, just be a teacher, it's more relax'. (Jarot, 2016). Without performance evaluation, a principal would not produce annual program, conduct teaching supervision, meet with Komite Sekolah, hold monthly evaluation meeting with teachers, and preparing students for National Examination. This system is intended to create a certain type of school culture, characterized by a constricted discipline, regularity of time use, and a high degree of certainty and predictability as implementation of modern institutional management.

When asked whether their principal performed well in their eye, most teachers answered that the principal need to improve the teaching-learning supervision, have sufficiently provided teachers with learning-related consultation, and have built productive communication with teachers, but they were not sure whether principal had carried out transparent and accountable administration. One teacher said that the principal needed to provide time for direct student-principal communication, in order for students to develop a feeling of being paid enough attention from the principal. In general teachers have positive attitude toward Mr Edy.

## 2) Principal and teachers of MAN

Interview with principal and teachers of MAN Banyumas resulted in different argumentation and logic. All interviewee had been familiar with the decentralization policy of the central government, with the principle of good governance and also with concept of school-based management.

The principal of MAN did not agree if Madrasah to be decentralized and given to district government. The main argument was that if Madrasahs were given to district, no one could guarantee the preservation of

Islamic character of the Madrasah curriculum and also Madrasah culture. He also argued that decentralization would not automatically provide Madrasah with more funds due to limited District budget, would not guarantee teachers to receive in service training or professional development. He also mentioned that Madrasah had been asset of the Muslim *ummah*, it should not be given to other side, especially if there was no guarantee of their religious (Islamic) commitment (Ali, 2016). He also mentioned that decentralization also produced local corruption, local hegemony by political parties, and also local corruptors, which he argued could be harmful for education sector.

However, teachers disclosed opposite argument. For them, Madrasah would be much better under the district government to guarantee the provision of regular supervision, whether mid-term or end-term of the year. Budi said 'Without supervision, this is Javanese men, principal would not carry out their duties well' (Budi, 2016).

Five Madrasah teachers argued that there was now the absence of participatory planning in the Madrasah, a weakened communication between principal and teachers, and the disfunctional *Madrasah Committee*. Three teachers admitted that there were often sudden briefings, but the content of the briefing was only instruction for teachers to do such and such, and not a consultative meeting.

That Madrasah principal was like a single fighter with whom he fought the teacher did not know. This could be seen in daily routine works of Madrasah in which principal often carried out procurement of various school needs by himself. 'He should have delegated all technical works to his four vice principals, vice principal for curriculum affairs, student affairs, and public relation affairs, and infrastructural affairs.' (Syarif, 2016).

All teachers argued that Mr. Ali was lack of vigorous management and leadership exercises. He seems to be lagging in providing consultation with teachers regarding affairs relevant to instructional and curriculum issues. Regarding the development of school vision and mission, teachers also said that the principal never talked about them. Many

times of the conduct of school meeting during his tenure, the principal often delivered speeches that were rife with Qur'anic or Prophetic quotations as bases for advice and guidance for teachers. In this Madrasah, according to teachers, there was no regular meeting whether held on weekly or monthly bases discussing instructional or curricular and extra curricular matters.

'What we regularly have every year is the meeting in the end term of academic year, when students of grade 12 finish their study here..we have a meeting led by the principal but this meeting is not consultative in nature..it is mere a ceremony' (Shereen, 2016).

In the matter of administrative control, all teachers argued that the principal is very strict. The principal had just built a new gate (double gates) to control the movement of teachers. The principal also applied attendance system by putting automatic presence machine, aimed at disciplining teachers. Teachers were also required to have a complete package of instructional tool for each subject matter. How to produce such tool was the responsibility of every individual teacher. Teachers would not be forgiven if they did not have that tool as the proof that teachers were always in a status of being prepared to teach.

Regarding the attention given to develop the quality of teachers via in service training or other measure, all teachers said that they were required to accomplish it personally, usually via their participation in the subject-based teacher consultative organization or Musyawarah Guru Mata Pelajaran (MGMP). The principal did not pay attention to it and never endeavored to provide budget whether from state source or from fund raised by the Madrasah Committee.

'What we know about the budget is always for building or park, computers and like that.... human resources are forgotten. . .' (Budi, 2016).

When this matter is confirmed to the principal, he argued that it was the State that is responsible for teacher professional development. The Madrasah was not possible to provide training or education for teachers.

The principal simply said, 'the regulation does not permit teacher training provided by individual Madrasah.. it is very expensive of course' (Ali, 2016).

Regarding the role and function of Madrasah Committee, teachers argue that they were never invited to attend the joint meeting between the committee, the principal and teachers. The meeting conducted by Madrasah Committee usually involved only members of the committee and the principal. The principal would inform the decision made to the teachers in morning ceremony. They regarded the Committee helped the Madrasah to raise money only, not in the development of school as an educational enterprise.

In general teachers of the Madrasah have less positive attitude toward the principal due to various perceived shortcomings of the principal such as a weakened communication that prevent consultation on various learning problems, the absence of motivational efforts or guidance for teachers by the principal, and lack of participatory decision making in instructional and non-instructional matters, and lack of transparency in the management practice, and the absence of teacher professional development by the principal.

## **E. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The spirit of reform is so dominant as it is easily observed in the Indonesian public life after the collapse of Suharto regime. Ultimately, for a country that has been long under the centralistic Military regime, the evidenced failure of education to foster civil society and to achieve human development, have prompt the government to device a comprehensive reform projects. All post Suharto governments tried their best to create autonomy via decentralization measure that are packed in a number of legal products (i.e. laws and regulations). In the education sector, the requirement by the House of Representative and People Assembly (MPR-RI) for the government to spend at least 20 percent of State Budget for education, the imposition of Laws that set 8 standard of education including standard of teacher and principal, have brought about positive development.

Decentralization of education opened the opportunity for local people to engage with each other parties more intensively as an implementation of democracy and wider public engagement. In practice, however, the imposition of MoNE Decree number 044/U/2002 have not yet empowered *Komite Sekolah* and *Komite Madrasah* to be able to carry out its roles as consultative body, as bridging agency between school and community, as supportive agent, and as mediatory agency. This regulation should have been accompanied by a kind of training or induction program for members of *school/Madrasah* committee.

The premature death of local autonomy in the Madrasahs mandated by Decree E.101/2001 and also further regulation about *Komite Sekolah*, which require accountability and transparency, provide a very good lesson that however superior an idea of reform, it would come to a an end if it changes power relation or reduces authority of those in power. This is evidenced in resistance of principal of madrasah to redistribute power to their vices and to apply participatory decision-making. In the Madrasah researched, there is still a tendency of power monopoly by the principal that made the principal tend to exercise a management as he likes, without effort to build consultation and two-way communication for better decision-making.

The implementation of district regulation concerning the assignment of teacher as school principal has created a positive culture of fair competition in teacher career development. The positive attitude of SMA teachers as well as MAN teachers is an indication that such regulation must exist in a government organization. The regulation should apply the accountability and transparency principles, to prevent from being monopolized by certain side, like MoRA provincial office in running the selection of Madrasah principals.

Annual performance evaluation for principal of Sekolah is a good practice in order principal to work in a more well-organized way in all organizational activities of the school. The absence of performance evaluation, like in the Madrasah being researched made teachers lost their faith in the leadership

capacity of their principals, and also many malpractices of management in the Madrasah might be very likely caused by this absence of regular evaluation. In short, regulation concerning assignment of teacher as principal and concerning annual performance evaluation should be proclaimed active not only for principal of Sekolah but also Madrasah. This would entail in efforts by aspiring teachers to develop their leadership capacity in strategic, instructional, managerial, and human resource domain.

This research proposes three recommendations. *First*, the government should provide professional development measure for all teachers of both Sekolah and Madrasah in order teachers to have needed competencies in delivering their professional duties, and also in order for principals to have increased leadership capacity. *Second*, the government in this regard MoRA Central Office should soon impose the decree about assignment of teachers as Madrasah principal, and that the assignment should be done in an transparent and accountable way to prevent public distrust to MoRA. Similarly, MoRA should apply regular performance evaluation for all public Madrasah principals. *Third*, there should be regular training provided for those involved in the running of *Komite Sekolah/KS* and *Komite Madrasahs/KM* to materialize the objectives of the establishment of KS/KM as a living consultative, bridging, supportive, and mediatory agency. *Fourth*, there is a need to conduct similar research that involves more *Sekolahs* and more Madrasahs in order to create a more valid, reliable and generalized results.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abdullah, T. (1986). The pesantren in historical perspectives. In T. A. Siddique, *Islam and society in Southeast Asia* (pp. 80-107). Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Study.
- Abdullah, T & Majelis Ulama Indonesia. (1991). *Sejarah ummat Islam Indonesia (The history of the Indonesian Muslim Society)*. Jakarta: Majelis Ulama Indonesia.

- Ali. (2016, March 19). Becoming a Madrasah principal in decentralisation era. (Researcher, Interviewer)
- Budi. (2016, March 26). Becoming a Madrasah principal in decentralization era. (Researcher, Interviewer)
- Burki, S.J. Perry, G.E.&Dillinger, W.R. (1999). *Beyond the center: Decentralizing the State*. Washington D.C.: The World Bank.
- BPS Kab Banyumas. (2015, January 10). BPS. Retrieved october 2016, from BPW Website: <http://banyumaskab.bps.go.id>
- Bray, M. & Thomas, M. (1998). *Financing of Education in Indonesia*. Manila: Asian Development Bank (ADB), Comparative Education Research Center.
- Brewster, C. and Railsback, J. (2003). *Building Trusting Relationship for School Improvement: Implication for Principals and Teachers*. Yellowknife: Northwest Regional Education Laboratory.
- Departemen Agama RI. (2004). *Sejarah Madrasah, pertumbuhan, dinamika dan perkembangannya di Indonesia (Madrasah History, growth, dynamics and development in Indonesia)*. Direktorat Jenderal Kelembagaan Agama Islam.
- DeArmond, M. a. (2014, March 7). How do school districts recruit and select principals? Evidence from Washington State.
- Dhofier, Z. (1982). *Tradisi pesantren: Study tentang pandangan hidup kyai (Pesantren tradition: A study of Kyais' way of life)*. Jakarta: LP3ES.
- Education Management Information System (EMIS) MORA. (2001). *Madrasah Aliyah Public and Private*. Jakarta: MoRA.
- Education Management Information System (EMIS). (2000). *Statistics of Madrasah Ibtidaiyah Negeri and Madrasah Tsanawiyah Negeri Se-Indonesia*. Jakarta: Direktorat Jenderal Kelembagaan Agama Islam.
- Edy. (2016, March 16). Becoming a principal in decentralized era. (Researcher, Interviewer).
- Elmore, R. F. (1993). *School decentralisation: Who Gains? Who Loses?* San Francisco: Josse-Bass.
- Habegger, S. (2008, September/Oktober). The principal's role in successful school: creating a positive school culture. *Principal*, pp. 42-46.
- Hallinger, P. (2012, ctober 4). School leadership that makes a Difference: Lessons from 30 years of International Research. Rome, Italy: Asia Pacific Centre for Leadership and Change.
- Harison, J.-A. (1998). School governance: is the clash between teachers and principals inevitable? *Journal of Educational Administration*, 36 (1), 59-82.
- Heller, R.W. and Pautler, A.J. (1990). The administrator of the future: combining Instructional and managerial leadership. In S. a. Jacobson, *Educational leadership in an age of reform* (pp. 131-143). London and New York: Longman.
- Hodgkinson, C. (1992). *Educational leadership: the Moral art*. New York, Albany: SUNY Press.
- Husain S. & Ashraf A. (1979). *Crisis in Muslim Education*. Jeddah: Holder and Stoughton King Abdul Aziz University.
- Jalal F. and Musthafa B . (2001). *Education Reform in the context of regional autonomy: The case of Indonesia*. Jakarta: Ministry of National Education, National Development Planning Agency adn the World Bank.
- Jarot. (2016, March 23). Becoming a principal in an SMA. (Researcher, Interviewer).
- Jones, S. (1991). The Javanese pesantren: Between elite and peasantry. In C. Keyes, *Reshaping local world: Formal education and cultural change in rural South East Asia*. New Heaven: Yale South East Asia Studies Yale Center for International and Area Studies.
- Law 25 of 2004. (2004). *The basic principle of governance*. Ministry of Law and Human Right.
- Lee, K. (1995). *Education and Politics in Indonesia 1945-1965*. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: University of Malaya Press.
- Leithwood, K. &. (1999). A century's quest to understand school leadership. In J. M. Louis, *Handbook of Reserch on Educational Administration*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publisher.
- Mauldin, L. (1961). *The colonial influence of Indonesian education*. Michigan:

- Unpublished Microfilmed dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers.
- Marwoto, E. (2016, April 9). How District Government Recruit School Principals. (Saefudin, Interviewer)
- Ministry of Religious Affairs. (2014). *Buku Statistik Pendidikan Islam (Islamic Education Statistics)*. Jakarta: Dirjen Pendidikan Islam.
- Myers, E. and Murphy, J. (1995). Suburban secondary school principals' perceptions of administrative control in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration* , 33 (3), 14-37.
- Nasution, S. (1983). *Sejarah pendidikan Indonesia (The history of Indonesian education)*. Bandung: Jemmars.
- New Leaders. (2013, July). Change agents: how states can develop effective school leaders. *The importance of leadership* .
- Nurhamid. (2015, January 21). Regulation on Madrasah Principal in MoRA. (Researcher, Interviewer)
- OECD/Asian Development Bank. (2015). *Education in Indonesia: Rising to the Challenge*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Poerbakawatja, S. (1970). *Pendidikan dalam alam Indonesia merdeka (Education in Independence Indonesia)*. Djakarta: Gunung Agung.
- Price, H. E. (2012). How Affective Relationships Shape Principal and Teacher Attitudes. *Online Journal of Educational Administration Quarterly* , 48 (1), 39-85.
- Rondinelli, D. (1981). Government decentralisation in Comparative perspectives. *International Review of Administrative Science* , 47 (2), 133-145.
- Sakai, M. (2002). *Beyond Jakarta: regional autonomy and local societies in Indonesia*. Adelaide: Crawford Publishing.
- Seong, D. N. (2007). Developing Singapore school leaders. *Commonwealth Education Partnership* , 111-113.
- Shereen. (2016, April 6). Becoming a Madrasah principal. (researcher, Interviewer)
- Starrat, R. (1998). Grounding moral educational leadership in the morality of teaching and learning. *Journal of Leading and Managing* , 4 (4), 243-255.
- Sumintono, B. (2006). Decentralized centralism: School based management policies and practices at state secondary schools in Mataram, Lombok, Indonesia . 20. Faculty of Education, the Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand.
- Supeno, H. (1999). *Agenda reformasi pendidikan (Educational reform agenda)*. Magelang: Pustaka Paramedia.
- Syarif. (2016, March 30). Becoming a Madrasah principal. (Researcher, Interviewer)
- The Wallace Foundation. (2013). *the principal as leader*. The wallace foundation.
- Tilaar, H. (2002). *Perubahan sosial dan pendidikan (Social change and education)*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Widiasarana Indonesia in collaboration with the Center for Education and Community Studies.
- Turner, M. Podger, O. Sumardjono, M & Tithayasa, W.T. (2003). *Desentralisation in Indonesia: Redesigning the State*. Canberra: Asia Pacific Press at the Australian National University.
- Vogel, L. R. (2015). Values and context: Taiwan principal preparation and practice from an American perspective. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies* , 7 (2), 47-60.
- Vlekke, B. (1959). *Nusantara: a history of Indonesia* (Revised Edition ed.). Bandung: Van Hoeve.
- Zamroni. (2000). *Pendidikan untuk demokrasi, tantangan menuju civil society (Education for democracy. challenge towards civil society)*. Yogyakarta: Bigraf.