

Obstructing Factors in the Implementation of Regional Au- tonomy in Educational Management

Moh. Huda A.Y.

Abstract: The research was conducted to identify the obstructing factors in the implementation of regional autonomy in educational management in Malang Regency, especially at public junior high and senior high schools. The method used to determine the priority scale of the obstructing factors was the Delphi Method. The result shows that the obstructing factors in public junior high schools (SLTPNs) and public senior high schools (SMUNs) are of the same type. They lie in the area of: attitude towards the educational autonomy; the completeness of the set of Law No 22, 1999; implementation of Law No 22 year 1999; understanding of practitioners on Law No. 25 year 1999; the completeness of the set of Law No 25, 1999; the implementation of Law No 25, 1999 in the schools; the financial dependence on School Board (BP3) and school sponsors was also found; the balance of the delegation of authority concerning schooling between government and the schools; low quality of human resources.

Keywords: obstructing factors, regional autonomy, and educational management.

The principles of the implementation of regional autonomy are outlined in the Decree of the People's Assembly No XV/MPR/1998, and are further realized in the form of Law No 22, 1999. According to the laws, the principles of the implementation emphasize on the principles of democracy, community's par-

Moh. Huda A.Y. adalah dosen Jurusan Administrasi Pendidikan FIP Universitas Negeri Malang (UM).

ticipation, equal opportunity, and justice, while also taking into account the regional potentials and diversity.

In Article 1 part 1 of Law No 22, 1999, an autonomic region, hereinafter referred to as *region*, is defined as a unit of legal community which has certain geographic boundaries which is authorized to regulate and manage the interests of the local community in accordance to self-initiatives based on the community's aspirations within the bondage of the unified state of Republic of Indonesia. In order that the authority to regulate and manage the interests of the community can be implemented well, in the sense that it proceeds without obstacles and challenges, thus the *central government* delegates extensive authority to *regional government* in a substantive and proportionally responsible manner.

The findings of a research of Center for Public Policy Studies in Azis (2000) reveal that in a number of cities and regencies in East Java there was an indication of a number of obstacles and challenges to the implementation of regional autonomy. The obstacles and challenges are: (1) various regulation and legal products concerning many issues are still based on the old regulation which is no longer appropriate with the nature and the demands of autonomy, (2) the quality of human resources in the region is still inadequate, (3) the bureaucracy of the regional government is still full of not-conducive behaviors, (4) the regional legislative bodies are not yet capable of playing their roles and performing their functions in a proportional, virtuous, aspirative, and cultivated manner, (5) the political processes in the local (regional) political arena have not proceeded in a healthy, virtuous, and democratic manner, and (6) the regional governments are still trying to find financial sources other than the original regional earnings (PAD).

Furthermore, Azis (2000) states that the obstacles to the implementation of autonomy in the region is related to the attitudes and mentality of the regional government officials and communities who have been under an authoritative power for too long a period, have been accustomed to being ruled and dictated, have possessed the prevailing habits of waiting for orders, and have been accustomed to asking for instructions from their superiors. Another writer, Huda (1998), states that from the perspective of educational management, there exist some obstacles which hinder the implementation of education management autonomy in the region. The obstacles are: (1) The structures of the educational organizations which are at present existent, which are subject to Presidential Decrees No 44 and 45, 1974, Nos 27 and 40, 1978, and No 47, 1979, are still used as the guidance for the educational administration

in a centralized manner. (2) The centralized system of educational management employed up to now has resulted in an impact in the form of a systemic dependency which hinders creativity and has created the practice of waiting for orders from superiors. (3) The legal regulations concerning education which are employed at present do not allow an opening for the implementation of education in a decentralized manner, especially for the government-run schools, e.g., USPN (Law of National Educational System) Article 36, part 1 places the responsibility of educational costs on the government; Article 38 part 2 states that the national curriculum is designed by a central government body, in this case the Ministry of National Education or some other ministries; Article 52 states that government carries out the monitoring of education implementation.

According to Soetopo (1999), other obstacles encountered in the implementation of regional autonomy related with the management of education are brought about among others by the fact that the democratization process has not run to its fullest in the region and that there are still many regional community's aspirations which have not been paid attention to, especially those concerning education. In line with that opinion, Iswanto (1999) states that the implementation of autonomy in educational management in the region is facing hindrances and impediments since the national educational budget is still compartmentalized, and that the school management is not effective since school masters are far from autonomous. In the mean time, the aphorism "education is the responsibility of the government, family, and society" appears to be technical and economical in order to raise fund from parents and community rather than to induce participation concerning the aspects of goals, contents, processes, evaluation, and the like. In the mean time, the fact that the betterment of teacher career and well-being is not carried out consistently and that there exist unaccountable cuts to teachers' salaries are likely to reduce educational accomplishment and might lower the community's appreciation towards teachers' reputation.

Furthermore, centralistic management of education tend to overlook the factor of heterogeneity found in the community. In addition, it requires a large organization. In the context of huge educational management, Naisbitt (1994) states that a very large organization needs to be broken down into smaller units in order not to block the dynamics of the community which develops more and more rapidly and often unpredictably. In relation to this, the autonomy of educational management in Malang Regency is expected to be able to realize the functions of school and the functions of the community

which are related reciprocally in accordance with the contexts of the community and the region.

In the mean time, the number of students registered in the general education in Malang Regency is 234,807 in elementary schools (SD), 78,895 in junior high schools (SLTP), and 42,208 in senior high schools (SMTA). These students are found in as many as 1,381 units of elementary schools (SD), 276 units of junior high schools (SLTP), and 115 units of senior high schools (SMTA). As the research object in the present research, it is decided to focus on state junior high schools (SLTP) and state senior high schools (SMUN) in Malang Regency considering the fact that drop-out rate in Malang Regency for SD is 0.40%, for SLTPN 2%, and for SMUN is 2.21%. While graduation percentage reaches 99.85% for SD, 98.20% for SLTPN, and 96.15 for SMUN. As for the completion of the school facility related with library, the fulfillment is 84.95% for SD, 67.40% for SLTPN, and 73.98% for SMUN. As for the completion of facility related with physical exercise, the fulfillment is 54.39% for SD, 46.07% for SLTPN, and 46.05% for SMUN. As for the completion of facility related with attempts at school health (UKS), the fulfillment is 74.60% for SD, 56.36% for SLTPN, and 61.52% for SMUN.

Based on these quality indicators and considering the fulfillment for each indicator on each level of education, it can be said that the education on the level of SD in Malang Regency shows a better performance than that on the levels of SLTPN and SMUN in Malang Regency (Strategic Plan of Office of Education in Malang Regency: 2000). In the mean time, *Madrasah Ibtidaiyah* (MI), *Madrasah Tsanawiyah* (MTS), and *Madrasah Aliyah* (MA) are not involved in the present research since these educational institutions are coordinated by the Ministry of Religious Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia (Depag RI) and have not been subjected to the regional autonomy implementation in the educational management in Malang Regency.

The great number, the heterogeneity, and the varying qualities of the educational institutions in Malang Regency may be regarded as educational potencies. Nevertheless, they might also become obstacles to the implementation of educational management autonomy in the region. Based on the above potencies, the implementation of educational autonomy in Malang Regency constitutes an urgent obligation and must be conducted based on the consideration of all of the existing factors, obstructing as well as supporting. This last mentioned should be paid attention to by all parties involved in education so that the best solution might be reached to overcome the problem. The solution

is by carrying out the research: *Obstructing Factors in the Implementation of Regional Autonomy in Educational Management in Malang Regency*.

METHODS

The method used in determining the priority scale of the obstructing factors in the implementation of regional autonomy in educational management at SLTPN and SMUN in Malang Regency was the Delphi Method. This method was employed to arrive at a consensus among the educational management experts (as many as six respondents), the key informants (officials of Offices of Education in the Province of East Java and Malang Regency) and the community public figures renowned for their reputation in managing education in SLTPN and SMUN in Malang Regency (as many as six respondents). The number of the (special) respondents involved in the weighting totaled twelve. The Delphi Method was carried out in two rounds with Witkin's (1984) and Cunningham's (1982) stage combination. While the implementation was done by observing the following steps, i.e. (1) starting the activity, (2) defining the problems, (3) deciding on the experts needed, (4) selecting the experts, (5) preparing a questionnaire, (6) delivering the questionnaire, (7) analyzing the questionnaire, (8) checking whether consensus had been reached, (9) if consensus was reached, immediately arranging and delivering the results, (10) if a consensus was not reached, proceeding with discovering the principal thoughts that emerged, and when a consensus was reached, proceeding with clarifying the principal thoughts, and then proceeding with disregarding the differences. If this had been undertaken, then proceeding with arranging and delivering the results. (11) If the principal thoughts were not found, then proceeding with assessing the responses and information, then proceeding with preparing a questionnaire again, and delivering the questionnaire to the experts. Further, the questionnaire, based on the consensus of special respondents, finally consisted of thirteen items.

In the mean time, in order to determine needs priority, a number of plots relating evaluation scores were designed for each category of purposes. Following Witkin (1984), to determine the confirmation of the needs and weight in the Delphi Method, MES (Magnitudes Estimation Scaling) was put to use, which in the present research was employed with the scales of 10 to 100 for each item.

While, the technique of describing the results of analysis to determine the priority scale was carried out through the following steps, i.e. drawing a

curve of needs value and grouping needs based on the curve into three categories of factors, i.e. insignificant, primary, and urgent obstructing factors.

RESULTS

The data of the obstructing factors to regional autonomy in education in SLTPN in Malang Regency are displayed in Table 1.

Table 1 Obstructing Factors in SLTPN in Malang

No Item	R 1	R 2	R 3	R 4	R 5	R 6	R 7	R 8	R 9	R 10	R 11	R 12	T	Mean	PK
1	60	50	40	35	30	40	40	40	50	60	40	50	535	44.58	.45
2	45	35	40	40	45	35	40	45	40	40	35	40	480	40.00	.40
3	40	50	40	35	50	60	50	35	40	45	40	40	425	43.75	.44
4	40	75	40	45	45	45	50	50	40	50	45	45	525	47.92	.48
5	40	45	40	30	45	30	40	35	40	45	50	45	485	40.42	.40
6	45	45	45	50	35	45	45	45	35	35	45	40	510	42.50	.43
7	60	80	45	40	45	45	80	35	70	45	40	80	665	55.42	.55
8	55	45	50	60	60	60	65	40	40	45	50	65	655	54.58	.55
9	65	50	45	65	70	50	50	45	55	45	60	50	655	54.58	.55
10	60	60	50	20	30	30	60	40	45	65	30	65	555	46.25	.46
11	45	60	70	60	55	60	60	55	50	45	50	60	660	55.00	.55
12	85	75	85	85	45	45	45	40	85	75	40	75	780	65.00	.65
13	50	60	40	20	60	20	60	25	50	65	20	20	490	40.83	.41

Note: R: Respondent T: Total CP: Consensus Percentage

From the above table the means is obtained $(X) = 553.462$.

Standard deviation is obtained $(SD) = 83.176$.

$X - \frac{1}{2} SD = 511.874$. CP = 42.66%.

$X + \frac{1}{2} SD = 595.05$. CP = 49.59%.

CP (consensus percentage) = Real Total divided by Maximum Total Score.

Obstructing factors are insignificant if the value of the consensus percentage of the factors <42.66%. There were 3 items of insignificant obstructing factors. The items are: (1) Item 13, i.e. the immediate community's cultural attitudes towards the changes concerning regional autonomy in education, (2) Item 5, i.e. the implementation of Law No 22, 1999 in the schools, and (3) Item 2, i.e. the understanding of educational practitioners on the contents of Law No 25, 1999.

Obstructing factors are primary if the value of the consensus percentage of the factors is between 42.66% and 49.59%. There were five primary ob-

structing factors. These items are (1) Item 4, i.e. the completeness of the set of Law No 25, 1999, (2) Item 10, i.e. the percentage of the dependency of educational fund allocation on the school sponsors, (3) Item 1, i.e. the understanding of educational practitioners on the contents of Law No 22, 1999, (4) Item 3, i.e. the completeness of the set of Law No 22, 1999, and (5) Item 6, i.e. the implementation of Law No 25, 1999 in the schools.

Obstructing factors are urgent if percentage of the obstructing factors (CP) > 49.59%. There were five urgent obstructing factors. The items are: (1) Item 12, i.e. the cultural attitudes of the schools towards the coming of changes concerning regional autonomy in education, (2) Item 7, i.e. the balance of the delegation of authority concerning schooling between the government and the schools, (3) Item 11, i.e. the quality of the human resources in carrying out the delegated regional autonomy responsibilities, (4) Item 8, i.e. the percentage of fund appropriation from DAU (General Allocation Fund) and (5) Item 9, i.e. the percentage of fund dependency on Parent-Teacher Association (BP3).

Furthermore, the data on the obstructing factors in SMUN in Malang Regency can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2 Obstructing Factors in SMUN in Malang Regency

No Item	R 1	R 2	R 3	R 4	R 5	R 6	R 7	R 8	R 9	R 10	R 11	R 12	T	Mean	PK
1	45	60	40	30	40	50	40	40	50	40	30	30	495	41.25	.41
2	40	40	40	35	25	45	40	40	45	40	25	35	450	37.50	.38
3	75	65	40	35	25	40	40	45	45	65	40	45	560	46.67	.47
4	50	40	55	45	50	50	60	65	60	50	45	40	610	50.83	.51
5	35	40	25	40	25	30	35	30	30	50	35	25	400	33.33	.33
6	50	45	50	45	35	45	35	60	30	45	50	40	530	44.17	.44
7	50	40	40	45	40	45	50	45	40	45	50	50	540	45.00	.45
8	60	60	70	40	70	80	70	35	50	70	40	60	705	58.75	.59
9	25	15	45	15	60	60	45	45	35	60	10	60	475	39.58	.40
10	40	15	40	15	50	25	50	50	65	65	30	15	460	38.33	.38
11	70	45	70	40	70	40	45	70	70	50	50	40	660	55.00	.55
12	80	55	65	80	65	55	65	80	80	75	65	80	845	70.42	.70
13	60	35	70	25	60	50	50	60	60	70	40	70	650	54.17	.54

Note: R: Respondent T: Total CP: Consensus Percentage

From the above table the means is obtained (X) = 567.692.

Standard deviation is obtained (SD) = 123.332.

$X - \frac{1}{2} SD = 506.03.CP = 42.17\%$.

$X + \frac{1}{2} SD = 629.36.CP = 52.45\%$.

CP (consensus percentage) = Real Total divided by Maximum Total Score.

Based on those figures, insignificant obstructing factors are obtained if the value of the obstructing factor percentage (CP) $< 42.17\%$. There were 5 items of insignificant obstructing factors. These items are (1) Item 1, i.e. the understanding of educational practitioners on the contents of Law No 22, 1999, (2) Item 9, i.e. the percentage of fund dependency on BP3, (3) Item 10, i.e. the percentage of the dependency of educational fund allocation on the school sponsors, (4) Item 2, i.e. the understanding of educational practitioners on the contents of Law No 25, 1999, and (5) Item 5, i.e. the implementation of Law No 22, 1999 in the schools.

Primary obstructing factors are obtained if the value of the consensus percentage of the factors is between 42.17% and 52.45% . There were 4 items of primary obstructing factors: (1) Item 4, i.e. the completeness of the set of Law No 25, 1999, (2) Item 3, i.e. the completeness of the set of Law No 22, 1999, (3) Item 7, i.e. the balance of the delegation of authority concerning schooling between the government and the schools, and (4) Item 6, i.e. the implementation of Law No 25, 1999 in the schools.

Urgent obstructing factors are obtained if the percentage of obstructing factors (CP) $> 52.45\%$. There were four items for urgent obstructing factors: (1) Item 12, i.e. the cultural attitudes of the schools towards the coming of changes concerning regional autonomy in education, (2) Item 8, i.e. the percentage of fund appropriation from DAU, (3) Item 11, i.e. the quality of the human resources in carrying out the delegated regional autonomy responsibilities, and (4) Item 13, i.e. the immediate community's cultural attitudes towards the changes concerning regional autonomy in education.

DISCUSSION

Based on the Delphi analysis, it is found out that the obstructing factors which have the insignificant priority scale in SLTPN in Malang Regency include the immediate community's cultural attitudes towards the changes concerning regional autonomy in education, the implementation of Law No 22, 1999 in the schools, and the understanding of educational practitioners on the contents of Law No 25, 1999.

These obstacles are considered not on an urgent scale, since the obstructing factors are such that they do not impede the implementation of edu-

cational management autonomy in SLTPN in Malang Regency. Therefore, if the immediate community's cultural attitudes towards the changes concerning regional autonomy in education, the implementation of Law No 22, 1999 in the schools, and the understanding of educational practitioners on the contents of Law No 25, 1999 are not yet accomplished as expected, this then will not restrain the implementation of educational management autonomy in Malang Regency.

Furthermore, the obstructing factors which have the insignificant priority scale in SMUN in Malang Regency include the understanding of educational practitioners on the contents of Law No 22, 1999, the percentage of fund dependency on School Board (BP3), the percentage of the dependency of educational fund allocation on the school sponsors, the understanding of educational practitioners on the contents of Law No 25, 1999, and the implementation of Law No 22, 1999.

Based on the Delphi analysis on the obstructing factors which have the insignificant priority scale in SMUN in Malang Regency, it can be stated that if there is found an educational fund dependency on the school sponsors and if the understanding of teachers and education practitioners on Law concerning regional autonomy is not yet as it should be, this then will not hamper the implementation of regional autonomy in educational management in SMUN.

Based on the description over the obstructing factors which have the priority scale of insignificant in SLTP and SMUN, there is similarity in insignificant obstructing factors, i.e. the implementation of Law No 22, 1999 in the schools and the understanding of educational practitioners on the contents of Law No 25, 1999. The fact that these two obstacles are regarded insignificant does not mean that the implementation of Law No 22, 1999 and the understanding of educational practitioners on the contents of Law No 25, 1999 are of good quality. In reality, the educational practitioners think of the implementation of education in the schools has run "as usual" in accordance with "superior's instructions." Whether or not the implementation has run in accordance with the existing effectual Law is not a concern for the educational practitioners.

In the mean time, obstructing factors which have the primary priority scale in SLTPN in Malang Regency covers five types, i.e. the completeness of the set of Law No 25, 1999, the percentage of the dependency of educational fund allocation on the school sponsors, the understanding of educational practitioners on the contents of Law No 22, 1999, the completeness of the

set of Law No 22, 1999, the implementation of Law No 25, 1999 in the schools.

Based on Delphi analysis, the weighting of the obstructing factors of the implementation of regional autonomy in education which have the primary priority scale can be stated as follows. If the completeness of the set of Law No 25, 1999, the percentage of the dependency of educational fund allocation on the school sponsors, the understanding of educational practitioners on the contents of Law No 22, 1999, the completeness of the set of Law No 22, 1999, the implementation of Law No 25, 1999 in the schools are not as they are expected to be, this then does not constitute obstructing factors which are urgent.

The obstructing factors which have the primary priority scale in SMUN in Malang Regency based on Delphi analysis are obtained as many as four obstacles, i.e. the completeness of the set of Law No 25, 1999, the completeness of the set of Law No 22, 1999, the balance of the delegation of authority concerning schooling between the government and the schools, and the implementation of Law No 25, 1999 in the schools. Thus, if the completeness of the set of Law No 25, 1999, the completeness of the set of Law No 22, 1999, the balance of the delegation of authority concerning schooling between the government and the schools, and the implementation of Law No 25, 1999 in the schools are not as they should be, this then will not impede the implementation of regional autonomy in educational management in SMUN in Malang Regency.

The obstructing factors which have the urgent priority scale must be immediately dealt with since if they are not fulfilled they will bring a great impact on the failure of educational management in SLTPN in Malang Regency. These urgent obstructing factors include five urgent obstructing factors, i.e. the cultural attitudes of the schools towards the coming of changes concerning regional autonomy in education, the balance of the delegation of authority concerning schooling between the government and the schools, the quality of the human resources in carrying out the delegated regional autonomy responsibilities, the percentage of fund appropriation from DAU and the percentage of fund dependency on BP3.

Based on Delphi analysis, the obstructing factors which have the urgent priority scale concerning regional autonomy in the educational management in SMUN in Malang Regency include the followings, i.e. the cultural attitudes of the schools and of the immediate community towards the coming of changes concerning regional autonomy in education, the great percentage of

fund dependency on the central government (DAU), the low quality of the human resources in the schools in carrying out the delegated regional autonomy responsibilities. Based on the description, there is a similarity in the obstructing factors which have the urgent priority scale between SLTP and SMUN, i.e. the indifference of the school milieu towards the implementation of regional autonomy in education, the great fund dependency on the central government, the quality of the human resources in executing the delegated regional autonomy responsibilities.

Schools as an educational institution which spring and grow within the community in the realization of regional autonomy in education are influenced by the conditions of their surroundings. The condition of the school milieu is in interaction with the immediate community, i.e. religion, socio-culture, mentality, traditions, perception, expectations, motivation, and the community's empowerment potencies in the context of the changing process in the educational management system. In the mean time, Muis (1999) and Djojonegoro (2000) further state that another prerequisite resource which the region must have in the implementation of educational management autonomy is the availability of human resources of quality to carry out education, which, in this case, means human resources of the teaching practitioners (teachers).

According to Djojonegoro (2000), educational problems will become more pressing in the era of regional autonomy since the quality of the human resources managing the education in the region, both academically and administratively, is still far from perfection. The quality of the human resources that we have, based on a study by UNDB (1996) in Muslimin (2000), is put on the 102nd place among 174 countries throughout the world. In such condition, great efforts are necessary to improve the quality of our human resources effectively in the management of educational autonomy at school level.

The quality of human resources needed in the implementation of educational autonomy management at school level, according to Umaedi (2000), includes a strong school leadership, effective educational practitioners, school membership which has a culture of quality, and participation of school and community members.

In line with that opinion, Mantja (1999) states that in order to optimize educational achievement in the autonomy of educational management in the region, it is necessary to have persons who are capable of mobilizing, have competence, responsible for managing, regulating, integrating, and directing all types of human resources in the field of education. Thus, they have to un-

derstand educational management. In line with the above opinion, according to Hamijoyo (1999), the success of educational autonomy in the region both in SLTP and in SMUN requires educational managers who have sufficient experience-based competence, and who have the capability of designing changes (*designer*), pushing changes (*pusher*), and implementing changes (*implementor*). In order to support the successful accomplishment of the implementation of regional autonomy in education in Malang Regency, the above prerequisites constitute an instrument to empower human resources in the management of regional autonomy in education as has been mandated by Law No 22, 1999.

The findings of a research of Center for Public Policy Studies in Azis (2000) report that in a number of cities and districts in East Java there is an indication of the existence of a number of obstacles and challenges to the implementation of regional autonomy, such as those described presently. (1) Various regulation and legal products concerning many issues are still based on the old regulation which is no longer appropriate with the nature and the demands of autonomy. (2) The quality of human resources in the region is considered low. (3) The bureaucracy of the regional government is still characterized with behaviors which are not conducive. (4) The regional legislative bodies have not been capable yet of playing their roles and performing their functions in a proportional, virtuous, aspirative, and mature manner. (5) The political processes in the regional political arena have not proceeded in a healthy, virtuous, and democratic manner. (6) The regional governments are still striving to find financial sources other than the primary regional earnings (PRE, PAD) which are at present available.

In that case, Huda (1998) states that the obstacle that can impede the implementation of educational management autonomy in the region is that the educational regulations in effect at present do not enable education to be implemented in a decentralized manner, and this is especially true in government-run schools. Another dilemma encountered in the implementation of autonomy, according to Soetopo (1999), is that the delegation of authority from the provincial government to the regional governments should ideally cover three aspects, i.e. personnel, fund, and facilities; nevertheless, this transfer of power is not satisfactorily complete since the provincial government tends to regard the districts and cities unprepared and since the democratization process in the region has not run to its fullest extent so that a lot of aspiration from the region's community, especially concerning education, is not paid sufficient attention to.

In line with the above opinions, Iswanto (1999) states that the implementation of educational management autonomy faces a number of obstacles since the national educational budget is still compartmentalized. For example, routine budget (DIK) is managed by the Ministries of Finance, National Education, and Interior Affairs (Depkeu-Depdikbud-Depdagri) and development budget (DIP) is managed by the National Developmental Agency and the Ministries of National Education and Interior Affairs (Bappenas-Depdikbud-Depdagri), while each of these has its own managerial regulations. In the mean time, the motto “education is the responsibility of the government, family, and society” seems to be technical and economical in order to raise fund from parents and community rather than to induce participation concerning the aspects of goals, contents, processes, evaluation, and the likes. Azis (2000) states that the presence of obstacles to the implementation of autonomy in the region is related to the attitudes and mentality of the regional government officials and communities who have for a very long time been under an authoritative power, been accustomed to being ruled and dictated, possessed the prevailing custom of waiting for orders, and been in the habit of to asking for instructions from their superiors. Furthermore, all those are likely to result in the decrease of the community’s initiatives and creativity.

In the mean time, related with the amount of fund in education sector, it is considered that Indonesia’s budget in 1998/1999 is very low. According to the report of World Bank (1999), the educational fund in Indonesia only amounts to as much as 9% of the State Budget (APBN). This educational budget is relatively small compared with the educational budget of the neighboring countries, such as, Malaysia as much as 23%, Singapore 19%, Philippines 20%, and Thailand 9%.

In relation with financial resources to cover the costs of the educational management autonomy, Guthrie and Reed (1986) describes the educational authorization in the U.S. In the U.S., educational autonomy was implemented in the following ways. The federal administration delegates authority to the 50 states, in turn the states delegates administrative responsibilities to thousands of schools in the states. In this way, elementary and high schools acquire educational fund from *tax*. The policy was determined by governors, legislative bodies, judges, educational agencies, and *thousands of profession partners*.

In line with the essence of the educational management autonomy in the region, according to Fattah (2000), besides the financial resources that come from governmental subsidies, in the form of routine budget (DIK) and devel-

opment budget (DIP), schools also need supporting fund from BP3. The region must also be able to cooperate for mutual benefits with various parties, i.e. non-governmental bodies, business world, and the community.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Conclusions

The priority scale of the insignificant obstructing factors in SLTPN in Malang Regency consists of three types, i.e. the immediate community's cultural attitudes towards the changes concerning regional autonomy in education, the implementation of Law No 22, 1999 in the schools, and the understanding of educational practitioners on the contents of Law No 25, 1999.

Furthermore, the priority scale of the primary obstructing factors in SLTPN in Malang Regency consists of five types, i.e. the completeness of the set of Law No 25, 1999, the percentage of the dependency of educational fund allocation on the school sponsors, the understanding of educational practitioners on the contents of Law No 22, 1999, the completeness of the set of Law No 22, 1999, the implementation of Law No 25, 1999 in the schools.

In the mean time, the priority scale of the urgent obstructing factors in SLTPN in Malang Regency consists of five types, i.e. the cultural attitudes of the schools towards the coming of changes concerning regional autonomy in education, the balance of the delegation of authority concerning schooling between the government and the schools, the quality of the human resources in implementing the delegated regional autonomy responsibilities, the percentage of fund appropriation from the ventral government (in the form of DAU or General Fund Allocation from the Central Government), and the percentage of fund dependency on School Board (BP3).

While the priority scale of the insignificant obstructing factors in SMUN in Malang Regency consists of five types, i.e. the understanding of educational practitioners on the contents of Law No 22, 1999, the percentage of fund dependency on BP3, the percentage of the dependency of educational fund allocation on the school sponsors, the understanding of educational practitioners on the contents of Law No 25, 1999, and the implementation of Law No 22, 1999.

Furthermore, the priority scale of the primary obstructing factors in SMUN in Malang Regency consists of four types, i.e. the completeness of the set of Law No 25, 1999, the completeness of the set of Law No 22, 1999, the balance of the delegation of authority concerning schooling between the gov-

ernment and the schools, and the implementation of Law No 25, 1999 in the schools.

While *the priority scale of the urgent obstructing factors in SMUN* in Malang Regency consists of four types, i.e. the cultural attitudes of the schools towards the coming of changes concerning regional autonomy in education, the great percentage of fund dependency on the central government (in the for of DAU), the low quality of the human resources in the schools in carrying out the delegated regional autonomy responsibilities, and the immediate community's cultural attitudes towards the changes concerning regional autonomy in education.

Suggestions

It is suggested to SLTPNs in Malang Regency to immediately change the static work culture to become dynamic concerning the implementation of the regional autonomy in education, to improve the quality of the school human resources (HR), to expand the cooperation with the school board (BP3) in relation with the required school budget fulfillment, to emphasize the importance of clear authority delegation from the central to the regional government, and to increase creativity to raise funds to support the provision of the well-being of school personnel (teachers and clerical staffs).

It is suggested that SMUNs in Malang Regency immediately find their own fund-sources so as to diminish the existing reliance on DAU, to improve the quality of the school human resources so as to be capable of implementing the regional autonomy in education, and to try to change the school's as well as the community's cultures which are indifferent towards the changes taking place in the school environment.

It is suggested to Malang Regency Office of National Education to precisely, i.e. scientifically, immediately identify the obstructing factors, especially the obstructing factors which have the urgent priority scale, encountered by SLTPs and SMUNs in Malang Regency, and then to attempt to find effective solutions to minimize and eliminate those urgent obstructing factors, so that the implementation of regional autonomy in education in Malang Regency may proceed as well as expected.

Finally, it is suggested to all parties committed to education in Malang Regency to be pro-active and cautious in contemplating the implementation of regional autonomy in education. In other words, Malang Regency Office of National Education as the most responsible party for education should in-

duce the active participation of educational management experts, to achieve collaboration and synergy with the government of Malang Regency, entrepreneurs, graduates and sponsors, both domestic and abroad, in the implementation of regional autonomy in education in accordance with the *vision* and *mission* in Malang Regency.

REFERENCES

- Aziz, A. 2000. *Otonomi Daerah: Kewenangan dalam Kemandirian*. Magelang: Akademik Militer.
- Cunningham, W.D. 1982. *Systematic Planning for Educational Change*. England: Old Dominion University.
- Decree of the People's Assembly No XV/MPR/1998. 1998. *Otonomi Daerah*. Jakarta: The People's Assembly of the Republic of Indonesia.
- District of Malang Office of National Education. 2000. *Renstra Dinas Pendidikan Kabupaten Malang*. Malang: District of Malang Office of National Education.
- Djojonegoro, W. 2000. *Pendidikan dan Dunia Industri Pendidikan Sebagai Industri Mulia, Unggulan di dalam Ilmu Pengetahuan dan Teknologi*. Jakarta: Indonesia National Education Convention.
- Fattah, N. 2000. *Sistem Pembiayaan Pendidikan dalam Konteks Manajemen Berbasis Sekolah*. Jakarta: Universitas Negeri Jakarta.
- Guthrie, J.W. & Reed, R.J. 1986. *Educational Administration and Policy: Effective Leadership for American Education*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Hamijoyo, S.S. 1999. *Pola Otonomi Daerah yang Efektif dan Efisien untuk Diimplementasikan dalam Bidang Pendidikan*. Malang: Universitas Negeri Malang.
- Huda, N. 1998. *Desentralisasi Pendidikan: Gagasan dan Pelaksanaannya*. Paper presented at National Education Convention, Jakarta.
- Iswanto, B. 1999. *Otonomi Daerah: Implikasi Bagi Pengelolaan Pendidikan*. Malang: Universitas Negeri Malang.
- Law No 22, 1999, 1999. *Tentang Pemerintahan Daerah*. Jakarta: DPR RI.
- Law No 25, 1999, 1999. *Tentang Perimbangan Keuangan Antara Pemerintah Pusat dan Daerah*. Jakarta: DPR RI.
- Mantja, W. 1999. *Mencari Format Desentralisasi di Bidang Manajemen Pendidikan Menyongsong Otonomi Daerah*. Malang: Universitas Negeri Malang.
- Muis, T. 1999. *Strategi Pemberdayaan Pemerintah Daerah dan Peningkatan Peran Serta Masyarakat dan Swasta dalam Rangka Mengimplementasikan Otonomi Daerah di Bidang Pendidikan*. Malang: Universitas Negeri Malang.
- Muslimin, S. 2000. *Reformasi Sistem dan Proses Pendidikan: Suatu Pemikiran dan Strategi Penciptaan SDM Unggul yang Beradab dalam Konteks Mengatasi Keterpurukan Bangsa*. Malang: Student Executive Body, Universitas Negeri Malang.

- Naisbitt, J. 1994. *Global Paradox*. (Translated by Budijanto). Jakarta: Binarupa Aksara.
- Soetopo, H. 1999. *Desentralisasi Manajemen Pendidikan dalam Kerangka Otonomi Daerah*. Malang: Universitas Negeri Malang.
- The World Bank. 2000. *The State of The World Children*. UNICEF: World Development Report 1998/1999.
- Umaedi. 2000. *Manajemen Peningkatan Mutu Berbasis Sekolah*. Jakarta: Ministry of National Education.
- Witkin, B.R. 1984. *Assessing Needs in Education and Social Program*. California: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- World Bank. 2000. *The State of the World Children*. UNICEF: World Development Report 1998/1999.