

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT: THE CHALLENGES OF ITS IMPLEMENTATION IN INDONESIA

Eny Winarti

Abstrak:

Krisis ekonomi yang melanda Indonesia dan mencapai puncaknya pada tahun 1997/ 1998 telah mendorong ditetapkannya Undang-undang tentang Otonomi Daerah. Beranggapan bahwa otonomi daerah dan otonomi pendidikan akan membantu mengatasi masalah tersebut, maka pemerintah menetapkan *School-Based Management* (SBM) sebagai bentuk sistem pendidikan Indonesia. Penelitian mengenai SBM memunculkan dua pendapat yang berbeda. Temuan positif mengenai penerapan SBM menunjukkan bahwa penerapan SBM dianggap mampu memberdayakan daerah setempat; sementara itu, penelitian yang lain menunjukkan bahwa penerapan SBM justru dianggap memunculkan masalah baru. Karena fokus penelitian yang terpisah-pisah, penulis beranggapan bahwa penelitian tersebut kurang dapat memberikan gambaran mengenai fenomena pendidikan di Indonesia secara menyeluruh. Bertolak dari kondisi tersebut, penulis mencoba menyatukan informasi untuk memunculkan konteks yang dapat membantu pembaca dalam memahami dinamika penerapan SBM dan kemudian mengenali tantangan penerapan SBM tersebut.

Key words:

education, decentralization, globalization, School-Based Management

1. Introduction

The global economic crisis, which affected Indonesia and severely struck in 1997/1998, encouraged Indonesia to adopt regional autonomy.¹ Its implementation eventually required Indonesian education, which had been centralized for more than thirty years, to be decentralized.² To fulfill these demands, the government passed the 2003 Education Acts.³ One of the policies listed in the Acts is the implementation the decentralization of education in the form of School-Based Management (SBM). The basic idea of SBM in Indonesia is that the SBM allows the distribution of authority from the central government to the local ones.⁴ Based on the National Education Commission (*Komisi Pendidikan Nasional*), the reason for Indonesia to adopt SBM is that after reviewing a study by the World Bank, the Commission considered that the system would be able to empower local schools, which eventually would increase schools' accountability.⁵

After the enactment of the Education Acts 2003, Indonesia begin to implement SBM; however, its implementation has drawn praise, criticism, and questions among education experts in Indonesia.⁶ Almost all of the arguments are compelling. For example, focusing his work on policy, Tilaar⁷ questioned the implications that might be resulted from its implementation. Faucher⁸ indicated that the implementation of SBM was noted to be empowering the region. Surprisingly, Bandur⁹ identified that the implementation of SBM in Flores had good impacts on school improvement and students' achievement, but had triggered conflicts on teachers. Unlike the others, evaluating the curriculum and the teachers, Bjork¹⁰ noted that the Local Curriculum Courses did not work as expected because of teachers' perspectives. Bjork¹¹ asserted that the implementation of SBM tended to be successful in relatively independent schools.

Focusing on different angles and offering different results, those studies seem to be debated. However, this paper is not intended to support or oppose one of those ideas, but to provide an overview that contextualizes those phenomena, to help the readers comprehend those different results.

The basic argument of this paper is that global economy that has influenced global education has influenced national economy. The national economy eventually has influenced the national education in the same manner as the global economy has an impact on the global education. To explain this notion, this paper begins with the discussion of the nature of globalization, which is economically driven, and its impact on education. Following the presentation is the impact of global economy on Indonesia's economy and Indonesian education, The challenges of the implementation of SBM and the conclusion are presented afterwards.

2. Globalization in Economy and Globalization in Education

2.1 *The Nature of Globalization in Economy*

To illustrate the nature of globalization, Appadurai's,¹² Castells,¹³ Friedman's,¹⁴ and Marginson and Sawir's¹⁵ ideas related to globalization are synthesized and presented in this section. According to Friedman,¹⁶ the process of globalization could be categorized into three stages: globalization 1.0, 2.0, and 3.0. In globalization 1.0, Friedman indicated that the world shrank from large into medium because of the integration of the countries.¹⁷ He added that imperialism or religious missionaries sometimes inspired this shrink. According to Friedman, the second globalization, globalization 2.0, which shrunk the world from medium into small, happened at the level of companies.¹⁸ Being influenced by the imperialism,¹⁹ which was followed by mercantilism, this process had encouraged the emergence of multinational companies.²⁰

Friedman's globalization 1.0 and 2.0 seems to be parallel with the word "flow" by Appadurai²¹ and Marginson and Sawir.²² Associating the word "flow" with fluid, Marginson and Sawir, like Appadurai, stated that the process of globalization includes ethnoscaples, finanscaples, technoscaples, mediascaples, and ideoscaples. It was mentioned that the imperialism had caused people to transport from one place to another. Since people brought with them their cultures and ideas, people thought that they needed to maintain them in their new places. When they communicated with the local people, a process of transferring ideas from the new comers to the local people, called ethnoscaples, which was eventually followed by the transfer of money, called finanscape; and the transfer of ideas, called ideoscaples, was also happening.²³ As an illustration, during the colonization period, Indonesia adopted systems owned by the countries of the colonists – the Netherlands and Japan. For example, during the Dutch and Japanese colonization, many schools were named in the languages of the colonists and the curriculum contents were adjusted to suit the needs of the colonists.²⁴

The scapes notion does not necessarily take place in sequence. This could happen simultaneously without any regular direction as in Friedman's²⁵ globalization 3.0 – the third stage of globalization. Friedman indicated that globalization 3.0, where we are now, was encouraged by the development of the technology, especially network. Friedman²⁶ and Wallerstein²⁷ indicated that the dynamics of the Berlin Wall had brought the economic system into one single system: capitalism. After the fall of the Berlin Wall, the idea of outsourcing (allowing companies to hire people from different countries) and offshoring (moving the company to other countries for financial reasons of the company) began to emerge and encourage people to develop technology so that the communication between the center of the companies and the branches become more effective.²⁸ This development has allowed people to access different types of media from and to other countries.²⁹ When these *scapes* notions from different fields are happening simultaneously, it might create a new configuration in which people are required to cooperate in a complex manner in the form of *networks*.³⁰

The improvement on cooperation and technology has an impact on many different aspects, especially economy. The *networks* has encouraged productivity, and as in economic laws, too much production forces consumerism and competition.³¹ To level the market, tariffs and subsidies regulation have been implemented by removing price adjustment.³² However, instead of leveling the nation-states, this policy has widened the gap between the rich and poor countries. The developing countries tend to produce primary products, which have less value added.³³ Meanwhile, having more capital (financial, cultural, and intellectual capital), rich countries has the capacity to process the raw materials. Then, the results of the manufacturing are sent back to the poor countries.³⁴ Unfortunately, what is happening in the market is not as expected. Sundaram and Arnim³⁵ indicate that overtime, the prices of the

primary products tend to decrease relatively to the manufactured products. The financial globalization has made the developing countries lose control over their exchange rates.³⁶ Consequently, instead of leveling the nation-states, this process had offered more benefits to the rich countries.

2.2 *The Impact of Globalization in Economy on Education*

Globalization on the economy had an impact on many aspects of development and policy, which indirectly had an impact on education.³⁷ Some international organizations that become the proponents of the knowledge of economy, such as the World Bank and IMF, emerge with the major purpose to provide loan to the developing country with the agenda to reduce poverty by promoting programs for development.³⁸ With the assumption that the knowledge of economy, which was invested in education, would help the developing country alleviate poverty,³⁹ the World Bank offers loans for education program followed by some agreements on education policies.⁴⁰ For example, at a higher level of education, they recommend that education is directed to prepare students for the workplace⁴¹ and that decentralizing education at the primary and secondary education becomes the school management model.⁴²

Generating education system from an attempt to prepare students for the workplace has triggered the adoption of economic vocabularies such as *link and match*, *standardization*, *accountability*, *stakeholder*, *knowledge of economy*, and *lifelong learning* into the education programs⁴³. The adoption of those economic terms in education eventually requires education to be treated like the economy. Spring indicated that the agenda of *knowledge of economy* was the knowledge to increase productivity, and in order to increase the productivity, education should be able to serve its stakeholders, known as the idea of *link and match*.⁴⁴ This indicates that education is used to serve economy.

Regarding the school management model for the primary and secondary schools, School-Based Management (SBM) is known to be one of the popular decentralization models of decentralization in education⁴⁵. It is said that SBM has the potential to be more efficient and more accountable because although being developed at the local level, it still allows service end users (the institutions in which the students might work later) to participate in designing the school curriculum in order to improve the learning outcome.⁴⁶ Therefore, it increases the possibility to empower the local potential to meet the global needs. However, for the sake of the quality control, education and learning should be standardized.⁴⁷ Some global testing services such as First International Mathematic Study (FIMS), Third International Mathematics and Science Studies (TIMSS), Programme for International Students Assessment (PISA) and English Testing Services (ETS) emerge. They are introduced as an effort to measure school accountability.⁴⁸

Unexpectedly, the unintended impact of learning standardization seems to be the same as the notion of globalization in economy in the case of the removal of price adjustment. Spring⁴⁹ criticizes that standardized tests have been the intellectual market for the dominated by groups that have more capitals. In addition, while the language used in the tests is usually generated from the dominant groups⁵⁰, a study by Thorndike⁵¹ indicates that test items can be culturally biased. Students who do not share knowledge with the dominant groups have the potential to fail the tests. In other words, while the standardized testing is deemed to maintain the quality, standardized testing also has the potential to widen the gap between students whose cultures are the same as and different from the test writers.

From the explanation, it can be seen that globalization in economy has triggered market competition.⁵² This competition eventually necessitates the governments of the related nations to respond to this situation so that the nation-states can continuously connect to the world market system⁵³. With the assumption that decentralization in education would be an effective education model in the globalization era, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank as the finance institutions that provide loans to the developing countries recommend this form of education to the donor countries.⁵⁴ Since decentralization in education is finance-driven model of education, the economic terms are embedded in education,⁵⁵ and this adoption is deemed to have similar impacts to those in the globalization of economy. The correlation between the global economy and the global education is parallel with the correlation between the Indonesian economy and Indonesian education as presented in the following section.

3. The Impact of Global Economy on Indonesia

3.1 *The Impact of Globalization in Economy on Indonesia's Economy*

This section is aimed at illustrating how global economy has affected Indonesia. It is indicated that since 1967, Indonesia had relied on oil, an unrenovable natural resource.⁵⁶ For the development of that unrenovable resource, Indonesia had allowed foreign investments⁵⁷. In addition, on the advice of the advisors of the IMF, those investments were used for the short-term investment program, including the development of the National Oil and Gas Mining Company (*Pertambangan Minyak dan Gas Bumi Nasional, Pertamina*)⁵⁸. Despite its high costs, Indonesia also used a satellite for domestic telecommunications, which was generally used by the developed countries.⁵⁹ This development necessitated the development of other sectors, such as television, which needed to be imported from other countries.⁶⁰ Since then, the telecommunication was introduced and people began to learn new ideologies.

Because of such a relationship, when the world market dropped,⁶¹ the economy of the country worsened and approached collapse.⁶² The severe economic crisis triggered Indonesian people to protest for a reform movement in which one of the

items was decentralization.⁶³ Becoming the proponent of the reform movement, IMF provided loans for the reform.⁶⁴ It was said that the organizations would be willing to help if the government agreed to reform by implementing decentralization.⁶⁵ Because of this reason, decentralization was implemented and was legalized by the laws on regional autonomy.⁶⁶

3.2 *The impact of Indonesia's Economy on Indonesian Education*

The economic crisis in Indonesia in 1997/ 1998 has triggered the emergence the decentralization, which was legalized by the enactment of Laws on regional autonomy, which eventually necessitated the implementation of decentralization in education.⁶⁷ For this purpose, the government then passed Education Acts⁶⁸ (*Undang-undang tentang Pendidikan Nasional*), which was followed by the guidelines of its implementation.⁶⁹ By these regulations, the government appointed National Education Standards Board (*BSNP, Badan Standard Nasional Pendidikan*) to standardize the contents of the curriculum and the graduate competencies. The curriculum is adjusted and modified at the local level, and is known as the School-Level Curriculum (*Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan, KTSP*).⁷⁰ This curriculum adopts similar key words as in globalization in education in general, such as *accountability, think globally and act locally* and *standardization*. Those words are explicitly stated in the defining terms of Indonesian KTSP, principles of curriculum development, operational guidelines, components, syllabus development, and learning objectives of Indonesian education⁷¹.

From this scenario, it can be seen that the implementation of SBM in Indonesia was first triggered by the economic problems at the national level, which was influenced by the world economic problems. The economic problem at the national level eventually influenced the political problem in the country. In order to solve the political and economic problems, the Indonesian Government took policies, in which the education policies became part of them. In other words, the *scapes* notions have triggered the emergence of the current education system in Indonesia – SBM.

3.2.1 *The Impact of the enactment of the 2003 Education Acts*

Like the globalization in economy and the globalization in education in general, the enactment of the 2003 Education Acts seems to bring paradox in its policies, its practices and its results because of the different characteristics among school units⁷². This section shows how the education policies generated from the 2003 Education Acts has caused those paradoxes.

Based on the 2003 Education Acts, the curriculum is developed locally by the school committee,⁷³ known as School-Level Curriculum (*Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan, KTSP*).⁷⁴ This committee might consist of the representatives of students' parents, community leaders, educators, schools alumni, business people,

and students.⁷⁵ It is important to note here that schools in remote areas, in which the communities tend to be less developed, might have problems related with the representativeness and the membership of the committee. Because of the background of the community, it is possible that the parents of the students who are selected as the members of the school committee do not have adequate education background.⁷⁶

Additionally, in order to control and monitor the quality of education, the Indonesian government appointed the National Education Standard Board (*Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan*, BSNP).⁷⁷ Regarding the curriculum development, the BSNP proposes seven principles of curriculum development. First, in developing the curriculum, the designer should refer to the potentials and the needs of the local without neglecting its surrounding. Second, the curriculum developed should embrace the diversity of the students and their background without discriminating against their religions, sex, gender, socio-economic background and ethnicity. Third, the content of the curriculum adjusted should be up to date with the science and technology development based on the needs of schools' stakeholders. Fourth, the learning should be relevant with the students' needs. Fifth, the curriculum should be holistic and spiral. Sixth, the curriculum should be directed for lifelong learning, and the last is that the curriculum should be balance between the local and the national needs.⁷⁸

Regardless of the principles of curriculum development, the learning evaluation is standardized although it can be in the form of written tests, observations, and projects. It is said that learning evaluations should be valid, objective, fair, open, systematic, accountable, and holistic.⁷⁹ Because of those principles of testing development, the national exam is developed collaboratively between the national and local government to measure students learning achievement.⁸⁰ It is also important to note that in order to be able to continue their education, students are required to pass a set of competencies determined by the government.⁸¹

All of those efforts (the curriculum principles and the standardized test) indicate that the documents of Indonesian education have adopted most jargons of global education, such as *standardized*, *stakeholders*, and *embracing the diversity*, but those jargons have arbitrarily contradicted. While some terms and principles, such as *the relevance between students' learning and the local needs*, refer to the decentralized system of education, some others, such as *standardization*, refer to the centralized system of education. It is seen that like in the economic flows, this requires teachers' skills to embrace the contradiction.

Additionally, the government also launch a nine year education program, and to ensure that the program runs well in the country, the government offers Operational Aid to School Program (*Dana Bantuan Operasional Sekolah*, BOS)⁸², which is intended to stimulate the education program in the districts.⁸³ However, the BOS is distributed to the schools based on the number of the students.⁸⁴ Consequently, it

can be predicted that regardless of the money the parents' of the students can earn and the high cost of education, rural schools, in which the number of the students tend to be less, will receive less funding to produce the same quality of education the same as those resulted by the schools with more financial capital. Consequently, the same as the dynamic of the core and periphery in the economic system, rural schools will tend to receive less benefit.

3.2.2 The Implementation of School-Based Management

This section discusses the implementation of SBM in Indonesia seen from the principles of power distribution, curriculum development and learning assessment. The study by Bjork⁸⁵ about the implementation power distribution in decentralized Indonesian education indicated that thirty years in centralized government made teachers less creative than they should have been. Having two memberships in society, as educators and civil servants, teachers were in a difficult position. The precedent system, in which teachers would gain regular pay increases every four years regardless of their efforts, made teachers less dedicated. The devolution system would only encourage the civil servants to perform what the government had expected them to do to make them safe in their jobs. Indriyanto⁸⁶ also had similar analyses. He emphasized that the 30-year centralized system had resulted in dependency among districts. In addition, the low teachers' income in poor districts also motivated teachers to hold other jobs, such as private lessons in the evening. As a result, teachers had less time to prepare and improve their teaching.

Additionally, Bjork⁸⁷ also indicated that curriculum development had its challenges. Based on the Education Acts, schools should offer Local Content Curriculum (LCC), an elective course that is adopted based on the uniqueness of the region⁸⁸. However, based on Bjork's study, none of the schools tried to apply LCC, as it should have been. The LCC was deemed to fail in embracing either the uniqueness of the area or the interests of the students. Instead of finding new subject matters, Bjork noted that teachers had changed the name of the subject to fit the LCC suggested by the government without significantly changing the content and the teaching methods. The changes in the content were merely to fit the changes of the academic system from semesters into a quarter systems.

The implementation of KTSP also affected students' learning and assessment. The standardized learning contents and processes, and students' competencies and assessment offered unique challenges. The Education Laws state that at the end of each level, (elementary school, junior and senior high school) students have the right to attend national examination developed by the government, which is aimed at measuring students' competencies.⁸⁹ However, the schools have the right to determine whether the students pass or fail in the exam.⁹⁰ Kompas⁹¹ reported that different schools had different benchmarks to pass or fail students. The benchmark ranged from 3.5 to 5.5. This indicates that 3.5 from different schools had different impacts to students: one was probably considered pass and the other fail.

Besides the benchmark, the test items are also noted to be problematic. Kompas⁹² reported that some test items sounded to be invalid, especially in Indonesian Language course (*Bahasa Indonesia*). It was noted that *Bahasa* was the subject in which most students failed. Teachers claimed that some items seemed to be ambiguous.⁹³ In a particular school, it was also reported that students failed on sociology. After a further study, it was founded that teachers did not have any academic background of knowledge of sociology.⁹⁴

Reviews from some studies presented previously seemed to offer negative results of the implementation of SBM. Those are different from a study by Bandur and Gamage.⁹⁵ Based on Bandur and Gamage's survey, it is indicated that the implementation of the decentralization had increased teachers and students' performance so that this cooperation increased students' achievement. In the study, however, Bandur and Gamage did not provide any information related to the teaching and learning activities in this classroom. Therefore, it could not be identified whether the teachers taught students for the test or for understanding.

In another study, Bandur⁹⁶ indicated that although the implementation of decentralization in education was deemed to increase students' performance, it triggered conflict between the regional government and school stakeholders. Bandur noted that the source of the conflict was due to the intervention of the District Education Department in selecting textbooks and some other policy decision making. In relation with the intervention from the government, a study by Bjork⁹⁷ about the rituals enacted in an Indonesian school seems to be able to explain this problem. Using the theory of hegemony, Bjork indicated that school rituals, generated from the dominant culture, might promote the legitimacy of the dominant culture and promote the interests of the subordinate groups in the form of counter hegemony. Bjork found that in this school, the school rituals, curriculum, textbooks, and teachers' responsibilities suggested by the government were greatly revised and adjusted based on the school agenda. It is important to note that the school selected by Bjork was a private school, in which most of the students were ethnic-Chinese and the instructors "showed great independence of thought and action."⁹⁸

3.2.3 The Challenges of the Implementation of SBM in Indonesia

To understand the challenges of the implementation of SBM, it is necessary to deconstruct the context. The deconstruction of the context begins from the curriculum, which indirectly becomes the center of the study when people talk about education system. Based on the theory of curriculum decision-making, Goodlad and Richter⁹⁹, Oliva¹⁰⁰ and Sowell¹⁰¹ indicate that in general, a curriculum is divided into four: societal, institutional, instructional and experiential. The societal curriculum is considered to be the broadest and to cover the social level, including the global, social, and political level. It is developed and decided by the board without necessarily being agreed by the lower level. The institutional curriculum is known

to be the most democratic because it is designed and is decided by the community together with educator staff. The instructional curriculum is known to be the most local. It is developed and decided at school level, and therefore the appropriateness of the design is determined by the ability of teachers and the curriculum designers at school level. Different from the other three curricula, the experiential curriculum is very personal, being developed and decided by the students based on their needs and interests.

From the explanation above, it can be inferred that the current Indonesian curriculum, the KTSP, is an institutional curriculum, which is economic, political, and social driven. The decentralization in education, which is presented by the adoption of SBM, is triggered by the global economic condition that influenced the economy of the country. The economic crisis in Indonesia in 1997 has accelerated the process of the globalization in Indonesian education. During that crisis, some international agencies, such as IMF and the World Bank, have got involved in overcoming the economic and political problems. These organizations indirectly have recommended the country to implement decentralization in education,¹⁰² in which KTSP becomes part of it.¹⁰³

In the curriculum development, the identification of the needs is prominent so that the aims of education can be formulated.¹⁰⁴ In the process of identifying the needs, four different ways of classification scheme should be considered. They are (1) needs of the students by level (human, national, state or regional, community, school and individual); needs of the students by types (physical/biological, socio-psychological, educational and developmental tasks); needs of the society by level (human, international, national, state, community, and neighborhood); and (2) needs of society by types (political, social, economic, educational, environmental, defense, health, and moral and spiritual).¹⁰⁵

Being implemented locally, KTSP requires the creativity of the people at the lower hierarchy to adjust the policy by identifying the needs of the students at the local level. What generally happens in a more dependent school is that the curriculum designer, in this context the school committee, the group that has more power has the greatest influence in developing the curriculum.¹⁰⁶ In the study by Ferimeldi about the interpretation of SBM across the educational hierarchy, it can be seen that perception differences between the governmental officials and the principals and the SBM implemented in Western countries¹⁰⁷ indicated the challenge of the local capability in developing and adjusting the national curriculum. In the study by Bjork, it can be inferred that in a less dependent school, teachers had the capacity to modify and adjust the curriculum. The schools even had more power either to promote or to resist the governments' interests.¹⁰⁸

To explain how those phenomena could happen, an article written by Lingard, Rawolle and Taylor¹⁰⁹ entitled "Globalising policy in education: working with

Bourdieu” is adopted here. Becoming the proponents of Bourdieu’s concepts, Lingard, Rawolle and Taylor affirm that any social construction consists of a complex hierarchy of multiple power relationships with their own logics and practices.¹¹⁰ The same case also happens in education policy. Citing from Mann, Lingard, Rawolle and Taylor assume that education policy in the global era has multiple hierarchies from the local, national, international, transnational, and global.¹¹¹ Meanwhile, Bourdieu assumes that global market is created and imposed by the powerful agents, neo-liberalism, as an effort to maintain their domination¹¹². By this construction, it can be inferred that while each level requires its autonomy, the notion of globalization creates a pattern of unification around the world. In other words, only more autonomous schools like the one selected by Bjork for his study¹¹³ would be able to resist with such uniformity.

Based on the local and global relationship introduced by Lingard, Rawolle and Taylor,¹¹⁴ like Bourdieu,¹¹⁵ the policy offered by the hierarchy above the nation circulates without the original context. Consequently, considering the complexity of the social formation, the ability of the schools to interpret the policy, which is influenced by habits,¹¹⁶ will determine the design of the KTSP, which eventually will affect the schools’ performance. In Indonesian context, the thirty years under centralized authority made the people in charge difficult to take initiatives. Therefore, it is understandable that teachers tended to be the curriculum implementers rather than the curriculum designers.¹¹⁷

Another important aspect to note is that in the context of globalization, the government and the bureaucratic fields have the largest power.¹¹⁸ While the government determines the policies, the bureaucrats ensure that the policies are well implemented.¹¹⁹ So far, it is difficult to locate how the curriculum has been evaluated. In general, people take for granted that the quality of education is reflected in the results of the National Exam. For example, without a critical academic review, in a public polling done by *Tempo Interaktif* about two third of the total respondents agreed that the poor results of the National Exam indicated the poor quality of Indonesian education.¹²⁰ Considering this, in the context of curriculum development, it is important to question (1) what is the purpose of education? (2) who develops the curriculum? (3) how eligible are they? and (4) who do they represent? In the context of teaching and learning, it is necessary to ask: (1) what kinds of learning activities will contribute to the achievement of the learning goals? (2) what learning media do the schools have? and (3) how important is the media in supporting the learning? In relation with the National Examination, it is prominent to consider (1) what is the purpose of the test? (2) who develops the test? (3) how qualified are the test developers and (3) how well does the test measure the students’ achievement? If these items are taken into account, the results of the National Exam will not be the only concern.

4. Conclusion

To sum up, it could be inferred that global economy and global education are parallel with Indonesia's economy and Indonesian education. The global economy and education has a unique relationship with the national economy and education. This unique relationship seems to be influenced by the *scapes* and *networks* notions¹²¹, which is not leveled. Because of this complicated relationship, it is difficult for the poor countries to benefit from the globalization¹²².

Given the phenomena in the implementation of SBM in Indonesia, three challenges could be identified. The first is due to the school autonomy. From the process of the emergence of SBM in Indonesia, it can be seen that financial capital becomes the driven force of the school reform. In general, the financial capital has the potential to create a unique power relationship and dependency. In the nature of curriculum development, such a dependency tends to weaken the school autonomy because the schools will have less freedom in developing the contents of the curriculum.¹²³ Given this fact, will Indonesia schools be willing to reduce any external supports for the sake of education autonomy?

The second and the third challenge are related with the habits and critical thinking. While the *scapes* and *flows* notions require education bodies to be critical, the thirty years centralized education system in Indonesia has formed unique practices in the education bodies. Instead of training them to be the curriculum designers, the system seemed to have caused education bodies and education practitioners to be merely curriculum implementer.¹²⁴ The habits of trying to serve the higher hierarchy for more than thirty years worsened by the dynamics of globalization that have led to the unification thought has made it even more difficult for Indonesian people to think critically. People generally assume that thinking critically is identical with questioning the position.¹²⁵ This model of questioning has the potential to lead to coercion because it might questions the authority of the dominant power.¹²⁶ Would education bodies and education practitioners be willing to be criticized for the sake of their development although it might threaten their authority? Would they be willing to encourage other people, including their students, to think critically if it might threaten their authority? Would people who are concerned with education be brave enough to take actions and to take risks resulted from their actions? Only if those challenges were overcome, I assume, the SBM, then could provide more benefits to the whole society.

Eny Winarti

Faculty of Science of Education of the University of Sanata Dharma, Yogyakarta, doctoral student of Ohio University, USA: anywinarti@gmail.com

Catatan Akhir:

- ¹ Kristiansen, S. and Pratikno "Decentralising Education in Indonesia" *International Journal of Educational Development*, 516.
- ² Jalal, F., & Musthafa, B. *Education reform in the context of regional autonomy: the case of Indonesia*, 16-24.
- ³ Undang-undang tentang Pendidikan Nasional, 2003.
- ⁴ Bandur, A., & Gamage, D. T. "SBM policies and programs: Improving teaching-learning environments and student achievements in Indonesia", 51-75.
- ⁵ Komisi Nasional Pendidikan, *Menuju pendidikan dasar bermutu dan merata: Laporan Komisi Nasional Pendidikan*, 9-32.
- ⁶ The studies by Bandur (2008), Bandur and Gamage (2009) and Bjork (2004; 2006), and a review by Tilaar (2009), for example, revealed positive and negative impacts of the implementation of the SBM.
- ⁷ Tilaar, H, *Kekuasaan dan pendidikan: Manajemen pendidikan nasional dalam pusran kekuasaan*, 334-336.
- ⁸ Faucher, C "Popular discourse on identity politics and decentralisation in Tanjung Pinang public schools", *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, 47(2), 273-285.
- ⁹ Bandur, A. *A study of the implementation of School-Based Management in Flores primary schools in Indonesia*.
- ¹⁰ Bjork, C., "Decentralization in education, institutional culture and teacher autonomy in Indonesia", *International Review of Education*, 50, 245-262.
- ¹¹ Bjork, C., "Reconstructing Rituals: Expressions of Autonomy and Resistance in a Sino-Indonesian School." *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 33(4), 465-491.
- ¹² Appadurai, A., *Modernity at Large. Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*, 33-43.
- ¹³ Castells, M, *The Rise of the Network Society*.
- ¹⁴ Friedman, T L., *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*, 3-33.
- ¹⁵ Marginson, S., & Sawir, E., "Interrogating global flows in higher education", *Globalisation, societies and education*, 3(3), 281-309.
- ¹⁶ Friedman, T L., *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*, 3-33.
- ¹⁷ Friedman, T L., *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*, 3-33.
- ¹⁸ Friedman, T L., *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*, 3-33.
- ¹⁹ Friedman, T L., *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*, 3-33.
- ²⁰ Sanderson, S. K., & Alderson, A. S., *World societies: The evolution of human social life*.
- ²¹ Appadurai, A., *Modernity at Large. Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*, 33-43.
- ²² Marginson, S., & Sawir, E., "Interrogating global flows in higher education. *Globalisation, societies and education*, 3(3), 283-284.
- ²³ Appadurai, A., *Modernity at Large. Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*, 33-43; Marginson, S., & Sawir, E., "Interrogating global flows in higher education. *Globalisation, societies and education*, 3(3), 283-284.
- ²⁴ Embree, E. R., Simon, M. S., & Mumford, W. B., *Island India goes to school*, 37-63.; Tilaar, H. A. R., *Pembangunan pendidikan nasional 1945-1995: Suatu analisis kebijakan*, 26-61.
- ²⁵ Friedman, T L., *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*, 3-33.
- ²⁶ Friedman, T L., *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*, 3-33.
- ²⁷ Wallerstein, I., "The rise and future demise of the World Capitalist System: Concepts for comparative analysis", *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 16(4), 395.
- ²⁸ Friedman, T L., *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*, 3-33.
- ²⁹ Appadurai (1996) and Marginson and Sawir (2005) considered that technology development had speeded up the development of other *scapes* notions (*ethnoscapes, financescapes, ideoscapes* and *mediascapes*).
- ³⁰ Marginson, S., & Sawir, E., "Interrogating global flows in higher education. *Globalisation, societies and education*, 3(3), 285.
- ³¹ Castells, M, *The Rise of the Network Society. The Information Age. Economy, Society and Culture*, 77-162.
- ³² Sundaram, J., & Arnim, R., "Trade liberation and economic development", *Science*, 323(5911), 211-212.

- ³³ Sundaram, J., & Arnim, R., "Trade liberation and economic development", *Science*, 323(5911), 211-212.
- ³⁴ Sundaram, J., & Arnim, R., "Trade liberation and economic development", 211-212.
- ³⁵ Sundaram, J., & Arnim, R. "Trade liberation and economic development", 211-212.
- ³⁶ Pereira, L., *Globalization and competition: why some emergent countries succeed while some others fall behind*, 51.
- ³⁷ Stromquist, N. P., & Monkman, K., "Defining globalization and assessing its implications on knowledge and education. In N. P. Stromquist & K. Monkman (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures*, 3-25.
- ³⁸ Marcus, E., The history of the World Bank, *The Economic Journal*, 112(447), 119-135.
- ³⁹ Stewart, T. A., *The wealth of knowledge: Intellectual capital an the twenty first century organization*, 11-18.
- ⁴⁰ Heyneman, S. P., "The history and problems in the making of education policy at the World Bank 1960–2000", *International Journal of Educational Development*, 23, 315-337.
- ⁴¹ Stromquist, N. P., & Monkman, K. (2000), "Defining globalization and assessing its implications on knowledge and education", In N. P. Stromquist & K. Monkman (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures*, 13.
- ⁴² Carnoy, M., "Globalization and education reform", In N. P. Stromquist & K. Monkman (Eds.), *Globalization and education: integration and contestation across cultures*, 52-54; Barrera-Osorio, F., Fasih, T., Patrinos, H. A., & Santibanez, L., "Decentralized decesion-making in schools: the theory and evidence on School-Based Management", 1-14.
- ⁴³ Spring, J. *Globalization of education: An introduction*.
- ⁴⁴ Spring, J. *Globalization of education: An introduction*.
- ⁴⁵ Barrera-Osorio, F., Fasih, T., Patrinos, H. A., & Santibanez, L. *Decentralized decesion-making in schools: the theory and evidence on School-Based Management* , 5.
- ⁴⁶ Barrera-Osorio, F., Fasih, T., Patrinos, H. A., & Santibanez, L., *Decentralized decesion-making in schools: the theory and evidence on School-Based Management*, 6.
- ⁴⁷ Heneyman (2003)
- ⁴⁸ Spring, J. "Research on globalization and education", *Review of education research*, 78(2), 350-352.
- ⁴⁹ Spring, J., *Conflict of interests: The politics of American education* (5th ed.), 199-204.
- ⁵⁰ In their book, Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) indicate that the language being standardized and used in formal practices is usually adopted from the language being standardized is the language of the most powerful group in the society.
- ⁵¹ Thorndike, R. L., Concepts of culture-fairness. *Educational Measurement*, 8(2), 63-70.
- ⁵² Astiz, M., Wiseman, A. W., & Baker, D. P. Slouching towards decentralization: consequences of globalization for curricular control in national education systems. *Comparative and international education society*, 46(1), 67.
- ⁵³ Astiz, M., Wiseman, A. W., & Baker, D. P., "Slouching towards decentralization: consequences of globalization for curricular control in national education systems", *Comparative and international education society*, 46(1), 67.
- ⁵⁴ Carnoy, M., "Globalization and education reform", In N. P. Stromquist & K. Monkman (Eds.), *Globalization and education: integration and contestation across cultures*, 47.
- ⁵⁵ Spring, J. *Globalization of education: An introduction (sociocultural, political, and historical studies in education)*, 3.
- ⁵⁶ Ricklefs, M., *A history of modern Indonesia since c. 1200*. 3rd ed.,
- ⁵⁷ Sadli, M., "Foreign Investement", In J. H. McGlynn, O. Matuloh, S. Charle, J. Hadler, B. Bujono, M. G. Agusta, & G. Suhartono (Eds.), *Indonesia in the Soeharto Years: Issues, incidents, and images*, 94.
- ⁵⁸ Sadli, M. "Foreign Investement", In J. H. McGlynn, O. Matuloh, S. Charle, J. Hadler, B. Bujono, M. G. Agusta, & G. Suhartono (Eds.), *Indonesia in the Soeharto Years: Issues, incidents, and images*, 94.
- ⁵⁹ Barker. D.J. , "Footprint of the state: Satellite communications" In J. H. McGlynn, O. Matuloh, S. Charle, J. Hadler, B. Bujono, M. G. Agusta, & G. Suhartono (Eds.), *Indonesia in the Soeharto Years: Issues, incidents, and images*, 07-109.

- ⁶⁰ Barker, D.J., "Footprint of the state: Satellite communications," In J. H. McGlynn, O. Matuloh, S. Charle, J. Hadler, B. Bujono, M. G. Agusta, & G. Suhartono (Eds.), *Indonesia in the Soeharto Years: Issues, incidents, and images*, 107-109.
- ⁶¹ In "Crisis, recovery and reforms in East Asia" Sundaram (2004, 83-109) indicated that the crises in East Asia in 1997-1998 was influenced by the flow of the international capital liberation. .
- ⁶² Djiwandono, J. " Economic Crisis" In J. H. McGlynn, O. Matuloh, S. Charle, J. Hadler, B. Bujono, M. G. Agusta, & G. Suhartono (Eds.), *Indonesia in the Soeharto Years: Issues, incidents, and images*, 334.
- ⁶³ Kristiansen, S. and Pratikno, "Decentralising Education in Indonesia", *International Journal of Educational Development*, 516-517.
- ⁶⁴ Subianto, B. , " The International Monetary Fund", In J. H. McGlynn, O. Matuloh, S. Charle, J. Hadler, B. Bujono, M. G. Agusta, & G. Suhartono (Eds.), *Indonesia in the Soeharto Years: Issues, incidents, and images*, 348.
- ⁶⁵ Kristiansen, S. and Pratikno, "Decentralising Education in Indonesia", *International Journal of Educational Development*, 516-517.
- ⁶⁶ Komisi Nasional Pendidikan., *Menuju pendidikan dasar bermutu dan merata: Laporan Komisi Nasional Pendidikan*, 17.
- ⁶⁷ Undang-undang tentang Otonomi Daerah 1999. No 22. Article 11.
- ⁶⁸ Undang-undang tentang Pendidikan Nasional, 2003.
- ⁶⁹ Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia No. 19 Tahun 2005 tentang Standard Nasional Pendidikan.
- ⁷⁰ Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia No. 19 Tahun 2005 tentang Standard Nasional Pendidikan. Article 4, Verses 16-17.
- ⁷¹ Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia No. 19 Tahun 2005 tentang Standard Nasional Pendidikan. Article 4, Verses 16-17.
- ⁷² Bjork, C. " Transferring authority to local school communities in Indonesia: Ambitious plans, mixed results", In C. Bjork (Ed.), *Educational decentralization*, 129-147); Bjork, C. " Local responses to decentralization policy in Indonesia", *The Comparative and International Education Society*, 47(2), 184-216; Bjork, C., "Decentralization in education, institutional culture and teacher autonomy in Indonesia", *International review of education*, 50, 245-262; Bjork, C. " Reconstructing rituals: Expressions of autonomy and resistance in a Sino-Indonesian school", *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 33(4), 465-491.
- ⁷³ Undang-undang Republik Indonesia No. 20 Tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional. Chapter10, Article 38, Verse 2.
- ⁷⁴ Kementerian Pendidikan Nasional, Pusat Kurikulum, *Naskah akademik kurikulum tingkat satuan pendidikan jenjang pendidikan dasar dan menengah*.
- ⁷⁵ Keputusan menteri pendidikan nasional Republik Indonesia No. 044/U/2002 tentang dewan pendidikan dan komite sekolah.
- ⁷⁶ Bjork, C. "Transferring authority to local school communities in Indonesia: Ambitious plans, mixed results" In C. Bjork (Ed.), *Educational decentralization*, 136-140.
- ⁷⁷ Undang-undang Republik Indonesia No. 20 Tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional. Chapter 9, Article 35.
- ⁷⁸ Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan., *Panduan penyusunan kurikulum tingkat satuan pendidikan*, 5-7.
- ⁷⁹ Lampiran Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia No. 20 Tahun 2007 tentang Standar Penilaian Pendidikan.
- ⁸⁰ Lampiran Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia No. 20 Tahun 2007 tentang Standar Penilaian Pendidikan.
- ⁸¹ Lampiran Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia No. 22 tahun 2006 tentang Standar Isi untuk Satuan Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah.
- ⁸² Peraturan Menteri Keuangan Nomor 247/ PMK07/ 2010 tentang Pedoman Umum Dana Alokasi sementara Bantuan Operasional Sekolah bagi Daerah Kabupaten dan Kota tahun anggaran 2011, Article 1, Verse 1.

- ⁸³ Peraturan Menteri Keuangan Nomor 247/ PMK07/ 2010 tentang Pedoman Umum Dana Alokasi sementara Bantuan Operasional Sekolah bagi Daerah Kabupaten dan Kota tahun anggaran 2011, Article 1, Verse 1.
- ⁸⁴ Peraturan Menteri Keuangan Nomor 247/ PMK07/ 2010 tentang Pedoman Umum Dana Alokasi sementara Bantuan Operasional Sekolah bagi Daerah Kabupaten dan Kota tahun anggaran 2011, Article 3, Verse 3.
- ⁸⁵ Bjork, C. "Transferring authority to local school communities in Indonesia: Ambitious plans, mixed results." In C. Bjork (Ed.), *Educational decentralization*, 129-147.
- ⁸⁶ Indriyanto, Bambang. "School-based Management: Issues and hopes toward decentralization in education in Indonesia", *Proceedings of the The 3rd international forum on education reform* , 1-20.
- ⁸⁷ Bjork, C., "Local responses to decentralization policy in Indonesia", *Comparative Education Review*, 47(2), 184-216.
- ⁸⁸ Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, *Model mata pelajaran muatan lokal*, 3.
- ⁸⁹ Peraturan pemerintah republik indonesia no. 19 tahun 2005 tentang standar nasional pendidikan, Articles 66 dan 69.
- ⁹⁰ Peraturan pemerintah republik indonesia no. 19 tahun 2005 tentang standar nasional pendidikan, Article 27, Verse 1.
- ⁹¹ Kompas, *Standar kelulusan UASBN diminta naik*.
- ⁹² Kompas, *Kualitas soal UN harus diuji peneliti*.
- ⁹³ Kompas, *Mestinya untuk menguji, bukan mengecoh*.
- ⁹⁴ Kompas, *Mestinya untuk menguji, bukan mengecoh*.
- ⁹⁵ Bandur, A., & Gamage, D. T., "SBM policies and programs: Improving teaching-learning environments and student achievements in Indonesia", *Education and Society*, 51-75.
- ⁹⁶ Bandur, A., *A study of the implementation of School-Based Management in Flores primary schools in Indonesia*.
- ⁹⁷ Bjork, C., "Reconstructing rituals in a Sino-Indonesian School", *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 465-491.
- ⁹⁸ Bjork, C., "Reconstructing rituals in a Sino-Indonesian School", *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 466.
- ⁹⁹ Goodlad, J.I. & Richter, M.N., *The development of a conceptual system for dealing with problems of curriculum and instruction*, 29-39.
- ¹⁰⁰ Olivia, P F., *Developing the curriculum*.
- ¹⁰¹ Sowell, E J, *Curriculum: An integrative introduction*.
- ¹⁰² Kristiansen, S. and Pratikno "Decentralising Education in Indonesia", *International Journal of Educational Development*, 513-531.
- ¹⁰³ Peraturan pemerintah republik indonesia no. 19 tahun 2005 tentang standar nasional pendidikan.
- ¹⁰⁴ Oliva, *Developing the curriculum*, 137.
- ¹⁰⁵ Oliva, *Developing the curriculum*, 183-210.
- ¹⁰⁶ Spring, J., *Conflict of Interest: The politics of American Education*, 32-70.
- ¹⁰⁷ Ferimeldi, "Perceptions of government officials and principals implementing school-based management in Indonesia".
- ¹⁰⁸ Bjork, C., "Reconstructing rituals in a Sino-Indonesian School", *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 33(4), 465-491.
- ¹⁰⁹ Lingard, B., Rawolle, S., & Taylor, S. "Globalising policy sociology in education: working with Bourdieu", *Journal of Education Policy*, 759-777.
- ¹¹⁰ Lingard, B., Rawolle, S., & Taylor, S. "Globalising policy sociology in education: working with Bourdieu", *Journal of Education Policy*, 761.
- ¹¹¹ Lingard, B., Rawolle, S., & Taylor, S. "Globalising policy sociology in education: working with Bourdieu." *Journal of Education Policy*, 762.
- ¹¹² Bourdieu, P, *Firing back. Against the tyranny of the market* 2, 84-85.

- ¹¹³ Bjork, C., "Reconstructing rituals in a Sino-Indonesian School", *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 33(4), 465-491.
- ¹¹⁴ Lingard, B., Rawolle, S., & Taylor, S. " Globalising policy sociology in education: working with Bourdieu", *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(6), 767-78.pp.8-9.
- ¹¹⁵ Bourdieu, P., "The social conditions of the international circulation of ideas", In R. Shusterman (Ed.), *Bourdieu: a critical reader*, 221.
- ¹¹⁶ Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. *Reproduction in education, society and culture*; Giroux, H A. *Theory and resistance in education: Towards a pedagogy for the opposition*.
- ¹¹⁷ Bjork, C. "Transferring authority to local school communities in Indonesia: Ambitious plans, mixed results" In C. Bjork (Ed.), *Educational decentralization*, 129-147; Bjork, C., "Local responses to decentralization policy in Indonesia", *The Comparative and International Education Society*, 184-216; Bjork, C. "Decentralization in education, institutional culture and teacher autonomy in Indonesia", *International review of education*, 245-262.
- ¹¹⁸ Lingard, B., Rawolle, S., & Taylor, S., "Globalising policy sociology in education: working with Bourdieu" *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(6), 13.
- ¹¹⁹ Lingard, B., Rawolle, S., & Taylor, S., "Globalising policy sociology in education: working with Bourdieu", *Journal of Education Policy*, 13-15.
- ¹²⁰ <http://202.158.52.210/jajak/indikator/>.
- ¹²¹ Appadurai (1996) and Marginson and Sawir (2005) considered that technology development had speeded up the development of other *scapes* notion (*ethmoscapes, finanscapes, ideoscapes* and *mediascapes*).
- ¹²² Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J., *Reproduction in education, society and culture*.
- ¹²³ Spring, J. *Conflict of interest: The politics of American education*, 99-101.
- ¹²⁴ Bjork, C. "Decentralization in education, institutional culture and teacher autonomy in Indonesia", *International review of education*, 245-262
- ¹²⁵ Janks, H., *Language and position*. , iii.
- ¹²⁶ Scott, J. C., *Dominations and the arts of resistance: Hidden transcripts*.

References

- Appadurai, A.,
1996 *Modernity at Large. Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, London.
- Astiz, M., Wiseman, A. W., & Baker, D. P.,
2002 "Slouching towards decentralization: consequences of globalization for curricular control in national education systems", *Comparative and international education society*, (XLVI, 1) 66-88.
- Bandur, A.,
2008 *"A study of the implementation of School-Based Management in Flores primary schools in Indonesia* (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Newcastle). Retrieved March 29, 2011, from <http://nova.newcastle.edu.au>.
- Bandur, A., & Gamage, D. T.,
2009 "Policies and programs: Improving teaching-learning environments and student achievements in Indonesia" *Education and Society*, (XXVII, 1), 51-75.

- Barker, D.J.,
 2007 "Footprint of the state: Satellite communications" in J. H. McGlynn, O. Matuloh, S. Charle, J. Hadler, B. Bujono, M. G. Agusta, & G. Suhartono (Eds.), *Indonesia in the Soeharto Years: Issues, incidents, and images* (2nd ed.), Lontar Foundation, Jakarta, Indonesia, 107-109.
- Barrera-Osorio, F., Fasih, T., Patrinos, H. A., & Santibanez, L.,
 2009 *Decentralized decision-making in schools: the theory and evidence on School-Based Management*, The World Bank, Washington.
- Bjork, C.,
 2002 "Reconstructing rituals: Expressions of autonomy and resistance in a Sino-Indonesian school", *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, (XXXIV, 4) 465-491.
- Bjork, C.,
 2003 "Local responses to decentralization policy in Indonesia", *the Comparative and International Education Society*, (XL, 2) 184-216.
- Bjork, C.,
 2004 "Decentralization in education, institutional culture and teacher autonomy in Indonesia", *International review of education*, (L) 245-262.
- Bjork, C.,
 2006 "Transferring authority to local school communities in Indonesia: Ambitious plans, mixed results", In C. Bjork (Ed.), *Educational decentralization*, Springer, Netherlands, 129-147.
- Bourdieu, P.,
 1999 "The social conditions of the international circulation of ideas", In R. Shusterman (Ed.), *Bourdieu: a critical reader*, Blackwell, Oxford, 220-228.
- Bourdieu, P.,
 2003 *Firing back. Against the tyranny of the market 2.*, Verso, London.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.,
 1977 *Reproduction in education, society and culture* (R. Nice, Trans.). Sage, London.
- Carnoy, M.,
 2000 "Globalization and education reform", In N. P. Stromquist & K. Monkman (Eds.), *Globalization and education: integration and contestation across cultures*, Rowman and Littlefield, Boston, Maryland, 43-61.
- Castells, M.,
 2000 *The rise of the network society* (Vol. 1, 2nd ed.), Blackwell, Oxford, UK.
- Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.,
 2006 *Model mata pelajaran muatan lokal*, Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, Jakarta.

- Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan.
 2006 *Panduan penyusunan kurikulum tingkat satuan pendidikan*, Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan, Jakarta, Indonesia.
- Djiwandono, J.,
 2007 "Economic Crisis", In J. H. McGlynn, O. Matuloh, S. Charle, J. Hadler, B. Bujono, M. G. Agusta, & G. Suhartono (Eds.), *Indonesia in the Soeharto Years: Issues, incidents, and images* (2nd ed.), Lontar Foundation Jakarta, Indonesia, 334.
- Embree, E. R., Simon, M. S., & Mumford, W. B.,
 1934 *Island India goes to school*, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
- Faucher, C.,
 2006 "Popular discourse on identity politics and decentralisation in Tanjung Pinang public schools", *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, (XLVII, 2), 273-285.
- Ferimeldi.,
 2005 "Perceptions of government officials and principals implementing school-based management in Indonesia", Ph.D. dissertation, George Mason University, United States – Virginia, Retrieved January 30, 2011, from Dissertations & Theses: A&I. (Publication No. AAT 3176560).
- Friedman, T L.,
 2006 *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, New York.
- Giroux, H A.,
 2001 *Theory and resistance in education: Towards a pedagogy for the opposition*. Bergin and Garvey, Connecticut.
- Goodlad, J.I. & Richter, M.N.,
 1966 *The development of a conceptual system for dealing with problems of curriculum and instruction* (Contract No. SAE – 8024 Project No. 454), Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov>.
- Heyneman, S. P.,
 2003 "The history and problems in the making of education policy at the World Bank 1960–2000" [Electronic version], *International Journal of Educational Development*, (XXIII), 315-337, doi:10.1016/S0738-0593(02)00053-6.
- Indriyanto, Bambang,
 2003 "School-based Management: Issues and hopes toward decentralization in education in Indonesia", *Proceedings of the 3rd international forum on education reform* (pp. 1-20). <http://www.worldedreform.com>.
- Janks, H.,
 1993 *Language and position*, Witwatersrand University and Hodder and Stoughton Educational, South Africa.

- Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf Jr., R. B.,
1997 *Language planning: from practice to theory*, Multilingual Matters, Great Britain.
- Kementrian Pendidikan Nasional, Pusat Kurikulum.,
2007 *Naskah akademik kurikulum tingkat satuan pendidikan jenjang pendidikan dasar dan menengah*, Retrieved from <http://www.puskur.net>.
- Keputusan menteri pendidikan nasional Republik Indonesia No. 044/U/2002 tentang dewan pendidikan dan komite sekolah.
- Komisi Nasional Pendidikan.,
2001 *Menuju pendidikan dasar bermutu dan merata: Laporan Komisi Nasional Pendidikan*, Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, Jakarta, Indonesia.
- Kompas.,
2010, April 22 *Standar kelulusan UASBN diminta naik*, Kompas, Jakarta, Retrieved from: <http://edukasi.kompas.com>.
- Kompas.,
2010, April 28 *Mestinya untuk menguji, bukan mengecoh*, Retrieved from <http://lipsus.kompas.com/ujiannasional/>.
- Kompas.,
2010, May 17 *Kualitas soal UN harus diuji peneliti*, Kompas, Jakarta, Retrieved from: <http://edukasi.kompas.com>.
- Kristiansen, S. and Pratikno.,
2006 "Decentralising Education in Indonesia", *International Journal of Educational Development*, (XXVI), 513-531.
- Lampiran Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia No. 20 Tahun 2007 tentang Standar Penilaian Pendidikan.
- Lampiran Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia No. 22 tahun 2006 tentang Standar Isi untuk Satuan Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah.
- Lingard, B., Rawolle, S., & Taylor, S.,
2005 "Globalising policy sociology in education: working with Bourdieu", *Journal of Education Policy*, (XX, VI) 759-777.
- Marcus, E.,
2002 "The history of the World Bank", *The Economic Journal*, (CXII, 447) 119-135, Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org>
- Marginson, S., & Sawir, E.,
2003 "Interrogating global flows in higher education", *Globalisation, societies and education*, (III, 3) 281-309, doi:10.1080/14767720500166878.
- Olivia, P F.,
2009 *Developing the curriculum* (7th ed.), Pearson Education, Boston, Massachusetts.

- Peraturan Menteri Keuangan Nomor 247/ PMK07/ 2010 tentang Pedoman Umum Dana Alokasi sementara Bantuan Operasional Sekolah bagi Daerah Kabupaten dan Kota tahun anggaran 2011.
- Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia No. 19 tahun 2005 tentang Standar Nasional Pendidikan (4496). Retrieved from <http://www.presidentri.go.id>.
- Pereira, L.,
2010 *Globalization and competition: why some emergent countries succeed while some others fall behind*, Cambridge University, New York.
- Ricklefs, M.,
2001 *A History of Modern Indonesia since c. 1200*. 3rd ed., Palgrave, Hampshire, London.
- Sadli, M.,
2007 "Foreign Investment", In J. H. McGlynn, O. Matuloh, S. Charle, J. Hadler, B. Bujono, M. G. Agusta, & G. Suhartono (Eds.), *Indonesia in the Soeharto Years: Issues, incidents, and images* (2nd ed.), Lontar Foundation, Jakarta, Indonesia, 94-96.
- Sanderson, S. K., & Alderson, A. S.,
2005 *World societies: The evolution of human social life*, Allyn and Bacon, New York.
- Scott, J. C.,
1990 *Dominations and the arts of resistance: Hidden transcripts*, Yale University, the US.
- Sowell, E J.,
2005 *Curriculum: An integrative introduction (3rd eds)*, Pearson Education, New Jersey.
- Spring, J.,
2005 *Conflict of interest: The politics of American education* (5th ed.), McGraw Hill, New York.
- Spring, J.,
2008 "Research on globalization and education", *Review of education research*, (LXXVIII, 2) 330-363, doi:10.3102/0034654308317846.
- Spring, J.,
2009 *Globalization of education: An introduction (sociocultural, political, and historical studies in education)*, Routledge, Madison Ave, New York.
- Stewart, T. A.,
2001 *The wealth of knowledge: Intellectual capital and the twenty first century organization*, Currency, New York.

- Stromquist, N. P., & Monkman, K.,
 2000 "Defining globalization and assessing its implications on knowledge and education", In N. P. Stromquist & K. Monkman (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures*, Rowman and Littlefield, Maryland, 3-25.
- Subianto, B.,
 2007 "The International Monetary Fund", In J. H. McGlynn, O. Matuloh, S. Charle, J. Hadler, B. Bujono, M. G. Agusta, & G. Suhartono (Eds.), *Indonesia in the Soeharto Years: Issues, incidents, and images* (2nd ed.), Lontar Foundation, Jakarta, Indonesia, 348.
- Sundaram, J. K.,
 2004 "Crisis, recovery and reforms in East Asia", In M. Desai & Y. Said (Eds.), *Global governance and financial crises*, Routledge, London, 83-109.
- Sundaram, J., & Arnim, R.,
 2009 "Trade liberation and economic development" [Electronic version], *Science*, (CCCXXIII, 5911) 211-212.
- Thorndike, R. L.,
 1971 "Concepts of culture-fairness", *Educational Measurement*, (VIII, 2) 63-70.
 Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org>.
- Tilaar, H. A. R.,
 1995 *Pembangunan pendidikan nasional 1945-1995: Suatu analisis kebijakan*, Grasindo, Jakarta, Indonesia.
- Tilaar, H. A. R.,
 2009 *Kekuasaan dan pendidikan: Manajemen pendidikan nasional dalam pusaran kekuasaan*, Rineka Cipta, Jakarta, Indonesia.
- Undang-undang Republik Indonesia No 22 tahun 1999 tentang Otonomi Daerah.
- Undang-undang Republik Indonesia No. 20 Tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional.
- Wallerstein, I.,
 1974 "The rise and future demise of the World Capitalist System: Concepts for comparative analysis", *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, (XVI, 4) 387-415 Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org>. <http://202.158.52.210/jajak/indikator/>.