Asia Pacific Journal of Education
Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:
http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/cape20

Becoming a principal in Indonesia: possibility, pitfalls and potential

Bambang Sumintono[a], Elslee Y.A. Sheyoputri[a], Na Jiang[a], Ifa H. Misbach[b] & Jumintono[c]

[a] Institute of Educational Leadership, Universiti Malaya, Malaysia

[b] Faculty of Educational Sciences, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia

[c] Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Published online: 24 Jul 2015.

Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 2015
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2015.1056595

Becoming a principal in Indonesia: possibility, pitfalls and potential

Bambang Sumintono[a]*, Elslee Y.A. Sheyoputri[a], Na Jiang[a], Ifa H. Misbach[b] and Jumintono[c]

[a]*Institute of Educational Leadership, Universiti Malaya, Malaysia;* [b]*Faculty of Educational Sciences, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia;* [c]*Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia*

(*Received 18 April 2015; accepted 20 May 2015*)

The preparation and development of school leaders is now considered to be fundamental to school and system improvement. In the pursuit of educational change and reform, the leadership of the principal is deemed to be of critical importance. This qualitative study is part of a large scale research project that is exploring principal preparation and development in seven different countries. In particular, this article focuses on how public secondary school principals in Indonesia are prepared, developed and selected for their role. Disappointingly little is known from the empirical literature about being a principal in Indonesia or about principal preparation and development. Therefore this contemporary, descriptive, non-experimental qualitative study focused on a purposive sample of 18 public secondary school principals in four different provinces in Indonesia. The initial findings reveal that even though principal training has been standardized in Indonesia and is now a compulsory part of a principal certification process, micro-political influences still currently govern the appointment of school principals.

Keywords: principal preparation; principal selection; education development; Indonesian public secondary schools; educational decentralization

Introduction

The centrality of leadership in the pursuit of better outcomes is now widely accepted and acknowledged (Hallinger, 2011). The quality of school leadership is now directly associated with better academic success and higher achievement for every student (Harris, 2014; Hoy & Miskel, 2005). Although many of the contemporary claims made for leadership remain contested and debated (Bush, 2011; Gunter & Fitzgerald, 2008; Harris, 2008), it remains the case that many countries are investing heavily in principals' preparation and development in the anticipation of improved performance and outcomes.

In many Asian countries, including Indonesia, there has been a propensity to follow Western approaches to leadership development and training, even though it is acknowledged that the cultural setting is so very different (Cravens & Hallinger, 2012). A recent review of the literature conducted by Hallinger and Bryant (2012) concluded that the contribution of research undertaken in the educational leadership field within an East Asian context is "relatively unimportant given the small volume" (p. 618). Further, during 2000–2011 in eight core journals in educational leadership and management, only one article about Indonesia could be located (Raihani, 2007). This reveals that relatively little is known about leadership and leadership development in Indonesia compared to other East Asian countries. The analyses of the available literature also highlight that there is a relative

*Corresponding author. Email: bambang@um.edu.my

paucity of contemporary empirical evidence about educational leadership in Indonesia. Despite some recent developments in this direction (see Hariri, Monypenny, & Prideaux, 2012; Sofo, Fitzgerald, & Jawas, 2012) the empirical literature concerning principal leadership in Indonesia still lags behind other countries in the Asia Pacific region.

The study outlined in this article, as part of the 7System Leadership Study (7SLS), aimed to investigate current perspectives and experiences of principals' professional preparation and development in different parts of Indonesia. A further objective of this study was to examine how principals are selected within an increasingly decentralized educational context. The article begins with an overview of Indonesian education and, in particular, outlines the history of principal preparation and development. This is important contextual information that sets the background for the empirical data that follows. The data collection and analysis is subsequently discussed, followed by the findings and discussion.

Principal development and selection

Formal schooling in Indonesia started in the Dutch colonial period in the late 1800s with a complicated and segregated education system that, it was claimed, did not directly benefit the local people (*pribumi*) (Raihani & Sumintono, 2010). During this era schools were elite and the number of *pribumi* students attending these schools was much lower than students of an Eastern or European origin. The majority of the teachers and all the principals in these schools were Dutch nationals (Poerbakawatja, 1970). During the Japanese occupation (1942–1945), the segregated education system was abolished to give greater opportunity to local people as previously they had been virtually excluded. Consequently, schooling in Indonesia expanded and also significantly improved. However this expansion resulted in a shortage of teachers which subsequently meant that all primary school teachers became secondary school teachers, while students at primary schools were taught by people who could only read and write (Poerbakawatja, 1970).

In 1945, Indonesia declared its independence and during the 1950s the trend of increasing student enrolments into primary and secondary schools reached 10 million students. This was five times higher than student enrolment during the Japanese occupation (Jalal & Musthafa, 2001). This further expansion meant that the Indonesian government had to create many more schools and had to appoint teachers with limited formal qualifications (Poerbakawatja, 1970). During this era the role of public school principal was also widened to become the person who collected money from parents in order to "pay a major share of the upkeep of schools including the allowance of teachers" (Lee, 1995, p. 171).

Backed by the rising oil revenue in 1974, the government launched the *Inpres* (presidential instruction) programme to build one school in each village (Duflo, 2004). As a result, during the first 10 years of the implementation of the *Inpres* programme, the Indonesian government appointed more than 600,000 primary school teachers (Raihani & Sumintono, 2010); and in 1979–1980 the national budget alone supported the construction of 10,000 new schools (Soedijarto, Moleong, Suryadi, & Machmud, 1980). At the primary school level however there was no special training for principals and no clear job specification (Beeby, 1979). At the secondary level, the situation was slightly different as the principal was usually a subject specialist, however the role was not specified or defined in any official way (Beeby, 1979).

In the 1980s the central government, which appointed every public school principal in the country, introduced voluntary preparation training for principal candidates that lasted

one week. The content of the training was mostly concerned with public administration and management and was provided by the education province office staff. Before taking up their post, mostly public secondary school principals had previously held posts as a vice principal. Most had been selected for the vice principal role by their principal. Although some administrative training was provided, there was still no stipulation or even expectation that the principal role required any specialist training or preparation. This was the status quo for several decades.

In 2001 a new era of educational reform, as part of changing state administration, brought in several new policies to reshape and redefine educational provision. These included: school operational support that did not differentiate between public and private school (Fitriah, Sumintono, Subekti, & Hassan, 2013), a teacher certification programme (Raihani & Sumintono, 2010) and an international standard school (Sumintono, Subekti, Mislan, Said, & Mohd Tahir, 2014). The appointment of public school principals was devolved to the district level (either a city or a region), as part of an active and energetic process of decentralization. In their appointment of principals, some district level officials asked for help from central government or the local university to train them but in the vast majority of cases principals were chiefly appointed based on personal connections and individual influence with district officers.

There are several research reports and articles about principal competency in Indonesia that offer very critical perspectives. In their study, Jones and Hagul (2001, p. 214) note that "school principals have little authority in running the school or in resource allocation, nor are they usually trained to manage or lead a school well". Bjork (2005) highlights that school principals do not have enough capacity, in terms of expertise and experience, to handle the challenges and opportunities of education autonomy. Furthermore other commentators note that good practice such as shared-decision making and the empowering of teachers does not happen most of the time because principals rely mainly on an autocratic leadership style (Bjork, 2005; Jones & Hagul, 2001; Sofo et al., 2012).

In their work, Lee and Hallinger (2012) found that Indonesian principals placed their main emphasis on school management and administration rather than leadership or development. Two further quantitative studies conducted in Sumatra, Lampung (Hariri et al., 2012) and Padang (Damanik, 2014) respectively, revealed that teachers' job satisfaction could be improved if the principals' decision-making style was less coercive and bureaucratic. The latter study emphasized that the leadership behaviour of the principal had a positive influence on school climate and that this was important also for school improvement (Damanik, 2014). Similarly, Jawas (2014) found that instructional leadership by the principal was associated with better teacher and organizational outcomes. Despite such findings, perceptions of the role of the principal in Indonesia continued to be firmly associated with routine management and administration rather than the processes of teaching and learning.

This situation continued until 2009, when the Minister of Education released a regulation (number 6/2009) stating that in order to be a principal, school leadership training was required (Ministry of National Education [MoNe], 2009). A National agency was established to provide this training called *Lembaga Pengembangan dan Pemberdayaan Kepala Sekolah* (LP2KS) or the "Agency for School Principal Empowerment and Development" (LP2KS, 2015). The training programme that resulted was called the "Development of Principals Managerial Skills". Its syllabus covers areas of student management, human resource management, curriculum development, school development planning, monitoring and evaluation, and information and communication technology in school. This training is in line with the Ministry of Education decree number

13/2007 regarding principal standards which stipulates that a school principal in Indonesia has to be competent in certain key areas (MoNE, 2007).

The structure of this programme involves a seven day session at the LP2KS (70 hours) located in Solo, Central Java; followed by three months (equal to 200 hours) of on the job learning (OJL) (apprenticeship) in two schools (his/her own school and another school in his/her district) where participants are asked to prepare an action plan for change and improvement. The last stage of the process is three days training (30 hours) in the LP2KS which mostly consists of completing a portfolio of the activities undertaken during the on the job learning and a presentation of the portfolio. The total time principals spend on this programme is 300 hours. Once principals have completed all the training and assessments in LP2KS and pass, the candidate will then be awarded a *nomor unik kepala sekolah* (or NUKS, a principal registration number). This number then makes them eligible to be appointed by the mayor as school principal in their respective district (LP2KS, 2015).

Although this new training programme has been in place for several years, independent empirical data about the way principals view it, how it shapes their current leadership practice and how it has influenced the process of appointment has not been forthcoming. The next section of this article therefore outlines data collection that allowed these issues to be explored in some depth.

Methodology

A qualitative interpretive approach was utilized to collect data about principal preparation and training in Indonesia (Creswell, 2012). According to Denzin and Lincoln (1994, p. 3) qualitative research allows the use of multiple methods and has a naturalistic orientation which is "attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of meaning people bring to them". The focus of this research study, as part of the larger 7SLS, was to gain a contemporary understanding of how principals are selected and trained in Indonesia. In particular, it sought to understand the impact of this training on the selection and appointment of principals.

The study used purposive sampling to select a sample of principals in public secondary schools. With such a large population of principals in Indonesia, this sample is clearly indicative and does not claim to be representative. There were 18 respondents selected (see Table 1) who came from four different provinces in Indonesia. Seven principals came from West Java, five principals from West Nusa Tenggara, and three principals from Central Java and Yogyakarta province respectively. The principals selected came from both city and rural areas to ensure that very different contexts were included in the sample.

The demographic information concerning the principals who participated in the study is summarized in Table 1.

All of the principals who participated in the study completed and returned the 7SLS survey instrument, which was designed to collect data about their preparation and development as school leaders. Each of the participants was also involved in a semi-structured interviewing process that lasted approximately 1.5 hours. These interviews probed for information and views about principal preparation and development. All interviews were recorded and subsequently fully transcribed. All the data were then prepared for inductive coding and different data sets were used to check on the accuracy and the validity of the thematic analyses that were deployed (Bazeley, 2013). The next section outlines the findings from the qualitative analysis and draws particularly on the qualitative data relating directly to principals' preparation, selection and appointment.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of principals' demographics ($n = 18$).

Demographics	Frequency	Per cent
Gender		
Male	15	83
Female	3	17
Age		
40–44 years	2	12
45–50 years	6	33
51–55 years	6	33
more than 55 years	4	22
School location		
City	12	67
Rural	6	33
Highest Education		
Undergraduate	4	22
Master's	12	67
Doctorate	2	11
Tenure as principal		
fewer than 2 years	4	22
2–4 years	5	28
5–8 years	6	33
more than 8 years	3	17

Findings

All of the principals who participated in the study were appointed after year 2001 where the autonomy began and all were involved in a selection process that consisted of a written test conducted at the district level. Eight principals in the sample did not have any formal preparation training at all. Five principals had been involved in some kind of school managerial training/public administration but only two principals in the sample had been trained by the LP2KS before they were officially appointed. The remaining three principals joined the LP2KS training after they had been appointed into the role. Excluding the five principals who attended the LP2KS training; the other respondents came from six different districts.

The data show great variety in the ways in which they were selected, prepared and appointed. Some principals in a region had been appointed without any consideration of their training or qualifications and had simply been "selected" for the post by the mayor. As one respondent explained:

> When a new mayor was elected, in the following 10 months only five public secondary school principals out of 20 schools in this region remained. The rest were new faces without any training or holding a principal registration number, even some without experience as a deputy principal at all. The rumour was that this is the only gift the new mayor could provide to his loyal supporters in the campaign. (P14[1])

Similarly, another principal from different province stated:

> I was the first batch of teachers who were trained by LP2KS that got NUKS, but it took nearly two years for me to be appointed as a principal in my region. Other friends from the same batch still work as teachers; the competition for a position is very tough especially if you don't know somebody in mayor's office. (P4)

The above statements highlight how the selection to the post of principal may not be solely based on achievement or competence but rather is motivated by political grace and

favour. A report from the LP2KS (2015) shows that from 2011 to 2014, there were 11,128 teachers from kindergarten to secondary school level enrolled in the principal preparation and training. The data showed that 10,847 (97%) of them passed and received a principal registration number (NUKS). Up until 2014, the statistics show that at the junior secondary school level (years 7–9), of the 2,075 teachers who were awarded NUKS, only 40% of them (832 teachers) had subsequently been appointed as a principal. At the secondary school level (years 10–12) this figure was much lower, at 22%. Only 542 secondary school teachers, out of 2,468 who were awarded NUKS, were actually appointed as a principal (LP2KS, 2015).

Such small percentages are quite revealing and must call into question why those sent for the LP2KS training were not subsequently hired as principals in significant numbers, particularly as the district government selected, and sent them, for the training. While it is acknowledged that principal preparation and training is still at early stage in Indonesia, the number of appointments of principals who received NUKS remains relatively low. Current statistical data (Ministry of Education and Culture [MoEC], 2015) reveal that only 7% of all public general secondary school principals across Indonesia has a principal who has been trained through the LP2KS programme (LP2KS, 2015), even though the numbers of teachers going through this programme has increased every year.

With regard to the usefulness of district level training that was not the LP2KS, principals in the sample were divided: some principals said that it was really useful, while some viewed it very differently. The advantages were outlined as follows:

> The training that I was involved in had a lot benefits because it provided new knowledge about school management, taught me to complete a school self-evaluation form, and how eight national education standards applied in my school. (P3)

> I thought it was effective because it made me competent in five areas stipulated by the ministry regulation, which are personality, managerial, entrepreneurship, supervision and social. (P2)

In contrast, other principals expressed negative experiences of district level preparation and training:

> The training was really boring, because it was given in the form of lectures. It was actually not effective, did not touch anything about leadership at all; the content of the training itself mainly explained theoretical things about the principals' role. (P8)

> The content of training taught us about concepts, theory even philosophy but not much practice. (P13)

These very different responses came from principals who all attended district level training. The documentary analysis, undertaken as part of the study, revealed that the content of district training tends to be fairly uniform and standardized. However, possibly the delivery of the programme could explain why participants view this training in such a polarized way (Bjork, 2005; Sofo et al., 2012).

In contrast, the views about the new national training programme tend to be more positive. For example, a principal who was involved in LP2KS training specifically noted:

> It really helped me and I recommend this training as a good preparation before a teacher is appointed as a principal. (P4)

Other principals in the sample similarly highlight the quality and the training methods of the new LP2KS programme:

> The LP2KS training is effective; it makes us know more how to become a good manager, also we about the duties of a principal in many situations that need our attention. (P5)

> The training really helps improve our competency and professionalism, especially in the apprenticeship stage. (P15)

> It is effective, because they taught everything that was needed later when we become a principal. (P1)

Most of the responses from those who had attended the LP2KS training tended to be positive, and the new methods and content were endorsed as useful in bringing about change in schools in the future. However, it was also noted that preparing local district officials is an important component in quality assuring the programme across the many districts in Indonesia (Sumintono, 2010).

Although there were positive comments about various aspects of principal preparation and training, the most single important preparatory factor, highlighted by all the principals in the study, was unequivocally the experience of being a deputy principal.

As one principal summarized:

> When my principal selected me as one of the deputy principals, my task was not just taking care of students in the classroom anymore. I was involved in whole-school planning such as representing my school at district level, planning and running a programme at school level, organizing and being the chairperson in school meetings. Those really helped a lot to prepare me as principal. (P7)

Similarly, three principals expressed similar views:

> I learned from the strength and weaknesses of my previous principals when I was a deputy principal. (P11)

> Actually the training I was given did not really change me, it only added new knowledge. Having the experience for eight years as a deputy principal made the greatest difference. (P10)

> The training I received before I become a principal was important; it was based on my own experience of being a deputy principal at that time. (P8)

These findings highlight how important the principal's leadership practice is in shaping teachers into future school leaders. This is consistent with international research findings that reinforce how being in a deputy role can significantly influence the subsequent leadership practice and behaviour of future principals (Day, Sammons, & Gu, 2008; Wallace Foundation, 2013). In many respects, the LP2KS training strengthens this association, as one of the requirements for selection is at least two years' experience as a deputy principal. Furthermore, some principals in the sample noted that their selection of their own deputy principals was heavily premised on their future capability to be a principal. For example,

> I know all the teachers who have the capacity and the potential to become a school leader in the future. So, the principal should be the only person to recommend who are the teachers to be selected by district government for principal training or LP2KS. (P7)

Without question, the competition to become a principal in any public secondary school in Indonesia is tight and it has been argued that this has resulted in practices that bypass the formal system of selection. The evidence from this study shows that the national qualification appears to be far less important, as a criterion for selection to the post of principal, than political influences and personal connections at the district level. While this situation may change as the national qualification becomes much more established, the findings from this study suggest that the existing practices of selection are generally politically driven and may prove difficult to eradicate.

After being appointed as a principal in Indonesia, many more opportunities exist to be involved in training and development. Of the 18 principals in the sample, 12 highlighted

that they participated in school management training after their appointment, either at district or national level. This training focused on a number of issues that included curriculum development, school based management, school supervision, teacher performance assessment, and the use of new technology for learning. Documentary analysis reveals that much of this training is focused on compliance and delivering national or local priorities (Sumintono, 2010). There is very little training, as yet, which focuses on developing principals in Indonesia as system leaders or leaders of change.

A number of principals in the study sought special training and developmental programmes to meet their particular leadership needs. As one principal noted: "I have to find my own pathway to develop my leadership skills and knowledge" (P8). For many principals this translates into pursuing a post-graduate qualification. In the study, 12 principals (67%) had received a master's degree and two were in receipt of a doctoral qualification.

Interestingly, the main challenge or pitfall facing principals in Indonesia, as perceived by the participants in this study, were how to improve school performance without the adequate resources to do so.

As two principals explain:

> The biggest challenge for the principal's leadership comes from the district; they always ask schools to improve students' achievement but this is not supported with enough funding. Even financial support from central government is limited and restricted. (P1)

> Local government regulations about the school budget is very tightly controlled for us, any room to develop the school is restricted by financial constraints. (P2)

Prior to year 2005, Indonesian schools were allowed to collect money from parents to supplement their school budget. When central government introduced a "free school programme" at the primary school level and then the secondary school level (Fitriah et al., 2013), many cities and regions across Indonesia stipulated that the principal could no longer collect additional money from parents (Sumintono et al., 2014). Naturally this policy has severely restricted principals' ability to supplement their budget and has also curtailed their ability to develop the school in ways which would have been previously possible.

Another contemporary challenge or pitfall facing principals in Indonesia concerns the sheer level of accountability placed upon them and the increasing interference at the district level:

> The difficult part comes from local government and its bureaucracy with their antagonistic regulations between one and another, or between different levels of governments. Also, intervention from certain corners, either bureaucrats, local parliament members even NGO, means that we now have to follow what they want. (P8)

> In this autonomy era district government interference is so common … this includes new student admissions, school tuition fees, teacher transfers to other schools. (P14)

> The common interference is when district education office arrange activities that request us to participate where it is not relevant, they interrupt the principal tasks and do so without offering any financial support. (P5)

These quotes highlight how decentralization, which in practice has meant devolving more authority to the district level, has resulted in greater bureaucracy and interference in the school system in Indonesia (Bjork, 2005). It has meant that principals now have less control over the daily running of their schools. For example, places in public schools are strictly limited and this is set against the fact that there is a large population of potential

students. So, the issue of student admissions is always fraught and now, it is argued, further exacerbated by local political interference (Sofo et al., 2012).

A further example of the increased influence of the district concerns the quality of teachers and teaching. As one principal notes:

> When I was appointed as a principal in this school, there was massive transfer of our teachers to other schools by the district government. I am left with unexperienced and unqualified teachers. So, to improve their quality I have to create a series of workshop, send them to other schools to learn, send them to seminars etc. It is really a hard work. (P16)

Another principal highlights the way in which the increased power at the district level has taken away some authority from the principal to improve teachers' practice:

> Now it is very difficult to change teachers' mindset, they are already in their comfort zone. (P11)

> It is now mandatory to teach 24 lesson hours per week for teachers, there is not enough time to develop their professionalism. (P2)

In summary, the data from the qualitative part of this study would indicate that decentralization has brought with it new tensions and challenges that make the job of the principal in Indonesia much more demanding (Sumintono, 2010). Also the data would suggest that it has subtly, and unintentionally, reinforced a situation where appointing principals is not solely based on merit or qualification but rather is a matter of political expedience.

Discussion

In Indonesia, as in many other countries, the role of the principal is dramatically changing and the challenges placed upon new principals are now substantial and acute (Sofo et al., 2012). It is no surprise therefore that, despite the establishment of a mandatory principal training qualification at a national level (LP2KS), principals still feel under-prepared to deliver all that is expected of them as a result of decentralization. The pressure to produce better school outcomes with reduced resources and a constrained budget is clearly a major pressure on new and existing principals in Indonesia, along with greater political interference in the day-to-day running of their school.

The findings from the qualitative part of this study indicates that while the LP2KS is intended to strengthen the leadership practice of principals, in the current context of de-centralization, this is not occurring. It would appear that the dramatic shift of power to the district level is actually restricting principals' ability to act creatively and independently. In their work, Briggs and Wohlstetter (2003) argue that increased pressure and workload on principals is one of the clear outcomes of de-centralization and school based management. However, they also note that if schools are to benefit from this re-positioning of power to the local level, they need to "creatively divide power amongst individuals by establishing work teams, networks and ad hoc committees" (Briggs & Wohlstetter, 2003, p. 360).

For the foreseeable future, it is unlikely that principals of Indonesian schools will be able to enact the type of leadership associated with such shared or distributed leadership. The evidence from this study indicates that the political constraints are currently far too great and that the autonomy, normally associated with decentralization and school based management, is far from being realized at the principal level. The new professional qualification for principals is unquestionably an important step forward for the Indonesian education system. But this is premised on it being actively as a means of

selecting and appointing new principals. The evidence to date is far from encouraging in this respect, although it is very positive that so many principals have already engaged in this national training programme.

Looking towards the future, the education system in Indonesia has some significant challenges ahead. Yet, in a relatively short period of time it has shown its clear ambition to modernize and to move forward. Undoubtedly progress has been made. There is great potential within the system to improve, but only if those with leadership responsibilities are given the latitude to innovate and to secure change. The next phase of development, and potentially the most difficult, will be to move away from damaging political practices that constrain, rather than enhance, the system's ability to significantly improve educational outcomes for all young people in Indonesia.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Professor Alma Harris and Dr Michelle Suzette Jones for their valuable comments and feedback on various drafts of this article.

Note

1. "P" is the code for principal, and "14" was the number of participants in our list.

ORCID

Ifa H. Misbach https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2905-1341

References

Bazeley, P. (2013). *Qualitative data analysis, practical strategies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Beeby, C. E. (1979). *Assessment of Indonesian education*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research and Oxford University Press.

Bjork, C. (2005). *Indonesian education: Teachers, schools and central bureaucracy*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Briggs, K. L., & Wohlstetter, P. (2003). Key elements of a successful school-based management strategy. In B. Creemers & D. Reynolds (Eds.). *School effectiveness and school improvement*, *14*(3), 351–372.

Bush, T. (2011). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cravens, X. C., & Hallinger, P. (2012). School leadership and change in East Asia: Building capacity for education reform. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *87*, 157–161.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research, planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Damanik, E. (2014). *Principal leadership style and its impact on school climate and teacher self-efficacy in Indonesian schools* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Curtin University of Technology, Australia.

Day, C. W., Sammons, P., & Gu, Q. (2008). Combining qualitative and quantitative methodologies in research on teachers' lives, work and effectiveness: From integration to synergy. *Educational Researcher*, *37*(6), 330–342.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research*. London: Sage.

Duflo, E. (2004). The medium run effects of educational expansion: Evidence from a large school construction program in Indonesia. *Journal of Development Economics*, *74*, 163–197.

Fitriah, A., Sumintono, B., Subekti, N. B., & Hassan, Z. (2013). A different result of community participation in education: An Indonesian case study of parental participation in public primary schools. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, *14*(4), 483–493.

Gunter, H. M., & Fitzgerald, T. (2008). The future of leadership research? *School Leadership & Management*, *28*(3), 261–279.

Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *49*(2), 125–142.
Hallinger, P., & Bryant, D. (2012). Mapping the terrain of educational leadership and management in East Asia. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *51*(5), 618–637.
Hariri, H., Monypenny, R., & Prideaux, M. (2012). Principalship in an Indonesian school context: Can principal decision-making styles significantly predict teacher job satisfaction? *School Leadership & Management*, *32*(5), 453–471.
Harris, A. (2008). Distributed leaderships: According to the evidence. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *46*(2), 172–188.
Harris, A. (2014). *Distributed leadership matters, perspectives, practicalities and potential*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2005). *Educational administration, theory, research and practice* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
Jalal, F., & Musthafa, B. (Eds.). (2001). *Education reform in the context of regional autonomy: The case of Indonesia*. Jakarta: Ministry of National Education, National Development Planning Agency and The World Bank.
Jawas, U. (2014). *Instructional leadership in Indonesian school reform: Local perception and practices* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Canberra, Australia.
Jones, G. W., & Hagul, P. (2001). Schooling in Indonesia: Crisis-related and longer-term issues. *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, *37*(2), 207–231.
Lee, K. H. (1995). *Education and politics in Indonesia 1945–1965*. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: University of Malaya Press.
Lee, M., & Hallinger, P. (2012). National contexts influencing principals' time use and allocation: Economic development, societal culture, and education system. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, *23*(4), 461–482.
LP2KS. (2015). *Lembaga Pengembangan dan Pemberdayaan Kepala Sekolah*. Retrieved from http://lppks.org/
MoEC. (2015). *Ministry of Education and Culture: School statistics*. Retrieved from http://www.kemdiknas.go.id/kemdikbud/
MoNE. (2007). *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional nomor 13 tahun 2007 tentang Standar Kepala Sekolah* [Decree of minister of national education about school principal standards]. Jakarta: Author.
MoNE. (2009). *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional nomor 6 tahun 2009 tentang Organisasi dan Tata Kerja Lembaga Pengembangan dan Pemberdayaan Kepala Sekolah (LP2KS)* [Decree of minister of national education about Agency for School Principal Empowerment and Development]. Jakarta: Author.
Poerbakawatja, S. (1970). *Pendidikan dalam Alam Indonesia Merdeka* [Education in Independence Indonesia]. Jakarta: Gunung Agung.
Raihani. (2007). An Indonesian model of successful school leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *46*(4), 481–496.
Raihani, & Sumintono, B. (2010). Teacher education in Indonesia: Development and challenges. In K.G. Karras, & C.C. Wolhuter (Series Eds.), *International handbook of teachers education worldwide: Training, issues and challenges for teachers profession* (pp. 181–197). Athens: Atraphos Edition.
Soedijarto, Moleong, L., Suryadi, A., & Machmud, D. (1980). Indonesia. In T. N. Postlethwaite & R. M. Thomas (Eds.), *Schooling in the ASEAN region, primary and secondary education in Indonesia, Malaysia, The Philipines, Singapore and Thailand* (pp. 48–96). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
Sofo, F., Fitzgerald, R., & Jawas, U. (2012). Instructional leadership in Indonesian school reform: Overcoming the problems to move forward. *School Leadership & Management*, *32*(5), 503–522.
Sumintono, B. (2010). School-based management policy and its practices at district level in the post new order Indonesia. *Journal of Indonesian Social Sciences and Humanities*, *2*, 41–67.
Sumintono, B., Subekti, N. B., Mislan, N., Said, H., & Mohd Tahir, L. (2014). In search of the excellent school: A case study of an Indonesian international standard school in improving its capacity building. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, *23*(3), 565–576.
Wallace Foundation. (2013). *The school principal as leader: Guiding schools to better teaching and learning*. New York, NY: Author.