

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316862833>

A Model of Effective School Management at Vocational High Schools

Conference Paper · August 2016

CITATIONS

0

READS

32

3 authors, including:



Nugraha Nugraha

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia

13 PUBLICATIONS 0 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Muhamad Arief Ramdhany

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia

3 PUBLICATIONS 0 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



public sector accounting [View project](#)



Kuangan Daerah [View project](#)

A Model of Effective School Management at Vocational High Schools

Yayat Supriyatna, Nugraha, M Arief Ramdhany

Faculty of Economics and Business Education

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia

Bandung, Indonesia

yayat_supriyatna@upi.edu

Abstract— The best model of effective school management is still questioned. This study aims to find the best model in the feasibility process and goal achievement model of effective school management in high vocational schools in West Java. In particular, this research can provide benefits to policy makers at the provincial and district/city, also the University as a reference in making education policy, particularly related to the development of effective school management model in vocational schools in West Java. Development of effective school management model is expected to answer a variety of systemic problems facing the quality of education. Development of effective school management model is instrumental in developing the theory and practice because of his position as the basic concept is to organize a series of rules that are used to describe the education system as a whole. As a start, this research activity begins with the identification and development stage of the blueprint model of effective school management at the vocational school. The questionnaire was distributed to 1200 respondents (teachers and principals) in 60 public and private VHS in the 20 Cities/Regencies. Data were analyzed using SEM-PLS. Results of the progress of the first phase indicate that the Principal Leadership, Culture School, and teacher performance have a significant influence on Effective School, while the Community Participation and School Financing have no significant effect, even for Schools Financing is negative.

Keywords— *School Management Model, Effective School, Vocational High Schools*

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the important goals of a country is the nation's intellectual life [1]. In Indonesia, the efforts are made through the implementation of the national education system. In this case, in accordance with the mandate of Law Number 20 Year 2003 on National Education System, the function of national education is to develop the ability and character development [2] as well as the civilization of dignity in the context of the intellectual life of the nation, aimed at developing students' potentials in order to become persons of faith and fear of God Almighty, noble, healthy, knowledgeable, capable, creative, independent, and become democratic and responsible citizens.

The mandate can be realized in a variety of pathways, levels and types of education when all education units organized effectively. Effective schools are characterized by the presence of strong and professional leadership, focus on teaching and learning, shared vision and goals, purposeful

teaching, high expectations, learning communities, accountability, and stimulating and secure learning environment [3]. The characteristic of effective schools is clearly evident from the focus on teaching and learning [4]. The focus on teaching and learning require the high performance of teachers so that the learning process can be more meaningful and purposeful [5]. The characteristic of effective schools is also evident from the high expectations from the public and public participation on the school, and the continuation of learning community [6]. Transparent and accountable fund management, community participation, and school culture in turn affect the level of the teacher's performance [7]. All these components require effective leadership in education units that can move all the other components, which in turn those may affect the achievement and the realization of an effective school.

A school can effectively reflect in the output or outcome quality [8]. All the output quality was not independent of: aspects of learners and educators of teachers as learners, which also contained the home/school/community partnership and support for learning; content, in which there are materials, curriculum, and standards of education and learning, the environmental aspects of the environment in which there are physical, psychosocial and cultural, as well as a variety of services for the creation of a climate conducive to support the learning process; and aspects of the process in which learner and teacher educators interact in a learning process effectively, supported by effective leadership, school administration, financing sources and financing management, and government support in the education system as a whole. An effective school that involves the presence of strong leadership, a clear mission, a safe and orderly climate, monitoring student progress, high expectation, teacher performance, and society participation [9].

In practice, the embodiments of effective schools still face many crucial problems and gaps [10]. It can be seen from the gap between high school and vocational school. The phenomenon of the gap between high school and vocational school can be seen from the lower passing grade for admission to vocational than passing grade to high school. It almost happened in Indonesia. This shows that the interest to enter vocational high school (VHS) is relatively low compared with the interest to go to general high school. These phenomena

must be anticipated by VHS when it will lead to the realization of an effective school.

Wood, et al. (2001: 576) states that the forces of globalization and technological forcing organizations around the world make a few changes [11], including changes in education [12]. Rapidly changing organizational environment and dynamic competition requires that educational institutions can become an effective institution [13]. The effective and effective and successful educational institution at the moment is the institution that can change quickly, constantly, and rapidly [14], in response to rapid environmental change, which is supported by the high performance of teachers, transparent and accountable school finance, community participation, conduciveness of school culture, and effective school leadership. The achievement of an effective school will depend on the individual and the internal and external environment.

The organization of schooling refers to how schools arrange the resources of time, space, and personnel for maximum effect on student learning [15]. The school's organizational plan addresses those issues that affect the school as a whole, such as the master schedule, the location of staff in different rooms, and the assignment of aides to teachers or teams [16].

The external challenges faced by school from the community in general as well as the demands of policy and education customers require school to adjust through a management with focus on changes in a variety of important components in the school [17], which is expected to realize an effective VHS. Management of provision of education of an educational institution at the level of education units (VHS) led by a school principal.

When examined in a comprehensive manner, many factors may affect the change management and effective school, both in terms of human resources, tools and methods, policies, and of its financial side [18][19]. Identification of factors that influence the effectiveness of schools have spawned constancy that leadership, school culture, community participation, the performance of teachers and other human resources, and aspects of school financing are the factors that has its own dominance in accordance with the problems facing VHS.

Thus the purpose of this study is to:

- Identify and obtain empirical overview of the various main factors that affect adherence to the process and the achievement of the objectives of effective management model at vocational schools in West Java.
- Analyze the linkages of main determinants in effective school management model at vocational schools in West Java.
- Seek and find the best model of management of effective school in the vocational schools in West Java.

This study is expected to provide contributions to the enrichment in the field of science and praxis of education in all fields, particularly in the management model of effective vocational schools. In particular, this study can provide

benefits for policy makers at provincial and municipal levels (provincial and municipal education office) as a reference for making educational policy, especially with regard to the effective management model at VHS in West Java. In the school environment, this study is expected to provide a model and effective school management strategy that is useful in the development of the quality of education that can be applied effectively in appropriate VHS characteristics.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. The Concept of Effective School

Effective school management is the management that is able to pick up and deliver the benefits of and on the environment, and able to manage resources valuable and rare [20]. Effective school management within the scope of the Education Administration, which is modified from [9], can be described as follows:



Fig. 1. Effective School Management

Figure 1 shows that effective school leadership is characterized by the presence of the principal elements of a strong leadership. Effective schools also marked by a clear school mission that are measurable and attainable. A safe and orderly climate, as well as school culture can improve the effectiveness of schools. Activity of monitoring student progress shows the efforts of the school to achieve an effective school. High expectation for learners engage teachers to play an active role in supporting and monitoring the student's progress in learning and communicating expectations about the level of learning achievement for all students. That is evident with the high teacher performance, so that the learning process can run effectively. Effective school is also evident from the community or society participation that indicates the presence of a mutually beneficial partnership between school and community.

Simply put, effective school is identified in two groups: internal and external effectiveness [21]. Internal effectiveness refers to the educational outputs that are not measured in monetary term, such as learning achievement and the number

of graduates. The external effectiveness refers to the output of a monetary nature, such as income level of graduates.

In education, the effectiveness and quality of education are systematically imaged through client/supplier, input, process, output, and consequences/customers (CIPOC). Client is an organizer of education, namely the Department of Education, Ministry of Education and Culture, and the Foundation. Input education is everything that should be available for the implementation of the learning process that is effective and efficient in vocational school, such as policy administration of VHS, vision and mission of the school, human and financial resources, materials and methods, as well as equipment and learning facilities. The education process is the implementation of the implementation of the teaching and learning process, in which the components of school leadership, school culture, community participation, and teacher performance related to each other in creating effective schools. Output can be science education, information, technology, changes in the attitude and character of the students who appear in a quality school. Consequences/Customers look at what the impact of educational output to the graduates, parents, and society in general.

With regard to product education services, [21] stated dimensions of quality include: performance, which consists of the physical setting of educational services, the location of schools, educational personnel resources, materials, communications and equipment; reliability; the ability to perform quality and services that were promised; responsiveness, the extent to which educators are able to do service to learners; guarantee of knowledge, the ability of schools to maintain the trust and confidence of stakeholders of education; empathy, attention and concern for learners.

Effective schools are characterized by a product or graduates expected, completeness organizations, such as the availability of adequate resources, the characteristics of teaching and work motivation of teachers, and a model of continuous evaluation of learning outcomes [22]. Meanwhile, effectiveness of the organization education depends on the importance of the full school hours (no empty); the good cooperation between teachers; pay attention to the condition of the physical facilities and other facilities; and the consistency in reward and punishment on students' attitudes.

B. Process of Development of Effective School

The process of developing organizational effectiveness of school is through the various steps of the main stages in the development process of school effectiveness: the orientation of the school community in the process; conditioning the school self-evaluation by means of the instrument; identify, summarize and analyze the data; identification of priority development needs of the school; prepare a plan for school development program; implementation of the school development program plan and monitor progress; evaluation of the school development plan; the impact of communication on community school development program; plan and subsequent action of self-evaluation and school development;

further evaluation back to the original process with school orientation on the process [23][24][25].

III. RESEARCH METHOD

This research was conducted in several public and private VHS at 20 City / Regency in West Java using a representative sample withdrawal. The necessary data in this study were collected through questionnaires (for the survey), interview, observation and documentation (for qualitative studies). Data analysis was carried out according to the needs of research, namely through the analysis of quantitative and qualitative analysis. The necessary data in this study were collected through a number of ways including studies of documentation, observation of activities, questionnaires, interviews, experiments, written test, and pilot projects. Data analysis was conducted in accordance with the needs of this research is through the analysis of qualitative and quantitative analysis, which is divided into three main stages of research.

This stage is the stage of identification and development of a blueprint model and effective management strategies in VHS schools, to confirm the identification of the determinants of effective schools. The steps taken at this stage are identification of the main factors that influence effective school management based on findings in the field; create a research instrument in the form of a questionnaire related to the key factors, as well as to test the validity and reliability of the instrument; analyzing the data collected from the questionnaire for VHS in West Java. The questionnaire was distributed to 1200 respondents (teachers and principals) in 60 public and private VHS in the 20 Cities/Regencies.

IV. RESEARCH RESULTS

Identification of the main factors that influence school management effectively has been done with reference to the theory of effective schools, so that there are five major factors that can be identified, namely Principal Leadership (X1), School Culture (X2), Public Participation (X3), School Financing (X4), and Teacher Performance (X5). Each variable was measured by specific indicators, as presented in Table I.

TABLE I. VARIABLES AND INDICATORS

| No. | Variables | Indicators | Items |
|-----|----------------------|---|-------|
| 1 | Effective School (Y) | Professional Leadership, Focus on Teaching and Learning, Vision and Objectives Together, Learning Aim, High Expectations on Achievement, Community of Learners, Accountability, Learning Environment, | 31 |

(Table I, cont.)

| | | | |
|--------------|------------------------------|--|------------|
| 2 | Principal Leadership (X1) | Have a Vision and Objectives, High Self Discipline, Based Value, Leadership Empowerment, Self-awareness in leadership skills, Building a Network | 26 |
| 3 | School Culture (X2) | The artifacts and learning environment, Norms, Dominant Value, School Philosophy, Enforcement of Rules | 20 |
| 4 | Community Participation (X3) | Types of Involvement, Characteristics of People, Public Attitudes, Compliance with Hope | 21 |
| 5 | School Funding (X4) | Investment Cost, Personal Costs, Cost of Non-Personal, Help Cost of Education, Transparency and Accountability | 22 |
| 6 | Teacher Performance (X5) | Focus on Students and Learning, Content, Practice Learning, Professional Teacher, Responsibility | 24 |
| Total | | | 144 |

Thus, the overall identification of the main factors affecting the effective management of schools includes six variables and 32 indicators. The indicator in this study is reflexive. The model assumes that reflexive constructs or latent variables affecting the indicators (the direction of causality of constructs to indicators or manifest) [26].

Making the research instrument refers to the identification of the main factors that influence effective school management. To capture the quantitative data, the research instrument was made in the form of a questionnaire that measures 6 and 32 indicator variables. The first step was to test the validity and reliability of the instrument. Results of testing the reliability and validity of the instruments are presented in Table II and III.

TABLE II. RELIABILITY TEST RESULTS

| Variable | r-stat | r-tab | Notes |
|-----------|--------|-------|----------|
| X1 | 0.965 | 0.374 | Reliabel |
| X2 | 0.900 | 0.374 | Reliabel |
| X3 | 0.964 | 0.374 | Reliabel |
| X4 | 0.965 | 0.374 | Reliabel |
| X5 | 0.940 | 0.374 | Reliabel |
| Y | 0.921 | 0.374 | Reliabel |

TABLE III. VALIDITY TEST RESULT (STAGE 1)

| Variable | Items | Valid | Not Valid |
|-----------|-------|-------|-----------|
| X1 | 26 | 24 | 2 |
| X2 | 20 | 16 | 4 |
| X3 | 21 | 19 | 2 |
| X4 | 22 | 22 | 0 |
| X5 | 24 | 23 | 1 |
| Y | 31 | 23 | 8 |
| Total | 144 | 127 | 17 |

The test results demonstrated the validity of the instrument that 17 items were not valid. This was caused by the vagueness and ambiguity in the phrase a statement on these items. Invalid items were then repaired and re-tested so that all results are valid.

Data were analyzed using SEM-PLS. Descriptive analysis and hypothesis testing is presented in Table IV and Table V.

TABLE IV. DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS (STAGE 1)

| Factor Loading, Residual and Weights | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Cons- struct | Indi- cator | Mean | Stdev | Loading | Residual | Weight |
| X1 | X1-1 | 16.370968 | 2.277717 | 0.806200 | 0.350100 | 0.194400 |
| | X1-2 | 14.403226 | 2.877041 | 0.902900 | 0.184700 | 0.184300 |
| | X1-3 | 15.370968 | 2.870048 | 0.878100 | 0.229000 | 0.175600 |
| | X1-4 | 15.112903 | 2.312509 | 0.892800 | 0.203000 | 0.198100 |
| | X1-5 | 14.725806 | 2.542552 | 0.928200 | 0.138400 | 0.186000 |
| | X1-6 | 22.870968 | 3.336258 | 0.889000 | 0.209600 | 0.194800 |
| X2 | X2-1 | 20.354839 | 2.643252 | 0.867700 | 0.247200 | 0.325400 |
| | X2-2 | 12.048387 | 1.540996 | 0.714700 | 0.489300 | 0.240000 |
| | X2-3 | 16.774194 | 2.035902 | 0.774200 | 0.400600 | 0.288300 |
| | X2-4 | 13.951613 | 2.682227 | 0.578900 | 0.664900 | 0.210000 |
| | X2-5 | 15.290323 | 1.850008 | 0.784000 | 0.385300 | 0.256800 |
| | X3-1 | 21.387097 | 4.832794 | 0.904400 | 0.182000 | 0.332300 |
| X3 | X3-2 | 13.370968 | 3.111238 | 0.893500 | 0.201700 | 0.288000 |
| | X3-3 | 19.145161 | 4.601663 | 0.923400 | 0.147200 | 0.269100 |
| | X3-4 | 12.225806 | 2.205948 | 0.708000 | 0.498700 | 0.273600 |
| | X4-1 | 8.145161 | 1.400782 | 0.834800 | 0.303100 | 0.260500 |
| | X4-2 | 8.370968 | 1.601576 | 0.850400 | 0.276900 | 0.252900 |
| | X4-3 | 41.516129 | 6.530488 | 0.903000 | 0.184600 | 0.253000 |
| X4 | X4-4 | 18.516129 | 3.386288 | 0.719200 | 0.482700 | 0.198400 |
| | X4-5 | 12.822581 | 2.392092 | 0.872700 | 0.238400 | 0.225000 |
| | X5-1 | 24.516129 | 3.076841 | 0.905600 | 0.179900 | 0.278700 |
| | X5-2 | 12.080645 | 1.417668 | 0.900900 | 0.188400 | 0.292400 |
| | X5-3 | 34.000000 | 3.728490 | 0.857500 | 0.264700 | 0.287700 |
| | X5-4 | 25.177419 | 4.190247 | 0.802900 | 0.355400 | 0.295700 |
| Y | Y-1 | 16.241935 | 2.420442 | 0.838600 | 0.296800 | 0.181800 |
| | Y-2 | 25.774194 | 2.498651 | 0.629800 | 0.603400 | 0.122200 |
| | Y-3 | 14.741935 | 2.449058 | 0.793400 | 0.370500 | 0.173200 |
| | Y-4 | 16.919355 | 1.961084 | 0.684900 | 0.531000 | 0.146700 |
| | Y-5 | 12.112903 | 1.558739 | 0.663400 | 0.559900 | 0.145400 |
| | Y-6 | 15.000000 | 2.734120 | 0.869500 | 0.244000 | 0.192900 |
| | Y-7 | 11.451613 | 1.798701 | 0.809400 | 0.344800 | 0.178100 |
| | Y-8 | 11.758065 | 1.743235 | 0.744300 | 0.446000 | 0.167100 |

In general, the factor loading for each indicator is above 0.7 indicating a high reflexive size of each indicator against the construct. However, the indicator X2-4 (Philosophy School at the School Culture constructs) was below 0.7, which means that the size of the reflexive of these indicators has not kept pace with the construct to be measured.

TABLE V. HYPOTESIS TESTING

| Structural Model--JackKnife | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|-------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | Entire Sample-estimate | Mean of Sub-samples | Jack-knife estimate | Standard error | T-Statistic | Standard error (Adjusted) | T-Statistic (Adjusted) Significance |
| X1→Y | 0.3580 | 0.3574 | 0.3924 | 0.1156 | 3.3949 | 0.1635 | 2.4005 Sig. |
| X2→Y | 0.3170 | 0.3168 | 0.3288 | 0.1055 | 3.1169 | 0.1492 | 2.2040 Sig. |
| X3→Y | 0.1210 | 0.1208 | 0.1338 | 0.0794 | 1.6857 | 0.1122 | 1.1920 NS |
| X4→Y | -0.0650 | -0.0647 | -0.0827 | 0.0842 | -0.9824 | 0.1191 | -0.6946 NS |
| X5→Y | 0.3110 | 0.3104 | 0.3464 | 0.0925 | 3.7463 | 0.1308 | 2.6490 Sig. |

V. DISCUSSION

Simultaneously, R-square value of 0.855 indicates a significant influence of the Principal Leadership, School Culture, Community Participation, Schools Financing and Teacher Performance on Effective Schools. Partially, the hypothesis testing showed that the Principal Leadership, School Culture, and Teacher Performance have a significant influence on Effective School, while the Community Participation and Financing School have no significant effect, even for Schools Financing is negative.

Results of testing this hypothesis used as a basis to dig deeper into the problems associated with the main factors that influence effective school management in public and private VHS in West Java. Some notes can be drawn from the results of this study are:

1) Minimum size of reflexive philosophy School Culture School to construct showed the diversity of respondents' perceptions relating to:

- Academic freedom and academic culture in schools leadership tends to be authoritarian and more task-oriented.
- Receipt and provision of information relating to the progress of the school (an attempt to more advanced and superior) inferior culture.
- School is reluctance in accepting criticism from external parties.
- School efforts in response to the needs / aspirations of external parties.

2) Community Participation and School Financing had no significant effect on the Effective School Management.

- Community participation has not been in line with expectations of school, from the aspects of types and forms of community participation in the school.
- School funding is perceived lack of transparency and unclear. Some respondents claimed not to know much about school funding issues.

3) Interaction of all the main factors that influence effective school management leads to poor school accountability.

In essence, this model leads to a low accountability of schools so that the model is continuously strive to increase the accountability of schools on a reciprocal basis can improve the effectiveness of community participation and school funding.

REFERENCES

- [1] Lin CY, Edvinsson L. National intellectual capital: A comparison of 40 countries. Springer Science & Business Media; 2010 Oct 29.
- [2] Law Number 20 Year 2003 on National Education System.
- [3] Elmore RF. Bridging the gap between standards and achievement: The imperative for professional development in education. Secondary lenses on learning participant book: Team leadership for mathematics in middle and high schools. 2002:313-344.
- [4] Stronge JH. Qualities of effective teachers. ASCD; 2007.
- [5] Shulman LS, Shulman JH. How and what teachers learn: A shifting perspective. Journal of curriculum studies. 2004 Mar 1;36(2):257-71.
- [6] Henderson AT, Mapp KL. A New Wave of Evidence: The Impact of School, Family, and Community Connections on Student Achievement. Annual Synthesis 2002. National Center for Family and Community Connections with Schools. 2002.
- [7] McLaughlin MW, Talbert JE. Building school-based teacher learning communities: Professional strategies to improve student achievement. Teachers College Press; 2006.
- [8] Colby J, Witt M. Defining quality in education. New York: A Publication of United Nations Children's Fund. 2000 Jun.
- [9] Sadker DM, Zittleman KR. Teacher-centered philosophies. Retrieved June. 2006;7:2013.
- [10] Granger DA. No Child Left Behind and the spectacle of failing schools: The mythology of contemporary school reform. Educational Studies. 2008 Jun 12;43(3):206-28.
- [11] Morgan K. The learning region: institutions, innovation and regional renewal. Regional studies. 2007 Mar 1;41(S1):S147-59.
- [12] Friga PN, Bettis RA, Sullivan RS. Changes in graduate management education and new business school strategies for the 21st century. Academy of Management Learning & Education. 2003 Sep 1;2(3):233-49.
- [13] Gumpert PJ. Academic restructuring: Organizational change and institutional imperatives. Higher education. 2000 Jan 1;39(1):67-91.
- [14] Fleming P. The art of middle management in secondary schools: A guide to effective subject and team leadership. Routledge; 2013 Dec 19.
- [15] Goleman D, Boyatzis R, McKee A. Primal leadership: Unleashing the power of emotional intelligence. Harvard Business Press; 2013.
- [16] Danielson, C. Enhancing Student Achievement: A Framework for School Improvement. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2002.
- [17] Sakhieva RG, Semenova LV, Muskhanova IV, Yakhyaeva AK, Iskhakova RR, Makarova EV, Shafigullina LS. Academic mobility of high school students: Concept, principles, structural components and stages of implementation. Journal of Sustainable Development. 2015 May 28;8(3):256.
- [18] Cummings TG, Worley CG. Organization development and change. Cengage learning; 2014.

- [19] Blandford S. Managing professional development in schools. Routledge; 2012 Nov 12.
- [20] Hoy, WK. and Miskel, CG. Educational Administration Theory, Research, And Practice 6th ed., International Edition, Singapore: McGraw-Hill Co, 2001.
- [21] Mulyasa. To Be A Professional Principal. Bandung, Remaja Rosdakarya Remaja, 2006.
- [22] Scheerens J, Bosker RJ. The foundations of educational effectiveness. Oxford: Pergamon; 1997 Jan.
- [23] Holdaway EA, Johnson NA. School effectiveness and effectiveness indicators. School Effectiveness and School Improvement. 1993 Aug 1;4(3):165-88.
- [24] Deal TK. AA (1982).” Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life”. Reading: Addison-Wesley. 2008.
- [25] Deal TE. The culture of schools. Educational leadership and school culture. 1993;3-18.
- [26] Ghozali I. Analisis Multivariate Lanjutan dengan Program SPSS. 2006.