

2016

**INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
ON EDUCATION & SOCIAL SCIENCE
(UK-ICESS)**

9-10th November

PROCEEDING

**“EDUCATIONAL & SOCIAL ISSUES
IN THE CHANGING ASIA”**

ISBN: 978-602-19859-7-7



UNIVERSITAS KANJURUHAN MALANG

unikama
Universitas Kanjuruhan Malang

Jl. S. Supriyadi No. 48 Malang
Telp. +62 341 801488 Fax. +62 341 831532
Website: <http://www.unikama.ac.id>

PROCEEDING

2016 International Conference on Education and Social Science (UK-ICSS) “Educational and Social Issues in the Changing Asia”

ISBN: 978-602-19859-7-7

Malang, Indonesia
November 9-10, 2016

**Universitas Kanjuruhan
Malang**

Jl. S. Supriadi No. 48
Malang, Indonesia – 65148
Tel. (+62)341-801488
Fax. (+62)341-831532
www.unikama.ac.id
www.uk-icess.org



PROCEEDING

2016 International Conference on Education and Social Science (UK-ICESS)

“Educational and Social Issues in the Changing Asia”

ISBN: 978-602-19859-7-7

Reviewers

Prof. Dr. Sudjijono, M.Hum
Prof. Dr. Laurens Kaluge
Dr. Supriyanto
Umi Tursini, Ph.D
Umiati Jawas, Ph.D
Rusfandi, Ph.D

Editors

Ayu Liskinasih, M.Pd
Uun Muhaji, M.Pd
Dr. Permata Ika Hidayati
Hena Dian Ayu, M.Si, M.Pd

Cover Design

Susiati

Printed and Published by

Universitas Kanjuruhan Malang
Jl. S. Supriadi No. 48 Malang, Indonesia – 65148
Tel. (+62)341-801488; Fax. (+62)341-831532
www.unikama.ac.id; www.uk-icess.org; uk-icess@unikama.ac.id

First printing, November 2016

Copyright ©2016 by Universitas Kanjuruhan Malang

The texts of the papers in this volume were set individually by the authors or under their supervision. Only minor corrections to the text may have been carried out by the publisher. By submitting the paper to the 2016 International Conference in Education and Social Sciences (UK-ICESS), the authors agree that they are fully responsible to obtain all the written permission to reproduce figures, tables, and text from copyrighted material. The authors are also responsible to give sufficient credit included in the texts, figures, legends, or tables. The organizer of the conference, reviewers of the papers, editors, and the publisher of the proceedings are not responsible for any copyright infringement and the damage they may cause.

PREFACE

The 2016 International Conference on Education and Social Science (UK-ICESS) is the first international conference hosted by Universitas Kanjuruhan Malang as a part of its XLI Dies Natalis commemoration. This international conference invites all educators and researchers in the field of education and social sciences to share latest issues, research, and information in these areas. Thus, as an important part of this academic forum, the organizing committee is pleased to present the Proceeding of 2016 International Conference on Education and Social Sciences which brings up the main theme of *Educational and Social Issues in the Changing Asia*.

There are 65 papers in this compilation, covering various topics around the theme of educational and social issues in the changing Asia which were studied from vast research areas; such as economics, health, education, language, arts, technology, geography, civics, and entrepreneurship. It is expected that all papers in this proceeding will enrich our knowledge and broaden our insights of current issues, trends, research, and information in the areas of education and social sciences.

Lastly, the organizing committee would like to deliver great appreciation to writers, presenters, and all parties who have been contributing to the publication of this proceeding.

Malang, November 2016

The Committee

TABLE OF CONTENT

Preface	iii
Table of Content	iv

Conference Papers

1. The Application of Cooperative Learning Model (Tutor and Tutee) in the Playing Outdoor Activities for Early Childhood <i>Achmadi; Aisyah</i>	1
2. Parenting Parents in Developing Character Education in Early Childhood <i>Aisyah; Isabella Hasiana</i>	8
3. Looking beyond Teacher's Classroom Management: EFL Teachers' Pedagogical Knowledge from Different Backgrounds in Teaching Autistic Students in Different Settings <i>Alam Aji Putera, M. Adnan Latief, Ali Saukah, Sri Rachmajanti</i>	15
4. Student Activities in Learning NCTM Standards with Cognitive Load Theory Concept of Rank in Grade X Vocational High School <i>Arika Indah Kristiana, Suharto</i>	25
5. Effect of Betel Leaves Decoctionin to Speeding Perineum Healing for Postpartum Women in BPM Endang Sutikno Kediri <i>Candra Wahyuni</i>	30
6. The Importance of Entrepreneurship Education for Farmer <i>Darmadji</i>	36
7. Is Internal Corporate Social Responsibility Related to Employee Engagement? <i>Dianawati Suryaningtyas</i>	46
8. Implementation of Entrepreneurial Learning Model Based on Local Wisdom through Mind Mapping Method to Achieve the Effectiveness of Learning <i>Endah Andayani; Lilik Sri Hariani; Suko Winarsih; Rusno</i>	54
9. Entrepreneurship Learning Model Involving the Businessman (Entrepreneur in Residence); Implementation of Social Entrepreneurship at Ciputra University <i>Wina Christina, Herry Purwoko, Astrid Kusumowidagdo</i>	64
10. The Implementation of Social Science Inquiry Learning Strategy in Civics Education <i>Hernawaty Damanik, I Nyoman S Degeng, Punaji Setyosari, I Wayan Dasna.</i>	71

11. Flores Local Genius on Move (Integrating both Character Education and Manggaraian Local Genius in Teaching English Speaking) <i>Hieronimus Canggung Darong</i>	78
12. The Effectiveness of <i>Jengah</i> Conception to Control the Students' Communication Anxiety in Mathematics Learning <i>I Made Ardana</i>	88
13. The Impact of Blended Learning towards Teaching Learning Process and Student's Maturity <i>R. Jacobus Darmanto; Agustinus Fahik</i>	95
14. The Use of Google Slides to Build Students' Collaborative Work in Reading Comprehension Skill to Master the Report Texts <i>Jastman</i>	103
15. Good Behaviour Game to Reduce Aggressive Behaviours on Children <i>Gracia Sudargo, Laura Makaria Sudargo</i>	113
16. The Implementation of Curriculum 2013 on Economics by Using Scientific Approach in SMAN Malang <i>Lilik Sri Hariani; Endah Andayani</i>	122
17. Students' Perception of Interactive Multimedia Mediated Web-based Learning <i>Mclean HY, Isnawati</i>	128
18. Building Student's Character through Indirect Teaching in Indonesian High Schools <i>Mirjam Anugerahwati</i>	138
19. The Relationship between Gender, Age, and Attitude toward Mathematics among Malaysian Gifted Students <i>Mohd Fadzil bin Kamarudin; Mohd Hasrul bin Kamarulzaman; Noriah Mohd Ishak</i>	143
20. The Development of Learning Model for Accounting Education Based On Islamic Ethics in Higher Institutions <i>Muslichah, Evi Maria</i>	154
21. Integrating Sustainability Education into Higher Institutions <i>Muslichah; Shabrina Ramadania</i>	167
22. Perceptions of Novice English Teachers on Student-Centre Approach in Teaching English <i>Neni Nurkhamidah; Sinta Dewi Yulianti</i>	176

23. What is so Difficult about Learning Science through English? <i>Novriani Rabeka Manafre</i>	182
24. Analysis Cognitive Ability Enhancement through Cosmography Constructivism Facilitated Media Learning Management System <i>Permata Ika Hidayati, Soetjipto</i>	188
25. Micro-Hydro Power Plant Realia as Media to Enhance Students' Understanding on Power Plant <i>Radina Anggun Nurisma, Hendrik Elvian Gayuh Prasetya, Teguh Hady Ari Wibowo</i>	197
26. Self-Control and College Adjustment: Aspect and Measurement <i>Rahmah Hastuti</i>	204
27. The Motivation and Performance of Health as Consequence the Welfare Employees <i>Ratna Wardani</i>	213
28. Connection and Mathematical Disposition toward Advanced Mathematical Thinking in APOS Mathematics Learning <i>Retno Marsitin</i>	221
29. An International Group Membership on <i>Facebook</i> and Its Effect on Giving Feedback during Peer Review <i>Riza Weganofa; Henni Anggraeni; Rofi'ul Huda</i>	232
30. Community Service: Empowering the Deaf <i>Riza Weganofa, Siti Mafulah, Fitri Anggraini</i>	239
31. Critical Thinking about Education and Tax Policy in Indonesia: Study on Cases of Tax Evasion in European Countries <i>Rostamaji Kornawan</i>	243
32. Bilingual Concept of Cross-Linguistic Transfer: A Challenge for Contrastive Rhetoric <i>Rusfandi</i>	248
33. The Use of Videos to Improve Students' Ability in Listening to Narrative Texts <i>Widia Purnamasari; Sakti Nugroho</i>	255
34. The Use of Online Media to Enrich Student's Vocabulary <i>Siti Mafulah, Fitri Anggraini Hariyanto</i>	268

35. The Development of Learning Physics Device Based on KKNi to Increase Students' Mastery Concept and Critical Thinking <i>Sudi Dul Aji, Choirul Huda, Chandra Sundaygara, Muhammad Nur Hudha</i>	277
36. A Survey Study on the Independence and the Openness of the Will be Teacher <i>Sudiyono; Maris Kurniawati</i>	285
37. Arts-based Responses to Cultural and Religion Identity to Inform Initial Teacher Education <i>Sue Erica Smith; Ratna Suryaratri; Deasyanti Adil</i>	292
38. Economic Empowerment Community to Economic Institutions <i>Pesantren</i> <i>Supriyanto</i>	300
39. Critical Thinking of the Elementary School Students in Coffee Plantation Area Based on Math Science Exemplars Task through Performance Assessment <i>Suratno; Dian Kurniati</i>	307
40. The Implementation of the Scientific Approach of Curriculum 2013 in English Classes at Sekolah Menengah Atas Negeri 6 Malang <i>Surya Fajar Cahyo Nuraeni</i>	313
41. Urgency of Education Based Socioecopreneurship in Indonesia (Analysis on Elementary Education) <i>Susan N H Jacobus</i>	324
42. Knowledge Management Model in the Achievement of Effectiveness of the Organization of Private Higher Education in Malang <i>Tanto Gatot Sumarsono; Abdurrabi</i>	329
43. Self-Assessment of Speaking Proficiency: Students' Criteria and Attitude <i>Umi Tursini</i>	341
44. Managing Instruction: Leadership Practices for Instructional Improvement in Indonesian School Reform <i>Umiati Jawas</i>	350
45. The Use of Creative Writing Handbook in Developing Ideas and Creativity of English Education Department Students in Writing Class <i>Uun Muhaji; Irene Trisisca</i>	365
46. The Analysis of Banking Systemic Risk in Indonesia <i>Vinus Maulina, Riril Mardiana Firdaus</i>	372

47. The Analysis of Banking Systemic Risk and Financial Linkages in Indonesia <i>Vinus Maulina; Sri Wilujeng</i>	382
48. Analysis of the Influence of the World's Oil Prices, Inflation, Interest Rate, and Rupiah / US Dollar Exchange Rate on the Return of Mining Sector's Shares Registered in Indonesia Stock Exchange in 2010 – 2015 <i>Waseso Segoro, Andri Kartika</i>	390
49. Improvement of Motivation and Learning Outcomes through Assessment of Social Sciences Student Portofolio in State Junior High School 5 Malang <i>Yuli Ifana Sari, Siti Halimatus Sakdiyah, Hermina Mulyati Sudir</i>	398
50. Couched Peer Feedback: Teacher's Intervention in Collaborative Peer Feedback Writing Activities <i>Annisa Astrid</i>	404
51. The Implementation of Fanpage in Creating Positioning Product for UMKM in Jakarta And Yogyakarta <i>Tjipto Djuhartono, Annisaa Utami, Wening Estiningsih</i>	416
52. The Implementation of Bureaucracy Reform: Role of Transformational Leadership, Organizational Culture and Employees Quality Competence as the Mediator <i>Christea Frisdiantara; Harinoto</i>	424
53. Knowledge Management and Transformational Leadership on Employees' Performance Mediated by Organizational Culture <i>Harinoto</i>	437
54. Establishing Reading Comprehension on Report Text through the Presence and Absence of the Text Itself <i>Veranika</i>	448
55. Counseling Families through Parenting Positive Techniques in Dealing with Authoritarian Parenting <i>Wiwit Wahyutiningsih</i>	455
56. I _b W Kecamatan Kedopok Kota Probolinggo <i>Irma Tyasari, Enike Dwi Kusumawati, Suryaningsih, HB Sujiantoro</i>	461
57. Revitalising Anti Corruption Values in Economy Development as The Learning for Pre-service Teachers <i>Ninik Indawati</i>	466

58. Innovation And Business Strategies To Enhance Firm Performance: Study of SMEs Cluster In Malang <i>Rita Indah Mustikowati, Iva Nurdiana Farida</i>	472
59. The Development of Policy Evaluation Model of Bank Indonesia(BI) and Otoritas Jasa Keuangan (OJK) for Mandatory Audit of BPRS <i>Koenta Adji Koerniawan, Irma Tyasari</i>	481
60. Community as the Actor in Empowerment: The Role of Community Information Group of Surabaya in Building Well-informed Community <i>Nurul Ratna Sari</i>	487
61. The Air Flow as Function of Temperature in Rectangular Heated Chamber in Solar Thermal Cyclone Wind Turbine Generator <i>Sugiono, A. Raharjo, Sujatmiko</i>	499
62. Development of Android-Based Blended Learning Accompanied with Video Tutorials To Improve Students' Understanding And Skill Of Computer Programming Course <i>Choirul Huda, Nurul Ain</i>	504
63. Evaluation of Placement Policy: Correlation between Placement Test Score and Students' Achievement in Integrated Course <i>Ayu Liskinasih, Rizky Lutviana</i>	513
64. Application of Multiculturalism Based Approach to Improve Students' Understanding in Literary Critism (Case Studies in English Literature Department of Kanjuruhan University, Malang) <i>Sujito</i>	519
65. Financial Performance Evaluation Department of Industry, Trade, and District in Indonesian Market Developments in Optimized SMEs <i>Ida Nuryana</i>	527

MANAGING INSTRUCTION: LEADERSHIP PRACTICES FOR INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT IN INDONESIAN SCHOOL REFORM

Umiati Jawas

umiati_jawas@unikama.ac.id

Universitas Kanjuruhan Malang

Abstract: This study sought to explore local perceptions and practices of school principals in managing instruction to improve schools' capacity for providing better education. A qualitative descriptive design focused on concept discovery and development was the method used in this study. The data were collected from in-depth interviews with six principals and fourteen teachers from senior secondary schools in Malang Regency, Indonesia. The participants' accounts revealed five main practices of managing instruction: monitoring learning hours, communicating instructional matters, providing learning resources and facilities, building partnerships with stakeholders, and improving the welfare of the teachers. The practices of monitoring learning hours and improving the welfare of the teachers were local practices influenced by Indonesian cultural and socio-economic factors. Three other practices of communicating instructional matters, providing learning resources and facilities, and building partnerships with stakeholders reemphasised practices of managing instruction suggested by empirical studies conducted in western contexts.

INTRODUCTION

Empirical studies have shown that school leaders have an important role in making school reform happen by creating structural and socio-cultural processes that develop the capacity of schools for improvement (Chen, 2008; Fullan, 2007; Hallinger & Heck, 2010). Their role is of importance, despite current trends toward emergent models of relational leadership such as facilitative and transformative (Fullan, 2007). Strong, committed and skilled school leaders are required to face the dynamic complexity of school reform and the importance of leadership cannot be reduced by mechanisms such as committees, standardised operating procedures, or participative decision-making (Chen, 2008). As change agents, school leaders develop school capacity to manage change (Fullan, 2007; Hallinger & Kantamara, 2000) and empower followers to realise their potentials; thus, they increase organisational productivity and capacity to restructure schools (Chen, 2008).

For reform to take place, change is introduced and implemented to all school aspects and incorporates other factors that may determine desired pedagogical improvement (Dalin, 2005). Reform depends not only on the educational context of a certain effort, but also on wider contexts of political, social, economic, cultural and demographic factors (OECD Report, 1989 cited in Dalin, 2005). Therefore, to initiate school reform, a holistic approach should develop and connect all levels of the internal system to the external system that they interact with (Elmore, 2000). Reform policies need to cover all systems to achieve the consistency of the

reform policy structure and involve them, to synchronise the efforts within the systems, and to create clarity and consistency at both the top and bottom of the system (Elmore, 2000)..

Yet, restructuring the education sector as a systemic approach to improvement may not necessarily lead to improvements in student achievement, particularly if these focus on wrong variables. Variables that are distant from day-to-day teaching and learning in schools have been argued to have less impact on student outcomes compared to variables related to psychological, instructional, and home environment (Datnow, 2005; Hattie, 2003). Current research on school leadership has been showing growing emphasis on the contribution of instructional leadership in school improvement (Alig-Mielcarek & Hoy, 2005; Gurr, et al., 2007). As instructional leadership accentuates students' learning and teacher empowerment, a focus on this type of leadership can be a strategy for school improvement.

Practices of developing the pedagogical capacities within the school were found to be a key to meet challenges such as low achievement in particular curriculum areas or of a specific group of students (Penlington, et al., 2008). Effective school leaders were distinguished by their focus on critical instructional areas and personal responsibility for instructional matters (Nettles & Herrington, 2007). Developing teachers' capacity and creating opportunities for them to plan and work together on instructional issues contributed to a school's high performance (Nettles & Herrington, 2007; Penlington, et al., 2008).

In addition, a significant amount of research has shown increasing evidence that principals do actually have an effect on student learning outcomes (Day, et al., 2008; Leithwood & Day, 2008; Nettles & Herrington, 2007; Penlington, et al., 2008; Louis, et al., 2010; Robinson, 2010; Robinson, et al., 2008). Some research emphasises principals' knowledge of curriculum content and instructional materials (Louis, et al., 2010; Stein & Nelson, 2003) and other research highlights the presence of principals' support for improved instruction (Leithwood, 2001; Louis, et al., 2010; O'Donnell & White, 2005). Other research has signified that instructional leadership is a core responsibility for principals (Mangin, 2007; Reitzug, et al., 2008; Robinson, 2010). Research has also shown that principals of effective schools have a strong focus on critical instructional areas (Halverson, et al., 2005).

Therefore, this study was conducted to explore perceptions and practices of school principals in Senior High Schools in Malang Regency, Indonesia in managing instruction to improve their schools' capacity for providing better teaching and learning quality. Such study is imperative considering unsatisfactory Indonesia educational performances as measured by some international indexes like PISA, TIMSS, and PIRLS scores (Sofo, Fitzgerald, & Jawas, 2012). The findings are expected to reveal what have been executed by the principals in accomplishing their school reform goals particularly in ensuring improved students' learning achievement. The focused question that this study was aiming for was what practices executed by the principals in managing instruction in the process of their school reform.

RESEARCH DESIGN

For this study, interviews were used to collect the data and designed as structured interviews to assure the comparability of data. Because of the depth and extent of the information sought in qualitative studies, this study used purposive samples that are typically small, with the primary criterion of the redundancy of information. This study used stratified purposeful sampling to ensure that all types of senior secondary schools were represented. Table 1 summarises the sample size who participated in the interviews .

Table 1 Profile of Research Participants

ID	Type of Senior Secondary School	Position	Gender
P1	Public	Principal	Male
P2	Public	Teacher	Male
P3	Public	Teacher	Female
P4	Public	Teacher	Female
P5	Public	Teacher	Female
P6	Public Islamic/madrasah	Principal	Male
P7	Public Islamic/madrasah	Teacher	Male
P8	Public Islamic/madrasah	Teacher	Male
P9	Public Vocational	Principal	Male
P10	Public Vocational	Teacher	Female
P11	Public Vocational	Teacher	Female
P12	Public Vocational	Teacher	Male
P13	Private	Principal	Male
P14	Private	Teacher	Male
P15	Private	Teacher	Female
P16	Private Islamic/madrasah	Principal	Male
P17	Private Islamic/madrasah	Teacher	Male
P18	Private Vocational	Principal	Female
P19	Private Vocational	Teacher	Female
P20	Private Vocational	Teacher	Male

Basic interpretative studies guided the analysis of interview data in this study. Basic interpretative studies describe and attempt to interpret experience where the data analysis typically involves categorisation and development of themes interpreted by the researcher through a certain disciplinary lens (Ary, et al., 2010). The analysis uses coding and looks for recurring themes. Codes develop from being descriptive and or literal data to interpretative and then explanatory and abstract data, moving towards conceptual analysis (Scott & Morrison, 2007). To ease the process of interview analysis, this study used QSR's NVivo 9 software. The process consisted of importing interview materials, creating nodes to store data about ideas or themes emerging from the analysis, coding to tag content about a specific theme or idea, and making classifications to group interview materials based on common characteristics found.

FINDINGS

Five practices of managing instruction were identified: monitoring learning hours, communicating instructional matters, providing learning resources and facilities, building partnerships with stakeholders, and improving the welfare of the teachers. Some local practices of improving instruction were found. The practices of monitoring learning hours and improving the welfare of the teachers were local practices influenced by Indonesian cultural and socio-economic factors. Three other practices of communicating instructional matters, providing learning resources and facilities, and building partnerships with stakeholders reemphasised the practices of managing instruction suggested by Weber's instructional leadership model and related empirical studies reviewed by Nettles and Herrington.

Monitoring Learning Hours

There were two different perceptions of this first practice of managing instruction. The majority of the participants regarded this practice more as time management. Only a few of the participants saw it as a practice of "classroom supervision" aiming at "evaluating teaching performance and providing feedback to the supervised teachers". This practice of classroom supervision matched with the original definitions of monitoring classroom hours offered by Weber and other scholars. P1, P2, and P3 reported "regular practices of classroom supervision" in their school. Classroom supervisions were done "at least once every semester". They said that the "feedback from these classroom supervisions" would "encourage teachers to review their teaching performance" and "inform what required actions are needed to improve teaching and learning activities".

The majority of the participants emphasised monitoring learning hours as the practice of "managing instructional time in their schools". This practice was seen as the way to "manage a big number of students, teachers and classes". There were more than 500 students in the participants' schools. Making sure instructional processes took place on time in large schools like theirs was quite challenging. As acknowledged by P6 and P16, making sure a large number of "parallel classes and students" were "on time" for instructional activities was not "easy". The challenging experience of managing a large number of teachers and students was also expressed by P9, P13, and P18. They imagined "a big disorder" in their schools if classes did not "begin or end at the scheduled time". Other participants associated the practice of monitoring learning hours with a "lack of discipline" and a "high occurrence of tardiness" in their schools. P1, P4, P5, P10, P12, P14, and P20 believed that this practice would "discourage students and teachers" to "come late" to class.

From the quotations, the majority of the participants regarded practice of managing instruction more as time management to ensure that learning activities began and finished on time. Only a few of the participants saw it as a practice of classroom supervision aiming at evaluating teaching performance and providing feedback to the supervised teachers. This practice of classroom supervision was actually the original definition of monitoring classroom hours offered by Weber and other scholars.

Communicating Instructional Matters

Principals communicated instructional matters with all teachers in formal meetings conducted regularly in schools. Principal-to-teacher communication was also done person-to-person. This practice of individual communication was usually a follow-up from the formal meetings. The issues communicated were generally those related to instructional programs for an on-going semester. The participants believed that principal-teacher communication would create a culture of collegiality between them. P1 described the communication between principal and teachers in his school as aiming to "shorten the distance" between them. P16 emphasised this practice as reinforcing "equity and respect" between principal and teachers. P18 saw that the exchange of reciprocal ideas in principal-teacher communication could lead to "collaboration" and "acceptability" of any "decision taken". For P9, good communication between principal and teachers would "synchronise their thoughts and actions".

P9's school was chosen as the exemplar of principal-to-teacher communication on instructional matters. Currently his school was revising its curriculum to incorporate components of character building in its content. Regular meetings were held between principal and teachers to discuss the desired format of this revised curriculum. In this meeting, intense communication between principal and teachers was built. P9 believed that the "more intense" the communication was, the more "common ground" they could have between them. In his

opinion, it would lead to "better decision making and results". To increase efficiency, task groups were formed where teachers were divided into groups to work on a certain task. Communication then happened among teachers in and between groups. P9 termed this as a "dynamic interaction". He thought "teacher-to-teacher communication" was "as important as principal-to-teacher communication".

Teacher-to-teacher communication on instructional matters was also reported by other participants. In P1, P4 and P8's school, teachers who taught similar subjects were grouped together to "work" on some "instructional programs". P1 said that this collaboration boosted their "confidence" in the "decisions" made and increased their "motivation" for improvements. P4 considered the exchange of ideas and resources in the groups offered opportunities to "learn from fellow teachers about best practices" to teach certain lessons. As a fresh graduate teacher, P8 found the collaboration with more experienced teachers to be advantageous for a junior teacher like him. The best practices he learnt from other teachers made him more prepared and confident in teaching. In P14's school, although the communication among teachers happened more casually, she said that it still gave her things to learn from other teachers to improve her teaching.

Participants indicated an implicit preference for teacher-to-teacher communication. Teacher-to-teacher communication was felt to be less intimidating than principal-to-teacher communication. The positional power of the principal contributed to P8's reluctance to have conversations with the principal. The feeling of shyness and lack of confidence made it difficult for him to speak with his principal. P19 said the position of the principal as the "superior" created "a barrier" that discouraged her to have communication with the principal. P15 also reported similar feelings. She felt an invisible distance between her and the principal that blocked the communication between them. P19 felt "freer and more relaxed" to have conversations with other teachers. Both P8 and P15 found it to be "easier and more comfortable" to communicate certain instructional issues with their "fellow teachers".

P20 noticed the presence of "commonality among teachers" made them "more open to communicate". P19 added that the "lack of gap" between teachers meant the communication "naturally happened". P3 felt "team spirit" existed between her and her fellow teachers. She said this spirit unified them and made the "relationship" even "closer". In her opinion, the "closer the relationship is, the more possible for the communication to take place" and the "more intense the conversations turn out to be". High frequency of meeting and close proximity between teachers was another reason for the occurrence of communication between them. All participants shared an office with their fellow teachers. P12 said that he communicated more with his fellow teachers simply because "they share an office and meet more frequently". P17 and P20 gave a similar reason.

From the quotations, instructional matters were communicated regularly in formal meetings between principals and teachers in addition to person-to-person communication as a follow-up. The issues communicated were generally about on-going instructional programs. The participants believed that a culture of collegiality would emerge from the communications between principal and teachers.

Providing Learning Resources and Facilities

The availability of learning resources and facilities was expected to bring improvements in the quality of instruction. It could also stimulate creativity and innovation in teaching and learning activities. The use of technology and multi-media received a very strong emphasis in the provision of learning resources and facilities. As it involved high cost to provide such school resources and facilities, in addition to government grants, external

financial support from parents and communities was sought. The financial support obtained was also seen as a trust given to schools and made this practice have an attached accountability, especially to the benefactors. The process involved in providing the resources and facilities was made to be transparent and accountable. Responsible use of the resources and facilities was also enforced.

P19 said that "sufficient" learning resources and facilities made her teaching "more resourceful and creative". She could "choose" what "main and supporting teaching materials" to use in the class activities. She could also "differentiate her techniques in presenting the materials". She added that the "variability" made the lessons "more attractive and understandable to her students". Similar comments were given by P3, P4, P5, and P11. P3 noticed that "the use of various learning materials and delivery improves the clarity of the lessons" she taught. P11 was aware of the impact on the "comprehension" of her students. She found that her students found it "easier to grasp and understand the lessons they learn". P4 and P5 expressed similar learning experiences of their students. They noticed their students' "increased mastery" of the lessons they taught.

Participants thought that the "compatibility" to "information technology" was "important and necessary" in providing learning resources and facilities. The resources and facilities were refurbished to be "equipped with internet access and multi-media". P18 focused on the "easy, fast and convenient features" of such resources and facilities. She said that to use these resources and facilities only needed some "clicks" away. P9 contrasted the ease with the "abundance of information and ideas to be gained". He even described the capacity as "limitless". Similar advantages of featuring Internet access and multi-media in learning resources and facilities were acknowledged by P3, P4, P5, P10, P11, P17, and P19. They were impressed with the "accessibility, speed, and variety of potential learning materials through the use of the Internet". They also found that "the use of multi-media makes the presentation and delivery of their learning materials to be more sophisticated and 'smart'". It increased their "confidence and enthusiasm" in teaching.

Participants were well aware of the "high cost" involved in providing technology-friendly learning resources and facilities. Their schools needed to seek for "additional financial supports". The "funding" that their schools received from "government" was added with "contributions from parents and communities". The participants were also aware of the embedded "accountability" from the external "financial assistance" their schools received. P16's school was chosen to be the first exemplar of accountable practices in providing learning resources and facilities. Currently, the school was building more classes equipped with better facilities. Being a private school, his school "relies much on financial contributions from parents and communities". P16 associated "trust with the money his school receives from the external stakeholders". To ensure that his school was "trustworthy", "accountability and honesty" became "the main principles". The process taken was made to be "transparent" and the progress was "regularly communicated" to parents and communities. "The use of the facilities is also regularly reported to the external stakeholders". P16 said that "continued support from external stakeholders" depended on how "trustworthy and accountable" his school was in the eyes of these stakeholders.

P9's school was chosen to be the second exemplar of responsible practices in providing learning resources and facilities. As a public vocational school, his school was a recipient of government funding for resource and facility improvements. The funding was usually a large amount. For P9 the "more money" his school got meant the "more accountability" it needed to prove. Similar to the approach taken by P16's school, the "transparency" of the whole process starting from bidding and financial transactions, and the procurement of resources and facilities

became the key “principle”. In his school, everyone had “access to evaluate” the process. To avoid the concentration of authority in certain individuals, “task forces” consisting of “teachers” and “representatives from the school committee” were formed. The “responsibility” was delegated to these task forces and they were required “to provide regular reports and updates of the project”. P9 noticed the “improvement” in his school’s “project management” from these practices of “transparency and delegation”.

From the quotations, the participants thought that availability of learning resources and facilities could bring improvements in the quality of instruction and stimulate creativity and innovation in teaching and learning activities. Since the use of technology and multi-media was the key approach, external financial support from parents and communities was requested to help with the high cost. The financial support received was seen as a trust from the stakeholders and required accountable practices in the process of procurement as well as the use of such resources and facilities.

Building Partnerships with Stakeholders

Parents and communities were considered to be important school stakeholders. Partnership with them was expected to encourage their meaningful involvement, to make schooling a successful experience for the students. Communities provided expertise and resources that were needed for school instructional improvements. Some approaches were taken by the schools to build partnerships with their stakeholders. Co-designing curriculum with partner industries and local institutions was the highlight of school-community partnerships. The need to involve parents was mainly driven by the need to share the responsibility between school and parents in educating the children. The increasing pressure to pass the national exit examination also required parental involvement in preparing students for the examination. The findings of this section reinforced some findings explained in Section 4.1 under the sub-heading of “Improvements in curriculum and learning outcomes”.

The availability of human, expertise and financial resources in the communities was both seen as an opportunity and a challenge for schools to build partnerships with their communities to get the benefits of these ready resources. For P18 to be able to have a “successful partnership with communities” depended on how her school could “sell its vision and mission to its communities”. She highlighted both the “quantity and quality of communication” as the means to make the communities “believe in” her school’s vision and mission and “share similar enthusiasm”. She added that “trustworthiness and respect” were the essence of the communication. In her experiences, “frequent, clear, polite and honest communication” could easily win support from communities. For private schools like hers, winning support from communities determined the “continued existence” of the schools. Using communication to build partnerships with stakeholders was also expressed by P1. In his opinion, “open and genuine” communication could make the “relationship” between a school and its stakeholders “closer and stronger”. Once a school had a “close and strong relationship” with its stakeholders, it would be “easy” to get their “support in school programs”.

Building partnerships with communities was also reported by P13. In his opinion, a “strong school-community partnership” depended on the “mutual benefits” that both sides could get from the established relationship. According to him, when “mutual contributions” became the foundation, it strengthened the “significance of the relationship”. In his experience, the contributions could vary from “simple, such as sincere gratitude, to substantial, like involvement in decision-making”. He underlined the importance of making the contributions “recognised and appreciated”. In P16’s school, “appreciation” of the community’s contributions was strongly “acknowledged”. P16 praised “the substantial contributions of local

pesantren” (Islamic boarding schools) in the Islamic learning of the students”. To “balance”, his school tried to “accommodate” the “interests and needs” of the local *pesantren*. His school “facilities are open to use” and the “teachers and students are ready to help, if needed by the local *pesantren*”. The “use of school facilities by the public” was also the approach to build a school-community partnership in P6’s school. As a madrasah school, the “*musholla*” (prayer room) in his school was “open to the public”. It was done as “an initial step to encourage the community’s involvement in his school”. P6 thought that the “interaction that happened in the *musholla* can break down the barriers” between his school and its community.

In P9’s school, building partnerships with stakeholders was mainly done by “involving” some “partner industries in revising curriculum for heavy machinery and automotive departments”. The partner industries were involved in “co-designing the content of the curriculum, recruiting students, evaluating learning progress, and providing job experiences”. His school contributed to the industries by providing a “qualified workforce of high performing students”. Collaboration with stakeholders in improving the curriculum also happened in P18’s and P16’s school. In P18’s school, partner industries were involved in identifying “required competencies from the perspectives of real practitioners” to enhance the “relevance” of the curriculum. The partner industries also became the “employers for student apprenticeships”. P18 regarded it as “an added benefit from the collaboration.” In P16’s school, the collaboration was done with local *pesantren* (Islamic boarding schools). The collaboration was intended to reduce the learning load of the students since the “students study Islam and its practices in these local *pesantren* during off-school hours”.

Building partnerships with parents also gained the attention of the participants. P13 and P1 believed that “educating children has to be a joint effort between schools and parents”. A similar emphasis on “shared responsibility between school and parents” in students’ learning was given by P4, P12, P18, and P19. They thought that “together with the school’s efforts, parents’ active involvement in their children’s learning can help the children to succeed in their study”. P1, P2, P5, and P20 wanted the parents to have “a genuine interest in their children learning” and be “aware of the progress achieved”. They believed when “parents actively engage in their children’s education”, it could “motivate their children to put their best effort into their study”. The role of parents in their children’s learning was added by P4, P6, P9, P18, and P19. In their opinion, “parental control and supportive home environment can determine the successful learning experiences of the students”. As “students spend longer hours at home than at school”, they believed that “parents and home environment have more substantial impacts on students’ learning”.

The need to involve parents also resulted from the increasing pressure of the national exit examination. This examination taken by students in the final year of their study determined whether the students could graduate and continue to a higher level. The participants were fully aware of the “pressures to pass the examination on schools and parents” as well. As mentioned by P1, P3, P6, P7, P9, P13, P16, P18, and P19, the pressure to pass the examination not only added “challenges to schools to achieve high graduation rates” but also put the “strain on parents to make sure their children perform well in the examination”. Therefore, involving parents became the option to “share the responsibility for preparing students for the examination”. P1, P3, P6, P9, P10, P13, P15, P17, P18, and P20 thought that “family environment and parental control” were the “external factors” determining “successful performance in the examination”. As parents had “more power” in exercising these external factors, schools needed to “include and involve” them in preparing the students for the examination. P1, P6, P9, P13, and P18 said that “communications and interactions with parents are intensified during this preparation time”.

From the quotations, a partnership with parents and communities was expected to encourage their meaningful involvement in school programs to make schooling a successful experience for the students. Communities provided expertise and resources that were needed for school instructional improvements. Co-designing curriculum with partner industries and local institutions was the highlight of school-community partnerships. The need to involve parents was mainly intended to share the responsibility between school and parents in educating the children and to get parents involved particularly in preparing their children for the national exit examination.

Improving the Welfare of Teachers

The attention given to the welfare of the teachers was because of the low salary they receive from this profession. The participants were aware of the economic burden experienced by teachers, especially by non-tenured teachers whose employment was contract-based. They believed that this economic burden could become an impediment for teachers to concentrate on their job and to give their best efforts. They were aware of its possible impact on the improvement process in their school. Although not all schools were financially capable, they tried to allocate some financial incentives and allowances to their teachers to lessen this financial burden. The participants were enthusiastic about the teacher certification program and found this government initiative could help their school in improving the welfare of their teachers.

Strong awareness of financial difficulties experienced by teachers could be seen from the statement of P9. Reflecting on his former experiences as a teacher, he realised that it was "quite challenging for teachers to meet their daily needs from the salary they get". He found the "slow process of wage increases for teachers adds to their financial difficulties". He then contrasted it with the "high cost of living and its increasing speed". He pointed at the popularity of "moonlighting practices" after school-hours among teachers as efforts to solve their financial problems. In his opinion, "working for long hours" would "drain teachers of their energy and concentration" to do their main job. He added that it would be difficult to expect "quality teaching from exhausted teachers". He warned of the "detrimental effects on the efforts to improve a school's instructional quality". Similar awareness of the impacts of teachers' financial problems on their teaching performance was expressed by P1 and P16. They added that the "financial strain" would lead to "psychological pressure". When teachers were in that situation, it would "degrade the quality of their teaching". For schools that were in their "journey of instructional improvements", it would be something "to be avoided".

To help teachers have a decent income, P9's school offered "additional teaching incentives" particularly for "non-tenured teachers". The money allocated for this financial assistance was generated from the "surplus in project management of government funding" received by the school. The amount of money generated made his school "quite financially capable" to run these teaching incentives. However, not all schools had strong financial capacity to offer substantial teaching incentives. As mentioned by P1, P13, P16, and P18, it required them to be "skilful and thorough in managing the school budget to allocate extra money to fund the incentives". Although the amount of money given was "not much", they believed that teachers would "still appreciate" the efforts taken.

The teacher certification program run by the government was seen as an "alternative" to increase teachers' incomes. Although this program was applied to teachers who were civil servants, the participants still considered it as "important external source for the welfare of their teachers". In P1 and P16's school, to help their teachers get the financial grant attached to this certification program, "administrative assistance" was provided. Teachers who already

succeeded in getting the certification were encouraged to be the “mentors” for teachers who failed or who were preparing to submit their application. The objective was to make every teacher in their school have a “similar opportunity to experience a financial reward from teaching”. P1 and P16 expected that when “welfare is enjoyed by all teachers, it will have a collective impact on instructional improvements” in their school.

From the quotations, the attention given to the welfare of the teachers was because of the awareness of the economic burden experienced by teachers. The participants believed that this economic burden could become an impediment for teachers to concentrate on their job and affect the improvement process in their school. Some financial incentives and allowances were allocated to lessen this financial burden. The government initiative of teacher certification program was also regarded as an effort to help improve the welfare of teachers.

DISCUSSION

The first practice of managing instruction was monitoring learning hours. The majority of participants described this practice more as time management to ensure that classes were started and finished on time. The goal was to eliminate tardiness and to cultivate punctuality and discipline not only among students but also among teachers as well. This practice was perceived to be imperative, considering the large number in the student population in the schools. In 2012, it was estimated that eight million out of fifty eight million students attended senior secondary schools (Antara News, 2012). On average, each school where the interviews took place had more than 400 students. In vocational senior secondary schools, the number could be as many as 1,000 students. Participants believed that time discipline would maintain an orderly climate in the schools. Providing a safe and orderly academic environment that supported effective teaching and learning has been identified among the instructional responsibilities of principals (Nettles & Herrington, 2007).

In addition to its definition as time management, monitoring learning hours was described as a practice of classroom supervision. This practice aimed at evaluating teaching performance and providing feedback to the supervised teachers. This classroom supervision was the definition of monitoring classroom hours in Weber’s instructional leadership model (1996). High performing principals were characterised by their ability to create opportunities for teachers to plan and work together on instructional issues and frequently monitor the instructional processes (Nettles & Herrington, 2007). However, this practice of classroom supervision was reported by very few participants. This indicated that evaluating teaching performance and providing feedback to the teachers did not get much attention from the participants.

The second practice of managing instruction was communicating instructional matters. Communication between principal and teachers reflected the ability of a school leader to cultivate action in common and build collective relationships. The participants perceived communication as the way to create a collegial relationship between principal and teachers. It promoted a culture of mutual trust between teachers and their principal. To build strong, positive, and productive relationships, a school leader needed to promote mutual trust. A collective relationship that was based on trust generated respect for each person's qualities and abilities. It activated people and accelerated their collective efforts. Providing such working relationships was recognised as a practice of leadership.

Teacher-to-teacher communication was also encouraged either in internal or external forums. The interviewed principals believed that communication would lead to collaborations among teachers. Teacher-to-teacher communication was among the foci of instructional leadership. It promoted collaborative inquiry among teachers and provided opportunities for

reflection, discourse, and professional growth to develop professional learning communities (Huffman & Hipp, 2003; Marks & Printy, 2003; Mitchell & Sackney, 2006; Reitzug, et al., 2008). Collaboration engaged teachers to work together to improve their working effectiveness, both personally and collectively. This practice was also identified as a practice of leadership (Donaldson, 2006; Meier, 2002; Saphier, 2005).

The third practice of managing instruction was providing school resources and facilities. The interviewed principals expected that this practice could stimulate improvements in classroom instruction. Instructional leadership signified the practice of providing supportive working conditions as one of the responsibilities of school principals in relation to classroom instruction (Nettles & Herrington, 2007). The promotion of a climate for learning and the establishment of a supportive working environment in terms of providing learning resources and facilities demonstrated a focus on instruction and a practice of instructional leadership (Marks & Printy, 2003; Nettles & Herrington, 2007; Reitzug, et al., 2008).

From the interviews, the use of technology and multi-media received a very strong emphasis in the provision of learning resources and facilities. To provide these costly assets, the schools had to work together with parents and communities to get financial support. In Murphy's (1990) model of instructional leadership, securing outside resources was included in the practice of developing a supportive network and environment. Leithwood et al (2008) characterised successful leaders as those who built productive relations with parents and the community. The financial support from parents and communities described by the participants unavoidably brought an attached accountability to the practice. From the interviews, there was an awareness among the participants of the need to be accountable for both the provision and proper utilisation of the resources and facilities. Such awareness of accountability indicated that ethics were adopted in exercising the practice. According to Ramsey (2006), ethics was important in the practice of leadership and one of the basic requirements to build a better school.

Building partnerships with stakeholders was the fourth practice of managing instruction. Perceiving education as a shared responsibility, the participants believed that partnership with parents and communities would make schooling a successful experience for the students. Partnerships with school stakeholders have been recognised as a practice of instructional leadership (Alig-Mielcarek & Hoy, 2005; Nettles & Herrington, 2007; Weber, 1996). Some scholars believed that a collaborative process between schools and the stakeholders determined the success of educational reforms (Sergiovanni, 2001). Building partnerships with school stakeholders was also an emphasis in Indonesian educational reform (Fadjar, 2003). The reform process sought for a more intense stakeholders' involvement in school programs and activities that could lead to a more transparent, accountable, democratic, and responsive school management (Ministry of National Education, 2004).

The need to involve parents and communities in Indonesian schools also resulted from the increasing pressure of the national exit examination. This examination is taken by students in the final year of their study. It determines whether the students can graduate and continue to a higher level. The pressure to pass the examination not only put a strain on parents but it also added challenges to schools to achieve high graduation rates. Participants thought that the family environment and parental control were external factors that helped determine successful performance in this examination. Therefore, preparing students for the examination was believed to be a shared responsibility between schools and parents. The participants believed that involvement of parents could eliminate possible conflicts that emerged from the pressure to pass the examination. Scholars have identified high involvement of the stakeholders as the characteristic of high-performing schools (Mohrman & Wohlstetter, 1994).

Improving the welfare of teachers was the last practice of managing instruction. From the interviews, the economic burden was considered a real obstacle that could prevent teachers from doing and giving their best. Attention to the welfare of teachers could be related to the Indonesian Gross National Income (GNI) profile issued by the World Bank. For 2011, Indonesia's GNI was US\$ 2,940 and it was categorised into a lower middle income country (The World Bank, 2013). Teaching was among jobs in Indonesia that did not offer a high salary (Chan & Sam, 2007; Tilaar, 2009). As described by one of the participants, the title of unsung heroes for Indonesian teachers contributed to the lack of financial reward to teaching and showed a lack of appreciation to teachers' roles in national development. Such treatment was criticised to undermine the important role of teachers in national development (Chan & Sam, 2007; Tilaar, 2009).

In the earlier models, the welfare of teachers was included into a practice of instructional leadership. In Hallinger and Murphy's model (1985) and the subsequent Murphy's model (1990), providing incentives for teachers was one of the practices of promoting an academic learning climate. Although this practice did not appear in recent practices of instructional leadership, it could be linked to a review by Leithwood et al (2008). Part of their review was on the effects of teachers' motivation, such as levels of commitment, sense of efficacy, morale, job satisfaction, and stress on student learning. The evidence showed that teachers' capacities, motivation and commitment and their working conditions had subsequent effects on student learning and achievement (Leithwood, et al., 2008).

In summary, the practices of managing instruction in Indonesian schools brought out two highlights. First, some of the identified practices confirmed the existing empirical findings on practices of instructional leadership in managing instruction. It could be said that the established practices of managing instruction contained a universal dimension and could be applied in a different school system and cultural context. Second, some other identified practices provided a new insight into how culture and school population could influence how to manage instruction. These Indonesian socio-cultural contexts illustrated a different way of managing instruction, while at the same time they enriched existing empirical findings on practices of managing instruction.

CONCLUSION

Instructional role of principal should focus on students and their learning as the core purpose and provides enhanced educational opportunities for students through influencing the behaviour of the teachers. To achieve this, teachers play an important role as the mediating variable between principal and students. Therefore, basically the practices of this instructional leadership can be seen as the empowerment of teachers for improving student learning. Thus, instructional leadership requires coordinated efforts between principals and teachers, for each other to play their roles to achieve the objectives. For this to happen there should be similar perceptions between principal and teachers, including their perceptions on the practices of instructional leadership. These shared beliefs can thrive and bond their commitment and enthusiasm to reach the objectives.

The findings suggest that the perceptions and practices performed by principals have an influence on teachers. They imply that principals have the capacity to create changes in their schools. This power, when used to introduce new directions and targets of reform as alternatives to current conditions and outcomes, could be a very effective medium for the change process to take place. Moreover, this proposition could be achieved, provided that principals were able to take initiatives to make necessary changes. Schools' readiness to change was facilitated when principals could identify major sources of existing problems and re-

examine the priorities and actions required for improvements to occur in their schools. More importantly, broad stakeholder participation and clear directions and specific targets for achievements are required for accomplishing the desired improvements.

REFERENCES

- Alig-Mielcarek, J., & Hoy, W. (2005). Instructional leadership: Its nature, meaning, and influence. In W. Hoy, & C. Miskel (eds), *Educational leadership and reform* (pp. 29-51). Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.
- AntaraNews. (2013). *Indonesian students reach 58 million! (Pelajar Indonesia sampai 58 juta siswa!)*. <http://www.antaranews.com>.
- Chen, P. (2008). Strategic leadership and school reform in Taiwan. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 19(3)293-318.
- Datnow, A. (2005). The sustainability of comprehensive school reform models in changing district and state contexts. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 41(1)121-153.
- Donaldson, G. (2006). *Cultivating leadership in schools: Connecting people, purpose and practice*. Columbia University: Teachers College Press.
- Elmore, R. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership*. Washington, DC: Albert Shanker Institute.
- Fadjar, M. (2003). Book introduction. In I. Abu-Duhou, *School-Based Management* (pp. xv-xxiii). Jakarta: Penerbit Logos Wacana Ilmu.
- Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change*, 4th edition. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Greenfield, T. B., & Ribbins, P. (1993). *Greenfield on educational administration: Towards a human science*. London: Routledge.
- Gurr, D., Drysdale, L., & Mulford, B. (2007). Instructional leadership in three Australian schools. *ISEA*, 35(3)20-29.
- Hallinger, P. (2010). Making education reform happen: Is there an 'Asian' way? *School Leadership & Management*, 30(5)401-418.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. (2010). Collaborative leadership and school improvement: Understanding the impact on school capacity and student learning. *School Leadership and Management*, 30(2)95-110.
- Hallinger, P., & Kantamara, P. (2000). Leading educational change in Thailand: Opening a window on leadership as a cultural process. *School Leadership and Management*, 20(1)189-206.
- Hallinger, P., & Lee, M. (2011). A decade of education reform in Thailand: Broken promise or impossible dream? *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 41(2)139-158.

- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behaviours of principals. *The Elementary School Journal*, 86 (2)217-247.
- Halverson, R., Grigg, J., Prichett, R., & Thomas, C. (2005). The new instructional leadership: Creating data-driven instructional system in schools. *Paper prepared for the annual meeting of the national council of professors of educational administration*, July 2005 in Washington DC.
- Hattie, J. A. (2003). *Teachers make a difference: What is the research evidence? Background paper at the 2003 ACER Research Conference, Carlton Crest Hotel, Melbourne, Australia, October 19-21, 2003*. Available at <http://www.acer.edu.au/documents/TeachersMakeaDifferenceHattie.doc>.
- Hopkins, D., Enskill, M., & West, M. (1994). *School improvement in an era of change*. London: Cassell.
- Huffman, J., & Hipp, K. (2003). *Reculturing schools as professional learning communities*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Education.
- Indonesia Ministry of Education. (2004). *Manajemen berbasis sekolah (School-Based Management)*. <http://www.depdiknas.or.id>: retrieved July 14, 2009.
- Leithwood, K. (2001). School leadership in the context of accountability policies. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, (4)217-235.
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2008). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership. *School Leadership and Management*, 28(1)27-42.
- Louis, K. S., Dretzke, B., & Wahlstrom, K. (2010). How does leadership affect student achievement? Results from a national US survey. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 21(3)315-336.
- Mangin, M. M. (2007). Facilitating elementary principals' support for instructional teacher leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(3)319-357.
- Marks, H., & Printy, S. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(3)370-397.
- Meier, D. (2002). *In schools we trust: Creating communities of learning in an era of testing and standardization*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Mitchell, C., & Sackney, L. (2006). Building schools, building people: The school principal's role in leading a learning community. *Journal of School Leadership*, 16(5)627-639.
- Murphy, J., & Beck, L. (1995). *School-based management as school reform: Taking stock*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press, Inc.
- Nettles, S., & Herrington, C. (2007). Revisiting the importance of direct effects of school leadership on student achievement: The implications for school improvement policy. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 82(4)724-736.
- O'Donnell, R., & White, G. (2005). Within the account era: Principals' instructional leadership behaviors and student achievement. *NASSP Bulletin*, 89(645)56-71.

- Penlington, C., Kington, A., & Day, C. (2008). Leadership in improving schools: A qualitative perspective. *School Leadership & Management*, 28(1)65-82.
- Ramsey, R. D. (2006). *Lead, follow, or get out of the way: How to be a more effective leader in today's schools*. Thousand Oaks: CA: Corwin Press.
- Reitzug, U., West, D., & Angel, R. (2008). Conceptualizing instructional leadership: The voices of principals. *Education and Urban Society*, 40(6)694-714.
- Robinson, V. (2010). From instructional leadership to leadership capabilities: Empirical findings and methodological challenges. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*9, 1-26.
- Robinson, V., Lloyd, C., & Rowe, K. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5)635-674.
- Saphier, J. (2005). Master of motivation. In R. Du Four, R. Eaker, & R. Du Four (eds), *On common ground: The power of professional learning communities* (pp. 85-113). Bloomington, IN: National Educational Service.
- Scott, D., & Morrison, M. (2007). *Key ideas in educational research*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Sergiovanni, T. (2001). *Leadership: What's in it for schools?* London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- 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.
- Stein, M., & Nelson, B. (2003). Leadership content knowledge. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 25, 423-448.
- Weber, J. (1996). Leading the instructional programs. In S. S. Piele, *School Leadership* (pp. 253-278). Eugene, OR: Clearinghouse of Educational Management.