

2ND JGP PROCEEDINGS

JOURNAL OF GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

Shifting Dynamics of Social Politics:
The Implication for Policy Making
and Community Empowerment

DOAJ
DIRECTORY OF
OPEN ACCESS
JOURNALS

INDEX  COPERNICUS
I N T E R N A T I O N A L

July 2017

ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE TOWARDS GENDER-RESPONSIVE SCHOOLS BASED ON MINTZBERG'S THEORY

Ismi Dwi Astuti Nurhaeni

ismidwiastuti@staff.uns.ac.id

Public Administration Study Program,

Faculty of Social and Political Sciences of Universitas Sebelas Maret

Yusuf Kurniawan

yusuf@staff.uns.ac.id

English Study Program,

Faculty of Cultural Sciences of Universitas Sebelas Maret

Abstract

Indonesian government has implemented education reform by regulating gender mainstreaming in education since 2008. The reform demands every education organization unit to integrate gender perspective into their education services called Gender Responsive School. School organization should be changed in order to implement gender mainstreaming in education. The Mintzberg's theory states that organizational change should be done in two dimensions, namely strategic and organizational dimensions. This article discusses about organizational change (schools) to be seen from strategic dimension (visions, positions, programs, and products) and organizational dimension (culture, structure, system and people). Four Senior High Schools in Sragen Regency Indonesia have been purposively selected. The primary data were obtained through in-depth interviews with principals, students, and parents and the secondary data were collected through documentation studies, such as schools' strategic plans and regulations. The data were then analyzed using Mintzberg's model. The data validity uses data source triangulation. The findings show that organizational change towards gender-responsive schools has been done both in strategic dimension and organizational dimension. Unfortunately, all of the schools didn't have gender responsive vision and gender responsive structure. Besides, most of the schools have not implemented gender-responsive culture and systems. They only integrated gender dimension incidentally. In conclusion changing organization in strategic dimension is more difficult than in organization dimension. In other words, changing the concrete level of organizations such as products (in the strategic dimension) or people (in the organizational dimension) is easier than changing the conceptual level of organizations such as vision (in the strategic dimension) and culture (in the organizational dimension). Accordingly, organizational change should be embodied from the strategic to technical level.

Keywords: *gender responsive school, Mintzberg's theory, organizational change*

INTRODUCTION

Indonesian government has implemented education reformation by issuing regulations on Gender Mainstreaming in education in 2008. The reformation states that every educational unit (one of them is school) must integrate gender perspective in its educational services called Gender Responsive School. Therefore, school organization has to be changed from gender-neutral/bias to responsive gender.

The implementation of gender mainstreaming in education through gender-

responsive schools is necessarily executed due to the existing discriminative practices at schools such as gender-bias in teaching-learning process, gender-stereotype in subject election, gender disparity in the interaction between students and between teacher and student, the low number of female registering at schools compared to that of male, the difference of game types between male and female, the difference of adoration-expression use to male and female, stereotype messages within children literature and game materials, discrimination in

students' competence in Mathematics, Biology, Physics and Chemistry and discrimination in leadership (Tuwor & Sossou, 2008; Evans, 1998; Makarova & Herzog, 2015; Agezo, 2010). Such stereotype should keep increasing because of sex-role socialization during child period, so that female is very difficult to get out of her being left-behind (Agezo, 2010).

Even though stereotype frequently harms female, a research finding shows that parent (mother) views that female child has better academic quality than male. It is shown by the research result of Wood, Kurtz-Costes, Rowley&Okeke-Adeyanju (2010) stating that mothers have less hope to their male children and they are considered to be academically less competent than female children. Mothers prefer paying their daughters more than their sons for their school. Moreover, it was found that female "creates more cooperative working-climate by endorsing higher employees' participation and collective accountability." In addition, they don't see the employees' participation and groups' decision making as a menace towards their authority, but they tend to see that as better and more creative problem-solving solution (Helgesen, 1995; Rosener, 1990) and probably that is more effective in the present organizational environment (Paris & Decker, 2012). Male students tend to leave school much younger than female students. The trend is similar to what has happened to the other developing countries (Grant & Behrman, 2010).

Although gender-discrimination practices at schools still occur to both men and women, this problem is frequently ignored (Tannock, 2008; Aikman & Unterhalter, 2007). Whereas education is the basic human right and an element which is strongly needed to women empowerment and a means to achieve development and peace. Besides the government, Non-Government Organizations play an important role in widening the access of education to the marginalized population by removing the obstacles towards education access and improving education quality (Roberts & Chittooran, 2016).

Organizations have to change and make adaptation to adjust to the social dynamics. On the other side, changes frequently take place very quickly. The question is whether the changes are

good or bad. The appropriate answer depends on the urgency of the cause of the change and how much it costs compared to the advantage to be obtained. In addition, changes also implicate the change of regulation (Pruna & Pruna, 2012; Angel-Sveda, 2012).

Choosing the appropriate time to begin to survive is considered one of the most important components of managerial activities. Every change is necessarily considered an opportunity. Beer (1990) in Pruna & Pruna (2012) considers the most efficient way to change behaviour is placing an individual in a new organization context demanding the role, responsibility and new relationship. A new situation is created, then forcing new behavior and manner.

The Mintzberg's Theory states that organizational change should be executed in two dimensions, i.e. strategic dimension and organizational dimension (Mintzberg, 1999). This article discusses about school organizational change seen from strategic dimension (covering the visions, positions, programs, and products) and organizational dimension (covering culture, structure, system and people). The study was conducted in Sragen Regency, Indonesia, which is purposively selected because Sragen's Gender-Related Development Index is still low and the schools having been researched have ever got trainings on Gender Responsive schools.

METHODS

Four Senior High Schools in Sragen Regency Indonesia have been purposively selected. The primary data were obtained through in-depth interviews with principals, students, and parents and the secondary data were gained through documentation studies, such as schools' strategic plans and regulations. The data were then analyzed using Mintzberg's model. The data having been collected were analyzed qualitatively and descriptively by referring to Mintzberg's classification model, namely strategic dimension and organizational dimension. Strategic dimension covers vision, positions, programs, and products. Meanwhile organizational dimension covers culture, structure, systems, and people. The validity uses data source triangulation.

RESULT AND FINDING

Organizational change on strategic dimension
Vision

Vision is the goal or dream of an organization in the future which will be achieved within certain period of time. In relation to gender perspective, organizational vision has to bear the dream of organization to actualize gender equality and equity at schools. Schools' vision is considered the foundation of every school community in doing their activities in line with the goals to have been set up in the future, both for academic and non-academic. To actualize gender-based schools it is necessary to integrate gender perspective into the schools' vision. Table 1 depicts the vision of each schools having been examined.

Table 1: Schools' visions according to gender-responsive categories

No	Location	Vision
1.	SMAN 3 Sragen	Prominent in achievement, virtuous, caring and environment cultured
2.	SMAN 1 Sumberlawang	Noble, virtuous and achievement-oriented
3.	SMKN 1 Sragen	The actualization of noble individual, smart in IQ, EQ, SQ, caring and environment cultured in order to be able to compete globally
4.	SMKN 2 Sragen	Producing graduates having faith and piety, being competent, competitive, having national personality and global view with environment-care

The research result reveals that none of the schools has responsive-gender vision. All of the schools' visions are still neutral gender. However, there are not affirmative-action vision and gender-discriminative vision.

Positions

Position can be defined as how organizations (schools) interact with competitive environment, and what can be done to make unique product in relation to gender-responsive schools.

In encountering the competitive environment change outside the schools, schools in Sragen Regency, Indonesia conducted collaboration with the Educational Institution, the institution of Women Empowerment, Child Protection

and Family Plan, Universities, and NGOs. In an educational unit, mutual relation between subject teachers has been embodied (it is called subject-teachers discussion/teachers' working consolidation/teachers work-group), and the relation between principals called principals forum. The relation is oriented to improving teacher's professionalism at schools and the improvement of educational services. In relation to actualizing equity and equality on gender unit products related to it have been produced.

At schools environment teachers and principals of each schools has policy product sample leading to gender responsive schools. The policy product is like what can be found at SMKN 2 Sragen, for instance the principals and teachers made self-confidence development program entitled *Program Ketarunaan*. The program is aimed at encouraging female students (minority) to be able to develop their potential and self-confidence. Moreover to fulfill the criteria of gender responsive school, the school has attempted to provide facilities: infrastructure supporting the needs of male and female equally (none is gendered-needs fulfillment), for example separating the male and female bathrooms, the making of covered front-part desk model, non-discriminative gender teaching model and other products which can support the school to lead to gender responsive school.

Programs

Program is a legitimate way to achieve the goal, so that the plans will be more well-organized and easily operated because within the programs various aspects to achieve the program are accommodated (Jones, 1994).

Education integrating gender equality and equity has been regulated in the act of the Minister of National Education Number 84 Year 2008 about gender mainstreaming in education. Based on the Act every educational unit should integrate gender perspective in their policy, program, and activities. Nevertheless, not all schools have integrated gender equality and equity into the schools' policies.

Some initiation to integrate gender to schools are conducted through a phase called

agenda setting phase and matching phase (Roger, 1983 in Sa'ud, 2008). In agenda setting phase identification process and the implementation of school priority and problems are executed. Problems in organization (problems at schools) are formulated and then a study about the environment to determine the innovation needs and innovation potential scores to schools is conducted. In relation to gender responsive school program, problem-identification activity is conducted through gender responsive school training and gender responsive school socialization. During the running of gender responsive school training, the government of Sragen Regency invited the principals of state senior high schools and vocational high schools of Sragen Regency. Gender responsive school training has been conducted twice in 2015.

As the follow up of gender responsive school training a wider-scale socialization inviting several teachers from each state senior high schools and state vocational high schools of Sragen regency was conducted. The socialization is aimed at making the schools set up school gender-responsive school programs and activities, such as making syllabus and gender-responsive lesson plans. School ceremonies and meetings are utilized as a means to conduct socialization on gender responsive school. One of the agreements achieved from the gender socialization conducted by the principals is the arrangement of the students' seats by sex-opposition and the making of lesson plans by subject teachers.

In the matching phase the adjustment between organization problems and the innovation to be done is executed, then it is planned and the design of the innovation implementation in accordance to the problem being encountered is made. In this phase, each school adjusts the problem with the school condition. The adjustments conducted by the schools in actualizing gender responsive school are among others: (1) evaluating the schools policy; (2) evaluating the fund availability and (3) evaluating the number of students. Because of the absence of reward and punishment mechanism from the government (both central and local government) makes the school not able to fully carry out gender-responsive school

program. Moreover, the absence of policy regulating the guidance of technical operation in integrating gender-perspective at school makes the principals have difficulties in guiding their staffs (teachers) to implement gender in the teaching-learning process. In the fund evaluation phase schools are required to make some breakthroughs to make gender responsive school come true. The adjustment is made to have especially innovation in the infrastructures at school. If the school doesn't have sufficient fund it cannot develop better school facilities. This problem is experienced by several schools so that it becomes a barrier of the implementation of gender responsive school innovation. Fund problem has become the main factor of the unavailability of the infrastructures to actualize gender responsive school. Infrastructure becomes an important thing due to the different needs of male and female students.

In the evaluation phase of the student numbers the schools identify the composition between the number of male and female students. One of the schools, i.e. SMKN 1 Sragen has more female students. Whereas SMKN 2 Sragen has more male students. Based on the description each of the principals has big responsibility to treat their students equally in both teaching-learning process and using the schools facilities.

Products

Products are considered the output of work programs conducted by schools to actualize gender equity and equality. The products are utilized by school to improve gender responsive environment. The products can be a policy or an activity, for instance on Kartini's day SMAN 1 Sumberlawang Sragen conducts competition followed by all of the students. Besides schools policy on gender-responsive infrastructure, it becomes a product which is continuously endorsed and improved. The infrastructures availability such as separated bathrooms, student desks with their front part covered, and the school health units separating between male and female students endorse the school to be gender responsive.

In the delivery of lesson material although the syllabus has not mentioned gender responsive teaching, in the implementation at school teachers have implemented gender

responsive environment, for example there is no discrimination towards male and female students while giving opportunities to the students to ask questions. What’s more, the school does not prohibit the female students to participate in the election of the head of school organization. Such policy or action accelerates the school change from gender neutral or bias to gender responsive.

Organizational change on organizational dimension

Organizational change on organizational dimension includes culture, structure, system and people.

Culture

School culture is considered the reflection of the activities and the interactions among the school communities within the school environment. The culture is reflected in the regulations and the norms of school. By referring to Kabeer’s model on gender analysis (in March, Smyth & Mukhopadhyay, 2005), school regulations are classified into two categories namely gender blind policies (often implicitly male-biased) and gender-aware policies. Gender neutral policies (interventions intended to leave existing distribution of resources and responsibilities unchanged), gender-specific policies (interventions intended to meet targeted needs of women/ men, within the existing distribution of resources and responsibilities) and gender-redistributive policies (interventions intended to transform existing distribution of resources and responsibilities to create balanced gender relationship) (Kabeer in March, Smyth & Mukhopadhyay, 2005).

The result of culture classification shows that school regulations which are considered the reflection of organizational culture still have gender-blind policies. In the case example of SMAN 3 Sragen, school culture classification referring to gender-blind policies is seen on the regulations regulating female students. It is mentioned in the regulation that students are forbidden to use canteen outside school. The prohibitions belong to the category of gender-blind policies, because if there are female students who need medicine or certain amenities in relation to their reproduction (such

as having period), which are not provided at school, the female students cannot buy them outside school. Besides, the prohibition to use canteen outside school, female students are also forbidden to get married or to get pregnant. The prohibitions belong to gender-blind policies, because they are just specified to female in order not to break the norms, meanwhile to male students the school applies the same regulation (to get married during their study period).

Gender-blind policy regulations are also found in the school regulations of SMAN 1 Sumberlawang. The regulation requires all students to participate in school ceremonies or school activities. It is different at SMKN 1 Sragen. The regulation of the school does not have gender-blind policies.

Table 2
Classification of gender-responsive school culture

No	School	Regulations	Category
1.	SMAN 3 Sragen	a. Female students are forbidden to use canteen outside the school b. Female students are forbidden to get married/pregnant	gender-blind policies
2.	SMAN 1 Sumberlawang	All students have to participate in the school ceremonies or activities	gender-blind policies
3.	SMKN 1 Sragen	No point of regulation which is gender-blind because most of the students are female	gender neutral policies
4.	SMKN 2 Sragen	No point of regulation which is gender-blind because most of the students are male	gender neutral policies

The school regulations are not only gender-blind policies regulations, but there are some which are gender-responsive. So, this makes gender-responsive organization culture. The table below describes gender responsive school culture.

Tabel 3
Description of gender-responsive school culture

No	Description of Gender Aware Policies
1.	All schools preventing gender violence
2.	All schools giving reward based on performance
3.	All schools avoiding gender discrimination
4.	All schools eliminating gender stereotypes
5.	One school some times using gender-based symbols/images / languages with gender-based harassment

Structure

The organizational structure is the framework for organizing the formal relationships of responsibility, authority, and accountability (Montana & Charnov, 1993). According to Robbins (1990) organizational structure confirms how assignment will be divided; who reports to whom, and formal coordination mechanism and interaction patterns to be followed. There are four components of organizational structure, namely (1) division of assignment (responsibility) to individuals (specialization); (2) The relations of formal report, hierarchy, control range; (3) Individuals grouping becomes the part of organization; and (4) System of relation, communication, coordination, and integration (vertical and horizontal).

In this article organization structure is school's organization structure. Seen from gender perspective school's organization structure is considered the representation of male and female proportionally within school organization, school committee, and school management. School organization structure is not subordinative harming one of the sexes in work allocation. Gender-responsive organization structure provides equal opportunity to male and female to occupy strategic positions at school.

The research finds that school organization structure is still dominated by male, especially the positions of principals, vice principals, head of committee, and head of school organization. Meanwhile female are mostly found in the position of administration. It doesn't mean that there is no endorsement to make the organization structure gender-responsive, but the opportunities given to them are frequently rejected, stating that they haven't had competence to carry out the responsibilities.

The disparity between male and female in occupying opposition occurs because of the absence of endorsement to the school communities (teachers and students) to utilize the opportunities awarded by the principals as the highest authority holder. Although the opportunity awarded is similar, if the participation of male and female is different,

the result will also be different, for example the school regulates that every student (either male or female) is entitled to participate in the election of the head of school intra organization. If there is no female participant to participate at the election, there is no endorsement to female students and even the school doesn't seem to care. This obstructs the actualization of gender equality and equity at school. This can be overcome if the school determines quota for balanced number of male and female will-be heads of school intra organization. It is an affirmative policy in determining the will-be students who will occupy the position.

System

System is the concept of synergy of organization elements to make the output of organization bigger than the output of individuals or the output of each section. A system is organized connection of integrated sections to achieve the goal holistically. The system has various inputs managed to produce a certain output, and collectively achieve the goal set out by the organization. There is a feedback between these various sections to ensure that they are in line to achieve the goal of the whole organization. The elements of system cover: goal, input, process, output, control mechanism, and feedback (Kambey, 2010).

Table 4
Gender integration in the element of organizational system

Element of System	Gender Integration
Goals	All schools have not gender responsive goals
Input	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- 50% of the three schools have gender responsive human resources- All schools have not gender supporting- All schools have gender responsive Facilities and infrastructure- All schools have not Gender tools
Process	Process standard: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- All schools have Gender redistributive policy in Development methods- All schools have Gender redistributive policy in Learning model- All schools have Gender redistributive policy in Class management- All schools have Gender redistributive policy in Assignment- All schools have gender Learning activities

Output	Substance standard: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- All schools have not gender responsive Syllabus- All schools have not gender responsive Lesson plan- All schools have gender responsive Teaching materials at certain subject- All schools have gender responsive Learning resources at certain subject- All schools have not gender responsive at Instructional Media
Control mechanism	All schools have control mechanism through Meeting & school ceremonies
Feed back	All schools give gender responsive feed back through Recommendation

There are five elements in organizational system, namely: goal, input, process, output, control mechanism, and feedback. Of the five elements, there have been some integrating gender and some others do not. Seen from the element of goal, none of the four schools has integrated gender into the school vision. In the input section, there are only three schools, which have human resources who understand about gender. For budget support the schools have not provided specific budget for an activity, but just integrated gender-perspective into a certain activity such as Kartini's day commemoration. From the perspective of facilities and infrastructures, the schools have integrated gender although it has not been maximally implemented, for instance gender-responsive desks (the front part is covered) has been fulfilled, just in several classes. In gender tools, it can be seen that the schools have not possessed guidance book of how to integrate gender to school. What has been done is just verbal socialization.

In the element process, all of the sub-element (development methods, learning models, class management, and assignment), have distributed and integrated gender into these processes even though it's not maximal yet. In term of teaching method every teacher is different, so that some of them have integrated gender in to their teaching and the others have not. Whilst in learning activities gender has been fully integrated.

In the output element (the sub-element syllabus, lesson plan, and instructional media) gender has not been integrated. Meanwhile in the output element the sub-components

of teaching materials and learning resources, gender integration is just implemented in a certain subject, such as Indonesian language. Meanwhile gender integration has not been done in Mathematics.

In the element of control mechanism the principals use meeting and school ceremonies as media to give socialization about gender to the school communities. In the element of feedback the principals give recommendation to the teachers to integrate gender in a wider scope such as enlarging the bathrooms for female students in SMKN 2 Sragen, formulating gender-responsive lesson plans, etc. The reason why gender has not been integrated into the syllabus is mainly caused by the absence of instructions from the government to execute it according to the source person.

People

The meaning of people here is the people at school (school communities) starting from the principals, teachers, administration staffs, and students both male and female, who have rules to integrate gender into school environment based on their own task and function. However, in fact not all of the school communities have known and understood about what gender is and how to integrate into their schools. It is because gender training is merely awarded to the principals as the highest authority holder at school.

Sragen Regency has conducted gender training twice about how to integrate gender into school to the principals. However, there hasn't been a training on gender provided to teachers and administration staffs. This results in the responsibility of the principals to give guidance and directions to their school communities in order to integrate gender into school. The principals even make use of flag ceremonies and teachers' meetings and meetings with students in school organization meetings to give socializations about gender. The principals are responsible to convey the way how to integrate gender into schools, starting from school culture which supports and respects to each other, none-gender discriminative teaching method, task and responsibility distribution based on the rule and competence of each, and

providing opportunities to male and female to occupy a position. Table 5 depicts the role of principals, teachers, administration staffs, and students in integrating gender into their schools environment.

Tabel 5
Description of the role of school communities in gender integration

Position	Role	Implementation
Principals	Authority delegation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Assigning teachers to participate in training to support the quality of class management (all schools)
	Human resource directing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Directing human resource in setting up the schools' regulation (all schools)
	Attention	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Participating in gender training- Giving socialization to the school communities about gender equality and equity (all schools)
	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Giving equal opportunities to students and teachers both male and female to develop the competence (all schools)
	Giving motivation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Motivating the students while attending school ceremonies- Motivating the teachers to be just in teaching process (all schools)
Teachers	Managing classes, giving motivation and support	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- The teachers give directions, supports and motivation to both male and female students to develop their potentials without discrimination.- Teaching without gender discrimination- Giving equal opportunities to the students to ask questions (all schools)
Students	Agent of Change	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Applying gender-sensitive culture at schools- Applying non-discriminative treatment to both genders (all schools)

Active roles of the school communities namely the principals, teachers, and students to integrate gender into the school is strongly needed. Each of the school community has different roles. The main role of the principals is endorsing and actualizing gender at schools, from assigning teachers to participate in gender training to endorsing teachers and students to develop themselves without gender discrimination.

Teachers have roles in providing endorsement and motivation and guidance to the students to develop their potential and competence, especially during teaching-learning process without differentiating sexes, for example during the teaching-learning process, teachers allow there students to ask questions and give their opinions without gender discrimination. Male and female students have equal rights to obtain teaching. Meanwhile students as agent of changes are demanded to be able to integrate gender into their attitude and behavior, at schools or outside schools. It is reflected when the students treat their friends and teachers without gender discrimination.

DISCUSSION

The study result shows that the schools have made organizational changes towards gender-responsive schools both in strategic and organizational dimensions. Interestingly, none of the schools has vision formulation integrating gender perspective. Accordingly, the organizational change leading to gender-responsive schools in strategic dimension is not done in the schools' vision, but in positions, programs and products. The absence of gender-responsive schools' vision potentially results in the discontinuity of gender integration at schools unless the principals as the policy maker have strong commitment to achieve it. Vision is considered an entity which can guide schools in achieving the goals having been determined. Without gender-responsive vision it means the schools do not have gender-responsive future dream formulation as the guidance to individuals and organizations in acting for positions, programs and products to actualize gender equality and equity.

The importance of organizational vision as the guidance of individuals' and organization behavior is in line with what Hill (2010) says that "Vision is something that can guide us as individuals or as organizations to reach a point that we have given some thought to rather than simply arriving wherever we might end up. Vision provides the drive needed to pursue something to completion. A vision can be a road map to help guide us in making decisions, prompting us to think through things. This can result in changes." By referring to Hill's

statement, the planed and continuous changes leading to gender responsive schools can be just conducted if the schools have gender-responsive visions.

Furthermore, Hill (2010) states that has a lot to do with where you will be in two years, five years, or even at the end of your years. Having a vision and seeing that vision come into reality will also have a lot to do with how satisfied we are at the end of whatever time period we might choose to examine. Vision provides the drive needed to pursue something to completion. A vision can be a road map to help guide us in making decisions, prompting us to think through things. This can result in changes.

In addition Khoza (2016) also states that Vision in the curriculum is needed to make the teachers able to operate vision within the goals, targets, and outcome. He states that subject/discipline curriculum/teaching vision is very important in teaching because it forms the foundation for why teachers teach their subjects. The vision is divided into personal daily experience, societal/social and professional/content visions/reasons. When teachers understand the teaching vision, they identify relevant curriculum goals. The goals are divided into aims, objectives and outcomes. Teachers have to understand the curriculum vision in order to achieve the curriculum goals.

Tabel 6
Organizational change in the strategic dimension

Dimension	Research Findings
Strategic Dimension	
Visions	The vision of all schools were neutral gender
Positions	The schools have developed the collaboration among institution
Programs	The schools have integrated gender perspective through agenda settingdan matching
Products	The schools have provided facilities and infrastructure of gender responsive schools
Organization Dimension	
Culture	Gender-blind policiesand gender-aware policies
Structure	Male-dominated structure without affirmative action for promoting the candidate
Systems	Varied from Gender-blind policies to Gender-aware policies, include gender neutral and gender redistributive policy
People	Principals, teachers, and student endorse gender integration within limited skill

The changes having been done by the schools in the organizational dimension happens on cultural, system, and people dimension. Whereas in the structural dimension, there is still male-dominated structure without affirmative action for promoting the candidate.

The research finds that culture and organizational system which are gender blind polices (often implicitly called male-biased) and also culture and organizational system with are gender aware policies. The inconsistency of gender responsiveness in cultural and system dimension, makes organization not process ideologies, beliefs, philosophies, feelings, assumptions, expectations, attitudes, norms and values, about gender equality and equity as social clue to schools communities in making the stances and behaving. This agrees with Silman (2012) and Sabanci et al. (2016) who state that organizational culture becomes the first aspect of organizational dimension. According to Silman (2012) and Sabanci et al. (2016) organizational culture is the ideologies, beliefs, philosophies, feelings, assumptions, expectations, attitudes, norms, and values. These elements guide our organizational behavior, help us make sense of the organizational world in which we operate, and create a mechanism for identifying with others at work.

Organizational culture is a complicated and multi-faceted area of study. Fard, Rostamy &Taghiloo (2009) suggest that organizational culture is the common ideologies, beliefs, philosophies, feelings, assumptions, expectations, attitudes, norms, and values, which should be considered collectively since they are interdependent and interinfluencing. (Silman, Ozmatyatli, Birol & Caglar, 2012). Furthermore Sabanci et al. (2016) state that organizational culture is a multilevel construct comprising many elements of primarily artifacts, values, and assumptions. As a set, these elements guide our organizational behavior, help us make sense of the organizational world in which we operate, and create a mechanism for identifying with others at work. At the core are the assumptions, beliefs, and values regarding work or non work interests that manifest in individuals' and groups' behavior that in turn affect or are affected by organizational systems,

procedures and norms and the underlying philosophy, strategy and so on”.

In organizational structure there are still male domination and lack of female representation on important positions at schools. Balancing male and female representation on strategic positions at schools becomes a homework which needs to be resolved. In the organizational system dimension there are variations from gender blind policies to gender aware policies, including gender neutral and gender redistributive policy. Every school has a system consisting of goals inputs, processes, output, control mechanism, and feedbacks. Some of them have been gender responsive. Gender responsive is found in feedbacks, whereas goals haven't been gender responsive.

In people, principals, teachers, and students integrated gender perspective in accordance to their own roles, for instance the principals have a role to endorse and socialize gender, and delegate authorities. Teachers gave motivation and endorsement to both male and female students to improve their competence in academic and the students have a role as an agent of change in integrating gender in their behavior and culture.

CONCLUSION

The findings show that organizational change towards gender-responsive schools has been done both in strategic and organizational dimensions. Unfortunately, all of the schools didn't have gender responsive vision and gender responsive structure. Besides, most of the schools have not implemented gender-responsive culture and systems. They only integrated gender dimension incidentally. In conclusion changing organization in strategic dimension is more difficult than in organization dimension. In other words, changing the concrete level of organizations such as products (in the strategic dimension) or people (in the organizational dimension) is easier than changing the conceptual level of organizations such as vision (in the strategic dimension) and culture (in the organizational dimension). Accordingly, organizational change should be embodied from the strategic to technical level. Thus, schools have a reference to implement gender responsive school.

REFERENCE

- Agezo, C. K. (2010). Female leadership and school effectiveness in junior high school in Ghana. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 48 (6), 689-703.
- Aikman, S & Unterhalter, E. (2007). *Practising gender equality in education*. Oxford, Oxfam GB.
- Angel-Sveda, A. (2012) Organizational change: Basic theoretical approaches. *The Public Administration and Social Policies Review*. 2(9), 74-82.
- Evans, K.S., (1998). Combating gender disparity in education: Guidelines for early childhood educators. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 26 (2), 83-87.
- Grant, M. J. and Behrman, J.R. (2010). Gender gaps in educational attainment in less developed countries. *Population and Development Review*, 36(1), 71-89.
- Helgesen, Sally. (1995). *The web of inclusion: A new architecture for building great organizational*. New York: Currency and Doubleday.
- Hill, Roger B. (2010). Excellence: The importance of vision and work ethic. *Technology & Engineering Teacher*, 70 (2), 28-31.
- Jones, Alan M. (1994). The learning organization: Adult learning and organizational transformation. *British Journal of Management*, 5(2), 153-162.
- Kambey, D.C. (2010). *Managemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Manado: Yayasan Tri Ganesha Nusantara.
- Khoza, S.B. (2016). Is teaching without understanding curriculum visions and goals a high risk?. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 30 (5), 104-119.
- Makarova, E. & Herzog, W. (2015). Trapped in the gender stereotype? The image of science among secondary school students and teachers. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 34 (2), 106-123.
- March, C., Smyth, I., Mukhopadhyay, M. (2005). *A Guide to Gender-Analysis Frameworks*. UK: Oxfam.
- Mintzberg, H. (1999). *Structure in five designing effective organization*. Engle Wood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Montana, P. & Charnov, B. (1993). *Management*. New York: Barron's Educational Series, 155-169.

- Paris, L. D. & Decker, D. L. (2012). Sex role stereotypes: does business education make a difference? *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 27(1), 36-50.
- Pruna, S. & Pruna, M. (2012). Implementing changes in organizations. Several considerations. *Journal of Criminal Investigations*. 29-35.
- Roberts, J. L. & Chittooran, M. M. (2016). Addressing gender inequities: the role of an NGO school in Uttar Pradesh, India. *Asian Education and Development Studies*, 5(1), 121-131.
- Robbins, S. (1990). *Organization theory, structure, design, and applications*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Rosener, J.B. (1990). Ways women lead: The Command-and-control leadership style association with men is no the only way to succeed. *Harvard Business Review*, 68, 119-25.
- Sa'ud, U. S. (2008). *Inovasi Pendidikan*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sabanci, A.; Sahin, A.; Sonmez, M. A.; Ozan, Y. (2016). The correlation between school managers' communication skills and school culture. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 30 (12), 155-171.
- Silman, F.; Ozmatyati, I. O.; Birol, C.; Caglar, M. (2012). Organizational culture at high schools In TRNC: A Comparative case study. *Journal of Education*, 42, 356-366.
- Suryadarma, Daniel. (2015). Gender differences in numeracy in Indonesia: Evidence from alongitudinal dataset. *Education Economics*, 23 (2), 180-198.
- Tannock, S., (2008). The problem of **education-based discrimination**. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*. 29 (5), 439-449.
- Tuwor, T & Sossou, M.A. (2008). **Gender discrimination and education** in West Africa: strategies for maintaining girls in school. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 12 (4), 363-379.
- Wood, D., Kurtz-Costes, B; Rowley, S&Okeke-Adeyanju, N. (2010). Mothers' academic **gender stereotypes** and **education**-related beliefs about sons and daughters in African American families. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 102 (2), 521-530.



Jusuf Kalla School of Government
JKSG
toward better governance



MIP
MAGISTER ILMU PEMERINTAHAN



KOMPAS GRAMEDIA

ISBN 978-602-6751-74-4



9

786026

751744