

## DETERMINANT IMPLEMENTATION OF GOVERNMENT POLICY SERANG CITY BANTEN PROVINCE INDONESIA IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMPULSORY 9 YEARS BASIC EDUCATION<sup>1</sup>

Milwan, Muchlis Hamdi, Aries Djaenuri<sup>2</sup>, Juntika<sup>3</sup>

### Abstract

The problem of this research is why the implementation of compulsory 9 years basic education policy in Serang city for the last 3 years (2014 - 2016) has not been able to realize the compulsory policy objective of 9 years basic education, examined from the determinant of public policy implementation. The main reference theory in this research is Muchlis Hamdi's theory (2014) about the assessment of policy implementation from the determinant side. The research method used is qualitative research design (explorative); to determine informants, researchers used purposive and snowball techniques; data collection techniques used: in-depth interviews, observation, and documentation techniques; and data analysis methods using qualitative data analysis. The research results are: a) Determinant substance of the policy: there is no clarity about the basic measures and objectives of compulsory basic education policy 9 years in Serang city and not yet equipped with mayor regulation that regulates further about basic education, b) Determinant of behavior the task of implementing the policy: commitment, level of performance, competence, and compliance officer of standard operating procedures (SOP) is still less satisfactory, c) Determinant interaction of network among implementing organization: communication and interaction of network between implementing organization not yet effective and not utilize technological progress in social media; d) Determinants of target group participation: targeted community participation has not been satisfactory (number of drop out rates is still high enough); e) Determinant resources: availability of funds, implementers, equipment, information and technology has not been adequate in terms of quantity and quality. The determinants of the success or failure of policy implementation from Hamdi's theory (2014) need to be clarified again the details of the indicators: a) the policy communication factor should be added as one of the indicators of the determinants of network interaction; b) commitment factors need to be added as an indicator of the behavioral determinant of the policy implementer's task; and c) economic, social and political factors should be added as an indicator of the determinants of resource availability in policy implementation.

Keywords: *determinants of policy implementation, implementation of education policy, compulsory basic education*

---

<sup>1</sup> This article is extracted from the Dissertation entitled: Implementation of Serang City Government Policy of Banten Province in the Implementation of the Nine Years Basic Education Program

<sup>2</sup> Milwan, Muchlis Hamdi, and Aries Djaenuri, Institute of Internal Administration, Doctoral Program, Science Program of Government, Graduate Program Institute of Domestic Government. e-mail: milwan.ut@gmail.com, muchlis.hamdi03@gmail.com, aries.djaenuri@yahoo.com

<sup>3</sup> Juntika, Indonesian Education University. e-mail:juntikanurihsan@upi.edu

## Introduction

Implementation of the 9-years compulsory basic education policy launched by the government of Indonesia officially since 1994 has been up and down. Initially targeted in 2003/2004. However, due to the multi-dimensional crisis, the target that has not been achieved, the deadline is then postponed to 2008/2009 based on Presidential Decision (PD) Number 5 year 2006 concerning the National movement for the acceleration of compulsory basic education nine years and illiteracy eradication<sup>4</sup>. The 9-years compulsory basic education completeness indicators stated in Presidential decision number 5 in 2006 are Pure Participation Rate (PPR)<sup>5</sup> primary school (PS)/Madrasah Ibtidaiyah (MI)/equivalent and Rough Participation Rate (RPR)<sup>6</sup> Junior high school (JHS)/Madrasah Tsanawiyah (MTs)/national equivalent reaches at least 95% in 2008. The target is stated by the government has been fully achieved, considering that in 2008, the PPR PS/MI at the national level has reached 115%

and the RPR JHS/MTs of 96,14% or has exceeded the set target (95%). However, the existing reality shows that until 2016 the number of drop out rates in Indonesia is still high. Based on data from the Ministry of Education and Culture (MEC), in 2015 - 2016 there are about 946.013 elementary students whom were unable to continue to junior high school (drop out). This is worsened with data 51.541 students who continue their education to junior high school did not pass. The grade, there are 997.554 Indonesian children who are only certified elementary school in 2015 until 2016<sup>7</sup>.

The high drops out rate above proves that the 9-years compulsory basic education program is not yet completed and very apprehensive given that all children aged 7-15 years in Indonesia are required to obtain a minimum of 9 years of primary education (PS-JHS) as mandated in article 31 of Indonesian Constitution the 1945 and the Law no. 20 year 2003 concerning national education system.

Similar to other regional governments, the municipal government of Serang Banten province is also obliged to manage and organize compulsory 9 years basic education program. City government Serang Banten province as an autonomous region was formed based on Law no. 32 year 2007 concerning the formation of Serang city<sup>8</sup>. In order to implement the 9-years compulsory basic education program and reduce the drop out rate in Serang city, Serang city government since 25 April 2011 has enacted District Regulation (DR) no. 7 year 2011 concerning the implementation of education in Serang city. One of the articles in the Serang city's regulation states that the Serang city government is responsible for completing the compulsory basic education program<sup>9</sup>. To complete the compulsory education program, the city government of Serang is obliged to provide funding (to finance the implementation of education) for the completion of compulsory education<sup>10</sup> and free all education

<sup>4</sup> Sukarno, Makmuri, Dede Wardiat and Titik Handayani. 2010. Looking for Alternative Model of Basic Education Completion. Jakarta: Population Research Center LIPI and publisher Elmatara (Member of IKAPI). P. 41.

<sup>5</sup> Pure Participation Rate is the school's participation of the population with regard to school age. PPR is calculated from the number of residents (school age) who are at school at a certain level divided by the number of school-aged residents at a certain level in the area concerned, multiplied by one hundred (100) and expressed in percent. PPR shows how many school-age residents who have been able to utilize educational facilities in accordance with the level of education. (Sukarno, et al., 2010: 73).

<sup>6</sup> Rough Participation Rate is is the school's participation of the population regardless of school age. RPR is calculated from the number of people who are at school at a certain level divided by the number of school-aged residents at a certain level in the area concerned, multiplied by one hundred (100) and expressed in percent. RPR are used to measure the success of educational development programs that are organized in order to expand opportunities for residents to get an education. RPR is the simplest indicator to measure the absorptive capacity of school-aged population in each level of education (Sukarno, et al., 2010: 73).

<sup>7</sup> Data abstracted from <http://www.jawapos.com/read/2016/10/17/58205/number-drop-out-of-school-in-indonesia-still-high>, [24/6/2017]

<sup>8</sup> The establishment of Serang city was passed on August 10, 2007.

<sup>9</sup> Serang City's District Regulation No. 7 Year 2011 concerning the Implementation of Education in Serang City, Article 70 (Perda Kota Serang Nomor 7 Tahun 2011, Pasal 70).

<sup>10</sup> Ibid, Article 16 sub-article (1e) and Article 121 sub-article (6).

costs for learners from poor families and neglected children<sup>11</sup>. However, until the end of 2016, the results of the 9-years compulsory basic education program implementation in Serang city have not reached the targets set in the Regional Medium-Term Development Plan (RMTDP).

The results of the implementation of compulsory basic education program 9 years in Serang city the last three years (2014 - 2016) can be seen from the achievement of the RPR and PPR basic education that has been defined in RMTDP Serang city. The target and achievement RPR and PPR of compulsory basic education program 9 years in the last three years can be seen in the following table.

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid, Article 16 sub-article (1g).

Table 1.

Target and Achievement RPR and PPR of Compulsory Basic Education Program 9 Years  
 In Serang City the Last Three Years (2014 - 2016)

No	Program performance indicators (outcome)	2014		2015		2016		Average performance (2014-2016)
		Target	Realization	Target	Realization	Target	Realization	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	GER PS (%)	125,5	108,36	125,5	107,18	125,5	108,73	108,09
2	PPN PS (%)	100	97,21	100	97,21	100	99,11	97,84
3	GER JHS (%)	99,5	86,65	99,75	91,92	100	92,24	90,27
4	PPN JHS (%)	95	75,96	95,5	77,53	96	82,78	78,76

Source: Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) Serang city (processed data) year 2014 – 2016

Based on the above table, the average achievement of RPR and PPR of Serang city for the last three years (2014 - 2016) for 7-12 years old (PS) and for the age of 13-15 years (JHS) no one reaches the set target in RMTDP Serang city. From the average achievement of RPR Serang city for JHS/aged 13 - 15 years (90,27%) above, it can be assumed that there is a minimum of 9,73% of elementary school graduates who did not go to JHS (drop out school) in the last three years 2014 - 2016). While the average achievement of PPR Serang city for JHS/aged 13 - 15 years (78,76%) above, it can be assumed that there is still at least 16,74% of the population aged 13-15 years who have not been able to service education facilities according to the level education (drop out) in the last three years (2014 - 2016).

Based on the above description, then to find out what the factors affect (determinant) implementation of compulsory basic education policy 9 years in Serang city, Banten Province of Indonesia, it is necessary to do in-depth research. The purpose of this study is to reveal in depth (explorative) implementation of compulsory 9 years basic education policy in Serang city, seen from determinant of public policy implementation which include: substance of policy, behavior of implementing task, interaction of network, participation of target group, and resources.

Policy implementation is a complex and complex process. However, despite its complexity and complexity, policy implementation holds a vital role in the policy process<sup>12</sup>. In other words,

policy implementation is a very important aspect of the entire policy process, because without any policy implementation stage, the policy programs that have been prepared will only be official records on the desk of policymakers, dreams or good plans that are neatly stored in the archive. This is in accordance with Udoji's statement (1981: 32) which states that: "The execution of policies is as important if not more important than policy making. Policies will remain dreams or print in file jakets unless they are implemented"<sup>13</sup>. So according to Udoji the implementation of the policy is something important and perhaps even more important than policy making. Policies will be good dreams or plans that are stored neatly in the archives if they are not implemented. Therefore, a policy program must be implemented in order to have the desired impact and objectives. Grindle (1980: 7) states, implementation is a general process of administrative measures that can be examined at the level of a particular program<sup>14</sup>. Grindle (1980: 7) adds that the new implementation

Revisions. Yogyakarta: CAPS (Centre of Academic Publishing Service). P. 226.

<sup>13</sup> Udoji, Chief J.O. 1981. The African Public Servant as a Public Policy Maker, Public Policy in Africa, African Association for Public Administration and Management. Addis Abeba. P.32.

<sup>14</sup> Grindle, Merilee S. 1980. *Politics and Policy Implementation in The Third World*. New Jersey:Princeton University Press. P.7.

<sup>12</sup> Winarno, Budi. 2014. *Public Policy: Theory, Process, and Case Study. Latest Editions &*

process will begin if goals and targets have been established, program activities have been compiled and funds are ready and channeled to reach the target<sup>15</sup>. In line with Grindle's view above, Mazmanian and Sabatier (1981) explain the meaning of policy implementation: to understand what actually happens after a program is declared valid or formulated is the focus of attention of policy implementation, ie events and activities that arise after the passing of the guidelines public policy guidelines covering both efforts to administer it and to have a real impact on society or events<sup>16</sup>.

According to Van Meter and Van Horn (1975), the policy implementation process as "those actions by public or private individuals (or groups) that are directed at the achievement of objective set fort in prior policy decision"<sup>17</sup>. While the view of Islamy (2003) about policy implementation is somewhat different from the views of the experts above.

According to Islamy (2003: 30):

Implementation of policy is not solely about the implementation of policies that have been accepted, because in the process of implementation of new demands (new demand) may emerge which must also be transformed back in the mechanism of policy formulation. So as a consequence, the initial policy (original) should be revised or replaced. Therefore, the process of policy formulation can not be separated by the process of implementation. Policy assessments may be undertaken at any stage of implementation or formulation if they are deemed necessary<sup>18</sup>.

Further Islamy (2003: 30)<sup>19</sup> state that:

<sup>15</sup> Loc.cit.

<sup>16</sup> Mazmanian, Daniel, dan Paul A. Sabatier. 1983. *Implementation and Public Policy*. USA: Scott, Foresman and Company.

<sup>17</sup> Van Meter, D.S dan Van Horn, C.E. 1975. *The Policy Implementatation Process: A Conceptual Framework*. Administration and Society.

<sup>18</sup> Islamy, M. Irfan. 2003. *Public Policy Analysis*. Malang: Post Graduate Program of Universitas Brawijaya. P. 30.

<sup>19</sup> Loc.cit.

In order to implement the policy successfully, the brokers responsible for the implementation of the policy should take account of the demands of society affected by the policy. Therefore, any existing policies should be ready to be changed at the implementation stage, because a particular policy may be strongly rejected by the community and should be removed. Often policy makers must negotiate directly with the people affected by a policy. In reality, in many cases community demands are excluded or overlooked in the implementation phase, and as a result, the policy can not be implemented in accordance with their wishes and satisfaction. In addition, feedback from the public on policy implementation is often inappropriate because of the lack of institutionalized feedback systems and the marginal role of communities in government processes.

From the above opinions, the implementation of the policy is the actions performed by the actors of policy implementation that actually happen after a program is declared valid to achieve the objectives outlined in the policy decision concerned and the policy can be revised at the implementation stage if indeed it is deemed necessary.

The next stage after the policy is enacted and declared effective then the policy must be implemented in an effort to realize the goals that have been set and agreed in the policy. In the implementation of the policy of course the influence of various interests must exist, whether involving the interests of the region (national, provincial, district or city), political, economic, elite groups, especially in policy positions including local elites and bureaucracy, as stated Grindle, 1980: 11-12), as follows: *A brief listing of those who might be involved in the implementation of any particular program would include national level planners; national, regional, and local politicians, economic elite groups, especially at the local level; recipient groups; and bureaucratic implementors at middle and lower levels*<sup>20</sup>.

So according to Grindle policy implementation of a program can be influenced by several things that include national, regional and local politicians planners, economic elite groups, especially at the local level; receiving groups; and bureaucrats at the middle and lower levels.

<sup>20</sup> Grindle, Merilee S, Op.cit, P.11-12.

Implementation of public policy can be seen from several perspectives or approaches. One of them is the implementation of problems approach introduced by Edwards III (1980). Edwards III (1980) suggests:

*In our approach to the study of policy implementation, we begin in the abstract and ask: What are the preconditions for successful policy implementation? What are the primary obstacles to successful policy implementation?*<sup>21</sup>

So according to Edwards III, the approach to studying policy implementation can begin in the abstract and ask: what are the prerequisites for successful policy implementation? and what are the main obstacles to successful policy implementation?

Based on these two questions, Edwards III (1980) offers and considers four factors which are the main requirements of successful public policy implementation processes, ie “*Communication, resources, dispositions or attitudes, and bureaucratic structure*”. These four factors become important criteria in the implementation of a policy<sup>22</sup>.

Similar to the opinion of Edwards III above, Van Meter and Van Horn (1975: 462), said that in the implementation of the policy there are six variables that affect the implementation performance (*..six variables which shape the linkage between policy and performance*), that is : (1) *Standards and objectives policy*, (2) *Resources policy*, (3) *Interorganizational communication and enforcement activities*, (4) *Characteristics of the implementing agencies*, (5) *The disposition of implementors*, dan (6) *Economic, social, and political conditions*<sup>23</sup>. While other opinions expressed by Hamdi (2014: 105)<sup>24</sup> say that:

The determinants of public policy implementation indicate various factors that may influence the success of policy implementation. The determinants are related to: 1) the substance of the policy, 2) the behavior of the implementing task, 3) the interaction of the network, 4) the participation of the target group, and 5) the resources. The substance of the policy concerns the consistency of the content derivation/policy specification, and the alignment of policy content with other policy content. Behavior of the task of implementing includes matters, such as work motivation, abuse of authority tendency, and learning ability. The interaction of networks is related to the cooperation between executives and the intergovernmental authority relations. Target group participation involves the level of acceptance of the benefits of activities and the ability to contribute according to existing procedures. The availability of resources consists of sufficient funds, availability of implementers, adequacy of equipment, availability of information and technological accuracy.

The theory of policy implementation Muchlis Hamdi's model (2014) selected as the main reference in this study with the following considerations. Muchlis Hamdi's model is a comprehensive alternative policy implementation model and was born due to numerous criticisms aimed at top-down policy implementation models and bottom-up models. It is said to be a comprehensive policy implementation model because Muchlis Hamdi's policy implementation model not only emphasizes the implementation of bottom-up or more bottom-up policy but can be used to review the implementation of the initiated policies or involving many parties, namely government, community, and others. Therefore, the policy implementation Muchlis Hamdi's model is more suitable or relevant to review the implementation of policies in Indonesia in general and in particular the implementation of education policy (compulsory 9 years basic education) involving many parties, namely government, society and/or other parties.

### **Methods**

The research design used is qualitative research design. Determination of informants in this study using purposive and snowball techniques. The purposive technique is used to determine the informants from the local government officials of Serang city (policy makers and policy implementers) who are involved or directly related to the implementation of

<sup>21</sup> Edward III, George C. 1984. *Public Policy Implementing*. London-England: Jai Press Inc.

<sup>22</sup> Milwan & FR. Wulandari. 2013. *Policy Implementation Model Licensing Services System One Counter (Study Best Practice Integrated Licensing Services Office Kab. Jembrana Bali)*. Proceedings of the National Seminar FISIP-UT. Through <http://www.fisip.ut.ac.id/semnas>.

<sup>23</sup> Van Meter, D.S dan Van Horn, C.E. Op.cit, P 462.

<sup>24</sup> Hamdi, Muchlis, Op.cit, P. 105.

compulsory 9 year basic education policy. The policy makers are: mayor of Serang, chairman and 2 members of commission 2 (education field) Serang city Regional Representative Council (RRC). While the implementers of the policy consists of: head/secretary of the office and 6 staff in the education office, 4 educational staff (school supervisor and technical service unit/TSU Education), one member of the board of education and 2 school committees or Madrasah. Snowball technique in this research is used to determine the informants coming from the target policy targets in the implementation of compulsory basic education policy 9 years (5 pupils and 5 students) in Serang city Banten province. Data collection techniques in this study are in-depth interviews (indepth interview), observation, and documentation techniques. The process of data management and analysis in this study using qualitative data analysis.

### Result and Discussion

There are several determinants of success of the implementation of 9 years basic eligible education policy in Serang city with reference to Muchlis Hamdi's theory policy implementation (2014). The determinants are related to: 1) the substance of the policy, 2) the behavior of the implementing task, 3) the interaction of the network, 4) the participation of the target group, and 5) the resources.

Policy substance factor. Analysis of policy substance Serang city's DR no. 07 year 2011 in the implementation of compulsory 9 years basic education policy in Serang city seen from the consistency of policy content/policy derivation, alignment of policy content with other policy content, and clarity of basic measures and policy objectives. Serang city's DR no. 07 year 2011 seen from its contents regulate the path, ladder and all types of education in the Serang city in the form of: early childhood education, primary education, secondary education, higher education, non-formal education, informal education, national, international, and based on local excellence, special education and special services, as well as religious education<sup>25</sup>. The contents or policy specifications Serang city's DR no. 7 year 2011, especially in relation to compulsory basic education 9 years is regulated in the following articles.

1) Article 1 of Serang city's DR no. 7 year 2011 on the general provisions of the definition of

primary education, primary school (PS), junior high school, and compulsory education;

- 2) Article 26 of Serang city's DR no. 7 year 2011 on the function and purpose of basic education;
- 3) Article 27 of Serang city's DR no. 7 year 2011 on the path, shape, type, and type of school;
- 4) Article 28 and 29 of Serang city's DR no. 7 year 2011 on learners;
- 5) Article 30 of Serang city's DR no. 7 year 2011 on implementation: The procedure for the implementation of basic education as referred to in article 27, article 28 and article 29 above, is further stipulated by mayor regulation. However, until 2016, the mayor regulation regulating further on basic education as mandated in the Serang city's DR no. 7 year 2011 has not been made.

Based on the content or policy specification in Serang city's DR no. 7 year 2011, especially on compulsory basic education 9 years when compared with the content of the Law no. 20 year 2003 concerning the national education system is in harmony because of the Law no. 20 year 2003 is one of the policies referred to in the "consideration of the drafting" of Serang city's DR no. 7 year 2011 concerning the implementation of education in Serang city. Furthermore, the contents of Serang city's DR no. 7 year 2011 when compared with the policy of distribution of government affairs in the field of education as stipulated in Law no. 23 year 2014, is irrelevant because in Serang city's DR no. 7 year 2011 still discuss the management of secondary education and special education that has become the authority of the province. Although in practice in 2014 - 2016 the city government of Serang city through the education and culture office of Serang city government is still managing secondary education that should have been the responsibility of the provincial government. This happens because the province of Banten including the city government of Serang in 2014 - 2016 has not enacted Law no. 23 year 2014. Furthermore the contents of Serang city's DR No. 7 year 2011 is still in harmony when compared with other policy content (other Serang city regulation about education management) which become the reference of compulsory implementation of 9 years basic education, which is Serang city's DR no. 1 year 2010 concerning compulsory learning Diniyah. This is seen from the contents of the two DR there are no articles and verses that contradict each other. However, when viewed from the side of the basic measures contained in Serang city's DR no. 7 year 2011 hence has not found the target of completion of compulsory education program 9 years in Serang

<sup>25</sup> Serang City's District Regulation No. 7 Year 2011, Op.cit, Article 18.

city. Whereas according to Van Meter and Van Horn, the basic measures and policy objectives are useful in outlining the objectives of overall policy decisions. The basic measures and objectives can not be implemented unless the basic measures and objectives are clearly stated so that the implementers can know what to expect from the basic measures and objectives. In conducting implementation studies, the objectives and targets of a program to be implemented should be identified and measured because the implementation can not succeed or fail if those goals are not considered. The target of the implementation of compulsory basic education policy 9 years per year is set in the Serang city RMTDP 2014 - 2018 which is prepared in the form of strategic plan of education and culture office of Serang city government 2014 - 2018.

As for the clarity of the basic measurements listed in Serang city's DR no. 7 year 2011 only contains the standard definitions related to compulsory 9-years basic education. Meanwhile, based on policy objectives, it is mentioned that the purpose of Serang city's DR no. 7 year 2011 is to ensure:

- a. public access to adequate, equitable and affordable education services;
- b. quality and competitiveness of education and its relation to the needs and/or conditions of society;
- c. effectiveness, efficiency and accountability of education management<sup>26</sup>.

Referring to the purpose of Serang city's DR no. 7 year 2011 above, then Serang city's DR no. 7 year 2011 does not set or specify the specific purpose of compulsory basic education 9 years.

Behavioral factor of policy executor task. Behavior of compulsory 9-years compulsory education policy in Serang city is seen from several indicators, among others: a) the ability of the implementing officer to understand each task (adaptation with task and work environment respectively); b) the performance level of the implementing officer; c) the level of obedience of the implementing officers on the guidelines or SOP and the ability to make the initiative; d) the degree of abuse of authority committed by the executing officer; and e) the ability to understand the basic measures and objectives of the 9-years compulsory policy.

The average implementing officer understands the tasks that become the respective duties in accordance with the provisions that govern them. In addition, policy implementers are

also able to adapt to their respective working environment in implementing compulsory basic education policy 9 years in Serang city. It is proven that there has never been any conflict between policy implementers in performing their duties and functions.

The performance of policy implementers in implementing compulsory basic education policy 9 years in Serang city is less satisfactory. Based on the observation at the attendance level of the policy implementers, especially the staff and the head of the education office and the school supervisors who made the informants in this study, the average attendance of the implementing officers is less effective. Every day (during the observation) after the morning apple the average executing officer (head of the field, supervisors, and school supervisors) goes out of the office and tends not to return to the office with any need or reason. For example, school supervisors (PS and JHS) in Serang city have not performed their duties professionally in conducting educational evaluation, because they rarely visit the schools that become their own. As for Serang city's DR no. 7 year 2011 article 15 sub-article (6) mentioned that the school supervisor is obliged to: a) perform the task of 40 (forty) hours per week from Monday to Saturday; b) carrying out academic supervision to educators of each competency standard and basic subject competency; and c) carry out managerial supervision of the educational unit at least 2 (two) times each month in accordance with the division of tasks. In practice, however, they visit the target schools if they are called or required by the school. Of course, the behavior of school supervisors is contrary to the provisions stipulated in the attachment of Ministry of Education and Culture Regulation no. 12 year 2007 concerning school supervisory standards/Madrasah, which states that school supervisors are tasked with assessing the performance of principals, teachers and school staff in carrying out their main tasks and responsibilities to improve the quality of education and learning/guidance of each subject in PS/MI or JHS/MTs. In this case how can school supervisors can provide an objective and fair value to the performance of principals, teachers and school staff if the concerned rarely visited his target school. The same thing happened to the behavior of employees of technical service unit/TSU Education of Serang city. Staff of TSU Education Serang city does not perform its duties and functions as mandated by Mayor Regulation Serang no. 31 year 2010 concerning the organization and working procedures of technical service unit of Serang city government education. TSU Education has the main duty to assist the head of office in the

<sup>26</sup> Serang City's District Regulation No. 7 Year 2011, Op.cit, Article 2.



implementation of early childhood education, primary education, secondary education, non-formal and informal education in accordance with its working area. But all this time in practice 7 TSU Education is available only carrying out the main task of assisting the head of service in the implementation of early childhood education and elementary school. While the main tasks of TSU Education to assist heads of service in the implementation of junior high school education, secondary education, non-formal and informal education did not happen. One of the impacts is that technical services that are very strategic for the implementation of basic education for junior high schools become ineffective because the coordination of technical activities directly under the head of JHS education and culture office of Serang city government.

Obedience of the implementing officers of the guidelines or SOP of compulsory 9-years basic education is still lacking. Examples in the new admissions provisions are adjusted to the quota of each school; but in practice there are some junior high schools who are forced to accept new students beyond the available seat quotas due to requests or "letters of power" from certain officials. While there are some schools that are short of students and threatened to close. This can be seen from the number of new students in Serang city junior high school in 2015 which is uneven, there are JHS (> 400 students) and many JHS (<70 students). In addition, TSU Education Serang city has not performed its duties and functions in accordance with Mayor Regulation Serang no. 31 year 2010, because only carrying out the main duty to assist the head of office in the implementation of early childhood education and PS, has not reached the implementation of JHS, secondary education, non-formal and informal education. According to the informants, the factors causing TSU Education Serang city has not carried out its duties and functions as described above, because it is influenced by the following factors. First, the number of TSU Education staff is inadequate. Currently, the average TSU Education only has: a) head of TSU; b) Head of subdivision. TU; c) 2 staff of civil servants/civil servants (paymasters and staffing); and d) 4 honorary staff (ICT, finance, student data, security). Based on Mayor Regulation Serang no. 31 year 2010 mentioned that the organizational structure of TSU Education consists of: head; sub. division of administration; and functional position groups. In performing its duties, head of sub. The administration division is assisted by: a) managing the administration of equipment; b) executor of financial administration manager; c) personnel administration personnel; d) executor of

the mailing agency; e) the executor of typing the official document; f) the kumputer operator; and g) housekeeper. Functional positions at the TSU Education are: a) archivist; b) computer institutions; c) statistics; d) teachers; e) school inspectors; and f) school supervisors whose numbers are adjusted to the needs and workload. Secondly, the amount of annual operational fund of TSU Education is not enough. Until now, the operational fund of TSU Education is still one with operational fund of education and culture office of Serang city government, so that the operational fund is the obstacle for TSU Education has not been able to perform the main task and function as mandated Article 3 Mayor Regulation Serang no. 31 year 2010. Third, the facilities and facilities of TSU Education facilities are inadequate. Office conditions used TSU Education is currently not feasible. The average office is still contracted, the staff workspace is very limited, and has no meeting room for coordination. Of course this condition also becomes an obstacle for TSU Education to improve its performance.

The ability of the implementing officers to make the initiative in implementing the 9-years compulsory basic education policy in Serang city is not prominent. There are several examples of initiatives undertaken by policy implementers in implementing the compulsory 9 years basic education policy in Serang city. First, there is an initiative from school supervisors (PS and JHS) not to routinely visit their own schools but to ask their target schools to contact them when problems arise. This initiative they do with the aim that performance of the target schools do not disturbed because they do not feel too closely supervised. However, this initiative is contrary to Ministry of Education and Culture Regulation no. 12 year 2007 concerning school supervisory standard/Madrasah. In this case how can school supervisors can provide an objective and fair value to the performance of principals, teachers and school staff if the concerned rarely visited his target school. Secondly, there are initiatives from certain schools (eg Public PS Drangong 1 Pandean and Public JHS 14 Serang city) that charge students activity sheet per semester to students and direct parents to purchase school uniforms at certain stores (Store Tohaga Market Royal ). This initiative, of course, contradicts the 9-years compulsory basic education program, which prohibits the school from attracting contributions to students.

The level of abuse of authority carried out by the executing officers of 9-years basic education in Serang city is very small in number, and even then done with "subtle and stealthy ways". For

example, the withdrawal of student activity sheet, security unit dues per semester to the students and directing parents to purchase school uniforms in certain stores, is an example of abuse of authority performed by the 9-years compulsory primary education officer in Serang city. However, so far no community members have dared to report abuse of authority by the school or school management person (principal/teacher) above directly to the education and culture office of Serang city government. While the behavior of policy implementers in terms of ability to understand the basic measures and objectives of compulsory 9-years policy in the city of Serang is still lacking. The average implementer of compulsory basic education policy 9 years in Serang city that made the informant in this research is not able to mention correctly Serang city's DR and other regulations which become the reference in implementing compulsory 9 years basic education. Thus, how the policy implementers will be able to understand the basic measures and objectives of the 9-years compulsory education policy if they rarely or even never read the contents of the Serang city regulation and other regulations that serve as reference in the implementation of 9-years compulsory basic education. This happens because the socialization or communication of the basic measures and objectives of the 9-years compulsory education policy in Serang city contained in the strategic plan education and culture office of Serang city government 2014-2018 is still less effective.

**Network Interaction Factor.** The interaction of the network in the implementation of compulsory education policy of 9 years of Serang city is related to the cooperation between mandatory 9-years compulsory education and the authority relationship between the government of Serang city. Interpersonal cooperation can be seen from: intensity of equalization of perception and availability of forum/container of cooperation and relationship of education and culture office of Serang city government with education and culture office of Banten provincial government related to implementation of compulsory 9 years study program. The perception equation among policy implementers of compulsory basic education 9 years of Serang city very often or often done that is every week; every Tuesday school supervisors and heads of TSU Education are obliged to attend the morning event at the education and culture office of Serang city government. In the morning event, the information and things that need to be followed up related to the implementation of general education including the implementation of compulsory basic education 9 years. As for the

forum/container of cooperation between management of 9 years basic education in Serang city, available 6 TSU Education (spread in 6 sub-districts) which become the coordination of early childhood education up to senior high school each districts, and one TSU Learning Activity Studio which handles non-formal learning activities. From 7 TSU Education form TSU Education communication forum which become media/forum to exchange opinion in order to formulate strategy how fair 9 years implementation can run well according to their tupoksi. TSU Education Serang city is the coordinator of early childhood education up to the level of senior high school in Serang city. Thus, the 9-years compulsory basic education development in each kecamatan automatically becomes the authority of TSU Education. But in practice 6 TSU Education Serang city has not perform the duties and ideal functions in accordance with the SOP has been established.

Interaction between mandatory 9-years compulsory education network in Serang city should also be seen in the coordination between the implementers of basic education, namely the field of elementary and junior high school coaching. However, in practice there is no coordination between the PS field supervisor and JHS counselor. In other words, each field of road construction alone. This is because in the organizational structure of the education and culture office of Serang city government (Serang city's DR No. 05 year 2014), the field of basic education development does not become one unity but is divided into two areas namely the field of elementary and junior high school coaching which has heads of fields and heads each section separately. In carrying out its duties and functions, both the head of the elementary school development<sup>27</sup> as well as head of JHS<sup>28</sup> each

<sup>27</sup> Field of Primary school (PS) is led by a Head of Field who is under and responsible to the Head of Service. The field of PS Development has the main duty to formulate and implement the technical policy in the curriculum and quality of elementary, elementary and elementary school elementary and institutional education, facilities and infrastructure of elementary school. The PS Development Sector performs the following functions:

- 1) preparation of activity plan in the curriculum and quality of primary, elementary and institutional PS and institutional education, facilities and infrastructure of elementary school;
- 2) formulation of technical policy in the curriculum and quality of primary, elementary

and institutional PS and institutional, elementary and educational facilities;

- 3) the implementation of curriculum and quality of elementary, elementary and elementary school, elementary school and institutional facilities, facilities and infrastructure;
- 4) implementation of coaching, coordination, curriculum curriculum facilities and quality of elementary, elementary and institutional PS and institutional education, facilities and infrastructure of elementary school;
- 5) supervision, evaluation and reporting on the implementation of curriculum and quality of elementary, elementary and elementary school, personnel and elementary school infrastructure, facilities and infrastructure;
- 6) the implementation of other tasks assigned by superiors in accordance with their duties and functions.

<sup>28</sup> Junior High School Development Sector (JHS) is headed by a Head of Field who is under and responsible to the Head of Service. Junior High School has the main duty to formulate and implement technical policy of curriculum and quality of junior high school education, personnel and student of JHS and institute, facility and infrastructure of JHS. Junior High School provides the following functions:

- 1) preparation of activity plan in the field of curriculum and quality of junior high school education, personnel and students of JHS and institutional, facilities and infrastructure of junior high school;
- 2) compilation of materials of formulation of technical policy in the field of curriculum and quality of junior high school education, personnel and students of JHS and institutional, facilities and infrastructure of junior high school;
- 3) conducting activities in the field of curriculum and quality of junior high school, personnel and junior high school and institutional, facilities and infrastructure of junior high school;
- 4) implementation of coaching, coordination, facilities in the field of curriculum and quality of junior high school education, personnel and students of JHG and institutional, facilities and infrastructure of junior high school;
- 5) supervision, evaluation and reporting on the implementation of field activities of curriculum and quality of junior high school education, personnel and students of JHS and institutional, facilities and infrastructure of junior high school;
- 6) the implementation of other tasks assigned by superiors in accordance with their duties and functions.

assisted by the head of the curriculum section and the quality of education; head of the personnel and personnel section; and heads of institutional sections and infrastructure facilities.

The relationship between the education and culture office of Serang city government with education and culture office of Banten provincial government related to the implementation of the 9-years compulsory education program, namely the relationship in terms of increasing the RPR and PPR and the preparation of work programs. In this case the provincial government each year trying to synergize its work program with the city government program which is then followed up by trying to verify the data to speed up the reporting process and other processes related to teachers, students, infrastructure facilities. Furthermore, the relationship with education and culture office of Banten provincial government continues to coordinate in terms of providing poor scholarship assistance channeled through the education and culture office of Banten provincial government to districts/cities in the province of Banten.

In practice, the education and culture office of Serang city government in the implementation of compulsory 9 years basic education policy requires support or inter-authority relationship among the existing government in Serang city. Education and culture office of Serang city government needs to do cooperation with the sub-district, Social Service, and Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) Serang city that has been less intense or even not been implemented because it is still its own way. First, cooperation with the sub-district is needed and needs to be improved to obtain data of citizens who have not been touched/served the compulsory basic education program 9 years. For example, based on observations and interviews at the location of the research sample: Neighborhood Association (NA) 01/Citizens Association (CA) 11 Cimuncang Village/Kali Gandu (front of RAU market) Serang city, there are 9 residents who dropped out of school, and Ciwaru Wetan Village, Banjar Agung Sub-District, Cipocok Jaya District, one family (5 out of 8 siblings) who drop out of the 9-years compulsory basic education program. However, the data of those who dropped out of school have not been recorded and reported to the education and culture office of Serang city government so that they have not been touched by the 9-years compulsory basic education program intensified by the city government of Serang. Secondly, there is no cooperation between the education and culture office of Serang city government with the relevant social services to

provide assistance to poor students and empowerment of parents who can not afford. Third, the cooperation between the education and culture office of Serang city government with CBS Serang city in terms of provision and publication of data on compulsory 9-years basic education has not been well coordinated, resulting in significant data discrepancies. For example, there is always difference of data of school participation rates (SPR), RPR, and PPR compulsory 9 years basic education owned by education and culture office of Serang city government with data owned by CBS of Serang city.

Target group participation factor. The participation of the target group in the implementation of compulsory 9 years basic education policy of Serang city is seen from the community's acceptance of the compulsory benefit of the 9-years compulsory education program and the ability of the community to contribute according to the procedures for the implementation of compulsory 9-years basic education program. According to the people of Serang city who became informants in this research; most of them do not know what the real benefits of compulsory 9-years basic education program. They only know the benefits of compulsory basic education program 9 years as a requirement to continue to secondary education (high school/vocational/equal). The compulsory function of the 9-years basic education program is to seek the expansion and equality of opportunities to obtain quality education for every Indonesian citizen. Furthermore, the 9-years compulsory basic education program aims to provide minimal education for Indonesian citizens to be able to develop their potential to be able to live independently in the community or continue education to a higher level<sup>29</sup>. Although there are still people who do not know the compulsory benefits of 9 years of primary education, most people in Serang city support the compulsory 9-years basic education, because according to them education is a necessity and very important for the future of their son.

Community participation to contribute in the implementation of compulsory education program including 9-years basic compulsory education is clearly regulated in Government Regulations (GR) no. 47 year 2008 concerning compulsory learning is related to the rights and obligations of citizens. The GR no. 47 year 2008, article 12 states that: (1) Every Indonesian citizen of compulsory education shall comply with

compulsory education program including 9 years compulsory basic education; (2) Every Indonesian citizen having a compulsory child is responsible for providing compulsory education to her child; (3) The district/city government shall strive for every Indonesian citizen of the compulsory education age to compulsory compulsory education, including 9 years compulsory basic education. Further in GR no. 47 year 2008, article 13 states that the community is entitled to: a) participate in the planning, implementation, supervision and evaluation of the implementation of compulsory education program; and b) get data and information about the implementation of compulsory education program. The form of implementation of the right of the community, among others: a. participate in providing input for program implementation; b. to include their children aged 7 to 15 years to attend compulsory education; c. participate in monitoring, supervising the implementation of compulsory education, monitoring children of compulsory education age who have not followed compulsory education, organizing compulsory education program in the neighborhood; d. participate in assessing the implementation of compulsory education, registering children of compulsory education, participating in the process of learning and assessment, and the continuity of compulsory education<sup>30</sup>. While the community is obliged to support the implementation of compulsory education program, including the compulsory 9-years basic education. The form of implementation of community obligations, among others: a. as a parent provides basic education for their children as compulsory for compulsory education; b. participate in the form of providing resources support (funds, facilities and infrastructure, manpower, organizing, management) to foster parents<sup>31</sup>.

While in Serang city's DR no. 7 year 2011 did not mention specifically the rights and obligations of residents of Serang city in the implementation of compulsory basic education program 9 years. In Serang city's DR no. 7 year 2011 only states that the community is entitled to participate in the planning, implementation, supervision and evaluation of education programs (in general). As for the liabilities of citizens, in Serang city's DR no. 7 year 2011 only states that citizens must: (a) follow elementary and secondary

<sup>30</sup> Ibid, Elucidation of the Article 13 sub-article (1).

<sup>31</sup> Ibid, Elucidation of the Article 13 sub-article (2).

<sup>29</sup> Government Regulations No. 47 Year 2008 Concerning Compulsory Learning, Article 2.

education to completion for community members aged 7 (seven) to 18 (eighteen) years; (b) provide educational resources support for the sustainability of education; and (c) create and support the implementation of learning, reading, writing and achievement cultures in their environment<sup>32</sup>.

However, in practice, the participation of Serang city community to contribute in the implementation of compulsory 9-years basic education program has not been in accordance with what is expected by article 5 sub-article (1) of Serang city's DR no. 7 year 2011. This is seen from the number of drop out rates/not continuing school from elementary level to JHS in 2014 - 2016 is still quite high. According to the informants, there are several factors that cause compulsory education students 9 years old school Serang dropped out of school, among others: family harmony (parent divorce cases), juvenile delinquency due to environmental influences (often not go to school without a description), and more factors prominent is the economic level of the people of Serang city is still low. The efforts that have been done by the government of Serang city in overcoming the problem of dropping out children due to economic factor or tuition cost is realized by giving some help. Firstly, the central government's School Operational Assistance (SOA) program aims to provide operational assistance to schools provided per student (in order for them to have a better quality basic education service to complete the 9-years compulsory basic education program. Second, the free education program since 2014. The program aims to free up the cost of education to all students by providing additional operational costs to the whole school to cover the shortfall of the SOA funds. Third, the Poor Student Support (PSS) program is government-provided assistance to students from under-served families able to be able to do learning activities in school.

Factor Resources. Resources in the implementation of the compulsory 9-years basic education policy of Serang city can be seen from the adequacy of funds, the availability of the implementers (competence and adequacy of staff), the adequacy of equipment, the availability of information, and the accuracy of the technology used. Funds in order to implement the compulsory 9-years basic education policy in Serang city, are considered inadequate, which is only an average of 8,5% (less than 10%) of the total education budget per year. The allocation of 9-year compulsory basic education program by 2015 (Rp 38,240,253,665)

decreased by 3,6% from 2014 (Rp 39,667,456,022) and in 2016 (Rp 33,657,556,804) decreased 12% from 2015<sup>33</sup>. In addition, the compulsory 9-year compulsory basic education program allocation is lower when compared to the allocation of secondary education funds. This is due to the Serang city government through the education and culture office of Serang city government in 2014-2016 has not implemented the provision of new education affairs division as regulated in the attachment of Law no. 23 year 2014 concerning regional government. Thus, in practice the education and culture office of Serang city government still exercises the authority of the district/municipality government in government affairs in education based on Law no. 32 year 2004 and Government Regulation no. 38 year 2007. Based on Law no. 32 year 2004 and Government Regulation no. 38 year 2007, the authority of regency/municipal government in government affairs in the field of education is very broad that includes the management and implementation of early childhood education, primary education, secondary education and non-formal education. While the authority of regency/ municipality government in government affairs in the field of education based on Law no. 23 year 2014, focusing more on the management and organization of basic education, early childhood education, and non-formal education. While the management and administration of secondary and special education diverted the central government into the authority of the provincial government.

The availability of human resources staff of 9 years compulsory basic education policy in Serang city 2014 - 2016 in terms of quantity and quality is still not in accordance with the needs. The number of shortage of compulsory education workers 9 years of Serang city 2014 - 2016 amounted to 1,995 teachers (30% of the needs). Including sport teacher less 174 people because available 50 teachers from 224 required teachers and religious teachers less 74 people because available 150 teachers from 224 teachers needed. The education staff, especially the administrative staff still lack 59 employees. To meet the shortage of educators and educational personnel are recruited honorary staff for educators and / or apprentices for education personnel (administrative staff). While from the side of fulfillment of quality of educator that is teacher certification for educator of compulsory elementary education 9 years in Serang city until end of year 2016 only reached

<sup>32</sup> Serang City's DR no. 7 Year 2011, Op.cit, Article 5 sub-article (1).

<sup>33</sup> Data is processed from the Evaluation Report of the Work Plan of the Department of Education and Culture in 2014-2016.

about 40%. This is because there are still many honorary teachers and have not fulfilled the requirements for teacher certification.

Availability and quality of facilities and infrastructure to support the implementation of compulsory 9-years basic education policy in Serang city is still inadequate. This can be seen from the condition of some existing facilities and infrastructure, among others: (1) the office of the education office is not feasible because it does not have a meeting room, the staff work space is not feasible, and does not have adequate archive space; (2) The office of 7 TSU Education is inadequate because it does not have a representative meeting room and an office that is not yet feasible; (3) there is still much need for classroom addition and rehabilitation, as well as the construction of facilities and infrastructure of some elementary and junior high schools.

The availability of information on the 9-years compulsory basic education policy in Serang city is inadequate, where complete and accurate information about free education can only be obtained through school and school committees. In this case there are still many informants who do not know in detail what the cost is free and what costs should be borne by the students of compulsory elementary education program 9 years. Because in practice there are still many costs that must be borne by the students themselves, among others: school uniforms, notebooks and other school supplies, a book package for students who want to have a private bookbook because the school is very limited, the cost of student activity sheets per semester, extra curricular activity cost (pool or camp) 2x per semester; wage salaries or monthly crossings for schools located on the protocol roads.

The technology used to socialize and implement compulsory 9-years basic education policy in Serang city 2014-2016 is inappropriate because it has not followed the latest technological developments. Although it has been using several media that is a coordination meeting forum which is regularly held every week at the education and culture office of Serang city government; meeting forum organized by each TSU Education; and information through banners. But not yet maximize the social media that is being loved or often accessed by the community today such as: website (being developed in 2016), twitter, face book, instagram, and other media social. Thus, the availability of implementing resources of 9 years compulsory education of Serang city in 2014 - 2016 is not sufficient.

In the case of the implementation of compulsory 9 years basic education policy in Serang city, there are several factors that need to be

clarified again the details of the indicator. First, the determinant of network interaction. In Hamdi's theory (2014) mentioned that the interaction of networks related to cooperation between executives and inter-governmental relationships of government. Based on the research findings, the determinants of network interaction need to be clarified not only in relation to inter-governmental cooperation and intergovernmental authority relation, but also the affirmation of indicators of policy communication factor should be mentioned clearly as one of the indicators of the determinant of network interaction. Although implicitly the policy communication factor is already included in the determinant of network interaction. In general, Edwards III discusses three important points in the policy communication process, namely transmission, consistency, and clarity<sup>34</sup>. There are several obstacles that arise in transmitting the implementation commands: 1) disagreements between the executives and the orders issued by policy makers; 2) information passes through multiple layers of bureaucratic hierarchy; 3) ultimately the capture of communications may be hampered by selective perceptions and the unwillingness of the implementers to know the requirements of a policy. Sometimes the executives ignore what is clear and try to guess the meaning of "real"<sup>35</sup>. If the policy implementation wants to be effective, then the implementation orders must be consistent and clear. Although the commands presented to the implementers of the policy have an element of clarity, but if the order is contradictory then the order will not facilitate the executor of the policy perform their duties properly. On the other hand, inconsistent policy implementation orders will encourage the implementers to take very loose measures in interpreting and implementing policies<sup>36</sup>. The lack of clarity of communication messages conveyed with regard to policy implementation will lead to misleading interpretations that may even contradict the meaning of the initial message. However, the lack of clarity of policy communication messages does not necessarily preclude implementation<sup>37</sup>. However, Hamdi's theory as the main reference in this research does not explicitly mention the communication factor as one of the factors

<sup>34</sup> Winarno, Budi, Op.cit, P.178.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid, P.178 - 179.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid, P.180.

<sup>37</sup> Loc.cit.

influencing or determining the success of policy implementation.

Second, the determinant of the behavior of the policy implementing task. In Hamdi's theory (2014) mentioned that the behavior of implementing tasks include matters, such as work motivation, tendency of abuse of authority, and learning ability<sup>38</sup>. Based on the findings of the research, the determinant of the behavior of the task of implementing the policy needs to be clarified not only in terms of work motivation, the tendency of abuse of authority, and learning ability, but also the affirmation of indicator of commitment factor must be mentioned clearly as one of the indicators of the behavior of the policy implementer. Echols and Hassan Shadily (2005), stated that: "commitment is a promise; fulfill its promises; And Responsibility"<sup>39</sup>. Meanwhile, according to Tualeka (2013) theoretically and scientifically, in order to implement the policy successfully there must be a commitment variable. Commitment is an agreement (engagement) to do something, or a contract<sup>40</sup>. Further, Tualeka (2013) states that:

empirically, policy implementation in Indonesia without any commitment variables, is less than maximum. That is, although there are already variables as proposed by policy implementation experts, such as George C. Edward III and Mazmanian and Sabatier, for the case in Indonesia if not coupled with the commitment variable, the implementation of the policy is less successful<sup>41</sup>.

Third, the determinant of resource availability. In Hamdi's theory (2014) mentioned that the availability of resources consists of sufficient funds, availability of implementers, the adequacy of equipment, information availability and technological accuracy. Based on the research findings, the determinants of resource availability need to be clarified not only in terms of the

adequacy of funds, the availability of implementers, the adequacy of equipment, the availability of information and the accuracy of technology, but it is also necessary to affirm the indicators of economic, social and political conditions should be clearly stated as one indicator that may affect the availability of resources. According to Van Meter and Van Horn (1975: 463) economic, social and political conditions are among the independent variables that influence the performance of policy implementation<sup>42</sup>. Further, Van Meter and Van Horn (1975: 463) explain that although the impact of these factors (economic, social and political conditions on the implementation of policy decisions are of little concern, they may have depth towards the achievement of the implementing agencies<sup>43</sup>.

### Conclusion and Suggestion

The lack of implementation of the 9 years compulsory basic education policy in Serang city from 2014 to 2016 achieved its objectives, influenced by the following determinants.

- a) Determinant substance of policy; of this determinant the implementation of the policy has not run smoothly because there is no clarity about the basic measures and goals of compulsory basic education policy 9 years in Serang city and not yet equipped with the Mayor Regulation which regulates further about basic education.
- b) Determinant of the behavior of policy implementers; of this determinant policy implementation has not run smoothly because of commitment, level of performance, competence, and obedience officer of executing to SOP still less satisfactory.
- c) Determinant of inter-organizational network interaction; of this determinant the implementation of the policy has not run smoothly because communication and interaction between network implementing organizations have not been effective (not yet take advantage of technological progress in the field of social media).
- d) Determination of target group participation; of the determinants of this policy implementation has not run smoothly because the target community participation has not been

<sup>38</sup> Hamdi, Muchlis, Op.cit, P. 105.

<sup>39</sup> Echols, John M dan Hassan Shadily.2005. English-Indonesian dictionary. Jakarta: Gramedia. P. 130.

<sup>40</sup> Tualeka, Basa Alim. 2013. *Understanding the Surabaya Foot Traders' Development Policy*. DIA, Journal of Public Administration. Juni 2013, Vol. 11, No. 1, P. 154.

<sup>41</sup> Loc.cit.

<sup>42</sup> Van Meter, D.S and Van Horn, C.E, Op.cit, P.463.

<sup>43</sup> Loc.cit.

satisfactory (the number of drop out rates is still high enough).

- e) Determinant availability of resources; of this determinant policy implementation has not run smoothly because the availability of funds, executors, equipment, information and technology has not been adequate both in terms of quantity and quality.

The Hamdi's theory (2014) of the determinants that influence the success or failure of policy implementation, there are several factors that need to be clarified again in the details of the indicator:

- 1) the policy communication factor should be added as an indicator of the determinants of the interaction of networks that Hamdi has (2014: 105);
- 2) the commitment factor should be added as an indicator of the behavioral determinant of the policy implementing task in the theory put forward by Hamdi (2014: 106); and
- 3) economic, social and political factors should be added as an indicator of the determinants of resource availability in policy implementation.

To anticipate and overcome the determinants in the implementation of compulsory 9 year basic education policy in Serang city to come, it is necessary to make suggestions as follows:

- a. City government Serang need to immediately revise Serang city's District Regulation no. 7 year 2011 to conform to the content or policy specification on the distribution of government affairs in the field of education based on Law no. 23 year 2014. In revising the law to involve the participation of the people of Serang city who have not been involved, although it will take a long process.
- b. Serang city government needs to conduct a thorough evaluation of the behavior of policy implementers in terms of commitment, level of performance, competence, and obedience of the implementing officers to SOP, then formulates and implements the follow-up plan of the evaluation result.
- c. City government Serang need to immediately establish the new organizational structure of the education and culture office of Serang city government with reference to the policy of distribution of governmental affairs of the new education sector based on Law no. 23 year 2014. One of the areas that need special attention is the merging of

elementary education and junior high school education that has been separated and stand-alone into one area, namely the field of basic education.

- d. Education and culture office of Serang city government needs to foster cooperation with cross-units to "hunt children drop out" in order to continue schooling again; for example in collaboration with sector police chief, district head and sub-district head to assign one or more members to hunt and record dropout children especially 9 years old.
- e. City government of Serang through education and culture office of Serang city government must educate about the importance of compulsory basic education 9 years to the people of Serang city so that they will participate actively in the success of compulsory education program 9 years in Serang city. Such education can be done through various methods of socializing compulsory basic education policy 9 years in urban village level.
- f. Serang city government must have a high commitment to ensure the availability of resources (funds, human resources, facilities/infrastructure, and technology) needed in the implementation of compulsory basic education program 9 years.
- g. Serang city government needs to establish a national movement of foster parents at city level to help drop out students coming from weak economic families who have not been well served. This can be done by involving the participation of private parties and local companies as donors of a national movement of foster parents.
- h. School committees of primary education, NGOs and the Serang city education council should be more active and consistent in evaluating the implementation of compulsory basic education policy 9 years per year and submitting the evaluation report to the Serang city government.

## References

### A. BOOKS AND ARTICLES

1. Edward III, George C. 1984. *Public Policy Implementing*. London-England: Jai Press Inc.



2. Grindle, Merilee S. 1980. *Politics and Policy Implementation in The Third World*. New Jersey:Princeton University Press.
  3. Hamdi, Muchlis. 2014. *Public Policy: Process, Analysis, and Participation*. Bogor: Ghalia Indonesia.
  4. Islamy, M. Irfan. 2003. *Public Policy Analysis*. Malang: Post Graduate Program of Universitas Brawijaya.
  5. Mazmanian, Daniel, dan Paul A. Sabatier. 1983. *Implementation and Public Policy*. USA: Scott, Foresman and Company.
  6. Milwan & FR. Wulandari. 2013. *Policy Implementation Model Licensing Services System One Counter (Study Best Practice Integrated Licensing Services Office Kab. Jembrana Bali)*. Proceedings of the National Seminar FISIP-UT. Through <http://www.fisip.ut.ac.id/semnas>.
  7. Sukarno, Makmuri, Dede Wardiat and Titik Handayani. 2010. *Looking for an Alternative Model of Basic Education Completion*. Jakarta: Population Research Center LIPI and publisher Elmatara (Member of IKAPI).
  8. Tualeka, Basa Alim. 2013. *Understanding the Surabaya Foot Traders' Development Policy*. DIA, Journal of Public Administration. Juni 2013, Vol. 11, No. 1, Hal. 146 – 158
  9. Udoji, Chief J.O. 1981. *The African Public Servant as a Public Policy Maker, Public Policy in Africa*, African Association for Public Administration and Management. Addis Abeba.
  10. Van Meter, D.S dan Van Horn, C.E. 1975. *The Policy Implementation Process: A Conceptual Framework*. Administration and Society.
  11. Winarno, Budi. 2014. *Public Policy: Theory, Process, and Case Study. Latest Editions & Revisions*. Yogyakarta: CAPS (Centre of Academic Publishing Service).
- B. DOCUMENT**
1. Law no. 20 Year 2003 Concerning National Education System
  2. Law no. 32 Year 2004 Concerning Regional Government.
  3. Law no. 32 Year 2007 Concerning the Formation of Serang City
  4. Law no. 23 Year 2014 Concerning Regional Government
  5. Government Regulation no. 38 Year 2007 Concerning the Division of Government Affairs between the Government and the Provincial and Regency/City Governments.
  6. Government Regulation no. 47 year 2008 Concerning Compulsory Learning
  7. Presidential Decision no. 5 Year 2006 Concerning the National Movement for the Acceleration Compulsory Compulsory Education of Nine Years Basic Education and the Elimination of Illiteracy.
  8. Serang City's District Regulation no. 7 Year 2011 Concerning the Implementation of Education in Serang City.
  9. Serang City's District Regulation no. 05 Year 2014 amendment to the Serang City's District Regulation area No. 02 of 2013 on the Establishment and

Organization Structure of Serang City  
Regional Office, Education and Culture  
Office of Serang City Government as one  
of the Regional Devices Work Unit  
(SKPD) in Serang City.

10. Mayor Regulation (Perwal) Serang No. 31  
Year 2010 on the Organization and  
Working Procedures of Technical Service  
Unit (TSU) of Serang City Government  
Education.
11. Central Bureau of Statistics Serang City,  
2015. Serang city in the number 2015
12. Central Bureau of Statistics Serang City,  
2016. Serang city in the number 2016
13. Central Bureau of Statistics Serang City,  
2017. Serang city in the number 2017
14. New City Strategy Plan Serang, 2016.
15. Evaluation Report of the Work Plan of  
Education and Culture Office of Serang  
City Government 2014-2016.

### **C. MAGAZINE, LETTER OFFICE, AND OTHERS**

1. Echols, John M and Hassan Shadily.2005.  
English-Indonesian dictionary. Jakarta:  
Gramedia.
2. [http://www.jawapos.com/read/2016/10/17/  
58205/number-drop-out-of-school-in-  
Indonesia-still-high,\[24/6/2017\]](http://www.jawapos.com/read/2016/10/17/58205/number-drop-out-of-school-in-Indonesia-still-high,[24/6/2017])