



AL-RIDHA: Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat

ISSN: 2986-8637

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.58223/al-ridha.v2i2>.

Volume 1, Nomor 1, September 2024

Publisher: P3MSTAI Al-Hamidiyah Bangkalan



This is an open access article under licensed Creative Commons
Attribution NonCommercial 4.0 International License

POLICY AND MANAGEMENT INTEGRATION OF THE EDUCATIONAL TRIUMVIRATE: Fostering Synergistic Collaboration Among Schools, Families, And Communities

Solehodin

UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, Indonesia

solahaddin518@gmail.com

Suheri

IAI At-Taqwa Bondowoso, Indonesia

heryvirgo83@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The visionary concept of the Educational Triumvirate (Tripusat Pendidikan), pioneered by the distinguished Indonesian educational philosopher Ki Hadjar Dewantara, posits that genuine pedagogical achievement is fundamentally contingent upon the reciprocal synergy among three vital domains: the school (formal), the family (informal), and the broader community (non-formal). Notwithstanding this profound normative foundation, contemporary educational practice frequently suffers from severe institutional fragmentation. Schools are systematically overburdened as solitary custodians of cognitive advancement and moral probity, whereas families are marginalized into passive administrative consumers, and community assets remain largely untethered from school learning environments. This scholarly article formulates a robust policy integration architecture and a systemic collaborative management model designed to harmonize these three domains. Utilizing a qualitative methodology grounded in critical literature review and policy synthesis, the inquiry delineates structural and sociocultural impediments, formulates an ecological

governance matrix, and operationalizes community-anchored social capital. The findings demonstrate that transcending institutional isolation necessitates transforming traditional compliance-driven interactions into reciprocal partnerships grounded in relational trust. The proposed collaborative framework rests upon four systemic pillars: multiscalar policy harmonization, inclusive participative leadership, continuous reciprocal communication channels, and contextualized community-based curriculum co-creation. Ultimately, synchronizing this triad builds a resilient ecological safety net capable of nurturing holistic human agency amidst digital disruption.

Keywords: Educational Triumvirate, Educational Policy, Collaborative Governance, Family-School Partnerships, Social Capital, Ecological Systems Theory.

INTRODUCTION

Education represents an ongoing process of enculturation, cognitive empowerment, and humanistic socialization that inherently transcends the architectural boundaries of formal school structures. Historically and philosophically, Ki Hadjar Dewantara articulated this foundational paradigm through the concept of the Educational Triumvirate (*Tripusat Pendidikan*), asserting that the holistic intellectual, emotional, and spiritual maturation of learners is sustained by a continuous dialectic across three organic domains: the realm of the school (*alam perguruan*), the realm of the family (*alam keluarga*), and the realm of youth and community (*alam pemuda*) (Dewantara, 1962). Each of these interconnected spheres performs distinct yet mutually reinforcing developmental functions: the informal household provides the primary cradle of emotional security, moral rectitude, and early character formation; the formal institution of the school systematically imparts advanced cognitive capabilities, scientific literacy, and structured socialization; and the surrounding community offers an authentic arena for civic engagement, vocational trial, and cultural contextualization (Wardhani, 2013).

Although this triadic vision has been enshrined within the legal architecture of Indonesian education—specifically under Law Number 20 of 2003 concerning the National Education System—contemporary reality displays an acute structural and operational disconnect. A persistent phenomenon of unilateral moral outsourcing has taken root across the educational landscape. Schools are disproportionately scrutinized and held unilaterally accountable by the public for systemic societal crises, ranging from student delinquency and cyberbullying to widespread youth moral alienation (Kaimuddin, 2018). Societal and policy reactions to such dilemmas almost invariably demand superficial curricular revisions within formal classrooms, conveniently ignoring escalating domestic neglect, parental disengagement, and the systemic erosion of community-level social cohesion (Darlis, 2017).

Simultaneously, institutionalized mechanisms for parental and community

participation within schools remain largely confined to tokenistic and procedural exercises. School committees and parent-teacher associations are frequently relegated to passive rubber-stamp organs or secondary funding conduits, rather than being treated as substantive co-architects in curriculum planning and pedagogical evaluation (Syaadah et al., 2023). The prevailing relationship between school leadership and families remains fundamentally transactional, mimicking the distanced dynamic between commercial service providers and consumer clients rather than an authentic, co-equal partnership of primary co-educators (Epstein, 2018).

Prior empirical and conceptual research examining these educational sectors has historically operated in isolation. Scholars have evaluated familial parenting patterns independently (Kaimuddin, 2018), examined internal formal classroom instructional designs in isolation (Irsalulloh & Maunah, 2023), or analyzed community vocational initiatives as detached entities. Comprehensive conceptual frameworks elucidating how integrative public policy instruments and modern organizational governance can be harmonized to bridge these persistent structural divides remain notably scarce. Consequently, this study bridges this conceptual and policy gap by formulating a comprehensive policy integration model and an operational collaborative management framework that synergizes schools, families, and communities into an integrated, mutually sustaining educational ecosystem.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a qualitative critical literature review design integrated with policy synthesis methodology. This approach is purposefully engineered to evaluate, contest, and synthesize theoretical constructs, legal frameworks, and empirical findings across diverse bodies of educational governance literature (Grant & Booth, 2009). The corpus examined comprises peer-reviewed academic journal articles published between 2013 and 2024, foundational philosophical texts on Indonesian education, national legislative documents (notably Law No. 20/2003 on the National Education System, Minister of Education and Culture Regulation No. 75/2016 on School Committees, and Regulation No. 30/2017 on Family Involvement), as well as empirical reports concerning school-based collaborative governance.

The analysis was conducted through a rigorous four-stage analytical protocol: (1) Literature Identification and Screening, which captured multidisciplinary scholarship using target descriptors including Educational Triumvirate, school-family-community partnerships, collaborative educational governance, and mesosystemic integration; (2) Thematic Categorization, systematically grouping retrieved texts across structural-policy impediments, socio-relational barriers, and participatory practices; (3) Comparative Critical Deconstruction, juxtaposing formal policy mandates against actual ground-level operational realities using the analytical frameworks of Bronfenbrenner's (1979) Bioecological Systems Theory and Epstein's (2018) Comprehensive Partnership Typology; and (4) Conceptual Model

Synthesis, formulating an integrative governance framework encompassing structural, managerial, and operational dimensions. Methodological credibility and analytical rigor were maintained through extensive cross-source triangulation and iterative audit trails.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Ecological Deconstruction of the Educational Triumvirate

The Educational Triumvirate has historically been conceptualized in a rigid, compartmentalized manner: the school is designated as the transmitter of cognitive acumen, the family as the private domain of ethical upbringing, and the community as a subsequent theater for occupational and social application (Dewantara, 1962). This mechanical segregation has proven increasingly untenable. When organizational boundaries between these domains are rendered impermeable, an institutional void of responsibility inevitably emerges. This vacuum becomes acutely glaring when learners confront sharp value dissonances between academic tenets, domestic environments permeated by unmonitored digital consumption, and pervasive subcultural pressures within unsupervised neighborhood spaces (Darlis, 2017).

To resolve this fragmentation, the Educational Triumvirate must be fundamentally reinterpreted through Bronfenbrenner's (1979) Bioecological Systems Theory. In this paradigm, adolescent growth occurs within nested tiers of environmental systems. While the family, the classroom, and the community peer circle represent primary microsystems in which direct interpersonal interactions occur, developmental equilibrium is governed by the quality of the mesosystem—the linkages and mutual feedback loops operating between these microsystems. When the mesosystemic bridge between domestic guardians and school educators is frail or nonexistent, young learners inhabit fractured ecological worlds. Conversely, when consistent moral expectations, communicative transparency, and shared socio-emotional support reinforce one another across the school, home, and community, developmental resilience is exponentially heightened (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Wardhani, 2013).

2. Multidimensional Impediments to Trilateral Collaboration

A rigorous synthesis of empirical literature and administrative realities uncovers three interconnected tiers of systemic obstacles that continue to paralyze collaborative educational efforts:

Structural and Policy Incongruence

National educational regulations in Indonesia present an uncoordinated mosaic of mandates. Ministry of Education and Culture Regulation No. 75 of 2016 frames school committees largely around financial oversight and physical resource mobilization, whereas Regulation No. 30 of 2017 champions parental engagement primarily for psychosocial character building. At the operational level, schools lack

clear unified procedural guidelines to synthesize these dual expectations. Furthermore, national school accreditation matrices and performance evaluations for educational leadership continue to be heavily weighted toward standardized academic indices and bureaucratic paper trails, offering virtually no quantifiable incentives for principals who invest institutional energy into building robust community and family partnerships (Irsalulloh & Maunah, 2023).

Sociocultural and Communicative Hierarchies

Deeply ingrained institutional hierarchies persist within public educational systems. School administrators and educators frequently construct a professional perimeter based on specialized pedagogical authority, viewing candid parental engagement or constructive critiques as external interference in professional autonomy (Syaadah et al., 2023). Conversely, families—most notably those hailing from marginalized socioeconomic backgrounds—regularly experience institutional intimidation, feeling alienated by academic jargon and bureaucratic protocol. Consequently, home-school communication degenerates into an episodic, reactive, and punitive mechanism: parents are summoned only when behavioral infractions, disciplinary sanctions, or financial deficits occur, entrenching mutual suspicion rather than cooperative goodwill (Epstein, 2018).

Sub-Optimized Community Social Capital

Surrounding community assets—ranging from local artisanal workshops, cultural elders, public healthcare clinics, to neighborhood civic organizations—remain profoundly alienated from daily educational routines. The social capital latent within these entities, encompassing networks of mutual reciprocity, localized technical wisdom, and intergenerational trust, is rarely envisioned as legitimate pedagogical capital (Putnam, 2000; Wardhani, 2013). Schools function as insular islands, conceptually closed to the rich physical and cultural ecosystems that envelop them.

3. Multiscalar Policy Integration Architecture

Overcoming structural isolation requires establishing an integrated policy architecture operating across three jurisdictional tiers:

Macro-Level (National Strategic Horizon): At the central governance tier, the Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education, alongside relevant coordinate ministries, must consolidate scattered decrees into an overarching National Triumvirate Partnership Masterplan. This macro-policy must formally incorporate authentic partnership indicators into the national School Quality Report (Rapor Pendidikan) and national accreditation instruments. School leaders must be held administratively accountable not merely for test performance metrics, but for demonstrably sustainable frameworks of family engagement, parent education programming, and localized community integration.

Meso-Level (Regional Governance & Educational Directorates): Regional education authorities must establish localized regulatory frameworks that mandate

and fund dedicated Community-School Liaison Officers within regional school clusters. These professionals bridge logistical, linguistic, and cultural divides between underserved families and school administrations, while coordinating local public budgets to support intersectoral youth welfare initiatives (Bryk et al., 2010).

Micro-Level (School Operational Governance): Each educational institution must formalize an institutional Partnership Charter embedded directly into its Medium-Term Work Plan (RKJM) and Annual Operational Budget (RKAS). This baseline charter delineates transparent codes of mutual conduct, explicit pathways for parental advocacy, and ethical protocols for engaging community organizations in co-curricular initiatives.

4. Systemic Collaborative Management Model

To translate integrated policies into tangible institutional practices, this article formulates an operational collaborative management model synthesizing Epstein's (2018) typology with indigenous Indonesian communal dynamics (gotong royong):

Pillar / Dimension	Core Operational Focus	Practical Implementation Mechanisms
Pillar I: Integrated Family Empowerment	Bi-directional parenting capacity building & domestic-academic alignment.	Monthly reciprocal parenting forums, digital literacy circles, parent-led mental health workshops, and home learning environment consultations.
Pillar II: Dialogic Reciprocal Communication	Continuous two-way, transparent, non-punitive multi-channel dialogue.	Digital communication portals, tri-annual student-led academic conferences, weekly formative learning logs, and multi-lingual outreach for marginalized parents.
Pillar III: Community Co-Creation & Volunteering	Mobilizing community social capital directly into classroom instruction.	Visiting professional masterclasses, local artisan residency programs, healthcare practitioner workshops, and structured parent volunteer taskforces.

Pillar	IV:	Place-based pedagogy and community service-learning integrated into curricula.	Experiential civic projects addressing local environmental and social challenges, oral history documentation with local elders, and village enterprise internships.
Contextualized Cultural Learning			

The first pillar redefines traditional paternalistic parenting interventions into reciprocal developmental alliances. Instead of hosting didactic lectures where educators instruct parents from a position of superiority, schools institute collaborative parenting circles. These forums address urgent digital-age dilemmas, including algorithmic radicalization, smartphone addiction, positive behavioral reinforcement, and adolescents' emotional regulation (Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Kaimuddin, 2018). This programmatic focus bridges the gap between classroom behavioral norms and home living environments.

The second pillar dismantles the episodic, deficit-driven communication archetype. Replacing the conventional teacher-dominated report card distribution, the model institutes Student-Led Conferences (SLCs). In this format, students articulate their self-reflections, showcase digital learning portfolios, identify academic struggles, and co-design improvement goals alongside both their classroom instructors and parents (Kraft & Dougherty, 2013). This transforms communication into an empowering triadic exercise of shared agency.

The third and fourth pillars open the school gates outward. By transforming school committees from passive fundraising appendages into Dynamic Community Councils, schools map out local human and cultural capital. Local entrepreneurs, municipal specialists, and traditional artisans co-develop authentic learning modules (Wardhani, 2013). Through structured service-learning projects, students investigate and contribute to solving tangible community issues—such as local watershed management or cultural documentation—solidifying character development through experiential civic immersion (Putnam, 2000; Dewantara, 1962).

5. Implementation Strategy: Relational Trust and Systemic Change

The institutionalization of this collaborative governance model demands deliberate organizational change management rooted in the cultivation of relational trust (Bryk & Schneider, 2002). Relational trust operates as the essential catalyst within educational environments; without it, even meticulously designed collaborative structures collapse into procedural posturing. Developing this trust necessitates four foundational managerial behaviors: respect, personal regard, competence, and integrity.

School leadership must model vulnerability and institutional transparency by providing public access to operational decisions and budgetary frameworks. Concurrently, teachers must be equipped with specialized professional development in intercultural communication and family engagement during both pre-service preparation and in-service training cycles. Finally, participation pathways must be flexibly differentiated to accommodate working-class families and single-parent households, ensuring that parental engagement is not monopolized exclusively by affluent or privileged demographics (Henderson & Mapp, 2002).

CONCLUSION

The Educational Triumvirate envisioned by Ki Hadjar Dewantara remains an extraordinarily modern blueprint that conceives of human development as an intrinsically collective responsibility. Contemporary crises in adolescent character, educational equity, and social cohesion are not merely manifestations of instructional deficiencies within formal classrooms; they represent deep structural fissures within the mesosystemic bonds that should seamlessly unite schools, homes, and community environments. Addressing these interconnected crises requires transcending cosmetic curricular adjustments in favor of structural public policy integration and systemic collaborative governance.

By enacting synchronizing policy mandates across national, regional, and school-level jurisdictions and deploying a four-pillar collaborative management model—anchored in reciprocal family empowerment, dialogic communication, community co-creation, and place-based learning—educational ecosystems can overcome chronic institutional isolation. When educational leadership honors parents as indispensable co-educators and embraces community assets as vibrant living curricula, schools transform from isolated academic factories into cohesive, humanizing ecologies capable of steering youth toward intellectual distinction and ethical citizenship.

REFERENCES

- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press.
- Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Bryk, A. S., Sebring, P. B., Allensworth, E., Luppescu, S., & Easton, J. Q. (2010). *Organizing schools for improvement: Lessons from Chicago*. University of Chicago Press.
- Darlis, D. (2017). Hakikat pendidikan Islam: Telaah terhadap hubungan pendidikan informal, non formal dan formal [The essence of Islamic education: An examination of the relationship between informal, non-formal, and formal education]. *Jurnal Tarbiyah*, 24(1), 145–163. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30829/tar.v24i1.131>

- Dewantara, K. H. (1962). Karya Ki Hadjar Dewantara bagian I: Pendidikan [Selected works of Ki Hadjar Dewantara part I: Education]. Majelis Luhur Persatuan Taman Siswa.
- Epstein, J. L. (2018). School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429494673>
- Grant, M. J., & Booth, A. (2009). A typology of reviews: An analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. *Health Information & Libraries Journal*, 26(2), 91–108. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-1842.2009.00848.x>
- Henderson, A. T., & Mapp, K. L. (2002). A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement. National Center for Family & Community Connections with Schools.
- Irsalulloh, D. B., & Maunah, B. (2023). Peran lembaga pendidikan dalam sistem pendidikan Indonesia [The role of educational institutions within the Indonesian education system]. *Pendidikdas: Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar*, 4(1), 45–56. <https://doi.org/10.56832/pendikdas.v4i1.164>
- Kaimuddin, K. (2018). Pembentukan karakter anak melalui lembaga pendidikan informal [Children's character building through informal educational institutions]. *Al-Maiyyah: Media Transformasi Gender dalam Paradigma Sosial Keagamaan*, 11(2), 290–307. <https://doi.org/10.35905/almaiyyah.v11i2.549>
- Kraft, M. A., & Dougherty, S. M. (2013). The effect of teacher–family communication on student engagement: Evidence from a randomized field experiment. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 6(3), 199–222. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19345747.2012.743632>
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. Simon & Schuster.
- Republic of Indonesia. (2003). Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 20 Tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional [Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 20 of 2003 on National Education System]. Lembaran Negara RI Tahun 2003 Nomor 78. State Secretariat.
- Syaadah, R., Rusli, R., & Siregar, M. (2023). Pendidikan formal, non formal dan pendidikan informal [Formal, non-formal, and informal education]. *PEMA: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pengabdian kepada Masyarakat*, 2(2), 125–134. <https://doi.org/10.56832/pema.v2i2.298>
- Wardhani, N. W. (2013). Pembelajaran nilai-nilai kearifan lokal sebagai penguat karakter bangsa melalui pendidikan informal [Learning local wisdom values as national character reinforcement through informal education]. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan*, 14(1), 77–86. <https://doi.org/10.17509/jpp.v14i1.318>

