UNDERSTANDING THE COMPLEXITY OF UNIVERSITY MANAGEMENT: A REVIEW OF HIGHER EDUCATION ORGANIZATION THEORY

Memahami Kompleksiti Pengurusan Perguruan Tinggi: Sebuah Kajian tentang Teori Organisasi Perguruan Tinggi

Jihaduddin
Universitas Mathla'ul Anwar Banten, Indonesia

Jihaduddun_hifni@yahoo.co.id

Abtract

Higher education/university takes on an essential function in society. According to the Indonesian Constitution No. 20/2003 on National Education System, the university has three principal functions, known as *Tri Dharma,* which encompasses education, research and social services. Through this, the Indonesian university is expected to be an agent of change to create competent and qualified graduates. Besides, university should also become a leading research institution where different innovations can be created to bring significant contribution to social development. For this purpose, the present article sets to examine how the organization of university in its endeavours to achieve *Tri Dharma* goal fits with relevant theory. A qualitative research was carried out amongst 15 senior university lecturers in Banten. Participants were interviewed and their responses have been incorporated into this article. The results show that the Javanese culture influences both the formal and informal structures of Indonesian universities.

Keywords: management, higher education, complexity, organization theory.

Abstrak

Pendidikan tinggi/universiti memiliki peranan penting dalam masyarakat. Menurut Undang-Undang Indonesia No. 2 tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional disebutkan bahwa universiti memiliki tiga fungsi mendasar yang lebih dikenal dengan istilah Tri Dharma yang meliputi pendidikan, penelitian dan pengabdian masyarakat. Melalui Tri Dharma, universiti di Indonesia diharapkan dapat menjadi agen perubahan dalam mencitakan lulusan yang kompeten dan berkualiti. Disamping itu, universiti juga diharapkan menjadi institusi penelitian yang dapat menghasilkan berbagai inovasi yang dapat menyumbang terhadap pembangunan masyarakat. Atas dasar tersebut, artikel ini akan melihat bagaimana pemenuhan fungsi *Tri Dharma* sudah sesuai dengan teori organisasi perguruan tinggi. Sebuah penelitian kualitatif telah dijalankan dan 15 pensyarah senior universiti-universiti di Banten dilibatkan dan artikel ini mengandungi jawapan-jawapan mereka. Hasil kajian menunjukkan bahawa budaya Jawa mempengaruhi struktur formal dan informal universiti-universiti Indonesia.

Kata Kunci: pengurusan, pendidikan tinggi, kompleksiti, teori organisasi.

INTRODUCTION
University is an institute that helps the birth of intellectual resources that are hoped to be able to give contributions to improve the quality of human resources. Producing, constructing and revitalizing the human resources paradigm, so that they have good cognition, affection and conation perspectives in the eye of the public as life provisions are definitely not easy. The authenticity sectors aren't the only things required from a university, legally and existentially, so that the legitimacy is recognized by the government and society as an institute that is capable to manage and produce qualified human resources. But a university should also be able to construct its institution morally and managerially to be able to survive and provide all products intellectualization processes to the society systematically, continually and in accordance with the demands and needs from society about their hopes and future goals of getting the benefits from studying in universities.

The role above is which eventually puts a university as an "ivory tower". A goal that is constantly pursued by society is to tread their life existences in social and nation activities. In other words, a university until today is an elementary way for society in their efforts to become elites - groups that give influences and strong driving forces and also as a leader in the middle of society communities. This is true of whatever the community is – be it a political community, economic community, social community, culture community, profession community and others.

University graduates are expected to be able to perform their functions as agents of social change that have open and intelligent comprehensions and mindsets of society in any fields (politic, law, education, health, religious) and any other dimensions. These graduates are also expected to bring enlightenment and influence the improvement of living standards and public welfare.

The buoyant expectation from society for these university graduates is quite reasonable. Because if it wasn't the university graduates then who else would give the enlightenments, reforms, and improvements in their living standards.

In line with law on national education system number 20 year 2003 stated that education is a conscious and planned effort to create an atmosphere of learning and learning process so that learners actively develop their potential to have spiritual, self-control, personality, intelligence, noble character, as well as the skills that he needs, the people of the nation and state.

But their desire of having qualified graduates that are able to do the best for them lately is only a hope. In fact, local university graduates find it difficult to get a job Based on data from the Central Bureau of Statistics (BPS) in February 2016 showed the University-level Higher education unemployment rate reached 13.44 percent or 943,488 people out of the total unemployed 7 020 000 persons.

Why? All this time the quality of university graduates on both national and regional scale are quite worrisome. The number of qualified graduates that is accountable to the society is pretty low.

This is one of the basic problems in education management in universities. In the end it can't be blamed that people often underestimate university graduates. People found that most of these

university graduates are unable to perform their missions as educated people, who have knowledge and values, which are the identities of the educated. The low values either in the form of religious value or ethic value, have also been worsening the existence of university graduates in the public eyes.

A lot of negative thoughts addressed to the graduates surely do not have to be negated defensively by universities. This is because it is a reality that should be responded wisely by the college leaders. The stakeholders should think of why this reality is happening. Therefore the universities need to find determinant factors which determine the low quality of most graduates. Isn't someone a university graduate when he meets good academic standards? Why haven't these university graduates reflect the academic standards, even though they have been through some studying process in the university. Why are they still unable to perform their mission as community renewal agents?

There are a lot of factors. Some say that it's because of the bad input, limited funds, and some say that the government regulation doesn't take side on the improvement of quality of university graduates. Those factors do influence the outputs of universities in creating their human resources. But from all determination factors that show the low quality of these graduates it mostly lies on the university management itself, which is the ability to manage universities integrally and overall by optimizing the resource allocations and utilization owned by that university.

Because adequate facilities don't guarantee if the abilities to arrange and optimizing resources including the human resources, don't master specific skills that become their competences in teaching and learning activities.

In such context the university management becomes a basic foundation for arrangement and improvement intended to produce qualified university graduates with academic qualifications that can be accounted to the society. Ted Wall, professor of education management from Mc Gill University, stated that, university management should be started from the awareness of all academicians, especially the leaders. So each policy is taken solely to improve the academic quality.

University leaders' awareness should start from the philosophy that managing a university isn't only oriented to the economic capital (profit oriented), but it should also be oriented to socio capital - which is a management target that is oriented to the constructivism and human character building aspects, or in other words the stakeholders should prioritize the human capital as output target for the existence of the university he manages.

This writing is trying to give answers theoretically on how that campus is organized, and how that organization works to achieve mutual goals. Theoretical answers are important, they are usually called theories. A theory should be richer, because that theory is a process (Moleong, 2002; Epstein & Sanders, 1998). Hereby is university organizer organization theory built from the meaning of education, bureaucracy theory, formal organization structure, informal organization, formal and informal organization structure cohesions, and previous studies.

HIGHER EDUCATION AND CULTURE

a. Higher Education Conception

Education is a continuous culture effort (Meichati, 1976). Higher education activities involve many people with varieties of ethnic backgrounds, religions, and local languages thus impacted on the organization behavior in general. Education is a conscious and planned effort to create learning and teaching process so the learners can actively develop their self-potentials in order to have religious spiritual strength, self-control, personality, intelligence, noble character, and the skills they need and the community of nations and state need (Constitution Number 20 in 2003 article 1 paragraph 1). The definition of education above doesn't seem in accordance with education philosophy, because the definition above has more contemporary meaning, and gives answers of on-going problems when the Constitution is established.

Education can be given the meaning of "an effort to conserve and pass on the cultural values to the next generations" (Hadisusanto, 1779: 6). To establish a life, it is needed to conserve a society culture, from one generation to the next. Therefore a condition of culture continuity will be created in the society. The weakness of this comprehension is that in fact culture always changes with time (Robbins,1983).

Values in society will keep on changing. What will not change is the process of change in values in society. Society structures and values constantly change. Even so, the relationship management in society continues beyond the standard structure. The relationship management even forms new structures and values. Therefore, education always studies how the relationship between members of the society becomes mutually beneficial. Education can also be given the meaning as mutual cohesion of society, and balance of preservation of life in society (Sutrisno, 1983).

The problem lies on how the society corresponds with the principle of mutual benefits, and then the direction of the relationship is determined by materials. Blackmailing is created, by the rich towards to the poor, between the stronger towards the weaker one. That kind of thing is totally unwanted by any religious teachings. With the passage of time society is certain of how important a religion is as an instrument institution. They will try as hard as they can to defend what they consider as right. In such condition, society wants two things, the first one is spiritual value that reflects honesty and the second one is the value of courage. Therefore, the concept of education being an effort to teach human with virtuous noble character is put forward. Education is an effort to become someone empowered and cultured. Education is an effort to "develop a man with the qualities of a warrior and a religious person" (*dadiyo manungso kang utami, kanthi watak satriyo pinandhito*) (Mangunhadinagoro, 2003). Higher education, being the final pedestal of all educational levels, should put itself as a vehicle of graduate establishment that has noble characters, holds cultural values, improves lives, and forms *satria pinandita*.

b. Higher Education Management

Higher education is held democratically and equitably and also non-discriminatory by upholding human rights, religious value, cultural value, and plurality (Constitution Number 20 in 2003 article 4 (1)). Higher education is held to empower all components of society. In the colonial era, education was intended to create prospective employees for the colonists (Atmodiwirjio, 2000).

In the independence era, education is held to create skilled workforces needed for the development. Even when BUMN held an education program it was intended only to create workforces with needed qualifications. Providing education surely cannot be separated from the interests of the stakeholders (Dhesi, 2001; Gormon & Corbit, 2002; Hollins, 2002). The interests of the party who organizes and funds an educational institution cannot be separated from the purpose and objectives of the education program which is held.

The organization of higher education is related to the second dimension of education management, which is organization (Stoner, 1982). Higher education needs to be organized, because it involves many people such as the professors with a few students, and staff. In management approach, education is an interaction process (Mantja, 1997). In universities, interaction between professors and students happen. Higher education also means making one becomes more mature (maturing students), strengthen weak human beings (empowering), the poor will be able to leave poverty. Educated people should have been more empowered, so education has the meaning of empowerment effort (O'neil, 1981; Kadiman, 2004; Tilaar, 2000). A society inhabited by educated people will have more prosperous and affluent lives (Szalai & Andrews, 1980; Robinson & Vaizey, 1966). Education is held democratically (Gonzalez, 1982; Dewey, 1944). A professor as an empowered adult cannot impose his will to his students, because the teachers, students, and staff are a team in a learning process.

Higher education is a process done by involving a team which are the professors, staff, and students that work together to achieve mutual goals (Herr, 1999; Hernandez & Morales, 1999; Bess, 1998). They form a management, rules, and other deals, so they can work well. That's why it isn't excessive if an educational institution is called an organization (Mantja, 1997). One of higher education organizations is called university. In a university there will also be an organization so that the university wheel can work well.

The role of education management in university education is organizing how the cooperation process between the leaders, professors, and staff can work well so that the university goal can be realized (Mantja, 1979; Allen & Helms, 2002; Atmodiwiria, 2000). The education management thinkers in social science, apprehends that "management as a process of a cooperative group in mobilizing the action of other (professors and staff) to achieve mutual goals" (Atmodiwirio, 2000;6). This sense puts two subjects, the leaders and the subordinates. The behavioral experts set "participative goals for leaders and subordinates" (Atmodiwirio, 2000; 11). Education management organizes the cooperation between individuals and groups so they can work together and unite their steps and work cultures to achieve the mutual goals and make it easier though it is realized that one individual with other individual are very likely to have different cultural background. If it's left just like that then they will be disintegrated in various behaviors and cultures and then a school will be difficult to coordinate.

University leaders become the mediators between cultures of educationists (Bartky, 1956). Therefore, the possibility of behavior and culture differentiation that encourages conflict between many parties, the founders, leaders, and professors, and school staff will be more decreased. The structures and rules in higher education that are developed by the founder are used to direct all institution activities in such ways (Mantja, 1997; Deem, 2004; Leonard & Leonard, 1999), but in the developments, the values developed and the implementation are sometimes not the same.

c. Higher Education Organization

The function of management is an organization consisting of arrangements, procedures, working procedures, governance, and other things that manage the organization to work well (Atmodirio, 2000). Through the organization we can manage work divisions, work relationships, work structures, and authority delegation. An organization can be seen from the arrangement, process, and system aspects (Sutarto, 2002; Thoha, 2003). From the arrangement aspect, organization is a whole process of grouping people, tools, tasks, responsibilities, and authorities in such ways. A leader should be able to drive the organization well to achieve mutual goals.

From the process aspect, organization is a process of work integration that the individuals or groups should do to perform their tasks in such ways, giving the best line for efficient, systematic, positive, and coordinated usage from the available businesses. From the system aspect, organization is a cooperation activities system of two persons or more, something intangible and not personal, mostly about relationships. Organization is simply a form of human association to achieve mutual goals.

The parties that cooperate in universities are professors and staff. They get involved in organizations either from the arrangement aspect, process aspect, or system aspect. From the arrangement of professors and staff, the leader and subordinates will be chosen. Them as personnel of an organization involved in a system where they influence each other between the leader and subordinates, between the professors and staff in a cooperated group working together to achieve the university goals. Briefly it can be deduced that university organization is a system of mutual influence between leaders, professors, and staff in a group that work together to perform academic activities.

The university leaders, professors, and staff in organization have different tasks, functions, and responsibilities. Limitations of authorities, tasks, and functions are managed in organization structures. Organization with strong structure will make the organization optimally utilizes the human resources they have (Anonim, 2004a). An organizational chart that's arranged clearly, where the members have their own tasks, is a must. Every organization member should be responsible with their tasks in hand.

Sutarto (2002) also recorded a few organizational structure restrictions, (a) organizational structure is a relationship between certain functions, physical factors, and people; (b) organizational structure is a relationship between the employees and their activities and also the overall parts such as tasks, jobs, or functions of each employee; (c) organizational structure is a relationship and tasks chart of those used by the organization especially the managerial functions; (d) organizational structure is a formal set of planned relationships between grouping functions, and physical factors and people needed to perform these functions; (e) organizational structure is arrangements of relationships, responsibilities, and authorities to achieve company goals; (f) organizational structure is a relationship between functions and activities in an organization.

Essentially organizational structure is a relationship between a variety of functions, activities, and the people in organization either vertically or horizontally. The structure of university organization is a relationship between functions, activities of leaders, professors, and staff in organization either vertically or horizontally.

Organizational structure is very important in maintaining the continuity of education management system that's being built (Anonymous, 2004b). The function explains who is authorized and who should perform the system and which related parties that support the system (Anonymous, 2004b). To understand how individuals and groups behave according to the functions in university organizations, it is recommended to start from the classic theory (Hoy & Miskel, 2001; Atmodiwirio, 2000). Therefore, discussion will be continued and started from the bureaucracy theory.

d. Higher education organization in Javanese culture perspective

Culture is a masterpiece, initiative result, and creative power of society (Soemardjan & Soemardi, 1964). Culture as covert culture consists of value system, beliefs, traditions, and a few tradition tools, all four of them are permanent. Meanwhile culture as overt culture that consists of knowledge, procedures, lifestyle, recreation, and everything that gives comfort, are dynamic (Koentjaraningrat, 1990).

Javanese culture is a life radiant or *pengejawantahan* of a Javanese human being that includes wills, goals, ideas, and passions in achieving welfares, and inner and outer security (Achmadi, 2004). Javanese culture teaches the harmony of life between human beings and the natural surroundings. Javanese culture becomes syncretic after a mixture between Muslim and Hinduism happened. This is also often called syncretic Muslim. The comprehension context of syncretic Muslim is often associated with sorting the community by traditions or patterned behaviors in many groups, such as priyayi, wong cilik, santri, and abangan (Achmadi, 2004; Geertz, 1960). Following the mindset above then a culture is a patterned behavior of society that's conducted in a long period of time. Culture is equated with traditions or customs.

Teachers in Java are also often called the *baghawan*, *pendeta*, *resi*, *empu*, or *pujangga*, even though all those terms have many differences. Teachers have the tradition of writing books as their masterpieces. Those books are indicators of how big their knowledge is. One of the book relics of Hindu Mataram in Merbabu mountain slope in Central Java is the *Arjuna Wiwaha* book by Empu Kanwa that teaches responsibilities of a Hindu knight in resisting lust and evil to the name of the natural ruler (Wiryamartana, 1990). It is illustrated that a knight, a hermit, and a priest named Arjuna are able to resolve the problem. The knight and priesthood values (satriyo-pinandito) in that book are admired until now and they are also taught to the society through puppet plays. Second generation books in Mataram Surakarta areas are book relics of Demak, Pajang, and Mataram kingdoms (Purwadi, 2004; Graaf & Pigeaud, 1975). Such as the Nitistruti, the relic of Headmaster Prince of Karanggayam (1994), who lived in the era of Pajang Kingdom, a syncretic Muslim kingdom where the values of Islam and Java were combined. The next books are the relics of Tripomo and Wirawiyata by Adipati Mangkunagara IV (1995) that teach how to be devoted to the country and the king. The other books are Pepeling lan Pamrayogo (Wigata, 1994), teaches about what can and cannot be done by the Javanese society. Babad Pagedhongan (Wiryono, 1996) reveals how the king maintained politics and power over his people. Books give us some comprehension that the history developed in the wider community is not the same with the one understood by the royal families. One of the very popular books is Wedhatama (Mangkunagara, 2004) which consists the guide of life of Javanese society packed in Ageming Aji Priyayi Jawi.

It is visible that the persona values in the education of Surakarta society are important. Generally there are two types of education provisions, the first one is the one received by the kings such as the Trustees in the era of Demak kingdom, Prince Karanggayam in the era of Pajang palace. The second provision is the one rejected by the kingdom, usually grows out of the commoners, such as Karangkobar institution with Professor Syeh Siti Jenar, Pengging Institution with Handayaningrat (Purwadi, 2004; Mulkhan, 2003). The king of Demak killed Syeh Siti Jenar and his followers, Handayaningrat and his followers, because culturally the teaching materials of both Professors disrupted social harmonies.

To discuss the university organizations, cultural significance are identified with social institutions (Koetjaraningrat, 1990). Social institutions manage what can be done and what cannot be done by their society. With social institutions, society behaviors will be patterned, forming traditions and customs. This tradition manages the harmonious relationships between the personnel of university organizations vertically and horizontally. The developed values of education provision are feudalistic, religious, fatalistic, teposliro, nobility, introspective, gugon tuhon, and heroism (Achmadi, 2004). The education provision values include *digugu lan ditiru* (used as an example of kindness), *Sepi ing pamrih lan rame ing gawe* (working without expecting nothing in return), *ing ngarso sung tulodo – ing madyo mangun karso – tut wuri handayani* (teachers should be able to become an example, learning together, and constantly following the changes that occur), *ber budi bowo leksono* (broadminded and prioritizing virtues), **sopo sing kuat lakune wahyune teko lan sopo cidro wahyune sirno** (teachers who persevere so that his dreams come true, if he cannot be trusted he will be left by his students), *Sugih tanpo bondho* (a teacher should have adequate knowledge and social services), *landhep tanpo natoni* (a teacher should be intelligent and alert), *banter ora nglancangi* (don't feel the most clever), *cendhek orang kungkulan lan duwur ora ngungkuli* (can get along harmoniously with fellow beings), behaves like a knight (talks are consistent with behaviors), has a character like pinandita (everything that is done solely for kindness / sincere). A teacher is a main figure of education, whether an educational institution functions or not highly depends on the teacher's wisdom.

Values of social harmony that supports the cohesiveness between groups and social structures in an educational institution are *lamun ngalah luhur wekasane* (we may give in right now but we will gain victory in the future), *mbampang den andapi* (if others attack we will temporarily give in), *ono catur mungkur* (if we are led to gossip about other people, it is best to say no). In an educational institution it is possible for only one value to develop such as Javanese culture, this term is called mono culture. Meanwhile, because an educational institution involves a variety of ethnic groups, languages, and religions, more than one culture will be developed, or it's usually called multi culture. Eventually Javanese culture that relates to the formal structure and informal organization cohesion are the customs or traditions or continuously patterned behavior that relates to wills, goals, ideas, and passion to achieve mutual welfares between the leaders, professors, and employees to reach mutual goals, prosperity, inner and outer security.

BUREAUCRACY THEORY

The relationship between leaders, professors, and employees can be assessed by the Weber theory. Some of the bureaucracy theory characteristics presented by Weber are: division of work and specializations, work orientations, authority arrangements, rules and regulations, and career orientations (Hoy & Miskel, 2001; Rice & Bishoprick, 1971). Atmodiwirio (2000;4)

characterize classic organizations with individual power, legal force, control range, chain of command, development and specialization.

The division of work is intended as a work distribution to individuals and groups (Melcher, t.th.; Blau & Scot, 1962). The intention of work division is to improve the employees' professionality and management efficiency (Barit, 2003; Pascale & Athos, 1985; Straub, 2002). Employees professionality will produce more productive people. Productive workers will produce work system that encourages improvement process in work productivity (Broom, 2002; Sims & Brinkman, 2002; Jorisen, 2002). Clear work division will push the workers to conduct repetitive activities. Work repetition will make them understand more about what to do. The repetition will make the individual worker become more expert in his job.

Organization arrangement shows authority levels and responsibilities (Hoy & Miskel, 2001). There must be authority boundaries between one worker and the others, between a leader and the other leaders, vertically and horizontally. In order to avoid collisions between one worker and the others, between one leader and the other leaders, vertically and horizontally, in different organization level, an arrangement of practice and organizational structure that should be followed by all parties, is created (Barit, 2003). This would encourage the workers to excel in their work so that all employees have the same chance to develop their careers to the top (Etzioni, 1964; Castetter, 1971). If the management system goes well, it's believed that improvement process of organization efficiency will go well too (Kotter, 1990; Milem, Berger & Dey, 2000; Robbins & Coulter, 1999).

The bureaucracy theory developed by Max Weber sees organization as a system. The real problem in work practice, especially on university organization is the difficulty to avoid synergies between sub-systems that do not go well. Therefore, it is very difficult to guarantee that university organization is able to go well (Sutarto, 1993). It is well aware that university organizations work in very complex conditions, and that it is possible for the sub-systems to not function properly (Scmid, 2002; Sufyarman, 2003; Suryadi & Tilaar, 1993). There are sub-systems or small personal campus groups that do not work as expected by system. Therefore, it is concluded that bureaucracy theory is very difficult to be implemented in campus.

The basic mistake from Weber's Bureaucracy theory is neglection of informal organization in organization (Hoy & Miskel, 2001). Every formal organization will spontaneously produce informal organization (Blau & Scot, 1962). This condition causes the existence of informal organization that is hard to avoid.

FORMAL ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE

The structure of formal organization in university organization is a legal structure. It's called legal because it has the characteristics such as: authority, formal structure, rules, roles, control authority, standard work procedures, work division, communication network, and chain of commands (Hanson, 1996). The simple characteristics of formal organizations are written statement of purpose, policies and procedures, and work division (Ubben & Hughes, 1992.) All characteristics above are managed in college environment in a decree determined by university leader or authorities. The authorities could be university rectors or higher officials.

School is Formal organization with many of the same characteristics as bureaucracy (Hoy & Miskel, 2001:99). "The school organization as we know it today ... can accurately be described as a highly developed bureaucracy" (Abbot, 1965:45 in Hoy and Miskel, 2001:99). Therefore, school organization is characterized as a bureaucratic organization, as a matter of fact it is as bureaucratic as a military organization. University organization often receives criticisms from many parties. Moreover it is often referred to have some similarities with factory organizations.

The key assumption of bureaucracy system implementation is where the subordinates have less knowledge and skills than their superiors. The superiors are seen to be more intelligent than the subordinates so formally they have the authority to control the subordinates. This is hard to be applied in universities. Universities tend to call themselves as professional organization. In fact, the professors have adequate abilities, and in some outlooks they are called the competent parties. The support staff should also have good knowledge and skills. A Weberian school structure is one in which professionalization and bureaucratization are complementary; both are high (Hoy & Miskel, 2001:101).

University organizations that consist of leaders, professors, and staff are teams (Gorton, 1976). Teams consisting of professionals are being helped by skilled staff. The staff should be able to give help so the professors can perform his tasks well. The bureaucracy experts always consider that all elements in organizations become behavioral and cultural unity. Therefore, it isn't feared that there's a party who would dissociate oneself from the organization working procedure. But in reality, the unity cannot always be well-controlled. A clique is not something that's impossible even in well-established organizations.

In turn, cliques, special groups, task forces outside of official duties are hard to avoid. The existence of informal groups for a manager is a very dilemmatic problem and to be avoided whenever possible because it may interfere (Pfeffer, in Staw, 1991). These groups are called the informal organizations. Informal organization in campus is not always small, but it may very big and complex even exceeding the formal organization, such as developing into a demonstration that opposes formal organization. Uncontrollable condition will cause officials replacement effort in formal organization, formal rules changes, or working procedure changes. If the formal structure cannot work accomodatively then the desire of the informal organization will be achieved, such as creating new formal organization structures, performing reshuffles, and so on. Big organization dynamics can disrupt the effort of organization achievement, that's why the classic organization experts need to find the way out.

One of the management experts is Mintzberg. In the condition stated above Mintzberg holds the view of "… more comprehensive conceptual framework for examining organization structure" (Mintzberg, 1983a; Hoy & Miskel, 2001:104). There are five basic coordination mechanisms that are tools to control work: (1) mutually beneficial rules, (2) direct supervision, (3) work process standardization, (4) work result standardization, and (5) work ability standardization.

Mintzberg's model is known as a very simple organization model, but it becomes very complex when applied to university organizations. Universities in general have mature experiences in managing their institutions. Universities should centralize upper level management, formalize technic structure, and professionalize the lecturers. The professional lecturers require their work

in coordination, led by capable and dynamic administrators, as in simple professional organizations.

The circuit of theory that discusses formal organization structure characteristics involves: (1) formal organization is a written statement of purpose, policies and procedures, and work division (Ubben & Hughes, 1992); (2) authority, formal organization structure, rules, roles, control authority, standard operating procedure organization, work division, communication network, and chain of command (Hanson, 1996), and (3) mutually beneficial rules, direct supervision, work process standardization, work result standardization, and work ability standardization (Mintzberg, 1983A).

The formal organization structure of university organizations are arrangements that show levels of authority and responsibilities, with the characteristics of: authorities and work divisions, mutually beneficial rules, roles of each sub-structure, control authority, standard operating procedures, standard work, standard workability, communication network, and chain of command and also are being approved by the competent authorities.

INFORMAL ORGANIZATION

Informal organizations exist because of the informal interactions and clique in group structures (Yrle, 2001). The existence of informal groups cannot be taken lightly when the management wants to increase organization productivity. A group is a very influential force to the overall individual motivational environment (Ndler & Lawler, in Staw, 1991). The existence of informal organizations will have a strong impact on organization behavior (Davis & Newstrom, t.th.; Rau & Hyland, 2002; West, 1999).

In a study program, when the program has just started, new officials, new lecturers and employees so informal organizations had not existed yet. But when the semester division meeting started, continued with technical meeting for preparation of lesson plans, distribution of learning materials between courses, and the lecturers and staff started to interact with each other, the birth of informal organization had just begun. Meeting rooms, canteen, and the park become the right places for the appearance of informal organizations, as a matter of fact those organizations can grow rapidly. Similarly with the mature study program, an election for the head of study program or head of higher levels in university will be conducted, and then the birth process of informal organization will grow rapidly. Informal organizations exist not only when the organizations are in the stage of leadership changes. In conducive condition, when the leader works hard nonstop, with a lot of activities, briefly, unsustainably, then the presence of informal organizations is unstoppable (Mintzberg, in Staw, 1991). It is not an open secret that the existence of informal organization may be constructive and at other times may be destructive (Hoy & Miskel, 2001).

Informal organizations have many characteristics such as: coalitions, psychological needs, authorities, informal leaderships, moral conflicts, informal norms, sentiments, social codes, loyalties, friendship bonds, personal goals, feelings and emotions, risky behaviors (Hanson, 1996). The simple characteristics of informal organization are individual needs, passions and feelings, roles and missions differences, power and influence patterns, competition and alliance, conversation relevance and work importance, sense of truth and trust, individual values, and skills and abilities (Ubben & Hughes, 1992). Informal organizations have the exact

characteristics as stated above, the involved members and personnel seem to manifest themselves openly. Some characteristics above may not appear clearly on the surface, so to understand about it a serious comprehension is needed. Their activities are not scheduled, they always move from one subject matter to the other, continuously responding to their needs (Mintzberg, in Staw, 1991). Javanese culture that is fine and gentle, allows the opposition and personnel of informal organization to not be easily understood.

Informal organization exists more because of status, positions, and roles difference between lecturers and staff (Reksohadiprojo & Handoko, 1992). The difference will bring consequence difference of interests, social, and economy. Even horizontally social, economy, and culture difference between the lecturers and staff will have an impact on the appearance of small groups. In every formed group there will be structure. This structure will determine who the leader is and who the member is. According to Reksohadiprojo & Handoko (1992) the structure of informal organization involves the leader, members, outskirts of the group, and outside of the group.

Theory circuit discussing about the informal organizations characteristics involve: (a) individual needs, passion and feelings, roles and missions difference, power and behavior patterns, competition and alliance, conversation relevance and work importance, sense of truth and trust, individual values, and skills and abilities (Ubben & Hughes, 1992), (b) coalitions, psychological needs, authorities, informal leaderships, conflicts, moral, informal norms, sentiments, social codes, loyalties, friendship bonds, personal goals, feelings and emotions, risky behaviors Hanson (1996), and (c) informal organization structure involves leaders, members, outskirts of the group, and outside of the group (Reksohadiprojo & Handoko, 1992).

University informal organization is two persons or more, leader, lectures, and / or employees that compete and form an alliance, roles and influences difference, values and abilities difference, independently and spontaneously, either consciously or unconsciously, clear or unclear, in performing academic activities.

FORMAL AND INFORMAL ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE COHESIONS
Groups, either they are formal or informal, are strong and potential sources for individuals to achieve their desired work levels (Nadlier and Lawer, in Staw, 1991). It should be admitted that there are similarities and differences of interests and goals between lecturers and lecturers, employees and employees, lecturers and employees, and personal and university organization. Interests and goals similarities and differences will establish a network, behavior, and culture that may unite or apart. Network, behavior, and culture that unite or apart will appear on how the leaders, lecturers, and employees coordinate either vertically or horizontally.

To view the relationships between leaders, lecturers, and employees we can borrow a phrase in physics about cohesion contasted with adhesion. Cohesion is adhesiveness (Engels, in Cahyono, 2005; Aryani, 2005). In a social system it is confirmed that there are elements that relate to each other. Cohesion is elements attachment (Harap, 2005).

One's behavior can be seen from his actions, words, and writings. Sentences presented either orally or in writing can be used as social cohesion indicator. Cohesion is a system that connects a meaning of one sentence to the other sentence (Mahriyuni, 2005). Sentence of dialogue results

between one person to the other will reflect whether those two persons or more are in one idea or culture unity or not. Unity or disintegration may be because of enjoyment of achievement and goals proportionality.

Malinowski theory, about social cohesion explains that "unity will happen if the areas of life are strongly based on the mutual benefit (reciprocity) under legal principles" (Tumanggor, Aripin, and Soeyoeti, 2005:3-4). Seeing the social status subject conducting communications then the social cohesion can be divided into two. First cohesion is vertical social and the second is horizontal social.

Vertical social cohesion is in the form of the struggle of common people against the authority, sometimes it becomes a momentarily issue as a stepping stone to the power stage, and then after the goal is achieved it is forgotten altogether. The theory originator of the loser democracy policy should be proud of himself because the theory was being practiced in Indonesia when Soeharto resigned and also resignation of school officials. Horizontal social cohesion is conflict management between elements in society. Cited that, "social cohesion between elements of the nation gets increasingly distant" (Wahono, 2002: 2). In university contexts, cohesion is a situation "how the lecturers and all staff understand about the ideas, notions, thoughts, and purposes of the leaders and cooperation with him" (Busher & Haris, 1999:311).

Formal and informal university organization cohesive structures happen if the leaders, lecturers, and employees unite in one cultural unity to perform academic activities and therefore, they mutually get the benefits. "Cohesiveness is ... describes the attractiveness of an organization to its members" (Bartky, 1956;66). Leaders, lecturers, and staff feel like they have very strong bond with university organizations. However Bartky also stated that "the cohesiveness is not constant but varies with the situations..... A cohesive organization is not always an effective one" (Bartky, 1956;67). Furthermore two structures are cohesive when (a) more prestige a person within a group, (b) a cooperative relationship, (c) frequency of interaction between two or more persons increase, (d) an attack on the group increases its cohesiveness, (e) members disagree on the solution of group problems, (e) members are embarrassed to belong, (f) too dominating, (g) regard of outside groups (Barkty,1956; 67).

Cohesion is adhesiveness, integrity, and reciprocal relationship between leaders, lecturers, and university staff in order to conduct learning.

CONCLUSION
Formal university organization structure is an arrangement that shows authority levels and responsibilities, with the characteristics of: authorities and work divisions, mutually beneficial rules, roles, control authorities, standard operating procedures, standard work results, standard work abilities, communication network, and chain of command and is also being approved by competent officials.

University informal organization is two persons or more of leaders, lecturers, and/or employees that compete and make an alliance, role and ability difference, independently, flexibly, and spontaneously, either consciously or unconsciously, clearly seen or not, in conducting academic activities.

Cohesion is adhesiveness, integrity, and reciprocal relationship between leaders, lecturers, and university staff in order to conduct learning.

Behavior cohesiveness of formal and informal university organization structures apparently is able to improve performance of institution, especially improving learning achievement. Informal organizations that have no place in educational institutions apparently can improve unsuccessful behaviors, educational components will avoid the efforts of achieving mutual goals.

Javanese culture that relates to the formal and informal structure cohesion is the customs or traditions or patterned behaviors continuously relate to wills, goals, ideas, and passion to achieve mutual well-beings between leaders, lecturers, and employees to achieve mutual goals, prosperities, inner and outer securities.

Cohesive structures of formal and informal organizations will play a role in decision-making support through issue submission, alternative submission, alternative elaboration, and agreement making. Informal organization takes role as a security when the formal organization structure faces some tensions. The overall meaning is that there's structure adhesiveness in formal and informal university organizations.

REFFERENCE
Bolt, James P. (2000). *Mengembangkan Pemimpin Tiga Dimensional dala Frances Hesselbein*, et al. (terj. Bob Widyahartono). The Leader of The Future. Jakarta: Elex Media Komputindo.

Burns, JM. (1978). *Leadership*. NY: Harper and Row, Inc.

Castetter, WB. 1966. *The Human Resource Function in Educational Administration*. NJ: Englewood Cliffts.

Covey, Stephen R. (2000). "Tiga Peranan Pemimpin dalam Paradigma Baru". Dalam Hesselbein et. al. Pemimpin Masa Depan. Jakarta: The Drucker Foundation-Elex Komputindo.

Cholik Muthohir T. (1993). *Metodik Pengajaran dan Pendidikan Jasmani*. Jakarta: Depdikbud.

Davis, Stanley M. (1993). *Managing Corporate Culture*. Cambridge-Mass: Ballinger.

Denison, D. (1994). *Corporate Culture and Organizational Effectiveness*. NY: Wiley.

Depdiknas, (2003). *Konstruk dan Indikator Kualitas Sekolah*. Jakarta: BAS Nasional Depdiknas

Dwiyogo, Wasis Joko. (1994). Konsepsi Bermain dan Berolahraga dalam Pendidikan Jasmani. Jurnal Pendidikan Jasmani Tahun 4 (1), April 1994.

Engkoswara. (1987). *Dasar-dasar Administrasi Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Ditjen Dikti Depdikbud.

Evans, William, M. (1988). *Organization Theory: Research and Design*. NY: McMillan.

Fattah, Nanang. (2000). *Ekonomi dan Pembiayaan Pendidikan*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.

Fatah, Nanang. (1996). *Landasan Manajemen Pendidikan*. Bandung: Rosdakarya.

Gaffar, Mohammad Fakry. (1994). Visi: Suatu Inovasi dalam Proses manajemen Strategik Perguruan Tinggi, Pidato Pengukuhan Jabatan Guru Besar. Bandung: IKIP Bandung.

Gafur, Abdul. (2006). *Landasan Teknologi Pendidikan*. Yogyakarta: PPs UNY.

Halaki, Oemar, (2010) Manajemen Belajar di Perguruan Tinggi, Sinar Baru Algesindo.

Handoko, T.Hani. (1999). *Manajemen*, Edisi 2, Yogyakarta: BPFE.

Hersey, Paul dan Blanchard, Ken. (1997). *Management of Organizational Behavior*. NJ: Prentice Hall Inc.

Hill, Roger B. & Petty, Gregory C. (1995). A New Look at Select Employability Skills: A Factor Analysis of The Occupational Work Ethic. *Journal of Vocational Educational research*, 20 (4), 59-73.

Hikmat. (2009). *Manajemen Pendidikan*. Bandung: Pustaka Setia.

Hofstede, G. (1990). *Culture's Consequences*. London: Sage Publications.

Jones, GR, (1995). *Organizational Theory: text and Cases*. Mass: Addison Wesley Publishing CO.

Keith, Sherry dan Girling, Robert H. (1991). *Education, Management and Participation: New Direction in Educational Administration*. Mass: Adison Wesley Publishing Co.

Kusuma, Imma Helianti. (2006). Manajemen Pendidikan di Era Globalisasi. *Jurnal Pendidikan Penabur,* no. 06/Th.V/June 2006, 77

Maksum, Ali. (2010). *Kualitas Guru Pendidikan Jasmani di Sekolah. Antara Harapan dengan Kenyataan*. Surabaya: FPOK Universitas Surabaya

Meyer, marshall. (1982). *Environments and Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey – Bass.

Morrisey, George L. (1997). *Pedoman Pemikiran Strategik: Pembangunan Landasan Perencanaan Anda*. Jakarta: Prenhallindo

Muhadjir, Noeng. (1987). *Teori Perubahan Sosial*. Yogyakarta: Rake Rasain.

Muttaqin, Miftahul. (2010). Survei Sarana Dan Prasarana Olahraga SMA Negeri Di Kabupaten Batang Tahun (2009/2010). Http: lib. Unnes.ac.id.

Nystrom, PC. Dan Tstarbuck, WH. (1981). *Handbook of Organizational Design*. NY: Oxford University Press.

Oemar, Hamalik. (2001). *Proses Belajar Mengajar*. Jakarta : Pt. Bumi Aksara.

Pettigrew, Andrew (1979) *On Studying Organizational Cultures.* Administrative Science Quarterly, 24 (4). pp. 570-581.

Rahman, Arif. (1997). Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi terhadap Kinerja Dosen DPTK IKIP Bandung. Tesis PPs-IKIP Bandung.

Sackman, Sonja A. (1991). *Cultural Knowledge in Organization Exploring the Collective Mind*. Newbury Park, Ca: Sage Publications.

Sallis, Edward. (1993). *Total Quality Management in Education*. London: Kogan Page Ltd.

Salusu. (1996). *Pengambilan Keputusan Stratejik untuk Organisasi Publik dan Organisasi Nonprofit*. Jakarta: Gramedia.

Sanusi, Ahmad. (1991). *Studi Pengembangan Model Pendidikan Profesional Tenaga Kependudukan*. Bandung: IKIP Bandung.