COLLABORATIVE MODEL OF CHARACTER EDUCATION MANAGEMENT: A STUDY OF SEMI-MILITARY TRAINING IMPLEMENTATION IN HIGH SCHOOL

**Ahmad Dimyati Ridwan[1], Annanda Muhamad Rizky[2],
Pahrian[3], Naila Tresna Utami[4], Shindy Aqryani[5], Tiara Ayu[6]**
Indonesian University of Education, Indonesia[1]
Sunan Gunung Djati State Islamic University, Bandung, Indonesia[2,3,4,5,6]
Email: ahmaddimyati16@upi.edu[1], Danirizki.uinsgd12@gmail.com[2],
pahrian0704@gmail.com[3], nailatresnautami24@gmail.com[4],
shindy.aqryani@gmail.com[5], tiaraayuu204@gmail.com [6]

Abstrak

The increasingly complex nature of juvenile delinquency demands that educational institutions no longer operate as single actors in character development. This article aims to analyze the collaborative management model between schools and military institutions (TNI/Polri) in providing student discipline education. Unlike previous studies that highlighted the psychological aspects of students, this research focuses on the managerial aspects: program planning, curriculum organization, and evaluation of cross-sectoral partnerships. Using descriptive qualitative methods, this study examines data from educational management literature and case studies of implementation in various schools in West Java. The results formulate an effective "School-Military Partnership" (SMP) model, which consists of three crucial stages: (1) Integrated planning to align a humanistic school culture with an instructive military culture; (2) Hybrid implementation that places military trainers as physical instructors and teachers as psychological companions; and (3) Post-training evaluation for program sustainability. It is concluded that this collaboration is not a form of school militarization, but rather a crisis management strategy that requires a clear legal umbrella (MoU) and strict supervision to remain within the pedagogical corridor.

INTRODUCTION

Modern educational institutions face unprecedented multidimensional challenges. Schools, which traditionally served as venues for the transfer of knowledge,

are now forced to assume a dominant role in social rehabilitation (the transfer of values). The phenomenon of student moral degradation, ranging from motorcycle gangs and organized brawls to drug abuse, has exceeded the managerial capacity of school guidance and counseling (BK) teachers. Teachers often lack the authority, physical skills, or punitive tools to handle students with high-risk behavior (Giroux, 2011).

Facing the complex challenges of 21st-century education, schools can no longer maintain siloed management. Revitalizing character education demands a balance between preserving disciplinary values (tradition) and an adaptive (modern) management approach. As expressed by Patriasya, Ridwan, et al. (2025), efforts to maintain tradition while responding to modernization are key to the dynamics of contemporary learning (Patriasya et al., 2025). In this context, the involvement of military institutions is not intended to return schools to an authoritarian past, but rather to adopt the efficiency and decisiveness of military management to address the character crisis that conventional approaches have failed to address.

These limited internal school capacity have fueled the need for cross-sectoral collaboration. School-Based Management (SBM) provides schools with the autonomy to establish partnerships with external parties, including the Indonesian National Armed Forces (TNI) or the National Police (Polri). These partnerships have given rise to a semi-military training-based character education model, often referred to as boot camps. However, the implementation of this collaboration is often ad hoc, reactive, and without thorough managerial planning.

Many schools simply "hand over" problematic students to the Kodim or Rindam without clear curriculum integration. As a result, an organizational culture clash occurs: the democratic-persuasive school culture collides with the command-and-instructional military culture. Without proper management, this collaboration risks becoming a mere "transfer of responsibility," rather than an educational synergy. Therefore, an in-depth study is needed on how to manage this partnership effectively and remain educational (Novriyansah, 2025).

While previous research focused primarily on the psychological impact on students (behavioristic), this article shifts to an Educational Management perspective. Its primary focus is: How do schools plan, organize, and evaluate collaborative programs with the military? What is the ideal management model for ensuring that military interventions align with the school's vision and mission?

LITERATURE REVIEW
1. Collaborative Governance Theory

To analyze school-military partnerships, this study uses the Collaborative Governance theoretical framework of Ansell and Gash (2008). This theory defines collaboration as a governance arrangement in which one or more public institutions (schools) involve non-state actors or other state institutions (the Indonesian National Armed Forces/Indonesian National Police) in a collective decision-making process. According to this theory, three keys to successful collaboration are: (a) Face-to-face dialogue to build shared understanding; (b) Trust-building; and (c) Commitment to the process. In the school context, this means that collaboration should not be limited to a written assignment but must be based on participatory planning.

2. School-Based Management and Partnerships

School-Based Management (SBM) gives schools the autonomy to explore resources outside the school to improve the quality of education (Mulyasa, 2022). One of the pillars of SBM is community participation and partnerships. Partnerships with the military can be seen as a resource-sharing strategy, where schools utilize military facilities and human resources to fill gaps in school competency in developing physical and mental discipline.

3. Hidden Curriculum

In educational management, the curriculum is not only what is written (the explicit curriculum), but also what students experience through rules, routines, and social interactions, known as the hidden curriculum. Military barracks training is rife with hidden curriculum, such as punctuality, neat uniforms, and respect for hierarchy. School management must be able to manage this hidden curriculum so that military values (such as obedience) do not overshadow academic values (such as critical thinking) (Syafitri, 2023).

4. Change Management

The implementation of a semi-military program in schools is essentially a form of organizational cultural change management. Fullan emphasizes that successful educational change requires leadership capable of managing resistance (Fullan, 2016). The introduction of military instructors into schools often causes culture shock for students and teachers. Therefore, a well-planned change management strategy is required, starting with socialization (unfreezing), implementation (moving), and standardizing the new culture (refreezing) to ensure smooth integration of civil-military cultures without destructive conflict.

RESEARCH METHODS

This research employed a qualitative approach with a Policy and Library Research design. This approach was chosen to explore the management and policy models underlying school-military collaboration practices.

Data Sources: Primary data were obtained from public policy documents, such as Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) between the Education Office and the Indonesian National Armed Forces (TNI/Polri) in various regions, technical guidelines for character education, and reports on the implementation of student discipline training activities (LDKS). Secondary data came from educational management literature, educational administration journals, and relevant news articles (Creswell, 2014).

Data Analysis Techniques: Data were analyzed using content analysis and SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) analysis. The SWOT analysis was used to analyze the existing collaboration model, identify its managerial weaknesses, and then reconstruct it into a more ideal and integrated management model.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Needs Analysis: Why is Collaborative Management Necessary?

From a human resource management perspective, schools have a competency gap in handling high-level physical discipline. Teachers are trained for pedagogical and professional academic competencies, not for physical crisis management or handling

motorcycle gang aggression. On the other hand, military institutions have core competencies in fostering discipline, esprit de corps, and mental resilience (Shobri & Abdillah, 2025).

This synergy, if managed with sound management principles, will create efficiency. Schools don't need to build military-style physical facilities; they can simply partner with institutions that already have them. However, the biggest challenge is organizational culture clash. The military is based on top-down instruction (command), while schools are based on bottom-up discussion (democracy). Without bridge management, this clash can be counterproductive for students.

B. "School-Military Partnership" (SMP) Management Model

Based on data analysis, an ideal collaborative management model was formulated that encompasses three main management functions (Terry, 1972):

1. Planning Stage: Integration of Vision and Legality

A common problem is that schools "let go" once students are handed over to trainers. Proper management requires Joint Planning.

a). Curriculum Alignment: Before training begins, the Vice Principal for Student Affairs and the Operations Section Officer (Pasiops) from the military unit must agree on the curriculum. Military physical training materials must be tailored to adolescent psychology. Combat material should be excluded; the focus should be on team building, the PBB (Marching Rules), and national insight.

b). Legality of the MoU: The collaboration must be governed by a clear MoU. Vital clauses that must be included are limits on physical punishment (to prevent violence) and health protocols. This is a form of risk management for the school.

Besides the curriculum, a crucial aspect that is often overlooked in planning is Risk Management. Schools and the military are required to prepare a Job Safety Analysis document for every physical activity. This includes medical evacuation procedures, student heart rate limits, and checks for pre-existing medical conditions. This risk management must be explicitly outlined in Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs). The absence of a written risk management often creates a fatal legal loophole in the event of an accident during training, ultimately damaging the school's reputation (Sallis, 2014).

2. Organizing & Actuating Stage: Dual Leadership

In field implementation, an effective management model is Dual Leadership.

a). Physical Instructor (TNI/Polri): Takes control of field training sessions to build authority, assertiveness, and provide shock therapy for problem students.

b). Assisting Instructor (Teacher): The guidance counselor or homeroom teacher must be present at the training location and be part of the organizational structure of the committee. The teacher's role is not to intervene in technical training, but rather to act as a safety officer who monitors the students' psychological well-being and provides a channel for discussion during breaks. The teacher's presence ensures the process remains humane.

In a dual leadership structure, the potential for role conflict between military instructors and teachers is very high. Military instructors tend to be results-oriented (compliance), while teachers are process-oriented (understanding). To bridge this gap, effective conflict management is necessary. Research has found that establishing a "Daily Communication Forum" between trainers and mentor teachers is very effective. In this forum, teachers can provide pedagogical feedback if the trainer's methods are

deemed too harsh, and conversely, trainers can provide disciplinary feedback if the teacher is deemed too permissive. This synergy creates a balanced organizational culture as described in organizational behavior theory (Judge & Robbins, 2017).

3. Monitoring & Evaluation Stage: Program Sustainability

Many programs fail because they stop completely after 3-5 days of training (one-shot programs). Good management requires Continuous Improvement.

a). Post-Training Evaluation: Schools must evaluate the impact on student behavior 1 month, 3 months, and 6 months after training.

b). Integration of Routines: Schools should incorporate positive elements of military culture into their daily post-training routines, such as more orderly morning assembly or a strict attendance system. This is known as culture maintenance management.

Program evaluation should not be based solely on subjective perceptions ('students look tidier'), but rather on data-driven evaluation. Schools need to develop Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for this partnership program, such as: a decrease in student tardiness, a decrease in the number of violations of discipline, and an increase in participation in school activities. Wibowo (2013) emphasized that character education must be measurable (Wibowo, 2017). If these KPIs are not achieved within 3 months of training, the school needs to re-engineer the training methods or even evaluate the continuation of the partnership with the relevant military unit.

C. Implementation Opportunities and Challenges

1. Opportunities: Increased public trust because the school is perceived as serious about addressing delinquency. Budget efficiency due to sharing facilities with the Indonesian National Armed Forces (TNI).

2. Challenges: Resistance from parents who worry about their children being treated harshly. Therefore, school public relations management must proactively disseminate training SOPs to parents before the program begins.

D. Risk Mitigation Strategies and Cultural Barriers

While the School-Military Partnership (SMP) model offers efficiency, its implementation often encounters cultural resistance. Based on Collaborative Governance theory, the success of collaboration is highly dependent on conflict resolution. The following mitigation strategies schools need to implement to overcome these barriers:

1. Mitigating Parental Resistance (Parental Trust Issues)

Parental concerns about the potential for "militarization" or physical violence are the biggest challenge. To address this, school management must implement the principle of radical transparency. Before training begins, schools are required to hold an Open House or socialization event featuring military instructors directly in front of parents. In this forum, military instructors must explain the agreed-upon (non-combat) training syllabus, thereby reducing the stigma of "fierce trainers" through face-to-face dialogue.

2. Student Trauma Mitigation (Psychological Safety)

Not all students have the same mental readiness. Schools must implement a strict physical and mental health screening system before students are sent to the barracks. Students with a history of acute asthma or anxiety disorders should receive special treatment or alternative programs. The role of the guidance counselor as a safety officer is crucial here to ensure that military rigor does not turn into traumatic stress that is counterproductive to adolescent mental development.

3. Managing Post-Training "Culture Shock"

Role confusion often occurs when students return to school; they are accustomed to strict commands but are again faced with a permissive school environment. To bridge this gap, schools need to establish a "Student Task Force" or school police whose members are training alumni. They are empowered to help enforce peer discipline, so that military values remain alive but are implemented through a persuasive approach among students.

E. Managerial Implications for Education Practitioners

This research provides the following practical implications for school principals and education policymakers:

1. The Importance of Standardizing MoUs: The Department of Education needs to issue standard guidelines for Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) for school-military collaboration. Currently, many MoUs are too general and do not address technical details such as the limits of corporal punishment (e.g., no direct physical contact, only measured push-ups). This lack of detail creates a dangerous risk management gap.

2. Shifting Teacher Roles: In this collaborative model, teachers are no longer the sole source of authority. Teachers must adapt to become "Moral Facilitators" who translate the military's rigid instructions into life values for students. This synergy requires teachers to embrace harsh disciplinary methods and utilize them as a platform for character development.

3. Performance-Based Budget Allocation: Schools must design activity budgets that not only cover training operational costs but also allocate funds for monitoring and evaluating post-activity impacts. Without an evaluation budget, these programs will become merely annual rituals without any quality improvement.

CONCLUSION

The collaborative model between schools and military institutions represents a strategic educational management innovation in response to the contemporary adolescent character crisis. However, its success is determined not by the intensity of the physical training, but rather by the thoroughness of its planning and management. This study concludes that this collaboration should be placed within the framework of an "Educational Partnership," rather than the militarization of educational institutions.

A clear division of managerial roles is needed: the military focuses on building the mental infrastructure (discipline and resilience) through instructive methods, while schools build the moral superstructure (values and ethics) through mentoring. With integrated management, from curriculum planning and dual leadership organization to ongoing evaluation, this partnership can provide a systemic solution to juvenile delinquency without compromising the school's academic climate.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research desing: qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (Vol. 54). United State of America: Sage Publications.

Fullan, M. (2016). *The new meaning of educational change*. Teachers college press.

Giroux, H. A. (2011). *Education and the Crisis of Public Values: Challenging the Assault on Teachers, Students, and Public Education. Counterpoints: Studies in the Postmodern Theory of Education. Volume 400.* ERIC.

Judge, T. A., & Robbins, S. P. (2017). *Essentials of organizational behavior* (Vol. 3).

Pearson Education (us).

Mulyasa, H. E. (2022). *Manajemen pendidikan karakter*. Bumi Aksara.

Novriyansah, M. A. D. (2025). MANAJEMEN KURIKULUM PENDIDIKAN BERBASIS MILITER: ANALISIS DAN TANTANGANNYA. *Pendas: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Dasar*, *10*(02), 400–413.

Patriasya, P. G., Ridwan, A. D., Susetyo, M. B., & Wicaksono, A. T. (2025). MERAWAT TRADISI MERESPON MODERNISASI: REVITALISASI PENDIDIKAN AGAMA ISLAM DALAM DINAMIKA PEMBELAJARAN KONTEMPORER. *Journal of Educational and Religious Perspectives*, *1*(3), 85–97.

Sallis, E. (2014). *Total quality management in education*. Routledge.

Shobri, K., & Abdillah, N. (2025). Penguatan Wawasan Kebangsaan Sebagai Strategi Pendidikan Moderasi Beragama di Era Revolusi Industri 4.0. *Akhlak: Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Islam Dan Filsafat*, *2*(3), 9–20.

Syafitri, R. (2023). Model manajemen pendidikan dalam meningkatkan kualitas dan daya saing lulusan yang berkarakter religius di era disrupsi (Studi kasus pada MAN 1 Kabupaten Rokan Hilir). *Journal of Education Research*, *4*(4), 1744–1752.

Terry, G. R. (1972). Principles of management. *(No Title)*.

Wibowo, A. (2017). *Manajemen pendidikan karakter di sekolah*.