



## Level of Satisfaction with the School-Based Management Process: Basis for Improved Management System

Mark Anthony C. Pasubillo<sup>1</sup>, John Mark R. Asio<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Regional Science High School, Philippines

<sup>2</sup>Gordon College, Philippines

Received : May 28, 2023	Revised : June 30, 2023	Accepted : July 3, 2023	Online : September 30, 2023
-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------

### Abstract

In instructional management styles and strategies, parents observe teachers and administration employed in an academic community. They must align the values parents expect from their children. As study participants, parents understand that the school administration must demonstrate academic excellence. This study aims to determine the level of satisfaction with the school-based management of stakeholders in a regional science high school in Olongapo City, Philippines. The stakeholders' level of satisfaction is measured through the four (4) major areas of school-based management: leadership and governance, curriculum and instruction, accountability and continuous improvement, and management and resources. The study employed a descriptive survey research method with the help of a survey questionnaire as the primary data-gathering tool. One hundred ninety (190) stakeholders voluntarily participated and responded to the call with the help of the purposive sampling technique. The researchers developed an instrument that underwent validity and reliability evaluation. The study also used descriptive and inferential statistics to assess the gathered data. The study revealed that the stakeholders were "very satisfied" regarding curriculum and instruction, accountability and continuous improvement, and management and resources. However, only leadership and governance yielded "satisfied" stakeholder remarks. Furthermore, there were no substantial differences in the school-based management satisfaction of the stakeholders when grouped according to their profiles. Based on the results, the researchers recommended some vital suggestions at the end of the study.

**Keywords** *School-Based Management, Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Instruction, Accountability and Continuous Improvement, Management and Resources*

### INTRODUCTION

School-based management (SBM) aims to enhance the quality of education through properly designated decision-making authority from district offices to individual schools. It supplies principals, teachers, students, and stakeholders with maximum control over the education process by distributing responsibility for decisions on budget, staff (teaching and non-teaching), and the curriculum (Elmegely, 2015). Cornito (2021) disclosed the need to mix centralized and decentralized techniques to improve education regarding school head decision-making and school running expenses and spending decision-making. In terms of independent schools' context regarding school-based management, Alrasheedi and Almutawa (2021) showed that schools gained the most support from top politicians, which led to swift implementation. This finding may have several advantages and disadvantages for the school.

Governments around the world are battling for better education by presenting various strategies. However, its quantity must also be considered to achieve a better or higher quality effect. This notion means that several teachers must be assigned to institutions with more than 50 students per room. Unfortunately, this type of idealism necessitates a financial investment, making it the source of all problems. Nevertheless, in a study by Laranang (2022), the author implored that a school's excellent management contributes significantly to quality instruction, leadership, pedagogical skills, and relationships with stakeholders. With this idea in mind, the four predictors of school-based management significantly influence school performance, especially in national

#### Copyright Holder:

© Mark Anthony C. Pasubillo & John Mark R. Asio. (2023)  
Corresponding author's email: [asio.johnmark@gmail.com](mailto:asio.johnmark@gmail.com)

#### This Article is Licensed Under:



achievement tests (Linao & Gosadan, 2019). In addition, Rohma et al. (2020) also support the idea that school-based management influences teachers' performance. Also, a recent study by Anif (2023) unveiled that the process of implementing school-based management showed the involvement of school members and the community in participatory decision-making. Nevertheless, under school-based management, the school heads or principals retain the power to determine the schools' future priorities (Lee & Chiu, 2017).

Moreover, despite the commitment of different education sectors, accessible and intelligible ways of SBM are still proving the system, especially in underdeveloped communities. This event has been very observable in the results of international tests. Accordingly, it was because of the undeniably poor facilities which highly affected the learning of the students. Furthermore, based on the evidence, the lack of facilities reduces the quality of education (Camacho & Farrales, 2018). The mentioned concept also reflects the ideas of Ogunode et al. (2022), who identified problems and different challenges in the implementation of school-based management in their basic schools. On the other hand, a literature review done by Yulfizar and Zulganef (2023) shared that previous research about school-based management demonstrated positive contexts in several aspects of the school, like attendance, academic achievement, and school management.

The researchers created this study to assess the school-based management of a regional science high school in Olongapo City, Philippines. It is also part of the school's mission to improve its services constantly. Due to this evolving process of upgrading and upskilling the school's services, the researchers commenced determining the level of satisfaction of stakeholders with the school-based management of the school and see to it whether there is still room for improvement and development. This study then intends to answer the following research questions in order to shed light on the actual satisfaction of stakeholders for the school-based management process of the school:

1. What are the basic demographic characteristics of the respondents?
2. What is the level of satisfaction of the respondents in the School-based Management Process of the school?
3. Is there a significant difference in the level of satisfaction of the respondents in the School-based Management process when grouped according to their demographic characteristics?

In the end, the result of this study will benefit the following: first of all, the stakeholders who sent their children to the school. Next would be the school heads, who can still employ and improve their leadership skills and techniques. Then, the teachers where they can do more and provide more to the student's learning environment. Finally, the students receive knowledge and other important life-sustaining experiences.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

Cited from the case study of Lindberg and Vanyushyn (2013), there are different schools of thinking on this topic, according to the literature on school-based management. The first school sees school-based management as a positive and productive tool for advancing the school. The other claims that it has only had a minor impact on school improvement. The school head's leadership role is the most important factor in ensuring a successful relationship between school-based management and school progress. It is thus a necessary component of successful school-based management. The study, derived from a qualitative case study undertaken among several divergent secondary schools in Sweden, is an attempt to conceptualize the school principal's important and pivotal leadership role in ensuring school improvement via effective school-based management in the said country.

Leadership and governance, curriculum and instruction, accountability and continuous improvement, and management and resources are some indicators used to assess Philippine

school-based management, which was also used as the independent variable of the research paradigm. Its current version of SBM is based on a powerful school principal. The various educational stakeholders have associations, such as the Faculty Club, Student Council, Parents Teachers Association, and Alumni Organization (Gamage & San Antonio, 2006). According to Gamage and San Antonio (2006), it was suggested that school heads wishing to develop the levels of trust among the stakeholders in their schools should endeavour to achieve a balanced representation in the school council, utilize committees appropriately, share more information with other stakeholders, provide adequate time for doing school business, and focus on teaching and learning to make the overall functioning of administration and stakeholders, including the student council highly effective. This idea becomes why the researcher utilized the stakeholders' satisfaction level as the dependent variable of the paradigm.

Pelayo (2018) shared that stakeholders play an important role in managing schools. They are the partners of the school leaders in making the schools conducive to teaching and learning. More so, it cannot be denied that the main focus of school teaching and learning activities is the child. The ultimate goal of the vision and mission of the schools is to develop the child to acquire lifelong learning and skills. It corresponds to the idea of Montera (2015), explaining that productive collaborations mandate parents and teachers to recognize the critical importance of each other's involvement in a child's life. In addition, from the perspective of Siason (2021), the empowerment of stakeholders will give them active roles in the planning and implementation of the learning continuity plan. Furthermore, Sanlad (2019) added that parental involvement contributes widely to positive school outcomes for children.

Withstanding, Abulencia (2012) also confirms from his article that the quality of basic education resounds in society's general development. Today, education becomes more relevant as we live amidst a knowledge-based society that demands human capital in the form of knowledge workers who can steer the local and global economies. The education systems in many societies need to be poised to meet the challenges. In the Philippines, SBM was officially implemented as a governance framework of DepEd with the passage of RA 9155 in 2001 as legal cover. In this context, the implementation of SBM in the country showed evidence that a drastic change came and influenced the school heads by performing well in school operations and management (Gaspar, 2022). The four cornerstones of the school-based-management process (leadership and governance, curriculum and learning, accountability and continuous improvement, and management of resources) were still in the beginning structure, and mechanisms are in place to demonstrate ACCESS (Perez & Lumaad, 2021).

Undoubtedly, SBM has contributed to the success of the school. However, questions about the effectiveness of SBM are still part of an endless debate about the best model for administrative structure for delivering primary and secondary education (Summers, 2021) in different parts of the country.

## **RESEARCH METHOD**

### **Research Design**

The proponents of the study decided to utilize a descriptive survey research design in order to determine the stakeholders' levels of satisfaction at the same time, compare their responses to their profile. Since the study intends to describe stakeholders' satisfaction level with school-based management and compare the scores or responses of the respondents, the said research design best suits the needs of the research paper.

### **Respondents**

The study's respondents were parents (stakeholders) of a junior public science high school

near Olongapo City. During a general assembly of parents/ guardians, the researchers chose them randomly. They were chosen because one of the researchers who currently teaches at the school mentioned above wants to ensure that the survey questionnaire was taken seriously.

The researchers employed a technique known as purposive sampling. This sampling technique's goal is to focus on specific population characteristics that are of interest. Thomas (2022) also proposed the same context as using such a technique wherein a certain characteristic determines the qualification of the respondents in the case of the current study, the parents. To control the dissemination of the survey questionnaire and make the collection easier, the proponents chose the parents to present at the general assembly as respondents.

### **Instruments**

The proponents developed a survey form to determine the stakeholders' satisfaction with school-based management. In the development of the survey, the proponents first searched for relevant literature that focused on school-based management programs. At the same time, the survey also incorporated documents like memorandums, circulars, and policies from the Department of Education about the school-based management process. The information paved the way for determining the appropriate content for the survey tool.

The composition of the survey questionnaire includes a basic profile characteristic and then the school-based management components. The school-based management component includes the following variables: curriculum and instruction, accountability and continuous improvement, management and resources, and leadership and governance. The researchers submitted the questionnaire to a panel of experts for face validity to verify its validity. They include a Master Teacher, a Head Teacher, a School Principal, and an Education Program Specialist. As for the veracity of the items, the questionnaire underwent a Cronbach alpha analysis and yielded an overall coefficient of 0.958, which is highly reliable. According to Taber (2018) and Bujang et al. (2018), Cronbach's Alpha is a statistical tool for the verification of constructed tests or scales whether they fit the purpose or not. Questionnaire development and questionnaire validation studies require such tests in order to verify their reliability. Furthermore, a value of around 0.70 or greater is desirable, which the current study displayed even better.

### **Data analysis**

In order to attain the research objectives, the gathered data underwent statistical analysis with the help of SPSS 23. The data analyst subjected the collected data to statistical treatment such as Mean, Frequency, independent *t*-test, and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). Mean and Frequency were the statistical treatment of choice for the profile and level of satisfaction. As for the differences in the responses, the statistical treatment of choice was the independent *t*-test and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The researchers also employed a 5-point Likert scale to determine the satisfaction level of the stakeholders.

### **FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

The following tables present the results of the study. It includes the profile of the respondents in terms of age, gender, and relationship to the student. It also considered the result for the stakeholders' level of satisfaction with the School-Based Management. Finally, the last three tables presented the test of difference for the respondent's satisfaction level with the School-Based Management system.

**Table 1.** Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents in terms of Age

Age	Frequency	Percentage (%)
21-30 years old	3	1.6
31-40 years old	78	41.3
41-50 years old	95	50.3
51-60 years old	9	4.8
61 years old and above	4	2.1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 1 presents the respondents' frequency and percentage distribution based on age. As seen from the table, more than half of the respondents are between 41 and 50 years old. The age group of 31-40 years came next, with more than 40 per cent of the sample respondents. On the other hand, the age bracket of 21-30 years old generated the fewest respondents, with only three (3) or 1.6 per cent of the total sample. Looking at the result of this part of the study, parents were in their late 20s and 30s when they had their children or children.

**Table 2.** Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents in terms of Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Female	147	77.4
Male	43	22.6
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 2 shows the respondents' frequency and percentage distribution regarding their gender. As observed, most respondents were female compared to their male counterparts. It is observable that in most school-related activities, moms or women are most active and usually available to support their children.

**Table 3.** Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents in Terms of Relationship to Students

Relationship	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Father	39	20.5
Mother	131	68.9
Guardian	3	1.6
Parent	4	2.1
Grandmother	4	2.1
Other Relatives	9	4.7
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 3 reveals the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents in terms of their relationship with students. As gleaned from the table, a good number of respondents were mothers to the students, followed by the fathers of the students. Both comprise almost 90 per cent of the respondents. On the other hand, the guardian got the fewest respondents, with only three (3) in the said category. As implied from the previous table, the mothers are the ones who partake in school activities and other related events in the school.

**Table 4.** Stakeholders' Level of Satisfaction

<b>SBM</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Description</b>
Curriculum and Instruction	4.32	Very Satisfied
Accountability and Continuous Improvement	4.28	Very Satisfied
Management and Resources	4.26	Very Satisfied
Leadership or Governance	4.17	Satisfied
<b>Overall Average</b>	<b>4.26</b>	<b>Very Satisfied</b>

*Legend: 1.00-1.80=Very Dissatisfied; 1.81-2.60=Dissatisfied; 2.61-3.40=Neutral; 3.41-4.20= Satisfied; 4.21-5.00=Very Satisfied*

Table 4 presents the stakeholders' level of satisfaction with SBM described in terms of Leadership or Governance, Curriculum and Instruction, Accountability and Continuous Improvement, and Management and Resources. It can be gleaned from the table that the overall level of satisfaction's mean is 4.26, which has an equivalent description of "very satisfied." Curriculum and instruction receive the highest mean of 4.32, followed by Accountability and Continuous improvement with 4.28. Both got a descriptive interpretation of "very satisfied." Then, Management and Resources garnered a mean score of 4.26, which produced a descriptive interpretation of "very satisfied" as well. Finally, Leadership and Governance yielded a mean of 4.17, corresponding to "satisfied" in the descriptive interpretation.

**Table 5.** Differences in the Stakeholders' Level of Satisfaction on SBM when Grouped According to Gender

<b>SBM</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>t-test</b>	<b>Sig</b>
Leadership and Governance	male	43	4.13	0.718	-0.470	.639
	female	147	4.18	0.711		
Curriculum and Instruction	male	43	4.37	0.537	0.583	.560
	female	147	4.30	0.726		
Accountability & Continuous Improvement	male	43	4.21	0.594	-0.720	.473
	female	147	4.30	0.667		
Management and Resources	male	43	4.28	0.704	0.218	.828
	female	147	4.26	0.695		

*Note: df = 188*

Table 5 displays the result of the independent t-test to determine the significant difference in the stakeholders' satisfaction level with School-Based Management. In general, there was no statistical evidence to prove variations in the respondents' responses when grouped according to gender. This result is obvious since the study yielded the following: for leadership and governance,  $t(188) = -0.470$ ; for curriculum and instruction,  $t(188) = 0.583$ . For accountability and continuous improvement,  $t(188) = -0.729$ ; for management and resources,  $t(188) = 0.218$ . All of the generated results obtained probability values greater than the alpha significance level of .05. Thus, the study's null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 6 illustrates the result of the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to the stakeholder's level of satisfaction with school-based management (SBM) when grouped according to age. Again, just like from the previous table, there was no specific proof that would show the difference in the response of the stakeholders. The study further revealed the following results: leadership and governance got  $F(4, 184) = 0.158$ ,  $p = .959$ ; curriculum and instruction generated  $F(4, 184) = 0.104$ ,  $p = .981$ ; for accountability and continuous improvement, it obtained,  $F(4, 184) = 0.240$ ,  $p = .915$ ; and for management and resources produced,  $F(4, 184) = 0.286$ ,  $p = .887$ . All of the generated  $p$ -values

were higher than the alpha significance level of .05. Therefore, the study's null hypothesis results from this acceptance.

**Table 6.** Analysis of Variance for Stakeholders' Level of Satisfaction on SBM when Grouped According to Age

<b>SBM</b>		<b>SS</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>F-test</b>	<b>Sig</b>
Leadership and Governance	Between Groups	0.328	4	0.082	0.158	.959
	Within Groups	95.180	184	0.517		
	Total	95.507	188			
Curriculum and Instruction	Between Groups	0.202	4	0.050	0.104	.981
	Within Groups	88.907	184	0.483		
	Total	89.108	188			
Accountability & Continuous Improvement	Between Groups	0.416	4	0.104	0.240	.915
	Within Groups	79.607	184	0.433		
	Total	80.023	188			
Management and Resources	Between Groups	0.561	4	0.140	0.286	.887
	Within Groups	90.307	184	0.491		
	Total	90.868	188			

**Table 7.** Analysis of Variance for Stakeholders' Level of Satisfaction on SBM when Grouped According to Relationship to Students

<b>SBM</b>		<b>SS</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>F-test</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
Leadership and Governance	Between Groups	1.829	5	0.366	0.718	.611
	Within Groups	93.731	184	0.509		
	Total	95.560	189			
Curriculum and Instruction	Between Groups	0.202	5	0.335	0.703	.622
	Within Groups	88.907	184	0.476		
	Total	89.108	189			
Accountability & Continuous Improvement	Between Groups	1.049	5	0.210	0.489	.784
	Within Groups	78.989	184	0.429		
	Total	80.038	189			
Management and Resources	Between Groups	3.452	5	0.690	1.444	.210
	Within Groups	87.962	184	0.478		
	Total	91.414	189			

Table 7 displays the result of the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to the stakeholders' level of satisfaction with School-Based Management when grouped according to their relationship with students. The study manifested no statistical proof of the difference in the respondents' remarks on the listed items of variables of the study. To justify the generalization, the study obtained the following: leadership and governance got  $F(5, 184) = 0.718$ ,  $p = .611$ , and the curriculum and instruction produced  $F(5, 184) = 0.703$ ,  $p = .622$ . As for the accountability and continuous improvement, it generated  $F(5, 184) = 0.489$ ,  $p = .784$ ; and for management and resources, it garnered  $F(5, 184) = 1.444$ ,  $p = .210$ . One can generalize that the probability values of each variable were higher than the alpha significance level of .05. Thus, it is safe to conclude that there exists no significant difference in the stakeholders' satisfaction level when grouped according to their relationship with students.

## Discussions

This study aims to determine stakeholders' satisfaction level with the school-based management of a public junior science high school. As revealed in the study, the stakeholders expressed their satisfaction level with each variable. The curriculum and instruction, accountability and continuous improvement, and management and resources obtained a general mean score equivalent to "very satisfied" remarks from the stakeholders. However, only leadership and governance got a "satisfied" answer from the stakeholders. In general, the stakeholders considered the school-based management satisfying. They observed most of the items as appropriate and applicable in the school. The study's result contradicted the findings from a literature review by Amon and Bustami (2021), wherein implementing school-based management could have been more successful. Another study from Indonesia by Bandur (2018) believed that effective implementation of school-based management policy is associated with a healthier teaching-learning environment and better student academic achievement. In the case of Malaysian education, Isa et al. (2020) also disclosed that the level of implementation of school-based management was at a moderate level. In a local study by Villanueva and Ortega-Dela Cruz (2019), in the case of curriculum and learning, they found that teachers employed different instructional practices and suggested that educational institutions still have to work on programs and projects that promote partnerships and linkages. On a positive note, Martin (2019) revealed that the strengths of the implementation of school-based management lay in two discrete contexts, namely, the value of cooperation and motivation and the worth of collaboration and delegation. Another concept shared by Verbo et al. (2023) is that leadership styles directly affect the school's performance in attaining the school-based management practice. Also, in a related article by Ballarta et al. (2022), the school-based management level of practices in selected public elementary schools in the MIMAROPA region was maturing structures. In a recent study by Caliba (2022), the author showed that teachers have favourable working conditions and are mostly involved in the different school-based management dimensions.

In addition, the study reveals no significant relationship between the stakeholders' SBM level of satisfaction and their profile. However, Arenque's (2021) study showed a significant difference in the implementation of curriculum and learning accountability and continuous improvement and management of the resource.

The data also demonstrate that a public institution's school-based management system is efficient and can satisfy most stakeholders. These findings are critical for the school's correct practice as an academic institution to continue to improve, and that: clear leadership and governance; updated and improving curriculum and instructions; effective and progressive accountability and continuous improvement; and appropriate management and meaningful use of resources should all be in place. To support the abovementioned idea, Maca (2019) mentioned that school-based management cultivates a culture of innovation by fostering transparency, enhancing collaboration, and ensuring stakeholders' participation in the school's decision-making. In addition, Pepugal (2022) also mentioned that the level of school-based management implementation was above the minimum standard. Aya et al. (2022) also revealed that school-based management practices satisfy quality standards.

## CONCLUSIONS

Based on the study results, the researchers concluded that more than half of the stakeholders belong to the age bracket 41-50 years old, the majority were female, and are mothers to their students. The stakeholders gave curriculum and instruction, accountability, and continuous improvement; management and resources obtained a "strongly agree" response; however, only leadership and governance got an "agree" remark.

There were no significant variations in the responses from the stakeholders when they were grouped according to their profiles.

From the aforementioned results of the study, this study revealed a different perspective in terms of the implementation of the school-based management process. The stakeholders presented a very high satisfaction rate among the four variables of the study. This study also revealed a different view since a good number of studies showed variation in their results, but the current study revealed the opposite. Additionally, this study is unique since it is a regional science school, a specialized school for students focused on the Science curriculum. The stakeholders for this particular type of school are quite different, and their opinions do not vary or deviate that much.

Based on the study's conclusion, the researchers now recommend that both parents should be encouraged to participate in school activities. There should be programs to encourage fathers to participate more in school activities; Parents should be more involved in school events, and the school should provide engaging activities for them, especially if it is for the betterment of their children. The institution should continue to strive for competence and competitiveness in order to achieve the institution's and community's expectations.

### **LIMITATION & FURTHER RESEARCH**

Like any other studies available online or in print, the current study also possessed limitations that other researchers may find helpful in the future. One of these limitations would be the respondents of the study; the current study only used one school. Therefore, future researchers can use multiple schools, not only public but also private schools. In addition, teachers and school heads can also be part of the analysis of the school-based management process as respondents as well. At the same time, future researchers can also try correlation studies or structural equation modelling by adding more variables to the study. This concept will try to seek associations or even discover the cause and effect of different constructs and variables in the study. This idea is applicable so as not to limit themselves to comparative study alone.

### **REFERENCES**

- Abulencia, A. S. (2012). School-based management: A structural reform intervention. *Philippine Normal University Journal on Teacher Education*, 44-67.
- Alrasheedi, G., & Almutawa, F. (2022). The nature of School-Based Management in independent schools in the state of Qatar: An analytical study. *Journal of School Choice*, 16(2), 235-257, <https://doi.org/10.1080/15582159.2021.1994278>
- Amon, L., & Bustami, M.R. (2021). Implementation of school-based management in curriculum and learning process: A literature review. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah (Dikdasmen)*, 1(1), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.31960/dikdasmen-v1i1-1060>
- Anif, M. (2023). Application of School-Based Management in Improving Quality in Junior High Schools. *JMKSP (Jurnal Manajemen, Kepemimpinan, Dan Supervisi Pendidikan)*, 8(2), 471-481. <https://doi.org/10.31851/jmksp.v8i2.11282>
- Arenque, D.D. (2021). Implementation of school-based management program in Bicol secondary schools. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*, 10(4), 660-670.
- Aya, M. K. F. D., Buenvenida, L. P., Tan, C. S., Bandy, M. M., & Manaig, K. A. (2022). Leadership practices, adversity quotient, and school-based management practices in the new normal: a descriptive-correlational approach. *International Journal of Theory and Application in Elementary and Secondary School Education*, 4(2), 59-84. <https://doi.org/10.31098/ijtaese.v4i2.1091>
- Ballarta, L.V., Illescas, C.M., Perez, D.R., & Hamora, L.A. (2022). School-Based Management Level of Practice in Selected Public Elementary Schools in Mimaropa Region, Philippines. *Journal of*

- Pedagogical Inventions and Practices*, 8, 134–146. Retrieved from <https://www.zienjournals.com/index.php/jpip/article/view/1672>
- Bandur, A. (2018). Stakeholders' responses to school-based management in Indonesia. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 32(6), 1082–1098. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-08-2017-0191>
- Bujang, M.A., Omar, E.D., & Baharum, N.A. (2018). A review on sample size determination for Cronbach's Alpha test: A simple guide for researchers. *The Malaysian Journal of Medical Sciences*, 25, (6), 85-99. <https://doi.org/10.21315/mjms2018.25.6.9>
- Caliba, I. (2022). Self-Efficacy, Working Conditions, School-Based Management Practices, and Teachers' Performance, *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 1(2), 107–125. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6523194>
- Camacho, R.F., & Farrales, S. (2020). School-Based Management validation of schools. <https://deped-ologapo.com/school-based-management-validation-of-schools/#:~:text=There%20are%20four%20principles%20which,Improvement%20and%20Management%20of%20Resources>.
- Cornito, C. M. (2021). Striking a Balance between Centralized and Decentralized Decision Making: A School-Based Management Practice for Optimum Performance. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Economic Review*, 3(4), 08–15. <https://doi.org/10.36923/ijsser.v3i4.122>
- Elmelegy, R.I. (2015). School-based management: an approach to decision-making quality in Egyptian general secondary school. *School Leadership & Management*, 35(1), 79-96. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2014.962499>
- Gamage D. & San Antonio, D. (2006). Effective participatory school administration, leadership, and management: Does it affect the trust levels of stakeholders? *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 1(2), 1-20. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1066691.pdf>
- Gaspar, E. S. (2022). Correlates Transformational management styles and School-Based Management (SBM) practices of school heads. *American Journal of Interdisciplinary Research and Innovation*, 1(1), 86–97. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajiri.v1i1.474>
- Lee, D.H.L., & Chiu, C.S. (2017). "School banding": Principals' perspectives of teacher professional development in the school-based management context. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 55(6), 686-701. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-02-2017-0018>
- Linao, R., & Gosadan, B. (2019). Meeting our Commitment: School-Based Management System in the lens of school performance. *JPAIR Multidisciplinary Research*, 38(1), 196–212. <https://doi.org/10.7719/jpair.v38i1.732>
- Isa, A. M., Mydin, A-A., & Abdullah, A. G. K. (2020). School-Based Management (SBM) Practices in Malaysia: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 10(9), 822-838. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v10-i9/7870>
- Laranang, J. A. I. (2022). Road mapping towards a successful School-Based Management System. *American Journal of Arts and Human Science*, 1(2), 93–122. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajahs.v1i2.442>
- Lindberg, E., & Vanyushyn, V. (2013). School-based management with or without instructional leadership: Experience from Sweden. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 2(3), 39–50. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/jel.v2n3p39>
- Maca, M. N. (2019). School-Based Management in the Philippines: Fostering Innovations in the Public Education System. *Romblon State University Research Journal*, 2(1), 35–59. <https://doi.org/10.58780/rsurj.v2i1.10>

- 
- Martin, M. (2019). The implementation of school-based management in public elementary schools. *Asian Journal of Assessment in Teaching and Learning*, 9(1), 44–56. <https://doi.org/10.37134/ajatel.vol9.no1.5.2019>
- Montera, F.V. (2015). *Stakeholders are recognized as partners in progress*. Retrieved from <https://www.depedmalaybalay.net/info/stakeholders-recognized-as-partners-in-progress.html>
- Pelayo, D.I. (2018). Stakeholder's role in school-based management. Retrieved from <https://www.pressreader.com/philippines/sunstar-pampanga/20180505/281586651225039>
- Pepugal, E.T. (2022). Levels of Perception on School-Based Management Implementation in San Luis National High School, Philippines. *American Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation*, 1(4), 26–34. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajmri.v1i4.516>
- Ogunode, N. J., Yahaya, D. M., & Musa, A. (2022). The school-based management committee of basic schools in FCT: Implementation problems and way forward. *European Multidisciplinary Journal of Modern Science*, 6, 44-51.
- Perez, D., & Lumaad, R. (2021). Educational leadership and management styles of public elementary school heads and level of school-based management of selected schools in Palawan, Philippines. *European Journal of Humanities and Educational Advancements*, 2(1), 35–50.
- Rohma, S., Harapan, E., & Wardiah, D. (2020). The influence of School-Based Management and teacher's professionalism toward teacher's performance. *Journal of Social Work and Science Education*, 1(1), 13-23. <https://doi.org/10.52690/jswse.v1i1.6>
- Sanlad, L. (2019). Parental involvement in learning: Implication to the academic achievement of learners, Munich, GRIN Verlag, <https://www.grin.com/document/506345>
- Siason, N.D. (2021). Twist and turns in school-based management: Experiences of school heads in the new normal. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(7), 13848–13882.
- Taber, K.S. (2018). The use of Cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in Science education. *Research in Science Education*, 48, 1273-1296. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2>
- Thomas, B. (2022). The role of purposive sampling technique as a tool for informal choices in social science in research methods. *JUST Agriculture Multidisciplinary E-Newsletter*, 2(5), 1–8.
- Verbo, R. J. C., Fernando, A. I., & Cabrera, W. C. (2023). Principals' leadership style towards the implementation of decentralized School-Based Management in selected secondary public schools in Mandaluyong City, Philippines. *International Journal of Economics Development Research (IJEDR)*, 4(1), 48–72. <https://doi.org/10.37385/ijedr.v4i1.970>
- Villanueva, J.S., & Ortega-Dela Cruz, R.A. (2019). The praxis of school-based management on curriculum and learning in the Philippines. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies*, 6(2), 89-101. <https://doi.org/10.23918/ijsses.v6i2p89>
- Yulfizar, S., & Zulganef. (2023). The influence of school-based management on the quality of education in private vocational high schools and its impact on employment competitiveness. *International Journal of Ethno-Sciences and Education Research*, 3(1), 7-13. <https://doi.org/10.46336/ijeer.v3i1.392>
-