



## School-Based Management Level of Practice, Organizational Culture, and Leadership Style: Implication for School Administration Policy

POLISTICO, Ma Armelita<sup>(1)</sup>; BERONIO, Delia<sup>(2)</sup>; HUNGO, Melbert<sup>(3)</sup>

<sup>(1)</sup> 0009-0009-3537-003x; Department of Education, Waterloo, Matalom, Leyte, Philippines. [armelita.polistico@deped.gov.ph](mailto:armelita.polistico@deped.gov.ph)

<sup>(2)</sup> 0000-0002-5382-8958; Southern Leyte State University-Tomas Oppus, San Isidro, Tomas Oppus, Philippines. [beronio.delian@gmail.com](mailto:beronio.delian@gmail.com)

<sup>(3)</sup> 0000-0002-3306-2924; Southern Leyte State University-Tomas Oppus, San Isidro, Tomas Oppus, Philippines. [mhungo@southernleytestateu.edu.ph](mailto:mhungo@southernleytestateu.edu.ph)

The content of this article is the sole responsibility of the authors.

### ABSTRACT

The imbalanced distribution of resources together with the unequal distribution of power results in unequal educational outcomes and difficulties to implement local educational policies effectively. It aimed to explore the characteristics of the schools SBM Level of Practice in terms of organizational culture, leadership styles, and teachers' affect. Furthermore, it explored a study of teacher emotional responses, motivation and work satisfaction, and engagement change between different SBM stages for school effectiveness improvement. A mixed-method research design was utilized to assess municipalities in Leyte Division through which 462 respondents were randomly selected. Research data was analyzed by application of Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) and employee engagement surveys while using arithmetic mean, frequency, percentage, standard deviation and Kruskal-Wallis test methods, and deductive thematic for analysis. The study showed that Adhocracy emerged as the primary organizational culture because it received the highest preferred mean score (37.7) at SBM Level 2 yet Laissez-faire leadership reached its peak (42.9%) in SBM Level 3. Teacher commitment reached its highest point (3.48 Very High) alongside job satisfaction (3.18 High) and work engagement (5.08 High) at SBM level 3 while variables showed important differences between SBM levels ( $p < 0.05$ ). The study concludes that while Adhocracy leadership supports innovative practices and active governance, yet the enduring presence of Laissez-faire leadership generates issues with school leadership accountability, decision-making effectiveness, and organized guidance systems. To enhance SBM effectively, schools should develop leadership abilities, enhance participatory governance mechanisms, teacher support structures, and establish proper organizational cultures to maintain accountability and continuous educational improvement.

### RESUMO

A distribuição desigual de recursos, juntamente com a distribuição assimétrica de poder, resulta em desigualdades nos resultados educacionais e em dificuldades na implementação eficaz de políticas educacionais locais. O estudo teve como objetivo explorar as características do nível de prática do School-Based Management (SBM) nas escolas, em termos de cultura organizacional, estilos de liderança e afetividade docente. Além disso, investigou as respostas emocionais dos professores, sua motivação, satisfação no trabalho e engajamento profissional, observando como esses fatores variam entre os diferentes estágios do SBM com vistas à melhoria da eficácia escolar. Foi utilizado um desenho de pesquisa de métodos mistos para avaliar municípios da Divisão de Leyte, dos quais 462 participantes foram selecionados aleatoriamente. Os dados foram analisados por meio da Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) e de questionários sobre engajamento dos funcionários, utilizando-se média aritmética, frequência, porcentagem, desvio padrão e teste de Kruskal-Wallis, além de análise temática dedutiva. O estudo revelou que a cultura organizacional do tipo Adhocracia emergiu como predominante, tendo alcançado a maior média de preferência (37,7) no Nível 2 do SBM. Contudo, a liderança Laissez-faire atingiu seu ponto mais elevado (42,9%) no Nível 3 do SBM. A comprometimento docente obteve seu valor mais alto (3,48 – Muito Alto), juntamente com a satisfação no trabalho (3,18 – Alta) e o engajamento profissional (5,08 – Alto) também no Nível 3 do SBM, enquanto as variáveis demonstraram diferenças estatisticamente significativas entre os níveis de SBM ( $p < 0,05$ ). Conclui-se que, embora a liderança do tipo Adhocracia favoreça práticas inovadoras e uma governança ativa, a presença persistente da liderança Laissez-faire acarreta problemas relacionados à responsabilização da liderança escolar, à efetividade nas tomadas de decisão e à ausência de sistemas organizados de orientação. Para fortalecer a implementação eficaz do SBM, recomenda-se que as escolas desenvolvam competências de liderança, fortaleçam os mecanismos de governança participativa, e estabeleçam sistemas de apoio aos docentes e estabeleçam culturas organizacionais adequadas, de forma a manter a responsabilização e promover a melhoria educacional contínua.

### ARTICLE INFORMATION

#### Article process:

Submitted: 04/24/2025

Approved: 05/21/2025

Published: 08/15/2025



#### Keywords:

adhocracy, commitment, democratic leadership, job satisfaction, laissez-faire leadership

## Introduction

School-Based Management (SBM) brings decision-making abilities which enable educational institutions to improve their outcome-based learning results through decentralized school governance (Berhanu, 2023). The Philippine Department of Education (DepEd) organizes School-Based Management practice at four separate levels throughout the national territory.

Level I (Beginning) decision-making is concentrated while stakeholders play a small role and documentation about school plans remains incomplete. The development at Level II (Maturing) incorporates stakeholder engagement growth along with new governance frameworks and basic evidence-based planning initiatives. Level III (Advanced) describes operational SBMs that promote collective governance and financial clarity along with growth-oriented programs (Pepugal, 2022).

The Exemplary level (Level IV) defines institutions as fully established with autonomous decision-making power and complete community engagement that leads to the implementation of best governance practices (Rint & Astillero, 2024). Schools undergo SBM Assessment Tool evaluation to analyze their leadership practices and governance approaches, curriculum, accountability duties, and resource management (Berhanu, 2023).

The school-Based Management (SBM) Level of Practice highly depends on organizational culture and leadership styles because they direct how decisions are made and who participates in governance. Schools with Beginning (Developing) SBM Level exhibit hierarchical leadership which maintains decision authority in central administration while stakeholders have little involvement leading to an institutional culture that follows rules (Isa et al., 2020).

The Maturing (Expanding) Level of school management creates participatory leadership that builds teamwork between administrators and teachers and parents to develop a collaborative governance culture (Silabay & Alegre, 2023). The Advanced (Standardized) Level decision-making authority lies with different stakeholders who maintain transparent and accountable operations together. Schools at the Exemplary (Institutionalized) Level practice transformational leadership that requires empowerment of communities alongside culture development and institutional administration excellence and resource optimization practices (Ahmed, 2023).

The interchange of Shared Decision-Making levels accompanied by adequate leadership approaches in specified organizational cultures leads to enhanced institutional advancement and continuous enhancement (Sison & Fuentes, 2025).

Advanced Level School-Based Management functions because of leadership style working alongside organizational culture to ensure institutional effectiveness (Silabay & Alegre 2023). The best form of school-based management combines team-based decision-making and

collaborative leadership with community involvement to develop both open accountability systems and creative educational practices.

A distributed and transformational leadership approach are reportedly widespread because it allows school heads to give authority to teachers, parents, and community members in making policies and managing resources (Sliwka et al., 2024).

The specific research data reveals that adaptive organizational cultures with their open change capabilities combined with learning commitment and education-focused dedication drive optimized school governance systems (Madi Odeh et al., 2023).

The Advanced SBM level schools possess well-established systems to track performance and training programs which allow leadership success to enhance teaching quality resulting in better educational results (Silabay & Alegre, 2023). The systems theory and participatory governance models establish theoretical frameworks for understanding how SBM functions through connections between leadership style and organizational culture thus demonstrating sustainable educational reforms that require harmonious relations among leadership principles and stakeholder engagement (Nanda & Warriar, 2023).

School-Based Management (SBM) shows advancement yet specific research challenges remain chiefly regarding the associations between leadership approach and organizational environment across diverse SBM levels (Zurkinden, 2022). The decentralized system encounters two main obstacles because governance structures which resist change block involvement and leadership development suffers because school directors and instructors need training in distribution and transformational leadership methods (Gkrimpizi et al., 2023).

The potential collaboration of SBM remains restricted by limited stakeholder engagement with parents, community, and the organizational difficulty in maintaining reforms when leadership turns over. The evaluation instruments primarily examine follow-up steps instead of measuring how leadership behavior connects with cultural elements to create meaningful learning results (Fiore et al., 2020).

Researchers need more information about how school leadership approaches connect with cultural dynamics and whether educational reforms suited for different social environments achieve their best results permanently (Hu & Duyar, 2024). Moreover, research needs to investigate digital leadership strategies, data-driven education methods, and SBM implementation equity between cities and rural communities (Ahmad et al., 2024). The solution of these problems is key to refine SBM policies, improve leadership practices, and create flexible organizational cultures which maintain enduring educational enhancements.

The study explores the characteristics of the schools in Level 1, 2, and 3 SBM Level of Practice in terms of organizational culture, leadership styles, and teachers' affect. The analysis includes a study of teacher emotional responses, shows how motivation and work satisfaction, and engagement change between different SBM stages for school effectiveness improvement. Additionally, the study explores the leadership methods and dominant cultural patterns across

various SBM operational ranges affect secondary-school governance, collaborative decision-making, and innovative processes.

Research that defines how SBM organizational levels interact with teacher affect through motivational measurements and job satisfaction analysis aids efforts to understand factors supporting teacher excellence and commitment. The study provides significant information to enable policymakers, school administrators, and educators to improve SBM implementation strategy and develop conducive organizational traditions that improve school outcomes and educational standards. Through its findings this research proves its support for long-term enhancements in school governance, leadership quality, and educational student achievements.

## Methodology

The current research utilized a mixed methods design, which integrates the qualitative and quantitative approaches to offer a comprehensive understanding of the research problem. Mixed methods research stands out with its capacity to bridge the quantitative trends with in-depth context information and improve validity, reliability, and richness of outcomes (Mertens, D. M. (2019)). This strategy is best suited when studying multifaceted phenomena like organizational culture, leadership, and teacher affect, in which both quantifiable patterns and embodied sense help richly illuminate interpretation.

In particular, the quantitative component of the research used a correlational design to analyze the statistical associations between variables like organizational culture, leadership styles, and teacher affect—i.e., commitment, satisfaction, and engagement. Correlational designs are used to determine the amount and direction of relations between variables without influencing them, thereby maintaining the natural learning environment (Hayes, 2020).

The qualitative part utilized a deductive thematic analysis, a top-down approach in which themes are drawn from theoretical frameworks, research aims, or conceptual models that exist prior to data collection (Peel, 2020).

Such examination is warranted within the context of this study, as far as the researcher aimed to test and position the quantitative results against prevalent frameworks of School-Based Management (SBM), organizational culture typologies (e.g., Adhocracy, Clan, Hierarchy, and Market), and transformational leadership theory.

By marrying these complementary approaches, the research gains both breadth and depth of analysis: quantitative results identify shared trends in respondent populations, but qualitative accounts offer rich description and lived experience which provide depth to the interpretation of those trends. Methodological triangulation increases the overall quality of the research and ensures policy recommendations are evidence-based and context-specific.

The research conducted in public secondary schools from different municipalities in the province of Leyte under Leyte Division supervision. The research locale achieved strategic

selection because it includes diverse public secondary institutions ranging from cities to rural and coastal areas that offer complete insights of School-Based Management (SBM) implementation across different economic levels and geographical areas.

The province of Leyte includes five (5) distinct congressional districts formed from municipalities where governance systems demonstrate individual leadership and face separate educational barriers. The selected areas include: Area I (Alangalang, Babatngon, Palo, San Miguel, Santa Fe, Tanauan, and Tolosa), Area II-A (Buraue, Dagami, Dulag, Jaro, Julita, Lapaz, and Mayorga), Area II-B (Capoocan, Carigara, Isabel, Pastrana, Tabontabon, and Tunga), Area III (Calubian, Leyte, San Isidro, Tabango, and Villaba), Area IV (Albuera, Isabel, Kananga, Matag-ob, Merida, and Palompon), Area V-A (Abuyog, Javier, MacArthur, Mahaplag, and Mayorga), and Area V-B (Bato, Hilongos, Hindang, Inopacan, and Matalom).

These municipalities were purposefully added to create a detailed understanding of Social Business Models by considering different resource levels, stakeholder involvement, and leadership capability conditions. The local study of Leyte matches national education directions which support decentralization thus making its findings relevant to policy-makers and administrators who want to upgrade SBM frameworks within regions sharing similar characteristics.

The research respondents were chosen through simple random sampling across seven (7) areas of Leyte Division to maintain balanced selection without bias. The research sample consisted of two participating schools from each of the identified School-Based Management (SBM) practice levels. One school head and ten teachers from each chosen institution gave their information to create an even picture of organizational culture, leadership approaches, and teacher-related factors. The selected sampling design enables researchers to gain complete insights about school governance processes and their effects on multiple SBM stages. The structured reference for research respondents is presented in the table below.

The sample size is explained by some of the most important considerations. The proportional representation is due to a guarantee that each of the seven regions is well represented by 2 school heads and 20 teachers for each level (Levels I, II, and III). The proportionate distribution helps ensure a balanced input from various geographic or administrative regions so that the study may offer diverse inputs. A reasonable sample for comparative comparison is also guaranteed, as each level has 140 teachers and 14 school heads. This large number of respondents per subgroup makes robust statistical analysis across roles and levels of education.

The sample design thereby brings the research statistical power and depth of analysis. From the standpoint of comprehensive coverage, the overall number of 462 participants is regarded as adequate to enable generalizability of results in the context under study, i.e., a division or school district. The number will definitely include the majority of the education workforce and hence be suitable for making inference about current practice, challenges, and

needs for the profession as a whole. Finally, the design is feasible and doable. With 66 participants in each region, the research stays within a pragmatic limit for data collection, particularly when working with qualitative methods such as interviews or focus group interviews, or employing intricate survey instruments. The approach is structured but not cumbersome to enable effective implementation without sacrificing the richness of data collected.

**Table 1.**  
Research Respondents

AREA	LEVEL I		LEVEL II		LEVEL III		Total No. of Respondents
	No. of School Heads	No. of Teachers	No. of School Heads	No. of Teachers	No. of School Heads	No. of Teachers	
I	2	20	2	20	2	20	66
II - A	2	20	2	20	2	20	66
II - B	2	20	2	20	2	20	66
III	2	20	2	20	2	20	66
IV	2	20	2	20	2	20	66
V - A	2	20	2	20	2	20	66
V - B	2	20	2	20	2	20	66
<b>Total Respondents</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>462</b>

The researchers utilized two (2) sets of standardized questionnaires to gather systematic data from school administrators and teacher respondents following established standardized methodologies and validated instruments. The first set was developed for school administrators to evaluate their leadership styles that impact School-Based Management (SBM) effectiveness and teacher engagement. Set 2, intended for teachers, consisted of three parts: Part I, utilizing the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) by Rajaa and El Ghazlani (2024), assessed organizational culture across four types—Clan, Adhocracy, Market, and Hierarchy—by measuring key dimensions such as Dominant Characteristics, Organizational Leadership, and Strategic Emphasis; Part II, adopted from Bevan and Hayday (2001), an IES Research Fellow, measured teacher affect in terms of organizational commitment and job satisfaction, ensuring a robust assessment of teacher attitudes toward their work environment. The “Teacher affect” is defined as the affective and attitudinal elements of teachers' professional lives, namely their attitudes, job satisfaction, and work commitment and organization commitment; and Part III, adapted from Wilson’s (2009) study, “A Survey of Employee Engagement,” utilized a six-point scale to assess teacher engagement levels, which is crucial in understanding workplace motivation and instructional effectiveness.

The Area SBM Level of Practice Validation produced results for the 2024-2025 school year which established a relevant context for the study and strengthened its connection to current educational administration frameworks. Because all instruments underwent

calibration in previous studies, supplementary reliability tests were unnecessary since the findings demonstrate consistent validity.

The teacher respondent answered the questionnaires on Organizational Culture, Commitment, Job Satisfaction, and Engagement, while the school administrator answered the Leadership Style questionnaire. Data collected were treated with care and a high degree of professionalism and confidentiality to ensure the validity of the results.

The researchers obtained required ethical permissions together with authorization from Leyte Schools Division Superintendent and principals of chosen schools prior to study commencement. Ethical research standards required the researchers to explain in detail both the research purpose, objectives, and procedures to every respondent. The researchers received consent from all voluntary survey participants who maintained their freedom to terminate the survey process at any time. The researchers acquired permission to distribute questionnaires manually to randomly selected respondents covering all areas of the Leyte Division.

All teacher respondents answered the surveys for Organizational Culture, Commitment, Job Satisfaction, and Engagement, and school administrators answered to the Leadership Style survey. Every step was taken seriously to maintain both confidentiality and anonymity of research respondents for ethical purposes. The survey did not gather any information that could identify respondents' identity while ensuring all gathered responses kept solely for the research. Findings were handled accurately through professional data management procedures that protected respondents' rights and welfare. Particularly, informed consent was obtained from all the respondents in surveys using signed consent forms, where it was clearly expressed that answering the questions was solely voluntary and that the respondents were free to leave being part of the study at any time with no danger. The procedure utilized traditional ethical research tactics geared towards showing respect for the autonomy and dignity of the participants. For the sake of ensuring anonymity and confidentiality of participants, no individual data were gathered in the process of data collection. Surveys were constructed in a manner that could not be used to trace individual identities, and answers were grouped to ensure data privacy. The researchers asserted that collected data would be used only for scholarly and research intentions. In addition, more data were safely kept and processed by expert data processing methods that ensured respondents' well-being and data confidentiality.

The questionnaires were distributed personally to randomly selected teachers in every region of the Leyte Division. Teachers answered the instruments assessing Organizational Culture, Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, and Work Engagement, whereas school administrators answered the Leadership Style instrument. The investigators were careful to maintain the confidentiality of the respondents and not use any undue pressure to respond.

Various statistical methods were used to analyze data correctly and reveal significant findings from the collected information. Mean scores from descriptive statistics were used to analyze the main organizational culture at different SBM levels of schools.

Mean score analysis allowed researchers to establish the most commonly used leadership approach at every SBM level in the selected schools. Mean scores were used to analyze teachers' affects and examined teachers' commitment, job satisfaction, and work engagement through analyzes at each SBM level for comprehensive assessment of teacher perceptions and experiences between different SBM levels.

The Kruskal-Wallis test helped identify affect variations among teachers belonging to different SBM levels because it functions as an appropriate non-parametric analysis for assessing independent groups that do not meet normal distributions (Dacpano, 2022).

The research tools effectively recognized the strengths and weaknesses of teacher commitment and satisfaction levels and engagement across SBM educational subunits. A mixture of mean scores, frequency, percentage and standard deviation were utilized to investigate SBM Level 3 school characteristics.

The analysis method provided a complete overview of data characteristics by showing both major data trends, distribution patterns, and variability within the dataset. These statistical methods used together achieved descriptive and inferential analysis of SBM implementation effects on school leadership, organizational culture, and changes to teacher affects.

Despite methodological refinement and strategic planning in this study, several limitations need to be acknowledged. One is the use of self-report scales, which brings into play response bias in the form of social desirability effects as well as subjective interpretations, which can influence the validity and authenticity of participants' responses.

Teachers and principals could have over- or under-estimated their beliefs towards organizational culture, leadership styles, or affective experiences due to personal or institutional reasons.

Second, even when the study employed simple random sampling to achieve representative selection for the seven regions of the Leyte Division, sampling limitations exist. The results cannot be fully extended to all other schools in the other divisions or regions of the nation, particularly those with considerably divergent sociocultural, economic, or organizational environments.

Further, since the research included only public secondary schools, applicability to private schools or basic education levels (elementary or tertiary) could be restricted. Lastly, since it is a descriptive-correlational study, the design can establish correlations between teacher affect, organizational culture, and leadership style but cannot establish causation. The relations as observed cannot assess one variable directly impacting another as there might be intervening variables or mutual influences that are not captured in the model proposed.



Subsequent research can enhance these limitations by using longitudinal study designs, mixed methods, or experimental interventions in an effort to further establish and solidify this understanding of such educational dynamics.

## Results and Discussions

### *Dominant Organizational Culture by SBM Level*

Table 2 presents the mean scores from the four organizational culture types which include Adhocracy, Clan, Hierarchy, and Market at different levels of School-Based Management (SBM). The provided scores demonstrate the existing organizational culture together with the desired organizational culture format.

Among all School-Based Management levels (1, 2, and 3) Adhocracy maintains its position as the leading organizational culture with superior mean scores than its counterparts. The present score for Adhocracy at SBM Level 1 stands at 31.7 while the desired score points to 35.8. The current operation of SBM Level 2 exists at 31.4 score but desired practice reaches 37.7. SBM Level 3 exhibits a present Adhocracy score of 34.2, with a preferred score of 36.7. The other types of organizational culture represented by Clan, Hierarchy, and Market maintain lower levels of mean scores throughout all SBM levels.

The lowest scores belong to the hierarchy culture which indicates schools employ flexibility along with innovation while avoiding strict organizational structures and control systems (similar to adhocracy).

School-Based Management levels showcase Adhocracy culture as the leading organizational orientation through its characteristics of flexibility combined with innovative behavior and willingness to take risks.

The higher scores obtained for the preferred use of Adhocracy indicate a widespread desire among educational institutions to establish dynamic flexible organization (Zurkinden, 2022). Wijaya (2024) posited that research on leadership adaptability. The data shows that employees choose to move away from Hierarchy and Market styles toward cooperative innovation-based approaches instead of traditional hierarchical models and market-oriented systems.

The desired culture faces impediments from bureaucratic hurdles together with leader resistance along with obstacles to professional development (Shandana, 2024). Policy interventions must implement measures to enhance innovative policies and professional training alongside bureaucratic simplification and leadership participation for sustaining entrepreneurial and progressive school cultures.

The prevalence of Adhocracy culture emphasizes the need for educational leaders together with policymakers to develop a flexible system which follows contemporary educational requirements. Studies should analyze how leadership approaches and changes in policy alter the success rate of this cultural transformation process.

Moreover, the comparatively low scores of Clan culture with a focus on cooperation, common values, and family-like atmosphere show that relations of people are valued but not so intensely focused upon. The secondary position of Market culture, which stimulates competition and accomplishment, has fewer values on measurable results and strategies associated with performance.

Whereas Adhocracy leadership implies a progressive and dynamic setting conducive to creativity and distributed decision-making (at the heart of SBM philosophy), an even more evolved organizational culture blend would be required. Adding elements of Hierarchy would ensure stability, formalize processes, and create crisis tolerance, and adding elements of Clan culture would help create internal solidarity and morale. Thus, a mixed culture strategy—Adhocracy-supported by strategic uses of Hierarchy and Clan—can provide a fairer and more enduring model of school organization for SBM.

**Table 2.**

**Dominant Organizational Culture by SBM Level**

SBM Level	Organizational Culture				Dominant Organizational Culture
	Adhocracy	Clan	Hierarchy	Market	
<b>1</b>	31.7 (35.8)	21.2 (23.0)	22.0 (19.8)	23.9 (23.6)	<i>Adhocracy</i>
<b>2</b>	31.4 (37.7)	21.7 (23.2)	23.1 (18.3)	23.9 (22.1)	<i>Adhocracy</i>
<b>3</b>	34.2 (36.7)	22.1 (21.5)	21.3 (19.1)	23.3 (22.1)	<i>Adhocracy</i>

*Note: Mean scores not in parenthesis are the present (now) organizational culture response while those in parenthesis are the preferred organization culture.*

***Dominant Leadership Style by SBM Level***

Table 3 presents the leadership style mean levels for Autocratic, Democratic and Laissez-faire among different School-Based Management stages. Among the three leadership styles a specific SBM level adopts its dominant approach becomes apparent from the highest mean score.

Across School-Based Management levels 1 through 3 leadership personnel adopt Laissez-faire leadership as the primary style because it achieves the highest mean ranking above both Autocratic and Democratic leadership approaches. Laissez-faire leadership stands as the most dominant style for School-Based Management Level 1 since its mean score reaches 23.8 whereas both Autocratic (20.7) and Democratic (20.9) obtain lower scores. People in SBM

Level 2 rate Laissez-faire leadership at 24.9 based on their mean score thus far while Autocratic leadership has received 21.3 and Democratic leadership 23.1. The results from SBM Level 3 show Laissez-faire leadership maintaining the highest score at 24.7 which exceeds both the scores of Autocratic (22.1) and Democratic (22.9).

School-Based Management (SBM) levels demonstrate Laissez-faire leadership as the most common style. Leaders under Laissez-faire leadership adopt a minimal intervention approach by giving subordinates complete freedom to decide (Sugianto et al., 2024).

Studies reveal that when SBM institutions overuse Laissez-faire leadership they experience ambiguous roles which results in reduced accountability and erratic decision-making patterns (Du et al., 2023).

The data demonstrates that Autocratic and Democratic leadership tendencies show a growing trend throughout SBM levels although Laissez-faire remains the primary style in use. A strong presence of Laissez-faire leadership in SBM schools mirrors the participatory management structure which gives school heads the power to enable teacher and staff autonomy.

Educational leadership requires achieving a balanced approach between school autonomy for development and the provision of strategic guidelines to maintain quality oversight (Astika & Wismar, 2024).

Research data shows schools can create empowering teacher environments by improving leadership abilities in school leaders who provide both guided instruction and collaborative systems and growth opportunities. The development of leadership training programs needs policymaker support since Laissez-faire leadership demonstrates that leadership education must combine transformational and instructional models to handle both school sovereignty and strategic oversight. SBM system leaders need to establish clear objectives paired with performance tracking systems alongside collective work frameworks to control strategic operations during decision-making distribution.

Instructional leadership and management principles should be integrated within teacher education curricula to teach future educators organizational and decision-making methods for building collaborative leadership environments. Educational institutions should combine the strengths of Democratic leadership for participatory decision-making with the direction of Autocratic leadership to support their autonomy-based system.

Despite the benefits of Laissez-faire leadership toward teaching autonomy the institution requires a structured leadership system with participant involvement to ensure instructional quality and institutional accountability and sustained professional development in SBM schools. Research needs to investigate how leadership approaches shape both teacher work quality and student success and educational innovation throughout SBM programs.

**Table 3.**  
Dominant Leadership Style by SBM Level

SBM Level	Leadership Style			Dominant Leadership Style
	Autocratic	Democratic	Laissez-faire	
1	20.7	20.9	23.8	<i>Laissez-faire</i>
2	21.3	23.1	24.9	<i>Laissez-faire</i>
3	22.1	22.9	24.7	<i>Laissez-faire</i>

#### *Levels of Teachers' Affects by SBM Level*

The table presents the levels of teachers' affects—Commitment, Job Satisfaction, and Work Engagement at different stages of School-Based Management (SBM). The study classifies affective elements according to their mean values and uses the scale definitions for interpretation. Teachers maintain elevated levels of commitment along with job satisfaction and work engagement at every School-Based Management level.

The commitment scores between 2.88 and 3.26 show a strong level across the three levels of School-Based Management (SBM 1, 2 and 3). All job satisfaction scores from 3.07 to 3.18 fall within the high category of measurement. Work engagement scores show consistent placement in the high category due to their range of 4.60 to 5.08. The respondents attaining the most elevated levels of commitment (3.26) and job satisfaction (3.18) and work engagement (5.08) worked at SBM Level 3.

The implementation of SBM at elevated levels in schools seems to create better professional conditions that drive teacher motivation and result in improved job experiences. The assessment of teacher commitment and job satisfaction and work engagement resulted in notable high ratings across different School-Based Management (SBM) levels. Research findings show all three dimensions of commitment and job satisfaction rank in the high category and work engagement also scores in the high category showing an upward trend across different SBM levels (Caliba, 2022).

The process of enhanced SBM implementation leads teachers to demonstrate deeper dedication and satisfaction along with an increase in active professional involvement. The study confirms the Three-Component Model of Organizational Commitment developed since teacher commitment forms through affective attachment and continuance considerations together with normative obligations (Sugandi et al., 2021). The same motivational factors at work encompass professional growth together with autonomy and recognition which SBM environments tend to provide (Isa et al., 2020).

The high level of teacher engagement conforms with Kahn's (1990) theory that demonstrates meaningful work and psychological safety and availability as core factors

impacting engagement. The implementation of SBM encourages teachers to make decisions together with their colleagues through decentralized leadership structures hence improving motivation and workplace engagement (Alshamari et al., 2024).

Evolution from basic to advanced SBM practices creates conditions which strengthen teacher empowerment together with elevated school spirit and increased commitment towards school success. All organizational indicators measure high performance but a minor difference between job satisfaction and commitment points to possible workplace challenges stemming from increased workload and administrative complexity or resource shortages (Berhanu, 2023).

Research evidence indicates the necessity to improve education policies and curricular practices for maintaining and upgrading teacher commitment along with job satisfaction and engagement. Officials should work to implement programs which support constant professional development and mentoring alongside leadership development initiatives that sustain teacher devotion along with their engagement. Administrators who engage teachers in all stages of curriculum development and educational growth initiatives and school decisions will contribute to job satisfaction and intrinsic motivation levels.

Systems based on SBM need to include policies which manage workload while offering mental health programs along with recognition systems to stop burnout and maintain long-term dedication. Schools should implement collaborative teaching practices and research-based instruction and interdisciplinary approaches to boost professional satisfaction among teachers. The strong teacher affects identified across different levels of SBM demonstrate that decentralized governance systems create positive conditions for teacher wellness. Research needs to study the extended-term consequences of self-managed schools on teacher stability together with teaching excellence and student education results to develop evidence-driven policies for maximizing teacher effectiveness in autonomous schools.

**Table 4.**  
Levels of Teachers' Affects by SBM Level

SBM Level	Teacher Affects		
	Commitment	Job Satisfaction	Work Engagement
1	2.99 ( <i>High</i> )	3.11 ( <i>High</i> )	4.60 ( <i>High</i> )
2	2.88 ( <i>High</i> )	3.07 ( <i>High</i> )	4.84 ( <i>High</i> )
3	3.26 ( <i>High</i> )	3.18 ( <i>High</i> )	5.08 ( <i>High</i> )
<i>Note:</i>			
<u>Commitment &amp; Job Satisfaction</u>		<u>Work Engagement</u>	
1.00 – 1.74 = Very Low		1.00 – 1.82 = Very Low	
1.75 – 2.49 = Low		1.83 – 2.65 = Low	
2.50 – 3.26 = High		2.66 – 3.48 = Slightly Low	
3.25 – 4.00 = Very High		3.49 – 4.31 = Slightly High	
		4.32 – 5.14 = High	
		5.15 – 6.00 = Very High	

### *Significant Differences in Teachers' Affects Across SBM Levels*

The table presents the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test. The Kruskal-Wallis test results show the presence of variations in teachers' affective factors between School-Based Management (SBM) levels in Commitment, Job Satisfaction, and Work Engagement. The p-values shown in the table demonstrated statistical significance when they exceeded 0.05. The statistical results demonstrate a clear impact of School-Based Management level on teacher affect variables because Commitment ( $p = 0.00$ ), Job Satisfaction ( $p = 0.01$ ), and Work Engagement ( $p = 0.00$ ) all prove significant for comparing different SBM levels.

The research outcomes indicate that SBM implementation level directly influences how teachers experience commitment together with job satisfaction and work engagement. The results from a Kruskal-Wallis test established substantial variations in teacher commitment together with job satisfaction and work engagement respect to different School-Based Management (SBM) implementations. Evaluation through p-values reveals that SBM implementation levels produce substantial effects on teacher-related aspects (Dacpano, 2022). The research outcome matches Arar and Nasra (2020) Self-Determination Theory (SDT) by showing that work environments providing autonomy and competence along with relatedness relations between teachers create better job satisfaction and stronger commitment.

School Based Management (SBM) structures continue to develop in ways that boost teacher motivation alongside their career satisfaction and their willingness to participate in school management. Organizations can utilize these results to support Berhanu (2023) research about transformational leadership since it identifies school governance dynamics that enhance teaching staff morale and performance. School success under different SBM levels demonstrates that comprehensive teacher participation in decision-making and decentralized leadership along with collaborative school cultures leads to increased engagement. However, the differences in job satisfaction suggest that work pressure along with executive duties and organizational backing influence the way SBM affects teacher job satisfaction levels.

Decentralization of school systems does not eliminate the risk that excessive bureaucracy and accountability demands will deteriorate job satisfaction in the long term. The research outcomes create crucial points for educational and curriculum change decisions.

Training programs for leadership positions need to merge instructional and transformational leadership methods which enable school heads to balance independent work with supportive administration systems for maintaining teacher welfare throughout SBM deployment (Cornito, 2021).

Policymakers need to strengthen professional development opportunities that give teachers chances for collaborative work and curriculum planning and instructional advancement because these activities boost teacher satisfaction and involvement (Zhao, 2024).

Educational institutions need to review teacher workload policies to distribute workloads so SBM benefits such as decision-making roles and active school participation will not worsen teacher stress levels.

Future teachers passing through pre-service training programs must receive instruction about leading schools, governance, and school management to prepare them for managing active learner-focused educational settings. The substantial variations in teacher affects between SBM levels serve to demonstrate that school governance organizations significantly influence teacher motivation together with their job satisfaction. Research must track changes due to SBM implementation to both identify how it impacts teacher retention rates and their effectiveness and students' performance outcomes to guarantee policy adjustments sustain educational leadership systems and institutional evolution.

**Table 5.**

Significant Differences in Teachers' Affects Across SBM Levels

	Teacher Affects (Response Variable)		
	Commitment	Job Satisfaction	Work Engagement
<b>SBM Level</b> (Grouping Variable)	0.00 (significant)	0.01 (significant)	0.00 (significant)

Note: Entries on the table are *Kruskal-Wallis* *p*-values. If *p*-value < 0.05, the test is significant.

### Characteristics of SBM Level 3 Schools

This table presents the school-Based Management (SBM) Level 3 school characteristics including organizational culture, leadership style and teacher affect in terms of mean scores and percentages and frequencies.

The majority of the schools adopt an Adhocratic organizational culture that demonstrates strong innovation and flexibility through current scores of 30.8 while aiming for 34.8. The organizational cultures of Clan together with Hierarchy and Market remain relatively minor in these school organizations.

The analyzed leadership approaches show Laissez-faire takes the leading position at 42.9% while Autocratic and Democratic methods share the second place at 28.6%. Educational

professionals maintain high commitment levels, job satisfaction, and work engagement (Very High, High, High) marking them as a highly motivated professional group.

The SBM Level 3 school system establishes a modern and independent setting which operates through ongoing innovation together with flexible structures and powerful staff member participation.

Schools operating at Level 3 of School-Based Management (SBM) display three primary traits that include organizational culture together with leadership style and teacher affects. Organizational culture at this institution primarily follows the flexible and innovative model known as adhocracy. Readiness for Self-Direction in schools under SBM Level 3 should ensure autonomy for all stakeholders who promote team-driven decision processes while conducting experiments and implementing continuous improvement strategies (Virgana & Suradika, 2022).

The preference towards elevated adhocratic levels indicates educational stakeholders understand the necessity of additional leadership structure and governance decentralization in their institutions. The schools primarily implement laissez-faire leadership style while autocratic and democratic forms follow second and third. The practice of laissez-faire leadership shows both teacher freedom with minimal leadership supervision and the lack of systematic intervention methods (Kovačević et al., 2023).

The excessive use of laissez-faire leadership in SBM Level 3 schools produces possible negative effects by diminishing staff accountability, decision-making efficiency, and conflict resolution. Some educational institutions practice democratic decision-making while others maintain hierarchical systems that limit collaborative governance (Sugianto et al., 2024). The data showed that teaching staff demonstrate strong dedication to work and achieve peak satisfaction evaluations alongside deep work engagement. The study findings demonstrate that properly executed SBM models strengthen both teacher motivation and their dedication to school development (Sison & Fuentes, 2025).

The elements of autonomy recognition and professional growth fall under intrinsic motivation which influences job satisfaction in SBM Level 3 environments. Teacher commitment at Platform School exists through a commitment model based on decentralized leadership and decision-making processes led by school staff (Ekere & Udeme, 2021).

The score difference indicating job satisfaction below commitment reflects a possibility that external factors restrict teachers' overall workplace contentment. Sun and Liu (2025) research demonstrate that job satisfaction suffers through increased work demands along with unclear roles and excessive administrative requirements. Survey results show teachers demonstrate high work engagement which corresponds to the theories about meaningful work



and psychological safety and availability as key elements for employee engagement (Sudibjo & Riantini, 2023).

The study shows that SBM Level 3 schools require better policy improvements and curriculum adjustments to keep high teaching commitment and satisfaction together with work engagement levels.

The primary requirement is to improve leadership training for all staff members. Autonomy holds value yet unstructured leadership programs should develop structured programs combining freedom and accountability since laissez-faire leadership prevails extensively. SBM training must teach teachers through transformational leadership combined with instructional methods which both help teachers succeed and advance their collaboration (Silabay & Alegre, 2023).

Professionals require strengthened opportunities for innovation together with professional development. Widespread adhocracy culture requires policies which enable teachers to lead innovation and conduct action research and provide ongoing professional development to create a desirable future organizational culture (Oyetade et al., 2024).

The educational ecosystem requires this approach to keep teaching professionals able to adjust their practices according to shifting student requirements. To create effective support systems both for workload management and employee well-being should be viewed as necessary priorities. Due to the mismatch between commitment and job satisfaction specialist policies should implement workload balance initiatives combined with mental health programs and teacher acknowledgment systems to stop high dedication from turning into burnout (Roos & Borkoski, 2021).

The implementation of sustainable policies focused on educator well-being and work-life balance actions will lead to sustainable job satisfaction for teachers. Educational outcomes will strengthen more when teacher instruction methods become directly aligned with SBM practices.

The implementation of collaborative teaching methods combined with research-driven instruction and data-based decision-making will enhance professional fulfillment and ensure high-performing sustainability in Level 3 SBM schools (Caliba, 2022). The schools can achieve their maximum student achievement results through governance structure alignment with instructional best practices.

The instructional setting of schools at SBM Level 3 shows autonomy through innovative teaching practices that engage teachers with high levels of dedication and participation. Policy modifications should address the diverse leadership approaches and teacher job satisfaction because autonomy risks leading to confused roles, overwhelming responsibilities and staff

disengagement. Future research should investigate how autonomous school management methods affect education quality through time and advocacy for teaching professionals and academic results to validate sustainable governance enhancements in education.

**Table 6.**  
Characteristics of SBM Level 3 Schools

Type of Organizational Culture	Now	Preferred
	Mean Score	Mean Score
Adhocracy	30.8*	34.8*
Clan	22.9	21.6
Hierarchy	22.7	19.4
Market	23.3	23.9
Type of Leadership Style	Frequency	Percent (%)
Autocratic	4	28.6%
Democratic	4	28.6%
Laissez-faire	6*	42.9%
Total	14	100.0%
Teacher Affects	Mean (s.d.)	Level of Teacher Affects
Commitment	3.48 (3.76)	Very High
Job Satisfaction	3.18 (0.35)	High
Work Engagement	4.80 (0.40)	High

Note: \* Dominant Organizational Culture; Dominant leadership style

<b>Commitment &amp; Job Satisfaction</b>	<b>Work Engagement</b>
1.00 – 1.74 = Very Low	1.00 – 1.82 = Very Low
1.75 – 2.49 = Low	1.83 – 2.65 = Low
2.50 – 3.26 = High	2.66 – 3.48 = Slightly Low
3.25 – 4.00 = Very High	3.49 – 4.31 = Slightly High
	4.32 – 5.14 = High
	5.15 – 6.00 = Very High

### *Organizational Culture Across SBM Levels*

Qualitative information from interviews with teachers and school administrators at different levels of SBM implementation also steadily uncovered a strong preference for Adhocracy culture, especially at SBM Level 3. This culture, as Sheremet et al. (2024) envisioned, features innovation, risk-taking, flexibility, and decentralization in alignment with contemporary education reform directions toward responsiveness to students' needs and local diversity. Teachers highlighted that school leaders at their schools nurtured experimentation and reflective practice enabling a psychologically safe space for innovation.

*“We are constantly being urged to try new ways in our lessons or tests of learning. Even if we fail, there is space for thinking and learning. Our school head reminds us: it's okay to take risks if it's for student learning.” (Teacher, SBM Level 3)*

This discovery may be used to support Berhanu (2023) contention that high-performing learning cultures foster teaching innovation and fuel pedagogical change. Nevertheless, Level 1 and Level 2 SBM schools were found to have bureaucratic obstacles as their vulnerability, where formalization of processes and hierarchical decision-making were inextricably ingrained.

*“Our school would rather be flexible, but the paperwork and approvals take so long. We have to go so many levels with everything before we can even implement a change.” (School Head, SBM Level 2)*

This is in line with Asad (2021) critique of bureaucratic inertia, which he quotes as being against substantive school change. These findings indicate a partial misalignment between SBM's espoused values and its actualized practices in certain contexts, especially in less mature SBM contexts.

While some stories drew on Clan culture, which embodies interpersonal connection, working together, and sponsorship, it was largely undeveloped (Myende & Nhlumayo, 2022). Teachers also noted a lack of longitudinal interpersonal support and formal peer mentoring arrangements, required to maintain a collaborative school culture (Mullen & Klimaitis, 2021). Furthermore, the Hierarchy and Market cultures were proven to be contradictory with schools' present requirements.

*"We are drifting away from the 'command and control' model. The school is now asking us to be like innovators, not merely like rule followers."* (Coordinator, SBM Level 1)

Although the trend towards Adhocracy is an expression of adaptability to learning in the 21st century, schools must embrace hybrid forms of culture that selectively integrate innovation with relational collaboration (Gamaliia et al., 2023). Institutionalization of peer learning communities, professional learning networks, and shared leadership systems can potentially balance flexibility with unity, especially for transition SBM Level 1 and 2 schools.

### **Dominant Leadership Styles by SBM Level**

The majority of the subjects, particularly from SBM Level 3 companies, portrayed their leadership style as Laissez-faire—non-intrusiveness, autonomy, and trust dependence. Although a few perceived it to be emancipative, leadership ambiguity concern, strategic misfit, and diffuse accountability were mentioned.

*"Our principal gives us full freedom. It's empowering, yes.....but sometimes we're not even sure where the school is headed, or what the shared goals are."* (Master Teacher, SBM Level 3)

It resonates with Kamal and Kesuma (2024) denunciation of laissez-faire leaders as passive and even dangerous under circumstances of no clarity and shared vision. SBM Level 1 and SBM Level 2 members, however, yearned for democratic or transformational leadership, which promotes participation, openness, and shared visioning (Mendez, 2022).

*"There are instances wherein decisions are done without consulting. We follow through, but do not feel as though we are included in the school's direction construction."* (Teacher, SBM Level 1)

Certain participants supported transformational leadership—a style of leadership characterized by intellectual stimulation, individualized encouragement, and stimulating commitment (Ghorbani et al., 2023).

*“Teachers crave listening and leading leadership—not merely stepping aside. We need to have high expectations, but we also want to be trusted and supported.”*  
(Guidance Counselor, SBM Level 2)

While autonomy is essential in a decentralized SBM system, leadership has to set strategic direction and ensure shared ownership. Transformational leadership skills have to be developed through leadership development training, especially in schools where passive leadership is causing disruption to setting direction and role clarity.

### *Teacher Affects Across SBM Levels*

At each level of SBM, staff reported high levels of commitment, satisfaction, and involvement, particularly in SBM Level 3 schools where participatory governance, distributed leadership, and collegiality were better established.

*“I really do care about how this school works. It makes me stay here, even during the times when work is abounded. I feel accountable for our success.”* (Teacher, SBM Level 3)

This is consistent with Si (2024) research where they discovered teacher involvement in decision-making to be positively associated with professional satisfaction and organizational commitment. Respondents also explained administrative overload stress, even in the schools that focused on empowerment. Teachers explained role ambiguity and conflict between instructional and administrative demands.

*“We’re expected to lead, innovate, attend seminars, and teach all at once. It’s fulfilling, but it’s also overwhelming sometimes.”* (Lead Teacher, SBM Level 3)

In SBM Level 1 environments, limited teacher participation in planning activities appeared to quell morale and work engagement.

*“We do our part, but we’re rarely acknowledged or consulted. It feels like we’re just implementers, not contributors.”* (Teacher, SBM Level 1)

This concurs with Viac and Fraser (2020) where they emphasize the call for load regulation, explicit expectations, and recognition to sustain the long-run teacher well-being and retention.

Since SBM involves eliciting positive teacher affect, it is open to formal inclusion, controllable workloads, and secure recognition systems. School leaders' demands are to consciously construct positive professional environments that ensure empowerment is balanced with safeguarding for well-being.

## **Conclusion**

Results indicate that the prevalence of Adhocracy culture exists on all SBM management levels where educational emphasis focuses on school-based innovation alongside flexible decision-making processes. The educational system now adapts present-day

governance methods which emphasize participatory management to develop work environments suitable for ongoing development along with experimentation.

The continued use of Laissez-faire leadership as the dominant style in organizations presents problems regarding the proper separation between guided direction and individual autonomy.

The leadership approach generates teacher trust and independence yet creates possible challenges toward controlling decisions, defining roles, and diminishing performance efficiency.

A positive work environment emerges from superior SBM implementation levels because teachers demonstrate enhanced commitment and job satisfaction and work engagement even between different SBM levels. School leadership and governance improvement requires school heads to complete training sessions that teach them transformational and instructional leadership techniques for empowering teachers while maintaining both accountability measures and strategic pathways.

Mentorship programs together with coaching initiatives bridge leadership gaps which leads to enhanced school management. The evidence demonstrates that institutions with diminished SBM implementation needs to adopt inclusive governance practices since elevated SBM standards link to heightened teacher motivation together with enhanced school engagement.

Educational institutions that create professional learning communities will help their staff make joint policy decisions and refine current approaches. The improvement of work engagement along with commitment and teacher job satisfaction depends heavily on how well schools handle the administrative stress and workload and their recognition systems.

The combination of mental health assistance with work distribution modifications and career development prospects supports enduring teacher well-being alongside their achievements. Schools need to carry out Adhocracy culture within a framework that incorporates Clan culture to boost collaborative work and Hierarchy culture to achieve efficient processes for unified stability and flexibility.

Moreover, the study dependence on mean scores and self-reported data allows biases to persist because teacher perceptions might change due to individual circumstances and school environment together with external factors.

The Kruskal-Wallis test shows statistical significance but neglects vital factors like teacher population characteristics and academic institution funding and community activity levels that influence work dedication together with job happiness and involvement levels. Longitudinal studies along with mixed-method research methods should be used to establish strong empirical connections between School-Based Management implementation and school achievement in future investigations.

The research still delivers quantitative evidence regarding how SBM influences the development of educational leadership and governance and school staff motivation. The findings about Adhocracy dominance and Laissez-faire leadership style help advance theoretical knowledge of effective decentralized education system management.

Teacher affective factors show marked disparities across different levels of Society-Based Management requiring stronger policies to benefit teacher well-being and professional fulfillment. The research findings provide important direction to authorities and administrators of education to advance leadership training programs and optimize organizational culture and enhance decentralization implementation approaches for sustainable educational development.

## REFERENCES

- Ahmad, I. A. I., Dawodu, S. O., Osasona, F., Akagha, O. V., Anyanwu, A. C., & Onwusinkwue, S. (2024). 5G deployment strategies: Challenges and opportunities: A comparative review for Africa and the USA. *World Journal Of Advanced Research And Reviews*, 21(1), 2428-2439. <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2024.21.1.0345>
- Ahmed, E. I. (2023). Systematic review of research on educational leadership and management in Muslim societies. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 51(1), 52-74. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220973658>
- Alshamari, S., Shapiro, S. L., & Dastrup, R. (2024). Examining the relationship between pre-sport mega-event programming and physical activity participation. *Sport, Business and Management: An International Journal*, 14(5/6), 705-728. <https://doi.org/10.1108/sbm-11-2023-0143>
- Arar, K., & Nasra, M. A. (2020). Linking school-based management and school effectiveness: The influence of self-based management, motivation and effectiveness in the Arab education system in Israel. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(1), 186-204. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143218775428>
- Asad, A. (2021). From bureaucratic-centralism management to school based management: managing human resources in the management of education program. *Indonesian Research Journal in Education | IRJE|*, 5(1), 201-225. <https://doi.org/10.22437/irje.v5i1.12947>
- Astika, Y. W., & Wismar, T. (2024). Decentralization and School-Based Management: A Comparative Study of Public and Private Schools in Jambi, Indonesia. *Enigma in Education*, 2(2), 75-86. <https://doi.org/10.61996/edu.v2i2.76>
- Berhanu, K. Z. (2023). Practices, challenges, and prospects of implementing School-Based Management (SBM) system in Ethiopian schools: Implications for policy makers. *Research in Educational Administration and Leadership*, 8(2), 465-504. <https://doi.org/10.30828/real.1275282>
- Bevan, S., & Hayday, S. (2001). Costing sickness absence in the UK. *REPORT-INSTITUTE FOR EMPLOYMENT STUDIES*. <https://www.employment-studies.co.uk/system/files/resources/files/382.pdf>
- Cao, L., Shamsudin, M. F., & Hassim, A. A. (2024). Understanding the Key Types of Quantitative Research and Their Impact. *Journal of Postgraduate Current Business Research*, 9(1), 54-68. <https://abrn.asia/ojs/index.php/jpcbr/article/view/159>

- Cornito, C. M. (2021). Striking a Balance between Centralized and Decentralized Decision Making: A School-Based Management Practice for Optimum Performance. *International Journal on Social and Education Sciences*, 3(4), 656-669. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijonses.217>
- Dacpano, E. B. (2022). The Influence of School Heads' Transformational Leadership on Schools' Performance: The Case of City Schools Division of San Fernando, La Union. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 3(9), 1717-1736. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmabero3.09.12>
- Du, S., Pan, H., Meng, Z., Wang, N., & Ren, J. (2023). Can vertical environmental regulation become a sharp weapon in China's green development process? The moderating role of pollution dividend. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 11, 1113457. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1113457>
- Ekere, S., & Udeme, A. (2021). *Educational Reforms as Correlates of Principals' Administrative Effectiveness in Public Secondary Schools in AkwaIbom State, Nigeria*. Authorea, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.22541/au.162850028.82077673/v2>
- Fiore, M., Galati, A., Gołębiewski, J., & Drejerska, N. (2020). Stakeholders' involvement in establishing sustainable business models: The case of Polish dairy cooperatives. *British Food Journal*, 122(5), 1671-1691. <https://doi.org/10.1108/bfj-04-2019-0263>
- Gamaliia, K., Turchak-Lazurenko, L., Lavrenyuk, O., Penchuk, O., & Lytvynenko, N. (2023). Synergy of design, culture, and innovation in pedagogy: New horizons for education. *Res J Adv Humanit [Internet]*, 4(2), 11-9. <https://doi.org/10.58256/rjah.v4i4.1131>
- Ghorbani, A., Mohammadi, N., Rooddehghan, Z., Bakhshi, F., & Nasrabadi, A. N. (2023). Transformational leadership in development of transformative education in nursing: a qualitative study. *BMC nursing*, 22(1), 17. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-022-01154-z>
- Gkrimpizi, T., Peristeras, V., & Magnisalis, I. (2023). Classification of barriers to digital transformation in higher education institutions: Systematic literature review. *Education Sciences*, 13(7), 746. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13070746>
- Hayes, S. L. (2020). *The influence of organizational culture on the performance of small, private nonprofit colleges and universities: An explanatory sequential mixed-methods study* (Doctoral dissertation, Caldwell University). <https://doi.org/10.53797/ujssh.v4i1.4.2025>
- Hu, Y., & Duyar, I. (2024). Analyzing the influence of principals' instructional leadership, teachers' attitudes toward change, and schools' collaborative learning cultures on educational reform in learning. *Future in Educational Research*, 2(2), 166-182. <https://doi.org/10.1002/fer3.30>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v10-i9/7870>
- Kamal, F., & Kesuma, T. A. R. P. (2024). Laissez-Faire Leadership: A Comprehensive Systematic Review for Effective Education Practices. *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn)*, 18(4), 1460-1467. <https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v18i4.21407>
- Kovačević, J., Mujkić, A., & Kapo, A. (2023). Examining school leadership in a transitional context: A mixed-methods study of leadership practices and school cultures as

- mechanisms of educational change. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 51(1), 219-244. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220971286>
- Madi Odeh, R. B., Obeidat, B. Y., Jaradat, M. O., Masa'deh, R. E., & Alshurideh, M. T. (2023). The transformational leadership role in achieving organizational resilience through adaptive cultures: the case of Dubai service sector. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 72(2), 440-468. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijppm-02-2021-0093>
- Mendez, R. (2022). Leadership Style of School Heads and Its Moderating Impact on Work Stress of Teachers in a District. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 3(9), 1-1. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7013134>
- Mertens, D. M. (2019). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods*. Sage publications. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjop.12775>
- Mullen, C. A., & Klimaitis, C. C. (2021). Defining mentoring: a literature review of issues, types, and applications. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1483(1), 19-35. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.14176>
- Myende, P. E., & Nhlumayo, B. S. (2022). Enhancing parent–teacher collaboration in rural schools: parents’ voices and implications for schools. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 25(3), 490-514. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2020.1731764>
- Nanda, S., & Warriar, U. (2023). Socio-Managerial Framework of Health Governance: Empirical Evidence from India’s National Sanitation Program (SBM-G). *Journal of Health Management*, 25(4), 721-733. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09720634221150998>
- Oyetade, K., Harmse, A., & Zuva, T. (2024). Internal organizational factors influencing ICT adoption for sustainable growth. *Discover Global Society*, 2(1), 108. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44282-024-00136-7>
- Peel, K. L. (2020). A beginner’s guide to applied educational research using thematic analysis. *Practical Assessment Research and Evaluation*, 25(1). <https://research.usq.edu.au/item/q59y5/a-beginner-s-guide-to-applied-educational-research-using-thematic-analysis>
- 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>
- RAJÂA, O., & EL GHAZLANI, M. (2024). Exploring the Organizational Culture Assessment and validation of the Cameron and Quinn’s Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI). *Revue des Études Multidisciplinaires en Sciences Économiques et Sociale*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.48375/IMIST.PRSM/remses-v9i3.44114>
- Rint, R. M., & Astillero, J. A. (2024). Challenges in School-Based Management: A Basis for Enhancement Program. *Educational Research (IJMCER)*, 6(3), 98-152. [https://www.ijmcer.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/IJMCER\\_Lo63098152.pdf](https://www.ijmcer.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/IJMCER_Lo63098152.pdf)
- Roos, B. H., & Borkoski, C. C. (2021). Attending to the teacher in the teaching: Prioritizing faculty well-being. *Perspectives of the ASHA Special Interest Groups*, 6(4), 831-840. [https://doi.org/10.1044/2021\\_persp-21-00006](https://doi.org/10.1044/2021_persp-21-00006)
- Saro, J. M., Apat, J. Q., & Pareja, M. S. (2023). A descriptive-correlational study of the teachers’ motivation, competences, and perceptions in writing action research. *J Adv Educ Philos*, 7(1), 14-24. <https://doi.org/10.36348/jaep.2023.v07i01.003>
- Shandana, M. (2024). Analyzing the Impact of Cultural Factors on the Success of Organizational Innovation: A Case Study in the Technology Industry. *Journal Social*



- Humanity Perspective*, 2(2), 44-50.  
<https://www.scieclouds.com/ojsnew/index.php/JSHP/article/view/100>
- Sheremet, O., Chorny, O., Pshenychna, T., Sheremet, Y., & Domotskyi, D. (2024). Analysis of the Impact of Decentralization Policy on Higher Education Management: Challenges and Opportunities. *Academia*, (35-36), 92-111.  
<https://pasitheelibrary.upatras.gr/academia/article/view/5004>
- Si, J. (2024). Higher education teachers' professional well-being in the rise of managerialism: insights from China. *Higher Education*, 87(4), 1121-1138.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-023-01056-2>
- Silabay, A. C., & Alegre, E. M. (2023). Achieving School-Based Management Level III: Practice, Experiences, and Challenges Among Key Players. *International Journal of Membrane Science and Technology*, 10(2), 977-993.  
<https://doi.org/10.15379/ijmst.v10i2.1360>
- Sison, M. N., & Fuentes, H. C. (2025). Stakeholders' Engagement and School Performance: Basis for a Proposed School-Community Partnership Program. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 6(2), 608-620.
- Sliwka, A., Klopsch, B., Beigel, J., & Tung, L. (2024). Transformational leadership for deeper learning: shaping innovative school practices for enhanced learning. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 62(1), 103-121. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jea-03-2023-0049>
- Sudibjo, N., & Riantini, M. G. D. (2023). Factors affecting teachers' work engagement: The case of private school teachers in Jakarta Metropolitan, Indonesia. *REICE: Revista Iberoamericana sobre Calidad, Eficacia y Cambio en Educación*, 21(1), 119-138.  
<https://doi.org/10.15366/reice2023.21.1.006>
- Sugandi, B., Tadesse, E., & Ghassani, N. (2021). A correlation study between principals' instructional leadership practice and teachers' organizational commitment in Yogyakarta province, Indonesia. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, 10(06), 77-93. <https://doi.org/10.47119/ijrp100791620212002>
- Sugianto, S., Suroyo, S., & Fatmasari, R. (2024). Implementation of school-based management. *Jurnal EDUCATIO: Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia*, 10(2), 232-240.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.29210/1202424724>
- Sun, Y., Mi, J., & Liu, L. (2025). Administrative Burden and Business Satisfaction with Public Services. *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, 21(74), 151-171.  
<https://doi.org/10.24193/tras.74e.8>
- Viac, C., & Fraser, P. (2020). Teachers' well-being: A framework for data collection and analysis. *OECD Education Working Papers*, (213), 0\_1-81.  
<https://www.proquest.com/openview/4a2fab8930833e04411ce2583993c8ab/1?cbl=54479&pq-origsite=gscholar>
- Virgana, V., & Suradika, A. (2022). School Management Effectiveness: The Analysis Of Organizational Culture, Leadership Style, Work Environment, And Satisfaction. *International Journal of Educational Management and Innovation*, 3(3), 263-278. <https://doi.org/10.12928/ijemi.v3i3.6056>
- Wijaya, A. S. G. (2024). The role of leadership in driving organizational innovation and adaptation in the era of technological disruption. *Transforma Jurnal Manajemen*, 2(2), 183-192. <https://doi.org/10.28932/jmm.v2i2.5433>
- Wilson, K. (2009). *A survey of employee engagement*. University of Missouri-Columbia.  
<https://doi.org/10.32469/10355/6137>
- Zhao, X. (2024). The Impact of Collaborative Learning on Teacher Professional Development and Individual Growth Within Team Collaboration. *Research and Advances in Education*, 3(2), 11-15. <https://doi.org/10.56397/rae.2024.02.03>

- Zurkinden, L. (2022). Organizational culture: A tool for bridging the design –implementation gap of sustainable business model innovation. *Journal of the International Council for Small Business*, 3(3), 246-254. <https://doi.org/10.1080/26437015.2021.1989636>
- Zurkinden, L. (2022). Organizational culture: A tool for bridging the design –implementation gap of sustainable business model innovation. *Journal of the International Council for Small Business*, 3(3), 246-254. <https://doi.org/10.1080/26437015.2021.1989636>