

Mapping School-Based Management Implementation in Senior High Schools in Ambon City: A Six-Factor Analysis in the Context of Maluku

Sendy Putra Pradana

Universitas Pattimura, Indonesia
sendy.pradana@lecturer.unpatti.ac.id

ABSTRACT

School-Based Management (SBM) enables schools to exercise greater autonomy in managing educational programs, resources, services, and stakeholder relationships in accordance with institutional and contextual needs. This study examined the profile of perceived SBM implementation among participating senior high schools in Ambon City using a six-factor framework incorporating the local context of Maluku. A quantitative cross-sectional descriptive survey was conducted involving 97 respondents from 10 public and private senior high schools. Schools were selected purposively, while quota-based recruitment was used to target approximately 10 respondents from each school. Data were collected using a 48-item, four-point Likert questionnaire organized into six empirically derived factors. Internal consistency across the six factors was adequate to very high (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.797\text{--}0.966$). Quality-Oriented Leadership and Capacity Development recorded the highest mean score ($M = 3.895$, $SD = 0.238$), closely followed by Context-Responsive Adaptive Governance ($M = 3.893$, $SD = 0.219$). Collaborative and Contextual Governance showed the relatively lowest mean ($M = 3.680$, $SD = 0.583$) and the greatest variability. Item- and school-level profiles further indicated uneven implementation, particularly in community engagement, local-context integration, resource management, student support, and distinctive school programs. The findings suggest that SBM in the participating schools was perceived positively, although implementation profiles varied across governance dimensions. Efforts to strengthen SBM may therefore benefit from sustaining internal leadership and adaptive capacity while enhancing community partnerships and the systematic integration of Maluku's social, cultural, and geographical characteristics into school programs.

Keywords: School-Based Management, School Governance, School Leadership, Local Context, Maluku

Corresponding Author: ¹Sendy Putra Pradana - ¹sendy.pradana@lecturer.unpatti.ac.id

How to cite : Pradana, S. P. (2026). Mapping School-Based Management Implementation in Senior High Schools in Ambon City: A Six-Factor Analysis in the Context of Maluku. *Journal of Social and Scientific Education*, 3(2), 485-500. <https://doi.org/10.58230/josse.v3i2.813>

INTRODUCTION

School-Based Management (SBM) represents a decentralized approach to educational governance that expands schools' authority to make decisions in accordance with institutional priorities and students' needs. Horwood et al. (2022) reported that school autonomy policies can strengthen principals' perceptions of their decision-making authority, whereas Ordofa & Asgedom (2022) emphasized that accountability remains essential to ensure that greater autonomy translates into improvements in educational processes and outcomes. Thus, SBM should not be understood merely as the transfer of decision-making authority from central government to individual schools, but rather as the capacity of schools to exercise such authority responsibly and purposefully. School autonomy, therefore, needs to be supported by leadership capable of mobilizing and developing organizational capacity.

Leadership capable of mobilizing organizational capacity has become increasingly essential, as contemporary school governance is unlikely to function effectively when decision-

making is concentrated solely in the principal. Distributed leadership is understood as a collective practice involving a shared vision, the distribution of responsibilities, participatory decision-making, and adaptive leadership (Nadeem, 2024). At the organizational level, distributed leadership has also been linked to more collaborative working environments among teachers and greater openness to professional contributions (De Jong et al., 2023). This internal collaboration should then extend beyond the school organization to support more productive relationships with families and local communities.

Relationships between schools, families, and communities are a crucial element of effective school governance, as educational needs cannot always be fulfilled solely through resources available within the school. School-community partnerships can contribute additional resources and forms of support, especially for schools facing resource limitations (Ngobeni, 2024). Effective collaboration between schools and communities also requires strong leadership, acknowledgment of partners' expertise, flexible communication mechanisms, and sufficient resource support (Haight et al., 2024). The role of collaboration becomes increasingly significant when School-Based Management (SBM) is implemented in educational systems shaped by specific geographical, social, and cultural contexts.

In Indonesia, the relationship among autonomy, leadership, and organizational culture continues to be a critical concern in the implementation of SBM. Principal leadership has been shown to support SBM implementation through the mediating influence of school culture, suggesting that decentralized structures alone are insufficient without leadership capacity to sustain them (Sumarsono et al., 2026). Similarly, the transition from more authoritative leadership practices toward shared decision-making in Indonesian schools is characterized by effective communication, collegial relationships, and the distribution of leadership responsibilities (Lessy et al., 2024). These findings indicate that SBM should be understood as a context-sensitive process shaped not only by institutional arrangements but also by the environments in which schools operate.

Attention to local context is particularly relevant for schools in archipelagic regions such as Maluku. Sedubun et al. (2024), in their study of senior high schools in the Aru Islands, reported that SBM practices coexist with challenges related to staffing limitations, student activity development, and the need to strengthen community involvement. Perspectives from place-based education further emphasize that local places, communities, environments, and lived experiences can serve as important foundations for making educational practices more meaningful and relevant (Yemini et al., 2025). Accordingly, assessing SBM implementation in Ambon requires an analytical framework that captures not only conventional managerial functions but also schools' responsiveness to the social, cultural, and geographical realities of their local environment.

These considerations reveal an important research gap. Existing studies of SBM in Indonesia have largely examined general implementation, participation, autonomy, leadership, and management quality. For example, Ela et al. (2023) found that the implementation of school participation does not necessarily ensure that all participatory roles are performed optimally or that established standards are fully met, while Bjork & Susanti (2023) showed that the effectiveness of community participation in the Indonesian context is strongly influenced by institutional arrangements and local characteristics. However, relatively limited research has sought to map SBM implementation through an empirically derived

multidimensional structure that explicitly incorporates social and cultural conditions, geographical characteristics, resource constraints, tolerance, and local networks as integral components of school governance.

The present study addresses this gap by applying an empirically derived six-factor framework to map SBM implementation across 10 senior high schools in Ambon City. Within this framework, local context is examined as a cross-cutting element of school governance rather than as an isolated or supplementary dimension. This positioning constitutes a key contribution of the present study, as it enables SBM implementation to be examined through factor-, item-, and school-level profiles within an archipelagic educational setting.

Accordingly, this study aims to: (1) describe SBM implementation based on the six empirical factors; (2) identify the aspects of implementation that are relatively strongest and those requiring further strengthening; (3) examine specific practices at the item level; and (4) map variations in SBM implementation profiles across 10 senior high schools in Ambon City.

METHODS OF RESEARCH

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative approach using a cross-sectional descriptive survey design. This design was selected because the study sought to describe the implementation of School-Based Management (SBM) based on respondents' perceptions at a single point in time, without introducing any experimental intervention. The use of descriptive statistics, particularly means and standard deviations, to characterize the level of implementation across several domains of school management has also been applied in school program implementation research by [Shanko & Kabtyimer \(2024\)](#). Similarly, a cross-sectional survey design was employed by [Dorukbaşı & Cansoy \(2024\)](#) to examine leadership and teachers' professional practices. Accordingly, the present analysis was intended to establish an implementation profile rather than to test causal relationships among constructs.

Population, Sample, and Sampling Procedure

The study population comprised personnel working in public and private senior high schools in Ambon City who had direct experience with or knowledge of school management practices. Ten public and private senior high schools participated in the study. Schools were selected purposively to include variation in institutional status and school-management settings relevant to the descriptive purpose of the study. Because school selection was non-probabilistic, the 10 participating schools were not intended to constitute a statistically representative sample of all senior high schools in Ambon City. The resulting school-level findings should therefore be interpreted as descriptive profiles of the participating schools rather than estimates of city-wide SBM implementation.

At the respondent level, the study employed a quota-based non-probability sampling approach. A target of approximately 10 respondents was established for each school, consisting of principals, vice principals, and/or teachers who were familiar with or directly involved in school management practices. This approach was intended to obtain information from a relatively comparable number of personnel across participating schools. In practice, nine schools contributed 10 respondents each, whereas one school contributed seven respondents because of the limited number of personnel available and willing to participate

during the data collection period.

Thus, the final sample consisted of 97 respondents. Because recruitment was conducted using school-level quotas rather than a complete enumeration of all eligible personnel, the total number of individuals approached was not systematically recorded. Consequently, a conventional response rate could not be calculated. The primary unit of analysis was the individual respondent, while school identity was retained as a grouping variable for constructing descriptive SBM implementation profiles across schools. The unequal number of respondents across schools was retained in the analysis and reported transparently because comparisons at the school level were not intended to support population-level inference or to establish a ranking of school performance. Methodologically, the sampling procedure can therefore be described as non-probability sampling, combining purposive sampling for school selection and quota sampling for determining the target number of respondents within each school.

Research Instrument

Data were collected using a locally contextualized School-Based Management (SBM) questionnaire developed for the Maluku context in a preceding instrument-development study. The instrument was not directly adapted from a single existing SBM questionnaire. Instead, it was developed through a process of conceptual adaptation and extension based on core SBM principles, school service management, distinctive school programs, and the local characteristics of Maluku. The development and validation procedures followed the educational instrument-development framework proposed by [El-Hamamsy et al. \(2022\)](#), which involved construct conceptualization, blueprint development, item generation, expert validation, empirical testing, and evaluation of reliability and internal structure.

The initial instrument consisted of 50 items representing 15 conceptual dimensions: school autonomy, principal leadership, community participation, transparency, accountability, quality assurance, curriculum management, student affairs, facilities and infrastructure, financial management, public relations, school administration, guidance and counseling, distinctive school programs, and Maluku local potential. These dimensions were initially organized into three broader conceptual domains: SBM governance, school service management, and contextual school development.

All items were rated using a four-point Likert scale: 4 = Strongly Appropriate, 3 = Appropriate, 2 = Less Appropriate, and 1 = Not Appropriate. The four-category response format was used to avoid a neutral midpoint and to encourage respondents to provide a more explicit assessment of the school management practices they had observed or experienced.

Evidence supporting the instrument was obtained from the preceding instrument-development study. Content validity was evaluated by four experts using Aiken's V, yielding coefficients ranging from 0.667 to 1.000, with a mean value of 0.877. The initial 50-item instrument also demonstrated high overall internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.944. Evidence based on internal structure was subsequently examined through Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) using responses from 107 senior high school teachers. The data yielded a KMO value of 0.675, indicating suitability for factor analysis at the lower end of the acceptable range, together with a statistically significant Bartlett's Test of Sphericity ($p < 0.001$). The EFA yielded a six-factor solution accounting for 68.4% of the total variance, with

48 of the 50 items demonstrating primary factor loadings of ≥ 0.40 . Two items (Items 3 and 20 in the initial version) did not meet the loading criterion and were therefore excluded from factor-score construction in the present implementation study. The preceding instrument-development analysis primarily used the magnitude of the primary factor loading as the item-retention criterion. Detailed cross-loading diagnostics are not reported in the present implementation study; therefore, the possibility of cross-loading among retained items cannot be fully evaluated here. These findings were interpreted as preliminary evidence supporting the content validity and internal structure of the instrument, rather than as confirmation of a definitive measurement model. It should be noted that the preceding EFA was conducted exclusively among senior high school teachers, whereas the present implementation study also involved principals and vice principals. Therefore, the equivalence of the six-factor structure across respondent roles has not yet been established. The factor structure is consequently treated as a preliminary operational framework rather than a fully invariant measurement model across professional groups.

Based on this empirical structure, the present study used 48 items organized into six factors, as presented in Table 1. The complete wording of the 48 retained items and their allocation across the six factors is provided in Supplementary Table S1.

Table 1 Six-Factor Structure of the Sbm Instrument

Factor	Factor Name	Number of Items
F1	Collaborative and Contextual Governance	16
F2	Accountability, Planning, and Resource Management	11
F3	Context-Responsive Adaptive Governance	8
F4	Quality-Oriented Leadership and Capacity Development	5
F5	Operational Management and Student Support	5
F6	Student Development and Distinctive Programs	3
Total		48

The six-factor structure was used as the operational scoring framework for analyzing SBM implementation in the present study. However, because this structure was derived from exploratory analysis in the preceding instrument-development study, it was treated as a preliminary empirical structure rather than a final confirmed measurement model. Further examination using larger independent samples and confirmatory factor analysis is therefore recommended to evaluate the stability and generalizability of the six-factor structure.

Data Collection Procedure

Data collection was conducted among the 10 participating senior high schools in Ambon City after coordination with the respective school authorities. At each school, potential respondents were identified from principals, vice principals, and teachers who had knowledge of or direct involvement in school management practices, in accordance with the respondent criteria established for the study. Approximately 10 respondents were targeted from each school, although the actual number depended on respondent availability during the data collection period.

Prior to completing the questionnaire, respondents were informed about the purpose of the study and the voluntary nature of their participation. The questionnaire was administered using the same instructions and four-point response scale across all participating

schools. Completed responses were subsequently checked for completeness and consistency before being entered into the dataset for statistical analysis. A total of 97 usable responses from the 10 participating schools were included in the final analysis.

Data Analysis

Data processing and statistical analyses were conducted using Jamovi version 2.7.30. Prior to analysis, the dataset was screened for completeness and consistency of response coding within the 1–4 scale. Because the six factors consisted of different numbers of items, factor scores were calculated using the mean of the constituent items rather than raw summed scores. This approach retained each factor score on the original 1–4 response metric and enabled direct comparisons across factors. For respondent i and factor j , the factor score was calculated as:

where represents the factor score of respondent i on factor j , X_{im} represents the response score for item m , and K_j represents the number of items included in factor j . Accordingly, F1 was calculated from 16 items, F2 from 11 items, F3 from eight items, F4 and F5 from five items each, and F6 from three items. Internal consistency was subsequently assessed separately for each of the six factors using Cronbach's alpha. Factor-level reliability was examined because the instrument represents a multidimensional structure; therefore, a single overall reliability coefficient was considered insufficient to characterize the internal consistency of the individual factors.

Descriptive analyses were then conducted in three stages. First, descriptive statistics for each factor were calculated, including the number of respondents (N), mean, standard deviation, median, minimum, maximum, and 95% confidence interval. Second, item-level mean scores were examined to identify practices with relatively higher and lower implementation scores within each factor. Third, mean scores for F1–F6 were calculated for each participating school to construct descriptive school-level SBM profiles. Because the number of respondents within each school ranged from seven to ten, school-level comparisons were interpreted descriptively rather than inferentially and were not used to establish rankings among schools.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

RESULTS

Reliability of the Six Sbm Factors

Before examining the implementation profile of SBM, the internal consistency of the six factor scores was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha. The reliability coefficients for each factor are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 Internal Consistency of the Sbm Factors

Factor	Number of Items	Cronbach's α
F1. Collaborative and Contextual Governance	16	0.966
F2. Accountability, Planning, and Resource Management	11	0.946
F3. Context-Responsive Adaptive Governance	8	0.854
F4. Quality-Oriented Leadership and Capacity Development	5	0.834
F5. Operational Management and Student Support	5	0.801
F6. Student Development and Distinctive Programs	3	0.797

The six factors demonstrated adequate to very high internal consistency. F1 and F2 yielded the highest Cronbach's alpha coefficients, whereas F6 showed the lowest coefficient. Nevertheless, the reliability coefficient for F6 remained adequate for use in the descriptive analysis. The particularly high alpha coefficient observed for F1 should be interpreted in light of its larger number of constituent items, because Cronbach's alpha is partly influenced by scale length. Accordingly, differences in alpha coefficients across factors should not be interpreted as indicating differences in the strength or level of SBM implementation.

Sbm Implementation Profile Among the 97 Respondents

To describe the overall pattern of SBM implementation, descriptive statistics were calculated for each of the six factors across the 97 respondents. The results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3 Descriptive Statistics of the Six Sbm Factors

Rank	Factor	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max	95% CI
1	F4. Quality-Oriented Leadership and Capacity Development	97	3.895	0.238	4.000	3.000	4.000	3.847–3.943
2	F3. Context-Responsive Adaptive Governance	97	3.893	0.219	4.000	3.000	4.000	3.849–3.937
3	F6. Student Development and Distinctive Programs	97	3.863	0.296	4.000	3.000	4.000	3.803–3.922
4	F5. Operational Management and Student Support	97	3.854	0.264	4.000	3.000	4.000	3.800–3.907
5	F2. Accountability, Planning, and Resource Management	97	3.845	0.314	4.000	2.364	4.000	3.782–3.909
6	F1. Collaborative and Contextual Governance	97	3.680	0.583	3.938	1.750	4.000	3.562–3.797

Note. Rank indicates the descriptive ordering of factor means and should not be interpreted as evidence of statistically significant differences between factors.

All six factors yielded mean scores close to the maximum possible score of 4. F4 (Quality-Oriented Leadership and Capacity Development) recorded the highest mean score ($M = 3.895$, $SD = 0.238$), followed very closely by F3 (Context-Responsive Adaptive Governance; $M = 3.893$, $SD = 0.219$). In contrast, F1 (Collaborative and Contextual Governance) showed the relatively lowest mean score ($M = 3.680$, $SD = 0.583$) and the greatest variability in respondents' perceptions.

Practices with the Highest and Lowest Relative Scores

To identify specific SBM practices that were perceived as relatively stronger or weaker within each factor, item-level mean scores were examined. Table 4 presents the highest- and lowest-rated practices within each of the six factors.

Table 4 Highest- and Lowest-Rated Practices Within Each Factor

Factor	Position	Practice	Mean
F1	Highest	Teachers are involved in developing teaching materials and learning programs	3.856
F1	Lowest	Social, cultural, and geographical conditions of Ambon/Maluku are considered when developing programs	3.536
F2	Highest	Information about school programs is communicated to school members and relevant stakeholders	3.928
F2	Lowest	Administrative services are conducted in an orderly, timely, and well-documented manner	3.794
F3	Highest (tie)	The school has the authority to develop programs according to its internal needs	3.948
F3	Highest (tie)	The principal conducts regular teacher supervision and professional development	3.948
F3	Lowest	The school utilizes local community networks	3.835
F4	Highest	The principal promotes a disciplined, open, and quality-oriented work culture	3.928
F4	Lowest	The school provides active guidance and counseling services	3.856
F5	Highest	The school has a clear system for addressing student problems	3.897
F5	Lowest	School facilities are well maintained	3.794
F6	Highest	Programs for developing student discipline, character, and leadership	3.948
F6	Lowest	Distinctive programs serve as a defining characteristic of the school	3.804

At the item level, relatively higher scores were observed for teacher involvement in instructional planning, communication of school programs, school autonomy, principal supervision, quality-oriented leadership, student problem management, and student character development. In contrast, relatively lower scores were observed for the integration of Ambon/Maluku's social, cultural, and geographical conditions into school programs, utilization of local community networks, administrative services, facility maintenance, and the development of distinctive school programs.

School-Level Sbm Implementation Profiles

To examine whether the six dimensions of SBM displayed similar or different patterns across the participating schools, factor means were subsequently calculated for each school. These school-level scores are presented descriptively in Table 5 and are intended to illustrate implementation profiles rather than to rank school performance.

Table 5 Mean Scores of the Six Sbm Factors by School

School	n	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6
1	10	3.981	3.991	3.988	4.000	3.980	4.000
2	10	3.762	3.709	3.800	3.820	3.740	3.800
3	10	3.906	3.891	3.925	3.940	3.940	3.933
4	10	2.262	3.891	3.950	3.980	3.980	3.900
5	10	3.525	3.455	3.712	3.680	3.700	3.733
6	10	3.925	3.982	3.975	4.000	3.920	3.667
7	10	3.769	3.855	3.888	3.900	3.820	3.767
8	10	3.831	3.809	3.812	3.740	3.640	3.867
9	10	3.931	3.918	3.912	3.920	3.860	4.000
10	7	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000

The school-level profiles revealed variation in the configuration of the six SBM factors. Some schools showed relatively consistent scores across factors, whereas others displayed more differentiated patterns. The most pronounced contrast was observed in School 4, where F1 ($M = 2.262$) was substantially lower than F2–F6, which ranged from 3.891 to 3.980. School 5 showed relatively lower scores particularly in F1 and F2, while School 6 showed a comparatively lower score in F6 and School 8 in F5. School 10 recorded the maximum mean score of 4.000 across all six factors based on responses from seven participants. This pattern should be interpreted cautiously because all responses were concentrated at the upper boundary of the scale, resulting in no observable variability and indicating a potential ceiling pattern.

DISCUSSION

Leadership and Adaptive Governance as Key Strengths of Sbm

The findings indicate that F4, Quality-Oriented Leadership and Capacity Development, achieved the highest mean score, although its value was almost identical to that of F3, Context-Responsive Adaptive Governance. [He et al. \(2024\)](#) demonstrated that instructional leadership by school principals contributes to teachers' professional development, while [Galdames-Calderón \(2023\)](#) emphasized that principals can strengthen organizational capacity by creating opportunities for teachers to assume leadership roles. In the present study, the relatively high scores for a quality-oriented work culture, involvement of school members, and supervision suggest that leadership has become one of the principal foundations of SBM implementation. These findings further indicate that school autonomy in the study context extends beyond formal decision-making authority and is translated into processes that provide direction and strengthen internal organizational capacity.

The similarly high score observed for F3 suggests that adaptive governance was also perceived as a prominent dimension of SBM implementation. Teacher leadership capacity is associated with professional learning and teacher self-efficacy ([Gümüş et al., 2022](#)). Sustained school improvement requires organizational capacity capable of embedding change into institutional routines ([Koh et al., 2023](#)). In the present study, authority to develop school programs, supervision, tolerance, and strategies for responding to constraints were brought together within the adaptive governance factor. This pattern suggests that strong SBM governance is characterized not merely by compliance with formal regulations, but also by the capacity of schools to adjust management practices in response to their specific needs and circumstances.

Accordingly, the relatively strong leadership and adaptive governance profiles should be sustained by institutionalizing distributed decision-making, continuous professional learning, and regular reflective supervision so that these practices do not remain dependent solely on individual school leaders.

Accountability, Planning, and Resource Management

F2 recorded a mean score of 3.845, with the communication of school program information receiving the highest rating. The use of data by school principals and teachers is more effective when supported by an organizational culture that positions data as a basis for decision-making ([Hawlitschek et al., 2024](#)). Data literacy is also important in translating

educational information into practical decisions ([Michos et al., 2023](#)). The present findings indicate that information-sharing mechanisms, self-evaluation, budget accountability, and the use of learning outcomes were generally perceived positively. However, the relatively lower score for administrative services suggests that there remains room to improve the efficiency of the administrative systems that support school governance. One plausible interpretation is that formal mechanisms for communicating programs and demonstrating accountability may already be relatively institutionalized, whereas the efficiency of day-to-day administrative services depends on more operational factors such as workflow organization, documentation practices, personnel capacity, and resource availability.

Strong accountability should also be safeguarded against becoming merely a mechanism of administrative compliance. [Jerrim & Sims \(2022\)](#) cautioned that accountability systems may generate pressure when their mechanisms emphasize control rather than improvement. [Rowe & Langman \(2025\)](#) likewise demonstrated that greater autonomy may create additional burdens for school principals when managerial responsibilities are not accompanied by sufficient resources. Therefore, the relatively high level of F2 would be more productive when accountability mechanisms are oriented toward continuous improvement rather than merely documenting activities. This consideration is particularly relevant for schools operating within archipelagic settings where resource management may be shaped by geographical and infrastructural constraints. Accordingly, strengthening F2 should not focus solely on increasing reporting requirements, but also on improving the efficiency and usability of administrative processes that support school-level decision making.

Operational Management, Student Support, and Distinctive Programs

F5 and F6 indicate that student problem management, distribution of responsibilities, and the development of student character and leadership were perceived positively by respondents. [Martinez-Yarza et al. \(2024\)](#) demonstrated that family engagement and students' sense of school belonging are associated with social-emotional development, while [Shaked \(2022\)](#) showed that school leadership plays an important role in directing family engagement toward broader educational objectives. The present findings suggest that student services should be maintained as an integrated component of school management rather than treated as an auxiliary function outside the SBM system. Nevertheless, the relatively lower scores for facility maintenance and guidance and counseling services indicate areas that should receive greater attention within the school planning cycle.

Distinctive school programs also remain an area with potential for further development, as the item concerning distinctive programs as a defining characteristic of the school received a lower mean score than student character development. The contrast between the relatively strong scores for routine student-development practices and the lower score for distinctive school programs may indicate that schools have been more successful in institutionalizing core student-management functions than in developing school-specific innovations. Distinctive programs may require not only internal organizational capacity but also sustained access to external resources, community networks, and locally relevant opportunities. School-community partnerships can facilitate the mobilization of resources that schools may struggle to provide independently ([Mkhize & Hungwe, 2022](#)). Leadership that extends beyond the physical boundaries of schools can also connect community assets with

institutional needs ([Salisbury & Richard, 2025](#)). In Ambon, distinctive school programs could therefore be developed through stronger engagement with local cultural resources, maritime potential, environmental characteristics, community assets, and the social identity of the region. Such programs could serve as a bridge between the internal capacity of schools and the distinctive characteristics of their surrounding context.

Collaborative and Contextual Governance as an Area for Strengthening

F1 recorded the lowest relative mean score and the greatest variation among the six factors. This finding is particularly important because F1 encompasses parent and school committee participation, alumni relations, external partnerships, public communication, curriculum development, and the translation of Ambon/Maluku contextual characteristics into school programs. Place-based approaches can enhance educational relevance by connecting learning experiences with students' environments and communities ([Hernandez et al., 2022](#)). Culturally responsive leadership similarly requires trust and sustained relationships with local communities ([Banwo et al., 2022](#)). Accordingly, the relatively lower F1 score should not necessarily be interpreted as evidence of SBM failure. Rather, it may represent the area with the greatest potential for further development once the internal governance capacity of schools has been relatively established. One plausible explanation for this pattern is that internal governance practices are largely within the organizational control of schools, whereas collaborative and contextual governance depends on sustained interaction with actors beyond the school, including parents, committees, alumni, community organizations, and local institutions. Such relationships require trust, coordination, continuity, and reciprocal engagement, which may vary considerably across school contexts.

The item-level findings reinforce this interpretation. The statement concerning consideration of Ambon/Maluku's social, cultural, and geographical conditions in program development received the lowest mean score within F1. At the same time, F3 remained highly rated because schools were perceived as capable of adapting to constraints, maintaining tolerance, and exercising internal decision-making authority. This pattern provides an important substantive insight: adaptation to local context appears to be stronger as an internal organizational capability than as an integrated component of external partnerships and program design. This pattern is consistent with interpreting local context as a cross-cutting element of school management rather than as an isolated dimension.

Variation in Sbm Profiles Across Senior High Schools

The descriptive comparison indicates that SBM implementation does not follow an identical configuration across all participating senior high schools. [Pratama \(2025\)](#), in a study of SBM in Indonesian senior high schools, similarly identified stakeholder involvement, autonomy, resource availability, bureaucratic complexity, and policy support as factors influencing SBM implementation. Consistent with this perspective, [Sugianto et al. \(2024\)](#) identified teachers' perceptions of management, principals' leadership styles, and teachers' work motivation as important factors associated with SBM implementation. Thus, relying on a single overall score may obscure the different developmental needs of individual schools.

This variation is particularly evident in School 4, which demonstrated very high scores on F2–F6 but a substantially lower score on F1. In contrast, School 6 exhibited a strong internal

governance profile but a relatively lower score on F6, while School 8 showed greater room for improvement in operational management and student support. [Wahyudi et al. \(2025\)](#) emphasized that environmental context plays an important role in shaping school-based management implementation, suggesting that SBM practices should be adapted to the specific conditions and needs of individual schools. This contextual variation may also contribute to differences in the development of management functions across schools. Therefore, the school-level findings are more appropriately interpreted as diagnostic profiles rather than as a basis for identifying the best- or worst-performing schools. Although previous studies suggest that stakeholder involvement, leadership, resource availability, and environmental conditions may contribute to variation in SBM implementation, the present descriptive design does not permit the observed differences among schools to be attributed to any specific causal factor.

The profile of School 10 requires particular consideration because all seven respondents produced the maximum score across all 48 items. More broadly, most factor means were concentrated near the upper boundary of the four-point response scale. Although these patterns may reflect genuinely positive perceptions of SBM practices, restricted response variation may reduce the ability of the instrument to distinguish more subtle differences in implementation and indicates a potential ceiling effect. Consequently, high mean scores should be interpreted as positive respondent perceptions rather than as definitive evidence that all SBM practices have been fully implemented. Future research could triangulate survey findings with school documents, observations, interviews, and institutional performance data to determine the extent to which highly positive perceptions correspond to observed practices.

Research Implications

Conceptually, this study supports the view that SBM constitutes a multidimensional governance system. The six factors reflect a multidimensional configuration in which autonomy, leadership, accountability, student services, school programs, community networks, and local context are represented within school governance. The finding that local-context items are distributed primarily across the collaborative and adaptive factors further supports the conceptualization of local potential as a cross-cutting dimension of school management. This interpretation is consistent with the empirical structure identified in the preceding instrument-development study, in which Maluku-context items did not form a single, completely independent local-context factor.

Practically, the six-factor profile may offer a preliminary diagnostic framework for schools and education authorities to identify more targeted areas for development. Schools with weaker F1 profiles may require stronger community networks and participatory mechanisms, whereas schools with relatively lower F5 scores may need greater attention to facilities and student support systems. This approach may provide more diagnostic information than assigning a single label indicating that SBM implementation at a particular school is simply “good” or “poor.” Accordingly, SBM evaluation can be directed toward a school-needs-based profiling approach, in which improvement strategies are aligned with the specific configuration of each institution.

Limitations

This study has several limitations. First, the sample of 97 respondents from 10 senior high schools limits the generalizability of the findings to all senior high schools in Ambon City or Maluku Province. Second, the number of respondents within each school was relatively small, ranging from 7 to 10 participants. Consequently, comparisons across schools should be interpreted descriptively and should not be used to infer population-level differences. In addition, because the total number of eligible personnel approached during quota-based recruitment was not systematically documented, a conventional response rate could not be calculated. Therefore, potential non-response bias cannot be fully assessed.

Third, the respondent eligibility criteria may have introduced selection-related positive-response bias because participants were recruited from personnel who were familiar with or directly involved in school management practices. Their greater exposure to SBM processes may therefore have contributed, at least in part, to the generally positive ratings observed in this study. Fourth, the data were based on respondents' self-reports, and most scores were concentrated near the upper boundary of the response scale. Therefore, the potential effects of social desirability bias and ceiling effects should be considered when interpreting the findings.

Fifth, the six-factor structure was derived from an EFA conducted exclusively among senior high school teachers in the preceding instrument-development study, whereas the present study also included principals and vice principals. Therefore, measurement equivalence across respondent roles has not yet been established. Detailed cross-loading diagnostics from the preceding instrument-development analysis were also not available for evaluation in the present study. In addition, the six-factor structure has not yet been tested through confirmatory factor analysis using a larger independent sample and should therefore be regarded as a preliminary measurement framework. Sixth, the cross-sectional design does not permit causal conclusions regarding relationships among leadership, resources, local context, and SBM implementation.

CONCLUSIONS

This study aimed to map the perceived implementation of School-Based Management across participating senior high schools in Ambon City using a six-factor framework that incorporates the local context of Maluku. The findings indicate that SBM was generally perceived positively, although its implementation was not uniform across dimensions. Quality-Oriented Leadership and Capacity Development and Context-Responsive Adaptive Governance emerged as the relatively strongest dimensions, whereas Collaborative and Contextual Governance showed the lowest mean score and the greatest variation, indicating greater room for strengthening community participation, external networks, and the integration of local characteristics into school programs. The school-level profiles further suggest that SBM implementation is better understood as multidimensional and context dependent rather than represented solely through a single overall score. These findings illustrate the potential value of factor-based descriptive profiles for identifying school-specific areas for development. Nevertheless, the findings should be interpreted within the limitations of the non-probability sample, relatively small number of respondents within each school, self-reported data,

potential ceiling effects, and the preliminary nature of the six-factor structure. Future studies should involve larger independent samples, confirm the factor structure through confirmatory factor analysis, and triangulate survey findings with interviews, observations, school documents, and institutional performance data.

REFERENCES

- Banwo, B. O., Khalifa, M., & Seashore Louis, K. (2022). Exploring trust: Culturally responsive and positive school leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 60(3), 323–339. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-03-2021-0065>
- Bjork, C., & Susanti, D. (2023). Can community participation leverage changes in teacher behavior? Evidence from remote areas of Indonesia. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 102, 102840. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2023.102840>
- De Jong, W. A., De Kleijn, R. A. M., Lockhorst, D., Brouwer, J., Noordegraaf, M., & Van Tartwijk, J. W. F. (2023). Collaborative spirit: Understanding distributed leadership practices in and around teacher teams. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 123, 103977. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103977>
- Dorukbaşı, E., & Cansoy, R. (2024). Examining the mediating role of teacher professional learning between perceived instructional leadership and teacher instructional practices. *European Journal of Education*, 59(3), e12672. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12672>
- Ela, A., Ismanto, B., & Iriani, A. (2023). School-based management: Participation in improving the quality of education. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran*, 7(1), 93–102. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jipp.v7i1.58286>
- El-Hamamsy, L., Zapata-Cáceres, M., Barroso, E. M., Mondada, F., Zufferey, J. D., & Bruno, B. (2022). The Competent Computational Thinking Test: Development and validation of an unplugged computational thinking test for upper primary school. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 60(7), 1818–1866. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07356331221081753>
- Galdames-Calderón, M. (2023). Distributed leadership: School principals' practices to promote teachers' professional development for school improvement. *Education Sciences*, 13(7), 715. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13070715>
- Gümüş, S., Çağatay Kılınç, A., & Bellibaş, M. S. (2022). The relationship between teacher leadership capacity at school and teacher self-efficacy: The mediating role of teacher professional learning. *School Leadership & Management*, 42(5), 478–497. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2022.2123791>
- Haight, J., Daniels, J., Gokiart, R., Quintanilha, M., Edwards, K., Mellon, P., Skoye, M., & Malin, A. (2024). Essential conditions for partnership collaboration within a school-community model of wraparound support. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 33(9), 2962–2977. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-024-02903-1>
- Hawlitshchek, P., Henschel, S., Richter, D., & Stanat, P. (2024). The relationship between teachers' and principals' use of results from nationwide achievement tests: The mediating role of teacher attitudes and data use culture. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 80, 101317. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2023.101317>

- He, P., Guo, F., & Abazie, G. A. (2024). School principals' instructional leadership as a predictor of teacher's professional development. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 9(1), 63. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-024-00290-0>
- Hernandez, J., Scherr, R., German, M., & Horowitz, R. (2022). Place-based education in high school science: Situating energy and climate change in students' communities. *Sustainability and Climate Change*, 15(1), 58–67. <https://doi.org/10.1089/scc.2021.0058>
- Horwood, M., Parker, P. D., Marsh, H. W., Guo, J., & Dicke, T. (2022). School autonomy policies lead to increases in principal autonomy and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 115, 102048. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2022.102048>
- Jerrim, J., & Sims, S. (2022). School accountability and teacher stress: International evidence from the OECD TALIS study. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 34(1), 5–32. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-021-09360-0>
- Koh, G. A., Askill-Williams, H., & Barr, S. (2023). Sustaining school improvement initiatives: Advice from educational leaders. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 34(3), 298–330. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2023.2190130>
- Lessy, Z., Pary, L. K., & Adamek, M. E. (2024). Communication methods for moving from authoritarian to allocative or distributed leadership, in Yogyakarta Province, Indonesia, as adopted by a high school principal: A case study. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 23(2), 331–353. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2022.2131580>
- Martinez-Yarza, N., Solabarrieta-Eizaguirre, J., & Santibáñez-Gruber, R. (2024). The impact of family involvement on students' social-emotional development: The mediational role of school engagement. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 39(4), 4297–4327. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-024-00862-1>
- Michos, K., Schmitz, M.-L., & Petko, D. (2023). Teachers' data literacy for learning analytics: A central predictor for digital data use in upper secondary schools. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28(11), 14453–14471. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11772-y>
- Mkhize, T. R., & Hungwe, J. P. (2022). All hands on deck! School-community partnerships as a nexus for resource mobilisation in South African rural schools. *Education Research International*, 2022, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/5286467>
- Nadeem, M. (2024). Distributed leadership in educational contexts: A catalyst for school improvement. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 9, 100835. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.100835>
- Ngobeni, S. (2024). Establishing sustainable school-community partnerships: Strategies for school management teams. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2024.2369987>
- Ordofa, B., & Asgedom, A. (2022). School accountability and its relationship with learning outcomes: A systematic literature review. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 6(1), 100358. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2022.100358>
- Pratama, M. F. (2025). Implementation of school-based management in public high schools in Indonesia. *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Dasar, Menengah Dan Tinggi (JMP-DMT)*, 6(4), 519–532. <https://doi.org/10.30596/jmp-dmt.v6i4.26400>
- Rowe, E., & Langman, S. (2025). Competitive grants in autonomous public schools: How school

- principals are labouring for public school funding. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 52(2), 899–917. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-024-00746-9>
- Salisbury, J. D., & Richard, M. S. (2025). Leading beyond the school walls: Understanding principal community activism. *The Urban Review*, 57(3), 521–546. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-025-00740-0>
- Sedubun, P. D., Ratumanan, T. G., & Laurens, T. (2024). Implementasi Manajemen Berbasis Sekolah (MBS) pada Sekolah Menengah Atas (SMA) Negeri 3 Kepulauan Aru: Implementation of School Based Management (SBM) at Senior High School (SMA) Negeri 3 Kepulauan Aru. *Edu Cendikia: Jurnal Ilmiah Kependidikan*, 4(02), 730–747. <https://doi.org/10.47709/educendikia.v4i02.4808>
- Shaked, H. (2022). How instructional leaders promote parental involvement: The Israeli case. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 36(7), 1193–1205. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-05-2022-0171>
- Shanko, S. S., & Kabtyimer, M. T. (2024). Examining the status of school improvement program implementation in primary schools: A case study in South Ethiopia region. *Frontiers in Education*, 9, 1394637. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2024.1394637>
- Sugianto, S., Suroyo, S., & Fatmasari, R. (2024). Implementation of school-based management. *Jurnal EDUCATIO: Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia*, 10(2), 232. <https://doi.org/10.29210/1202424724>
- Sumarsono, R. B., Gunawan, I., Sunarni, Kusumaningrum, D. E., & Asimiran, S. B. (2026). Does principal leadership make a difference in school-based management in Indonesia? The balanced scorecard lenses. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 21(2), 202–228. <https://doi.org/10.1177/19427751251368865>
- Wahyudi, H., Pratiwi, S. N., & Mahmood, R. B. (2025). School-based management policy: A dual-approach strategy for enhancing school quality. *Al-Tanzim: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 9(2), 667–680. <https://doi.org/10.33650/al-tanzim.v9i2.10778>
- Yemini, M., Engel, L., & Ben Simon, A. (2025). Place-based education – a systematic review of literature. *Educational Review*, 77(2), 640–660. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2023.2177260>