Received: 21 October 2026 | Revised: 6 November 2026 | Accepted: 11 November 2026

*Research Article*

# Explanatory Multiple Case Study On How School Heads Sustain Advanced School-Based Management: A Basis For Causal Model

Mayvelle V. Malayan [1] | Danilo G. Baradillo [2]

[1-2] Graduate School, University of the Immaculate Conception, Davao City, Philippines

## Abstract

**Introduction:** Philippine public schools may achieve Level III School-Based Management (SBM), but sustaining advanced practice remains challenging. Workload, limited resources, weak stakeholder participation, and uneven leadership capacity threaten continuity.

**Objective:** This study examined leadership practices sustaining advanced SBM, stakeholder participation in decentralized governance, differences across cases, and the causal model emerging from cross-case evidence.

**Methods:** An explanatory multiple-case design covered five public elementary and secondary schools in Davao Region (Region XI), selected through maximum variation purposive sampling. Data came from interviews with five school leaders and ten key informants (two per case). Thematic and cross-case analyses were conducted. Ethical clearance was granted by the University of the Immaculate Conception Research Ethics Committee.

**Results:** Five leadership themes emerged: strategic and learner-centered leadership, distributed leadership, evidence-based improvement, accountability and transparency, and collaborative leadership culture. Five stakeholder engagement themes included open communication, participatory decisions, trust-building, decentralized responsibility, and sustained partnerships. Differences reflected school size, staff capacity, learner needs, resources, and community conditions.

**Conclusions:** Advanced SBM persisted when leadership and stakeholder engagement became routine systems rather than validation exercises. The proposed model integrates leadership foundations, shared leadership, accountability, participatory governance, trust, partnerships, and institutionalization. It provides a basis for leadership development and future longitudinal and mixed-methods research.

**Correspondence**
Mayvelle V. Malayan,
University of the Immaculate Conception,
Department of Education - Davao De Oro, Philippines
Email:mmalayan_240000001566@uic.edu.ph

**Keywords:** Davao Region; distributed leadership; explanatory multiple-case study; participatory governance; school heads; school-based management; stakeholder engagement

**Cite as:** Malayan, M., & Baradillo, D. (2026). Explanatory Multiple Case Study On How School Heads Sustain Advanced School-Based Management: A Basis For Causal Model. Review of Economics, Accounting, Business, and Management Studies, 1(1), 172-190. https://doi.org/10.68354/743928

**© The Author(s) 2026.** This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution License.

## 1. Introduction

School-Based Management (SBM) moves decisions on school operations and improvement closer to the school and its community. In the Philippines, the Revised SBM Framework placed learners at the center of school governance and described three levels of practice, with Level III (advanced) marking defined standards, clear outcomes, and strong community involvement (Department of Education, 2012). DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2024 later revised the SBM system (Department of Education, 2024).

Reaching the advanced level does not guarantee staying there. In Malaysia, more than ten years of SBM practice have not removed the difficulty of sustaining high-level practice, owing to limited leadership capacity and limited school-level autonomy (Isa et al., 2020). Indonesian school heads face constrained budgets, facilities, human resources, and weak integration of technology (Juniar & Prasetyo, 2025). In Ethiopia, school leaders report scarce professional development and inadequate support from education authorities (Berhanu, 2023). These studies point to recurring problems of leadership capacity, decision authority, institutional support, and stakeholder involvement.

Philippine evidence shows the same pattern. In Northern Samar, administrative, environmental, and technological problems slowed implementation even where overall SBM practice was high (Baluyot, 2025). In Calubian North District, Leyte, gaps in facilities, human resources, community relations, and service delivery affected the SBM level (Niez et al., 2025). In Camarines Norte, irregular School Improvement Plan (SIP) assessment, limited curriculum inclusiveness, and low collaboration with communities weakened implementation (Quinones & Abanto, 2024). In Davao City, Patalinghug (2023) found that school heads struggled to keep earlier levels of practice because pedagogical, administrative, and managerial duties overloaded them.

Prior work has documented implementation levels, challenges, leadership behaviors, and training needs (Ang et al., 2025; Cubillas, 2025; Kimilat & Baguio, 2025). Kimilat and Baguio (2025) reported that fewer than half of the schools in Bislig City Division had reached the advanced level and called for evidence on how schools sustain SBM over time. Casilla (2026) described strengths of leadership and stakeholder engagement in Level 3 schools. Few studies compare contrasting school types to explain how school heads keep advanced practice running after validation and why their approaches differ. This study addresses that gap through an explanatory multiple-case design in Davao Region

### *1.1. Literature Review*

Philippine SBM grew from the Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001 (Republic Act 9155), the Schools First Initiative, and the Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda. DepEd Order No. 83, s. 2012 introduced the Revised SBM Framework and its Assessment Process and Tool, together with School Governing Councils, School Improvement Planning, and School Report Cards (Department of Education, 2012). Under SBM, schools set priorities, allocate resources, and answer to both the community and the government (Amon & Anggal, 2021). Practices differ across schools according to local needs (Bustamante, 2022). Delegated authority has raised participation and commitment (Bandur et al., 2021), and Philippine evidence links SBM to modest gains in educational outcomes (Ang et al., 2025).

Sustaining SBM depends on leadership. School leadership influences learning through interconnected paths, including school conditions and leaders' practices (Leithwood et al., 2020). UNESCO (2024) places leadership at the center of learning improvement, and Ghamrawi (2023) links quality education to distributed leadership and empowered governing bodies. Collaboratively prepared SIPs and annual plans guide resource use (Dones et al., 2023). Improvement works as a continuing cycle of data sharing and feedback (Koh et al., 2023), evidence guides change when staff interpret the evidence together (Rääk & Eisenschmidt, 2025), and weak follow-through on planned actions undermines

contextualized SBM practice (Patiam, 2025). Rigorous oversight and adaptive leadership supported SBM quality in an Indonesian senior high school (Afriyanti et al., 2025).

Stakeholder engagement forms the second pillar. Stakeholder input and feedback drive program improvement (De Torres, 2021), and community participation correlates with SBM implementation (De Vera, 2022). School committees help align programs with the local social setting (Ferriswara et al., 2024). Applying a uniform model to schools of different size and location affects participation (Adeoye, 2023). In rural and remote Philippine schools, communication, partnership, and monitoring formed the main areas of engagement (Arguelles & Sarsale, 2025). The literature also records limits. Autonomy improves quality and accountability, yet scarce resources, weak managerial capacity, and low committee participation constrain SBM (Fitri et al., 2025). Some settings report heavier bureaucratic load and declining teacher morale (Saputra & Hartati, 2024), and teachers report unclear roles in SBM processes (Cubillas, 2025).

### *1.2. Theoretical Framework*

General Systems Theory (von Bertalanffy, 1968) treats an organization as an open system of interdependent parts exchanging information and resources with its environment. In this study, each school is an SBM system linking the school head, teachers, parents, community partners, plans, resources, monitoring, and accountability. Feedback from monitoring allows the system to detect gaps and adjust. Equifinality, a principle within systems theory, holds that a system reaches the same end state through different paths and from different starting conditions (von Bertalanffy, 1968). The principle guided the comparison of five schools reaching the same outcome, sustained Level III SBM, through different routes.

Distributed Leadership Theory (Spillane, 2006) views leadership as practice emerging from interaction among leaders, followers, and the situation, spread across formal leaders and staff who lead through expertise. The theory guided the analysis of how school heads assigned roles, shared decisions, and involved teachers, coordinators, parents, and community stakeholders. Together, the two lenses informed the interview guide, the initial coding categories (planning, delegation, monitoring, accountability, communication, participation, and partnership), and the cross-case comparison.

### *1.3. Research Questions*

The study investigated how school heads in Region XI sustained advanced SBM. Four questions guided the inquiry:

*RQ1*. What leadership practices enable school heads to sustain effective School-Based Management?

*RQ2*. How do school heads engage teachers, parents, and community stakeholders to support participatory and decentralized governance?

*RQ3*. What explains the similarities and differences across the case units?

*RQ4*. What causal model emerges from the similarities and differences across the case units?

## 2. Materials and Methods

### *2.1. Research Design*

The study used a qualitative explanatory multiple-case design. Explanatory case studies suit how and why questions about a contemporary phenomenon in a real-life setting where the researcher has little control over events (Yin, 2018). Each school formed one case unit, with the school leader as the primary participant. Within-case analysis built a detailed account of each school, and cross-case analysis identified shared patterns and context-specific variations (Yin, 2018). The design supports analytic rather than statistical generalization.

### *2.2. Respondents and Sampling Procedure*

Maximum variation purposive sampling selected five public schools in Davao Region with advanced (Level III) SBM status. The cases varied by school level (three elementary and two secondary), size (one small and four large schools), setting (urban and rural), learner population (one school hosted a

Special Education [SPED] Center), and schools division (Digos City, Davao City, Davao del Norte, Tagum City, and Davao de Oro). Inclusion criteria required that participants (a) currently led a public elementary or secondary school in Region XI, (b) led a school whose advanced SBM level was confirmed by the school's SBM assessment output, and (c) held a direct role in leading the SBM council and its practices.All five schools had reached the advanced level before the current leaders assumed their posts, and each leader had served three to three and a half years in the present school.

The five participants comprised four principals and one assistant principal (Case 4). Two key informants per case, ten in total, were teachers, SBM coordinators, a head teacher, a master teacher, and a school administrative officer who worked closely with the leader. Informants confirmed, clarified, or extended the leaders' accounts. The number of cases follows replication logic in multiple-case research (Yin, 2018) and the recommendation to keep case studies to a small number of cases to preserve depth (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Table 1 presents the case profiles.

**Table 1.** Profile and Distinctive Context of the Five Case Units

| **Point of Comparison** | **Case 1** | **Case 2** | **Case 3** | **Case 4** | **Case 5** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Participant code | POI1 | POI2 | POI3 | POI4 | POI5 |
| Role | School Head/ Principal | School Head/ Principal | School Head/ Principal | Assistant Principal | School Head/ Principal |
| Sex | Male | Male | Male | Female | Male |
| DepEd Leadership Experiences | Nearly 21 years in DepEd and approximately 20 years in school leadership | Entered DepEd in 2013; began performing school-head functions in 2015 | 30 years of service in DepEd, with 23 years in school leadership experience | 17 years of management and leadership experience | 20 years of leadership experience across different school environments |
| Time assigned in the present school | 3 years | 3 years and 3 months | 3 years and 4 months | 3 years | 3 years and 5 months |
| Career or leadership pathway | Managed eight schools, gaining experience in varied personnel, community, and organizational contexts | Present school was his third station; began as a designated school-in-charge shortly after entering DepEd | Served as school head in a large central elementary school decision-making. | Progressed from master teacher and SBM committee member to program and documentation coordinator, then assistant principal | Served as a school head in five schools with different school environments for two decades. |
| School setting and key features | Small urban public elementary school with limited personnel and resources but an established culture of community participation | Rural public national high school with department structures, diverse secondary programs, and geographically dispersed stakeholders | Large public central elementary school with multiple grade-level leaders, master teachers, substantial enrollment, and complex personnel and infrastructure needs | Large public national high school with almost 200 teachers, numerous programs, supported by assistants, grade-level heads, master teachers, focal persons, and external partners | Large rural public central elementary school with a SPED Center, a large teaching workforce, diverse learners, and specialized instructional accommodation needs |
| SBM status upon or during assignment | Advanced SBM Level | Advanced SBM Level | Advanced SBM Level | Advanced SBM Level | Advanced SBM Level |
| Primary leadership orientation | Learner-centered, adaptive, appreciative, and partnership-oriented leadership | Direction-setting, hands-on supervision, skills-based delegation, and continuous follow-up | Situational, consultative, data-informed, fair, and firm leadership | Evidence-based accountability, role modelling, distributed leadership, and systematic monitoring | Learner-needs-based planning, data-guided intervention, functional documentation, coaching, and shared leadership |

| Point of Comparison | Case 1 | Case 2 | Case 3 | Case 4 | Case 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Central contextual challenge | Sustaining established SBM practices with a small workforce, limited resources, and uneven stakeholder attendance | Coordinating departments, personnel, programs, and documentary requirements in a rural secondary-school setting | Maintaining fairness, discipline, reliable data, and common direction within a large and complex school community | Coordinating almost 200 teachers and numerous programs while ensuring that evidence, reports, and responsibilities remained complete and aligned | Coordinating a large school while ensuring that programs, resources, and interventions addressed individualized and specialized learner needs |
| Informant status in current dataset | Two informants | Two informants | Two informants | Two informants | Two informants |

Note: POI = participant (school leader). All five schools held advanced (Level III) SBM status before the current leader's assignment.

*2.3. Research Instruments*

A semi-structured interview guide with open-ended questions and follow-up probes addressed leadership practices (RQ1) and stakeholder engagement (RQ2). The questions drew on the SBM framework and the two theoretical lenses. Expert validators reviewed the guide for clarity, relevance, and alignment with the study objectives, and the research adviser approved the final version. The core interview questions for school leaders and key informants are provided in Appendix A.

*2.4. Data Collection and Analysis*

After ethical clearance, the researcher obtained endorsements from the Graduate School Dean, the DepEd Regional Office, the five Schools Division Offices, and the school heads of the participating schools. Each participant and informant received an orientation on the purpose, procedures, and voluntary nature of the study and signed a written informed consent form. The researcher conducted face-to-face in-depth interviews with each school leader and separate individual interviews with each informant. School leaders were not told which staff members served as informants. All interviews were audio-recorded with consent.

Interviews took place in Cebuano, Filipino, and English. The researcher transcribed the recordings verbatim and translated them into English. Field notes complemented the interview data. In the Results, quotations appear in English translation and carry participant codes: POI1 to POI5 for the school leaders and IOI1A to IOI5B for the informants.

Analysis followed the six phases of thematic analysis: familiarization, initial coding, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and reporting (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The analysis treated thematic analysis as an iterative and interpretive process (Ahmed et al., 2025). Initial codes captured planning, delegation, monitoring, accountability, communication, participation, and partnerships. A data analyst reviewed the coding and theme development. Cross-case analysis then compared the themes across the five cases in a theme-by-case matrix to separate shared practices from case-specific emphases and to link differences to school context (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Yin, 2018). The pattern of shared mechanisms and contextual variations formed the basis of the proposed causal model.

*2.5. Trustworthiness*

The study applied the criteria of Lincoln and Guba (1985). Credibility rested on triangulation of leader and informant accounts and on member checking, in which participants reviewed their transcripts and summaries of findings. Confirmability and dependability rested on an audit trail of data collection procedures and analytic decisions, a standard interview guide, and retained transcripts and recordings (Janis, 2022). Transferability rested on detailed descriptions of each case context and on verbatim evidence. The first author is a public school teacher.

*2.6. Ethical Considerations*

The University of the Immaculate Conception Research Ethics Committee (UIC-REC) reviewed and approved the study before data collection. Participation was voluntary, and participants could pause, skip questions, or withdraw at any time without consequence. Interviews took place at times convenient to participants. Codes replaced names in all transcripts and reports. Separate informant interviews and the non-disclosure of informant identities to school heads reduced the risk of pressure on staff. Data were stored on password-protected devices with access limited to the researcher and authorized persons, retained for three to five years after the study, and used for this study only.

## 3. Results and Discussion

### *3.1. Leadership Practices That Enable School Heads to Sustain Effective School-Based Management*

Table 2 summarizes the five leadership themes and their core ideas.

**Table 2.** Leadership Practices That Enable School Heads to Sustain Effective School-Based Management

| Essential theme | Core ideas |
|---|---|
| Strategic and learner-centered leadership | Aligning school programs and activities with the School Improvement Plan (SIP) and Annual Implementation Plan (AIP). Basing school decisions on the actual and emerging needs of learners. Setting clear school goals, priorities, targets, and timelines. Contextualizing programs according to the capacities and conditions of learners and teachers. Prioritizing interventions that directly improve learner performance and well-being. Allocating available resources according to identified performance gaps and school priorities. |
| Shared and distributed leadership | Delegating responsibilities instead of concentrating tasks on the school head. Assigning teachers and personnel according to their competencies and strengths. Establishing functional SBM committees and school planning teams. Involving teachers in planning, decision-making, and implementation. Developing ownership of programs among teachers and other personnel. Building leadership capacity among staff so school processes continue even without constant direction from the school head. |
| Systematic monitoring, evaluation, and evidence-based improvement | Conducting regular monitoring of school programs and activities. Using classroom observations, progress reviews, meetings, and monitoring tools. Providing immediate feedback when implementation gaps are identified. Reviewing performance data to determine strengths, weaknesses, and needed interventions. Adjusting programs and strategies based on monitoring and evaluation results. Using evidence of outcomes to guide continuous school improvement. |
| Accountability, transparency, and documentation | Maintaining complete and accurate Means of Verification (MOVs). Requiring timely documentation and reporting of programs and activities. Keeping minutes, attendance records, photographs, monitoring records, and financial documents. Practicing transparency particularly in financial and resource management. Clarifying individual responsibilities and holding personnel accountable for assigned tasks. Institutionalizing documentation so successful SBM practices are preserved across school years. |
| Collaborative and adaptive leadership culture | Establishing positive relationships among teachers, school personnel, and stakeholders. Maintaining open and consistent communication within the organization. Balancing democratic and directive leadership depending on the situation. Coaching, mentoring, motivating, and guiding personnel when difficulties arise. Promoting teamwork and collective responsibility for school accomplishments. Developing a school culture where SBM becomes part of everyday operations rather than an activity undertaken only for validation. |

3.1.1. Strategic and learner-centered leadership.

The leaders used the SIP and AIP as working governance tools that tied activities to learner needs, performance gaps, and resources. POI1 explained the starting point:

First and foremost, the benefit of the learners must be considered. We then return to the School Improvement Plan, which is not prepared by the school head alone but is developed collaboratively. (POI1)

Informants described the same orientation. In Case 2, an informant linked the school's advanced status to the leader's planning focus:

Under his administration, the school sustained its advanced level because he remained focused on learning, teachers, and the school environment. He consistently supported activity proposals submitted by department heads for program implementation. Consequently, school events were successful because they were well planned. (IOI2A)

In Case 1, an informant confirmed that POI1 consulted teachers on SIP content and reached out to PTA and barangay officials (IOI1A). POI4 added a strict evidence rule: every activity needed data, an activity plan, a place in the SIP and AIP, and an output benefiting learners. In Case 5, planning turned on intervention programs, accommodations, and therapy-related support for SPED learners (POI5). These findings agree with UNESCO's (2024) emphasis on a learning focus and with Leithwood et al.'s (2020) account of leaders shaping school conditions for learning. They also mirror the planning-to-supervision cycle of SBM described by Amon and Anggal (2021) and the role of collaboratively prepared plans in guiding budgets (Dones et al., 2023).

3.1.2. Shared and distributed leadership.

Every leader rejected one-person management, but the form of distribution followed school size and staff capacity. In Case 4, scale made distribution an organizational necessity:

The school has almost two hundred teaching personnel, so grade-level heads and master teachers are empowered. The principal cannot manage everything alone. Four assistants have specific tasks, and other leaders are likewise authorized to perform their responsibilities. (POI4)

In Case 1, a small school, delegation matched tasks to individual teachers' strengths (IOI1A). Case 2 issued designation letters to every staff member at the start of each school year, which allowed the SBM coordinator to follow up and locate documents (IOI2A). POI3 granted bounded authority: teachers decided on implementation "as long as these do not compromise safety, learner achievement, or any other targets" (POI3). The pattern fits Spillane's (2006) view of leadership stretched across people and situations and Nadeem's (2024) description of distributed leadership as shared, mutually supportive improvement work. The leaders still kept coordination and oversight. Distribution expanded participation in implementation without removing the head's final responsibility.

3.1.3. Systematic monitoring, evaluation, and evidence-based improvement.

Monitoring served improvement as well as compliance. Case 1 held post-evaluations of each activity to identify "what went wrong, what went right" and adjust the next one (IOI1A). POI3 used a classroom monitoring tool and weekly meetings to keep staff aware of progress toward targets. POI5 described an integrated cycle:

I conduct regular monitoring through classroom visits, meetings, and progress reviews to check if activities are implemented as planned and if learners' interventions are working. I require proper documentation and timely reporting, and I provide feedback and immediate support or adjustment when gaps are identified. (POI5)

In the same school, accomplishment reports were checked against action plans to expose gaps between plans and results (IOI5A). These routines match the continuing improvement cycle supported by data sharing and feedback (Koh et al., 2023), collaborative interpretation of evidence (Rääk & Eisenschmidt, 2025), and the need for follow-through monitoring in contextualized SBM (Patiam, 2025). In systems terms, monitoring supplied the feedback loop that let each school correct course during implementation.

3.1.4. Accountability, transparency, and documentation.

Documentation recorded every phase of the program cycle and made resource use visible. Case 4 posted expenses on transparency boards every quarter and inventoried all property bought by the school or donated by the local government unit (LGU). POI3 stressed fairness and transparency over MOOE, PTA funds, and donations so that "everyone should be made aware of how these are used." An informant in Case 1 confirmed that the head reported MOOE spending to teachers (IOI1B). POI5 described sustainability as visible in records:

Sustainability in the school is demonstrated through functional documentation and evidence, such as meeting minutes, monitoring records, attendance records, photographs, and liquidation documents. Financial resources are examined through trend-based analysis. (POI5)

These practices support Amon and Anggal's (2021) point that SBM schools answer to both community and government, and Hasnadi et al.'s (2024) call for transparent and responsible planning, implementation, and evaluation. The leaders described documentation as a tool for continuity across school years, beyond its use for validation.

3.1.5. Collaborative and adaptive leadership culture.

The leaders kept standards constant while adjusting their style to the situation. POI3 described combining autocratic and democratic approaches "depending on the situation," with firmness reserved for safety, discipline, and urgent decisions. POI4 urged leaders to be approachable and flexible because "not all of your plans will go as you wish," and to reach out to stakeholders first. An informant in Case 4 described the human side of delegation:

A school head should be people-oriented, aware of the burden and scope of the work of the personnel, inquire about their condition and evaluate their ability to perform their duties. Staff feel better supported and assured and are more effective. (IOI4A)

This finding agrees with Remorosa and Paglinawan (2024), who link collaborative expertise to SBM implementation, and with Bush (2018), who stresses the cultural and organizational context of leadership. Without support, delegation risks incomplete work and staff exhaustion. The leaders reduced this risk by checking on personnel capacity before and during delegated tasks.

*3.2. Ways School Heads Engage Teachers, Parents, and Community Stakeholders to Support Participatory and Decentralized Governance*

Table 3 summarizes the five engagement themes.

**Table 3.** Ways School Heads Engage Teachers, Parents, and Community Stakeholders to Support Participatory and Decentralized Governance

| Essential theme | Core ideas |
|---|---|
| Open and multi-channel stakeholder communication | Conducting regular face-to-face meetings, conferences, assemblies, and consultations. Using Facebook pages, group chats, and other digital platforms for announcements and updates. Maintaining written communication through letters, memoranda, reports, and learners' notebooks. Providing communication alternatives for stakeholders with limited digital access. Regularly communicating school plans, activities, accomplishments, and emerging concerns. Providing two-way communication channels where stakeholders can ask questions, provide feedback, and express ideas. |
| Inclusive and participatory decision-making | Inviting stakeholders to participate in school planning processes. Consulting teachers and parents before important school decisions are finalized. Gathering stakeholder suggestions and incorporating relevant feedback into school programs. Involving stakeholders in setting priorities and identifying school needs. Encouraging stakeholders to express differing views and recommendations. Treating teachers, parents, and community partners as partners rather than passive recipients of school decisions. |
| Transparency and trust-building | Regularly sharing school plans and implementation progress with stakeholders. Presenting information about budgets, expenditures, and resource utilization. Reporting school accomplishments and program outcomes to the community. Explaining the rationale or basis behind significant school decisions. Practicing fairness, respect, honesty, and accountability in stakeholder relationships. Building stakeholder confidence through consistent communication and visible evidence of school progress. |
| Stakeholder empowerment and decentralized responsibility | Delegating leadership responsibilities to teachers based on their strengths and expertise. Allowing teachers to lead committees, programs, and school improvement activities. Assigning meaningful responsibilities to parents and community partners. Providing leadership and capacity-building opportunities to teachers and stakeholders. Recognizing stakeholder contributions and accomplishments. Developing shared ownership and accountability for school programs and outcomes. |
| Sustaining partnerships through shared commitment | Strengthening partnerships with PTA, LGUs, community organizations, and other external partners. Encouraging stakeholders to contribute expertise, time, resources, and other forms of support. Maintaining regular consultations to sustain stakeholder involvement. Addressing limited participation through reminders, flexible communication, and continuous engagement. Clarifying stakeholder roles and responsibilities to strengthen commitment. Connecting stakeholder participation to the common goal of improving learner outcomes and school performance. |

Note: Interpretation of the weighted mean are as follow: 4.50 – 5.00 (Strongly Agree); 3.50 – 4.49 (Agree); 2.50 – 3.49 (Neutral); 1.50 – 2.49 (Disagree); 1.00 – 1.49 (Strongly Disagree)

3.2.1. Open and multi-channel stakeholder communication.

No school relied on a single channel. Case 1 combined PTA meetings, messages sent through learners, the school Facebook page, and parents' group chats (POI1). Case 4 posted even small activities on its Facebook page, used classroom group chats for weather and emergency announcements, and held quarterly PTA meetings (POI4). In Case 5, the head consulted the PTA board before any general assembly, and advisers relayed information through group chats (IOI5A). Case 5 also used letters and learners' notebooks for families without internet access. The findings match the communication, social media, and PTA mechanisms reported in rural Philippine schools (Arguelles & Sarsale, 2025). Flexible channels helped schools reach parents constrained by work schedules, distance, connectivity, and family responsibilities. Communication served as the entry point for every other form of participation.

3.2.2. Inclusive and participatory decision-making.

The leaders involved stakeholders in identifying needs, setting priorities, and evaluating plans. POI1 put the principle plainly: stakeholders "should be involved in planning, implementation, and decision-making," not governed by a one-person rule. POI3 described plenary meetings with parents:

> During that plenary meeting, we discuss how we are going to maintain, improve, and solve problems in our school. I see to it that the parents participate in the discussion and even in the decision-making. They suggest, and I listen to their grievances and their suggestions. (POI3)

Decisions in these meetings were reached "through the majority" after the group examined the options (POI3). An informant in Case 5 reported that the head revised plans when stakeholder feedback showed a strategy was not working (IOI5B). Participation had limits. POI2 described the balance:

> A school head should not monopolize school operations. I solicit ideas from others. I still have the final say, but I first bring together their ideas and contributions. My role is to carefully weigh the available options. (POI2)

This account shows consultation feeding a decision the head still owned. The pattern supports Adeoye's (2023) view of school-level participation and the call for consultation by Yatri et al. (2022), but it also echoes concerns in the wider literature on how far decentralization redistributes decision power (Fitri et al., 2025; Saputra & Hartati, 2024). In these schools, stakeholder input shaped plans and implementation, while school heads retained accountability for final decisions.

3.2.3. Transparency and trust-building.

Trust grew from repeated, visible evidence. POI1 paired transparency with recognition of stakeholders' completed projects during assemblies. POI4 described how quarterly transparency boards answered the question "Where is the money?" before parents asked it. POI5 used scheduled SBM team meetings, semestral consultations, bulletins, and accomplishment dashboards so that "everyone can track progress and decisions." These practices agree with De Vera's (2022) link between participation and SBM implementation and with Roque's (2023) finding that SBM implementers manage MOOE fairly and openly.

*Stakeholder empowerment and decentralized responsibility.* Empowerment began with information and grew into responsibility. In Case 1, the PTA board and School Planning Team discussed school deficiencies together and decided how stakeholders would respond (POI1). POI2 described his approach as "you lead, but you capacitate," encouraging staff to contribute and ask questions. Case 4 extended leadership to grade heads, master teachers, and student leaders. POI5 described a sequence: involve stakeholders in planning, delegate according to strengths, then offer leadership and capacity-building opportunities. He tied role clarity to commitment:

> I encourage shared responsibility by actively involving teachers, parents, and community partners in planning, implementing, and evaluating school initiatives. Their roles are clearly defined to promote collaboration. We value their ideas and recognize their contributions, thereby creating a sense of ownership, accountability, and commitment to achieving the school's goals. (POI5)

Empowerment in these schools combined information, responsibility, capacity building, and recognition. The findings fit Ghamrawi's (2023) account of empowered governing bodies and Dones et al.'s (2023) evidence on stakeholder roles in planning.

3.2.4. Sustaining partnerships through shared commitment.

Partnerships lasted when stakeholders saw results and understood their roles. In Case 1, collaboration among teachers, parents, and the community turned an abandoned area into a colorful, functional learner space supported by many donations (POI1). Case 4 relied on letters issued as memoranda, read by parents and

photographed into group chats (IOI4A). POI5 addressed uneven participation through reminders, regular consultation, role clarification, convenient scheduling, and recognition. These findings agree with Ferriswara et al. (2024) on community involvement in context-appropriate programs and with Bandur et al. (2021) on participation and school autonomy.

*3.3. Leadership Practices that Enable the School Head to Sustain Effective School-Based Management*

Table 4 compares the ten themes across the five cases. Similarity groups shared a common emphasis, while the other cases showed a distinct variation.

**Table 4.** Cross-case similarities and differences in leadership practices and stakeholder engagement

| Essential theme | Cases | | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Similarities | Differences | |
| Leadership practices that enable school heads to sustain effective School-Based Management | | | |
| Strategic and learner-centered leadership | 1, 2, 4 | | Commonly emphasized aligning school programs with identified school and learner needs, prioritizing learner welfare, and using the SIP as the basis for planning and implementation. |
| | | 3 | Emphasized establishing authentic baseline data from assessment results before determining targets and interventions. |
| | | 5 | Emphasized highly individualized, learner-responsive planning because of the SPED context, including intervention programs and specialized support. |
| Shared and distributed leadership | 1, 3, 4 | | Shared responsibilities through committees, teamwork, collaboration, and involvement of teachers and personnel in school activities and governance. |
| | | 2 | Emphasized being a hands-on school head while delegating responsibilities and closely following up on delegated work. |
| | | 5 | Explicitly promoted distributed leadership by assigning responsibilities according to strengths and developing teacher ownership and capacity. |
| Monitoring, evaluation, and evidence-based improvement | 1, 2, 3 | | Commonly relied on monitoring, follow-up, feedback, and assessment of results to determine implementation progress and needed improvements. |
| | | 4 | Gave stronger emphasis to scheduled document collection, output evaluation, deadlines, and monitoring tools as routine practices. |
| | | 5 | Used a highly structured monitoring system involving classroom visits, team check-ins, progress reviews, documentation, immediate feedback, and program adjustments. |
| Accountability, transparency, and documentation | 1, 2, 4 | | Emphasized accountability through proper reporting, documentation, transparency, and communication of school accomplishments and use of resources. |
| | | 3 | Strongly emphasized transparency in MOOE, PTA funds, IGP funds, donations, fairness, and firmness in financial decision-making. |
| | | 5 | Focused on extensive documentary evidence such as minutes, attendance, photographs, monitoring tools, liquidation records, and trend analysis. |
| Collaborative and adaptive leadership culture | 1, 2, 5 | | Emphasized teamwork, supportive relationships, open communication, motivation, and collaboration in maintaining effective school operations. |
| | | 3 | Explicitly combined democratic and autocratic leadership depending on situational demands. |
| | | 4 | Emphasized consistency, role modeling, and maintaining a positive and harmonious work environment. |
| Ways how school heads engage teachers, parents…. | | | |
| Open and multi-channel communication | 1, 2, 3 | | Commonly used meetings, conferences, PTA assemblies, consultations, digital communication, and direct interaction to keep stakeholders informed. |

| Essential theme | Cases | | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Similarities | Differences | |
| Leadership practices that enable school heads to sustain effective School-Based Management | | | |
| | | 4 | Extensively used the school Facebook page, classroom group chats, assemblies, and broadcasting mechanisms for school announcements and activities. |
| | | 5 | Combined digital platforms with manual communication such as letters and learners' notebooks to reach parents without internet access. |
| Inclusive and participatory decision-making | 2, 3, 4 | | Teachers, parents, and stakeholders were involved through consultation, planning meetings, feedback, and participation in school initiatives. |
| | | 1 | Strongly emphasized that the SIP itself is collaboratively developed rather than prepared by the school head alone |
| | | 5 | Extended participation across planning, decision-making, implementation, consultations, and open feedback mechanisms |
| Transparency and trust-building | 1, 2, 5 | | Trust was built through openness, stakeholder involvement, reporting of accomplishments, communication, and transparency in school programs and resource use. |
| | | 3 | Particularly emphasized fairness and complete transparency regarding school finances and various funding sources. |
| | | 4 | Built trust by visibly presenting school achievements, projects, and evidence of how resources were utilized during PTA engagements. |
| Stakeholder empowerment and decentralized responsibility | 1, 3, 4 | | Empowered stakeholders by sharing responsibilities, involving teachers and parents in school activities, and encouraging participation in governance. |
| | | 2 | Practiced delegation while retaining close monitoring and follow-up by the school head. |
| | | 5 | Delegated responsibilities according to strengths, provided leadership opportunities, and deliberately built stakeholder ownership and capacity. |
| Sustaining partnerships through shared commitment | 2, 3, 4 | | Maintained partnerships through regular communication, stakeholder participation, shared responsibilities, resource support, and continued involvement in school programs. |
| | | 1 | Benefited from an already established and highly active culture of LGU and community stakeholder participation. |
| | | 5 | Sustained commitment through recognition of stakeholder contributions, regular accomplishment updates, participation in planning, and developing a sense of shared ownership |

RQ3 asked what explains the pattern in Table 4. The similarities reflect a common governance core: every school linked plans to learner needs, distributed responsibility, monitored progress, documented results, communicated widely, and kept stakeholders involved. The differences follow five contextual conditions identified in the case profiles.

3.3.1 School size and organizational complexity.

The two largest schools developed the most formal systems. Case 4, with almost 200 teachers, built a multi-layer structure of assistants, grade heads, master teachers, and focal persons, together with scheduled document collection and digital broadcasting. Case 3, a large central school, relied on monitoring tools, weekly meetings, and firm, transparent rules to keep a complex staff aligned. Learner needs. The SPED Center in Case 5 pushed planning toward individualized interventions and pushed communication toward manual channels for families without internet access. Staff capacity and leader background. In Case 2, a rural secondary school, the leader stayed hands-on and followed up closely on delegated work. POI4's background as a documentation coordinator matches her emphasis on evidence. Community conditions. Case 1 inherited an established culture of LGU and community participation and drew on it for partnerships and donations. Data quality. Case 3 treated baseline validation as a precondition for planning in a large school where unreliable data would mislead targets:

First, obtain data on the current situation. Is the data accurate? Was it collected properly? You should always establish a baseline. Once you have the baseline, you can determine how to set your targets. (POI3)

These variations show equifinality in practice (von Bertalanffy, 1968). The five schools sustained the same outcome through different combinations of structure, supervision, and engagement, each fitted to its context. The cases did not show one superior route. They showed a shared set of mechanisms adapted to local conditions, which agrees with Adeoye's (2023) caution against applying a uniform SBM model across different school settings.

*3.4. Proposed Causal Model for Sustaining Advanced SBM*

Figure 1 presents the model derived from the cross-case analysis. The model is an explanatory framework built from patterns in five cases. The model proposes relationships for testing and does not claim experimentally established causation.




**Figure 1.** Proposed causal model for sustaining advanced School-Based Management. Solid arrows show the main flow, double-headed arrows show reciprocal relationships, and dotted arrows show contextual influences from each case.

The upper band holds the contextual strengthening mechanisms drawn from the case differences: a mature stakeholder culture (Case 1), hands-on supervised delegation (Case 2), baseline-driven planning and financial fairness (Case 3), role modeling and rigorous documentation (Case 4), and SPED-responsive planning with structured monitoring (Case 5). These conditions strengthen the common pathway rather than replacing it.

The main pathway begins with a *leadership foundation* of strategic, learner-centered leadership and a collaborative, adaptive culture. This foundation supports a shared *leadership mechanism* of distributed leadership, stakeholder empowerment, and decentralized responsibility. Shared leadership feeds two reciprocal mechanisms. The *performance and accountability mechanism* covers monitoring, evidence-based improvement, transparency, and documentation. The *participatory governance mechanism* covers multi-channel communication and inclusive decision-making. Accurate reporting improves the quality of participation, and participation strengthens collective monitoring. Both mechanisms converge in a *relational and partnership mechanism* of trust, sustained partnerships, and shared commitment.

The next stage, *institutionalization* of SBM, occurs when practices become functional committees, established routines, embedded monitoring cycles, continuous documentation, and stakeholder ownership. Institutionalization did not emerge as a separate theme. The model draws this stage from two core ideas in Table 2, documentation that preserves practices across school years and SBM as part of everyday operations, and from routines observed across cases: designation letters (Case 2), focal persons and rotating leadership assignments (Case 4), weekly target reviews (Case 3), action plans checked against accomplishment reports (Case 5), and an established culture of community participation (Case 1). The final outcome is sustained advanced SBM, marked by continuous school improvement, effective decentralized governance, strong stakeholder participation, and organizational sustainability.

One further explanation deserves testing. Every school reached Level III before its current leader arrived. Inherited institutional maturity, as well as the current leader's practice, therefore helps explain sustained status. The model accounts for inheritance through the institutionalization stage, which allows practices to outlast individual leaders. Future studies should separate the two influences.

### *3.5. Theoretical and Practical Implications*

The findings extend General Systems Theory to school governance by showing feedback loops at work: monitoring results flowed back into plans, and transparency reports flowed back into stakeholder trust. The findings qualify Distributed Leadership Theory. Leadership was distributed in planning and implementation, while school heads retained coordination, oversight, and, as POI2 stated, the final say. Equifinality accounted for the variation across cases. Five schools reached the same outcome through different routes, which suggests SBM standards work best as shared goals with locally designed means.

For practice, school heads should treat the SIP and AIP as working governance tools linking learner needs to activities, resources, evidence, and corrective action. Leadership development and technical assistance should train school heads to use learner data, delegate according to staff readiness, and support delegated work through monitoring and feedback. Documentation and transparency should serve continuity, not validation alone. Schools should open two-way communication channels, involve stakeholders early enough to shape priorities, and report back on how stakeholder input changed decisions. Division and regional offices should expect different routes to the same standards and tailor support to school size, learner population, and community conditions.

## 4. Conclusion

Five school leaders in Davao Region sustained advanced SBM through practices that became part of daily school operations. For RQ1, the leaders combined strategic and learner-centered planning, distributed responsibility, systematic monitoring, documented accountability, and an adaptive, collaborative culture. For RQ2, they engaged teachers, parents, and community partners through multiple communication channels,

consultation in planning, visible transparency, delegated responsibility, and partnerships built on shared commitment. For RQ3, the cases shared a common governance core, and their differences followed school size, learner needs, staff capacity, leader background, community conditions, and data quality. For RQ4, the proposed model links a leadership foundation to shared leadership, reciprocal accountability and participatory governance, trust and partnership, and institutionalization, which together sustain advanced SBM.

The study contributes a context-sensitive explanation of SBM sustainability and a model for testing. Future research should test the model through longitudinal and mixed-methods designs, track schools through leadership transitions, compare schools at different SBM levels, and include parents, learners, barangay officials, and other community partners as participants.

## 5. Limitations of the Study

The study has several limitations. First, five purposively selected schools in one region do not support statistical generalization. Readers should judge transferability against the detailed case descriptions. Second, the evidence rests on interview accounts from school leaders and staff with a stake in their school's SBM status, which raises the risk of social desirability bias. Third, parents, learners, and community partners were not interviewed, although RQ2 concerns their engagement. Their perspectives reached the study only through the accounts of leaders and staff. Fourth, one case was led by an assistant principal rather than a principal. Fifth, the researcher conducted, transcribed, translated, and coded the interviews, so translation and interpretation choices may have shaped the findings, despite member checking and analyst review. Sixth, all schools reached Level III before the current leaders arrived, which limits claims about the leaders' unique contribution. Finally, the proposed model has not been tested. Future studies should include stakeholder voices, compare leader transitions, and test the model with larger samples and quantitative measures of SBM performance and learner outcomes.

## 6. Supplementary Details

*6.1. Supplementary Materials & Data availability statement:*
The interview transcripts contain identifiable information about participants and schools and are not publicly available. De-identified excerpts are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

*6.2. Author Contributions:*
This journal uses the Contributor Roles Taxonomy (CRediT) to recognize individual author contributions, reduce authorship disputes, and facilitate collaboration. The corresponding author will be responsible for all correspondence related to the paper and must ensure that the other authors are included in the communication regarding submission, revision, and publication processes. We encourage authors to include a statement in the paper that shares and accurately describes each author's contribution. To be eligible for authorship, each individual must have contributed to at least one of the following: conceptualization, methodology, formal analysis, or investigation, as well as at least one aspect of writing (either original draft preparation or writing reviews and editing).

| Name of Author | C | M | So | Va | Fo | I | R | D | O | E | Vi | Su | P | Fu |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mayvelle V. Malayan | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | |
| Danilo G. Baradillo | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | |

*6.3. Funding:*
This research received no external funding.

*6.4. Institutional Review Board Statement*
The study was conducted in accordance with the ethical guidelines of the University of the Immaculate Conception and approved by the University of the Immaculate Conception Research Ethics Committee (UIC-REC) protocol number on date of approval.

*6.5. Informed Consent Statement:*
Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

*6.6. Acknowledgments:*
I would like to express my deepest gratitude to everyone who supported me in completing this dissertation. I am especially grateful to my adviser, Dr. Danilo G. Baradillo, for his guidance and encouragement, and to my panel of research examiners—Dr. Avee Joy B. Dayaganon, Dr. Sylvia J. Pidor, Dr. Porferia S. Poralan, Dr. Nelca Stephany U. Amatong, and Dr. Ava Sheldin T. Guerrero—for their thoughtful feedback. I thank the University of the Immaculate Conception, particularly the Graduate School, the Research Ethics Committee, and Dean Dr. Mary Jane B. Amoguis, for their academic and institutional support. My appreciation also goes to DepEd Region XI Regional Director Allan G. Farnazo, CESO III, and the Schools Division Offices of Digos City, Davao del Norte, Davao de Oro, Davao City, and Tagum City for permitting me to conduct this research, as well as to my participants and their informants for generously sharing their time and experiences. I am grateful to our SAES school head, Sir Robert J. Sta. Ana, my colleagues, friends, and prayer warriors for their understanding, encouragement, prayers, and support. To my classmates and co-advisees Krizza Mae E. Aguirre, Agustin A. Pandoma, Virgil John D. Bogaoan, and Charilyn Balbuena, thank you for standing by me throughout this journey. I also thank my family—Mama Gina, Papa Dondon and the rest of my family for their love, sacrifices, prayers, and faith in me. To my partner, Kent, for his constant patience, understanding, encouragement, and support. Above all, I praise and thank the Lord for giving me the wisdom, strength, grace, and faith to persevere and complete this work.

*6.7. Conflicts of Interest:*
The authors declare no conflict of interest.

*6.8. Disclosure Statement:*
The authors use generative AI in improving the language quality of the manuscript and generating the causal model for sustaining advanced school-based management.

## References

Adeoye, M. A. (2023). Stakeholder's perceived reasons for decentralization reform in school-based management. ASEAN Journal of Economic and Economic Education, 2(1). https://ejournal.bumipublikasinusantara.id/index.php/ajeee/article/view/219

Afriyanti, A., Mulawarman, W. G., Dwiyono, Y., Komariyah, L., Haryaka, U., & Akhmad, A. (2025). Implementation of school-based management for improving the quality of education at Linggang Bigung Public Senior High School. Borneo Educational Journal, 7(2), 621–635. https://doi.org/10.24903/bej.v7i2.2047

Ahmed, S. K., Mohammed, R. A., Nashwan, A. J., Ibrahim, R. H., Abdalla, A. Q., Ameen, B. M. M., & Khdhir, R. M. (2025). Using thematic analysis in qualitative research. Journal of Medicine, Surgery, and Public Health, 6, 100198. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.glmedi.2025.100198

Amon, L., & Anggal, N. (2021). Implementation of school-based management in curriculum and learning processes: A literature review. European Journal of Research Development and Sustainability, 2(7), 90–98. https://scholarzest.com/index.php/ejrds/article/view/1079

Ang, J. V., Adlit, M. F., Docdoc, V. A., Comeros, J. S., & Lagnason-Pacheco, L. (2025). School-based management implementation and educational outcomes in Philippine public schools: An explanatory sequential inquiry. Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology, 9(4), 2625–2644. https://doi.org/10.55214/25768484.v9i4.6611

Arguelles, R., & Sarsale, M. (2025). Stakeholder engagement practices in rural and remote schools: Insights from Filipino school leaders. Issues in Educational Research, 35(1), 42–60. https://www.iier.org.au/iier35/arguelles.pdf

Baluyot, L. C. (2025). Challenges in the implementation of school-based management in the Division of Northern Samar. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 9(7), 1389–1398. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.907000115

Bandur, A., Hamsal, M., & Furinto, A. (2021). 21st century experiences in the development of school-based management policy and practices in Indonesia. Educational Research for Policy and Practice, 21(1), 85–107. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10671-021-09293-x

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

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Bush, T. (2018). Research on educational leadership and management: Broadening the base. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 46(3), 359–361. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143218758555

Bustamante, J. D. R. (2022). School based management (SBM) practices and effective school performance. International Journal of Research Publications, 104(1), 638–653. https://doi.org/10.47119/IJRP1001041720223507

Casilla, A. P. (2026). Strengths of school-based management: A thematic study of leadership and stakeholder engagement in Level 3 schools. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 9(12), 3082–3086. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.91200236

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Cubillas, C. D. (2025). School-based management practices in the new normal among elementary schools in the Division of Butuan City. Pantao: The International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences, 4(3), 4268–4280. https://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS0403396

De Torres, P. (2021). Stakeholders' involvement in school-initiated activities of District I elementary schools: Basis for enhanced community partnership program of activities. International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology, 6(2), 481–490.

De Vera, V. N. (2022). Stakeholders' participation and its correlation with implementation of school-based management of Bambang East elementary school. International Journal of Research Studies in Education, 11(11). https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2022.855

Department of Education. (2012). Implementing guidelines on the revised School-Based Management (SBM) framework, assessment process and tool (APAT) (DepEd Order No. 83, s. 2012). Department of Education, Republic of the Philippines.

Department of Education. (2024). Policy guidelines on the implementation of the revised School-Based Management system (DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2024). Department of Education, Republic of the Philippines.

Dones, M. D., Jr., Estremera, M. L., & Deuda, M. J. D. (2023). School-based management perspectives: Exploring top-down policy execution at the grassroots level. European Journal of Educational Management, 6(2), 101–118. https://doi.org/10.12973/eujem.6.2.101

Ferriswara, D., Ambarwati, A., Roekminiati, S., & Pramudiana, I. D. (2024). School committees' effectiveness in the context of school-based management policy. KnE Social Sciences, 9(7). https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v9i7.15533

Fitri, Y., Rania, Lestari, W., Ningtias, G. D., Efendi, M. A., Natasya, Lustikha, O. V., Bravelia, D., Rahman, F. A., Esza, D., Imelda, Fitriani, A., Rahmawati, N., Putra, A. R., & Azwar, A. S. A. (2025). Implementation management based

school in improving education quality. IJE (International Journal of Education), 3(2), 53–62. https://doi.org/10.24036/ije.3.2.53-62

Ghamrawi, N. (2023). Toward agenda 2030 in education: Policies and practices for effective school leadership. Educational Research for Policy and Practice, 22, 325–347. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10671-023-09341-8

Hasnadi, Sudibyo, H., & Zikriati. (2024). School based management: A strategy to improve the quality of education. JoIEM (Journal of Islamic Education Management), 5(1), 60–74. https://doi.org/10.30762/joiem.v5i1.3125

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

Janis, I. (2022). Strategies for establishing dependability between two qualitative intrinsic case studies: A reflexive thematic analysis. Field Methods, 34(3), 240–255. https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X211069636

Juniar, C. M., & Prasetyo, M. A. M. (2025). Challenges of educational autonomy in the implementation of school-based management. el-Tarbawi, 18(1), 62–81. https://doi.org/10.20885/tarbawi.vol18.iss1.art3

Kimilat, C. O., & Baguio, E. L. (2025). Structural and non-structural transformations of school-based management level of practice in Bislig City Division. International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, 15(8), 28–36. https://doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.15.08.2025.p16404

Koh, G. A., Askell-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

Leithwood, K., Sun, J., & Schumacker, R. (2020). How school leadership influences student learning: A test of "The Four Paths Model." Educational Administration Quarterly, 56(4), 570–599. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X19878772

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. SAGE Publications.

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

Niez, R., Tancinco, N., Retuerto, G., Vicera, C., & Ang, J. (2025). Leadership trends and challenges in school-based management: A case study of Calubian North District, Leyte, Philippines. International Journal of Innovative Research and Scientific Studies, 8(2), 4259–4269. https://doi.org/10.53894/ijirss.v8i2.6277

Patalinghug, J. E. V. (2023). Journey towards School-Based Management (SBM) peaks: A traversal into SBM leaders' grassroots experiences [Completed research]. Department of Education E-Saliksik Research Portal. https://e-saliksik.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2024/02/XI_2023_Patalinghug_Journey-Towards-School-Based-Management-SBM-Peaks-A-Traversal-into-SBM-Leaders-Grassroots-Experiences-1.pdf

Patiam, A. M. C. (2025). Evaluation of contextualized SBM practices in selected public elementary schools in the Philippines: Inputs for compliance and performance monitoring. Educational Process: International Journal, 18, e2025514. https://doi.org/10.22521/edupij.2025.18.514

Quinones, J. I. D., & Abanto, R. G. (2024). Extent of implementation of school based management (SBM) in selected secondary schools in Camarines Norte: Basis for policy recommendation. International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation, 11(9), 740–763. https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2024.1109063

Rääk, K., & Eisenschmidt, E. (2025). Sustainable evidence-driven school improvement: Routines and data use in Estonian schools. Frontiers in Education, 9, 1517985. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1517985

Remorosa, M. M. R., & Paglinawan, J. L. (2024). Collaborative expertise and professional competence on school-based management implementation of teachers. International Journal of Scientific and Management Research, 7(11), 236–245. https://doi.org/10.37502/IJSMR.2024.71121

Roque, J. L. (2023). The effect of the implementation of school-based management in decision makers and stakeholders of selected public schools in the Philippines. Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers, 14(2), 294–304. https://doi.org/10.47750/jett.2023.14.02.028

Saputra, E., & Hartati, P. (2024). School-based management: A literature review of its implementation and impact on school organizational effectiveness. PPSDP International Journal of Education, 3(2), 408–417. https://doi.org/10.59175/pijed.v3i2.330

Spillane, J. P. (2006). Distributed leadership. Jossey-Bass.

UNESCO. (2024). Global education monitoring report 2024/5: Leadership in education: Lead for learning. UNESCO.

von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). General system theory: Foundations, development, applications. George Braziller.

Yatri, I., Fatayan, A., & Granatuma, H. F. (2022). The implementation of school-based management in Islamic elementary schools. AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan, 14(3), 4629–4636. https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v14i3.2239

Yin, R. K. (2018). Case study research and applications: Design and methods (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

**Appendix A**

*Questions for School Leaders*

Research Question 1: Leadership practices for sustaining SBM

1. Can you briefly describe your experience as a school head and your involvement in implementing School-Based Management in your school?

2. How do you make sure SBM programs and school improvement plans are carried out consistently by your team?

3. What challenges have you encountered in sustaining SBM, and how do you address them through leadership practices?

4. In your view, which leadership practices are most important to keep SBM sustainable, and what advice would you give other school heads?

Research Question 2: Stakeholder engagement

5. What communication strategies do you use to keep stakeholders informed?

6. How do you foster collaboration among parents, teachers, and community members when implementing school programs?

7. What leadership practices do you apply to strengthen participatory and decentralized governance in your school?

8. What challenges do you encounter in engaging stakeholders in participatory and decentralized governance, and how do you address them?

*Questions for School Leaders*

Research Question 1: Leadership practices for sustaining SBM

1. Can you briefly describe your experience as a school head and your involvement in implementing School-Based Management in your school?

2. How do you make sure SBM programs and school improvement plans are carried out consistently by your team?

3. What challenges have you encountered in sustaining SBM, and how do you address them through leadership practices?

4. In your view, which leadership practices are most important to keep SBM sustainable, and what advice would you give other school heads?

Research Question 2: Stakeholder engagement

5. What communication strategies do you use to keep stakeholders informed?

6. How do you foster collaboration among parents, teachers, and community members when implementing school programs?

7. What leadership practices do you apply to strengthen participatory and decentralized governance in your school?

8. What challenges do you encounter in engaging stakeholders in participatory and decentralized governance, and how do you address them?