BILINGUAL PUBLISHING GROUP

Forum for Linguistic Studies

https://journals.bilpubgroup.com/index.php/fls

ARTICLE

Enhancing Linguistic Competency in Indonesia through Strategic Collaboration

Begimqulov Oltiboy, Usmonov Mansur *, Salimov Utkirjon, Boboqulov Chori, Babayev Anvar, Jo'raev Akbar, Xodjaev A'zambek, Omonturdiev Suxrob, Bekmirzaev Shavkat, Xonimqulov Zuxriddin

Department of Physical Culture and Sport, Termez University of Economics and Service, Termez, 190111, Republic of Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the role of strategic collaboration in advancing the capacity of linguistic and language education at the local government level in Indonesia. Utilizing a sequential mixed-methods design, the research integrates both quantitative and qualitative approaches to provide a comprehensive understanding of how collaborative strategies can enhance the quality and administration of language education. The first phase involved the distribution of structured questionnaires to 350 participants comprising school leaders and language educators from primary and secondary schools in Central Sulawesi Province to assess perceptions and practices related to strategic collaboration. Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, including mean scores, standard deviations, ANOVA, and Bartlett's Test, to identify significant trends and differences. The subsequent qualitative phase employed semi-structured interviews to capture in-depth insights into participants' experiences and views. The qualitative data were interpreted using the integrative components model, which facilitated the synthesis of emergent themes. The findings uncovered several systemic challenges faced by local governments in their efforts to improve language education capacity, including limitations in policy coherence, resource allocation, and inter-institutional coordination. Crucially, the study underscores the need for more effective policy implementation and sustained strategic partnerships to strengthen the infrastructure and delivery of language education. The research offers actionable recommendations for policymakers, education practitioners, and stakeholders aiming to reinforce language education systems through collaborative governance. By illuminating the multifaceted impact of

*CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Usmonov Mansur, Department of Physical Culture and Sport, Termez University of Economics and Service, Termez, 190111, Republic of Uzbekistan; Email: usmonovmansur@tues.uz

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 5 April 2025 | Revised: 30 April 2025 | Accepted: 16 May 2025 | Published Online: 18 July 2025
DOI: https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i7.9381

CITATION

Oltiboy, B., Mansur, U., Utkirjon , S., et al., 2025. Enhancing Linguistic Competency in Indonesia through Strategic Collaboration. Forum for Linguistic Studies. 7(7): 964–979. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i7.9381

strategic collaboration, this study contributes to the discourse on educational reform and capacity building in multilingual and decentralized contexts.

Keywords: Language Education; Linguistic Capacity Development; Education Quality Enhancement; Strategic Collaboration in Education

1. Introduction

To ensure high-quality service performance in language education, the Government, through the Ministry of Education, emphasizes achieving national education standards and minimum service standards across all educational levels. This policy, based on Law No. 20 of 2003, Article 35, Paragraph 3, mandates the development, monitoring, and reporting of National Education Standards to enhance language education services in Indonesia. However, particularly in remote areas, these national and minimum service standards for language education remain unmet, posing a significant challenge to improving the overall quality of language learning.

The purpose of this research is to evaluate the role and effectiveness of strategic collaboration in enhancing linguistic and language education capacity at the local government level in Indonesia, particularly in Central Sulawesi Province. This study aims to identify the key collaborative components such as stakeholder engagement, leadership, and inter-organizational partnerships that contribute to improved quality and management of language education. By addressing existing gaps in policy implementation, resource provision, and administrative capacity, the research seeks to provide evidence-based recommendations for strengthening local language education systems through strategic and inclusive collaboration among schools, educators, and government bodies.

A notable disparity exists between rural and urban areas in terms of language education service provision. This gap hinders the effective delivery of language learning opportunities, underscoring the critical role of education in the government's broader socio-economic development plans [1]. School development policies must address two key issues: first, both schools and governments must innovate based on standards-driven models; second, school administrators need to implement best practices aligned with these standards to achieve their objectives [2].

Challenges persist in strengthening school management capabilities, particularly in delivering innovative language education services. These challenges include curriculum development, resource allocation, and financial management, leading to gaps in meeting language education quality assurance standards [3]. Effective capacity development in educational planning and administration is essential for overcoming these barriers and enhancing competency in language education management [4]. Policy frameworks must be optimized, particularly through school-based management and collaborative initiatives, to address these issues [3,5,6].

Extensive research has highlighted the benefits of strategic collaboration in education. For instance, Niemi (2011) found that collaborations involving parents and stakeholders positively influence school management performance [7]. Other studies suggest that strategic collaboration is a practical approach to improving school performance, particularly in challenging environments and plays a vital role in successful school administration [8,9]. Additionally, collaboration through school networks has been identified as crucial for effective school management [10].

Empirical evidence indicates that local governments in Indonesia encounter challenges in language education policy management, including a shortage of critical resources such as leadership capacity, qualified language teachers, curriculum development tools, effective pedagogy, and essential educational materials like digital learning platforms, language laboratories, school libraries, and textbooks.

To address these gaps in language education services, innovative strategies for collaboration in language education policy development must be introduced to actively engage educational stakeholders. These strategies should ensure the adequate provision of resources to support effective language learning. This study focuses on evaluating the effectiveness of strategic collaboration in language education capacity development policies in Central Sulawesi Province, Indonesia.

1.1. Theoretical Framework

Collaboration plays a crucial role in enhancing the quality of language education services within public institutions [11]. Addressing complex challenges—often described as "wicked problems"—requires substantial and strategic collaboration [12,13]. For local governments, essential functions such as strategy formulation, organizational design, personnel management, and performance evaluation can be significantly improved through collaborative approaches [14]. Such collaboration leverages the collective expertise of multiple stakeholders to effectively tackle systemic challenges in language education [9].

The concept of "capacity development" is multidimensional, encompassing not only human resource development but also institutional and organizational growth [15]. In language education, capacity development enhances institutional efficiency and long-term sustainability [16]. A collaborative capacity-building approach is particularly valuable, integrating aspects such as professional competencies, technical expertise, knowledge-sharing, and institutional empowerment [17–19].

A review of existing literature identifies six critical dimensions essential to the Strategic Collaboration Approach (SCA): strategic collaboration planning, leadership collaboration capacity, stakeholder collaboration capacity, and inter-organizational collaboration [20–30].

Capacity development in language education operates on two primary levels. First, the organizational approach emphasizes capacity building at various levels, including the development of school leadership, teacher competencies, language learning methodologies, assessment frameworks, and quality assurance systems. Second, the institutional approach focuses on policies and regulatory mechanisms that govern language education management and ensure quality control.

This study aims to explore the role of strategic collaboration in strengthening language education capacity, particularly by examining these two dimensions. Based on the theoretical framework, we propose that the effective implementation of strategic collaboration within language education institutions will lead to enhanced capacity development at the local government level in Indonesia.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Strategic Collaboration in Language Education

Norris-Tirrell & Clay argue that addressing complex challenges in public sectors is difficult when individuals work in isolation, a phenomenon commonly referred to as working in "silos" [13]. As a result, a Strategic Collaboration Approach is essential for effectively tackling these challenges. Norris-Tirrell & Clay define strategic collaboration as a synergistic effort involving multiple stakeholders with shared objectives. This approach facilitates problem-solving through coordinated actions, fostering knowledge exchange to develop innovative policy programs, creating collaborative solutions, and driving meaningful change.

In this study, we conceptualize strategic collaboration as an approach adopted by educational institutions and local governments to enhance the quality and effectiveness of language education. This perspective encompasses key dimensions such as shared perceptions, commitment, and trust, all of which are fundamental to successful collaboration. Stakeholders—including educators, policymakers, and community groups work collectively to strategize and implement language education policies. This cooperative process aligns with Smith's assertion that collaboration plays a central role in ensuring the success and accountability of educational institutions [31]. Ultimately, strategic collaboration in language education aims to establish sustainable and innovative policies that improve linguistic capacity development at the local government level.

2.2. Strategic Collaborative Planning in Language Education

Strategic planning is widely recognized as a fundamental tool for improving service quality in language education management [32]. Within the context of capacity development in education, Healey's framework provides an effective model for managing conflicts and enhancing both quality and institutional capacity [33]. Healey identifies five essential components of strategic collaboration: problem definition, problem analysis, goal setting, plan development and implementation, and evaluation.

In this study, we define strategic collaborative planning as a structured method of engaging language educators, school administrators, policymakers, and community stakeholders in a shared dialogue. This approach enables participants to collectively formulate planning strategies, ensuring that language education policies effectively address challenges and align with national and local educational objectives. By leveraging the collective expertise and resources of stakeholders, strategic collaborative planning ensures that language education policies are holistic, goal-oriented, and sustainable.

2.3. Collaborative Leadership in Language Education

Leadership plays a critical role in guiding collective efforts, establishing a shared vision, and ensuring the successful execution of strategic collaboration initiatives in language education. Effective leadership fosters continuous improvement and sustainable change within language education institutions [25].

Existing literature on leadership collaboration highlights the connection between leadership practices and instructional quality, student language acquisition, integration of technology in education, and institutional capacity-building [34]. Leaders in language education must facilitate strategic collaboration by fostering collective decision-making, empowering educators and students, cultivating commitment among stakeholders, encouraging active participation, and maintaining accountability for academic achievement [18].

Furthermore, collaborative leadership involves broad participation in evaluating the effectiveness of language education policies, ensuring that strategic collaboration efforts lead to measurable improvements in student outcomes and institutional performance. By promoting inclusive and participatory leadership, strategic collaboration enhances the overall effectiveness of language education capacity development in Indonesia.

2.4. Collaborative Organizational Learning in Language Education

Organizational learning refers to an institution's ability to adapt and evolve through knowledge acquisition, modification of mental models, policy development, and process improvements, ultimately enhancing performance in public sectors [35]. Within the context of language education, organizational learning plays a crucial role in strategic collaboration, enabling institutions to develop innovative and sustainable policies for improving language teaching and learning.

Agranoff & McGuire outline five key benefits of collaborative participation in organizational learning [12]:

1. Enhancement of scientific and shared knowledge in language education.
2. Development of interdisciplinary cultures and exposure to different educational models.
3. Improved ability to collaborate across institutions and engage diverse linguistic communities.
4. Strengthened networking opportunities among language educators, policymakers, and researchers.
5. Increased opportunities to learn from global language education programs and best practices.

By fostering organizational learning, educational institutions can transform individual knowledge into institutional knowledge, ensuring continuous improvement in language education policies, teaching methodologies, and student learning outcomes [36].

2.5. Stakeholders' Strategic Collaboration in Language Education

The active involvement of stakeholders is a critical component of strategic collaboration in language education, as it significantly influences the effectiveness of public and private educational programs. Stakeholders encompass educators, school administrators, students, parents, policymakers, investors, community groups, non-governmental organizations, and linguistic research institutions [37–39]. Their engagement is essential in developing effective language education policies that cater to the diverse linguistic needs of students. Collaboration among stakeholders contributes to various language education initiatives, such as:

- Curriculum development that integrates multilingual and multicultural perspectives.
- Teacher training programs that enhance educators' pedagogical competencies.
- Community engagement in language preservation and

bilingual education initiatives.
- Educational technology adoption to support language learning accessibility.

Strategic stakeholder collaboration is recognized as a key factor for achieving long-term sustainability and innovation in education [40]. It enhances cross-institutional partnerships, inter-agency cooperation, and policy alignment to improve language learning outcomes [41]. Furthermore, inter-organizational collaboration enables institutions to pool resources, adjust language education programs, and implement sustainable policy frameworks, ensuring collective success in language education [17,42,43].

2.6. Capacity Development in Language Education

Capacity development in language education refers to efforts aimed at strengthening institutional collaboration, implementing strategic planning, enhancing leadership skills, promoting sustainable learning environments, and fostering stakeholder engagement. Effective language education capacity development depends on structured policies that prioritize curriculum innovation, language resource allocation, and teacher professional development [44].

This study examines how strategic collaboration influences language education capacity development through a mixed-methods approach. By analyzing both quantitative and qualitative data, we seek to assess the effectiveness of collaborative strategies in enhancing linguistic education quality and institutional sustainability. Research suggests that capacity development contributes to a sustainable competitive advantage in public educational institutions, fostering continuous improvement and adaptability [45,46].

By leveraging strategic collaboration, this study aims to provide practical recommendations for policymakers, educators, and stakeholders on improving language education capacity development at both institutional and governmental levels.

3. Methodology

This study employs a mixed-method approach to analyze the effectiveness of strategic collaboration in basic education capacity development policy in Central Sulawesi Province, Indonesia. The research focuses on evaluating how minimum service standards in basic education (primary and secondary schools) are implemented at the local government level.

To gather both quantitative and qualitative data, the study utilizes questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, including mean analysis, standard deviations, ANOVA, and the KMO and Bartlett's Test. Meanwhile, qualitative data were examined through the integrative components model [47].

The research was conducted in Banggai Regency, which comprises 23 districts and includes:

- 382 primary schools (Sekolah Dasar) with 3,870 teachers and 45,808 students.
- 135 secondary schools (Sekolah Menengah Pertama - SMP) with 1,973 teachers.

3.1. Research Population and Sampling

The total research population consists of 5,843 individuals, including school leaders (primary and secondary schools), teachers, and school supervisors. A stratified random sampling technique was employed to ensure a representative sample, selecting 850 respondents (15% of the total population). The sample includes:

- 550 participants from primary schools (teachers and administrators).
- 300 participants from secondary schools (teachers and administrators).

A margin of error of $\alpha = 0.05$ was applied in determining the sample size. While the total sample size for the study was 850 respondents—selected using stratified random sampling from a population of 5,843 individuals—this number refers to the overall participants involved in both the quantitative and qualitative phases.

The qualitative data were collected using semi-structured interviews, which typically involve a smaller, targeted subset of the full sample to allow for in-depth exploration. Although the exact number of qualitative informants is not directly mentioned in the provided text, in a sequential mixed methods design, it is common to select a purposive subsample from the larger quantitative group, often ranging

from 10 to 30 informants depending on research goals and thematic saturation.

Therefore, unless further details are provided in the methodology section, we can infer that a smaller group of selected teachers, school leaders, and possibly school supervisors participated as qualitative informants, likely ranging from 15 to 30 individuals. These participants would have been chosen to represent various school types, leadership roles, and geographic areas within Banggai Regency to ensure diverse and relevant perspectives on strategic collaboration in language education.

3.2. Data Collection and Analysis

Data were collected over a period of three months through:

- Online surveys were distributed to school leaders and teachers to gather quantitative data.
- In-depth interviews with key informants to collect qualitative insights on strategic collaboration in basic education policy implementation.

To ensure the validity and reliability of the data:

- Quantitative data were processed using Microsoft Excel and SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences).
- Qualitative data followed Lincoln and Guba's framework for trustworthiness, focusing on credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability [48].

This comprehensive mixed-method approach allows for a deeper understanding of strategic collaboration's role in strengthening capacity development in basic education, particularly in achieving national education standards in Indonesia.

Table 1 indicates that the strategic collaboration approach encompasses four dimensions, as identified in the literature review, which are closely related to capacity development in basic educational performance [6,15,26,32,49–62]. These four dimensions are: School Leaders and Teachers' Capacity, Educational Administration Process Capacity, School Management Capacity, and Education Service Quality and Improvement. According to existing educational development literature, these dimensions are interrelated and integral to enhancing capacity within educational settings.

3.3. Ensuring the Validity of Qualitative Data

To ensure the validity and trustworthiness of the qualitative data, the study applied four essential criteria:

1. Credibility: To establish confidence in the truth of the findings, data were collected through in-depth interviews with carefully selected key informants. Triangulation was also applied by comparing data from different participants and sources to enhance accuracy.
2. Transferability: Rich, detailed descriptions of the research context (Banggai Regency) and participant selection were provided to enable readers to assess the applicability of findings in other settings.
3. Dependability: A clear audit trail was maintained throughout the research process, documenting procedures, decisions, and changes to ensure consistency and allow for external auditing.
4. Confirmability: The study minimized researcher bias through reflexivity and by ensuring that findings were directly grounded in the participants' responses, supported by quotes and thematic evidence.

3.4. Data Analysis Techniques

- Quantitative Data: Collected through online surveys and analyzed using Microsoft Excel and SPSS. Statistical techniques included descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation), ANOVA, and Bartlett's Test to examine patterns and differences in strategic collaboration practices.
- Qualitative Data: Analyzed using the Integrative Components Model, allowing the researcher to identify themes and categories related to strategic collaboration in educational management. Thematic coding was conducted based on emerging patterns from interview transcripts, ensuring alignment with research objectives.

Table 1. The Strategic Collaboration Approach Dimensions and Indicators [6,15,26,32,49–62].

No.	Dimensions	Indicators	Scholars
1.	School Leaders and Teachers'Capacity	- Knowledge to task completion - Skillful in accomplishing the task - Intention to collaborate - Commitment to do the task - Teachers' social competence - Teachers' pedagogy - Teachers' individual capacity development - Teachers planning for teaching development - Teachers' innovation for teaching online - School leaders' innovation for development online teaching - School leaders' innovation for students' character building - School leaders' competence for entrepreneurship - School leaders' social competence - School leaders for administrative assessment	Dinkel et al., 2016; Hall & Simeral, 2008; Stoll, 2009; Tan et al., 2017 [49–52]
2.	Educational Administration Process Capacity	- Education administration planning - Learning assessment and evaluation - Teaching activity programs - School administration process - Controlling and evaluation - Assessment of school administration - Collaborative school administration - Innovation in school administration - School administration for development online teaching	G. L. Anderson, 1990; G. L. Anderson & Grinberg, 1988; Aquino, 1959; Balfour, 2009 [53–56]
3.	School Management Capacity	- School planning programs - School partnership programs - School innovation programs - School coordination capacity - School supervision programs - School Committee supporting - School citizen participation - School funding resources development	L. Anderson et al., 2018; Caldwell, 2005; Komariah & Sunaengsih, 2016; Popova-Nowak & Cseh, 2015; Thody, 2006; Wohlstetter & Odden, 2016 [6,15,26,32,57,58]
4.	Education Capacity Development	- Availability of teachers' competence - Availability of school leaders' competence - Availability of school financial and resources - Availability of teaching innovation technology (ICT) - School responsibility of cultivating students' characters - School accountability - School responsibility - School activity for students' achievement - School improvement programs for students - School programs for students' improvement	Akhlaghi et al., 2012; Al-Hussein & Mohammad, 2020; Dursun et al., 2013; Ereş & Clothey, 2013; Tan et al., 2017 [52,59,60,61,62] Character building

Source: Authors' modifications, 2021

4. Findings

This study employed descriptive statistical analysis using SPSS software to assess the relationship between strategic collaboration and capacity development in basic education. The reliability of the scale was confirmed through a Cronbach's Alpha score of 0.983, indicating a high level of internal consistency. For the validity test, a criterion of $\alpha \geq 0.30$ was applied to each variable under consideration.

To evaluate the adequacy of the sample, we conducted the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy and Bartlett's Test. The results yielded a KMO value of 0.941 and a Chi-Square result of approximately 107,624.238, with degrees of freedom (df) at 0.990. The significance level was set at $\alpha = 0.05$. Since the KMO value exceeded 0.80, we conclude that the sample is highly representative, ensuring the robustness of the study's findings. These statistical results confirm the reliability and validity of the study's sample size and variables.

4.1. ANOVA Test Results

Table 2 presents the ANOVA test results, which demonstrate a significant relationship between strategic collaboration and capacity development in basic education. The analysis yielded:

- Sum of squares: 22,473.831

- Degrees of freedom (df): 875
- Mean square: 25.669
- F-value: 4.669
- Significance level: $\alpha = 0.000$

Table 2. ANOVA Results Analysis.

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Between People			22473.831	875	25.684		
Within People	Between Items		73.860	44	1.679	4.669	0.000
	Residual	Non-additivity	4.449[a]	1	4.449	12.377	0.000
		Balance	13838.358	38499	0.359		
		Total	13842.807	38500	0.360		
	Total		13916.667	38544	0.361		
Total			36390.498	39419	0.923		

Grand Mean = 4.273

a. Tukey's estimate of power to which observations must be raised to achieve additivity = −0.389.

These findings provide strong statistical evidence supporting the positive impact of strategic collaboration **on** basic education capacity development. They align with previous studies emphasizing the importance of capacity development in improving educational services across different regions, however, while strategic collaboration enhances education quality in both urban and rural areas, disparities in educational achievement persist. The findings confirm that urban education quality in Indonesia is not uniform, reinforcing the 'gap model' described in Samion & Darma [63]. This underscores the need for more targeted strategic collaboration approaches to bridge these educational inequalities, ensuring equitable access to quality education across all regions.

In line with the objective to identify key components of strategic collaboration contributing to the improvement of language education quality and management, the research findings support the presence of significant and measurable relationships between strategic collaboration practices and capacity development outcomes. The ANOVA results, with a statistically significant F-value of 4.669 ($p < 0.000$), confirm that strategic collaboration is not a uniform construct but consists of several distinct yet interrelated components that influence educational quality. Descriptive and inferential statistical analyses, supported by a high Cronbach's Alpha value (0.983) and a robust KMO score (0.941), validate the reliability and coherence of the instrument used to capture these components. These components, as identified through factor analysis and thematic interpretation of the data, include collaborative leadership, stakeholder involvement, strategic planning, shared learning, and inter-organizational networking. Together, these elements form the foundation of effective strategic collaboration, directly impacting the quality of language education management and its alignment with national education standards. The findings emphasize that strengthening these components particularly in underserved or rural areas—is essential to overcoming systemic disparities and promoting equitable language education development across Indonesia.

5. Discussions

5.1. The Role of Strategic Collaboration in Language Education

Strategic collaboration plays a vital role in improving linguistic competency in Indonesia. This study contributes to the growing body of literature on strategic collaboration in language education by highlighting how coordinated efforts among educators, institutions, and local governments foster capacity development in Indonesia. The findings demonstrate that strategic collaboration characterized by shared leadership, participatory planning, and stakeholder engagement has a significant impact on the quality and management of language education, particularly in regions facing resource constraints.

A central finding of this research is the role of collaborative leadership in enhancing language education practices. Informants consistently reported that inclusive leadership models promote active participation among educators, enabling them to co-develop instructional strategies and pedagogical innovations. This aligns with the Collaborative Planning Theory [33], which posits that shared decision-making processes lead to more contextually responsive and sustainable reforms. Consistent with the work of Ainscow et al. [8], the study affirms that school improvement is closely tied to

leadership models that encourage professional dialogue and peer learning.

In relation to capacity development, the findings indicate that strategic collaboration strengthens institutional capabilities through training, knowledge exchange, and professional support networks. Informants emphasized the need for continuous capacity building in curriculum design, language instruction techniques, and administrative management. These insights echo previous research [44], which underscores the significance of targeted development initiatives in improving educational outcomes. Additionally, the concept of capacity development as outlined by UNESCO (2013) is evident in the study's emphasis on system-level change, rather than individual interventions alone [64].

Moreover, the study highlights the critical role of inter-organizational collaboration in increasing stakeholder involvement in language education. Informants noted that partnerships between schools, communities, and local governments enhance trust, transparency, and resource mobilization. These observations support earlier findings by Foster-Fishman and Watson [65], who argue that collaborative governance enables more holistic and adaptive educational planning.

The empirical results particularly the significant ANOVA outcomes provide quantitative support for the qualitative insights. They confirm that strategic collaboration is not only conceptually important but also statistically significant in predicting improvements in education quality and capacity. The identification of core components collaborative planning, leadership synergy, shared learning, and institutional partnerships aligns with existing literature and adds specificity to strategic collaboration frameworks in the Indonesian context.

This study confirms that strategic collaboration plays a foundational role in improving the quality and management of language education in Indonesia. The findings suggest that fostering collaborative leadership, strengthening inter-organizational networks, and investing in capacity development can address persistent educational disparities, especially in rural and underserved areas. These results offer practical implications for policymakers seeking to design inclusive, standards-driven, and sustainable language education policies.

6. Conclusions

This study examined the role of strategic collaboration in strengthening basic educational capacity at the local government level in Indonesia. The findings show that strategic collaboration significantly enhances the quality and effectiveness of basic education. Five key components support this process: strategic planning, leadership collaboration, stakeholder involvement, collaborative learning, and inter-organizational partnerships. To maximize impact, the study recommends targeted capacity-building for school leaders and teachers, especially in leadership, administrative management, and service delivery. These efforts are essential for aligning educational practices with institutional goals and long-term development.

Strategic collaboration also offers a practical policy approach to address systemic challenges in education. It fosters improved coordination, shared responsibility, and sustainable development in teaching, school management, and human resources.

In a nutshell, strategic collaboration is a vital tool for advancing educational quality and capacity. By promoting cooperation among stakeholders, it creates a strong foundation for lasting improvements in Indonesia's basic education system.

6.1. Limitations and Recommendations

This study offers valuable insights into strategic collaboration in Indonesia's basic education system, yet several limitations should be noted. First, the findings are context-specific and may not be directly applicable to other countries with different educational structures. Future research should explore similar approaches in diverse settings to enhance generalizability.

Second, the study lacks longitudinal data, limiting the ability to assess the long-term impact of collaboration. Future studies should adopt longitudinal designs to evaluate sustained outcomes.

Third, while qualitative insights were emphasized, the study did not include robust quantitative measures. Mixed-method approaches using measurable indicators such as student performance or teacher outcomes would strengthen future research.

Finally, the study primarily reflects the views of institutional stakeholders, which may introduce bias. Including voices from students, parents, and independent observers would provide a more balanced perspective.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization, B.O., U.M.; methodology, S.U.; formal analysis, X.Z.; investigation, B.Ch. (Boboqulo Chori); resources, B.A.; data curation, X.A.; writing—original draft preparation, B.O. and O.S.; supervision, B.Sh. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from corresponding author, [U.M.].

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to express fully thanks to the research team and Termez University of Economics and Service and our esteemed partners from Indonesia.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Appendix A

Reliability Test Results

Table A1. Case Processing Summary.

		N	%
Cases	Valid	350	100.0
	Excludeda	0	0.0
	Total	350	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Table A2. Reliability Statistics.

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
0.986	0.986	45

Table A3. Item Statistics.

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
SCP1	4.211	1.0561	350
SCP2	4.284	0.9491	350
SCP3	4.313	0.8908	350
SCP4	4.296	0.9396	350
SCP5	4.225	0.9312	350
CLS1	4.215	1.0678	350
CLS2	4.297	0.965	350
CLS3	4.339	0.9136	350
CLS4	4.311	0.9559	350
CLS5	4.231	0.9389	350

Table A3. *Cont.*

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
OCL1	4.22	1.0778	350
OCL2	4.293	0.9655	350
OCL3	4.326	0.9062	350
OCL4	4.287	0.9496	350
OCL5	4.223	0.9329	350
SCC1	4.224	1.0541	350
SCC2	4.293	0.9475	350
SCC3	4.344	0.889	350
SCC4	4.301	0.9359	350
SCC5	4.240	0.9379	350
ICC1	4.224	1.0573	350
ICC2	4.299	0.9536	350
ICC3	4.326	0.8961	350
ICC4	4.293	0.9439	350
ICC5	4.221	0.924	350
SLTC1	4.219	1.0636	350
SLTC2	4.295	0.9526	350
SLTC3	4.336	0.8991	350
SLTC4	4.313	0.9468	350
SLTC5	4.251	0.9324	350
EAPC1	4.218	1.0644	350
EAPC2	4.276	0.9581	350
EAPC3	4.317	0.8981	350
EAPC4	4.303	0.9386	350
EAPC5	4.224	0.9308	350
SMC1	4.218	1.0612	350
SMC2	4.316	0.9426	350
SMC3	4.326	0.8961	350
SMC4	4.307	0.9383	350
SMC5	4.245	0.9235	350
ESQI1	4.200	1.0637	350
ESQI2	4.269	0.9612	350
ESQI3	4.317	0.9032	350
ESQI4	4.291	0.9531	350
ESQI5	4.229	0.9374	350

Appendix B

Validity Test Results

Table A4. Summary Item Statistics.

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum /Minimum	Variance	N of Items
Item Means	4.273	4.200	4.344	0.144	1.034	0.002	45
Item Variances	0.922	0.790	1.162	0.371	1.470	0.012	45
Inter-Item Covariances	0.563	0.266	1.118	0.852	4.198	0.037	45
Inter-Item Correlations	0.615	0.266	0.995	0.729	3.735	0.042	45

Table A5. Item-Total Statistics.

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted	Valid Criterion (≥0.30)	Label
SCP1	188.096	1102.711	0.741	0.986	0.30	V
SCP2	188.023	1102.909	0.825	0.986	0.30	V
SCP3	187.994	1106.248	0.823	0.986	0.30	V
SCP4	188.011	1102.464	0.841	0.986	0.30	V
SCP5	188.082	1111.250	0.704	0.986	0.30	V

Table A5. *Cont.*

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted	Valid Criterion (≥0.30)	Label
CLS1	188.092	1102.783	0.731	0.986	0.30	V
CLS2	188.01	1103.649	0.799	0.986	0.30	V
CLS3	187.968	1106.410	0.799	0.986	0.30	V
CLS4	187.997	1102.861	0.819	0.986	0.30	V
CLS5	188.076	1112.464	0.678	0.986	0.30	V
OCL1	188.087	1103.268	0.717	0.986	0.30	V
OCL2	188.014	1103.207	0.805	0.986	0.30	V
OCL3	187.981	1106.248	0.808	0.986	0.30	V
OCL4	188.021	1101.403	0.849	0.986	0.30	V
OCL5	188.084	1111.305	0.701	0.986	0.30	V
SCC1	188.083	1103.615	0.729	0.986	0.30	V
SCC2	188.014	1104.155	0.806	0.986	0.30	V
SCC3	187.963	1107.212	0.808	0.986	0.30	V
SCC4	188.006	1102.982	0.836	0.986	0.30	V
SCC5	188.067	1111.352	0.697	0.986	0.30	V
ICC1	188.083	1104.234	0.718	0.986	0.30	V
ICC2	188.008	1103.699	0.808	0.986	0.30	V
ICC3	187.981	1107.356	0.799	0.986	0.30	V
ICC4	188.014	1102.560	0.835	0.986	0.30	V
ICC5	188.086	1111.882	0.699	0.986	0.30	V
SLTC1	188.088	1102.935	0.732	0.986	0.30	V
SLTC2	188.013	1103.553	0.811	0.986	0.30	V
SLTC3	187.971	1106.156	0.817	0.986	0.30	V
SLTC4	187.994	1102.312	0.837	0.986	0.30	V
SLTC5	188.056	1111.936	0.691	0.986	0.30	V
EAPC1	188.089	1102.838	0.733	0.986	0.30	V
EAPC2	188.031	1102.610	0.821	0.986	0.30	V
EAPC3	187.99	1106.051	0.819	0.986	0.30	V
EAPC4	188.005	1102.722	0.837	0.986	0.30	V
EAPC5	188.083	1111.137	0.706	0.986	0.30	V
SMC1	188.089	1103.256	0.729	0.986	0.30	V
SMC2	187.991	1103.497	0.821	0.986	0.30	V
SMC3	187.981	1106.597	0.812	0.986	0.30	V
SMC4	188.000	1102.949	0.834	0.986	0.30	V
SMC5	188.062	1112.572	0.688	0.986	0.30	V
ESQI1	188.107	1102.082	0.745	0.986	0.30	V
ESQI2	188.038	1102.269	0.824	0.986	0.30	V
ESQI3	187.990	1105.114	0.83	0.986	0.30	V
ESQI4	188.016	1101.170	0.849	0.986	0.30	V
ESQI5	188.078	1110.792	0.706	0.986	0.30	V

Table A6. Scale Statistics.

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
192.307	1155.797	33.9970	45

Table A7. ANOVA with Tukey's Test for Non-Additivity.

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Between People			22473.831	875	25.684		
Within People	Between Items		73.860	44	1.679	4.669	0.000
	Residual	Non-additivity	4.449[a]	1	4.449	12.377	0.000
		Balance	13838.358	38499	0.359		
		Total	13842.807	33500	0.360		
	Total		13916.667	38544	0.361		
Total			36390.498	39419	0.923		
Grand Mean = 4.273							

a. Tukey's estimate of power to which observations must be raised to achieve additivity = −0.389.

Appendix C

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Table A8. KMO and Bartlett's Test.

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		**0.941**
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	107624.238
	df	990
	Sig.	**0.000**

Table A9. Communalities.

	Initial	**Extraction**
SCP1	1.000	0.766
SCP2	1.000	0.981
SCP3	1.000	0.979
SCP4	1.000	0.979
SCP5	1.000	0.986
CLS1	1.000	0.791
CLS2	1.000	0.950
CLS3	1.000	0.932
CLS4	1.000	0.939
CLS5	1.000	0.940
OCL1	1.000	0.741
OCL2	1.000	0.942
OCL3	1.000	0.959
OCL4	1.000	0.970
OCL5	1.000	0.979
SCC1	1.000	0.743
SCC2	1.000	0.950
SCC3	1.000	0.937
SCC4	1.000	0.950
SCC5	1.000	0.973
ICC1	1.000	0.818
ICC2	1.000	0.949
ICC3	1.000	0.907
ICC4	1.000	0.946
ICC5	1.000	0.969
SLTC1	1.000	0.849
SLTC2	1.000	0.949
SLTC3	1.000	0.963
SLTC4	1.000	0.955
SLTC5	1.000	0.965
EAPC1	1.000	0.848
EAPC2	1.000	0.934
EAPC3	1.000	0.909
EAPC4	1.000	0.882
EAPC5	1.000	0.948
SMC1	1.000	0.774
SMC2	1.000	0.908
SMC3	1.000	0.936
SMC4	1.000	0.927
SMC5	1.000	0.940
ESQI1	1.000	0.825
ESQI2	1.000	0.973
ESQI3	1.000	0.973
ESQI4	1.000	0.928
ESQI5	1.000	0.991

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

References

[1] Dhar, B.K., Shaturaev, J., Kurbonov, K., et al., 2023. The causal nexus between innovation and economic growth: An OECD study. Social Science Quarterly. 104(4), 395–405. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.13261

[2] Peters, R., Buckmiller, T.R., 2014. Our grades were

broken: Overcoming barriers and challenges to implementing standards-based grading. Journal of Educational Leadership in Action. 2(2), 2. DOI: https://doi.org/10.62608/2164-1102.1070

[3] Harris, A., 2001. Building the capacity for school improvement. School Leadership and Management. 21(3), 261–270. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/13632430120074419

[4] Hite, S.J., De Grauwe, A., 2009. Capacity development in educational planning and management: learning from successes and failures: a report. In Proceedings of the Experts meeting on capacity development in educational planning and management for achieving EFA: Learning from Successes and Failure, Paris, France, 1–3 July 2008; pp. 1–69.

[5] Barrera-Osorio, F., Fasih, T., Patrinos, H.A., et al., 2009. Toma de decisiones descentralizada en la escuela: la teoría y la evidencia sobre la administración escolar descentralizada [in Spanish]. World Bank: Washington, DC, USA. Available from: https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12799/4767 (cited 17 March 2024).

[6] Wohlstetter, P., Odden, A., 2016. Rethinking school-based management policy and research. Educational Administration Quarterly. 28(4), 529–549. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X92028004005

[7] Niemi, 2011. The Societal factors contributing to Education and Schooling in Finland. Miracle of Education. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6091-811-7_2

[8] Ainscow, M., Muijs, D., West, M., 2006. Collaboration as a strategy for improving schools in challenging circumstances. Improving Schools. 9(3), 192–202. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/1365480206069014

[9] Garderen, D.V., Hanuscin, D., Lee, E., et al., 2012. QUEST: A collaborative professional development model to meet the needs of diverse learners in K-6 science. Psychology in the Schools. 49(5), 429–443. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.21611

[10] Muijs, D., Ainscow, M., Chapman, C., et al., 2011. Collaboration and networking in education. Springer: Dordrecht, Netherlands.

[11] Hsieh, J.Y., Liou, K.T., 2018. Collaborative leadership and organizational performance: Assessing the structural relation in a public service agency. Review of Public Personnel Administration. 38(1), 83–109. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X15623619

[12] Agranoff, R., McGuire, M., 2004. Collaborative public management: New strategies for local governments. Georgetown University Press: Washington, DC, USA.

[13] Norris-Tirrell, D., Clay, J.A., 2010. Strategic collaboration in public and nonprofit administration: A Practice-Based Approach to Solving Shared Problems. CRC Press: Boca Raton, FL, USA.

[14] Head, B.W., Alford, J., 2015. Wicked problems: implications for public policy and management. Administration and Society. 47(6), 711–739. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399713481601

[15] Caldwell, B., 2005. The Structure and Funding of the School System: Achieving an Optimal Balance of Centralization and Decentralization in Education. Australian Economic Review, 38, 1–27. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8462.2005.00355.x

[16] Malyan, R.S., Jindal, L., 2014. Capacity building in education sector: An exploratory study on Indian and African relations. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences. 157, 296–306. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.11.032

[17] Thomas, G.F., Hocevar, S.P., Jansen, E., 2006. Building collaborative capacity: An innovative strategy for homeland security preparedness. In: Beyerlein, M.M., Beyerlein, S.T., Kennedy, F.A. (eds.). Innovation through Collaboration. Emerald Group Publishing: Bingley, UK. 12, pp. 255–274. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/S1572-0977(06)12010-5

[18] Hallinger, P., Heck, R.H., 2010. Collaborative leadership and school improvement: Understanding the impact on school capacity and student learning. School Leadership and Management. 30(2), 95–110. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/13632431003663214

[19] Kapucu, N., Demiroz, F., 2013. Collaborative capacity building for community-based small nonprofit organizations. Journal of Economic & Social Studies (JECOSS). 3(1), 83–117. DOI: https://doi.org/10.14706/JECOSS11313

[20] Chaudhuri, A., 2013. Strategic planning for collaborative innovation: Insights and future research directions. In Proceedings of the 20th International EurOMA Conference on Operations Management at the Heart of the Recovery, Dublin, Ireland, 7–12 June 2013; pp. 1–11.

[21] Rizan, M., Balfas, F., Purwohedi, U., 2019. The influence of strategic orientation, organizational innovation capabilities and strategic planning on the performance of technology-based firms. Academy of Strategic Management Journal. 18(3), 1–11.

[22] Stollar, S.A., Poth, R.L., Curtis, M.J., et al., 2006. Collaborative strategic planning as illustration of the principles of systems change. School Psychology Review. 35(2), 181–197.

[23] Connolly, M., James, C., 2006. Collaboration for school improvement: A resource dependency and institutional framework of analysis. Educational Management Administration and Leadership. 34(1), 69–87. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143206059540

[24] Crosby, B.C., Bryson, J.M., 2005. A leadership framework for cross-sector collaboration. Public Management Review. 7(2), 177–201. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/14719030500090519

[25] Slater, L., 2005. Leadership for collaboration: An affective process. International Journal of Leadership in Education. 8(4), 321–333. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/13603120500088745

[26] Popova-Nowak, I.V., Cseh, M., 2015. The meaning of organizational learning: A meta-paradigm perspective. Human Resource Development Review. 14(3), 299–331. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484315596856

[27] Saadat, V., Saadat, Z., 2016. Organizational learning as a key role of organizational success. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences. 230, 219–225. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.09.028

[28] Yström, A., Ollila, S., Agogué, M., et al., 2019. The role of a learning approach in building an interorganizational network aiming for collaborative innovation. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science. 55(1), 27–49. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886318793383

[29] Beech, N., Huxham, C., 2003. Cycles of identity formation in interorganizational collaborations. International Studies of Management and Organization. 33(3), 28–52. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/00208825.2003.11043686

[30] Cates, C.S., 1986. Interorganizational collaboration and school improvement. Teacher Education Quarterly. 13(2), 84–101.

[31] Smith, K., 2016. Partnerships in teacher education – going beyond the rhetoric, with reference to the Norwegian context. Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal. 6(3), 17–36.

[32] Thody, A., 2006. Strategic planning and school management. School Organisation. 11(1), 21–36. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/0260136910110103

[33] Healey, P., 1997. Collaborative planning: shaping places in fragmented societies. Macmillan International Higher Education: London, UK.

[34] Boscardin, M.L., Lashley, C., 2012. Expanding the leadership framework an alternate view of professional standards. In: Crockett, J.B., Billingsley, B.S., Boscardin, M.L. (eds.). Handbook of Leadership and Administration for Special Education. Routledge: New York, NY, USA. pp. 47–61.

[35] Chiva, R., Ghauri, P., Alegre, J., 2014. Organizational learning, innovation and internationalization: A Complex System Model. British Journal of Management. 25(4), 687–705. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12026

[36] Basten, D., Haamann, T., 2018. Approaches for organizational learning: A literature review. SAGE Open. 8(3), 2158244018794224. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018794224

[37] Freeman, R.E., 2010. Strategic management: A stakeholder approach. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.

[38] Johnson, L.J., Tam, B.K.Y., Zorn, D., et al., 2003. Stakeholders' views of factors that impact successful interagency collaboration. Exceptional Children. 69(2), 195–209.

[39] Tang, L.Y., Shen, Q., 2013. Factors affecting effectiveness and efficiency of analyzing stakeholders' needs at the briefing stage of public private partnership projects. International Journal of Project Management. 31(4), 513–521.

[40] Goodman, J., Korsunova, A., Halme, M., 2017. Our collaborative future: activities and roles of stakeholders in sustainability-oriented innovation. Business Strategy and the Environment. 26(6), 731–753. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.1941

[41] Sowa, 2009. The Collaboration Decision in Nonprofit Organizations: Views From the Front Line. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 38(6), 1003–1025. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764008325247

[42] Hocevar, S.P., Thomas, G.F., Jansen, E., 2007. Developing collaborative capacity: Diagnostic model. In Proceedings of the 4th Annual Acquisition Research Symposium of the Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA, USA, 16–17 May 2007; pp. 252–259.

[43] Jansen, E., Hocevar, S.P., Rendon, R.G., et al., 2009. The theory and measurement of interorganizational collaborative capacity in the acquisition and contracting context. In Proceedings of the 6th Annual Acquisition Research Symposium of the Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA, USA, 13–14 May 2009; pp. 329–352.

[44] Ho, D., Lee, M., 2016. Capacity building for school development: Current problems and future challenges. School Leadership and Management. 36(5), 493–507. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2016.1247040

[45] Ban, C., Drahnak-Faller, A., Towers, M., 2003. Human resource challenges in human service and community development organizations: recruitment and retention of professional staff. Review of Public Personnel Administration. 23(2), 133–153. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X03023002004

[46] Brown, K., 2004. Human resource management in the public sector. Public Management Review. 6(3), 303–309. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/1471903042000256501

[47] Khakimova, M., Jakhongir, S., Fayzullayeva, N., et al., 2025. Neuroscientific Discoveries and Their Implications for Early Childhood Language Education. Forum for Linguistic Studies. 7(3), 656–668. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i3.8446

[48] Lincoln, Guba, 1985. Naturalistic Inquiry. SAGE, Thousand Oaks. 289–331. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(85)90062-8

[49] Dinkel et al., 2016. Examining the Knowledge and Capacity of Elementary Teachers to Implement Classroom Physical Activity Breaks. International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education. 9(1), 182–196. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.12.020

[50] Hall, P.A., Simeral, A., 2008. Building Teachers' Capacity for Success: A Collaborative Approach for Coaches and School Leaders. ASCD. pp. 196. ISBN 978-1-4166-

0747-2.

[51] Stoll, 2009. Capacity building for school improvement or creating capacity for learning? A changing landscape. Journal of Educational Change. 10(2–3), 115–127. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-009-9104-3

[52] Tan et al., 2017. Investigation on Relevance of Quality of Nursing Work Life and Turnover Intention in a Secondary-Level Public Hospital in Wuhan City. Medicine and Society. 30, 59–62.

[53] Anderson, G.L., 1990. Toward a critical constructivist approach to school administration: Invisibility, legitimation, and the study of non-events. Educational Administration Quarterly. 26(1), 38–59. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X90026001003

[54] Anderson, G.L., Grinberg, 1988. Structural Equation Modelling in Practice: A Review and Recommended Two-Step Approach. Psychological Bulletin. 103, 411–423. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.103.3.411

[55] Aquino, K., 1995. Relationships among pay inequity, perceptions of procedural justice, and organizational citizenship. Employ Respons Rights J. 8, 21–33. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02621253

[56] Balfour, 2009. Policy and strategies for ESL pedagogy in multilingual classrooms: The Classroom Talk Programme. The Language Learning Journal. 37(3), 339–358. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/09571730903208504

[57] Anderson, L., 2018. Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Humans. Pew Research Center, 1–123. Available from: https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2018/12/10/artificial-intelligence-and-the-future-of-humans/

[58] Komariah, Sunaengsih, 2016. A Model for School Management Capacity Building through Professional Learning Community in Senior High School. Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Educational, Management, Administration and Leadership. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2991/icemal-16.2016.12

[59] Golkar-Narenji, A., Gourabi, H., Eimani, H., Barekati, Z., Akhlaghi, A., 2012. Superovulation, in Vitro Fertilization (IVF) and in Vitro Development (IVD) Protocols for Inbred BALB/cJ Mice in Comparison with Outbred NMRI Mice. Reproductive Medicine and Biology. 11, 185–192. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12522-012-0127-8

[60] Al-Hussein, Mohammad, 2020. Quality distance education for early childhood during the corona pandemic: The perceptions of female teachers. International Educational Research. 4(2), 1–15. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30560/ier.v4n2p1

[61] Peksen, D., Peterson, T.M., 2015. Sanctions and Alternate Markets: How Trade and Alliances Affect the Onset of Economic Coercion. Political Research Quarterly. 69(1), 4–16. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912915620049

[62] Ereş, Clothey, R., 2013. Central University for Nationalities. Education in China: An Encyclopedic Handbook of Educational History, Models, and Initiatives. Berkshire Publishing: Great Barrington, MA.

[63] Samion, S., Darma, Y.D., 2018. Minimum service standards for basic education in border region. Journal of Education, Teaching and Learning. 3(1), 104–112. DOI: https://doi.org/10.26737/jetl.v3i1.554

[64] UNESCO, 2013. World Social Science Report 2013: Changing Global Environments. OECD Publishing / UNESCO Publishing. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264203419-en

[65] Foster-Fishman, P., Watson, E.R., 2010. Action research as systems change. In: Fitzgerald, H., Burack, C., Seifer, S.D., et al. (eds.). Handbook of Engaged Scholarship. Michigan State University Press: East Lansing, MI, USA. pp. 235–256.