
IMPLEMENTATION OF JAKARTA'S JOINT NEW STUDENT ADMISSION POLICY: A CASE STUDY IN PRIVATE HIGH SCHOOLS

SITI FATIMAH AZZAHRA, DEDY ACHMAD KURNIADY, AND TAUFANI CHUSNUL KURNIATUN

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia

Corresponding author: sitifatimahazzahra7@upi.edu

Abstract

The Joint New Student Admission System (*PPDB Bersama*) was introduced by Jakarta's Provincial Education Office to expand equitable access to quality education for economically vulnerable students through government-private school collaboration. Despite its equity goals, implementation faces administrative, technical, and organizational challenges. This qualitative case study analyzes policy implementation at three private senior high schools in West Jakarta using Edward III's framework: communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure. Data were collected through interviews, focus group discussions, and document analysis involving principals, staff, teachers, and students. Findings reveal that communication remains inconsistent due to fragmented policy dissemination and limited parental understanding; human and technological resources are adequate but constrained by verification procedures and system instability; implementers demonstrate strong commitment to supporting vulnerable students, though the no-transfer policy creates unintended disciplinary issues; and bureaucratic procedures follow official guidelines but are hindered by rigid quotas and limited school-level autonomy. The study concludes that while *PPDB Bersama* enhances educational equity, its effectiveness requires strengthened socialization, improved cross-agency coordination, flexible resource allocation, and adaptive bureaucratic mechanisms. Strategic recommendations are proposed to optimize policy performance and reinforce private schools' role in achieving equitable and inclusive education in Jakarta.

Keywords: educational equity, Edward III Model, joint student admission system, policy implementation, private senior high school

Introduction

Educational equity is a constitutional mandate in Indonesia, enshrined in the 1945 Constitution and reinforced through the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 4, which emphasizes inclusive and equitable quality education for all (United Nations, 2015). Coleman (1969) argued that equality of educational opportunity requires equal access to quality education regardless of school type whether public or private. Educational administration scholars further emphasize that equity is shaped by policy structures, governance mechanisms, and strategic resource allocation (Engkoswara & Komariah, 2010; Napitupulu et al., 2022). However, actual conditions in DKI Jakarta reveal a persistent gap between these ideals and ground realities.

Despite allocating over 20% of its regional budget to education, Jakarta's gross enrollment rate at the senior secondary level remains below the national average (*BPS DKI Jakarta, 2023*). These disparities highlight a structural challenge requiring targeted policy intervention. Public senior high schools can accommodate only 33.66% of junior high graduates, while 168 out of 267 urban villages lack a public senior high school entirely (*Dinas Pendidikan DKI Jakarta, 2022*). Meanwhile, private schools, particularly in West Jakarta, outnumber public schools by a ratio of three to one but remain financially inaccessible to low-income families (*Makarim et al., 2022*).

To address these access gaps, the Jakarta Provincial Education Office introduced the Joint New Student Admission System (*Penerimaan Murid Baru Bersama*, or *PPDB Bersama*) as a collaborative policy mechanism designed to ensure tuition-free enrollment for economically disadvantaged students in participating private schools. This policy represents a strategic effort to leverage private sector capacity to achieve public equity goals. However, early implementation reveals practical challenges including uneven socialization, inconsistent cross-agency coordination, rigid quota arrangements, and complications arising from the mandatory no-transfer rule (*Makarim et al., 2022*).

Previous research on student admission policies in Indonesia has examined various dimensions of implementation. *Setiawan and Rahaju (2021)* found that communication clarity and administrative consistency strongly influence admission system effectiveness. *Rizki and Ridwan (2023)* emphasized the importance of public communication and human resource readiness in digital-based admission processes. *Prasetyaningrum and Marmoah (2020)* analyzed internal strengths and weaknesses of private schools using SWOT analysis, while *Andra Swasti Atmaja et al. (2024)* demonstrated that government financial support to private schools can broaden access and improve quality. *Landolt and Bauer (2025)* further highlighted the importance of justice-oriented admission approaches in promoting social equity.

Although these studies provide valuable insights, they focus primarily on specific technical, managerial, or communication-related aspects of admission systems. No prior research has systematically examined the implementation of a collaborative government-private admission policy such as *PPDB Bersama* using a comprehensive theoretical framework. Specifically, no study has applied *Edward III's (1980)* policy implementation model, encompassing communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure to analyze *PPDB Bersama* within Jakarta's unique socioeconomic and institutional context.

This research gap is significant because *PPDB Bersama* functions not merely as an administrative mechanism but as a strategic instrument for redistributing educational opportunities across socioeconomic strata. Understanding how this policy is enacted at the school level, and identifying the facilitators and barriers to effective implementation, is critical for informing future policy design and improving collaborative governance in education.

This study offers two key contributions. Theoretically, it integrates Edward III's implementation framework with empirical qualitative evidence from multiple stakeholders: school principals, administrative staff, teachers, and students providing a holistic and contextual analysis absent in prior literature. Practically, the findings can inform the Jakarta Education Office in refining communication mechanisms, coordination procedures, and policy flexibility, while offering private schools actionable insights into resource preparation, student support, and compliance management. Guided by this research gap and theoretical orientation, the study addresses the following research questions:

1. How is the *PPDB Bersama* policy implemented in private senior high schools in West Jakarta?
2. How does communication influence policy implementation?
3. How do resources affect implementation outcomes?

4. How do implementers' disposition and commitment shape policy execution?
5. How does bureaucratic structure support or hinder implementation?

By answering these questions, this study aims to advance both scholarly understanding of collaborative admission policies and practical strategies for achieving educational equity in urban Indonesia.

Literature Review

Policy implementation theory

Policy implementation theory provides the conceptual foundation for understanding how policies transition from formal decisions to actual practice. Among various theoretical frameworks, [Edward III's \(1980\)](#) model offers a comprehensive lens for analyzing implementation processes through four interdependent variables: communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure. Communication determines how accurately policy directives are interpreted and transmitted among implementers; resources influence the administrative and technical capacity to execute policies; disposition reflects implementers' attitudes, commitment, and willingness to enact policies; and bureaucratic structure governs the standardization, coordination, and procedural mechanisms that facilitate or constrain implementation ([Edward III, 1980](#)).

Empirical studies consistently affirm the salience of these variables across diverse policy contexts. [Veryal et al. \(2023\)](#) found that inconsistent communication and fragmented coordination among implementers significantly hindered student admission processes in Bekasi, demonstrating that unclear messaging weakens policy execution. Similarly, [Rheza \(2021\)](#) illustrated how implementer readiness and uneven school distribution shaped the effectiveness of Indonesia's zonasi-based admission system, highlighting the critical role of resource distribution and bureaucratic coordination. These findings underscore recurring challenges such as communication gaps, limited technical preparedness, and variable implementer commitment.

However, opportunities also emerge through clear standard operating procedures (SOPs) and supportive policy frameworks that guide administrative action and reduce ambiguity ([Setiawan & Rahaju, 2021](#)). Contextual factors including school size, leadership quality, demographic characteristics, infrastructure availability, and local governance culture, further determine how each component of Edward III's model manifests at the school level ([Yuliah, 2020](#)). This theoretical lens directly informs the present analysis of *PPDB Bersama* implementation, particularly in relation to how communication clarity, resource adequacy, implementer attitudes, and procedural structures operate within Jakarta's private school settings.

Student admission policies in Indonesia

Student admission systems in Indonesia are designed to expand equitable access, maintain transparency, and prevent discrimination in educational opportunities ([Diana et al., 2022](#)). These policies are expected to uphold principles of objectivity and accountability to ensure fairness across diverse school environments. However, the practical application of admission policies often encounters significant operational constraints that undermine their equity objectives.

[Diana et al. \(2022\)](#) emphasize that admission policies must be implemented with strict adherence to fairness principles, yet their study also reveals substantial gaps between policy intent and ground-level execution. [Lasrin \(2023\)](#) found that while digital platforms improve transparency in admission

processes, they simultaneously create operational burdens for schools with limited technological infrastructure and digital literacy. This technological divide disproportionately affects schools in lower-income areas, paradoxically reinforcing the very inequities that admission reforms seek to address.

[Safitri and Istiyono \(2022\)](#) reported that uneven public understanding of admission procedures and inconsistent technical application across schools undermine the intended equity of zonasi-based implementation. Their research identified communication failures, inadequate socialization, and limited parental awareness as major impediments to effective policy adoption. These challenges are particularly pronounced in contexts where parents lack familiarity with digital registration systems or where schools provide insufficient guidance during the enrollment process.

These studies collectively identify recurring implementation challenges: fragmented communication flows, uneven technological readiness, inconsistent administrative practices, and limited stakeholder understanding. These factors are highly relevant to *PPDB Bersama*, which integrates digital processes with school-level verification procedures and relies on effective coordination between government agencies and private schools. At the same time, opportunities exist through policy innovation, strategic digitalization, and targeted government support, which can strengthen admission practices even in resource-constrained and institutionally diverse contexts ([Rizki & Ridwan, 2023](#)).

Contextual factors such as socioeconomic disparities, unequal geographic distribution of schools, varying levels of parental awareness, and differences in school management capacity significantly shape how admission policies are adopted and interpreted at the local level ([Mashudi, 2019](#)). Because *PPDB Bersama* operates within Indonesia's broader New Student Admission System (PPDB) ecosystem, understanding these systemic dynamics is essential for analyzing how Edward III's four implementation variables influence policy enactment in private school environments.

The joint new student admission system (PPDB Bersama)

PPDB Bersama represents Jakarta's collaborative policy innovation designed to expand educational access for economically vulnerable students through strategic partnerships between the government and private high schools. [Makarim et al. \(2022\)](#) note that the program involves more than 400 private schools across Jakarta and provides full financial subsidies covering tuition fees, books, uniforms, and examination costs to eligible beneficiaries. This collaborative structure reflects the Jakarta government's response to structural constraints including public school capacity shortages and the unequal geographic distribution of state senior high schools across urban villages.

The policy emerged from a recognition that traditional public school expansion alone cannot address Jakarta's enrollment gaps within existing budget and infrastructure constraints. By mobilizing private sector capacity through financial incentives and regulatory frameworks, *PPDB Bersama* attempts to achieve public equity goals through hybrid governance mechanisms ([Makarim et al., 2022](#)). This approach aligns with broader trends in educational governance emphasizing public-private partnerships as instruments for expanding access and improving service delivery ([Andrabi et al., 2020](#)).

However, empirical evaluations reveal significant implementation challenges that complicate the policy's equity objectives. [Makarim et al. \(2022\)](#) documented mismatches between *PPDB Bersama*'s placement mechanisms and the parallel zonasi system, causing administrative confusion, empty seats in participating schools, and misalignment with other admission pathways. [Prasetyaningrum and Marmoah \(2020\)](#) highlighted internal challenges within private schools—including resource shortages, infrastructure limitations, inconsistent management quality, and varying organizational capacities—that directly influence program execution effectiveness. These implementation obstacles correspond

directly to Edward III's (1980) four variables. Communication challenges arise from unclear quota allocations and frequently changing procedural guidelines. Resource constraints manifest in limited administrative staff, inadequate technological infrastructure, and insufficient training for school operators. Disposition-related issues emerge from mixed implementer attitudes toward *PPDB Bersama* students, who often come from non-traditional educational backgrounds and may require additional support. Bureaucratic structure complications include variations in internal SOPs, inconsistent coordination mechanisms, and limited school-level autonomy in adapting procedures to local contexts.

At the same time, *PPDB Bersama* offers meaningful opportunities for participating schools. These include increasing enrollment in institutions experiencing declining student interest, reducing financial burdens on low-income families, enhancing schools' social legitimacy and community reputation, and accessing government subsidies that stabilize institutional finances (Andra Swasti Atmaja et al., 2024). Contextual factors such as school reputation, local demographic composition, leadership readiness, and prior experience with government programs strongly influence how individual schools adopt and operationalize *PPDB Bersama* (Prasetyaningrum & Marmoah, 2020). Understanding *PPDB Bersama* through Edward III's framework is therefore essential for analyzing the complex interplay of communication processes, resource distributions, implementer attitudes, and procedural structures that shape collaborative admission schemes in Jakarta's unique institutional environment.

The existing literature demonstrates that policy implementation, admission mechanisms, and school-government collaborations are fundamentally shaped by the dynamic interplay of communication clarity, resource distribution, implementer attitudes, and procedural structures, all operating within specific socioeconomic and institutional contexts. Studies on Indonesia's zonasi system, digital-based admissions, and private school governance have provided valuable insights into systemic challenges including inadequate communication infrastructure, uneven technological capacity, coordination difficulties across government levels, and variable stakeholder readiness (Diana et al., 2022; Rizki & Ridwan, 2023; Safitri & Istiyono, 2022).

However, a clear research gap remains. No prior study has specifically examined *PPDB Bersama* implementation in Jakarta's private senior high schools using Edward III's comprehensive theoretical model. Most existing research focuses either on narrow technical aspects of digital admission systems or on broad issues of educational access, without analyzing how collaborative government-private policies function in actual school contexts (Setiawan & Rahaju, 2021; Veryal et al., 2023). Furthermore, no research has integrated multi-source qualitative data from interviews, focus group discussions, and document analysis to examine how multiple stakeholders: principals, administrative staff, teachers, and students, experience and enact *PPDB Bersama*.

This gap is significant for both theoretical and practical reasons. Theoretically, *PPDB Bersama* represents a distinctive collaborative governance model that extends beyond traditional public service delivery, requiring new analytical frameworks that account for multi-actor coordination, hybrid funding mechanisms, and equity-oriented policy goals (Makarim et al., 2022). Practically, understanding implementation dynamics is critical for improving policy design, strengthening institutional capacity, and ensuring that equity objectives are achieved rather than undermined by operational challenges.

The present study addresses this gap by systematically examining how Edward III's four variables, communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure, shape *PPDB Bersama* implementation across three private high schools in West Jakarta. By providing nuanced, context-

sensitive insights into policy practice, stakeholder experiences, and institutional variations, this research contributes to both scholarly literature on collaborative admission policies and practical knowledge for achieving educational equity in urban Indonesia.

Methodology

Research design and approach of the study

This study employed a qualitative case study approach to investigate *PPDB Bersama* policy implementation in private senior high schools in West Jakarta. A qualitative design was selected because it enables exploration of participants' interpretations, administrative practices, and contextual variations that cannot be captured through quantitative measures (Creswell, 2013). The case study approach is particularly appropriate for examining contemporary policy phenomena within real-life institutional contexts where multiple data sources and stakeholder perspectives are required (Yin, 2018). The analytical framework is grounded in Edward III's (1980) policy implementation model, which structures the investigation around four variables: communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure. This theoretical lens guided data collection instrument development, coding procedures, and thematic analysis.

Research site and participants

The study was conducted in three private senior high schools in West Jakarta implementing *PPDB Bersama*: SMA Padindi, SMA Fajrul Islam, and SMA Tunas Indonesia. These schools were purposefully selected to represent varying institutional capacities, demographic profiles, and administrative arrangements, enabling comparative insights across different implementation contexts.

A total of 21 participants were selected using purposeful sampling (Creswell, 2013), ensuring inclusion of individuals with direct involvement in *PPDB Bersama* processes. Table 2 summarizes participant distribution.

Table 2. *Participant Distribution Across Schools*

School	Administrators/Staff	Students	Total
SMA Padindi	Principal, VP Curriculum, VP Student Affairs, Operator	3	7
SMA Fajrul Islam	Principal, Operator	3	5
SMA Tunas Indonesia	Principal, Administrative Staff	3	5
Total	15	9	21

Inclusion criteria required participants to have: (1) direct involvement in *PPDB Bersama* implementation (socialization, verification, or admission decisions); (2) administrative or managerial responsibilities; or (3) student enrollment through *PPDB Bersama* for at least one semester. This multi-level composition ensured holistic case analysis encompassing policy enactors and recipients (Stake, 2010).

Data collection

Three complementary methods were employed to ensure data triangulation and credibility (Patton, 2015):

1. Semi-structured interviews were conducted individually with principals, administrative staff, and operators (45–60 minutes each). Interview protocols were developed based on Edward III's four variables, covering policy transmission, resource availability, implementer attitudes, and procedural structures.

2. Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) were organized with administrative staff and teachers at each school (60–90 minutes) to explore collective interpretations, operational challenges, and coordination dynamics.

3. Document analysis examined school SOPs, *PPDB Bersama* guidelines from the Education Office, verification forms, monitoring instruments, and administrative records to triangulate interview and FGD data.

All instruments were validated by two qualitative research experts and two education practitioners prior to fieldwork, ensuring content validity, clarity, and contextual appropriateness (Creswell, 2013). Informed consent was obtained from all participants, and confidentiality was maintained through pseudonyms and secure data storage.

Data analysis

Data were analyzed using thematic analysis following Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase framework, supported by NVivo 12 software for systematic coding and theme development:

Phase 1 – Familiarization: All interviews and FGDs were transcribed verbatim and read repeatedly to develop deep familiarity with the dataset.

Phase 2 – Initial Coding: Data segments were coded both deductively (based on Edward III's four variables) and inductively (allowing emergent codes from participant narratives), consistent with Miles et al. (2014).

Phase 3 – Theme Development: Codes were organized into candidate themes reflecting communication patterns, resource configurations, implementer dispositions, and bureaucratic procedures, with systematic cross-school comparisons.

Phase 4 – Theme Refinement: Candidate themes were reviewed for internal coherence and external consistency with the entire dataset. Codes were merged, reorganized, or subdivided as needed.

Phase 5 – Theme Definition: Final themes were clearly articulated to capture nuanced aspects of *PPDB Bersama* implementation across the four theoretical dimensions.

Phase 6 – Reporting: Themes were synthesized into integrated narratives incorporating participant quotes, FGD insights, and documentary evidence.

Trustworthiness

Credibility was established through (1) methodological triangulation combining interviews, FGDs, and documents; (2) data source triangulation across multiple stakeholder groups; (3) member checking with selected participants to validate interpretations; and (4) thick description of school contexts enabling transferability assessment (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Dependability was ensured through maintaining a comprehensive audit trail documenting all coding decisions, theme

development processes, and analytical refinements. Confirmability was supported by grounding all interpretations in direct evidence from transcripts and documents, with regular peer debriefing sessions to challenge emerging interpretations and reduce researcher bias.

Results

This section presents findings from interviews, focus group discussions, and document analysis conducted across three private senior high schools implementing *PPDB Bersama*. The findings are organized according to [Edward III's \(1980\)](#) four implementation variables: communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure. Table 3 summarizes major themes and supporting evidence, followed by cross-school comparative analysis.

Table 3. *Summary of Themes, Subthemes, and Supporting Evidence*

Edward III Variable	Key Themes	Cross-School Patterns	Illustrative Quote
1. Communication	Policy transmission inconsistency	All schools receive updates via WhatsApp; sudden changes create confusion	"Updates come through WA; sometimes they change suddenly" (Operator-FI)
	Clarity of guidelines	Technical guidelines generally clear but frequent revisions complicate implementation	"Juknis is clear, but it keeps changing" (VP-Padindi)
	Internal communication quality	Varies by school: Padindi structured, FI/TI fragmented	"We repeat info to avoid miscommunication" (Principal-Padindi)
2. Resources	Human resource capacity	Operator workload concentration varies: Padindi distributed, FI/TI centralized	"Everything depends on the operator" (FGD-FI)
	Technological infrastructure	System errors and server instability disrupt workflows across all schools	"Server is down, upload fails" (Operator-TI)
	Financial support adequacy	PPDB Bersama covers full costs; no additional fees allowed	"Everything covered, no extra payments" (Staff-Padindi)
3. Disposition	Training needs	Operators lack formal training; learn independently or through peer networks	"We learn by doing" (Operator-FI)
	Leadership commitment	Principals actively monitor but vary in proactiveness (Padindi proactive, FI/TI reactive)	"Principal supervises and evaluates regularly" (Staff-Padindi)
	Operator dedication	High commitment despite heavy workload and limited support	"I recheck all data myself" (Operator-FI)
	Student motivation	PPDB students grateful and motivated; some need behavioral guidance	"Thankful everything is free; it motivates us" (Student-TI)
	MOU compliance	Schools comply but enforcement varies; no-transfer rule creates discipline challenges	"3-year no-transfer rule; parents sign" (Principal-FI)

Edward III Variable	Key Themes	Cross-School Patterns	Illustrative Quote
4. Bureaucratic Structure	SOP adherence	Schools follow Education Office SOPs with minor internal adjustments	"SOP from Office; we just follow" (Staff-TI)
	Role division clarity	Clear at Padindi; unclear at FI/TI due to limited staff	"Operator handles verification; TU uploads" (VP-Padindi)
	Monitoring mechanisms	Regular supervisor monitoring; schools respond reactively to feedback	"After monitoring, we fix per supervisor notes" (Operator-FI)
	Coordination effectiveness	Coordination exists but primarily problem-driven, not preventive	"Contact supervisor when system errors occur" (Staff-TI)

Overview of *PPDB Bersama* implementation

PPDB Bersama implementation across the three schools demonstrates shared procedural compliance with Education Office mandates: receiving guidelines, conducting verification, admitting students, and submitting reports, but reveals significant operational variations influenced by institutional capacity and administrative readiness. All schools perceive the policy as beneficial for expanding access and stabilizing enrollment, demonstrating strong normative commitment. However, implementation is characterized by top-down policy flow with limited school-level autonomy, creating challenges when adapting to rapid updates or addressing system failures.

SMA Padindi exhibits the most structured implementation due to clear task division and stronger administrative support. In contrast, SMA Fajrul Islam and SMA Tunas Indonesia display more reactive patterns, heavily dependent on one or two operators managing verification processes alongside other responsibilities. While all schools successfully enroll *PPDB* students and comply with reporting obligations, bottlenecks and delays occur when interpreting new instructions or resolving technical issues. Overall, implementation can be characterized as procedurally compliant but operationally uneven, shaped by contextual differences in school readiness and administrative flexibility.

Communication: fragmented transmission and inconsistent clarity

Communication emerged as the most critical variable shaping implementation fidelity. NVivo analysis revealed dense coding connections across all participant groups regarding communication challenges, particularly policy transmission inconsistencies and guideline ambiguities.

Policy transmission, all schools receive *PPDB Bersama* updates primarily through WhatsApp groups managed by the Education Office, supplemented by occasional meetings and phone calls from supervisors. This informal communication channel enables rapid dissemination but creates information instability. As one operator explained, "*Changes usually come in WA, and sometimes there is no complete document*" (Operator-FI). Sudden updates often lack accompanying official documentation, forcing operators to seek clarification through peer networks or repeated inquiries to district supervisors.

Guideline clarity, while technical guidelines (Juknis) are generally perceived as clear, frequent mid-process revisions create operational confusion. "*The Juknis is clear, but it keeps changing so we adjust again*" (VP-Padindi). This pattern was consistent across schools, though impacts varied: Padindi's distributed task structure allowed faster adaptation, whereas FI and TI experienced verification delays due to operator overload.

Internal communication quality, cross-school comparison reveals stark differences in internal communication management. Padindi employs multi-channel strategies: WhatsApp, in-person briefings, and written memos, ensuring message consistency: "*We use multiple media so no one misses important information*" (Operator-Padindi). Conversely, FI and TI rely almost exclusively on WhatsApp and verbal announcements, creating information gaps when operators are unavailable: "*Sometimes information on WA gets missed*" (Student-TI).

Parental understanding, document analysis and FGD data indicate limited parental comprehension of PPDB Bersama procedures, particularly regarding the meaning of "free education" and no-transfer obligations. This communication gap generates repeated verification requests and delays enrollment finalization.

Resources: adequate funding, constrained capacity

Resource analysis revealed a paradox: while financial support is adequate, human and technological resources constrain implementation effectiveness.

Human Resources, the most significant resource challenge involves operator workload concentration. FI and TI depend on single operators managing PPDB Bersama alongside other administrative duties: "*All verification piles up to the operator; we learn everything by ourselves*" (Operator-FI). Padindi's distributed structure involving VP Curriculum, VP Student Affairs, and dedicated administrative staff, mitigates this pressure: "*Tasks are shared. If the operator is busy, the vice principal can step in*" (VP-Padindi).

Technological infrastructure, all schools face system instability issues including server downtime, upload failures, and slow processing speeds during peak registration periods: "*Sometimes the server is down and the upload fails*" (Operator-TI). These technical disruptions disproportionately affect FI and TI, which lack backup devices or alternative internet connections. Padindi's superior facilities including stable networks and updated hardware, enable faster problem resolution: "*Our equipment is quite complete, so the process runs smoothly*" (Operator-Padindi).

Financial support, PPDB Bersama provides comprehensive subsidies covering tuition, books, uniforms, and examination fees. All participants confirmed that schools cannot charge additional fees: "*Everything is covered, no additional payments allowed*" (Staff-Padindi). This financial adequacy removes economic barriers for students and stabilizes school revenue streams.

Training deficiencies, a critical gap exists in formal training opportunities. Operators across all schools reported learning verification procedures independently through trial-and-error or informal peer consultation: "*We really need training; so far we learn by doing*" (Operator-Padindi). This training deficit increases error rates and lengthens adaptation periods when system updates are introduced.

Disposition: high commitment, variable support

Implementer disposition analysis revealed consistently positive attitudes toward *PPDB Bersama*'s equity mission, but variable institutional support for translating commitment into effective practice.

Leadership commitment, all principals demonstrate commitment to *PPDB Bersama*, but commitment manifestations differ. Padindi's leadership is proactive, conducting regular coordination meetings and systematic monitoring: "*Whenever there is an update, we hold a short meeting to ensure everyone understands*" (VP-Padindi). FI and TI principals exhibit more reactive engagement, responding to problems rather than preventing them: "*We follow procedures, but often need to re-coordinate when the system has issues*" (Principal-TI).

Operator dedication, despite heavy workloads and limited training, operators display remarkable dedication, maintaining data accuracy and managing complex verification processes: "*I recheck all data and coordinate with TU and keviswaan*" (Operator-Padindi). However, this individual commitment cannot fully compensate for systemic capacity constraints, particularly at FI and TI where operators handle multiple responsibilities simultaneously.

Student attitudes, PPDB students consistently express gratitude and motivation: "*We are thankful because everything is free; it motivates us*" (Student-TI). However, some students require behavioral guidance related to smoking habits and discipline compliance. Schools address these issues through educational approaches rather than punitive measures, though effectiveness varies by institutional culture and support systems.

MOU compliance challenges, the mandatory three-year no-transfer rule creates unintended consequences. While schools comply with MOU requirements "*There's a 3-year no-transfer rule; parents sign the letter*" (Principal-FI), enforcement difficulties emerge when students face academic or social adaptation challenges. Some students and parents request transfers due to school mismatch, but rigid policy provisions prevent flexible responses.

Bureaucratic structure: Standardized procedures, limited flexibility

Bureaucratic structure analysis reveals strong SOP adherence but limited school-level autonomy in adapting procedures to local contexts.

SOP implementation, all schools follow standardized SOPs provided by the Education Office, with minor internal workflow adjustments: "*The SOP is from the Office; we just follow and adjust*" (Staff-TI). While this standardization ensures consistency, it also constrains schools' ability to address context-specific challenges. For example, fixed quota allocations prevent schools from accepting additional PPDB students even when capacity exists.

Role distribution, role clarity varies significantly. Padindi exhibits well-defined task divisions across administrative units: "*Operator handles verification; TU manages uploads*" (VP-Padindi). This functional differentiation enables efficient workflow management. Conversely, FI and TI lack clear role delineation, with most tasks concentrated in single staff members: "*I handle everything alone, so if I'm busy, the process must wait*" (TU Staff-TI).

Monitoring and reporting, regular monitoring by Education Office supervisors provides accountability mechanisms. Schools receive feedback through monitoring visits and must address identified deficiencies: "*After monitoring, we fix everything according to the supervisor's notes*" (Operator-FI). However, monitoring is primarily compliance-focused rather than capacity-building oriented, limiting its developmental impact.

Coordination mechanisms, coordination between schools and the Education Office occurs mainly through problem-driven communication rather than systematic collaboration: "*We contact the supervisor if the system has an error*" (Staff-TI). This reactive coordination pattern delays problem resolution and prevents proactive issue identification. Document analysis confirms limited horizontal coordination among schools, reducing opportunities for peer learning and shared problem-solving.

Discussion

This study provides comprehensive evidence on how *PPDB Bersama* is implemented in Jakarta's private high schools and identifies critical factors shaping policy outcomes. The findings demonstrate that while the policy achieves its procedural objectives, enrolling economically vulnerable students in participating schools implementation effectiveness is significantly constrained by communication fragmentation, resource limitations, and bureaucratic rigidity. This discussion integrates the findings with [Edward III's \(1980\)](#) theoretical framework and situates them within broader literature on educational policy implementation in Indonesia.

Communication as the primary implementation determinant

Communication emerged as the most influential variable affecting *PPDB Bersama* implementation, confirming [Edward III's \(1980\)](#) assertion that policy transmission clarity fundamentally shapes implementers' capacity to execute directives accurately. The reliance on informal WhatsApp-based communication, while enabling rapid dissemination, created information instability characterized by sudden updates, incomplete documentation, and contradictory messages. This finding aligns with [Veryal et al. \(2023\)](#), who documented how fragmented communication channels undermined admission policy implementation in Bekasi, and extends their analysis by revealing how informal digital platforms, though technologically modern can paradoxically weaken implementation fidelity when used as primary communication mechanisms.

The frequent mid-process guideline revisions observed across all three schools reflect broader challenges in Indonesia's education policy environment, where centralized directives often fail to account for ground-level operational realities ([Fitri Rachmadhany & Matin, 2021](#)). This pattern suggests that Jakarta's Education Office operates within a policy-making culture prioritizing rapid adaptation over procedural stability, creating persistent uncertainty for school-level implementers. The differential impact of communication challenges across schools with Padindi's multi-channel strategy proving more resilient than FI and TI's WhatsApp-dependent approaches, demonstrates that institutional capacity mediates communication effectiveness, supporting [Setiawan and Rahaju's \(2021\)](#) finding that internal coordination mechanisms significantly influence policy outcomes. Parental understanding deficits, particularly regarding "free education" provisions and no-transfer obligations, highlight a critical gap in external stakeholder communication. This finding resonates with [Safitri and Istiyono's \(2022\)](#) observation that inadequate public socialization undermines zonasi policy equity goals. The failure to effectively communicate policy terms to parents not only generates administrative delays but potentially compromises informed consent, raising questions about whether families fully understand the long-term implications of *PPDB Bersama* enrollment conditions.

Resource Paradox: financial adequacy, operational constraints

The resource dimension revealed a significant paradox: while *PPDB Bersama* provides adequate financial support covering all educational costs, human and technological resource constraints substantially limit implementation capacity. This finding complicates simplistic assumptions that financial investment alone ensures policy success, supporting [Edwards III's \(1980\)](#) argument that multiple resource types must be simultaneously adequate for effective implementation.

The heavy concentration of verification responsibilities on individual operators, particularly at FI and TI, creates single points of failure that jeopardize implementation continuity and quality. This finding extends [Listari and Chotijah's \(2023\)](#) research on digital admission systems by demonstrating that technological platforms do not reduce human resource demands but rather transform them into specialized technical competencies that require dedicated personnel. Padindi's distributed task structure involving multiple administrative actors with clearly defined responsibilities, offers an alternative organizational model that mitigates operator overload and enhances implementation resilience.

Technological infrastructure deficiencies, including persistent server instability and system errors during peak registration periods, align with [Lasrin's \(2023\)](#) documentation of digital platform limitations in resource-constrained school environments. These findings challenge optimistic narratives about technology-driven educational transformation by revealing how technical failures disproportionately burden schools with limited backup infrastructure and alternative connectivity options. The fact that system errors affect all participating schools regardless of internal capacity, suggests that Education Office technology infrastructure requires substantial upgrading to support reliable implementation.

The critical absence of formal training opportunities represents a systemic resource gap that undermines implementation quality across all schools. Operators' reliance on trial-and-error learning and informal peer networks, while demonstrating commendable initiative, is fundamentally inadequate for developing the specialized competencies required for complex verification procedures. This finding supports [Rizki and Ridwan's \(2023\)](#) emphasis on human resource readiness as a prerequisite for effective digital admission systems and suggests that Jakarta's Education Office has underinvested in capacity-building relative to policy expectations.

Notably, the comprehensive financial subsidies provided through *PPDB Bersama* successfully remove economic barriers for participating students, confirming the policy's core equity mechanism. This finding aligns with international evidence on educational access interventions, where financial aid programs effectively expand opportunity for disadvantaged populations ([Andrabi et al., 2020](#)). The fact that schools cannot charge additional fees ensures genuine cost elimination rather than mere subsidy, strengthening the policy's redistributive impact.

Disposition: Normative Commitment Constrained by Structural Limitations

Implementer disposition analysis revealed consistently strong normative commitment to *PPDB Bersama*'s social equity mission across all participant groups: principals, operators, teachers, and students. This widespread value alignment represents a significant policy asset, as disposition directly influences implementation effort and creativity in problem-solving ([Edward III, 1980](#)). However, the findings also demonstrate that positive attitudes cannot fully compensate for structural constraints, supporting [Raghavan's \(2025\)](#) argument that implementer motivation requires enabling conditions to translate into effective practice.

The differential manifestation of leadership commitment, proactive at Padindi versus reactive at FI and TI illustrates how organizational culture and capacity shape disposition's operational impact. Padindi's systematic coordination meetings and preventive monitoring reflect what might be termed "anticipatory commitment," whereas FI and TI's problem-driven engagement represents "responsive commitment." This distinction suggests that disposition operates not as a binary variable but along a continuum of organizational readiness and strategic orientation. Operator dedication, evident across all schools despite heavy workloads and minimal training, highlights the reliance on individual professionalism to maintain implementation quality. While this dedication is admirable, it creates vulnerability when personnel change or experience burnout. The sustainability of PPDB Bersama implementation therefore depends critically on institutionalizing processes rather than depending on exceptional individual effort.

Student motivation patterns revealed an unexpected positive outcome: PPDB students demonstrated gratitude and academic engagement, contradicting potential concerns about stigmatization or reduced motivation among subsidy recipients. This finding aligns with research on educational voucher programs showing that financial support can enhance rather than diminish student commitment (Andrabi et al., 2020). However, the behavioral challenges observed among some students, particularly regarding discipline and smoking, suggest that PPDB students from non-traditional educational backgrounds may require additional social-emotional support beyond academic instruction, consistent with literature on vulnerable student populations (Veronika Shinta Damayanti, 2021).

The no-transfer rule created unintended consequences by limiting schools' flexibility to address student-school mismatches. While designed to ensure stable enrollment and prevent gaming behavior, this rigid provision may inadvertently harm students experiencing genuine adaptation difficulties. This finding illustrates a broader tension in equity policies between administrative efficiency and individualized responsiveness, suggesting that policy rigidity can paradoxically undermine the welfare of intended beneficiaries.

Bureaucratic structure: standardization versus contextual adaptation

The bureaucratic structure dimension revealed strong adherence to Education Office SOPs but limited school-level autonomy for contextual adaptation. This finding reflects a fundamental tension in hierarchical education systems between ensuring consistency and enabling flexibility (Mashudi, 2019). While standardized procedures promote equity by preventing arbitrary decision-making, they also constrain schools' ability to respond creatively to local challenges.

The fixed quota system exemplifies bureaucratic rigidity's limiting effects. Schools with available capacity and willing to accept additional PPDB students cannot do so due to predetermined allocations, resulting in inefficient resource utilization and missed opportunities to expand access. This finding suggests that Jakarta's Education Office prioritizes administrative predictability over dynamic responsiveness, potentially reducing the policy's overall equity impact.

Role distribution clarity, strong at Padindi but weak at FI and TI, demonstrates how internal organizational structure mediates bureaucratic procedures' effectiveness. Schools with well-defined functional divisions can implement standardized SOPs more efficiently than those relying on generalist staff managing multiple responsibilities. This finding implies that successful PPDB Bersama implementation requires not only clear external guidelines but also adequate internal organizational differentiation.

The primarily compliance-focused monitoring mechanism represents a missed opportunity for capacity development. While accountability is essential, monitoring that emphasizes deficiency identification without providing constructive support fails to build implementation competence over time. This finding aligns with broader critiques of audit culture in education, where external oversight focuses on documentation rather than substantive improvement (Yuliah, 2020).

The reactive coordination pattern between schools and the Education Office characterized by problem-driven communication rather than systematic collaboration, prevents proactive issue identification and limits peer learning opportunities. This finding suggests that *PPDB Bersama* operates within a vertical accountability framework that underutilizes horizontal knowledge-sharing mechanisms, contrary to collaborative governance principles that emphasize network-based problem-solving (Makarim et al., 2022).

Implications for educational equity and collaborative governance

Collectively, these findings offer important insights for understanding how collaborative government-private policies function in practice. *PPDB Bersama* demonstrates that structural equity interventions, providing financial access for disadvantaged students can successfully operate through private school partnerships when adequate subsidies remove economic barriers. However, the implementation challenges documented in this study reveal that equity policies require not only funding but also robust communication systems, sufficient human and technological resources, supportive organizational cultures, and flexible bureaucratic mechanisms.

The variation in implementation effectiveness across the three schools despite identical policy mandates and similar contexts, underscores the critical role of institutional capacity in mediating policy outcomes. This finding has significant implications for scaling collaborative admission policies: successful expansion requires targeted capacity-building for lower-resourced schools rather than simply extending enrollment quotas.

The persistent tension between standardization and flexibility observed throughout the findings suggests that Jakarta's Education Office should consider developing tiered implementation frameworks that provide core procedural consistency while allowing schools discretion in operational details. Such adaptive governance approaches could preserve equity safeguards while enabling contextually responsive problem-solving.

Conclusion

This study examined *PPDB Bersama* implementation in three Jakarta private high schools using Edward III's (1980) framework. The findings reveal that *PPDB Bersama* is implemented through a top-down procedural framework characterized by procedural compliance but operational unevenness. All schools successfully follow Education Office mandates receiving guidelines, conducting verification, admitting students, and submitting reports, yet implementation quality varies substantially based on institutional capacity rather than policy design alone. While the policy achieves its core equity objective of providing tuition-free access for economically vulnerable students, effectiveness is constrained across all four implementation variables.

Communication emerged as the primary implementation determinant. Fragmented policy transmission through informal WhatsApp channels creates information instability, procedural uncertainty, and parental understanding deficits that undermine implementation fidelity. The reliance

on rapid digital messaging without comprehensive documentation generates confusion when guidelines change mid-process, with differential impact across schools based on internal coordination capacity.

Resources reveal a critical paradox: adequate financial subsidies coexist with severe human resource concentration on individual operators, technological infrastructure deficiencies causing persistent system errors, and complete absence of formal training opportunities. While *PPDB Bersama* successfully removes economic barriers through comprehensive cost coverage, operational capacity constraints, particularly heavy workload on single operators and unreliable technological systems, limit implementation effectiveness.

Implementer disposition demonstrates consistently strong normative commitment among principals, operators, teachers, and students toward *PPDB Bersama*'s equity mission. However, structural constraints, particularly workload burdens and limited support systems, prevent this commitment from fully translating into effective practice. PPDB students exhibit gratitude and motivation, though some require additional behavioral guidance, while the mandatory no-transfer rule creates unintended challenges for students experiencing genuine school-mismatch situations.

Bureaucratic structure ensures procedural consistency through standardized SOPs and regular monitoring, yet rigid quota allocations and limited school-level autonomy hinder contextual adaptability and flexible problem-solving when challenges arise. Schools follow Education Office procedures closely, but fixed quotas prevent enrollment expansion even when capacity exists, and compliance-focused monitoring provides limited capacity-building support.

Cross-school comparison reveals that schools with distributed administrative structures and proactive leadership achieve significantly smoother implementation than those relying on centralized operators and reactive management. This variation underscores that equitable policy outcomes require equitable capacity-building support, not just equitable funding. The study contributes theoretically by extending Edward III's framework to collaborative government-private education policies and practically by providing actionable insights for strengthening *PPDB Bersama* through improved communication protocols, capacity development, and procedural flexibility.

Implications

For Policy Makers:

1. Establish formalized multi-channel communication protocols replacing WhatsApp-dependent dissemination with structured documentation and official briefings.
2. Develop comprehensive training programs for operators covering verification procedures, system troubleshooting, and regular policy updates.
3. Upgrade technological infrastructure through stable servers, backup systems, and enhanced bandwidth to eliminate technical disruptions.
4. Introduce flexible quota mechanisms allowing schools to accept additional PPDB students when capacity exists.
5. Strengthen parental socialization through community information sessions and clear policy explanations.

For School Practitioners:

1. Distribute administrative responsibilities across multiple staff following collaborative workload management models.

2. Implement multi-channel internal communication combining digital platforms, briefings, and written documentation.
3. Develop backup technical systems including alternative connectivity and offline verification procedures.
4. Create structured mentoring programs for PPDB students addressing academic and social-emotional needs.
5. Build horizontal peer networks with other schools to share problem-solving strategies.

For Educational Stakeholders:

1. Supervisors should provide responsive real-time technical assistance beyond periodic monitoring visits.
2. Teacher associations can facilitate peer learning where experienced implementers mentor new participants.
3. Parent-teacher organizations should actively socialize policy terms to enhance community understanding.

Recommendations for Future Research

Future studies should: (1) expand geographic scope across Jakarta's regions and diverse school types to assess contextual variations; (2) conduct longitudinal tracking of PPDB students' academic outcomes and social integration over three years; (3) employ mixed-methods approaches integrating qualitative analysis with quantitative performance metrics; (4) investigate parental perspectives on navigating admission processes and understanding policy terms; (5) assess digital literacy among school staff to identify targeted training needs; (6) examine intermediary governance levels to reveal coordination dynamics within education bureaucracy; and (7) compare collaborative admission models across Indonesian provinces to identify transferable best practices for scaling equitable access policies nationally.

Disclosure Statement

The authors declares that there is no potential conflict of interest in this study. All data and information presented in this research are the original work of the author and do not involve any third parties with financial or non-financial interests. This study was conducted with a high level of academic integrity and in full compliance with all applicable research ethics guidelines.

References

Abdissamad, Z. (2021). *Metode penelitian kualitatif* [Qualitative research methods]. Syakir Media Press.

Andra Swasti Atmaja, Sidabalok, A. S., Raihan, M., Putra, F. A., & Silalahi, N. I. L. (2024). Perancangan sistem informasi penerimaan peserta didik baru (PPDB) berbasis web [Design of web-based new student admission information system (PPDB)]. *Jurnal Komputer Teknologi Informasi dan Sistem Informasi (JUKTISI)*, 2(3), 515–523. <https://doi.org/10.62712/juktisi.v2i3.101>

Andrabi, T., Das, J., Khwaja, A. I., Ozyurt, S., & Singh, N. (2020). Upping the ante: The equilibrium effects of unconditional grants to private schools. *American Economic Review*, 110(10), 3315–3349. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20180924>

Badan Pusat Statistik DKI Jakarta. (2023). *Statistik pendidikan Provinsi DKI Jakarta 2023* [Education statistics of DKI Jakarta Province 2023]. BPS DKI Jakarta.

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

Coleman, J. S. (1969). Equality of educational opportunity, reexamined. *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*, 2(2–4), 347–354. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0038-0121\(69\)90029-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0038-0121(69)90029-9)

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Diana, Santaria, R., Sabani, F., Kaharuddin, & Kaso, N. (2022). Implementasi penerimaan peserta didik baru berbasis zonasi terhadap efektivitas distribusi peserta didik pada sekolah menengah atas [Implementation of zoning-based new student admission on the effectiveness of student distribution in senior high schools]. *Konsepsi*, 11(2), 242–251. <http://www.p3i.my.id/index.php/konsepsi/article/view/199>

Dinas Pendidikan DKI Jakarta. (2022). *Laporan distribusi sekolah menengah atas negeri DKI Jakarta tahun 2022* [Report on the distribution of public senior high schools in DKI Jakarta 2022]. Dinas Pendidikan Provinsi DKI Jakarta.

Edward III, G. C. (1980). *Implementing public policy*. Congressional Quarterly Press.

Engkoswara, & Komariah, A. (2010). *Administrasi pendidikan* [Educational administration]. Alfabeta.

Fitri Rachmadhany, & Matin, M. (2021). Implementasi kebijakan penerimaan peserta didik baru (PPDB) sistem zonasi di SMA Negeri 14 Bekasi [Implementation of zoning system policy for new student admission (PPDB) at SMA Negeri 14 Bekasi]. *Wahana*, 73(1), 84–98. <https://doi.org/10.36456/wahana.v73i1.2893>

Landolt, L., & Bauer, I. (2025). Learnings of policy enactment: Student perspectives on social justice in Zurich's selective secondary school admissions. *Journal of Education Policy*, 40(1), 1–23.

Lasrin, H. (2023). Upaya peningkatan akses dan mutu pendidikan: Manajemen penerimaan peserta didik baru di SMA Kosgoro Bogor [Efforts to improve access and quality of education: Management of new student admission at SMA Kosgoro Bogor]. *Abdi Insani*, 10(4), 2383–2392.

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

Listari, L. M., & Chotijah, U. (2023). Sistem informasi penerimaan peserta didik baru berbasis website (Studi kasus SMP Muhammadiyah 8 Benjeng) [Website-based new student admission information system (Case study at SMP Muhammadiyah 8 Benjeng)]. *Jurnal Nasional Komputasi dan Teknologi Informasi (JNKTI)*, 6(3), 250–259. <https://doi.org/10.32672/jnkti.v6i3.6115>

Makarim, F. H., Elmira, M. B., & Felicia, N. (2022). Peningkatan partisipasi: Peluang pengembangan PPDB Bersama di DKI Jakarta yang lebih lama dan melibatkan [Increasing participation: Opportunities for longer and more inclusive joint PPDB development in DKI Jakarta]. *Pusat Studi Pendidikan dan Kebijakan*, 1–7.

Mashudi, A. (2019). Kebijakan PPDB sistem zonasi SMA/SMK dalam mendorong pemerataan kualitas sumberdaya manusia di Jawa Timur [Zoning system policy for senior high school/vocational school admission in promoting equitable distribution of human resource quality in East Java]. *Nidhomul Haq: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 4(2), 186–206.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Napitupulu, Best, M., Sibagariang, S., Sihombing, Z. A. N., & Turnip, H. (2022). Pentingnya administrasi dalam pendidikan [The importance of administration in education]. *Pediaqu*, 1(4), 214–222.

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Prasetyaningrum, A., & Marmoah, S. (2020). Analisis SWOT manajemen peserta didik dalam penerimaan peserta didik baru di sekolah negeri [SWOT analysis of student management in new student admission at public schools]. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 5(5), 524–532. <https://journal.uii.ac.id/ajie/article/view/971>

Raghavan, R. H. M. (2025). Improving transparency and verifiability in school admissions: Theory and experiment. *Management Science*, 71(2), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2023.00105>

Rheza, D. A. (2021). Implementasi kebijakan sistem zonasi dalam pemerataan pendidikan pada jenjang SMA Negeri di Kota Pangkalpinang [Implementation of zoning system policy in educational equity at public senior high school level in Pangkalpinang City]. In *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Fisip UNDIP* (pp. 2588–2593). Universitas Diponegoro.

Rizki, T. M., & Ridwan, M. (2023). Implementasi kebijakan penerimaan peserta didik baru (PPDB) online tingkat sekolah menengah atas di Kota Medan [Implementation of online new student admission (PPDB) policy at senior high school level in Medan City]. *Administratio: Jurnal Ilmiah Administrasi Publik dan Pembangunan*, 14(2), 205–220. <https://doi.org/10.23960/administratio.v14i2.408>

Safitri, D. W., & Istiyono, E. (2022). The impacts of zoning system policies of new students' admission on the education quality equalization. *Journal of Education Research and Evaluation*, 6(4), 619–628. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jere.v6i4.52712>

Satori, D., & Komariah, A. (2020). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif* [Qualitative research methodology]. Alfabeta.

Setiawan, H. R., & Rahaju, T. (2021). Evaluasi sistem zonasi penerimaan peserta didik baru (PPDB) tingkat SMP di Kota Surabaya [Evaluation of zoning system for new student admission (PPDB) at junior high school level in Surabaya City]. *Publika*, 9(4), 491–502. <https://doi.org/10.26740/publika.v9n4.p491-502>

Stake, R. E. (2010). *Qualitative research: Studying how things work*. Guilford Press.

United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development*. United Nations. <https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda>

Veronika Shinta Damayanti, R. H. P. (2021). Implementasi kebijakan penerimaan peserta didik baru (PPDB) sistem zonasi untuk SMP Negeri di Kecamatan Tembalang dan Kecamatan Semarang Tengah Kota Semarang ditinjau dari perspektif public value [Implementation of zoning system policy for new student admission (PPDB) in public junior high schools in Tembalang and Central Semarang Districts viewed from public value perspective]. *Jurnal Fisip UNDIP*, 44(8), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1751-8113/44/8/085201>

Veryal, D. E., Dewi, A. Y., & Khambali, A. (2023). Sistem informasi PPDB di SMP Muhammadiyah Wonopringgo berbasis Android [Android-based PPDB information system at SMP Muhammadiyah Wonopringgo]. *Jurnal Surya Informatika*, 13(1), 9–18. <https://doi.org/10.48144/suryainformatika.v13i1.1410>

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

Yuliah, E. (2020). The implementation of educational policies. *Jurnal At-Tadbir*, 30(2), 129–153. <https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/107798887/57-libre.pdf>