



Linking Instructional Supervision to Teacher Performance in the Context of School Management

*Agus Setiana¹

^{1,2,3,4} STAI Miftahul Ulum Tasikmalaya, Jawa Barat, Indonesia

E-mail: 1setiana.a314@gmail.com *Corresponding Author

Article History: Received: July, 30th 2024; Accepted: August, 5th August; Published: August, 31th 2024.

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the effects of instructional supervision on teacher performance in public primary schools in Pulaupanggung District, Tanggamus Regency. Instructional supervision is conceptualized as a multidimensional process comprising planning, implementation, and follow-up activities aimed at improving instructional quality. Using a quantitative, non-experimental *ex post facto* design, data were collected from 75 teachers selected through cluster random sampling across 32 schools. A structured questionnaire with a four-point Likert scale was employed to measure instructional supervision and teacher performance in lesson planning, instructional implementation, and learning evaluation. Data were analyzed using simple linear regression techniques. The results indicate that instructional supervision planning does not have a significant effect on teacher performance across all instructional dimensions. In contrast, the implementation of instructional supervision shows a significant influence on teacher performance in lesson planning and learning evaluation, while follow-up supervision demonstrates a significant effect specifically on learning evaluation. However, neither implementation nor follow-up supervision significantly affects instructional implementation. These findings suggest that the effectiveness of instructional supervision depends more on direct supervisory engagement and continuous feedback than on formal planning procedures. The study contributes to the literature by integrating perspectives from educational administration and performance management, emphasizing the importance of supervision as a managerial-pedagogical mechanism. Practically, the results highlight the need for school leaders to prioritize meaningful supervision implementation and systematic follow-up to enhance teacher performance. Despite its contributions, the study is limited by its correlational design and reliance on self-reported data, indicating opportunities for future research using mixed-methods approaches.

Keywords: *instructional supervision; teacher performance; instructional leadership; performance management; educational administration*



Copyright © 2024 The Author(s)

This is an open-access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



INTRODUCTION

Education plays a strategic role in developing high-quality human resources capable of responding to global challenges. In this context, improving educational quality is not solely determined by curriculum design and learning facilities, but is strongly influenced by teacher performance as the central actor in instructional processes. Teacher performance represents a multidimensional construct encompassing professional competence, pedagogical skills, and the ability to plan, implement, and evaluate learning effectively and sustainably.

From the perspective of educational administration, efforts to enhance teacher performance are inseparable from structured school management systems, particularly instructional supervision mechanisms. Meanwhile, within performance management theory, supervision functions as a developmental and control instrument aimed at aligning organizational objectives with individual performance through continuous feedback, coaching, and follow-up actions (Aguinis, 2019; DeNisi & Smith, 2014). Integrating these perspectives positions instructional supervision not merely as an administrative routine, but as a managerial–pedagogical intervention that directly influences instructional quality and outcomes.

Conceptually, instructional supervision refers to a professional service process that provides guidance, facilitation, and evaluative feedback to teachers through systematic planning, implementation, and follow-up activities to improve instructional quality (Glickman et al., 2018). Contemporary supervision models have shifted from traditional inspection-oriented approaches toward collaborative and developmental paradigms that emphasize reflection, professional dialogue, and continuous teacher learning (Zepeda, 2017). This paradigm aligns with the organizational learning perspective, which views schools as learning organizations where supervision serves as a mechanism for collective capacity building.

In this framework, the role of the school principal as a supervisor is critical in bridging institutional goals with classroom-level instructional practices. Principals function not only as administrators but also as *instructional leaders* responsible for fostering supportive academic climates, providing constructive feedback, and ensuring effective supervisory follow-up that leads to improved teacher performance (Hallinger & Heck, 2010; Robinson et al., 2014). Empirical evidence suggests that the effectiveness of instructional supervision depends more on the quality of its implementation and follow-up than on planning alone (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017).

Previous studies examining the relationship between instructional supervision and teacher performance have produced mixed findings. Some research reports a significant positive effect of supervision on specific dimensions of teacher performance, particularly in instructional evaluation and reflective practice (Kraft & Gilmour, 2017). Conversely, other studies indicate that supervision practices dominated by administrative compliance and limited feedback yield minimal impact on classroom instruction (Hoque et al., 2020). These inconsistencies highlight a research gap, particularly regarding how different



supervision components planning, implementation, and follow-up differentially influence various aspects of teacher performance.

Addressing this gap, the present study aims to analyze the effects of instructional supervision comprising planning, implementation, and follow-up on teacher performance in lesson planning, instructional implementation, and learning evaluation. By integrating perspectives from educational administration and performance management, this study is expected to contribute theoretically to the advancement of instructional supervision research and provide practical insights for school leaders in designing supervision models that effectively enhance teacher performance.

METHODS

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative, non-experimental research design using an *ex post facto* approach, in which data were collected after the occurrence of the observed phenomena without manipulation of independent variables. This design is commonly applied in educational research to examine naturally occurring relationships between variables where experimental control is not feasible (Cohen et al., 2018; Creswell & Creswell, 2018). A correlational framework was adopted to analyze the relationship between instructional supervision and teacher performance. Simple linear regression analysis was utilized to assess the direction and strength of the influence between variables, a method widely used to evaluate predictive relationships in educational and behavioral studies (Field, 2018).

Population and Sample

The population consisted of all teachers employed in public primary schools in Pulaupanggung District, Tanggamus Regency, during the 2023–2024 academic year, totaling 295 teachers across 32 schools. The sample was determined using a cluster random sampling technique, with schools treated as sampling clusters to ensure proportional representation across institutions. Cluster sampling is considered appropriate when populations are naturally grouped and geographically dispersed, as in school-based research contexts (Taherdoost, 2016). Based on the Slovin formula, 75 teachers were selected as research participants.

Research Instrument

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire designed to measure instructional supervision and teacher performance. The instrument employed a four-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree/very rarely*) to 4 (*strongly agree/very often*). The use of an even-numbered Likert scale without a neutral option was intended to reduce central tendency bias and encourage respondents to provide more decisive responses, a practice supported in attitudinal and behavioral research (Chyung et al., 2017).

The questionnaire initially consisted of 84 items, which were subjected to item validity testing prior to administration. Only valid items were included in the final instrument. The questionnaire measured multiple dimensions of instructional supervision



planning, implementation, and follow-up as well as teacher performance in lesson planning, instructional implementation, and learning evaluation. The use of self-report questionnaires is widely accepted in educational supervision and teacher performance studies due to their efficiency and ability to capture perceptual data across large samples (DeVellis, 2017).

Data Analysis

Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. Simple linear regression analysis was conducted to examine the influence of instructional supervision variables on dimensions of teacher performance. This technique is appropriate for assessing linear relationships between independent and dependent variables in educational research (Hair et al., 2019). Statistical significance was evaluated at a 0.05 alpha level, consistent with conventional standards in social science research.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Effect of Instructional Supervision Planning on Teacher Performance in Lesson Planning

The results indicate that the relationship between instructional supervision planning (X1) and teacher performance in lesson planning (Y1) was weak, with a correlation coefficient of $r = 0.059$. The coefficient of determination ($R^2 = 0.004$) suggests that supervision planning accounted for only 0.4% of the variance in teacher performance related to lesson planning. Statistical testing revealed that this relationship was not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$), indicating that supervision planning did not have a meaningful effect on teachers' lesson planning performance.

Effect of Instructional Supervision Planning on Teacher Performance in Instructional Implementation

Analysis of the relationship between instructional supervision planning (X1) and teacher performance in instructional implementation (Y2) also showed no significant effect, with a probability value of $p = 0.104$ (> 0.05). These findings suggest that supervision planning alone was insufficient to influence how teachers implemented learning activities in the classroom.

Effect of Instructional Supervision Planning on Teacher Performance in Learning Evaluation

Similarly, the results demonstrated no statistically significant relationship between instructional supervision planning (X1) and teacher performance in learning evaluation (Y3) ($p = 0.324 > 0.05$). This indicates that the planning dimension of supervision did not substantially affect teachers' ability to evaluate student learning outcomes.

Effect of Instructional Supervision Implementation on Teacher Performance in Lesson Planning

In contrast, the relationship between the implementation of instructional supervision (X2) and teacher performance in lesson planning (Y1) showed a low but statistically significant correlation, with $r = 0.231$ ($p < 0.05$). The coefficient of



determination ($R^2 = 0.053$) indicates that the implementation of supervision contributed 5.3% to the variance in teachers' lesson planning performance.

Effect of Instructional Supervision Implementation on Teacher Performance in Instructional Implementation

The analysis revealed that the implementation of instructional supervision (X2) did not have a statistically significant effect on teacher performance in instructional implementation (Y2), as indicated by a probability value of $p = 0.104$ (> 0.05). This finding suggests that supervision implementation did not significantly influence teachers' classroom instructional practices.

Effect of Instructional Supervision Implementation on Teacher Performance in Learning Evaluation

The relationship between instructional supervision implementation (X2) and teacher performance in learning evaluation (Y3) was found to be statistically significant, with a probability value of $p = 0.049$ (< 0.05). This result indicates that effective implementation of supervision was associated with improvements in teachers' evaluation of student learning.

Effect of Follow-Up Instructional Supervision on Teacher Performance in Lesson Planning

The findings showed that follow-up instructional supervision (X3) did not have a statistically significant effect on teacher performance in lesson planning (Y1) ($p = 0.074$ > 0.05). This suggests that follow-up activities were not strongly associated with teachers' lesson planning performance.

Effect of Follow-Up Instructional Supervision on Teacher Performance in Instructional Implementation

Similarly, no statistically significant relationship was identified between follow-up instructional supervision (X3) and teacher performance in instructional implementation (Y2), with a probability value of $p = 0.391$ (> 0.05). This indicates that follow-up supervision did not significantly affect classroom instructional practices.

Effect of Follow-Up Instructional Supervision on Teacher Performance in Learning Evaluation

In contrast, the relationship between follow-up instructional supervision (X3) and teacher performance in learning evaluation (Y3) was statistically significant, with a probability value of $p = 0.024$ (< 0.05). This finding suggests that follow-up supervision activities played an important role in enhancing teachers' capacity to evaluate learning outcomes.

Discussion

The findings of this study demonstrate that instructional supervision does not exert a uniform influence across all dimensions of teacher performance, indicating meaningful differences between supervision planning, implementation, and follow-up. Overall, the results suggest that the effectiveness of instructional supervision lies primarily in how it is enacted and sustained through follow-up processes rather than in formal planning activities alone. This pattern highlights the limited capacity of supervision planning to



directly shape teacher behavior when it is not accompanied by consistent interaction, feedback, and professional support.

The absence of significant effects of instructional supervision planning on teacher performance in lesson planning, instructional implementation, and learning evaluation suggests that planning activities may function largely as administrative procedures rather than as developmental mechanisms. From a performance management perspective, planning represents an initial stage that requires effective execution and reinforcement to translate institutional goals into individual performance improvements. When supervision planning is not internalized by teachers or aligned with their instructional needs, its impact on classroom practice remains minimal. This finding is consistent with prior research indicating that supervision planning often emphasizes compliance and documentation rather than instructional growth, thereby limiting its influence on teacher performance.

In contrast, the implementation of instructional supervision showed a significant, although modest, effect on teacher performance in lesson planning and learning evaluation. This finding underscores the importance of direct supervisory engagement, such as classroom observations, feedback discussions, and professional dialogue, in supporting teachers' instructional competencies. Through implementation-focused supervision, teachers are more likely to reflect on their instructional design and assessment strategies, which can lead to measurable improvements in planning and evaluative practices. However, the lack of a significant effect on instructional implementation suggests that classroom teaching practices are influenced by a wider range of contextual and situational factors, including classroom dynamics, time constraints, and instructional autonomy, which may limit the immediate impact of supervision.

The significant influence of follow-up instructional supervision on teacher performance in learning evaluation further emphasizes the role of continuous feedback and reflective processes in strengthening teachers' evaluative competencies. Follow-up activities function as feedback loops that allow teachers to review instructional outcomes, refine assessment approaches, and align evaluation practices with learning objectives. From an organizational learning perspective, such feedback mechanisms are essential for embedding reflective practice within schools and fostering sustainable improvements in instructional quality. The absence of significant effects on lesson planning and instructional implementation suggests that follow-up supervision may be more frequently oriented toward reviewing outcomes rather than supporting proactive instructional design or real-time teaching practices.

Collectively, these findings indicate that instructional supervision is most effective when it operates as a dynamic, interaction-based process rather than a static administrative function. The results reinforce the view that supervision should be conceptualized as a managerial-pedagogical mechanism that integrates educational administration, instructional leadership, and performance management principles. For school leaders, this implies a need to prioritize meaningful supervisory interactions and



systematic follow-up over procedural planning activities. From a theoretical standpoint, this study contributes to the literature by demonstrating that different components of instructional supervision exert differentiated effects on teacher performance, thereby highlighting the importance of examining supervision as a multidimensional construct.

Despite these contributions, the findings should be interpreted in light of certain limitations. The reliance on self-reported data may introduce perceptual bias, as teachers' responses may not fully reflect actual classroom practices. Additionally, the correlational design limits the ability to draw causal conclusions regarding the effects of instructional supervision. Future research could employ mixed-methods designs, incorporating classroom observations and qualitative interviews, to provide deeper insight into the mechanisms through which supervision influences teacher performance. Examining contextual factors such as school culture, leadership style, and teacher professional motivation may also enhance understanding of the conditions under which instructional supervision becomes most effective.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the effects of instructional supervision encompassing planning, implementation, and follow-up on teacher performance in lesson planning, instructional implementation, and learning evaluation. The findings indicate that instructional supervision planning does not have a significant influence on teacher performance across all instructional dimensions, suggesting that planning activities alone are insufficient to generate meaningful improvements in teaching practice.

In contrast, the implementation and follow-up of instructional supervision demonstrate a more substantial role, particularly in enhancing teachers' performance in lesson planning and learning evaluation. These results highlight that direct supervisory engagement and continuous feedback mechanisms are more effective in supporting teacher performance than formal supervisory planning. The differentiated effects across performance dimensions further suggest that instructional supervision operates as a multidimensional process whose impact depends on how supervision is enacted and sustained in practice.

The findings contribute theoretically by reinforcing the integration of educational administration, instructional leadership, and performance management perspectives in understanding instructional supervision. Practically, the results imply that school leaders should prioritize the quality of supervision implementation and systematic follow-up to strengthen teachers' instructional and evaluative competencies. Despite these contributions, the study is limited by its correlational design and reliance on self-reported data, which constrain causal interpretation. Future research is encouraged to employ mixed-methods approaches and explore contextual factors that may moderate the effectiveness of instructional supervision in improving teacher performance.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aguinis, H. (2019). *Performance management* (4th ed.). Chicago Business Press.



- Arikunto, S. (2010). *Prosedur penelitian: Suatu pendekatan praktik*. Rineka Cipta.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education* (8th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315456539>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- DeVellis, R. F. (2017). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2018). *SuperVision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach* (10th ed.). Pearson.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (2010). Collaborative leadership and school improvement: Understanding the impact on school capacity and student learning. *School Leadership & Management*, 30(2), 95–110. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632431003663214>
- Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2014). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635–674. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X08321509>
- Sugiyono. (2012). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.
- Zepeda, S. J. (2017). *Instructional supervision: Applying tools and concepts* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Chyung, S. Y., Roberts, K., Swanson, I., & Hankinson, A. (2017). Evidence-based survey design: The use of a midpoint on the Likert scale. *Performance Improvement*, 56(10), 15–23. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pfi.21727>
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hylar, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). Effective teacher professional development. *Learning Policy Institute*. <https://doi.org/10.54300/122.311>
- DeNisi, A. S., & Smith, C. E. (2014). Performance appraisal, performance management, and firm-level performance. *Academy of Management Annals*, 8(1), 127–179. <https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520.2014.873178>
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). Multivariate data analysis in behavioral research. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 169, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmva.2018.12.001>



-
- Hoque, K. E., Bt. Kenayathulla, H. B., & Islam, R. (2020). Teacher supervision practices and their impact on teacher performance. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 34(5), 805–820. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-11-2018-0363>
- Kraft, M. A., & Gilmour, A. F. (2017). Revisiting the widget effect: Teacher evaluation reforms and the distribution of teacher effectiveness. *Educational Researcher*, 46(5), 234–249. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X17718797>
- Taherdoost, H. (2016). Sampling methods in research methodology: How to choose a sampling technique. *International Journal of Academic Research in Management*, 5(2), 18–27.