



## A Bottom-Up Model of Teacher Supervision in the Selected Islamic Private High Schools in East Lombok – Indonesia

Marsukin; Hari Witono; Sudirman; Untung Waluyo; Asrin

School of Education Administration, Graduate Program, University of Mataram, Indonesia

<http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v11i3.5700>

---

### **Abstract**

This study aims to explore and understand how teachers and principals in private schools implement, feel, and experience the patterns of mentoring, guidance, mentoring, and evaluation of school supervisors. This case study involved four private Islamic high schools in East Lombok, West Nusa Tenggara Province, Indonesia. The data of the research were collected through document examinations, interviews, and field observations. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with three groups of informants. Interview data were obtained from two education supervisors at Islamic private high schools, four teachers, and two school principals. The results of this study revealed that supervisors never provide transparent and open feedback to teachers so that they did not know what the supervisor's expectations were. The overall findings of this research indicate that school supervisors had carried out their duties and responsibilities in the pro-forma basis. The supervisors' infrequent visit and lack of feedback resulted in misunderstanding and miscommunication among participants. In addition, the overall findings indicate that school supervisors in four research locations use a top-down model.

**Keywords:** *Supervision; Top-Down; High Schools*

### **Introduction**

In Indonesia's primary and secondary education systems, educational supervisors function as practical technical implementers in the field of academic and managerial supervision (Indonesian Ministry of Education, 2017). Education supervisors are positioned at every level of education, starting in kindergarten, elementary school, middle school, and high school. This research was carried out under educational supervision at the high school level; this private school is not very different from supervisors in state schools. They supervise the running of academic activities so that student teachers and principals can increase their capacity in the field of teaching professionally. They also provide managerial guidance for principals at private high schools in managing academic activities. Therefore, school supervisors are required to have better academic abilities than teachers and school principals so that their supervisory duties can achieve optimal results. By referring to the description above, it can be inferred that supervisors play the role of educational consultants who assist teachers and school principals in improving the quality of education. Therefore, the role of an educational supervisor is as a partner, pioneer, innovator,

collaborator, motivator, assessor, mentor, researcher, and educational consultants for teachers and school principals (Sopacua & Nirahua, 2021).

In the field of education in Indonesia, the dynamics of supervision have become an interesting subject and have been extensively researched. Supervision is an important aspect of the education system and plays an important role in forming a learning culture among teachers, improving the quality of teaching, and encouraging the growth of professionalism among teachers (Nurulita et al., 2021). However, existing facts show that many regions of Indonesia lack supervisors. Due to their high workload, supervisors appear to focus more on administrative issues than on quality issues (Harris et al., 2018). School supervisors often neglect their duties because they believe that school principals and teachers know and understand their own problems better. Therefore, there are still many educational supervision activities in Indonesia that require improvement (Fathih, 2022).

In general, school supervision in Indonesia is often associated with a top-down supervision model, which usually involves centralized decision making and direction from the supervisor or principal to teachers and other staff. In this top-down model, supervisors provide clear directions and expectations to teachers and staff regarding their goals, standards, and teaching practices. Research conducted by Gumah et al. (2021) found that clear expectations and goals set by supervisors had a positive effect on teacher motivation and student achievement. The top-down approach often emphasizes the consistency and standardization of learning implementation. This could lead to the adoption of uniform teaching policies and practices. A study reported by Arong & Ogbadu (2010) and Tyagi (2010) demonstrated that a top-down approach is used by external agents to control and evaluate the improvement of school performance. The top-down supervision model is usually directed at ensuring teachers or schools' compliance with established standards and goals. This model is often in line with the policy objectives set hierarchically in centralized education systems. This alignment can guarantee consistency and coherence in implementing educational reforms (Spillane 2004). Although top-down features offer certain benefits, such as clarity of direction and efficiency in decision-making, empirical research also points to potential drawbacks. Top-down policies can limit teacher autonomy, inhibit innovation and creativity, and pose challenges to local educational needs (Hashim et al., 2023).

In general, the top-down supervision model shows a strong control pattern from superiors to subordinates. This means that authority and decisions are centralized in the hands of supervisors. This top-down model tends to reduce or limit teachers' autonomy in carrying out their duties (Susilowati, et al. 2017). In the top-down supervision model, superiors strictly establish the procedures and policies that subordinates must adhere to. As a result, because their supervisor determines whether their actions are correct, subordinates become limited. Consequently, teachers tend not to have the independence or freedom to take initiative in carrying out their duties. This relationship shows that the top-down supervision model and the supervisor's authoritarian leadership are often interrelated and can produce similar organizational dynamics. However, it is crucial to note that this strategy has limits and may hinder creativity, innovation, and subordinate involvement in efficiently attaining corporate goals. As a result, supervisors must strike a balance between offering advice and enabling their subordinates to operate independently. Supervisors may build a more collaborative and empowered work atmosphere, encouraging creativity and innovation while retaining appropriate monitoring.

Their research showed that teachers' job satisfaction was worse when they felt they were under more top-down monitoring. These findings imply that instructors' sentiments of discontent and annoyance may be influenced by the top-down supervisory paradigm. They believed that there was little opportunity for experimentation and creativity in their teaching methods because of the emphasis on conformity and obedience to standards. These results underline the necessity of a more balanced approach to supervision that considers the independence, originality, and professional development of instructors. It's imperative to have a more balanced approach to supervision that values teachers' independence, inventiveness, and

professional development. This is especially crucial given how education is evolving and how instructors must become creative and adaptive in order to fulfill the wide range of requirements of their pupils.

A study conducted by Wells (2017) found that teachers who experienced top-down supervision reported feeling demotivated and disengaged. They felt that the hierarchical nature of the supervision restricted their autonomy and creativity in classroom practices. Additionally, teachers felt that the focus on compliance and accountability overshadowed the importance of professional growth and innovation. Moreover, another recent study conducted by Setia & Nasrudin (2020) explored the impact of the top-down model of supervision on teacher job satisfaction. Their findings revealed that teachers who perceived higher levels of top-down supervision reported lower levels of job satisfaction. These results suggest that the top-down model of supervision may contribute to feelings of dissatisfaction and frustration among teachers. They felt that the focus on compliance and adherence to standards left little room for exploration and innovation in their teaching practices. These findings highlight the need for a more balanced approach to supervision that takes into account teachers' autonomy, creativity, and professional growth. A more balanced approach to supervision that incorporates teachers' autonomy, creativity, and professional growth is necessary. This is particularly important in light of the changing landscape of education and the need for teachers to adapt and innovate to meet the diverse needs of students.

In contrast to the top-down model, the bottom-up supervision model provides opportunities for teachers and supervisors to work together optimally through collaborative work (Allen, 2013). The bottom-up school supervision model has several advantages that can increase the effectiveness and active participation of school teachers. With active participation in the supervision process, the bottom-up model opens up space for wider involvement of all parties. Teachers in schools feel more involved in identifying areas of need and jointly formulating appropriate solutions to improve students' performance and learning activities. By considering the perspectives and direct experiences of teachers in schools, bottom-up models enable a deeper understanding of the specific needs and challenges faced by schools. This allows for more focused and directed supervision and the implementation of more appropriate and relevant strategies to improve the quality of education. Through an approach that empowers the teaching staff to play an active role in the supervision process, the bottom-up model can increase intrinsic motivation and job satisfaction. Teachers feel valued and heard and have the opportunity to contribute to continuous improvement in their work environment. This can result in increased enthusiasm and dedication in performing their duties. The bottom-up model tends to be more flexible in responding to changes and dynamics that occur in the school context. By fostering a sense of ownership and autonomy among teachers, the bottom-up model can lead to a more collaborative and innovative educational environment. This approach can also help in identifying and addressing specific challenges faced by teachers, ultimately leading to better student outcomes. This bottom-up model inspires the potential for transformative leadership in the field of supervision.

Although there is increasing recognition of the potential for transformational leadership in the field of educational supervision, especially in encouraging innovation and positive change, few studies on supervision in Indonesia highlight the application of transformational approaches in school supervision activities. The transformational supervision model, characterized by a visionary leadership style and inspirational motivation, has been proven to foster a culture of collaboration, professional learning, and continuous improvement. Arif et al., (2022) explained that a supervisor is expected to be able to carry out new tasks related to creating a positive school culture in Indonesia. Of course, this is a challenge for supervisors who use an authoritarian parenting model. It is estimated that conflicts of interest will emerge regarding the more inclusive and empowering monitoring practices introduced by the current Indonesian government. By shifting to a more collaborative and supportive approach, supervisors run the risk of reducing their focus on accountability and rigorous evaluation of teaching practices. This potential results in a reduction in the quality of teaching and overall student outcomes.

This study uses the Systems Approach to Supervision (SAS) theory, introduced by Holloway (1995), as a theoretical framework to describe the supervision models implemented by supervisors in the schools studied. This theoretical framework offers a holistic system to understand supervisory practices in the school environment. SAS views schools as complex systems consisting of interrelated aspects, such as administrators, instructors, students, curriculum, and community stakeholders (Regassa, 2013). This holistic approach allows for more comprehensive and sustainable supervision by considering the interconnected nature of educational components (Shaked & Schechter, 2016). Through SAS, researchers hope to reveal school supervision models implemented by supervisors at the research location. In the long term, this approach will encourage a culture of continuous improvement and collaboration between stakeholders, resulting in better outcomes for teachers, students, and school staff.

By understanding how the components of a school system interact with and influence each other, supervisors can better identify areas that need improvement and implement effective strategies to improve overall school performance. The Systems Approach to school supervision has similar principles to the systems thinking theory (Senge, 2006), which states that system approach consists of dynamic interconnected components that work together to achieve common goals. By viewing schools as complex systems, supervisors can identify problems that must be addressed and intervene at the root of the problem. This approach makes it possible to provide a more comprehensive and sustainable assessment of school performance. By utilizing the Systems Approach to school supervision, the researchers seek to better understand the interrelated factors influencing supervisors to foster continuous improvement and accountability within the school community.

In general, SAS focuses on the interrelated relationships between stakeholders and subsystems in schools. This systems theory describes supervision as a comprehensive process that focuses on the interactions and relationships among administrators, teachers, students, the curriculum, and the wider community. Through this approach, supervisors can identify areas for improvement and develop strategies to enhance overall school performance. By examining the interconnectedness of various components within the school system, SAS provides a holistic view that can lead to more effective decision-making and sustainable growth. By considering the interconnectedness of all aspects of the school environment, supervisors can create a cohesive and supportive system that promotes growth and success. This approach allows for a more holistic and collaborative approach to supervision, that leads to a more effective and efficient educational system. By emphasizing communication and collaboration, supervisors can create a culture of trust and shared responsibility within the school community. Ultimately, this approach is expected to result in a more effective way of making supervisory decisions and positive outcomes for all involved in the supervisory process.

The SAS approach offers practical applications to improve teaching and learning in schools. Through SAS, supervisors can coach and support teachers in implementing evidence-based learning practices, implementing differentiated learning to meet diverse student needs, and utilizing data to inform stakeholders about learning outcomes. At the heart of SAS, continuous feedback is provided in the school supervision system. Through SAS, supervisors can use feedback to collect data on teaching practices, student learning outcomes, and communication dynamics between teachers, principals, and supervisors. Thus, they can make appropriate decisions and adjustments to improve their school performance. This continuous feedback cycle helps supervisors to identify areas of strength and areas that need improvement. Through continuous feedback, supervisors can direct teachers to achieve their teaching and learning goals more effectively. By actively engaging in feedback loops, supervisors can create a culture of continuous improvement in the school community.

## **Research Method**

This study employed qualitative research methods, specifically a multiple case study design, to examine four private Islamic secondary schools located in the West Nusa Tenggara Province of Indonesia. Due to this, a thorough investigation was undertaken by researchers in the four chosen schools with the aim of investigating and comprehending the intricate phenomena that principals and instructors encounter when responding to supervisory activities. By employing this research methodology, scholars were able to thoroughly investigate the execution of supervision practices. The primary objective of this case study is to acquire a comprehensive comprehension of the ways in which principals and teachers in private schools perceive, experience, and implement the mentoring, guidance, mentoring, and evaluation patterns of school supervisors. The study's results will offer significant contributions to the understanding of the difficulties and achievements associated with supervision methods in private institutions, potentially guiding the development of future enhancement strategies. By analyzing the viewpoints of principals and instructors, it is possible to obtain a comprehensive understanding of how supervision influences school culture and student outcomes.

This case study examined four private institutions in East Lombok that were dedicated to Islamic education. The selection process for these educational institutions encompassed factors including their standing, magnitude, geographical placement, and voluntary engagement in the study. The participants in this research comprised three distinct groups: school principals, instructors, and supervisors. A panel of four principals was assembled from each of the chosen schools to offer their perspectives on leadership styles, supervisory methodologies, and organizational environments. In order to achieve a diverse range of experiences and subject matters, four principals and four teachers from each of the participating schools were deliberately selected through purposive sampling. Their insights pertained to their personal encounters with supervisors and the influence that supervision had on the development of their professional performance. Furthermore, the participation of two administrators tasked with supervising the educational process at the institution yielded valuable perspectives on their respective responsibilities, obstacles, and engagements with principals and instructors. The insights gained from the interviews yielded a thorough comprehension of the interrelationships among principals, instructors, and supervisors in the context of education. The insights contributed by every participant illuminate the significance of proficient supervision in nurturing professional development and augmenting overall academic achievement.

The information for this study was gathered via document analyses, interviews, and observational methods. The objective of this system is to incorporate all research-based data sources, such as principals, instructors, and school supervisors employed in private high schools and supervisory offices within the province of West Nusa Tenggara. The researcher conducted an observation of the educational supervision process, encompassing the decision-making process as well as the reporting procedure for educational supervision outcomes. These formed the foundation for the collection of data. Observations were conducted in schools while the subjects performed their duties without being disturbed. Through analysis of the data gathered from these observations, areas of educational supervision practices that could be enhanced were identified. Overall, the purpose of this research is to offer insights that can be utilized to improve the efficacy of school supervision in the province of West Nusa Tenggara. Interviews that were semi-structured were carried out with the three cohorts of informants. The interviews were carried out in May 2023, subsequent to securing authorization from the graduate office. Research sources consist of data sources, including supervisors, instructors, and school principals. The interview data were collected from four instructors, two school principals, and two education administrators working at private high schools in the province of West Nusa Tenggara. In order to establish the data's credibility, the transcribed interview responses were resubmitted to the participants for verification of the data's accuracy. All subjects utilized in this research were treated with strict confidentiality. The employed methodology for the interview was a semi-structured interview in which the number of questions could be

expanded based on the responses provided by the resource person, who centered the conversation on fundamental inquiries that aligned with the research objective.

Following this is the document verification procedure. Examining documents resulting from the education supervision process, such as meeting decisions and report forms, is required to complete this procedure. The education supervisor conducts the supervision process. Additionally, the necessary documents were modified to incorporate the insights gathered from interviews and observations. Document analysis and compilation are essential processes that substantiate the data acquired from sources through interviews and observations. Documents were acquired by means of observation, and documentation was maintained in the form of physical or digital notes. Following this, these notes were synchronized with the information sources gathered in advance through interviews and observations. The data collected through these three methodologies was compiled and analyzed in alignment with the objectives of this research. For this study's data analysis, the qualitative data analysis paradigm proposed by Miles and Huberman (1994) serves as the foundation of the study. The data collected through these three methodologies was compiled and analyzed in alignment with the objectives of this research. For this study's data analysis, the qualitative data analysis paradigm proposed by Miles and Huberman (1994) serves as the foundation. The data acquired for this study were transcribed prior to analysis. In accordance with emergent themes, pertinent data were gathered in the form of categories, whereas extraneous data were eliminated. Following the completion of the categorization process, the data were systematically presented, analyzed, and concluded in accordance with the research's specific focus. Conclusions were reached following the simplification of all acquired data. The results obtained from this phenomenological case study are presented in an extensive narrative structure. In addition, the significance of the findings for theory, practice, and future research are discussed during the study outcomes discussion. Through active participation of principals, teachers, and supervisors, as well as the application of diverse data collection and analysis techniques, the researchers made a significant contribution to the field of educational leadership and management by gaining a comprehensive understanding of the dynamics of supervision.

## **Findings**

Data analysis related to the research questions results in four main themes, namely (1) unclear supervisory mission, (2) low frequency of school visits, and (3) lack of feedback from supervisors. Below is the elaboration of the data.

An interview with GP1, a female teacher, revealed that there was no definite supervision schedule. The frequency of attendance can be once or twice per semester. School supervisors generally focus their input on the implementation of an independent learning policy, but do not monitor it consistently. GP1 said, "... *school supervisors don't play an active role in helping us implement it independent learning curriculum learning model. The supervision process was conducted only to accommodate administrative needs.*" Similarly, GP2 explained that " *honestly, many teachers are unable to develop learning plans using the latest models because they do not understand the new curriculum. When asked by the supervisor, the answer was that we understood the new curriculum better. Moreover, they rarely came to our school.*" In line with the description above, GL1 added, "*The supervisor carries out mentoring activities for us only once a semester, namely every time there is a school work plan preparation activity.*" The results of this data analysis show that school supervisors carry out their supervisory duties through mentoring activities that are pro forma in nature, that is, simply carrying out their duties as a 'business as usual'. This lack of consistent and meaningful supervision from the school supervisors may be contributing to the teachers' lack of understanding of the new curriculum. It is crucial for supervisors to provide ongoing support and guidance to ensure the successful implementation of the curriculum. This means that supervisors need to actively engage with teachers, provide constructive feedback, and offer resources to help them effectively

teach the new curriculum. By fostering a supportive and collaborative environment, supervisors can help teachers feel more confident and competent in their teaching practices.

The results of the observations showed the same evidence as that conveyed by the participants. During carrying out this research activity, the researcher met the supervisor only once. They came to school, met the teachers they supervised that day, and gave the teacher an assessment sheet for them to fill in themselves. Documentation data from the various schools showed similarities. Generally, schools do not have data from supervisors, such as feedback or records of teacher performance improvement. From the description of the data above, it can be concluded that the three data sources used by researchers—including interviews, field observations, and document studies – show harmony and suitability that support each other. Triangulation of this data strengthens the picture that the pattern of mentoring by school supervisors at the private Islamic high school level in West Nusa Tenggara Province is top-down in nature. This top-down approach may limit the effectiveness of teacher development and growth, as it lacks a holistic feedback loop that includes input from supervisors. Future research could explore ways to incorporate supervisor feedback into the mentoring process to enhance teacher performance and professional development.

Next, data analysis shows that the pattern of supervisors' supervision to teachers is not steady. Supervisor coaching is less effective, because the frequency of meetings with teachers is minimal. GP1 said, *'our supervisors have actually tried to use a collaborative approach with teachers to help their professional development. However, no follow-up was performed for this activity. So my impression is that they work just to carry out their duties formally.'* GP2's description shows similar findings: *"class visits are indeed carried out by school supervisors to observe the implementation of the teaching and learning process, but there are no notes or input for teacher development. These class visits are often carried out without prior notification, and in the end, the teacher is always blamed without any solution being provided."* GP1 reinforces what has been said by GP2, *"The school supervisor provided guidance to me just by looking around at a glance at my teaching preparation. In general, I do not know what aspects were observed during the learning process."* Other supporting data obtained from observations in the four schools showed congruency with the interview data. According to the researcher's notes, the supervisor was present at the school only once when this research was conducted. In the written document notebook, they are present at school to provide directions for the implementation of the teacher's main duties, such as planning, implementing, and assessing students. From interviews with school supervisors, information was obtained that they came three times to the school to evaluate the results of their guidance. From the interview with PS1, the following explanation was obtained, *"We provide guidance and training to teachers starting from: lesson planning, lesson implementation, assessment of learning outcomes, guidance in writing written work, and so on."* Data from interviews with KS1 showed the same results. *"The guidance pattern given by supervisors for teachers in our schools is to control and evaluate the implementation of programs that are prepared on a regular basis."* All these quotes were in contrast with teachers' explanations.

From observation activities at the school, researchers once met one of the supervisors. It was noted that the supervisor carried out routine school administration checks, such as inspecting the completeness of teachers' teaching, teaching modules, and learning tools. Based on information from the teachers being supervised, they had to fill in the supervision implementation sheet sent via the WA. They filled out the sheet only for administrative purposes. During these activities, the supervisors remained mostly passive. Without clear directions and suggestions from supervisors, participants felt dissatisfied with the supervision of their performance because they did not know the supervisor's expectations. The interview results described the participants' expectations of their supervisors.

*"To be honest, they never provided clear input or suggestions for improvement. We need guidance and support in this regard. However, he only left it up to us to supervise ourselves without clear direction."* (GL 2).

*"We have never received constructive input or suggestions to improve the way we teach. We really hope for a professional assessment from him."* (GL1)

*"We are ready to follow directions if there is a record of our shortcomings in teaching ."* (GP2)

When these expectations were confirmed by the supervisor, they were surprised because they felt the teacher had behaved well. *"They never said their expectations,"* said PS2. In the same vein, PS1 expressed his astonishment, *"it is very difficult to know what is expected from us when the teachers never speak frankly."* When these expectations were expressed to supervisors, they were surprised, *"they never said their expectations"* said PS1. In the same vein, Ps2 said, *"It is very difficult to know what is expected when teachers do not speak frankly"*. These responses were in contrast with data uttered by the teachers. This finding implies that the supervisor needed more open communication and give guidance to their supervisees in order to improve their teaching practices. They need to establish a strong foundation of communication and support for fostering a successful supervisory relationship.

The participants provided almost the same opinions regarding the frequency of class visits. GP 2 said, *"In one semester, we were only supervised once and it wasn't very effective, we only looked at the sub-subjects, then the supervisor talked a lot about other things, then after that asked for signatures. So far there has been no feedback from the supervisors. When we are supervised after the matter is finished, there is no more meaningful feedback."* GL1, a male teacher, explained, *'The supervisor simply enters the class and assesses the learning tools we use in class. He never commented on whether our learning tools were in line with the new curriculum's demands. We do not know whether our devices meet government standards.'* Teacher GL 2 explained, *"The supervisor gives input to the teacher...yes, that's right, but the input is only verbal. He told us only to correct administrative errors. There is no special guidance for the academic direction. All forms were submitted via WA. We just filled it in according to his request."* Teacher GP1 added, *'The weakness of supervision lies in his lack of updating the latest learning tools from the local department, while the weakness of supervisors is that there is no guidance when we administer the devices so that when we are supervised, many weaknesses appear in administration, especially for learning tools that are basic to teachers.'* All these quotes denote a lack of support and guidance in utilizing the latest learning tools and administering devices effectively. This leads to weaknesses in supervision and administration. This highlights the need for clearer direction and training in these areas to improve overall performance.

A similar view was expressed by KS 1 and KS2 *"To be honest, I respect what the supervisor does, but I am not sure whether the frequency of visits of only two times in one semester is an effective approach."* (KS1). In the same vein, KS 2 stated, *"In my opinion, giving autonomy to teachers to assess themselves is good, but it must be supported by an adequate frequency of visits and providing feedback according to the teacher's needs."* All the principals' remarks indicate a common concern regarding the need for more consistent and supportive supervision practices to enhance teacher performance and development. It is clear that there is a desire for increased guidance and feedback to ensure teachers are effectively supported in their roles.

The results of this research show that supervisors never provide transparent and open feedback to teachers. Thus, they do not know their teaching performance. GP1 stated, *"As we never get any feedback, we just fumble in teaching the present curriculum."* Similarly, GL2 expressed, *"our supervisor come just to check the completeness of administrative work. Really, we want to hear from him about what he thinks about our teaching performance"*. In general, participants expect to know the results of the supervisor's evaluation on their teaching performance and get clear feedback in the form of suggestions for improvement or even necessary corrective actions. They hope that supervisors can identify teachers'



professional development needs and provide suggestions or facilitate the necessary training and development. This lack of feedback can lead to confusion and hinder professional growth. Clear communication and support from supervisors are therefore crucial for teachers to excel in their roles.

### ***Discussion***

The results of this study revealed that private school supervisors in four research locations use a top-down model. This model places supervisors as authorities, who direct and supervise teacher performance in one direction. In this model, the primary decisions and directions come from the school supervisor and the teacher. Based on performance standards that teachers in the school must meet, teachers follow the supervisor's instructions. This standard covers curriculum, teaching, and discipline enforcement in schools. Through this activity, supervisors conduct routine supervision of teacher performance on a regular basis to assess the extent to which their performance is in accordance with predetermined standards. This hierarchical structure can sometimes lead to a lack of autonomy for teachers in decision-making processes. This can potentially hinder creativity and innovation in the classroom, as teachers may feel limited in their ability to try new teaching methods or approaches. These findings are in line with research study reported by Hashim et al., (2023). However, clear communication and collaboration between supervisors and teachers can help ensure that expectations are met while still allowing for some flexibility in teaching practices. The present study shows that a supervisor's top-down approach did not give a significant impact on teacher morale and job satisfaction. These findings yield similar results as reported by Susilowati, et al. (2017).

The findings of this study indicate that the manner in which a supervisor operates, which is hierarchical in nature, can substantially influence the morale and job satisfaction of teachers. By cultivating an atmosphere that does not promote collaboration and transparency, supervisors do not have the ability to inspire and engage teachers in schools. Such a manner will eventually result in the decline of academic achievements for students. Top-down approaches often promote policy standardization and uniform implementation across educational institutions, neglecting local circumstances and student requirements. This approach may therefore lead to passive and unresponsive teachers' responses to the particular challenges that schools may encounter.

The results indicate that a potential obstacle to effective communication between supervisors and school personnel. Insufficient teacher collaboration and participation in the school decision-making process may impede the progress of school development as a whole. In order to tackle this matter, it is critical that school supervisors foster an environment that encourages collaboration and open communication among all parties involved. Supervisors can ensure that policies and practices are tailored to the specific requirements of their students and teachers. The present study showed that the absence of supervisors' feedback and teachers' autonomy in decision- impedes the teachers' professional development Teachers perceived their capacity to develop and enhance their teaching quality as being constrained. In order to effect positive changes in the school environment, it is imperative to cultivate a culture of collaboration between supervisors and teachers. By granting educators a voice in policy formulation and implementation, educational institutions can enhance their readiness to address the varied requirements of their students. Moreover, this collaborative strategy may increase teachers' job satisfaction.

In general, the results of this show that school supervisors do their obligations and tasks only in a pro forma basis. In another word, they work only for business as usual. This happens because their comprehension regarding their responsibility to oversee and offer supervisory aid to educators who require their assistance is deficient. This causes them to overlook their imminent responsibilities. In this relation, Marzano and Toth (2013) state that the efficacy of supervisors of this nature in fostering teachers' growth as reflective and collaborative learners was comparatively low due to their lack of knowledge and

competence. As an educational officer, they exhibited a diminished capacity to apply the mentoring-based model of collaborative learning activities with teachers. Thus, it is suggested that teachers and supervisors collectively resolve problems, foster a sense of collegiality, and cultivate stronger relationships each other. In general, it was evident that these supervisors were not accustomed to the "new culture" of collaborative supervision with instructors in the professional environment.

## Conclusion

The findings of this study indicate that the manner in which a supervisor operates, which is hierarchical in nature, can substantially influence the morale and job satisfaction of teachers. It is therefore suggested that by cultivating an atmosphere that promotes collaboration and transparency, supervisors develop their ability to inspire and engage educators, which will ultimately result in enhanced academic achievements for students. The results of the study indicate that although top-down models may foster uniformity and compliance with certain established criteria, they may impede the ability to adjust and generate novel ideas in light of regional requirements. Effective school administration and student achievement therefore require that a balance be made between centralized control and localized autonomy. Teachers may perceive their capacity to develop and enhance their teaching quality as being constrained. This may ultimately impede the progress of the school as a whole and have an adverse effect on student learning outcomes. In order to effect positive changes in the school environment, it is possible to cultivate a culture of collaboration and grant instructors a voice in decision-making. By granting educators a voice in policy formulation and implementation, educational institutions can enhance their readiness to address the varied requirements of their pupil bodies. Moreover, this collaborative strategy may increase educator retention and job satisfaction. In general, the results of this investigation suggest that school administrators have executed their obligations and tasks in a pro forma fashion, working their way down. Their comprehension regarding their responsibility to oversee and offer supervisory aid to educators who require their assistance is deficient. This causes them to overlook the imminent requirements of the instructors. In general, the supervisors in this study demonstrated an unpreparedness to adopt the "new culture" of collaborative supervision with instructors within the workplace.

## References

- Allen, D. (2013). Reconstructing professional learning community as collective creation. *Improving Schools*. Vol. 16(3), pp. 191-208. <https://doi.org/10.1177/136548021350105>
- Arif F. Ming-Huei C. I W. Mokhammad A. & Anang K. (2022). The role of transformational leadership and knowledge management and learning organization on vocational schools performance during digital era. *Frontiers in Psychology*. Vol 13. pp 1-4. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.895341>
- Arong, F. E., & Ogbandu, M. A. (2010). Major causes of declining quality of education in Nigeria administrative perspective: A case study of Dekina Local Government Area. *Canadian Social Science*, 6(3), 183-198. <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/css/article/view/j.css.1923669720100603.021/1086>
- Aseltine, J. M., Faryniarz, J. O., & Rigazio-DiGilio, A. J. (2006). *Supervision for learning: A performance-based approach to teacher development and school improvement*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD): Alexandria, VA
- Ebele, U. & Agbade, O. (2017). Enhancing the standard of teaching and learning in the 21st century via qualitative school-based supervision in secondary schools in Abuja municipal area council (AMAC). *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*. Vol 9. pp. 79-83. <https://doi.org/10.5897/IJEAPS2016.0490>
- Fathih, M. A. (2022). Revisiting the Principles of Planning of Educational Supervisory Coaching in Education. *Al-Idaroh: Journal of Islamic Education Management Studies (Meninjau Kembali Prinsip dan Perencanaan Supervisi Pendidikan Sebagai Pengawasan dalam Pendidikan yang Bersifat*

- Pembinaan). *Al-Idaroh: Jurnal Studi Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, Vol 6 (2), pp. 142-157. <https://doi.org/10.54437/alidaroh.v6i2.384>
- Gumah, B., Wenbin, L., & Aziabah, M. A. (2021). Supervisors' Leadership Styles' Influence on Foreign Teachers' Self-Efficacy in a Cross-Cultural Work Setting: A Moderated Mediation Analysis. *Sage Open*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244021994546>
- Haris, I., Naway, F., Pulukadang, W. T., Takeshita, H., & Ancho, I. V. (2018). School supervision practices in the Indonesian education system; perspectives and challenges. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 9(2), 366-387. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/jsser/issue/37944/438306>
- Hashim, A.K., Torres, C. & Kumar, J.M. (2023). Is more autonomy better? How school actors perceive school autonomy and effectiveness in context. *J Educ Change* Vol (24), pp. 183–212. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-021-09439-x>
- Hassan, R., Ahmad, J., & Boon, Y. (2018). Instructional Leadership Practice Among Headmasters in the Southern Region of Malaysia. *The Journal of Social Sciences Research*. Special Issue. 2, pp: 76-90, <https://doi.org/10.32861/jssr.spi2.76.90>
- Holloway, E. (1995). *Clinical supervision: A systems approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Leithwood, K., Day, C., Sammons, P., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2006). *Successful School Leadership: What It Is and How It Influences Pupil Learning*. Nottingham: DfES Publications.
- Maisyaroh, Bambang Budi Wiyono, Hardika, Anabelie Villa Valdez, Solaiman B. Mangorsi & Sanaorai P.T. Canapi | Kar-wai Tong (Reviewing editor) (2021) The implementation of instructional supervision in Indonesia and the Philippines, and its effect on the variation of teacher learning models and materials, *Cogent Education*, Vol 8 (1), pp 1-30. DOI:10.1080/2331186X.2021.1962232
- Marzano, R.J. & Toth, M.D. (2013). *Teacher Evaluation Model: A New Model for Teacher Growth and Student Achievement*. Englewood. Marzano Research Center.
- Miles, M. B., and Huberman, A. M. 1994. *Quality Data Analysis*. London: SAGE Publication.
- Ministry of Education (2017). A Guide to Basic Education School Supervisor (*Panduan Kerja Pengawas Sekolah Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah*). Direktorat Pembinaan Tenaga Kependidikan Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah. Jakarta: Kemendikbud.
- Nurulita, N. D., Prestiadi, D., & Imron, A. (2021). Education Supervision as A Teacher Professionalism Improvement. In *1st International Conference on Continuing Education and Technology (ICCOET)* 589 (Iccoet), pp. 129–131.
- Purfitasari, Septi & Masrukhi, & Prihatin, Titi & Mulyono, Sungkowo. (2020). Teacher Supervision Models for Answering Educational Challenges in the Era of Disruption. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Science and Education and Technology (ISET 2019)*. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, Vol 443 pp 457-460
- Senge, P. M. (2006). The fifth discipline The art and practice of the learning organization. *Broadway Business*.
- Setia, R., & Nasrudin, D. (2020). Teacher Supervision as an Improvement in The Quality Of Education. *International Journal of Education and Social Science Research*. Vol. 3 (3) pp 11-20 <https://doi.org/10.37500/ijessr.2020.3032>
- Shaked, Haim & Schechter, Chen. (2016). Holistic School Leadership: Systems Thinking as an Instructional Leadership Enabler. *NASSP Bulletin*. 100. 177-202.
- Sopacua, H. & Nirahua, SEM. (2021). The Role Of An Supervisors And Supervisory Against Education System Of Education. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications (IJSRP)*. Vol. 11. pp. 689-698. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.11.07.2021.p11591>
- Susilowati, K., Sarwi, S., & Anni, C. (2017). Development of an Equality-Based Managerial Supervision Model for School Supervisors (Pengembangan Model Supervisi Manajerial Pengawas Sekolah Berbasis Kesejawatan). *Educational Management*, Vol. 6(1), pp. 80-86.
- Tadesse Regassa, Taye Tolemariam , Bekalu Ferede, Adula Bekele Hunde, Abbi Lemma, An Exploration of the Utilization of Supervision Feedbacks: The Case of Some Secondary Schools in Jimma Zone, *Education*, Vol. 3 No. 6, 2013, pp. 309-318. doi:10.5923/j.edu.20130306.05

- Tesfaw, T. & Hofman, R.H.. (2014). Relationship between instructional supervision and professional development. *International Education Journal*. Vol. 13. pp. 82-99. <https://research.rug.nl/en/publications/relationship-between-instructional-supervision-and-professional-d>
- Tyagi, R. S. (2010). School-based instructional supervision and the effective professional development of teachers. *Journal of Comparative and International Education*, Vol. 40(1), pp. 111-125. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057920902909485>
- Wells, C. L. (2017). *Understanding issues of control in top-down management pedagogies*. *Power and Education*, 9(3), pp. 192-201. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1757743817737334>

### Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).