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Abstract:
This research is a qualitative multisite study using the interactive and modified analytic induction analyses. The focus of this research was the instructional supervision management at three middle schools in Blitar involving various supervisors. This research used a snowball sampling techniques with identified key information. The data was collected by using observation, interview, and documentation. The researcher ensured the credibility, dependability, conformability, and transferability by doing triangulation, independent auditor and readers, reflective review, and detail indepth report. Results of this research showed that the three schools employed various supervisors including head of the education department, the education department official supervisors, principals, and senior teachers employing the integrated participative team based supervisory planning, organizing, implementation, and evaluation by which principals took the main responsibility of instructional supervision. The integrated participative team based supervision management turned out to make the instructional supervision worked better, to provide satisfactory teachers’ in service professional development, to make teachers performed better, to gain satisfactory results of students performance, and to gain stakeholder trusts.

Keywords:
Instructional supervision, Management, Middle school

Citation:

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.
Integrated participative team based instructional supervision

Introduction
The Indonesian independence preamble assures that all Indonesian citizens have the right for education and are required to complete basic education as a part of the national education framework in order to enrich the life of a nation (Undang-Undang Dasar 1945, Preamble and chapter 31 verses 1-5). The basic education consists of formal primary and middle schoolings (UU RI No 20, Year 2003, Chapter VI verse 13). These have become obligatory for all Indonesian citizens (Saud and Sumantri, 2007:121). The primary education has to be managed effectively, efficiently, and qualified as the foundation to develop human resources (Kusnandar, 2007:27-28). The quality must refer the national education system requiring the quality of content standard, process standard, outcomes competency standard, teachers standard, educational staff standard, and educational facilities standard (Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia, No 19 Year 2005). Teachers are considered as having the core roles of the overall quality (Mutohar, 2006:2). Therefore, a professional teacher provision and development are highly important. According the decree of Indonesia Republic No. 14 year 2005 and the Indonesian government decree No. 74 year 2008, higher institutions have the responsibility to handle this. Danim (2011:3) calls this as the higher institutional based teacher provision.

Nowadays problems have been identified that not all graduates are ready to professionally involve in the educational practices (Imron, 2011:3-5). Whereas, they are expected to be the pioneer in succeeding education. Teachers have central roles in education (Zepeda, 2007:12). To be professional teachers they need precondition or teacher induction (Danim, 2011:5) and professional help (Zepeda, 2007:11), or teacher professionalization (Mulyasa, 2007; Mantja, 1998; Mantja, 2010; Danim and Khairil, 2010; and Danim, 2011). The teacher professionalism has been a concern of various scholars such as Hoyle (1982), Shanahan, Meehan, and Mogge (1994), Wai (1996), U.S. Department of Education (1997), Simola, Kivinen, and Rinne (1997), Montero and Vez (1998), UNESCO (2003), Breshears (2004), Cort, Härkönen, and Volmari (2004), Hypolito (2004), Akue-zuilo (2006), Komba and Nkumbi (2008), Pandey (2009), Noordin, Rashid, Ghanii, Arpin, and Darus (2009), Emeh and Ogahoh (2010), and Levin (2011). They considered that this was very important. Strengthening teachers’ high competency, performance, and learning process success are essential (Mutohar, 2006:3), because humanly teachers are very close to students (Bafadal, 2009:4), professionally determine the success of education (Adler, 1982), and functionally as decision makers in class (Danielson, 2007).

Sahertian (2008:1) says that teacher professionalism can be done through higher education institutions, professional institutions, and individual bases in terms of both pre-service education and in-service education. Institutionally, the effective teachers professionalism has been considered in the form of continuing professional development using instructional supervision (Gwyn, 1961:28; Glickman, 1981:3; Mantja, 1998:8; Zepeda, 2007:29; Burhanudin, 2007:73; Sahertian, 2008:2; Pidarta, 2009:3; Mantja, 2010:8; 107; Suhandar, 2010: 40; Maryono, 2011:20-23; and Imron, 2011:6). The preliminary study conducted in various schools in Blitar East Java Indonesia confirmed these theories. There were unique practices of instructional supervision in Blitar involving head of the local department of education, official supervisors, principals, vice principals, senior teachers, and core subject senior teachers or master teachers. Prior to determining the study, the researcher did the preliminary meta analysis study.

Smyth (1991), Hills (1991), and Kutsyuruba (2003), in Africa by Kamindo (2008), Sibanda, Mutopa, and Maphosa (2011), Ugboko and Adediwura (2012), Alimi and Akinfolarin (2012), and Ayeni (2012), In the Middle East and Asean countries other than Indonesia by Haans (2007), Abidin (2008), Carron, Grauwe, and Govinda (1998), Sharma, Yusoff, Kannan, and Baba (2011), Tyagi (2011), and Beaecher and Thuy (2011), and in Indonesia by Mantja (1990), Karyono (2007), Terminingsi (2009), Lekipiouw (2009), Mujiono (2009), and Saleh (2011) revealed similar results that instructional supervision was very important and useful help for teachers to develop their professionalism and to enhance the quality of learning which positively influence students’ achievement. However, generally there were problems of (1) the lack of teachers’ involvement in supervision process, (2) the lack of principal skills in supervision and competency in the subject matters being supervised, (3) teachers’ trust to supervisors, (4) administrators’ attitude which are not being positive, (5) less practices of developmental supervision, (5) having expectation of being help with correct supervision, and (6) having no research of instructional supervision in middle schools.

Considering these problems and looking at the interesting phenomenon of the instructional supervision practices conducted in middle schools in Blitar, East Java, Indonesia involving various supervisors for the same supervisory objectives and the same subjects of supervision, the researcher considered important and useful to research the instructional supervision management at middle schools in Blitar, East Java, Indonesia.

Focus of the research
The focus of this research was how integrated participative team based instructional supervision management at middle schools in Blitar, East Java, Indonesia was implemented. This focus was elaborated to be (1) how was the planning integrated participative team based instructional supervision in terms of the process and programs, (2) how was the organization of the integrated participative team based instructional supervision in terms of roles and work flow, and (3) how the integrated participative team based instructional supervision was implemented in terms of supervisory approach, supervisory behaviours, supervisory techniques, and teachers problem resolution, and (3) how the integrated participative team based instructional supervision evaluated in terms of feedbacks and follow up.

Objectives of the research
This research was aimed at exploring and describing the integrated participative team based instructional supervision management at middle schools in Blitar, East Java, Indonesia which was elaborated as (1) the planning of the integrated participative team based instructional supervision in terms of the process and programs, (2) the organization of the integrated participative team based instructional supervision in terms of roles and work flow, (3) the implementation of integrated participative team based instructional supervision in terms of supervisory approach, supervisory behaviours, supervisory techniques, and teachers problem resolution, and (4) the evaluation of the integrated participative team based instructional supervision in terms of feedbacks and follow up.

This research was limited to the exploration and description of the phenomenon on the integrated participative team based instructional supervision management at middle schools in Blitar, East Java, Indonesia implemented in 2011 to 2014.
Integrated participative team based instructional supervision

Theoretical review

Ethimologically supervision is viewed as having the words “super” and “vision” (Suhardan, 2010:35) meaning having a higher rank or position or superior to such as superintendent (Webster’s New World Dictionary, 1991:1343). This concerns the ability to perceive something not actually visible, as through mental acuteness or keen foresight (Webster’s New World Dictionary, 1991:1492). Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon (2004:8) define supervision as to watch over, to direct, and to superintend. Conceptually, meanwhile globally the term instructional supervision is used, in Indonesian context there have been variety of terms and definitions which basically have the same meanings. These are the so-called supervisi pembelajaran (the plain translation would be learning supervision), supervisi pengajaran (the plain translation would be teaching supervision), and supervisi akademik (the plain translation would be academic supervision). These three terms basically refer the instructional supervision.

The term instructional supervision is broadly used to refer the educational supervision for improving teaching and learning process. This is synonymous with the general supervision (ASCD, 1987:129). Instructional Supervision term has been used by Glickman (1992), Sergiovanni and Starratt (2002), Beaver (2002), Gentry (2002), Kruskamp (2003), Thobega (2003), Kutsyuruba (2003), Kelehear (2010), Farley (2010), Sharma, Yusoff, and Kannan (2011), and Alimi and Akinfolarin (2012) to refer professional help to teachers. Glickman (1992) views instructional supervision as the efforts to enable teachers to develop their own personal quality in improving their teaching and learning for the success of the students. Sergiovanni and Starratt (1983:13) define it as a set of activity or roles specification designed to influence teaching and learning. This is an opportunity given to teachers to develop their capacities in contributing to the success of students (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 2002). Hoy and Miskel (1991) state that instructional supervision is the opportunity for teachers to be competent in exploring the ways of doing their professional development. So, the involvement of teachers in Instructional Supervision is very important (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 2002:95).

The term Supervisi Pengajaran was used by Mantja (1998, 1990, 2000, and 2010), Ekosusilo (2003), Burhanudin (2007), Imron (2007a, b, c), Karyono (2007), Lekipiouw (2009), and Terminingsi (2009) to refer the professional supports or help given to teachers by supervisors in order to enhance the teachers’ professional ability, especially teaching ability related to the learning process with students’ interaction (Imron, 2007a: 55). The term Supervisi Pembelajaran was used by Imron (2011) and Mantja (2010:9) similiarzing with the so-called Supervisi Akademik. The term Supervisi Pembelajaran has been defined as a set of teachers support efforts as the professional assistance to teachers by principals, district supervisors or the so-called Pengawas, and other supervisors in order to enhance the teacher professional ability in succeeding the students learning process and outcomes (Imron, 2011:8, Depdikbud, 1986). The term Supervisi Akademik was used by Mantja (2010), Prasojo and Sudiyono (2011), Saleh (2011), Pusat Pengembangan Tenaga Pendidikan (2011), and Direktorat Tenaga Kependidikan (2007, 2010). Prasojo and Sudiyono (2011) and Saleh (2011) define Supervisi Akademik to refer what has been said by Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon (2007), Glickman (1981), and Daresh (1989) as a set of activities to help teachers develop their ability in organizing their teaching process to attain the instructional objectives. Direktorat Tenaga Kependidikan (2007:6-7) states that conceptually the Supervisi Akademik is a set of activities to help teachers develop their ability to manage their instructional process for the attainment of the instructional objectives.
In terms of the approaches, the instructional supervision has evolved from the scientific, artistic, and clinical approaches to supervision as developmental (Glickman, 1980). These have been followed by the development of supervisory orientation from non-directive, directive informational, and controlled, to collaborative approach. Supervisory techniques have also been developed including the various individual and grouping techniques ranging from observation, class visit, and conference (Neagly and Evans, 1980). The recent prominent approach is the supervision as developmental which includes the concerns of the maturity and responsibility of teachers allowing to identify the four quadrant types of teachers as dropped out, less attention, analytic observer, and professional teachers (Glickman, Gordon, Gordon and Ross Gordon, 2004).

Historically, instructional supervision has been developed in various different functions with similar aims. From 800 to 1400, there appeared the concept of Close supervision on religious and moral development which functioned as supervision of moral and religious development in England (Gwyn, 1961:4). In 1636-1647, the concept of supervision moved to the Supervision of religious and moral development which had similar function, but was employed in England and the United State of America (Gwyn, 1961:4). In 1827, there appeared the concept of Supervision by Visiting Committee which functioned as supervision of instruction at schools (Gwyn, 1961:5). After 1827, there was the General Supervision and Special Supervision which functioned as supervision to help superintendent in supervising primary and middle schools and classroom supervision for specific subject matters (Gwyn, 1961:5). In around 1980s to 1990s supervision was conceptually to be the administrative or supervision done by the administration staffs (Lucio and McNeil, 1979:11, Mantja, 2000:20), Burhanudin, 2007:11). In 1916, the concept of Supervision to lead and help teachers which functioned as supervision to lead and direct teachers was popular (Cubberly, 1916, in Gwyn, 1961:10). In 1921 there existed the concept of Supervision for Improvement of Instruction which functioned as teacher rating by visitation, observation, and grading. In the early twentieth century which was about 1900-1920, supervision was conceptually defined as supervision done by specialists (Lucio and McNeil, 1979:11, Mantja, 2000:20, Burhanudin, 2007:11). In 1922 the Supervision for Improvement of teaching act appeared to function as supervision in improving teaching acts, selection and organization of lessons, measurements, and teachers appraisal which allow to rate teachers (Scott, 1924, in Gwyn, 1961:10).

In 1920-1960, the scientific supervision which functioned as a means of improving learning and teaching situation using scientific method was evolved (Gwyn, 1961:11-13). In 1930-1960 there came Supervision as Guidance functioning as the guidance of teachers and Supervision as Curriculum Improvement functioning as guidance of teacher to develop curriculum (Gwyn, 1961:11-16). In 1940-1960 Supervision as Group Processes was conceptually meant to focus on effective learning concerning personality and group interaction for better results of students achievement (Gwyn, 1961:11-16). In 1956-1960, there existed the Supervision as Indigenous to Instructional team to emphasize on the internal leadership and master teacher development (Gwyn, 1960). During the year of 1930-1960, Gwyn (1961) says that there appeared the Creative Supervision. Clinical Supervision began to be popular in 1965-1970 with organized cycles using pre-conference and post-conference as well as feedback (Cognan, 1973, Goldhammer, 1969, Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon, 2007). In 1970-1980 there existed Supervision as Management to inspect the educational and administration implementation which was more on the so-called managerial supervision.
In 1980s there were more types of supervisions appearing in the educational fields. These were Self-Directed Supervision, Skills-focused supervision/Scientific Supervision, Social Work Supervision, Developmental Supervision, Cognitive-Based Supervision, Peer Supervision/ Collegial Supervision, and Contingency Supervision (Wiles and Bondi, 1986:7, as also in Mantja, 2000:28, Glatthorn, 1984, Hunter 1984, Kadushin, 1985, Glickman, 1987, Costa and Carmston, 1985, Garman, 1986, Glatthorn, 1987, Hersey and Blanchard, 1988, Anderson, 1993, Glatthorn, 1990, Sergiovanni, 1991, Munson, 1993). In 1990s there also appeared Differentiated Supervision, Organizational Supervision, and Clinical and social works supervision. Finally, beginning in 2004 the supervision as developmental has been developed and widely used (Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon, 2004, 2009). Such supervisions have been an integrated part of teacher professional development which have been directed to solve problems of teachers’ competency, skills, and instructional interaction (Mantja, 2010). These have been implemented by considering the human ability of teachers with suitable approaches, methods, and techniques (Mantja, 1998; Danim, 2002; Sahertian, 2008; Mantja, 2010; and Suhardan, 2010). To make the supervisory effective, supervision management has been obviously very important to deal with. UNESCO (2007a) develops such management in terms of management of supervision staff including recruitment, career development, training, and work situation as well as financial support, and management of supervisory work including work visit organization, reporting, and followed up.

Research Method

This research was a qualitative research using the multisite study design with Interactive Model of Analysis (Hubberman, 1984, 1992:20) and Analytic Modified Induction Method of developing theory (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998) and using a customized framework with reference to Arifin (1998) analysis framework. Alongside the data collection, the analysis was done respectively by data collection, data display, data reduction, and data verification and conclusion in which the last three processes were interactively managed.

The data were collected using observation, interview, and documentation with field notes, recording, semi-guided interview schedule, documents, and by using contact summary. The contexts of this research were three state middle schools. Samples were taken by determining the key information and the snowballing technique. The data reliability and validity checks were done by checking credibility, dependability, conformability, and transferability with data source triangulation, member check, collegial discussion, and audit involving professional scholars including Dr. Suyitno, M.Pd, Dr. Muwahid, M.Pd.I, and Dr. Akhyak, M.Pd.I.

The Analytic Modified Inductive Method of developing theory was done by developing instructional supervision and management concept as the bases of analysis, selecting the research sites and developing research protocols, making research in the first site to find temporary findings and temporary conclusion, doing research in the second site to find temporary findings and conclusion, comparing the findings of the first and second sites as well as inducing the first temporary finding conclusion with the second temporary finding conclusion to develop the cross sites analysis to gain cross site temporary findings and conclusions. Where the similarity was the main interest, differences were kept noted. The following work was doing research in the third site and finding temporary findings and conclusions. Then, cross case analyses between the temporary findings and conclusions of the first and second sites with the third sites were done to find the final findings and conclusion by inducing the conclusions of the first and second sites to the third sites. In these processes, the analytic modified induction was done. From the final results, the
researchers formulate propositions as the primary results of this research in terms of the substantive theory.

The research was done by the following phase: (1) preliminary study and field orientation, (2) focused explorative study including collecting data, displaying data, reducing data, making conclusion, and checking the four types of the reliability and validity, (3) report writing, and (4) report finalization.

Findings
The primary findings of this research can be explained as the following:
1. In the initial stage, the instructional planning involved educational leaders comprising head of the education department, official supervisors, and principals allowing participative program planning, synchronization, and shared decision. These caused better teamwork and synchronized objectives and targets;
2. In developing instructional annual and semester program, principals conducted program planning involving vice principals, senior teachers, and master teachers allowing contribution and suggestions for effective planning and arousing shared decision. The official supervisors visited principals to synchronize their programs. These cause effective programs with rational and factual objectives and target expectations;
3. The instructional supervision was done by official supervisors, principals, vice principals, senior teachers, and master teachers. The main responsibility and accountability of the instructional supervision belonged to principals. The instructional supervision was organized by firstly identifying teachers’ problem and dividing teachers for the instructional supervision work of each supervisors. The instructional supervision for teachers requiring supports and development in technical skills was assigned to the senior supervisors and the master teachers, mainly for those requiring help of the related subject matters. The instructional supervision for teachers with limited requirement of the technical supports was done by the principals and/or the vice principals. This concerned with general issues in instructional planning, administration, learning process, and evaluation. All vice principals, senior teachers, and master teachers had to hand their reports to the principals. All supervisors were allowed to make feedback and propose for followed up, but the final decision was made by the principals. The flow of the work was problem identification and assignment distribution with identified groups of teachers for each of them, All supervisors work based on the assignments and propose for follow up, and finally principals made the final decision. This organization practice turned out to contribute to the use of principals effective time, better team work and appropriate problem solving, teachers openness for having collegial supports allowing to solve problems within respected subject matters, and better teachers’ performance;
4. The main mode of the instructional supervision tended to be focusing on problem solving and in service professional development. The approaches used by all of the supervisors were clinical supervision with directive informational and collaborative instructional behaviour. The directive informational mainly was done to provide supports with new policies and instructional matters concerning the curriculum, instructional approaches and method, and information technology. This was done mostly in groups. The collaborative behaviour was implemented in all individual instructional supervision process. The supervisors employed eclectic techniques based on the situation ranging from group and individual techniques with Teachers Work Group, Classroom Visit and Observation, Pre and post conferences.
5. All supervisors made direct evaluation on the instructional supervision process with teachers and provide feedbacks. Follow up recommendations we made collaboratively among teachers and supervisors. Corrective actions on certain concerns observed and noted by the supervisors were made directly whenever possible and when, this was not possible, it was included in the follow up. The principals made decision on the follow up by providing on going professional supports with individual guidance with professional collegial coaching and mentoring, group guidance using the Teacher Work Group program, and continuing education, and action research.

6. This integrated participative instructional supervision management turned out to contribute to better instructional process, better students learning achievement, and proper in-service professional development based on the teacher’s problems and needs.

These findings supported the advantage of using clinical approach to supervision allowing proper problem solving and in service professional development and the supervision as developmental model allowing proper supervisory behaviour as using the directive informational and collaborative behaviour. As stated by Glickman, Gordon, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (2004) such model can result better students’ outcomes.

Conclusion and Suggestion

Based on the above findings, it was concluded that this research revealed the following propositions of facts:

1. Proposition 1: The integrated participative team based instructional supervision planning involving head of the education department, official supervisors, and principals allowed shared decision and caused better team work and synchronized objectives and targets.

2. Proposition 2: The integrated participative team based instructional supervision planning involving principals, vice principals, senior teachers, and master teachers allowed contribution and suggestions for effective planning that cause effective programs with rational and factual objectives and target expectations.

3. Proposition 3: The integrated participative team based instructional supervision which was organized by making supervisory team in which official supervisors, vice principals, senior teachers, and master teachers supervise teachers on behalf of the principals enabled principals to manage their supervisory tasks effectively, to provide suitable professional supports to teachers, and to enforce collegial professional improvement as well as identify realistic problems.

4. Proposition 4: The combination of clinical supervision and the directive informational as well collaborative instructional supervision behaviour approaches enable supervisors to help teachers solve their problems develop their professional practices and teachers to propouse developmental follow up.

5. Proposition 5: The overall integrated participative team based instructional supervision management enabled shared decision for achieving schools objectives and targets, enabled effective practical in service professional development for vice principals, senior teachers, and master teachers in terms of their leadership role succession, for teachers to solve their professional practice problem and to enhance their professional competence, enabled the improvement of classroom instructional process, and enabled the improvement of students’ learning outcomes.

It is suggested that results of this research are used as reference to develop new ways of effective instructional supervision and it management, as reference for doing further research, and as reference to improve teachers’ professional development.
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