



## THE INFLUENCE OF COACHING-BASED ACADEMIC SUPERVISION ON TEACHER PERFORMANCE AT SMA NEGERI 1 AMURANG AND SMA NEGERI 1 MOTOLING

### PENGARUH SUPERVISI AKADEMIK BERBASIS BIMBINGAN TERHADAP KINERJA GURU DI SMA NEGERI 1 AMURANG DAN SMA NEGERI 1 MOTOLING

Swingly Suriadi Yesaya Liow<sup>1\*</sup>, Jeffry S.J Lengkong<sup>2</sup>, Deitje A. Katuuk<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1\*</sup>Manado State University, Email: [Swinglyliow6@gmail.com](mailto:Swinglyliow6@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup>Manado State University, Email: [jeffrylengkong@unima.ac.id](mailto:jeffrylengkong@unima.ac.id)

<sup>3</sup>Manado State University, Email: [deitjekatuuk@unima.ac.id](mailto:deitjekatuuk@unima.ac.id)

\*email koresponden: [Swinglyliow6@gmail.com](mailto:Swinglyliow6@gmail.com)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.62567/micjo.v3i2.2401>

#### Abstract

This study aims to analyze the influence of coaching-based academic supervision on teacher performance at SMA Negeri 1 Amurang and SMA Negeri 1 Motoling. The study employed a quantitative approach with an explanatory design. The population consisted of 122 teachers, all of whom were included as the sample using a saturated sampling technique. Data were collected through a Likert-scale questionnaire that had been tested for validity and reliability. Data analysis included descriptive analysis, prerequisite tests, and simple linear regression. The results showed that coaching-based academic supervision does not have a significant effect on teacher performance ( $p > 0.05$ ). The coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) value of 0.013 indicates that the contribution of coaching-based academic supervision to teacher performance is very low, accounting for only 1.3%, while most of the variation in teacher performance is influenced by other factors outside the research model. These findings indicate that coaching-based academic supervision has not been able to directly improve teacher performance, especially when its implementation is not carried out consistently and in depth. This study emphasizes that the effectiveness of coaching-based supervision is contextual and highly dependent on the quality of implementation and the support of the school's organizational environment.

**Keywords :** Academic Supervision, Coaching, Teacher Performance.

#### Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis pengaruh supervisi akademik berbasis coaching terhadap kinerja guru di SMA Negeri 1 Amurang dan SMA Negeri 1 Motoling. Penelitian menggunakan pendekatan kuantitatif dengan desain eksplanatori. Populasi penelitian berjumlah 122 guru yang seluruhnya dijadikan sampel melalui teknik sampling jenuh. Pengumpulan data dilakukan menggunakan angket skala Likert yang telah diuji validitas dan reliabilitasnya. Analisis data meliputi analisis deskriptif, uji prasyarat, dan regresi linier sederhana. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa supervisi akademik berbasis coaching tidak berpengaruh signifikan terhadap kinerja guru ( $p > 0,05$ ). Nilai koefisien determinasi ( $R^2$ ) sebesar 0,013 menunjukkan bahwa kontribusi supervisi akademik berbasis coaching terhadap kinerja guru sangat rendah, yaitu hanya sebesar 1,3%, sedangkan sebagian



besar variasi kinerja guru dipengaruhi oleh faktor lain di luar model penelitian. Temuan ini mengindikasikan bahwa supervisi akademik berbasis coaching belum secara langsung mampu meningkatkan kinerja guru, terutama apabila implementasinya belum dilakukan secara konsisten dan mendalam. Penelitian ini menegaskan bahwa efektivitas supervisi berbasis coaching bersifat kontekstual dan sangat dipengaruhi oleh kualitas pelaksanaan serta dukungan lingkungan organisasi sekolah.

**Kata Kunci :** Supervisi Akademik, *Coaching*, Kinerja Guru.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Teacher performance is a key factor in determining the quality of learning in secondary schools, as it directly influences the quality of both the learning process and student outcomes. Teachers with high performance are able to plan, implement, and evaluate instruction effectively and continuously. Various studies indicate that teacher performance is influenced not only by individual competence but also by the quality of professional development carried out systematically within the school environment (Soro, 2024; Hattie, 2015). Therefore, improving teacher performance requires structured and sustainable managerial support.

One form of professional development that plays a strategic role is academic supervision. Conceptually, academic supervision does not merely function as administrative control, but rather as a mentoring process aimed at improving the quality of teachers' instructional practices. However, several studies reveal that academic supervision in schools still tends to be administrative in nature and has not yet been able to drive significant changes in teaching practices (Nawas, 2023; Aswad & Yulidar, 2025). This condition indicates a gap between the ideal concept of academic supervision and its implementation in practice.

In response to these limitations, the coaching approach in academic supervision has emerged as a more collaborative and reflective alternative. Coaching-based academic supervision emphasizes professional partnerships between school principals and teachers through reflective dialogue, constructive feedback, and continuous follow-up. A number of studies show that coaching has a positive impact on improving teaching practices and teacher professionalism (Kraft et al., 2018; Sims et al., 2021). However, the effectiveness of this approach is not universal, as it is highly dependent on the quality of implementation and the organizational context of the school.

On the other hand, internal factors, particularly work motivation, also play an important role in determining teacher performance. Work motivation reflects both internal and external drives that influence teachers' commitment, discipline, and initiative in carrying out their professional duties (Ryan & Deci, 2020; Robbins & Judge, 2019). Teachers with high work motivation tend to be more open to change and professional development, while low motivation can hinder the effectiveness of various development programs, including academic supervision.

Previous studies generally indicate that coaching-based academic supervision and work motivation have a positive effect on teacher performance (Aswad & Yulidar, 2025; Soro, 2024). However, these findings are not entirely consistent, particularly when examined in schools with different characteristics. In other words, the effectiveness of coaching-based supervision still leaves room for empirical testing in more specific contexts.

Empirically, conditions at SMA Negeri 1 Amurang and SMA Negeri 1 Motoling show variations in the implementation of academic supervision and levels of teacher work motivation. Coaching-based academic supervision has begun to be implemented but has not yet been carried out consistently and comprehensively. Meanwhile, teacher work motivation varies, which affects the quality of instructional practices. These variations indicate a gap between the concept of coaching-based supervision and its practical implementation in schools.

Contrary to the general trend of previous research findings, the results of this study show that coaching-based academic supervision does not have a significant effect on teacher performance. This



finding confirms that the effectiveness of coaching-based supervision cannot be understood normatively as an approach that is always successful, but rather depends heavily on the quality of implementation, consistency, and contextual factors such as school leadership and organizational culture. Therefore, this study not only examines the effect of coaching-based supervision but also critically evaluates the general assumption regarding its effectiveness in educational practice.

Based on the gap between theoretical concepts, previous research findings, and the empirical results obtained, this study aims to analyze the effect of coaching-based academic supervision on teacher performance at SMA Negeri 1 Amurang and SMA Negeri 1 Motoling. This study is expected to provide theoretical contributions by clarifying the limitations of the effectiveness of coaching-based supervision, as well as practical contributions for schools in designing more contextual, realistic, and sustainable teacher development strategies.

## 2. RESEARCH METHOD

This study employed a quantitative approach with an explanatory design to examine the effect of coaching-based academic supervision on teacher performance. The research was conducted at SMA Negeri 1 Amurang and SMA Negeri 1 Motoling during the second semester of the 2025/2026 academic year.

The population consisted of 122 teachers, all of whom were included as the sample using a saturated sampling technique. The research variables included coaching-based academic supervision as the independent variable and teacher performance as the dependent variable. Teacher performance was measured based on aspects of lesson planning, implementation, and evaluation.

Data were collected using a Likert-scale questionnaire that had been tested for validity and reliability. Data analysis included descriptive analysis, prerequisite tests, and simple linear regression to examine the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable. Data processing was carried out using SPSS with a significance level of 0.05.

## 3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### 1. Description of Research Variables

The results of the descriptive analysis of coaching-based academic supervision variables at SMA Negeri 1 Amurang and SMA Negeri 1 Motoling are presented in the following table.

**Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Coaching-Based Academic Supervision**

School	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviasi
State Senior High School 1 Amurang	68	78	128	103.66	10.556
State Senior High School 1 Motoling	54	61	123	86.98	13.805

Based on the table above, the average score for coaching-based academic supervision at SMA Negeri 1 Amurang was 103.66 with a standard deviation of 10.556, while at SMA Negeri 1 Motoling it was 86.98 with a standard deviation of 13.805. This indicates a difference in the level of implementation of coaching-based academic supervision between the two schools.

To interpret these average scores, score category criteria were used, compiled based on the theoretical scores of the research instrument. The instrument consisted of 30 items with a Likert scale of 1–5, resulting in a minimum score of 30 and a maximum score of 150. The score range was then divided into five categories, as presented in the following table.

**Table 2. Criteria for Coaching-Based Academic Supervision Categories**

Score Range	Category
30 – 54	Very Low
55 – 78	Low
79 – 102	Currently
103 – 126	Tall



127 – 150	Very Tall
-----------	-----------

Based on these categorization criteria, the results of the average categorization of coaching-based academic supervision scores at the two schools are presented in the following table.

**Table 3. Categorization of Coaching-Based Academic Supervision**

Sekolah	Mean	Category
State Senior High School 1 Amurang	103.66	Tall
State Senior High School 1 Motoling	86.98	Currently

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the implementation of coaching-based academic supervision at SMA Negeri 1 Amurang is in the high category, while at SMA Negeri 1 Motoling it is in the moderate category.

These findings indicate that the implementation of coaching-based academic supervision at SMA Negeri 1 Amurang has been running relatively optimally, while at SMA Negeri 1 Motoling it is still not optimal and tends not to be implemented consistently. This difference indicates variations in the quality of coaching-based academic supervision implementation across educational units.

## 2. Analysis Prerequisite Test

### a. Normality Test

The normality test was conducted to determine whether the residual data in the regression model was normally distributed. The normality test in this study used the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. The results of the data normality test are presented in the following table.

**Table 4. Data Normality Test Results**

Data	N	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	Keterangan
Residual (State Senior High School 1 Amurang)	68	0.07	Normal
Residual (State Senior High School 1 Motoling)	54	0.099	Normal

Based on the table above, the significance value (Asymp. Sig. 2-tailed) for the residual data from SMA Negeri 1 Amurang is 0.070, while for SMA Negeri 1 Motoling it is 0.099. The decision-making criteria for the normality test are: if the significance value (Sig.) is greater than 0.05 (Sig. > 0.05), then the data are normally distributed. Conversely, if the significance value (Sig.) is less than 0.05 (Sig. < 0.05), then the data are not normally distributed. Therefore, because both significance values are greater than 0.05, it can be concluded that the residual data in both research groups are normally distributed. These results indicate that the regression model in this study meets one of the basic assumptions, namely the assumption of normality, allowing the analysis to proceed to the next stage.

### a. Linearity Test

The linearity test was conducted to determine whether the relationship between the independent variable, coaching-based academic supervision, and the dependent variable, teacher performance, is linear. This test is one of the assumptions that must be met before conducting a regression analysis.

The linearity test in this study was conducted using ANOVA analysis in SPSS. The results of the linearity test are presented in the following table.

**Table 5. Results of the Linearity Test of Academic Supervision on Teacher Performance**

School	Komponen	F	Sig.	Information
State Senior High School 1 Amurang	Linearity	0.737	0.397	Linear
	Deviation from Linearity	1.415	0.161	There are no deviations
	Linearity	0.074	0.788	Linear



State Senior High School 1 Motoling	Deviation from Linearity	1.728	0.105	There are no deviations
-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-------	-------	-------------------------

Based on the table above, the significance value for the Deviation from Linearity component for SMA Negeri 1 Amurang is 0.161 and for SMA Negeri 1 Motoling it is 0.105.

The decision-making criterion for the linearity test is that if the significance value for the Deviation from Linearity is greater than 0.05 (Sig. > 0.05), there is no deviation from linearity, and the relationship between the variables is considered linear.

Therefore, because both significance values are greater than 0.05, it can be concluded that there is no deviation from linearity. This indicates that the relationship between coaching-based academic supervision and teacher performance at both schools is linear.

Furthermore, the significance value for the Linearity component also indicates that the relationship between the two variables tends to follow a linear pattern, although it does not demonstrate strong significance. This indicates that the linear relationship is consistent, but the strength of the relationship between the variables still needs further examination through regression analysis.

With the fulfillment of this linearity assumption, the regression model in this study is deemed suitable for use in further analysis.

#### b. Heteroscedasticity Test

A heteroscedasticity test was conducted to determine whether there was inequality in the residual variances in the regression model. The test used was the Glejser test, which regresses the absolute value of the residuals against the independent variable, namely coaching-based academic supervision.

The results of the heteroscedasticity test are presented in the following table.

**Table 6. Heteroscedasticity Test Results (Glejser Test)**

School	Variable	Sig.	information
State Senior High School 1 Amurang	Coaching-Based Academic Supervision	0.164	There is no heteroscedasticity
State Senior High School 1 Motoling	Coaching-Based Academic Supervision	0.908	There is no heteroscedasticity

Based on the table above, the significance value of the coaching-based academic supervision variable at SMA Negeri 1 Amurang was 0.164 and at SMA Negeri 1 Motoling it was 0.908. Both values are greater than 0.05 (Sig. > 0.05).

This indicates that the coaching-based academic supervision variable does not significantly affect the absolute value of the residuals, thus indicating no heteroscedasticity in the regression models at either school.

Therefore, it can be concluded that the regression model in this study meets the assumption of homoscedasticity and is suitable for further analysis.

### 3. Hypothesis Test Results

The hypothesis test in this study was conducted to determine the effect of coaching-based academic supervision on teacher performance at SMA Negeri 1 Amurang and SMA Negeri 1 Motoling. Hypothesis testing was conducted using simple linear regression analysis, observing the significance value (Sig.) in the t-test. The results of the hypothesis testing are presented in the following table.

**Table 7. Hypothesis Test Results**

Variable	B	t	Sig.	Information
Coaching-Based Academic Supervision	0.113	1.246	0.215	Not significant

Based on the table above, a significance value of 0.215 was obtained ( $p > 0.05$ ). The results of the simple linear regression analysis indicate that coaching-based academic supervision did not significantly impact teacher performance at SMA Negeri 1 Amurang and SMA Negeri 1 Motoling. This



is indicated by a significance value greater than 0.05 ( $p > 0.05$ ), therefore, the hypothesis stating an effect cannot be accepted.

The regression coefficient value of 0.113 indicates a positive relationship between coaching-based academic supervision and teacher performance, but the effect is not statistically significant.

This finding suggests that an increase or decrease in the quality of coaching-based academic supervision does not directly lead to significant changes in teacher performance.

#### 4. Coefficient of Determination

The coefficient of determination is used to determine the extent to which the independent variable, namely coaching-based academic supervision, contributes to explaining the variation in the dependent variable, namely teacher performance. The results of the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) analysis are presented in the following table.

**Table 8. Coefficient of Determination ( $R^2$ )**

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error
0.113	0.013	0.005	13.756

Table 8 shows a coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) of 0.013. This indicates that coaching-based academic supervision only explains 1.3% of the variation in teacher performance, while 98.7% is influenced by factors other than the variables studied.

This low coefficient of determination indicates that the contribution of coaching-based academic supervision to teacher performance is low. Therefore, coaching-based academic supervision is not a primary factor influencing teacher performance in the context of this study.

This finding demonstrates that teacher performance is a complex phenomenon and is influenced not only by a single variable but also by various other factors, such as principal leadership, school organizational culture, teaching experience, teacher professional competence, and work environment conditions.

#### Discussion

The findings of this study indicate that coaching-based academic supervision does not have a significant effect on teacher performance at SMA Negeri 1 Amurang and SMA Negeri 1 Motoling. This suggests that the presence of coaching-based supervision has not been able to directly improve teacher performance, even though conceptually this approach is considered effective in various literature.

Empirically, the descriptive results show that coaching-based academic supervision at SMA Negeri 1 Amurang falls into the high category, while at SMA Negeri 1 Motoling it is in the moderate category. However, these differences in the level of implementation are not followed by statistically significant changes in teacher performance. In addition, the very low coefficient of determination ( $R^2 = 0.013$ ) indicates that coaching-based supervision contributes only 1.3% to the variation in teacher performance. This confirms that coaching-based supervision is not a dominant factor in determining teacher performance in this research context.

These findings differ from several previous studies that report a positive impact of coaching on improving instructional practices and teacher performance (Kraft et al., 2018; Sims et al., 2021; Garet et al., 2021). However, other studies suggest that the effectiveness of coaching is highly dependent on the quality of implementation, the intensity of interaction, and organizational support within schools (Prenger et al., 2019; Desimone & Pak, 2022). Therefore, this study reinforces the view that coaching is not universally effective, but rather highly contextual.

In this study, coaching-based academic supervision has not been fully implemented in accordance with ideal coaching principles, such as reflective dialogue, professional partnership, and continuous feedback (Knight & van Nieuwerburgh, 2019). In practice, supervision still tends to be procedural and has not yet encouraged deep reflection on teaching practices. This condition limits the ability of coaching to produce significant changes in teacher performance.

Furthermore, contextual factors such as time constraints, high administrative workload, and limited organizational support also affect the effectiveness of coaching implementation. Teachers with



heavy workloads tend to lack sufficient time for in-depth professional reflection. This is consistent with the findings of Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2017) and Garet et al. (2021), which show that the effectiveness of professional development is strongly influenced by working conditions and institutional support.

From a theoretical perspective, these findings can be explained through Self-Determination Theory, which emphasizes that changes in professional behavior are influenced by intrinsic motivation developed through the fulfillment of needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Ryan & Deci, 2020). Coaching that does not provide sufficient opportunities for deep reflection and fails to build strong professional relationships tends to be less effective in enhancing teacher motivation and performance.

Moreover, the low contribution of coaching-based supervision to teacher performance indicates that teacher performance is a multidimensional phenomenon influenced by various other factors, such as school leadership, professional competence, teaching experience, and school organizational culture (Day & Gu, 2014; Hattie, 2015; Leithwood et al., 2021). Therefore, coaching-based supervision should not be positioned as the sole strategy for improving teacher performance, but rather integrated with other more comprehensive approaches.

The differences between SMA Negeri 1 Amurang and SMA Negeri 1 Motoling also highlight the importance of school context in determining the effectiveness of academic supervision. This further confirms that the same approach does not necessarily produce uniform outcomes across different environments.

Thus, this study makes an important contribution by critically examining the common assumption that coaching-based academic supervision is always effective in improving teacher performance. The findings emphasize that the effectiveness of coaching depends heavily on the quality of implementation, consistency, and the support of the school's organizational context.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

Based on the research objectives, it can be concluded that coaching-based academic supervision does not have a significant effect on teacher performance at SMA Negeri 1 Amurang and SMA Negeri 1 Motoling. This finding indicates that the presence of coaching-based supervision has not automatically improved teacher performance, particularly when its implementation has not been carried out consistently, systematically, and in depth.

In addition, the low contribution of coaching-based supervision to teacher performance suggests that teacher performance is more strongly influenced by other factors, such as professional competence, school leadership, and organizational culture. This confirms that improving teacher performance cannot rely on a single developmental approach, but rather requires more comprehensive and integrated strategies. Thus, this study emphasizes that the effectiveness of coaching-based academic supervision is contextual and highly dependent on the quality of implementation as well as the support of the school's organizational system.

#### 5. REFERENCES

- Campbell, P. F., & Malkus, N. N. (2011). The impact of elementary mathematics coaches on student achievement. *The Elementary School Journal*, 111(3), 430–454. <https://doi.org/10.1086/657654>
- Cordingley, P., Higgins, S., & Greany, T. (2023). *Developing great teaching: Professional learning and development*. Education Development Trust.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2022). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute.
- Day, C., & Gu, Q. (2014). *Resilient teachers, resilient schools: Building and sustaining quality in testing times*. Routledge.
- Desimone, L. M., & Pak, K. (2022). *Instructional coaching and teacher change*. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*. <https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737221082123>



- Garet, M. S., Wayne, A. J., Stancavage, F., Taylor, J., & Walters, K. (2021). The impact of coaching on teacher practice. *American Educational Research Journal*.  
<https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312211000000>
- Hattie, J. (2015). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.
- Knight, J., & van Nieuwerburgh, C. (2019). *Instructional coaching: A partnership approach to improving instruction*. Corwin.
- Kraft, M. A., Blazar, D., & Hogan, D. (2018). The effect of teacher coaching on instruction and achievement: A meta-analysis of the causal evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 88(4), 547–588. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654318759268>
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2021). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 41(1–2), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077>
- O'Reilly, M., & Langelotz, L. (2019). Coaching as a professional development approach in education. *Professional Development in Education*, 45(3), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2018.1529610>
- Pas, E. T., Bradshaw, C. P., & Hershfeldt, P. A. (2015). Teacher coaching in schools: Improving teacher practices and student outcomes. *School Psychology Review*, 44(1), 3–19. <https://doi.org/10.17105/spr-44-1-3-19>
- Prenger, R., Poortman, C. L., & Handelzalts, A. (2019). Factors influencing teachers' professional development in learning communities. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 86, 102909. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.102909>
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2019). *Organizational behavior* (18th ed.). Pearson.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective. Springer.
- Sims, S., Fletcher-Wood, H., O'Mara-Eves, A., Cottingham, S., Stansfield, C., Van Herwegen, J., & Anders, J. (2021). What are the characteristics of teacher professional development that increase pupil achievement? Education Endowment Foundation.
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2017). Motivation and teacher burnout. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 67, 152–160. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.06.006>
- Nawas, N. (2023). Supervisi akademik dan peningkatan kinerja guru. *Jurnal Pendidikan*.
- Soro, S. (2024). Kinerja guru dan faktor-faktor yang memengaruhinya. *Jurnal Pendidikan*.