

The Influence of Academic Supervision and Its Skills of Teachers on the Performance of High School Teachers in Sape District, Indonesia

Triyani, Triyani; Makki, Muhammad; Mustari, Mohamad; Setiadi, Dadi; Fahrudin, Fahrudin

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Triyani, T., Makki, M., Mustari, M., Setiadi, D., & Fahrudin, F. (2024). The Influence of Academic Supervision and Its Skills of Teachers on the Performance of High School Teachers in Sape District, Indonesia. *Path of Science*, 10(5), 3061-3069. <https://doi.org/10.22178/pos.104-6>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY Lizenz (Namensnennung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.de>

Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY Licence (Attribution). For more information see: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

The Influence of Academic Supervision and Its Skills of Teachers on the Performance of High School Teachers in Sape District, Indonesia

Triyani ¹, Muhammad Makki ¹, Mohamad Mustari ¹, Dadi Setiadi ¹, Fahrudin ¹

¹ *University of Mataram*

Jl. Majapahit No 62 Mataram, Nusa Tenggara Barat, Indonesia

DOI: [10.22178/pos.104-6](https://doi.org/10.22178/pos.104-6)

LCC Subject Category: L7-991

Received 15.04.2024


Accepted 28.05.2024

Published online 31.05.2024

Corresponding Author:

Triyani

triyanitris58@gmail.com

© 2024 The Authors. This article is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) 

Abstract. This research aims to determine 1) The influence of academic supervision by the school principal on the performance of high school teachers in Sape District, 2) The influence of IT skills of teachers on the performance of high school teachers in Sape District, 3) The influence of academic supervision and IT skills of teachers on the performance of high school teachers in Sape District. This research will be conducted at public high schools in Sape District from March to May 2023. The research adopts a quantitative approach with an ex post facto design, which investigates events that have already occurred. The population in this research includes all permanent teachers (GT) in three public high schools in Sape District. The total number of GTs is 152 individuals, and the sample in this research consists of 60 permanent teachers. The findings of this research are as follows: 1) There is a partial influence of academic supervision by the school principal on the performance of teachers by 89%, 2) There is a partial influence of IT skills of teachers on the performance of teachers by 11%, 3) Simultaneously, academic supervision and IT skills of teachers by the school principal have an influence on the performance of teachers by 98%. The findings regarding academic supervision by the school principal that affects teachers' performance in public high schools in the Sape District indicate that academic supervision conducted by the school principal is one of the critical factors that can influence teacher performance. The IT skills of teachers that affect teachers' performance in public high schools in Sape District show that the IT skills applied by teachers are one of the critical factors that can influence teacher performance.

Keywords: Influence of Academic Supervision; Teacher IT Ability; Teacher Performance.

INTRODUCTION

In the era of rapid information technology development, education is one of the sectors undergoing significant transformation. Academic supervision and teachers' information technology (IT) skills are two critical factors in ensuring the effectiveness of education. However, there have not been many comprehensive studies exploring the influence of academic supervision and teachers' IT skills on teacher performance at the high school level.

Education is the foundation of building a quality society, and teacher performance plays a central role in achieving this goal. In this context, academic supervision and teachers' information

technology skills are essential interconnected elements that, if managed well, can positively influence teacher performance.

Academic supervision serves as a driver of performance improvement because it encompasses various activities such as monitoring, guidance, and professional development to improve teaching quality. Through this approach, teachers can receive constructive feedback and support in overcoming learning challenges and developing relevant pedagogical skills. Academic supervision creates an environment where reflection and continuous improvement become integral to teaching

practice, thus significantly improving teacher performance.

Teachers' information technology skills are vital to integrating technology into learning in the digital transformation era. Teachers with IT skills can create more dynamic and relevant learning experiences, facilitate access to information, and stimulate student creativity. Furthermore, teachers' IT skills can also improve classroom and administrative management efficiency, unlock new potential in delivering learning materials, and foster student engagement.

The synergy between Academic Supervision and Teachers' IT Skills creates a solid foundation for improving teacher performance. Academic supervision integrated with technology utilisation can provide more accurate data regarding teaching practices, facilitate identifying professional development needs, and accelerate teachers' adaptation to technology-based education developments. Thus, academic supervision and teachers' IT skills create a dynamic, results-oriented learning environment.

The increased performance of teachers due to academic supervision and IT proficiency impacts individual performance and the overall quality of learning. Teachers who are continuously empowered through supervision and effectively utilise technology can create more interactive, relevant, and motivating learning experiences, thus positively impacting student achievement.

Combining academic supervision and teachers' IT skills allows for broader educational transformation. Teachers' success in facing modern education dynamics will ensure the emergence of skilled, innovative, and globally competitive generations. Therefore, understanding and effectively implementing academic supervision and teachers' IT skills are imperative to achieve quality and sustainable educational goals.

Education is the foundation of building a quality society, and teacher performance plays a central role in achieving this goal. In this context, academic supervision and teachers' information technology skills are essential interconnected elements that, if managed well, can positively influence teacher performance.

School principals also play an essential role in helping teachers improve their performance as supervisors. School principals, as supervisors, are obligated to provide guidance and mentoring to

teachers or other educational personnel and administrators. Authors [1] reinforce this by stating: "Daily activities show that the school principal is indeed the key to the continuity of the education process in the school. From supervising teachers, checking teaching preparations, handling letters, receiving guests, attending meetings outside the school, and others are the duties of the school principal."

Supervision conducted by school principals has functions of oversight and continuous gradual mentoring. Authors [2] stated that the objectives of oversight are 1) to ensure that tasks are carried out by established provisions, procedures, and instructions; 2) to ensure that the results achieved are in line with the established objectives; 3) to ensure that available resources can be effectively and efficiently utilised; 4) to identify organisational weaknesses and difficulties and seek improvement solutions. Meanwhile, mentoring entails providing guidance or concerning the supervisor's task of mentoring teachers to improve the quality of learning, thus ultimately enhancing student learning achievement.

Performance means something achieved, work capability, or demonstrated achievement [3]. The author [4] defines performance as a person's success in carrying out a task. Lawler and Porter assert that performance is "successful role achievement" obtained from one's actions. From these definitions, performance can be understood as the result achieved by an individual according to the standards applicable to the relevant job.

Teacher performance is a teacher's work, which results in carrying out assigned tasks based on competence, experience, dedication, and time [5]. The measure of a teacher's performance is seen in their sense of responsibility in carrying out the trust of their profession the moral obligation on their shoulders. This will be evident in their obedience and loyalty in carrying out their teaching duties.

Teacher performance is defined as the ability of a teacher based on knowledge, attitude, skills, capabilities, and motivation in carrying out professional tasks of educating, teaching, guiding, directing, training, and evaluating students. Factors affecting performance include 1) mental attitude (work motivation, work discipline, work ethics); 2) education; 3) skills; 4) leadership management; 5) income level; 6) salary and health; 7) social security guarantee; 8) work

climate; 9) facilities and infrastructure; 10) technology; 11) achievement opportunities.

Leadership management factors that cause low teacher performance include school principal supervision and supervision from subject supervisors or educational units. If teacher performance is not improved, it will impact the quality of education. The low Human Development Index (HDI) in Indonesia currently prompts the government to improve the quality of education. Efforts should be made to enhance and improve teacher performance within educational institutions to improve HDI in the education sector.

Based on initial observations of teacher performance conducted at SMA Negeri 1 Sape, SMA Negeri 2 Sape, and SMA Negeri 3 Sape in Sape District, it is evident that Academic Observation of teachers is not optimal. This can be seen from the fact that some teachers still enter class late, have inadequate lesson preparation and have messy classroom administration. On the other hand, the level of IT proficiency among teachers also does not show optimal results, as evidenced by the evaluation of suboptimal student learning outcomes and the lack of student response to the teaching methods applied in SMA Negeri in Sape District.

The results of teachers' performance in the learning process are the outcomes of a teacher's work, both in terms of quality and quantity, in carrying out tasks according to their responsibilities and authority based on established performance standards. Teacher performance at schools is a crucial issue. It requires every school to arrange and make improvements according to spatial and temporal dimensions, especially for schools designated to carry out their core functions and duties in a disciplined and timely manner. This demand is a global trend that must be met, whether willingly or unwillingly, to align teacher performance at schools, accelerating external changes using various approaches. Efforts to improve teacher performance at schools continue by enhancing the quality of teachers, improving human resource capabilities in solving multiple problems, and increasing the institution's responsibility towards issues and demands from within the educational institution itself and external sources.

Principal supervision and IT Gurus' abilities are crucial factors in improving teacher performance

and will affect the school's achievement of its goals. Principal supervision can lead the group or organisation towards success or failure in achieving the established goals. Principal supervision significantly influences the behaviour of its followers.

METHOD

This research will be conducted at High Schools in Sape District for three months from March to May 2023. This research uses a quantitative approach with an ex post facto design, which is research conducted to examine events and then retrospectively analyse the factors that may have caused those events [6]. The researcher cannot directly control the independent variables because the events have already occurred and cannot be manipulated. The independent variables in this study are academic supervision and IT Guru's abilities, with the dependent variable being teacher performance.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the researcher first describes the conditions of public high schools in Sape District based on the variables studied before the researcher describes the research data. There are three public high schools in Sape District, with 152 permanent teachers.

Of the three senior high schools in Sape District, each is located in Rai Oi 1 Village, namely SMA 2 Sape, SMAN 1 Sape in Bugis Village, and SMA 3 Sape in Buncu Village.

Research conducted at 3 State High Schools in Sape District focused on Permanent Teachers (GT) with a population of 152 people and a sample size of 60 people with the following details: SMAN 1 Sape with a sample of 23 respondents; SMAN 2 Sape with a sample of 19 respondents; SMAN 3 Sape with a sample of 18 respondents.

Next, the researcher describes the research data regarding three research variables, namely Academic Supervision variables (X1), Teacher IT Capabilities (X2), and Teacher Performance (Y), as follows:

1. Principal Academic Supervision Variable (X1). Data on the Principal Academic Supervision variable (X1) consists of three sub-indicators:

1) planning supervision, 2) carrying out supervision, 3) follow-up supervision. To find out the response to each statement item from each of the following sub-indicator tables:

1.1. *Planning Academic Supervision.* Data on the indicator "planning academic supervision" can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1 – Indicator "planning supervision"

Score	Response	Statement Item Number									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	TP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	KK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	SR	17	18	14	14	16	10	11	31	50	19
4	SL	43	42	46	46	44	50	49	29	10	41

Notes: TP – Never; KK – Sometimes; SR – Often; SL – Always.

Table 1 shows data from 60 respondents answering each indicator statement "planning supervision" as follows: the first statement item located at statement 1 of the lesson, with code X1.1 showing the results that no respondents responded disagree, no respondents responded sometimes, 17 respondents responded often, and 43 respondents responded always.

Furthermore, respondents' responses regarding the purpose of supervision are clearly stated in the supervision program, indicated by item 2 with code X1.2. It can be seen from the reactions that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 18 respondents responded often, and 42 respondents responded always. Respondents' responses regarding whether the supervisor schedules supervision are shown by item 3 with code X1.3. It can be seen from the reactions that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 14 respondents responded often, and 46 respondents responded always. Moving on to respondents' responses regarding whether the supervision methods are clearly stated in the supervision program, indicated by item 4 with code X1.4, it can be seen from the reactions that no respondents responded often, 14 respondents responded sometimes, and 46 respondents responded always.

Then, respondents' responses regarding whether supervision is conducted using appropriate instruments for what will be measured are shown by item 5 with code X1.5. It can be seen from the reactions that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 16 respondents responded often,

and 44 respondents responded always. Furthermore, respondents' responses regarding whether the instrument items are easily understood are shown by item 6 with code X1.6. It can be seen from the reactions that no respondents responded never and sometimes, ten respondents responded often, and 50 respondents responded always. Respondents' responses regarding whether the aspects to be measured in the lesson plans are stated in the supervision instrument are shown by item 7 with code X1.7. It can be seen from the responses that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 11 respondents responded often, and 49 respondents responded always.

Respondents' responses regarding the need for teachers to be the top priority in supervision activities are shown by item 8 with code X1.8. It can be seen from the reactions that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 31 respondents responded often, and 29 respondents responded always. Respondents' responses regarding whether supervision is conducted according to the school's academic calendar are shown by item 9 with code X1.9. It can be seen from the reactions that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 50 respondents responded often, and ten respondents responded always. Respondents' responses regarding whether supervisor activities are conducted to help teachers improve their teaching performance are shown by item 10 with code X1.10. It can be seen from the reactions that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 19 respondents responded often, and 41 respondents responded always.

1.2. *Implementation of Academic Supervision.* The indicator data for "implementation of academic supervision" can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2 – Indicator "implementation of academic supervision"

Score	Res- ponse	Statement Item Number																							
		11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24										
1	TP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0										
2	KK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0											
3	SR	32	27	32	33	31	28	32	30	20	30	20	19	23	22										
4	SL	28	33	28	27	29	32	28	30	40	30	40	41	37	38										

Notes: TP – Never; KK – Sometimes; SR – Often; SL – Always.

Table 2 shows data from 60 respondents answering each indicator statement "planning

supervision" as follows: the first statement item located at statement 1 of the lesson, with code X1.1 showing the results that no respondents responded disagree, no respondents responded sometimes, 17 respondents responded often, and 43 respondents responded always.

Furthermore, respondents' responses regarding the purpose of supervision are clearly stated in the supervision program, indicated by item 2 with code X1.2. It can be seen from the reactions that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 18 respondents responded often, and 42 respondents responded always. Respondents' responses regarding whether the supervisor schedules supervision are shown by item 3 with code X1.3. It can be seen from the reactions that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 14 respondents responded often, and 46 respondents responded always. Moving on to respondents' responses regarding whether the supervision methods are clearly stated in the supervision program, indicated by item 4 with code X1.4, it can be seen from the reactions that no respondents responded often, 14 respondents responded sometimes, and 46 respondents responded always.

Then, respondents' responses regarding whether supervision is conducted using appropriate instruments for what will be measured are shown by item 5 with code X1.5. It can be seen from the reactions that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 16 respondents responded often, and 44 respondents responded always. Furthermore, respondents' responses regarding whether the instrument items are easily understood are shown by item 6 with code X1.6. It can be seen from the reactions that no respondents responded never and sometimes, ten respondents responded often, and 50 respondents responded always. Respondents' responses regarding whether the aspects to be measured in the lesson plans are stated in the supervision instrument are shown by item 7 with code X1.7. It can be seen from the responses that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 11 respondents responded often, and 49 respondents responded always.

Respondents' responses regarding the need for teachers to be the top priority in supervision activities are shown by item 8 with code X1.8. It can be seen from the reactions that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 31 respondents responded often, and 29

respondents responded always. Respondents' responses regarding whether supervision is conducted according to the school's academic calendar are shown by item 9 with code X1.9. It can be seen from the reactions that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 50 respondents responded often, and 10 respondents responded always. Respondents' responses regarding whether supervisor activities are conducted to help teachers improve their teaching performance are shown by item 10 with code X1.10. It can be seen from the responses that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 19 respondents responded often, and 41 respondents responded always.

Lastly, respondents' responses regarding whether supervision helps teachers formulate teaching objectives to improve teaching and learning processes are indicated by item 23 with code X1.23. It can be seen from the responses that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 23 respondents responded often, and 37 respondents responded always. Respondents' reactions regarding whether supervision helps teachers develop lesson plans to enhance teaching administration skills are indicated by item 24 with code X1.24. It can be seen from the responses that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 22 respondents responded often, and 38 respondents responded always.

1.3. *Following up on Academic Supervision.* Data on the indicator "following up on supervision" can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3 - Indicator "Following Up on Academic Supervision"

Score	Res- ponse	Statement Item Number															
		25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37			
1	TP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2	KK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
3	SR	16	21	18	18	17	18	14	14	16	10	11	31	50			
4	SL	44	39	42	42	43	42	46	46	44	50	49	29	10			

Notes: TP – Never; KK – Sometimes; SR – Often; SL – Always.

Table 3 shows information from 60 respondents answering each indicator statement "following up on supervision", namely the first statement item located in statement 16 states that the supervisor collaborates with teachers in determining student learning activity observation strategies, with code X1.25 indicating the results where no

respondents gave a response of sometimes, 16 respondents responded often, and 44 respondents responded always.

Furthermore, respondents' responses regarding whether the supervisor provides solutions to teachers experiencing issues evaluating students are indicated by item 26 with code X1.26. It can be seen from the reactions that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 21 respondents responded often, and 39 respondents responded always. Respondents' responses regarding whether the supervisor collects observation teaching data as problem data in the teacher's faced challenges and discusses solutions are indicated by item 27 with code X1.27. It can be seen from the responses that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 18 respondents responded often, and 42 respondents responded always. Respondents' responses regarding whether the supervisor creates a list of potential teacher behaviour problems and discusses solutions with the respective teachers are indicated by item 28 with code X1.28. It can be seen from the responses that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 18 respondents responded often, and 42 respondents responded always. Respondents' responses regarding whether the supervisor provides solutions for teachers experiencing difficulties in teaching and learning processes are indicated by item 29 with code X1.29. It can be seen from the responses that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 17 respondents responded often, and 43 respondents responded always.

Next, respondents' responses regarding whether the supervisor identifies issues in teaching and learning processes and discusses them are indicated by item 30 with code X1.30. It can be seen from the responses that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 18 respondents responded often, and 42 respondents responded always. Respondents' reactions regarding whether supervision monitors the use of media, aids, and learning resources used by teachers during teaching and learning processes are indicated by item 31 with code X1.31. It can be seen from the responses that no respondents answered never and sometimes, 14 respondents answered often, and 46 respondents answered always.

Respondents' responses regarding whether the supervisor guides teachers to develop students' potential are indicated by item 32 with code

X1.32. It can be seen from the reactions that no respondents answered never and sometimes, 14 respondents answered often, and 46 respondents answered always. Respondents' responses regarding whether supervision guides teachers in developing self-potential are indicated by item 33 with code X1.33. It can be seen from the reactions that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 16 respondents responded often, and 44 respondents responded always. Respondents' responses regarding supervision guiding and motivating teachers in developing information technology for learning are indicated by item 34 with code X1.34. It can be seen from the reactions that no respondents gave responses of never and sometimes, 10 for often, and 50 for always.

Lastly, respondents' responses regarding supervision assessing teachers during teaching and learning processes are indicated by item 35 with code X1.35. It can be seen from the reactions that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 11 respondents responded often, and 49 respondents responded always. Respondents' responses regarding supervision identifying issues in teaching and learning processes and discussing them are indicated by item 36 with code X1.36. It can be seen from the reactions that no respondents responded never, and sometimes, 31 responses answered often, and 29 responses answered always. Respondents' reactions regarding the supervisor making notes of issues found during supervision and discussing them are indicated by item 37 with code X1.37. It can be seen from the responses that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 50 responded often, and ten responded always.

2. Teacher IT Capability Variable (X₂).

2.1. *Integrity of technology in teaching.* Table 4 presents data information from 79 respondents answering each question indicator "integrity of technology in teaching", namely the first question item located in statement 1 states whether supervision socialises the program at the beginning of the academic year, with code X2.1 indicating the results where no respondents gave a response of disagree, no respondents gave a response of sometimes, 33 respondents responded often, and 46 respondents responded always.

Table 4 – Technology integration in teaching

Score	Response	Statement Item Number							
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	TP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	KK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

3	SR	16	31	25	31	32	30	27	30
4	SL	44	29	35	29	28	30	33	30

Notes: TP – Never; KK – Sometimes; SR – Often; SL – Always.

Furthermore, respondents' responses regarding whether the objectives and methods of supervision are clearly stated in the supervision program are indicated by item 2 with code X2.2. It can be seen from the responses that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 36 respondents responded often, and 43 respondents responded always. Respondents' reactions regarding whether supervision schedules are created are indicated by item 3 with code X2.3. It can be seen from the responses that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 41 respondents responded often, and 38 respondents responded always. Respondents' reactions regarding whether supervision is carried out according to the measured instrument are indicated by item 4 with code X2.4. It can be seen from the responses that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 29 respondents responded often, and 50 respondents responded always.

Next, respondents' responses regarding whether the items used during supervision are easy to understand are indicated by item 5 with code X2.5. It can be seen from the reactions that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 42 respondents responded often, and 37 respondents responded always. Respondents' responses regarding whether the needs of teachers are the top priority in supervision activities are indicated by item 6 with code X2.6. It can be seen from the reactions that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 30 respondents responded often, and 49 respondents responded always. Respondents' responses regarding whether supervision is conducted according to the school's academic calendar are indicated by item 7 with code X2.7. It can be seen from the reactions that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 40 respondents responded often, and 39 respondents responded always.

The last respondents' responses regarding whether supervision is conducted according to the school's academic calendar are indicated by item 8 with code X2.8. It can be seen from the reactions that no respondents responded never or

sometimes, 53 respondents responded often, and 26 respondents responded always.

2.2. Carry out supervision of Teacher IT Capabilities. Data on the indicator "carrying out supervision" can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5 – Indicator "carrying out supervision"

Score	Response	Statement Item Number											
		9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
	TP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	KK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	SR	28	17	27	19	16	21	20	14	17	15	16	15
4	SL	32	43	33	41	44	39	40	46	53	45	44	45

Notes: TP - Never, KK - Sometimes, SR – Often; SL – Always.

Table 5 shows data information on the distribution of 60 respondents answering each statement indicator "conducting supervision" The first statement item located in statement 9 states whether supervision ensures the availability of a special place to store teacher teaching aids, with code X2.9 indicating the results where no respondents gave a response of disagree or sometimes, 39 respondents responded often, and 21 respondents responded always.

Furthermore, respondents' responses regarding whether supervision ensures teachers have syllabi, lesson plans (RPP), and instruments as learning guidelines are indicated by item 10 with code X2.10. It can be seen from the responses that no respondents gave a response of disagreement, and sometimes, 39 respondents responded often, and 21 respondents responded always. Respondents' reactions regarding whether supervision ensures teachers have an annual program book (PROTA) are indicated by item 11 with code X2.11. It can be seen from the responses that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 28 respondents responded often, and 32 respondents responded always. Respondents' reactions regarding whether supervision ensures that teachers have a semester program (PROMES) are indicated by item 12 with code X2.12. It can be seen from the responses that no respondents responded never or sometimes, 40 respondents responded often, and 20 respondents responded always.

Next, respondents' responses regarding whether supervision ensures that teachers have Minimum Competency Criteria (KKM) for each subject are indicated by item 13 with code X2.13. It can be

seen from the responses that no respondents responded never or sometimes, 24 respondents responded often, and 36 respondents responded always. Respondents' reactions regarding whether supervision ensures that teachers have a student attendance list (absenteeism) are indicated by item 14 with code X2.14. It can be seen from the responses that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 37 respondents responded often, and 23 respondents responded always. Respondents' reactions regarding whether supervision ensures that teachers have a list of student learning outcomes are indicated by item 15 with code X2.15. It can be seen from the responses that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 38 respondents responded often, and 22 respondents responded always.

Respondents' responses regarding whether supervision ensures that teachers have a collection of test questions used are indicated by item 16 with code X2.16. It can be seen from the reactions that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 20 respondents responded often, and 40 respondents responded always. Respondents' reactions regarding whether supervision ensures teachers have teaching materials are indicated by item 17 with code X2.17. It can be seen from the responses that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 39 respondents responded often, and 21 respondents responded always.

Furthermore, respondents' responses regarding whether supervision ensures that teachers have a program book for student improvement for those who experience learning difficulties are indicated by item 18 with code X2.18. It can be seen from the responses that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 40 respondents responded often, and 20 respondents responded always. Respondents' reactions regarding whether supervision guides teachers in developing teaching materials according to the characteristics of the material and the learning model to be integrated are indicated by item 19 with code X2.19. It can be seen from the responses that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 39 respondents responded often, and 21 respondents responded always. Respondents' reactions regarding whether supervision guides teachers in preparing syllabi and lesson plans (RPP) are indicated by item 20 with code X2.20. It can be seen from the responses that no respondents responded never and sometimes, 25 respondents responded often, and 35 respondents responded always. Respondents'

reactions regarding whether supervision guides teachers in preparing teaching aids are indicated by item 21 with code X2.21. It can be seen from the reactions that no respondents gave a response of disagreement, and sometimes, 37 respondents responded often, and 23 respondents responded always.

The last respondents' responses regarding whether supervision guides teachers with a professional approach are indicated by item 22 with code X2.22. It can be seen from the reactions that no respondents responded to disagreement; sometimes, 20 respondents responded often, and 40 respondents responded always.

2.3. *Following up on Teachers' IT Capabilities.* Data on the indicator "following up on supervision" can be seen in Table 6.

Table 6 – Indicator "Following Up on Teacher IT Capabilities"

Score	Response	Statement Item Number								
		21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
1	TP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	KK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	SR	17	11	13	14	9	8	31	25	15
4	SL	43	49	47	46	51	52	29	35	45

Notes: TP – Never; KK – Sometimes; SR – Often; SL – Always.

Table 6 shows data distribution information with 60 respondents answering each statement indicator "follow-up supervision", namely the first statement item different in statement 23 states whether supervision provides solutions for teachers experiencing difficulties in teaching and learning activities, with code X2.23 indicating the results where 0 respondents disagreed, no respondents answered sometimes, 19 respondents answered often, and 41 respondents answered always.

Furthermore, respondents' responses regarding whether supervision discusses the results of supervision with teachers are indicated by item 24 with code X2.24. It can be seen from the reactions that no respondents answered never and sometimes, 26 respondents answered often, and 34 respondents answered always. Respondents' responses regarding whether supervision discusses the list of preparations not brought by teachers in the classroom are indicated by item 25 with code X2.25. It can be seen from the responses that no respondents answered never and sometimes, 41 respondents

answered often, and 19 respondents answered always. Respondents' reactions regarding whether supervision seeks solutions with teachers to address problems found during supervision are indicated by item 26 with code X2.26. It can be seen from the responses that no respondents answered never and sometimes, 31 respondents answered often, and 29 respondents answered always.

The last respondents' responses regarding whether supervision provides solutions to teachers with difficulty teaching are indicated by item 27 with code X2.27. It can be seen from the reactions that no respondents answered never and sometimes, 43 respondents answered often, and 17 respondents answered always.

CONCLUSIONS

REFERENCES

1. Fathurohman, P., & Suryana, A. (2011). *Supervisi Pendidikan dalam Pengembangan Proses Pengajaran* [Educational Supervision in the Development of the Teaching Process]. Bandung: Refika Aditama (in Indonesian).
2. Jasmani, A., & Mustofa, S. (2013). *Supervisi Pendidikan: Terobosan Baru Dalam Peningkatan Kinerja Pengawas Sekolah dan Guru* [Education Supervision: New Breakthroughs in Improving the Performance of School Supervisors and Teachers]. Yogyakarta: ArRuzz Media (in Indonesian).
3. Fatmi, A. (2009). *Supervisi Akademik dalam Rangka Peningkatan Profesionalisme Guru* [Academic Supervision to Improve Teacher Professionalism]. Retrieved from <https://osf.io/9bd23/download> (in Indonesian).
4. As'ad, M. (1991). *Psikologi Industri* [Industrial Psychology]. Yogyakarta: Liberty (in Indonesian).
5. Malayu, S. (1997). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia: Dasar dan Kunci Keberhasilan* [Human Resource Management: Fundamentals and Keys to Success]. Jakarta: Toko Gunung Agung (in Indonesian).
6. Sugiyono. (2016). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan: Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D* [Education Research Methods: Quantitative, Qualitative and R&D Approaches]. Bandung: Alfabeta (in Indonesian).

Based on the results of the research and discussion that have been conducted, this study can conclude that partially, there is an influence of academic supervision by the school principal on teacher performance of 89%. This occurs because the school principal conducts academic supervision of teachers in managing learning, starting from planning supervision, implementing supervision, following up on supervision routinely, and providing monitoring and guidance with good communication. And there is an influence of IT Guru's ability on teacher performance of 11%. This occurs because teachers with IT skills can conduct learning well through integrating technology in teaching and developing learning materials digitally, as well as monitoring and evaluating digitally, which can positively impact teacher performance.