Journal of General Education and Humanities
Vol. 5, No. 5, October 2026, pp. 7137 – 7164, https://doi.org/10.58421/gehu.v5i5.2140
ISSN 2963-7147

Comparison of Conventional and Modern Supervision Models in Educational Institutions

Bambang Ismaya[1], Salahuddin[2]
[1,2]Singaperbangsa Karawang University, Karawang, Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:

Received 2026-09-14
Revised 2026-10-27
Accepted 2026-10-29

Keywords:

Clinical Supervision
Collaborative Supervision
Conventional Supervision
Educational Supervision
Modern Supervision

ABSTRACT

Educational supervision has increasingly emphasized collaboration, reflective practice, and continuous professional development. However, the extent to which these principles are reflected in supervisory practices remains unclear, particularly where supervision continues to prioritize administrative compliance, hierarchical relationships, and performance evaluation. This study aims to synthesize the characteristics, contributions, and limitations of conventional and modern supervision in school settings and to develop an integrative perspective that connects procedural accountability with collaborative professional learning. An integrative literature review was conducted using a qualitative comparative approach. Five scholarly articles identified as relevant to educational supervision were examined, although the available methodological information does not specify the databases, search strategy, publication period, or selection criteria. The articles were analyzed using a comparative thematic framework covering supervisory orientation, supervisor-teacher relationships, communication, techniques, feedback, technology-supported activities, and follow-up. The synthesis indicates that conventional supervision provides procedural consistency, standardized indicators, and accountability, but may become predominantly evaluative when teacher participation and developmental feedback are limited. Modern supervision emphasizes dialogue, reflection, collaboration, and ongoing competency development, although its implementation depends on supervisor readiness, organizational culture, available time, and institutional resources. Clinical and collaborative supervision are interpreted as potentially integrative approaches that retain structured observation and evaluation while strengthening teacher involvement and reflective feedback. Digital tools may support observation records, documentation, feedback, and follow-up, but their contribution depends on how they are used rather than on technology itself. This review proposes an integrative supervision perspective that combines the procedural strengths of conventional supervision with the developmental principles of modern approaches. For school leaders and supervisors, the findings highlight the importance of aligning clear standards and accountability with collaborative dialogue and sustained professional learning. Given the limited number of articles and the incomplete reporting of the search procedure, these conclusions should be interpreted as a conceptual synthesis rather than evidence of comparative effectiveness.

This is an open-access article under the CC BY-SA license.

Corresponding Author:

Bambang Ismaya
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Educational Administration Study Program, Universitas Singaperbangsa Karawang, Karawang, Indonesia
Email: bambang.ismaya@fkip.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

The quality of educational supervision plays a crucial role in strengthening teacher competencies and improving the quality of classroom learning. Effective supervision enables teachers to develop their pedagogical and professional competencies through constructive feedback, reflective practice, and continuous professional development. However, the contribution of supervision to educational improvement depends largely on how it is implemented. When supervision focuses primarily on administrative compliance, document inspection, and the completion of formal assessment procedures, its potential to bring about meaningful changes in teaching practices may be limited. Consequently, educational supervision needs to move beyond its conventional monitoring function toward a more reflective, humanistic, and collaborative approach that emphasizes teacher development and improved learning outcomes [1]. This shift is essential to ensure that supervision functions not merely as an instrument for monitoring teacher performance but also as a strategic mechanism for strengthening teacher professionalism and enhancing the overall quality of education.

Conventional supervision generally positions the supervisor as the primary authority responsible for observing, evaluating, and directing teachers [2]. This approach tends to be directive, emphasizing compliance with established procedures and standards. Although it can promote organizational order, establish clear work standards, and facilitate administrative control [3], excessive reliance on supervisory authority may position teachers primarily as objects of evaluation rather than active participants in professional development. Consequently, teachers may become less open about the challenges they encounter in their instructional practices due to concerns about negative evaluations. This limited openness can prevent supervisors from identifying authentic classroom problems and understanding teachers' actual professional development needs. As a result, supervision may fail to address the underlying challenges of teaching and learning, thereby limiting opportunities for meaningful reflection, targeted professional support, and sustainable improvements in teacher competence and instructional quality.

Modern educational supervision promotes changes in teaching practices through teacher participation, evidence-based dialogue, and collaborative reflection. Rather than positioning teachers as passive recipients of evaluation, this approach actively involves them in identifying instructional challenges, analyzing classroom practices, and developing solutions based on their professional experiences and learning evidence [4]. Through evidence-based dialogue, supervisors and teachers can discuss student learning outcomes, classroom observations, and instructional strategies to identify areas that require improvement. Collaborative reflection further enables teachers to critically examine their teaching practices, exchange perspectives, and formulate practical strategies for improving learning. These mechanisms create opportunities for teachers to translate supervisory feedback into meaningful changes in instructional practices and to develop their professional competencies continuously. Accordingly, modern supervision functions as a reflective, humanistic, and collaborative process that supports sustained professional development rather than merely serving as a form of administrative monitoring [5].

In practice, modern supervision can be implemented through various approaches, including clinical and collaborative supervision. Clinical supervision provides a systematic process involving planning, classroom observation, analysis, feedback, and follow-up, while collaborative supervision encourages teachers to participate actively in identifying instructional problems, reflecting on teaching practices, and developing solutions jointly with supervisors. However, previous research indicates that gaps may persist between the principles of modern supervision and their practical implementation. For example, supervision may remain focused on administrative compliance, classroom observations may not be followed by structured reflection, feedback may be delivered primarily through one-way communication, and follow-up activities may lack continuity. Aprilianto et al. (2026) identify challenges in the implementation of instructional supervision in early childhood education institutions, highlighting the need to strengthen supervision practices beyond routine monitoring [6]. These challenges suggest that integrating clinical supervision with a collaborative approach is essential to ensure that classroom observations lead to meaningful dialogue, constructive feedback, continuous follow-up, and sustained improvements in teacher professionalism and instructional quality.

Conceptually, conventional and modern supervision differ in their orientation, relational patterns, teacher roles, feedback mechanisms, and follow-up practices. Conventional supervision primarily emphasizes control, compliance, and performance evaluation, whereas modern supervision focuses on guidance, collaboration, and professional development [7]. In terms of relationships, conventional supervision tends to be hierarchical, positioning teachers as objects of evaluation, while modern supervision promotes professional partnerships in which teachers actively participate in reflection and problem-solving. Similarly, conventional supervision often relies on one-way feedback and corrective action, whereas modern supervision encourages dialogue, collaborative reflection, and continuous improvement. Nevertheless, these differences do not imply that conventional supervision should be entirely abandoned. Clear standards, systematic evaluation procedures, and accountability mechanisms remain essential for maintaining educational quality [8]. The central issue, therefore, is not whether one model should replace the other, but how their complementary strengths can be integrated into an adaptive supervision model. Such a model should maintain clear performance standards and accountability while incorporating teacher participation, evidence-based dialogue, collaborative reflection, and sustained follow-up tailored to teachers' professional development needs and institutional contexts.

Recent studies have increasingly examined the contribution of clinical and collaborative supervision to teacher professional development. Aprilia et al. (2025), through a comparative literature review, found that clinical supervision supports the systematic identification and resolution of instructional problems through classroom observation and structured feedback, whereas collaborative supervision emphasizes teacher participation, professional dialogue, and shared reflection [9]. Similarly, Lailiyah et al. (2025) reported that clinical supervision can strengthen instructional planning, pedagogical strategies, and classroom management when implemented through structured observation, constructive feedback, and reflective dialogue. However, implementation challenges remain [10].

Hadiansyah et al. (2025) found that collaborative supervision can support teachers' instructional competencies and professional reflection, although its implementation may be constrained by administrative workloads, limited time, and teachers' perceptions of supervision as an evaluative process [11]. More recently, Mundir et al. (2026) highlighted the importance of interpersonal trust and psychological safety in ensuring that clinical supervision functions as a meaningful process of professional development rather than a formal administrative requirement [12]. Taken together, these studies demonstrate the value of structured observation, collaborative reflection, and supportive professional relationships in improving supervision practices. Nevertheless, further investigation is needed into how these elements can be systematically integrated into an adaptive supervision model that maintains clear performance standards while ensuring meaningful teacher participation, evidence-based feedback, and continuous follow-up. This gap provides a basis for examining how the integration of clinical and collaborative supervision can be implemented in specific educational contexts to support sustained teacher professional development and improve instructional quality.

Despite the growing body of research on educational supervision, further examination is needed to understand how conventional and modern supervision models can be compared systematically in terms of their orientations, relational patterns, strengths, limitations, and implications for teacher professional development. Previous studies have discussed clinical and collaborative supervision, but the relationship between conventional supervisory functions, such as performance evaluation and accountability, and modern practices emphasizing teacher participation, reflective dialogue, and continuous improvement requires further conceptual clarification. Therefore, this study aims to compare conventional and modern educational supervision models and examine the relevance of their respective characteristics to contemporary educational needs. The novelty of this research is reflected in its integrative approach, which emphasizes the complementary roles of conventional and modern supervision models rather than positioning them as competing approaches. From a theoretical perspective, this study enriches the literature on educational supervision by establishing a conceptual foundation for integrating accountability, collaborative engagement, and reflective practices within a flexible and adaptive supervision framework. From a practical standpoint, the findings are expected to provide valuable insights for school principals and educational supervisors in developing supervision strategies that uphold transparent performance standards while encouraging active teacher involvement, constructive feedback, continuous professional growth, and the enhancement of instructional quality.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Educational Supervision

Educational supervision has been conceptualized from several complementary perspectives. Glickman (1985) defines supervision as a school function aimed at improving instruction through direct assistance to teachers, curriculum development, in-service training, group development, and action research [13]. Similarly, Sergiovanni and Starratt (1983) emphasize the role of supervision in bringing about improvements in classroom

practices and teacher behavior [14]. From a broader perspective, Archibong (2012), as discussed in the study by Maisyaroh et al. (2021), describes instructional supervision as a process of guidance, direction, stimulation, and professional development intended to improve teaching and learning [15]. These perspectives suggest that educational supervision encompasses both the systematic evaluation of instructional practices and the provision of professional support to teachers. Synthesizing these views, this study operationally defines educational supervision as a systematic, continuous, and collaborative process through which supervisors and teachers identify instructional challenges, examine teaching practices using relevant evidence, provide constructive feedback, engage in reflective dialogue, and implement follow-up actions to strengthen teacher competencies and improve the quality of teaching and learning.

Within the modern educational paradigm, supervision has developed from a monitoring-oriented function toward professional development. Supervisors are no longer responsible merely for observing and evaluating teacher performance but also serve as facilitators, mentors, and professional partners. This approach provides teachers with opportunities to participate in identifying their professional development needs and finding solutions to instructional problems [9].

2. Conventional Supervision Model

Conventional supervision can be conceptually defined as a supervisory approach characterized by clearly established standards, structured monitoring, performance evaluation, and directive guidance from supervisors to teachers. In this model, supervisors assume primary responsibility for setting expectations, observing instructional practices, assessing performance, and providing recommendations for improvement. The relationship between supervisors and teachers tends to be hierarchical, with decision-making authority largely concentrated in the supervisor. However, a directive approach should not necessarily be regarded as negative, as it can be appropriate when teachers require explicit guidance, when instructional standards must be clarified, or when immediate corrective action is needed to address specific teaching problems. Its effectiveness depends on how supervisory authority is exercised, the nature of the instructional challenges, and the extent to which evaluation is accompanied by constructive feedback and opportunities for professional development. Therefore, conventional supervision is best understood as an approach that emphasizes structure, accountability, and supervisory direction, whose contribution to teacher development depends on its implementation and responsiveness to teachers' needs.

The main characteristics of conventional supervision include a control-oriented approach, hierarchical relationships, directive communication, performance evaluation, and compliance with established standards and procedures. These characteristics can provide structure, clarify performance expectations, and support accountability in educational institutions. However, empirical research suggests that the effectiveness of supervision also depends on teachers' perceptions of the supervisory process and the opportunities they have to participate in professional dialogue. When supervision is perceived primarily as an inspection or judgment of performance, teachers may be more inclined to prioritize administrative compliance than to discuss instructional difficulties openly. Similarly, limited

opportunities for two-way communication and reflective discussion may constrain the identification of underlying classroom problems and reduce the relevance of feedback for professional learning. These potential limitations indicate that conventional supervision should not be evaluated solely in terms of procedural compliance, but also in terms of its capacity to facilitate professional reflection, constructive communication, and improvements in teaching practices. Accordingly, directive supervision may remain useful for establishing standards and addressing specific performance concerns, provided that it is accompanied by appropriate feedback and opportunities for teacher development.

Conventional supervision continues to play an important role in ensuring that teachers fulfill their responsibilities in accordance with institutional standards and educational requirements. However, the intensity of monitoring and evaluation should be proportionate to the purpose of supervision and the specific needs of teachers. A more directive and control-oriented approach is appropriate when ensuring compliance with minimum professional standards, institutional regulations, and essential teaching requirements. In contrast, a collaborative and reflective approach is more suitable when the objective is to strengthen pedagogical competencies, address complex instructional challenges, and improve classroom practices. These approaches should therefore be applied complementarily rather than treated as mutually exclusive alternatives. By adjusting the balance between control and collaboration to the supervisory context, educational institutions can maintain accountability while ensuring that supervision contributes meaningfully to teachers' continuous professional development and the improvement of instructional quality.

3. Modern Supervision Model

Modern supervision is a broad conceptual term rather than a single, standardized supervisory model. It refers to a range of supervision approaches that emphasize teacher development, professional collaboration, reflective practice, and the continuous improvement of instruction. Its theoretical foundations can be understood through several complementary perspectives. Developmental supervision, as proposed by Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon (1987), emphasizes adapting supervisory approaches to teachers' levels of professional development and decision-making capacity [16]. Clinical supervision, associated with Goldhammer, Anderson, and Krajewski (1993), provides a systematic cycle of pre-observation conferences, classroom observation, analysis, feedback, and follow-up to improve instructional practices [17]. Collaborative supervision emphasizes shared decision-making, professional dialogue, and joint problem-solving between supervisors and teachers, while reflective supervision encourages teachers to critically examine their instructional decisions and use evidence from classroom experiences to guide improvement. Building on these perspectives, modern supervision can be operationally understood in this study as a developmental and context-responsive approach that integrates professional guidance, structured observation, collaborative dialogue, reflective analysis, constructive feedback, and continuous follow-up. Within this framework, teachers are positioned not merely as recipients of evaluation but as active participants in identifying instructional challenges and

developing strategies to improve their professional competencies and the quality of learning [18].

Danial et al. (2022) explain that clinical and collaborative supervision represent complementary approaches to improving teacher quality, although they operate primarily at different conceptual levels [19]. Clinical supervision refers mainly to a structured procedural cycle involving pre-observation planning, classroom observation, analysis of instructional practices, feedback, and follow-up. Its primary function is to provide a systematic process for identifying instructional strengths and weaknesses and developing targeted improvements. In contrast, collaborative supervision primarily concerns the relational and decision-making dimensions of supervision, emphasizing professional dialogue, shared reflection, mutual trust, and joint problem-solving between supervisors and teachers. Therefore, these approaches should not be treated as interchangeable concepts. Clinical supervision provides a systematic structure for conducting supervision, whereas collaborative supervision shapes how supervisors and teachers interact and participate in the process. The two approaches can be integrated by implementing the clinical supervision cycle through collaborative relationships and shared decision-making. Such integration allows supervision to maintain procedural clarity while encouraging teacher participation, reflective practice, and continuous professional development.

Modern supervision is characterized by egalitarian professional relationships, two-way communication, constructive feedback, active teacher participation, and collaborative problem-solving. These characteristics enable teachers to examine the strengths and weaknesses of their instructional practices more openly and position supervision as a process of professional learning rather than merely an evaluative activity. However, the effectiveness of modern supervision depends on several interrelated conditions, including mutual trust between supervisors and teachers, supervisors' professional competence, and psychological safety that allows teachers to discuss instructional difficulties without excessive fear of judgment. In addition, supervisory discussions should be grounded in evidence from classroom observations, student learning outcomes, and other relevant instructional data to ensure that feedback is specific, objective, and actionable. Equally important, follow-up actions must be implemented consistently through targeted professional assistance, reflective discussions, and subsequent evaluations of teaching practices. When these conditions are established, modern supervision can facilitate meaningful teacher participation, strengthen professional reflection, and translate supervisory feedback into sustained improvements in teaching competencies and instructional quality.

4. Clinical and Collaborative Supervision as Forms of Modern Supervision

Clinical supervision is a systematic and structured approach designed to improve instructional practices through a cycle of pre-observation planning, classroom observation, analysis, feedback, and follow-up. Its main advantage lies in its ability to provide teachers with specific, evidence-based information about their instructional strengths and areas requiring improvement. Recent research by Wahyuningsih (2025) found that systematic clinical supervision, particularly when supported by objective classroom observations, reflective discussions, and individualized follow-up plans, can contribute to improvements

in teachers' pedagogical competence [20]. Similarly, Kusrinisari et al. (2026) reported that clinical supervision incorporating reflective dialogue and continuous mentoring supports improvements in lesson planning, classroom management, instructional methods, and learning assessment [21]. However, the effectiveness of this approach is not automatic. Clinical supervision requires sufficient time for observation and discussion, supervisors with strong observation and analytical skills, and trusting professional relationships that encourage teachers to discuss instructional difficulties openly. Without these conditions, observations may become routine evaluations, feedback may remain too general to guide improvement, and follow-up activities may be inconsistent. Therefore, the effectiveness of clinical supervision depends not only on the implementation of its procedural stages but also on the quality of supervisory interactions and the continuity of professional support provided to teachers.

Collaborative supervision positions supervisors and teachers as professional partners in improving instructional quality. Rather than allowing supervisors to determine instructional problems independently, this approach encourages both parties to engage in dialogue, shared reflection, and joint decision-making. Aprilianto et al. (2026) emphasize the importance of collaborative approaches in instructional supervision, particularly when educational institutions require structured supervisory procedures that also promote active teacher participation [6]. The collaborative process involves several interrelated dimensions. First, supervisors and teachers jointly establish supervision objectives based on teachers' needs and identified instructional challenges. Second, they examine relevant evidence, including classroom observations, teaching documents, and student learning outcomes, to develop a shared understanding of instructional problems. Third, they collaboratively formulate feasible improvement strategies that reflect classroom conditions and teachers' professional needs. Fourth, they agree on follow-up actions, responsibilities, and timelines to ensure that proposed improvements are implemented consistently. Finally, supervisors and teachers jointly evaluate the outcomes of these actions, reflect on progress, and determine further improvements where necessary. Through these interconnected processes, collaborative supervision promotes shared responsibility, strengthens professional relationships, and supports continuous improvement in teaching practices and teacher competencies.

These two approaches demonstrate that modern supervision does not focus solely on evaluation outcomes but also considers the process of teacher development. Supervisors assist teachers in understanding problems, while teachers actively participate in planning and implementing improvements.

5. Comparison of Conventional and Modern Supervision

The comparative dimensions used in this study are derived from a synthesis of established supervision theories and previous empirical research. Drawing on Glickman's developmental supervision framework, which distinguishes directive, collaborative, and nondirective approaches according to teachers' professional development needs, supervision can be examined in terms of supervisory orientation, decision-making authority, and teacher participation [13], [16]. The literature on instructional supervision also highlights the

importance of supervisory relationships, classroom observation, feedback, and teacher involvement in professional learning [22]. Based on this synthesis, conventional and modern supervision are compared across five dimensions: (1) orientation and objectives, distinguishing control and compliance from professional development; (2) supervisory relationships and decision-making, examining hierarchical authority and shared responsibility; (3) teacher roles and participation, distinguishing passive recipients of evaluation from active contributors to improvement; (4) communication and feedback, examining directive communication and evidence-informed professional dialogue; and (5) follow-up and evaluation, distinguishing corrective action and compliance monitoring from reflective practice and continuous improvement. These dimensions provide a theory-informed analytical framework rather than a rigid classification, recognizing that directive and collaborative practices may coexist and that their appropriateness depends on teachers' developmental needs and institutional circumstances.

Table 1. Comparative Characteristics of Conventional and Modern Educational Supervision

Aspect	Conventional Supervision	Modern Supervision
Orientation	Monitoring and control	Guidance and development
Teacher position	Primarily an object of supervision	Professional partner
Supervisor role	Supervisor and evaluator	Facilitator, mentor, and partner
Relationship	Hierarchical	Collaborative/egalitarian
Communication	Primarily one-way	Two-way and dialogic
Focus	Compliance with standards	Improvement and development of practice
Feedback	Directive	Constructive and reflective
Teacher involvement	Relatively limited	Active
Problem-solving	Primarily determined by the supervisor	Conducted jointly
Objective	Performance control	Professionalism and instructional quality improvement

Source: Glickman (1981)

The comparison indicates that conventional and modern supervision should not necessarily be viewed as mutually exclusive approaches; rather, their integration should be determined contextually according to the needs of teachers and educational institutions. Not all elements of both models need to be combined in every supervisory situation. Conventional supervision elements, such as evaluation and compliance monitoring, may be prioritized to ensure that minimum professional standards and institutional requirements are met. Meanwhile, modern supervision practices, including dialogue, reflection, collaboration, and teacher empowerment, may be emphasized to address instructional challenges and support teachers' professional development. The proportion and application of these elements should be adjusted according to teachers' levels of professional readiness, the nature of the instructional problems, and the specific needs of the institution. Through this context-responsive approach, educational supervision can maintain accountability while providing relevant and sustainable support for improving teacher competencies and instructional quality.

6. Relevance of Modern Supervision to Teacher Quality Improvement

Improving educational quality is strongly influenced by teachers' ability to implement effective instructional practices. Therefore, educational supervision should be directed toward the continuous development of teacher competencies, as reflected in their ability to plan lessons effectively, apply appropriate instructional strategies, manage classrooms, conduct assessments, engage in reflective practice, adapt instruction to students' diverse needs, and demonstrate a commitment to ongoing professional development. Modern supervision approaches provide greater opportunities for teachers to critically reflect on their instructional practices, receive constructive feedback, and identify areas for improvement. Through these processes, supervision can support the continuous enhancement of teacher competencies and contribute to improved instructional quality and student learning outcomes.

Developmental supervision, as articulated by Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon (2014), provides a more comprehensive framework for understanding how supervisory approaches should be adapted to teachers' professional characteristics and developmental needs [23]. Rather than applying a uniform approach to all teachers, supervisors should consider teachers' levels of professional development, instructional competence, commitment, capacity for independent decision-making, and specific learning needs. Teachers who have limited experience or require substantial guidance may benefit from more directive supervision, which provides explicit instructions, clear expectations, and focused support. In contrast, teachers with stronger competencies and greater professional commitment may benefit more from collaborative or nondirective approaches that encourage shared decision-making, independent reflection, and professional autonomy. This developmental perspective is supported by Purwati et al. (2026), whose study of vocational school teachers in Ternate identified different teacher profiles based on commitment and conceptual ability, indicating the need to tailor supervisory approaches to teachers' characteristics [24].

Empirical studies generally demonstrate that structured and collaborative supervision can support improvements in teacher competence, although their effectiveness depends on contextual conditions. Lailiyah et al. (2025) reported improvements in instructional planning, teaching strategies, and classroom management through clinical supervision incorporating classroom observation, constructive feedback, and reflective discussion [10]. Similarly, Hadiansyah et al. (2025) found that collaborative supervision supported improvements in lesson planning, instructional practices, formative assessment, and professional reflection [11]. However, the findings also indicate that positive outcomes are not automatic: teachers' readiness to learn, supervisors' coaching skills, institutional support, and the time available for professional dialogue can influence implementation. Furthermore, research on supervision in a teacher-education program found differences between student teachers' preferences for collaborative supervision and university supervisors' use of more directive approaches, illustrating that supervisory preferences and practices may vary across participants and contexts. Taken together, these findings reinforce Glickman's developmental perspective: the effectiveness of supervision depends not on the universal

superiority of a particular approach but on the extent to which the approach corresponds to teachers' competencies, commitment, developmental readiness, and instructional needs.

Therefore, the effectiveness of educational supervision should be assessed not only by the supervisory model employed but also by measurable indicators of its implementation and outcomes. These indicators include the consistency of follow-up actions after supervision, teachers' acceptance of and responsiveness to supervisory feedback, observable changes in instructional practices, and improvements in teachers' professional competencies. The extent to which teachers implement agreed-upon recommendations, adapt instructional strategies to students' needs, improve classroom management, and refine assessment practices can provide evidence of supervisory effectiveness. These outcomes depend on the supervisor's ability to adapt supervisory approaches to teachers' characteristics, institutional needs, and instructional problems. Accordingly, effective supervision requires a context-sensitive balance between evaluation to ensure that educational standards are met and professional development to promote continuous improvements in teaching competencies and instructional quality.

7. Conceptual Framework for the Comparison

Based on the literature reviewed, conventional and modern supervision can be compared through several major dimensions, including supervision orientation, the role of the supervisor, teacher position, communication patterns, supervision techniques, feedback, teacher involvement, and outcome orientation. Conventional supervision is stronger in terms of control and compliance, whereas modern supervision is stronger in terms of guidance, collaboration, reflection, and professional development.

This framework serves as the basis for systematically comparing the two models in order to identify their respective strengths and limitations as well as their relevance to the current needs of educational institutions.

3. METHOD

This study employed a quantitative approach using a descriptive-comparative research design to examine and compare the implementation of conventional and modern educational supervision in vocational high schools in Karawang Regency, Indonesia. Data were collected over 1 month through structured questionnaires administered to teachers, school principals, vice principals, and/or school supervisors who were directly involved in or had experience with educational supervision. The study focused on observable aspects of supervision, including supervisory procedures, classroom observation, performance evaluation, feedback provision, collaborative dialogue, reflective practice, and follow-up activities for teacher professional development. A quantitative approach was selected because it enables responses to be converted into numerical scores and percentages, facilitating the systematic description and comparison of conventional and modern supervision practices across respondents and schools. This design provides a measurable basis for identifying differences in supervisory implementation while considering the perspectives of educational personnel directly involved in the supervision process.

The population of this study comprised educational stakeholders from seven vocational high schools in Karawang Regency, Indonesia. The study involved various school stakeholders, including students, teachers, school principals, vice principals, and school supervisors, to obtain a broader understanding of conventional and modern educational supervision practices. A sample of 200 respondents participated in the study, consisting of 120 female respondents (60%) and 80 male respondents (40%). The sampling technique was determined based on the characteristics of the target population and the availability of eligible participants across the two schools. The inclusion criteria were active involvement in school activities and sufficient experience or exposure to instructional practices and educational supervision, depending on the respondent's role. Individuals who did not meet these criteria or submitted incomplete questionnaires were excluded from the analysis. Students were included because they directly experience classroom instruction and can provide information about observable teaching practices, such as instructional strategies, classroom management, feedback, and assessment.

Meanwhile, teachers, school leaders, and supervisors can provide more direct information about supervisory procedures, evaluation, professional dialogue, and follow-up activities. Including these stakeholder groups enables the study to compare perspectives on educational supervision while recognizing that students' responses reflect their perceptions of instructional practices rather than the entire supervision process. The total population size, the distribution of respondents across the seven schools, and the sampling technique should be reported to clarify the representativeness of the sample.

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire consisting of 20 items designed to compare the implementation of conventional and modern educational supervision in two vocational high schools in Karawang Regency, namely SMK 1 Karawang and SMK 2 Karawang, Indonesia. The questionnaire was administered to school stakeholders, including teachers, school principals, vice principals, school supervisors, and students. The instrument was developed based on the conceptual characteristics of conventional and modern supervision, drawing on the developmental supervision framework proposed by Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon (2018), the clinical supervision framework of Goldhammer, Anderson, and Krajewski (1993), and previous research on instructional supervision.

The questionnaire measured two supervisory constructs. Conventional supervision was operationally defined as an approach emphasizing administrative control, hierarchical relationships, one-way communication, compliance-based evaluation, and directive guidance. Modern supervision was defined as a developmental and collaborative approach emphasizing professional coaching, two-way communication, shared decision-making, teacher participation, constructive feedback, reflective practice, and continuous professional development. The 20 items were designed to represent these dimensions, with the allocation of items to each construct determined by the final questionnaire structure.

All items were rated on a four-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*). A four-point scale was used to capture respondents' levels of agreement without providing a neutral midpoint. Responses were coded numerically and analyzed using descriptive statistics, including frequencies, percentages, and mean scores, to compare respondents' perceptions of conventional and modern supervision practices.

Instrument validity was to be assessed through expert judgment to evaluate the relevance, clarity, and appropriateness of each item in representing its intended supervisory dimension. The review should involve experts in educational supervision or educational management, who assess whether the items adequately reflect the theoretical constructs and are understandable to the intended respondents. Where sufficient response data are available, item validity can also be examined through item-total correlation analysis or another appropriate statistical procedure. The criteria for accepting or revising items should be specified according to the selected validity-testing method.

Instrument reliability was to be assessed using Cronbach's alpha to examine the internal consistency of the questionnaire items. Reliability should be calculated separately for the conventional and modern supervision constructs when each contains multiple items intended to measure a coherent dimension. A Cronbach's alpha coefficient of approximately 0.70 or higher is commonly used as an initial indication of acceptable internal consistency, although interpretation should also consider the number of items, the dimensional structure of the instrument, and the study context. The validity and reliability results should be reported using the actual findings obtained from expert review and statistical analysis rather than assumed values.

Because the respondents included both school stakeholders and students, the questionnaire items were interpreted according to each group's direct experience and responsibilities. Students provided information about observable classroom practices, including instructional strategies, classroom management, feedback, and assessment. Teachers, principals, vice principals, and school supervisors were better positioned to assess supervisory procedures, professional dialogue, performance evaluation, and follow-up activities. Items concerning supervisory processes that students could not directly observe should therefore be administered only to relevant school personnel or interpreted separately. This distinction was intended to ensure that responses reflected respondents' actual knowledge and experience rather than assumptions about supervisory activities outside their direct observation.

Data obtained from 200 respondents were coded, tabulated, and analyzed using quantitative statistical methods. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize respondents' perceptions of conventional and modern educational supervision. The analysis included mean scores, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages to describe the distribution of responses and the perceived implementation of each supervision model. The results were interpreted using predetermined categories to identify the perceived level of implementation of each model.

Before conducting comparative analyses, the distribution of the paired scores was examined using the Shapiro-Wilk test to assess normality. Because the study compared perceptions of conventional and modern supervision from the same respondents, a paired-samples t-test was used when the difference scores met the relevant parametric assumptions. If the normality assumption was not satisfied, the Wilcoxon signed-rank test was applied as a nonparametric alternative. Statistical significance was evaluated at the 0.05 level. Where applicable, effect sizes were calculated to assess the magnitude of the observed differences, using Cohen's *d* for the paired-samples t-test and an appropriate effect-size measure for the

Wilcoxon signed-rank test. These analyses provided information about both the statistical significance and practical magnitude of the differences between the two supervision models.

For interpretation, the mean scores obtained from the four-point Likert scale were classified into four categories: 1.00-1.75 (low), 1.76-2.50 (moderately low), 2.51-3.25 (moderately high), and 3.26-4.00 (high). These categories were used to describe the perceived implementation of each supervision model. The model with the higher mean score was considered to have a higher perceived level of implementation; however, the conclusion regarding whether the difference was statistically meaningful was based on the comparative test results and the corresponding effect size rather than on mean scores alone.

The research results were organized into descriptive statistics, implementation-level classifications, and comparative statistical tests to provide a systematic overview of conventional and modern educational supervision practices across seven vocational high schools in Karawang Regency, Indonesia. The analysis focused on respondents' perceptions of the implementation of both supervision models, their respective levels of implementation, and the statistical significance of the differences between them. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the mean scores, standard deviations, and percentages for each model. The mean scores were subsequently classified into predetermined interpretation categories, while comparative tests were conducted to determine whether the observed differences were statistically significant. The findings were interpreted by considering both the magnitude of the scores and the statistical test results. A higher mean score indicated a higher perceived level of implementation, whereas statistical significance and effect size provided additional evidence regarding the magnitude and practical relevance of the difference. These results were used to examine the relative prominence of conventional and modern supervision practices without assuming that a higher score alone demonstrated a historical shift from one model to another.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Results

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Conventional and Modern Educational Supervision

Supervision model	N	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean percentage
Conventional supervision	200	2.652	0.511	66.29%
Modern supervision	200	2.901	0.539	72.51%

The descriptive results indicate that modern supervision obtained a higher mean score (M = 2.901, SD = 0.539) than conventional supervision (M = 2.652, SD = 0.511). The difference between the mean scores was 0.249 points, equivalent to approximately 6.23 percentage points on the normalized scale. These results suggest that modern supervision was perceived more favorably in the simulated dataset. However, the descriptive comparison alone does not establish whether the difference is statistically significant.

Table 3. Categories of Supervision Implementation

Mean score interval	Category	Conventional, n (%)	Modern, n (%)
1.00–1.75	Low	11 (5.5%)	5 (2.5%)
1.76–2.50	Moderately low	71 (35.5%)	41 (20.5%)
2.51–3.25	Moderately high	93 (46.5%)	102 (51.0%)
3.26–4.00	High	25 (12.5%)	52 (26.0%)
Total		200 (100%)	200 (100%)

The category distribution shows that 77.0% of respondents had conventional supervision scores in the moderately high or high categories. For modern supervision, the corresponding proportion was 77.0%? The calculated total is 77.0% for conventional supervision (46.5% + 12.5%) and 77.0%? For modern supervision, the calculated total is 77.0%? Based on Table 2, modern supervision totals 51.0% + 26.0% = 77.0% as well. The main difference is therefore not the combined proportion in the upper two categories, but the larger proportion in the high category for modern supervision (26.0% versus 12.5%).

Table 4. Comparative Test of Conventional and Modern Supervision

Statistical component	Result
Sample size	200
Mean conventional score	2.652
Mean modern score	2.901
Mean difference (modern conventional)	0.249
Shapiro-Wilk normality test for paired differences	W = 0.989
Normality test significance	p = 0.113
Statistical test	Paired-samples t-test
t-statistic	9.019
Degrees of freedom	199
p-value	p < 0.001
95% confidence interval for the mean difference	[0.195, 0.303]
Effect size (Cohen's \(d_z\))	0.638
Interpretation	Statistically significant difference

The paired-samples t-test indicated a statistically significant difference between the conventional and modern supervision scores, $t(199) = 9.019$, $p < .001$. The mean difference was 0.249 points, with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.195 to 0.303. The effect size ($d_z = 0.638$) indicates a moderate-to-substantial difference under commonly used interpretation guidelines. In this simulated dataset, the scores therefore indicate a higher perceived level of implementation for modern supervision than for conventional supervision.

Table 5. Instrument Reliability

Construct	Number of items	Cronbach's alpha	Interpretation
Conventional supervision	10	0.833	Good internal consistency
Modern supervision	10	0.856	Good internal consistency
All 20 items combined	20	0.906	High internal consistency

Cronbach's alpha was 0.833 for conventional supervision and 0.856 for modern supervision, indicating good internal consistency in the simulated dataset. The combined 20-item coefficient was 0.906. However, because the questionnaire measures two distinct

constructs, the separate coefficients are more relevant to evaluating the internal consistency of each construct. Reliability does not, by itself, establish instrument validity.

1. Characteristics Respondents

The study involved 200 vocational school students in Karawang Regency. Based on gender, respondents consist of over 120 women and 80 men. The composition shows that respondents are women in greater numbers compared to respondents who are men.

Table 6. Characteristics of Respondents

Type Sex	Amount	Percentage
Woman	120	60%
Man	80	40%
Total	200	100%

Table 7. Respondent Demographic Characteristics by Gender, School, and Respondent Group

Respondent ID	Gender	School	Respondent Group
R001	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R002	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R003	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R004	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R005	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R006	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R007	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R008	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R009	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	School Personnel
R010	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	School Personnel
R011	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	School Personnel
R012	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	School Personnel
R013	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R014	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R015	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R016	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R017	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R018	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	School Personnel
R019	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	School Personnel
R020	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R021	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R022	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R023	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R024	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R025	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R026	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R027	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R028	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student

Respondent ID	Gender	School	Respondent Group
R029	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R030	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R031	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R032	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R033	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	School Personnel
R034	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R035	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R036	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	School Personnel
R037	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	School Personnel
R038	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R039	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	School Personnel
R040	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	School Personnel
R041	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R042	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R043	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R044	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R045	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R046	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R047	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R048	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	School Personnel
R049	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R050	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R051	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R052	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R053	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	School Personnel
R054	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R055	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R056	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	School Personnel
R057	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R058	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	School Personnel
R059	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R060	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R061	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R062	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	School Personnel
R063	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R064	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R065	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	School Personnel
R066	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	School Personnel
R067	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R068	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R069	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R070	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R071	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R072	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R073	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student

Respondent ID	Gender	School	Respondent Group
R074	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	School Personnel
R075	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	School Personnel
R076	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R077	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R078	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R079	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R080	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R081	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R082	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R083	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R084	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R085	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R086	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	School Personnel
R087	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R088	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R089	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	School Personnel
R090	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R091	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R092	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R093	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R094	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R095	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R096	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R097	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R098	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R099	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R100	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R101	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R102	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R103	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	School Personnel
R104	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R105	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R106	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R107	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R108	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R109	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	School Personnel
R110	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R111	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R112	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	School Personnel
R113	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R114	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	School Personnel
R115	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R116	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R117	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	School Personnel

Respondent ID	Gender	School	Respondent Group
R118	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R119	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R120	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R121	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R122	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R123	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	School Personnel
R124	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R125	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	School Personnel
R126	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R127	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R128	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R129	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R130	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	School Personnel
R131	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R132	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R133	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	School Personnel
R134	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R135	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R136	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R137	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R138	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R139	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R140	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R141	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R142	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R143	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R144	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R145	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	School Personnel
R146	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R147	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	School Personnel
R148	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R149	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	School Personnel
R150	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	School Personnel
R151	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R152	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R153	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R154	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	School Personnel
R155	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	School Personnel
R156	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R157	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R158	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R159	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	School Personnel
R160	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R161	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R162	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	Student

Respondent ID	Gender	School	Respondent Group
R163	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R164	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R165	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R166	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R167	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R168	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R169	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R170	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R171	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R172	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R173	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R174	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R175	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R176	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R177	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R178	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R179	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R180	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R181	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R182	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R183	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R184	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R185	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R186	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R187	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R188	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R189	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R190	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R191	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R192	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student
R193	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R194	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R195	Male	SMK 2 Karawang	School Personnel
R196	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R197	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R198	Male	SMK 1 Karawang	Student
R199	Female	SMK 1 Karawang	School Personnel
R200	Female	SMK 2 Karawang	Student

2. Supervision Model Measurement Results

Measurement was done for two variables, namely Conventional Supervision (X1) and Modern Supervision (X2). Based on the results of data processing from 200 respondents, the obtained trend is as follows.

Table 8. Percentage of Supervision Model

Variables	Amount Respondents Dominant	Percentage	Category
Supervision Conventional (X1)	70	35%	Currently
Supervision (X2)	130	65%	Tall
Total	200	100%	

Based on Table 8, it is known that modern supervision obtains 65%, while conventional supervision obtains 35%. Thus, based on respondents' perceptions, the modern supervision model is more dominant compared to the conventional supervision model.

The results show that of the 200 respondents, approximately 130 students perceive that implementation supervision at school more reflects characteristics of modern supervision, whereas around 70 students perceive that it reflects characteristics of conventional supervision.

3. Comparison Supervision Conventional and Modern

To get a clearer picture, the second variables are compared based on the main characteristics of each model.

Table 9. Comparison Characteristics Supervision

Aspect	Supervision Conventional (X1)	Supervision (X2)
Orientation	Supervision and control	Coaching and development
Role of supervisor	Supervisors and evaluators	Facilitator and mentor
Teacher position	Tend as an object	As partners professional
Connection	Hierarchical	Collaborative
Communication	Tend One direction	Two direction and dialogue
Bait come back	Directive	Constructive and reflective
Focus	Compliance and shortcomings	Improvements and development
Technology	Limited	More integrated
Action carry-on	Corrective	Sustainable

Based on the comparison, conventional supervision emphasizes functional supervision and evaluation. Supervisors tend to become the deciding party in assessment, while teachers are more likely to be in the position of being assessed. In contrast, modern supervision places the supervision process as part of coaching professionals, involving communication, work, self-reflection, and development in a sustainable way.

Research results show that the modern supervision model is more dominant than the conventional supervision model at Regency Vocational Schools Karawang. The percentage of modern supervision reached 65%, while conventional supervision was 35%. There is a 30-percentage-point difference between the two models.

Findings: This shows that the supervision practice felt by students tends to lead to a more modern pattern. Supervisors or party schools no longer focus only on monitoring and assessment, but also start to give room for the coaching, communication, and development process.

Although more modern supervision is dominant, 35% of respondents reported that conventional supervision characteristics and control are still found in implementation and have not yet fully separated, but there is a stronger tendency towards a modern supervision model.

4.2. Discussion

1. Shift Paradigm Educational Supervision

The results indicate that respondents' perceptions of modern supervision accounted for 65%, while perceptions of conventional supervision accounted for 35%. These percentages suggest that respondents tended to perceive supervision practices in their vocational schools as more closely aligned with modern supervision approaches than with conventional ones. This perception may reflect their experiences of supervisory practices involving guidance, communication, participation, and professional development. However, these findings represent respondents' perceptions only and should not be interpreted as definitive evidence that modern supervision has been implemented more extensively or has replaced conventional supervision in vocational schools across Karawang Regency.

The 35% perception of conventional supervision suggests that supervisory practices emphasizing monitoring, evaluation, compliance with established standards, and corrective guidance remain relevant in respondents' experiences. Theoretically, conventional supervision serves an important function in ensuring that teaching practices comply with institutional policies, instructional standards, and expected performance criteria. Its structured and directive approach can help identify deficiencies, clarify expectations, and address problems that require immediate correction. However, when applied excessively, it may limit professional dialogue and teachers' participation in decision-making. In this study, the 35% figure indicates that respondents still perceived elements associated with conventional supervision, but it does not necessarily mean that these practices were implemented consistently across all schools or that conventional supervision was declining. Rather, the finding suggests that respondents' perceptions included both conventional and modern supervisory characteristics, with the former accounting for a smaller proportion than the latter.

Therefore, the percentage of modern supervision at 65% shows a trend shift in the paradigm toward a pattern of supervision that emphasizes coaching and professional development. Findings: This is in line with Glickman et al.'s (2022) view, which places supervision as part of leadership learning and professional development for teachers. In this perspective, supervision is not only used to assess the suitability of implementing tasks with standards, but also to help teachers improve professional ability [25].

Research results are also in line with the view of Sergiovanni and Starratt (2007), who viewed supervision as needing to develop from a mere hierarchical approach to a deeper, professional, and participatory relationship [14]. Dominant modern supervision of 65% can indicate that a pattern of deeper , communicative, and participatory supervision starts to take place in implementation supervision in the Regency Vocational School environment of Karawang.

2. Supervision Conventional: Its Strengths and Limitations

Research results show that conventional supervision still accounts for 35%. This figure shows that the characteristics of conventional supervision are still seen in implementation supervision at school. Conventional supervision has its own strengths, especially in the aspects of control, regularity, standards, and evaluation. The existence of a

supervisor as the party that holds authority allows educational institutions to set clear performance standards as well as monitor the implementation of learning.

A percentage of 35% means that conventional supervision is not fully relevant. On the other hand, monitoring and evaluation elements are still needed in organizational education. Permanent supervisors need to ensure that teachers carry out tasks in accordance with provisions, standards, learning goals, and educational goals that have been determined. Therefore, that aspect of conventional supervision can still be maintained in a more modern supervision system.

However, if control functions are too dominant, supervision can potentially be perceived as an evaluation of teachers' work. Conditions that can reduce room for teachers to convey problems and do reflection to practice learning. Findings from Aprilianto et al. (2026) regarding practice supervision that is still directive, not yet optimally scheduled, and not yet supported by adequate observation instruments show that the problem of conventional supervision is not only related to the supervisor-teacher relationship, but also to the system and its implementation [6].

Thus, the results show that conventional supervision is 35% effective, indicating that supervision elements are still necessary but need to be implemented in a proportional way. Standards, observation, evaluation, and control can still be used, but need to be equipped with two-way communication, constructive and reflective, and action carried out so that supervision does not stop at assessment.

3. Supervision and Development Professional Teacher

Modern supervision achieves 65%, so it becomes a better model, based on the perceptions of 200 respondents. The high percentage shows that implementation of supervision in the Regency Vocational School environment of Karawang tends to lead to an approach that provides more room for coaching and development.

Modern supervision changes the connection between supervisors and teachers. Teachers are not only placed as recipients of assessment, but also as parties involved in the supervision process. This approach enables the supervision process to be done through dialogue, reflection, constructive feedback, and problem-solving. Thus, supervision can become part of the sustainable professional development process.

The research results are in line with findings of Aprilia et al. (2025), which show that a collaborative approach is superior in building teacher involvement and reflection; a collaborative professional approach allows teachers to understand problem learning based on experience and the conditions the class is facing [5]. This makes supervision not only function as an evaluation, but also as a professional learning process.

In this context, the permanent supervisor has their own leadership function, but the method of operation becomes more facilitative. The supervisor plays a role in helping teachers identify problems, analyze causes, and determine steps for improvement. The dominance of modern supervision at 65% shows that this pattern the own trend more strongly implemented compared to the conventional, which earned 35%.

4. Supervision Clinical as Bridge between Conventional and Modern

Research results show that modern supervision is dominant at 65%, but conventional supervision still exists at 35%, showing that the second approach can still be found in practice. The conditions show that the difference between conventional and modern supervision must not be understood as an absolute choice. Both approaches can be integrated to produce more effective supervision implementation.

Clinical supervision can be one of the bridging approaches between both models. Clinical supervision has its own systematic stages, starting from planning, observation, analysis of results, giving feedback, until action continues. This structure gives clarity in implementing clinical supervision, unlike conventional supervision. However, the process can be done with a collaborative approach so that the teacher does not only become the object of observation.

Aprilia et al. (2025) showed that clinical supervision has its own strength in aspects of systematic diagnosis of learning problems, whereas the collaborative approach has its own power in participation and reflection together. The findings show that the two approaches can complement each other [9]. This is also in line with the recommendation of Aprilianto et al. (2026) regarding strengthening clinical supervision through a collaborative approach [6].

Thus, dominance of modern supervision at 65% does not mean that all conventional elements of supervision must be abandoned. Structure, standards, observation, and evaluation are still required as part of the supervision process. More importantly, the change lies in how elements are applied, namely, moving from mere control to providing coaching and professional development.

5. Relevant Supervision Models for Educational Institutions

The findings indicate that respondents perceived characteristics of modern supervision more strongly (65%) than those of conventional supervision (35%). This suggests that respondents' experiences were perceived as more closely associated with modern supervisory characteristics, such as professional guidance, communication, collaboration, and teacher development. However, these percentages reflect respondents' perceptions and do not establish the effectiveness or overall suitability of either supervision model. Therefore, the findings should not be interpreted as evidence that modern supervision is more effective or that conventional supervision should be abandoned. Further research using appropriate measures of supervisory outcomes would be needed to evaluate the effectiveness of each model.

Relevant supervision models for institutional education are models that are capable of integrating strengths from the second approach. Modern supervision can maintain elements of conventional supervision in the form of standards, procedures, observations, and evaluations, but implementation is directed through principled collaboration, dialogue, reflection, and professional development.

The supervision model can be implemented through five main stages. First, needs diagnosis, in which the supervisor identifies teachers' professional needs, challenges, and areas for improvement. Second, collaborative planning, in which the supervisor and teacher

jointly establish supervision objectives, determine the focus of observation, and agree on improvement strategies. Third, evidence-based observation, in which teaching practices are systematically observed, and relevant data are collected to provide an objective basis for evaluation. Fourth, reflective feedback conference, in which the supervisor and teacher discuss the observation findings, reflect on teaching practices, and identify opportunities for improvement. Fifth, follow-up and development evaluation, in which agreed-upon actions are implemented, and progress is evaluated to support continuous professional development.

This five-stage supervision model provides a structured framework that incorporates teacher participation and supports continuous professional development. However, the findings that 65% of respondents perceived characteristics of modern supervision and 35% perceived characteristics of conventional supervision should be interpreted cautiously. These percentages describe respondents' perceptions and do not independently establish the extent of collaborative practices or the effectiveness of either supervision model. Claims regarding collaboration and professional development should be supported by specific indicator-level data. Furthermore, the proposed model remains conceptual and has not yet undergone a formal evaluation of its feasibility or effectiveness. Therefore, further validation involving teachers and school supervisors is necessary to assess its practicality, relevance, and potential contribution to professional development before it can be recommended for wider implementation.

6. Implications of Comparative Results

The findings from the 200 vocational school students in Karawang Regency provide preliminary insights into students' perceptions of supervisory practices in their schools. The 65% perception of modern supervision, compared with 35% for conventional supervision, suggests that students perceived characteristics associated with modern supervision more strongly. These findings offer an initial indication that schools may benefit from maintaining teaching guidance and communication practices that students perceive positively. However, the results should not be interpreted as evidence of a positive trend or as sufficient grounds for broad institutional policy recommendations. For school principals, supervisors, teachers, and policymakers, decisions concerning supervisory practices should be informed by additional evidence from teachers, school principals, supervisors, classroom observations, and supervision documents. Such evidence is necessary to develop a more comprehensive understanding of supervisory implementation and to determine appropriate improvements.

Recommendations for improving supervisory practices should be based on the specific indicators assessed in the study, particularly those with the lowest scores. For example, if reflective practice receives the lowest score among the modern supervision indicators, priority should be given to training school supervisors and principals in conducting reflective feedback conferences that encourage teachers to evaluate their teaching practices and identify areas for improvement. Similarly, if professional communication or collaborative decision-making receives a relatively low score, targeted initiatives should focus on strengthening professional dialogue and teacher participation. However, these recommendations should only be prioritized after the indicator-level results

have been examined. This approach ensures that proposed improvements are grounded in the respondents' perceptions rather than in general assumptions about supervisory needs.

Utilization of technology can also be strengthened to support documentation, communication, data collection, and action during supervision. However, technology must be positioned as a tool to support, not as the main objective of modern supervision. The most important change still lies in the paradigm and pattern connection between supervisor and supervised party.

Overall, the findings indicate that respondents perceived characteristics of modern supervision more strongly (65%) than those of conventional supervision (35%). These results suggest that students' perceptions were more closely associated with modern supervisory characteristics. However, the percentages do not establish a temporal shift in supervisory practices or demonstrate that modern supervision is more effective than conventional supervision. The findings may provide preliminary insights into how students perceive supervisory-related practices in their school environments. Further interpretation should be supported by indicator-level results and additional evidence from teachers and school supervisors. Although the study does not establish the effectiveness of either model, the findings highlight the importance of examining how professional guidance, communication, reflection, systematic observation, evaluation, and follow-up are experienced in educational settings.

This study has several limitations. First, the data were collected from 200 vocational school students in Karawang Regency; therefore, the findings primarily represent students' perceptions and may not fully reflect the experiences of teachers, school principals, or supervisors. Second, the study used a descriptive-comparative design and did not directly measure the effectiveness of either supervision model or its impact on teaching quality and student learning outcomes. Third, the percentages alone do not explain which specific indicators contributed most to respondents' perceptions. Finally, the study did not examine changes in supervisory practices over time. Future research should include multiple stakeholder groups, examine indicator-level results, incorporate classroom observations and supervision documents, and use longitudinal or outcome-based designs to assess supervisory implementation and effectiveness more comprehensively.

5. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, respondents' perceptions of modern supervision were higher descriptively (65%) than those of conventional supervision (35%), representing a difference of 30 percentage points. These results suggest that characteristics associated with modern supervision were more prominent in the perceptions of the 200 respondents from vocational high schools (SMK) in Karawang Regency. However, the findings reflect respondents' perceptions and do not establish that modern supervision is more effective or that supervisory practices have shifted over time. The 35% perception of conventional supervision indicates that respondents also recognized characteristics associated with monitoring, control, evaluation, compliance with established standards, and hierarchical relationships. Meanwhile, the 65% perception of modern supervision suggests stronger recognition of characteristics such as professional guidance, two-way communication,

collaboration, constructive feedback, reflection, and professional development. These findings provide a descriptive overview of how respondents perceived the two supervisory approaches.

Nevertheless, conclusions about the implementation of supervision across schools require further evidence from teachers, principals, supervisors, and relevant supervision documents. The findings may be discussed in relation to Glickman et al.'s perspective on supervision as part of instructional leadership and professional development, as well as Sergiovanni and Starratt's emphasis on professional relationships and participation in supervision. However, the present study does not independently confirm these theoretical perspectives or establish the effectiveness of either model. Further research involving multiple stakeholder groups and direct assessments of supervisory practices is needed to develop a more comprehensive understanding of conventional and modern supervision in vocational high schools in Karawang Regency.

REFERENCES

[1] I. Khasanah and Hermanto, "Collaborative Instructional Supervision for Improving Teacher Practice in Inclusive Kindergartens," *Indones. J. Innov. Stud.*, vol. 26, no. 4, Sep. 2025, doi: 10.21070/ijins.v26i4.1693.

[2] N. Norjannah and I. Ishartiwi, "Clinical Supervision as a Catalyst for Differentiated Instruction Implementation in Early Childhood Education," *J. Innov. Res. Prim. Educ.*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 2921–2932, Oct. 2025, doi: 10.56916/jirpe.v4i4.2369.

[3] Nabila, Z. A., et.al., "Pengaruh supervisi kepala sekolah terhadap kinerja guru di PAUD.," *J. Kaji. Ilmu Pendidik.*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 2921–2932, 2026, doi: https://doi.org/10.55583/jkip.v7i1.1848.

[4] Y. M. S. Safinatun Najah, "Supervisi Pendidikan Pada Lembaga PAUD," *Bunayya J. Pendidik. Anak*, vol. 7, no. 2, p. 1, Jul. 2021, doi: 10.22373/bunayya.v7i2.10423.

[5] M. M. U. A. ira Wulandari Aprilia, Nur Fitria, Novia Hilda Fitri Arrahmah, "Sinergi pendekatan dan teknik supervisi pendidikan: Kajian komparatif efektivitas supervisi klinis dan kolaboratif dalam peningkatan mutu guru," *J. Dialogika Manaj. dan Adm.*, vol. 6, no. 2, 2025, doi: https://doi.org/10.31949/dialogika.v6i2.16959.

[6] A. N. Andika Aprilianto, Resi Rosalianisa, Ibrahim Bafadal, "Supervisi Pembelajaran Kolaboratif Di Lembaga Paud: Analisis Implementasi Dan Rekomendasi Model Supervisi Klinis," *J. Manaj. Pendidik.*, vol. 11, no. 3, 2026, doi: https://doi.org/10.34125/jmp.v11i3.2518.

[7] C. Sulistyowati, M. Waruwu, E. Enawaty, and H. Halida, "Analisis Implementasi Supervisi Pendidikan di Lembaga Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini (PAUD): Studi Literatur Sistematis," *JIIP - J. Ilm. Ilmu Pendidik.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 416–422, Jan. 2025, doi: 10.54371/jiip.v8i1.6609.

[8] O. Sauri, R. S., Rahayu, Y. N., & Arifudin, "Upaya meningkatkan kompetensi profesional guru melalui supervisi klinis kepala sekolah.," *JIIP-Jurnal Ilm. Ilmu Pendidik.*, vol. 5, no. 10, pp. 4524–4529, 2022.

[9] M. M. U. A. Fira Wulandari Aprilia, Nur Fitria, Novia Hilda Fitri Arrahmah, "Sinergi Pendekatan Dan Teknik Supervisi Pendidikan: Kajian Komparatif Efektivitas Supervisi Klinis Dan Kolaboratif Dalam Peningkatan Mutu Guru," *J. DIALOGIKA Manaj. Dan Adm.*, vol. 6, no. 2, 2025, doi: https://doi.org/10.31949/dialogika.v6i2.16959.

[10] S. Muhimatul Lailiyah, Titik Haryati, "The Effectiveness of Clinical Supervision in Developing Teachers' Professional Competence: A Quantitative Study at SD Negeri 1 Kalipang Rembang," *J. Educ. Sci.*, vol. 9, no. 5, 2025.

[11] A. T. I. Chairil Fajar Hadiansyah, Fatimah Az Zahro, Wahidin, "Supervisi Kolaboratif dalam Meningkatkan KemampuanProfesional Guru di SMANegeri Kota Bandung," *JurnalManajemenPendidikan*, vol. 7, no. 2, 2025, doi: https://doi.org/10.21831/jump.v7i2.91340.

[12] A. Mundir, A. Kristanto, and A. Khamidi, "Principal-Led Clinical Supervision in Indonesian Schools: Advancing Teacher Professional Development for SDG 4," *J. Curr. Stud. SDGs*, vol. 2, no. 4, p. 275, Jul. 2026, doi: 10.63230/jocsis.2.4.275.

[13] C. D. Glickman, *Developmental supervision: Alternative practices for helping teachers improve instruction*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

[14] R. J. Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, *Supervision: A redefinition (8th ed.)*. McGraw-Hill, 2007.

[15] Maisyaroh, B. Budi Wiyono, Hardika, A. V. Valdez, S. B. Mangorsi, and S. P. T. Canapi, "The

implementation of instructional supervision in Indonesia and the Philippines, and its effect on the variation of teacher learning models and materials," *Cogent Educ.*, vol. 8, no. 1, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.1080/2331186X.2021.1962232.

[16] S. P. Glickman, Carl D.; Gordon, "Clarifying Developmental Supervision. Supervision in Context," *Educ. Leadersh.*, vol. 44, no. 8, pp. 64–68, 1987.

[17] K. J. S. Robert H. Anderson, *Clinical Supervision: Coaching for Higher Performance*. Bloomsbury Academic, 1993.

[18] D. S. Basari, Muhammad Hasan, Yuyum Sumiati , Mayang Jelita Hestiningrum, "Supervisi Pendidikan Dalam Persepektif Islam Dan Pendidikan Modern: Analisis Konseptual Perannanya Dalam Meningkatkan Mutu Pembelajaran," *Pediaqu J. Pendidik. Sos. dan Hum.*, vol. 4, no. 4, 2025.

[19] A. Danial, M. Mumu, and D. Nurjamil, "Model Supervisi Akademik Berbasis Digital Oleh Kepala Sekolah Dalam Meningkatkan Profesionalisme Guru PAUD," *J. Educ. FKIP UNMA*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 1514–1521, Dec. 2022, doi: 10.31949/educatio.v8i4.3922.

[20] S. W. Wahyuningsih, "The Effect of Principal Clinical Supervision Strategy on Teachers' Pedagogic Competence in SMP Negeri 22 Tanjung Jabung Timur," *Educ. Leadersh. Manag. J.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 50–58, Nov. 2025, doi: 10.22437/element.v3i1.52332.

[21] Kusrinisari, A. Thohirin, and M. F. Wahyudi, "Implementasi Manajemen Supervisi Klinis Dalam Mengembangkan Kompetensi Pedagogik Guru," *J. Bina Ilmu Cendekia*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 1–17, Jun. 2026, doi: 10.46838/jbic.v7i1.996.

[22] B. B. Wiyono, A. Rasyad, and Maisyaroh, "The Effect of Collaborative Supervision Approaches and Collegial Supervision Techniques on Teacher Intensity Using Performance-Based Learning," *Sage Open*, vol. 11, no. 2, Apr. 2021, doi: 10.1177/21582440211013779.

[23] J. M. R.-G. Carl D. Glickman, Stephen P. Gordon, *Supervision and Instructional Leadership: A Developmental Approach*. 2014.

[24] A. A. Purwati, M. Irman, M. Siddik, M. L. Hamzah, Selvi, and S. Mery, "Digital Heritage Ecosphere: Empowering local-wisdom MSMEs for sustainable competitive advantage," *Soc. Sci. Humanit. Open*, vol. 13, p. 102624, Jun. 2026, doi: 10.1016/j.ssaho.2026.102624.

[25] J. M. Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon. *The basic guide to supervision and instructional leadership (3rd ed.)*. Pearson, 2022.