

Relational Supervision in Sociology Education: Cooperation, Distance, and Subject-Matter Mismatch in an Indonesian School District

Elda Vita^{1*}; Erianjoni Erianjoni²; Desri Nora³

^{1,2,3}Universitas Negeri Padang

*Corresponding author, e-mail: eldavita728@yahoo.com

Abstract

Educational supervision depends not only on formal authority but also on the quality of interaction through which teachers receive guidance, feedback, and professional recognition. This qualitative intrinsic case study examines interactions between sociology teachers and a subject supervisor in Pariaman, Indonesia. The analysis draws on observations, repeated in-depth interviews, and documentation collected from January to March 2017 with 14 key informants: 12 sociology teachers, one supervisor, and one supervisory coordinator. Findings reveal a relational pattern characterized by simultaneous association and dissociation. Cooperation occurred through lesson-plan review, occasional classroom observation, teacher consultation, MGMP activities, and coordination with the education office. At the same time, infrequent school visits, uneven classroom observation, limited subject-specific guidance, and a mismatch between the supervisor's Geography background and teachers' Sociology needs generated distance and contravention. The study argues that supervision becomes developmentally meaningful when administrative oversight is converted into recurrent, subject-sensitive, dialogic professional interaction. The study contributes a relational view of supervision in which professional dialogue, trust, and context-sensitive feedback matter alongside formal monitoring procedures.

Keywords: academic supervision; professional learning; sociology teachers; teacher-supervisor interaction.

How to Cite: Vita, E., Erianjoin, E. & Nora, D. (2025). Relational Supervision in Sociology Education: Cooperation, Distance, and Subject-Matter Mismatch in an Indonesian School District. *Charta Educa: Jurnal Kajian Pendidikan*, 1(3), 107-115.



This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons 4.0 Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. ©2025 by author.

Introduction

Supervision is often described in educational policy as a mechanism for improving instructional quality, ensuring professional standards, and supporting teacher development. Yet formal supervision does not operate through regulations alone. It is enacted through encounters: a supervisor visits a school, reviews a lesson plan, observes or does not observe a classroom, asks questions, offers suggestions, joins a teacher forum, and responds to problems raised by teachers. The quality of these encounters shapes whether supervision is experienced as professional learning, administrative inspection, symbolic compliance, or a mixture of all three. For this reason, supervision can be understood not only as an organizational function but also as a relational practice.

This relational perspective is particularly important for subject teachers. General pedagogical guidance can support planning, assessment, and classroom management, but subject-specific professional learning also requires sensitivity to disciplinary content, forms of reasoning, curriculum sequences, and characteristic teaching problems. A sociology teacher, for example, may need support in connecting abstract concepts such as social structure, stratification, conflict, social change, or research methods with locally meaningful cases. A supervisor

who is professionally distant from the discipline may still offer useful pedagogical advice, but teachers may question the legitimacy or usefulness of guidance when they perceive that disciplinary knowledge is insufficient.

The study reported here emerged from such a situation in Pariaman, West Sumatra. Sociology teachers were formally supervised by an official whose professional background was Geography rather than Sociology. The fieldwork found contradictory accounts. Some teachers described their relationship with the supervisor as good and helpful. They reported assistance with instructional documents, consultation about teaching problems, classroom feedback, and participation in the subject-teacher forum. Other teachers described supervision as infrequent, limited to checking documents, or disconnected from their classroom practice. Some stated that the supervisor rarely visited schools or did not enter their classrooms. These apparently inconsistent accounts are analytically valuable because they show that institutional relationships need not be uniformly cooperative or conflictual. The same supervisory arrangement can generate both forms simultaneously.

George Simmel's relational sociology offers a useful starting point for examining this pattern. Simmel treated society not as a substance existing independently of individuals but as patterns of reciprocal interaction. Social forms such as cooperation, exchange, competition, conflict, and subordination emerge through recurring relations. From this perspective, a supervisory system exists sociologically through what teachers, supervisors, coordinators, and institutions actually do in relation to one another. A formal job description may establish authority, but the meaningful form of supervision is produced through repeated reciprocal conduct.

The study also used the familiar distinction between associative and dissociative social processes. Associative processes include cooperation and accommodation, while dissociative processes include competition, contravention, and conflict. In this analysis, these categories are retained as sensitizing concepts rather than rigid labels. They help organize the empirical tension between cooperation and relational distance. However, contemporary supervision research allows the analysis to move beyond a simple positive-negative classification toward questions of feedback, professional learning, trust, subject fit, and continuity.

Recent Indonesian studies emphasize that academic supervision is most useful when it is connected to teacher learning rather than confined to documentation. Haryanto (2024) found that supervision can contribute to professional development when planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, and follow-up are linked and when teachers have opportunities to respond to supervisory processes. Nurdin, Muzakkar, and Badarudin (2024) similarly show that academic supervision involves preparation, implementation, assessment, follow-up, and reporting, while continuing problems with learning media and instructional practice require sustained support. Widyawati (2024) describes supervision as part of improving learning quality through systematic implementation rather than one-off inspection.

The shift toward developmental supervision is also evident in model-building research. Rokhman et al. (2024) developed a scientific-based academic supervision model organized around observing, questioning, experimenting, associating, and communicating. Although their design differs from the present qualitative case, the model underscores an important principle: effective supervision requires interactional processes that invite professional reasoning rather than only verify compliance. Digital supervision research makes a related point. Nisa et al. (2024) found that digital academic supervision can support teacher professionalism partly through personal learning networks, indicating that professional development depends on connections among teachers, supervisors, and knowledge resources rather than on a single supervisory visit.

Other recent evidence emphasizes teacher performance and managerial support. Riyadi, Kusumaningsih, and Ginting (2024) report relationships among academic supervision, managerial skills, motivation, and teacher performance. Lelatobur (2024) discusses academic supervision management as a factor in improving teacher performance. These studies are useful, but quantitative associations alone do not reveal what supervision feels like in interaction. A supervision program may exist formally and still be experienced as distant; conversely, a limited formal structure may become valuable when the relationship enables timely consultation and credible feedback.

The issue of communication is therefore central. Supervisory interaction involves more than transferring instructions from a higher administrative level to teachers. Teachers interpret the supervisor's expertise, intentions, frequency of contact, responsiveness, and fairness. Supervisors interpret teachers' readiness, professionalism, and willingness to receive feedback. Misunderstanding can emerge when each party has different expectations about what supervision should accomplish. Nangimah (2024), although studying thesis supervision rather than school supervision, demonstrates that supervisory relationships are negotiated through communicative strategies and that apparent difficulties may reflect differences in interactional expectations. The context is different, but the relational lesson is relevant: supervision is accomplished through communication, not merely assigned by role.

In the Pariaman case, subject-matter mismatch sharpened this issue. Teachers repeatedly mentioned that the sociology supervisor had a Geography background. This fact should not be interpreted automatically as evidence of incompetence; professional capability cannot be inferred from degree labels alone. What matters

empirically is that teachers themselves used the mismatch to explain why some guidance felt insufficiently specific. The mismatch thus became a social fact in the relationship because it influenced trust, expectations, and consultation behavior. The important question is not whether a Geography-trained supervisor can supervise Sociology in principle, but how perceived disciplinary distance shaped the actual interaction.

Teacher professional development literature also suggests that credible learning is often collaborative and embedded in practice. Hargreaves and O'Connor (2018) describe collaborative professionalism as joint work grounded in shared responsibility and professional judgment. Supervision can contribute to such professionalism when teachers and supervisors discuss real classroom evidence, examine student learning, and revisit prior feedback. By contrast, sporadic document inspection produces little opportunity for cumulative learning. The contemporary challenge is therefore to move from episodic supervision to professional learning relationships.

The article revisits the 2017 data with this relational-developmental lens. The empirical material remains historically situated; no attempt is made to present the case as a description of current policy in Pariaman. Its value lies in revealing a persistent organizational problem: the gap between supervision as formally assigned work and supervision as experienced professional support. Because many school systems continue to rely on supervisors who cover multiple institutions and sometimes adjacent subjects, the case remains analytically relevant.

The article asks two questions. First, what forms of interaction characterized the relationship among sociology teachers, the subject supervisor, and the supervisory coordinator? Second, how did frequency of contact, classroom presence, professional guidance, and perceived subject-matter fit shape the developmental value of supervision? The contribution is to recast supervision as a relational infrastructure. Supervision becomes educationally consequential when institutional authority is translated into repeated, credible, subject-sensitive interaction through which teachers can seek support, receive evidence-based feedback, and negotiate professional problems.

The case-study design follows the logic of studying a bounded institutional relationship in context (Yin, 2018), while thematic interpretation was guided by attention to patterned meaning across qualitative evidence (Braun & Clarke, 2021).

Method

The study used a qualitative intrinsic case-study design. The case was the pattern of interaction linking sociology teachers, the designated subject supervisor, and the supervisory coordinator in Pariaman. The intrinsic case approach was appropriate because the research sought an in-depth understanding of a bounded supervisory arrangement rather than statistical generalization. The fieldwork took place between 7 January and 7 March 2017 across schools and the local education office.

Contextual records gave differing totals for the number of sociology teachers and schools in the wider supervisory area. The analytic sample, however, is clear: 14 informants consisting of 12 sociology teachers, one subject supervisor, and one supervisory coordinator. Informants were selected purposively because they were directly involved in the interaction under study. The wider school network provides context, but the analysis is based on these 14 key informants.

Data collection combined passive observation, repeated in-depth interviews, and documentation. Passive observation involved visiting school settings and observing teacher-supervisor activity without participating in the supervisory process. Visits covered several public senior high schools and the education office. Observations included school arrival routines, teacher interactions, supervisory visits, and occasions when the supervisor engaged with instructional documents or classroom processes. These observations enabled comparison between participants' accounts and directly observed forms of contact.

In-depth interviews were conducted with teachers, the supervisor, and the coordinator. Recurring questions addressed frequency of contact, lesson-plan review, classroom supervision, guidance on teaching strategies, MGMP activities, professional difficulties, and perceived strengths or limitations of the supervisory relationship. Repeated interviews allowed participants to explain experiences in their own terms. Several teachers spoke in Minangkabau; excerpts used for analysis were translated into Indonesian and then rendered in English for publication.

Documentation included school administrative records, supervision-related materials, instructional documents, and institutional information. These materials were used to contextualize supervisory duties, instructional planning, and teacher distribution. Where contextual counts differed across records, the article relies on the explicit 14-informant analytic sample rather than extrapolating uncertain population figures.

Trustworthiness was addressed through source and method triangulation. Similar questions were posed to different categories of informants, and interview accounts were compared with observations and documents. Observations and interviews were repeated to check the consistency of information. Contradictory accounts were

retained as analytically meaningful because disagreement itself reveals the unevenness of supervisory experience across teachers and schools.

Analysis followed an interactive qualitative logic informed by Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014): data condensation, display, comparison, and conclusion drawing occurred iteratively. Material was coded for concrete interactional practices including visiting, observing, checking documents, asking about difficulties, giving suggestions, coordinating, participating in MGMP, delegating, being absent, and being perceived as insufficiently subject-specific. These codes were then grouped into four themes: cooperative instructional support, coordination and professional forums, episodic supervision and relational distance, and subject-matter mismatch as a legitimacy problem. The Discussion interprets these patterns through relational sociology and contemporary supervision literature.

The study has important limitations. The data were collected in 2017 and cannot be assumed to describe current arrangements. The study report does not provide a fully standardized interview schedule or a complete observation log for each participant. The study also centers the perceptions of teachers and supervisory actors rather than measuring student learning outcomes. Accordingly, claims are confined to the organization and experience of supervision in this case.

Results and Discussion

Cooperative interaction through instructional support

A substantial part of the field material shows cooperative interaction between teachers and the supervisor. Several teachers described the relationship as good, approachable, and practically useful when they encountered difficulties with instructional documents or classroom teaching. The supervisor reviewed lesson plans and other learning administration, asked about problems, and in some instances offered suggestions about teaching methods. For these teachers, supervision was experienced as assistance rather than punishment.

One teacher explained that the supervisor frequently asked about instructional documents and the difficulties she experienced during teaching, adding that the supervisor's presence made her feel helped. Another described the supervisor observing her teaching and subsequently discussing what had been done well and what should be improved. These accounts demonstrate a developmental form of supervision: observation was connected to feedback and feedback was framed as support for classroom practice.

The cooperation was not limited to document correction. Teachers reported receiving suggestions about teaching strategies appropriate to material and students. This is significant because it moves supervision closer to pedagogical reasoning. Reviewing whether a lesson plan exists is an administrative act; discussing why a method is appropriate for particular learners is a professional-learning act. The difference lies in the depth of interaction.

Field observations also recorded occasions when the supervisor provided guidance on learning administration. The supervisor's role included checking preparation and offering solutions where documents needed revision. The pattern corresponds to Haryanto's (2024) account of supervision as a cycle involving planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, and follow-up. In the Pariaman case, however, this cycle did not occur with equal consistency for every teacher.

Coordination, MGMP, and the wider professional network

A second cooperative pattern involved relationships beyond the individual teacher-supervisor dyad. The supervisory coordinator described a generally positive relationship with supervisors and explained that coordination forums were used to discuss difficulties, divide responsibilities, and facilitate supervisory work. These institutional links mattered because the supervisor operated within a broader administrative structure rather than independently.

Teachers and the supervisor also referred to MGMP, the subject-teacher association, as an important interactional space. The supervisor participated as a resource person and discussed teaching problems with teachers. One supervisor account emphasized that the relationship with teachers was particularly close during MGMP meetings, when classroom constraints and instructional issues could be discussed collectively.

MGMP changed the social form of supervision. A school visit positions the supervisor in an evaluative relationship with an individual teacher, whereas a teacher forum can create a more collegial setting in which problems are shared. It also allows expertise to circulate horizontally among teachers rather than only vertically from supervisor to teacher. In this sense, professional forums functioned as a partial compensation for the limitations of individual supervision.

The data also indicate informal delegation to more experienced teachers. The supervisor described expectations that senior teachers or MGMP leaders would assist junior colleagues. Such arrangements can strengthen collective capacity, but they can also blur responsibility if delegation becomes a substitute for supervisory presence. The empirical record includes both possibilities.

Episodic visits and uneven classroom presence

Alongside cooperation, teachers repeatedly described supervision as infrequent. Several reported that the supervisor came to school only once in a semester or approximately every few months. Some said visits occurred without a predictable schedule. Others reported that the supervisor checked learning documents but did not observe classroom instruction.

This episodic pattern generated relational distance. Teachers could not rely on supervision as a continuous source of consultation. One teacher described the relationship as merely "ordinary" because the supervisor rarely visited the school. Another stated that the supervisor had not entered her classroom during teaching and that document checking occurred in the teachers' room. A further account described only one classroom observation over a long period.

These accounts do not mean that the supervisor never observed lessons; other teachers clearly reported classroom observation and feedback. The important finding is unevenness. Supervision was experienced differently across participants. For some, the supervisor was a source of guidance; for others, the relationship was too intermittent to become professionally meaningful.

This unevenness explains why associative and dissociative processes coexisted. Cooperation could occur during a visit, but long intervals between visits weakened continuity. A teacher might have a cordial relationship with the supervisor while still judging the supervisory system as insufficient. Dissociation therefore did not necessarily take the form of open conflict. It often appeared as contravention, disappointment, low expectations, and reliance on one's own professional judgment when support was unavailable.

Subject-matter mismatch as a problem of professional legitimacy

The most persistent source of tension concerned the supervisor's professional background in Geography. Teachers used this mismatch to explain why subject-specific guidance was limited. Some stated that the supervisor could check documents or provide general pedagogical advice but did not fully understand Sociology. One teacher said that because the supervisor came from Geography, she had to rely on her own professionalism in subject matters.

The analysis does not treat disciplinary background as an automatic measure of supervisory competence. A skilled educator can often support teaching across related fields. However, what mattered sociologically was that teachers perceived the mismatch as relevant. This perception influenced how they interpreted supervisory feedback and whether they expected to consult the supervisor about disciplinary questions.

Subject fit is particularly important in Sociology because content and pedagogy are intertwined. Teaching social stratification, conflict, research methods, or social change requires decisions about conceptual accuracy, examples, evidence, and the relationship between theory and contemporary society. General feedback on classroom management may be useful, but teachers may still need a professional interlocutor who can discuss these disciplinary dimensions.

The subject mismatch also affected legitimacy when combined with infrequent contact. If a supervisor visits regularly, observes carefully, asks questions, and develops knowledge of the subject community, professional credibility can grow through interaction. When contact is limited, the formal mismatch becomes more salient because there are fewer opportunities to build relational trust and demonstrate relevant expertise.

Cooperation and contravention formed one supervisory relationship

Taken together, the findings show that the supervisory relationship cannot be classified simply as effective or ineffective. The same system contained cooperation, coordination, mentoring, and feedback, but also absence, uneven classroom observation, doubts about subject expertise, and dissatisfaction. The relational pattern was mixed.

This mixed pattern is consistent with Simmel's insight that social relationships can contain opposing forms simultaneously. Cooperation does not eliminate tension; tension can exist within an ongoing cooperative institution. Teachers continued to prepare documents, attend MGMP, receive occasional guidance, and recognize the supervisor's formal role even when they criticized aspects of performance. Contravention did not dissolve the relationship; it exposed the gap between expected and experienced supervision.

Contemporary supervision scholarship frames instructional supervision as a developmental process that combines observation, feedback, dialogue, and follow-up rather than document inspection alone (Glickman et al., 2018; Zepeda, 2017). Indonesian studies similarly emphasize collaborative and evidence-informed supervision as a mechanism for professional learning (Fauzi, 2024; Herman & Khalaf, 2024; Suchyadi et al., 2023). The relational interpretation is also consistent with sociological accounts that treat interaction, association, and institutional roles as patterned social relations rather than isolated individual behavior (Ritzer & Stepnisky, 2021; Simmel, 1955).

Discussion

Supervision is a relational infrastructure, not a sequence of visits

The findings suggest that supervision should be conceptualized as relational infrastructure. An infrastructure is useful not because it exists formally but because it enables recurring flows - in this case, flows of feedback, questions, curricular information, instructional evidence, and professional support. A supervisory appointment without recurrent interaction provides weak infrastructure; a network of regular observation, consultation, peer learning, and follow-up provides stronger infrastructure.

This interpretation helps explain the contradictory teacher accounts. The supervisor did perform valued functions, but access to those functions was uneven. The issue was therefore less the absolute presence or absence of supervision than its distribution and continuity. Contemporary studies support this emphasis. Nurdin et al. (2024) describe supervision as a staged process that includes preparation, implementation, assessment, follow-up, and reporting. Haryanto (2024) similarly emphasizes follow-up. The Pariaman case shows what happens when stages are not experienced as a continuous cycle by all teachers.

The developmental value of supervision accumulates over time. A first observation establishes a baseline; feedback identifies a problem; a later observation allows teacher and supervisor to examine change. If the supervisor returns only after several months with no continuity, feedback becomes episodic. Teachers may comply with document requirements but lose the opportunity for iterative professional learning.

From inspection to dialogic professional learning

The distinction between document checking and pedagogical dialogue is central to the case. Teachers generally accepted administrative review, but the most positively described interactions involved conversation: asking about problems, discussing methods, and reflecting after classroom observation. Such dialogue acknowledges teachers as professional actors rather than objects of inspection.

Rokhman et al. (2024) provide a contemporary model that explicitly includes questioning and communicating within supervision. Nisa et al. (2024) show that personal learning networks can mediate the relationship between digital supervision and professionalism. Although the present data predate widespread digital supervision, the underlying mechanism is similar. Teachers learn when supervision creates access to people and ideas with which they can reason about practice.

This is also consistent with collaborative professionalism (Hargreaves & O'Connor, 2018). Professional collaboration is not simply friendliness or attendance at meetings. It involves shared work around teaching and learning. In the Pariaman case, MGMP was one of the strongest spaces for such shared work. The implication is that supervisors should see subject associations not as peripheral activities but as part of the supervisory architecture.

Subject expertise and relational legitimacy

The supervisor's Geography background raises a broader policy question about subject assignment. The data do not justify a categorical rule that supervisors must always hold identical disciplinary degrees. What they show is that perceived subject distance can reduce professional legitimacy, particularly when teachers need disciplinary guidance and contact is infrequent.

Legitimacy can be built through several routes. Formal subject expertise is one route. A second is demonstrated pedagogical expertise and careful preparation. A third is networked expertise: the supervisor can connect teachers with experienced subject colleagues, university academics, or professional resources. The problem arises when formal authority is not accompanied by any of these forms of disciplinary support.

In this sense, subject mismatch should be treated as a design problem rather than an individual deficit. Districts may face staffing constraints that make perfect subject matching impossible. The response should be to create co-supervision, clustered subject networks, or MGMP-based expertise so that supervisors are not expected to provide knowledge outside their disciplinary strength alone. Digital professional networks, as discussed by Nisa et al. (2024), may further reduce the constraints of geography and staffing.

Association and dissociation as normal organizational dynamics

The use of associative and dissociative categories becomes more useful when dissociation is not equated with failure. Contravention can signal unmet professional expectations. Teachers' complaints about rare visits or limited subject guidance reveal what they believe supervision should provide. Such criticism can therefore be treated as diagnostic information for organizational improvement.

Simmel's relational perspective helps avoid the assumption that harmony is the only sign of a functioning institution. Constructive disagreement can contribute to professional learning if the system allows it to be voiced and addressed. A teacher who says that supervision is too administrative is not necessarily resisting accountability; the teacher may be asking for deeper instructional support.

The challenge is to distinguish productive tension from disengagement. When teachers continue to discuss problems with supervisors and professional forums, tension can be negotiated. When expectations fall so low that teachers no longer seek assistance, relational infrastructure weakens. The Pariaman case contains signs of both: some teachers actively consulted, while others relied on themselves because they expected limited support.

Implications for supervision of sociology teachers

Sociology education requires more than generic classroom monitoring. Supervisors need enough disciplinary understanding to discuss how concepts are represented, how social evidence is used, how sensitive issues are handled, and how students are encouraged to connect sociological theory with local realities. Even when supervisors are not sociology specialists, supervision can become subject-sensitive through preparation and partnership.

A practical model could include three levels. First, general academic supervision addresses planning, assessment, classroom management, and student participation. Second, subject-sensitive supervision examines disciplinary objectives, conceptual accuracy, examples, and learning tasks. Third, professional-network supervision uses MGMP or digital communities to connect teachers with peers and experts. Such layering reduces the unrealistic expectation that one supervisor must personally possess every form of expertise.

Frequency also matters. Rather than aiming only for more visits, systems should prioritize coherent contact. A short pre-observation conversation, one focused observation, written or oral feedback, and a follow-up discussion can form a meaningful cycle. Digital communication can support interim consultation when travel is difficult, but it should complement rather than replace evidence from teaching practice.

Recent Indonesian supervision research provides useful support. Widyawati (2024) emphasizes implementation directed toward learning quality; Riyadi et al. (2024) associate supervision and managerial capacity with teacher performance; and Munira et al. (2024) discuss supervision within culturally diverse educational contexts. Together with the case, these studies suggest that effective supervision is not a single technique. It is a coordinated system of authority, expertise, communication, and professional learning.

Limitations and future research

The study's historical character is the first limitation. Fieldwork occurred in 2017, while Indonesian curriculum, supervisory structures, digital communication, and administrative responsibilities have since changed. The case should therefore be read analytically rather than as a current evaluation of Pariaman.

Second, the study relies primarily on teacher and supervisor accounts, observations, and documents. It does not measure changes in teacher practice or student outcomes attributable to supervision. Future studies could combine interactional data with repeated classroom observations and teacher-development indicators. Third, the study contains inconsistent contextual counts for the wider teacher population. The article resolves this only by limiting claims to the documented 14 informants; future research should maintain a clear sampling audit trail.

A promising research direction is to examine supervisory interaction longitudinally. Rather than asking teachers once whether supervision is effective, researchers could follow several supervision cycles from pre-observation to feedback and follow-up. Conversation analysis could identify how feedback is negotiated. Network analysis could examine how MGMP, supervisors, senior teachers, and digital groups distribute professional knowledge. Comparative research could also test whether subject-matched supervision produces different forms of trust or instructional feedback from cross-subject supervision.

Conclusion

The Pariaman case demonstrates that educational supervision is produced through relationships rather than job descriptions alone. Sociology teachers experienced meaningful cooperation when supervisors reviewed instructional preparation, discussed teaching problems, observed lessons, offered feedback, and participated in professional forums. At the same time, infrequent visits, uneven classroom observation, and doubts about subject-specific expertise created relational distance and contravention.

These patterns were not mutually exclusive. Cooperation and dissatisfaction coexisted within the same institutional arrangement. This finding shifts attention away from asking whether supervision was simply "good" or "bad" and toward examining the conditions under which supervision becomes developmentally useful. Continuity, dialogue, classroom evidence, credible expertise, and access to professional networks were the conditions most clearly implicated in teachers' accounts.

For sociology education, the implication is that supervision should combine general pedagogical support with subject-sensitive professional learning. Where exact disciplinary matching is impossible, districts can strengthen legitimacy through MGMP, co-supervision, peer expertise, and digital professional networks. The goal is not more administrative contact for its own sake, but a recurrent relational infrastructure through which teachers can ask, test, revise, and improve professional practice.

Declarations

Author contribution

Author 1: developed the main research idea and objectives, designed the research methodology, conducted data collection and investigation, performed the data analysis, and prepared the first draft of the manuscript. Author 2: contributed to the development and implementation of the research methodology, supported the data collection and investigation process, and reviewed and revised the manuscript to improve its academic quality, clarity, and structure. Author 3: provided input into the research concept and direction, supervised and guided the overall research process, reviewed and improved the manuscript, and contributed to obtaining financial support or research funding

Funding

The research received no specific grant from any funding agency.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest related to the publication of this article.

Use of generative AI

Generative AI were used solely for translation and language editing of the manuscript. The authors take full responsibility for the content and accuracy of the article.

Acknowledgments

Authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to all parties who contributed to and supported the completion of this study. Their valuable assistance, support, and encouragement are greatly appreciated.

References

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*. SAGE.
- Fauzi, A. (2024). Peran supervisi kolaboratif dalam membangun budaya pembelajaran profesional di madrasah. *UNISAN Jurnal*, 3(2), 839-849.
- Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2018). *SuperVision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach (10th ed.)*. Pearson.
- Hargreaves, A., & O'Connor, M. T. (2018). *Collaborative professionalism: When teaching together means learning for all*. Corwin.
- Haryanto, H. (2024). Teacher professional development in academic supervision: A qualitative study at Madrasah Tsanawiah. *Journal of Education and Teaching (JET)*, 5(3), 350-361. <https://doi.org/10.51454/jet.v5i3.445>
- Herman, H., & Khalaf, O. I. (2024). Evidence from school principals: Academic supervision decision-making on improving teacher performance in Indonesia. *Advances in Decision Sciences*, 27(3), 46-71. <https://doi.org/10.47654/v27y2023i3p46-71>
- Lelatobur, L. E. (2024). Peran manajemen supervisi akademik dalam meningkatkan kinerja guru. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan*, 7(5), 5038-5046.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook (3rd ed.)*. SAGE.
- Munira, S. L., Rahma, N. S., Sabri, A., & Lubis, Y. (2024). Supervisi pendidikan dalam pendidikan multikultural. *JUPI: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Islam*, 22(4), 1-9.
- Nangimah, M. (2024). "My brain doesn't communicate with my hands": Navigating negotiated interaction in Swedish and Indonesian supervision. *Frontiers in Education*, 9, 1404378. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2024.1404378>
- Nisa, K., Imron, A., Rasdiana, Sobri, A. Y., Hariyadi, R., Anggara, R. A., Rudyman, Risaldi, D., Azizah, F., Attamimi, M. R., & Salym, A. Q. N. (2024). Increasing teacher professionalism through the implementation of digital academic supervision in Indonesian secondary school: Personal learning networks as mediator. *Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development*, 8(8), 6420. <https://doi.org/10.24294/jipd.v8i8.6420>
- Nurdin, N., Muzakkar, A., & Badarudin, B. (2024). Analisis pelaksanaan supervisi akademik dalam meningkatkan kinerja guru pada sekolah dasar di Kecamatan Masbagik. *NUSRA: Jurnal Penelitian dan Ilmu Pendidikan*, 5(3), 1231-1244. <https://doi.org/10.55681/nusra.v5i3.3145>
- Ritzer, G., & Stepnisky, J. (2021). *Sociological theory (11th ed.)*. SAGE.
- Riyadi, F. A., Kusumaningsih, W., & Ginting, R. B. (2024). Pengaruh supervisi akademik, keterampilan manajerial kepala sekolah dan motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja guru SD Negeri di Kecamatan Bulu Kabupaten

- Temanggung. *Jurnal Inovasi Pembelajaran di Sekolah*, 5(1), 236-244.
<https://doi.org/10.51874/jips.v5i1.214>
- Rokhman, R., Diana, N., Etek, Y., Koderi, K., & Sufian, M. (2024). The development of a scientific-based academic supervision management model. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 16(2), 1450-1464.
- Simmel, G. (1955). *Conflict and the web of group affiliations* (K. H. Wolff & R. Bendix, Trans.). Free Press. (Original work published 1908)
- Suchyadi, Y., Indriyani, S. R., & Destiana, D. (2023). Basic concepts of educational supervision along with related administrative studies. *Journal of Humanities and Social Studies*, 6(3), 406-410.
<https://doi.org/10.33751/jhss.v6i3.7506>
- Widyawati, D. (2024). Implementation of academic supervision in improving the quality of learning at SMA N 2 Batang, Batang Regency. *Riwayat: Educational Journal of History and Humanities*, 7(4), 2962-2970.
<https://doi.org/10.24815/jr.v7i4.41920>
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods (6th ed.)*. SAGE.
- Zepeda, S. J. (2017). *Instructional supervision: Applying tools and concepts (4th ed.)*. Routledge.