



TAROGAU: Journal of Islamic Studies

Volume 1 - Number 2 - April 2026; -

P-ISSN: xxxxxxxxxxxx

DOI: xxxxxxxx

<https://ejournals-glm.id/index.php/tarogau>

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

The Research and Development Supervision Competence of Islamic Religious Education Supervisors

Sartika S. Hasan

Institut Agama Islam Negeri Ternate

tikahasan1411@gmail.com

Jasin Ibrahim

Institut Agama Islam Negeri Ternate

ibrahimjasin293@gmail.com

*Corresponding Author

[Received: June 26, 2026] [Revised: August 19, 2026] [Accepted: August 29, 2026] [Published: August 30, 2026]

Abstract

One of the competency dimensions a school principal must possess, as stipulated in Permendiknas Number 13 of 2007 concerning School Principal Standards, is supervisory competence, most notably academic supervision of the teaching and learning process. Beyond the school principal, Islamic Religious Education (PAI) supervisors are also required to master a research and development competence, alongside personality, academic supervision, managerial supervision, evaluation, and social competencies, as mandated by the Regulation of the Minister of Religious Affairs Number 2 of 2012. This study aims to analyse whether the research and development supervision competence of PAI supervisors in schools has been fully realised, or whether it remains insufficiently directed toward PAI teachers, students, and schools. The study used a qualitative case-study design. Data were obtained through in-depth interviews using purposive sampling with PAI teachers and their supervisor at MTs Alkhairat Gambesi; transcripts were analysed thematically using qualitative analysis software (NVivo). The findings show that the supervisor's mastery of PAI teaching methods and his capacity to mentor teachers holistically are well realised, and that supervision planning and evaluation follow a structured annual cycle. However, the competence's distinctive research dimension, namely the systematic conduct of research and the compilation of documented teaching handbooks, remains only partially realised, present as intention rather than concrete output. These findings identify the specific location of the gap between policy and practice and may serve as baseline data for further research examining this issue in different contexts.

Keywords: Competence, supervision, supervisor, Islamic religious education, research and development

\Introduction

One of the competency dimensions a school principal must possess, as stipulated in the appendix of Regulation of the Minister of National Education (Permendiknas) Number 13 of 2007 concerning School Principal Standards, is supervisory competence (Kementerian Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia, 2007). Under this regulation, every school principal is obliged to supervise the teachers within the school he or she leads, and one of the central components of educational supervision is supervising teachers in carrying out the teaching and learning process, commonly known as academic supervision. Mulyasa (2005) defines academic supervision as professional assistance provided to teachers through a cycle of systematic planning, careful observation, and objective feedback. The essence of academic supervision is therefore not to judge teachers' performance in managing the learning process, but to help teachers improve the quality of learning and to develop their professional capacity.

In a broader sense, supervision can be understood as a set of activities involving observing, guiding, and monitoring, designed to assist teachers and other school personnel in carrying out their duties (Sahertian, 2000). As the field of educational administration developed, supervision came to be distinguished into two closely related but conceptually separate domains: academic supervision, which concerns the improvement of teaching and learning, and administrative or managerial supervision, which concerns the administrative aspects that support the implementation of learning, such as documentation, facilities, and school governance (Purwanto, 2003). Although administrative supervision and academic supervision are positioned as equally important, academic supervision is generally regarded as the core activity because it interacts most directly with the quality of instruction that students experience in the classroom. The scope of academic supervision typically covers curriculum implementation; teachers' planning, delivery, and assessment of learning; the achievement of graduate-competency, process, and content standards; and the continuous improvement of learning quality (Purwanto, 2003; Priansa & Somad,

2014). Supervision, in this sense, is not intended merely to evaluate subordinates' performance; rather, it is intended to provide assistance to teachers so that they can improve and enhance the learning process, thereby producing more optimal learning outcomes.

Several scholars have offered complementary formulations of what supervision fundamentally is and what it is for. Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon (2014) describe supervision as "a process designed to help teachers and supervisors learn more about their practice, to be better able to use their knowledge and skills to serve parents and schools, and to make the school a more effective learning community." This developmental conception treats supervision as a shared learning process between the supervisor and the teacher rather than a one-directional act of inspection. Sergiovanni and Starratt (2007) similarly argue that supervision should be understood as a collegial and reflective process, one that is negotiated between supervisor and teacher rather than imposed hierarchically; framed this way, the legitimacy of supervision rests less on positional authority and more on the supervisor's capacity to build a trusting professional relationship. Taken together, these views converge on the idea that the ultimate purpose of educational supervision is to develop teachers' professional competence so that the objectives of learning, and by extension the objectives of education as a whole, can be achieved more optimally.

To realise these purposes, supervisors may draw on a variety of techniques and approaches. In terms of technique, supervision is commonly divided into individual techniques, such as classroom visits, observation visits, and individual guidance on curriculum implementation, and group techniques, such as staff meetings, group discussions, and in-service training or workshops (Purwanto, 2003; Priansa & Somad, 2014). In terms of approach, Priansa and Somad (2014) classify supervisory approaches into three types: the direct (directive) approach, in which the supervisor gives explicit direction, reinforcement, and correction; the indirect (non-directive) approach, in which the supervisor gives teachers greater latitude to identify and articulate their own instructional problems; and the collaborative approach, which

combines elements of both. Sahertian (2000) frames the collaborative approach in particular as a synthesis of directive and non-directive techniques, allowing the supervisor to adapt the degree of guidance to the teacher's level of experience, confidence, and specific instructional needs. Darsono's (2016) case study of supervision practice in a madrasah in Trenggalek similarly found that supervisors who combined directive and non-directive elements, applying each selectively according to the teacher's characteristics and the nature of the problem at hand, were perceived by teachers as more effective and less threatening than supervisors who relied on a single, fixed approach (Darsono, 2016). Which technique and approach a supervisor should use is therefore not a matter of personal preference alone, but should be adapted to the particular problems faced by the teacher being supervised, the teacher's individual characteristics, and the situation and conditions prevailing in the school (Sahertian, 2000; Priansa & Somad, 2014).

While the discussion above concerns supervision in general and, more specifically, the supervisory competence expected of a school principal, Islamic Religious Education (Pendidikan Agama Islam, or PAI) supervisors in Indonesia occupy a distinct institutional position with a broader and more specialised mandate. Unlike school principals, who supervise all subjects and staff within a single school, PAI supervisors are external functional officials under the Ministry of Religious Affairs who are tasked with supervising Islamic religious education teachers across a number of schools within their assigned working area. This mandate is formalised in the Regulation of the Minister of Religious Affairs Number 2 of 2012 concerning Madrasah Supervisors and Islamic Religious Education Supervisors in Schools, which stipulates that PAI supervisors must master six core competencies: personality competence, academic supervision competence, managerial supervision competence, educational evaluation competence, research and development competence, and social competence (Kementerian Agama Republik Indonesia, 2012). Personality competence concerns the supervisor's integrity, work ethic, and exemplary conduct as a religious educator; academic supervision competence concerns the capacity to

guide PAI teachers in planning, delivering, and assessing religious instruction; managerial supervision competence concerns the capacity to guide school-level administration of PAI programmes; educational evaluation competence concerns the capacity to assess the achievement of PAI learning outcomes at the school and district level; and social competence concerns the supervisor's ability to build cooperative relationships with teachers, principals, and the wider school community. The fifth competence, research and development, is the specific focus of the present study.

The research and development competence obliges PAI supervisors to master the methods and substance of Islamic religious education, to conduct research relevant to their supervisory assignment, to compile teaching methods, guides, or handbooks that can be used by the PAI teachers under their guidance, and to mentor PAI teachers in developing their professional capacity on an ongoing basis (Kementerian Agama Republik Indonesia, 2012). Unlike academic and managerial supervision competence, which are primarily oriented toward monitoring and coaching in the field, the research and development competence positions the supervisor as a producer of knowledge, someone who is expected not only to observe classroom practice but also to systematically investigate the problems that PAI teachers face and to translate the findings of that investigation into usable guidance, whether in the form of written handbooks, training modules, or structured mentoring programmes. This positions the PAI supervisor, at least in principle, as an intermediate figure between academic research and field-level teacher development, a role that is considerably more demanding than that of a conventional classroom inspector.

Several prior studies suggest that this ideal is not always matched by practice. In an early and often-cited study of PAI supervisors' performance, Habibullah (2013) found that supervisors' activities in the field tended to be dominated by administrative monitoring and the completion of standardised report forms, while substantive pedagogical coaching, let alone research-based coaching, remained comparatively underdeveloped. More recently, Manalu, Kadir, and Siregar (2020),

examining the implementation of the Ministry of Religious Affairs' regulation on PAI supervision, similarly found that supervisors' performance in the field frequently fell short of the six-competency standard set out in the regulation, particularly with respect to competencies that require more than routine visitation, such as the research and development competence. These findings suggest a persistent gap between the normative expectations embedded in national policy and the operational realities of PAI supervision at the school level, a gap that appears to be most pronounced precisely in the competency domain that requires supervisors to generate and apply research, rather than simply to observe and report.

Despite the importance of this competency domain for the long-term professional development of PAI teachers, and despite indications from earlier research that it may be inadequately implemented, relatively little empirical work has examined, in a focused and in-depth manner, how PAI supervisors themselves understand and enact their research and development responsibilities in everyday practice, and how PAI teachers experience and evaluate that enactment. Much of the existing literature on PAI supervision addresses supervisory competence in general or academic supervision competence specifically, leaving the research and development competence comparatively under-examined as a distinct object of study. This study seeks to address that gap by analysing, through the perspective of PAI teachers being supervised, whether the research and development supervision competence of PAI supervisors has been fully realised in schools, or whether it remains insufficiently directed toward PAI teachers, students, and the school as a whole. In doing so, the study aims to provide baseline empirical data that can inform both future research on this specific competency domain and, more practically, the design of coaching and training programmes intended to strengthen it.

Methods

This study employed a qualitative approach with a single case-study design (Yin, 2014), chosen because the research question concerns not merely whether PAI

supervisors possess research and development supervision competence in the abstract, but how that competence is understood, enacted, and experienced within a bounded, real-world setting. A case-study design allows the researchers to examine the interaction between the supervisor's practice, the teachers' perceptions, and the institutional context in sufficient depth to capture nuances that a broader, more extensive survey-based design would likely miss. The case selected for this study is a madrasah tsanawiyah, MTs Alkhairat Gambesi, together with the PAI supervisor formally assigned to oversee Islamic religious education at that school, providing a bounded unit of analysis within which the research and development competence could be examined as it is actually practised, rather than as it is idealised in policy documents.

Data were obtained primarily through in-depth, semi-structured interviews. Informants were selected using a purposive sampling technique (Patton, 2002), on the grounds that the research questions required informants with specific, first-hand knowledge of the phenomenon under study rather than a demographically representative sample. Following this rationale, informants were selected according to four criteria: (1) a sound and demonstrable understanding of the issue being studied, namely the practice of PAI supervision; (2) active, current involvement in the field being studied, meaning active status as a PAI teacher or supervisor rather than a retired or inactive one; (3) availability and willingness to provide information to the researchers within the time frame of the study; and (4) a demonstrated ability to provide information that is consistent with, and can be corroborated against, actual conditions in the field. To meet these criteria, the informants selected for this study were active teachers who had pursued the Islamic religious education teaching profession, together with the PAI supervisor responsible for their school, as of the 2025 academic year.

The interview instrument was developed around the four established indicators of the research and development supervision competence set out in the Regulation of the Minister of Religious Affairs Number 2 of 2012, namely: the

supervisor's mastery of PAI teaching methods; the supervisor's ability to conduct research related to his or her supervisory assignment; the supervisor's ability to compile teaching methods or handbooks for use by PAI teachers; and the supervisor's ability to mentor PAI teachers in their professional development. Using these four indicators as a guiding framework, the interviews explored informants' direct experience of being supervised, including the frequency and format of supervisory visits, the planning process that preceded each supervisory cycle, the techniques and approaches the supervisor used during classroom visits and group coaching sessions, and the manner in which supervision results were evaluated, communicated, and followed up.

After each interview was completed, the audio recording was transcribed verbatim. The transcripts were then analysed thematically, following the six-phase approach described by Braun and Clarke (Braun & Clarke, 2006): familiarisation with the data, generation of initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and producing the final analytic narrative. This process was supported by qualitative data-analysis software, specifically NVivo (Edwards-Jones, 2014), which was used to organise transcripts, assign codes systematically across informants, and retrieve coded segments for comparison across the four competency indicators. Thematic analysis assisted by software of this kind is widely regarded as an effective means of examining interview data in sufficient depth and detail to identify recurring patterns while still preserving the contextual richness of individual informants' accounts, and it allowed the researchers to move iteratively between the raw transcripts and the emerging thematic structure rather than committing prematurely to a fixed coding scheme. To strengthen the credibility of the analysis, coded themes were cross-checked against the original transcripts and, where possible, against more than one informant's account of the same supervisory episode, so that the findings presented in the following section reflect patterns corroborated across informants rather than the impression of a single respondent.

Result and Discussion

A. Needs Analysis of the PAI Supervisors' Coaching Programme

Referring to the Regulation of the Minister of Religious Affairs Number 2 of 2012 concerning Madrasah Supervisors and Islamic Religious Education Supervisors in Schools, the preliminary phase of this study examined the extent to which PAI supervisors' current practice already matches the six-competency standard the regulation sets out, with particular attention to the research and development competence. Consistent with Habibullah's (2013) earlier finding that PAI supervisors' fieldwork tends to be dominated by administrative monitoring, this study's preliminary observation and documentation review found that, at the district level, PAI supervisors' duties have to date largely been confined to monitoring and evaluation through the completion of standardised report forms, essentially checklists recording whether a lesson took place and whether certain administrative documents were present. Coaching in the fuller sense envisaged by the regulation, that is, guidance on specific teaching techniques and structured assistance in resolving classroom problems, has not been implemented in a systematic or research-informed way, largely because an appropriate operational model for delivering this kind of coaching has not yet been established at the district or school level. This is consistent with Manalu, Kadir, and Siregar's (2020) conclusion that implementation of the ministerial regulation on PAI supervision frequently falls short of the standard it sets, particularly in competency domains, such as research and development, that demand more than routine visitation.

This gap has practical consequences for classroom practice. Informants in this study reported that the limited scope of the coaching they received had, over time, constrained their ability to vary their instructional methods; several teachers specifically mentioned a lack of creativity in the use of varied learning models as a consequence of receiving mostly administrative rather than pedagogical feedback, a pattern that in their assessment had made PAI instruction less engaging for students than it might otherwise be. Based on this preliminary needs analysis, comprising an

examination of the training curriculum and objectives that currently guide supervisor development, the substantive materials used in supervisor training, and the way that training is evaluated, it is clear that a more structured coaching programme, grounded in pedagogical-competence training rather than administrative compliance alone, is needed if the research and development competence is to be realised in a way that visibly benefits classroom instruction rather than remaining a formal requirement on paper.

B. Research and Development Supervision Competence: Findings from MTs Alkhairat Gambesi

Building on the indicators established in the Regulation of the Minister of Religious Affairs Number 2 of 2012, namely mastery of PAI teaching methods, the ability to conduct research related to the supervisory assignment, the ability to compile teaching methods or handbooks, and the ability to mentor PAI teachers, this study conducted in-depth interviews with PAI teachers at MTs Alkhairat Gambesi, whose supervisor is Ridwan Musaid. The PAI teacher interviewed at this school was found to have an academic background and professional qualification directly relevant to Islamic religious education, having previously served as a PAI teacher before pursuing further study in the field; the teacher's substantive mastery of PAI subject matter was therefore not in question, and the interview could focus more specifically on the supervisor's contribution to the teacher's ongoing professional development.

Mastery of PAI teaching methods. Teachers reported that the supervisor visits the school only once a week to observe teachers and students during classroom instruction. Within that limited window, however, teachers consistently described the supervisor as more than simply proficient in PAI teaching methods; he was regarded by the teachers interviewed as an authority in the field, someone whose command of pedagogical method extended beyond what would be expected of a routine monitoring visit. This finding is broadly consistent with the theoretical expectation, articulated by Mulyasa (2005) and Sahertian (2000), that a supervisor's credibility with

teachers rests substantially on demonstrated subject-matter and pedagogical expertise rather than positional authority alone; where that expertise is visible to teachers, as it appeared to be at MTs Alkhairat Gambesi, teachers are more willing to treat supervisory visits as a genuine source of professional learning rather than as a compliance exercise to be endured.

Ability to conduct research related to the assignment. Teachers also reported that the supervisor was seen as capable of conducting research related to his own area of mastery, in the sense that he engaged in a form of ongoing, informal inquiry into instructional problems he observed, even though this activity had not yet been formalised into a documented research output, such as a published classroom-action-research report or a structured needs assessment. This partial realisation of the research indicator is significant: it suggests that the cognitive and professional capacity for research-based supervision exists at the level of the individual supervisor, but that this capacity has not yet been translated into the systematic, documented research practice envisaged by the regulation. In terms of monitoring more broadly, the supervisor was reported to interview teachers, and particularly the school principal, on matters concerning both classroom teaching and extracurricular activities, an approach that extends the evidence base for his informal inquiry beyond direct classroom observation alone.

Ability to compile teaching methods or handbooks. With respect to compiling structured guidance materials, the supervisor was reported to be capable of planning measurement guidelines and instruments intended to support PAI teachers' practice. However, teachers were consistent in describing this planning function as remaining largely at the conceptual or intention stage; concrete guidance documents, handbooks, or written instructional aids had, at the time of the interviews, not yet been finalised or distributed for regular use. This finding represents the clearest evidence in this case of the research and development competence being only partially realised: the planning intention is present, and is recognised by teachers as a genuine commitment on the supervisor's part, but the tangible output that would allow this competence to

benefit teachers beyond the individual supervisory relationship has not yet materialised.

Ability to mentor PAI teachers. Finally, with regard to mentoring, teachers described the supervisor as consistently providing guidance to all PAI teachers at the school, and, notably, as approaching this mentoring holistically rather than focusing narrowly on a single aspect of a teacher's performance. Rather than isolating one weakness for correction, the supervisor was reported to consider a teacher's overall development, encompassing classroom management, subject mastery, and engagement with students, when providing feedback. This holistic orientation aligns with the developmental conception of supervision advanced by Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon (2014) and by Sergiovanni and Starratt (2007), in which supervision functions as an ongoing professional-learning relationship rather than a series of discrete, narrowly scoped corrective interventions.

Taken together, these four sub-findings indicate an uneven pattern of realisation within the research and development competence: mastery of teaching method and the mentoring function appear to be comparatively well realised in this case, while the research and handbook-compilation functions, arguably the two elements that most distinguish this competence from ordinary academic supervision, remain only partially realised, consistent with the broader pattern reported by Habibullah (2013) and by Manalu, Kadir, and Siregar (2020).

C. Supervision Planning

Planning for supervision by the PAI supervisor was found to follow the statutory functions assigned to PAI supervisors under prevailing regulation, namely: (1) formulating the PAI supervision programme; (2) providing coaching, guidance, and professional development for PAI teachers; (3) monitoring the implementation of PAI national standards; (4) assessing the outcomes of the supervision programme; and (5) reporting on the implementation of supervisory duties. This planning process is required to be completed at the beginning of each academic year, and, as practised at MTs Alkhairat Gambesi, covers both individual and classical (group) supervision.

Individual supervision planning encompasses the coaching, or monitoring, of individual PAI teachers, together with monitoring of the four national education standards most directly relevant to classroom practice: the content standard, the process standard, the graduate-competency standard, and the assessment standard.

This planning practice is consistent with Weihrich and Koontz's (1993) classical management-theory account of controlling as a management function that measures and evaluates performance in order to determine the extent to which planning objectives have been achieved, thereby providing a systematic reference point for constructing subsequent, more effective and efficient supervision plans. Understood this way, supervision planning is not a one-off administrative exercise completed at the start of the year and then set aside; rather, it functions as the first stage of an iterative management cycle in which each year's plan is informed by an evaluation of the previous year's outcomes. The extent to which the PAI supervisor in this case study explicitly used prior evaluation results to inform the current year's plan could not be confirmed in full detail from the interviews conducted, which itself points to an area where the research and development competence, specifically the research component that would generate the evidence needed to inform planning, remains underdeveloped in practice.

D. Supervision Implementation

In practical terms, supervision at MTs Alkhairat Gambesi is implemented through two main individual visits and a parallel cycle of group coaching. In the first individual visit, the PAI supervisor examines administrative documents related to teaching, including lesson-plan (RPP) documents, to verify that planning requirements have been met before instruction is observed directly. In the second visit, supervision shifts to the implementation of learning in the classroom itself, through direct classroom observation, together with supervision of how learning is assessed. In carrying out this academic supervision, the supervisor, acting in his role as supervisor, uses a structured academic-supervision instrument as the medium

through which PAI teachers' competence is formally assessed, providing a documented basis for feedback rather than relying solely on informal impression.

Alongside this individual cycle, classical, or group, supervision is conducted in the form of group coaching sessions held three times per semester. The first meeting, held at the beginning of the semester, in January or July depending on the academic calendar, focuses on the preparation of lesson plans, timed to coincide with the point at which teachers are required to prepare their instructional planning documents for the semester ahead. The second meeting, held at mid-semester, in March or September, focuses on teaching methods and strategies and on the use of information-technology-based instructional media, on the premise that by this point in the semester teachers are ready to refine, rather than simply establish, their approach to classroom delivery, with the goal of enabling teachers to manage learning in ways that are effective, engaging, and enjoyable for students. The third meeting, held toward the end of the semester or ahead of final examinations, in May or November, focuses on the assessment of learning, with the aim of equipping PAI teachers to design assessment items that are both technically sound and of high pedagogical quality.

In carrying out both the individual and the group supervisory cycle, the supervisor was reported to rely on two broad techniques, individual and group, consistent with the general distinction between individual and group supervisory technique discussed above (Purwanto, 2003; Priansa & Somad, 2014). To reduce the anxiety that teachers commonly associate with being observed, the supervisor was reported to adopt, deliberately, a collegial or partnership-oriented approach informed by the principles of andragogy, or adult education, treating PAI teachers as adult professionals with their own experience and judgement rather than as subordinates to be corrected. In practice, this meant that the supervisor actively worked to build an image of himself not as an inspector whose visit is to be feared, but as a colleague whose arrival is anticipated because it brings assistance with the genuine difficulties teachers encounter in their teaching. Building on this relational foundation, the

supervisor then provided direction, input, and practical assistance addressing the specific instructional problems that teachers raised.

This collegial, andragogy-informed approach to academic supervision closely mirrors Sahertian's (2000) description of the collaborative approach as a synthesis of directive and non-directive elements, and is consistent with Priansa and Somad's (2014) three-part classification of supervisory approaches into direct, indirect, and collaborative types; the case observed here appears to sit closest to the collaborative pole of that continuum, combining the supervisor's willingness to give direct, substantive input with a relational style that leaves room for teachers to raise and frame their own concerns. It is also consistent with Darsono's (2016) finding that supervisors who blend directive and non-directive elements according to the situation, rather than applying either approach rigidly, tend to be perceived by teachers as more supportive and less threatening. In terms of supervisory model, the practice observed here can be characterised as a scientific model, in the sense that the supervisor consistently prepared for each visit in advance, including preparing the academic-supervision instrument and recording tools used during observation, before conducting supervision. This is consistent with the four hallmarks of the scientific model of supervision described by Sahertian (2000): that it is carried out in a planned and continuous manner; that it is systematic and follows established procedures and techniques; that it makes use of structured, purpose-built data-collection instruments; and that it produces objective data grounded in the real conditions observed, rather than impressionistic judgement.

E. Supervision Evaluation

The evaluation stage of the supervision cycle at MTs Alkhairat Gambesi is conducted by analysing the results gathered from the preceding stages: assessment of teaching administration, review of lesson-plan documents, observations made during classroom visits concerning the implementation of learning, and assessment of learning outcomes. Drawing on this consolidated body of evidence, the PAI supervisor analyses the results of supervision and identifies both the strengths and

the weaknesses of the PAI teachers under his guidance. Where the findings point to a strength, the supervisor encourages the teacher to maintain, and where possible to further develop, that strength. Where the findings point to a weakness, the supervisor uses a personal, individualised approach to provide direction, input, and guidance on how the identified shortcoming can be addressed. When a specific instructional problem is identified during this process, the supervisor provides direction, input, and a proposed solution for resolving it, together with an explanation of the likely underlying causes of the problem and of the general strategies available for addressing problems of that kind.

Beyond this individualised feedback, the supervisor also conducts broader coaching and evaluation activities linked to the results of this analysis and to the identification of PAI teachers' competence more generally, through structured mentoring and training activities referred to locally as *Pembimbingan dan Pelatihan*, or *Bimlat*. Within these activities, the supervisor evaluates teachers' competence in preparing lesson plans, implementing learning, and conducting assessment. This overall evaluative process closely mirrors Ralph Tyler's (1949) classical formulation of evaluation as a systematic process of data collection undertaken to determine the extent to which, and the manner in which, the objectives set out in a plan have been achieved, and, where they have not been fully achieved, to identify precisely what remains unachieved and why. Consistent with Weihrich and Koontz's (1993) controlling function discussed above in relation to supervision planning, evaluation in this case functions as the closing stage of a management cycle that began with planning, was carried out through implementation, and is completed by feeding evaluation results back into the next planning cycle.

Importantly, the results of supervision are not communicated to PAI teachers alone. They are also reported to the school principal, so that the principal, in turn, can follow up on the supervisor's findings by developing school-level programmes to improve teacher competence, rather than leaving responsibility for improvement solely with the individual teacher and the external supervisor. This reporting practice

situates PAI supervision within the wider system of school management discussed at the beginning of this article, in which the school principal's own supervisory competence, exercised internally, and the PAI supervisor's competence, exercised externally, are intended to operate in a complementary rather than a parallel or disconnected fashion.

F. Integrative Discussion

Read together, the findings presented above suggest a more differentiated picture of PAI supervisors' research and development competence than either full realisation or full neglect. Consistent with Habibullah (2013) and with Manalu, Kadir, and Siregar (2020), this study finds that the coaching and mentoring functions embedded within the research and development competence, that is, the supervisor's direct engagement with teachers through classroom visits, group sessions, and individualised feedback, are comparatively well realised at the case-study site, and are experienced by teachers as genuinely useful rather than merely procedural. What remains only partially realised is the competence's distinctive research dimension: the systematic investigation of instructional problems, and the translation of that investigation into documented handbooks, guides, or training materials that could benefit PAI teachers beyond the individual supervisory relationship and beyond the tenure of any single supervisor.

This distinction matters because it identifies, with more precision than the earlier literature has offered, exactly where the gap between policy and practice is located. The gap is not primarily a gap in supervisors' pedagogical competence, expertise, or relational skill, all of which appeared reasonably well developed in this case, but a gap in the institutional infrastructure and operational model needed to convert informal, individual expertise into documented, transferable research output. This is consistent with the preliminary needs-analysis finding, discussed in Section A above, that PAI supervisors' duties have tended to remain confined to monitoring and evaluation through standardised forms, precisely because a suitable operational model for research-based coaching has not yet been established at the system level.

Addressing this gap, the findings suggest, requires an intervention aimed less at individual supervisors' motivation or capability and more at providing supervisors with structured time, guidance, and institutional support for producing and disseminating the research-based materials that the regulation envisages, a possibility taken up further in the conclusion below.

Conclusion

This study set out to analyse whether the research and development supervision competence of Islamic Religious Education (PAI) supervisors has been fully realised in schools, or whether it remains insufficiently directed toward PAI teachers, students, and schools, taking the case of a PAI supervisor and the teachers under his guidance at MTs Alkhairat Gambesi as its focus. The findings indicate that this competence is realised unevenly rather than uniformly. The supervisor's mastery of PAI teaching methods and his capacity to mentor teachers holistically were both found to be well developed and to be recognised as such by the teachers interviewed, consistent with the theoretical expectation that a supervisor's credibility rests on demonstrated pedagogical expertise combined with a collegial, andragogy-informed relational style (Mulyasa, 2005; Sahertian, 2000; Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2014). By contrast, the two elements of the competence that most distinguish it from ordinary academic supervision, namely the systematic conduct of research related to the supervisory assignment and the compilation of documented teaching guides or handbooks, were found to remain only partially realised, present as intention and informal practice but not yet translated into concrete, transferable output.

Supervision planning in this case was found to be consistent with Weihrich and Koontz's (1993) view of controlling as a management function that measures and evaluates performance against planning objectives, providing a systematic basis for constructing more effective and efficient supervision plans in subsequent cycles. Similarly, the coaching and evaluation activities the supervisor conducts through mentoring and training, or Bimlat, activities were found to align closely with Tyler's

(1949) classical account of evaluation as a process of determining the extent to which planning objectives have been achieved and, where they have not, identifying what remains unachieved and why. Taken together, these findings suggest that the management cycle underpinning PAI supervision, planning, implementation, and evaluation, is functioning in this case largely as intended, but that the research and development competence's distinctive research dimension has not yet been fully integrated into that cycle as a source of evidence that could strengthen future planning.

These findings carry both theoretical and practical implications. Theoretically, they suggest that future research on PAI supervisors' competence would benefit from disaggregating the research and development competence into its constituent indicators, mastery of method, research capacity, documentation capacity, and mentoring capacity, rather than treating it as a single, undifferentiated construct, since the present study found meaningfully different degrees of realisation across these indicators within a single supervisory relationship. Practically, the findings suggest that strengthening this competence is unlikely to be achieved simply by exhorting supervisors to conduct more research or to produce more handbooks; rather, it is likely to require the Ministry of Religious Affairs and related institutions to design a structured, research-based training model that gives supervisors the time, methodological guidance, and institutional support needed to convert their existing field expertise into documented, disseminable output, addressing the operational-model gap identified in the needs analysis reported in this study.

This study is subject to several limitations that should temper the generalisability of its findings. It is based on a single case, one PAI supervisor and the teachers he supervises at one school, and its qualitative, in-depth design, while well suited to capturing the nuance of how the research and development competence is enacted in practice, does not permit statistical generalisation to the wider population of PAI supervisors across Indonesia. The informants interviewed for this study, moreover, were drawn from a single school, and their perceptions, while corroborated

across more than one informant where possible, remain perceptions rather than an independent, external assessment of the supervisor's research output. Future research examining this issue in different contexts, across a larger number of supervisors and schools, and, where feasible, incorporating direct documentary evidence of supervisors' research and development output alongside interview data, would help establish how far the pattern identified in this study, strong coaching and mentoring realisation alongside a persistent gap in the research and documentation functions, holds more broadly across the PAI supervisory workforce. Notwithstanding these limitations, the findings of this study may serve as useful baseline data for such future research, and as a starting point for policy discussion on how best to close the gap between the research and development competence as it is defined in regulation and as it is currently practised in the field.

References

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Darsono. (2016). Implementasi pendekatan direktif, non direktif dan kolaboratif dalam supervisi pendidikan Islam (Studi kasus di MAN Trenggalek). *Ta'allum: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.21274/taalum.2016.4.2.335-358>
- Edwards-Jones, A. (2014). Qualitative data analysis with NVIVO. *Journal of Education for Teaching International Research and Pedagogy*, 40(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2013.866724>
- Engkizar, E., Muliati, I., Rahman, R., & Alfurqan, A. (2018). The importance of integrating ICT into Islamic study teaching and learning process. *Khalifa: Journal of Islamic Education*, 1(2), 148–168.
- Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2014). *Supervision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach* (9th ed.). Pearson.
- Habibullah, A. (2013). Kinerja pengawas Pendidikan Agama Islam. *EDUKASI: Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Agama dan Keagamaan*, 11(1), 46–64.
- Kementerian Agama Republik Indonesia. (2012). *Peraturan Menteri Agama Nomor 2 Tahun 2012 tentang Pengawas Madrasah dan Pengawas Pendidikan Agama Islam pada Sekolah*. Kementerian Agama RI.
- Kementerian Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia. (2007). *Peraturan Menteri*

Pendidikan Nasional Nomor 13 Tahun 2007 tentang Standar Kepala Sekolah/Madrasah.
Kementerian Pendidikan Nasional RI.

- Manalu, S. B., Kadir, A., & Siregar, N. S. S. (2020). Implementasi Peraturan Menteri Agama tentang Pendidikan Agama Islam pada sekolah dalam kinerja pengawas Pendidikan Agama Islam. *Strukturasi: Jurnal Ilmiah Magister Administrasi Publik*, 2(2), 168–177. <https://doi.org/10.31289/strukturasi.v2i2.57>
- Mulyasa, E. (2005). *Menjadi kepala sekolah profesional: Dalam konteks menyukseskan MBS dan KBK*. PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Priansa, D. J., & Somad, R. (2014). *Manajemen supervisi & kepemimpinan kepala sekolah*. Alfabeta.
- Purwanto, N. (2003). *Administrasi dan supervisi pendidikan*. PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Sahertian, P. A. (2000). *Konsep dasar dan teknik supervisi pendidikan dalam rangka pengembangan sumber daya manusia*. Rineka Cipta.
- Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (2007). *Supervision: A redefinition* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. University of Chicago Press.
- Wehrich, H., & Koontz, H. (1993). *Management: A global perspective* (10th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.