A COACHING-BASED ACADEMIC SUPERVISION MODEL TO IMPROVE TEACHER PERFORMANCE: A CASE STUDY IN INDONESIAN PRIMARY EDUCATION

Yanti Yuni Astuti[1a*], Ngurah Ayu Nyoman[2b], Muhammad Prayito[3c]

[123]Manajemen Pendidikan, Pascasarjana, Universitas Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia, Semarang

[a]*yantiyunia79@gmail.com*
[b]*E-mail: ngurahayunyoman@upgris.ac.id*
[c]*E-mail: prayito@upgris.ac.id*

(*) Corresponding Author
yantiyunia79@gmail.com

ABSTRACT
This study investigates the implementation of coaching-based academic supervision as a strategy to enhance teacher performance at SD Negeri 1 Sedan, Indonesia. Employing a qualitative descriptive design, the research collected data through in-depth interviews, classroom observations, and document analysis. The findings reveal that effective supervision begins with systematic planning, including needs assessment, scheduling, performance indicators, and coach selection. The application of the GROW model (Goal, Reality, Options, Will) during coaching sessions fosters reflective dialogue, enabling teachers to identify instructional challenges and develop actionable improvement plans. Classroom observations demonstrate notable progress in lesson planning, instructional strategies, and teacher–student interaction; however, challenges remain in time management and equitable learning participation. This study offers novelty by positioning the principal as an active coach, emphasizing a collaborative and solution-oriented supervision model. The study concludes that coaching-based supervision significantly contributes to continuous teacher.

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

INTRODUCTIONS

Teacher performance is one of the key determinants of educational quality in schools. It reflects the teacher's ability to carry out instructional duties responsibly to improve student learning outcomes (Supardi, 2018). Optimal performance contributes directly to instructional quality and the achievement of broader educational goals. Supardi (2018) emphasizes that teacher performance indicates the successful implementation of teaching tasks according to established standards, while Erjati (2017) highlights teachers' responsibilities in guiding students toward developmental maturity. Teacher performance is influenced by multiple internal and external factors, including personality, motivation, knowledge, skills, experience, school leadership, school climate, facilities, and the learning environment (Yamin, Martinis, & Maisah, 2019; Mangkunegara, 2017; Kasmir, 2019).

Academic supervision is one of the essential approaches to improving teacher performance. It aims to enhance teaching competence through activities such as planning, observation, feedback, and follow-up actions (Prasojo, 2015; Arikunto, 2019). Academic supervision also contributes to teachers' ongoing professional growth, which is central to achieving educational objectives (Sagala, 2018). International research similarly highlights the importance of instructional supervision as a driver of teaching quality, where principals act as instructional leaders who guide pedagogical improvement (Zepeda, 2017; Hairon & Goh, 2019).

Recently, coaching-based academic supervision has gained prominence as an empowering and collaborative approach to teacher development. Glickman (2017) notes that coaching-oriented supervision focuses on reflective dialogue and shared problem-solving. Whitmore (2015) defines coaching as unlocking a person's potential to maximize performance, while Grant (2019) views it as a results-oriented process for enhancing work performance. Compared to traditional supervision models that tend to be evaluative or administrative, coaching emphasizes autonomy, professional trust, and teacher agency factors shown to improve teacher learning and motivation (Knight, 2021). In educational contexts, coaching supports teachers in identifying challenges and developing sustainable solutions to improve instructional practice.

One commonly used coaching framework is the GROW Model (Goal, Reality, Options, Will), which provides a structured flow for effective coaching session planning (Panchal & Riddell, 2020). In the Goal stage, teachers identify expected outcomes; in the Reality stage, current challenges are explored; in the Options stage, possible solutions are evaluated; and in the Will stage, teachers commit to implementing action plans (Whitmore, 2019). The GROW Model facilitates reflective conversations between school leaders and teachers, allowing teachers to analyze and improve their instructional strengths and weaknesses. Coaching thus builds collaborative relationships and creates a supportive environment for continuous professional learning (Mardiyatun, 2021).

Although numerous studies have examined academic supervision and coaching in education, a clear research gap remains. Previous studies predominantly focused on administrative or conventional supervision models, while only a few investigated principals acting as active instructional coaches in primary schools. Existing research also tends to discuss coaching theoretically rather than examining its structured implementation in real school contexts. As a result, there is limited empirical understanding of how coaching-based academic supervision can be operationalized to strengthen teacher performance in Indonesian primary education settings. This gap underscores the need for research that explores coaching-driven supervision practices conducted directly by principals, particularly in rural or under-resourced primary schools.

Therefore, this study aims to examine the implementation of academic supervision with coaching techniques at SD Negeri 1 Sedan, Sedan District. The study focuses on the planning, implementation, and evaluation processes as well as the impact of coaching-based academic supervision on improving teacher performance. Findings from this research are expected to contribute both practically and theoretically to the development of effective supervision models in primary education.

METHOD

This study employed a qualitative descriptive design with a phenomenological lens, aiming to explore the implementation of coaching-based academic supervision in improving teacher performance at SD Negeri 1 Sedan. Descriptive qualitative research is grounded in postpositivist philosophy, examining natural conditions in which the researcher acts as the primary instrument (Sugiyono, 2022). Qualitative inquiry seeks to understand behaviors, perceptions, motivations, and experiences holistically within their natural context (Moleong, 2018; Hendryadi, 2019). The phenomenological emphasis in this study was used not as a full phenomenological method but as an analytic lens to capture teachers' lived experiences during coaching-based supervision while still maintaining a descriptive qualitative orientation (Sukmadinata, 2019). Data collection took place during the odd semester of the 2024/2025 academic year, from February to July 2025, at SD Negeri 1 Sedan, Sedan District.

The research subjects consisted of teachers who had participated in coaching-based academic supervision conducted by the school principal. Informants were selected using purposive sampling based on the following criteria: a minimum of two years of teaching experience, prior participation in formal coaching sessions, and willingness to be

interviewed (Moleong, 2018). A total of eight informants were involved: seven teachers and one principal, ensuring adequate representation of the school's supervisory process. The researcher served as the primary instrument (Sugiyono, 2018), supported by interview guides, observation sheets, documentation checklists, audio recorders, and cameras (Ibrahim, 2015).

Data were collected using observation, in-depth interviews, and documentation. Observations were conducted to understand how coaching-based academic supervision was implemented in real classroom and supervisory settings (Sugiyono, 2018). In-depth interviews with open-ended questions were used to obtain deeper insights into planning, implementation, and evaluation processes (Koentjaraningrat, 2022). Documentation included supervision schedules, lesson plans, supervision forms, and evaluation reports. Data triangulation was conducted through (1) triangulation of sources (teachers, principal, documents), (2) triangulation of techniques (observation, interviews, documentation), and (3) triangulation of time (repeated checks at different stages of supervision). Credibility was further strengthened using member checking and negative case analysis, while transferability, dependability, and confirmability were ensured through detailed reporting and auditability procedures (Sugiyono, 2017).

Data were analyzed using the interactive model of Miles and Huberman (2019), consisting of data collection, data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing. Condensed data were organized into themes, supported by narrative descriptions and relevant documentation. Ethical considerations were strictly observed: all participants provided informed consent, identities were anonymized using pseudonyms, and participation was fully voluntary with the right to withdraw at any time. These procedures ensured that the study adhered to established ethical standards in qualitative educational research.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION
Result
Planning of Coaching-Based Academic Supervision

The planning stage was carried out systematically through a collaborative needs assessment led by the principal. Diagnostic activities included classroom observations, review of instructional documents, analysis of student learning outcomes, and examination of data from the PMM platform. The principal noted that the most recurrent issues involved designing student-centered learning and improving assessment practices: *"From the identification stage, the common problem that needs to be addressed is how to design student-centered learning… including how assessments should not only measure memorization"* (W.1, KS, June 2, 2025). Teachers confirmed that the needs identification process was participatory rather than top-down, as emphasized by a teacher: *"The principal identifies and determines our needs, then invites us to formulate solutions and improvement plans together"* (GR-1, June 3, 2025). Six informants highlighted their active involvement in this stage.

Planning also included flexible scheduling to accommodate teaching hours and minimize instructional disruption. Teachers reported that schedules were communicated clearly and adjusted when needed, with five informants identifying flexibility as a key strength. In addition, performance indicators—covering curriculum understanding, content mastery, lesson planning, and instructional delivery—were jointly discussed and agreed upon during planning meetings. The principal also selected coaches based on pedagogical expertise, communication skills, and experience in professional learning facilitation, explaining: *"We identify competent teachers who have experience and the ability to serve as coaches…"* (W.1, KS, June 2, 2025). Four informants noted that the choice of coach influenced their sense of comfort and openness during supervision.

Implementation of Coaching-Based Academic Supervision

The implementation phase comprised pre-observation conferences, classroom observations, coaching conversations, and follow-up actions. During the pre-observation conference, the principal clarified instructional goals, lesson plans, and anticipated challenges while establishing psychological safety for teachers. As one teacher stated, *"The principal prepares the observation instruments and understands our needs so that coaching becomes more effective"* (GR-2, June 3, 2025). Seven informants regarded this stage as crucial for creating clarity and reducing anxiety.

Coaching conversations were facilitated using the GROW (Goal–Reality–Options–Will) model. Teachers were encouraged to articulate learning goals, reflect on classroom realities, explore multiple improvement strategies, and commit to specific action plans. Teachers consistently reported that the dialogic nature of the coaching process made them feel supported and empowered rather than evaluated.

Classroom Observation in Coaching-Based Supervision

Classroom observations were conducted using structured instruments aligned with the indicators established during the pre-observation conference. Supervisors maintained a non-intervention stance throughout the lesson. A teacher explained that observations were carried out objectively and documented carefully for later reflection: *"The supervisor observes us using structured instruments and records what happens as material for reflection…"* (GR-2, June 3, 2025). Observation focused on instructional openings, teaching strategies, student engagement, formative assessment practices, and teacher–student interactions. Five informants felt that the non-judgmental approach helped them feel respected and comfortable during the process.

Reflection and Feedback

Reflection sessions were conducted immediately after observations. Supervisors used open-ended questions to prompt teachers to examine their instructional decisions and consider alternative approaches. The principal described the process as follows: *"The supervisor provides reflection and feedback using questions that prompt teachers to think and follow up consistently"* (W.2, KS, June 2, 2025). Teachers perceived the feedback as constructive, specific, and solution-oriented. Six informants identified the reflection stage as the most impactful component of the coaching cycle, as it deepened their understanding of both strengths and areas needing improvement.

Evaluation of Teacher Performance

Teacher performance was evaluated through observation notes, lesson documentation, student learning outcomes, and reflective journals. The evaluation results indicated improved lesson plan organization, clearer instructional delivery, increased student engagement, and stronger classroom interactions. Despite these gains, seven teachers acknowledged persisting challenges related to time management and ensuring equitable participation among students. These findings suggest that coaching contributed to meaningful improvements while highlighting the need for continued support in specific areas.

Evaluation of the Coaching Process

The coaching process was evaluated jointly by supervisors and teachers to identify strengths and aspects requiring refinement. As stated by the principal, *"We evaluate together… What has worked well? What needs improvement for the next session?"* (W.3, KS, June 2, 2025). Teachers reported that coaching enhanced their instructional organization and helped foster higher student engagement. However, five informants noted that the depth of reflective questioning during coaching sessions still needed improvement to stimulate deeper analytical thinking.

Teachers' Individual Reflection

Teachers demonstrated growth in their reflective capacity, shifting from descriptive recounts of classroom events toward more analytical reflections. They were increasingly able to identify successes, diagnose challenges, and propose strategies based on evidence. Six teachers showed notable progress in their ability to articulate reflective insights, indicating that coaching played a significant role in strengthening professional metacognition.

Reflection of the Coach/Supervisor

The supervisor also engaged in self-reflection regarding the quality of coaching provided. He acknowledged that more advanced reflective questioning techniques were needed to optimize coaching effectiveness: *"There is a need for deeper reflective questioning… this must be improved"* (W.3, KS, June 2, 2025). This reflective stance contributed to continuous improvement in subsequent coaching cycles and demonstrated that the coaching model

fosters learning not only among teachers but also among supervisors. A summary of the main research findings is presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Summary of Research Findings

Supervision Aspect	Main Findings	Informant Frequency
Planning	• Collaborative needs identification, flexible scheduling, performance indicators, coach selection	6/8
Implementation	• Dialogic coaching using GROW model; psychological safety; prepared instruments	7/8
Classroom Observation	• Objective, structured, non-intervention; focus on instructional process	5/8
Reflection & Feedback	• Open-ended questioning, constructive feedback, joint solution-making	6/8
Teacher Performance Evaluation	• Improvement in planning, strategies, interaction; time management issues remain	7/8
Coaching Process Evaluation	• Positive teacher perception; reflective questioning not yet optimal	5/8
Teacher Reflection	• More analytical, solution-oriented reflection	6/8
Supervisor Reflection	• Recognition of strengths and weaknesses; commitment to improvement	4/8

Discussion

Planning of Academic Supervision

The planning process observed at SD Negeri 1 Sedan demonstrates a strong reliance on diagnostic data and collaborative decision-making. This approach confirms Soro's (2024) findings that effective supervision requires systematic identification of teacher needs using multiple data sources such as classroom observations, student outcomes, and curriculum documents. The emphasis on combining quantitative and qualitative evidence is consistent with Glickman's (2017) argument that supervision planning must be grounded in an accurate understanding of teachers' instructional challenges.

The participatory nature of planning in this study where teachers were actively involved in setting goals and identifying areas for improvement mirrors international coaching models. Knight's Instructional Coaching framework stresses partnership, dialogue, and transparency in goal formulation, positioning teachers as co-designers of their professional growth rather than passive recipients of directives. The findings also indicate that such collaboration increases ownership over the improvement process, reinforcing the argument that coaching-based supervision is most effective when teacher agency is prioritized. Thus, the planning approach used at SD Negeri 1 Sedan not only aligns with the theoretical foundations of coaching but also provides empirical support for the claim that shared decision-making enhances teacher engagement and readiness for change.

Supervision Scheduling

The flexible scheduling implemented in this study stands in contrast to the rigid, predetermined supervision cycles documented by Hanik et al. (2024). Teachers at SD Negeri 1 Sedan appreciated being consulted about schedule adjustments, which minimized instructional disruption and allowed supervision activities to occur in a psychologically supportive environment. This flexibility aligns closely with Zepeda's (2017) global analysis, which argues that effective supervision systems must account for teachers' workload, daily demands, and contextual constraints to maximize participation and reduce resistance.

The findings of this study suggest that scheduling is not a trivial logistical matter but rather a structural condition that shapes teachers' attitudes toward supervision. Flexibility operates as a contextual enabler that allows the coaching process to run more smoothly, supports emotional safety, and promotes the perception of supervision as

a partnership. This reinforces the interpretation that adaptive scheduling is an essential variable for the successful implementation of coaching-based academic supervision, especially in primary school settings where daily schedules are tightly structured.

Development of Performance Indicators

The formulation of performance indicators in this study was specific, operational, and directly linked to instructional practice, covering curriculum understanding, content mastery, lesson planning, and lesson delivery. This contrasts with the generic and overly broad indicators criticized by Hanik et al. (2024), who argue that non-specific standards often fail to guide meaningful professional growth.

The specificity and clarity found here align with the perspectives of Hairon & Goh (2017), who emphasize that targeted and contextually grounded indicators support deeper professional learning because they help teachers focus on concrete instructional behaviors rather than abstract expectations. By involving teachers in co-constructing these indicators, the principal ensured that supervision goals were relevant, feasible, and aligned with both individual teacher needs and broader school priorities.

This study therefore strengthens the conclusion that clear, actionable performance indicators increase the precision and effectiveness of coaching-based supervision. They also create a shared reference point for observation, reflection, and follow-up, which is essential for sustaining improvement over time.

Implementation Through Coaching

The implementation of academic supervision in this study relied heavily on dialogical coaching practices, particularly the use of the GROW (Goal–Reality–Options–Will) model during coaching conversations. This approach stands in contrast to administrative or compliance-oriented supervision models described by Wahyudi et al. (2024), which tend to be directive and evaluative. Instead, the findings reveal that teachers experienced coaching as a supportive process that encouraged reflection, exploration of alternatives, and collaborative problem-solving.

These results strongly align with Knight's conceptualization of instructional coaching as a partnership-driven process where teachers are empowered to make instructional decisions. They also resonate with Glickman's (2017) argument that reflective dialogue promotes professional autonomy and deepens pedagogical reasoning. By positioning teachers as active thinkers rather than subjects of evaluation, coaching at SD Negeri 1 Sedan helped cultivate intrinsic motivation and professional confidence.

Overall, this study reinforces the conclusion found in global literature that dialogic coaching—rather than supervisory inspection is more likely to generate substantive improvements in instructional practice. The findings contribute empirical evidence from an Indonesian primary school context, where the adoption of coaching principles has traditionally been limited..

Evaluation and Reflection

Evaluation in this study incorporated multiple sources of evidence, including observation notes, lesson documents, student learning outcomes, and reflective journals. The integration of these data sources enabled teachers to gain a more holistic picture of their instructional strengths and weaknesses. The improvement observed in lesson planning, instructional clarity, student engagement, and classroom interaction supports Juhadira's (2024) argument that reflective, feedback-oriented supervision enhances instructional effectiveness.

Zepeda and Sullivan (2020) highlight that reflective dialogue fosters deeper pedagogical reasoning by prompting teachers to analyze their instructional decisions in context. The findings of this study echo this assertion, as teachers viewed reflection sessions as the most impactful stage of the supervision cycle. However, the tendency of the supervisor to occasionally default to direct advice rather than sustained questioning indicates that coaching principles were not applied consistently. Knight (2021) warns that such lapses are common in schools transitioning from directive supervision models, as supervisors often revert to evaluative behaviors during feedback sessions.

Taken together, these findings suggest that while reflective evaluation was effective in improving teacher performance, full mastery of coaching techniques especially reflective questioning remains an area for development.

This partially explains why some challenges, such as time management and equitable student participation, persisted despite overall progress.

Conceptual Model

The conceptual model of academic supervision using a coaching is illustrated as follows**:** Inputs → Processes → Outputs (with Mediating Factors). (1) Inputs: diagnostic needs identification, teacher readiness, flexible scheduling (2) Processes: dialogic GROW coaching, objective classroom observation, structured reflective dialogue**.** (3) Outputs: improved instructional planning, enhanced teaching strategies, stronger reflective capacity, (4) Mediating Factors: psychological safety, competence of coach/supervisor, collaborative school culture

The model illustrates that coaching-based supervision is not a linear intervention but a dynamic system influenced by contextual, relational, and instructional variables.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the implementation of coaching-based academic supervision at SD Negeri 1 Sedan and found that it was effective in improving teacher performance. Coaching-based supervision was implemented through systematic planning, collaborative execution, and reflection-oriented evaluation. The planning stage involved identifying teachers' needs through observation, reflective dialogue, and collegial discussion, supported by flexible scheduling that accommodated teachers' instructional responsibilities. During implementation, the principal acted as an instructional coach, providing constructive feedback based on classroom observations that encouraged improvements in instructional design and pedagogical techniques. Evaluation was carried out through analysis of observation data and teacher reflections, which informed follow-up actions in the form of continuous professional development. The results demonstrate that coaching-based supervision built on dialogic interaction and shared reflection produces stronger improvements compared with traditional administrative or compliance-based supervision approaches.

The novelty of this research lies in its application of a coaching-oriented supervision model that integrates collaborative goal-setting, dialogic feedback, and reflective practice between the principal and teachers, offering a more developmental alternative to conventional supervisory models. The findings highlight the critical role of the principal as an instructional coach who facilitates ongoing professional learning rather than merely inspecting documents or enforcing procedures.

The findings provide several practical implications for school leaders and teachers. For principals, the study demonstrates the importance of adopting coaching stances such as active listening, reflective questioning, and collaborative problem-solving to strengthen teacher performance. For teachers, the coaching process encourages continuous professional growth, deeper instructional reflection, and the development of more adaptive teaching strategies aligned with students' learning needs.

The study contributes theoretically by reinforcing coaching-based academic supervision as a viable model within educational management. It supports the conceptual shift from hierarchical supervision toward partnership-oriented approaches, where psychological safety, dialogic interaction, and reflective practice serve as mediating mechanisms that enhance instructional quality. This research also enriches the literature by offering a contextualized model of coaching-based supervision in Indonesian primary schools.

However, this study has several limitations. The research was conducted in a single school, limiting the generalizability of its findings to broader educational contexts. In addition, the study did not explore the long-term influence of coaching-based supervision on sustained teacher performance or student outcomes. Future research should involve multiple schools with diverse characteristics to examine contextual variations, employ longitudinal designs to measure long-term impacts, and analyze additional outcomes such as changes in student engagement, student achievement, and the transferability of the coaching model to schools with different resource conditions and organizational cultures.

REFERECES

Arikunto, S. (2019). *Dasar-dasar supervisi*. PT Rineka Cipta.

Bogdan, R.C., & Taylor, S.J. (2024). *Qualitative research methods: An introduction*. Sage Publications.

Glickman, C. (2017). *Supervision and instructional leadership: A development approach*. Pearson.

Grant, R. M. (2019). *Analisis strategi kontemporer, konsep, teknik, aplikasi* (Edisi kedua). Erlangga.

Hamrin. (2021). *Sukses menjadi pengawas sekolah: Tips dan strategi jitu melaksanakan tugas*. Samudra Biru.

Hanik, dkk. (2024). Supervisi akademik dengan teknik coaching dalam meningkatkan kualitas guru di tingkat sekolah dasar. *Jurnal Pendidikan, 12*(1), 34-45.

Hendryadi, H. (2019). *Metode penelitian*. Lembaga Pengembangan Manajemen dan Publikasi Imperium.

Ibrahim, M. (2015). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif*. Alfabeta.

Juhadira, S. (2024). Efektivitas coaching terhadap peningkatan kinerja guru di sekolah dasar. *Jurnal Pengembangan Pendidikan, 13*(2), 210-220.

Kontjaraningrat, K. (2022). *Pengantar ilmu antropologi*. Rineka Cipta.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2024). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage Publications.

Lolowang, D., Weo, F., & Mamahit, L. (2024). Penerapan supervisi akademik berbasis coaching dalam meningkatkan kompetensi guru di SD Negeri I Lolak. *EDUKASIA: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran, 6*(1), 230-241.

Mardiyatun, M. (2021). Implementasi coaching individual untuk peningkatan kompetensi profesional guru pendidikan agama Islam dalam melaksanakan penelitian tindakan kelas. *STRATEGY: Jurnal Inovasi Strategi dan Model Pembelajaran, 1*(1), 46-54.

Mangkunegara, A. A. P. (2017). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia (Perusahaan)*. PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.

Majid, A. (2019). *Strategi pembelajaran*. PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.

Moleong, L. J. (2018). *Metode penelitian kualitatif*. Remaja Rosdakarya.

Mopangga, A. (2021). Konsep teknik coaching dalam meningkatkan kemampuan guru di TK Negeri Pembina Tabongo Kabupaten Gorontalo. *Prosiding Pengembangan Anak Usia Dini Holistik Integratif Era Covid 19*, 65-78.

Novitasari, D., Asbari, M., & Sasono, I. (2021). Analisis pengaruh religiusitas dan kualitas pelayanan terhadap kepuasan kerja: Studi kasus pada karyawan industri manufaktur. *Jurnal Manajemen Strategi dan Aplikasi Bisnis, 4*(1), 117–130.

Panchal, S., & Riddell, D. (2020). *Coaching for performance: The GROW model*. Kogan Page.

Pasaribu, N. H. (2021). Penerapan coaching dalam program perkembangan peserta didik. *Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia, 2*(11), 1928-1939.

Prasojo, L. D. (2015). *Supervisi akademik*. Gava Media.

Rahardjo, M. (2024). Triangulasi dalam penelitian kualitatif. *GEMA*.

Sagala, S. (2018). *Konsep dan makna pembelajaran*. Alfabeta.

Salim, G. (2021). *Effective coaching*. Bhuana Ilmu Populer.

Sary, O. I. P., & Wulandari, W. (2022). Peran kepala sekolah dalam coaching model Tirta pada pelaksanaan supervisi guru. *Pedagogika: Jurnal Ilmu-Ilmu Kependidikan, 2*(1), 96–101.

Sugiyono. (2022). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif dan R&D*. Alfabeta.

Supardi. (2018). *Kinerja guru*. PT Raja Grafindo Persada.

Sukmadinata, N. S. (2019). *Metode penelitian pendidikan*. Remaja Rosdakarya.

Suprianto, S., & Imron, M. (2023). Coaching sebagai pendekatan pembinaan dalam meningkatkan kinerja guru di sekolah dasar. *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan, 9*(2), 12-22.

Whitmore, J. (2015). *Coaching for performance*. Gramedia Pustaka.

Wahyudi, D., Utaminingsih, I., & Ismaya, N. (2024). Penerapan supervisi akademik di sekolah dasar wilayah Kecamatan Nalumsari: Analisis dan solusi pembinaan guru. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar, 15*(2), 125-136.

Winarno, A., & Daryanto, A. (2021). *Supervisi pendidikan: Teori dan praktik*. Gava Media.

Yamin, M., Martinis, & Maisah. (2019). *Manajemen pembelajaran kelas strategi meningkatkan mutu pembelajaran*. Gaung Persada.

Yusuf, A. M. (2017). *Metodologi penelitian*. UNP Press.