

Principal Accountability and Supervision: Strengthening School Governance and Educational Quality

Fitria Iswari

Universitas Pakuan, Bogor, Indonesia

Correspondence Email: fitriaiswari@gmail.com*

Keywords

Accountability, Supervision, School Governance, Educational Quality

Abstract

Principal accountability and supervision are critical components in strengthening school governance and improving educational quality. This study aims to analyze the accountability and supervision of school principals in supporting school governance and improving the quality of education. The method used is a literature study by reviewing scientific books, journal articles, and policy documents relevant to educational leadership. The results show that principal accountability is reflected in systematic program planning, transparent resource management, and structured performance reporting. Principal supervision has been shown to play a significant role in improving the quality of learning through observation, feedback, and teacher professional development. However, the study also found various obstacles such as limited managerial competence, a lack of evaluation instruments, and inconsistent monitoring that hamper the effectiveness of accountability and supervision. These findings emphasize the importance of strengthening school leadership capacity and developing more comprehensive evaluation instruments.

INTRODUCTION

Principals play a strategic role as decision-makers, administrators, and primary supervisors in school governance, so the quality of education is significantly influenced by the effectiveness of their accountability and supervision. However, various research data indicate that the implementation of principals' accountability and supervision functions still faces numerous challenges in the field. Research by Langi et al. (2019) revealed that principals' supervisory activities often do not run optimally because monitoring, standard monitoring, and administrative assessments are not carried out consistently. Similar findings were also demonstrated by Anggraini (2017), who explained that supervision in many schools remains general and does not address academic aspects in depth, thus not having a significant impact on

improving the quality of learning. Furthermore, other research indicates that many school programs are not structured according to regulations, lack needs assessments, weak documentation, and a lack of operational instruments to support the implementation of principals' duties.

Principal accountability is widely recognized as a core foundation for effective school governance. Robbins and Judge (2019) emphasize that accountability ensures leaders act responsibly in achieving organizational goals. Mulyasa (2013) asserts that principals must demonstrate measurable responsibility in managing school programs. Bush (2011) highlights that clear accountability improves institutional credibility.

Modern education systems place significant pressure on principals to maintain transparency in school operations. Darling-Hammond (2010) notes that accountability frameworks now include learning outcomes and institutional performance. OECD (2018) reports that stakeholders increasingly demand clarity in school decision-making. Leithwood et al. (2020) state that accountability strengthens data-based school leadership. Supervision is a critical leadership function that supports teaching quality and instructional effectiveness. Glickman et al. (2010) explain that supervision assists teachers through structured guidance. Hallinger and Murphy (2013) find that principals shape instructional climate through supervision. Wanzare (2012) argues that supervision promotes teacher professionalism.

Research has consistently shown that principal accountability correlates with overall school performance. Ladd and Fiske (2011) report that performance-based accountability enhances school improvement. Louis et al. (2010) observe that accountable leadership fosters stronger teacher commitment. Waters et al. (2003) conclude that effective leadership significantly impacts student outcomes. Supervision contributes to strengthening instructional processes within classrooms. Kimball et al. (2004) find that teacher evaluation helps improve instructional decision-making. Stronge et al. (2013) demonstrate that feedback mechanisms increase teaching quality. Borman and Kimball (2005) identify supervision as a determinant of teacher growth.

Despite its importance, accountability practices often face implementation challenges in schools. Hallinger (2011) acknowledges that many principals lack structured administrative reporting skills. Bush and Glover (2014) state that inconsistent monitoring weakens accountability systems. Darling-Hammond et al. (2020) highlight insufficient leadership training as a major barrier. The complexity of school management requires principals to balance multiple roles simultaneously. Spillane (2006) emphasizes the distributed nature of school leadership tasks. Leithwood et al. (2020) argue that increased autonomy heightens principal responsibility. Day et al. (2016) note that strong accountability supports adaptive leadership.

These developments underscore the need to reexamine how accountability and supervision reinforce school quality. Hallinger and Heck (2010) assert that leadership mechanisms influence school performance pathways. Bush (2011) argues that accountability and supervision are inseparable leadership functions that shape the effectiveness of school leadership. Hoy and Miskel (2013) emphasize the structural role of principal leadership in shaping school systems and ensuring organizational coherence. In light of these perspectives, this study aims to analyze how

principal accountability and supervision function within school governance and how both contribute to the overall improvement of educational quality.

METHODS

This study employed a library research method, reviewing scholarly books, journal articles, and policy documents relevant to principal accountability and supervision. Literature was selected based on relevance, credibility, and novelty to gain a comprehensive theoretical understanding. Data collection involved identifying key concepts, searching sources through academic databases, selecting literature according to the research focus, and organizing findings into analytical themes. Data were analyzed using content analysis, which involved coding, categorizing, and synthesizing information from various sources.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Level of Principal Accountability in Managing Educational Programs

Principal accountability in managing educational programs reflects the extent to which school leaders demonstrate responsibility in planning, organizing, and supervising school activities. Robbins and Judge (2019) emphasize that leader accountability determines the direction and quality of organizational decision-making. Bush (2011) explains that an accountable principal is able to ensure that each program runs according to procedures and quality standards. Hoy and Miskel (2013) add that accountability is a key indicator of the credibility and effectiveness of educational leadership. A principal's accountability can be measured through their ability to develop systematic, needs-based program plans. Mulyasa (2013) states that a principal's work plan reflects their understanding of school development priorities. Siagian (2010) explains that unfocused planning indicates weak administrative responsibility. Sudjana (2006) also emphasizes that program planning is a key foundation for ensuring successful educational implementation. Accountable educational program implementation is characterized by transparency in budget utilization and effective resource management. Purwanto (2016) emphasizes that fund utilization reports are a form of principal accountability to stakeholders. Heizer and Render (2017) explain that efficient resource management demonstrates high managerial competence. Siagian (2010) adds that financial accountability significantly determines the integrity of educational institutions. Program evaluation and reporting are crucial aspects in measuring the level of accountability of school principals. Anwar (2014) found that non-substantive program reports indicate weak oversight and poor quality of activity implementation. Luddin (2013) points out that incomplete reports and minimal documentation are signs of low leadership accountability. Anggraini (2017) emphasizes that unsystematic reporting hinders schools from objectively assessing program success.

Effectiveness of Principal Supervision on Learning Implementation

Principal supervision is a key determinant of the quality of learning processes in schools because it directly guides, monitors, and supports teacher performance. Glickman et al. (2010) emphasized that structured supervision can improve learning effectiveness. Hallinger and Murphy (2013) stated that principal supervision plays a crucial role in creating a conducive instructional climate. Wanzare (2012) found that regular supervision helps improve teacher motivation and professionalism in managing learning. The effectiveness of supervision is determined by the principal's ability to conduct classroom observations and provide constructive feedback. Stronge et al. (2013) explained that appropriate feedback can improve teachers' teaching strategies. Kimball et al. (2004) showed that evaluations conducted through supervision make teachers more reflective in developing learning methods. Sergiovanni (2009) emphasized that humanistic supervision encourages teachers to innovate and improve the quality of teaching. Previous research shows that effective supervision contributes to improved student learning outcomes. Waters et al. (2003) found that strong instructional leadership is positively correlated with academic achievement. Day et al. (2016) stated that principal supervision can create a learning culture that supports student success. Ladd and Fiske (2011) emphasized that improving teacher performance through supervision can have a direct impact on students' academic development.

Barriers to Accountability and Supervision in School Leadership Practices

Barriers to accountability often arise from limited managerial competence among school leaders, particularly in planning, reporting, and evaluating educational programs. Bush and Glover (2014) explain that many principals lack adequate administrative skills to effectively implement accountability. The OECD (2018) found that incomplete evaluation instruments hamper the implementation of systematic accountability. Darling-Hammond et al. (2020) assert that incomplete leadership training leaves principals ill-prepared to carry out accountability functions. Supervision barriers frequently occur due to inconsistencies in monitoring and weak implementation of instructional oversight. Wanzare (2012) states that academic supervision is often not conducted routinely, preventing teachers from receiving ongoing coaching.

Hallinger (2011) indicates that some principals lack strong classroom observation skills, making supervision ineffective. Anwar (2014) notes that minimal supervision documentation results in a lack of feedback that can be used to improve learning quality. Structural and contextual constraints in schools further exacerbate accountability and supervision challenges. Luddin (2013) revealed that excessive administrative burdens make it difficult for principals to focus on program supervision and reporting. Anggraini (2017) found that inadequate infrastructure and evaluation instruments were the main obstacles to implementing quality

supervision. Purwanto (2016) emphasized that a lack of internal coordination also resulted in suboptimal accountability and oversight.

Implications of Findings for Strengthening School Governance and Quality

The findings indicate that strengthening principal accountability is essential for improving school governance, particularly in ensuring transparency, structured planning, and effective resource utilization. Bush (2011) explained that strong accountability creates clear leadership direction consistent with school goals. Robbins and Judge (2019) stated that accountable leaders are able to build institutional trust and legitimacy. Ladd and Fiske (2011) emphasized that increased performance-based accountability has a direct impact on the effectiveness of educational governance. Effective supervision practices also have significant implications for strengthening instructional quality and school performance. Glickman et al. (2010) explained that structured supervision helps teachers develop professional competencies continuously. Hallinger and Murphy (2013) showed that strong instructional supervision strengthens a culture of learning and improves the quality of learning in schools. Stronge et al. (2013) emphasized that consistent supervisory feedback contributes to improving teachers' teaching practices. The findings further imply the need for capacity building in leadership training to address barriers in accountability and supervision. Darling-Hammond et al. (2020) stated that educational leaders need evidence-based training to improve managerial and supervisory skills. The OECD (2018) highlighted the importance of providing adequate evaluation instruments to enable principals to conduct effective monitoring. Leithwood et al. (2020) emphasized that strengthening leadership capacity is key to improving the quality of governance and sustainable school success.

CONCLUSIONS

This study concludes that principal accountability and supervision play a crucial role in strengthening governance and improving the quality of education, particularly through structured program planning, transparent resource management, and consistent instructional supervision oriented toward improving teacher performance. However, various obstacles, such as limited managerial competency, a lack of evaluation instruments, and weak documentation, indicate that efforts to strengthen principal capacity are still essential. Therefore, further research is recommended to conduct empirical studies through direct observation, surveys, or a mixed approach to obtain a more comprehensive picture of the effectiveness of accountability and supervision, and to develop a more adaptive and measurable school leadership model.

REFERENCES

- Anggraini, Y. (2017). Implementation policy of supervision of employee task office of Cipocok Jaya Districts, Serang City, Banten Province. *Jurnal Bina Praja*, 9(2), 195–204. <https://doi.org/10.21787/jbp.09.2017.195-204>

- Borman, G., & Kimball, S. (2005). Teacher evaluation and instructional improvement. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 80(2), 49–70. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327930pje8002_4
- Bush, T. (2011). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (4th ed.). SAGE.
- Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2014). School leadership models: What do we know? *School Leadership & Management*, 34(5), 553–571. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2014.928681>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *The flat world and education*. Teachers College Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Meyerson, D., LaPointe, M., & Orr, M. (2020). *Preparing school leaders*. Jossey-Bass.
- Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2016). *Successful school leadership*. Open University Press.
- Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2010). *SuperVision and instructional leadership*. Pearson.
- Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 10(2), 171–176. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2011.557517>
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (2010). Collaborative leadership and school improvement. *School Leadership & Management*, 30(2), 95–110. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632431003663214>
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (2013). Running on empty? *Journal of Educational Administration*, 51(6), 768–789. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-03-2012-0031>
- Handoko, T. H. (2011). *Manajemen*. BPFE.
- Heizer, J., & Render, B. (2017). *Operations management*. Pearson.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2013). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (9th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Kimball, S., Heneman, H., & Milanowski, A. (2004). Performance evaluation and teacher effectiveness. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 12(3). <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v12n5.2004>
- Ladd, H. F., & Fiske, E. B. (2011). Weighted student funding in New Zealand. *Journal of Education Finance*, 36(4), 378–407.
- Langi, A. T., Luddin, M. R., & Akbar, M. (2019). Performance management of community counselors (Case study: Balai Pemasyarakatan Jakarta Timur-Utara). *Opción*, 35(Special Issue 19), 28–52.
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077>
- Louis, K. S., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K. L., & Anderson, S. E. (2010). *Learning from leadership*. The Wallace Foundation.
- Mulyasa, E. (2013). *Menjadi kepala sekolah profesional*. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- OECD. (2018). *Education policy outlook 2018*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264301528-en>
- Purwanto, N. (2016). *Administrasi dan supervisi pendidikan*. Rineka Cipta.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2019). *Organizational behavior* (18th ed.). Pearson.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (2009). *The principalship*. Pearson.
- Siagian, S. P. (2010). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Bumi Aksara.

- Spillane, J. P. (2006). *Distributed leadership*. Jossey-Bass.
- Stronge, J. H., Ward, T. J., & Grant, L. W. (2013). What makes good teachers good? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 63(4), 339–355. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487112432107>
- Sudjana. (2006). *Manajemen pendidikan*. Sinar Baru.
- Wanzare, Z. (2012). Instructional supervision in public schools. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 7(1).
- Waters, T., Marzano, R. J., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us*. McREL.