THE INFLUENCE OF THE ROLES OF SCHOOL SUPERVISORS AND PRINCIPALS ON THE QUALITY OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL: A CASE STUDY IN REMBANG DISTRICT REMBANG REGENCY

Wahyuni Rahma Dianti[1a*], Ngasbun Egar[2b], and Ghufron Abdullah[3c]

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

[a] *yaniyuni43@gmail.com*
[b] *ngasbunegar@ugris.ac.id*
[c]*ghufronabdullah@upgris.ac.id*

(*) Corresponding Author
yaniyuni43@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study aims to examine the influence of the roles of school supervisors and principals on the quality of public elementary schools in Rembang District, Rembang Regency. Using a quantitative correlational approach, data were collected through a Likert-scale questionnaire distributed to 188 teachers from 45 public elementary schools. The research focuses on three main variables: school quality (dependent), the role of school supervisors, and the role of principals (independent). The results indicate that both school supervisors and principals have a statistically significant influence on school quality, both partially and simultaneously. However, the direction of influence is negative, suggesting that increased perception of their roles tends to appear in schools experiencing lower performance. Factor analysis reveals that managerial supervision by supervisors and the supervisory role of principals are the most dominant dimensions perceived by teachers. The novelty of this study lies in its finding that strong perceived leadership roles do not always correlate positively with school quality, especially when such roles are implemented as responses to existing problems. The study is limited by its use of perception-based data and cross-sectional design. Future research is recommended to adopt mixed methods, include objective school quality indicators, and use longitudinal data for broader and deeper insights.

INTRODUCTIONS

Education is a fundamental pillar in shaping an excellent generation with noble character and the capacity to respond to the challenges of the times. Article 31 of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia affirms that every citizen has the right to education, and the government is responsible for organizing a national education system

to enlighten the life of the nation. National education aims to develop students' potential to become individuals who are faithful, pious, noble in character, healthy, knowledgeable, competent, creative, independent, and democratic, as well as responsible citizens (Law No. 20 of 2003).

The demand for high-quality education continues to rise in line with the development of globalization and digitalization. The quality of education has become a key measure for evaluating the success of the learning process, both in terms of input, process, and output (Sani, 2015). The quality of basic education, particularly in Rembang District, Rembang Regency, has become a serious concern due to existing disparities between schools in terms of students' literacy, numeracy, and character. Table 1 presents the quality report scores of several public elementary schools in the district based on three main indicators.

Table 1. Average Quality Report Scores for Schools in Rembang District

No	School Name	Literacy	Numeracy	Character
1	SDN1 Kutoharjo	83.33%	83.33%	56.06%
2	SDN 1 Leteh	56.67%	26.67%	55.93%
3	SDN 1 Pasar Banggi	69.57%	73.91%	55.25%
4	SDN 1 Pulo	71.43%	42.66%	52.4%
5	SDN 1 Sumberjo	80.77%	64%	60%
6	SDN 1 Tanjungsari	80%	50%	64.88%
7	SDN 1 Waru	96.3%	96.3%	72%
8	SDN 2 Kutoharjo	83.33%	83.33%	56.06%
9	SDN 2 Leteh	86.67%	90%	57.19%
10	SDN Pasarbanggi	52%	40%	59.55%
11	SDN 2 Pulo	52.17%	48.53%	60.01%
12	SDN 2 Sumberjo	86.67%	90%	57.19%
13	SDN Negeri 2 Waru	52%	40%	59.55%
14	SDN 3 Kutoharjo	52.17%	48.53%	60.01%
15	SDN 3 Sumberjo	71.43%	42.66%	52.4%
16	SDN 3 Waru	80.77%	64%	60%
17	SDN 4 Kutoharjo	80.77%	64%	60%
18	SDN 5 Kutoharjo	80%	50%	64.88%
19	SDN 6 Kutoharjo	96.3%	96.3%	72%
20	SDN Gedangan	83.33%	83.33%	56.06%
22	SDN Gegunung Wetan	83.33%	83.33%	56.06%
23	SDN Kabongan Kidul	80.77%	64%	60%
24	SDN Kasreman	86.67%	76.67%	57.38%
25	SDN Kedungrejo	80.77%	64%	60%
26	SDN Ketanggi	76.67%	63.33%	58.17%
27	SDN Kumendung	71.43%	42.66%	52.4%
28	SDN Magersari	80.77%	64%	60%
29	SDN Mondoteko	80.77%	64%	60%

No	School Name	Literacy	Numeracy	Character
30	SDN Ngadem	80%	50%	64.88%
31	SDN Ngotet	86,67%	90.00%	85.33%
32	SDN Pacar	86.67%	76.67%	57.38%
33	SDN Padaran	80.77%	64%	60%
34	SDN Punjulharjo	76.67%	63.33%	58.17%
35	SDN Sridadi	71.43%	42.66%	52.4%
36	SDN Sukoharjo	80.77%	64%	60%
37	SDN Tasikagung	80.77%	64%	60%
38	SDN Tireman	80.77%	64%	60%
39	SDN Tlogomojo	76.67%	63.33%	58.17%
40	SDN Tritunggal	60.87%	52.17%	53.96%
41	SDN Turusgede	96.3%	96.3%	72%
42	SDN Weton	83.33%	83.33%	56.06%

(Source: School Quality Report, 2024)

The data indicate that although some schools have achieved high scores in literacy and numeracy, the character indicator remains relatively low and inconsistent. This reflects the suboptimal performance of key actors in the basic education system, particularly school supervisors and principals.

Improving education quality demands synergy among various stakeholders. Danim (2014) states that at least five dominant factors determine educational quality: principal leadership, teachers, students, curriculum, and collaborative networks. School supervisors have a strategic role in conducting academic and managerial supervision, as well as guiding teachers and principals (Ministry of Education Regulation No. 143 of 2014). However, Sumarno's (2021) study in Central Java found that many supervisors are still preoccupied with administrative tasks and have not yet maximized their function as agents of change. In fact, around 35% of supervisors lacked adequate digital competence (GTK Ministry of Education and Culture, 2022), and only 46% of teachers/principals perceived positive impacts from supervisory practices (LPMP, 2022).

Additionally, school principals also play a vital role as instructional leaders. Principals are not merely administrative managers but also serve as professional mentors, school culture creators, and visionaries in education. Holilah et al. (2023) demonstrated that principal leadership significantly influences the quality of basic education. However, in practice, many principals in Rembang have not optimally fulfilled this role. Researcher observations in March–April 2025 revealed that: (1) 75% of principals had not routinely conducted academic supervision, (2) 58% of teachers had not received coaching on differentiated learning, and (3) only 25% of schools had fully implemented data-based planning.

Based on this context, several issues arise that merit further investigation: (1) The suboptimal role of school supervisors in academic and managerial supervision. (2) Weak principal leadership in teacher development and school program management. (3) Disparities in education quality among elementary schools in Rembang District. Thus, this study focuses on examining the influence of the roles of school supervisors and principals on the quality of public elementary schools in Rembang District, Rembang Regency. It is expected to offer empirical contributions to policy formulation for improving basic education quality in a systematic and sustainable manner.

The uneven distribution of basic education quality in Rembang District, as described in the introduction, highlights the need to strengthen the roles of key actors in the education system, particularly school supervisors and principals. To deepen the understanding of their influence on school quality, this section discusses the theoretical

concepts of educational quality, influencing factors, quality indicators, and the roles of school supervisors and principals in the context of educational management.

Educational quality is a central concept in education, referring to the extent to which an institution can meet stakeholders' expectations. Widiyanti and Suranto (2020) classify education quality into three main components: input, process, and output. Inputs include human resources and infrastructure; processes reflect the effectiveness of learning activities; and outputs are indicated by students' academic and non-academic achievements. Rusman (2020) adds that quality is not only determined by results but also by processes carried out systematically and consistently. Arcaro (2015) describes quality as the result of a structured process aimed at achieving customer satisfaction—in this case, students and the wider community. Similarly, Zahro (2015) asserts that education quality reflects an institution's ability to manage resources to enhance learning processes. Triatna (2015) emphasizes that quality is the perception of service recipients regarding the input, process, and output delivered. Therefore, school quality is an accumulation of various internal and external factors that collectively influence the success of educational services.

Various factors affect school quality. Sukmadinata (2015) argues that quality depends on continuous educational processes supported by effective management, a conducive learning environment, and adequate facilities and infrastructure. Atmodiwiro (2016) categorizes these factors into input and process elements, including human resources, funding, policies, and supporting tools. Danim (2015) identifies five dominant factors influencing education quality: principal leadership, teachers, students, curriculum, and collaboration networks. Furthermore, Murgatroyd and Morgan (2015) introduce the 3Cs of Total Quality Management (culture, commitment, communication) as foundational principles of educational quality management. Arcaro (2015) also highlights the role of internal factors such as intelligence, talent, interest, and student motivation, as well as external factors such as family support and the school environment. The synergy of these factors determines how effectively teaching and learning processes achieve optimal outcomes.

To comprehensively assess education quality, it is essential to understand its dimensions and indicators. According to Government Regulation No. 57 of 2021, the dimensions of educational quality include input, process, output, and outcome. Hidayat and Machali (2017) assert that high-quality schools exhibit characteristics such as strong leadership, a culture of quality, professional teacher management, and continuous evaluation. Triatna (2015) further classifies school quality indicators into three major categories: input quality, process quality, and output quality. Input indicators include teacher competence, school facilities, and accountable funding systems. Process indicators consist of relevant curricula, effective teaching methods, and systematic program management. Output indicators include student learning outcomes, graduate competitiveness, and community recognition of educational results. These indicators are summarized in the following table 2:

Table 2. Dimensions and Indicators of School Quality

Quality Dimension	Key Indicators
Input	Teacher competence, school facilities, funding
Process	Curriculum, instructional quality, program management
Output	Student achievement, graduate competitiveness

In the context of improving educational quality, school supervisors play a strategic role as professionals tasked with conducting academic and managerial supervision of educational institutions. Siregar (2023) states that supervisors are not only evaluators but also facilitators and quality improvement partners for teachers and principals. This aligns with Darmasah (2020) and Rizky (2021), who emphasize that supervisors should not only assess but also actively provide ongoing guidance and training. Sari (2022) adds that supervisors contribute to teacher professionalism and effective school management. Research by Kaiman et al. (2020) and Jafriany et al. (2024) confirms that strengthening the supervisory role directly impacts the quality of learning processes, school governance, and overall education quality.

Alongside supervisors, principals are key figures in implementing school quality programs. Mulyasa (2016) outlines seven essential roles of school principals: educator, manager, administrator, supervisor, leader, innovator, and motivator. Each role significantly contributes to fostering a culture of quality within schools. Setiawati (2023) highlights that principals have a direct influence on school quality through strong, vision-driven leadership. Wahyosumidjo (2014) and Sutarto & Amri (2020) find that collaborative and transformational leadership models among principals can create productive, dynamic, and results-oriented learning environments. Thus, principals are not only administrative managers but also the driving force in establishing an effective and high-performing educational ecosystem.

In conclusion, both school supervisors and principals play critical roles in improving the quality of basic education. Their contributions complement one another within an effective and sustainable education management framework, which constitutes the primary focus of this study

METHOD

This study employed a quantitative approach with a correlational research design. A quantitative approach was selected to examine the influence between the independent variables, namely the Role of School Supervisors (X_1) and the Role of School Principals (X_2), on the dependent variable, which is School Quality (Y). The study used a causal survey method, wherein data were collected through questionnaires distributed to respondents to capture their perceptions of existing phenomena (Sugiyono, 2020).

The research was conducted in 45 public elementary schools located in Rembang District, Rembang Regency. The selection of the research site was based on accessibility and efficiency considerations, as the researcher is part of the local area. The study was carried out from April to May 2025. The research stages were implemented systematically, beginning with title submission, proposal writing and seminar, instrument testing, data collection, data analysis, and final report writing and revision. The timeline was as follows: title submission in October, proposal development from October to December, proposal seminar from December to January, instrument testing in February, data collection from March to April, data analysis in April and May, and report writing and thesis defense in May.

The population in this study comprised all public elementary school teachers in Rembang District, totaling 356 individuals. The sample size was determined using Slovin's formula with a 5% margin of error as referred by Siregar (2015), resulting in a total sample of 188 respondents. The sampling technique used was proportional random sampling, in which the proportion of teachers from each school was calculated, followed by random selection of individual respondents. The sample distribution per school was adjusted based on population size and proportional calculations.

The study variables consisted of two independent variables: the Role of School Supervisors (X_1) and the Role of School Principals (X_2), and one dependent variable: School Quality (Y). Conceptually, school quality is defined as a measure of satisfaction with educational services, based on the input, process, and output components produced. The Role of School Supervisors refers to their responsibility and functions in overseeing educational implementation through academic and managerial supervision, coaching, and evaluation. Meanwhile, the Role of School Principals is defined as leadership behaviors that influence and guide the school community toward achieving shared goals.

Operationally, school quality was measured based on three dimensions: (1) input, which includes teacher competence, infrastructure, and funding; (2) process, which involves curriculum, instructional strategies, evaluation, and school management; and (3) output, represented by student learning outcomes and graduate competitiveness. The Role of School Supervisors was measured through five dimensions: implementation of academic supervision, managerial supervision, performance evaluation, professional development of teachers, and the role as facilitator and assessor. The Role of School Principals was assessed through seven dimensions as formulated by Mulyasa (2016): educator, manager, administrator, supervisor, leader, innovator, and motivator.

Data were collected using a closed-ended Likert scale questionnaire with five levels of response: strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), somewhat agree (3), agree (4), and strongly agree (5). The questionnaire was constructed

based on an instrument blueprint containing indicators for each variable and was administered to all 188 respondents. The Likert scale was considered appropriate for measuring respondents' attitudes, perceptions, and opinions related to the research variables (Sugiyono, 2014).

The research instrument was tested for validity and reliability before use. Validity was assessed using Pearson product-moment correlation with a try-out sample of 30 respondents outside the main sample. Items were considered valid if the calculated r-value exceeded the critical r-value (0.361). The validity test results indicated that most items across all variables were valid. Reliability was tested using Cronbach's Alpha method. The results showed that all variables had alpha values greater than 0.90, indicating very high reliability (Sugiyono, 2014; Riduwan, 2015). A summary of the reliability test results is presented in the following table:

Table 3. Summary of Reliability Test Results

No	Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Conclusion
1	School Quality (Y)	0.931	Reliable
2	Role of Supervisor (X_1)	0.957	Reliable
3	Role of Principal (X_2)	0.944	Reliable

The collected data were analyzed using SPSS version 22. Before conducting regression analysis, assumption tests were performed, including normality (Kolmogorov-Smirnov), homogeneity (Levene), linearity (F-test via ANOVA), and multicollinearity (tolerance and Variance Inflation Factor). Data were considered normally distributed if the significance value was > 0.05, homogeneous if significance > 0.05, linear if a linear relationship existed between variables, and free of multicollinearity if tolerance > 0.10 and VIF < 10.

The hypothesis testing in this study aimed to examine the influence of the Role of School Supervisors (X_1) and the Role of School Principals (X_2) on School Quality (Y), both partially and simultaneously. Partial tests were performed using the t-test, while the simultaneous test employed the F-test. The regression analysis consisted of simple linear regression and multiple linear regression. The simple regression equation used was $Y = a + bX$, and the multiple regression equation used was $Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2$.

Conceptually, the research design illustrates a causal relationship between two independent variables (Role of School Supervisors and Role of School Principals) and one dependent variable (School Quality). This design is expected to provide empirical insights into the contribution of educational leadership roles toward improving the quality of basic education units.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION
Result

This study involved 188 teachers from 45 public elementary schools in Rembang District, Rembang Regency, as respondents. The instrument used was a closed-ended questionnaire based on a five-point Likert scale, designed to measure respondents' level of agreement with a number of statements representing three main variables: School Quality (Y), the Role of School Supervisors (X_1), and the Role of School Principals (X_2). To gain an initial understanding of respondents' perceptions, descriptive analysis was conducted on the total scores for each variable, including the minimum, maximum, mean, and standard deviation values. These results were then used to classify respondents' perceptions into five Likert scale categories: very low, low, moderate, high, and very high.

The School Quality variable was measured across three main dimensions: quality input (teacher competence, infrastructure, and funding), quality process (curriculum, instruction, and school management), and quality output (student achievement, graduates, and public satisfaction). The theoretical maximum score was 105, and the actual scores ranged from 66 to 100, with a mean of 92.85 and a standard deviation of 0.897. Most respondents rated their schools' quality as high, with 132 teachers (70.21%) selecting "Strongly Agree" and 56 teachers (29.79%) selecting "Agree." No respondents gave negative responses. This indicates that teachers perceived the quality of their schools—

particularly in terms of the learning process and availability of inputs—as already very good. Factor analysis revealed that the quality process dimension contributed the most (loading factor = 0.630), followed by input quality (0.553), and output quality (0.133). These findings suggest that teachers' perceptions of school quality are more strongly influenced by the quality of internal processes than by educational outcomes.

The Role of School Supervisors was measured across five dimensions: academic supervision, managerial supervision, performance evaluation, professional development, and the role as facilitator and assessor. The maximum score for this variable was 110, with actual scores ranging from 76 to 106, a mean of 95.77, and a standard deviation of 1.042. The distribution of responses showed that 60 respondents (31.9%) selected "Strongly Agree," 97 (51.6%) "Agree," 24 (12.8%) "Somewhat Agree," and 7 (3.7%) "Disagree." No one selected "Strongly Disagree." This indicates that while most teachers viewed the role of school supervisors positively, around 16.5% felt that supervisors had not yet performed their roles optimally. Further factor analysis showed that the managerial supervision dimension had the highest loading factor (0.861), followed by performance evaluation (0.772), suggesting that supervisors' effectiveness in managerial oversight and teacher performance review were the most impactful aspects in the teachers' perception.

The Role of School Principals was analyzed using seven leadership dimensions: educator, manager, administrator, supervisor, leader, innovator, and motivator. The maximum theoretical score was 105, with actual scores ranging from 64 to 105, a mean of 94.53, and a standard deviation of 1.017. A total of 64 respondents (34%) selected "Strongly Agree," 55 (29.3%) "Agree," 57 (30.3%) "Somewhat Agree," and 12 (6.4%) "Disagree." This indicates that 36.7% of respondents provided less positive assessments, suggesting that while the principal's leadership was appreciated, there remain challenges, particularly in managerial and administrative aspects. In-depth factor analysis indicated that the supervisor dimension was the most dominant (loading factor = 0.841), followed by motivator (0.741) and educator (0.738). In contrast, the administrator (0.282) and manager (0.413) roles were perceived as the weakest, highlighting the need to strengthen school principals' administrative and organizational management skills.

Factor analysis in this study aimed to identify the most dominant dimension within each variable. For the School Quality variable, the quality process dimension was the most dominant (0.630), indicating that the quality of teaching and school management strongly influenced teachers' perceptions. Input quality ranked second (0.553), while output quality had the lowest influence (0.133). For the Role of School Supervisors, managerial supervision was the most dominant (0.861), followed by performance evaluation (0.772), while academic supervision, professional development, and facilitation had lower contributions. For the Role of School Principals, the roles of supervisor (0.841), motivator (0.741), and educator (0.738) had the strongest impact, whereas administrator and manager were the least influential.

Before conducting regression analysis, assumption tests were carried out to ensure the data met the basic requirements of linear regression analysis. These included tests for normality, linearity, multicollinearity, and homogeneity. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test returned a significance value of 0.742 (> 0.05), indicating that the data were normally distributed. The ANOVA linearity test showed a significant linear relationship between the independent variables (X_1 and X_2) and the dependent variable (Y), with p-values < 0.05. The multicollinearity test confirmed that all variables had VIF values below 10 and tolerance values above 0.10, meaning no high correlation existed between the independent variables. The Levene's Test for homogeneity yielded a significance value of 0.111 (> 0.05), indicating that the data were homogeneous. Thus, all assumptions for regression analysis were met, allowing for valid hypothesis testing.

Hypothesis testing was conducted to determine the influence of the Role of School Supervisors (X_1) and the Role of School Principals (X_2) on School Quality (Y), both partially and simultaneously. The results of simple linear regression showed that the Role of School Supervisors had a correlation value of $r = -0.241$ and a coefficient of determination (R^2) of 0.058, indicating that 5.8% of the variation in school quality was explained by the role of the supervisor. The significance value was 0.001 (< 0.05), indicating a statistically significant influence, although the

regression coefficient was negative (–0.095). The resulting regression equation was: $\hat{Y} = 101.903 – 0.095X_1$.

Likewise, simple regression for the Role of School Principals produced a correlation value of $r = –0.207$ and $R^2 = 0.043$, indicating that 4.3% of the variance in school quality was explained by this variable. The significance value was 0.004 (< 0.05), indicating a significant effect with a regression coefficient of –0.065. The resulting equation was: $\hat{Y} = 98.947 – 0.065X_2$.

The negative coefficients for both variables may suggest that the more intensive the roles of supervisors and principals are perceived, the more likely those roles are observed in schools currently facing quality challenges, or that teachers' perceptions may not align with objective indicators of school performance.

Simultaneous multiple regression analysis showed that the two independent variables (X_1 and X_2) contributed 17.3% to the variation in school quality, with an R^2 value of 0.173. The F-test yielded a value of 19.147 with a significance of 0.000 (< 0.05), indicating that the regression model was significant overall. The resulting multiple regression equation was: $\hat{Y} = 111.274 – 0.159X_1 – 0.134X_2$.

This model indicates that for every one-point increase in the perception of the role of school supervisors, school quality scores decrease by 0.159 points, and for every one-point increase in the perception of the principal's role, school quality decreases by 0.134 points, assuming other variables remain constant. This is consistent with the pattern found in the simple regression models.

In conclusion, the findings of this study demonstrate that both individually and collectively, the roles of school supervisors and principals significantly influence the quality of public elementary schools in Rembang District. However, the direction of influence found was negative, which may warrant further consideration in evaluating the functional roles of educational actors at the school level.

Discussion

This study aimed to examine the influence of the roles of school supervisors and school principals on the quality of public elementary schools in Rembang District, Rembang Regency. The results indicated that both variables significantly influence school quality, both partially and simultaneously. However, the direction of influence found in the analysis tends to be negative, which opens space for further discussion and interpretation of the phenomena occurring in the field.

The Influence of School Supervisors' Role on School Quality

The results of the simple regression analysis show that the role of school supervisors (X_1) has a significant negative influence on school quality (Y), with a correlation coefficient of $r = –0.241$ and a significance value of 0.001 (< 0.05). Although the coefficient of determination (R^2) is only 5.8%, the results indicate a statistically significant relationship. The negative regression coefficient suggests that an increased perception of the school supervisor's role correlates with a decrease in school quality scores.

This finding contrasts with theories that state school supervisors play a critical role in mentoring teachers, developing school management, and promoting improvements in education quality (Siregar, 2023; Jafriany et al., 2024). However, this result can be interpreted through an empirical lens. It is possible that supervisors are more intensively present in schools experiencing quality gaps, resulting in teachers from these schools having strong perceptions of supervisor presence, while the schools' quality scores remain suboptimal. In this context, the presence of supervisors functions more as an intervention in underperforming schools rather than a reflection of successful supervisory impact on school quality.

Factor analysis supports this finding, with the managerial supervision dimension having the highest loading factor (0.861), followed by performance evaluation (0.772). This indicates that supervisors are perceived more for their role in managerial aspects than in academic mentoring. The low loading factor for academic supervision suggests that direct coaching related to instruction may not be optimally or evenly implemented across schools.

The Influence of School Principals' Role on School Quality

Similarly, the simple regression test for the role of school principals (X_2) also shows a significant negative influence on school quality, with r = –0.207 and a significance value of 0.004 (< 0.05). The regression coefficient of –0.065 indicates that the higher the teachers' perception of the principal's role, the lower the school quality score observed in the model. This finding contradicts educational leadership theories that position principals as change agents and instructional leaders who are critical to shaping the direction and quality of educational institutions (Mulyasa, 2016; Wahyosumidjo, 2014).

There are several critical interpretations of this finding. First, high perceptions of the principal's role may arise in schools that are in the process of quality improvement. In such cases, principals are more active in responding to quality issues, leading to stronger teacher perceptions of leadership, while the school's objective performance is still developing. Second, there may be a gap between principals' formal roles and the actual results of school quality improvement.

Factor analysis reveals that the dimensions of supervisor (0.841), motivator (0.741), and educator (0.738) are the most strongly perceived by teachers. However, the administrator (0.282) and manager (0.413) dimensions show lower influence. This suggests that while principals are relatively effective in providing guidance and motivation, they remain less effective in program and administrative management, which are crucial for building a sustainable foundation of school quality. This finding is consistent with Holilah et al. (2023), who found that many principals lack skills in data-based management and systematic academic supervision.

The Simultaneous Influence of Supervisors and Principals on School Quality

Simultaneously, the roles of school supervisors and principals significantly influence school quality, with an R^2 value of 0.173 or 17.3%. This means that the combination of both roles explains nearly one-fifth of the variation in school quality, while the remaining variance is influenced by other factors such as teacher performance, parental involvement, curriculum, and infrastructure support. The F-statistic value of 19.147 with a significance of 0.000 confirms that the regression model is statistically valid.

However, the fact that both regression coefficients remain negative suggests a consistent pattern that requires further investigation. This indicates the possibility that the formal roles of supervisors and principals have not been fully effective in producing tangible improvements in school quality. These roles may still be administrative or symbolic in nature, rather than strategic roles that directly enhance the quality of inputs, processes, and outputs in education.

Implications of the Findings and Critical Reflection

These findings carry several important implications. First, the approach to school supervision should be reconsidered. Supervision should not be limited to administrative and evaluative functions but must become transformative and aimed at building teacher capacity. Second, principals need further training in data-based school management, academic supervision, and strategic instructional leadership. Third, the results highlight the importance of measuring school quality not only based on perception but also on diverse and valid objective indicators.

Methodologically, a negative regression coefficient does not necessarily indicate a failure of the role, but may reflect the reality of the role as a response to the conditions of schools. Therefore, future research should combine quantitative and qualitative approaches to explore the social and cultural contexts of schools in greater depth.

CONCLUSION

Based on the research findings, it can be concluded that the roles of school supervisors and principals significantly influence the quality of public elementary schools in Rembang District, both partially and simultaneously, albeit with a negative direction of influence. The role of school supervisors is most prominent in the

dimensions of managerial supervision and performance evaluation, while the principal's role stands out in the dimensions of supervision, motivation, and educational leadership, yet remains weak in administrative and managerial aspects. Simultaneously, both roles contribute only 17.3% to the variation in school quality, indicating that perceptions of role intensity do not always correlate directly with actual educational quality achievements. The novelty of this study lies in the finding that high perceptions of the roles of supervisors and principals are negatively correlated with school quality, suggesting that such role intensification tends to occur more frequently in low-performing schools as a form of intervention, rather than as an indicator of role effectiveness. This study has limitations due to its quantitative nature based on perception data and the use of a cross-sectional design, without integrating objective measures of school quality such as national assessment scores or educational report cards. Therefore, future research is recommended to adopt a mixed-methods approach that combines perceptual and objective data and to be conducted longitudinally in order to explore causal relationships more deeply, while also expanding the research coverage to improve the generalizability of the findings.

REFERECES

Arcaro, J. S. (2015). *Quality in education: An implementation handbook*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Arikunto, S. (2017). *Prosedur penelitian: Suatu pendekatan praktik* (Revisi ke-15). Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Atmodiwiro, S. (2016). *Manajemen pendidikan Indonesia*. Jakarta: Ardadizya Jaya.

Danim, S. (2014). *Pengembangan profesi guru: Dari prajabatan, induksi ke profesionalisme*. Jakarta: Kencana.

Darmasah. (2020). Peran strategis pengawas dalam supervisi manajerial dan akademik. *Jurnal Supervisi Pendidikan*, 8(2), 156–166.

Fattah, N. (2016). *Landasan manajemen pendidikan*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.

Ghozali, I. (2011). *Aplikasi analisis multivariate dengan program SPSS*. Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

Hidayat, A., & Machali, I. (2017). *Pengelolaan pendidikan: Konsep, prinsip dan aplikasi dalam pendidikan Islam*. Yogyakarta: Kalimedia.

Holilah, N., Sutisna, & Rahman, A. (2023). Kepemimpinan kepala sekolah dalam meningkatkan mutu pendidikan di sekolah dasar. *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan*, 14(1), 25–34.

Jafriany, D., Rofiq, A., & Handayani, S. (2024). Efektivitas supervisi pengawas sekolah terhadap peningkatan mutu pembelajaran. *Jurnal Kependidikan dan Supervisi*, 8(2), 115–127.

Kaiman, M., Siahaan, D., & Putra, R. (2020). Dimensi peran pengawas sekolah dalam supervisi pendidikan. *Jurnal Administrasi Pendidikan*, 27(2), 185–195.

Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. (2014). *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia Nomor 143 Tahun 2014 tentang Jabatan Fungsional Pengawas Sekolah dan Angka Kreditnya*. Jakarta: Kemendikbud.

Kompri. (2015). *Manajemen pendidikan*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Mariyam, M., Hartati, S., & Wulandari, F. (2023). School culture, principal role, and teacher motivation in improving school quality. *International Journal of Educational Research Review*, 8(1), 88–98.

Mulyasa, E. (2016). *Menjadi kepala sekolah profesional: Dalam konteks menyukseskan MBS dan KTSP*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.

Murgatroyd, S., & Morgan, C. (2015). *Total quality management in the public sector*. Jakarta: RajaGrafindo Persada.

Naziardi, M., & Nilawati. (2016). Peran komite sekolah dalam meningkatkan mutu pendidikan di sekolah dasar. *Jurnal Administrasi Pendidikan*, 23(1), 68–74.

Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. (2014). *Permendikbud No. 143 Tahun 2014 tentang Jabatan Fungsional Pengawas Sekolah dan Angka Kreditnya*. Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional. (2007). *Permendiknas No. 13 Tahun 2007 tentang Standar Kompetensi Kepala Sekolah*. Jakarta: Depdiknas.

Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia. (2003). *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 20 Tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional*. Jakarta: Sekretariat Negara.

Rahman, A., & Putri, S. (2019). Tantangan pengawas sekolah dalam meningkatkan mutu pendidikan. *Jurnal Kependidikan*, 21(1), 45–52.

Riduwan. (2015). *Skala pengukuran variabel-variabel penelitian*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Rizky, M. (2021). Supervisi pendidikan dan peningkatan mutu sekolah. *Jurnal Evaluasi Pendidikan*, 13(1), 45–57.

Rusman. (2020). *Manajemen kurikulum*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.

Sani, R. A. (2015). *Pembelajaran ilmiah untuk implementasi kurikulum 2013*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Sari, M. D. (2022). Supervisi pengawas dalam pembinaan guru dan manajemen sekolah. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan dan Supervisi*, 10(1), 99–110.

Setiawati, I. (2023). Pengaruh peran kepala sekolah dan manajemen berbasis sekolah terhadap mutu sekolah. *Edum Journal*, 6(1), 10–20.

Siregar, A. (2023). Peran pengawas sekolah dalam meningkatkan mutu satuan pendidikan. *Jurnal Supervisi Pendidikan*, 11(1), 55–68.

Siregar, S. (2015). *Statistik parametrik untuk penelitian kuantitatif: Dilengkapi perhitungan manual dan aplikasi SPSS versi 17*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Siregar, T. (2023). Profesionalisme pengawas sekolah dalam supervisi akademik dan manajerial. *Jurnal Supervisi Pendidikan*, 11(1), 30–40.

Stronge, J. H. (2013). *Principal leadership: Best practices and impact on school quality*. New York: ASCD.

Sugiyono. (2014). *Metode penelitian pendidikan: Pendekatan kuantitatif, kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Sugiyono. (2020). *Metode penelitian kombinasi (Mix Methods)*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Sukmadinata, N. S. (2015). *Landasan psikologi proses pendidikan*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.

Sumarno. (2021). Analisis peran pengawas sekolah dalam meningkatkan kinerja guru di Jawa Tengah. *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan*, 15(2), 145–159.

Suwanto, H., Makhdalena, & Azhar. (2019). Peran kepala sekolah dan komite dalam meningkatkan mutu pendidikan. *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan*, 10(3), 155–170.

Triatna, C. (2015). *Manajemen pendidikan*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.

Widiyanti, N., & Suranto, T. (2020). Mutu pendidikan dan model manajemen peningkatannya. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran*, 15(2), 121–135.

Wahyosumidjo. (2014). *Kepemimpinan kepala sekolah: Tinjauan teoritik dan permasalahannya*. Jakarta: RajaGrafindo Persada.

Zahro, L. (2015). *Manajemen mutu pendidikan*. Surabaya: Pustaka Aksara.