

## Performance Study of Kindergarten School Supervisors in North Sulawesi Province

Ni Dewi Eka Suwaryaningrat<sup>1</sup>, Harol R. Lumapow<sup>1</sup>, Joulanda A. M. Rawis<sup>1</sup>,  
Jeffry S. J. Lengkong<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Doctoral Study Program in Educational Management, Postgraduate Program Universitas Negeri  
Manado, Indonesia

\*Corresponding author: [nidewiekha@unima.ac.id](mailto:nidewiekha@unima.ac.id)

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received: June 25, 2024; Received in revised form: August 26, 2024; Accepted: September 09, 2024;

Available online: September 14, 2024;

### ABSTRACT

This research aims to analyze the relationship between work climate, discipline, and interpersonal communication on the performance of kindergarten school supervisors in North Sulawesi Province. The background to this research is based on school supervisors' important role in improving education quality through effective supervision. However, various problems were found, such as a lack of discipline, supervisory experience, and an unsupportive work climate, which impacted the performance of school supervisors. This research uses a survey method with a correlational approach. Data was obtained through questionnaires from 40 kindergarten school supervisors in North Sulawesi. The variables studied include work climate (X1), discipline (X2), interpersonal communication (X3), and school supervisor performance (Y). Data analysis was carried out using descriptive and inferential statistical techniques, with the help of the SPSS version 29 for Windows and Microsoft Excel 2021 programs. The research results showed that work climate, discipline, and interpersonal communication each had a strong positive correlation with supervisory performance. The coefficient of determination for work climate is 0.544, which means that 54.4% of the variation in supervisory performance can be explained by work climate. Discipline has a coefficient of determination of 0.435, indicating that 43.5% of the variation in supervisory performance can be explained by discipline. Interpersonal communication has a coefficient of determination of 0.582, indicating that 58.2% of the variation in

supervisory performance can be explained by interpersonal communication. Simultaneously, these three variables have a significant relationship with the performance of school supervisors. Multiple regression analysis shows that the combination of a good work environment, high discipline, and effective communication overall improves the performance of school supervisors. The calculated F value is 35.743 with a significant probability level of less than 0.001, indicating that this regression model can be used to predict supervisor performance with a high level of confidence. This research suggests focusing on improving work climate, discipline, and interpersonal communication to improve supervisor performance, which contributes theoretically and practically to education in North Sulawesi.

**Keywords:** Discipline, Interpersonal Communication, School Supervisor Performance, Education, North Sulawesi, Work Climate.

## INTRODUCTION

One way to produce quality people is through education. Education is flexible in the sense that it always follows current developments in terms of technology and science so as not to be left behind by the progress of the times. Education is the main resource in development. Only with educated people will a nation be able to develop in a planned and sustainable manner. Education is often a driving force for the progress of other development sectors (Alifah, 2021). The position of school supervisor is recruited through teachers who are deemed competent and accomplished. (In Ministerial Decree PANRB 21/2010) it is stated that the requirements to become a school supervisor are as follows: 1) Civil servant teacher who has an educator certificate, 2) has 8 years of teaching experience or as a school principal for at least 4 years, 3) has a Bachelor's/D4 diploma, 4) have skills or expertise according to the field of supervision, 5) have the lowest rank of Class III/C Room Manager, 6) be a maximum of 55 years old, 7) pass the selection for prospective school supervisors, 8) take part in and pass training for prospective supervisors and obtain STTPP, 9) each element of the work assessment in the SKP has a minimum good score in the last 2 years. Paying attention to these requirements shows that the position of school supervisor is not just a support but has a strategic position for the success of an educational institution. In achieving educational goals, each supervisor is expected to play a role and responsibility to facilitate and evaluate educational programs as planned by the school. The results of the evaluation from the supervisor will provide feedback for the school in correcting various deficiencies to achieve school progress effectively, efficiently, and productively (Lumapow, 2011).

From the results of the researcher's observations and interviews regarding the experiences of several teachers in the field, the following were found: (1) School supervisors play more of a role as inspection officers so the results of supervision tend to be administrative. Supervisors do not guide the teaching and learning process, let alone encourage teacher creativity in managing the teaching and learning process (PBM). (2) the presence of supervisors in schools seems to place a psychological burden

on teachers so that good communication cannot be created because they are suspected of reporting their weaknesses to their superiors. So the presence of supervisors in schools has not been utilized by teachers to help solve the teaching problems and student learning outcomes they face. (3) The communication carried out by the supervisor in carrying out supervision does not seem to be following his role as a school supervisor and as a liaison between the school and the District/City Education Office. For this reason, it is necessary to know the interpersonal (organizational) communication skills of supervisors after the new provisions regarding the duties and functions of supervisors and their relationship to the effectiveness of their supervision. (4) School supervisors in carrying out their duties and responsibilities such as providing guidance, assessment, service, and assistance to teachers have not gone as expected. This happens because there is no harmonious relationship, openness, and good cooperation between supervisors and teachers or school principals or between supervisors and the supervisors themselves so supervision does not run effectively. Good communication within an organization or school greatly determines the success of supervisors in carrying out their duties. (5) The role of school supervisors as teacher assessors and trainers has not been implemented optimally, which is indicated by supervisors who rarely visit schools, meaning that guidance is lacking. (6) The supervisor's visit to the school was very short, the input given was too general, not well documented, and not followed up. This finding shows that the supervision carried out by school supervisors does not follow their role as controllers of educational quality. (7) So far, school supervisors are accustomed to carrying out inspections on general matters such as finances, equipment/infrastructure, and building construction so the task of assessing and developing teachers to improve the quality of the teaching and learning process has been neglected. (8) The results of supervision by school supervisors have not been followed up by regional policymakers. All of the problems mentioned above affect the performance of school supervisors.

Paying attention to the phenomena mentioned above shows that there are many problems related to the duties of school supervisors. These problems are within the scope of supervisors, such as managerial abilities, educational background, responsibility in tasks, performance in tasks, commitment to tasks, work experience, work culture, and attitudes towards tasks (Mamuli et al., 2023). Concerning this research from the problems mentioned above, the core of the problem is supervisory performance which is defined as systematic and planned efforts in carrying out supervisory duties and functions to achieve educational goals. This performance includes various aspects such as planning, organizing, implementing, and evaluating educational programs. Supervisory performance also includes the ability to facilitate, assess, provide information, and evaluate the educational process in schools. However, performance is not only related to measuring the efficiency and effectiveness of a school supervisor's work but more than a manifestation of the supervisor's commitment to being accountable for the tasks entrusted to him.

Many factors influence the performance of school supervisors in carrying out supervision duties in schools. These factors include supervisor competency, work climate, discipline, interpersonal communication, supervisor welfare, commitment to duties, supervisor educational qualifications, and work experience. Work climate is one of the variables that greatly influences the performance of school

supervisors. Because a good working climate will encourage school supervisors to work optimally. Work discipline is another variable that has a huge influence on the performance of school supervisors. Work discipline includes obedience to rules, punctuality, and responsibility in carrying out tasks. School supervisors who are disciplined will be more effective in carrying out their duties and responsibilities (Ansyu et al., 2023).

Work discipline is a management action to encourage organizational members to fulfill the demands of various provisions that must be obeyed by employees. This includes compliance with rules and procedures, punctuality, and a high work ethic (Mantiri et al., 2024). Humans need good and effective interpersonal communication skills so that they can carry out all their activities smoothly. This includes the ability to speak clearly and effectively, listen empathetically, and understand and respond effectively to verbal and nonverbal messages from others (Korompot et al., 2023). Various efforts to improve the performance of school supervisors aimed at improving the quality of education are increasingly feeling the urgency. The indicators can be seen from the amount of attention and research directed at improving the ability of school supervisors to better manage and organize educational institutions (Sumual et al., 2024). This phenomenon is what makes researchers very interested in discussing it further in scientific work in the form of a dissertation, taking the specification title "Performance Study of Kindergarten School Supervisors in Manado City".

## METHOD

The research method used in this research is a survey with a correlational approach. The research was conducted in 3 regencies/cities out of 11 regencies and 4 cities in North Sulawesi Province, namely (1) Manado City, (2) Bolaang Mongondow Regency, and (3) Sangihe Islands. In this research, the target population is 360 school supervisors in North Sulawesi Province. Meanwhile, the affordable population is 265 Kindergarten School Supervisors. So, the total population in this study was 265 respondents. Sampling techniques help researchers generalize about the population represented. Based on the calculation results, the sample size of Kindergarten School Supervisors in this study was 40 respondents distributed from 3 districts/cities in North Sulawesi Province. The data collection technique was carried out through the questionnaire method. Data analysis techniques were carried out using descriptive statistical techniques and inferential statistical techniques. In addition, the relationship between one independent variable and one dependent variable was tested using simple linear regression analysis techniques. The relationship between the three independent variables together with one dependent variable was tested using multiple linear regression analysis techniques.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Normality test

**Table 1. Normality test  
 Tests of Normality**

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
IKLIM KERJA	.070	40	.200 <sup>*</sup>	.968	40	.319
KEDISIPLINAN	.106	40	.200 <sup>*</sup>	.954	40	.104
KOMUNIKASI INTERPERSONAL	.082	40	.200 <sup>*</sup>	.969	40	.327
KINERJA PENGAWAS	.077	40	.200 <sup>*</sup>	.972	40	.404

\*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Table 1 is used to find out whether the variables Supervisory Performance (Y), Work Climate (X1), Discipline (X2), and Interpersonal Communication (X3) used in the research are normally distributed or not, the researcher refers to the theory of (Singih Santoso, 2014) data is said to be normally distributed (symmetrical) in the Shapiro-Wilk test if the Significance value (Sig.) is greater than 0.05. In the Supervisory Performance variable, the value of Sig. is 0.40 or is said to be the Sig value. Greater than 0.05 then H0 is accepted and H1 is rejected, which means the data is normally distributed. In the Work Climate variable, the Sig value. Is 0.32 or is said to be the Sig value? Greater than 0.05 then H0 is accepted and H1 is rejected, which means the data is normally distributed. In the Discipline variable, the Sig value. Is 0.10 or is said to be the Sig value? Greater than 0.05 then H0 is accepted and H1 is rejected, which means the data is normally distributed. In the Interpersonal Communication variable, the Sig value. Is 0.33 or is said to be the Sig value? Greater than 0.05 then H0 is accepted and H1 is rejected, which means the data is normally distributed.

### Linearity Test

**Table 2. Linear Test of Work Climate Variables with Supervisory Performance**

		ANOVA Table					
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
KINERJA PENGAWAS * IKLIM KERJA	Between Groups (Combined)		6576.458	23	285.933	4.240	.002
	Linearity		4168.246	1	4168.246	61.814	<.001
	Deviation from Linearity		2408.213	22	109.464	1.623	.162
	Within Groups		1078.917	16	67.432		
Total			7655.375	39			

From Table 2, it can be seen that the Deviation from Linearity (Sig.) value is 0.162 which is greater than 0.05. So, it can be concluded that there is a significant linear relationship between variable X1 and variable Y. The Ftable value is searched based on the value (df) in Deviation from Linearity and Within Groups. From Table 2 it can be seen that the df value is 22; 16 (distribution of Ftable values at

5% or 0.05 significance attached). From the Ftable distribution at a significance of 0.05, guided by the (df) value, it was found that the Ftable value was 2.254. From Table 2 it is known that the Fcount value is  $1.623 < F_{table} 2.254$ . So because the Fcount value is smaller than the Ftable value, it can be concluded that there is a significant linear relationship between variable X1 and variable Y.

**Table 3.** Linear Test of Discipline Variables with Supervisory Performance.

			ANOVA Table				
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
KINERJA PENGAWAS * KEDISIPLINAN	Between Groups	(Combined)	4834.208	23	210.183	1.192	.364
		Linearity	3329.279	1	3329.279	18.882	<.001
		Deviation from Linearity	1504.929	22	68.406	.388	.980
	Within Groups		2821.167	16	176.323		
	Total		7655.375	39			

From Table 3, it can be seen that the Deviation from Linearity (Sig.) value is 0.980, which is greater than 0.05. So it can be concluded that there is a significant linear relationship between variable X2 and variable Y. The Ftable value is searched based on the value (df) in Deviation from Linearity and Within Groups. From Table 3 it can be seen that the df value is 22; 16 (distribution of Ftable values at 5% or 0.05 significance attached). From the Ftable distribution at a significance of 0.05, guided by the (df) value, it was found that the Ftable value was 2.254. From Table 3 it is known that the Fcount value is  $0.388 < F_{table} 2.254$ . So because the Fcount value is smaller than the Ftable value, it can be concluded that there is a significant linear relationship between variable X2 and variable Y.

**Table 4.** Linear Test of Interpersonal Communication with Supervisory Performance.

			ANOVA Table				
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
KINERJA PENGAWAS * KOMUNIKASI INTERPERSONAL	Between Groups	(Combined)	6388.375	24	266.182	3.151	.012
		Linearity	4453.342	1	4453.342	52.723	<.001
		Deviation from Linearity	1935.033	23	84.132	.996	.517
	Within Groups		1267.000	15	84.467		
	Total		7655.375	39			

From Table 4, it can be seen that the Deviation from Linearity (Sig.) value is 0.517 which is greater than 0.05. So, it can be concluded that there is a significant linear relationship between variable X3 and variable Y. The Ftable value is searched based on the value (df) in Deviation from Linearity and Within Groups. From Table 4 it can be seen that the df value is 23; 15 (distribution of Ftable values at 5% or 0.05 significance attached). From the Ftable distribution at a significance of 0.05, guided by the (df) value, it was found that the Ftable value was 2.297. From Table 4 it is known that the Fcount value is  $0.996 < F_{table} 2.297$ . So because the Fcount value is smaller than the Ftable value, it can be concluded that there is a significant linear relationship between variable X3 and variable Y.

### Hypothesis testing

Relationship between Work Climate Variable (X1) and Supervisory Performance Variable (Y)

**Table 5.** Determinant Coefficient of Work Climate Variable (X1) with Supervisory Performance Variable (Y)

**Model Summary<sup>b</sup>**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.738 <sup>a</sup>	.544	.532	9.579

a. Predictors: (Constant), IKLIM KERJA

b. Dependent Variable: KINERJA PENGAWAS

The results from table 5. in this section show a value of  $R = 0.738$  and a coefficient of determination (R-square) of 0.544 (which is the square of the correlation coefficient, or  $0.738 \times 0.738 = 0.544$ ). This shows the understanding that the performance of the Supervisor (Y) is influenced by 54.4% by the work climate (X1), while the remainder ( $100\% - 54.4\% = 45.6\%$ ) is explained by other causes.

**Table 6.** ANOVA Test of Work Climate Variable (X1) with Supervisory Performance Variable (Y)

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	4168.246	1	4168.246	45.422	<.001 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	3487.129	38	91.767		
	Total	7655.375	39			

a. Dependent Variable: KINERJA PENGAWAS

b. Predictors: (Constant), IKLIM KERJA

The results from Table 5, in this section, show a value of  $R = 0.738$  and a coefficient of determination (R-square) of 0.544 (which is the square of the correlation coefficient, or  $0.738 \times 0.738 = 0.544$ ). This shows the understanding that the performance of the Supervisor (Y) is influenced by 54.4% by the work climate (X1), while the remainder ( $100\% - 54.4\% = 45.6\%$ ) is explained by other causes.

**Table 6.** ANOVA Test of Work Climate Variable (X1) with Supervisory Performance Variable (Y).

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	31.666	13.249		2.390	.022
	IKLIM KERJA	.729	.108	.738	6.740	<.001

a. Dependent Variable: KINERJA PENGAWAS

The results of the coefficient test, in this section, show the value (constant) = 31.666 the B value = 0.729 the t value = 6.740, and the significance level = 0.001. From the Coefficients table, the simple regression calculation equation is  $\hat{Y} = a + bX_1 = 31.666 + 0.729X_1$ . The regression coefficient of 0.729 states that it has a positive value, which means that a better work climate is predicted to improve the supervisor's performance. On the other hand, if the work climate worsens, the supervisor's performance is also predicted to decline. So, this states that the direction of prediction is unidirectional (linear). Information that an increase or decrease in the independent variable (X1) will increase/decrease in the variable (Y).

### Relationship between Discipline Variable (X2) and Supervisory Performance Variable (Y)

**Table 7.** Determinant Coefficient of Discipline Variable (X2) with Supervisory Performance Variable (Y)

**Model Summary<sup>b</sup>**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.659 <sup>a</sup>	.435	.420	10.670

a. Predictors: (Constant), KEDISIPLINAN

b. Dependent Variable: KINERJA PENGAWAS

The results from Table 7 in this section show a value of R = 0.659 and a coefficient of determination (R-square) of 0.435 (which is the square of the correlation coefficient, or  $0.659 \times 0.659 = 0.435$ ). This shows the understanding that the performance of the Supervisor (Y) is influenced by 43.5% by discipline (X2), while the remainder ( $100\% - 43.5\% = 56.5\%$ ) is explained by other causes.

**Table 8.** ANOVA Test for Discipline Variables (X2) with Supervisory Performance Variables (Y)



**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3329.279	1	3329.279	29.244	<,001 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	4326.096	38	113.845		
	Total	7655.375	39			

a. Dependent Variable: KINERJA PENGAWAS

b. Predictors: (Constant), KEDISIPLINAN

The results of the ANOVA test, in this section, show the results obtained, namely the Fcount = 29.244 with a probability level of sig. <0.001. Because the probability (0.001) is much smaller than 0.05, the regression model can be used to predict supervisor performance.

**Table 9.** Correlation Coefficient of Discipline Variable (X2) with Supervisory Performance Variable (Y)

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	35.511	15.783		2.250	.030
	KEDISIPLINAN	.668	.124	.659	5.408	<,001

a. Dependent Variable: KINERJA PENGAWAS

The results of the coefficient test, in this section, show a value (constant) = 35.511 and a B value = 0.668 a value of t = 5.408, and a significance level = 0.001. From the Coefficients table, the simple regression calculation equation is  $\hat{Y} = a + bX_2 = 35.511 + 0.668X_2$ . The regression coefficient of 0.668 states that it has a positive value, which means that better discipline is predicted to improve supervisory performance. On the other hand, if discipline worsens, the supervisor's performance is also predicted to decline. So, this states that the direction of prediction is unidirectional (linear). Information that an increase or decrease in the independent variable (X2) will increase/decrease in the variable (Y).

### Relationship between Interpersonal Communication Variable (X3) and Supervisory Performance Variable (Y)

**Table 10.** Determinant Coefficient of Interpersonal Communication Variable (X3) with Supervisory Performance Variable (Y)

**Model Summary<sup>b</sup>**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.763 <sup>a</sup>	.582	.571	9.180

a. Predictors: (Constant), KOMUNIKASI INTERPERSONAL

b. Dependent Variable: KINERJA PENGAWAS

The results from Table 10, this section show a value of R = 0.763 and a coefficient of determination (R-square) of 0.582 (which is the square of the correlation coefficient, or  $0.763 \times 0.763 = 0.582$ ). This shows the understanding that the Supervisor's performance (Y) is influenced by 58.2% by interpersonal communication (X3), while the remainder ( $100\% - 58.2\% = 41.8\%$ ) is explained by other causes.

**Table 11.** ANOVA test of Interpersonal Communication Variable (X3) with Supervisory Performance

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	4453.342	1	4453.342	52.850	<.001 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	3202.033	38	84.264		
	Total	7655.375	39			

a. Dependent Variable: KINERJA PENGAWAS

b. Predictors: (Constant), KOMUNIKASI INTERPERSONAL

Variable (Y)

The results of the ANOVA test, in this section, show the results obtained, namely the Fcount = 52.850 with a probability level of sig. <0.001. Because the probability (0.001) is much smaller than 0.05, the regression model can be used to predict supervisor performance.

**Table 12.** Correlation Coefficient of Interpersonal Communication Variable (X3) with Supervisory Performance Variable (Y)

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	26.874	12.943		2.076	.045
	KOMUNIKASI INTERPERSONAL	.787	.108	.763	7.270	<.001

a. Dependent Variable: KINERJA PENGAWAS

The results of the coefficient test, in this section, show the value (constant) = 26.874 the B value = 0.787 and the t value = 7.270, and the significance level = 0.001. From the Coefficients table, the simple regression calculation equation is  $\hat{Y} = a + bX_3 = 26.874 + 0.787X_3$ . The regression coefficient of

0.787 states that it has a positive value, which means that better interpersonal communication is predicted to improve supervisory performance. Conversely, if interpersonal communication worsens, then the supervisor's performance is also predicted to decline. So, this states that the direction of prediction is unidirectional (linear). Information that an increase or decrease in the independent variable (X3) will increase/decrease in the variable (Y).

**The relationship between the Work Climate Variables (X1), Discipline (X2), and Interpersonal Communication (X3), together with the Supervisory Performance Variable (Y)**

**Table 13.** Determinant Coefficient of Work Climate Variables (X1), Discipline (X2), and Interpersonal Communication (X3) on Supervisory Performance Variables (Y)

**Model Summary<sup>b</sup>**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.865 <sup>a</sup>	.749	.728	7.311

a. Predictors: (Constant), KOMUNIKASI INTERPERSONAL, IKLIM KERJA, KEDISIPLINAN

b. Dependent Variable: KINERJA PENGAWAS

The results from Table 13 in this section show a value of R = 0.865 and a coefficient of determination (R-square) of 0.749 (which is the square of the correlation coefficient, or  $0.865 \times 0.865 = 0.749$ ). This shows the understanding that the Supervisor's performance (Y) is influenced by 74.9% by work climate (X1), Discipline (X2), and interpersonal communication (X3), while the rest is ( $100\% - 74.9\% = 25.1\%$ ) is explained by other causes. Based on the Model Summary Table, the magnitude of the relationship between work climate, discipline, and interpersonal communication simultaneously (together) on supervisory performance as calculated by the correlation coefficient is 0.749, this shows a strong influence. Meanwhile, the simultaneous contribution or contribution of variables X1, X2, and X3 to Y = 74.9%, while the remaining 25.1% is determined by other variables.

**Table 14.** ANOVA Test of Work Climate Variables (X1), Discipline (X2), and Interpersonal Communication (X3) on Supervisory Performance Variables (Y)

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	5731.217	3	1910.406	35.743	<.001 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	1924.158	36	53.449		
	Total	7655.375	39			

a. Dependent Variable: KINERJA PENGAWAS

b. Predictors: (Constant), KOMUNIKASI INTERPERSONAL, IKLIM KERJA, KEDISIPLINAN

The results of the ANOVA test in this section are shown. The results obtained are  $F_{count} = 35.743$  with a probability level of  $sig. < 0.001$ . Because the probability (0.001) is much smaller than 0.05, the regression model can be used to predict supervisor performance.

**Table 15.** Multiple Regression Coefficients for Work Climate Variables (X1), Discipline (X2), and Interpersonal Communication (X3) on Supervisory Performance Variables (Y)

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.770	11.871		.233	.817
	IKLIM KERJA	.525	.114	.532	4.618	<.001
	KEDISIPLINAN	-.160	.150	-.158	-1.068	.293
	KOMUNIKASI INTERPERSONAL	.622	.130	.603	4.796	<.001

a. Dependent Variable: KINERJA PENGAWAS

The coefficient table 15 provides information about the presence/absence of the influence of variables X1,  $2.770 + 0.525X1 + -0.160X2 + 0.622X3$ . From Table 16, the R-square value is 0.749 with a probability value ( $sig. F_{Change}$ ) = 0.001. Because of the sig value.  $F_{change} < 0.05$ , then the decision is  $H_0$  rejected, and  $H_a$  accepted. This means that work climate, discipline, and interpersonal communication are simultaneously and significantly related to supervisory performance.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the results and discussion above, it can be concluded that there is a significant relationship between work climate and the performance of school supervisors. This implies that the work climate can be improved through improving the performance of supervisors. It is estimated that the better the performance of supervisors in a school, the better the work climate at that school. There is a significant relationship between discipline and the performance of school supervisors. This implies that discipline can be improved through improving the performance of supervisors. It is estimated that the better the performance of supervisors in a school, the better the discipline in that school. There is a significant relationship between interpersonal communication and the performance of school supervisors. This implies that interpersonal communication can be improved through improving the performance of supervisors. It is estimated that the better the performance of supervisors in a school, the better the interpersonal communication in that school will be. There is a significant relationship between work climate, discipline, and interpersonal communication simultaneously (together) and the performance of school supervisors. This implies that the work climate, discipline, or interpersonal communication can be improved through improving the performance of supervisors. It is estimated

that the better the performance of supervisors in a school, the better the work climate, discipline, and interpersonal communication in that school.

## REFERENCES

- Alifah, S. (2021). Peningkatan Kualitas Pendidikan Di Indonesia Untuk Mengejar Ketertinggalan Dari Negara Lain. *Cermin : Jurnal Penelitian*, 5(1).
- Ansyu, S., Podung, B. J., & Sumual, S. D. M. (2023). Pengaruh Kepemimpinan Kepala Sekolah Dan Iklim Sekolah Terhadap Kinerja Guru Sma Negeri Di Kota Kotamobagu. *YUME : Journal of Management*, 6(2), 345–350.
- Korompot, S., Usuh., E. J., Tambingon, H., & Sumual, S. D. M. (2023). Meningkatkan Kinerja Guru Dalam Pelaksanaan Supervisi Edukatif Oleh Kepala Sekolah Di SDN Sonsilo Minahasa Utara. *INNOVATIVE: Journal Of Social Science Research*, 3(2), 10865–10872.
- Lumapow, H. R. (2011). Hubungan Pengorganisasian Program Terhadap Kinerja Pamong Belajar Pada Sanggar Kegiatan Belajar. *Cakrawala Pendidikan*, 30(2).
- Mamuli, E. K., Lumapow, H. R., & Sumual, S. D. . (2023). Pengaruh Kepemimpinan Kepala Sekolah Dan Motivasi Guru Terhadap Kinerja Guru Sekolah Menengah Pertama Di Kecamatan Tabukan Selatan Tengah Dan Tenggara Kabupaten Kepulauan Sangihe. *Jurnal Mirai Management*, 8(3), 136–142.
- Mantiri, R. E., Tuerah, R., Sumual, S. D. ., & Lengkong, J. S. J. (2024). Pengaruh Supervisi Kepala Sekolah Dan Iklim Sekolah Dengan Kinerja Guru Tk Di Kota Tomohon. *Jurnal Mirai Management*, 9(1), 546–551.
- Sumual, S. D. M., Wongkar, M. M., Mosey, S. H., & Pagawak, D. (2024). Pentingnya Sikap Transparansi Dalam Pengawasan Pendidikan. *Journal on Education*, 6(4), 19976–19986.