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Abstract---This study aimed to describe the description of the implementation of the principal's supervision and examine the effect of the intensity of the principal's supervision on the performance of teachers at UPTD SMPN 17 Marusu Maros Regency. The type of research used was descriptive quantitative; the populations in this study were all teachers at UPTD SMPN 17 Marusu Maros Regency. The sampling technique was a saturated sampling technique, so the total samples were several teachers with 22 people. The data collection technique used was the technique of distributing questionnaires and documentation. Data analysis techniques were a descriptive analysis in the form of percentages and inferential analysis using analysis prerequisite testing (normality test) and hypothesis testing (t test). The results showed that the intensity of the principal's supervision had a significant effect on teacher performance at UPTD SMPN 17 Marusu Maros Regency, where based on the results of the descriptive analysis, it was concluded that the intensity of supervision was in the medium category.
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Introduction

Principal supervision is essential to improve and improve teacher performance. Intensive principal supervision visits will assist teachers through coaching, monitoring, assessment and mentoring, and training activities. The research of Zakso supports this, Radiana (2013), which states that the principal's workload to carry out face-to-face activities is part of the working hours. In total is 37.5 hours of work in one week carrying out coaching activities, monitoring the
implementation of 8 SNPs, evaluating and professional guidance, and training teachers. Thus, previous research is related to research that has been carried out to determine the effect of the intensity of principal supervision on teacher performance (Newey & McFadden, 1994; West et al., 1984).

In this case, it is necessary to increase the frequency of visits by principals to carry out academic supervision of teachers continuously and continuously so that it is expected to improve teacher performance. The problems of some teachers in managing to learn at UPTD SMPN 17 Marusu, Maros Regency are influenced by the role of the principal; supervision has an essential role in helping teachers overcome difficulties, policies for implementing the new curriculum in schools. As the direct leader, the principal also must supervise the teachers in his school intensively. The next problem is due to the lack of intense supervision so that teachers find it challenging to carry out learning. Factors that affect teacher performance come from outside, such as work climate, organizational culture, supervision of principals, social security, and income levels (Yuliandri & Kristiawan, 2017). Pidarta (2005), suggests several factors affect teachers' performance in carrying out their duties, namely the supervision of the principal, work facilities, expectations, and the trust of school personnel. Based on this, the intensity of the principal's supervision visits has decreased and impacts the low performance of teachers (Montgomery & Baker, 2007; Harris & Sass, 2014).

Method

This study uses a descriptive type of research with a quantitative approach. The population is 22 teachers at UPTD SMPN 17 Marusu, Maros Regency, while the sampling technique is saturated. Arikunto (2006), suggests that if the respondent is less than 100, it is better to take all so that the research is a population study so that 22 teachers are obtained as respondents. It carried out data collection techniques by distributing questionnaires to 22 teachers and documentation techniques. The stages of this research started from observation, taking teacher data, distributing questionnaires, and analyzing the data. The data analysis technique used is descriptive analysis and inferential analysis. The descriptive analysis aims to describe the principal's supervision and teacher performance. In contrast, the inferential analysis uses the t-test, which aims to examine the effect of the intensity of the principal's supervision on teacher performance at UPTD SMPN 17 Marusu, Maros Regency (Nugraha et al., 2020; Widana et al., 2020).

Result and Discussion

The results of research that have been conducted on teacher respondents at UPTD SMPN 17 Marusu, Maros Regency, found that in descriptive analysis, the intensity of supervision carried out by the principal was in the medium category. It can describe the results of these studies in the following table:
Based on table 1, the highest respondent's answer frequency is in the medium category by nine respondents (interval 37 < X ≤ 48). The lowest respondent's answer frequency is in the deficient category of 1 respondent who answers the statement at interval X ≤ 32 (Konovalenko et al., 2021; Husin et al., 2021). So, it can be concluded the results Respondents' answers, the distribution of the intensity of the supervision of the principal in UPTD SMPN 17 Marusu, Maros Regency is in the medium category. The results showed that the highest percentage value of the principal's supervision intensity variable of 40.91% was in the medium category, while the lowest percentage value of 4.54% was in the deficient category. This indicates that the principal's intensity of supervision from the aspects of planning, implementation, and follow-up has not been maximally achieved. The problem found by Nugraha, is that teachers consider that supervision only assesses teacher performance by using a supervision instrument; after that, they complete their duties as supervisors and have evidence of carrying out supervision when asked by their superiors later. Some follow up on the results of supervision, but only for administrative completeness (Hirschhorn et al., 2008; Liu et al., 2013).

Principal supervision is one way of evaluating teacher performance through a cycle of systematic planning, careful and careful observation. Through supervision activities, teachers provide feedback with improved performance (Khoeriyah, 2017). This shows the importance of academic supervision of school supervisors in improving teacher performance. Improvements in teacher performance are needed through intensive supervision. This is in line with Sahertian (2000), opinion, which argues that intensive supervision aims to foster intensive teaching programs always to improve efforts. Difficulties in preparing teaching materials, preparing learning media, and others, because teachers have a significant and strategic position and role in the overall effort to achieve quality education (Ni'am Sholeh, 2006).

The findings of the descriptive results of this study have similarities with the research of Lastriyani (2013), which shows that the implementation of the principal's academic supervision is in the moderate category—while the differences found in the results of Afifah (2018), show that the intensity of the principal's academic supervision is in a suitable category (76-80 intervals)—overall measured from indicators guiding teachers to carry out learning, method selection, class management, media selection, instrument preparation, and assessment of monitoring results. This regard indicates that the principal's academic supervision from several aspects has been carried out intensively. The

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval Score</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X &gt; 48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.63</td>
<td>Very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 &lt; X ≤ 48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 &lt; X ≤ 43</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40.91</td>
<td>Currently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 &lt; X ≤ 37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.63</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X ≤ 32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
study results Akib & Saleh (2015), show that the principal as a supervisor is in a suitable category, supported by guidance, assistance, supervision, and assessment. The results of other studies show the positive and significant influence of the principal as a supervisor on teacher performance, so that supervision has a complex role in building education into a professional (Rifaldi, 2014).

Furthermore, the results of the inferential analysis used were the prerequisite analysis test (normality test) to test the research data through normal distribution or not, and the hypothesis test (t-test) to test the effect of the intensity of the principal's supervision on teacher performance. The results of the normality test are as follows:

![Figure 1. Normality test results](image)

Based on Figure 1, the normality test results on the variable intensity of supervision and teacher performance meet the assumption of normality; the residual data spread around the diagonal line and follows the direction of the diagonal line. The results of hypothesis testing (t-test) can be described as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3,380</td>
<td>5,783</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>0,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision intensity</td>
<td>0,521</td>
<td>0,297</td>
<td>0,285</td>
<td>2,348</td>
<td>0,028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows the results of hypothesis testing using the t-test; it was found that there was a significant effect of supervision intensity on teacher performance, resulting in a t-count > t-table, which was 2,348 > 2,093 or sig < 0.05, i.e., 0.028 < 0.05, so H0 was rejected. And H1 is accepted. This indicates a significant level of 5%, so there is sufficient evidence to state that X influences Y, meaning that the supervision carried out by the principal has an intensive (significant) effect on teacher performance. The results of this study are supported by the research of Handayani & Rasyid (2015), that principal supervision has a significant effect on teacher performance. The intensive supervision of a principal has a positive effect on teacher performance. Ramadona & Wibowo (2016), proves the influence of principal supervision on teacher performance. The effect is evidenced by the
results of the t-test of 5.7026 > t-table of 2.021 so that it is concluded that it has a significant effect (Gasquet et al., 2001; Balram & Dragićević, 2005).

Furthermore, Anuli (2019), found that the implementation of intensive supervision contributed to improving teacher performance. Meanwhile, the results of this study are different from Riwana (2019), research which found that the implementation of supervision had no positive and significant effect on teacher performance. It is proven by the probability value of 0.406, which is greater than the sig value. 0.05. And the correlation coefficient value of 0.063 indicates the implementation of educational supervision has a fragile effect on teacher performance (Malmquist & Danielsson, 1994; Hoogland et al., 2016).

The findings of this study follow the opinion of experts that supervision carried out by principals intensively will help teachers develop innovation and creativity. The supervision results are material or input for school principals to conduct coaching (Kristiawan, 2014). Altunay et al. (2013), stated that supervision must be done thoughtfully to help and solve problems faced by teachers. Increasing teacher performance will affect the quality of education. Teachers who have high performance will compete and be efficient to improve the quality of education (Amanda, et al, 2017; Astuti, 2016).

Conclusion

The intensity of the principal's supervision has a significant effect on teacher performance at UPTD SMPN 17 Marusu, Maros Regency; based on the results of descriptive analysis, it is concluded that the intensity of supervision is in the medium category. The results of hypothesis testing using the t-test; it was found that there was a significant effect of supervision intensity on teacher performance, resulting in a t-count > t-table, which was 2.348 > 2.093 or sig < 0.05, i.e., 0.028 < 0.05, so H0 was rejected. And H1 is accepted. This indicates a significant level of 5%, so there is sufficient evidence to state that X influences Y, meaning that the supervision carried out by the principal has an intensive (significant) effect on teacher performance (Probyshevichy, 2021; Mantra, 2017).

References


