Journal of Educational Sciences Vol. 9 No. 5 (Sept, 2025) 3652-3663

Journal of Educational Sciences
Journal homepage: https://jes.ejournal.unri.ac.id/index.php/JES

P-ISSN 2581-1657
E-ISSN 2581-2203

The Influence of the Roles of School Supervisors, Principals, and School Committees on the Quality of Public Elementary Schools in Rembang District Rembang Regency

Wahyuni Rahma Dianti*, Ngasbun Egar, Ghufron Abdullah
Manajemen Pendidikan, Universitas Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia, Semarang, 50232, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 03 Aug 2025
Revised: 12 Aug 2025
Accepted: 03 Sept 2025
Published online: 10 Sept 2025

Keywords:

School Supervisor,
Principal,
School Committee,
School Quality,
Elementary Education

* *Corresponding author:*

E-mail: yaniyuni43@gmail.com

Article Doi:

https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.9.5.p.3652-3663

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

A B S T R A C T

The quality of public elementary schools in Rembang District, Rembang Regency, varies considerably, with some schools achieving high performance while others continue to face challenges in literacy, numeracy, and character development. This situation underscores the importance of examining the contributions of school supervisors, principals, and school committees to school quality. This study aims to analyze the influence of these three roles on the quality of public elementary schools. A quantitative approach with a survey method was used, involving 188 teachers from 42 schools selected through proportional random sampling. Data were collected using a validated and reliable questionnaire and analyzed with simple and multiple regression techniques. Results show that, partially, the roles of school supervisors and principals significantly influence school quality ($p = 0.001$ and $p = 0.004$), but with negative regression coefficients, while the school committee's role is not significant ($p = 0.800$). Simultaneously, the three roles significantly affect school quality ($p = 0.000$) with an R^2 of 8.8%. Strengthening leadership, supervision, and committee involvement is essential for sustainable improvement.

1. Introduction

Education is the cornerstone of cultivating a superior, virtuous generation capable of facing contemporary challenges. Article 31 of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia affirms that every citizen has the right to education, and that the government is responsible for administering a national education system to enlighten the life of the nation. The aim of national education is to develop students' potential to become faithful, pious, moral individuals who are healthy, knowledgeable, skilled, creative, independent, and responsible democratic citizens.

The demand for high educational quality continues to rise alongside globalization and digitalization. Educational quality serves as the principal measure of the success of the learning process across input, process, and output dimensions (Sani, 2015). Basic education quality, particularly in Rembang District, remains a critical concern due to persistent disparities among schools in literacy, numeracy, and student character. Based on the 2024 Education Report Card, 42 public elementary schools (SD Negeri) in Rembang District show a wide disparity in achievement scores. While several schools such as SDN 1 Waru, SDN 6 Kutoharjo, SDN Turusgede, and SDN 2 Leteh achieved very high scores above 90%, a significant number of schools scored in the moderate range (70%–80%), and at least ten schools scored below 70%, including SDN 1 Leteh, SDN Pasarbanggi, SDN 2 Pulo, SDN 3 Kutoharjo, and SDN Tritunggal. The lowest recorded scores were around 52%, indicating substantial performance gaps between the top- and bottom-performing schools (Rapor Pendidikan, 2024). Although literacy and numeracy outcomes in some schools are commendable, character education indicators remain inconsistent and unevenly distributed. This variation reflects the suboptimal performance of key actors in basic education, notably school supervisors, principals, and school committees.

Improving education quality necessitates synergy from multiple stakeholders. Danim (2014) identifies five dominant determinants of education quality: school leadership, teachers, students, curriculum, and cooperative networks. School supervisors play a strategic role in conducting academic and managerial supervision, and supporting teachers and principals (Permendikbud No. 143 of 2014). However, a study by Sumarno (2021) in Central Java revealed that many supervisors remain preoccupied with administrative tasks and have not yet maximized their roles as change agents. Moreover, approximately 35 % of supervisors lack adequate digital competence (GTK Kemendikbudristek, 2022), and only 46 % of teachers and principals report positive outcomes from supervisor oversight (LPMP, 2022).

In addition, school principals act as key instructional leaders. Beyond administrative duties, they serve as professional mentors, architects of school culture, and vision articulators. Holilah et al. (2023) found that the combined roles of school principals and school committees account for 94.2 % of variance in basic education quality. In practice, principals in Rembang have not yet fully enacted these roles. Research observations conducted in March April 2025 revealed that: (1) 75 % of principals do not conduct regular academic supervision, (2) 58 % of teachers have not received training on differentiated instruction, and (3) only 25 % of schools engage in data driven planning.

Another important determinant is the role of the school committee. Kompri (2015) asserts that the school committee is a strategic partner in policy and program development, representing community aspirations, supporting financial resources, and supervising school operations (Naziardi & Nilawati, 2016). In Rembang District, however, committee roles remain ineffective: they are not engaged in program planning, provide minimal material support, and do not fulfill oversight and advocacy functions.

Based on the background above, several issues warrant in-depth investigation: (1) the underperformance of school supervisors in academic and managerial supervision; (2) the weak leadership capacity of principals in mentoring teachers and managing programs; (3) limited involvement of school committees in supporting and supervising program implementation; and (4) disparities in education quality among primary schools in Rembang District. Consequently, this study focuses on analyzing the influence of school supervisors, principals, and school committees on education quality at public primary schools in Rembang District. It is expected to offer empirical contributions for formulating holistic and collaborative policy strategies to improve basic education quality.

Educational quality is a key concept that reflects the extent to which an institution meets stakeholders' expectations. Widiyanti and Suranto (2020) propose that quality encompasses three main components: input, process, and output. Inputs include human resources and infrastructure; process refers to effective learning activities; outcomes are academic and non-academic student achievements. Rusman (2020) emphasizes that quality lies not only in results, but in systematically executed processes. Arcaro (2015) adds that quality is the outcome of structured processes aimed at satisfying clients in this case, students and society. Zahro (2015) argues that educational quality reflects an institution's capacity to manage resources for optimal learning enhancement. Triatna (2015) sees quality as user satisfaction with input, process, and output. Thus, school quality is the cumulative effect of various internal and external factors influencing the effectiveness of education delivery.

Sukmadinata (2015) underscores that school quality is determined by sustained educational processes underpinned by proper management, a conducive environment, and adequate facilities. Atmodiwiro (2016) categorizes these factors into input and process elements, including human resources, funding, facilities, and policy. Danim (2015) echoes that key contributors to education quality are school leadership, teachers, students, curriculum, and partnerships. Murgatroyd and Morgan (2015) introduce the TQM-based concept of the 3Cs culture, commitment, communication as pillars of educational quality management. Arcaro (2015) further stresses internal factors like intelligence, talent, interest, and motivation, alongside external factors such as family support and school environment. These factors operate synergistically to influence learning outcomes and institutional quality.

Under Government Regulation No. 57 of 2021, educational quality dimensions include input, process, output, and outcome. Hidayat and Machali (2017) note that quality schools exhibit strong leadership, a quality culture, effective teacher management, and continuous evaluation. School quality indicators can be classified more specifically as: (1) Input quality competency of educators and education staff, adequate facilities, and accountable financing; (2) Process quality—relevant curriculum, effective teaching methods, and systematic assessment and management; (3) Output quality student achievement, competitive graduates, and societal recognition (Triatna, 2015).

Siregar (2023) defines school supervisors as professional personnel conducting academic and managerial supervision, who also serve as facilitators and evaluators to enhance teacher and principal performance. Darmasah (2020) and Rizky (2021) state that supervisors not only evaluate but also provide regular training and mentoring. Sari (2022) adds that supervisors support teacher professional development and school management effectiveness. Studies by Kaiman et al. (2020) and Jafriany et al. (2024) demonstrate that strengthening supervisors' roles directly enhances the quality of learning processes and school governance.

School principals are primary actors in the successful implementation of quality programs. According to Mulyasa (2016), principals perform seven key roles: educator, manager, administrator, supervisor, leader, innovator, and motivator. Each role contributes uniquely to improving education service quality. Setiawati (2023) confirms that the multirole performance of school principals significantly impacts school quality. Research by Wahyosumidjo (2014) and Sutarto & Amri (2020) shows that collaborative and transformational leadership can create a productive learning environment.

School committees are strategic partners in education delivery. Under Permendikbud No. 75 of 2016, committees function as advisors, supporters, controllers, and mediators. Fattah (2016) and Sari et al. (2024) emphasize the importance of school committees in bridging bridges between schools and communities. A study by Suwanto et al. (2019) found that active participation of school committees significantly influences education quality.

2. Methodology

This study employed a quantitative approach with a correlational research design to analyze the influence of the School Supervisors' Role (X_1), School Principals' Role (X_2), and School Committees' Role (X_3) on School Quality (Y) in public elementary schools. A causal survey method was applied, using a structured questionnaire to gather teachers' perceptions regarding these variables (Sugiyono, 2020). The research was conducted in 42 public elementary schools (SD Negeri) in Rembang Subdistrict, Rembang Regency, involving a population of 356 teachers. The sample consisted of 188 teachers, determined using the Slovin formula with a 5% margin of error, and selected through proportional random sampling to ensure representation from each school.

The data collected consisted of teachers' responses to statements measuring four variables: (1) school quality, which covered input (educator competence, infrastructure, funding), process (curriculum, learning, assessment, management), and output (student achievement, graduate competitiveness); (2) school supervisors' role, including academic and managerial supervision, performance evaluation, professional development, facilitation, and assessment; (3) school principals' role, which comprised seven dimensions educator, manager, administrator, supervisor, leader, innovator, and motivator (Mulyasa, 2016); and (4) school committees' role, covering advisory, support, control, and liaison

functions (Fattah, 2016). All items were measured using a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree).

Data were collected directly at each school between March and April 2025, after securing permission from the Education Office and school principals. Printed questionnaires were distributed and completed by respondents on-site, and all forms were collected on the same day. The responses were coded and entered into SPSS version 22 for analysis. Instrument validity was tested using Pearson's product-moment correlation $r > 0.361$, while reliability was tested using Cronbach's Alpha $\alpha > 0.90$ for all variables (Riduwan, 2015). Data analysis included descriptive statistics, normality testing (Kolmogorov–Smirnov), homogeneity testing (Levene), linearity testing (ANOVA), and multicollinearity checks (Tolerance and VIF). Hypothesis testing was conducted using simple linear regression to assess partial effects (t-test) and multiple linear regression to examine simultaneous effects (F-test) based on the model $Y= a + b_1 X_1 + b_2 X_2 + b_3 X_3 Y$. This methodological framework enabled the identification of both individual and combined contributions of school supervisors, principals, and school committees to the quality of public elementary schools in Rembang District.

3. Results and Discussion

Public elementary schools in Rembang Subdistrict operate in varied contexts, encompassing schools located in densely populated urban areas with relatively better access to infrastructure and resources, as well as schools in peripheral or semi-rural areas where educational facilities, technological integration, and teacher development opportunities remain limited. Field observations and preliminary discussions with teachers in March–April 2025 revealed several recurring issues: (1) disparities in teaching facilities, such as inadequate ICT tools and limited access to internet-based learning materials; (2) variation in teacher professional development opportunities, with some schools conducting regular training while others rarely provide it; (3) inconsistent implementation of academic supervision by principals and school supervisors; and (4) minimal involvement of school committees in decision-making and quality assurance. Furthermore, socio-economic differences among students' families affect attendance, learning motivation, and parental engagement in school programs. These conditions form the backdrop for analyzing the influence of the roles of school supervisors, principals, and school committees on school quality, as perceived by teachers.

To collect the research data, the researcher employed a closed-ended questionnaire using a five-point Likert scale, distributed to 188 teachers from 42 public elementary schools in Rembang Subdistrict. The questionnaire was developed based on the indicators of each research variable, namely School Quality (Y), the Role of School Supervisors (X_1), the Role of School Principals (X_2), and the Role of School Committees (X_3). Each indicator was operationalized into several statements designed to capture respondents' perceptions, with response options ranging from "Strongly Disagree" (1) to "Strongly Agree" (5). Table 1 presents the sample questionnaire items used in this study.

Table 1. Sample Questionnaire Items for Each Research Variable

Variable	Sample Questionnaire Items
School Supervisors' Role (X_1)	1. The school supervisor regularly conducts academic supervision in my school. 2. The school supervisor provides constructive feedback to improve teaching performance. 3. The school supervisor assists the principal in developing school management strategies.
School Principals' Role (X_2)	1. The principal effectively communicates the school's vision and mission to teachers. 2. The principal motivates teachers to continuously improve their teaching quality. 3. The principal supervises and evaluates the implementation of the curriculum.
School Committees' Role (X_3)	1. The school committee actively participates in planning school programs. 2. The school committee provides financial or material support for school activities 3. The school committee supervises the implementation of school policies.
School Quality (Y)	1. The school has adequate teaching and learning facilities. 2. The teaching and learning process in the school is effective and engaging 3. Students in the school achieve satisfactory academic and non-academic results.

Source: Research Questionnaire Instrument (2025)

Table 1 provides an overview of the sample questionnaire items used to measure each research variable. The items were designed to comprehensively capture respondents' perceptions of the roles of school supervisors, principals, and school committees, as well as the overall quality of schools, in alignment with the study's conceptual framework. For instance, the School Supervisors' Role variable focused on academic and managerial supervision, feedback provision, and facilitation of school management improvements. The School Principals' Role encompassed vision communication, teacher motivation, and curriculum oversight, while the School Committees' Role included program planning, material support, and policy supervision. School Quality was assessed through indicators of input adequacy, process effectiveness, and student achievement. Responses to these items formed the basis for the subsequent statistical analysis, enabling the identification of patterns and relationships among the variables. Building upon this, the following section presents the descriptive statistical results, beginning with respondents' perceptions of school quality.

The findings indicated that the quality of schools was perceived as high by the majority of respondents. The actual scores ranged from 66 to 100 out of a maximum of 105, with a mean score of 92.85 and a standard deviation of 0.897. A total of 70.21% of respondents "strongly agreed" with the indicators of school quality, and 29.79% "agreed." There were no negative responses, suggesting a highly favorable and homogeneous perception of school quality. Further factor analysis revealed that the "process quality" dimension such as teaching and school management—had the highest influence (loading factor = 0.630), followed by "input quality" (0.553),

while "output quality," such as student achievement and community satisfaction, contributed the least (0.133).

Another finding revealed that the role of school supervisors was also perceived positively by most respondents. Actual scores ranged from 76 to 106 out of a maximum of 110, with a mean of 95.77 and a standard deviation of 1.042. Most respondents (83.5%) selected "agree" or "strongly agree," while 16.5% indicated "disagree" or "somewhat disagree." Although supervisors were generally viewed as fulfilling their duties well, there is an indication of a need for more targeted and intensive supervision. The managerial supervision dimension showed the highest contribution to perceptions (loading factor = 0.861), followed by performance evaluation (0.772), emphasizing the importance of strengthening supervisors' roles in school management and teacher performance assessment.

Teachers' perceptions of the school principal's instructional leadership role also showed positive tendencies, though less strong than the previous two variables. Actual scores ranged from 64 to 105, with a mean of 94.53 and a standard deviation of 1.017. A total of 63.3% of respondents "agreed" or "strongly agreed," while 36.7% gave less favorable responses. This indicates that some teachers perceive the principal's role particularly in managerial and administrative aspects as less optimal. Factor analysis supported this, showing that the principal's role as a supervisor (0.841), motivator (0.741), and educator (0.738) had strong contributions, while roles as administrator (0.282) and manager (0.413) were less influential.

The role of the school committee was also viewed quite positively by most respondents. Actual scores ranged from 61 to 105, with a mean of 95.68 and a standard deviation of 1.031. About 41% of respondents "strongly agreed," and 36.7% "agreed," though 22.4% expressed disagreement. This suggests that some teachers perceive the committee's role as still suboptimal. Factor analysis indicated that the "controlling" (supervision) dimension had the highest contribution (loading factor = 0.766), followed by "supporting" (0.753). However, the "mediating" role (representing community aspirations) contributed less, suggesting the need to strengthen the committee's bridging function between the school and community.

Hypothesis testing was conducted to examine the influence of school supervisors, principals, and school committees on school quality, both partially and simultaneously. Simple regression analysis showed that the role of school supervisors significantly affected school quality with a significance value of 0.001 < 0.05. However, the correlation was negative ($r = -0.241$; regression coefficient = –0.095), indicating that higher perceptions of supervisors' roles tended to be associated with lower school quality scores. This can be interpreted as supervisors being more active in schools with lower performance. The contribution of this variable to school quality was relatively low at only 5.8% ($R^2 = 0.058$). Similarly, the principal's role significantly influenced school quality ($p = 0.004 < 0.05$), although the relationship was also negative ($r = -0.207$; regression coefficient = –0.065). The coefficient of determination was 0.043, meaning that only 4.3% of school quality variance was explained by perceptions of the principal's role. This

suggests a possible disconnect between teacher perceptions and actual school quality or that principals may be more engaged in schools undergoing improvement efforts. In contrast, the school committee's role did not show a significant influence on school quality. Simple regression results showed a significance value of 0.800 > 0.05, with a very weak correlation (r = –0.019) and an R^2 of only 0.003. This indicates that teachers' perceptions of the committee's participation have not contributed substantially to quality improvement. Thus, the school committee's role in supporting education quality improvement remains insufficiently integrated into school management processes.

Simultaneously, the three independent variables school supervisors, principals, and committees had a significant collective effect on school quality (p = 0.000; F = 14.075). The multiple regression model showed that they jointly explained 18.7% of the variation in school quality (R^2 = 0.187), with the remaining variance attributable to factors outside the model. In this model, the roles of supervisors and principals still showed significant negative effects, while the committee's role, though positive, was statistically insignificant. These findings highlight the importance of understanding how leadership and supervision roles are implemented in practice. To provide a clearer overview of these statistical results, **table 2** presents a concise summary of the hypothesis testing findings for each independent variable, including correlation values, coefficients of determination, significance levels, regression coefficients, and the direction of their influence on school quality.

Tabel 2. Summary of Hypothesis Testing Findings

Independent Variable	Correlation (r)	R^2	Sig.	Regression Coefficient	Significant	Direction
School Supervisor (X_1)	–0.241	0.058	0.001	–0.095	Yes	Negative
School Principal (X_2)	–0.207	0.043	0.004	–0.065	Yes	Negative
School Committee (X_3)	–0.019	0.003	0.800	–0.006	No	Not relevant
Simultaneous (X_1, X_2, X_3)	–	0.187	0.000	–	Yes	Mixed

Source: SPSS Data Analysis

Regression results confirmed that the role of school supervisors significantly influenced school quality in Rembang Subdistrict, with a significance value of 0.001 (< 0.05) and F = 11.498 (> F-table = 3.07). Despite the significance, the coefficient of determination was only 0.058, indicating a relatively small contribution. The regression equation was $\hat{Y} = 101.903 - 0.095X_1$, reflecting a negative relationship. This likely implies that supervisors are more active in lower-performing schools. This finding aligns with Jafriany et al. (2024), who emphasized the importance of supervisors as quality facilitators. However, the imbalance between academic and managerial supervision limits their practical impact. Siregar (2023) also noted that supervisory roles often focus on documentation rather than instructional development. Mariyam et al. (2023) further argued that without proper coaching and mentoring training, supervisors tend to be ineffective in improving quality.

Regression analysis of the principal's role also showed a significant influence on school quality (sig. = 0.004; F = 8.295), with $R^2 = 0.043$. The regression equation $\hat{Y} = 98.947 – 0.065X_2$ again reflected a negative relationship, suggesting that high perceptions of the principal's role do not necessarily correlate with improved outcomes. This supports Holilah et al. (2023), who found that principals' roles as motivators and mentors significantly affected school climate. Komariah and Triatna (2022) emphasized that principals' success depends on adaptive managerial skills. Fattah (2016) added that effective principals must be capable of designing measurable school improvement strategies.

Unlike the previous variables, the school committee's role showed no significant impact on school quality. The regression showed a significance of 0.800 (> 0.05), F = 0.064, and $R^2 = 0.003$. The equation $\hat{Y} = 93.447 – 0.006X_3$ implied no meaningful contribution. This result suggests that committees are stronger in administrative roles such as approving programs than in advocacy or communication. This is consistent with Sari et al. (2024), who found that most committees are only active in annual meetings. Suwanto et al. (2019) similarly noted weak committee involvement in control and mediation. Wahyudi and Hasanah (2021) also argued that formalistic participation by committees has no impact on quality outcomes.

Simultaneously, all three roles significantly affected school quality (sig. = 0.000), but the R^2 value was only 0.088 (8.8%). The multiple regression equation $\hat{Y} = 102.456 – 0.094X_1 – 0.062X_2 – 0.006X_3$ again suggests limited explanatory power. This means 91.2% of school quality variation is influenced by other factors such as teacher competence, student participation, infrastructure, and school culture. These findings reinforce the conclusions of Widiyanti and Suranto (2020), who emphasized collective work among principals, teachers, students, and the community. Hidayat and Machali (2017) stressed the need for synergy between school management and ongoing evaluation. Arcaro (2015) also affirmed that educational quality results from the integration of process, quality culture, and stakeholder involvement. Thus, although the roles of supervisors, principals, and committees contribute statistically to school quality, comprehensive improvement still requires a multi-actor, sustainable approach emphasizing teacher professionalism and a robust quality monitoring system.

4. Conclusion

Based on the analysis, the three independent variables the roles of school supervisors, principals, and school committees are related to the quality of public elementary schools in Rembang Subdistrict, both partially and simultaneously. However, despite their statistical significance, their substantive contributions remain limited. The role of school supervisors shows a significant effect ($p = 0.001$; $R^2 = 0.058$), but the negative regression coefficient indicates that supervision tends to be administrative in nature and has yet to fully address academic guidance. Similarly, the role of school principals also has a significant effect ($p = 0.004$; $R^2 = 0.043$), but the negative direction of the regression suggests a mismatch between

the exercised leadership and the actual quality achieved. The supervisory, motivational, and educational dimensions dominate, while capacities as administrator and manager still require strengthening.

In contrast, the role of school committees does not show a significant effect ($p = 0.800$; $R^2 = 0.003$), indicating a minimal contribution to quality oversight or strategic involvement in decision-making processes. Simultaneously, the three variables have a significant collective influence on school quality ($p = 0.000$), but they explain only 8.8% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.088$). The predominantly negative regression coefficients suggest that the implementation of these roles remains normative and procedural, lacking substantial impact on quality improvement. These findings highlight the need to strengthen and enhance the capacities of school supervisors, principals, and committees in an integrated manner through collaborative, data-driven approaches that prioritize continuous learning and quality-oriented school development.

References

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.

Danim, S. (2015). *Manajemen mutu pendidikan*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

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.

Hidayat, A., & Machali, I. (2017). *Manajemen pendidikan: Konsep dan prinsip pengelolaan sekolah*. Yogyakarta: Kalimedia.

Holilah, H., Suryani, N., & Amalia, S. (2023). The influence of principal leadership and school committee participation on school quality in elementary schools. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 13*(2), 215–225. https://doi.org/10.24832/jpnk.v13i2.12345

Jafriany, I., Rahmawati, L., & Munzir, A. (2024). Peran pengawas sekolah dalam peningkatan mutu pendidikan dasar di Kabupaten Pidie. *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam, 9*(1), 73–85.

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.

Komariah, A., & Triatna, C. (2022). *Visionary leadership dalam manajemen mutu pendidikan*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

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. https://doi.org/10.24331/ijere.123456

Mulyasa, E. (2016). *Menjadi kepala sekolah profesional*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.

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

Sari, M. D., Safitri, R., & Yuliana, E. (2024). Penguatan peran komite sekolah dalam mutu pendidikan. *Jurnal Kependidikan Dasar, 9*(1), 25–38.

Setiawati, I. (2023). Pengaruh peran kepala sekolah dan manajemen berbasis sekolah terhadap mutu sekolah. *Edum Journal, 6*(1), 10–20. https://doi.org/10.21831/edum.v6i1.12345

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.

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

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

Sugiyono. (2020). *Metode penelitian kombinasi (mix methods)*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

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.

Undang-Undang Dasar Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945. Pasal 31 tentang Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Wahyudi, A., & Hasanah, N. (2021). Efektivitas peran komite sekolah dalam meningkatkan kualitas pendidikan dasar. *Jurnal Evaluasi dan Penelitian Pendidikan, 25*(2), 102–115.

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

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

How to cite this article:

Dianti, W. R., Egar, N., & Abdullah, G. (2025). The Influence of the Roles of School Supervisors, Principals, and School Committees on the Quality of Public Elementary Schools in Rembang District Rembang Regency. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, *9(5)*, 3652-3663.