Assyfa Journal of Islamic Studies

AJIS. Vol. 4 No. 1 (2026) Page 678-684

e-ISSN: 2988-7399 p-ISSN: 2988-7399

https://doi.org/10.61650/ajis.v4i1.1371

ORIGINAL RESEARCH ARTICLE

Principal Leadership, School Committee Participation, and Teacher Performance Quality in Mesuji Makmur: A Correlational Study

Ija Yanti[1*], Dwi Sugianik[1], Ismail Fahmi[1], Sujari Rahmanto[1], Suwanto[1]

[1]Institut Agama Islam Al-Hikmah Lampung, Indonesia

Correspondence: Izayanti92@gmail.com

Article History: 20 February 2026 • Revised: 25 March 2025 • Accepted: 15 April 2026 • Published: 30 April 2026date pending

ABSTRACT

This correlational study examines whether principal leadership and school committee participation are associated with teacher performance quality in public elementary schools in Mesuji Makmur District. The supplied analysis contains 81 teacher questionnaires and defines performance through lesson planning, instructional implementation, and evaluation. The reported multiple regression was weak and statistically nonsignificant, $R = .083$, $R^2 = .007$, adjusted $R^2 = -.019$, $F(2, 78) = 0.268$, $p = .765$. Principal leadership had $B = 0.021$, $t = 0.268$, $p = .789$; committee participation had $B = 0.044$, $t = 0.642$, $p = .523$. These results do not support claims of a statistically detectable association in this dataset, and the model explains only 0.7% of observed score variation. The source also contains a contradictory claim of 53.4% explained variance and labels its school-level population table an assumed example; neither is used as a finding. The verified population frame, response process, reliability coefficients, and complete diagnostic outputs were not supplied. Results should therefore be read as a transparent report of the available regression tables, pending verification against original survey records and statistical output.

Keywords: Principal Leadership; School Committee; Teacher Performance; Elementary Schools; Multiple Regression

ABSTRAK

Studi korelasional ini mengkaji hubungan kepemimpinan kepala sekolah dan partisipasi komite sekolah dengan kualitas kinerja guru pada sekolah dasar negeri di Kecamatan Mesuji Makmur. Analisis yang disediakan mencakup 81 kuesioner guru; kualitas kinerja didefinisikan melalui perencanaan, pelaksanaan, dan evaluasi pembelajaran. Regresi berganda yang dilaporkan lemah dan tidak signifikan: $R = 0{,}083$; $R^2 = 0{,}007$; R^2 terkoreksi $= -0{,}019$; $F(2, 78) = 0{,}268$; $p = 0{,}765$. Kepemimpinan kepala sekolah memiliki $B = 0{,}021$; $t = 0{,}268$; $p = 0{,}789$, sedangkan partisipasi komite memiliki $B = 0{,}044$; $t = 0{,}642$; $p = 0{,}523$. Model hanya menjelaskan 0,7% variasi skor. Naskah sumber juga menyebut angka 53,4% yang bertentangan dan memberi label tabel jumlah guru per sekolah sebagai contoh asumsi; keduanya tidak diperlakukan sebagai temuan. Kerangka populasi, proses respons, koefisien reliabilitas, dan hasil diagnostik lengkap belum tersedia. Temuan ini perlu diverifikasi dengan kuesioner dan keluaran analisis asli sebelum pengajuan.

Kata kunci: Kepemimpinan Kepala Sekolah; Komite Sekolah; Kinerja Guru; Sekolah Dasar; Regresi Berganda

How to cite: Yanti, I., Sugianik, D., Fahmi, I., Rahmanto, S., & Suwanto. (2026). Principal Leadership, School Committee Participation, and Teacher Performance Quality in Mesuji Makmur: A Correlational Study. *Assyfa Journal of Islamic Studies*, *4*(1), 678–684. Retrieved from https://journal.assyfa.com/index.php/ajis/article/view/1371

1. INTRODUCTION

Teacher performance involves lesson planning, classroom instruction, and assessment. Principals can influence the conditions in which teachers perform these tasks through supervision, professional communication, and allocation of resources. Reviews of leadership research find associations with teacher and student outcomes but also variation across settings and practices (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006; Robinson et al., 2008).

School committees may contribute advice, support, and oversight. Their work can affect school priorities and the learning environment, yet it may be more distant from an individual teacher's daily pedagogical choices. Indonesian studies have examined principal leadership and committee roles in relation to teacher performance, including work in the same district (Abidin, 2021; Ja'is et al., 2025). That prior district study reported a different population frame, making careful description of the current dataset necessary.

The present manuscript defines the outcome as the quality of pedagogical work across planning, implementation, and evaluation, and surveys teachers about leadership and committee participation. Comparing these variables is worthwhile even when the associations are weak or absent. In a correlational design, results describe covariation; they cannot establish that a principal or committee caused changes in performance.

This revision reports the numerical regression tables supplied with the manuscript, addresses contradictions in the surrounding text, and identifies information required for independent verification. The question is whether either predictor, alone or jointly, is associated with the measured teacher-performance score among the 81 analyzed respondents.

© 2026 Yanti & Sugianik. Published by CV. Bimbingan Belajar Assyfa, Indonesia

2. RESEARCH METHODS

The design is cross-sectional and correlational. The manuscript reports questionnaire responses from 81 teachers in public elementary schools in Mesuji Makmur District, Ogan Komering Ilir Regency. It calls the approach total sampling; however, a school-by-school population table explicitly says its allocation is assumed, and the independently verified population roster and response count are unavailable. We therefore describe 81 analyzed records without claiming a confirmed census.

Principal leadership (X1) was operationalized through managerial activity, supervision, work climate, and motivation. School committee participation (X2) concerned advice, support, and oversight. Teacher performance quality (Y) covered planning, teaching, and learning evaluation. The source describes a five-category Likert questionnaire but does not provide all items, item scores, instrument validation results, or scale reliabilities; construct coverage and measurement precision remain to be checked.

The reported analysis used descriptive statistics followed by ordinary least-squares multiple regression with two predictors. The regression model is $Y = a + b1X1 + b2X2$. The source presents model R, R^2, adjusted R^2, F and p values, along with each unstandardized coefficient, standard error, standardized beta, t and p value. We reproduce the reported numbers without inventing missing output.

For assumptions, the manuscript reports predictor tolerance of .984 and variance inflation factor of 1.016 and one deviation-from-linearity result for X2 and Y ($p = .064$). Standardized residuals ranged from −2.278 to 2.502, but their range alone does not establish normality. Results of a formal residual-normality test, a heteroscedasticity check, influential observations, and the X1–Y linearity test were not supplied.

The α threshold for the reported significance tests is .05. Analyses are interpreted as associations among self-reported scores, not as causal effects. Because the source conflicts about the proportion of variance explained, the regression model table ($R^2 = .007$) is used as the basis for interpretation; the unsupported 53.4% claim is excluded pending confirmation against original software output.

3. RESULTS AND FINDINGS

For the 81 records, the reported mean (SD) of principal leadership was 72.8642 (9.59525); school committee participation was 74.5062 (10.66785); and teacher performance quality was 78.8765 (6.44667). These are raw scale totals. Questionnaire item counts and possible score ranges are unavailable, so labeling them “high” would require additional instrument information.

The model summary gives $R = .083$, $R^2 = .007$, adjusted $R^2 = -.019$, standard error of estimate = 6.50647, and $F(2, 78) = .268$ with $p = .765$. The two predictors jointly account for an estimated 0.7% of variation in the observed performance score; the adjusted estimate is slightly below zero, indicating little explanatory gain over an intercept-only model after the predictor penalty.

© 2026 Yanti & Sugianik. Published by CV. Bimbingan Belajar Assyfa, Indonesia

For principal leadership, the table reports B = .021 (SE = .076), standardized β = .031, t = .268, and p = .789. For committee participation, B = .044 (SE = .069), standardized β = .073, t = .642, and p = .523. Neither coefficient is statistically distinguishable from zero at α = .05 on the reported test.

The fitted equation is Y = 74.094 + .021X1 + .044X2, using the reported unstandardized coefficients. Its positive signs describe point estimates only. The source's statement that the predictors explain 53.4% of variance contradicts the model table (R^2 = .007) and is not included as a result. Likewise, the assumed five-school distribution is not presented as verified sampling data.

Tolerance (.984) and VIF (1.016) do not suggest substantial collinearity between the two predictors. The reported X2–Y deviation-from-linearity p value of .064 does not provide evidence of deviation at .05, but this one result cannot establish all model assumptions. The conclusions remain conditional on checking original statistical and questionnaire records.

4. DISCUSSION

The principal-leadership coefficient is small and nonsignificant in the available regression. This differs from research that finds links between leadership and teacher outcomes (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006; Wang et al., 2011). Differences in practice, context, and measurement can produce different associations. The present result concerns a particular self-report scale and cannot show that leadership is generally irrelevant.

The committee coefficient is also nonsignificant. A committee's advice, resource support, or governance oversight may influence school conditions indirectly, while the present outcome focuses on teachers' planning, instruction, and evaluation. This possible mismatch of level and mechanism is an interpretation, not a tested mediation. Prior Indonesian findings should be compared only after verifying the current population frame and instrument (Abidin, 2021; Ja'is et al., 2025).

The joint model explains only 0.7% of the observed performance score variation and has adjusted R^2 below zero. The 53.4% statement elsewhere in the source cannot be reconciled with its model summary and should not appear in a submission without supporting output. A weak model may reflect omitted factors, restricted score range, measurement error, or little association in the sampled records; the present data do not distinguish among these explanations.

Measurement deserves particular attention. The source does not provide instrument items, possible score ranges, item validity evidence, or observed reliability estimates. Teacher performance was reported through a questionnaire rather than independently observed classroom practice. Multiple responses collected from the same teacher at one time can also create shared-method bias. A later study could pair validated scales with observations, lesson artifacts, and student work.

Sampling claims must be made with care. The source states 81 respondents and includes a table assigning those teachers to five schools, but expressly labels that table an assumed example. A separate published Mesuji Makmur study reports a wider population and a sample of 81 (Ja'is et al., 2025). Whether these are distinct datasets, overlapping analyses, or different sampling frames

© 2026 Yanti & Sugianik. Published by CV. Bimbingan Belajar Assyfa, Indonesia

cannot be determined from this manuscript. The current analysis should report only 81 records until its original roster is checked.

The available diagnostics do not fully address regression validity. Low VIF indicates little predictor overlap, but residual normality, heteroscedasticity, influential cases, and the linear form of both relationships need direct evaluation. Reporting a test plan is not the same as reporting its results. Given weak coefficients and incomplete diagnostics, uncertainty should be conveyed without interpreting positive signs as improvements caused by leadership or participation.

Practically, principals may continue to support teacher learning through focused observation and usable feedback, while committees can support resources and constructive school dialogue. Research on feedback and sustained professional development explains why implementation quality matters (Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). These are plausible actions supported by wider scholarship rather than effects demonstrated by the present regression.

This study's useful contribution is a transparent null result on a narrowly defined pedagogical-performance score, together with clear checks needed before publication. The original teacher roster, consent and response details, questionnaire, item analyses, reliability, and full regression output should be provided. Future preregistered or repeated studies could examine teacher competencies, professional learning, school climate, and more direct measures of teaching, while keeping causal claims aligned with design.

5. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Among the 81 reported teacher records, principal leadership and school committee participation showed no statistically significant partial or joint association with the measured quality of teacher performance. The model reported $R^2 = .007$, or 0.7% explained variance, and $F(2, 78) = .268$, $p = .765$. The source's conflicting 53.4% claim is unsupported by the table.

Before submission, the authors should verify the sampling roster and school allocation, instrument validity and reliability, diagnostic tests, and model output. The findings should remain correlational; the available data do not support a claim that strengthening either predictor will by itself raise teacher performance.

REFERENCES

Abidin, M. Z. (2021). Pengaruh kepemimpinan kepala sekolah dan peran komite sekolah terhadap kinerja guru. *EDUKATIF: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 3(4), 1775–1783. https://doi.org/10.31004/edukatif.v3i4.685

Angga, I. M. D., & Wiyasa, I. K. N. (2021). Kontribusi kepemimpinan kepala sekolah dan iklim kerja terhadap kinerja guru. *Jurnal Pedagogi dan Pembelajaran*, 4(1), 14–22. https://doi.org/10.23887/jp2.v4i1.32309

Avalos, B. (2011). Teacher professional development in teaching and teacher education over ten years. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*(1), 10–20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.08.007

A'yun, N. Q. (2022). Pengaruh kepemimpinan kepala sekolah terhadap kinerja guru di sekolah. *Journal of Islamic Education and Innovation*, 3(2), 86–96. https://doi.org/10.26555/jiei.v3i2.6607

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Psychology Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410617095

© 2026 Yanti & Sugianik. Published by CV. Bimbingan Belajar Assyfa, Indonesia

Borko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. *Educational Researcher, 33*(8), 3–15. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X033008003

Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute. https://doi.org/10.54300/122.311

Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. *Educational Researcher, 38*(3), 181–199. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X08331140

Fauzan, R., Lasminto, Mukhayati, S., & Ngurah Ayu Nyoman, M. (2025). Peran kepemimpinan kepala sekolah dalam peningkatan kinerja guru. *Pendas: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Dasar*, 10(2). https://doi.org/10.23969/jp.v10i2.27125

Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*(4), 915–945. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312038004915

Guskey, T. R. (2002). Professional development and teacher change. *Teachers and Teaching, 8*(3), 381–391. https://doi.org/10.1080/135406002100000512

Hallinger, P., Liu, S., & Chen, L. (2025). Principal instructional leadership and teacher attitudes: A meta-analytic review, 1989–2024. *European Journal of Education, 60*(4), Article e70199. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.70199

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research, 77*(1), 81–112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Huriyah, L., Mudlofir, A., Aziz, M. A., Ma'arif, M. A., Amaliati, S., & Yusrianingsih. (2025). The importance of Islamic education teachers' performance assessment in realising high quality of madrasah. *Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Islam, 22*(2), 317–338. https://doi.org/10.14421/jpai.v22i2.11412

Ja'is, J., Widayatsih, T., & Suherman, S. (2025). The influence of principal leadership and school committee participation on teacher performance at a public elementary school in Mesuji Makmur District. *J-CEKI: Jurnal Cendekia Ilmiah*, 4(3), 735–753. https://doi.org/10.56799/jceki.v4i3.7910

Kennedy, M. M. (2016). How does professional development improve teaching? *Review of Educational Research, 86*(4), 945–980. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315626800

Kraft, M. A., Blazar, D., & Hogan, D. (2018). The effect of teacher coaching on instruction and achievement: A meta-analysis of the causal evidence. *Review of Educational Research, 88*(4), 547–588. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654318759268

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: Effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 17*(2), 201–227. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243450600565829

López-Martín, E., Gutiérrez-de-Rozas, B., González-Benito, A. M., & Expósito-Casas, E. (2023). Why do teachers matter? A meta-analytic review of how teacher characteristics and competencies affect students' academic achievement. *International Journal of Educational Research, 120*, Article 102199. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2023.102199

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2019). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (4th ed.). SAGE.

Opfer, V. D., & Pedder, D. (2011). Conceptualizing teacher professional learning. *Review of Educational Research, 81*(3), 376–407. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311413609

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (4th ed.). SAGE.

Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(5), 635–674. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X08321509

Ross, J. A., & Gray, P. (2006). Transformational leadership and teacher commitment to organizational values: The mediating effects of collective teacher efficacy. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 17*(2), 179–199. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243450600565795

Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research, 104*, 333–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039

© 2026 Yanti & Sugianik. Published by CV. Bimbingan Belajar Assyfa, Indonesia

Stoll, L., Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Wallace, M., & Thomas, S. (2006). Professional learning communities: A review of the literature. *Journal of Educational Change, 7*, 221–258. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-006-0001-8

Tan, C. Y., Dimmock, C., & Walker, A. (2024). How school leadership practices relate to student outcomes: Insights from a three-level meta-analysis. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 52*(1), 6–27. https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432211061445

Vescio, V., Ross, D., & Adams, A. (2008). A review of research on the impact of professional learning communities on teaching practice and student learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(1), 80–91. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2007.01.004

Wang, G., Oh, I.-S., Courtright, S. H., & Colbert, A. E. (2011). Transformational leadership and performance across criteria and levels: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of research. *Group & Organization Management, 36*(2), 223–270. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601111401017

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). SAGE.

© 2026 Yanti & Sugianik. Published by CV. Bimbingan Belajar Assyfa, Indonesia