International Journal of Social Science and Human Research

ISSN (print): 2644-0679, ISSN (online): 2644-0695

Volume 07 Issue 06 June 2024

DOI: 10.47191/ijsshr/v7-i06-40, Impact factor- 7.876

Page No: 3862-3867

The Influence of Principal Leadership on Student Satisfaction of Public High Schools in Tangerang City Sub-District

Desy Pastina¹, Unifah Rosyidi², Heru Santosa³

^{1,2,3}State University of Jakarta Jl. R. Mangun Muka Raya No 11 Pulo Gadung Jakarta Timur 13220 Indonesia



ABSTRACT: This research aims to determine the effect of principal leadership on student satisfaction in State Senior High School in sub-districts of Tangerang City. The method used for this is explanatory research with a quantitative approach through survey method. The sample of 353 students was taken with probability sampling technique using proportionate stratified random sampling method. Data were collected through a questionnaire that had been tested for validity and reliability using the product moment correlation method and Cronbach's Alpha coefficient. The results of this research can be seen that the principal's leadership has positive effect and significant effect on student satisfaction. The findings of this study are expected to contribute to the development of strategies to increase learner satisfaction through improving the quality of principal leadership. This research provides recommendations for school principals and education managers to pay more attention to leadership aspects in order to achieve optimal satisfaction of learners.

KEYWORDS: principal's leadership, student, satisfaction

I. INTRODUCTION

Educational institutions are required to be able to fulfil the needs of their students. Therefore, if you want to meet the satisfaction of students, educational institutions must be able to see what their students need and want. Satisfaction in this era is highly considered by every form of organisation. There are many benefits for the organisation concerned when the level of satisfaction is high, which will increase loyalty and prevent turnover (Lupiyoadi, 2016: 246). A successful organisation is able to make its users at the top of the goal because managers believe that users are the only true profit centre (Kotler and Keller, 2018: 134).

The position of students here has an important role, because students as raw input or raw input, meaning that schools as formal educational institutions that provide educational services must be able to develop the potential possessed by each student and also students become the benchmark for the achievement of an educational institution, whether the school has good quality can be seen from the output or produced. According to Rahyu and Fahmi (2018: 147-152) student satisfaction is an attitude shown by students, both positive and negative attitudes that match their expectations with the teaching and learning process services they receive. According to Tjiptono (2016: 84), customer satisfaction or dissatisfaction is the customer's response to the evolution of perceived discrepancies (disconfirmation) between

Educational institutions are required to be able to fulfil the needs of their students. Therefore, if you want to meet the satisfaction of students, educational institutions must be able to see what their students need and want. Satisfaction in this era is highly considered by every form of organisation. There are many benefits for the organisation concerned when the level of satisfaction is high, which will increase loyalty and prevent turnover (Lupiyoadi, 2016: 246). A successful organisation is able to make its users at the top of the goal because managers believe that users are the only true profit centre (Kotler and Keller, 2018: 134).

The position of students here has an important role, because students as raw input or raw input, meaning that schools as formal educational institutions that provide educational services must be able to develop the potential possessed by each student and also students become the benchmark for the achievement of an educational institution, whether the school has good quality can be seen from the output or product produced. According to Rahyu and Fahmi (2018: 147-152) student satisfaction is an attitude shown by students, both positive and negative attitudes that match their expectations with the teaching and learning process services they receive. According to Tjiptono (2016: 84), customer satisfaction or dissatisfaction is the customer's response to the evolution of perceived discrepancies (disconfirmation) between previous expectations and the actual performance of the perceived product. Meanwhile, according to Fatihudin & Firmansyah, (2019: 3), customer satisfaction is the customer's perception that his expectations have been met or exceeded.

In this case, what is meant by customers is learners or students, therefore from this definition it can be concluded that student satisfaction is a positive attitude of students towards administrative services carried out by education personnel because there is a match between what is expected and needed and the reality received.

Customer (student) satisfaction can be influenced by several factors, namely the learning process at school, the school life environment, communication, administrative services and school management. As for what is included in the learning process is the method applied by the teacher when delivering the lesson to the students.

Based on the early observation, it is known that the learning environment in Tangerang City State Senior High School is still inadequate, starting from the physical environment such as school facilities and the social environment such as the number of bullying that occurs among students. The leadership model applied by the school principal can also affect learner satisfaction. Principal leadership is a very important factor, and is one of the parts that determine the success in achieving the objective of an organisation or educational institution. Principal leadership is the main determinant of the school dynamic process. The effectiveness of educational leadership cannot be separated from several aspects that develop leadership effectiveness so that the quality of education can be achieved. The failure and success of schools are largely determined by the principal, because the principal is the controller and determinant of the direction that the school wants to take towards its goals (Enas, 2018: 158). Therefore, the principal is required to be active towards subordinates which can be seen from their duties and responsibilities. Based on the background of the problems that have been described, the problem formulation in this research is 'Is there an influence of the principal's leadership on the satisfaction of public high school students in Tangerang City District?'

The results of this research are expected to provide benefits to improve the scientific and knowledge related to student satisfaction in learning activities and things that could affect such as the leadership of school principals. In addition, the results of this research can be used by the next researcher as a reference material in conducting research related to learner satisfaction and leadership applied by school principals.

II. METHOD

The type of research conducted is quantitative descriptive approach. The population of students of Public High Schools in Tangerang City Sub-District is 2979 students. The sample in the research was 353 students using the Slovin Formula. The sampling technique in this study used probability sampling technique, which is a sampling technique that provides equal opportunities for each element (member) of the population to be selected as a sample member. The instrument used is a questionnaire with a Likert scale score. Data analysis techniques use Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) and use SmartPLS to test hypotheses with A=0.05 significance.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This research is to reveal the influence of principal leadership on students' satisfaction. Data collection in this study has been distributed to all public high schools in Tangerang City District, totalling 2979 people with the sample of 353 students. Data on the learner satisfaction variable (Y) has a total of 30 valid items with a measurement scale that includes 5 (five) alternative answers. The acquisition of data from the research results is then continued with descriptive statistical calculations with the following results:

Tabel 1. Descriptive Variable of Student Satisfaction

No	Description	Y
1	Mean	112,686
2	Standard Error	0,557
3	Median	113
4	Mode	107
5	Standard Deviation	10,468
6	Sample Variance	109,568
7	Range	60
8	Minimum	77
9	Maximum	137
10	Sum	39778
11	Count	353

The learner satisfaction instrument used in the study obtained 30 valid statements with a scale of 1-5, so that the theoretical score of 40 - 200 and the empirical score range of 77 - 137, obtained a score range of 60. Based on data calculations, the average (mean) is 112.686; standard deviation of 10.468; variance of 109.568; median of 113 and mode of 107. Further data on student satisfaction is displayed in the form of a frequency distribution as follows:

Tabel 2. Frequency Distribution of Learner Satisfaction Score

Satisfaction (Y)												
	STS TS				KS		S			SS		
Item	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	Rata - Rata	
Y.2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	54	14.6%	190	51.2%	109	29.4%	4.16	
Y.3	0	0.0%	5	1.3%	18	4.9%	186	50.1%	144	38.8%	4.33	
Y.4	0	0.0%	4	1.1%	26	7.0%	169	45.6%	154	41.5%	4.34	
Y.6	0	0.0%	4	1.1%	27	7.3%	218	58.8%	104	28.0%	4.20	
Y.8	0	0.0%	5	1.3%	41	11.1%	156	42.0%	151	40.7%	4.28	
Y.9	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	96	25.9%	111	29.9%	146	39.4%	4.14	
Y.10	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	56	15.1%	142	38.3%	155	41.8%	4.28	
Y.12	0	0.0%	11	3.0%	124	33.4%	142	38.3%	76	20.5%	3.80	
Y.13	0	0.0%	3	0.8%	129	34.8%	159	42.9%	62	16.7%	3.79	
Y.17	0	0.0%	1	0.3%	170	45.8%	125	33.7%	57	15.4%	3.67	
Y.18	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	99	26.7%	190	51.2%	64	17.3%	3.90	
Y.20	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	38	10.2%	167	45.0%	148	39.9%	4.31	
Y.22	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	134	36.1%	189	50.9%	30	8.1%	3.71	
Y.23	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	135	36.4%	121	32.6%	97	26.1%	3.89	
Y.24	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	79	21.3%	99	26.7%	175	47.2%	4.27	
Y.25	0	0.0%	4	1.1%	89	24.0%	163	43.9%	97	26.1%	4.00	
Y.26	0	0.0%	8	2.2%	46	12.4%	213	57.4%	86	23.2%	4.07	
Y.27	0	0.0%	10	2.7%	38	10.2%	175	47.2%	130	35.0%	4.20	
Y.29	0	0.0%	9	2.4%	45	12.1%	210	56.6%	89	24.0%	4.07	
Y.30	0	0.0%	6	1.6%	64	17.3%	162	43.7%	121	32.6%	4.13	
Y.32	0	0.0%	4	1.1%	83	22.4%	203	54.7%	63	17.0%	3.92	
Y.33	0	0.0%	8	2.2%	73	19.7%	185	49.9%	87	23.5%	3.99	
Y.34	1	0.3%	5	1.3%	99	26.7%	190	51.2%	58	15.6%	3.85	
Y.35	0	0.0%	9	2.4%	86	23.2%	145	39.1%	113	30.5%	4.03	
Y.36	0	0.0%	2	0.5%	112	30.2%	221	59.6%	18	4.9%	3.72	
Y.37	0	0.0%	5	1.3%	102	27.5%	220	59.3%	26	7.0%	3.76	
Y.39	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	100	27.0%	220	59.3%	33	8.9%	3.81	
Y.40	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	101	27.2%	130	35.0%	122	32.9%	4.06	
	Grand Mean Satisfaction										4.02	

Based on table 2 above, it can be seen that the average value obtained by the satisfaction variable is 4.02 or included in the good category. The satisfaction variable has the lowest average value in indicator Y.17 with an average value of 3.67 which states that I am very quick to respond to questions or requests for help from teachers in class. The highest average value is in indicator Y.4 with an average value of 4.34 which states that I always give valid reasons for being absent from school.

The principal leadership instrument used in the study obtained 40 valid statements with a scale of 1-5, so that the theoretical score of 40 - 200 and the empirical score range of 86 - 154, obtained a score range of 68. Based on data calculations, the mean was 122.866; standard deviation of 13.644; variance of 186.167; median of 120 and mode of 108. Furthermore, the principal leadership data is displayed in the form of frequency distribution as follows:

Table 3. Frequency Distribution of Principal Leadership Score

Principal Leadership (X1)												
	STS		S TS				S			Rata		
Item											- Rata	
Item	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	Rata	
Principal Leadership (X1) STS TS KS S SS Ra												
		STS	TS	TS		KS		S		SS		
Item	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	- Rata	
X1.2	0	0.0%	9	2.4%	31	8.4%	209	56.3%	104	28.0%	4.16	
X1.4	0	0.0%	9	2.4%	12	3.2%	227	61.2%	105	28.3%	4.21	
X1.5	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	38	10.2%	184	49.6%	131	35.3%	4.26	
X1.6	0	0.0%	9	2.4%	70	18.9%	184	49.6%	90	24.3%	4.01	
X1.8	0	0.0%	9	2.4%	42	11.3%	215	58.0%	87	23.5%	4.08	
X1.9	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	41	11.1%	198	53.4%	114	30.7%	4.21	
X1.10	0	0.0%	12	3.2%	53	14.3%	231	62.3%	57	15.4%	3.94	
X1.11	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	48	12.9%	228	61.5%	77	20.8%	4.08	
X1.12	0	0.0%	12	3.2%	85	22.9%	178	48.0%	78	21.0%	3.91	
X1.13	0	0.0%	9	2.4%	73	19.7%	189	50.9%	82	22.1%	3.97	
X1.14	0	0.0%	42	11.3%	104	28.0%	160	43.1%	47	12.7%	3.60	
X1.16	45	12.1%	135	36.4%	75	20.2%	61	16.4%	37	10.0%	2.75	
X1.17	0	0.0%	81	21.8%	134	36.1%	113	30.5%	25	6.7%	3.23	
X1.18	12	3.2%	3	0.8%	90	24.3%	207	55.8%	41	11.1%	3.74	
X1.19	33	8.9%	99	26.7%	98	26.4%	92	24.8%	31	8.4%	2.97	
X1.20	12	3.2%	33	8.9%	143	38.5%	150	40.4%	15	4.0%	3.35	
X1.21	0	0.0%	36	9.7%	36	9.7%	180	48.5%	101	27.2%	3.98	
X1.22	6	1.6%	36	9.7%	77	20.8%	184	49.6%	50	13.5%	3.67	
X1.23	6	1.6%	27	7.3%	83	22.4%	199	53.6%	38	10.2%	3.67	
X1.24	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	17	4.6%	214	57.7%	122	32.9%	4.30	
X1.25	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	31	8.4%	210	56.6%	112	30.2%	4.23	
X1.28	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	39	10.5%	206	55.5%	108	29.1%	4.20	
X1.30	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	45	12.1%	190	51.2%	118	31.8%	4.21	
X1.32	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	1.6%	229	61.7%	118	31.8%	4.32	
X1.33	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	63	17.0%	199	53.6%	91	24.5%	4.08	
X1.34	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	2.2%	216	58.2%	129	34.8%	4.34	
X1.35	0	0.0%	3	0.8%	44	11.9%	176	47.4%	130	35.0%	4.23	
X1.37	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	1.1%	211	56.9%	138	37.2%	4.38	
X1.38	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	55	14.8%	203	54.7%	95	25.6%	4.11	
X1.39	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	1.1%	226	60.9%	123	33.2%	4.34	
X1.40	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	1.3%	218	58.8%	130	35.0%	4.35	
	•	Grand I	Mean 1	Principal	Lead	ership	•	•	•	•	3.95	

Based on table 3 above, it can be seen that the average value obtained by the Principal Leadership variable is 3.95 or included in the good category. The Principal Leadership variable has the lowest average value in indicator X1.16 with an average value of 2.75 which states that the principal conducts socialisation of new policies with all school members. The highest average value is in indicator X1.37 with an average value of 4.38 which states that the principal treats me as a private individual, not just as a member of a work group.

Normality test is a test of whether or not the distribution of data to be analysed is normal. In this study, the normality test was carried out on the distribution model of the research variables. Before testing the hypothesis, it is necessary to study the normal distribution model used as a sample from a normally distributed population. Data normality testing is used to determine the form of data distribution used in research. The data used must be in the form of a normal distribution if the significant value of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test results ≥ 0.05 .

Table 4. Normality Test Results

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test							
		Unstandardized					
	Residual						
N		353					
Normal Parameters a, b	Mean	.0000000					
	Std.	9.30434527					
	Deviation						
Most Extreme	Absolute	.044					
Differences	Positive	.029					
	Negative	044					
Test Statistic		.044					
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.095°						
a. Test distribution is N	Normal.	•					
b. Calculated from data.							
c. Lilliefors Significan	on.						

The results of the normality test using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test show that the research variables used have a significance value of 0.095. This research variable has a significance value greater than the 5% alpha value (sig> 0.05) indicating that the distribution of research variables is normally distributed.

Table 5. Linearity Test Results of Principal Leadership on Satisfaction

ANOVA Table											
						Sum	of	df	Mean	F	Sig.
						Squares			Square		
Satisfaction (Y) *	Kepemimpinan	Kepala	Between	(Combined)		9893.029		51	193.981	2.036	.000
Sekolah (X1)			Groups	Linearity		4300.436		1	4300.436	45.141	.000
				Deviation	from	5592.592		50	111.852	1.174	.210
				Linearity							
			Within Groups	3		28675.068		301	95.266		
			Total			38568.096		352			

From the results above, it is known that the significant level of the linearity test of the principal's leadership variable with satisfaction shows a result of 0.210 where the sig of linearity> 0.05, it can be concluded that the two variables have a linear relationship.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of the research analysis show that the influence of the Principal Leadership variable on Satisfaction has a regression coefficient value of 0.240 and a significance value of 0.000 with a significance degree value of 0.05, meaning that 0.000 <0.05 or there is a significant influence and t count shows a value of 6.570> t table (1.967). This means that Principal Leadership has an effect on satisfaction. These results indicate that the greater the increase in principal leadership, the higher the satisfaction of students. The hypothesis which states that there is an effect of principal leadership on learner satisfaction, shows that Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted.

REFERENCES

1) Lupiyoadi, R. (2019). Manajemen Pemasaran jasa. Edisi Pertama. Jakarta: SalembaEmpat.Tavel, P. 2007 Modeling and Simulation Design. AK Peters Ltd.

- Kotler, Phillip dan Kevin Lane Keller. (2016). Manajemen Pemasaran edisi 12 Jilid 1 & 2. Jakarta: PT. Indeks.Sannella,
 M. J. 1994 Constraint Satisfaction and Debugging for Interactive User Interfaces. Doctoral Thesis. UMI Order Number:
 UMI Order No. GAX95-09398., University of Washington.
- 3) E Rahyu, S Fahmi. JURING (Journal for Research in Mathematics Learning) 1 (2), 147-152, 2018. 7, 2018.
- 4) Lupiyoadi, R. (2019). Manajemen Pemasaran jasa. Edisi Pertama. Jakarta: SalembaEmpat.Tavel, P. 2007 Modeling and Simulation Design. AK Peters Ltd.
- 5) Fatihudin, D., & Firmansyah, A. 2019. Pemasaran Jasa: (Strategi, Mengukur Kepuasan Dan Loyalitas Pelanggan). Deepublish.
- 6) Enas. 2018. Efektivitas Kepemimpinan Kepala Sekolah dalam Meningkatkan Kinerja Guru. Journal of Management Review, 2 (3), 252-260. https://doi.org/10.25157/jmr.v2i3.1803
- 7) Haryanti, A. T., Suryani, N., & Rozi, F. (2019). Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan, Citra Sekolah, dan Emosional Terhadap Kepuasan Peserta Didik. Economic Education Analysis Journal, 8(3), 1260-1274. https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/eeaj/article/view/34955
- 8) Irawan, H. (2019). Membedah Strategi Kepuasan Pelanggan. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- 9) Sugiyono. (2019). Metodelogi Penelitian Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif Dan R&D. Bandung: ALFABETA.
- 10) Rustami, N. A., & Kurniatun, T. C. 2016. Pengaruh kualitas jasa pendidikan terhadap kepuasan mahasiswa di Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia. Jurnal ADPEND Tata Kelola Pendidikan, 1(1), 42-52. https://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/jtkp/article/view/3254/0Brown, L. D., Hua, H., and Gao, C. 2003. A widget framework for augmented interaction in SCAPE.



There is an Open Access article, distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution – Non Commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0)

(https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/), which permits remixing, adapting and building upon the work for non-commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited.