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Abstract
This study aims to analyze the effect of work supervision on work discipline and teacher performance at SMK Negeri 3 Pekanbaru. Meanwhile, the research was carried out from April to June 2020. The data source for this research was the teachers of SMK Negeri 3 Pekanbaru with 51 respondents as the research sample. The data collection technique used the census method. In addition, the data analysis technique was descriptive analysis, validity and reliability tests, normality and linearity tests, and hypothesis testing, namely path analysis tests. The results of the study: Sub Structure 1 shows direct work supervision (X) has a significant positive effect on work discipline (Y1) with an influence value of 35.9%. Sub Structure 2 shows that work supervision (X) and work discipline (Y1) has a significant positive effect on teacher performance (Y2) at SMK Negeri 3 Pekanbaru, with an influence value of 79%. Furthermore, the indirect effect shows; Work supervision (X) has a significant positive effect on teacher performance (Y2) through work discipline (Y1) teachers at SMK Negeri 3 Pekanbaru
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INTRODUCTION
SMK Negeri 3 Pekanbaru is an educational institution that has an essential role in providing services to its students. Educators and education personnel must combine improved services with facilities and infrastructure in the teaching and learning process (Sarwono, 2009). Since desires, critical duties, and functions, as well as infrastructure, must all be balanced (Edison, Anwar, & Komariyah, 2016).

Performance refers to the degree to which an activity, program, or policy is completing the organization’s goals, objectives, vision, and mission (Ma’ruf, 2011). Teachers whose performance is low will be seen from the teacher's behavior concerned (Ghani & Herlina, 2017). A teacher whose performance is low and rarely evaluates their performance, this can be seen in the following table.

Table 1. Assessment of Teacher Work Targets at SMK Negeri 3 Pekanbaru City, 2015-2019

| No. | Task Activities | Target | Realization |
|-----|----------------|--------|-------------|
|     |                |        | 2015  | 2016  | 2017  | 2018  | 2019  |
|     |                |        | Quality | Time  | Quality | Quality | Quality |
| 1   | Carry out the learning process (RPP) with details: planning | 100     | 12 months | 50   | 45   | 53   | 60   | 65   |
and implementing learning, evaluating the value of learning outcomes, carrying out a follow-up on learning outcomes.

|   |                                                                 |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|----------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | Attending Functional Training for 30 to 60 hours               | 100| 12 months | 50| 64| 60| 67| 65|
| 3 | Make written papers in the form of research results in the field of education at school, in school seminars, and stored in schools | 100| 12 months | 40| 46| 50| 55| 60|
| 4 | Guiding students in practice                                 | 100| 12 months | 60| 63| 70| 50| 68|

Source: SMK Negeri 3 Pekanbaru City, 2020

According to Robbins and Judge (2013), the factors that affect performance include supervision and discipline. Edison, Anwar, and Komariyah (2016) the factors that influence performance are discipline. One part of human resource strength is represented in attitude and disciplinary behaviors (Fathoni, 2006). It is because disciplinary behavior can have a major impact on the ability to pursue something intended (Gomes, 2003).

To see the level of teacher discipline, it can be seen from the attendance of employees, for more details can be seen in the following table.
Table 2 shows the level of employee absenteeism in the last five years. To be precise, it has increased from 2015 to 2019. The high percentage of absenteeism is because female teachers who prioritize family matters dominate SMK Negeri 3 Pekanbaru. Furthermore, they reside a long distance from the school, making it impossible to get to class on time.

Supervision is a systematic effort to observe and monitor whether the various functions, activities, and activities that occur within the organization are following a predetermined plan or not (Siagian, 2010).

Panjaitan (2018) has previously conducted research on supervision of discipline and performance, supervision and work discipline affect teacher performance. Work discipline mediates the effect of supervision on teacher performance. Then, according to Marsilah (2018), supervision affects discipline. Rosmiati (2018) supervision affects teacher performance. In contrast to research conducted by Calorina and Hasbullah (2020) the results of the study show that supervision does not affect teacher performance.

Based on the background of the problem above, there is a gap, namely the difference in the results of previous studies that have been carried out (Research gap). Furthermore, there is a gap phenomenon in the background of the described problem, where the absence rate is increasing. In addition, many teachers who submit their lesson plan on time.

Based on the background description and theoretical review above, the writer is interested in conducting research and taking the title, namely: Performance Control’s Effect on SMKN 3 Pekanbaru’s Work Discipline and Teacher Performance.

Performance

According to Mahsun (2009), performance is a description of the level of achievement of the implementation of an activity, program, policy in realizing the goals, objectives, mission, and vision contained in the organization’s strategic planning.

Discipline

According to Fathoni (2006), discipline is a person's awareness and willingness to obey all company regulations and applicable social norms.

Supervision

Lubis (2009) says that supervision is an act of examining whether everything is achieved or going according to a predetermined plan.

| Year | the Total of the Teacher | Absent | Leave Early | Total of Absent |
|------|--------------------------|--------|-------------|-----------------|
| 2015 | 71                       | 31     | 44          | 100             |
| 2016 | 75                       | 30     | 42          | 102             |
| 2017 | 79                       | 32     | 43          | 112             |
| 2018 | 80                       | 35     | 45          | 119             |
| 2019 | 82                       | 37     | 55          | 157             |

Source: Teacher of SMK Negeri 3 Pekanbaru, 2020
Research Conceptual Framework

Hypothesis
Based on the formulation of the problem and the theoretical basis, the hypotheses in this study are:
1) Supervision affects the discipline of teachers at SMK Negeri 3 Pekanbaru
2) Supervision has an effect on teacher performance at SMK Negeri 3 Pekanbaru
3) Discipline affects teacher performance at SMK Negeri 3 Pekanbaru
4) Supervision has an effect on teacher performance through the work discipline of teachers at SMK Negeri 3 Pekanbaru.

METHOD

Research Design
This research is based on the respondents' responses from the survey results using a questionnaire in the form of questions and statements. The questionnaire was created using the Linkert scale to assess teacher conduct, opinions, and perceptions concerning the phenomena that occur in the SMK Negeri 3 Pekanbaru work environment. This research was conducted starting in March until June 2020.

Population and Research Sample
The population in this study was 53 teachers at SMK Negeri 3 Pekanbaru. Since the population in this study is relatively small, the entire population in this study will be sampled, namely 53 teachers minus 2, the principal, and the author. According to Sugiyono (2012), saturated sampling is a sampling technique when all members of the population are used as samples.

Data Collection Technique
The technique of collecting data in this research is using questionnaires and documentation. The questionnaire was conducted to obtain quantified descriptive data to test hypotheses with the Likert scale. It has 5 alternative answers for each question or statement submitted in the questionnaire following predetermined indicators.
Data Analysis Technique

The data analysis technique used in this research is Path Analysis with the help of SPSS (Statistical Product and Service Solutions) IBM Version 24. The test steps used in this research are descriptive analysis of research variables, normality test, multicollinearity test, Linearity test, and model fit test (G of Fit).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Validity Test and Reliability Test

The results of the statistical test of k work supervision variables (X) Based on table 4. it appears that all indicators of Work Supervision as a whole $r_{count}$ is greater than $r_{table}$, namely the lowest $r_{count}$ is 0.556 and the highest is 0.628 with n of 51 and $r_{table}$ of 0.30 Thus, overall indicators of work supervision variables can be declared valid.

| Indicators | N  | $r_{count}$ | $r_{table}$ | Information |
|------------|----|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| X1.1       | 51 | 0.556       | 0.30        | Valid       |
| X1.2       | 51 | 0.628       | 0.30        | Valid       |
| X1.3       | 51 | 0.619       | 0.30        | Valid       |
| X1.4       | 51 | 0.602       | 0.30        | Valid       |

Source: Primary Data processed in 2020

Based on table 2, it can be seen that all indicators of work discipline as a whole $r_{count}$ are greater than $r_{table}$, namely, the lowest $r_{count}$ is 0.493 and the highest is 0.750 with n of 51 and $r_{table}$ of 0.30. Thus, overall indicators of Work Discipline variables can be declared valid.

| Indicators | N  | $r_{count}$ | $r_{table}$ | Information |
|------------|----|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Y1.1       | 51 | 0.556       | 0.30        | Valid       |
| Y1.2       | 51 | 0.628       | 0.30        | Valid       |
| Y1.3       | 51 | 0.619       | 0.30        | Valid       |
| Y1.4       | 51 | 0.602       | 0.30        | Valid       |
| Y1.5       | 51 | 0.750       | 0.30        | Valid       |
| Y1.6       | 51 | 0.525       | 0.30        | Valid       |
| Y1.7       | 51 | 0.584       | 0.30        | Valid       |
| Y1.8       | 51 | 0.695       | 0.30        | Valid       |

Source: Primary Data processed in 2020

Based on table 3, it can be seen that all indicators of teacher performance as a whole $r_{count}$ are greater than $r_{table}$, namely, the lowest $r_{count}$ is 0.333 and the highest is 0.794 with n of 51 and $r_{table}$ of 0.30. Thus, overall indicators of teacher performance variables can be declared valid.
Furthermore, the reliability test of Work Supervision shows the results of the calculation of the calculated Alpha Cronbach value $\gt$ Alpha table 0.7, with the lowest calculated Cronbach Alpha value of 0.726 and Cronbach's calculated Alpha value of 0.763. So, it can be concluded that the overall indicator of the monitoring variable is reliable as shown in table 4. The following:

| Indicators | N  | $r_{count}$ | $r_{table}$ | Information |
|------------|----|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Y2.1       | 51 | 0.602       | 0.30        | Valid       |
| Y2.2       | 51 | 0.794       | 0.30        | Valid       |
| Y2.3       | 51 | 0.761       | 0.30        | Valid       |
| Y2.4       | 51 | 0.512       | 0.30        | Valid       |
| Y2.5       | 51 | 0.333       | 0.30        | Valid       |

Source: Primary Data processed in 2020

The results of the reliability test of the Work Discipline variable in this study can be seen in table 5. It shows that all the instruments used to measure the work discipline variable show the results of calculating the Cronbach Alpha value $\gt$ Alpha table 0.7, with the lowest Cronbach Alpha value being 0.831 and Cronbach's Alpha value count is 0.861. So it can be concluded that the overall indicator of the work discipline variable is reliable.

| Indicators | N  | Alpha Cronbach$_{count}$ | Alpha Cronbach$_{table}$ | Information |
|------------|----|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
| Y1.1       | 51 | 0.835                    | 0.70                      | Reliable    |
| Y1.2       | 51 | 0.861                    | 0.70                      | Reliable    |
| Y1.3       | 51 | 0.845                    | 0.70                      | Reliable    |
| Y1.4       | 51 | 0.858                    | 0.70                      | Reliable    |
| Y1.5       | 51 | 0.831                    | 0.70                      | Reliable    |
| Y1.6       | 51 | 0.857                    | 0.70                      | Reliable    |
| Y1.7       | 51 | 0.851                    | 0.70                      | Reliable    |
| Y1.8       | 51 | 0.838                    | 0.70                      | Reliable    |

Source: Primary Data processed in 2020
The results of the reliability test of the Teacher Performance variable in this study can be seen in Table 6, which shows that all the instruments used to measure the Teacher Performance variable. It shows the results of calculating the Cronbach Alpha value > Alpha table 0.7, with the lowest Cronbach Alpha value being 0.701 and Cronbach's Alpha value is calculated at 0.805. Therefore, it can be concluded that the overall indicator of the teacher's performance variable is reliable.

**Table 6. The results of the teacher's performance reliability test**

| Indicators | N | Alpha Cronbach<sub>count</sub> | Alpha Cronbach<sub>table</sub> | Information |
|------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|
| Y2.1       | 51 | 0.765                       | 0.70                        | Reliable    |
| Y2.2       | 51 | 0.701                       | 0.70                        | Reliable    |
| Y2.3       | 51 | 0.712                       | 0.70                        | Reliable    |
| Y2.4       | 51 | 0.792                       | 0.70                        | Reliable    |
| Y2.5       | 51 | 0.805                       | 0.70                        | Reliable    |

Source: Primary Data processed in 2020

**Normality Test**

**Substructure Normality Test 1**

The results of the structural normality test 1 show that the standard residual value has met the normality requirements, namely, the standard residual value is between -1.941 to 1.817. It can also be said that there is no outlier data or the data has met the normal distribution requirements.

**Table 7. Results of Normality Test for Sub Structure 1**

|                       | Minimum     | Maximum     | Mean       | Std. Deviation | N  |
|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|----------------|----|
| Predicted Value       | 0.0000000   | 0.0000000   | 0.0000000  | 0.0000000      | 51 |
| Std.Predicted Value   | 0.00        | 0.00        | 0.00       | 0.00           | 51 |
| Standard Error of     | 5.49        | 1.365       | 0.746      | 0.188          | 51 |
| Predicted Value       | -41.45736   | 1.0601314   | -0.117535  | 2071.8819      | 51 |
| Adjusted Predicted     | -7.54586519 | 7.06615660  | 0.0000000  | 3.04912540     | 51 |
| Residual              |            |             |            |                |    |
| Std. Residual         | -1.941      | 1.817       | 0.00       | 0.960          | 51 |
| Stud. Residual        | -2.073      | 1.949       | 0.001      | 1.011          | 51 |
| Deleted Residual      | -8.60650827 | 7.31176567  | -0.1175347 | 4.01745959     | 51 |
| Stud. Deleted Residual| -2.148      | 1.967       | 0.001      | 1.026          | 51 |
| Mahal Distance        | 0.15        | 5.179       | 0.980      | 1.120          | 51 |
| Cook's Distance       | 0.00        | 0.302       | 0.022      | 0.044          | 51 |
| Centered Leverage Value| 0.00        | 0.104       | 0.020      | 0.022          | 51 |

a. Dependent Variable: Unstandardized Residual Y1

Source: Primary Data processed in 2020
Sub Structure Normality Test 2

The results of the normality test of structure 2 show that the standard residual value has met the normality requirements, namely, the standard residual value is between -1.904 to 1.893. It can also be said that there is no outlier data or the data has met the normal distribution requirements.

Table 8. Normality Test Results for Sub Structure 2

| Source: Primary Data processed in 2020 |
|---------------------------------------|
|                                     |
| Predicted Value                      | .0000000 | .0000000 | .0000000 | .00000000 | 51 |
| Std. Predicted Value                 | .000     | .000     | .000     | .000     | 51 |
| Standard Error of Predicted Value    | .206     | .648     | .340     | .092     | 51 |
| Adjusted Predicted Value             | -.2345541| .3543184 | -.0011322| .09369562 | 51 |
| Residual                             | -.275329534| 2.74295133| .00000000| 1.42005786 | 51 |
| Std. Residual                        | -1.904   | 1.893    | .000     | .980     | 51 |
| Stud. Residual                       | -1.973   | 1.952    | .000     | 1.008    | 51 |
| Deleted Residual                     | -.96373844| 2.97431622| .00113221| 1.50459032 | 51 |
| Stud. Deleted Residual               | -2.037   | 2.013    | .002     | 1.022    | 51 |
| Mahal Distance                       | .031     | 9.022    | 1.961    | 1.633    | 51 |
| Cook’s Distance                      | .000     | .134     | .020     | .027     | 51 |
| Centered Leverage Value              | .001     | .180     | .038     | .033     | 51 |
Multicollinearity Test

The results of the multicollinearity test show that the entire tolerance value for the independent variable is supervision (0.641) and discipline (0.641), the VIF value for the exogenous supervision variable (1.559), discipline (1.559), thus all independent variables can be stated that there is no multicollinearity. As in the table below:

| Model | Collinearity Statistics | Information |
|-------|--------------------------|--------------|
|       | Tolerance   | VIF          |              |
| 1     | (Constant)  |              |              |
| Controlling | 0.641 | 1.559 | No Multicollinearity |
| Discipline   | 0.641 | 1.559 | No Multicollinearity |

**Dependent Variable: Teachers’ Performance**

*Source: Primary Data processed in 2020*

Linearity Test

The results of the linearity test of exogenous variables on endogenous variables show a sig value for the supervision variable on the discipline of 0.105, the supervision variable on teacher performance of 0.107 and the discipline variable on teacher performance of 0.554 in deviation from linearity > alpha (0.05). It can be concluded that the supervision variable has a linear relationship to the discipline variable, then the supervision and discipline variable has a linear relationship to the teacher's performance, which can be seen in table 10.
Table 10. Linearity Test of Exogenous Variables on Endogenous Variables

| Linearity Test                        | Sig  | Alpha | Information |
|--------------------------------------|------|-------|-------------|
| X Controlling on Discipline          | 0.102| 0.05  | Linear      |
| X Controlling on Teachers’ Performance | 0.107| 0.05  | Linear      |
| Y1 Discipline on Teachers’ Performance | 0.554| 0.05  | Linear      |

Source: Primary Data processed in 2020

The goodness of Fit Test (Model Feasibility Test)

Table 11. Model Feasibility Test

| Model | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F    | Sig.  |
|-------|----------------|----|-------------|------|-------|
| Regression | 375.305 | 2  | 196.152 | 90.047 | .000* |
| Residual         | 100.828 | 48 | 2.101   |      |       |
| Total            | 476.133 | 50 |          |      |       |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Y1, X
b. Dependent Variable: V2

Source: Primary Data processed in 2020

From the results of the calculation of table 11, GoF is obtained that the calculated F value is greater than the F table, namely 90.047 > 3.18 (n = 51 and independent/exogenous variable 2). Thus, it can be concluded that the model has a large GoF, meaning that the model used describes diversity or is suitable for use. in this model.

The Effect of Supervision on Work Discipline

The results of this study indicate that there is a strong influence between supervision and the work discipline of teachers at SMK Negeri 3 Pekanbaru. This is in line with Elfrida's opinion (2018) which explains that the supervisory program in schools can run effectively and efficiently if supervisors understand properly and correctly the basic concepts, objectives, functions, tasks, supervisory competencies.

The Effect of Work Supervision on Teacher Performance

The results of this study support the research conducted by Warsono and Sarwono, AE (2009) that principal supervision has a positive and significant effect on teacher discipline, which is also supported by the research results of Ma'ruf (2011), Marsilah (2018) and Rosmiati (2018), Ghani and Herlina (2017), but the results of the study contradict the results of research conducted by Calorina and Hasbullah (Calorina & Hasbullah, 2020) that supervision does not affect teacher discipline.

The Effect of Work Discipline on Teacher Performance

Regulations regarding the discipline of civil servants in Indonesia have been regulated in PP Number 53 of 2010. PP number 53 is an update of Government Regulation Number 30 of 1980. PP Number 53 of 2010 contains provisions for obligations, prohibitions, disciplinary
penalties, authorized officials punishing, imposing disciplinary penalties, objections to disciplinary penalties, and enactment of disciplinary punishment decisions

In this study it was also proven that teacher work discipline was measured by 7 indicators, namely attendance, permission to leave during working hours, obeying working hours rules, obeying regulations, carrying out tasks, working carefully and enthusiastically, carrying out tasks with full responsibility and focusing on targets work. Overall, it can be categorized as very good. This is following the main tasks of the teacher, one of which is carrying out learning.

**The Effect of Work Supervision on Teacher Performance through Work Discipline**

In carrying out the work of teachers, discipline and supervision are needed. Discipline in the sense of carrying out work obligations as teachers, especially teachers with ASN status, as stated in Government Regulation Number 30 of 1980. PP Number 53 of 2010 contains provisions for obligations, prohibitions, disciplinary penalties, officials authorized to punish, imposing disciplinary penalties, objections to disciplinary penalties, and the enactment of disciplinary punishment decisions. Teachers are obliged to carry out the teaching and learning process in schools as their main task.

Teaching and learning activities in schools need supervision from the principal. SMK Negeri 3 based on an analysis of the description of the level of teacher discipline can be categorized as very good. This is inseparable from the teacher's awareness of his obligations and the supervisory function of the principal. Although it is still found that some teachers are still lacking discipline in carrying out their obligations, such as coming late to school, and there are still teachers who leave the school environment without permission, where this need is for the benefit of personal.

The combination of discipline and supervision carried out by the principal can improve the performance of teachers at SMK Negeri 3 Pekanbaru, as evidence of the results of this study that supervision affects teacher performance, teacher work discipline also has an influence on teacher performance, and supervision through discipline further strengthens its influence on teacher performance.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the results of descriptive analysis and statistical analysis as well as the discussion in this study, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1) The results showed that the supervision variable had a positive effect on the work discipline of teachers at SMK Negeri 3 Pekanbaru, the better the supervision, the higher the teacher's work discipline.

2) The results showed that the supervision variable had a positive effect on the teacher's performance at SMK Negeri 3 Pekanbaru.

3) The results showed that the discipline variable had a positive effect on the teacher's performance at SMK Negeri 3 Pekanbaru.

4) The results showed that the strengthening of supervision had a positive effect on teacher performance through teacher work discipline at SMK Negeri 3 Pekanbaru.
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