

Higher Education Governance and Lecturer Performance: The Role of Leadership, Commitment, and Culture

Syamsul Hidayat
Universitas Bina Bangsa

Naufal Affandi
Universitas Bina Bangsa

Henry Eryanto
Jakarta State University

Dede Rahmat Hidayat
Jakarta State University

This study aims to formulate a model and analyze the direct influence of Transformational Leadership, Organizational Commitment, and Organizational Culture on Governance and Lecturer Performance in Private Universities. This study uses an associative quantitative approach or research aimed at knowing the effect of exogenous variables on endogenous variables. The population in this study were lecturers in Banten Indonesia; as many as 211 lecturers participated as respondents in this study. Data collection using survey methods and analysis techniques using SEM with Lisrel 8.80 software. Based on the findings of the study and the discussion of its findings, the following conclusions can be drawn: (1) Transformational Leadership Affect Private University Governance; (2) Transformational Leadership Has No Effect on Private College Lecturer Performance; (3) Organizational Commitment Affects Private University Governance; (4) Organizational Commitment Affects Private University Lecturer Performance; and (5) Organizational Culture Affects Private University Governance; (6) Organizational Culture does not affect the Performance of Lecturers of private universities; (7) Governance affects the work of a lecturer at a private university.

Keywords: transformational leadership, organizational commitment, organization culture, governance, and lecturer performance

INTRODUCTION

The deterioration in academic instruction is also caused by the performance of lecturers (Holert, 2016). Therefore, universities are able to take into account factors relating to concerns with lecturer performance. Implementing and managing higher education are both very important because they show whether or not a university meets the necessary quality standards.

In order to increase the caliber of student services and the lecturers' output, the management of universities has gone through a process of shifting from classical management to modern management. According to Deem & Lucas, (2007) concept, the governance of high-quality colleges must be based on a paradigm of transformation (good university governance). The evaluation and collection of accreditation scores from BAN-PT represent the quality of higher education (National Accreditation Board for Higher Education).

With certification, the public's understanding of the value of education and the community's ability to afford education are growing (Atmanti, 2005). As proof, there are 96% more private universities overall than public universities (Data & Tinggi, 2019), demonstrating a strong interest on the part of the business sector to participate actively in the delivery of higher education. On the other hand, this engagement creates a different issue, namely the poor governance of private institutions, which results in low-quality private universities and insufficient accreditation. The low rate of certification is linked to the professors' poor performance, including their published research and results from their volunteer work.

The government, through the Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia, continues to encourage and facilitate the continuous improvement of the quality and independence of universities in terms of quality, quantity, the learning process, the results of the educational process, and the number of graduates. The quality of how higher education is run and managed is just as important because it shows that a university meets the necessary quality standards.

According to Salvioni et al., (2017), universities have a significant role in social responsibility and stakeholder relationship management, but universities also expand research topics and add education programs, which makes it difficult for institutions to implement higher education governance. The purpose of lecturers in the organizational structure of universities is to perform a strategic function, although the governance of universities serves as the focal point. Performance must therefore constantly adjust to the higher education system's current rapid paradigm transition.

The quality of higher education implementation is determined and influenced by a number of factors, including leadership factors, organizational commitment, organizational culture, and governance, as well as the effectiveness of the lecturers themselves in respecting their tri dharma. In addition, lecturers play a strategic role in improving the quality of education. (Holert, 2016; Milder, 2011; Pradana, A.S, Hakim, M.S., dan Kunaifi, 2018; Purwanto et al., 2020; Rahmah, 2016; Razak et al., 2017).

While Dirwan, (2014) confirms the leadership style and performance of university lecturers, along with what was done by Dirwan, (2014), the research that has been done is related to higher education performance in addition to being carried out at state universities. Several variables are discussed by Rohmah, (2016) including leadership variables and organizational culture. Thus, commitment organizational, organizational culture, and leadership are the variables being researched. The several variables in the to-be-conducted research are those related to private university governance.

The goal of this study is to come up with a structure and measurement model for lecturer performance at private universities based on variables like organizational commitment, organizational culture, transformational leadership, and governance.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Lecturer Performance

A measure of the accomplishments or aims set by universities, such as the tri dharma activities, which combine teaching, research, and community service results, are used to evaluate the achievements of private university lecturers. (Amstrong, Michael, 1998; Daniel C, 1995; Davis, 1996; Gibson, J.L, Ivancevich, J.M., Donnelly, J.H., & Konopaske, 2003; S. Hidayat et al., 2017; Kusdiby, 2021; Maryoto.S, 2000; R. Wayne Mondey, Robert M. Noe, 1993; Stolovitch, H.D., & Keeps, E, 2006).

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership is a condition in which the followers of a transformational leader experience idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration in addition to feeling trust, admiration, loyalty, and respect for the leader. They also feel inspired to go above and beyond what they initially expected. (Dharma, 2006; Gray Yukl, 1989; S. Hidayat et al., 2017; Ken Blanchard, 1996; Kusdiby, 2021; Rivai, 2007; Rivai, V.H., & Murni, 2009; Robbin, S.P. & Judge, 2012; Siagian, 2003).

Leadership outcomes have a significant impact on performance, according to research on the relationship between transformative leadership and performance. (Noruzy, A., Dalfard, V.M, Azhdari, B., Nazari-Shirkouhi, S.& Rezazadeh, 2013); (Chen, G., Kirkman, B.L., Kanfer, R., Allen, D.,&Rosen, 2007); (Braun, 2013); (Nohe, C., Michaelis, B., Menges, J, I., Zhang, Z., & Sonntag, 2013), and (Charbonnier-Voirin, A., El Akremi, A., & Vandenberghe, 2010).

Leadership and governance are strongly intertwined. To maintain the effectiveness of the organization and to support individual and group efforts to attain shared goals, the leader must exercise their influence over others. Regarding the efficiency of private higher education governance, leadership is frequently transferred to or channeled through volunteerism from followers. The following research hypotheses are based on studies on transformational leadership, governance, and performance:

H1: Transformational Leadership affects Governance.

H2: Transformational Leadership affects Lecturer Performance.

Organizational Commitment

The three dimensions of organizational commitment are affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Organizational commitment is an individual's declaration of good values and agreement with the organization. It includes both organizational commitments to employees and employee commitments to the organization. This is very important for the organization because employees who have a high level of commitment to the organization tend to have a professional attitude. (Alhawary., F.A dan Aboruman., A., 2011; Anat., F dan Carmeli., 2003; Firat et al., 2009; S. (Universitas B. B. Hidayat & Tjahjono, 2015; Jaros, 2007; Kumar dan Eng., 2012; Meyer), 1997; Meyer, J.P., Allen, N.J. & Smith, 2002; Mowday et al., 1979; Robbin, S.P. & Judge, 2012; Solinger et al., 2008; Ulrich D, 1998).

Attitude commitment and behavioral commitment are the two components of (Meyer), 1997) organizational commitment approach. The focus of the attitude approach (also known as the "attitudinal commitment") is on how people think about their interactions with the organization. People will think about whether their beliefs and objectives fit with the organization. High employee commitment will be exhibited by a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's values and aims. While the behavioral strategy (behavioral Commitment) is connected to the method through which the person has been connected to a specific organization. The action demonstrates a person's commitment, as does their presence. Incorporated is also intellectual capital (Ulrich D, 1998).

Based on its purpose and meaning as an exchange of values between the organization's owner and its members, commitment also exhibits a practical side. In an ideal world, people put forward assertions about what ethics entail, have shared knowledge of what ethical values are, and are agreed upon and established together as a result of their involvement in the organization.

The engagement of lecturer commitments is required in this scenario to promote excellent governance for universities in order for the objectives of private institutions to be accomplished. Organizational commitment has an impact on sound corporate governance, according to research (Christy et al., 2018; Remeikiene et al., 2013; Ristanti et al., 2014; Septiawan, 2018). As a result, professors must commit to their institutions, work hard to participate in all organizational activities, and uphold the ideals of sound university governance.

The research hypothesis is the following, which is based on studies on organizational commitment, governance, and performance:

H3: Organizational Commitment affects Governance.

H4: Organizational Commitment affects Lecturer Performance.

Organizational Culture

The elements of organizational culture are the values chosen, and work culture is a reflection of the values, conventions, and standards that are believed in and held by its members or organizations and formed to generate behaviors in working so that they are practical and efficient. Environmental culture, high-performance culture, communicative culture, inventive culture, and creative culture are examples of organizational culture indicators. (Hogan, S.J., & Coote, L., 2014; Kreitner, R., & Kinicki, 2012; Lunenburg, 2011; Naor, M., Linderman, K., & Schroeder, 2010; Nawawi Hadari, 2003; Ndraha, 2002; Rivai, V.H., & Murni, 2009; Sackman, 1991; Siregar, 2010; Suryadi, 2003; Triguno, 2004).

The role of lecturers in implementing the trinity of higher education—teaching, research, and community service—as well as supporting activities—plays an important strategic role in the management and implementation of private universities. This work culture is demonstrated by the role of lecturers in these activities.

A superior organization's traits are reflected in its organizational culture, which affects how well it operates. The study by Tseng (2010) investigates the connection between corporate performance and organizational culture. Implementing organizational culture in this situation has a huge impact on how well knowledge management projects perform. According to the study's findings, knowledge management can be improved by increasing knowledge conversion, which in turn has a good and significant impact on lecturer performance.

Organizational culture is a set of shared values, beliefs, and norms that affect how organizational members think, feel, and behave at work (Lunenburg, 2011). The following study hypothesis is based on studies on organizational culture, governance, and performance:

H5: Organizational Culture affects Governance.

H6: Organizational Culture affects Lecturer Performance.

Governance

The term “governance” refers to a new set of values that is beginning to be used as a benchmark for assessing whether an individual, group, college, institution, or company has successfully exercised its management authority. At this time, there is no such college, institution, or company; rather, there is only an expert opinion that “good governance” calls for more accountable, responsive, and transparent management. (Astin, 1993; Blanchard, 1992; Churches, 1988; Covey., 1992; Falchikov, 1989; Gibson, 1996; Ken Blanchard, 1996; Miller, 1974; Prokopenko, 1987; Ralph G. Lewis dan Douglas H. Smith, 1994; Sabandar et al., 2018; Seldin, 1984; Sukamto, 1994).

The management and implementation of sound university governance are modeled after that of governmental institutions. In the meantime, Khumarga, (2004) listed a number of qualities of effective government, including fairness, the rule of law, transparency, accountability, responsiveness, involvement, and effectiveness.

These ideas are combined in such a way as to result in 10 good governance principles that are accepted and suggested for use by all local governments in Indonesia. Naturally, university administrators can also adopt these ten precepts as good university governance, specifically the Governance of Private Universities, which is based on the idea of good governance and includes indicators for the five aspects of the precepts of good governance: (1) Accountability, (2) Credibility, (3) Transparency, (4) Responsible, and (5)

Fairness. Therefore, the effectiveness of lecturers is directly impacted by good governance. The study's research foundation is (Sabandar et al., 2018), which provides evidence for earlier studies on governance.

H7: High Teacher Governance affects Lecturer Performance.

METHODOLOGY

The performance of lecturers at private universities in Indonesia is investigated in this study in connection to transformational leadership, organizational commitment, organizational culture, governance, and lecturer performance. The participants in this study are lecturers at Bina Bangsa University, Banten Jaya University, and Serang Raya University, three private universities in the Banten Province. Online surveys distributed to participants were utilized by the researchers. The proportionate random sampling approach was used to draw a sample because it ensured that every member of the population had an equal chance of being chosen. The sample size was 211 individuals using the Taro Yamane calculation with a 5% population error rate.

Structural equation modeling (SEM) can be used to support theories or hypotheses and provide an explanation for the absence of latent variables. The SEM was employed in this work, and this technique can also be used to validate the model. The SEM results will support the existence of a link between the latent variables.

Using the latent variable score, the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) test examines all latent variables that have been processed and simplified (LVS). Because the purpose of this study is to measure unidimensional indicators from the constructs of transformational leadership, organizational commitment, organizational culture, governance, and lecturer performance, it employs the two-step approach, first- and second-order methods, in the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) test. Following confirmation factor analysis (CFA) computation and analysis, the structural model is used to investigate the validity and reliability of indicators generating latent variables (research variables), as well as the effect of variables in other path analyses. An independent (exogenous) variable's influence on a dependent (endogenous) variable can be either direct or indirect in this relationship. For this measurement model, we will make a SIMPLIS program and use Lisrel 8.8 to run the SIMPLIS program.

RESULTS

Data Analysis

In the study, questionnaires were given out to 211 respondents, who were permanent lecturers and permanent lecturers with additional responsibilities at 3 (three) private universities in Serang City. The respondent profile is shown in the following table 1.

**TABLE 1
RESPONDENT PROFILE**


Respondent Profile	Category	Sum	Percentage (%)
Gender	Man	142	67%
	Woman	69	33%
Age	≤ 30 Years	83	39%
	31 - 40 Years	48	23%
	41 - 49 Years Old	42	20%
	> 50 Years	38	18%

Respondent Profile	Category	Sum	Percentage (%)
Recent Education	S2	199	94%
	S3	12	6%
Length of Work	≤ 2 Years	49	23%
	3-9 Years	102	48%
	10-12 Years	35	17%
	≥ 13 Years	25	12%

Source: Primary data processed for this study (2022)

Based on the information gathered and processed during the study, it can be said that all construct variables have been measured for their latent scores and are fit and reliable to the measurement model using calculations and analysis of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) two-step approach at both the first level or first order and at the second level or second order. Since structural models are created by adding statements about the relationships between latent variables to the SIMPLIS computer, this structural measurement also uses a Latent Variable Score (LVS) and the SIMPLIS program. The coefficient or variable in the study is significant or influential if the structural equation's t-value (Structural Equation) is greater than or equal to 1.96. The following path diagram shows the outcomes of the t-values (T-values):

FIGURE 1
PATH DIAGRAM T-VALUES



The t-value for each path is shown in Figure 1 above. There are two types of variables: exogenous variables, which are made up of KT (Transformational Leadership), KO (Organizational Commitment), and BO (Organizational Culture). The endogenous variables also include TK (Governance) and KD (Lecturer Performance).

To evaluate the hypotheses in this study, structural equation modeling (SEM) was used. The researcher began by determining the model's goodness of fit. The fit indices suggested that the model reasonably fit the data. RMSE=0.087 shows how well the model matches the data. The seven hypotheses were evaluated using path analysis by the researcher. Table 2 displays the outcomes of the data processing.

TABLE 2
HYPOTHESIS TEST RESULT

Hypothesis/Path	Calculated t-value	Standard Coefficient	Result
H1: KT → TK	2.12	0.27	Accepted
H2: KT → KD	-0.43	0.09	Rejected
H3: KO → TK	2.41	0.48	Accepted
H4: KO → KD	3.50	1.17	Accepted
H5: BO → TK	5.55	0.65	Accepted
H6: BO → KD	0.43	0.43	Rejected
H7: TK → KD	5.27	0.57	Accepted

Discussion

Table 2 demonstrates that two of the hypotheses were not accepted and were therefore rejected, whereas five were. According to the findings of hypothesis test 1 (H1) in this study, transformational leadership has an impact on the governance of higher education, which implies that the better the transformational leadership, the more it inevitably improves the governance of private institutions. In addition, leadership and governance go hand in hand. Leadership is the act of persuading others to comprehend and concur with what has to be done and how the work is carried out efficiently, as well as the process of assisting both individual and group efforts to reach shared goals. The findings of this hypothesis demonstrate that effective transformative leadership and private university governance are inextricably linked.

According to the findings of hypothesis test 2 (H2) in this study, transformational leadership has little impact on the productivity of academics at private universities. This implies that teachers at private universities cannot perform any better under greater transformative leadership. Therefore, according to Yukl (2013) and Bass (1985), transformational leadership is a state in which the followers of a transformational leader experience trust, adoration, loyalty, and respect for the leader and are inspired to go above and beyond what they initially planned to do. The findings of this study show that administrators at private institutions have not been successful in inspiring and changing teachers to significantly raise their level of performance.

Organizational commitment has an impact on the governance of private institutions, according to the findings of hypothesis test 3 (H3) in this study. This demonstrates the high level of dedication that academics at private universities have to their organization's efforts to enhance private university governance. No matter how well the governance structure for higher education is designed, it will only function efficiently if professors are involved in it. As a result, professors who are dedicated to higher education will make an effort to participate in all organizational activities and implement sound university governance.

According to the findings of this study's fourth hypothesis test (H4), organizational commitment has an impact on the governance of private universities. This demonstrates how the high commitment of lecturer associations has enhanced the productivity of professors in private higher education. It is essential to evaluate a lecturer's performance in light of the execution of the tri dharma of higher education in each lecturer since a lecturer's commitment is tied to their desire to continue working as lecturers.

Organizational culture has an impact on the governance of private institutions, according to the findings of hypothesis test 5 (H5) in this study. This demonstrates how a college's organizational culture can enhance the college's governance. Of fact, there may be perceptual disparities between these two variables.

According to the findings of hypothesis test number six (H6) in this study, organizational culture had no bearing on the productivity of lecturers at private universities. This demonstrates that a university's organizational culture cannot enhance the performance of college lecturers. Organizational culture plays a vital role in the management and execution of private institutions, which helps to increase their general

performance. The role of lecturers in carrying out the tri dharma of higher education—teaching, research, and community service—as well as supporting activities, demonstrates this work culture.

According to the findings of hypothesis test 7 (H7), governance has an impact on the productivity of academics at private universities. This demonstrates how effective universities are at managing professors and raising lecturers' levels of performance. This indicates that effective university governance has a significant impact on these teachers' performance. As the organizing and managing tenet of good university governance (GUG), this tenet borrows from governance organizations where elements of trustworthiness, accountability, transparency, responsibility, and providing access to justice can enhance the performance of universities, including the lecturers' performances.

CONCLUSION

The uniqueness of this study is the testing of the private university governance model, which has an effect on the productivity of private university instructors. The idea of “governance” is a new value system that is beginning to be used as a benchmark for determining whether universities effectively exercise their management authority over the universities in question. It should be highlighted that there is currently no consensus on the requirements for good “governance” at universities in terms of the indicators or elements that must exist. Only one expert has said that “good governance” means putting management in place that is more responsive, proactive, open, and responsible.

The principles of good governance, specifically the governance of private universities adapted from the concept of good governance, with indicators that have been set into 5 aspects of the principles of good governance, namely, (1) accountability, (2) credibility, (3) transparency, (4) responsibility, and (5) fairness, can be adopted by university organizers as good university governance. A theoretical contribution that can be used by other institutions is the governance questionnaire of private universities. mainly because the questionnaire's questions were taken from sources that promote good governance.

The administration of private institutions has not properly embraced other elements, according to a study on the failure of transformational leadership and organizational culture to improve governance and lecturer performance. Managers don't see organizational commitment as a benefit that can improve governance and lead to better accreditation if this governance is properly implemented as internal quality.

The effectiveness of college administrators and lecturers shouldn't be impacted by corporate culture and transformative leadership, according to theory. However, organizational commitment is a factor that influences governance and lecturer performance, thus managers of private universities must pay close attention to this factor.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We appreciate the support of Banten Jaya University, Bina Bangsa University, and Serang Raya University.

REFERENCES

- Amstrong, M., Baron, A. (1998). *Performance Management*. Institute of Personal and Development.
- Astin, A.W. (1993). *Assessment for Excellence the Philosophy and Practice of Assessment in Higher Education*. The Oryx Press.
- Atmanti, H.D. (2005). Investasi Sumber Daya Manusia Melalui Pendidikan. *Dinamika Pembangunan*, 2(1), 30–39.
- Blanchard, K. (1996). *Leader of the Future*. Jossey Bass Inc.
- Blanchard, K.H., Hersey, P.H., Johnson, D.E. (1992). *Management of Organization Behavior*. Prentice Hall Inc.
- Braun, N. (2013). Transformational leadership, job satisfaction, and team performance: A multilevel mediation model of trust. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1(24), 270–283.

- Charbonnier-Voirin, A., El Akremi, A., & Vandenberghe, C. (2010). A multilevel model of transformational leadership and adaptive performance and moderating role of climate for innovation. *Group & Organization Management*, 6(35), 699–726.
- Chen, G., Kirkman, B.L., Kanfer, R., Allen, D., & Rosen, B. (2007). A multilevel study of leadership, empowerment, and performance in team. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2(92), 331.
- Churches, A. & Magin, D. (1988). What Do Student Learn From Self Assessment and Peer Assessment. *Proceedings Conference of The Australian Society for Education Strategy*, 29.
- Covey, S.R. (1992). *Principle Centered Leadership*. A Fire Book of Sihon & Schuster Inc.
- Data, P., & Tinggi, P. (2019). *Perguruan tinggi* (Vol. 2013, Iss. 1).
- Deem, R., & Lucas, L. (2007). Research and teaching cultures in two contrasting UK policy contexts: Academic life in Education Departments in five English and Scottish universities. *Higher Education*, 54(1), 115–133. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-006-9010-z>
- Dharma, A. (2006). *Manajemen Prestasi Kerja*. Rajawali Press.
- Dirwan, A. (2014). Analisis Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi Dan Komitmen Terhadap Kinerja Dosen Perguruan Tinggi Swasta. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 7(1), 133–141.
- Falchikov, N., & Boud, D. (1989). Student Self-Assessment in Higher Education: A Meta-Analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 59.
- Faleh, A.A., & As'ad, H.A. (2011). Measuring the Effect of Academic Satisfaction on Multi-Dimensional Commitment: A Case Study of Applied Science Private University in Jordan. *Journal International Business Research*, 4(2), 153–160.
- Feldman, D.C., & Arnold, H.J. (1995). *Managing Individual and Group Behavior in Organizations*. McGraw Hill Book Company.
- Firat, B., De Mul, S., Van Wichelen, S., De Mul, S., & Van Wichelen, S. (2009). *Commitment and Complicity in Cultural Theory and Practice*. Columbia University Press.
- Freund, A., & Carmeli, A. (2003). An empirical assessment: Reconstructed model for five universal forms of work commitment. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18(7), 708–725.
- Gibson, J.L. & Ivancevich, J.M. (1996). *Organization Behavior and Management*. Irwin Inc.
- Gibson, J.L., Ivancevich, J.M., Donnelly, J.H., Konopaske, R. (2003). *Organizations: Behavior, Structure, Process* (11th Ed.). McGraw Hill Company.
- Hidayat, S., & Tjahjono, H.K. (2015). Peran Etika Kerja Islam dalam Mempengaruhi Motivasi Intrinsik, Kepuasan Kerja dan Dampaknya terhadap Komitmen Organisasional (Studi Empiris pada Pondok Pesantren Modern di Banten). *Akmenika: Jurnal Akuntansi Dan Manajemen*, 12(2), 625–637.
- Hidayat, S., Rohaeni, N., & Saleh, M. (2018). Gaya kepemimpinan, motivasi kerja dan kinerja guru di pondok pesantren. *Jurnal Bina Bangsa Ekonomika*, 9(1), 9–17.
- Hogan, S.J., & Coote, L.V. (2014). Organizational culture, innovation, and performance: A test of Schein's model. *Journal of Business Research*, 8(67), 1609–1621.
- Holert, T. (2016). Lecture Performance. *Pop*, 5(2), 64–68. <https://doi.org/10.14361/pop-2016-0210>
- Jaros, S. (2007). Meyer and Allen Model of Organizational Commitment: Measurement Issues. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 6, 7–26.
- Khumarga, D. (2004). Good Governance di Perguruan Tinggi. *UNJ Jakarta*, 5.
- Kreitner, R., & Kinicki, A. (2012). *Organizational Behavior*. Mc Graw-Hill Education.
- Kumar dan Eng., R. (2012). Perceived Organizational Commitment and its Impact to the Turn Over Intention: Correlation Analysis. *Journal of Global Business and Economic*, 4(1).
- Kusdibyo. (2021). Kepemimpinan Dan Kinerja Dosen Dalam Peningkatan Mutu Pendidikan Pada Perguruan Tinggi Maritim. *Jurnal Sains Teknologi Transportasi Maritim*, 3(2), 10–18. <https://doi.org/10.51578/j.sitektransmar.v3i2.38>
- Lewis, R.G., & Smith, D.H. (1994). *Total Quality in Higher Education*. St Lucie Press.
- Lunenburg, F.C. (2011). Organizational culture performance relationship: Views of excellence and theory. *Z. National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervisi Journal*, 4(29), 1–10.
- Maryoto, S. (2000). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. BPFE UGM.
- Meyer, A. (1997). *Commitment in the Workplace (Theory Research and Application)*.

- Meyer, J.P., Allen, N.J., & Smith, C.A. (2002). Commitment to Organizational and Occupations Extension and Test of Three-Component Conceptualization. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61, 20–52.
- Milder, P. (2011). Teaching as art: The contemporary lecture-performance. *PAJ - Journal of Performance and Art*, 33(1), 13–27. https://doi.org/10.1162/PAJJ_a_00019
- Miller, R.I. (1974). Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluation. *Josey Base Publishers*, 224.
- Mondy, R.W., Noe, R.M., Premeaux, S.R. (1993). *Human Resource Management*. Allyn and Bacon A Division of Simon & Schuster, Inc.
- Mowday, R.T., Steers, R.M., & Porter, L.W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14(2), 224–247. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(79\)90072-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(79)90072-1)
- Naor, M., Linderman, K., & Schroeder, R. (2010). The Globalization of Operations In Eastern and Western Countries; Unpacking the relationship between national and organizational culture and its impact on manufacturing performance. *Journal of Operations Management*, 3(28), 194–205.
- Nawawi, H. (2003). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia* (Kelima). Gajah Mada University Press.
- Ndraha, T. (2002). *Teori Budaya Organisasi*. PT. Rineka Cipta.
- Nohe, C., Michaelis, B., Menges, J.I., Zhang, Z., & Sonntag, K. (2013). Charisma and organizational change ; A multilevel study of perceived charisma, commitment to change, and team performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 2(24), 378–389.
- Noruzi, A., Dalfard, V.M., Azhdari, B., & Nazari-Shirkouhi, S. & Rezazadeh, A. (2013). Relation between transformational leadership, organizational learning, knowledge management, organizational innovation, and organizational performance and empirical investigation of manufacturing firms. *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, 64(5–8), 1073–1085.
- Pradana, A.S., Hakim, M.S., dan Kunaifi, A. (2018). Gaya Kepemimpinan Mayoritas Di Perguruan Tinggi X. *Sain Dan Seni POMITS*, 7.
- Prokopenko, J. (1987). *Productivity Management*. International Labour Office.
- Purwanto, A., Wijayanti, L.M., Hyun, C.C., & Asbari, M. (2020). The Effect of Transformational, Transactional, Authentic and Authoritarian Leadership Style Toward Lecture Performance of Private University in Tangerang. *Dinasti International Journal of Digital Business Management*, 1(1), 29–42. <https://doi.org/10.31933/dijdbm.v1i1.88>
- Rahmah, N. (2016). Strategi Pimpinan Dalam Peningkatan Budaya Kerja Dosen di Perguruan Tinggi. *Jurnal Pusaka*, 3(2), 47–67.
- Razak, Y., Syah, D., & Aziz, Abd. (2017). Kepemimpinan, Kinerja Dosen Dalam Peningkatan Mutu Pendidikan Perguruan Tinggi. *Tanzhim*, 1(2), 33–44. <https://doi.org/10.51578/j.sitektransmar.v3i2.38>
- Rivai, V. (2007). *Kepemimpinan dan Perilaku Organisasi*. Rajawali Press.
- Rivai, V.H., & Murni, S. (2009). *Education Management Analysis Theory and Practice*. Rajawali Press.
- Robbin, S.P., & Judge, T.A. (2012). *Organizational Behavior*. Prentice Hall.
- Rohmah, N. (2016). Strategi Pimpinan Dalam Peningkatan Budaya Kerja Dosen Di Perguruan Tinggi. *Jurnal Penelitian Dan Pengukuran Psikologi Pustaka*.
- Sabandar, S.Y., Tawe, A., & Musa, C.I. (2018). The implementation of Good University Governance in the Private Universities in Makassar (Indonesia). *Espacios*, 39(2).
- Sackman, S. (1991). Uncovering Culture in Organizations. *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 27(3), 295–317.
- Salvioni, D.M., Franzoni, S., & Cassano, R. (2017). Sustainability in the Higher Education System: An Opportunity to Improve Quality and Image. *Sustainability*, 9(6), 914. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su9060914>
- Seldin, P. (1984). *Changing Practices in Faculty Evaluation*, 36.
- Siagian, S.P. (2003). *Teori & Praktek Kepemimpinan*. Rineka Cipta.
- Siregar, C.N. (2010). Peran Sosial, Ekonomi dan Budaya Masyarakat dalam Meningkatkan Keamanan di Kabupaten Natuna Provinsi Kepulauan Riau. *Jurnal Sositologi*, 9(21), 945–956.

- Solinger, O.N., van Olffen, W., & Roe, R.A. (2008). Beyond the Three-Component Model of Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(1), 70–83. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.70>
- Stolovitch, H.D., & Keeps, E.J. (2006). *Handbook of Human Performance Technology: Principles, Practices, and Potential*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Sukamto, T. (1994). *Evaluasi Diri Demi Peningkatan Mutu Pendidikan*. IKIP Press.
- Suryadi, E. (2003). *Kepemimpinan Transformasi dan Budaya Organisasi*. Manajerial.
- Triguno. (2004). *Budaya Kerja, Menciptakan Lingkungan yang Kondusif untuk Meningkatkan Produktivitas Kerja*. Golden Terayon.
- Ulrich, D. (1998). *Human Resources Champion*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Werther, W.B., & Davis, K. (1996). *Human Resources and Personnel Management*. McGraw-Hill.
- Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial Leadership: A Review of Theory and Research. *Journal of Management*, 15(2), 251–289. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920638901500207>