

Lecturer's View on Higher Education Performance: A Study at Public Universities in Indonesia

Andi Arif Rifa'i

Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Mas Said Surakarta

Moh. Ashif Fuadi

Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Mas Said Surakarta

Supriyanto

Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Mas Said Surakarta

Moh. Mahbub

Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Mas Said Surakarta

Dewi Zulaiha

Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta

This study aims to describe the performance of higher education organizations based on the views or assessments by lecturers. This research design is in the form of a survey, with research samples coming from five universities in Bangka Belitung, Indonesia. Samples were taken randomly with a total of 155 lecturers. The research results are based on five main dimensions, namely; human resources effectiveness and efficiency (mean= 3.2821/ moderate category), focus on process (mean= 3.0527/ moderate category), structural transformation (mean= 3.3206/ moderate category), teamwork (mean= 3.1811/ moderate category), and organizational strategy (mean= 3.3237/ moderate category). The results suggested to improve lecturers' performance by strengthening aspects such as organizational leadership, organizational commitment, organizational culture, and organizational quality management.

Keyword: higher education performance, public universities, Indonesia

INTRODUCTION

The Indonesian Central Statistics Agency (BPS/Badan Pusat Statistik) in 2021 noted that the Human Development Index (IPM) experienced a slowdown of 0.49% compared to 2020 (Saputra, 2021). Meanwhile, based on the report from UNDP in HDR 2020, Indonesia's HDI index score of 0.718 is ranked 107 out of 189 countries (<https://hdr.undp.org/en/data>). Both data show that human resource development efforts in Indonesia are not yet optimal. This condition, in the future, will have an impact on Indonesia's economic growth and global competitiveness in the world arena.

The problem above indirectly highlighted education quality of higher education. Higher education plays an important role in supporting economic growth and global competitiveness (ESG, 2015). In addition, universities also play an important role in social improvement (Zhang et al., 2020) and sustainable human resource development (Aleixo et al., 2021). Therefore, it is necessary to evaluate (research) the performance of universities to develop future strategies and improve organisational performance (Jalaliyoon & Taherdoost, 2012). Organisational performance can be seen as the organisation's capacity to identify and implement appropriate strategies for its goals (Maâlej, Louati, & Affes, 2015).

In developing a strategy to improve the performance of higher education institutions (HEIs), the main concern is the human resources of HEIs. The most important changes in higher education and especially in higher education organizations are changes on the human side, namely: changes in people's attitudes, values, beliefs, and feelings (Ş. Zlate & Enache, 2015). In line with that, one of the efforts to improve organizational performance or the main strategy of higher education management is to motivate its employees (S. Zlate & Cucui, 2015). Apart from that, human resources (HR) commitment is also needed to encourage higher education innovation and impact organizational performance (Sugiono, 2019). In line with that, Schermerhorn, Jr., Hunt and Osborn call it the term effectiveness of the organization's HR, which can realize its capabilities to deliver sustainable high-performance results (Schermerhorn, Jr., Hunt, & Osborn, 2002).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Performance is an important variable in every organisation that becomes a benchmark for the organisation's success. Its performance describes the level of effectiveness and efficiency of using existing resources (Berman, 2006:9), according to Daft, the effective and efficient use of these resources can be described the organisation's ability to achieve its goals effectively and efficiently (Shahzad, Luqman, Khan, & Shabbir, 2012:979).

Ken Blanchard sees organizational performance as an effort to achieve organizational goals (Usman, 2011). Therefore, the team's efforts in achieving organizational goals must be maintained. In line with that, a high-performing organization can transform its structure and how it works (Holbeche, 2005). In the management system, the transformation is the transformation of inputs into outputs to achieve several outputs (outcomes). Performance is also an illustration of the relationship between minimal cost and effective cost (economy), between effective cost and output realization (efficiency) and between output and outcome achievement (effectiveness) (Hurduzeu, 2015).

An important performance position in an organization, making organizational performance measurement a part of the institution's quality improvement program (Berman, 2006). The benefit of conducting an assessment of performance is to obtain information regarding whether there is an increase in performance (Berman, 2006). Therefore, it is necessary to continuously evaluate the performance of an organization or university to obtain information related to performance and be useful for formulating organizational strategy.

Organizational performance assessment can be grouped into two categories, namely assumptions and measurement focus (Berger & Berger, 2004). Concerning the assumptions and focus of measuring the performance of higher education organizations, this study adopts the dimensions that have been developed by several experts (researchers). The researchers in the field of organizational performance have an agreement in measuring organizational performance on the following aspects:

- 1) Human Resources (HR); involvement, development or empowerment of awards or recognition and appreciation, and respect.
- 2) Process; process focus, customer focus, innovation, and information quality.
- 3) Structure; structure or design flexibility, learning organization and management responsibilities.
- 4) Teamwork; independent team and individual roles.
- 5) Strategy; technology integration, integrated quality management, optimal productivity, external orientation and organizational goals.

Based on several opinions, theories and concepts above, the performance of higher education organizations (PT) in this study is defined as the organization's ability to streamline human resources, processes, structures, teamwork and strategies to achieve goals following customer expectations. The organizational performance of PT is measured using the dimensions as shown in table 1 below:

TABLE 1
DIMENSIONS AND INDICATORS OF HEIS PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

No.	Dimensions of Higher Education Performance	Higher Education Performance Indicators
1.	Effectiveness and Efficiency of Human Resources	1) Decision making is always delegated to all elements in the university. 2) The university management is open to receiving input from all employees. 3) All employees need to manage themselves as part of the organization. 4) Employee involvement and self-management are always encouraged in every job.
2.	Focus on process	1) External customer needs (Parents, the world of work and others) are the focus of Higher Education (HE). 2) Report to everyone financial and non-financial information needed to encourage improvement. 3) Continue to innovate products, processes and services (Employees believe that to be competitive they must continue to innovate). 4) Creating highly interactive internal communication.
3.	Structure Transformation	1) All elements in Higher Education are encouraged to have knowledge and expertise in their field of duty. 2) Every service to higher education stakeholders (students) is based on information technology (using IT). 3) Learning organizations are built and empowered to deal with the changes in Higher Education (HE). 4) Stimulate cross-functional and cross-organizational collaboration.
4.	Teamwork	1) Work teams (committees) in each activity are empowered to make decisions. 2) All potential (members) are utilized/used synergistically. 3) All members have the opportunity to develop and excel.
5.	Strategy	1) In providing services, universities use technology that is integrated with resources, knowledge and techniques 2) All information is stored in a database that can deal with new situations. 3) Higher Education Organizations prioritize the total commitment of all supporting their elements. 4) Continuous improvement is pursued by the management of Higher Education (HE) to ensure the program's sustainability. 5) The needs of internal customers (lecturers, education personnel and students) are the main focus to be met by universities. 6) Balance long term focus and short-term focus.

(Berger & Berger, 2004)

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study applies quantitative research with a survey design. This research aims to describe the performance of higher education institutions from the lecturer's point of view. This study uses an instrument in a questionnaire for data collection. The research sample was taken randomly, while the total sample was 155 lecturers from 5 universities in the archipelagic province of Bangka Belitung, Indonesia. Data analysis used the average calculation to find out the description of respondents' answers. In concluding the average in this study, refers to table 2 below:

TABLE 2
CONCLUSION CRITERIA BASED ON INTERVAL CLASS

Interval Class	Conclusion Category
1,00 – 1,78	Very low
1,79 – 2,56	Low
2,57 – 3,34	Moderate
3,35 – 4,12	High
4,13 – 4,90	Very high

RESULTS

Research Respondents

The respondents of this study came from 5 State Universities (public universities) in the Province of the Bangka Belitung Islands, Indonesia. The five public universities are under the coordination of different ministries, namely; the University of Bangka Belitung (UBB) and Polman Negeri Bangka Belitung are under the coordination of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology, while IAIN Syaikh Abdurrahman Siddik (SAS) Bangka Belitung is under the coordination of the Ministry of Religious Affairs (MoRA), Poltekkes Kemenkes Pangkalpinang and Akper Belitung under the coordination of the Ministry of Health. The descriptions of research respondents can be described in more detail in the following explanation:

TABLE 3
DISTRIBUTION OF RESEARCH RESPONDENTS

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Gender				
Male	88	56.8	56.8	56.8
Female	67	43.2	43.2	100.0
Total	155	100.0	100.0	
Age				
<i>missing</i>	6	3.9	3.9	3.9
20 - 25 years	11	7.1	7.1	11.0
26 - 30 years	46	29.7	29.7	40.6
36 - 40 years	34	21.9	21.9	62.6
36 - 40 years	25	16.1	16.1	78.7
> 40 years	33	21.3	21.3	100.0
Total	155	100.0	100.0	

Higher Education Institutions (HEI's)				
IAIN Syaikh Abdurrahman Siddik (SAS) Bangka Belitung	28	18.1	18.1	18.1
Akper Pemkab Belitung	15	9.7	9.7	27.7
Poltekes Kemenkes Pangkalpinang	12	7.7	7.7	35.5
Polman Negeri Bangka Belitung	16	10.3	10.3	45.8
Universitas Bangka Belitung (UBB)	84	54.2	54.2	100.0
Total	155	100.0	100.0	
Length of work				
<i>missing</i>	11	7.1	7.1	7.1
1 - 5 years	72	46.5	46.5	53.5
6 - 10 years	36	23.2	23.2	76.8
11 - 15 years	27	17.4	17.4	94.2
16 - 20 years	4	2.6	2.6	96.8
> 20 years	5	3.2	3.2	100.0
Total	155	100.0	100.0	

Based on the data distribution in table 3, the percentage of male respondents is 56.8%, while female respondents are 43.2%. The data shows that the difference in the percentage between male and female respondents is 13.6%. So, the respondents are balanced between men and women.

Based on the origin of the university, table 3 shows that as many as 54.2% of respondents came from UBB, which this university has 5 faculties and 23 study programs and is the largest university in the Province of Bangka Belitung Islands. While 28% of respondents came from IAIN Syaikh Abdurrahman Siddik (SAS), which is a public university which has 3 faculties and a Postgraduate Program with 11 study programs, 16% of respondents came from the Polman Negeri Bangka Belitung (Bangka Belitung State Manufacturing Polytechnic), which has two majors with 5 Diploma study programs, 15% of respondents are from Akper Pemkab Belitung (only has Diploma Nursing study program), while 12% of respondents from Poltekes Kemenkes Pangkalpinang have 5 study programs. The data on the distribution of the respondents in this study were spread across 5 public universities at once in 44 study programs.

Based on the years of service (in table 3), the respondents in this study were in the range of 1 – 15 years (87.1%), which consisted of; a working period of 1 – 5 years is 46.5%, 6 – 10 years is 23.2%, and 11 – 15 years is 17.4%. Meanwhile, 2.6% of respondents had 16-20 years of service, 3.2% of respondents with more than 20 years of service, and 7.1% of respondents did not mention how long they had worked but gave a perfect response.

Lecturer's Response on the Performance of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs)

**TABLE 4
LECTURER'S VIEW ON HIGHER EDUCATION PERFORMANCE**

Higher Institution Performance Indicators (HEI's)	SD	Mean	Conclusion Category
Delegation of decisions	0.88360	3.2668	moderate
Openness to criticism	0.92786	3.1865	moderate
Awareness of being part of the organization	0.86921	3.3483	high
Encouraging Employee Engagement and self-management	0.80401	3.3268	moderate

Human resource involvement		3.2821	moderate
Fulfilment of external customer needs	0.90657	3.2700	moderate
Disclosure of financial and non-financial information	0.98543	2.6253	moderate
Employee innovation ability	0.86968	3.1467	moderate
Creation of effective internal communication	0.89178	3.1689	moderate
Focus on process		3.0527	moderate
Placement of employees according to knowledge and expertise	0.99223	3.3237	moderate
Utilization of IT (Information Technology) for ease of service	0.95115	3.4141	moderate
Build and empower the ability to think and act as a team to face change	0.82291	3.2042	moderate
Cross-functional and organizational collaboration	0.82291	3.3405	moderate
Structure transformation		3.3206	moderate
Team empowerment	0.88104	3.0792	moderate
Potential utilization	0.91268	3.2407	moderate
Opportunity for growth and achievement	0.96729	3.2744	moderate
Teamwork		3.1981	moderate
Integration of technology with resources, knowledge and techniques	0.92830	3.2563	moderate
Information storage management	0.91430	3.3947	moderate
Total employee commitment	0.85161	3.2073	moderate
Continuous improvement to ensure the sustainability of the program	0.89388	3.5010	high
Fulfilment of stakeholder needs	0.90657	3.2700	moderate
Balance short term and long term focus	0.92090	3.3131	moderate
Strategy		3.3237	moderate

Human Resources (HR) Involvement

Based on table 4, it can be concluded as follows:

- 1) The mean (average) value of decision delegation is 3.2668, which is in the class interval 2.57 – 3.34 (see table 2) in the moderate category.
- 2) The mean (average) value of openness to criticism is 3.1865, which means it is in the class interval 2.57 – 3.34 (see table 2) in the moderate category.
- 3) The mean (average) value of awareness of being part of the organization is 3.3483 (rounded to 3.35), which means that in the class interval 3.35 – 4.12 (see table 2), it is in the high category.
- 4) The mean value (average) of involvement in self-management is 3.3268, which means that it is in the class interval 2.57 – 3.34 (see table 2) in the moderate category.
- 5) The mean (average) dimension of HR involvement of 3.2821 is in the moderate category.

Focus on Process (Needs Fulfilment, Openness, Innovation and Communication)

Based on table 4, it can be concluded as follows:

- 1) The mean (average) value of meeting the needs of external customers is 3.2700, which means that it is in the class interval of 2.57 – 3.34 (see table 2) in the moderate category.
- 2) The mean (average) value of financial and non-financial information disclosure is 2.6253, which means that it is in the class interval of 2.57 – 3.34 (see table 2) in the moderate category.
- 3) The mean (average) value of employee innovation ability is 3.1467, which means that it is in the class interval 2.57 – 3.34 (see table 2) in the moderate category.

- 4) The mean value (average) of creating effective internal communication is 3.1689, which means that it is in the class interval of 2.57 – 3.34 (see table 2) in the moderate category.
- 5) The mean (average) dimension of focus on the organizational performance variable process of 3.0527 is in the moderate category.

Structural Transformation (Employment Placement, IT Utilization, Encouraging Organizational Learning, and Collaboration)

Based on table 4 above, it can be concluded as follows:

- 1) The mean (average) value of knowledge and expertise is 3.3237, which is in the class interval of 2.57 – 3.34 (see table 2) in the moderate category.
- 2) The mean (average) use of IT (Information Technology) by and for the convenience of services is 3.4141, which means that it is in the class interval 2.57 – 3.34 (see table 2) in the moderate category.
- 3) The mean (average) value of building and empowering the team's thinking and acting skills to deal with change is 3.2042, which means it is in the moderate class interval of 2.57 – 3.34 (see table 2) category.
- 4) The mean value (average) of cross-functional and organizational collaboration is 3.3405, which means that it is in the class interval 2.57 – 3.34 (see table 2) in the moderate category.
- 5) The mean (average) dimension of the organizational performance variable structure transformation of 3.3206 is in the moderate category.

Teamwork (Empowerment, Utilization of Potential and Equal Opportunities)

Based on table 4 above, it can be concluded as follows:

- 1) The mean (average) value of team empowerment is 3.0792, which is in the class interval of 2.57 – 3.34 (see table 2) in the moderate category.
- 2) The mean (average) value of potential utilization is 3.2407, which means it is in the class interval 2.57 – 3.34 (see table 2) in the moderate category.
- 3) The mean (average) opportunity for development and achievement is 3.2744, which means that it is in the moderate category in the class interval 2.57 – 3.34 (see table 2).
- 4) The average value (mean) of the teamwork dimension of the organizational performance variable is 3.1981, which means that it is in the class interval 2.57 – 3.34 (see table 2) in the moderate category.

Strategy (Technology Integration, Information Management, Total Commitment, Continuous Improvement, Meeting Customer Needs and Balancing Short-Term and Long-Term Goals)

Based on table 4 above, it can be concluded as follows:

- 1) The mean (average) value of knowledge and technique is 3.2563, which is in the class interval of 2.57 – 3.34 (see table 2) in the moderate category.
- 2) The mean (average) value for managing information storage is 3.3947, which means that in the class interval 2.57 – 3.34 (see table 2), it is in the moderate category.
- 3) The mean value (average) of total employee commitment is 3.2073, which means that it is in the class interval 2.57 – 3.34 (see table 2) in the moderate category.
- 4) The mean value (average) of continuous improvement to ensure the program's sustainability is 3.501, which means that it is in the 3.35-4.12 class interval (see table 2) in the high category.
- 5) The mean (average) value of meeting the needs of stakeholders is 3.270, which means that it is in the class interval of 2.57 – 3.34 (see table 2) in the moderate category.
- 6) The mean (average) value of meeting the needs of stakeholders is 3.3131, which means that it is in the class interval of 2.57 – 3.34 (see table 2) in the moderate category.
- 7) The mean (average) strategic dimension of the organizational performance variable is 3.3237, which means that it is in the class interval 2.57 – 3.34 (see table 3) in the moderate category.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Organizational performance is the organization's ability to make effective resources, processes, structures, teamwork and strategies to achieve goals following customer expectations. The target of organizational performance is said to be of quality if it matches or exceeds the expectations of its customers (Mishra, 2006:11). The college customers can be internal (educators, education staff, and students) and external (parents, the world of work, and others).

From the results of the descriptive analysis of the data analysis above, seen from the five dimensions, the performance of the higher education organization is in the medium category, meaning that its performance is not optimal. In terms of the effectiveness and efficiency of human resources, it shows that the placement of human resources as an important source to realize capabilities, as stated by Schermerhorn Jr (Schermerhorn, Jr., Hunt, & Osborn, 2002), has not been carried out properly, so that the delegation of decisions, openness in receiving input, the active role of all elements and their involvement has not been maximized optimally.

Meanwhile, universities have not been maximal in terms of focusing on the process, fulfilling internal and external customer needs, disclosing information (financial and non-financial), encouraging innovation, and creating good internal communication. In addition, work teams have not yet been built, and the potential utilization and the provision of opportunities for the development and achievement of all elements of HEIs have not been maximized. Utilization of information technology, total commitment, and balancing long-term and short-term focus as an organizational strategy has not been carried out optimally. They concluded that the organizational performance of HEIs is not as expected.

Management studies experts agree that organizational performance is an important variable to continue studying or researching. This variable cannot stand alone or appear by itself without the supporting variables. The main weakness that is the cause of the non-optimal strategic process of the institution, which has an impact on organizational performance is not optimal, is the lack of funding (O Shea & O Hara, 2020). Based on several variables that affect organizational performance above, the variables that determine organizational performance are; HEIs quality assurance (HEIs internal quality assurance), quality leadership, quality commitment and quality culture.

The variables that affect organizational performance (directly or indirectly) based on various theories and research results are as follows;

TABLE 6
VARIABLES AFFECTING ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE

No	Variables	Sources
1	Culture	(Aluko, 2003)
	Organisational culture	(Naranjo-valencia et al., 2016) (Jacobs et al., 2013), (Shahzad et al., 2012), (Ng'ang'a & Nyongesa, 2012), (Soedjono, 2005)
	Higher education organizational culture	(Ehtesham et al., 2011) (Imam et al., 2013)
	Learning organisation culture quality culture	(Hussein, Omar, Noordin, & Amir, 2016) (Ullah et al., 2016)
2	Organisational commitment	(Simons & Rowland, 2011), (Irefin & Mechanic, 2014)
	Higher organisation commitment	(Jing & Zhang, 2013)
	Commitment to superior	(Zehir et al., 2012)
	Total quality commitment	(Wagar & Rondeau, 1998)

3	Leadership	(Kuria et al., 2016) (Idrus et al., 2014)
	Transformational leadership	(Madanchian et al., 2003) (Koech & Namusonge, 2012), (Ebrahimi et al., 2016), (Zehir et al., 2012), (García-morales et al., 2012)
	Transactional leadership	(Koech & Namusonge, 2012), (Ebrahimi et al., 2016), (Zehir et al., 2012)
	Leadership style	(Zehir et al., 2011) (Timothy et al., 2011)
	Leadership effectiveness	(Popa, 2012)
4	Quality Management Practice (QMP)	(Romle et al., 2015)
	Total Quality Management (TQM)	(Ngambi & Nkemkiafu, 2015) (Alamri et al., 2014)
5	Human resource management strategy	(Sani, 2012)
6	Organisational innovation	(Hussein, Omar, Noordin, & Ishak, 2016), (Naranjo-valencia et al., 2016), (Ebrahimi et al., 2016), (Maâlej et al., 2015)
7	Training and development	(Ghafoor et al., 2011)
8	Internal sources of knowledge	(Maâlej et al., 2015)
9	Organization learning	(García-morales et al., 2012)
10	Knowledge management	(Slavković & Babić, 2013), (Gholami et al., 2013)

In this study, the performance of higher education organizations is assessed based on five main dimensions, namely, HR effectiveness and efficiency, focus on process, structure transformation, teamwork and strategy. Based on the results of the data analysis, the description of the five dimensions:

- 1) The mean (average) dimension of HR effectiveness and efficiency (HR involvement and involvement) of 3.2821 is in the medium category.
- 2) The mean (average) dimension of focus on the organizational performance variable process of 3.0527 is included in the category medium.
- 3) The mean (average) dimension of organizational performance variable structure transformation of 3.3206 is in the medium category.
- 4) The average value (mean) of the teamwork dimension of 3.1981 is in the medium category.
- 5) The value of mean (average) of the strategy dimension is 3.3237, which means it is in the medium category.

Based on analysis of lecturer's response (view) regarding HEI's or the university's performance, it can be concluded that of the five dimensions of organizational performance, all of them are in the medium category, so there is a need for a university strategy to improve its performance. Performance determinants that can take into account include; organizational culture, organizational commitment, organizational leadership and organizational quality management.

REFERENCES

- Alamri, A.M., Alharthi, A.M., Alharthi, D.K., Saleh, W., & Hasan, S.H. (2014). Organization Performance Improvement using TQM. *International Journal of Computer Applications*, 108(9), 29–33.
- Aleixo, A.M., Leal, S., & Azeiteiro, U.M. (2021). Higher education students' perceptions of sustainable development in Portugal. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 327, 129429. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.129429>
- Aluko, M.A.O. (2003). The Impact of Culture on Organizational Performance in Selected Textile Firms in Nigeria. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, 12(2), 164–179.

- Berger, L.A., & Berger, D.R. (Eds.). (2004). *The Talent Management Handbook Creating Organizational Excellence by Identifying, Developing, and Promoting Your Best People*. McGraw-Hill.
- Berman, E.M. (2006). *Performance and Productivity in Public and Nonprofit Organizations* (Second). M.E. Sharpe, Inc. All.
- Ebrahimi, P., Moosavi, S.M., & Chirani, E. (2016). Relationship between Leadership Styles and Organizational Performance by Considering Innovation in Manufacturing Companies of Guilan Province. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 230, 351–358.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.09.044>
- Ehtesham, U.M., Muhammad, T.M., & Muhammad, S.A. (2011). Relationship between Organizational Culture and Performance Management Practices : A Case of University in Pakistan. *Journal of Competitiveness*, 4, 78–86.
- García-morales, V.J., Jiménez-barrionuevo, M.M., & Gutiérrez-gutiérrez, L. (2012). Transformational Leadership Influence on Organizational Performance Through Organizational Learning and Innovation. *Journal of Business Research*, 65(7), 1040–1050.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.03.005>
- Ghafoor, A., Ahmed, F., & Aslam, M. (2011). Impact of Training and Development on Organizational Performance. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 11(7), 63–68.
- Gholami, M.H., Asli, M.N., Nazari-Shirkouhi, S., & Noruzy, A. (2013). Investigating the Influence of Knowledge Management Practices on Organizational Performance: An Empirical Study. *Acta Polytechnica Hungarica*, 10(2), 205–216.
- Holbeche, L. (2005). *The High Performance Organization: Creating Dynamic Stability and Sustainable Success* (First). Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Hurduzeu, R. (2015). The Impact of Leadership on Organizational Performance. *SEA - Practical Application of Science*, III(1), 289–294.
- Hussein, N., Omar, S., Noordin, F., & Amir, N. (2016). Learning Organization Culture , Organizational Performance and Organizational Innovativeness in a Public Institution of Higher Education in Malaysia : A Preliminary Study. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 37(16), 512–519.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671\(16\)30159-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(16)30159-9)
- Hussein, N., Omar, S., Noordin, F., & Ishak, N.A. (2016). Organizational Innovativeness as Predictors to Organizational Performance of Public Universities in Malaysia. In C.Y. Fook (Ed.), *7th International Conference on University Learning and Teaching (InCULT 2014) Proceedings* (pp. 453–463). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-664-5>
- Idrus, A., Armanu, Sudiro, A., & Rohman, F. (2014). The Influence of Bureaucratic Leadership, Organizational Culture and Organizational Commitment of Organizational Performance (A Study on SKPD Financial Managers in Jayapura Government). *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 5(11), 189–201.
- Imam, A., Abbasi, A.S., Muneer, S., & Qadri, M.M. (2013). Organizational Culture and Performance of Higher Educational Institutions: The Mediating Role of Individual Readiness for Change. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 5(20), 23–35.
- Irefin, P., & Mechanic, M.A. (2014). Effect of Employee Commitment on Organizational Performance in Coca Cola Nigeria Limited Maiduguri , Borno State. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 19(3), 33–41.
- Jacobs, R., Mannion, R., Davies, H.T.O., Harrison, S., & Konteh, F. (2013). The relationship between organizational culture and performance in acute hospitals. *Social Science & Medicine*, 76, 115–125. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2012.10.014>
- Jalaliyoon, N., & Taherdoost, H. (2012). Performance Evaluation of Higher Education; A Necessity. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 5682–5686.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.497>
- Jing, L., & Zhang, D. (2013). Does Organizational Commitment Help to Promote University Faculty's Performance and Effectiveness? *Asia-Pacific Edu Res*, 23, 201–212.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-013-0097-6>

- Koech, P.M., & Namusonge, G.S. (2012). The Effect of Leadership Styles on Organizational Performance at State Corporations in Kenya. *International Journal of Business and Commerce*, 2(1), 1–12.
- Kuria, L.K., Namusonge, G.S., & Iravo, M. (2016). Effect of Leadership on Organizational Performance in the Health Sector in Kenya. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 6(7), 658–663.
- Maâlej, R.B.Z., Louati, H., & Affes, H. (2015). The Relationship Between Organizational Innovations, Internal Sources of Knowledge and Organizational Performance. *International Journal of Managing Value and Supply Chains (IJMVSC)*, 6(1), 53–67. <https://doi.org/10.5121/ijmvsc.2015.6105>
- Madanchian, M., Hussein, N., Noordin, F., & Taherdoost, H. (2003). Effects of Leadership on Organizational Performance. *Economics and Education*, pp. 115–119.
- Naranjo-valencia, J.C., Jiménez-jiménez, D., & Sanz-valle, R. (2016). Studying the links between organizational culture, innovation, and performance in Spanish companies. *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología*, 48, 30–41.
- Ng'ang'a, J.M., & Nyongesa, W.J. (2012). The Impact of Organisational Culture on Performance of Educational Institutions. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(8), 211–217.
- Ngambi, M.T., & Nkemkiafu, A.G. (2015). The Impact of Total Quality Management on Firm's Organizational Performance. *American Journal of Management*, 15(4), 69–85.
- O Shea, S., & O Hara, J. (2020). The impact of Ireland's new higher education system performance framework on institutional planning towards the related policy objectives. *Higher Education*, 80(2), 335–351. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-019-00482-5>
- Popa, B.M. (2012). The Relationship Between Leadership Effectiveness and Organizational Performance. *Journal of Defense Resources Management*, 3(1), 123–127.
- Romle, A.R., Razak, R.C., & Shamsudin, A.S. (2015). Mapping the Relationships between Quality Management Practices, Human-Oriented Elements and Organizational Performance: A Proposed Framework. *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, 6(3). <https://doi.org/10.7763/IJIMT.2015.V6.601>
- Sani, A.D. (2012). Strategic Human Resource Management and Organizational Performance in The Nigerian Insurance Industry: The Impact of Organizational. *Business Intelligence Journal*, 5(1), 8–20.
- Saputra, D. (2021, November 16). *Indeks Pembangunan Manusia 2021 Tumbuh Melambat, Kok Bisa?* Bisnis.Com. Retrieved from <https://ekonomi.bisnis.com/read/20211116/9/1466566/indeks-pembangunan-manusia-2021-tumbuh-melambat-kok-bisa>
- Schermerhorn, J.R., Jr., Hunt, J.G., & Osborn, R.N. (2002). *Organizational Behavior* (Seventh). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Shahzad, F., Luqman, R.A., Khan, A.R., & Shabbir, L. (2012). Impact of Organizational Culture on Organizational Performance: An Overview. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 3(9), 975–985.
- Simons, S.M., & Rowland, K.N. (2011). Diversity and its Impact on Organizational Performance: The Influence of Diversity Constructions on Expectations and Outcomes. *Journal of Technology Management & Innovation*, 6(3), 171–183.
- Slavković, M., & Babić, V. (2013). Knowledge Management, Innovativeness, and Organizational Performance: Evidence From Serbia. *Economic Annals*, LVIII(199), 85–108. <https://doi.org/10.2298/EKA1399085S>
- Soedjono. (2005). Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi Terhadap Kinerja Organisasi dan Kepuasan Kerja Karyawan pada Terminal Penumpang Umum di Surabaya. *Jurnal Manajemen & Kewirausahaan*, 7(1), 22–47.
- Sugiono, E. (2019). Strategi peningkatan kinerja perguruan tinggi swasta: Peranan budaya inovasi, pembelajaran dan komitmen organisasi. *Forum Ekonomi*, 21(1), 53–66. <http://dx.doi.org/10.29264/jfor.v21i1.5222>

- Timothy, O., Okwu, A.T., Akpa, V.O., & Nwankwere, I.A. (2011). Effects of Leadership Style on Organizational Performance: A Survey of Selected Small Scale Enterprises in Ikosi-Ketu Council Development Area of Lagos State, Nigeria. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1(7), 100–111.
- Ullah, A., Akhtar, N., & Malik, M.T. (2016). Relationship Between Quality Culture and Organizational Performance With Mediating Effect of Competitive Advantage. *Al-Idah*, 32, 76–86.
- Wagar, T.H., & Rondeau, K.V. (1998). Total Quality Commitment and Performance in Canadian Health Care Organisations. *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*, 11(4), 1–5.
- Zehir, C., Gülen, Ö., Zehir, S., & Müceldili, B. (2011). The Effects of Leadership Styles and Organizational Culture over Firm Performance: Multi-National Companies in Istanbul. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 24, 1460–1474. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.09.032>
- Zehir, C., Sehitoglu, Y., & Erdogan, E. (2012). The Effect of Leadership and Supervisory Commitment to Organizational Performance. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 58, 207–216. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.994>
- Zhang, G., Wu, J., & Zhu, Q. (2020). Performance evaluation and enrollment quota allocation for higher education institutions in China. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 81, 101821. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2020.101821>
- Zlate, S., & Cucui, G. (2015). Motivation and Performance in Higher Education. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 180, 468–476. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.02.146>
- Zlate, Ş., & Enache, C. (2015). The Interdependence Between Human Capital and Organizational Performance in Higher Education. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 180, 136–143. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.02.096>