University Governance and Dean's Leadership in Improving Lecturer Performance

Edi Mulyadi, Suhaya, Jarnawi A. Dahlan

Pascasarjana Universitas Islam Syekh-Yusuf, Tangerang, Banten, Indonesia
Pascasarjana Universitas Islam Syekh-Yusuf, Tangerang, Banten, Indonesia
Departemen Pendidikan Matematika Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia
e-mail: emulyadi@unis.ac.id, suhaya@unis.ac.id, jarnawi@upi.edu

ABSTRACT. Research is based on the idea that university governance and the dean's leadership are very important for improving lecturer performance. This study aims to analyze the effect of university governance and the dean's leadership on the performance of lecturers at the Islamic University of Sheikh-Yusuf (UNIS). The study uses a quantitative approach with correlation and regression analysis techniques. The sample size of the study was 40 lecturers taken using proportional stratified random sampling. The research gives the result that there is a positive and significant influence on the university governance on the performance of lecturers at the Islamic University of Syekh-Yusuf. University governance has a positive and significant effect of 71.06% on the performance of lecturers; dean leadership has a positive and significant effect of 16.40% on lecturer performance, and together there is a positive and significant effect of university governance and dean's leadership of 73.59% on the performance of lecturers at the Islamic University of Syekh-Yusuf..

Keywords: University Governance, Leadership, Lecturer Performance.

INTRODUCTION

Law of Republic of Indonesia No.14, 2005 article 1, verse 2 and government regulation of Republic of Indonesia No. 37, 2009 article 1, verse 1 stated "lecturer is a professional educator. The main task of a lecturer is transforming, developing, and spreading knowledge, technology, and art through education, research, and community service." Lecturers who successfully carry out their duties properly mean that they have quality academic competence.

With qualified lecturers, the learning process can take place well. It is an ideal thing, yet in reality such condition in a university are not always easy to obtain. This reality is also found in Islamic University of Syekh-Yusuf, especially in Faculty of Social Science and Political Science. Improving the quality and productivity of lecturers is something that needs to be done systematically, planned, and integrated. Therefore, the ability to manage and foster a higher education institution is very important, including to improve lecturer performance. In this regard, the lecturer as a success determinant of higher education is suspected to be influenced by various factors. Among of these factors is university governance and dean's leadership.

The importance of studying the university governance in UNIS in its influence on the lecturers performance, among others, because at the operational level, university governance is closely related to a broad field that includes managerial and leadership accountability. In its application at the university, governance is not a business practice like a company, but appears through overall direction, regulate and control the actions of executive management by fulfilling expectations and responsibilities. The involvement of all university stakeholders must be able to build harmony in the organization of good university governance.

Furthermore, the leadership factor needs to be assessed because from the experience of the success leader, there is the ability to anticipate changes by utilizing opportunities and motivating the staff to achieve high levels of productivity. Leadership in an organization is very important (Syahrul, Herri, Johan & Ahmad, 2016). It is very decisive in the performance and achievement of organization goals (Johan & Herri in Syahrul, Herri, Johan & Ahmad, 2016). In this case, university as an intellectual generation maker has a very important role in developing professional and competitive human resources. The achievement of success is related to the leadership of the university itself. This phenomenon in UNIS reflects the need for more systematic study through research.

Lembaga Administrasi Negara (1993) stated performance as "an illustration of the achievement level of activity implementation in realizing goal". Performance is "the achievement of organization goal in form of quantitative and qualitative outputs, creativity, flexibility, reliable or other things that the organization need (Suprihati, 2014). Benardin and Russel (1993) defined "Performance is defined as the record of outcomes reduced on a specified job function or activity during a specific time." In line with that, according to Timpe (1993), Performance is the peak of the three elements which is connected to each other, namely skills, effort, and the nature of external circumstances. (Ghaffari, Shah, Burgoyne, Nazri & Salleh, 2017) defines performance as a process where managers ensure the activitiy and result of the employees in accordance with the goal of organization. Thus, performance can be defined as the work activities of an organization both public and private, in the form of quantitative and qualitative outputs for the achievement of organization.

Specifically, the lecturer performance of a university is a real behavior displayed by each lecturer as a job achievement produced by the lecturer in accordance with their role (UPI, 2009). As work behavior and the work of lecturers in carrying out their roles and functions of Tri Dharma of higher education. Conceptually, lecturer performance refers to the process and result of the task implementation on the aspects of competence, namely pedagogical competence, social competence, personal competence, and professional competence.

According to Surya (2000) "the lecturer is a determinant of educational success through his performance at the institutional level, instructional, and experimental. Lecturer performance is not only shown by working result, but also shown by working behavior. A good lecturer performance is also shown by student achievement (Glasman, 1986). In this case, there are several indicators of lecturer performance, such as seen in students and parents satisfactions, students learning achievement, social behavior, and lecturer attendance (Murgatroyd and Morgan, 1993).

Sulistijani & Rosida (2003) stated several factors that influence lecturer performance, including (a) knowledge, (b) skills, (c) abilities, and (d) attitude, (e) behavior. Meanwhile, the research result from Yusrizal (2017) through the analysis of the main competencies obtained almost the same result, namely (1) lecture planning, (2) implementation of learning activities, (3) mastery of the material, (4) mastery of learning strategy, (5) mastery of methodology, (6) mastery of classroom management, (7) communication, discipline and (8) the ability to evaluate learning outcomes. Based on the results of the output, a good lecturer performance can be seen from the result obtained by student achievement assessment (Glasman, 1986). The lecturer performance

indicator reflected on the satisfaction of students and parents, students learning achievement, social behavior, and lecturer attendance (Murgatroyd and Morgan, 1993). Thus, performance can be seen at two perspectives, they are internal performance and external performance.

Governance refers to all structures, processes, and activities involved in the planning and supervision of institutions and working people (Fielden, 2008). A tertiary education is an education unit that organizes higher education in the form of university, institute, college, community college, academy, or community academy (Governement Regulation number 4, 2014). Hence, university governance is all structures, processes and activities that exist within a university which are arranged in order to reach the goals of university.

The concept of university governance can be interpreted as a series of mechanisms to lead and control a university, so that the operation of university runs according to the expectations of all the stakeholders. Good University Governance (GUG) can be defined as structure, system, and process used by university organs in an effort to provide an added value of university continuously in a long term. The role of GUG is to create working structure and create check and balance system, because the effectiveness of a university is related to the comparison of routine and occasional cost issued by a university which result can be useful in the future.

The principles of good governance in higher education are generally the same as those applied to a corporation. The difference is in a non-profit orientation. Those principles are adopted then adapted, namely transparency, accountability, responsive, responsibility, independency, and fairness. Some researchers added the elements of authority, consultation, and representation.

In private universities, rector/chairman is responsible to the foundation. The challenge is the harmonious relationship between the foundation and rector/chairman. In this case, there is a trend of discrepancy according to the theory of agency (Coase in Shattock, 2003). There is a difference of interest between foundation and rector/chairman, especially because of the separation between management and finance. Harmonization of the foundation relationship with the leaders of higher education can be done by implementing good governance. Serian in Wijatno (2009) stated the description of principle application of good university governance in higher education, among others transparency, accountability, responsibility, independency, fairness, relevance, effective and efficient, and non-profit principle.

"Leadership is an ability to influence a group in the direction of achieving goals" (Robbins & Judge, 2008). Besides, Nurdin (2001) also stated that "leadership refers to the ability and readiness of a person to influence, encourage, persuade, lead, move and force others to accept the influence and do something which can help to achieve certain goals or objectives." Therefore, the leadership of an institution is a factor that gives an influence on the level of employee performance. In case of university, one of which is lecturer.

The characteristic of higher education is different from corporation, industry and service. At university, the leader is in charge of the dean, the chair of study programs, the lecturer, and staff. All of them are colleagues as well as peer group. Therefore, the leadership style which is oriented to power will be less effective. A relevant leadership style in academic field is the one which is oriented to expertise and behavioral. As Kelley (2002) said that subordinate group in university is the source of thinking power and the program implementation power. The right leadership style will legitimize leadership, so that the subordinate will voluntarily support the leader's program.

Leadership in academic field needs higher skill mastery. Leadership in academic field is temporary for only a few years and after that it returns to teaching and researching as a member of the faculty. A dean is a member of faculty, but he does not carry out his full duties as a lecturer and researcher while serving as administrator. His term of office depends on university policy or

on the applicable provisions and this position for a limited period. Most deans return to faculty when their term of office expires. In this case, the dean's leadership is complex.

In addition to the expertise-oriented style, it is also appropriate to use participatory leadership style in higher education (Pearce and Conger, 2003). The dean as the highest leader of faculty involves his representatives in decision making. The success of leadership in higher education, especially dean's leadership is measured by effectiveness. The effectiveness criteria need to be negotiated and established. At the same time, a Good University Governance (GUG) model has also been adapted as a result of the adoption of Good Corporate Governance (GCG).

Based on the description above, this study aims to examine the factors of governance developed by foundation both partially and simultaneously. Besides, this study also aims to examine dean's leadership in improving lecturer performance in one of the private university..

METHOD

According to the characteristic of the problem and its variables, this study uses quantitative approach. Quantitative studies use many numbers ranging from data collection to processing, analysis, and the delivery of the result. The data collection was carried out using simple random sampling of 40 lecturers of Islamic University of Syekh-Yusuf. The sample size of 40 is based on the opinion of Ruseffendi (1994) that correlative research needs minimum sample of 30 respondents.

The instrument used in the measurement of all three variables is Likert scale questionnaire, with two model questions, namely favorable and unfavorable. To obtain a valid instrument, the three measurements were tested first. The initial number of university governance variable questionnaire items was 22 items. Dean's leadership variable was 24 items, and lecturer performance variable was 22 items. Based on the result of calculation through validity test using the Product Moment correlation formula from Pearson, the valid item number of university governance variable was 21 items, dean's leadership variable was 18 items, and lecturer performance variable was 21 items. While the instrument of reliability test using Cronbach Alpha resulted value of alpha university governance variable 0.883 (high), dean's leadership variable 0.735 (sufficient), and lecture performance 0.952 (high).

Based on the formulation of the problem, the data processing technique in this study use multiple linear regression analysis with SPSS V.21 and decision making in null hypothesis rejection is 5%. The regression equation estimated in this study is $\hat{Y}=b_0+b_1 X_1+b_2 X_2$

Where

Y : Lecturer performance improvement

X1: Governance

X2: Dean's leadership

Since all variables use Likert scale questionnaire, so before analyzing the data, the three variables are transformed using Method of Successive Interval (MSI). The process of data transformation was using the Microsoft Excel application.

RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

Result

As the purpose of this study is to examine the functional relationships both partially and simultaneously between university governance variable (as X1), dean's leadership (as X2), on lecturer performance, the data analysis was performed using multiple linear regressions. In order to make the calculation process meets the requirements, the obtained scale measurement is

transformed by using Method of Successive Interval (MSI). Thus, the initial requirements for the measurement scale have been fulfilled.

The following assumptions are needed in the regression analysis. The first assumption is residual normality. The result of testing with Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistics found that the residual distribution is almost normal. The result can be seen in table 1.

Table 1: Residual Normality Test

		Unstandardized Residual
N		40
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	0E-7
	Std. Deviation	5.52452279
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.128
	Positive	.128
	Negative	-.096
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.809
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.530

Since one of regression constructed in this study are multiple regressions which connect governance and leadership with lecturer performance, it is necessary to test the assumption of collinearity which is a symptom of the relationship between the independent variables. The result of collinearity test with variance Inflection Factor (VIF) and tolerance can be seen in table 2.

Table 2: Collinearity Test

	Collinearity Statistics	
	Tolerance	VIF
University Governance	.885	1.131
Leadership Dean's	.885	1.131

From the results of the test, it is found that VIF value of two variables is 1.131 which is less than 10, and the tolerance value 0.885 which is more than 0.1. It means there is no symptom of multicollinearity between governance and leadership variables.

The third assumption is variance diversity or heteroscedasticity. The test using regression of unstandardized residual shows both governance and leadership variables have a sig. value = 1.00. It means that both heteroscedasticity assumption variables are fulfilled. Thus, the calculation result of regression from the data obtained can be used as prediction.

From the data processing and analysis, it is proven that there is a positive and significant effect of university governance (X1) on lecturer performance (Y). The analysis gives the correlation coefficient of 0.843. The correlation has a positive value, means it can be stated that the more university governance improved, the lecturer performance will also improve. On the analysis, it is also obtained the determination coefficient of 0.7106. It shows that 71.06% lecturer variable is influenced by university governance variable. From the analysis of variance, it is known that the functional relationship between governance and performance are very significant, it has the value of F = 74.076 with sig. = 0.00. Thus, governance partially gives significant effect on the lecturer performance. The result of calculation on the equation between governance and lecturer performance is

$$Y = 0{,}981\, X_1 - 1{,}789 e_1$$

From the equation, it is obtained the information that for every improvement of university governance by 1 point, the lecturer performance will increase by 0.981.

The data analysis which measures the influence of dean's leadership on lecturer performance obtained that dean's leadership (X2) has a positive value and significant effect on lecture performance (Y). The analysis gives correlation coefficient X2 to Y by 0.405. The correlation is positive. It means the more dean leadership improved, the lecturer performance will also improve. The calculation also obtained determination coefficient of 0.1640. It means dean's leadership can influence by 16.40% of lecturer performance changes. The results show that the influence of dean's leadership is not too large on the lecturer performance. The result is also shown from variance analysis test on regression model. The value of F_h = 9.183 with sig. = 0.00.4. Thus, it can be concluded that dean's leadership influences the lecturer performance, but the effect is smaller than governance. The equation which connects dean's leadership with lecturer performance is

$$Y = 0,812\ X_2 + 19,595\ e_2$$

The equation means that for every improvement of dean's leadership by one point, the lecturer performance will improve by 0.812, assuming X1 is fixed.

The result of calculation of university governance and dean's leadership on lecturer performance prove that there is a positive and significant effect of university governance and dean's leadership together on lecturer performance. From the calculation result, it is obtained the correlation coefficient between university governance (X1) and dean's leadership (X2) lecturer performance (Y) as much as 0.849. The correlation is positive. It means that if the university governance and dean's leadership continue to improve, the lecturer performance will also improve. The determination coefficient is 0.7208. It means university governance and dean's leadership is able to influence 72.08% of lecturer performance changes. This result is supported by the variance analysis on multivariable linear regression of university governance and dean's leadership on lecturer performance show a significant value (F = 41,503 with sig. = 0.00). Thus, it can be concluded that university governance and dean's leadership together give the effect on lecturer performance.

The equation of regression which connects the three variables is

$$Y = 0,852\ X_1 + 0,138\ X_2 - 13,149\ e_3$$

The regression equation shows that the improvement of one point of university governance will improve lecturer performance for 0.852; and the improvement of one point of dean's leadership will improve lecturer performance for 0.318. According to the calculation, it can be concluded that there is a positive and significant effect of university governance and dean's leadership together on lecturer performance.

Discussions

The first finding in this study is good university governance has a positive influence on lecturer performance. It means if the university governance is good then the lecturer performance will be good. Good lecturer performance cannot be achieved if there is no support from good university governance. It can be explained from the respondent answers on university governance variable. The accountability dimension has the highest average value and categorized as good (legality of establishment, university performance is audited and published, also has internal audit team). It means that the university is already good because it already has legality, namely an operational license. Besides, the performance is audited and published to the public and the audit team whose function is to audit the implementation of university tasks and the result of the audit are made as continuous improvement.

Accountability is meaningful in its function, implementation and responsibility. Universities have clear (written) job descriptions and responsibilities from the structural. Accountability means that university governance has legality of establishment, the university's mission is in line with the effort of creating qualified graduates, and university has audit internal team. While the lowest variable of university governance is independency and non-profit dimensions. University policies are prepared independently without any pressure from the foundation. The intervention of foundation is not dominant in influencing the management of university. Besides, the role of outside parties is not dominant in influencing the policies compiled by the university is still low. Based on the results of respondents' answer, the highest score is education and teaching dimension. This finding is appropriate with the study results of Chairunnisa (2015), concluded that there is a positive and significant relationship between university governance and lecturer professionalism. Chairunnisa discussed the importance of university governance which is focused on control, organizational control, also its main tasks and functions. Therefore, quality of a university is influenced by its governance.   Based on the tendency of university governance variable, it shows that employees who consider the role university governance running well are in the high category. The result tendency of university governance variable indicate that employees who consider the role of university governance in medium and low category. If it is summed, the score is greater that the number of high category. It means that the university has not been optimal in improving lecturer performance.

It shows the university governance on employee has not been optimal, namely the indicators that have innovation. It means that the leader always considers the needs of his employees. Based on the data, it can be seen that the university governance as an effort to improve lecturer performance is still not optimal. Based on this fact, it can be concluded that one of the steps to optimize the university governance is to conduct supervision at the bottom line. The leader needs to carry out the organizational communication with employees in the form of instruction, supervision, and briefing. The efforts aim to find out the needs and performance of employees.

Dean's leadership has a very important role in determining the success or failure of the faculty is the second finding of this study. The role and attitude of dean's leadership appears from the way of communicating, giving tasks, giving command, giving motivation, encouraging the enthusiasm of his employees, and decision making. Dean's leadership has a great correlation with performance. Dean's leadership capacity determines the attitudes and behavior of lecturer to reach the desired goal. This fact can be explained by the respondents' answer about dean's leadership variable. The level dimension of clarity of vision and mission has the highest average value (good category). It means that dean is able to socialize vision and mission of faculty towards students and has a strong desire on the vision and mission achievement. Besides, he is able to inspire the academic community to realize the vision and mission of dean in the future. While the lowest dimension of dean's leadership is the level of willingness to delegate authority.

The results of this study strengthen the findings from Tirtaputra & Surya (2016); Sriyanti & Dahlan (2017); Dahri & Akil (2018) that leader and leadership behaviors make a significant contribution towards job satisfaction which ultimately leads to organizational commitment. The commitment of university organization is to encourage high performance of lecturers in the Tri Dharma of higher education, among others learning, research, and community service. Harahap & Riyandi (2015) concluded that "dean's leadership has a positive and significant effect towards lecturer performance." Chalhoub (2010) stated that "entrepreneurial competence, compensation, and performance evaluation has a positive and significant effect, while participation has no real effect, and business performance is highly dependent on innovation. Bateh dan Heyliger (2014) concluded that faculty members who have more dominant transformational leaders will improve job satisfaction and faculty members who have more dominant passive leaders will reduce job

satisfaction. Trisnaningsih (2011) stated that motivation has the most dominant influence towards lecturer performance.

Sriyanti & Dahlan (2017) stated that the competency that must be possessed by a leader is the innovation ability, thinking out of the box, having the ability to develop a strong internal cooperation between job units and building a strategic relationship with outside parties. This is consistent with the theory from Yukl (2005) which states that leadership is very closely related to performance. Leadership is expected to be able to provide a vision that inspire human resources to increase commitment thus contributing to productivity and competitiveness of a higher education. With innovative leadership in university, starting from the head of study programs, dean, as well as the leader of existing institution has an important role in improving the performance of lecturers.

As the third result of this study, the lecturer performance is simultaneously influenced by governance and leadership. It means that the of institution leaders in a university needs to be accompanied by governance which in accordance with modern management principles. The commitment of leadership at the aspect of communication can make a real contribution in employee empowerment (Sari, 2009). Organization, in this case the foundation, must take important advantage to develop human capital investment by integrating plans and strategies which increase the value of human resources (Ghaffari, Shah, Burgoyne, Nazri, & Salleh, 2017). Thus, the combination between governance developed by the management (foundation and rector) is needed in order to give a clear direction for the leaders of institution in university as an effort of improving lecturer performance. This combination then becomes a synergy of two parties who complete and support each other.

Related to the findings, it can be stated that the factors of lecturer performance consist of internal factors and external factor. According to the result of the study of Syahrul, Herri, Johan & Ahmad (2016) there are eight components which need to be considered in developing the leadership competencies of an institution, among others communication ability, planning, delegating task, supervising, developing and building network, academic ability, leadership style, flexibility, and conflict management.

CONCLUSION

Based on the result and discussion of the study, it can be drawn as follows; First, there is a positive and significant effect of university governance on lecturer performance at the Islamic University of Syekh-Yusuf. University governance influences by 71.06% on the lecturer performance. Second, there is a positive and significant effect of dean's leadership of 16.40% on lecturer performance at the Islamic University of Syekh-Yusuf. Third, there is a positive and significant effect of university governance and dean's leadership together of 73.59% on lecturer performance at the Islamic University of Syekh-Yusuf.

RECOMMENDATION

According to the conclusion above, writer states some suggestions as follows; First, Islamic University of Syekh-Yusuf is suggested to do the improvement in all components of university governance through systems and procedures that can lead to the realization of Good University Governance. Second, faculty as study programs management unit should seek to improve their ability to manage and develop study programs by ensuring the implementation of governance, leadership, and effective quality assurance. Third, the rector should ensure the selection of dean who is credible, accountable, transparent, responsible, and fair in managing the study programs. Fourth, the improvement of dean's capacity should be carried out through the translation and implementation of the university's vision and mission.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bateh, J. & Heyliger, W. (2014). Academic Administrator Leadership Styles and the Impact on Faculty Job Satisfaction. *The Journal of Leadership Education, 13*(3), 34–49. DOI: 10.12806/V13/I3/RF3

Benardin, H. J. & Russel, J. E. (1993). *Human Resource Management: An Experiential Approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Chairunnisa, C. (2015). Hubungan tata kelola universitas dan profesionalitas Dosen, dengan mutu layanan pendidikan. *Faktor Jurnal Ilmiah Kependidikan, 2*(3), 184–197.

Chalhoub, S. M. (2010). Innovation management and though leadership: A cultural requirement in a global competitive environment. *The Journal of American of Business, 16*(1), 240-245.

Dahri, N.W. & Akil, M. (2018). Budaya organisasional, kepuasan kerja, dan komitmen organisasional dalam meningkatkan perilaku inovatif. *Jurnal Bisnis Teori dan Implementasi, 9*(2), 191–199.

Fielden, J. (2008). *Global Trends in University Governance*. Washington: World Bank.

Ghaffari, S., Shah, I. M., Burgoyne, J., Nazri, M., & Salleh. J.R. (2017). The Influence of Motivation on Job Performance: A Case Study at Universiti Teknologi Malaysia. *Aust. J. Basic & Appl. Sci., 11*(4), 92–99.

Glasman, N. S. (1986). Three evaluation-related Behaviors of the school principal. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysisnal, 8*(3), 227–236. DOI: 10.3102/01623737008003227.

Harahap, D. A. & Riyandi, R. (2015). Pengaruh budaya organisasi dan motivasi berprestasi terhadap kinerja dosen universitas riau kepulauan batam tahun akademik 2014/2015. *Jurnal dimensi, 4*(3). DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.33373/dms.v4i3.

Kelley, N. (2002). Notes on the political economy of black music. *In Rhythm and Busissenss*. Ed. Norman Kelly. New York: Akshic Books.

Lembaga Administrasi Negara. (1993). *Sistem administrasi negara Republik Indonesia*. Jakarta: CV Haji Masagung.

Murgatroyd, S., & Morgan, M. (1993). *Total Quality Management and The School*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Nurdin, S. (2001). *Penerapan Model Pendekatan Aptitude Treatment Interaction (ATI) dalam Pembelajaran IPS di Sekolah Dasar*. Disertasi Doktor pada Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia: Tidak diterbitkan.

Robbins, S. P., & Judge. T. A. (2008). *Perilaku Organisasi (Buku 1 dan 2)*. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.

Ruseffendi, E. T. (1994). *Dasar-dasar penelitian pendidikan dan bidang non-eksakta lainnya*. Semarang: IKIP Semarang Press.

Peraturan Presiden R.I No.8 Tahun 2012 Tentang Kerangka Kualifikasi Nasional Indonesia.

Pearce, C.L. & Conger, J. A. (2003). *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership*. USA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Sari, T. U. (2019). The effect of ethical leadership on voice behavior: the role of mediators organizational identification and moderating self-efficacy for voice. *Journal of Leadership in Organizations, 1*(1), 48–66.

Shattock, M. (2003). *Managing Successful Universities. Maidenhead*. England: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.

Sriyanti & Dahlan, J. A. (2017). The effects of organizational culture, leadership behavior, and job satisfaction on employee organizational commitment. *Journal of Positive Management, 8*(4), 80–96. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/JPM.2017.132.

Sulistijani, S., & Rosida, R. (2003). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.

Suprihati, S. (2014). Analisis faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi kinerja Karyawan perusahaan Sari Jati di Sragen. *Jurnal Paradigma, 12*(01), 93–112.

Surya, M. (2000). *Psikologi pembeljaran dan pengajaran*. Bandung: Pustaka Bani Quraisy.

Syahrul, L., Herri, Johan, A. P., & Ahmad, A. W. (2016). Identifikasi kompetensi utama manajerial dan kepemimpinan pengelola perguruan tinggi tingkat jurusan. *Prosiding National*

Conference of Applied Sciences, Engineering, Business and. Information Technology. Politeknik Negeri Padang, 15–16 Oktober 2016.

Timpe, A. D. (1993). *Kinerja (performance)*. Jakarta: Gramedia.

Trisnaningsih. (2011). Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi Kinerja Dosen Akuntansi pada Perguruan Tinggi Swasta di Jawa Timur Tahun 2007. *Jurnal Akuntansi dan Auditing, 8*(1).

Tirtaputra, I. P. A., & Surya, I. A. K. (2016). Pengaruh kepemimpinan transformasional dan kepuasan kerja terhadap komitmen organisasional pada UPTKesmas Sukawati II. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Unud*, *5*(4), 2080–2107.

Undang-Undang Nomor 14 Tahun 2005 tentang Guru dan Dosen.

Undang-Undang Nomor 12 Tahun 2012 tentang Pendidikan Tinggi.

UPI. (2009). Pedoman penilaian kinerja dosen. Tidak diterbitkan. Bandung: FIP.

Yukl, G.A. (2005). *Leadership in Organizations*. Simon & Schuster(Asia) Pte. Ltd.

Yusrizal, Y. (2017). Pengembangan instrumen penilaian kinerja dosen di perguruan tinggi. *Jurnal Parameter, 29*(1), DOI: doi.org/10.21009/parameter.291.10.

Wijatno, S. (2009). *Pengelolaan perguruan tinggi secara efisien, efektif, dan ekonomis untuk meningkatkan mutu penyelenggaraan pendidikan dan mutu lulusan*. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.