

Antecedents Of Lecturer Performance And Its Impact On Graduates' Competencies At Medan City University

Kuras Purba

Postgraduate at Sari Mutiara University Indonesia (USM) Medan, North Sumatera, Indonesia

Email: kuraspurba69@gmail.com

Abstract. Education is an ongoing issue that continues to be researched over time. Private universities established by foundations are required to make efforts to enhance the competencies of their graduates, which results in high competitiveness. This study aims to examine the antecedents of lecturer performance and its impact on graduate competence at Medan city. The factors studied in the antecedents include: foundation management, university governance, and dean leadership and their effects on graduate competence. The population in this research is final semester students of the Management Study Program, Faculty of Economics, at nine private universities in Medan City. The sample selection in this study was carried out using multi-stage sampling, starting with purposive sampling of private universities and incidental sampling of students. The total sample in this study comprises 576 students representing the nine private universities proportionally. Data analysis used descriptive statistics and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM). This research concludes: (1) Foundation management has a positive and significant effect on university governance. (2) Foundation management has a direct positive and significant effect on dean leadership. (3) University governance has a positive and significant effect on lecturer performance. (4) University management has a positive and significant effect on dean leadership. (5) University governance has a positive and significant effect on lecturer performance. (6) Dean leadership has a positive and significant effect on lecturer performance. (7) Lecturer performance has a positive and significant effect on graduate competence. (8) Foundation management has a positive and significant effect on dean leadership through university governance. The abstract should be self-contained, meaning there are no citations are included. It should concisely inform the reader of the manuscript's purpose, methods, findings, and significance. The abstract should be written in relatively nontechnical language, yet clear enough for an informed reader to understand the manuscript's contribution. The abstract contains approximately 100-200 words.

Keywords: Lecturer Performance, Graduated Competencies.

1. INTRODUCTION

Education is an issue that is endlessly researched over time. A country will progress when supported by superior, competitive education that can create qualified human resources that are reliable and serve as the driving force for every dimension of national development. The quality of education, as explained in Article 1, paragraph 17 of Law No. 20 of 2003, states that: "National education standards are the minimum criteria regarding the education system throughout the legal territory of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia." The minimum national education standards consist of standards for content, process, graduate competencies, education personnel, facilities and infrastructure, management, financing, and educational assessments that must be improved systematically (Article 35, paragraph 1 of Law No. 20 of 2003).

The ability to manage and develop universities is considered essential, including improving the performance of lecturers at universities in the city of Medan. According to Law No. 14 of 2005 (Article 1, Paragraph 2) and Government Regulation No. 37 of 2009

(Article 1, Paragraph 1), lecturers are professional educators whose main task is to transform, develop, and disseminate knowledge, technology, and the arts through education, research, and community service. In accordance with the demands of the times, quality human resources can be achieved through the three pillars of higher education (teaching, research, and community service). A lecturer who successfully fulfills their primary duties effectively means that the lecturer possesses quality academic competence.

The performance of lecturers in Medan City plays a very important role in improving and enhancing the quality of higher education. The current performance of lecturers needs attention because they are one of the essential components in the higher education system in Indonesia. The roles, duties, and responsibilities of lecturers are significant in achieving the national education goals, which are to enlighten the nation's life, enhance the quality of Indonesian people, including qualities of faith/devotion, noble character, and mastery of knowledge, technology, and art, as well as to realize an advanced, just, prosperous, and civilized Indonesian society.

The faculty members at private higher education institutions are not entirely composed of individuals with a Master's degree teaching undergraduate students, and there are still some with a Doctorate degree teaching graduate students. Instructors are required to have the necessary qualifications to effectively convey their knowledge to students. Competent and qualified faculty will facilitate the dissemination of knowledge and technology, making it easier for students to understand and develop according to their abilities in the field of study they are pursuing. Universities that have quality faculty will be highly sought after by the community both now and in the future. Institutions that fail to adapt to current and future changes will be left behind by society and will eventually experience decline, potentially leading to the closure of those universities.

Lecturers, as the key to educational success, are greatly influenced by all available educational resources. Therefore, this research will examine how to improve lecturer performance and its relationship with graduate competencies, which is influenced by foundation management, university governance, and dean leadership.

2. LIBRARY STUDY

A. Lecturer Performance

The performance of lecturers can be observed and measured based on the specifications or competency criteria that each lecturer must possess. In relation to lecturer performance, the behaviors in question refer to the activities of lecturers during the learning process. Lecturer performance encompasses several dimensions, namely: (1) quality of work; (2) promptness; (3) initiative; (4) capability; and (5) communication (Sedarmayanti, 2000). These five aspects can be used as measures in assessing an individual's performance level.

The performance of lecturers has specific specifications and can be seen and measured based on the competencies or criteria that each lecturer must possess. The behaviors of lecturers that reflect their performance are the activities they engage in during the learning process, which include how a lecturer plans lessons, conducts learning activities, and assesses learning outcomes. Conceptually and generally, the performance of lecturers encompasses the competency aspect of their duties, namely professional competency, social competency, and personal competency. The measurement of the dimensions of lecturer performance in this study refers to the theory developed by the Ministry of National Education (Depdiknas). The performance variable of lecturers is measured through three dimensions, namely: Education and Teaching, Research and Development of Science, and Community Service.

B. Foundation Management

Management is a process of planning, organizing, directing, and controlling carried out by a company, institution, or foundation to achieve the desired objectives. To empower the organizational factors possessed by the university, they need to be managed effectively with good management practices to ensure that goals are achieved efficiently and effectively. Broadly speaking, good management encompasses different processes that include planning, organizing, actuating, and controlling that are conducted to achieve the specified goals using human resources and other resources. Related to human empowerment, in this case, educators (lecturers), Human Resource Management (HRM) is necessary, which involves policies and practices in determining human resources in management positions, including recruiting, screening, training, rewarding, and conducting evaluations (Dessler, 2006).

C. University Governance

The term governance is used to describe all the structures, processes, and activities involved in the planning and supervision of institutions and their personnel (Fielden, 2008). Meanwhile, higher education institutions are educational units that provide higher education. Higher education institutions include (1) universities; (2) institutes; (3) colleges; (4) polytechnics; (5) academies; and (6) community colleges (Government Regulation No. 4 of 2014). Higher education institutions are organizations that provide higher education. The governance structure of state higher education institutions consists of at least: (1) the university senate, which carries out the function of determining and considering the implementation of academic policies; (2) the university leader, who is an academic executor that performs the function of setting non-academic policies and managing the university for and on behalf of the Minister; (3) the internal supervisory unit, which is the supervisory element that carries out non-academic oversight functions for and on behalf of the university leader; and (4) the advisory board, which carries out non-academic advisory functions and other functions established in the statutes.

The management structure of higher education institutions consists of: (1) Leadership elements, consisting of the rector and vice-rectors; (2) Administrative implementation elements, which include the bureau and its subdivisions; (3) Academic implementation elements, namely faculties, departments, institutions, and centers; (4) Elements for the development and implementation of strategic tasks, which are bodies/centers; and (5) Support elements, namely technical implementation units (UPT).

D. Dean's Leadership

The dean, department head, program coordinator, or similar officials are the direct superiors of lecturers who have the responsibility to guide and mentor the lecturers in their capacity as those accountable for the implementation of BKD (Academic Development) at the faculty or department level or similar positions. Leadership is a process of influencing the activities of an organization in an effort to establish and achieve goals (Lock and Crawford, 2001). Leadership is defined in various ways by experts, but generally, it describes the relationship between the leader and the followers (Locander et al., 2002). Locander et al. (2002) further explain that leadership implies that leaders influence those being led, but the relationship between leaders and followers is mutually beneficial for both parties.

According to Yulk (1987) as quoted by Usman (2008), several definitions that are considered representative over a quarter of a century are as follows:

- a. Leadership is the behavior of an individual who leads the activities of a group towards a shared goal.
- b. Leadership is interpersonal influence exercised in a particular situation, and directed through communication processes towards the achievement of one or more specific goals.
- c. Leadership is the initial formation and maintenance of structure in hopes and interactions.
- d. Leadership is the gradual increase of influence above and beyond mechanical compliance with organizational routine directives.
- e. Leadership is the process of influencing the activities of an organized group towards the achievement of goals.
- f. Leadership is a process of giving meaning (meaningful direction) to collective efforts, which results in a willingness to put in the desired effort to achieve objectives.
- g. Leaders are those who consistently make effective contributions to the social order, as well as those who are expected and perceived to do so.

E. Graduate Competencies

Kreiner and Kinicki (2003) explain that the concept of competence is understood as a combination of abilities and skills. Abilities and skills receive significant attention in today's management circle. Wolod, Wallace, and Zeffane (2001), Robbins and Judge (2007), as well as Harris (2000) describe the concept of competence as a combination of aptitude and ability. Aptitude indicates the capability to learn something that is potential in nature. Ability refers to an individual's capacity to perform various tasks in a job. Ability is cultivated by knowledge and skills. Meanwhile, according to Spencer and Spencer (1993), it is mentioned that competence is an intrinsic part of a person's personality and can predict behavior and performance broadly across all situations and job tasks.

To produce quality graduates in both educational and non-educational fields, the curriculum is one of the essential instruments in the educational process. As stipulated in Law Number 12 of 2012 concerning Higher Education, the higher education curriculum is a set of plans and arrangements regarding the objectives, content, teaching materials, and methods used as guidelines for organizing learning activities to achieve the goals of

higher education. Thus, the achievement of educational goals will highly depend on the curriculum that is implemented. In line with the development of science, technology, and the arts, as well as the increasingly complex demands of the future, an adaptive and anticipatory curriculum system is required to meet the demands of the times, yet it must also be easy to implement in educational practice. Essentially, the preparation of the curriculum for educators includes two main components: (i) the curriculum component to provide educational competency skills, and (ii) the curriculum component to provide competency skills in the substantive material that will be taught.

F. Hypothesis

H1: Foundation management has a positive and significant impact on university governance.

H2: Foundation management directly has a positive and significant impact on dean leadership.

H3: University governance has a positive and significant impact on faculty performance.

H4: University management has a positive and significant impact on dean leadership.

H5: University governance has a positive and significant impact on faculty performance.

H6: Dean leadership has a positive and significant impact on faculty performance.

H7: Faculty performance has a positive and significant impact on graduate competency.

H8: Foundation management has a positive and significant impact on dean leadership through university governance.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Types of research

This type of research utilizes a causal quantitative approach by measuring the strength of the relationship between two or more variables. The approach used in this study is a survey approach, which involves collecting as much data as possible regarding facts that support the research, with the aim of understanding the status and symptoms and finding similarities in status by comparing them with selected or predetermined standards (Arikunto, 2002).

B. Sample and Data Source

The population of this study comprises active students of the Management Study Program in their final semester at 9 private universities in Medan City, North Sumatra, totaling 3,012 individuals. The selection of these nine private universities is

based on faculty accreditation, the length of time they have been established, and the increase in the number of students over the past three years.

The sample size in this study was calculated based on the number of indicators multiplied by 6, so the total sample size is $6 \times 96 = 576$ students. The sample size from each university was chosen using proportional random sampling. The data for this research were collected using three methods: (1) documentation, (2) questionnaires, and (3) interviews.

C. Variables and Dimensions

This research consists of variables including foundation management, university governance, dean leadership, and graduate competencies, with the dimensions shown in the following table:

Table 1. Research variables

No.	Variable	Dimension
1.	Foundation Management	Planning, Organizing, Directing, Supervising
2.	University Governance	Transparency, Accountability, Responsibility, Independence, Justice, Relevance, Effectiveness and Efficiency, Non-profit
3.	Dean Leadership	Designing work according to context, Developing members, Leading by example, Providing support
4.	Graduate Competence	Aspects of work, academic aspects, managerial aspects, attitude and character aspects

D. Data Analysis Techniques

The data analysis in this research includes: (1) Descriptive Statistics. Descriptive analysis is a way to depict problems based on the data available by organizing the data in such a way that the characteristics of the data can be easily understood, explained, and used for subsequent purposes (Sirojuzilam et al., 2016; Lutfi et al., 2016 & Tarmizi et al., 2016 & 2017). Thus, in this case, there are activities or processes of data collection and data processing according to its purpose. (2) Inferential Statistics, and (3) Partial Least Squares Model. PLS is characterized by a reflective indicator model, where the direction of causality flows from the indicators to the latent variables, and the indicators are considered uncorrelated. The removal of one indicator results in a change in the meaning of the latent variable (Muda et al., 2016 and Syahyunan et al., 2017), and measurement error exists at the level of the latent variable. Latent variables with formative indicators can be in the form of composite variables (Nurzaimah et al., 2016). PLS is a powerful analytical method because it does not assume that data must be on a specific measurement scale and is also suitable for relatively small sample sizes.

In terms of model complexity, PLS can accommodate up to 100 constructs and indicators. Essentially, the difference between covariance-based SEM and component-based PLS SEM is whether we are using structural equation modeling to test theory or developing theory for predictive purposes (Ghozali, 2006).

In a situation where we have a strong foundation and theoretical testing or theoretical development, the main objective of the research, the method with covariance-based SEM is more appropriate. However, with uncertainty in factor score estimation, the predictive accuracy may be lost.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Respondent Characteristics

Table 2. Characteristics of Respondents

No	Attribute	Option	Quantity	%
1.	Gender	Male	270	47
		Female	306	53
2.	Age	18 – 21	392	68
		22 – 24	161	27
		>24	23	4
3.	Living Status	With Parents	234	41
		Not With Parents	342	59
4.	Regional Origin	Medan City	199	35
		Outside Medan		
		Outside North Sumatera	317	55
5.	Employment Status	Full time	36	6
		Part time	47	8
		Internship	33	6
		Unemployed	460	80
6.	Participation in Organizations	Still Aktive	147	26
		Ever Aktive	173	30
		Never Participated	256	44

The information in Table 2 shows that the majority of students in the Bachelor of Management Study Program in Medan are aged 18-21, live with their parents, are from outside the city of Medan, and are not employed. It can be concluded that most high school graduates do not enroll in private colleges in Medan but instead apply to private universities in Java.

5. RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Direct Influence

The direct influence between variables in this study is summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Direct Effect Between Variables

	Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	T Statistics (O/STD EV)	P Values
Dean's Leadership ->Lecturer Performance	0.087	0.090	0.032	2.673	0.008
Dean's Leadership -> Action Speed Level	0.895	0.895	0.012	74.588	0.000
Dean's Leadership -> Level of Clarity of Vision and Mission	0.818	0.817	0.027	30.765	0.000
Dean's Leadership -> Level of Willingness to Delegate Authority	0.888	0.888	0.011	82.021	0.000
Dean's Leadership -> Level of Willingness to Set an Example	0.901	0.901	0.010	94.796	0.000
Dean's Leadership -> Level of Confidence	0.905	0.905	0.011	79.637	0.000
Dean's Leadership -> Level of Optimism	0.906	0.906	0.010	95.003	0.000
Dean's Leadership -> Vision and Mission Achievement Level	0.899	0.899	0.011	85.247	0.000
Lecturer Performance-> Graduate Competencies	0.112	0.114	0.046	2.411	0.016
Lecturer Performance -> Education and Teaching	0.820	0.831	0.026	31.795	0.000
Lecturer Performance -> Research and Development of Science	0.915	0.912	0.009	98.347	0.000
Lecturer Performance -> Community Service	0.918	0.916	0.009	97.154	0.000
Graduate Competencies -> Scientific Aspect	0.893	0.894	0.009	95.680	0.000
Graduate Competencies -> Managerial Aspect	0.807	0.807	0.019	41.605	0.000
Graduate Competencies -> Job Aspects	0.826	0.827	0.017	47.892	0.000
Graduate Competencies -> Attitude and Character Aspects	0.785	0.786	0.019	40.697	0.000
Foundation Management -> Dean's Leadership	0.026	0.023	0.055	0.483	0.629
Foundation Management -> Lecturer Performance	0.307	0.312	0.061	4.999	0.000
Foundation Management -> Guidance	0.841	0.842	0.014	58.668	0.000

Foundation Management -> Pengawasan	0.869	0.869	0.012	72.643	0.000
Foundation Management -> Organizing	0.844	0.844	0.015	58.140	0.000
Foundation Management -> Planning	0.778	0.779	0.024	32.222	0.000
Foundation Management -> University Governance	0.728	0.733	0.031	23.353	0.000
University Governance-> Accountability	0.707	0.707	0.030	23.588	0.000
University Governance-> Effectiveness and Efficiency	0.838	0.838	0.015	56.512	0.000
University Governance-> Independence	0.717	0.718	0.023	31.204	0.000
University Governance -> Dean's Leadership	0.304	0.308	0.060	5.101	0.000
University Governance-> Lecturer Performance	0.353	0.351	0.068	5.194	0.000
University Governance-> Justice	0.761	0.761	0.022	34.437	0.000
University Governance-> Nonprofit	0.704	0.705	0.024	29.828	0.000
University Governance-> Relevance	0.796	0.796	0.017	48.036	0.000
University GovernanceE-> Responsibility	0.814	0.815	0.017	48.454	0.000
University Governance-> Transparency	0.703	0.704	0.026	26.994	0.000

B. Indirect Influence

The direct influence between variables in this study is summarized in Table 4.

Table 4. Indirect Effects

Mean, STDEV, T-Values, P-Values	Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	T Statistics (O/STDEV)	P Values
Dean's Leadership -> Scientific Aspect	0.009	0.009	0.005	1.749	0.081
Dean's Leadership -> Managerial Aspect	0.008	0.008	0.004	1.760	0.079
Dean's Leadership -> Job Aspects	0.008	0.008	0.005	1.751	0.081
Dean's Leadership -> Attitude and Character Aspects	0.008	0.008	0.004	1.753	0.080

Dean's Leadership ->Graduate Competencies	0.010	0.010	0.006	1.744	0.082
Dean's Leadership -> Education and Teaching	0.071	0.075	0.027	2.593	0.010
Dean's Leadership -> Research and Development of Science	0.079	0.083	0.030	2.676	0.008

Dean's Leadership -> Community Service	0.080	0.083	0.030	2.671	0.008
Lecturer Performance -> Scientific Aspect	0.100	0.102	0.041	2.417	0.016
Lecturer Performance -> Managerial Aspect	0.090	0.092	0.037	2.436	0.015
Lecturer Performance -> Job Aspects	0.092	0.095	0.038	2.420	0.016
Lecturer Performance -> Aspect Attitude and Character	0.088	0.090	0.036	2.434	0.015
Learning Environment and Lecturer Performance -> Scientific Aspect	0.091	0.090	0.046	1.952	0.051
Learning Environment and Lecturer Performance -> Managerial Aspect	0.082	0.082	0.042	1.954	0.051
Learning Environment and Lecturer Performance -> Job Aspects	0.084	0.084	0.043	1.955	0.051
Learning Environment and Lecturer Performance -> aspects of attitude and character	0.080	0.079	0.041	1.950	0.052

Foundation Management -> Accountability	0.515	0.518	0.034	15.285	0.000
Foundation Management -> Scientific Aspect	0.058	0.061	0.025	2.347	0.019
Foundation Management -> Managerial Aspect	0.053	0.055	0.022	2.360	0.019
Foundation Management -> Job Aspects	0.054	0.056	0.023	2.345	0.019
Foundation Management -> Attitude and Character Aspects	0.051	0.053	0.022	2.356	0.019
Foundation Management -> Effectiveness and Efficiency	0.610	0.614	0.030	20.327	0.000
Foundation Management -> Independence	0.522	0.526	0.030	17.335	0.000
Foundation Management -> Dean's Leadership	0.221	0.226	0.045	4.872	0.000
Foundation Management -> Lecturer Performance	0.279	0.280	0.048	5.782	0.000
Foundation Management -> Graduate Competences	0.065	0.068	0.028	2.343	0.019
Foundation Management -> Justice	0.554	0.558	0.031	17.636	0.000
Foundation Management -> Nonprofit	0.512	0.517	0.030	16.998	0.000
Foundation Management -> Education and Teaching	0.480	0.493	0.036	13.241	0.000
Foundation Management -> Research and development of Science	0.536	0.540	0.032	16.891	0.000
Foundation Management -> Community Service	0.538	0.543	0.032	17.065	0.000

Foundation Management -> Relevance	0.580	0.583	0.029	19.890	0.000
Foundation Management -> Responsibility	0.593	0.597	0.030	19.717	0.000

Foundation Management -> Action Speed Level	0.222	0.223	0.047	4.724	0.000
Foundation Management -> Level of Clarity of Vision and Mission	0.203	0.204	0.045	4.549	0.000
Foundation Management -> Level of Willingness to Delegate Authority	0.220	0.221	0.047	4.686	0.000
Foundation Management -> Level of Willingness to Set an Example	0.223	0.225	0.048	4.648	0.000
Foundation Management -> Level of Confidence	0.224	0.226	0.048	4.669	0.000
Foundation Management -> Level of Optimism	0.224	0.226	0.048	4.660	0.000
Foundation Management -> Vision and Mission Achievement Level	0.223	0.224	0.048	4.663	0.000
Foundation Management -> Transparency	0.512	0.516	0.031	16.581	0.000
University Governance -> Scientific Aspect	0.038	0.039	0.018	2.139	0.033
University Governance-> Managerial Aspect	0.034	0.035	0.016	2.145	0.032
University Governance -> Job Aspects	0.035	0.036	0.016	2.142	0.033
University Governance-> Attitude and Character Aspects	0.033	0.034	0.016	2.139	0.033
University Governance->Lecturer Performance	0.026	0.028	0.012	2.154	0.032
University Governance -> Graduate Competences	0.042	0.044	0.020	2.135	0.033
University Governance-> Education and Teaching	0.311	0.316	0.059	5.295	0.000
University Governance -> Research and Development of Science	0.347	0.346	0.062	5.592	0.000

6. CONCLUSION

Based on the data and analysis of the research, the following can be concluded as answers to the hypotheses:

- a. Foundation management has a positive and significant effect on university governance.
- b. Foundation management directly has a positive and significant effect on the leadership of the dean.
- c. University governance has a positive and significant effect on lecturer performance.
- d. University management has a positive and significant effect on the leadership of the dean.
- e. University governance has a positive and significant effect on lecturer performance.
- f. Dean leadership has a positive and significant effect on lecturer performance.

- g. Lecturer performance has a positive and significant effect on graduate competence.
- h. Foundation management has a positive and significant effect on the leadership of the dean through university governance.

7. SUGGESTIONS

Based on the conclusions stated above, several recommendations can be derived from this research as follows:

- a. The role of the foundation is very important in improving the quality of university governance and dean leadership, which ultimately leads to an enhancement of graduate competence. Therefore, the management of the foundation needs to be improved.
- b. Dean leadership needs to be enhanced in terms of translating and implementing the faculty's vision and mission in alignment with the university's vision and mission. This is vital to ensure alignment in perspectives and goals that the higher education institution aims to achieve in order to improve the competence of its graduates.
- c. Lecturer performance needs to be improved in terms of education and teaching. This remains the weakest aspect among the three roles of universities in the private university environment.
- d. Graduate competence remains very weak in terms of attitude and character, which are the most important aspects in the job market. It is recommended that private university governance implement a learning system and curriculum that focus on developing good attitudes and character in the graduates of private institutions.

REFERENCES

- ensimon, E. M. (1989). The meaning of "good presidential leadership": A frame analysis. *Review of Higher Education*, 12, 107–123.
- Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2002). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia (Edisi revisi)*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2003). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Henderson, R., & Cockburn, I. (1994). Measuring competence? Exploring firm effects in Management.
- Mahsun, M. (2006). *Pengukuran kinerja sektor publik*. Yogyakarta: BPF.
- Mangkunegara, A. P. (2006). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia perusahaan*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.

- Mathis, R. L., & Jackson, J. H. (2001). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia*.
- Pusser, B., & Ordorika, I. (2001). *Bringing political theory to university governance: The University of California and the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México*.
- Rivai, V. (2005). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia untuk perusahaan, dari teori ke praktek (Edisi pertama, cetakan ketiga)*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2008). *Buku 1 dan 2*. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.
- Rotter, J. B., & Simanjuntak, P. J. (2005). *Manajemen dan evaluasi kinerja*. Jakarta: Lembaga Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Indonesia.
- Slameto. (2010). *Belajar dan faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhinya*. Jakarta: PT Rineka Cipta.
- Sudiro, A. (2009). Pengaruh komitmen keorganisasian dan kepuasan kerja terhadap kinerja tenaga edukatif/dosen: Studi di Universitas Brawijaya Malang. *Jurnal Riset Manajemen Indonesia*, 2.
- Suryarama. (2009). Peran yayasan dalam pengelolaan bidang pendidikan pada perguruan tinggi swasta. *Jurnal Organisasi dan Manajemen*, 5(1), Maret 2009.
- Yukl, G. A. (2000). *Leadership in organizations*. Simon & Schuster (Asia) Pte. Ltd.