



INNOVATIVE: Journal Of Social Science Research

Volume 4 Nomor 3 Tahun 2024 Page 3129-3137

E-ISSN 2807-4238 and P-ISSN 2807-4246

Website: <https://j-innovative.org/index.php/Innovative>

Analysis of The Relationship Between Teaching Quality, Institutional Policy, Leadership and Performance of Higher Education Institutions

Muhamad Risal Tawil^{1✉}, Saryanto², Lazuardy Alief³, Basuki Winarno⁴, Firman Ashadi⁵

(1) Politeknik Baubau

(2) Universitas Sarjanawiyata Tamansiswa

(3) Universitas Binawan

(4) School of Interdisciplinary Management & Technology, ITS

(5) Universitas PGRI Argopuro Jember

Email: risaltawil@gmail.com^{1✉}

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengidentifikasi pandangan dan persepsi pengajar mengenai kontribusinya terhadap pengelolaan dan perancangan kebijakan pendidikan di lingkungan perguruan tinggi. Penelitian ini menggunakan survei dan kuesioner. Sampel ditentukan dengan metode simple random sampling. Sampelnya meliputi pengajar dan siswa. Hasil penelitian mengungkapkan bahwa pengetahuan, kemampuan menghasilkan, dan menyebarkan pengetahuan dari pengajar, serta sikap siswa dalam berpartisipasi merupakan faktor utama penentu mutu pendidikan di perguruan tinggi. Namun, pengajar cenderung kurang memperhatikan atau tidak mempunyai pengetahuan luas tentang sistem kredit homogen. Pendapat para pengajar menunjukkan bahwa mereka menilai kualitas terutama berdasarkan pencapaian tujuan dan sasaran yang ditetapkan oleh lembaganya, serta kemampuan staf pengajar dalam mengembangkan kemampuan siswa untuk maju dalam transformasi dirinya sendiri.

Kata Kunci: *Persepsi Pengajar, Pendidikan, Kualitas, Siswa, Perguruan Tinggi*

Abstract

This research aims to identify the views and perceptions of lecturers regarding their contribution to the management and design of educational policies in higher education environments. This research uses surveys and questionnaires. The sample was determined using the simple random sampling method. The sample included lecturers and students. The research results reveal that knowledge, the ability to produce and disseminate knowledge from lecturers, as well as students' attitudes towards participating are the main factors determining the quality of education in higher education. However, lecturers tend to pay little attention or do not have extensive knowledge about the homogeneous credit system. The lecturers' opinions show that they assess quality primarily based on the achievement of the goals and objectives set by their institutions, as well as the ability of the teaching staff to develop students' abilities to progress in their own transformation.

Keyword: Lecturer Perceptions, Education, Quality, Students, Higher Education

INTRODUCTION

The scientific approach to administration and the human relations school have both contributed to the development of quality management as a central concept in modern administration. This paradigm shift not only enhances product quality but also boosts operational efficiency, lowers costs, and boosts customer satisfaction (Tannady & Budi, 2023). Companies that have successfully implemented quality management principles have provided clear evidence that this approach is an important contribution to developing modern administrative doctrine (Saryanto et al., 2024). The implementation of quality management has changed the way companies operate and compete in the global market. The focus on customer satisfaction as the key to long-term business success has driven companies to continuously improve their processes. Thus, quality management has played an important role in updating and improving the global industrial landscape, inspiring companies to strive towards excellence in quality and service (Susanto et al., 2023).

The ability of an educational institution to fulfill its mission or, in the context of a study program, to achieve its stated goals determines quality in the field of education (Silalahi et al., 2022). The idea of quality as adaptation to a goal faces obvious drawbacks when the goal cannot be clearly defined, which in turn makes it difficult to determine whether a product or service is functional or dysfunctional (Tannady & Sitorus, 2017). Typically, educational institutions expect the client to clearly define their needs down to the final level, enabling them to tailor their services to meet those needs. However, when it comes to higher education, problems arise in determining who the actual client is (Rahayu et al., 2018). Client identification in higher education is complex because it involves multiple stakeholders who each have different expectations and needs (Martini et al., 2021). Students are often

considered the main clients because they are the direct recipients of educational services. However, parents, government, funding providers, industry, and society also have a stake in educational outcomes, making them indirect clients (Lonaldi, 2023).

Students expect a quality education that can prepare them for future careers and lives. Parents want an education that is worth their investment (Asaloei et al., 2020). Governments and funding providers seek assurances that higher education produces graduates who are competent and able to contribute to the economy and society. The industry wants job-ready graduates with relevant skills and knowledge (Tannady, 2023). Society in general expects educational institutions to educate responsible and ethical individuals who can contribute positively. Because of these diverse stakeholders, higher education institutions must be able to balance and accommodate diverse needs and expectations. This challenge requires a comprehensive and inclusive management approach, involving dialogue and cooperation between all stakeholders (Fitriyanti et al., 2023). If we apply the principles of Total Quality Management with flexibility and adaptation, taking into account the unique complexities and dynamics of higher education, it can be an effective tool for achieving this. In this context, quality measurement must involve various indicators that reflect the satisfaction and success of various stakeholders (Asih & Alief, 2022). Additionally, educational institutions must integrate ongoing feedback from all clients into the continuous improvement process to remain relevant and responsive to changing needs and expectations. In this way, higher education can fulfill its mission effectively and sustainably, focusing on quality as an ever-evolving, adaptive goal.

RESEARCH METHOD

Empirical research in this area is relatively scarce, especially when compared with the more widespread doctrinal contributions. Therefore, the main information is the basis. In surveys and questionnaires. A group of university lecturers contributed to the modification of the questionnaire, enhancing its validity and relevance. We selected the sample using a simple random sampling method. The sample included lecturers and students. This research is important because it provides empirical data that has rarely been available before, providing valuable insight into the views and experiences of professors in the field of economics related to the implementation of TQM in academic settings. We hope this data can identify challenges and opportunities in implementing TQM in universities and serve as a foundation for developing more effective policies and strategies to enhance the quality of higher education.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The results of the analysis reflect that most lecturers support the idea of qualities related to the acquisition of abilities by students that enable them to progress in their own transformation. In addition, they also emphasize the importance of training students who are able to assume social commitment. These priorities demonstrate a focus on the holistic and social development of students. In contrast, their considerations of quality related to efficiency and meeting the expectations of customers, both students and the organizations where graduates work, lag far behind. This shows that aspects such as operational efficiency and customer satisfaction are not top priorities for lecturers in the context of education quality. Lecturers place more importance on developing students' individual abilities and social responsibility than on more technical aspects of management such as efficiency and satisfaction of external stakeholders. The majority of lecturers strongly support aspects of self-development and social commitment in their definition of educational quality. These data are important for understanding the priorities and views of educators regarding what is considered quality education and can serve as a basis for further improvements and developments in the education system that accommodate these views and values.

The results obtained show that the majority of teaching staff have a high level of knowledge about the use of technology platforms to support teaching. However, they report a low level of knowledge regarding issues related to homogeneous credit systems. This makes sense, given the lack of significant development in the integration process and the similarity of educational progress to other aspects. More than half of lecturers do not have extensive knowledge of how their university addresses issues related to the pre-university training process. They also reported low levels of knowledge about alliance policies with other universities. This shows that there is an information gap among lecturers regarding their institutions' policies and strategies for establishing collaboration and improving the quality of education through alliances and exchange networks. Upon analyzing the influence of university professors on important educational quality attributes, we discovered that they primarily influence relationships with pre-university training processes, alliances with other universities, and collaboration and exchange networks.

Lecturers tend to have greater influence on aspects they understand well. However, there are exceptions to this rule although many lecturers report a lack of awareness of the relationship between formal systems and processes and pre-university material, the majority of them nevertheless attribute it to a high or very high influence on the quality of teaching. Lecturers exert significant influence on issues they fully understand, but they also acknowledge the importance of factors they may not fully understand. This highlights the

need for increased information and training related to institutional policies and procedures to strengthen the role of lecturers in improving the quality of education. A better understanding of how universities manage pre-university training processes and alliance policies can empower lecturers to contribute more effectively to improving the quality of education at their institutions.

Lecturers believe that their knowledge of the subject they are teaching, along with their ability to produce, collect, and convey this knowledge to students, primarily determines the quality of their teaching. Regarding these factors, the lecturers almost all agreed, with a frequency of 90% or more. This shows that lecturers' in-depth knowledge and communication skills are key elements of teaching quality. Apart from that, the lecturers' responses also emphasized the importance of students' participation and motivation in the learning process. In this case, the lecturers' opinions are in line with the quality doctrine in educational institutions, which considers that the metaphor of students as clients is of little use in the field of teaching. Instead, they propose that students are collaborators or co-producers in the service of teaching. This view emphasizes that students' active involvement in the teaching and learning process is essential for achieving quality educational outcomes.

Lecturers' opinions on the importance of rigor in selecting teaching staff reaffirm their belief that the most intimate circle of the teaching and learning process determines the quality of teaching. They contend that institutions must ensure the abilities of lecturers, closely related to the transcendental variables that influence teaching quality, through a strict selection process. In addition, student acceptance of teaching is also an important factor. This shows that the relationship between lecturers and students is central to an effective education system and that educational success is highly dependent on lecturer competence and student engagement. Thus, educational institutions need to ensure that they have appropriate mechanisms to select and develop quality teaching staff, as well as create an environment that encourages active participation and student motivation. We can only achieve and maintain high teaching quality in this way.

We can implement the university system integration process to improve the relatively low quality of higher education. In fact, the creation of a supranational university space or the implementation of a standard system for measuring and accrediting academic assets is always associated with efforts to improve the quality of education. However, these two factors turned out to have a smaller impact on the number of lecturers who rated the quality of higher education as high. Many lecturers attribute the greater impact to other factors not necessarily related to supranational university space initiatives. Although these initiatives are usually part of the agenda of educational institutions, lecturers generally consider that there

are other factors that have a greater influence on the quality of teaching. One of the most significant factors is the relationship with the pre-university process, with 72% of the lecturers surveyed indicating that this factor has a considerable impact on the quality of higher education. This opinion reflects that while initiatives such as measurement standards and accreditation of academic assets are important, there is a more pressing need to focus on how higher education institutions prepare students before they enter university. Scholars view the pre-university process, comprising a range of academic and social activities and programs, as a crucial factor in determining students' readiness and success in higher education.

Additionally, the emphasis on the pre-university process suggests that lecturers recognize the importance of building a strong foundation for students before they enter more challenging academic environments. This involves not only academic aspects but also social skills and life skills that will help them navigate university life more effectively. Thus, to improve the overall quality of higher education, it is important for educational institutions to not only focus on implementing standards and accreditation systems but also on efforts to improve pre-university processes. By ensuring that students have adequate preparation before entering higher education, institutions can help create a more productive and high-quality learning environment. This, in turn, will help in achieving better higher education goals and produce graduates who are more competent and ready to face the challenges of the world of work.

Respondents considered that lecturers' knowledge of the subjects they teach was the most influential factor on the quality of tertiary education, followed by teaching staff motivation, lecturers' communication skills, lecturers' ability to train themselves and study independently, and coordination between lecturers of the same subject. However, knowledge about students' individual situations or students' possible preferences for lecturers was not considered very important by the surveyed lecturers. From the results of these responses, it appears that lecturers tend to place more value on abilities traditionally associated with good lecturers, especially knowledge of the subjects they teach. In addition, pedagogical training or efforts made by lecturers to improve their abilities are also considered important. This reflects trends in movements seeking to reform higher education, such as the implementation of different types of leadership in the classroom and other efforts to improve the quality of teaching. However, this research appears to have given less attention to other factors that may also influence the quality of higher education, such as lecturers' ability to choose appropriate teaching methods to meet students' needs or their knowledge of students' individual situations. Therefore, we may need to conduct further

research to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the factors that influence the quality of higher education.

From the results of the analysis, it appears that these values adequately express society's collective opinion about the quality of teaching at the university. However, there is an interesting finding that managers do not appear to have a significant bias towards the notion of teaching quality. They tend to recognize almost any notion of the quality of university teaching. The only exception seen in all three cases is the low adherence of respondents to the concept of quality, understood as efficiency in resource consumption. This may be due to the perception that efficiency should be implicit in all their daily work as managers. These findings suggest that perceptions of the quality of teaching at universities may vary among external faculty managers, but in general, there is a commonality in recognition of the importance of various aspects of teaching quality. This shows that to improve the quality of teaching at universities, it is important to consider various perspectives and understand the views of the various parties involved in the higher education process.

CONCLUSION

From the research results, the conception of quality expressed by the surveyed lecturers is mainly related to ensuring that students develop the necessary capacities to progress in their own transformation and to the need to train pupils to be able to take social commitments. Lecturers also consider that the main determining factors for the quality of education at universities are the lecturer's knowledge of the subject, the lecturer's ability to generate, collect, and disseminate his knowledge, as well as the students' attitudes, participation, and learning motivation. However, there are findings that lecturers tend to pay less attention or do not have extensive knowledge about the homogeneous credit system. Most teaching staff also lack high-level knowledge of how universities address the issue, including in terms of pre-university training and alliance policies with other universities. The opinions of the lecturers show that they judge quality primarily based on the achievement of the goals and objectives set by their institutions, as well as the ability of the teaching staff to develop students' abilities to progress in their own transformation. These findings can make an important contribution to the management and design of education policy, as well as provide a basis for further discussion of the quality of higher education.

REFERENCES

- Tannady, H., & Budi, I. S. K. (2023). The Influence of Organization Culture, Work Environment and Leadership On Performance of Fulltime Lecturer (Case Study of Private Higher Education Institution which Supported by Corporate). *Journal on Education*, 5(4), 13020-13025.
- Susanto, P. C., Parmenas, N. H., Febrian, W. D., Sani, I., Tannady, H., & Suryawan, R. F. (2023). Paternalistic Leadership in Law Firm: Indicators of Success and Implementation. *Journal of Law, Politic and Humanities*, 4(1), 28-35.
- Tannady, H., & Sitorus, T. (2017). Role of compensation, organization culture, and leadership on working motivation of faculty member (study case: universities in North Jakarta). *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 19(10), 41-47.
- Rahayu, M., Rasid, F., & Tannady, H. (2018). Effects of self efficacy, job satisfaction, and work culture toward performance of telemarketing staff in banking sector. *South East Asia Journal of Contemporary Business, Economics and Law*, 16(5), 47-52.
- Lonaldi, L. (2023). The Influence of Organizational Culture, Work Environment and Work Motivation on Employee Performance. *Journal on Education*, 5(4), 11498-11502. <https://doi.org/10.31004/joe.v5i4.2096>
- Tannady, H. (2023). ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECT OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP, CAREER ADAPTABILITY AND JOB EMBEDDEDNESS ON PERCEIVED CAREER SUCCESS: STUDY AT METAL MANUFACTURER COMPANY. *JURNAL EKOBIS DEWANTARA*, 6(3), 647-653.
- Fitriyanti, R., Sawitri, I., Edityawati, M., Sudjana, K., Bakti, R., & Lestari, A. (2023). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan dan Disiplin terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Desa Srimukti Tambun Utara. *Journal on Education*, 5(4), 16470-16477. <https://doi.org/10.31004/joe.v5i4.2807>
- Asih, R. A., & Alief, L. (2022). Students' Experiences and Learning Objectives: Implications for Future Online Learning. *Journal of education and learning (EduLearn)*, 16(2), 226-234.
- Saryanto, S., Sahib, A., Soegiarto, I., Musmulyadin, M., & Retnaningsih, R. (2024). Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Lecturer Development Programs in the Context of Higher Education Management. *International Journal of Educational Narratives*, 2(2), 214-223.
- Martini, M., Hurit, R. U., Hasan, M., Bhaga, B. J., Larasati, R. A., Baba, W. N., ... & Laba, I. N. (2021). *Membangun Pembelajaran Merdeka Belajar dan Kampus Merdeka di Pendidikan Tinggi*. Media Sains Indonesia.
- Asaloei, S. I., Wolomasi, A. K., & Werang, B. R. (2020). Work-Related stress and performance among primary school teachers. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 9(2), 352-358.

Silalahi, R. M. P., Andry, J. F., Bernanda, D. Y., & Tannady, H. (2022). Big Data Analytics in Library to Classification Book Publishers. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 6(2), 4303-4310.