Migration Letters

Volume: 21, No: 5, pp. 682-691

ISSN: 1741-8984 (Print) ISSN: 1741-8992 (Online)
www.migrationletters.com

Study of the Influence of Leadership, Organizational Climate, Commitment and Lecturer Creativity on Quality Management in Higher Education

Akmal Sutja[1], Muhamad Hamdi[2], Rully Andi Yaksa[3], Mohammad Muspawi[4]

Abstract

The low-performance accountability score of Jambi University in Indonesia in 2022 was the starting point for this research. This influence study aims to determine the magnitude of the influence of leadership, organizational climate, commitment, and creativity of lecturers on the quality management of higher education. This research uses an associative quantitative approach with an explanatory survey method using regression and path analysis, a research population of 620, and a sample of 86 with a stratified random sampling technique. The number of questionnaires is 105, and they are conducted through statistical assumption tests of normality, homogeneity, and linearity. The research results show that there is an influence of leadership, organizational climate, and commitment to quality management of higher education simultaneously at 58.8% (strong), with details of leadership influence 66.88% (very strong), organizational climate 12.49 (low but sure), commitment 16.27 (quite strong) while lecturer creativity 0.43% (very weak) does not have a significant influence on the quality management of higher education, based on research findings, the recommendations given are the development of leadership training, building a quality culture and customer satisfaction-oriented commitment, creating a creativity laboratory.

Keywords: *Leadership, Organizational Climate, Commitment, Creativity, Quality Management.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Efforts to improve the quality of higher education have yet to be implemented seriously (Cabacang, 2021; Gordiychuk et al., 2020; Vaganova et al., 2020). Although higher education has established a quality assurance institution, it has not been implemented comprehensively by every party involved (Cantwell et al., 2022; Marciniak, 2015). Quality improvement efforts tend only to fulfill administrative accreditation requirements (Leiber, 2020; Utami et al., 2021). Weak higher education quality management reduces the quality and competitiveness of higher education. (Mensah, 2020; Pehlivan & Cicek, 2021; Sakthivel & Raju, 2006), Quality and competitiveness are not only determined by graduates but also by the average period of study. (Nasim et al., 2020) other symptoms, such as the organizational climate has not been seen to develop a culture of quality, such as the difficulty of students contacting lecturers (Hasbullah et al., 2020) the use of e-learning is not yet optimal (Mulay & Khanna, 2020) the low frequency of lecture

[1] Universitas Jambi, Indonesia
[2] Universitas Jambi, Indonesia
[3] Universitas Jambi, Indonesia
[4] Universitas Jambi, Indonesia

meetings (Van Schalkwyk & Steenkamp, 2020) lecturers are often absent from teaching (Geron-Pinon et al., 2021) and there is no clarity on the curriculum or syllabus that students must study (Abbas et al., 2021; Gulden et al., 2020). boring (Bi, 2022; Simangunsong, 2019) and subjective assessments (Hossain & Hossain, 2019). On the other hand, students' reading interest is still relatively low, and they lack concentration in studying (Cabacang, 2021; Gulden et al., 2020; Vaganova et al., 2020), careless assignments, a culture of plagiarism, and low learning motivation. (Hadiyanto et al., 2021; Muller & Wulff, 2020)

The urgency of higher education to innovate in relation to institutional management, learning, research, community service, and other elements is intended to provide a learning environment that is able to provide experiences that support competencies to be applied in the work environment and community development (Baas et al., 2022; Muller & Wulff, 2020). In addition, higher education needs to manage service processes using concepts and strategies that have been proven successful in improving quality, such as TQM, ISO 9000, EFQM, and other quality management models. (Cabacang, 2021; Gulden et al., 2020; Vaganova et al., 2020). The impetus for implementing quality management in higher education is based on several reasons, namely, that quality management can improve service quality-oriented processes with high quality (Sayeda et al., 2020). High quality automatically provides a competitive advantage, which makes consumers accustomed to high-quality products and rejects all defective products (Abbas et al., 2021; Geron-Pinon et al., 2021; Simangunsong, 2019). For this reason, implementing quality management in higher education is a necessity.

Sayeda Begum and Chandrasekharan Rajendran (2020) stated that quality management has made a real contribution to the world of organizational management, which supports continuous quality improvement. In line with this, Leiber (2020) states that quality management basically refers to the concept of policies, systems, and processes designed to ensure the maintenance and improvement of institutional quality.

Sallis (2002) states that quality management in higher education with a reverse hierarchical management pattern determines duties and responsibilities at the lowest organizational structure and the leading implementers. Thus, the leading implementers of this quality management are lecturers (Edward Sallis, 2002) and the lowest organizational structure is the study program (Cornesky, 1992) in this case the head of the study program.

In order for higher education to be able to base its development by focusing on mastery of knowledge, various managerial efforts should be made so that lecturers as the leading spearhead can be moved together to improve the quality which is their respective responsibility (Muhid; Rosita, Fitrah Dewi and Erisy, 2021) These efforts need to be driven by higher education leadership (Eddy, 2020; Jenny, 2022; Lestari, 2021) because quality management requires integrated movements from leaders to direct various parties to achieve the vision and mission that has been set (Jenny, 2022; Leiber, 2020) In line with this, Eddy (2020) stated that an organizational leader, apart from being able to develop his subordinates, the leader must also be able to develop his abilities as a leader with the aim of being able to keep up with work demands. Furthermore, Jenny and Ngo (2022) stated that quality management tends to be top-down, so the most influential parties are higher education leaders.

Jenny's side (2022) states that another factor that is considered urgent in implementing quality management is the commitment and mental attitude of various parties, both leaders and lecturers (Cornesky, 1992). Leaders have a central position and are very much needed in quality management (Lieber et al., 2018); quality management must be sourced and driven at every level of leadership, both at the macro, meso, and micro levels (Jenny, 2022; Muhid; Rosita, Fitrah Dewi and Erisy, 2021). The implementation of quality management offers various patterns, such as the ISSO model with SACA, the Daming

model with PDCA (Plan, Do, Check, Action), or the SNMPTN model with its 6 steps. However, any model that is implemented simply goes through 4 stages, namely 1). Standard Setting; 2). Implementation (including monitoring); 3). Evaluation (including self-evaluation); and 4). Quality Improvement (including benchmarking). (Lestari, 2021; Sayeda Begum, Chandrasekharan Rajendran, 2020)

In line with the role of lecturers, lecturers have a very strategic position in improving, increasing and developing the quality of higher education (Cornesky, 1992; Sayeda Begum, Chandrasekharan Rajendran, 2020) as implementers and parties who have direct contact with students (Eddy, 2020; Jenny, 2022; Leiber, 2020) Leaders and lecturers are two parties who have a greater role in higher education quality management (Eddy, 2020).

In another, Sisi Lestari (2021) stated that the commitment and creativity of lecturers is very central to quality management. The commitment and creativity of lecturers must be at the forefront of realizing the vision and mission of higher education (Jenny, 2022; Lestari, 2021). The role of lecturers in quality management must be considered. Even though the leadership makes such efforts, quality management can fail if there is a lack of effort or concern from lecturers (Eddy, 2020; Muhid; Rosita, Fitrah Dewi and Erisy, 2021)

In line with lecturer creativity, Corner Sky (1992) stated that lecturer creativity still needs to be maximized in managing SCL-oriented learning (Student Center Learning). Failure to overcome academic quality issues actually triggers the emergence of multiple issues (Jenny, 2022) not only concerning individual graduates but also has a double impact on quality and public accountability (Lestari, 2021), which in turn leads to a poor image of higher education (Sayeda Begum, Chandrasekharan Rajendran, 2020)

Based on the thoughts above, it is deemed necessary to conduct an in-depth study of the quality management of higher education so that the shortcomings and advantages in its management can be identified by targeting leadership factors, organizational climate, commitment, and creativity of lecturers. By knowing this, it is hoped that it can provide input in intervention efforts to improve the quality management of higher education.

2. METHODS

This research uses an associative quantitative approach, namely research carried out to find the relationship between one variable and another variable. This influence study was carried out from January to November 2023 at Jambi University, Indonesia, the only university in Jambi Province, Indonesia. Location selection was based on considerations of low accountability scores. Jambi University's performance in 2022, the independent variable in this research is leadership (X1), organizational climate (X2), Lecturer commitment (X3), and Lecturer creativity (X4), while the dependent variable is quality management of higher education (Y)

This research involved all lecturers at Jambi University in Indonesia, namely 620, as the research population. There are eight faculties at this university. To maintain a representative sample, a stratified random sampling technique was used in the sample determination process. The results found 86 samples.

Furthermore, in line with the research objective, namely to describe field conditions as they are, this research uses an explanatory survey method, the instruments used are leadership questionnaires (20 items), organizational climate (25 items), commitment (20 items), creativity questionnaires (20 items) and quality management (20 items) a total of 105 items, the questionnaire was distributed using g-form, then the data was collected and the statistical assumptions of normality, homogeneity and linearity were tested as a condition for fulfilling the regression and path analysis tests, considering that the research

data was all measured on an ordinal scale while on the other hand The application of path analysis requires an interval scale, so the data is first transformed into interval data, after the normality of the data is tested using K-S, it is obtained 1.981, which means small at a confidence level of <α=0.01 and acceptance <α=0.05, thus the data is normally distributed, while the linearity of the data shows f-count amounting to 13,378 sign α.00 for three variables, namely leadership (x1), organizational climate (x2), and lecturer commitment (x3) while lecturer creativity (x4) shows that it is not linear, thus the three variables meet the requirements for path analysis to test the direct and indirect effects of each research instrument.

Next, to interpret the magnitude of the joint influence between variables x on y or the coefficient (R2) used Cohen et al. (2000) criteria as in Table 1 below

Table 1. Criteria for Interpreting Effect Size

No	Determination Value (%)	Interpretation
1	.0 – .10	Poor=ugly
2	.11 – 0.30	Modest = weak
3	.31 – 0.50	Moderate=medium
4	>.51	Strong = strong, big

Meanwhile, to interpret the meaning of the magnitude of influence partially, use the criteria of Hieronymus (2020) as in table 2 below.

Table 2. Criteria for Interpreting Partial Effects

No	Determination Value	Interpretation
1	0,00 – 0,04	Low or very weak
2	0,05 – 0,16	Low but sure
3	0,17 – 0,49	Strong enough
4	0,50 – 0,81	Tall or strong
	0,82 – 1,00	Very tall or very strong

3. RESULTS

Before testing the hypothesis, statistical assumptions are tested, namely normality, homogeneity and linearity of the data. Considering that all research variable data is measured on an ordinal scale, whereas on the other hand, the application of path analysis requires an interval scale, the data is first transformed into interval data, in this case using Edward's (2002) successive interval method with the following steps:

1. Determine the number of frequencies (f)
2. Calculate proportions with the formula: Pi=f/N
3. Calculating cumulative proportion (PK)
4. Determine Z value obtained from the standard normal curve table
5. Calculate the scale value (SV) with the formula:

$$SV \frac{\text{Density at lower limit} - \text{density at upper limit}}{\text{Area under upper limit} - \text{Area under lower limit}}$$

Based on the steps above with the help of SPSS 21 for Windows software, the statistical assumption test for data normality, data linearity and data homogeneity can be seen in table 3 below.

Table 3. Recapitulation of Data Normality, Data Linearity and Data Homogeneity

Data Normality			Linearity (ANOVA)			Data Homogeneity		
			V	f_{count}	sign	V	x^2_{count}	$x^{2\ table}$
n		86	$x_1 - y$	39.682	.000	x_1	5.00	41.337
Normal parameters a,b	Mean	62,430	$x_2 - y$	26.779	.000	x_2	4.67	41.337
	Std.deviaatio	12,728	$x_3 - y$	56.576	.000	x_3	5.00	41.337
Modt extrem differences	Absolute	,214	$x_4 - y$	.102	752	x_4	2.40	41.337
	Positive	,172	$x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 - y$	13.378	.000		5.00	41.337
	Negative	-,214						
Kolmogoriv-Smirnov Z		1,981						
Asymp.Sig.(2-tailed)		,780						

Based on Table 3 above, it can be seen that through the K-S test, 1.981 was obtained, which means it is smaller at the level of confidence < α=0.01 and acceptance <α=0.05, thus indicating that variable y is normally distributed then the linearity of the data shows that three variables meet the requirements of path analysis, namely leadership. (x1-y), organizational climate (x2-y), and lecturer commitment (x3-y), while lecturer creativity (x4-y) has not been met. Overall, the obtained f-count amounting to 13,378 sign α.00, so it is interpreted that the three variables are linear towards y. next, the homogeneity of the data shows the dependent variable towards the independent variable leadership (x1), organizational climate (x2), and lecturer commitment (x3), and lecturer creativity (x4) has a homogeneous variance; in other words, the data sources have the same properties or characteristics.

After the statistical assumption test requirements have been carried out, the leadership influence hypothesis (x1), organizational climate (x2), lecturer commitment (x3), and lecturer creativity (x4) on the implementation of higher education quality management (y) both partially and collectively which can be seen in table 2 below

Table 4. Recapitulation of Hypothesis Testing

Variable	Description		P			Σ	%	Interpretation
	% mean	Stdev	direct		indirect			
Leadership (X1)	77,40	12,32	$p_y.x_1$	0,4081	0.2607	0.668	66.88	Very strong
Organizational Climate (X2)	76,35	13,03	$p_y.x_2$	0.0954	0.0295	0.1249	12.49	Low but sure
Commitment (X3)	72,37	12,32	$p_y.x_3$	0.0895	0.0732	0.16.27	16.27	Strong enough
Lecturer Creativity	51,09	15,52	$p_y.x_4$	0.0040	0.0003	0.0043	0.43	Very weak

Variable (X4)	Description		P			∑	%	Interpreta
Quality management (Y)	79,84	12,80	R^2 (rxy. x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)	x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 – y		0.588	58.8	Strong

Based on Table 4 above, it can be seen that theoretical conceptions are related to leadership (x1), organizational climate (x2), and commitment (x3), which have been proven to influence the quality management of higher education. In comparison, lecturer creativity (x4) does not show a significant position regarding higher education quality management.

In the table above, you can also see the variable that has the greatest influence on the implementation of quality management in higher education (Y), namely leadership (X1), namely 66.88%. Meanwhile, the variable that has the smallest influence is lecturer creativity (X4), which is 0.43%.

4. DISCUSSION

4.1 The Influence of Leadership on the Implementation of Quality Assurance

Research findings show that leadership (X1) influences the implementation of quality management in higher education by 66.88%, which is in the very strong category, with a direct influence of 0.408 and an indirect influence of 0.260. The findings of this research are in line with previous research, which states that without leadership at all institutional levels, the process of improving the quality management of higher education cannot be carried out and realized (Cabacang, 2021; Gordiychuk et al., 2020; Sallis, 2002). In line with the findings of this research, Sayeda Begum and Chandrasekharan Rajendran (2020) stated that for a long time, people have realized the importance of leadership, and now it has become a scientific discipline. Cornesky (1992) further stated that every year, it becomes clearer that effective leadership at the level of society and all organizations is an important factor in dealing with problems in this world. Therefore, in any activity or program and at any organizational level, it is increasingly convincing that leadership makes a real contribution to the success of higher education in carrying out its activities (Lestari, 2021; Muhid; Rosita et al., 2021). It is not surprising that every time the leadership changes, there are changes in lecturers' participation in carrying out academic tasks (Jenny, 2022).

Besides that, the main customers who need to be satisfied in the industrial world are customers (Cornesky, 1992), while in the world of higher education, the main customers are students who are an inherent element of the organization (Edward Sallis, 2002; Sallis, 2002). There are fundamental differences from the hierarchical pattern in that top management tends to act as a senior manager. In contrast, in the reverse hierarchy, the top position is occupied by someone who plays the role of leader. Although leaders and managers have the same scope of duties and are sometimes interchanged, they have different philosophies (Leiber, 2020; Sayeda et al., 2020). In line with this, Muhid, Rosita, Fitrah Dewi, and Erisy (2021) state the basic differences between managers and leaders that Managers value stability, order, and efficiency, while leaders value flexibility, innovation, and adaptation. Managers care deeply about how things are, and they try to get people to do them better. Leaders pay close attention to what things mean to people and try to agree on the most important things to do.

Another difference between managers and leaders is related to responsibility or risk (Cornesky, 1992). In the hierarchical pattern, the risk and responsibility lie with the top manager, while in the reverse hierarchical management pattern, the responsibility lies with the lowest structure of higher education (Jenny, 2022). On the other hand, the customers referred to in higher education are not only students or pupils but also include internal parties who have an important role and are responsible for achieving quality management in higher education (Eddy, 2020)

4.2 The influence of organizational climate on quality management

The research findings show that Organizational Climate (X2) influences the quality management of higher education by 12.49%, which is in the low but definite category. The direct influence is 0.095, and the indirect influence is 0.029. This finding is in line with the results of research by Gulden et al. (2020), which states that there are two important things that staff need to produce quality, namely an environment that is suitable for working and an environment that appreciates success and achievements achieved. The factors inherent in the organizational climate will produce the quality of the organizational climate, which ultimately influences the quality of higher education quality management (Eddy, 2020; Sallis, 2002)

4.3 The influence of commitment on quality management

The research findings show that the lecturers' commitment (X3) influences higher education quality management (Y) by 16.27%, which is in the quite strong category, with a direct influence of 0.089 and an indirect influence of 0.073. This finding is in line with research results (Simangunsong, 2019; Utami et al., 2021; Vaganova et al., 2020), which found that commitment has become one of the most important factorial factors in discussing management, especially organizational behavior, and is often equated with motivation and leadership factors. , organizational culture, and climate. Leiber (2020) further stated that commitment is the first-order factor that needs to be built in the implementation of quality management in higher education, both the commitment of leaders and those led.

4.4 The influence of lecturer creativity on quality management

The research findings show that lecturer creativity (X4) on higher education quality management (y) of 0.43%, which is in the very weak category; in other words, lecturer creativity does not have a significant influence on higher education quality management with a direct effect of only 0.0004 and an indirect effect of 0.000. In the case of low lecturer creativity in higher education quality management, Jenny (2022) requires an optimal role from leaders to continue to increase the positive, creative characteristics of lecturers and reduce non-positive organizational culture. Characteristics of creativity that need attention, for example, first in terms of the emergence of scientific ideas, writing scientific essays, and finding academic findings (Cornesky, 1992; Lestari, 2021). Leaders are expected to be able to make changes in a better direction, namely changes to the work culture of an organization that creates creativity (Eddy, 2020)

Apart from the findings of this research, certain limitations must be taken into account, even though the sample was obtained directly from the lowest level, namely lecturers and heads of higher education study programs, which shows that leadership, organizational climate, and commitment influence the quality management of higher education, all participants are higher education higher education personnel (Amelia & Arsyad, 2024). Country, it is recommended that further research involve private higher education participants with a diversity of races, personalities, and countries so that the population becomes heterogeneous.

4.5 The influence of leadership, organizational climate, commitment, and creativity

Based on the research findings show that the influence of leadership, organizational climate, commitment, and creativity on higher education quality management shows an influence of 66.88% with a strong interpretation; in other words, leadership, organizational climate, commitment, and creativity simultaneously influence the quality management of higher education.

5. CONCLUSION

Based on the research findings, it can be concluded that leadership, organizational climate, commitment, and creativity of lecturers simultaneously influence the quality management of higher education, namely 58.8% (strong), with details of the leadership influence being 66.88% (very strong). Organization was 12.48% (low but certain), the influence of commitment was 16.27% (quite strong), while lecturer creativity did not show a significant influence, namely only 0.43% (very weak). Through the findings obtained in this study, in the framework of quality management of higher education, the quality of leadership, organizational climate, and commitment and creativity of lecturers in various higher education institutions in Indonesia are highly recommended. Developing leadership training, building a culture of quality and commitment-oriented towards customer satisfaction, and creating a creativity laboratory need to be carried out so that the entire academic community has adequate competence and is involved in measurable and monitored quality management of higher education. Apart from that, further research that examines the quality management of higher education in terms of personality, culture, ethnicity, and race also needs to be carried out. This research can provide information regarding the advantages and disadvantages of the factors studied in supporting the quality management of higher education. Apart from that, studies that examine the influence of quality management and the competence of lecturers in implementing the tri dharma of higher education are also being carried out so that educators know what benefits can be obtained through implementing quality management in higher education.

References

Abbas, J., Kumari, K., & Al-Rahmi, W. M. (2021). Quality management system in higher education institutions and its impact on students' employability with the mediating effect of industry–academia collaboration. Journal of Economic and Administrative Sciences. https://doi.org/10.1108/jeas-07-2021-0135

Amelia, A., & Arsyad, A. W. (2024). The Influence of Leadership Style, Education and Training (Diklat) and Work Discipline on Perumdam Tirta Kencana Employee Performance, Samarinda City. Eduvest-Journal of Universal Studies, 4(1), 226–242.

Baas, M., van der Rijst, R., Huizinga, T., van den Berg, E., & Admiraal, W. (2022). Would you use them? A qualitative study on teachers' assessments of open educational resources in higher education. The Internet and Higher Education, 54, 100857. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IHEDUC.2022.100857

Bi, H. H. (2022). Applying statistical process control to teaching quality assurance at higher education institutions. Quality Management Journal, 29(2), 145–157. https://doi.org/10.1080/10686967.2022.2035288

Cabacang, G. S. (2021). Quality is never an accident: A survey on the total quality-management practices amongst selected higher education institutions in the philippines. International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 20(10), 23–41. https://doi.org/10.26803/IJLTER.20.10.2

Cantwell, B., Case, J., & Marginson, S. (2022). 50 years of Higher Education: a critical reflection and thoughts on an evolving agenda. Higher Education, 84(6), 1169–1181. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00960-3

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). Research Methods in Education (C. Louis (ed.)). London: Routledge.

Cornesky, R. A. (Robert A. (1992). Implementing total quality management in higher education. Magna Publications.

Eddy, S. S. (2020). Manajemen SDM Perguruan Tinggi: Pendekatan Kepemimpinan Profesional. Penebar Media Pustaka.

Edward Sallis, G. J. (2002). Knowledge Management in Education Enhancing Learning & Education. Kogan Page.

Geron-Pinon, G., Solana-Gonzalez, P., Trigueros-Preciado, S., & Perez-Gonzalez, D. (2021). Management indicators: their impact on Latin-American universities accreditation. Quality in Higher Education, 27(2), 184–205. https://doi.org/10.1080/13538322.2021.1890318

Gordiichuk, S. V., Kalinina, L. M., Snikhovska, I. E., & Goray, O. V. (2020). Quality management of educational activities in the training of specialists in the field of health care: The case of ukrainian medical HEIs. International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 19(8), 371–392. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.19.8.20

Gulden, M., Saltanat, K., Raigul, D., Dauren, T., & Assel, A. (2020). Quality management of higher education: Innovation approach from perspectives of institutionalism. An exploratory literature review. Cogent Business & Management, 7(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2020.1749217

Hadiyanto, Noferdiman, Syamsurizal, Muhaimin, & Krisantia, I. (2021). Students' soft skills, hard skills, and competitiveness (SHC): A suggested model for Indonesian higher education curriculum. International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 20(2), 218–234. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.20.2.12

Hasbullah, M. A., Selirowangi, N. B., Pradana, M. S., Khulel, B., & Hudi, M. (2020). Quality and Affordable Education through Quality Management Systems in Higher Education. EDUTEC : Journal of Education And Technology, 3(2), 151–160. https://doi.org/10.29062/edu.v3i2.52

Hironymus, G. (2020). Path Analysis (Analisis Jalur) Konsep & Praktik dalam Penelitian. PT Penerbit Mitra Group.

Hossain, M. M., & Hossain, M. A. (2019). Understanding the Quality Management of Private Universities in Bangladesh: A Hierarchical Model. Quality Management Journal, 26(4), 191–206. https://doi.org/10.1080/10686967.2019.1647771

Jenny, N. (2022). Dekan Memimpin. CV Budi Utama.

Leiber, T. (2020). Impact evaluation of quality management in higher education. Taylor & Francis.

Leiber, T., Stensaker, B., & Harvey, L. C. (2018). Bridging theory and practice of impact evaluation of quality management in higher education institutions: a SWOT analysis. European Journal of Higher Education, 8(3), 351–365. https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2018.1474782

Lestari, M. (2021). Kepemimpinan Transformasional. NEM.

Marciniak, R. (2015). Methodological proposal for the application of international benchmarking in order to assess the quality of virtual higher education. RUSC Universities and Knowledge Society Journal, 12(3), 46–61. https://doi.org/10.7238/rusc.v12i3.2163

Mensah, J. (2020). Improving Quality Management in Higher Education Institutions in Developing Countries through Strategic Planning. Asian Journal of Contemporary Education Journal of Contemporary Education, 4(1), 9–25. https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.137.2020.41.9.25

Muhid;Rosita, Fitrah Dewi dan Erisy, S. A. (2021). TEORI DAN IMPLEMENTASI PENJAMINAN MUTU DI PERGURUAN TINGGI. Klik Media.

Mulay, R. V., & Khanna, V. T. (2020). An empirical study on quality improvement in higher education institutions with reference to selected processes. Quality Management Journal, 28(1), 41–56. https://doi.org/10.1080/10686967.2020.1848367

Muller, F. A., & Wulf, T. (2020). Technology-supported management education: a systematic review of antecedents of learning effectiveness. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 17(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-020-00226-x

Nasim, K., Sikander, A., & Tian, X. (2020). Twenty years of research on total quality management in Higher Education: A systematic literature review. Higher Education Quarterly, 74(1), 75–97. https://doi.org/10.1111/HEQU.12227

Pehlivan, D., & Cicek, K. (2021). A knowledge-based model on quality management system compliance assessment for maritime higher education institutions. Quality in Higher Education, 27(2), 239–263. https://doi.org/10.1080/13538322.2021.1905654

Sakthivel, P. B., & Raju, R. (2006). An Instrument for Measuring Engineering Education Quality from Students' Perspective. Quality Management Journal, 13(3), 23–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/10686967.2006.11918559

Sallis, E. (2002). Total Quality Management in Education (3rd ed.). Kogan Page.

Sayeda Begum, Chandrasekharan Rajendran, P. S. L. (2020). Total quality management in higher education : study of engineering institutions. Taylor & Francis.

Simangunsong, E. (2019). Factors determining the quality management of higher education: A case study at a business school in Indonesia. Cakrawala Pendidikan, 38(2), 215–227. https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v38i2.19685

Utami, P. P., Widiatna, A. D., Ayuningrum, S., Putri, A., Herlyna, & Adisel. (2021). Personality: How does it impact teachers' organizational commitment? Cakrawala Pendidikan, 40(1), 120–132. https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v40i1.33766

Vaganova, O. I., Gilyazova, O. S., Gileva, A. V., Yarygina, N. A., & Bekirova, E. S. (2020). Quality management of educational activities in higher education. Revista Amazonia Investiga, 9(28), 74–82. https://doi.org/10.34069/ai/2020.28.04.9

Van Schalkwyk, R. D., & Steenkamp, R. J. (2020). A total quality service framework for private higher education in South Africa. Quality Management Journal, 27(2), 106–119. https://doi.org/10.1080/10686967.2020.1722044