

Women's Leadership Policy Strategy: Improving Quality of Education (TQM) In Higher Education

Lusy Tunik Muharlisiani¹, Endang Noerhartati², Dewie Tri Wijayati³, Yatim Riyanto⁴, Toho Cholik Mutohir⁵, Soedjarwo⁶, Warih Handayani⁷, Moedjito⁸, Siti Bariroh⁹, Abdul Talib Bin Bon¹⁰

Lusy Tunik Muharlisiani

Department of English Education, Universitas Wijaya Kusuma, Surabaya, Indonesia
Postgraduate Student, Department of Education Management, Unesa, Surabaya, Indonesia
lusy.18007+lusytm_fbs@uwks.ac.id

Endang Noerhartati

Department of Agroindustrial Technology, Universitas Wijaya Kusuma Surabaya, Indonesia
Postgraduate Student, Department of Education Management, Unesa, Surabaya, Indonesia
endang.18006+endang_noer@uwks.ac.id

Dewie Tri Wijayati, Yatim Riyanto, Toho Cholik Mutohir,

Professor, Department of Education Management, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia
tri_de@yahoo.com+jatimriyanto@gmail.com+toho.ditjora@gmail.com

Soedjarwo, Warih Handayani, Moedjito,

Lecture, Department of Education Management, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia
soedjarwo9@gmail.com+warihhandayani@unesa.ac.id+ak.mudjito@gmail.com

Siti Bariroh - Universitas Gresik, Indonesia

Siti.bariroh60@gmail.com

Abdul Talib Bin Bon

Fakulti Pengurusan Teknologi dan Perniagaan Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia (UTHM) Johor,
Malaysia
talibon@gmail.com

Abstract

The main problem is how strategies improve the quality of education in higher education: 1) understanding of the reality of the program, the quality of the program and the factors that influence it. In improving the quality of education, there must be sustainability of performance (functioning as a measure to address the problems of low quality education that relies on conventional approaches) and improving quality (directing higher education institutions to learn and implement Total Quality Management) that is integrated with each quality management level of management and all units in the organizational system that aim to provide satisfactory services to customers, so they must optimize management to improve quality. The approach used is qualitative: (1) students are satisfied with services; (2) the service to its students; (3) to have high quality and meet the expectation; (4) the services of higher education: division of labor, relationships and communication between leaders, employees, salary / honor received and service. One of flourish base qualification is Integrated Quality Management (IQM) and needs the character change of the one who is the leader and the one who does work; the command from the leader changed by the worker into the initiative. The result can be concluded as follows 1) the understanding of stakeholders in the reality of study programs and factors influencing; 2) the quality of education process relatively customer satisfaction fulfillment

Key Words: Leadership Policy. Quality of Education, TQM, Higher Education, IQM

1. Introduction

Quality-based Leadership Policy is leadership that is able to implement quality management properly. It is necessary to change the nature of the relationship between the management (leader) and those who carry out work (leaders, lecturers, employees, laboratory staff, and technicians). The task of the leadership is not only to give orders, but to encourage and facilitate the improvement of the quality of work carried out by members.

The effort of a PT to improve the quality of its performance requires the existence of leadership that always motivates other members of the PT to always improve the quality of its work. In order for leadership in a higher education institution to successfully manage quality on an ongoing basis, the PT needs to do the process systematically.

The purpose and activities of monitoring and evaluation are to examine effectiveness in order to improve the quality of education. Evaluation is not always useful in certain cases, therefore other evaluation results also require other information that will be used to make further decisions in the planning and implementation of the program in the future. These activities are continuously carried out so that it is a continuous quality improvement process.

The new paradigm of higher education management emphasizes the importance of institutional autonomy based on accountability, evaluation, and accreditation and leads to the ultimate goal of continuous quality improvement. On the other hand, the trend of globalization, the needs of the community and the demands of increasingly fierce competition require a high commitment to the implementation of quality education. This understanding emphasizes the need for universities to implement a quality management, including an Educational Quality Assurance System to ensure that the quality of education in a tertiary institution can be maintained and improved in accordance with planned.

Higher education has two main objectives: 1) preparing students to become members of the community who have academic and professional abilities that can apply, develop, enrich the repertoire of science, technology and art, 2) develop and disseminate science, technology, art and strive for its use to improve the lives of the people and enrich national culture (PP number 60 of 1999, about PT, article 2).

Improving the quality of education cannot be done partially, but must be comprehensive and sustainable. To improve the ability of lecturers, professional education of educators and education staff began (elements of leadership, lecturers and administrative staff). To improve lecture operations, learning facilities and facilities and the welfare of lecturers, the education budget of 20% will begin to be realized, besides that the lecture process must also be improved, no longer limited to developing low-level thinking skills, namely knowledge and understanding, but intermediate thinking, namely application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation, and continued on high-level thinking, namely problem solving and creativity. For that we need a leader who can improve the quality of work and can motivate all subordinates to work well.

Minimum lecturer academic qualifications: 1) Masters degree graduates for diploma or undergraduate programs; and 2) Doctoral program graduates for postgraduate programs. As a professional, lecturers have the rights and obligations in implementing the Tridarma of Higher Education. In carrying out professional duties and lecturers are obliged: 1) Carry out education, research, and community service; 2) Plan, implement the learning process, and assess and evaluate learning outcomes; 3) Increasing and developing academic qualifications and competencies on an ongoing basis in line with the development of science, technology and art; 4) Acting objectively and not discriminating on the basis of consideration of gender, religion, ethnicity, race, certain physical conditions, or the socioeconomic background of students in learning; 5) Uphold the laws and regulations, laws and codes of ethics, as well as religious and ethical values; and 6) Maintain and foster national unity. Improving the quality of education will not be achieved if the performance of lecturers is insufficient, the performance of lecturers will not be achieved as expected, this greatly affects the quality of education

It can be said that improving the quality of education in higher education can be done by increasing the quality of higher education resources, especially leaders and lecturers, leaders as policy holders and power have a role in efforts to improve the quality of education as well as lecturers by improving their performance and inherent factors in improving performance can have a positive impact in improving the quality of education in higher education. The general objective in this study was to see the influence and strong contribution of leadership to the quality of higher education. In this paper, we will discuss and be more careful about the factors that influence the improvement of the quality of higher education, including leadership, so that all of this is closely related to improving the quality of higher education. Although there are still many other factors, but in this study the focus is on the relationship to these two variables, both individually and together.

Specific objectives to be achieved are: 1) Knowing how much the stages of leadership and quality of education at PT; 2) Knowing the relationship and contribution of leadership to improving the quality of higher education; 3) Knowing the relationship and contribution to improving the quality of higher education; 4) Knowing the contribution of leadership to improving the quality of education of PT

$$\text{Kinerja} = f \{ \text{Motivasi Kerja} \times \text{Kemampuan} \times \text{Peluang} \}$$

2. Metodology and Data Analysis

The research method uses quantitative research methods because it examines the phenomena that occur, namely leadership policies and lecturer performance towards improving the quality of higher education.

The data collected in this study was analyzed using descriptive statistical techniques as well as inferential statistics. Descriptive analysis is an analysis used to analyze data by describing or describing the collected data as it is without intending to make conclusions that apply to the general or generalizations. Descriptive statistics are used to present data on each research variable singly, namely the variable leadership policy and lecturer performance and improving the quality of higher education. Inferential statistics used are for testing instruments that include validity and reliability tests; Test requirements for analysis which includes tests for normality and homogeneity of data; and hypothesis test research which includes correlation test, regression. The collected data is then analyzed. The data analysis technique uses the Exell Office 2007 program and SPSS version 16.00. The population in this study were all lecturers who served in three universities. To determine the sample used random sampling technique means that 150 respondents were taken randomly. Singarimbun and Efendi (1989) who say that a large sample that is normally distributed is a sample of > 30 cases, and if the data analysis used is a correlation technique then the sample that must be taken is at least 20 cases.

Similarly, Arikunto (2013) about the procedure for determining the number of samples based on opinion as follows: if the sample size is large it can be taken as a sample with 15-25% or more or by measuring at least: (1) the ability of researchers seen from time, energy and funds ; (2) the narrow area of observation of each object due to the lack of data, (3) the size of the risk borne by the researcher

3. Result and Discussion

To find out the stages of leadership, lecturer performance and quality of education in higher education, in this study used descriptive statistics. The leadership stages are used descriptive statistic the stages of leadership variables can be explained in table 1

Table 1. Analysis of Descriptive Statistics of Variables in Leadership

No	Indikator	Nilai Mean	Nilai Standar Deviasi
1	Visionary	19.63	3.560
2	Agent of Change	19.51	3.315
3	Confidence	18.05	4.603
4	Charismatic	18.53	4.574
5	Empathic	18.66	4.104
6	Awaken Inspiration	17.78	2.849
7	Stimulating Intellectuals	16.93	3.319
8	Leadership Variables	129.10	12.253

Table 1 shows the leadership stage, the results of calculations on the research data show that the leadership stage is high and satisfying for the whole item, the visionary dimension has a value (mean = 19.63, SD = 3,560), the dimension of change agent has a value (mean = 19.51, SD = 3.315), dimensions of confidence have values (mean = 18.05, SD = 4,603), charismatic dimensions have values (mean = 18.53, SD = 4,574), empathic dimensions have values (mean = 18.66, SD = 4.104), dimensions of inspiring have values (mean = 17.78, SD = 2,849), intellectual stimulating dimensions have values (mean = 16.93, SD = 3.319), and overall leadership variables have values (mean = 129.10, SD = 12.253)

The stages of Lecturer Performance are used with descriptive statistics, in table 2.

Table 2. Analysis of Descriptive Statistics Lecturer Performance Variables

No	Indikator	Mean Score	Standar Deviasi Score
1	Ability to plan teaching	20.35	3.364
2	Mastery in subjects	19.02	4.562
3	Mastery of delivery techniques	19.87	4.340
4	Variation in the use of teaching methods	25.03	5.247
5	Providing individual services	23.53	4.593
6	Assessment and reporting	21.79	5.051
	Lecturer Performance	129.49	17.306

From table 2 shows the stage of lecturer performance, the results of the calculation of the research data show the lecturer performance stage is high and satisfactory for the whole item, the dimensions of teaching planning ability have a value (mean = 20.25, SD = 3.364), mastery dimensions in the subject matter (mean = 19.02, SD = 4,564), dimension of mastery of delivery techniques has a value (mean = 19.87, SD = 4.340), dimension of use of teaching methods has value (mean =

25.03, SD = 5.247), individual service dimensions have value (mean = 23.53, SD = 4,593), the dimensions of assessment and reporting have values (mean = 21.79, SD = 5,051), the variable performance of lecturers as a whole has a value (mean = 129.49, SD = 17.306). Educational Quality Stages are used with descriptive statistics, the stages of education quality variables can be explained in table 3

Table 3. Analysis of Descriptive Statistics on Variable Quality of Education

No	Indicator	Nilai Mean	Nilai Standar Deviasi
1	Institutional Identity	13.94	2.552
2	Curriculum	13.45	2.919
3	Learning process	11.51	3.496
4	Lecturers and Staff	13.03	3.962
5	Facilities and infrastructure	12.81	3.371
6	Management	15.42	3.818
7	Financing	14.47	4.169
8	Assessment and Learning	16.90	4.030
9	Students Activities	16.45	4.396
10	Quality of Education	239.51	31.660

From table 3 shows the stages of education quality, the results of calculations on the research data show the stage of education quality is high and satisfactory for the whole item, the institution's identification dimension has a value (mean = 13.94, SD = 2,552), curriculum dimensions have a value (mean = 13.45, SD = 2,919), the dimensions of the learning process have values (mean = 11.51, SD = 3,496), dimensions of lecturers and staff have values (mean = 13.03, SD = 3.962), dimensions of facilities and infrastructure have values (mean = 12.81, SD = 3.371), the management dimension has a value (mean = 15.42, SD = 3,818), the financing dimension has a value (mean = 14.47, SD = 4,169), the dimensions of assessment and learning have a value (mean = 16.90, SD = 4,030), the dimension of student activity has value (mean = 16.45, SD = 4,396), the overall education quality variable has a value (mean = 239.51, SD = 31,660).

Inferential research results Relationship between Leadership Towards Higher Education Quality Improvement.

To answer the second research question, data was obtained from leadership instruments and education quality which were answered by 150 lecturers, through person correlation analysis and simple regression. Pearson correlation analysis provides the Pearson r correlation coefficient in the form of positive (+) or negative (-) for indicating the form of the relationship between variables. Coefficient values between 0.00 and 1.00 also mean the strength of the relationship. The means of 'rule of thumb' by Johnson and Nelson (1986) are used to explain the strength of the correlation that has no relationship (0.00); very low; low; simple; very high and perfect connectivity (1.00).

To find out the magnitude of the relationship between leadership variables on educational quality was analyzed using bivariate regression. From the results of the calculation of bivariate regression analysis on the data on leadership variables on education quality, the regression direction b is equal to = 0.428 and a constant of 72.742. Thus the second form of the relationship (X1 with Y) can be illustrated by the regression equation $\hat{Y} = 72.742 + 0.428X1$. The strength of the contribution of the X1 variable to Y is indicated by the ry1 correlation coefficient of = 0.312. The significance test of the correlation coefficient is obtained by the t-test value of 5.57. While the alphabet at $\alpha = 0.05$; dk = 148 can get the price of alphabet = 1.65, at $\alpha = 0.01$ is 2.33. Furthermore, an analysis of the coefficient of determination is held. The coefficient of determination is the square of the correlation coefficient between variables X1 and variable Y. The coefficient of determination X1 with Y is $(ry1)^2 = (0.312)^2 = 0.098$. This means that 9.8% of the variation that occurs in the quality of education can be explained by leadership through regression $\hat{Y} = 72.742 + 0.428X1$.

Relationship and Contribution of Lecturer Performance to Educational Quality Improvement

To answer the research questions, data were obtained from the lecturer performance instrument and the quality of education answered by 150 lecturers, through Pearson correlation analysis and bivariate regression. From the results of the calculation of a simple regression analysis on the data variable lecturer performance on the quality of education obtained the direction of regression b = 0.469 and a constant of 67.303. Thus the second form of the relationship (X2 with Y) can be described by the regression equation $\hat{Y} = 67.303 + 0.469X2$. The strength of the relationship between variables X2 and Y is shown by the ry2 correlation coefficient of = 0.483. Meaning of correlation coefficient with t test obtained by counting of 6.717. While the alphabet at $\alpha = 0.01$; dk = 148 can get the price of alphabet = 2.33.

Furthermore, an analysis of the coefficient of determination is held. The coefficient of determination is the square of the correlation coefficient between variables X2 and variable Y. The coefficient of determination X2 with Y is $(ry2)^2 = (0.483)^2 = 0.234$. This means that 23.4% of the variation that occurs in the quality of education can be explained by the performance of the lecturer through regression $\hat{Y} = 67.303 + 0.469X2$

Knowing the relationship and contribution of leadership and lecturer performance together towards improving the quality of higher education.

The HA4 hypothesis proposed in this study is that there is a positive relationship between leadership and lecturer performance together on the quality of education. The calculation of multivariate regression data on leadership variables and lecturer performance on educational quality produces a regression direction of a1, 0.316 for variable X1 (leadership),

a₂ of 0.427 for variable X₂ (lecturer performance), and constant a of 31,913. The form between the independent variables and the dependent variable can be described by the regression equation $\hat{Y} = 31,913 + 0.316X_1 + 0.427X_2$. The strength of multivariate correlation between variables X₁, X₂ and Y variables obtained by the correlation coefficient R = 0.534. The coefficient of determination between variables (X₁, X₂) and the dependent variable (Y) is equal to R² = (0.534)² = 0.285 indicating that 28.5% of the variations that occur in the education quality variable can be explained together by leadership variables and lecturer performance together through the regression equation $\hat{Y} = 31,913 + 0.316X_1 + 0.427X_2$. The remaining variance is explained by other variables.

4. Conclusion and Recommendation

From the descriptive study in general it can be concluded that the level of education quality, leadership and quality of education are in good condition, this becomes the basis for efforts to plan and assess the quality or quality of education at PT. Improving the quality of education will be carried out well with the planning and evaluation of various management activities that have been carried out in a certain period of time, both in the management of higher education management and the learning process and management of human resources. The quality of human resources, especially lecturers as leaders in the learning process activities is needed as a basis for efforts to improve and improve the learning process, the quality and quality of an educator will be seen in the achievement of the management of learning activities and student achievement PT.

PT leadership has an important role in the management of quality universities, leaders in carrying out leadership that is not good and unprofessional, will give a bad influence on the achievement of quality education in higher education, this is due to all policies in managing PT management lies with the leadership, so that the existence of good leadership will be the foundation in achieving the quality of education itself, in an effort to achieve that a leader needs the ability and quality in managing, guiding, fostering and directing every element of the PT in achieving educational goals.

Based on the results of the research and conclusions as stated above, the following suggestions are conveyed; Leaders in the management of PT resources need appropriate leadership tailored to the needs and circumstances that exist within the scope of the PT by evaluating and appropriately evaluating various activities that have been carried out, a leader being in an educational institution especially PT, so that the right leadership can provide motivation and strong indication of the management and implementation of quality learning activities at PT, for that the leader must improve self-quality and improve leadership professionalism, and understand and have the ability to carry out leadership in efforts to achieve educational goals, be more sensitive and care for every problem and activities that take place, with the hope of directly addressing any shifts or disputes that arise, in order to maintain the process of improving the quality of education of PT. Higher Education is a system, namely a structure consisting of various components that are closely related to each other functionally, so that it is synergistic integration. In these components there are processes that are in accordance with their respective functions, but not exclusively or individually, but are interrelated, mutually supportive, and influence each other (Tampubolon, 2001: 79). The right quality management system needs to be developed. Ministry of National Education (2003) explains Higher Education in higher education is declared quality or quality, if: 1. The university is able to establish and realize its vision through the implementation of its mission (deductive aspect); 2. The college is able to meet the needs of stakeholders (inductive aspects), in the form of: (a). Community needs (societal needs); (b) The needs of the workforce (industrial needs); Professional needs. Thus universities must be able to plan, run and control a process that guarantees the achievement of quality as described above

References

- Bachor (2015) and Besterfield, D. H. (1999). *Total Quality Management*. Prentice Hall: United States of America.
- Cheng, Y. C. (1996). *School – Based Management: A Mechanism for development*. The Falmer Press Washington, D.C.
- Edward D and Kotler, P (1996). *Marketing Management: Planning, Implementation and Controll*. New York: Addison Wesley Publishing Hal. Inc.
- Follet and Levin & H.M. Lockheed (1993). *Effective Schools in Developing Countries*. The World Bank: Educational Employment Division, Populations and Human Resource Development
- Gulickch L. David and Davis B. Stanley. (2006). *Quality Management: Introduction to Total Quality Managemen For Production, Processing and Service*. New Jersey: Pearson Education. Inc.
- Jhon Soeprihatno. (1996). *Penilaian Kinerja dan Pengembangan Karyawan*, Edisi Ke I, Cetakan Kedua, Yogyakarta : BPFE.
- Kotter and Cascio, Wayne F. (1995). *Managing Human Resources, Productivity, Quality of Worklife, Profits*. New York : McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Hadari Nawawi (2010) and Majid Konting, Mohd., (1990). *Kaedah penyelidikan pendidikan*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Levin and Locked (2013) and Mortimore, P. (20083) *School effectiveness and the management of effective learning and teaching*. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*. 4(290–310)
- 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. (2000). *Essentials of Organizational Behavior*. New Jersey: PrenticeHall. Robin. S. P. (2006). *Organizational behavior*. New Jersey : Prentice Hall. Inc.

- Scheerens.J. and Bosker.R.J. (2007).*The Foundations of Educational Effectiveness*. London: Pergamon.
- Stogdill, R.M. 2014. Handbook of leadership. A Survey of theory and research. New York Free Press.
- Sukmadinata, Nana, Sy. (2008). *Pengembangan Kurikulum, Teori dan Praktek*, Bandung : PT. Refika Aditama.
- Tampubolon (2011) and Supriatno, John. (1996). *Penilaian Kinerja dan Pengembangan Guru*, Yogyakarta : BPFE Surya,
- M. (2000). *Manajemen Guru Dalam Desentralisasi Pendidikan*. Bandung.
- Terry, Robert, W. (2013). *Autentic Leadership: Courage In Action*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publisher.
- Toha, Miftah. (2010), *Kepemimpinan dan Manajemen*, Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia No. 20/2003, Tentang *Sistem Pendidikan Nasional*.

Biographies

Lusy Tunik Muharlisiani, is a is an English lecturer in the English Education Department of Faculty of Language and Sains in *UniversitasWijaya Kusuma Surabaya, Indonesia*. Her major interests are Skills Learning, TEFL, Research Methodology, ELT Management (Entrepreneurship), Media and CALL. Lusy Tunik Muharlisiani holds a Master of Technology Education degree in Universitas PGRI Adi Bana Surabaya. I am a member of TEFLIN (Teaching English Foreign Language International) and APSPBI (Asosiasi Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris), and now Postgraduate student, Department of Education Management, Unesa, Surabaya, Jawa Timur, Indonesia

Endang Noerhartati, is a lecturer at Department of Agroindustrial Technology, Universitas Wijaya Kusuma Surabaya, Indonesia, I holds a Master of Universitas Gajah Mada Yogyakarta, and now Postgraduate Student, Department of Education Management, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Jawa Timur, Indonesia. Endang Noerhartati is Vice Rector of Relationship, Cooperation, and Development Universitas Wijaya Kusuma Surabaya. Her major interests are Research Methodology, Management University Entrepreneurship Education. Entrepreneurship Sorghum, Food Processing Technology, and Sorghum Processing

Dewie Tri Wijayati, Yatim Riyanto, Toho Cholik Mutohir are professor at Department of Education Management, Unesa, Surabaya, Indonesia

Warih Handayaniingrum, Moedjito and Soedjarwo are Associate Professor, Department of Education Management, Unesa, Surabaya, Jawa Timur, Indonesia

Siti Bariroh, is an associate professor lecturer in Universitas Gresik, *Indonesia*. Her major interests are Research Methodology and ELT Management (Entrepreneurship). I am a Master of Technology Education degree in Universitas PGRI Adi Bana Surabaya. I am vice rector II Universitas Gresik

Prof. Dr. Abdul Talib Bin Bon Is Professor Management From Faculty Management Of Technology And Private Vocational School, Department Of Position Position And Manufacture Of Field Of Expertise, Economics, Business And Management, Operations Management. Field Of Specialization Operations Research / Management, Qualification Institution 2008 Doctor Falsafah Computer Science Universite De La Rochelle, 1998 Graduate Private Vocational School Of Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 1991 Youth Mechanical Private Vocational School Universiti Technology Malaysia, Year 1986 Malaysia Mechanical Diploma Of Mechanical Teachers.