



Academic Leadership and Human Resource Development in Private Higher Education: Evidence from STISIP Margarana Tabanan

I Nyoman Gede Widiana^{1*}, Anak Agung Ketut Sri Candrawati², Yerimias Mone³

Department of Public Administration, STISIP Margarana Tabanan, Bali, Indonesia^{1,2,3}

*Corresponding author: widiana.nayaka@gmail.com | candrawati874@gmail.com | miasmone49@gmail.com

Received: 24 March 2026 | Revised: 18 April 2026 | Published: 29 May 2026

Abstract

Purpose: This study aims to analyze the role of academic leadership in planning, implementing, and evaluating human resource (HR) development programs, and to identify supporting and inhibiting factors at STISIP Margarana Tabanan, Bali, Indonesia.

Research Methodology: A qualitative case study approach was employed. Data were collected through in-depth interviews, participatory observation, and documentation involving 12 purposively selected informants, including institutional leaders, program heads, lecturers, and administrative staff. Data were analyzed using thematic analysis, with triangulation and member checking ensuring data validity.

Results: Academic leadership played an active role in all stages of HR development. In planning, a Strategic HR Development Plan (2025–2030) was formulated, targeting 35% doctoral-qualified lecturers by 2028, supported by annual training needs analysis and allocation of 15% of the operational budget. Implementation included doctoral scholarships, certification programs, pedagogical training, and research mentoring. Evaluation involved performance assessments and satisfaction surveys, showing a 75% satisfaction rate. Key supporting factors included leadership commitment and budget allocation, while inhibiting factors included administrative burden, resistance to change, and limited access to international training.

Conclusions: Academic leadership demonstrates both transformational and collaborative roles, although intellectual stimulation needs strengthening.

Limitations: This study is limited to a single-case qualitative design at STISIP Margarana Tabanan, which may restrict the generalizability of the findings to other institutional contexts.

Contributions: This study proposes a Collaborative–Transformational Academic Leadership Model integrating collaborative processes as a mediating mechanism for sustainable HR development and institutional performance improvement.

Keywords: *Academic Leadership, Human Resource Development, Private Higher Education, Qualitative Case Study, Transformational Leadership*

How to Cite: Widiana, I. N. G., Candrawati, A. A. K. S., & Mone, Y. (2026). Academic Leadership and Human Resource Development in Private Higher Education: Evidence from STISIP Margarana Tabanan. *Journal of Economics, Management, Entrepreneurship, and Business (JEMEB)*, 6(1), 45-59.

1. Introduction

Higher education institutions bear a strategic responsibility not only to produce graduates who are competent, competitive, and principled but also to continuously develop their own internal human

resources (HR), namely, lecturers and administrative staff ([Kardini, Elshifa, Adiawaty, & Wijayanti, 2023](#); [Zaakiyyah, 2024](#)). These two groups are the primary determinants of institutional quality: lecturers drive teaching, research, and community service (*tridharma*), while administrative staff support operational excellence. The sustained development of both groups fundamentally depends on the quality and orientation of academic leadership ([Damayanti, Sianturi, Damayanto, Bangkara, & Ristianti, 2023](#)).

Academic leadership in higher education is a multidimensional construct that transcends formal, positional authority. It encompasses the capacity to inspire a shared vision, stimulate intellectual growth, foster collaborative cultures, and translate institutional goals into sustainable human capital investments ([Whittaker & Montgomery, 2022](#)). More broadly, academic leaders are expected to act as change agents who bridge strategic planning with practical implementation, ensuring that policies are effectively transformed into academic practices that enhance institutional quality. This role also requires balancing administrative responsibilities with academic values such as autonomy, collegiality, and innovation, while simultaneously responding to external pressures related to accreditation, competitiveness, and technological advancement in the higher education sector. The transformational leadership paradigm, characterized by idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration ([Bass and Avolio \(1994\)](#)), has attracted substantial scholarly attention as particularly fitting for higher education contexts, where autonomy, collegial governance, and knowledge creation are defining features.

Indonesia's higher education landscape is characterized by a dual public-private structure, with private higher education institutions (PHEIs) constituting approximately 97% of the total number of universities and employing a large proportion of the national academic workforce ([Ministry, Culture, & Technology, 2023](#)). PHEIs, especially smaller institutions located in regional areas, face distinctive HR development challenges, including limited financial resources, lower rates of doctoral qualifications among lecturers, restricted access to nationally competitive research grants, and institutional cultures that may be more resistant to change than those of established public universities.

STISIP Margarana Tabanan, a private institution founded in 1985 and located in Tabanan Regency, Bali Province, provides an instructive case for examining these dynamics. The institution offers two undergraduate programs—Public Administration and Entrepreneurship—and holds an institutional accreditation of '*Baik*' (Good). At the time of this study, only one of the 15 permanent lecturers (6.67%) held a doctoral degree, while 14 (93.33%) held master's degrees. Furthermore, only two of the 15 lecturers (13.33%) possessed lecturer certifications (*Sertifikat Dosen/Serdos*). Research productivity data from the Science and Technology Index (SINTA) database indicate 12 registered authors with a combined SINTA Overall Score of 235, a modest figure reflecting the need to strengthen the institution's research culture. These conditions underscore the urgency of effective academic leadership to accelerate HR development.

Existing research on academic leadership in Indonesian PHEIs has predominantly focused on the statistical relationship between leadership style and lecturer performance ([Sustiyatik \(2023\)](#)), has been conducted in the context of large public universities ([Hallinger & Heck, 2010](#)). There is a notable absence of in-depth, process-oriented studies examining how academic leadership shapes the entire HR development cycle—planning, implementation, and evaluation—in small regional PHEIs. This study addresses this gap by conducting a qualitative case study at STISIP Margarana Tabanan.

This study is guided by the following research questions: 1) How does academic leadership contribute to HR planning at STISIP Margarana Tabanan? 2) How does academic leadership contribute to the implementation of HR development at STISIP Margarana Tabanan? 3) How does academic leadership contribute to HR evaluation at STISIP Margarana Tabanan? and 4) What are the supporting and inhibiting factors shaping the role of academic leadership in HR development at STISIP Margarana Tabanan? This study makes two primary contributions: it provides empirically grounded insights into

academic leadership processes within a small regional higher education institution context that remains underrepresented in the literature, and it proposes a Collaborative-Transformational Academic Leadership Model that extends existing theoretical frameworks by positioning the collaborative process as a critical mediating mechanism between leadership functions and sustainable human resource development outcomes.

2. Literature Review and Hypothesis/es Development

2.1 Academic Leadership: Conceptual Foundations

Academic leadership is broadly defined as the process of influencing, motivating, and directing individuals or groups within higher education institutions to collaboratively achieve academic and institutional goals. Crucially, academic leadership differs from corporate leadership in its emphasis on epistemic autonomy, collegial authority, and value-driven decision-making within the framework of academic freedom ([Olabiya, Vuuren, Xue, & Zhu, 2025](#); [Djourova, & Abate, 2020](#)). Leaders in higher education must simultaneously navigate formal bureaucratic structures and informal peer networks, balancing managerial efficiency with the organic and decentralized nature of academic work ([Elo, & Uljens, 2023](#); [Dung, & Hai, 2020](#)).

Academic leadership in higher education is increasingly viewed as a strategic driver for strengthening institutional effectiveness through human resource development. Beyond administrative responsibilities, academic leaders are expected to cultivate a supportive organizational culture that encourages continuous learning, enhances faculty capacity, and promotes innovation in teaching, research, and community engagement ([Suseno, Harsasi, & Pujiwati, 2025](#)). This role is particularly important in private higher education institutions, where limited resources require leaders to optimize human capital through effective coordination, targeted development programs, and sustained motivation ([Sušanj, Jakopeć, & Đorić, 2020](#)). As a result, academic leadership functions not only as a managerial mechanism but also as a transformative force that shapes institutional resilience, improves academic quality, and ensures long-term sustainability in an increasingly competitive higher education environment ([Menon & Suresh, 2021](#)).

A seminal conceptualization distinguishes between positional and distributed leadership in academia. Positional leadership is exercised through formal roles, such as institutional chairpersons, vice chairs, or program heads, whereas distributed leadership acknowledges that leadership capacity resides across the academic community, including senior faculty who serve as mentors, committee chairs, or intellectual catalysts. Both dimensions are operative at STISIP Margarana Tabanan, where the formal authority of the chairperson and vice-chairperson coexists with the informal influence of senior lecturers in shaping institutional culture.

2.2 Transformational Leadership in Higher Education

Among the leadership paradigms applied in higher education contexts, transformational leadership has received the most attention. Transformational leadership comprises four dimensions: idealized influence (role modeling ethical conduct and inspiring trust), inspirational motivation (articulating a compelling vision), intellectual stimulation (challenging assumptions and encouraging creative problem-solving), and individualized consideration (attending to individual followers' developmental needs and aspirations) ([Hilton, Madilo, Awaah, & Arkorful, 2023](#); [Saad, 2021](#)).

Leadership that focuses on inspiring and motivating followers to exceed expected levels of performance by fostering commitment, engagement, and a shared vision within an organization is called transformational leadership ([Agazu, Kero, & Debela, 2025](#)). The four main dimensions of transformational leadership are idealized influence, where the leader acts as an ethical role model; inspirational motivation, where the leader communicates a clear and compelling vision; intellectual stimulation, where the leader encourages creativity and critical thinking; and individual consideration,

where the leader provides personal support and attention to the development needs of followers [\(Asbari, 2020\)](#). Transformational leadership is considered highly relevant because it supports continuous improvement in teaching, research, and institutional development in higher education environments. This leadership style promotes trust, collaboration, and innovation, becoming important factors in achieving long-term institutional effectiveness and expectations, thus being considered to improve individual performance and strengthen organizational culture [\(Deng, Gulseren, Isola, Grocutt, & Turner, 2023\)](#).

Empirical evidence from Indonesian higher education confirms that transformational leadership is positively associated with lecturers' research commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and willingness to engage in professional development programs [\(Lai, Tang, Lu, Lee, & Lin, 2020; Sustiyatik, 2023\)](#). [Hallinger and Heck \(2010\)](#) cautioned that leadership effects in education are generally indirect, mediated by organizational capacity variables such as collaborative culture, shared purpose, and trust. This observation positions the collaborative process as a theoretically significant mediator between leadership behavior and institutional outcomes, a proposition that the present study empirically examines.

2.3 Human Resource Development in Higher Education

Human resource development (HRD) in higher education encompasses planned and systematic activities designed to enhance the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and performance of academic and administrative staff [\(Armstrong & Taylor, 2020\)](#). In the Indonesian regulatory framework, HRD obligations are formally established by Law No. 14 of 2005 on Teachers and Lecturers and Law No. 12 of 2012 on Higher Education, both of which mandate continuous professional development for lecturers as a prerequisite for institutional quality assurance and accreditation.

Human resource development (HRD) in higher education is closely linked to institutional efforts to ensure continuous improvement in academic quality and organizational performance [\(Anderson, 2020\)](#). It involves a range of structured programs such as faculty development, competency enhancement, pedagogical training, research capacity building, and administrative skill improvement [\(Han & Stieha, 2020\)](#). These activities are designed not only to upgrade individual capabilities but also to align staff competencies with institutional strategic goals and evolving educational demands. In higher education institutions, HRD is therefore considered a critical mechanism for sustaining academic excellence, improving teaching effectiveness, and strengthening institutional competitiveness in an increasingly dynamic and quality-driven educational environment [\(Salamun, Masrur, & Muhtarom, 2023; Wiśniewska, & Grudowski, 2024\)](#).

In private higher education institutions (PHEIs), HRD faces distinct challenges compared to public universities. These challenges include limited financial resources, lower proportions of doctoral-qualified lecturers, restricted access to research funding, and variability in institutional governance capacity [\(Yusup, Sanusi, Trisnamansyah, & Muchtar, 2021\)](#). As a result, the effectiveness of academic leadership becomes increasingly important in optimizing available resources and ensuring sustainable HR development. Leaders in PHEIs must adopt strategic approaches such as targeted training programs, scholarship facilitation, performance-based incentives, and collaborative partnerships to enhance faculty capacity and institutional competitiveness [\(Utama, 2023\)](#).

HRD in higher education institutions typically encompasses: (a) academic qualification advancement (doctoral studies); (b) professional certification (lecturer certification/Serdos); (c) pedagogical and andragogical training; (d) research methodology development; (e) administrative and IT capacity building; (f) continuing professional development programs; and (g) soft skills development, including leadership, communication, and teamwork [\(Armstrong & Taylor, 2020\)](#). Each domain requires intentional leadership support to translate policy mandates into operational realities.

2.4 Academic Leadership and HR Development: Theoretical Linkages

The relationship between academic leadership and HRD operates through several theoretical mechanisms. Strategic human resource management (SHRM) theory posits that leaders play a central role in aligning HRD investments with institutional strategies, thereby enhancing organizational capability and competitive advantage [\(Armstrong & Taylor, 2020\)](#). In this perspective, academic leaders are responsible for ensuring that human resource development initiatives are not implemented in isolation, but are systematically integrated into long-term institutional planning, resource allocation, and performance management systems [\(Isre, 2025; Gedro, Allain, De-Souza, Dodson, & Mawn, 2020\)](#). Furthermore, SHRM emphasizes that the effectiveness of HRD is highly dependent on the extent to which leadership is able to create coherence between individual development needs and broader organizational objectives, thereby enabling sustainable capacity building within higher education institutions. Organizational learning theory [Argyris and Schön \(1997\)](#) suggests that leaders facilitate the creation of reflective organizational environments in which evaluation and feedback loops drive the iterative improvement of HR practices. Distributed leadership theory further highlights the importance of leadership networks—beyond individual authority—in sustaining HRD across complex institutional systems [\(Spillane, 2005\)](#).

Empirical studies consistently demonstrate that leadership quality is one of the strongest predictors of institutional HR effectiveness. Research at Universitas Negeri Malang found that value-based academic leadership significantly improved lecturers' research performance. A study at Universitas Udayana documented that participative leadership styles effectively support administrative staff career development. However, both studies employed quantitative methods and measured leadership effects at a single point in time, limiting insights into how leadership shapes HRD processes dynamically over time. This limitation is addressed in the present qualitative case study.

2.5 Research Gap

Three critical gaps inform this study. First, the existing literature on academic leadership and HRD in Indonesia is predominantly quantitative and focuses on large public universities, with insufficient attention to the qualitative, process-level dynamics in small regional PHEIs. Second, prior studies have generally examined the effect of leadership on specific HR outcomes (e.g., research productivity or lecturer performance) rather than the entire HRD cycle from planning to evaluation. Third, no prior study has specifically investigated the role of academic leadership in HRD at STISIP Margarana Tabanan. This study addresses all three gaps simultaneously, contributing both context-specific evidence and a theoretically grounded model of academic leadership in small PHEIs.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study employed a qualitative approach with a case study design [\(Yin, 2018\)](#). This design was selected because the central research questions are oriented toward understanding 'how' and 'what' phenomena occur in a real-world context—specifically, how academic leadership functions within the HR development processes of a single, bounded institutional setting [\(Creswell & Poth, 2018\)](#). A case study design enables the rich, contextually embedded analysis required to capture the complexity of leadership processes that quantitative approaches would necessarily oversimplify.

3.2 Study Site and Research Duration

The study was conducted at STISIP Margarana Tabanan, located on Jalan Raya Tabanan, Tabanan Regency, Bali Province, Indonesia. The institution was selected based on its status as a small regional PHEI with documented HR development challenges and its willingness to participate in academic research. The research was conducted from February to June 2026, for approximately five months.

3.3 Informants and Sampling Strategy

Informants were selected through purposive sampling, with the following inclusion criteria: holding a strategic leadership or functional role relevant to HR development, possessing at least three years of experience at STISIP Margarana Tabanan, and willingness to participate. A total of 12 informants were recruited, representing diverse institutional roles to ensure multiple perspectives. Table summarizes the composition of the informants.

Table 1. Informant Composition

No.	Informant Role	Institutional Position	n
1	Chairperson of STISIP	Strategic leader	1
2	Vice Chairperson for Academic Affairs	Academic leadership	1
3	Head of Public Administration Program	Program leadership	1
4	Head of Entrepreneurship Program	Program leadership	1
5	Head of Academic Administration	Administrative leadership	1
6	Permanent Lecturers	Academic staff	6
7	Administrative Staff	Non-academic staff	1
Total			12

Table 1 presents a detailed overview of the informants involved in this study, comprising a total of 12 participants selected purposively based on their roles and relevance to academic leadership and human resource development processes at STISIP Margarana Tabanan. The informants represent a wide range of institutional positions, including top-level strategic leadership (Chairperson), academic leadership (Vice Chairperson for Academic Affairs), program-level leadership (Heads of Public Administration and Entrepreneurship Programs), administrative leadership (Head of Academic Administration), academic staff (permanent lecturers), and non-academic administrative staff. This composition was designed to ensure that the data collection captures multiple perspectives from both decision-making and operational levels within the institution.

3.4 Data Collection Techniques

Three complementary data collection methods were employed.

In-depth interviews: Semi-structured interviews were conducted with all 12 informants using a pre-tested interview guide covering the four research questions. The interviews were audio-recorded (with informed consent), lasted 45–90 minutes each, and were subsequently transcribed verbatim. The interview data constituted the primary analytical corpus.

Participatory observation: The researcher observed leadership behavior across key institutional settings, including leadership meetings, training events, and routine academic-administrative interactions over the five-month data collection period. Observations were documented through detailed field notes.

Documentation analysis: Institutional documents were systematically reviewed, including the Strategic Development Plan (*Rencana Strategis/Renstra* 2025–2030), Annual Budget Work Plan (*Rencana Kerja Anggaran/RKA* 2025), lecturer certification records, SINTA research productivity data, training records, and lecturer performance assessment instruments.

3.5 Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using [Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña \(2014\)](#) interactive model, comprising three concurrent processes: data condensation (systematic coding and categorization of raw interview transcripts, field notes, and document extracts); data display (organization of condensed data into thematic matrices and visual summaries); and conclusion drawing and verification (iterative

interpretation of emerging findings against extant theory, with verification through additional data collection where necessary).

3.6 Trustworthiness

The trustworthiness of the study was established using four strategies consistent with [Lincoln and Guba \(1985\)](#) criteria. Credibility was enhanced through source triangulation (cross-referencing interview, observation, and documentary data), method triangulation, and member checking (the participants validated key interpretations and findings). Transferability was addressed through a thick description of the institutional context. Dependability was ensured by maintaining an audit trail of all the analytical decisions. Confirmability was strengthened by the researchers' reflexivity and peer debriefing sessions conducted throughout the data analysis.

4. Results and Discussions

4.1 Institutional Context: STISIP Margarana Tabanan

STISIP Margarana Tabanan was established in 1985 under the Yayasan Pendidikan Margarana Tabanan Foundation. The institution's vision is: 'To realize STISIP Margarana Tabanan as a higher education institution that is quality-driven, high-achieving, morally upright, and globally oriented by 2045.' The institution holds an accreditation status of 'Baik' (Good) for both its programs (Public Administration and Entrepreneurship, both S1/Bachelor level).

The HR profile of the institution at the time of the study is summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Human Resource Profile of STISIP Margarana Tabanan (2026)

HR Indicator	Count (n)	Percentage (%)
Total permanent lecturers	15	100%
Doctoral qualification (S3)	1	6.67%
Master qualification (S2)	14	93.33%
Certified lecturers (Serdos)	2	13.33%
Non-certified lecturers	13	86.67%
SINTA-registered authors	12	—
SINTA Overall Score (2026)	235	—

Table 2 presents the human resource profile of STISIP Margarana Tabanan at the time of the study, highlighting the overall composition and academic qualifications of the institution's permanent lecturers. The data indicate that the institution has a total of 15 permanent lecturers, with a dominant proportion holding master's degrees (93.33%) and only one lecturer (6.67%) holding a doctoral qualification. In terms of professional certification, only 13.33% of lecturers have obtained lecturer certification (*Sertifikasi Dosen/Serdos*), while the majority (86.67%) remain uncertified. Additionally, the institution has 12 SINTA-registered authors with an overall SINTA score of 235 in 2026, reflecting a developing but still limited research productivity profile.

These findings illustrate that although the institution has a stable number of academic staff, there are significant gaps in terms of academic qualification advancement and professional certification. The low proportion of doctoral-qualified and certified lecturers indicates the need for continuous human resource development initiatives, particularly in supporting further academic study and professional accreditation. Moreover, the moderate SINTA performance suggests that research productivity is still in the development stage and requires stronger academic leadership support to enhance scholarly output.

4.2 Academic Leadership in HR Development Planning

4.2.1 Strategic HR Development Planning

The findings indicate that the academic leadership at STISIP Margarana Tabanan has undertaken structured, forward-looking HR development planning. The Strategic HR Development Plan (*Rencana Strategis/Renstra* SDM 2025–2030) was developed through inclusive participatory workshops involving all program heads, representative lecturers and administrative staff. The plan establishes explicit quantitative targets: increasing the proportion of doctoral lecturers from 6.67% (2026) to 35% by 2028 and achieving full lecturer certification (*Sertifikat Dosen/Serdos*) for at least five lecturers by 2027.

The Vice Chairperson for Academic Affairs articulated the institutional rationale clearly:

"Every year, we already have a roadmap for lecturer development. The primary priority is to encourage master's-holding lecturers to pursue doctoral degrees, as this is an absolute requirement for improving program accreditation. We have also established cooperative agreements with several state universities to facilitate doctoral study opportunities for our lecturers." (Vice Chairperson I, Interview, March 2026)

This finding resonates with [\(Armstrong & Taylor, 2020\)](#) framework of strategic HRD, which emphasizes the importance of aligning human capital investment with long-term organizational strategy. It also reflects the proactive dimension of transformational leadership, specifically the articulation of an inspiring vision that links individual development to collective institutional goals [\(Bass & Avolio, 1994\)](#).

4.2.2 Training Needs Analysis

Annual training needs analyses (TNA) are conducted at the beginning of each academic year. Program heads systematically identify competency gaps by cross-referencing individual lecturer performance evaluations from the preceding year, accreditation self-evaluation reports (LKPT/LED), and emerging national HR quality indicators (*Indikator Kinerja Utama/IKU*). The TNA outcomes directly inform the prioritization and sequencing of development programs for the following year, ensuring that resource allocation is evidence-based rather than administratively routine.

4.2.3 Budget Allocation for HR Development

Documentary analysis of the 2025 Annual Budget Work Plan (*Rencana Kerja Anggaran/RKA* 2025) confirmed that 15% of the total operational budget was designated for HR development activities, including training programs, doctoral scholarship support, workshops, and national/international seminars. This level of budgetary commitment reflects substantive institutional prioritization of HRD, particularly notable for a small regional PHEI with constrained financial resources.

4.3 Academic Leadership in HR Development Implementation

4.3.1 Doctoral Scholarship Program

Since 2023, STISIP Margarana Tabanan has provided full tuition scholarships to five lecturers enrolled in doctoral programs at Universitas Jember and Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Surabaya. The Chairperson personally monitors academic progress and provides informal academic mentoring to participating lecturers, reinforcing the individualized consideration dimension of transformational leadership [\(Bass & Avolio, 1994\)](#). This program directly addresses the most critical HR development gap identified in the institution's profile.

4.3.2 Lecturer Certification (Serdos) Support

Program heads actively assist lecturers in compiling comprehensive portfolios required for the national lecturer certification process. This support includes formative feedback on portfolio components, guidance on the documentation of teaching, research, and community service activities, and logistical coordination with the national certification assessment system. By 2026, two of the 15 permanent lecturers had achieved Serdos certification (13.33%), with additional applications in progress.

4.3.3 Pedagogical Training and Educational Technology Development

The institution's Center for Learning and Quality Assurance Development (*Lembaga Pengembangan Pembelajaran dan Penjaminan Mutu/LP3M*) organizes blended pedagogical training on a semesterly basis. The most highly attended programs involved e-learning platform utilization and the development of AI-assisted teaching materials, reflecting current trends in educational technology adoption in Indonesian higher education. Leadership's role in facilitating these programs extends to negotiating external facilitators, providing dedicated time releases, and publicly endorsing participation as a professional expectation.

4.3.4 Research Productivity and Publication Support

Leadership has facilitated the formation of research clusters among lecturers, encouraging collaborative grant applications for both internal competitive schemes and external funding bodies (Ministry of Education, Culture, Research and Technology; BRIN). A publication incentive scheme provides financial rewards for each article published in nationally accredited (SINTA-indexed) and internationally indexed journals. Observational data confirmed that the chairperson and vice-chairperson regularly visited lecturer workrooms to engage in informal dialogues about research challenges and progress, cultivating a supportive and motivating work climate.

4.4 Academic Leadership in HR Development Evaluation

4.4.1 Lecturer Performance Assessment

Formal lecturer performance assessments (*Penilaian Kinerja Dosen/PKD*) are conducted on a semesterly and annual basis using a multidimensional instrument encompassing teaching quality, research output, publication volume, and community service engagement. The PKD results directly inform (a) performance-based allowance calculations, (b) recommendations for academic rank (*jabatan fungsional*) promotions, and (c) the identification of individuals requiring additional developmental support.

4.4.2 Satisfaction Surveys and Evaluative Feedback

Post-training satisfaction surveys were administered to all participants following each HR program. Survey results, aggregated and analyzed by LP3M, indicated an average satisfaction rate of 75% across programs. Qualitative feedback consistently identified two improvement priorities: greater practicality in training content and delivery, and more sustained follow-through beyond single-session workshops. These findings were communicated to the leadership as actionable recommendations in subsequent planning cycles.

4.4.3 Evaluative Meetings and Feedback Integration

Semester-end and annual evaluation meetings attended by leadership, program heads, and lecturer representatives generate formal recommendations for programmatic improvement. However, evaluation findings also revealed a significant structural weakness: the absence of a clearly operationalized reward and accountability system for lecturers who fall behind in their doctoral study progress or fail to meet publication targets. This gap undermines the accountability

function of evaluation and reduces the incentive alignment necessary for sustained behavioral changes.

4.5 Supporting and Inhibiting Factors

4.5.1 Supporting Factors

Four primary enabling conditions were identified in this study. First, strong personal commitment from both the Chairperson and the foundation (*Yayasan*) to HR development as an institutional priority is manifested in consistent policy alignment and resource protection. Second, dedicated budget allocation (15% of operational expenditure) provides a meaningful financial foundation for the sustained programming. Third, informal mentorship from senior lecturers creates a distributed leadership network that supports junior faculty members beyond formal leadership channels. Fourth, collaborative partnerships with peer higher-education institutions and local government agencies expand training, research, and student-placement opportunities.

4.5.2 Inhibiting Factors

Table 3. Supporting and Inhibiting Factors in Academic Leadership's HR Development Role

Supporting Factors	Inhibiting Factors
Strong leadership and foundation commitment	High administrative and teaching workloads
Dedicated budget allocation (15% of operations)	Resistance to change (technology adoption)
Senior lecturer mentorship networks	Limited access to internationally certified training
Institutional partnerships (universities, government)	Absence of integrated digital HR information system

Table 3 shows that four principal barriers were identified in this study. First, high administrative and teaching workloads, particularly for lecturers concurrently serving in leadership or committee roles, reduce the time available for professional development activities. Second, moderate resistance to change, especially regarding the adoption of digital and AI-based teaching technologies among some senior staff, slows the implementation of innovation-oriented development programs. Third, limited access to internationally recognized certified training constrains the diversity and quality of development opportunities. Fourth, the absence of an integrated digital HR information system forces manual tracking of individual development progress, reducing monitoring efficiency and management responsiveness.

4.6 Discussion: The Collaborative-Transformational Academic Leadership Model

4.6.1 Theoretical Interpretation

The overall pattern of academic leadership behavior observed at STISIP Margarana Tabanan aligns with the transformational leadership dimensions articulated by [Bass and Avolio \(1994\)](#). Idealized influence is evident in the chairperson's personal engagement in monitoring doctoral progress and providing informal mentoring. Inspirational motivation is manifested in the institution's articulation of a 2045 vision and its translation into concrete, ambitious HR development targets. Individualized consideration is demonstrated through personal scholarship support and informal dialogues with individual lecturers.

However, intellectual stimulation, the dimension most directly linked to fostering creativity, challenging assumptions, and promoting research innovation, was the least developed. The current model of training provision, primarily organized and delivered in a top-down manner by LP3M, limits lecturers' opportunities to drive their own learning agendas. Strengthening this dimension requires leadership to create more frequent bottom-up forums, such as critical article review sessions, collaborative writing retreats, and discipline-specific research seminars, where lecturers actively propose and co-design their own development pathways.

4.6.2 The Collaborative-Transformational Academic Leadership Model

Building on these findings and integrating the theoretical insights from [Hallinger and Heck \(2010\)](#), [Armstrong and Taylor \(2020\)](#), and [Spillane \(2005\)](#), this study proposes a Collaborative-Transformational Academic Leadership Model (C-TALM) as an original theoretical contribution. The model posits that sustainable HR development in higher education institutions cannot be achieved through individual leadership authority alone but requires a structured collaborative process that mediates between leadership functions and HR outcomes.



Figure 1. The Collaborative-Transformational Academic Leadership Model (C-TALM)

Figure 1 schematically illustrates the six integrated components of the model, namely academic leadership, planning, implementation, evaluation, collaborative process as a mediating variable, continuous human resource development, and institutional performance. The model demonstrates a structured and dynamic relationship in which academic leadership initiates and directs HR development processes through strategic planning, operational implementation, and systematic evaluation. These processes are further strengthened by the collaborative mechanism that connects all stakeholders, ensuring that leadership actions are effectively translated into shared practices. Ultimately, the integration of these components leads to continuous improvement in human resource competencies and contributes to the enhancement of overall institutional performance in private higher education institutions.

The model's core theoretical contribution lies in its explicit positioning of the Collaborative Process as a structural mediating variable between the management functions of academic leadership (planning, implementation, evaluation) and the outcome of continuous HR development. This formulation extends [Bass and Avolio \(1994\)](#) transformational leadership theory by specifying the organizational mechanism through which leadership intentions become institutionalized developmental practices. It also operationalizes [Hallinger and Heck \(2010\)](#) insight that educational leadership effects are mediated by organizational capacity by identifying collaborative processes as specific capacity-building mechanisms. The model provides a practical explanation of how collaborative mechanisms function as the operational bridge between strategic leadership actions and tangible organizational outcomes in higher education settings. By embedding collaboration as a mediating structure, the model highlights that leadership effectiveness is not solely determined by individual leader capabilities, but also by the quality of interaction, coordination, and shared engagement among institutional stakeholders. This perspective reinforces the importance of distributed participation in sustaining human resource development initiatives and ensuring that leadership strategies are effectively translated into institutional practices that are adaptive, inclusive, and sustainable in the long term.

The collaborative process is constituted by six stakeholder groups: the Chairperson, Vice Chairperson, Program Heads, LP3M, lecturers, administrative staff, Yayasan (foundation), partner universities, vision, shared responsibility, knowledge sharing, joint problem-solving, and continuous improvement development programs, a shift that would directly strengthen the intellectual stimulation dimension currently underperforming. Second, an integrated digital HR information dashboard should be

developed to enable real-time monitoring of doctoral study progress, certification status, and publication productivity, thereby reducing the administrative burden associated with manual tracking. Third, a structured intergenerational mentoring program should be formalized, pairing senior lecturers with junior colleagues in domain-specific research and teaching partnerships is recommended. Fourth, a transparent and widely communicated reward and accountability framework should be operationalized, with performance indicators co-constructed by leadership and lecturers to ensure legitimacy and motivation.

5. Conclusions

This qualitative case study examined the role of academic leadership in human resource development at STISIP Margarana Tabanan, Bali, Indonesia. The findings show that academic leadership plays a proactive and strategic role in HR development planning through a structured HR development plan (2025–2030), annual training needs analysis, and dedicated budget allocation. In implementation, leadership acts as a motivator, facilitator, and role model by supporting doctoral scholarships, lecturer certification, pedagogical training, and research development, including informal practices that strengthen organizational climate. Evaluation practices such as performance assessments and satisfaction surveys are in place but remain limited due to the absence of a formal reward and accountability system for development outcomes. Overall, the study proposes the Collaborative-Transformational Academic Leadership Model (C-TALM), which positions collaborative processes as a mediating mechanism linking leadership functions with sustainable HR development and institutional performance improvement in small regional private higher education institutions.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to express sincere gratitude to the Chairperson, Vice Chairperson for Academic Affairs, Program Study Heads, lecturers, and administrative staff of STISIP Margarana Tabanan for their valuable support and participation throughout the research process. Appreciation is also extended to all informants who generously shared their experiences and insights during the interviews. The authors also acknowledge the institution for providing access to relevant documents and facilitating the implementation of this study.

Author Contributions

INGW contributed to the conceptualization of the study, development of the research framework, coordination of data collection, and drafting and interpretation of the manuscript; AAKSC contributed to the design of the research methodology, supervision of data collection through interviews, participatory observation, and documentation analysis, as well as participation in data analysis using the Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña model and critical revision of the manuscript; and YM contributed to field data collection, transcription and organization of interview data, documentation analysis, initial coding in qualitative analysis, and support in validation through member checking. All authors have read and approved the final manuscript and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article. The research was conducted independently without any financial, commercial, or institutional influence that could be perceived as affecting the objectivity or interpretation of the findings.

References

- Agazu, B. G., Kero, C. A., & Debela, K. L. (2025). Transformational leadership and firm performance: a systematic literature review. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 14(1), 29. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13731-025-00476-x>
- Anderson, V. (2020). A digital pedagogy pivot: re-thinking higher education practice from an HRD perspective. *Human Resource Development International*, 23(4), 452-467. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2020.1778999>
- Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1997). Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective. Addison-Wesley. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40183951>
- Armstrong, M., & Taylor, S. (2020). *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice* (15th ed.).
- Asbari, M. (2020). Is transformational leadership suitable for future organizational needs?. *IJOSPOL-International Journal of Social, Policy and Law*, 1(1), 51-55. <https://doi.org/10.8888/ijospl.v1i1.17>
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.).
- Damayanti, F., Sianturi, N. M., Damayanto, A., Bangkara, B. A., & Ristianti, D. H. (2023). The Excellence of Lecturer HR in Increasing Competition In Research-Based Higher Education Services. *Tafkir: Interdisciplinary Journal of Islamic Education*, 4(1), 37-57. <https://doi.org/10.31538/tijie.v4i1.292>
- Deng, C., Gulseren, D., Isola, C., Grocutt, K., & Turner, N. (2023). Transformational leadership effectiveness: an evidence-based primer. *Human Resource Development International*, 26(5), 627-641. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2022.2135938>
- Djourova, N. P., Rodríguez Molina, I., Tordera Santamatilde, N., & Abate, G. (2020). Self-efficacy and resilience: mediating mechanisms in the relationship between the transformational leadership dimensions and well-being. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 27(3), 256-270. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051819849002>
- Dung, L. T., & Hai, P. V. (2020). The effects of transformational leadership and job satisfaction on commitment to organisational change: a three-component model extension approach. *The South East Asian Journal of Management*, 14(1), 6. <https://doi.org/10.21002/seam.v14i1.11585>
- Elo, J., & Uljens, M. (2023). Theorising pedagogical dimensions of higher education leadership—a non-affirmative approach. *Higher Education*, 85(6), 1281-1298. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00890-0>
- Gedro, J., Allain, N. M., De-Souza, D., Dodson, L., & Mawn, M. V. (2020). Flattening the learning curve of leadership development: Reflections of five women higher education leaders during the Coronavirus pandemic of 2020. *Human Resource Development International*, 23(4), 395-405. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2020.1779911>
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (2010). Collaborative leadership and school improvement: Understanding the impact on school capacity and student learning. *School Leadership & Management*, 30(2), 95-110. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632431003663214>

- Han, S. J., & Stieha, V. (2020). Growth mindset for human resource development: A scoping review of the literature with recommended interventions. *Human resource development review*, 19(3), 309-331. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484320939739>
- Hilton, S. K., Madilo, W., Awaah, F., & Arkorful, H. (2023). Dimensions of transformational leadership and organizational performance: the mediating effect of job satisfaction. *Management Research Review*, 46(1), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-02-2021-0152>
- Isre, A. M. (2025). Critical Elements Of School Leadership And Human Resource Management: A Systematic Review Of Influencing Factors And Development Strategies. *Journal of Idealistic Human Resources*, 1(1), 1-17. [https://doi.org/10.70764/gdpu-jihhr.2025.1\(1\)-01](https://doi.org/10.70764/gdpu-jihhr.2025.1(1)-01)
- Kardini, N. L., Elshifa, A., Adiauwaty, S., & Wijayanti, T. C. (2023). The role of quality human resources in developing missions of future universities in Indonesian higher education. *Munaddhomah: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 4(1), 49-59. <https://doi.org/10.31538/munaddhomah.v4i1.342>
- Lai, F. Y., Tang, H. C., Lu, S. C., Lee, Y. C., & Lin, C. C. (2020). Transformational leadership and job performance: The mediating role of work engagement. *Sage Open*, 10(1), 2158244019899085.. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019899085>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*.
- Menon, S., & Suresh, M. (2021). Factors influencing organizational agility in higher education. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 28(1), 307-332. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-04-2020-0151>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook (3rd ed.)*.
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Research and Technology (Kemdiktisaintek). (2023). *Data perguruan tinggi Indonesia*.
- Olabiyyi, O. J., Vuuren, C. J. V., Du Plessis, M., Xue, Y., & Zhu, C. (2025). Digital academic leadership in higher education institutions: A bibliometric review based on CiteSpace. *Education Sciences*, 15(7), 846. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15070846>
- Saad Alessa, G. (2021). The dimensions of transformational leadership and its organizational effects in public universities in Saudi Arabia: A systematic review. *Frontiers in psychology*, 12, 682092. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.682092>
- Salamun, S., Masrur, M., & Muhtarom, M. (2023). Education and Human Resource Development for Improving the Reputation of Higher Education Institutions. *Al-Tadzkiyyah: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 14(2), 293-311. <https://doi.org/10.24042/002023141899900>
- Spillane, J. P. (2005). Distributed leadership. *The Educational Forum*, 69(2), 143-150. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131720508984678>
- Suseno, B. D., Harsasi, M., & Pujiwati, A. (2025). Academic Human Resources Development In Realized Excellent and Competitive Higher Education. *International Journal of Ethno-Sciences and Education Research*, 5(4), 153-157. <https://doi.org/10.46336/ijeer.v5i4.1095>
- Sustiyatik, E. (2023). The dual pillars of academic excellence: Transformational leadership and organizational commitment. *Journal of Innovation in Business and Economics*, 7(01), 79-88. <https://doi.org/10.22219/jibe.v7i01.28221>
- Sušanj, Z., Jakopec, A., & Đorić, A. (2020). Academics' effectiveness and professional development in Croatia: Challenges for human resource management in higher education institutions. *European journal of education*, 55(4), 476-488. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12422>

- Utama, Z. M. (2023). Human Resource Management: A Study on Private University in Indonesia. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 15(4), 4814-4820. <https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v15i4.4483>
- Whittaker, J. A., & Montgomery, B. L. (2022). Advancing a cultural change agenda in higher education: issues and values related to reimagining academic leadership. *Discover sustainability*, 3(1), 10. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-022-00079-6>
- Wiśniewska, M. Z., & Grudowski, P. (2024). The culture of excellence and its dimensions in higher education. *The TQM Journal*, 36(2), 593-615. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TQM-11-2022-0325>
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods (6th ed.)*.
- Yusup, Y., Sanusi, A., Trisnamansyah, S., & Muchtar, H. S. (2021). The effect of tridharma human resource management in higher education on improving the quality of private higher education lecturers in clusters of higher schools in DKI Jakarta and West Java Regions. *Journal of Industrial Engineering & Management Research*, 2(4), 190-208. <https://doi.org/10.7777/jiemar.v2i4.177>
- Zaakiyyah, H. K. A. (2024). Innovative strategies to enhance the quality of higher education management: Human resource development and the critical role of communication. *Journal of Contemporary Administration and Management (ADMAN)*, 2(1), 331-336. <https://doi.org/10.61100/adman.v2i1.128>