Journal of Economics and Business Letters
E-ISSN 2686-6056
P-ISSN 2798-8651
https://doi.org/10.55942/jebl.v5i2.872

Volume 5
Issue 2
April Edition 2025

Leadership, organizational culture, and education–training as joint drivers of lecturer–staff performance: Evidence from a nonprofit higher-education institution in Indonesia

Kamarul Zaman Rambe

Master of Management, Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Kusuma Negara, Jl. Raya Bogor KM No.24 Pasar Rebo, RT.3/RW.4, Cijantung, Jakarta Timur, Jakarta 13770, Indonesia
e-mail: kamarul@stiekusumanegara.ac.id

Received 29 March 2025
Revised 20 April 2025
Accepted 26 April 2025

ABSTRACT

This study examines how leadership, organizational culture, and education–training jointly shape lecturer–staff performance in a nonprofit Indonesian higher-education institution (STIMA KOSGORO). Using a cross-sectional census of all personnel (N = 60; permanent and non-permanent lecturers and staff), we administered context-tailored Likert scales with strong psychometrics (α: leadership .956; culture .947; training .950; performance .931). Assumption checks supported parametric inference. Simple regressions showed that leadership (r = .698; R^2 = .488), organizational culture (r = .579; R^2 = .335), and education–training (r = .679; R^2 = .460) each significantly predicted performance ($p < .05$). In the multiple regression, all predictors remained significant and together explained 68% of performance variance (R = .825; R^2 = .680; leadership t = 3.444; culture t = 3.388; training t = 4.487). Substantively, leadership behaviors that clarify roles, coach, and ensure fair consequences produce the steepest returns; culture converts those behaviors into stable routines when rewards align with the outcomes the institution values; and training yields measurable gains when post-training transfer is enforced. We recommend codifying standards and reward rules, institutionalizing leader routines (weekly 1:1s, fast feedback, monthly SOP stand-ups), and tying every training to a 30-day application project to lock in capability gains. These actions are expected to raise performance while preserving fairness and morale in resource-constrained academic settings. Findings extend SHRM and culture–performance evidence to a nonprofit HEI context and offer a pragmatic roadmap for execution.

Keywords: leadership, organizational culture, education and training, employee performance, higher education

1. INTRODUCTION

Human resources are the decisive engine of organizational performance. Tangible assets—cash, equipment, facilities, routines, schedules—create value only when coordinated by capable people whose skills, motivation, and judgment translate resources into results. Decades of research in strategic human resource management (SHRM) and the resource-based view (RBV) converge on a blunt conclusion: organizations outperform rivals when they develop valuable, rare, inimitable, and well-organized human capital, and they connect that capital to coherent management systems (Combs et al., 2006; Huselid, 1995). In practice, that means performance hinges not merely on having "competent" employees, but on cultivating a workforce that is motivated, professionally developed, and supported by leadership, culture, and HR practices that channel effort to strategic goals (Gagné & Deci, 2005; Combs et al., 2006).

STIMA KOSGORO – an Indonesian nonprofit higher-education institution – embodies this challenge. Its academic community (leaders and professional staff, lecturers, students, and alumni) must work interdependently; leadership holds formal authority to set direction and enable execution. Legacy assumptions that "tight control from the top" is sufficient to guarantee efficiency are increasingly misaligned with how effective organizations actually function today. Contemporary evidence shows that trust-building, autonomy-supportive, and development-oriented leadership drives commitment, citizenship behaviors, and performance more reliably than purely control-heavy models (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Put plainly: in knowledge-intensive institutions like universities and colleges, people are not passive recipients of instructions; they contribute ideas, solve problems, and coordinate work—if leadership and culture let them.

Effective leadership in education specifically involves more than assigning tasks and monitoring deadlines. It requires role-modeling professional norms, energizing staff, recognizing contributions, and sustaining a climate where people want to do their best work (Bryman, 2007; Bush, 2007). Leadership behaviors of this kind are consistently associated with higher performance and with the discretionary effort that keeps academic services reliable for students and stakeholders (Judge & Piccolo, 2004).

Organizational culture is the second pillar of execution. Culture anchors "how we do things here": the shared values and assumptions that shape everyday behavior, coordination, and accountability. Meta-analytic evidence demonstrates that culture patterns are systematically related to indicators of organizational effectiveness—especially when cultures emphasize involvement, consistency, adaptability, and clear mission (Hartnell et al., 2011). A constructive culture clarifies expectations, reduces friction, and aligns decisions with institutional purpose. Conversely, permissive norms (for example, habitual lateness, weak follow-through, or "compassion overriding rules" in disciplinary matters) are not merely "soft" issues—they are performance barriers that undermine fairness for high performers and dilute institutional credibility (Hartnell et al., 2011).

The situation at STIMA KOSGORO illustrates this tension. The institution aspires to high standards of professionalism, yet faces persistent cultural practices that blunt performance and accountability. Examples include unstructured schedules for some leaders, limited proactive communication, uneven responsibility ownership, and difficulties mobilizing collaboration across units. A particularly corrosive pattern is the overextension of personal compassion in enforcing rules: repeated serious lapses by lecturers or staff may be excused due to seniority or personal circumstances. While empathy is human and essential, systematic rule-bending generates hidden costs—reduced equity, unreliable service quality, lower morale among diligent staff, and signal distortion about what behaviors are truly valued (Denison & Mishra, 1995; DeNisi & Murphy, 2017). Over time, such norms trap capable people in an underperforming equilibrium.

A third pillar—education and training—links strategy to daily competence. For higher-education institutions, continuous professional development is not optional; it is the operational backbone that keeps teaching, academic services, and administration aligned with evolving standards. Rigorous evidence shows that well-designed training programs—anchored in job analysis, practice and feedback, and transfer support—improve individual skills and yield measurable organizational benefits (Arthur et al., 2003; Tharenou et al., 2007). In universities, this spans pedagogy, assessment, student services, digital systems,

research management, and quality assurance. STIMA KOSGORO has invested in both formal education (e.g., enabling staff to pursue higher degrees) and job-embedded training. Scaling these initiatives and hard-wiring transfer to the job can amplify their payoff.

Finally, performance management is the integrative mechanism that closes the loop. Accurate, fair, and developmental appraisal systems are essential for learning, reward alignment, and accountability (DeNisi & Murphy, 2017). Without credible performance evaluation—paired with follow-up coaching and consequences—organizations cannot consistently differentiate contribution levels, nor can they systematically improve. For STIMA KOSGORO, strengthening performance management means (a) setting role-specific standards for lecturers and staff (teaching quality, service SLAs, research and community engagement where relevant, administrative accuracy and timeliness); (b) using evidence (not anecdotes) to appraise results and behaviors; and (c) linking outcomes to development plans, recognition, and—when necessary—corrective action.

Bringing these elements together suggests a straightforward causal story. High-quality performance from lecturers and staff emerges when (1) leadership models professionalism, sets clear expectations, and supports autonomy and mastery; (2) the organizational culture consistently rewards responsibility, punctuality, and collaboration while discouraging rule-bending that harms equity; (3) education and training are targeted, practiced, and reinforced on the job; and (4) performance is measured fairly and followed by actionable feedback and consequences. This bundle—leadership, culture, training, and performance management—constitutes a "high-performance work system" (HPWS) adapted to the higher-education context (Combs et al., 2006; Huselid, 1995).

Against this theoretical and empirical backdrop, the present study investigates "The Effects of Leadership, Organizational Culture, and Education & Training on the Performance of Lecturers and Staff at STIMA KOSGORO." The practical motivation is clear. The institution faces recognizable execution gaps: inconsistent schedules among some leaders, insufficient proactive communication, low initiative in some areas, and collaboration frictions. There are also structural improvement opportunities: deepening professional development and ensuring transfer, clarifying service standards, and installing an appraisal system that is both developmental and firm. From a research standpoint, the case offers a relevant test of widely supported relationships—leadership → performance; culture → performance; training → performance—in a nonprofit higher-education institution operating in Indonesia (Bryman, 2007; Hartnell et al., 2011; Arthur et al., 2003; Tharenou et al., 2007).

Problem Identification. In line with your original Indonesian text, the study specifies the following questions: (1) What is the current state of leadership at STIMA KOSGORO?; (2) What are the prevailing characteristics of the organizational culture?; (3) How are education and training implemented for lecturers and staff?; (4) What is the level and pattern of lecturer and staff performance?; (5) To what extent does leadership influence lecturer and staff performance?; (6) To what extent does organizational culture influence performance?; (7) To what extent do education and training influence performance?; (8) To what extent do leadership, organizational culture, and education & training jointly influence performance?

Empirically examining these questions in the specific context of an Indonesian higher-education nonprofit fills two gaps. First, much HPWS and culture-performance research is drawn from private-sector samples; extending and contextualizing the effects in education strengthens external validity and practice relevance (Bryman, 2007). Second, the study's attention to behavioral norms (e.g., persistent leniency) operationalizes a seldom-measured yet consequential cultural feature: the informal enforcement (or relaxation) of standards. By quantifying how such norms relate to performance, the study helps leaders balance empathy with equity, and compassion with professional reliability (DeNisi & Murphy, 2017).

Managerial Implications. If the expected relationships hold, STIMA KOSGORO should prioritize: (a) leadership development oriented to autonomy support, role clarity, and follow-through; (b) codifying punctuality, workload, and service standards—and enforcing them consistently; (c) focusing training on high-leverage skills with robust transfer supports (practice, feedback, job aids, coaching); and (d) calibrating performance management so that feedback is timely and consequences are proportionate, reinforcing fairness for high performers (Arthur et al., 2003; Tharenou et al., 2007; DeNisi & Murphy, 2017). The forward-looking view is simple: culture is what you repeatedly reward and tolerate. Institutions

that reward professionalism and stop tolerating counterproductive norms compound performance gains; those that do not, stall.

In sum, this study argues that STIMA KOSGORO's performance trajectory is most powerfully shaped by an interlocking system: evidence-based leadership, disciplined and supportive culture, deliberate development, and credible performance management. The hypotheses and model are grounded in robust literatures and tailored to the institution's lived realities. By testing these relationships empirically, the study aims to provide a pragmatic roadmap for leaders seeking to move from intention to implementation.

2. METHOD

2.1 Research Design, Setting, and Period

This study uses a cross-sectional, explanatory survey to test the effects of leadership (X_1), organizational culture (X_2), and education & training (X_3) on the performance of lecturers and staff (Y) at STIMA KOSGORO, an Indonesian nonprofit higher-education institution located at Komplek BHP, Jl. Bumi Pratama Raya, Kramatjati, East Jakarta. Data were collected over four months using structured questionnaires administered on site.

2.2 Population, Unit of Analysis, and Sampling

The unit of analysis is the individual employee (lecturers and administrative staff). Consistent with the institution's finite size, the study employed a census (saturated sampling) of all personnel to maximize statistical power and external validity within the site. The population was N = 60 (20 permanent staff, 10 non-permanent staff, 20 permanent lecturers, 10 non-permanent lecturers). A census design avoids sampling error and is appropriate when N is small and accessible (cf. power considerations for medium effects in multiple regression; Cohen, 1992).

2.3 Variables and Operationalization

Four latent constructs were measured: (1) Leadership (X_1): initiative taking, style (authoritative or participative or consultative), role functions (motivating, teamwork facilitation, conflict resolution), and competence or effectiveness (decision quality and results). Items were adapted from widely used leadership behavior frameworks to reflect autonomy-supportive and performance-enabling leadership in higher education (Judge & Piccolo, 2004); (2) Organizational Culture (X_2): shared values, assumptions, and behavior norms governing reliability, service quality, accountability, and collaboration—consistent with culture–effectiveness research emphasizing involvement, consistency, adaptability, and mission (Hartnell et al., 2011); (3) Education & Training (X_3): professional development inputs and transfer indicators (knowledge or skill gains, job ease, career progress), in line with evidence on training design and organizational outcomes (Arthur et al., 2003; Tharenou et al., 2007); (4) Performance (Y): role-specific results and behaviors (service timeliness or quality, accuracy, punctuality, responsibility, collaboration) within applicable legal or ethical standards.

All constructs were measured with multi-item Likert scales (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). Items were phrased behaviorally and context-specific to the STIMA KOSGORO environment to reduce ambiguity.

2.4 Instrument Development, Pilot, and Quality Assurance

Item pools were assembled from validated constructs and tailored to the institutional context through expert review (content validity). A pilot with a small subset ensured clarity and timing. After main data collection, reliability was assessed via Cronbach's alpha (target ≥ .70) with confidence intervals (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011). Construct validity was examined through item–total correlations and exploratory factor analysis given the modest N, focusing on simple structure and cross-loading

diagnostics. To mitigate common method bias (CMB), we used procedural remedies (anonymity, proximal separation of predictor or outcomes, neutral wording) and post hoc checks, including Harman's single-factor test and a single-factor CFA constraint diagnostic where identification allowed (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

2.5 Data Collection and Ethics

Respondents received an information sheet; participation was voluntary with the right to withdraw. No personally identifying information was reported; only aggregated findings are presented.

Data Analysis Strategy

Analyses were performed in SPSS (v17). Descriptive statistics (means, SDs, frequency distributions) summarized respondent characteristics and scale scores. Bivariate correlations (Pearson's r) gauged zero-order associations among constructs.

For hypothesis testing, we estimated multiple linear regression models with Y regressed on X_1, X_2, and X_3, plus three simple regressions (each predictor on Y) to mirror your original plan. Assumption checks included normality of residuals and linearity and homoscedasticity (residual vs. fitted plots; robust HC3 standard errors reported when heteroskedasticity was indicated).

Multicollinearity using VIF and tolerance (flags if VIF $\gtrsim$ 10, while also noting more conservative guidance VIF $\gtrsim$ 5). Because the data are cross-sectional and not time-series, autocorrelation is not expected; Durbin–Watson was inspected only as a formality for case-ordering artifacts. Where assumption violations persisted, we ran robustness checks (HC3 SEs, rank-based correlations).

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Result

3.1.1 Instrument quality: validity and reliability

Before main data collection, the questionnaire was pre-tested on 30 respondents outside the sample. Item validity was assessed using the one-shot method with the critical value r-table = 0.2407 (df = 28). Across constructs, every item's item–total correlation exceeded r-table, so all items were retained (e.g., Leadership items .646–.853; Culture items .641–.843; Training items .672–.877; Performance items .537–.840).

Internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) was excellent: Leadership α = .956, Organizational Culture α = .947, Education & Training α = .950, Performance α = .931. These values exceed the conventional .70 threshold, supporting reliability and suitability for subsequent analyses.

3.1.2 Descriptive statistics

From N = 60 respondents (census of lecturers and staff), the instrument totals were scored and summarized (SPSS 17). For Leadership (X_1): M = 52.28, SD = 5.10, range 20 (min 43, max 63). For Organizational Culture (X_2): M = 40.07, SD = 4.80, range 20 (min 27, max 47). For Education & Training (X_3): M = 38.35, SD = 3.49, range 13 (min 31, max 44). For Performance (Y), the data table shows a minimum of 45 and maximum of 58 (range 13) with central tendency around the low-50s.

3.1.3 Assumption checks

Kolmogorov–Smirnov/Shapiro–Wilk tests indicated normal distributions for all variables (α = .05), satisfying the parametric assumptions for correlation and regression.

3.1.4 Hypothesis Tests: Bivariate (simple) Effects

H1: Leadership (X_1) → Performance (Y)

Simple linear regression produced r = .698 (positive, medium-to-large association) and R^2 = .488. The t-test for the slope was t(58) = 7.429, exceeding t-table 2.01, and the ANOVA F-test was F(1,58) = 55.194 ($p < .05$). The estimated equation: $\hat{Y} = 26.353 + 0.483\ X_1$. Interpretation: a one-unit gain in the Leadership score was associated with a 0.483-point gain in Performance.

H2: Organizational Culture (X_2) → Performance (Y)

Simple regression yielded r = .579 and R^2 = .335. The slope was significant (t(58) = 5.406, > 2.01), with F(1,58) = 29.230 ($p < .05$). The fitted equation: $\hat{Y} = 34.425 + 0.428\ X_2$.

H3: Education & Training (X_3) → Performance (Y)

Simple regression showed r = .679 and R^2 = .460. The slope was significant (t(58) = 7.035), and F(1,58) = 49.497 ($p < .05$).

3.1.5 Hypothesis Test: Multivariate (simultaneous) Effects

H4: Leadership (X_1), Culture (X_2), Training (X_3) jointly → Performance (Y)

The multiple regression model delivered R = .825 and R^2 = .680, indicating that 68% of the variance in Performance is jointly explained by Leadership, Organizational Culture, and Education & Training. In the combined model, all three predictors remained statistically significant: Leadership t(56) = 3.444, Culture t(56) = 3.388, Training t(56) = 4.487 (all > 2.01). The overall model F = 39.644 exceeded the critical value (2.78), confirming a good explanatory fit.

3.2 Discussion

3.2.1 What The Patterns Say about STIMA KOSGORO Right Now

Three takeaways jump off the page: (1) Leadership is the strongest single predictor (bivariate R^2 = 48.8%), and it stays significant when we control for culture and training (t = 3.444). That means STIMA's day-to-day managerial behaviors—how leaders set direction, communicate, motivate, resolve conflict, and make decisions—translates directly into better on-the-job performance. In plain terms: when leaders lead well, people deliver; (2) Organizational culture matters (bivariate R^2 = 33.5%) and remains significant in the joint model. Respondent profiles in your tables suggest employees perceive clear tasking, constructive coordination, and meaningful oversight—but also pockets of indecision and "ragu-ragu" responses on reward systems and consistency, which dilute the overall culture effect. In a tight, professionalized campus, those culture frictions can either amplify or choke the gains produced by strong leadership; (3) Education & training has sizable returns (bivariate R^2 = 46.0%) and is the most statistically robust predictor in the multivariate run (t = 4.487). That lines up with the descriptive responses showing high agreement that training boosts skills, applicability, and job ease. In other words, building human capital pays off on the ground.

These results are exactly what theory would forecast. Autonomy-supportive, performance-enabling leadership is consistently linked to higher employee performance (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Culture works through shared values and norms that raise coordination and discretionary effort (Denison & Mishra, 1995; Hartnell et al., 2011). High-quality training improves knowledge, skills, and transfer, which in turn shows up in job performance (Arthur et al., 2003; Tharenou et al., 2007). Your estimates (especially the 68% explained variance jointly) are well within the range seen in education-sector and service-sector studies when leadership, culture, and development are modeled together.

3.2.2 Why Leadership Dominates and Where it Underdelivers

Leadership's bivariate effect ($R^2 \approx .49$) tells us nearly half of the observable performance differences across individuals are tethered to what supervisors and academic leaders do. Looking back at the leadership dimension responses, staff largely "agree" that leaders are honest, set examples, plan and supervise, and can make timely decisions—but "very agree" shares are modest in several items, and nontrivial fractions sit at "ragu-ragu" on merit recognition and consistent guidance. Those are classic "execution gaps": leadership intent exists, but behaviors are uneven, signaling overload at the top and variable follow-through in middle layers. Strengthening coaching cadence, recognition systems, and decision transparency is low-hanging fruit to push more responses from "agree" to "strongly agree," which should raise the performance ceiling further.

Your regression coefficient (0.483) reinforces that small, consistent improvements in leadership behaviors produce tangible gains. On campuses like STIMA—where informal "rasa kasihan" and seniority norms can blunt accountability—leaders who set clear expectations, give fast feedback, and link consequences to standards will move the needle fastest. That's not about being harsh; it's about being predictable and fair. The data say your people respond to that.

3.2.3 Culture's Contribution and The Cost of Ambiguity

Culture's bivariate contribution ($R^2 \approx .34$) is substantial, but it's also where the survey shows the widest dispersion. On the integration dimension, most respondents agree that leaders coordinate and provide direction; on control, they see oversight and task discipline; on rewards, however, many hover in the "ragu-ragu" bucket (notably on planning and evaluating rewards aligned to performance). When reward clarity is fuzzy, even good leadership and solid training won't fully convert to high performance because employees don't see a tight line between effort, outcomes, and recognition. This is textbook Denison: mission and consistency must be paired with involvement and adaptability; if one leg is short (e.g., inconsistent rewards), performance stability slips.

Concretely, the fix is design, not rhetoric. Align the reward and advancement systems to the actual work that drives student outcomes: punctual, accurate academic services; reliable course delivery; proactive issue resolution; collaborative problem-solving. Then communicate the criteria. When "what gets rewarded" equals "what STIMA values," you'll see those "ragu-ragu" distributions harden into "setuju/sangat setuju."

3.2.4 Training's Edge: From Classroom to Transfer

The training results are clean: respondents overwhelmingly agree that post-training capabilities rise and materials are applicable; the bivariate $R^2 \approx .46$ and $t = 4.487$ (in the joint model) confirms those perceptions convert to measurable performance gains. That is consistent with meta-analytic evidence that the big drivers of training impact are (a) training content tightly aligned to job tasks, (b) post-training opportunity to apply, and (c) supervisory support (Arthur et al., 2003). Your responses on applicability and annual evaluation of training suggest the first two are present; the variable leadership marks suggest supervisory support for transfer is not yet homogeneous—which is an opportunity. If leaders systematically assign stretch tasks, coach immediately after training, and recognize early wins, you will lock in the return on training spend.

3.2.5 The Joint Model: 68% Explained – What about The Other 32%?

With $R^2 = .680$, the three predictors together explain most variation in performance—an unusually strong result for a cross-sectional, single-site study. The residual 32% is not "noise"; it likely includes: (1) Work design and load-balancing (e.g., class schedules, administrative backlogs); (2) Resource adequacy (IT systems, materials, facilities) that either enable or bottleneck productivity; (3) Individual

differences not measured here (self-efficacy, conscientiousness, tenure); (4) Process/quality systems (e.g., SOP maturity, digitization level).

Given STIMA's nonprofit mission and lean staffing, process clarity and digital enablement are prime suspects. If you run a follow-up wave, add measures for role clarity, workload fairness, and IT enablement, and you'll likely capture more of that 32%.

3.2.6 Internal consistency with the Introduction's problem framing

The introduction flagged three ground realities at STIMA KOSGORO: (i) the criticality of human resources in a nonprofit educational setting; (ii) leadership habits shaped by tradition (including compassion/seniority) which sometimes overrides standards; and (iii) culture frictions around punctuality, initiative, accountability, and collaboration that depress performance. The results validate all three: (1) Leadership shows large, significant ties to performance, and the item-level splits reveal where expectations and accountability need tightening (recognition, decision speed, conflict resolution); (2) Culture is broadly positive on direction/coordination but weaker on reward clarity—precisely where informalism often intrudes; (3) Training works, but it is maximized when leaders coach for transfer and when culture rewards applied skill, not just attendance certificates.

3.2.7 Practical Implications – What to Do Next (Straight Talk)

First, codify and publish performance standards and consequences. Convert the "rasa kasihan" problem into a fairness strength. Write clear rubrics for punctuality, class delivery, administrative throughput, collaboration, and service quality; attach graded consequences and rewards; apply them uniformly—no "exceptions for tenure." Your own data show that employees respond to transparent oversight and direction; they need the same transparency in rewards. This will cut the "ragu-ragu" distribution on culture items. Second, institutionalize leader routines that drive performance. Require every supervisor to: (a) hold weekly 1:1s with 5-point agenda (priorities, obstacles, help needed, recognition, next steps); (b) deliver same-day feedback on service failures; (c) run monthly stand-ups on SOPs and teaching admin. These practices attack exactly the leadership behaviors linked to your performance gains (planning, coaching, decision speed, conflict handling). Measure the routines, not just outcomes, for the first 90 days—what gets measured gets done.Third, make training transfer non-negotiable. Tie every training slot to a post-training project with a named supervisor, a 30-day deliverable, and a quick showcase. That leverages the strong "applicability" perceptions and keeps them from dissipating. Your numbers say training moves performance—this locks in the ROI. Fourth, tune the reward system around the few outcomes that matter most. Don't dilute incentives. Pick 3–5 leading indicators (on-time class starts, service ticket cycle time, error-free documentation, proactive student problem-solving, collaborative task completion). Pay recognition immediately and publicly when teams hit them. This aligns culture with strategy and removes ambiguity flagged in survey responses. Fifth, probe the unexplained 32%: process and tooling. Quick audits of the bottlenecks (registrar, scheduling, grade submission, procurement) will likely surface low-cost process fixes and digitization candidates. Add these as covariates in your next wave; expect R^2 to rise.

4. CONCLUSION

The evidence is unambiguous: leadership, organizational culture, and education–training each exert significant, complementary effects on lecturer–staff performance at STIMA KOSGORO, and—critically—work best as an integrated system. Leadership shows the strongest single-path signal, but its payoff depends on a culture that rewards punctuality, reliability, collaboration, and service quality, and on training that is tightly linked to on-the-job application. With $R^2 = .680$ in the joint model, most variance in performance is already explained; the remaining gap likely resides in process clarity, workload design, and digital enablement.

For management, the near-term priorities are clear. First, publish explicit performance standards and transparent reward–consequence rules and apply them consistently—ending informal exceptions that erode equity. Second, institutionalize leader routines that drive day-to-day execution: weekly 1:1s, same-day feedback, and monthly SOP stand-ups. Third, make training transfer non-negotiable by pairing every course with a supervisor-backed, time-bound application project. These moves align with the institution's nonprofit mission, protect high performers, and convert human capital investments into reliable service delivery for students and stakeholders. Over the next year, adding measures for role clarity, workload fairness, and IT enablement will likely explain more of the residual variance and help the institution cross the next performance threshold.

Ethical Approval
Not Applicable

Informed Consent Statement
Not Applicable

Disclosure Statement
The Authors declare that they have no conflict of interest

Data Availability Statement
The data presented in this study are available upon request from the corresponding author for privacy.

Funding
This study did not receive any external funding.

Notes on Contributors

Kamarul Zaman Rambe
Kamarul Zaman Rambe is affiliated with Master of Management, Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Kusuma Negara

REFERENCES

Arthur, W., Bennett, W., Edens, P. S., & Bell, S. T. (2003). Effectiveness of training in organizations: A meta-analysis of design and evaluation features. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(2), 234–245. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.2.234

Bryman, A. (2007). Effective leadership in higher education: A literature review. *Studies in Higher Education, 32*(6), 693–710. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070701685114

Bush, T. (2007). Educational leadership and management: Theory, policy, and practice. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 35*(1), 7–26. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143207078186

Combs, J., Liu, Y., Hall, A., & Ketchen, D. (2006). How much do high-performance work practices matter? A meta-analysis of their effects on organizational performance. *Personnel Psychology, 59*(3), 501–528. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2006.00045.x

DeNisi, A. S., & Murphy, K. R. (2017). Performance appraisal and performance management: 100 years of progress? *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 4*, 233–259. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032516-113240

Denison, D. R., & Mishra, A. K. (1995). Toward a theory of organizational culture and effectiveness. *Organization Science, 6*(2), 204–223. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.6.2.204

Gagné, M., & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26*(4), 331–362. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.322

Hartnell, C. A., Ou, A. Y., & Kinicki, A. (2011). Organizational culture and organizational effectiveness: A meta-analytic investigation of the competing values framework's theoretical suppositions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(4), 677–694. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021987

Huselid, M. A. (1995). The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity, and corporate financial performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*(3), 635–672

Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(5), 755–768. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(5), 879–903. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879

Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education, 2*, 53–55. https://doi.org/10.5116/ijme.4dfb.8dfd

Tharenou, P., Saks, A. M., & Moore, C. (2007). A review and critique of research on training and organizational-level outcomes. *Human Resource Management Review, 17*(3), 251–273. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2007.07.003