Islamic Higher Education Institutional Change: Leader's Motivation and Vision

Mochamad Iskarim
IAIN Pekalongan
moch.iskarim@yahoo.com

Sutrisno
State Islamic University (UIN) Sunan Kalijaga Yogyakarta, Indonesia
trisno_63@yahoo.com

Tasman Hamami
State Islamic University (UIN) Sunan Kalijaga Yogyakarta, Indonesia
tasmanhamami61@gmail.com

Muhammad Zubair Khan
Balochistan University of Information Technology, Engineering, and Management Sciences (BUITEMS), Quetta-Pakistan
dr.zubair.statistics@gmail.com

DOI: https://doi.org/10.28918/jei.v6i2.4296
Received: August 30, 2021  Revised: October 30, 2021  Approved: Desember 29, 2021

Abstrak
Tulisan ini membahas tentang motivasi dan visi pemimpin perguruan tinggi keagamaan Islam negeri dalam upaya peningkatan mutu perguruan tinggi pasca perubahan kelembagaan. Penelitian ini merupakan penelitian kualitatif deskriptif lapangan yang dilakukan di IAIN Purwokerto dan IAIN Pekalongan. Metode pengumpulan data menggunakan dokumentasi dan wawancara; analisis datanya menggunakan model analisis interaktif dengan tahapan pengumpulan data, reduksi data, penyajian data, dan verifikasi/kesimpulan. Hasil penelitian adalah sebagai berikut: (1) perubahan kelembagaan yang sering terjadi pada perguruan tinggi keagamaan Islam negeri dijadikan sebagai starting point upaya peningkatan mutu akademik dan kelembagaan. Perubahan kelembagaan ini harus ditindaklanjuti dengan pengelolaan mutu kelembagaan perguruan tinggi yang baik; direncanakan, dilaksanakan, dimonitoring, dan dievaluasi secara sinergis; (2) motivasi dan visi pemimpin menjadi modal utama dalam upaya peningkatan mutu kelembagaan. Motivasi dan visi pemimpin ini harus diejawantahkan dalam tindakan nyata dan terukur, serta didukung dengan kepemimpinan transformasional; dan (3) akreditasi dan pemenuhan sarana prasarana perguruan tinggi merupakan tools yang muara akhirnya terwujudnya mutu yang
Abstract
This paper discusses the motivation and vision of state Islamic higher education leaders in their attempt to improve higher education quality after the institutional change. This is a field descriptive qualitative study which is conducted in IAIN Purwokerto and IAIN Pekalongan. The data collection is done using documentation and interview method; the data is analyzed using an interactive analysis model which covers steps of data collection, data reduction, data presentation, and verification/conclusion. The results of the study are as follows: (1) the institutional change which is frequently experienced by state Islamic higher education institutions is considered as the starting point of the effort to increase academic and institutional quality. This institutional change must be followed by well-prepared quality management of higher education institutions; planned, executed, monitored, and evaluated synergically; (2) the leader’s motivation and vision serve as an important aspect in the effort to improve the institutional quality. The motivation and vision must be elaborated into real and calculated actions, as well as supported by transformational leadership; and (3) the accreditation and fulfillment of facilities and infrastructure of higher education is a tool the final objective of which is the establishment of true quality, namely quality culture displayed by the academic community. As a recommendation, the motivation and vision of higher education leaders should focus on improving internal institutions, improving education services and public accountability, and the relevance of education to the future needs of the new generation in the future.
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INTRODUCTION
Change is inevitable. It also happens in an institution or organization. The changes in an organization are not only in terms of structure, but also in terms of technology, physical setting, and human resources such as attitude, mindset, skill, and values of belief (Djohan, 2018: 4; Robbins, 2013: 235). The main target of the organizational changes is the change of attitude and work skill, work role, and strategy in competition (Sunyoto & Burhanudin, 2015: 162; Yulk, 2013: 103). The organizational change will succeed if the leaders can condition their subordinates’ hearts and thought, design work systems, build vision and strategy, implant new approaches in the culture, build synergic work team, calculate, evaluate, control the result, and must be able to adapt to
Currently, the institutional change of Islamic higher education only deals with quantitative aspects and has not yet reached qualitative ones. The increase of policy communication frequency, amount of resources (human, finance, facilities, and infrastructure), also beurocracy expansion do occur. However, those are not followed by the quality of human resource performance, which is the core of the management aspect of higher education (Hadis & Nurhayati, 2010: 3; Maisah et al., 2020: 416; Muksin, 2019: 81-82; Nadhiroh & Jannah, 2017: 227; Sholehuddin et al., 2020: 256; Yudiawan, 2020: 224). Higher education transformation (State Islamic Institute to State Islamic University) has now been inevitable as a demand of the current development (Alhamuddin, 2016: 13; Islami, 2018: 602-608; Zaenuri, 2018: 33-34). The current development needs to be treated appropriately and wisely by the development context. If it is treated stagnantly then moslems will be left behind. In the period of institutional change or transformation of higher education, the visionary and strong leaders (Duderstadt, 2000: 261-289; Razik & Swanson, 1995: 293; Sukron, 2017: 61; Widodo, 2013: 22-25), and those who emphasize on creativity, trust and constant contribution to the society, specify objective and direction for the organization members, form culture and value, develop institutional vision supported by all, and can plan changes in facing life challenges are highly needed (Pawlowski, 2007: 9; Suharputra, 2015: 354).

The role of leaders and their strategic vision significantly influence the organization’s development in the period of change. The leaders must be able to influence (Daft, 2013: 372; Rue & Byars, 2000: 310), motivate subordinates (Campbell & Nelson, 2011: 364; Colquitt, 2009: 441; Newstrom, 2014: 159), manage the organization as a form of their responsibility (Filho, 2017: 184), control behavior (Hendriyadi, 2018: 894; Nawawi, 1995: 79), the final goal of which is to achieve organization objectives (Daft, 2013: 372; Hersey & Blanchard, 1982: 83). Leaders who are highly committed have a big impact on the betterment of organization quality (Abuhav, 2017: 39). The organization is considered to have quality if it has excellency and can satisfy stakeholders’ need to achieve customer satisfaction (Abuhav, 2017: 39; Goetsch & Davis, 2014: 2; Lee & Li, 2018: 306-307; Tjiptono & Diana, 2009: 3-4), has excellence service (Almana et al., 2018: 121-123; Jaccard, 2013: 19; Wibisono, 2018:
Studies on leadership have been conducted by many academicians, especially in terms of leadership style. Chung-Hsiung Fang et al. (2009: 1-2) identify that the leadership styles can affect positively the organizational commitment and satisfaction at work. Generally, the leadership is oriented to build trust, norms, and values, as well as satisfaction at work (Ridwan & Beg, 2007: 1). The leadership style is significantly influenced by the closeness of family, group, and ethics (Kelidbari et al., 2016: 465-467; Yuan et al., 2005: 25-26). The transactional and transformational leadership which is displayed by the leaders have a very high influence on the innovation climate in the organization (Lirong & Minxin, 2008: 4; Ye et al., 2011: 319). Transformational leadership determines more satisfaction at work in an innovative organization (Wamy T.S. & Swamy, 2014: 58). The leadership style in the educational institution influences significantly and is closely related to the innovation encouraged by the educational institution (Chen & Chen, 2007: 424). Hsien-Che Lee & Yi-Wen Liu (2008: 1907) shows that the leadership style can influence the innovation performance and innovation capability of an organization. Similar premises are also proposed by Jorge Ferreira et al. (2018: 5-6), He Yuentong & Li Taoran (2013: 194), Norizah Mohamad et al. (2015: 7), Mansir (2020: 1), and Belghis Bavarsad et al. (2015: 5) that the leadership and leadership style in an organization, including educational organizations, significantly influence the organizational performance, culture and work ethics. In her research, Endah Christianingsih (2011: 31) underlines that visionary leadership and lecturers’ performance influence positively and significantly the efforts of higher education quality management.

Studies cited above either on the institutional change or the leadership and leadership styles in the efforts to improve the performance and quality of organizations have often been found. However, studies that examine the leaders’ motivation and vision to establish the quality state of Islamic higher education in specific seems to be rare, especially in the transition period or institutional change. This research is expected to complement the result of existing studies. The role of leaders and their strategic motivation and vision seems to highly influence the achievement of institutions in the
transitional period. The result of this study can be used for consideration by the leaders and executives of higher educations in their efforts to achieve a quality higher education organization that can compete globally.

HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: MOTIVATION AND CONSEQUENCES

At first, both IAIN (State Islamic Institute) Purwokerto and IAIN Pekalongan were both branch faculties of other IAINs. IAIN Purwokerto originated from the Tarbiyah Faculty of IAIN Sunan Kalijaga Yogyakarta (1964-1994) and the Tarbiyah Faculty of IAIN Walisongo Semarang (1994-1997), both based in Purwokerto. The transfer of the parent from IAIN Sunan Kalijaga Yogyakarta to IAIN Walisongo Semarang was based on geographical considerations and the efficiency of regional technical development. Meanwhile, IAIN Pekalongan was previously the Sharia Faculty of IAIN Walisongo in Bumiayu (1968-1973) and became the Sharia Faculty of IAIN Walisongo in Pekalongan (1973-1992). STAIN (State Islamic School of Higher Learning) Purwokerto transformed to IAIN Purwokerto in 2014 based on Presidential Regulation Number 139 of 2014. Meanwhile, STAIN Pekalongan transformed to IAIN Pekalongan in 2016 based on Presidential Regulation number 73 of 2016. In 2021 (as per 11 May 2021) IAIN Purwokerto transformed to UIN (State Islamic University) Prof. K.H. Saifuddin Zuhri Purwokerto. In the meantime, IAIN Pekalongan currently (2021) is in the process of transformation to UIN.

These two universities have phenomenal progress in the academic field after institutional changes. This phenomenal progress can be used as a reason for the need to research at these two universities. IAIN Purwokerto can carry out internal institutional improvements through accelerated accreditation of institutions and study programs after institutional development in less than 3 years (2015-2018); IAIN Purwokerto succeeded in increasing the institutional accreditation score from 335 to 347 (B) and increasing the accreditation of study programs from 3 study programs to 8 study programs accredited A. Meanwhile, for IAIN Pekalongan, the phenomenal progress shown is the ability to make breakthroughs in the internal improvement of higher education through accelerated development. college buildings for 5 consecutive years (2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021) after institutional development. In addition, IAIN Pekalongan is also able to increase institutional accreditation from accredited C to B (score 350) in a span of 2
years (2016-2018). Presumably, not all PTKIN can lead to achieving certain (phenomenal) institutional achievements in the field of quality assurance after institutional development.

Both Higher Education Institutions (IAIN Purwokerto and IAIN Pekalongan) share the same motivation of institutional change as follow: First, scientific motivation and academic mandatory. The scientific motivation is meant to adapt to characteristics of science developed in Islamic education (Ahmad Roqib, Rector of IAIN Purwokerto, 2020). The transformation from STAIN to IAIN has significant impacts on the improvement of the academic” (Ade Dedi Rohayana, 2020). In addition, the motivation of transformation is related to mandatory giving to higher education. The academic scope of IAIN is wider and bigger than that of STAIN (Ade Dedi Rohayana, Rector of IAIN Pekalongan, 2020). The change of STAIN to IAIN provides opportunities for universities to develop academic and scientific fields. Universities do not only develop religious knowledge, but also general scientific fields.

Second, compliance to regulations, which means that the transformation from STAIN to IAIN is following existing regulations such as Regulation of Republic Indonesia Number 12 of 2012 about Higher Education, Governmental Regulation of Republic Indonesia Number 60 of 1999 about Higher Education, Governmental Regulation of Republic Indonesia Number 4 of 2014 about Execution of Higher Education dan Management of Higher Education, and Regulation of Minister of Religion Affair of Republic Indonesia Number 15 of 2014 about Transformation of Religious Higher Education. Those regulations underline that the School of Higher Learning is a religious Higher education administering academic education, vocation, and/or professional education in the scope of the specified discipline. It means that if the status of an institution is School of Higher Learning then it can only carry out one field of study. Whereas, in reality, STAIN currently administers several fields of study such as Tarbiyah, Syariah, Ushuluddin, Business Economy, and other fields of study. This is not compliant with the existing regulations. Hence, it needs to be transformed into IAIN.

Third, public trust and aspiration. The institutional transformation from STAIN to IAIN is meant to build and increase the public’s trust. The increasing trust of the public in higher education institutions will affect the policy to improve Gross Participation
Rate (GNP). “The bigger the institution, the higher the public’s trust will be. That’s why
the public will be more interested in continuing studies in State Islamic Higher
Education (PTKIN), and so at the same time one of the national objectives namely to
increase the GNP percentage, will be fulfilled” (Luthfi Hamidi, 2020). As we all know,
the institutional change of higher education to IAIN or UIN will result in an increasing
amount of study programs in each faculty. This gives more opportunities to the public to
have access to higher education based on their interest. The availability of various study
programs in higher education will increase the public’s interest to enroll.

Meanwhile, the consequences and strategies of action after the institutional
change which are experienced by IAIN Purwokerto and IAIN Pekalongan are as follow:
(1) bettering administration aspects, (2) designing adaptive curriculum, (3)
strengthening and improving work pattern, and (4) improving quality of higher
education. An aspect that is considered important and hence prioritized in IAIN
Purwokerto is the increase of accreditation rank of study programs and institutions.
Meanwhile, the priority chosen by IAIN Pekalongan is to complete the facilities and
infrastructure of higher education. The priorities of both institutions are closely related
to leaders’ vision which is developed from the start. Leaders’ vision significantly
influences the achievement of higher education after the institutional change. The
leader's vision is a picture of the future that articulates values, goals, and the identity of
followers. This shows that leadership is closely related to the vision that is built,
because the vision is the leader's reflection in seeing the situation and the future of the
institution. The vision built by the leader can generate commitment and follower action
to the leader and his vision.

The motivation of institutional change of IAIN Purwokerto and IAIN Pekalongan
elaborated above is the evidence that the higher educations must be able to keep it up to
date with today’s conditions as well as the increasing demand of the public along with
their social life change. Examined thoroughly, it will be found that the institutional
change of Islamic higher education is motivated by several reasons, as proposed by
some experts in their research, among them are (1) technology enhancement (Ertmer &
Ottenbreit-Leftwich, 2010: 255-257; Hutchison & Reinking, 2011: 312); (2) economic
conditions and global competition (Porter M E, 2000: 19-20; Tidström & Hagberg-
Andersson, 2012: 336); (3) social and demographic changes (Coccia & Rolfo, 2013:
Motivation serves as the driving machine for institutional change. Without strong motivation to change, Islamic higher education will never obtain meaningful change or at least will experience lateness in responding to today’s conditions as well as its logical consequences. This is in line with what is proposed by (Greenberg & Baron, 2003: 592; Kreitner & Knicks, 2001: 664; Robbins, 2001: 551), basically, the institutional change of Islamic higher education, either private or state, will never occur until there emerges leaders’ motivation or management to change to be better. Changes in higher education institutions are a necessity. Furthermore, these changes must be followed up with strategic efforts through leadership policies. The leader's policy is a breakthrough in improving higher education in a period of change.

However, there are more important things to pay attention to in changing higher education institutions, namely changes in terms of quality. Although institutionally higher education institutions still have the status of institutes, actually universities can still exist and have competitiveness. The condition is that the university (institute) must commit to implementing higher education quality assurance. In Cheng’s perspective (Cheng, 2003: 210-211), the implementation of higher education quality assurance must come to future quality assurance where the task of higher education is to make education relevant to the future needs of new generations in the future. Quality assurance should not stop at internal quality assurance alone but the implementation of future quality assurance. Here it can be stated that institutional change is important, but actually what is more important is the change in the mindset of the academic community in improving the quality of the institution itself.

LEADERS’ VISION TOWARD HIGHER EDUCATION QUALITY

To establish a quality higher education, the role of the leaders (i.e., the Rectors) is very important. Their vision toward quality significantly affects quality improvement commitments and policies in higher educations where they are in charge. Leaders are general policymakers. General policies made by the leaders are then interpreted and operationalized by their subordinates in real actions. Goodwill from the leader that comes from the vision of the leader influences the policies in universities. So the
direction of quality development policy is strongly influenced by how committed a leader (Rector) is.

According to Luthfi Hamidi, as IAIN Purwokerto Rector of 2014 -2018, “Quality is closely related to Accreditation.” It has continuous systemic impacts that the policies in IAIN Purwokerto after the institutional change are oriented to improve the higher education quality through accreditation acceleration, both institution and study program.

After the transformation from STAIN to IAIN, quality improvement becomes one of the main priorities. The quality parameter is the accreditation rank. That’s why IAIN Purwokerto worked hard to achieve a high accreditation rank, both in institution and study program levels (Luthfi Hamidi, 2020).

The commitment which is based on the leaders’ vision that ‘quality is closely related to accreditation’ has a significant influence on the accreditation rank of institution and study programs in IAIN Purwokerto. This is seen in the betterment of accreditation scores in that higher education. The score of both institution and study program accreditation increases. When the status is still STAIN, its accreditation score was 335 (accredited B). The score increases when the status changes to IAIN. The score is 347 (accredited B) (http://iainpurwokerto.ac.id/sertifikat-akreditasi/?op=prodi accessed on Friday, 15 January 2021 at 10:29). Even though both are accredited B, but the score increases. Meanwhile, the accreditation score of study programs increases by more than 50%. When the status is still STAIN, the study programs accredited A are only 3, and after the status change to IAIN, with serious effort, the study programs accredited A increases to 8. This shows that there is commitment and effort to improve higher education quality through the acceleration of institutional accreditation, and it is influenced by the leader’s vision.

Meanwhile, in IAIN Pekalongan, the leader’s vision after the institutional change is that “Quality is closely related to completeness of facilities and infrastructure.” This leader’s vision then yields in commitments and policies of IAIN Pekalongan to complete facilities and infrastructure, more specifically the establishment of the new building. The rector admits that by providing complete facilities and infrastructure, excellent service to the stakeholder will be easy to achieve. It is in line with the statement of Ade Dedi Rohayana, as Rector of IAIN Pekalongan:

Quality is closely related to the completeness of facilities and infrastructure. The priority agenda after the institutional change is related to campus facilities and infrastructure. That’s why the change to IAIN becomes the starting point to
improve facilities and infrastructure. The improvement of facilities and infrastructure will help the quality improvement. (Ade Dedi Rohayana, 2020).

The focus to complete facilities and infrastructure of higher education after the institutional change in IAIN Pekalongan is verified by Zaenal Mustakim and Muhlisin. As the Vice-Rector II of IAIN Pekalongan, Zaenal Mustakim (2020) says that there are three priorities after the institutional change from STAIN to IAIN, namely (1) academic development; (2) facilities and infrastructure development; and (3) human resource development. Those three priorities are closely related to and support each other. However, the most prioritized among the three is facilities and infrastructure development.

Meanwhile, according to Muhlisin (2020), higher education institutional development must be supported by strong infrastructure. The academic and institutional quality improvement efforts, especially in IAIN Pekalongan, become priorities after the status change. However, the quality improvement must be accompanied by the completeness of facilities and infrastructure as the main support. Higher education will have more opportunities to improve quality if the infrastructure such as buildings and all the applications can be fulfilled. In other words, the quality improvement after the status change will be achieved more optimally with the availability of complete facilities and infrastructure. Hence, the efforts to complete facilities and infrastructure should be prioritized.

The leader’s commitment to complete facilities and infrastructure after the status change make IAIN Pekalongan successful. After the change to IAIN in 2016, in 2017 it can build a new building for the first time in Kabupaten Pekalongan. This first building 8,300 m² is provided for the Faculty of Economy and Islamic Business (FEB). In 2018, the institution received government funds to construct a building of 8,300 m² for the Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teaching Training (FTIK). In 2019, IAIN Pekalongan is trusted by the government to build an Integrated Lecture Building (ILB) which is finished at the end of 2019 and used at the beginning of 2020 (Zaenal Mustakim, 2020). In 2020, IAIN Pekalongan continues to build the Faculty of Syariah building in front of ILB which is finished at the end of 2020. Then, this year (2021) IAIN Pekalongan is in the process of constructing a new building for Library and the Faculty of Ushuludin, Adab, & Dakwah (FUAD). IAIN Pekalongan has been constructing buildings to complete faculties and
infrastructure of higher education consecutively since the institutional change (2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, dan 2021). All funds for the building construction come from APBN and SBSN. In the context of this research, the success of IAIN Pekalongan in completing facilities and infrastructure starts from the leader’s vision which states that “Quality is closely related to Completing facilities and infrastructure.

Both IAIN Purwokerto and IAIN Pekalongan have executed continuous improvement toward higher education quality after the institutional change. The end of all efforts done by both higher educations is similar, namely the improvement of higher education quality. The only difference is in the leaders’ commitment (goodwill) and early steps (policy) done by each higher education. The leader’s commitment toward quality and strategic efforts done afterward is influenced by strategic vision built by leaders in interpreting “quality” after the higher education institutional change.

Based on the above explanation, it is clear that the vision built by a leader highly affects the institutional quality of higher education, especially for higher education which experiences institutional change or transformation. As the highest rank leader in higher educations, rectors must have a far-reaching vision and be able to socialize the vision to the academic community of higher education. This supports the result of a study conducted by Endah Christianingsih (2011: 31) that visionary leaders positively and significantly influence the higher education efforts to improve its institutional quality. However, the leader’s vision alone is not adequate to serve as the main capital to improve institutional quality. Other aspects help to determine the achievement of higher education institutional quality, namely the strengthening of the quality assurance system of higher education. This is in line with the statement of Aswin Bancin (2017: 11) dan Muh. Fitrah et. al. (2018: 84), that higher education quality must be strengthened by its quality assurance system. Quality assurance aims to continuously maintain and improve higher education quality. This quality assurance system is administered internally to achieve the vision and mission of higher education, and to satisfy stakeholders’ needs through the execution of three pillars of higher education.

Examining the findings in IAIN Purwokerto and IAIN Pekalongan, it is clear that in the beginning phase of the institutional change the leaders interpret quality as ‘the increase of accreditation score’ and quality is closely related to ‘completeness of facilities and infrastructure’ of higher education. The leaders’ vision is then interpreted
by all elements of the academic community in the form of making all efforts to increase institution accreditation score (for IAIN Purwokerto) and completing facilities and infrastructure of higher education (for IAIN Pekalongan). According to the researcher, quality is not only related to the betterment of institutional accreditation but also the completeness of facilities and infrastructure. If quality is only limited to institution accreditation, then the final benchmark of higher education is only on the accreditation rank. Accreditation serves only as the benchmark that higher education has been by the specified quality standards. The effort to satisfy standards here is more administrative, in which when a higher education can prepare the administration well then it will get a good accreditation score.

According to Pawlowski (Pawlowski, 2007) accreditation is a mechanism to see the fulfillment of quality standards. However, true quality is achieved when there exists a quality culture and it is maintained well in a higher education institution. This quality culture has become the spirit in every activity of the three pillars of higher education. The quality performers do not think about the administration to fulfill the existing quality standards. Quality has been a part of their life. In doing their responsibility as academicians, they understand well what quality means. A researcher lecturer does not think about fulfilling his research report which tends to be administrative. Instead, he focuses on producing meaningful researches which can give a significant contribution to the public.

This understanding also applies when we interpret quality as the fulfillment of higher education facilities and infrastructure. Facilities and infrastructure are indeed an important aspect in executing the three pillars of higher education, either in education, research, or community development, but the facilities and infrastructure are not the benchmarks that assure that the higher education has quality or not. The final objective of higher education quality improvement is the establishment of the quality culture displayed by the academic community. To build the culture, the awareness and commitment of the academic community, as well as the understanding of self as a person who has obligations and consequences of the chosen profession, are needed. From the researcher’s point of view, the binding system is needed to build the quality culture. The system serves as a tool to bind, discipline, and have consequences. Of course, the objective of the system is to coerce the system executors to be compliant to
it and finally to build a crystalized habit as a character (culture). The system must be planned, executed, and controlled well so that it becomes an effective tool to build a quality culture in higher education. Here the researcher underlines that the accreditation or the fulfillment of facilities and infrastructure serves only as a tool or system the final objective of which is to create true quality of higher education, namely quality culture.

CONCLUSION
To conclude this paper, the researcher tries to resume the above discussion as follows: First, the institutional change which often happens to the state of Islamic higher education must be regarded as the starting point of the efforts to improve academic and institutional quality. This institutional change must be followed by good higher education quality management: planned, executed, monitored, and evaluated synergically. Second, the leaders’ motivation and vision serve as the main aspect to improve the institutional quality. The motivation and vision must be elaborated into real and calculated actions, as well as supported by transformational leadership. Third, the accreditation and the fulfillment of higher education facilities and infrastructure serve as a tool the final objective of which is the establishment of quality culture displayed by the academic community. Besides that, currently the higher education management, either in the capital city or work units of organization, needs to develop the binding system as a strategic effort to establish higher education quality after the institutional change.

The recommendations of this research are addressed to Islamic religious universities in general, that in the perspective of implementing higher education quality assurance, the motivation and vision of leaders should be focused on efforts to improve internal institutions, improve education services and public accountability, and the relevance of education to the future needs of new generations in the future.
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