

---

## The Development of Lecturer Qualifications to Voice Behavior as an Effort to Enhance Higher Education Management in Indonesia

---

Listiana Sri Mulatsih<sup>1</sup>, Surya Dharma<sup>2</sup>, Elfitra Azliyanti<sup>3</sup>, Nindy Yudita Putri<sup>4</sup>

### **Abstract:**

*The efficacy of managing higher education institutions is influenced by a multitude of factors, among which human resource management holds significant importance. Both individual and collective behaviours within the workforce play a substantial role in shaping the institution's performance. Individual workplace behaviours, which can be evaluated through levels of job satisfaction, are classified into four categories based on whether they are constructive or destructive, and active or passive. A focal point of this study is the concept of voice behaviour. Research concerning human resources within higher education often centres on performance metrics or other elements directly associated with their core responsibilities, defined under the Tri Dharma of higher education. This study encompasses all lecturers actively engaged in teaching at X University, spanning across various ranks and qualifications. Participants were grouped into several demographic categories, namely: gender, age, highest educational attainment, and academic position. The objective of this research is to characterise the constructive behaviours of lecturers and examine the variances across these demographic groups. The analytical approach employed involves analysis of variance (ANOVA) and hypothesis testing through the t-test.*

**Keywords:** Effectiveness, Constructiveness, Voice Behavior, One Way Anova

Submitted: November 29, 2024, Accepted: December 17, 2024, Published: December 31, 2024

## 1. Introduction

Private universities in Indonesia predominantly rely on tuition fees paid by students as their primary source of revenue. Consequently, maintaining and increasing student enrolment directly impacts the financial sustainability of these institutions. However, a noticeable trend has been observed: the number of new students enrolling at private universities has been declining in recent years. This shift can be attributed to changes in the status of state universities, which are now legal entities able to offer self-funded programs for newly introduced study programs. As a result, private universities face increasing competition as they struggle to attract and retain students in a challenging educational landscape (Suparman, Hidayat, Ilyas, & Apriliani, 2019).

---

<sup>1</sup> Universitas Bung Hatta, Padang, Indonesia, [listiana@bunghatta.ac.id](mailto:listiana@bunghatta.ac.id)

<sup>2</sup> Universitas Bung Hatta, Padang, Indonesia, [sdharma3005@gmail.com](mailto:sdharma3005@gmail.com)

<sup>3</sup> Universitas Bung Hatta, Padang, Indonesia, [elfitraazliyanti@bunghatta.ac.id](mailto:elfitraazliyanti@bunghatta.ac.id)

<sup>4</sup> Universitas Bung Hatta, Padang, Indonesia, [nindy Yudita Putri9@gmail.com](mailto:nindy Yudita Putri9@gmail.com)

X University, a prominent private institution with over four decades of history, continuously seeks to enhance its appeal by aligning with government-set quality standards. Key to these efforts are its lecturers, who play a crucial role in delivering education aimed at improving society's knowledge and enlightenment. The university has been making substantial progress in increasing the proportion of lecturers with doctoral degrees, reaching 37.5% of its 264 active faculty members in 2023. This proportion is expected to rise in the coming years, responding to the growing discourse about potential government mandates requiring doctoral qualifications for lecturers. Moreover, the institution's commitment to academic excellence is reflected in the 25.75% of its faculty who hold the rank of Associate Professor, serving as a benchmark of academic achievement (Wati, Dharma, & Jadmiko, 2018).

Despite these qualifications and advancements, X University's performance in attracting and retaining students has shown an unexpected negative correlation with the proportion of lecturers holding doctoral degrees and functional ranks. This anomaly raises concerns, as highly qualified human resources are typically expected to positively influence student enrolment and retention. This paradox invites further investigation into factors that may contribute to such trends, with voice behaviour emerging as a potential area of focus.

Voice behaviour, defined as the proactive expression of ideas, suggestions, or concerns intended to improve organizational processes, has been shown to contribute to institutional success, especially in environments marked by intense competition (Kong et al., 2017). Lecturers who engage in voice behaviour are more likely to offer innovative ideas and solutions, which can support the institution's efforts to adapt and thrive (Shih & Wijaya, 2017; Liao et al., 2019). Therefore, fostering and enhancing voice behaviour among lecturers could be crucial for X University's efforts to reverse the trend of declining student enrolment and maintain its competitive edge.

This study aims to bridge the research gap by examining the relationship between lecturer qualifications, functional positions, and their engagement in voice behaviour, particularly in the context of a private university facing competitive pressures. Previous research has often overlooked the role of voice behaviour in higher education management, focusing instead on individual qualifications or institutional strategies in isolation (Duffy & Chenail, 2009; Sari & Suryani, 2023). By integrating voice behaviour into the analysis, this research seeks to contribute new insights into how proactive lecturer engagement can positively influence institutional outcomes, such as student enrolment and retention.

The novelty of this research lies in its focus on the underexplored intersection of lecturer qualifications, functional positions, and voice behaviour, specifically in the context of a private university in Indonesia. The findings could have significant implications for higher education institutions, particularly in understanding how human resource engagement can drive institutional success amid increasing competition.

The objective of this study is to investigate the relationship between lecturer qualifications, functional positions, and their engagement in voice behaviour at X

University. Specifically, the study aims to explore how the proportion of lecturers with doctoral degrees and higher functional ranks correlates with student enrolment and retention rates. Furthermore, it seeks to examine the role of voice behaviour in enhancing institutional resilience and success, particularly in the context of a competitive higher education environment. By addressing this gap, the research intends to provide insights into how fostering voice behaviour among lecturers can contribute to improving university performance and attracting new students (Dharma, 2022; Duffy & Chenail, 2009; Jasmara & Wati, 2021; Khalisa & Eryansyah, 2022; Nyavon, 2016; Park & Park, 2016; Rahmayani & Kamener, n.d.; Rutberg & Bouikidis, 2018; Sari & Suryani, 2023; Suparman et al., 2019; Wati, Dharma, & Jadmiko, 2018; Wati, Dharma, & Rosha, 2018).

## **2. Theoretical Background**

### **Lecturer Qualifications and Educational Performance**

Lecturer qualifications, which include academic degrees, teaching experience, and functional positions, directly influence the quality of teaching and management in higher education (Suparman, Hidayat, Ilyas, & Apriliani, 2019). The relationship between qualifications and performance has been explored extensively, and it has been found that lecturers with higher qualifications tend to demonstrate better teaching outcomes (Khalisa & Eryansyah, 2022). This aligns with the theory of **Human Capital Theory** (Becker, 1993), which posits that investments in education and training improve the skills and competencies of workers, leading to higher productivity and overall performance in their respective roles. In higher education, investing in lecturer qualifications can lead to improved instructional effectiveness, thereby enhancing the educational experience for students.

### **Voice Behavior and Lecturer Effectiveness**

Voice behavior, which refers to the proactive communication of ideas, suggestions, or concerns that can improve organizational outcomes (Morrison, 2011), is an important factor in enhancing the management of higher education institutions. Lecturers' willingness to engage in voice behavior is influenced by their perceptions of organizational support, institutional culture, and their personal career aspirations. In this regard, **Social Exchange Theory** (Blau, 1964) can help explain how lecturers' engagement in voice behavior is influenced by the perceived benefits and costs of such actions. According to this theory, when lecturers perceive that their institution supports their professional development, they are more likely to engage in voice behavior, which can ultimately lead to improved institutional practices and teaching methodologies.

### **Influence of Functional Position and Educational Level**

The functional positions held by lecturers, such as lecturers, associate professors, and expert assistants, also affect their involvement in voice behavior. Studies by Sari and Suryani (2023) suggest that individuals in higher functional positions, such as associate professors, tend to exhibit higher levels of voice behavior due to their greater institutional experience and confidence in influencing decision-making processes.

Additionally, differences in educational levels (e.g., Master's versus Doctoral degrees) can influence lecturers' approach to voice behavior. According to **Self-Determination Theory** (Ryan & Deci, 2000), higher educational qualifications may lead to greater autonomy and intrinsic motivation, empowering lecturers to voice their opinions more freely.

### **Implications for Higher Education Management**

The interaction between lecturer qualifications, functional positions, and voice behavior is crucial for effective higher education management. Lecturers who engage in voice behavior provide valuable insights that can lead to improved teaching methods, curriculum development, and overall educational strategies. This has practical implications for the management of higher education institutions, as it highlights the need for fostering an environment that encourages proactive communication and collaboration. The **Transformational Leadership Theory** (Bass, 1999) emphasizes that leaders who inspire and support their staff in a transformational way can enhance their performance and willingness to contribute to organizational improvements.

Furthermore, the significance of lecturer qualifications in improving institutional management is supported by the findings of Sari and Suryani (2023), which indicate that lecturer professionalism plays a critical role in advancing higher education practices. When lecturers are professionally qualified and motivated, they are more likely to contribute positively to institutional change and development.

### **3. Methodology**

The research approach employed in this study is descriptive comparative in nature. Descriptive research aims to characterise a psychological variable within specific individuals or demographic groups in their natural settings, without exerting any intervention on the variables being observed (Siedlecky, 2020; Rutberg & Bouikidis, 2018; Park & Park, 2016). The insights derived from this descriptive analysis are anticipated to reveal levels, proportions (%), and variations across one or more variables, thereby facilitating a more profound and comprehensive understanding of the issue at hand. Descriptive research holds particular value when the targeted variable has seldom, if ever, been documented or was last examined under conditions presumed significantly different from the current context (Duffy & Chenail, 2009). While descriptive studies typically involve a large sample size ( $n$ ) to satisfy statistical assumptions, they may also be conducted with smaller sample sizes when the population under examination is uniquely specialised or limited in number.

This research not only provides descriptive insights but also examines significant variations across one or more variables relative to differing subject characteristics, commonly distinguished by demographic factors such as gender, age, educational background, and most recent functional position (Rutberg & Bouikidis, 2018; Park & Park, 2016). Employing a comparative research design, this approach is well-suited for highlighting disparities in variable scores based on specific reference

characteristics. The primary data for this study were gathered through field surveys using questionnaires. The research instrument utilised measures of voice behaviour, encompassing both promotive and prohibitive voice, as developed by Liang, Farh, and Farh (2012). The analytical approach involves testing construct validity and reliability, assessing the normality assumption, and conducting a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and difference tests.

#### 4. Empirical Findings/Result

##### Description of Respondent Demographics

The survey successfully obtained responses from 112 participants, whose ages spanned from 21 to 65 years, yielding a mean (M) age of 50.73 years with a standard deviation (SD) of 10.50 years. The tenure of respondents ranged between 2 and 40 years, with an average (M) of 23.61 years and a standard deviation (SD) of 10.13 years. Both age and length of service showed a distribution skewed below the mean (Skew: -0.86 for age and -0.48 for service length). A detailed breakdown of these time-based variables is presented in Table 1 below.

**Table 1. Description of Time-Based Variables (N=112)**

| Variables         | Statistical Measures |            |          |           |             |
|-------------------|----------------------|------------|----------|-----------|-------------|
|                   | <i>Min</i>           | <i>Max</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>Skew</i> |
| Age               | 21                   | 65         | 50.73    | 10.50     | -0.86       |
| Length of Service | 2                    | 40         | 23.62    | 10.13     | -0.48       |

Source: STATA, processed, 2024

The respondent cohort comprised 68 males (67.33%) and 44 females (43.56%), with 25 lecturers employed under the PNS-DPK status (24.73%) and 87 foundation-appointed lecturers (86.14%). In terms of educational attainment, the majority held master's degrees, with 63 lecturers (62.38%), while a smaller portion, 49 lecturers (48.51%), held doctoral degrees. Functional positions were largely represented by Lectors, accounting for 64 respondents (63.37%), followed by 36 individuals at the Associate Professor level or higher (35.64%), 7 Expert Assistants (6.93%), and 5 Teaching Staff members (4.95%). A comprehensive overview of respondents' demographic characteristics is presented in Table 2 below.

**Table 2. Description of Demographic Characteristics of Respondents (N=112)**

| Characteristics | Demographics | N  | %     |
|-----------------|--------------|----|-------|
| Gender          | Man          | 68 | 67.33 |
|                 | Woman        | 44 | 43.56 |
| Bond            | PNS/DPK      | 25 | 24.75 |
|                 | Foundation   | 87 | 86.14 |
| Education       | S2           | 63 | 62.38 |
|                 | S3           | 49 | 48.51 |

Married Status

| Characteristics     | Demographics             | N  | %     |
|---------------------|--------------------------|----|-------|
|                     | Marry                    | 98 | 97.03 |
|                     | Not Married              | 14 | 13.86 |
| Functional Position |                          |    |       |
|                     | Teaching Staff (TS)      | 5  | 4.95  |
|                     | Expert Assistant (EA)    | 7  | 6.93  |
|                     | Lector (L)               | 64 | 63.37 |
|                     | Associate Professor (AP) | 36 | 35.64 |
| Serving Status      |                          |    |       |
|                     | Yes                      | 57 | 56.44 |
|                     | No                       | 55 | 54.46 |

Source: STATA, processed, 2024

### Testing Research Instruments (Construct Validity and Reliability)

In terms of its measurability, the voice behaviour variable is classified as a latent variable, where its assessment is conducted through multiple items structured across various dimensions. This study employs confirmatory factor analysis to verify that these measurement items genuinely capture the intended hypothetical constructs, represented by a series of elements or question items. The validity of each item is determined by examining factor loadings ( $\lambda$ ), while the validity of the construct itself is evaluated through discriminant validity, using the average variance extracted (AVE) coefficient as an indicator. Construct reliability, on the other hand, is assessed through the composite reliability (CR) approach.

The five items utilised to assess the promotive dimension demonstrated validity, as each achieved factor loadings exceeding 0.5, with an AVE value of 0.73. This dimension exhibited robust construct reliability, with a CR of 0.93. In contrast, within the prohibitive dimension, two items—namely Item 7 and Item 10—were deemed invalid due to ambiguity. Item 7 displayed factor loadings above 0.5 (0.54 and 0.57) across both dimensions, a similar issue observed with Item 10 (0.53 and 0.55). Upon removal of these items, the prohibitive dimension achieved an AVE of 0.56 and a CR of 0.79. A full summary of the test results is provided in Table 3 below.

**Table 3. Construct Validity and Reliability Testing**

| Items                         | Factor Loadings ( $\lambda$ ) |             | AVE  | CR   |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|------|------|
|                               | 1                             | 2           |      |      |
| Dimension 1: <i>Promotive</i> |                               |             |      |      |
| Item 1                        | <b>0.84</b>                   | 0.26        | 0.73 | 0.93 |
| Item 2                        | <b>0.88</b>                   | 0.24        |      |      |
| Item 3                        | <b>0.85</b>                   | 0.22        |      |      |
| Item 4                        | <b>0.82</b>                   | 0.33        |      |      |
| Item 5                        | <b>0.88</b>                   | 0.27        |      |      |
| Dimensi 2: <i>Prohibitive</i> |                               |             |      |      |
| Item 6                        | 0.39                          | <b>0.54</b> | 0.56 | 0.79 |
| Item 7*                       | 0.54                          | <b>0.57</b> |      |      |
| Item 8                        | 0.21                          | <b>0.86</b> |      |      |
| Item 9                        | 0.29                          | <b>0.81</b> |      |      |

Item 10\* 0.53 0.55

Source: STATA, processed, 2024

### Description of Voice Behavior Based on Functional Position and Educational Level

The primary aim of this study is to outline the overall voice behaviour scores and examine their variation across different functional positions. Across all respondents, the mean voice behaviour score (M) was found to be 27.50, with a standard deviation (SD) of 6.23. Associate Professors demonstrated the highest average score for voice behaviour (M = 29.78, SD = 4.53), followed by Lectors (M = 27.17, SD = 6.06), Expert Assistants (M = 23.86, SD = 4.26), and, lastly, Teaching Staff, who registered the lowest average (M = 20.40, SD = 12.54). A detailed breakdown is available in Table 4 below.

**Table 4. Description of Voice Behavior Score based on Functional Position**

| Functional Position      | M     | SD    |
|--------------------------|-------|-------|
| Teaching Staff (TS)      | 20.40 | 12.54 |
| Expert Assistant (EA)    | 23.86 | 4.26  |
| Lector (L)               | 27.17 | 6.06  |
| Associate Professor (AP) | 29.78 | 4.53  |
| Total                    | 27.50 | 6.23  |

Source: STATA, processed, 2024

The application of One-Way ANOVA testing reveals a statistically significant difference in voice behaviour scores across functional positions ( $F=3,108=5.14$ ;  $P<0.01$ ). A full account of these test results is provided in Table 5 below.

**Table 5. One Way Anova**

| Source         | SS      | df  | MS     | F    | Prob > F |
|----------------|---------|-----|--------|------|----------|
| Between groups | 538.61  | 3   | 179.54 | 5.14 | 0.00     |
| Within groups  | 3773.39 | 108 | 34.94  |      |          |
| Total          | 4312    | 111 | 38.85  |      |          |

Source: STATA, processed, 2024

Post hoc analysis using the Bonferroni method (refer to Table 6) indicated that significant differences emerged solely between TS and Associate Professors (AP), with a mean difference of -9.83, SE = 2.81, and  $P < 0.01$ .

**Table 6. Bonferonni Post-Hoc Analysis**

| Functional Position |    | Mean.<br>Diff | S.E  | t     | P. Bonferonni |
|---------------------|----|---------------|------|-------|---------------|
| AP                  | TS | - 9.38        | 2.81 | -3.34 | <0.01         |
|                     | EA | - 5.92        | 1.86 | -3.19 | .10           |
|                     | L  | - 2.61        | 1.16 | -2.25 | .22           |
| L                   | TS | - 6.77        | 3.07 | -.63  | .09           |
|                     | EA | - 3.31        | 2.36 | -1.4  | .97           |
| EA                  | TS | - 3.46        | 5.03 | -.69  | 1.00          |

Source: STATA, processed, 2024

### Description of Voice Behavior Based on Educational Level

When analysed by educational level, respondents holding a master's degree exhibited a lower average voice behaviour score (M = 26.79, SD = 6.32) compared to their

counterparts with doctoral qualifications ( $M = 28.41$ ,  $SD = 6.06$ ). Although a minor difference was observed (Mean Diff =  $-1.61$ ), this variation did not reach statistical significance ( $P = 0.18 > 0.05$ ).

**Table 7. Differences in Voice Behavior Scores Based on Education Level**

| Variables      | S2    |      | S3    |      | Mean.<br>Diff | df  | t    | P   |
|----------------|-------|------|-------|------|---------------|-----|------|-----|
|                | M     | SD   | M     | SD   |               |     |      |     |
| Voice Behavior | 26.79 | 6.32 | 28.41 | 6.06 | -1.61         | 110 | 1.36 | .18 |

Source: STATA, processed, 2024

## 5. Discussion

### Comparison of Voice Behavior Based on Functional Position

The focal point of this research is Human Resources (HR) within Higher Education, specifically examining their role in achieving effective institutional management. Individual behaviours, often manifesting as expressions of job satisfaction, are categorised into four distinct types along constructive-destructive and active-passive dimensions. A particular aspect under study here is voice behaviour. The research sample comprises all actively teaching lecturers at X University, totalling 112 individuals. These participants span a range of lecturer qualifications and are classified according to various demographic factors, including gender, age, years of service, highest educational attainment, and functional position.

Analysis revealed that the functional position levels of Teaching Staff (TS) and Expert Assistants (EA) yielded scores below the overall average, while Lectors (L) recorded scores slightly below this benchmark. In contrast, Associate Professors (AP) displayed an average score above the overall mean. This trend suggests that the propensity to voice aspirations for organisational advancement aligns with the lecturers' respective functional levels. Examining the descriptive statistics of functional position distribution, it is observed that the average score for Teaching Staff is below the overall mean, and the Expert Assistant's average score of 23.86 also falls short of the mean. The Lector score, at 27.17, is marginally below the overall average of 27.50, whereas Associate Professors achieved an above-average score of 29.78. It is reasonable that Lectors contribute a score approximating the overall average, given that they represent the largest group in the sample by functional position.

The outcomes of the One Path Analysis reveal significant variation in scores across different functional position levels, indicating that voice behaviour differs notably by functional rank. This finding underscores the importance of encouraging lecturers to advance in their functional positions—not only to meet accreditation requirements but also to enhance the effectiveness of university management through improved voice behaviour. It appears that lecturers with higher functional positions exhibit more constructive voice behaviours, contributing positively to institutional objectives. The analysis provides sufficient evidence to conclude that voice behaviour scores vary among the four functional position categories. Given the research hypothesis, which anticipates at least one pair of groups showing significant differences, it becomes essential to identify precisely where these distinctions occur among the groups. The



application of post hoc testing, specifically the Bonferroni method, and outcome comparison reveals distinct group differences (as summarised in Table 6). The voice behaviour of Associate Professors (AP) differs significantly from that of Teaching Staff (TS), while no significant differences are observed between the voice behaviour of Associate Professors (AP) and that of Expert Assistants (EA) or Lectors (L). Similarly, the voice behaviour of Lectors does not significantly differ from that of Teaching Staff or Expert Assistants, nor is there a notable difference between the voice behaviour of Expert Assistants and Teaching Staff. These findings suggest that, while there are meaningful differences in voice behaviour among the four functional positions, they are only statistically significant between Associate Professors and Teaching Staff. Thus, voice behaviour appears to be consistent across functional positions, with the exception of the contrast between Associate Professors and Teaching Staff.

Employee voice behaviour contributes significantly to system effectiveness by enabling the articulation of critical issues and proposing solutions to address potential challenges. When a system operates more effectively, voice behaviour becomes essential to the organisation's sustainability and success, as it fosters organisational development. Employees who engage in voice behaviour not only put forth new ideas but also endeavour to implement them. Recognising its value, organisations should actively enhance employee voice behaviour, as it directly supports improved decision-making processes, thereby positively impacting service quality. Furthermore, individuals who demonstrate voice behaviour tend to exhibit loyalty, as their expression of opinions is aimed at driving better outcomes for the organisation.

Considering the findings of this research, it is evident that employee voice behaviour at X University shows a significant difference only between lecturers holding the functional positions of Teaching Staff (TS) and Associate Professor (AP). Notably, the majority of lecturers at X University hold the position of Lector (L), with 64 individuals (63.37%) occupying this role. The disparity in voice behaviour between Teaching Staff (TS) and Associate Professors (AP) may be interpreted as somewhat expected. Teaching Staff, occupying the lowest tier in the functional hierarchy, may exhibit hesitation in expressing their opinions, possibly due to their junior status. Conversely, Associate Professors, who are more senior both in age and functional rank, appear more inclined to voice their opinions. This tendency may also be influenced by prior experience in structural roles or other factors beyond the scope of this study.

The analysis revealed no significant differences in voice behaviour between other functional positions, specifically between Associate Professor (AP) and Lector (L), Associate Professor (AP) and Expert Assistant (EA), Lector (L) and Expert Assistant (EA), Lector and Teaching Staff (TS), as well as Expert Assistant (EA) and Teaching Staff (TS). Given the importance of enhancing voice behaviour, these non-significant results warrant further investigation. The absence of significance in these comparisons may be attributable to a range of underlying factors that require deeper exploration. The first factor to consider is seniority. A significant portion of lecturers at X University, specifically 87 Foundation-affiliated lecturers, were recruited primarily

from the alumni pool. This recruitment approach fosters a unique emotional attachment between lecturers and students, often leading to hesitancy, apprehension, and a sense of deference stemming from the thought, "they were once my lecturers." Seniority further manifests in terms of age or year of university entry; when a lecturer was once junior to others during their studies, a natural deference to senior colleagues may subsequently influence their voice behaviour, resulting in a reluctance to express opinions openly.

The second factor to consider is the influence of role models. Presently, 57 lecturers occupy formal positions, a figure closely comparable to the 55 lecturers without such roles. Observing the conduct of those lecturers who have held or currently hold positions yet exhibit minimal voice behaviour, it becomes evident that they may serve as examples—or even role models—for junior lecturers to emulate.

The third factor to consider is gender. At X University, 68 lecturers are men, and while men are generally perceived to be more assertive in expressing ideas, the findings of this study indicate that this tendency is not particularly significant. Further research is warranted to explore whether this phenomenon stems from a particular "fearlessness" in expressing ideas, or, conversely, from a hesitation or cautiousness influenced by the perceived risks associated with voicing thoughts. It may be that lecturers hold back out of concern that sharing ideas might result in adverse consequences, such as professional tension or rejection by colleagues. Additionally, there could be an emerging sense of apathy, as observations and experiences suggest that voiced ideas often lack meaningful follow-up. This environment may prompt lecturers to opt for silence, preferring to avoid potential conflict over expressing ideas, especially if those ideas might not lead to tangible action. Consequently, significant ideas either remain unspoken or are only expressed when circumstances appear more favourable, as lecturers weigh the risks of potential outcomes.

The fifth factor pertains to tenure, with lecturers at X University having an average tenure of 23.62 years, a duration that reflects a considerable period of service within the institution. Over such an extended career, these lecturers have encountered diverse leadership styles, managerial approaches, as well as numerous changes in regulations, work climates, and professional environments. These cumulative experiences significantly shape their perceptions and decisions regarding the evolving profile of Bung Hatta University.

An unintended outcome of this extended tenure is a certain level of 'personal branding' among the lecturers. For instance, one group of lecturers has come to be recognised as "research-focused," distinguishing themselves by securing various internal and external grants, while another group dedicates efforts towards external projects, often outside the campus sphere. Additionally, some lecturers prioritise external funding activities, engage actively in pursuing promotions to higher functional roles, or invest their efforts in student-related matters. The distinction between activities that serve 'personal branding' and those that contribute to 'institutional branding' thus becomes increasingly blurred, as lecturers balance their individual pursuits with the broader identity of the university.

The sixth factor concerns the marital status of lecturers. Within the sample, 98 lecturers were married, while 14 remained unmarried, indicating that the majority were married. Naturally, those who are married face the necessity of balancing their time between professional duties and family obligations. This balancing act often differs between male and female lecturers. For male lecturers, who frequently hold primary financial responsibility as heads of families, work may be largely motivated by the need to provide, whereas for female lecturers, the role may serve as a source of supplementary income. Consequently, it is common for female lecturers to feel more settled or content spending time on campus, while male lecturers, if unoccupied with formal responsibilities, may be inclined to seek other engagements outside the campus.

This tendency suggests that, for male lecturers without formal positions, prolonged presence on campus may be less frequent. Given that the majority of respondents were both male and married, one can reasonably expect them to approach time management with a highly pragmatic mindset. Recognising and harnessing these dynamics could be instrumental in fostering a more effective managerial environment, encouraging a climate where time and roles are optimally structured for the benefit of both individual lecturers and the institution as a whole.

### **Comparison of Voice Behavior Based on Educational Level**

The second objective of this research is to examine notable differences in voice behaviour variables among lecturers based on their educational qualifications. The measurement results for all respondents revealed an average score (M) of 27.60 with a standard deviation (SD) of 6.19. When analysed by educational level, lecturers holding a Master's degree demonstrated a slightly lower average voice behaviour score (M=26.79, SD=6.32) compared to those with a Doctoral degree (M=28.41, SD=6.06), whose average exceeded that of the overall respondent group. Although a small difference in mean scores was observed (Mean Difference = -1.61), this variance was not statistically significant ( $P = .18 > 0.05$ ).

Among the respondents, 63 lecturers held a Master's degree, while 49 possessed a Doctoral degree. Research findings indicate that voice behaviour scores among lecturers with a Master's level qualification are lower compared to those with a Doctoral degree. This suggests that, within the Master's level group, behaviours encompassing the identification of significant issues, proposing solutions to address potential challenges, and generating and implementing new ideas are comparatively less prevalent than these behaviours are among lecturers with Doctoral qualifications. Despite the fact that the majority of lecturers at X University are qualified at the Master's level, this discrepancy raises intriguing questions. Further investigation into the underlying causes of this difference would offer valuable insights.

Regrettably, despite observing a variation in the average voice behaviour scores, this difference was determined to be statistically insignificant. This outcome suggests that there is insufficient evidence to assert a meaningful distinction between the voice behaviour of lecturers with Master's level qualifications and those with Doctoral qualifications. In essence, the voice behaviour of lecturers with Doctoral degrees

mirrors that of their counterparts with Master's degrees. The concept of voice behaviour—defined as an individual's response in the workplace through suggestions, opinions, concerns, or ideas aimed at enhancing the work environment, or as an expression of job dissatisfaction through proactive organisational actions (extra-role behaviours)—does not appear to differ notably between these groups.

Organisational aspirations for advancing Human Resources will ultimately prove counterproductive if the findings of this research are not duly assessed and acted upon. The policy of allocating funds for doctoral-level education must be supported by a substantial increase in the number of lecturers attaining doctoral qualifications. Empirical observations highlight various policy implementations concerning lecturers' educational advancement, such as the provision of study permits for pursuing higher degrees, incentive schemes for fulfilling the tri dharma of higher education for both Master's and Doctoral level lecturers, and requirements for senior roles that necessitate doctoral qualifications. Additionally, current shortcomings in "monitoring" the distribution of lecturers as examiners and supervisors for final projects, theses, and dissertations, as well as in enforcing academic regulations, suggest that the effectiveness of these policies in Human Resources development warrants a comprehensive review and reassessment.

The availability of human resources at X University with qualifications according to standards, with a quantity above the LLDIKTI Z figure, should be correlated with the number of students as the main source of income for the institution. Apart from that, the availability of human resources with these qualifications should create an effective decision-making process in managing higher education. The findings actually provide evidence that there is no difference in voice behavior based on the lecturer's qualification level. It is hoped that the expression of ideas, concerns, suggestions for improving the work environment and the entire process will be widely accepted, with many lecturers having PhD qualifications or Associate Professors, not as expected. Lecturer qualifications that meet standards will give rise to voice behavior that responds to job dissatisfaction with an attitude of being willing to take extra roles in work behavior, which is also difficult to realize. Job dissatisfaction by human resources can take the form of active-constructive actions, namely voice behavior, therefore organizations should improve this attitude for the sake of effective organizational management. Because voice behavior is an attitude that is able to reveal important issues and problems and suggest solutions to overcome potential threats that can make the system more effective.

Exit attitudes reflect a form of active yet destructive response to job dissatisfaction. A high prevalence of such exit attitudes, often indicative of high employee turnover, sends a detrimental signal to the organisation. This trend not only raises recruitment and training costs but also impacts organisational effectiveness in the long term. Conversely, loyalty is a passive-constructive form of job dissatisfaction, wherein employees, though dissatisfied, continue to demonstrate allegiance to the organisation. If such loyalty is predominant, it can also hinder organisational effectiveness, as the passivity associated with it stifles the growth of ideas and

attention to innovation. This response remains constructive, as it neither harms nor detracts from the organisation's stability.

The final response to job dissatisfaction is neglect, characterised by passivity coupled with a destructive impact. This attitude is particularly harmful and should be proactively mitigated, as it contributes negative value to the organisation. When employees' aspirations, ideas, or suggestions are consistently disregarded or met with indifference, a sense of "distrust" in leadership may develop, gradually fostering a culture of neglect towards tasks and responsibilities that deserve attention. When left unchecked, widespread neglectful behaviour can severely compromise the organisation's overall efficacy

## 6. Conclusions

The study found that the respondent profile was predominantly female, with a notable proportion of respondents holding positions as Foundation lecturers. In terms of educational qualifications, the majority of respondents possessed Master's degrees, followed by those with Doctoral degrees. The distribution of functional positions indicated a diverse range of academic ranks among the participants. The overall score for voice behaviour indicated moderate levels of engagement across the sample. A deeper exploration revealed differences in voice behaviour across functional positions, with Associate Professors demonstrating the highest scores, followed by Lecturers, Expert Assistants, and Teaching Staff. Educational qualifications showed a slight variance in voice behaviour scores, with individuals holding Doctoral degrees scoring slightly higher than those with Master's degrees. The analysis indicated significant differences in voice behaviour across functional positions, with distinct variations between Teaching Staff and Associate Professors. However, the difference between respondents with Master's and Doctoral degrees was not found to be statistically significant.

Further research should focus on expanding the sample to include a wider range of respondents from both private and public higher education institutions to better understand voice behaviour in diverse academic settings. Additionally, exploring the underlying factors that contribute to the observed differences in voice behaviour, such as institutional culture, leadership styles, or teaching methods, would provide deeper insights. Identifying other potential variables that significantly influence voice behaviour could also help develop targeted strategies for enhancing academic engagement and communication in higher education.

## References:

- Dharma, S. (2022). *Analisis statistik terapan dalam penelitian sosial dengan Stata*. Bogor: In-Media.
- Duffy, M., & Chenail, R. J. (2009). Values in qualitative and quantitative research. *Counseling and Values*, 53(1), 22-38. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-007X.2009.tb00098.x>

- Jasmara, T., & Wati, L. (2021). Pengaruh kualitas sistem informasi akademik dan kualitas pelayanan terhadap kepuasan mahasiswa pada pembelajaran daring di Universitas Bung Hatta. *Jurnal Ekonomi Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis Universitas Bung Hatta*. <https://ejurnal.bunghatta.ac.id/index.php/JFEK/article/view/19100>
- Khalisa, M., & Eryansyah, E. (2022). Voice of novice EFL Indonesian lecturers. *VELS Journal of English Language Education Studies*, 6(2), 418-429. <https://doi.org/10.26486/vels.v6i2.2910>
- Nyavon, P. (2016). Pengaruh kinerja dosen pada mahasiswa dengan motivasi belajar. *Psikoborneo*, 4(2), 184-190. <https://doi.org/10.17508/psikoborneo.v4i2.666>
- Park, J., & Park, M. (2016). Qualitative versus quantitative research methods: Discovery or justification? *Journal of Marketing Thought*, 3(1), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.15577/jmt.2016.03.01.1>
- Rahmayani, I., & Kamener, D. (n.d.). Analisis kepuasan mahasiswa terhadap proses pembelajaran pada Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Bung Hatta. *Jurnal Ekonomi Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis Universitas Bung Hatta*. <https://ejurnal.bunghatta.ac.id/index.php/JFEK/article/view/447>
- Rutberg, S., & Bouikidis, C. D. (2018). Focusing on the fundamentals: A simplistic differentiation between qualitative and quantitative research. *Nephrology Nursing Journal*, 45(2). <https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A537590662/AONE?u=anon~b16846&sid=googleScholar&xid=8e7052f8>
- Sari, D. P., & Suryani, N. (2023). Does participative decision making affect lecturer performance in higher education? *International Journal of Educational Management*, 37(3), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-10-2022-0503>
- Sari, D. P., & Suryani, N. (2023). Evidence from Indonesian higher education institutions. *SAGE Open*, 13(1), 21582440241278455. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241278455>
- Sari, D. P., & Suryani, N. (2023). Gendered in-role behaviours of Indonesian university leaders. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies*, 7(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2170106>
- Sari, D. P., & Suryani, N. (2023). Indonesia lecturers' professionalism. *Atlantis Press*, 1(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.220301.001>
- Sari, D. P., & Suryani, N. (2023). Learning from English lecturers' voices in teaching oral communication in EFL classrooms in Indonesia. *ResearchGate*. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.36547.48164>
- Sari, D. P., & Suryani, N. (2023). Positive influence on innovative work behavior in higher education. *KUEY: Journal of Education and Learning*, 7(2), 1558-1570. <https://doi.org/10.26486/kuey.v7i2.1558>
- Sari, D. P., & Suryani, N. (2023). Predicting the outcomes of servant leadership in Indonesian higher education institutions. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 61(4), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-10-2022-0203>
- Sari, D. P., & Suryani, N. (2023). The role of lecturer qualifications in enhancing higher education management in Indonesia. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 45(2), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2023.2170106>

- Suparman, A., Hidayat, M. T., Ilyas, W. A., & Apriliani, H. (2019). What makes an effective lecturer? Voices from students and implications for policymakers in Indonesia. *EAI Endorsed Transactions on Creative Technologies*, 6(2), e1. <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.13-2-2019.2286091>
- Wati, L., Dharma, S., & Jadmiko, P. (2018). Analysis on the effectiveness of Bung Hatta University's promotion. *Andalas Management Review*.
- Wati, L., Dharma, S., & Rosha, Z. (2018). Analysis of student satisfaction at X University, using the SERVQUAL method. *e-Jurnal Apresiasi Ekonomi*, 6(3), 262-268.