

Reprinted From

ISSN: 1936-6612, E-ISSN: 1936-7317

Advanced Science Letters

Volume 22, Numbers 5-6, May 2016, pp. 1662-1665(4)

<http://www.aspbs.com/>

DIAGNOSTIC EVALUATION OF LECTURER QUALITY IN LEARNING PROCESS AT “NEW PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS” IN TANGERANG, INDONESIA

¹Sasmoko, ²Teddy Trilaksono, ³Yasinta Indrianti, ⁴Roslee Bin Ahmad

¹ Primary Teacher Education Department, Faculty of Humanities,
Bina Nusantara University, Jakarta, Indonesia, 11480

¹ Research Interest Group in Educational Technology,
Bina Nusantara University, Jakarta, Indonesia, 11480

²Technopreneurship Department, Surya University, Jakarta, Indonesia, 15143

³Psychology Department, Faculty of Psychology, Tarumanagara University, Indonesia , 11440

⁴Faculty of Education, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Malaysia

URL: <https://www.ingentaconnect.com/contentone/asp/asl/2016/00000022/f0020005/art00136>




Document details

[< Back to results](#) | 1 of 1
[Save to Mendeley](#) [Download](#) [Print](#) [E-mail](#) [Save to PDF](#) [Save to list](#) [More...](#)

Advanced Science Letters

Volume 22, Issue 5-6, 1 May 2016, Pages 1662-1665

Diagnostic evaluation of lecturer quality in learning process at “new private higher education institutions” in Tangerang, Indonesia (Article)

Sasmoko^{a,e}, Trilaksono, T.^{b,e}, Indrianti, Y.^{c,e}, Ahmad, R.B.^d ^aDepartment of Elementary Teacher Education, Bina Nusantara University, Indonesia^bDepartment of Technopreneurship, Surya University, Indonesia^cDepartment of Psychology, Tarumanagara University, Indonesia[View additional affiliations](#)

Abstract

[View references \(20\)](#)

In higher education, the quality of learning process is very important especially in the early stage of institution establishment. Many of the newly recruited lecturers have only limited experiences on how to conduct a good learning session. This paper provides a diagnostic evaluation of the quality of lectures in a university in Tangerang. The research aims to find empirical evidence of: (1) the tendency of learning quality of lecturer at “new higher education institutions” in Tangerang regency, and (2) the most dominant indicator in determining the lecturers’ quality of the learning process at the “new higher education institutions” in Tangerang Regency. The research method use Neuroresearch (qualitative and quantitative). Then, for the data collecting use questionnaire that filled by students for all lesson in semester 2 and use Likert scale model with the data range from 1 to 5. The research found that the lecturer at the “new higher education institutions” in Tangerang Regency tend to have a high quality in the learning process with the significance level at; $<0; 05$. The main indicator that significantly affect the high quality of the lecturers teaching for two semesters is the factor of broad knowledge of the lecturer. This factor can increase because of the lecturer ability in imparting the university values. The implications of the research: the lecturer can use the feedback on the study to improve their performance at the new higher education institution. The lecturer also should have broad knowledge, ability to communicate well with students, and have a sense of nationality and dedication to Indonesia. © 2016 American Scientific Publishers. All rights reserved.

Author keywords

Diagnostic evaluation Lecturer quality in the learning process New higher education institution

ISSN: 19366612

Source Type: Journal

Original language: English

DOI: 10.1166/asl.2016.6720

Document Type: Article

Publisher: American Scientific Publishers

References (20)

[View in search results format >](#)
 All [Save to Mendeley](#) [Print](#) [E-mail](#) [Save to PDF](#) [Create bibliography](#)
 1 Abari, A.A.F., Yarmohammadian, M.H., Esteki, M.

Assessment of quality of education a non-governmental university via ServQual model ([Open Access](#))

(2011) *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, pp. 2299-2304. Cited 13 times.
doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.04.097

[View at Publisher](#)[Metrics](#) [View all metrics >](#)

3 Citations in Scopus

75th Percentile

1.36 Field-Weighted

Citation Impact

[PlumX Metrics](#)

Usage, Captures, Mentions, Social Media and Citations beyond Scopus.

Cited by 3 documents

Mathematical theory of evidence to subject expertise diagnosis

Maseleno, A. , Pardimin , Huda, M.

(2018) *ICIC Express Letters*

Diagnostic activity of teachers at high school

Galustyan, O.V. , Lazukin, V.F. , Petelin, A.S.

(2018) *Espacios*

Digitizing standard operating procedure to improve employees wellbeing

Sutopo, Y.A. , Polela, Y.A. , Indrianti, Y.

(2017) *Man in India*

[View all 3 citing documents](#)

Inform me when this document is cited in Scopus:

[Set citation alert >](#)[Set citation feed >](#)

Related documents

The status of quality assurance in two lebanese universities | Kokybės užtikrinimas dviejuose Libano universitetuose ir jo poveikis studentų priėmimui

Al Chibani, W.

(2016) *Pedagogika*

2 Darling-Hammond
(2010) *Center for American Progress*

3 Dogan, S., Aydin, B.
(2012) *African Journal of Business Management*, 6, p. 2107. Cited 2 times.

4 Haveman, R., Smeeding, T.
The role of higher education in social mobility

(2006) *Future of Children*, 16 (2), pp. 125-150. Cited 107 times.
http://www.futureofchildren.org/usr_doc/07_5563_haveman-smeeding.pdf
doi: 10.1353/foc.2006.0015

View at Publisher

5 Khodayari, F., Khodayari, B.
(2011) *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research in Business*, 1, p. 38. Cited 7 times.

6 Kim, H., Hannafin, M.J.
Developing situated knowledge about teaching with technology via Web-enhanced Case-based activity

(2011) *Computers and Education*, 57 (1), pp. 1378-1388. Cited 19 times.
doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2011.01.008

View at Publisher

7 Neuman, W.L.
(2000) *Social Research Methods, Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Cited 1199 times.
4th edn., Allyn and Bacon, USA

8 Niess, M.L.
Investigating TPACK: Knowledge growth in teaching with technology

(2011) *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 44 (3), pp. 299-317. Cited 75 times.
doi: 10.2190/EC.44.3.c

View at Publisher

9 (2003) *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia No 20 Tahun 2003 Tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional, Jakarta*

10 (2005)

11 (2014) *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia No 49 Tahun 2014 Tentang Standar Nasional Pendidikan Tinggi, Jakarta*

A study of the relation between the quality perceived by medical tourists and customer satisfaction

Abdoli, A. , Bahmani, P.
(2017) *Journal of Engineering and Applied Sciences*

Report on a research experiment on the independent sentencing procedure: A sample from the Wuhu model

Weidong, C. , Lei, C.
(2013) *Social Sciences in China*

View all related documents based on references

Find more related documents in Scopus based on:

Authors > Keywords >

□ 12 Sanusi, A.
(2013) *Jurnal Bisnis Darmajaya*, p. 01.

□ 13 Sasmoko
(2013) *Penelitian Eksploratori, Eksplanatori Dan Konfirmatori (Neuroresearch)*
Media Plus, Jakarta

□ 14 Sasmoko, Anggriyani, D.
(2015) *Neuroresearch: A Model of Research Method, Proceedings of 1St International Conference on Educational Studies*

□ 15 Sasmoko, Ying, Y.
Construct validity in neuroresearch
(2015) *Proceedings of International Conference on Education (ICOED)*

□ 16 Thanki, R.
How do we know the value of higher education to regional development?

(1999) *Regional Studies*, 33 (1), pp. 84-89. Cited 50 times.
<http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/carfax/00343404.html>

□ 17 Yahya, M.
(2010) *Dasar-Dasar Penelitian Metodologi Dan Aplikasi*
PT Pustaka Rizki Putra, Semarang

□ 18 Yarmohammadian, M.H., Haeri, M.R.
(2003) *Quality in Higher Education via Accreditation, First International Conference on Management*
Banglore, India, December

□ 19 Yarmohammadian, M.H.
(2004) *Quality in Higher Education, Encyclopedia of Higher Education, Ministry of Science, Research, and Technology*
Tehran, Iran

□ 20 Yarmohammadian, M.H., Bahrami, S., Abari, F.
(2008) *Educational Administration and Planning, Health Management and Economic Research Center*. Cited 2 times.
Isfahan University of Medical Sciences, Isfahan (In Persian)

👤 Sasmoko, ; Department of Elementary Teacher Education, Bina Nusantara University, Indonesia

© Copyright 2016 Elsevier B.V., All rights reserved.

About Scopus

[What is Scopus](#)
[Content coverage](#)
[Scopus blog](#)
[Scopus API](#)
[Privacy matters](#)

Language

[日本語に切り替える](#)
[切换到简体中文](#)
[切换到繁體中文](#)
[Русский язык](#)

Customer Service

[Help](#)
[Contact us](#)

ELSEVIER

[Terms and conditions](#) [Privacy policy](#)

Copyright © 2018 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved. Scopus® is a registered trademark of Elsevier B.V.

Cookies are set by this site. To decline them or learn more, visit our [Cookies page](#).

 RELX Group™

Aims and Scope
Editorial Board
Instructions for Authors
Contact Information
Subscription Information
Copyright Transfer Agreement
Indexed/Abstracted
Cover Library
Contents

Advanced Science Letters

ISSN: 1936-6612 (Print); EISSN: 1936-7317 (Online)
Copyright © 2000-2018 American Scientific Publishers. All Rights Reserved.

EDITORIAL BOARD

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Dr. Hari Singh Nalwa, USA

Editorial Office:

ADVANCED SCIENCE LETTERS
American Scientific Publishers
26650 The Old Road, Suite 208
Valencia, California 91381-0751, USA
Tel. (661) 799-7200
Fax: (661) 799-7230
E-mail: science@aspbs.com



ASIAN EDITOR

Dr. Katsuhiko Ariga, PhD
Advanced Materials Laboratory
National Institute for Materials Science
1-1 Namiki, Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-0044, JAPAN

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Diederik Aerts (Quantum theory, Cognition, Evolution theory)
Brussels Free University, Belgium.

Yakir Aharonov (Physics, Quantum Physics)
School of Physics and Astronomy, Israel.

Peter C. Aichelburg (Gravitation)
University of Vienna, Austria.

Jim Al-Khalili (Foundations of Physics, Nuclear Reaction Theory)
University of Surrey, UK.

Jake Blanchard (Engineering Physics, Nuclear Engineering)
University of Wisconsin–Madison, USA.

Simon Baron-Cohen (Cognitive Neuroscience)
University of Cambridge, UK.

Franz X. Bogner (Cognitive Achievement)
University of Bayreuth, Germany.

John Borneman (Anthropology)
Princeton University, USA.

John Casti (Complexity Science)
Internationales Institut für Angewandte Systemanalyse, Austria.

Masud Chaichian (High Energy Physics, String Theory)
University of Helsinki, Finland.

Sergey V. Chervon (Gravitation, Cosmology, Astrophysics)
Ulyanovsk State Pedagogical University, Russia

Kevin Davey (Philosophy of Science)
University of Chicago, Chicago, USA.

Tania Dey (Colloids/Polymers/Nanohybrids)
Canada.

Roland Eils (Bioinformatics)
Deutsches Krebsforschungszentrum Heidelberg, Germany.

Thomas Görnitz (Quantum theory, Cosmology)
University of Frankfurt, Germany.

Bert Gordijn (Nanoethics, Neuroethics, Bioethics)
Radboud University Nijmegen, The Netherlands.

Ji-Huan He (Textile Engineering, Functional Materials)
Soochow University, Suzhou, China.

Nongyue He (Biosensors/Biomaterials)
China.

Irving P. Herman (Materials and Solid State Physics)
Columbia University, USA.

Dipankar Home (Foundations of Quantum Mechanics)
Bose Institute, Kolkata, India.

Jucundus Jacobeit (Climate, Global Change Ecology)
University of Augsburg, Germany.

Yuriy A. Knirel (Bioorganic Chemistry)
N. D. Zelinsky Institute of Organic Chemistry, Russia.

Arthur Konnerth (Neurophysiology, Molecular Mechanisms)
University of Munich, Germany.

G. A. Kourouklis (Physics Solid State Physics)
Aristotle University Thessaloniki, Greece.

Peter Krammer (Genetics)
Deutsches Krebsforschungszentrum Heidelberg, Germany.

Andrew F. Laine (Biomedical Engineering)
Columbia University, USA.

Minbo Lan (Organic Functional Materials)
China.

Martha Lux-Steiner (Physics, Materials Science)
Hahn-Meitner-Institut Berlin, Germany.

Klaus Mainzer (Complex Systems, Computational Mind, Philosophy of Science)
University of Augsburg, Germany.

JoAnn E. Manson (Medicine, Cardiovascular Disease)
Harvard University, USA.

Mark P. Mattson (Neuroscience)
National Institute on Aging, Baltimore, USA.

Lucio Mayer (Astrophysics, Cosmology)
ETH Zürich, Switzerland.

Karl Menten (Radioastronomy)
Max-Planck-Institut für Radioastronomie, Germany.

Yoshiko Miura (Biomaterials/Biosensors)
Japan.

Fred M. Mueller (Solid State Physics)
Los Alamos National Laboratory, USA.

Garth Nicolson (Illness Research, Cancer Cell Biology)
The Institute for Molecular Medicine, Huntington Beach, USA.

Nina Papavasiliou (DNA Mutators, Microbial Virulence, Antiviral Defence, Adaptive Immunity, Surface Receptor Variation)
The Rockefeller University, New York, USA.

Panos Photinos (Physics)
Southern Oregon University, USA.

Zhiyong Qian (Biomedical Engineering, Biomaterials, Drug Delivery)
Sichuan University, CHINA.

Reinhard Schlickeiser (Astrophysics, Plasma Theory and Space Science)
Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany.

Surinder Singh (Sensors/Nanotechnology)
USA.

Suprakas Sinha Ray (Composites/Polymer Science)
South Africa.

Koen Steemers (Architecture, Environmental Building Performance)
University of Cambridge, UK.

Shinsuke Tanabe (Environmental Chemistry and Ecotoxicology)
Ehime University, Japan.

James R. Thompson (Solid State Physics)
The University of Tennessee, USA.

Uwe Ulbrich (Climat, Meteorology)
Freie Universität Berlin, Germany.

Ahmad Umar (Advanced Materials)
Najran University, Saudi Arabia.

Frans de Waal (Animal Behavior and Cognition)
Emory University, USA.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Filippo Aureli, Liverpool John Moores University, UK

Marcel Ausloos, Université de Liège, Belgium

Martin Bojowald, Pennsylvania State University, USA

Sougato Bose, University College, London, UK
Jacopo Buongiorno, MIT, USA
Paul Cordopatis, University of Patras, Greece
Maria Luisa Dalla Chiara, University of Firenze, Italy
Dionysios Demetriou Dionysiou, University of Cincinnati, USA
Simon Eidelman, Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, Russia
Norbert Frischauf, QASAR Technologies, Vienna, Austria
Toshi Futamase, Tohoku University, Japan
Leonid Gavrilov, University of Chicago, USA
Vincent G. Harris, Northeastern University, USA
Mae-Wan Ho, Open University, UK
Keith Hutchison, University of Melbourne, Australia
David Jishiashvili, Georgian Technical University, Georgia
George Khushf, University of South Carolina, USA
Sergei Kulik, M.V.Lomonosov Moscow State University, Russia
Harald Kunstmann, Institute for Meteorology and Climate Research, Forschungszentrum Karlsruhe, Germany
Alexander Lebedev, Laboratory of Semiconductor Devices Physics, Russia
James Lindesay, Howard University, USA
Michael Lipkind, Kimron Veterinary Institute, Israel
Nigel Mason, Open University, UK
Johnjoe McFadden, University of Surrey, UK
B. S. Murty, Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Chennai, India
Heiko Paeth, Geographisches Institut der Universität Würzburg, Germany
Matteo Paris, Università di Milano, Italia
David Posoda, University of Vigo, Spain
Paddy H. Regan, University of Surrey, UK
Leonidas Resvanis, University of Athens, Greece
Wolfgang Rhode, University of Dortmund, Germany
Derek C. Richardson, University of Maryland, USA
Carlos Romero, Universidade Federal da Paraíba, Brazil
Andrea Sella, University College London, London, UK
P. Shankar, Indira Gandhi Centre for Atomic Research, Kalpakkam, India
Surya Singh, Imperial College London, UK
Leonidas Sotiropoulos, University of Patras, Greece
Roger Strand, University of Bergen, Norway
Karl Svozil, Technische Universität Wien, Austria
Kit Tan, University of Copenhagen, Denmark
Roland Triay, Centre de Physique Théorique, CNRS, Marseille, France
Rami Vainio, University of Helsinki, Finland
Victor Voronov, Bogoliubov Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Dubna, Russia
Andrew Whitaker, Queen's University Belfast, Northern Ireland
Lijian Xu, Hunan University of Technology, China
Alexander Yefremov, Peoples Friendship University of Russia, Russia
Avraam Zeligidis, University of Patras, Greece
Alexander V. Zolotaryuk, Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, Ukraine

[Terms and Conditions](#) [Privacy Policy](#), Copyright © 2000-2018 American Scientific Publishers. All Rights Reserved.



AMERICAN
SCIENTIFIC
PUBLISHERS

Copyright © 2016 American Scientific Publishers
All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America

Advanced Science Letters
Vol. 22, 1662–1665, 2016

Diagnostic Evaluation of Lecturer Quality in Learning Process at “New Private Higher Education Institutions” in Tangerang, Indonesia

Sasmoko^{1,5,*}, Teddy Trilaksono^{2,5}, Yasinta Indrianti^{3,5}, and Roslee Bin Ahmad⁴

¹*Department of Elementary Teacher Education, Bina Nusantara University, Indonesia*

²*Department of Technopreneurship, Surya University, Indonesia*

³*Department of Psychology, Tarumanagara University, Indonesia*

⁴*Faculty of Education, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Malaysia*

⁵*Research Interest Group in Education Technology (RIG-ET), Bina Nusantara University, Indonesia*

In higher education, the quality of learning process is very important especially in the early stage of institution establishment. Many of the newly recruited lecturers have only limited experiences on how to conduct a good learning session. This paper provides a diagnostic evaluation of the quality of lectures in a university in Tangerang. The research aims to find empirical evidence of: (1) the tendency of learning quality of lecturer at “new higher education institutions” in Tangerang regency, and (2) the most dominant indicator in determining the lecturers’ quality of the learning process at the “new higher education institutions” in Tangerang Regency. The research method use Neuroresearch (qualitative and quantitative). Then, for the data collecting use questionnaire that filled by students for all lesson in semester 2 and use Likert scale model with the data range from 1 to 5. The research found that the lecturer at the “new higher education institutions” in Tangerang Regency tend to have a high quality in the learning process with the significance level at $\alpha < 0.05$. The main indicator that significantly affect the high quality of the lecturers teaching for two semesters is the factor of broad knowledge of the lecturer. This factor can increase because of the lecturer ability in imparting the university values. The implications of the research: the lecturer can use the feedback on the study to improve their performance at the new higher education institution. The lecturer also should have broad knowledge, ability to communicate well with students, and have a sense of nationality and dedication to Indonesia.

Keywords: Diagnostic Evaluation, Lecturer Quality in the Learning Process, New Higher Education Institution.

1. INTRODUCTION

Education is a conscious and a deliberate effort to create an atmosphere of learning and learning process. The purpose is to make the learners are actively developing their potential to have the spiritual strength of religion, self-control, personality, intelligence, noble character, and the needed skills by them, society, nation, and state (Law No. 20 of 2003, Article 1).

Higher education as part of the national education system has a strategic function in national development. Therefore, the higher education institutions need to have quality and among others is the learning process. The quality of the learning process is the important factors in higher education, especially in new private higher education institutions. This research is about a diagnostic evaluation of the lecturer quality in the learning process at the

Universities in Tangerang Regency. The research aims to find empirical evidence of:

- (1) The tendency of learning quality of lecturer at “new higher education institutions” in Tangerang Regency, and
- (2) The most dominant indicator in determining the lecturer quality on the learning process at the “new higher education institutions” in Tangerang Regency.

Thanki¹⁶ stated that the role of higher education in the nation development occurs due to the rise of awareness in which the knowledge and information are supporting the realization of global economic progress. It happens through the graduates who are superior, competent, and certainty that every student has the ability and the motivation in achieving success.⁴

The involvement of higher education institution needs to be manifested in the quality of higher education. The quality of higher education is a benchmark of an organization achievement, especially for a university or higher education institution, with

*Author to whom correspondence should be addressed.

no exception of the new higher education institution.^{1, 18–20} The improving service quality of higher education lies at the ability to realize the institutional and cultural climate change through the development of decision-making systems, operational, and human resources.⁵

Sanusi¹² stated that the role of the private higher education institution is getting bigger in providing higher education services. It is to support the advancement of government regulations to meet the satisfaction of higher education services. The emergence of several new private universities/higher education also shows that the government and the community are committed realizing the mandate of the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia in 1945 in educating the nation. This commitment must be accompanied by several strategic stages, both in the provision of facilities and infrastructure, as well as qualified lecturers.

The advantage of this research is expected to give a contribution to the managers of “new higher education institutions” in Tangerang Regency. It is related to the quality of lecturers in the learning process with the purpose to assist the determination of improvement and development program as a way to improve the quality of graduates. Moreover, this study is expected to be useful for the development of higher education science and provide a reference for further research.

2. METHODS

This study uses a quantitative method with Neuroresearch approach. Sasmoko¹⁴ says that Neuroresearch is a combination of qualitative research methods (exploratory through the study of theory) with quantitative (explanatory). The combination of both approaches makes the social science research (including science education) becomes more interesting because it gives an opportunity that the qualitative research is deepened by analyzing indicators of the dependent and independent variables as well as the background category of the research subject (confirmatory research). This kind of research becomes the basis upon which Neuroresearch Method is developed.¹³ The stages of this research are as follows:

First, develop the research instrument. The instrument use the questionnaire of Diagnostic Evaluation of Lecturers’ quality on the learning process which consists of 12 indicators:

- (1) Have a good learning plan,
- (2) The discipline of lecturer,
- (3) The lecturers’ ability in the presentation,
- (4) Providing assignment related to the subject matter,
- (5) Have the honesty and accuracy of selecting the evaluation method,
- (6) Have a good individual relationship with students,
- (7) Have a good relationship with the students group,
- (8) Establishing a good evaluation process,
- (9) Has a broad knowledge,
- (10) Imparting the university value,
- (11) Enthusiasm in teaching, and
- (12) Carefully in conducting the exam process.

Second, set a measurement scale. The measurement use “Likert Scale Model” with scale range from 1 to 5 as an interval scale.

Third, examination of research instrument. It includes:

- (a) The content validity with rational judgment,
- (b) The construct validity using Orthogonal Iteration approach (rotation) through formula of Product Moment, and

Table I. The tendency of lecturer quality on learning process in the even semester of academic year 2013/2014.

No.	Variabel/ Indicator	Lower–Upper Bound	Description
(1)	Y	4.4565–4.5604	The lecturer tends to have high quality in the learning process, significantly at $\alpha < 0,05$
(2)	X ₁	4.4067–4.5437	The lecturer tends to have a good lesson plan, significantly at $\alpha < 0,05$
(3)	X ₂	4.4549–4.5726	The lecturer tends to have high discipline, significantly at $\alpha < 0,05$
(4)	X ₃	4.3638–4.5096	The lecturer tends to have a good presentation ability, significantly at $\alpha < 0,05$
(5)	X ₄	4.5496 – 4.6486	The lecturer tends to give assignment related to the lesson, significantly at $\alpha < 0,05$
(6)	X ₅	4.4275–4.5426	The lecturer tends to have honesty and accuracy in selecting evaluation method, significantly at $\alpha < 0,05$.
(7)	X ₆	4.5368–4.6419	The lecturer tends to have a good individual relationship with each student, significantly at $\alpha < 0,05$
(8)	X ₇	4.3759–4.5023	The lecturer tends to have a good relationship with students community, significantly at $\alpha < 0,05$
(9)	X ₈	4.3123–4.4600	The lecturer tends to be able to build a good evaluation process, significantly at $\alpha < 0,05$.
(10)	X ₉	4.4638–4.5752	The lecturer tends to have a broad knowledge, significantly at $\alpha < 0,05$.
(11)	X ₁₀	4.4490–4.5550	The lecturer able to impart the university values, significantly at $\alpha < 0,05$
(12)	X ₁₁	4.5858–4.6860	The lecturer tends to show the teaching enthusiasm, significantly at $\alpha < 0,05$
(13)	X ₁₂	4.5659–4.6678	The lecturer tends to be careful/precise in doing test process, significantly at $\alpha < 0,05$

(c) Calculating Reliability Index with Cronbach Alpha with the result of rii is 0,9131.

Fourth, conduct diagnostic evaluation. It is in the form of student assessment of all lecturers in all subjects at the end of the even semester of the academic year 2013/2014 and odd semester of 2014/2015 at new private higher education institution in Tangerang Indonesia as a result of purposive sampling.

Fifth, have a test for normality, linearity, hypotheses testing on 1 and 3 with a central tendency, and hypotheses testing on 2 and 4 with regression trees analysis.

3. RESULT

The idea of the paralleled semi-extension rule based.

3.1. The Result of Hypotheses Testing 1

The tendency of lecturer quality on learning process in the even semester of academic year 2013/2014. The analysis with confidence interval approach and the significance level is 0,05. The results are as follows.

The table shows that lecturers of “new higher education institutions” in Tangerang Regency in the even semester of the

Table II. The tendency of lecturer quality on learning process in the odd semester of academic year 2014/2015.

Variabel/ No.	Indicator	Lower–Upper Bound	Description
(1)	Y	4.4066–4.4970	The lecturer tends to have high quality in learning process, significantly at $\alpha < 0,05$
(2)	X ₁	4.4098–4.5102	The lecturer tends to plan a good lesson, significantly at $\alpha < 0,05$
(3)	X ₂	4.4071–4.5014	The lecturer tends to have high discipline, significantly at $\alpha < 0,05$
(4)	X ₃	4.2984–4.4355	The lecturer tends to have a good presentation ability, significantly at $\alpha < 0,05$
(5)	X ₄	4.4972–4.5870	The lecturer tends to give assignment related with the lesson, significantly at $\alpha < 0,05$.
(6)	X ₅	4.3820–4.4858	Lecturers tend to have the honesty and accuracy of selecting the evaluation method significantly at $\alpha < 0,05$.
(7)	X ₆	4.5304–4.6257	The lecturer tend to have a good individual relationship with each student, significantly at $\alpha < 0,05$
(8)	X ₇	4.3598–4.4619	The lecturer tends to have a good relationship with the student group significantly at $\alpha < 0,05$.
(9)	X ₈	4.1608–4.2767	The lecturer tends to be able to build a good evaluation process, significantly at $\alpha < 0,05$.
(10)	X ₉	4.4570–4.5636	The lecturer tends to have a broad knowledge, significantly at $\alpha < 0,05$.
(11)	X ₁₀	4.3338–4.4372	The lecturer able to impart the university values, significantly at $\alpha < 0,05$
(12)	X ₁₁	4.5016–4.5900	The lecturer tends to show enthusiasm in teaching, significantly at $\alpha < 0,05$.
(13)	X ₁₂	4.5327–4.6234	The lecturer tends to be careful in running the test process, significantly at $\alpha < 0,05$.

academic year 2013/2014 is likely to have a high quality in the learning process and with a significance level at $\alpha < 0,05$.

3.2. The Result of Hypotheses Testing 2

An analysis of even semester of academic year 2013/2014 done by Biner Segmentation which called Classification and Regression Trees. The researchers set the Pruning of Depth at 2, Parent at 2, and Child at 1, with significance level $\alpha < 0,05$. The results are:

1. “Having a broad knowledge” is the most dominant indicator in shaping the quality of lecturers’ learning process at “new higher education institution” in Tangerang Regency in even semester of 2013 with significance level at $\alpha < 0,05$.
2. “The lecturer’s ability in planning the learning process” and “the ability in imparting the university values” are the indicators which decide the lecturer that “having broad knowledge” with significance level at $\alpha < 0,05$.

3.3. The Result of Hypotheses Testing 3

The tendency of lecturer quality on learning process in odd semester of academic year 2014/2015. The analysis with confidence interval approach and the significance level is 0,05. The results are as follows.

The table shows that lecturers of ‘new higher education institutions’ in Tangerang Regency in the odd semester of the academic

year 2014/2015 is likely to have a high quality in the learning process with a significance level at $\alpha < 0,05$.

3.4. The Result of Hypotheses Testing 4

An analysis of odd semester of academic year 2014/2015 was done by Biner Segmentation which called Classification and Regression Trees. The researchers set the Pruning of Depth at 2, Parent at 2, and Child at 1, with significance level $\alpha < 0,05$. The results are:

1. “Having a broad knowledge” is the most dominant indicator in shaping the quality of lecturers’ learning process at “new higher education institutions” in Tangerang Regency in odd semester of 2014/2015 with significance level at $\alpha < 0,05$.
2. “The lecturer ability in building individual relationship toward students” and “the ability in imparting the university values” are the indicator of lecturers who “having broad knowledge” significantly at $\alpha < 0,05$.
3. Improvements with 1 (one) program development (treatment) to improve the knowledge of lecturers will only increase 0.08 times from the condition of the quality of lecturers in the learning process. But, if it fixes with 25 priority programs (treatment), then the quality of lecturers in the learning process will be increased by two times from the lecturer’s current conditions.

4. DISCUSSION

Based on twelve (12) indicators to examine the quality of lecturers in the learning process, it can be concluded that in general, the lecturers have a good quality. This conclusion is based on an assessment carried out by the students during the two (2) consecutive semesters. The main indicator that significantly affects the high quality of the lecturers teaching for two semesters is the factor of broad knowledge of the lecturer. Niess⁸ expressed that the lecturer’s knowledge is required in the 21st century. The lecturers are expected to carry the essential experiences required for developing the knowledge, skills, and characters that lecturer need. By collaborating the knowledge and wisdom of experienced through case-based activity, teachers utilized and built up their own teaching-with-technology knowledge and skill.⁶

It was found that the ability of the lecturer in imparting the university values is the deciding factor for increasing the lecturers’ knowledge. Other determining or deciding factors from the two semesters look different. In the first deciding factor is a good lesson planning process while the second is the ability of a lecturer in building individual relationships with students. As stated by Dogan and Aydin³ the individual who submits himself to the organization will give extraordinary effort to the organization’s benefit and embraces the objectives, aims and values of the organization.

The evaluation of the learning process is one means to improve the quality and the grade of education through lecturers’ quality in implementing the learning process. There are some programs for the lecturer, such as:

- (1) Enhancing the professionalism of related disciplines, such as applied approach, manners, the substance of science;
- (2) Character building, such as communication skills, emotional quotient, spiritual quotient;
- (3) Increasing social competence, such as community service, certification programs;

- (4) Improving managerial capabilities, such as leadership training;
- (5) Increasing the general knowledge, such as training related with legislation, national standards of education, and others.

The study found interesting result for further research. It is about the capability of lecturers in imparting the university values become the deciding factor for two consecutive semesters. Therefore, the further research is necessary related to the implementation of the basic values of a new university/higher education. This implementation is to support the establishment of the quality of the learning process which will ultimately have an impact on the quality of education.

References and Notes

1. A. A. F. Abari, M. H. Yarmohammadian, and M. Esteki, *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 15, 2299 (2011).
2. Darling-Hammond, *Center for American Progress* (2010).
3. S. Dogan and B. Aydin, *African Journal of Business Management* 6, 2107 (2012).
4. R. Haveman and T. Smeeding, *The Future of Children* 16, 125 (2006).
5. F. Khodayari and B. Khodayari, *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research in Business* 1, 38 (2011).
6. H. Kim and M. J. Hannafin, *Elsevier Computers and Education* 57, 1378 (2011).
7. W. L. Neuman, *Social Research Methods, Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, 4th edn., Allyn and Bacon, USA (2000).
8. M. L. Niess, *Journal Educational Computing Research* 44, 299 (2011).
9. Republik Indonesia, Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia No 20 Tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional, Jakarta (2003).
10. Republik Indonesia Undang-Undang No. 14 Tahun 2005 tentang Guru dan Dosen, Jakarta (2005).
11. Republik Indonesia, Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia No 49 Tahun 2014 tentang Standar Nasional Pendidikan Tinggi, Jakarta (2014).
12. A. Sanusi, *Jurnal Bisnis Darmajaya* 01 (2013).
13. Sasmoko, Penelitian Eksploratori, Eksplanatori Dan Konfirmatori (neurore-search), Media Plus, Jakarta (2013).
14. Sasmoko and D. Anggriyani, Neurore-search: A model of research method, *Proceedings of 1st International Conference on Educational Studies* (2015).
15. Sasmoko and Y. Ying, Construct validity in neurore-search, *Proceedings of International Conference on Education (ICOED)* (2015).
16. R. Thanki, *Journal of The Regional Studies Association* 33, 84 (1999).
17. M. Yahya, *Dasar-Dasar Penelitian Metodologi Dan Aplikasi*, PT Pustaka Rizki Putra, Semarang (2010).
18. M. H. Yarmohammadian and M. R. Haeri, Quality in higher education via accreditation, *First International Conference on Management*, Bangalore, India, December (2003).
19. M. H. Yarmohammadian, Quality in Higher Education, Encyclopedia of Higher Education, Ministry of Science, Research, and Technology, Tehran, Iran (2004).
20. M. H. Yarmohammadian, S. Bahrami, and F. Abari, Educational Administration and Planning, Health Management and Economic Research Center, Isfahan University of Medical Sciences, Isfahan (In Persian) (2008).

Received: 26 August 2015. Accepted: 28 September 2015.

Delivered by Ingenta to: Sasmoko Sasmoko
IP: 114.124.32.1 On: Mon, 17 Oct 2016 11:05:43
Copyright: American Scientific Publishers