



Received: 19 February 2026, Revised: 22 August 2026, Accepted: 30 September 2026, Published: 20 October 2026

Governance Transformation and Contestation in Private Islamic Higher Education Institutions amid Institutional Conflict

Edi Putra Jaya*, Bustian, Sri Sudewi Aria, Taufik¹

¹Institut Agama Islam Negeri Kerinci, Jambi, Indonesia

ABSTRACT:

Governance conflicts in Private Islamic Higher Education Institutions (PIHEI) involve disputes over authority, institutional legitimacy, decision-making, and accountability between foundations and institutional leadership. Although there has been research on the governance of private higher education in the past, attention has been very limited, and only attention has been paid to the resolution of authority conflicts through Islamic values-based mechanisms. This study aims to develop an Islamic governance model to resolve governance conflicts in Private Islamic Higher Education Institutions (PIHEI). A qualitative multi-case study was conducted at two PIHEIs in Jambi Province, Indonesia. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews and document analysis with 24 participants, including foundation administrators, institutional leaders, senate members, lecturers, and administrative staff. In case and cross-case analysis, repetition patterns were identified, and an informed model was developed. The findings suggest that the main conflict arises from the gap between formal governance arrangements and the practical exercise of authority. Four dimensions underlie conflict resolution: clear differentiation of authority, shura-based participatory governance, Islamic ethical values ('*adl*, '*amanah*, and '*islah*), and institutionalized conflict resolution mechanisms. Resolution requires integrating formal structures, participation, and the legitimacy of Islamic ethics. This model operationalizes Islamic values in managing authority, accountability, and institutional reconciliation.

Keywords: Governance Transformation; Governance Contestation; Private Islamic Higher Education Institutions; Institutional Conflict; Islamic Governance.

ABSTRAK:

Konflik tata kelola pada Perguruan Tinggi Islam Swasta (PTIS) mencakup perselisihan mengenai kewenangan, legitimasi kelembagaan, pengambilan keputusan, dan hubungan akuntabilitas antara yayasan dan pimpinan perguruan tinggi. Meskipun penelitian sebelumnya telah membahas tata kelola perguruan tinggi swasta, perhatian terhadap penyelesaian konflik kewenangan melalui mekanisme tata kelola berbasis nilai-nilai Islam masih terbatas. Penelitian ini bertujuan mengembangkan model tata kelola perguruan tinggi Islam untuk menyelesaikan konflik kelembagaan. Penelitian menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif dengan desain studi multikasus pada dua PTIS di Provinsi Jambi, Indonesia. Data dikumpulkan melalui wawancara semi-terstruktur dan analisis dokumen yang melibatkan 24 partisipan, meliputi pengurus yayasan, pimpinan perguruan tinggi, anggota senat, dosen, dan tenaga kependidikan. Analisis dalam kasus dan lintas kasus dilakukan untuk mengidentifikasi pola tata kelola dan mengembangkan model. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa konflik terutama disebabkan oleh kesenjangan antara pengaturan tata kelola formal dan pelaksanaan kewenangan dalam praktik. Terdapat empat dimensi utama penyelesaian konflik, yaitu kejelasan pembagian kewenangan, tata kelola partisipatif berbasis syura, nilai-nilai etika Islam ('*adl*, '*amanah*, dan '*islah*), serta mekanisme penyelesaian konflik yang terlembagakan. Penyelesaian konflik secara berkelanjutan memerlukan integrasi struktur formal, proses partisipatif, dan legitimasi etis Islam. Model ini berkontribusi pada kajian tata kelola pendidikan tinggi dengan mengoperasionalkan nilai-nilai Islam dalam pengelolaan kewenangan, akuntabilitas, dan rekonsiliasi kelembagaan.

Kata Kunci: Transformasi Tata Kelola; Kontestasi Tata Kelola; Perguruan Tinggi Islam Swasta; Konflik Kelembagaan; Tata Kelola Islam.

*Corresponding Author,
Email address: ediputraja@gmail.com (Edi Putra Jaya)



Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License
©2026 Jawda : Journal of Islamic Education Management.

INTRODUCTION

Private Islamic Higher Education Institutions (PIHEIs) play an important role in advancing Islamic education and contributing to human resource development in Muslim societies. As institutions that combine academic missions with Islamic values, PIHEIs are expected to maintain effective governance, institutional accountability, academic quality, and ethical leadership. However, governance in PIHEIs involves multiple institutional actors, including foundations, university leaders, academic bodies, and other governing units, whose responsibilities and authority may overlap. This complexity is particularly significant in private higher education because the foundation commonly functions as the educational organizer, while institutional leadership is responsible for academic and operational management. Recent research shows that governance and quality management in Indonesian Islamic higher education are shaped not only by formal managerial mechanisms but also by institutional values, ethical considerations, and the distinctive purposes of Islamic education.¹

In this study, drawing on the organizational conflict perspective of Rahim and Bonoma,² governance conflict refers to disagreements or tensions among institutional actors concerning the interpretation, distribution, exercise, or limitation of authority in institutional governance and decision-making. In this study, governance conflict refers to disagreements or tensions among institutional actors concerning the interpretation, distribution,

¹Awaliyah Musgamy et al., "Quality Governance and Institutional Negotiation in Indonesian Islamic Higher Education under Globalised Policy Regimes," *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research* 25, no. 1 (2026): 1011–32, <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.25.3.45>; S.N Yahya et al., "Financing for Accountability: A Multi Site Analysis of Islamic Governance-Driven Budget Practices in Private Islamic Higher Education Institutions," *EDUKASI: Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Agama Dan Keagamaan* 23, no. 3 (2025): 639–57, <https://doi.org/10.32729/edukasi.v23i3.2364>.

²M.A Rahim and T.V Bonoma, "Managing Organizational Conflict: A Model for Diagnosis and Intervention," *Psychological Reports* 44, no. 3_suppl (1979): 1323–44, <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1979.44.3c.1323>.

exercise, or limitation of authority in institutional governance and decision-making. The concept specifically encompasses conflicts between foundation authorities and university leadership, as well as disagreements involving academic and managerial governing bodies when they concern institutional authority, strategic or academic decision-making, accountability, or the boundaries of organizational responsibility. Governance conflict is therefore understood primarily as a structural and relational phenomenon rather than as an interpersonal dispute alone. It may occur through formal or informal processes and does not necessarily escalate into a legal dispute; rather, it includes recurring disagreements that affect institutional decision-making, policy implementation, coordination, or organizational relationships.

In the case of private higher education, such disputes typically arise out of questions of authority, a lack of clarity as to who is responsible for what and competing interests between the foundation and the university management. Suryarama found that the foundations in private universities played a very significant role, particularly in the administrative and financial areas and that problems between the foundation board and the university management were largely to do with administrative and financial matters amongst other organisational issues.³ Similarly, Zulkifli et al.⁴ A major risk of conflict of interest between the foundations as institutional organisers and the academic communities as university managers, especially where the lines of authority are not clearly drawn. From a legal and institutional perspective, Gunadi further demonstrates that the relationship between foundations and private universities in Indonesia involves distinct organizational roles and may generate internal and external conflicts when the

³Suryarama S, "Peran Yayasan Dalam Pengelolaan Bidang Pendidikan Pada Perguruan Tinggi Swasta," *Jurnal Organisasi Dan Manajemen* 5, no. 1 (2009): 55–62, <https://doi.org/10.33830/jom.v5i1.215.2009>.

⁴Zulkifli Zulkifli et al., "Good University Governance, Konflik Kepentingan Penyelenggara Dan Pengelola Universitas Swasta," *Jurnal Dimensi* 10, no. November (2021): 569–83, <https://doi.org/10.33373/dms.v10i3.3609>.

functions of foundation organs and university management are not properly differentiated.⁵ Such conditions indicate that governance conflict in PIHEIs should not be viewed merely as interpersonal disagreement but also as a structural problem concerning the distribution, boundaries, and exercise of institutional authority.

This governance problem is particularly relevant to the empirical context of this study, which involves two private Islamic higher education institutions in Jambi Province, Indonesia. In both institutions, the foundation and campus institution are placed in an organizational structure in which management's role is limited to coordination. In contrast, the day-to-day management of the institution is carried out by the head of the institution. Preliminary information from official institutional documents and interviews conducted before the main study indicates concerns among foundation actors about their limited involvement in institutional matters, including financial management, the appointment and dismissal of institutional leaders, and strategic decision-making.

These preliminary findings indicate tensions over how authority is distributed and implemented between foundations and institutional management. Tensions do not always surface as open disputes; they can also remain closed because related parties are reluctant to express their concerns openly. These conditions relate to ambiguities in authority distribution and perceived difficulties in institutional development, including challenges in student enrollment, accreditation, and the transformation of institutional status. These initial conditions provide an important empirical basis for current multi-case investigations, while the systematic findings of the study are presented through subsequent cross-case analysis.

Higher education governance is increasingly understood as a complex process involving multiple actors, accountability demands, and different forms of institutional authority. Governance extends

⁵Ariawan Gunadi, "Promoting Regional Integration through Higher Education: Legal Analysis on the Empowerment of Foundation in Private Universities," *Indonesian Journal of International Law* 13, no. 3 (2016): 395–419, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.17304/ijil.vol13.3.657>.

beyond hierarchical administrative control to encompass relationships among governing bodies, executive leaders, academic actors, and other stakeholders. Tricker emphasizes that governance concerns the frameworks through which organizations are directed, controlled, and held accountable, while also recognizing the importance of organizational culture and ethical considerations.⁶ In universities, the relationship between governance, leadership, and management can involve different institutional logics. Blaschke, Frost, and Hattke show that leadership, governance, and management may reflect different institutional logics that interact in university decision-making and organizational communication.⁷ In Islamic higher education, these governance challenges are further complicated by the institutional role of religious and ethical values. Musgamy et al. found that quality governance in Indonesian Islamic higher education is a value-laden process in which formal audit and accountability mechanisms may coexist with ethical, spiritual, and holistic dimensions of Islamic education.⁸ Consequently, governance conflicts in PIHEIs cannot be adequately understood solely through technocratic or procedural perspectives.

Governance conflicts can be further understood through organizational conflict theory, which emphasizes the structural and relational conditions that generate conflict among organizational actors. Rahim and Bonoma classify organizational conflict into intrapersonal, intragroup, and intergroup forms and argue that appropriate diagnosis is necessary before effective intervention strategies can be developed.⁹ This perspective is particularly relevant

⁶Bob Tricker and Robert Ian Tricker Tricker, *Corporate Governance: Principles, Policies, and Practices*, ed. Oxford University Press, 4th ed. (Italy, n.d.).

⁷Steffen Blaschke, Jetta Frost, and Febian Hattke, "Towards a Micro Foundation of Leadership, Governance, and Management in Universities. Higher Education," *The International Journal of Higher Education Research* 68, no. 5 (2014): 711–32, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-014-9740-2>.

⁸Musgamy et al., "Quality Governance and Institutional Negotiation in Indonesian Islamic Higher Education under Globalised Policy Regimes."

⁹Rahim and Bonoma, "Managing Organizational Conflict: A Model for Diagnosis and Intervention," 1979.

to higher education because governance conflicts may occur across organizational boundaries, including between foundations, university leaders, and academic bodies. At the same time, theories suggest that organizational practices are shaped not only by regulatory formalities but also by normative and cultural-cognitive elements that shape institutional legitimacy.¹⁰ In PIHEI, formal authority can coexist with normative expectations rooted in Islamic values and institutional traditions. Governance conflicts can result not only in disputes over who has authority, but also in competing understandings of how authority should be legitimately exercised.

Islamic educational thought has provided an ethical foundation that can enrich contemporary approaches to governance and conflict resolution. Principles such as *shura* (*shura* (consultative decision-making), *'adl* (justice and fairness), *amanah* (trustworthiness and responsibility), and *islah* (reconciliation and constructive improvement) emphasize responsible authority, consultation, fairness, and constructive management of disagreement. Recent scholarship on Islamic higher education leadership highlights prophetic and ethical values as important foundations for institutional leadership and governance.¹¹ These principles also resonate with contemporary ethical leadership theory, which conceptualizes leadership as involving moral conduct, ethical decision-making, and the promotion of appropriate behavior within organizations.¹² Thus, Islamic ethical principles can provide a normative foundation for governance practices that seek to combine institutional effectiveness with moral responsibility.

¹⁰W Richard Scott, "Institutions and Organizations: Ideas, Interests, and Identities," *Copenhagen Journal of Asian Studies* 32, no. 2 (2014): 136–38.

¹¹Khaeroni, Izamudin, and Subhan, "Prophetic Leadership for Sustainable Islamic Higher Education: A Systematic Literature Review of Transformative Values and SDG Alignment (2009–2024)," *Journal of Asian Islamic Educational Management* 3, no. 2 (2025): 63–72, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.53889/jaiem.v3i2.752>.

¹²Michael E Brown and Linda K Trevino, "Ethical Leadership: A Review and Future Directions," *The Leadership Quarterly* 17, no. 6 (2006): 595–616, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.004>.

However, recognizing Islamic values at the normative level does not necessarily mean these values have been translated into formal forms appropriate to government mechanisms. Musgamy et al. argue that Islamic values have been articulated in Indonesia's Islamic higher education mission, but institutions are weak in formal quality indicators and often function more symbolically than operationally.¹³ Similarly, Yahya et al. demonstrate that accountability remains an important governance concern in PIHEs and that Islamic governance values need stronger alignment with institutional financing and accountability practices.¹⁴ This distinction between normative recognition and institutional operationalization is important because the presence of Islamic principles in institutional discourse does not automatically ensure that they function as concrete mechanisms for allocating authority, making decisions, managing disagreement, or resolving governance conflicts. The academic problem addressed by this study therefore concerns the limited integration of structural governance mechanisms and Islamic ethical principles in explaining and resolving governance conflicts within foundation-based PIHEs.

Despite the growing body of literature on higher education governance, private institutional governance, organizational conflict, and Islamic educational leadership, important questions remain unresolved regarding how governance conflicts between foundations and institutional leadership can be systematically understood and resolved in PIHEs. Existing studies have examined foundation–university relationships,¹⁵ organizational conflict and

¹³Musgamy et al., "Quality Governance and Institutional Negotiation in Indonesian Islamic Higher Education under Globalised Policy Regimes."

¹⁴Yahya et al., "Financing for Accountability: A Multi Site Analysis of Islamic Governance-Driven Budget Practices in Private Islamic Higher Education Institutions."

¹⁵S, "Peran Yayasan Dalam Pengelolaan Bidang Pendidikan Pada Perguruan Tinggi Swasta"; Zulkifli et al., "Good University Governance, Konflik Kepentingan Penyelenggara Dan Pengelola Universitas Swasta"; Gunadi, "Promoting Regional Integration through Higher Education: Legal Analysis on the Empowerment of Foundation in Private Universities."

its resolution,¹⁶ and Islamic governance and ethical leadership.¹⁷ However, these strands of scholarship have rarely been integrated into an empirical framework that explains how structural authority, institutional legitimacy, and Islamic ethical principles interact in the resolution of governance conflicts. The problem addressed in this study is therefore: how do governance conflicts emerge and operate between foundations and institutional leadership in PIHEIs, how are such conflicts currently managed and resolved, and what governance principles and mechanisms can be synthesized into an Islamic higher education governance model for conflict resolution? Accordingly, this study aims to (1) identify the forms and causes of governance conflicts in foundation-based PIHEIs; (2) examine the mechanisms and practices used by institutional actors to manage and resolve these conflicts; and (3) synthesize recurring structural, relational, and normative patterns across cases into an empirically grounded Islamic higher education governance model for resolving governance conflicts. The study employs a qualitative multi-case approach to enable comparison across institutional contexts and to identify both case-specific dynamics and recurring governance patterns.

The study is expected to make three interconnected contributions to the literature and practice of Islamic higher education governance. First, empirically, it contributes cross-case

¹⁶Afzalur Rahim and Thomas V Bonoma, "Managing Organizational Conflict: A Model for Diagnosis and Intervention," *Sage Journals* 44, no. 3 suppl (1979), <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1979.44.3c.1323>; Nidya Dudija, "Strategi Penanganan Konflik Pada Proses Penggabungan Perguruan Tinggi Swasta," *Psikohumaniora: Jurnal Penelitian Psikologi* 3, no. 1 (2018): 37–58, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.21580/pjpp.v3i1.970>.

¹⁷Musgamy et al., "Quality Governance and Institutional Negotiation in Indonesian Islamic Higher Education under Globalised Policy Regimes"; Yahya et al., "Financing for Accountability: A Multi Site Analysis of Islamic Governance-Driven Budget Practices in Private Islamic Higher Education Institutions"; Khaeroni, Izamudin, and Subhan, "Prophetic Leadership for Sustainable Islamic Higher Education: A Systematic Literature Review of Transformative Values and SDG Alignment (2009–2024)"; Brown and Trevino, "Ethical Leadership: A Review and Future Directions."

evidence on how governance conflicts are produced, experienced, and resolved within foundation-based PIHEIs, thereby extending existing research on foundation–university relations and governance accountability.¹⁸ Second, theoretically, this theory provides an integrative perspective by combining governance theory, organizational conflict theory, institutional theory, and Islamic ethical leadership to explain governance conflicts specifically and at the same time structural, relational, and normative.¹⁹

This integration responds to the need for governance approaches that recognize the interaction between formal authority, institutional legitimacy, and value-based leadership in higher education. Third, practically, the study contributes an empirically grounded governance model that translates Islamic ethical principles—particularly *shura*, *‘adl*, *amanah*, and *islah*—into functional principles for authority clarification, accountability, consultative decision-making, and institutionalized conflict resolution. Such an approach extends existing discussions of Islamic governance beyond normative recognition toward institutional operationalization²⁰ and may provide practical guidance for

¹⁸Yahya et al., “Financing for Accountability: A Multi Site Analysis of Islamic Governance-Driven Budget Practices in Private Islamic Higher Education Institutions”; S, “Peran Yayasan Dalam Pengelolaan Bidang Pendidikan Pada Perguruan Tinggi Swasta”; Zulkifli et al., “Good University Governance, Konflik Kepentingan Penyelenggara Dan Pengelola Universitas Swasta”; Tricker and Tricker, *Corporate Governance: Principles, Policies, and Practices*.

¹⁹Tricker and Tricker, *Corporate Governance: Principles, Policies, and Practices*; Blaschke, Frost, and Hattke, “Towards a Micro Foundation of Leadership, Governance, and Management in Universities. Higher Education”; Rahim and Bonoma, “Managing Organizational Conflict: A Model for Diagnosis and Intervention,” 1979; Scott, “Institutions and Organizations: Ideas, Interests, and Identities”; Khaeroni, Izamudin, and Subhan, “Prophetic Leadership for Sustainable Islamic Higher Education: A Systematic Literature Review of Transformative Values and SDG Alignment (2009–2024)”; Brown and Trevino, “Ethical Leadership: A Review and Future Directions.”

²⁰Musgamy et al., “Quality Governance and Institutional Negotiation in Indonesian Islamic Higher Education under Globalised Policy Regimes”; Yahya et al., “Financing for Accountability: A Multi Site Analysis of Islamic Governance-

foundations, university leaders, academic bodies, and policymakers in developing governance arrangements that are both institutionally effective and ethically legitimate.

METHODS

This study employed a qualitative multi-case study design to explore governance conflict and resolution practices in their institutional contexts and develop an empirically grounded governance model. Creswell and Poth explain that qualitative inquiry is suitable for exploring meanings, experiences, and processes within their contextual settings.²¹ Yin describes case study research as appropriate for investigating contemporary phenomena within their real-life contexts, particularly when the boundaries between the phenomenon and its context are not clearly evident.²² The cases were two private Islamic higher education institutions (PIHEIs) in Jambi Province, Indonesia, identified as Case A in Kerinci Regency and Case B in Tebo Regency to preserve confidentiality. Both operate under foundation-based governance.

Purposive selection required private Islamic higher education status, foundation-based governance, reported foundation–management disputes lasting more than five years, and access to relevant participants and documents. The unit of analysis was governance conflict within foundation–management relationships, particularly disputes over authority, decision-making, accountability, coordination, and institutional responsibilities. Each bounded case included foundation administrators, institutional leaders, academic bodies, and administrative personnel. The multi-case design enabled within-case examination and cross-case

Driven Budget Practices in Private Islamic Higher Education Institutions”; Khaerani, Izamudin, and Subhan, “Prophetic Leadership for Sustainable Islamic Higher Education: A Systematic Literature Review of Transformative Values and SDG Alignment (2009–2024).”

²¹Jhon W Creswell, *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*, 5th ed. (SAGE Publications, Inc, 2018).

²²Robert K Yin, *Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods* (SAGE Publications, 2018).

comparison for analytical rather than statistical generalization. This approach suited inquiry into participants' experiences and a contemporary organizational phenomenon embedded in real-life contexts, consistent with qualitative and case study principles.

Data were collected over approximately three months through semi-structured interviews and document analysis; observation was not used. The 24 purposively selected participants comprised 16 from Case A (five foundation administrators, one chair, two vice-chairs, three senate members, two lecturers, and three administrative staff) and eight from Case B (two foundation administrators, one chair, one vice-chair, one senate member, two lecturers, and one administrative staff). Participants held relevant governance, leadership, academic, or administrative roles and had direct involvement in or substantive knowledge of foundation-management relations. After receiving explanations of the study, confidentiality, and voluntary participation, all provided informed consent. Each participant took part in than three interview sessions. The interviews lasted one hour on average. The interviews talked about types of conflict and why they happen. They also looked at where authority ends how decisions are made, who is held responsible how people work together how conflicts are handled and what rules guide the organization. The interviews were not recorded with audio. Instead notes were written down during and right after each session.

Documents were looked at to understand the rules, who is responsible for what how things are done, who is held responsible and how conflicts are managed. These documents include rules, orders from leaders, how the organization is organized, a work plan, meeting notes, letters, notes on conflicts, and documents showing the organization is approved. The documents available will be different for each case. The results of the interviews will later be compared with the documents to see where they agree, where they differ, and what is different in each situation.

The analysis was done step by step. It started by reviewing each case. Then the information was put into categories and themes. Evidence was put together. Cases were compared. The main ideas about how the organizations were run were drawn out. Each case was looked at on its own. Statements and records were coded for things like conflict, who has authority, how decisions are made, who is responsible, how the groups relate, and how problems are fixed. Themes were compared between types of conflict, who is involved how authority works how decisions are. Who is responsible how problems are solved and what Islamic values guide the process. Common patterns helped build the model. Each case had its own special differences that were just part of the situation. The final parts of the model were combined with ideas from teachings. These ideas include shura, which means consultation, 'adl which means justice and fairness amanah which means trust and responsibility and islah which means fixing problems and making things better.

This model shows how Islamic values can be applied in life by clarifying who is responsible and ensuring people are in charge, which helps them communicate, make decisions together, and solve problems in the organization. Trust is built by looking at information from different groups and documents. People involved in the study also discussed the work. The study describes all the notes, codes, themes, and decisions taken during the analysis. The researchers also reflect on their respective views. Formal examinations of the people involved were not carried out, this was due to some sensitive topics and also because the people had a role in the organization. The research was allowed to take place as it was. People participated consciously and with their own consent, then their names and identities were kept secret, then the observation records were kept and safe to use. Interviews were conducted in mutually agreed places and were considered comfortable and did not arouse suspicion from other parties. The interview model used was established based on the needs and in accordance with theory.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

RESULTS

3.1. Authority Contestation and the Gap between Formal Governance Structure and Institutional Practice

A cross-case analysis of two Islamic Higher Education Institutions (PIHEI) shows that the main cause of governance conflicts is competition for leadership between the Foundation and campus management. Although both institutions have clear rules defining each group's duties and roles, problems still arise. This problem does not stem from unclear or missing rules, but from differing interpretations of those rules that lead to different practices. In both cases, conflict tensions increase when campus management conducts activities beyond operations, especially when dealing with financial issues and making important decisions related to institutional matters. For example, the establishment of financial systems such as new bank accounts for tuition fees and other income is seen by foundations as a step that reduces their control and authority over the institution.

Analysis of the documents shows that, in both cases, the articles of association and the Foundation's decision designate the Foundation as the institution's legal administrator. The Foundation is given full authority to manage institutional affairs, including the inauguration and dismissal of the head of the institution in accordance with the applicable regulations. Meanwhile, in the organizational structure, the head of the institution is placed with a level of coordination with the Foundation in managing academic and operational activities.

Thus, these documents show that the formal distribution of authority between the two parties is quite clear. The data show that the conflict is worsening because of differences of opinion about who has the right to lead the institution. In Case A, the Foundation challenged the appointment of the institution's leader. The Foundation's chairman, who had resigned, signed the appointment. In Case B, a similar problem also arose. This suggests that the

Foundation and campus management disagree over who controls the institution, making the leadership situation uncertain and controversial.

These findings show that the conflict is more than just an administrative dispute. This conflict is already widespread over who controls the institution and its resources. The Foundation feels that its role as the institution's organizer is weakening. Meanwhile, campus management feels their move is appropriate because it is a step toward improving institutional management and gaining more independence.

A comparison between the two cases shows that governance conflicts in Islamic Higher Education Institutions stem from a gap between formal authority and real practice. Then official rules, structures, and decisions do not guarantee coexistence. Conflicts can still occur when the people involved, such as foundations and campus management, disagree about where their power begins and ends. So even though governance documents already exist, the real challenge is to ensure all parties agree on how the rules should be implemented in practice.

3.2. Conflict Escalation and Divergent Conflict Trajectories in Two Cases

The findings show that the authority contestation in both cases gradually became institutionalized. The conflict did not start with one event but with a series of steps that reduced contact between participants and weakened communication between the foundation and campus management.

In both cases, the first phase of the conflict meant the foundation stopped participating in institutional work. Interviews reveal that campus management began making choices without consulting the foundation. The foundation saw this as a reduction in its role as an organizer. That first disagreement about authority then became a relational fight between the foundation and campus management.

The conflict grew stronger as the way the foundation and campus management communicated fell apart. The study shows that formal meetings happened rarely because both sides were full of feelings. As a result, opportunities to talk through differences and rebuild trust became very limited. The cross-case study also shows that the fights unfolded differently in Case A and Case B. In Case A, the fight lasted more than five years and stayed open until campus leadership changed. The new leader was a turning point that eased the tension between the foundation and campus management. In contrast, Case B lasted about four years. That fight eased after the institution got a warning from a regional Islamic higher education authority. The warning prompted the foundation and campus management to rethink their positions and restore coordination.

These findings suggest that the length and easing of the fights depended more on external changes than on internal actions. In both places, the fights eased after major environmental changes, not because the institutions solved things on their own. This shows that when internal rules fail, fights rely on external pressure rather than the institution's own power. Finally, although the governance fight strained the relationship between the foundation and campus management, it did not disrupt the work. Lecturers kept teaching, salaries stayed the same, learning went on, and graduations happened normally. That means the fight stayed at the governance level and did not stop the services.

3.3. Conflict Resolution Attempts and Institutional Limitations

The findings show that both cases seek to resolve governance conflicts through formal meetings, discussions, and support from academic bodies. The institutional mechanisms that have been implemented have failed to create solutions because they do not have the power or effectiveness to unite the disputing parties.

In both cases, the senate helped the foundation and campus management to communicate. Many meetings were held involving the foundation to restore coordination between the foundation and

campus management. However, campus management did not fully accept the meeting's decision, so the conflict continued.

The findings also show that decision-making is highly centered on campus leadership, meaning that governance mechanisms have too few checks and balances. Although foundations act as institutional organizers, campus leaders have significant freedom to decide on important institutional-related issues. Thus, the imbalance of authority makes collective decision-making less effective. Another key point is that neither institution has effective conflict-resolution mechanisms. No written rules govern how disputes between foundations and institutional managers should be handled, such as mediation, negotiation, or decision-making when opinions differ. As a result, conflict resolution depends on meetings and the willingness of the people involved.

The informants said that a good settlement plan must begin with a mediator approach who can contact and communicate with each party individually before holding a joint meeting. This is necessary because the conflict has crossed institutional boundaries and has become personal and emotional. Thus, before a formal agreement can be reached, trust between the actors must be rebuilt. These findings also show that conflict resolution fails in both cases not because there is no place to talk. Rather, it fails because it lacks a solid, reliable conflict management framework. They cannot resolve differences in interests, ideas about authority, and weak relationships between the foundation and campus management.

3.4. Islamic Governance Values in Rebuilding Institutional Relationships

The findings show that Islamic values acted as a base to help rebuild ties between foundations and campus management. Even though most of the conflict happened in governance the people interviewed said that healing should be guided by values like justice, deliberation (*musyawarah*) trust and responsibility (*amanah*).

Justice is often mentioned when discussing how to resolve governance disputes. The speakers said that justice in running institutions comes from mutual respect for the limits of authority and each party's duties under the rules. Here, justice does not mean giving power to everyone, but ensuring that each institutional actor carries out their duties in their respective fields according to rules and regulations. Trust is closely tied to how authority is used. The speakers believed that leaders should use power according to their role and not go beyond their duties. This view shows how important ethical accountability is in educational governance, where power is seen not only as control but also as an obligation.

The findings also show that deliberation is seen as a way to rebuild institutional good relations. The conflict resolution document reveals efforts to reshape governance through discussions attended by all relevant parties. This is done by providing balanced representation to various groups. The plan to rebuild the foundation structure with representation from both the campus and the foundation group shows efforts to bring justice and rebuild trust. These findings show that Islamic values serve as a balancing tool, not just a symbolic idea. Justice, trust, and consideration create a structure that transforms conflict from a power struggle into an opportunity to rebuild teamwork among actors. From these cross-case findings four linked governance dimensions were seen as tools, for solving conflict in PIHEIs: clarifying structural authority, shura-based participatory governance, Islamic ethical governance values and formal conflict-resolution mechanisms.

Table 1. Cross-Case Comparison of Governance Conflicts in PIHEIs

Findings Dimension	Case A	Case B
Authority contestation	Conflict between the foundation and campus management over institutional authority, including questions regarding the legitimacy of the appointment of the new STIT leader, whose appointment decree	Conflict between the foundation and campus management arising from different understandings of institutional control.

	was signed by a former foundation chairperson who had resigned.	
Financial management and decision-making	The establishment of separate financial management mechanisms, including new bank accounts for tuition payments and other institutional revenues, was perceived by the foundation as a reduction of its authority.	The establishment of separate financial management mechanisms and campus decision-making without foundation involvement formed part of the authority contestation.
Duration of conflict	More than five years.	Approximately four years.
Factors contributing to conflict de-escalation	A change in campus leadership became a turning point in reducing tensions.	A formal warning from a regional Islamic higher education authority encouraged the parties to reconsider their positions and restore institutional coordination.
Conflict resolution mechanisms	Formal meetings and institutional resolution efforts failed to produce a sustainable settlement.	Formal meetings and institutional resolution efforts failed to produce a sustainable settlement.
Continuity of academic services	Teaching and learning activities, lecturers' duties, salary payments, and graduation processes continued normally.	Teaching and learning activities, lecturers' duties, salary payments, and graduation processes continued normally.

DISCUSSION

4.1. Governance Conflict as an Authority Implementation Gap

The findings of this study suggest that governance conflicts in Islamic Higher Education Institutions (PIHEI) should not be seen simply as the result of problematic organisational structures or a lack of formal rules. Instead, view these conflicts more academically as pointing to a gap between what official documents say and how authority is used in practice. Although governance records such as

statutes, institutional decrees, and organisational charts define the roles of foundations and campus leaders, these written arrangements do not guarantee that everyone understands who has decision-making authority.

This insight builds on research on private higher-education governance. Previous studies have often pointed to uncertainties between ownership, strategic control, and day-to-day operations as a source of conflict between foundations and institutional managers. This study offers a new view. This study shows that conflicts can still occur even if a clear role description is in place. The real problem is not a lack of structure. Rather, it is a lack of managerial agreement within the institution about how authority should be used.

From a governance theory perspective, higher education institutions are not top-down systems. Authority is shared among various actors, rather than by a single central group. Governance is a process. It includes dialogue, accountability, and collaboration between governing bodies, leaders, and faculty. In PIHEI. Foundations are usually the owners and help establish the institution. Academic leaders are expected to run teaching, research, and day-to-day operations. Problems arise when people argue where one role ends and another begins. These authority disputes can later create tension even if the rules seem clear on paper.

The findings also support institutional theory, particularly the argument that organizational practices are influenced not only by regulatory structures but also by normative interpretations and perceptions of legitimacy.²³ In this context, actors do not simply follow formal rules; they interpret authority based on their understanding of institutional responsibility, organizational identity, and legitimate control. Therefore, governance conflict represents a struggle over the meaning of authority itself rather than merely a disagreement over administrative procedures.

²³Scott, "Institutions and Organizations: Ideas, Interests, and Identities."

Compared with previous research that often emphasizes structural ambiguity as the main source of conflict, this study highlights the importance of authority interpretation and relational legitimacy. Research on private university governance has shown that conflicts may arise when foundations and university managers compete over influence, resources, and decision-making power. However, the present study further shows that conflict resolution requires more than formally separating roles; it requires mechanisms that enable actors to recognize each other's legitimacy and operate within mutually accepted boundaries of responsibility.

Basically, this study adds to the literature on education governance by suggesting that governance conflict in PIHEIs is a multi-layered problem with three linked parts: structural authority, relational interaction, and normative legitimacy. A clear structure is needed to set out who does what. That alone is not enough. You also need ways for people to take part and moral principles that show how power should be used. In short, good governance in PIHEIs needs both an institutional design and processes that turn official power into something that is seen as rightful and responsible.

4.2. Development of Islamic Education Governance Model for Conflict Resolution

a. Model Development Process: From Empirical Findings to Governance Framework

The Islamic Education Governance Model produced in this study was created using a structured approach. This model's implementation technique begins by identifying real-world data, comparing findings across cases, and finally synthesising them into a theory. This model does not only derive from what people think is right about governance. Instead, it comes from a pattern seen in two private Islamic higher education institutions. These institutions face conflicts between the foundations that establish them and the people who run them. This model is built from what happens in those real-life situations.

The first stage involved identifying the empirical patterns of governance conflict. The cross-case findings revealed four fundamental challenges: contested authority boundaries between foundations and campus leaders, limited participation of institutional actors in decision-making processes, reliance on informal approaches for conflict management, and the need to restore institutional relationships through ethical principles. These findings indicate that governance conflict in PIHEs involves not only structural disagreement but also relational and normative dimensions.

The second stage involved abstracting these empirical findings into broader governance themes. The problem of contested authority was conceptualized as the need for structural clarity of authority differentiation. The limited effectiveness of institutional communication mechanisms was interpreted as the need for shura-based participatory governance. The emphasis of informants on justice, responsibility, and reconciliation was synthesized into the dimension of Islamic ethical governance values. Finally, the absence of formal procedures for resolving disputes was developed into the dimension of institutionalized conflict resolution mechanisms.

The third stage involved integrating these empirical themes with relevant theoretical perspectives. Governance theory explains the importance of authority distribution, accountability, and coordination among institutional actors.²⁴ Organizational conflict theory provides an analytical lens for understanding disagreements among groups with different interests and perceptions of authority.²⁵ Institutional theory explains why formal structures alone may not guarantee effective governance practices because organizational actions are also shaped by normative and cultural

²⁴Tricker and Tricker, *Corporate Governance: Principles, Policies, and Practices*; Blaschke, Frost, and Hattke, "Towards a Micro Foundation of Leadership, Governance, and Management in Universities. Higher Education."

²⁵Rahim and Bonoma, "Managing Organizational Conflict: A Model for Diagnosis and Intervention," 1979.

considerations.²⁶ Meanwhile, Islamic governance perspectives contribute ethical principles that emphasize justice (*'adl*), trustworthiness (*amanah*), consultation (*shura*), and reconciliation (*islah*).²⁷

Based on this process, the proposed model positions governance conflict resolution as a sequential and interconnected process rather than as four independent components. Structural clarity of authority functions as the foundation, establishing legitimate boundaries between institutional actors. Shura-based participatory governance operates as a relational mechanism that enables dialogue and shared decision-making. Islamic ethical governance values provide normative legitimacy by guiding how authority should be exercised responsibly. Finally, institutionalized conflict resolution mechanisms transform conflict management from personal and informal practices into sustainable organizational procedures.

Therefore, the model developed in this study suggests that effective governance conflict resolution in PIHEIs requires the integration of structural, relational, and normative dimensions. Clear authority arrangements alone are insufficient; they must be supported by participatory processes, ethical legitimacy, and formal mechanisms that sustain institutional reconciliation.

b. Structural Clarity and Authority Differentiation

The first component of the proposed Islamic Education Governance Model is clear differentiation of roles and authority. This component means that foundations and institutional leaders in Islamic Higher Education Institutions (PIHEIs) should have clear boundaries for their responsibilities. I notice that governance conflicts are likely when formal authority structures exist but the

²⁶Scott, "Institutions and Organizations: Ideas, Interests, and Identities."

²⁷Khaeroni, Izamudin, and Subhan, "Prophetic Leadership for Sustainable Islamic Higher Education: A Systematic Literature Review of Transformative Values and SDG Alignment (2009–2024)"; Brown and Trevino, "Ethical Leadership: A Review and Future Directions."

institutional actors do not share an understanding about the legitimate scope of responsibilities.

In foundation-based education institutions the relationship between the foundation and campus management is interdependent, not a simple hierarchy. The foundation acts as the organizer and guardian of institutional direction while institutional leaders manage academic and operational tasks. I think that effective governance requires differentiation of authority than domination by one institutional actor.

This finding supports governance perspectives that stress the need to balance authority, accountability and coordination in organizations. Higher education governance differs from bureaucratic models because decision-making involves many actors with distinct sources of legitimacy.²⁸ In higher education foundations derive legitimacy from their legal and organizational role; institutional leaders derive legitimacy from their professional responsibility for academic management. From my point of view conflict arises when these sources of legitimacy are seen as competing of complementary.

The findings extend studies on private university governance, which have highlighted that conflict can happen when foundation authority and university managerial autonomy are not clearly separated.²⁹ However this study adds a point: authority differentiation is not just a legal or administrative arrangement. I believe that authority differentiation is more, than an administrative arrangement; it also demands a shared governance

²⁸Tricker and Tricker, *Corporate Governance: Principles, Policies, and Practices*; Blaschke, Frost, and Hattke, "Towards a Micro Foundation of Leadership, Governance, and Management in Universities. Higher Education."

²⁹S, "Peran Yayasan Dalam Pengelolaan Bidang Pendidikan Pada Perguruan Tinggi Swasta"; Zulkifli et al., "Good University Governance, Konflik Kepentingan Penyelenggara Dan Pengelola Universitas Swasta"; Gunadi, "Promoting Regional Integration through Higher Education: Legal Analysis on the Empowerment of Foundation in Private Universities."

culture where each actor sees the legitimacy and limits of the other actors' roles.

From an institutional theory perspective, formal structures represent only one dimension of governance effectiveness. Institutional practices are also shaped by normative expectations and shared interpretations among organizational members.³⁰ Therefore, establishing statutes and organizational structures is necessary but insufficient. Governance arrangements must be accompanied by processes that create collective understanding regarding authority boundaries.

Within the proposed model, structural clarity functions as the foundational element upon which other governance mechanisms are developed. Without clear authority differentiation, participatory decision-making mechanisms such as *shura* may become ineffective because actors do not have a common understanding of who has responsibility for particular decisions. Similarly, ethical values such as *'adl* and *amanah* cannot be operationalized effectively when institutional roles remain contested.

Therefore this study suggests that differences in authority within PIHEIs should be seen as the step, toward good governance. The foundation and the campus leadership should not be viewed as places where power fights with each other. As parts of the same team. Their roles need to be set out. They need to work. They need to act in an honest way.

c. Shura and Participatory Governance

I think the second piece of the proposed Islamic Education Governance Model is shura-based governance. This piece stresses that groups talk together make decisions together and bring in the people from the institution into the way things run. The research shows that just having meetings and discussion rounds is not enough to solve problems, in governance when the people involved do not feel recognized and do not own the decisions.

³⁰Scott, "Institutions and Organizations: Ideas, Interests, and Identities."

In the view of governance shura is not just a formality of collecting thoughts but is a moral way to reach decisions by talking, taking responsibility and looking at things together. So shura works when meetings exist and when everyone who matters can speak up help shape choices and accept the shared result.

These findings contribute to a broader discussion of shared governance in higher education. Previous studies have emphasised that effective university governance requires interaction between various actors, including governing bodies, institutional leaders, and the academic community; hence, governance does not rely solely on hierarchical authority.³¹ However, this study expands on that perspective by showing that participation should be supported by recognition of institutional legitimacy. Without mutual recognition between actors, consultative forums can be symbolic rather than transformative.

The results show a difference between consultation work and participatory governance as a formal practice. In the examples studied communication forums existed,. They could not fully resolve conflicting interests because decision-making power, trust and acceptance among people were still disputed. This shows that shura needs institutional conditions that allow open dialogue, fair representation and a pledge to shared decisions.

From the view of ethical governance shura acts as a bridge between structural authority and relationship legitimacy. Clear limits of authority show who's responsible for decisions while consultation ensures that those decisions take into account the views of people who matter. Thus shura stops authority from being used by one person.

In the proposed model, shura-based participatory governance follows clarification of structural authority. Once institutional roles are clear, consultation becomes a tool for aligning interests,

³¹Tricker and Tricker, *Corporate Governance: Principles, Policies, and Practices*; Blaschke, Frost, and Hattke, "Towards a Micro Foundation of Leadership, Governance, and Management in Universities. Higher Education."

reducing confusion, and building trust. Therefore, shura should not replace governance structures; shura should serve as a relational tool that makes governance arrangements more legitimate and acceptable. The study argues that PIHEI should transform shura from a value into a formal governance tool. In this case, consultation should be part of decision-making for participation to become a lasting practice, not just a quick conflict-resolution tool.

d. Islamic Ethical Values and Institutional Legitimacy

The third part of the proposed Islamic Education Governance Model bases institutional legitimacy on ethical values. The results show that ideas such as 'adl (justice), amanah (responsibility and trust), and islah (reconciliation and redress) create ways to solve governance issues within PIHEI. These values appear not only in institutional guidelines. They help guide actions in governance.

This result agrees with studies that say governance in Islamic higher education is not just about being efficient and having ways to be held accountable. It also includes value-based parts.³² Still this study adds more by showing that Islamic values can be used as governance rules when they are linked to how power is shared how decisions are made and how conflicts are handled.

The idea of 'adl helps explain fairness in how institutions are run. In the case of foundation-based PIHEIs fairness does not always mean giving the amount of power to everyone. Instead it means giving the amount of power based on what each person or group is responsible for. So fairness means seeing the roles using open ways to make decisions and not letting one person have too much control. The concept of *amanah* strengthens this governance perspective by emphasizing that authority is a responsibility rather than merely a source of institutional power. Leaders and governing actors are expected to exercise their authority within their designated roles

³²Musgamy et al., "Quality Governance and Institutional Negotiation in Indonesian Islamic Higher Education under Globalised Policy Regimes"; Yahya et al., "Financing for Accountability: A Multi Site Analysis of Islamic Governance-Driven Budget Practices in Private Islamic Higher Education Institutions."

and remain accountable for institutional interests. This perspective complements ethical leadership theory, which emphasizes that effective leadership requires moral responsibility, ethical decision-making, and promoting appropriate organizational behavior.³³ Meanwhile *islah* offers a direction for resolving conflict. It changes the goal of governance. Of focusing on winning disputes within institutions it focuses on repairing relationships and improving conditions, in organizations. In this view conflict is not seen as something damaging. It is also seen as a chance to rebuild how governance works and to make institutional cooperation stronger.

The findings also contribute to institutional theory by showing that legitimacy in PIHEIs is constructed through the interaction between formal structures and normative values. Formal governance arrangements may establish legal legitimacy, but institutional sustainability also requires moral legitimacy grounded in fairness, responsibility, and trust among organizational actors.³⁴ Therefore, Islamic ethical values serve as a bridge between formal governance compliance and socially accepted institutional practices.

Within the proposed model, Islamic ethical values function as a normative foundation that connects structural clarity and participatory governance with sustainable conflict resolution. Structural arrangements determine the distribution of authority, *shura* provides a mechanism for interaction, while Islamic ethical principles determine how authority and participation should be exercised. Thus, Islamic values are positioned not as supplementary elements but as an integral dimension of governance effectiveness in PIHEIs.

³³Brown and Trevino, "Ethical Leadership: A Review and Future Directions."

³⁴Scott, "Institutions and Organizations: Ideas, Interests, and Identities."

e. Institutionalized Conflict Resolution

The fourth component of the proposed Islamic Education Governance Model is institutionalized conflict resolution, which involves shifting conflict management from informal, personality-dependent approaches to systematic institutional mechanisms. The findings indicate that governance conflicts in PIHEIs tend to persist when conflict resolution relies primarily on individual relationships, personal mediation, or temporary interventions rather than established procedures.

This finding contributes to organizational conflict literature by showing that the sustainability of conflict resolution depends not only on actors' willingness to reconcile but also on the availability of institutional mechanisms that regulate how disagreements are managed. Rahim and Bonoma³⁵ emphasize that effective conflict management requires appropriate diagnosis and intervention strategies based on the nature of conflict. In the context of PIHEIs, governance conflicts require mechanisms specifically designed to address disputes involving authority, institutional roles, and accountability relationships.

Previous studies on higher education governance have highlighted the importance of accountability structures and participatory decision-making in maintaining institutional effectiveness.³⁶ However, this study extends those perspectives by showing that governance systems also require explicit arrangements for conflict prevention and resolution. Without such mechanisms, even institutions with formal governance structures may experience prolonged tensions because disagreements are

³⁵Rahim and Bonoma, "Managing Organizational Conflict: A Model for Diagnosis and Intervention," 1979.

³⁶Musgamy et al., "Quality Governance and Institutional Negotiation in Indonesian Islamic Higher Education under Globalised Policy Regimes"; Yahya et al., "Financing for Accountability: A Multi Site Analysis of Islamic Governance-Driven Budget Practices in Private Islamic Higher Education Institutions"; Blaschke, Frost, and Hattke, "Towards a Micro Foundation of Leadership, Governance, and Management in Universities. Higher Education."

managed through informal negotiations rather than institutional procedures.

Moving from ways to institutionalized conflict resolution needs several things: clear rules to spot governance disputes, open mediation places where people can speak agreed ways to negotiate and steps to check that solutions are carried out. Institutionalized conflict resolution does not try to make conflict disappear; instead institutionalized conflict resolution gives paths so that differences in interests can be handled well.

From an Islamic governance point of view institutionalized conflict resolution is linked closely to the principle of *islah*, which focuses on bringing people together and making things better.. Reconciliation is not just about forgiving each other or having a quick peace. Instead *islah* calls for group work to fix how governance is set up to rebuild trust and to stop conflicts from happening again.

In the model we suggest, institutionalized conflict resolution is the step of changing governance. Clear structure sets limits of authority. *Shura* builds people's involvement. Islamic ethical values give direction for using authority. Institutionalized conflict resolution ways then make sure that when disagreements come institutionalized conflict resolution ways can solve disagreements, with responsible and lasting methods.

Therefore, this study argues that effective governance in PIHEIs requires moving beyond a culture of conflict avoidance toward a culture of conflict governance. Conflict should not be viewed solely as an organizational failure but as a governance challenge that requires structured, ethical, and participatory responses.

4.3. Theoretical and Practical Contributions

a. Theoretical Contribution

This study contributes to the literature on higher education governance by developing an integrative framework that explains governance conflict in Private Islamic Higher Education Institutions (PIHEIs) through the interaction of structural, relational, and

normative dimensions. Previous studies on private higher education governance have largely focused on institutional roles, accountability, and organizational arrangements.³⁷ Meanwhile, studies on Islamic higher education have emphasized ethical values, leadership, and institutional quality.³⁸ However, these perspectives have rarely been integrated to explain how authority conflicts between foundations and institutional leaders emerge and how they can be resolved.

The proposed Islamic Education Governance Model extends existing governance perspectives by demonstrating that effective conflict resolution requires more than structural clarification of authority. Although clear institutional roles are necessary, governance sustainability also depends on participatory mechanisms and ethical legitimacy. Therefore, this study advances the understanding of governance conflict as a multidimensional phenomenon involving:

1. Structural dimension related to authority distribution and institutional roles;
2. Relational dimension related to communication, participation, and trust among actors;
3. Normative dimension related to ethical principles that shape legitimate governance practices.

This point of view builds on the idea of conflict inside organizations by explaining that arguments between groups are not just about money or power but also about who has the right to make

³⁷S, "Peran Yayasan Dalam Pengelolaan Bidang Pendidikan Pada Perguruan Tinggi Swasta"; Zulkifli et al., "Good University Governance, Konflik Kepentingan Penyelenggara Dan Pengelola Universitas Swasta"; Gunadi, "Promoting Regional Integration through Higher Education: Legal Analysis on the Empowerment of Foundation in Private Universities."

³⁸Musgamy et al., "Quality Governance and Institutional Negotiation in Indonesian Islamic Higher Education under Globalised Policy Regimes"; Yahya et al., "Financing for Accountability: A Multi Site Analysis of Islamic Governance-Driven Budget Practices in Private Islamic Higher Education Institutions"; Khaeroni, Izamudin, and Subhan, "Prophetic Leadership for Sustainable Islamic Higher Education: A Systematic Literature Review of Transformative Values and SDG Alignment (2009–2024)."

decisions. The research also adds to the study of how institutions work by showing that official rules need support from people and how they interact to work properly. This research also contributes to leadership by going beyond simply discussing Islamic values in official documents. The model suggested shows how Islamic ideas like fairness, trust, consultation and reform can be used in ways to handle who is, in charge how choices are made, who is responsible and how disagreements are settled.

b. Practical Contribution

Practically the model gives guidance to foundations, institutional leaders, academic bodies and policymakers who are involved in the governance of PIHEIs. For foundations the model stresses that foundations must exercise their responsibilities as organizers while respecting the professional autonomy of academic and operational management. Clear authority boundaries can reduce misunderstandings. Prevent excessive intervention in institutional management.

For leaders, the model highlights that leadership authority should be exercised through accountability, consultation, and ethical responsibility. Institutional leaders are expected not only to achieve organizational objectives but also to maintain constructive relationships with governing bodies and academic communities.

For bodies such as senates, the model emphasizes their role as participatory governance forums that facilitate dialogue, balance institutional interests, and strengthen collective decision-making. Rather than functioning only as approval mechanisms, academic bodies can serve as spaces for shura and institutional reconciliation.

For policymakers and higher education authorities the study suggests that it is important to develop governance guidelines for Islamic higher education institutions that address not only organizational structures but also mechanisms, for preventing and resolving internal governance conflicts.

Novelty of the Proposed Model

The new thing about this study is bringing together the way things are run how people take part and Islamic moral ideas into a way of solving problems that is made for foundation-based PIHEIs. Usual ways of running things focus on being responsible working well and keeping control. The new way puts rightness as something very important for lasting management.

This way is different because it sees values not as extra morals that are outside the way things are run but as parts that help decide who has power how choices are made and how problems are fixed. This way the study connects the management ways with the moral ideas from Islamic education.

So the new way gives a way to understand and deal with management problems in PIHEIs by mixing the rules of running an organization with Islamic moral ideas. This mix gives another way for schools that want to be good, at what they do and also be fair and right.

CONCLUSIONS

This study shows that governance conflicts in Islamic Higher Education Institutions or PIHEIs are more than simple quarrels between foundations and leaders. Instead governance conflicts reveal governance challenges that stem from differing views on authority, legitimacy and who should make decisions.

This study also says that lasting solutions to governance conflicts in PIHEIs need to bring structural, relational and normative aspects. The Islamic Education Governance Model that we propose offers a view of the governance model on how governance works not just through clear roles, accountability and formal procedures but also through ways that involve people and build ethical legitimacy. By mixing governance rules with values like *shura*, meaning consultation; *ʿadl*, meaning justice; *amanah*, meaning trustworthiness and responsibility; and *islah*, meaning reconciliation the model gives a framework that fits each context. It

turns authority relationships into practices that feel fair and work together.

From a theoretical perspective, this study contributes to the educational governance literature. This study offers a context-based model that can later help us understand governance conflicts in faith-based institutions of higher education. This study further advances governance and institutional theory. This study shows that governance conflicts within organisations are shaped by more than structures; they also stem from how people interact and interpret what is legitimate. In addition, this study highlights values that go beyond words or ideas. This study shows that Islamic values can act as rules for who gets authority, how decisions are made, how accountability works, and how conflicts are resolved.

On the other hand, governance models can provide comprehensive guidance to foundations, leaders, academic groups, and policymakers. They can help stakeholders design rules that balance oversight with managers' and academics' freedom. These findings suggest limiting who holds authority, strengthening consultation mechanisms, and incorporating ethical principles into rules and conflict-resolution processes. These efforts can build trust, reduce recurring governance tensions, and help institutions stay strong over time.

This study looked at two PIHEIs in one Indonesian province. That was a limitation. Because this is a multi-case qualitative study, we are not trying to produce numbers that can be applied to every institution. So the governance model we propose should be seen as something that can be applied in the analysis, not as a rule that is automatically suited to every situation. Future work could test how well governance models work in regions, different types of institutions, and in other cultural environments. More studies that incorporate methods might also examine how value-based governance is implemented, how well governance conflicts are resolved, and how institutions perform; these are all interconnected.

REFERENCES

- Blaschke, Steffen, Jetta Frost, and Febian Hattke. "Towards a Micro Foundation of Leadership, Governance, and Management in Universities. Higher Education." *The International Journal of Higher Education Research* 68, no. 5 (2014): 711–32. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-014-9740-2>.
- Brown, Michael E, and Linda K Trevino. "Ethical Leadership: A Review and Future Directions." *The Leadership Quarterly* 17, no. 6 (2006): 595–616. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.004>.
- Creswell, Jhon W. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. 5th ed. SAGE Publications, Inc, 2018.
- Dudija, Nidya. "Strategi Penanganan Konflik Pada Proses Penggabungan Perguruan Tinggi Swasta." *Psikohumaniora: Jurnal Penelitian Psikologi* 3, no. 1 (2018): 37–58. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.21580/pjpp.v3i1.970>.
- Gunadi, Ariawan. "Promoting Regional Integration through Higher Education: Legal Analysis on the Empowerment of Foundation in Private Universities." *Indonesian Journal of International Law* 13, no. 3 (2016): 395–419. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.17304/ijil.vol13.3.657>.
- Khaeroni, Izamudin, and Subhan. "Prophetic Leadership for Sustainable Islamic Higher Education: A Systematic Literature Review of Transformative Values and SDG Alignment (2009–2024)." *Journal of Asian Islamic Educational Management* 3, no. 2 (2025): 63–72. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.53889/jaiem.v3i2.752>.
- Musgamy, Awaliyah, Rappe Rappe, Abd RAhman R, Abdul Aziz Muslimin, and Sitti Nadirah. "Quality Governance and Institutional Negotiation in Indonesian Islamic Higher Education under Globalised Policy Regimes." *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research* 25, no. 1 (2026): 1011–32. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.25.3.45>.
- Rahim, Afzalur, and Thomas V Bonoma. "Managing Organizational Conflict: A Model for Diagnosis and Intervention." *Sage Journals* 44, no. 3 suppl (1979). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1979.44.3c.1323>.

- Rahim, M.A, and T.V Bonoma. "Managing Organizational Conflict: A Model for Diagnosis and Intervention." *Psychological Reports* 44, no. 3_suppl (1979): 1323–44. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1979.44.3c.1323>.
- S, Suryarama. "Peran Yayasan Dalam Pengelolaan Bidang Pendidikan Pada Perguruan Tinggi Swasta." *Jurnal Organisasi Dan Manajemen* 5, no. 1 (2009): 55–62. <https://doi.org/10.33830/jom.v5i1.215.2009>.
- Scott, W Richard. "Institutions and Organizations: Ideas, Interests, and Identities." *Copenhagen Journal of Asian Studies* 32, no. 2 (2014): 136–38.
- Tricker, Bob, and Robert Ian Tricker Tricker. *Corporate Governance: Principles, Policies, and Practices*. Edited by Oxford University Press. 4th ed. Italy, n.d.
- Yahya, S.N, M.S Nugraha, D Melyati, E.S Hajar, M.S Rohmah, and S.A Pradana. "Financing for Accountability: A Multi Site Analysis of Islamic Governance-Driven Budget Practices in Private Islamic Higher Education Institutions." *EDUKASI: Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Agama Dan Keagamaan* 23, no. 3 (2025): 639–57. <https://doi.org/10.32729/edukasi.v23i3.2364>.
- Yin, Robert K. *Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods*. SAGE Publications, 2018.
- Zulkifli, Zulkifli, Sri Langgeng Ratnasari, T Munzir, Herni Widiyah Nasrul, and Widodo Ismanto. "Good University Governance, Konflik Kepentingan Penyelenggara Dan Pengelola Universitas Swasta." *Jurnal Dimensi* 10, no. November (2021): 569–83. <https://doi.org/10.33373/dms.v10i3.3609>.