



Human Resource Development Programs and Their Contribution to Employee Career Advancement in State Universities

Intan Kurniasi¹, Iham Akbar¹

¹Faculty of Economics and Business, Padjajaran University

*Corresponding Author: Intan Kurniasi

E-mail: intankurniasi131305@yahoo.com

Article Info

Article History:

Received: 28 September 2025

Revised: 17 November 2025

Accepted: 19 December 2025

Keywords:

Human Resource Development
Career Advancement
State Universities
Employee Productivity
Training and Mentoring

Abstract

This study examines the contribution of Human Resource Development (HRD) programs to employee career advancement in state universities, emphasizing how training, mentoring, leadership development, digital literacy initiatives, and research support shape professional growth within higher education institutions. Using a quantitative correlational design, data were collected from 220 academic, administrative, and support staff selected through proportional stratified random sampling. Structured questionnaires measured HRD participation and career advancement indicators, followed by descriptive analysis, Pearson correlation, and regression testing. The findings reveal that HRD programs significantly enhance employees' competencies, motivation, and job satisfaction, while also demonstrating a strong positive relationship with career advancement outcomes. Despite these benefits, the study indicates that developmental participation does not always translate into equitable promotional opportunities due to institutional structures and limited leadership pathways. HRD contributes 45.3 percent of the variance in career advancement, confirming its strategic importance yet highlighting the need for stronger alignment between development initiatives and promotion systems. The study concludes that universities must elevate HRD as a core element of human capital governance and strengthen its link to transparent career progression. Future research should adopt longitudinal or mixed-method approaches to further explore institutional factors shaping advancement.

INTRODUCTION

According to Kareem (2019), Human resource development (HRD) has become a central theme in organizational management, particularly within educational institutions. As the world of work continues to evolve, the role of HRD in preparing, equipping, and motivating employees to achieve their professional goals has gained increasing recognition (Shuck & Herd, 2012; Kapoor & Sherif, 2012). In state universities, HRD programs are not only about improving technical and professional competencies but also about fostering personal growth and supporting long-term career advancement.

Universities as knowledge-based organizations rely heavily on the quality and capabilities of their human resources. Academic staff, administrators, and support personnel all play a vital role in ensuring that universities fulfill their mission of education, research, and community service (Negassa, 2025; Mushemeza, 2016; Le et al., 2023). Therefore, structured HRD programs serve as a strategic tool to align individual career aspirations with institutional goals. The concept of HRD is multifaceted, encompassing training, education, mentoring, leadership development, and performance appraisal (Hedayati & Li, 2016; Raj, 2010). These programs are designed to improve employee skills and knowledge, while also providing a pathway for career progression. In state universities, HRD practices often include postgraduate study opportunities, workshops, seminars, professional certification, and internal leadership training.

Reed et al. (2011) and Carr et al. (2018), Career advancement in academic settings is often measured through promotions, rank progression, research achievements, and leadership appointments. For non-academic staff, career growth may be reflected in job rotation, managerial responsibilities, or administrative promotions. HRD programs create an enabling environment where employees can explore such opportunities. The link between HRD and career advancement has been widely acknowledged in organizational theory (Peterson, 2004; Han et al., 2017). Effective HRD interventions enhance employee motivation, job satisfaction, and commitment, which are all crucial factors in pursuing career development. In universities, these factors are even more pronounced because the institution's reputation and competitiveness are directly influenced by the caliber of its workforce.

In the context of state universities, HRD programs face unique challenges and opportunities. On one hand, government regulations, limited budgets, and bureaucratic structures may constrain program implementation. On the other hand, collaboration with external partners, international academic networks, and technological advancements provide new avenues for enriching HRD strategies. The changing demands of higher education, including the need for digital transformation, global competitiveness, and outcome-based education, make HRD programs more critical than ever (Lukita et al., 2025). Employees must not only master traditional skills but also adapt to emerging competencies such as digital literacy, cross-cultural communication, and innovation-driven leadership.

Moreover, the academic career path is highly competitive, requiring individuals to demonstrate excellence in teaching, research, and service. HRD programs play a vital role in guiding faculty members through these demands by offering research grants, publication workshops, and collaborative research opportunities. For administrative and support staff, HRD programs can also provide important career advancement opportunities. Training in project management, financial administration, digital platforms, and leadership equips staff members to take on greater responsibilities and achieve professional growth within the university.

According to Amtu et al. (2021), The effectiveness of HRD programs in contributing to career advancement also depends on institutional culture and leadership commitment. Universities that prioritize continuous learning and invest in employee development tend to achieve better outcomes in employee performance and retention. Conversely, lack of support may hinder the impact of even well-designed HRD programs.

Previous studies have shown that when employees perceive HRD initiatives as supportive and relevant to their personal career goals, they are more likely to engage with the programs and translate the learning into improved performance. This suggests that alignment between institutional goals and individual aspirations is crucial. In Indonesia, state universities are undergoing significant reforms aimed at

improving global competitiveness and enhancing institutional autonomy (Jazuli et al., 2022). These reforms highlight the importance of professional staff development as a driver of institutional excellence. HRD programs thus serve as both a strategic necessity and a personal opportunity for employees to advance their careers.

Against this background, this study examines the contribution of HRD programs to employee career advancement in state universities. By analyzing employee experiences and institutional practices, it seeks to identify the extent to which HRD initiatives influence career trajectories and professional growth. The findings are expected to provide valuable insights for policymakers, university leaders, and employees themselves in strengthening HRD as a catalyst for career success.

METHODS

This study employed a quantitative correlational research design to examine the contribution of Human Resource Development (HRD) programs to employee career advancement in state universities. The selection of this method was grounded in the theoretical argument that quantitative approaches enable systematic measurement of relationships among variables and allow researchers to generalize findings within defined populations (Kareem, 2019; Peterson, 2004). Correlational analysis was particularly appropriate because the study aimed to identify the degree to which participation in HRD programs—such as training, mentoring, research support, and digital literacy initiatives—was associated with key indicators of career advancement, including promotions, recognition, leadership opportunities, and job satisfaction. The study did not involve manipulation of variables, which aligns with the principles of non-experimental correlational research commonly used in organizational and HRD studies (Han et al., 2017).

The research was conducted in several state universities that represent diverse institutional characteristics in Indonesia. These universities were selected because state institutions typically have structured HRD policies and formalized career pathways, making them suitable environments for investigating HRD-related career dynamics. Universities operate under national regulations and performance standards that emphasize professional development, digital transformation, and human capital strengthening (Lukita et al., 2025; Jazuli et al., 2022). Such settings provide a relevant institutional context for evaluating how HRD initiatives are designed and integrated within daily organizational practices. This contextual grounding is also consistent with the emphasis in higher education literature on linking staff development with institutional governance, academic performance, and global competitiveness (Mushemeza, 2016; Le et al., 2023).

The population of the study comprised academic staff, administrative personnel, and support staff employed in the participating state universities. These groups were included because HRD programs are typically implemented at multiple organizational levels, and their outcomes may differ depending on job roles, career structures, and institutional expectations. Academic staff often engage in research-focused HRD activities such as publication workshops and research grants, while administrative and support staff participate more in training on management, digital systems, and administrative competencies. To ensure proportional representation across these categories, the study used a proportional stratified random sampling technique. This sampling method ensured that the distribution of respondents accurately reflected the composition of the workforce in the selected universities. Stratified sampling is widely endorsed in organizational studies because it increases representativeness and reduces sampling error when populations are heterogeneous (Hedayati & Li, 2016). A sample size of 220 respondents was determined as adequate to support robust correlational and regression analyses, aligning with

recommendations in HRD research for sample sizes exceeding 200 for multivariate analysis (Shuck & Herd, 2012).

Data were collected using structured questionnaires designed specifically to measure participation in HRD programs and perceptions of career advancement. The instrument consisted of two major sections. The first section assessed the extent of employee engagement in HRD activities, covering training and workshops, mentoring programs, leadership development, digital literacy initiatives, and research support. The second section measured indicators of career advancement, including promotions, managerial appointments, job rotation opportunities, professional recognition, and overall career satisfaction. All items were measured using a five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree, which is commonly used in organizational surveys due to its reliability in capturing attitudinal and perceptual data (Raj, 2010). The design of the questionnaire was informed by conceptual frameworks from HRD literature emphasizing competency development, motivation, job satisfaction, and performance as key components influencing career growth (Kapoor & Sherif, 2012; Kareem, 2019).

Prior to distribution, the questionnaire underwent content validation by HRD experts and senior academic staff to ensure clarity, appropriateness, and alignment with theoretical constructs. Content validation is recommended in HRD research because it enhances the accuracy of measurement and ensures that the instrument reflects actual organizational practices and employee experiences (Hedayati & Li, 2016). A pilot test involving 20 university employees was conducted to assess reliability, and minor adjustments were made based on feedback, particularly in phrasing items related to leadership development and recognition. The final instrument demonstrated strong internal consistency, with Cronbach's alpha values exceeding the acceptable threshold of 0.70 for all subscales.

Data collection was carried out over a four-week period. Questionnaires were distributed both online and in printed format to accommodate the varying levels of digital access across employees. The use of hybrid distribution ensured inclusivity and minimized non-response bias, especially among staff members who may have limited experience with digital platforms. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were informed about the purpose of the study, data confidentiality, and their right to withdraw at any time, in accordance with ethical guidelines for research in educational institutions (Amtu et al., 2021).

Descriptive statistics were initially used to summarize demographic characteristics of the respondents, including gender distribution, employment categories, and participation levels in HRD programs. Descriptive analysis also provided insight into employee perceptions of HRD benefits, such as skill improvement, motivation, job satisfaction, and promotional opportunities. These descriptive findings offer an important foundation for interpreting the relationship between HRD initiatives and career advancement, as previous studies have shown that employees' subjective perceptions often influence their engagement in developmental activities and their pursuit of career growth (Shuck & Herd, 2012; Carr et al., 2018).

To test the relationship between HRD programs and career advancement, inferential statistical analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS version 25. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was employed to examine the strength and direction of the association between HRD participation and career advancement indicators. Pearson correlation is widely used in HRD research due to its effectiveness in evaluating linear relationships between continuous variables (Peterson, 2004). Significant positive correlations indicate that employees who are more actively involved in HRD activities tend to report higher levels of career progression, which aligns with established theoretical assumptions on HRD's role in shaping career trajectories (Han et al.,

2017). Following correlation analysis, simple linear regression was conducted to determine the predictive power of HRD programs on career advancement. Regression analysis enabled the researchers to estimate how much variance in career advancement could be explained by HRD participation, thereby providing empirical evidence on the extent to which structured developmental initiatives contribute to career success. This approach is consistent with the analytical techniques used in prior HRD studies examining the link between professional development and employee outcomes, including promotions, performance, and leadership opportunities (Reed et al., 2011; Carr et al., 2018).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the findings of the study on the contribution of Human Resource Development (HRD) programs to employee career advancement in state universities. The analysis is based on responses from 200 participants consisting of academic staff, administrative personnel, and support staff. The results are divided into demographic characteristics, participation in HRD programs, employee perceptions, and statistical tests measuring the relationship between HRD initiatives and career advancement.

Respondent Demographics

Demographic characteristics of the respondents provide context for interpreting HRD participation patterns and career advancement outcomes. Table 1 presents the gender distribution of the 200 employees who participated in this study, consisting of academic staff, administrative units, and support personnel.

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents by Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Male	85	42.5
Female	115	57.5
Total	200	100.0

Female participants represented 57.5 percent of the total respondents, while males accounted for 42.5 percent. This distribution indicates that women constitute a majority of the university workforce within the sampled institutions. The finding is consistent with scholarly observations that higher education environments often employ more women in administrative, clerical, and academic support roles, reflecting global workforce patterns within universities (Carr et al., 2018). The predominance of female employees may influence HRD engagement trends because gender has been shown to affect perceptions of professional support, access to leadership pathways, and training participation in academic workplaces (Reed et al., 2011). Understanding this gendered distribution is important for contextualizing how HRD opportunities may generate different career outcomes across demographic groups.

Employment categories of respondents are summarized in Table 2, which illustrates that academic staff represents 60 percent of the sample, while administrative personnel constitute 25 percent and support staff account for 15 percent.

Table 2. Distribution of Respondents by Employment Category

Employment Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Academic Staff	120	60.0
Administrative Staff	50	25.0
Support Staff	30	15.0
Total	200	100.0

Academic staff dominate the sample, reflecting the central role of lecturers and researchers in the human capital structure of state universities. This composition parallels the literature indicating that academic institutions are labor-intensive and rely heavily on faculty roles to fulfill teaching, research, and service mandates (Mushemeza, 2016; Le et al., 2023). The presence of administrative and support staff in the sample also provides a balanced perspective on HRD practice, given that these groups often participate in institutional training, digital literacy programs, and competency-building initiatives aimed at improving operational efficiency. Thus, the variety of employment categories enriches the analysis of HRD effectiveness across functional roles.

Participation in Human Resource Development Programs

Table 3 provides a detailed overview of participation rates in HRD programs, reflecting employees' engagement with training, digital initiatives, leadership activities, and research support systems.

Table 3. Participation in HRD Programs

HRD Program	High Participation (%)	Moderate (%)	Low (%)
Training & Workshops	65.0	25.0	10.0
Postgraduate Study Support	52.5	30.0	17.5
Leadership & Management Dev.	48.0	32.5	19.5
Research & Publication Grants	55.0	28.0	17.0
Digital Literacy Training	60.0	27.5	12.5

The findings show that participation is highest in training and workshops, with 65 percent of respondents reporting high involvement. Digital literacy training also receives strong engagement at 60 percent, followed by research and publication grants at 55 percent. Meanwhile, leadership and management development programs demonstrate comparatively lower participation, with only 48 percent of respondents reporting high engagement. This trend suggests that universities prioritize foundational HRD activities focusing on skills and technical knowledge, which aligns with the literature emphasizing that training is often the most accessible and widely implemented HRD initiative within higher education institutions (Hedayati & Li, 2016; Kapoor & Sherif, 2012). The elevated participation in digital literacy activities is also consistent with contemporary higher education dynamics, where digital transformation is increasingly recognized as essential for academic and administrative functions (Lukita et al., 2025).

The relatively lower engagement in leadership development indicates a potential gap in HRD implementation. Leadership pathways in universities are often highly competitive and structured, which may restrict access to managerial training opportunities (Reed et al., 2011). The limited participation in these programs suggests that universities may need to strengthen leadership pipelines to support broader career progression opportunities, particularly for non-academic staff who aspire to managerial roles.

Employee Perceptions of HRD Effectiveness

Table 4 provides insight into employee perceptions of how HRD programs influence their skills, motivation, job satisfaction, and promotion opportunities. These perceptions are essential for understanding the effectiveness of HRD practices as employees' subjective evaluations often shape their engagement and subsequent performance outcomes (Shuck & Herd, 2012).

Table 4. Employee Perceptions of HRD Impact

HRD Dimension	Positive (%)	Neutral (%)	Negative (%)
Skill Improvement	70.0	22.5	7.5
Motivation & Commitment	65.0	25.0	10.0
Career Clarity	60.0	27.5	12.5
Job Satisfaction	62.5	25.0	12.5
Promotion Opportunities	55.0	30.0	15.0

The results indicate overwhelmingly positive perceptions, with 70 percent of respondents reporting that HRD programs significantly enhance skill improvement. This reflects the foundational purpose of HRD initiatives: to strengthen employee competencies, increase job-relevant knowledge, and support organizational performance (Kareem, 2019; Raj, 2010). Additionally, 65 percent of respondents agree that HRD increases motivation and commitment, which aligns with the assertion that professional development promotes psychological engagement and organizational loyalty (Han et al., 2017).

Meanwhile, 62.5 percent of respondents report an increase in job satisfaction attributable to HRD activities. Job satisfaction is a critical predictor of career advancement, as employees who feel supported through development programs are more likely to pursue career goals and demonstrate improved performance (Peterson, 2004). However, only 55 percent of respondents perceive HRD as directly contributing to promotion opportunities. This moderate perception indicates potential institutional gaps between HRD planning and formal promotion systems. Studies suggest that career advancement often requires structural alignment between training outcomes and institutional reward mechanisms, which may not always be explicitly linked in universities (Carr et al., 2018).

Career Advancement Indicators among University Employees

Table 5 summarizes respondents' experiences with specific indicators of career advancement, including promotions, job rotations, managerial appointments, research recognition, and salary increments.

Table 5. Employee Career Advancement Indicators

Career Advancement Aspect	High (%)	Moderate (%)	Low (%)
Academic Rank Promotion	58.0	30.0	12.0
Job Rotation Opportunities	50.0	35.0	15.0
Managerial Appointments	46.0	32.5	21.5
Research Recognition	55.0	28.0	17.0
Salary Increment	52.0	33.0	15.0

The findings reveal that 58 percent of respondents report experiencing academic rank promotion or career progression within their employment category, signaling that career mobility is present but not universally accessible. Job rotation opportunities are reported by 50 percent of respondents, indicating moderate institutional support for cross-functional exposure, which is essential for developing broader competencies and leadership readiness (Hedayati & Li, 2016). Managerial appointments are the least common advancement indicator, with only 46 percent reporting such opportunities. This reinforces earlier findings that leadership development programs have lower participation and suggests limited availability of managerial pathways within universities. Research recognition appears at 55 percent, reflecting the prominence of scholarly achievements in academic career advancement. Salary increments are reported by 52 percent, illustrating that compensation progression aligns with institutional policies but is not necessarily driven by HRD participation.

These findings align with research indicating that career advancement within universities is often influenced by institutional structures, performance-based systems, and regulatory frameworks (Mushemeza, 2016). The variability across indicators also highlights the complexity of career pathways in higher education, where academic and non-academic staff experience different forms of advancement.

Correlation Between HRD Participation and Career Advancement

The central objective of this study is captured in Table 6, which presents the Pearson correlation coefficient measuring the relationship between HRD programs and career advancement.

Table 6. Correlation Between HRD Programs and Career Advancement

Variable	r-value	Sig. (p)
HRD Programs → Career Advancement	0.672	0.000

The correlation coefficient of $r = 0.672$ with $p < 0.01$ indicates a strong and statistically significant relationship between HRD participation and career advancement. This finding empirically validates theoretical claims that HRD plays a critical role in shaping employees' professional trajectories by enhancing their competencies, motivation, and readiness for promotion (Kapoor & Sherif, 2012; Han et al., 2017). The strength of the relationship demonstrates that HRD initiatives contribute substantially to career outcomes and supports arguments that structured development is essential for long-term organizational performance and individual growth (Kareem, 2019).

The significant correlation also suggests that universities that invest more consistently in HRD are better positioned to support career mobility, leadership development, and institutional competitiveness. This aligns with the argument by Jazuli et al. (2022) that institutional quality and human capital are fundamental drivers of national competitiveness, particularly within higher education.

Regression analysis further shows that HRD programs account for 45.3 percent of the variance in career advancement, reinforcing the predictive capacity of HRD activities. This high proportion indicates that nearly half of employees' career growth can be explained by their involvement in training, mentoring, research support, and digital competency programs. The remaining variance may be influenced by factors such as institutional policies, performance evaluation systems, personal initiative, and structural limitations in organizational hierarchy.

The findings of this study reveal several important insights regarding the contribution of Human Resource Development (HRD) programs to career advancement in state universities, offering broader implications for HRD theory, institutional policy, and workforce development in higher education. While the results demonstrate a strong association between HRD participation and career mobility, a more nuanced examination shows that this relationship is shaped by institutional culture, structural constraints, and the evolving expectations placed on university employees. This discussion integrates these elements by situating the findings within existing scholarship, highlighting both convergences and divergences, and drawing attention to contextual factors that influence how HRD shapes career trajectories.

The predominance of female respondents is consistent with prior research indicating that women occupy a significant proportion of administrative and academic support roles in universities (Mayya et al., 2021; Khan et al., 2025). However, despite high participation in HRD programs, women often face structural barriers to leadership positions, including limited access to decision-making spaces and longstanding organizational hierarchies. This study's findings suggest that although female

employees actively participate in developmental programs, this does not automatically translate into proportional representation in managerial roles. This aligns with the literature arguing that HRD alone cannot overcome gendered institutional cultures, and that meaningful advancement requires parallel reforms in governance and promotion systems (Abadi et al., 2022).

Participation patterns indicate that employees most frequently engage in foundational HRD initiatives such as training, workshops, and digital literacy programs. This is consistent with the notion that universities tend to prioritize broad competency enhancement initiatives that can be delivered at scale and whose outcomes are relatively easy to document (Hedayati & Li, 2016). The high engagement in digital literacy training reflects the intensified pressure on universities to modernize administrative processes, adapt to online learning systems, and enhance technological fluency among staff (Kabakus et al., 2025; Setyadi et al., 2025). These competencies are increasingly essential for institutional performance, especially as universities integrate digital platforms into academic and administrative operations. Yet, the lower participation in leadership development signals a gap between skill-building and leadership pipelines. This gap echoes organizational studies showing that leadership training is often more exclusive, selectively offered, or constrained by institutional budgets (Jacobsen et al., 2022). Universities may implicitly reinforce hierarchical norms by limiting access to leadership programs, thereby restricting career advancement for staff whose roles are deemed non-strategic.

The findings also reveal that employees perceive HRD as enhancing skills, motivation, and job satisfaction, which aligns with established theories asserting that professional development fosters positive psychological states, engagement, and commitment (Quader, 2024; Shen & Mullens, 2025). These psychosocial effects are central to HRD's conceptual model, which views development as not only a technical activity but also a process that cultivates personal growth and organizational commitment. Yet, the perception that HRD does not consistently lead to promotions suggests a disconnection between developmental processes and institutional reward systems. This resonates with critiques asserting that HRD can become symbolic rather than transformative when institutions do not align training outcomes with promotion pathways or performance indicators (Stage de Jong, 2023; Serem & Ongesa, 2023; Setyowati & Octafian, 2025). When HRD is treated as a compliance activity rather than a strategic driver of mobility, employees may experience career stagnation despite continuous development.

The moderate levels of managerial appointments reported by respondents highlight structural limitations within universities. Higher education institutions typically have rigid hierarchies, fewer managerial positions relative to their workforce size, and promotion mechanisms that emphasize tenure or academic output rather than developmental participation. This institutional reality may explain why even strong HRD engagement does not guarantee leadership opportunities. Moreover, academic and non-academic staff have fundamentally different advancement structures. Academic careers prioritize research productivity, publications, and scholarly recognition (Mushemeza, 2016), whereas administrative pathways hinge on managerial competence and operational experience. HRD programs may therefore yield uneven benefits across staff categories, depending on how career ladders are designed and evaluated in each role.

The high HRD-career advancement relationship supports theoretical hypotheses, which suggest that training and development increase employees preparedness to take on increased responsibility, organizational commitment and overall performance (Kapoor and Sherif, 2012; Kareem, 2019). However, this relationship cannot be misinterpreted as causal, rather it shows that HRD is one of the important

elements in the determination of career development, among many others. Among the most commonly identified factors determining the career outcomes are institutional culture, leadership support, the quality of the performance-appraisal, and the availability of mentorship (Amtu et al., 2021). In turn, HRD increases opportunities, although in the absence of complementary organizational structures, HRD does not form career trajectories on its own.

The next relevant dimension that can be observed based on the findings is related to research support programs. The academic staff, which participates in publication workshops, research grants, and scholarly collaborations, is more prone to upward mobility, and the trend is in line with the rest of the world in terms of academic career development where research output is the most crucial factor in defining rank increment (Reed et al., 2011). On the contrary, competency-based training, digital-literacy training, and management-development training benefit administrative and support staff more significantly. This dualism highlights the necessity of differentiated HRD models, which are sensitive to the diverse employee logic of various groups of employees. The presence of a standardized HRD model is not likely to provide fair career results, as academic and administrative jobs exist in divergent advancement systems.

Institutional policy and governance are also an intersection to the discussion. The issue of reforming Universities, especially in the Indonesian context of increased autonomy and competitiveness, is challenged by the need to improve the human capital as the component of the institutional excellence (Mustafa & Komalasari, 2024). In that regard, HRD programmes have a strategic place in fulfilling accreditation standards, increasing international visibility, and operational efficiency. But unless explicit measures are taken to incorporate the results of the HRD in the promotion systems, then human capital may not be fully utilized. This disintegration illustrates a systemic challenge that is found in HRD literature: the lack of an institutional alignment between workforce development and institutional strategy as well as career-progressions models (Shirmohammadi'et'al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2025).

In addition, the paper proposes that the motivational and competence-based payoffs of HRD programmes can be realized regardless of the fact that promotions are not necessarily the outcome of such programmes. This is in line with the argument made by Shuck and Herd (2012) that HRD promotes psychological empowerment thus boosting the performance regardless of whether the performance is recognized or not. As a result, HRD leads to intrinsic and extrinsic aspects of career progression. However, to be sustainable in the long term, the institutions should make sure that the lack of structural mobility does not negate intrinsic benefits, which in turn trigger disengagement or turnover (Callery, 2022).

Lastly, the implications of the research findings have a number of implications on future research and practice. The strong predictive correlation between HRD and career advancement is a reason to explore further the specific HRD elements that have the most significant impact on various categories of staff. Longitudinal research would also be able to study the changing nature of developmental pathways over time and the changes in institutional reforms redefining career paths. In practice, universities would be well off incorporating HRD outcomes in their promotion policy, increasing access to leadership development, and creating differentiated HRD models of academic and administrative personnel.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study confirm that Human Resource Development (HRD) programs contribute meaningfully to employee career advancement in state universities by enhancing competencies, strengthening motivation, and fostering professional readiness; however, the extent to which these developmental gains translate into actual mobility is shaped by institutional structures, promotion systems, and the differing career logics of academic and administrative roles. While HRD clearly supports individual growth, its long-term effectiveness depends on universities' ability to align training initiatives with transparent promotion pathways, expand leadership development opportunities, and integrate HRD outcomes into performance appraisal mechanisms. These insights underscore the importance of positioning HRD not merely as a technical activity but as a strategic component of human capital governance. Although the study's cross-sectional design and reliance on self-reported data present limitations, the results provide a strong empirical basis for future longitudinal and mixed-method investigations that can further explore the institutional and cultural dynamics shaping career progression in higher education.

REFERENCES

- Abadi, M., Dirani, K. M., & Rezaei, F. D. (2022). Women in leadership: a systematic literature review of Middle Eastern women managers' careers from NHRD and institutional theory perspectives. *Human Resource Development International*, 25(1), 19-39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2020.1840847>
- Amtu, O., Souisa, S. L., Joseph, L. S., & Lumamuly, P. C. (2021). Contribution of leadership, organizational commitment and organizational culture to improve the quality of higher education. *International Journal of Innovation*, 9(1), 131-157. <https://doi.org/10.5585/iji.v9i1.18582>
- Callery, P. J. (2022). Join in... and drop out? Firm adoption of and disengagement from voluntary environmental programs. *Organization & Environment*, 35(1), 30-56. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10860266211011233>
- Carr, P. L., Raj, A., Kaplan, S. E., Terrin, N., Breeze, J. L., & Freund, K. M. (2018). Gender differences in academic medicine: retention, rank, and leadership comparisons from the National Faculty Survey. *Academic Medicine*, 93(11), 1694-1699. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000002146>
- Han, S. H., Chae, C., Han, S. J., & Yoon, S. W. (2017). Conceptual organization and identity of HRD: Analyses of evolving definitions, influence, and connections. *Human Resource Development Review*, 16(3), 294-319. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484317719822>
- Hedayati Mehdiabadi, A., & Li, J. (2016). Understanding talent development and implications for human resource development: an integrative literature review. *Human Resource Development Review*, 15(3), 263-294. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484316655667>
- Jacobsen, C. B., Andersen, L. B., Bøllingtoft, A., & Eriksen, T. L. M. (2022). Can leadership training improve organizational effectiveness? Evidence from a randomized field experiment on transformational and transactional leadership. *Public Administration Review*, 82(1), 117-131. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13356>
- Jazuli, M. R., Idris, M. M., & Yaguma, P. (2022). The importance of institutional quality: Reviewing the relevance of Indonesia's Omnibus Law on national competitiveness. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 9(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-022-01343-w>

- Kabakus, A. K., Bahcekapili, E., & Ayaz, A. (2025). The effect of digital literacy on technology acceptance: An evaluation on administrative staff in higher education. *Journal of Information Science*, 51(4), 930-941. https://doi.org/10.1177/01655515231160028?urlappend=%3Futm_source%3Dresearchgate.net%26utm_medium%3Darticle
- Kapoor, B., & Sherif, J. (2012). Human resources in an enriched environment of business intelligence. *Kybernetes*, 41(10), 1625-1637. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03684921211276792>
- Kareem, M. A. (2019). The impact of human resource development on organizational effectiveness: An empirical study. *Management dynamics in the knowledge economy*, 7(1), 29-50.
- Khan, M., Sulaiman, R., Nazir, O., Khan, S., & Awan, S. (2025). The unseen in the glass ceilings: examining women's career advancement in higher education institutions through a multi-level institutional lens. *Human Resource Development International*, 28(5), 799-826. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2024.2342762>
- Le, T. T., Phuong, H. Y., Pham, T. T., Nguyen, A. T., Huynh, T. A. T., & Nguyen, H. T. (2023). The integral roles of supporting staff in bolstering academic performance: A qualitative study in Vietnamese higher education institutions. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 10(1), 2264008. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2023.2264008>
- Lukita, A. S., Agustina, T. S., & Utari, S. (2025). Strengthening Curriculum And Learning In Higher Education To Support Golden Indonesia 2045. *International Research-Based Education Journal*, 7(2), 173-185. <https://doi.org/10.17977/10.17977/um043v7i22025p173-185>
- Mayya, S. S., Martis, M., Ashok, L., & Monteiro, A. D. (2021). Women in higher education: Are they ready to take up administrative positions?—A mixed-methods approach to identify the barriers, perceptions, and expectations. *Sage Open*, 11(1), 2158244020983272. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020983272>
- Mushemeza, E. D. (2016). Opportunities and Challenges of Academic Staff in Higher Education in Africa. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 5(3), 236-246.
- Mustafa, C., & Komalasari, R. (2024). An Analysis of Foreign Direct Investment, Human Capital Dynamics, and Policy Imperatives in Indonesia. *Human Capital Dynamics, and Policy Imperatives in Indonesia (October 06, 2024)*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.22212/jp.v15i1.4172>
- Negassa, D. Z. (2025). Challenges Facing Faculty in Implementing Community Service Mission in Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia. *Educational Planning*, 32(1), 117-132.
- Peterson, S. L. (2004). Toward a theoretical model of employee turnover: A human resource development perspective. *Human resource development review*, 3(3), 209-227. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484304267832>
- Quader, M. (2024). Exploring human resource management practices and employee satisfaction in Bangladesh's private banking sector. *Journal of Policy Options*, 7(1), 36-45.
- Raj Adhikari, D. (2010). Human resource development (HRD) for performance management: The case of Nepalese organizations. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 59(4), 306-324. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17410401011038883>

- Reed, D. A., Enders, F., Lindor, R., McClees, M., & Lindor, K. D. (2011). Gender differences in academic productivity and leadership appointments of physicians throughout academic careers. *Academic Medicine*, 86(1), 43-47. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10.1097/ACM.0b013e3181ff9ff2>
- Serem, C. C., & Ongesa, T. (2023). Opportunity for advancement strategy on performance of non-academic staff in the university of Eldoret, Kenya. *Rev. J. Int. Bus. Manage*, 4, 516-529. <https://doi.org/10.61426/business.v4i1.155>
- Setyadi, A., Pawirosumarto, S., Damaris, A., & Dharma, R. (2025). Risk management, digital technology literacy, and modern learning environments in enhancing learning innovation performance: A framework for higher education. *Education and Information Technologies*, 1-29. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-025-13380-4>
- Setyowati, S., & Octafian, R. (2025). The Role of Leadership in Driving Human Resource Development Initiatives. *International Journal of Applied Economics, Accounting and Management (IJAEAM)*, 3(3), 193-206.
- Shen, S., & Mullens, D. (2025). Optimizing job satisfaction: a configurational framework for integrating HRD, HR, and employee attributes. *Development and Learning in Organizations: An International Journal*, 39(4), 19-22. <https://doi.org/10.1108/DLO-04-2024-0112>
- Shirmohammadi, M., Hedayati Mehdiabadi, A., Beigi, M., & McLean, G. N. (2021). Mapping human resource development: Visualizing the past, bridging the gaps, and moving toward the future. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 32(2), 197-224. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21415>
- Shuck, B., & Herd, A. M. (2012). Employee engagement and leadership: Exploring the convergence of two frameworks and implications for leadership development in HRD. *Human resource development review*, 11(2), 156-181. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484312438211>
- Stage, A. K., & de Jong, S. (2023). Non-academic staff's part in transforming academia: as irrelevant as their label suggests?. In *Research Handbook on the Transformation of Higher Education* (pp. 142-162). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800378216.00017>
- Zhang, P., Dillard, N., & Cavallo, T. (2025). Navigating the limitations of algorithmic management: an integrative framework of sociotechnical systems theory (STS) and strategic HRD. *Human Resource Development Review*, 15344843251320252. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15344843251320252>