Proceeding of 2nd International Conference on Education, Society and Humanity
e-ISSN : 2986-5832
p-ISSN : 2986-6979
Vol. 03 No. 01 (2025)
Available online at https://ejournal.unuja.ac.id/index.php/icesh

PERCEPTION OF STUDENTS ON TEACHING QUALITY: A STUDY OF ONE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY

Muhamad Taufik Hidayat[1,3], Atika Azzahro Hazima[1,2], Achmad Januar Arifin[1], Putri Pramesti Hening[1], Annisa Fitri[1], Tivana Aulia Sasmito[1]
[1] Department of Elementary School Teacher Education, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, Surakarta, Indonesia
[2] Teacher Professional Education, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
[3] School of Education, Culture, and Society, Monash University, Melbourne, Indonesia
*Email: mt.hidayat@ums.ac.id

Abstract

The Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) is a critical tool for ensuring the quality of higher education. However, SET results do not always comprehensively capture students' perspectives. Factors such as ambiguous evaluation forms, varying interpretations of questions, and the influence of non-academic factors on student responses can impact the reliability of the results. This research aims to reveal students' positive perceptions of the SET and uncover students' negative perceptions of the SET. This study employs a qualitative research method with a descriptive approach. The participants consisted of eight informants, including lecturers and students. Data collection methods included in-depth interviews. The data were analyzed using a thematic approach. The validity of the data was ensured through check and recheck, researcher diligence, time triangulation, researcher triangulation, rechecking, and confirmation with informants. The findings indicate that informants held positive and negative perceptions of various aspects of the learning process. Seven key criteria related to student satisfaction were identified, spanning both offline and online learning environments. These criteria were based on student evaluations conducted at the end of each semester. Overall, the perceptions provided by the informants were consistent with the lecturers' expertise and understanding in their respective fields.

Keywords: *SET, Evaluation, Perception, Students*

INTRODUCTION

The SET is an important instrument in maintaining the quality of higher education. This evaluation allows students to give feedback on the quality of teaching (1). By providing a space for students to express their opinions on their learning experience, SET not only helps identify the strengths and weaknesses of teaching but also supports the professional development of lecturers. It helps lecturers understand the needs and expectations of students more deeply, as well as improve their teaching methods to create a more effective learning environment that aligns with the times (2). However, it is important to note that SET results do not always entirely reflect students' perceptions. Various factors may affect the results, such as unclear evaluation forms, differences in understanding the questions, and non-academic factors influencing students'

responses.

The lack of ability to accurately describe students' perceptions can lead to significant consequences, such as a poor understanding of students' learning needs, decreased teaching effectiveness, and missed opportunities to develop more relevant teaching methods for them. If students' positive or negative perceptions are not adequately addressed, educational institutions may lose opportunities to improve teaching and enhance the student learning experience (3). This highlights the importance of exploring additional evaluation methods or qualitative approaches that can delve deeper into how students honestly respond to teaching from their lecturers.

Similar challenges are faced at Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta (UMS), where SET is used as a standard evaluation tool. However, the quality and validity of SET in assessing the quality of lecturers' teaching are still in question. Various studies have shown that the SET system does not fully reflect the complex variations in students' views on the quality of teaching. Therefore, research that directly compares SET results with students' perceptions qualitatively can provide a deeper understanding.

Previous research often focused solely on statistical analysis of SET data without considering the social and situational contexts that may influence students' perceptions (4); (5); (6); (7); (8); (9); (10); (11); (12); (13); (14); (15); (16); (17); (18). Furthermore, previous studies have shown inconsistent results regarding the validity of SET. Most studies found that SET is quite valid, as shown by (4) in Lesotho, (5) in the Netherlands, (6) in Malaysia, (8) in South Africa, (9) in India, (10) in South Korea, (12) in the United States, (13) in Costa Rica, (14) in the United States, and (17) in the UK. Other studies, however, found that SET lacks validity, as demonstrated in the research by (11) in Jordan, (7) in Nigeria, and (15) in the UK.

This highlights the importance of adopting a qualitative approach that allows researchers to explore how individual learning experiences, classroom dynamics, and social expectations can influence students' responses to teaching methods. The objectives of this study are to uncover students' positive perceptions of the SET and to uncover students' negative perceptions of SET. This research is expected to significantly contribute to our understanding of the effectiveness and relevance of SET in the context of higher education evaluation.

METHOD

Type and Design

This study uses a descriptive qualitative approach. This approach allows for an in-depth analysis of the differences between students' implicit perceptions of lecturers' teaching and the views openly expressed through the SET results (explicit expressions).

Data and Data Sources

The subjects and informants in this study are students from the Department of Elementary School Teacher Education at Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, Indonesia. The sample was purposively selected based on inclusion criteria, namely:

1. Active students,
2. Have completed courses with five selected lecturers,
3. Meeting sample variation and

4. Willing to participate in the study. Eight students participated, with the following details in Table 1.

Table 1 Informants and Student Subjects

No	Student Code	Class	Gender
1	MB	2019	Male
2	IS	2019	Female
3	AR	2020	Male
4	AM	2020	Female
5	DI	2021	Male
6	AU	2021	Female
7	FD	2022	Male
8	AN	2022	Female

Meanwhile, the sample of lecturers selected as research subjects was based on variations in gender and teaching experience, as detailed in Table 2.

Table 2 Lecturer

No	Lecturer Code	Teaching Experience	Gender
1	TU	>15 Years	Male
2	IP	>15 Years	Female
3	IM	>20 Years	Male
4	FC	<5 Years	Female
5	OZ	>15 Years	Male

Data Collection Technique

The data collection techniques in this study involved interviews. The researcher conducted in-depth interviews with students regarding eight aspects of the SET, including class organization, course materials, teaching methods, student interaction, feedback, learning media, library and supporting resources, and satisfaction level. After completing the interviews over several months, the researcher held a focus group discussion (FGD) with all the students. All statements from the interviews and FGD were recorded, and the key points were noted. These recordings were then transcribed for further analysis. The research data consisted of transcripts of in-depth interviews with informants and discussion transcripts from the FGD.

Data Validity

The validity of the data in this research is ensured through several methods, including check and recheck, researcher diligence, time triangulation, researcher triangulation, rechecking, and confirmation with informants.

Data analysis

Qualitative data obtained from interviews with students will be analyzed using a thematic approach. Key themes be extracted from the interview transcripts and classified based on recurring patterns.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

RESULT

The research findings indicate variations in informants' positive and negative perceptions across different criteria related to the learning process. Regarding classroom organization, lecturers are perceived positively when they explain learning objectives, provide a course contract aligned with its implementation, and maintain punctual class durations. Additionally, positive perceptions arise when lecturers appreciate students who turn on their cameras, coordinate the class effectively, and enforce agreed-upon penalties. On the other hand, lecturers are perceived negatively if class durations are not punctual, they fail to appreciate students on camera, rarely conduct face-to-face sessions, create course contracts unilaterally, and do not communicate learning objectives.

In the criterion of lecture materials, lecturers are perceived positively if they master the subject matter, provide direct demonstrations during practical sessions, use analogies to support explanations, deliver comprehensive and clear explanations, and provide e-books as supplementary materials. Additionally, lecturers are viewed positively if they reinforce learning, use bilingual instruction in English courses, incorporate grammar teaching during exercises, and check assignments during class sessions. Conversely, lecturers are perceived negatively if they randomly select students to ask or answer questions, conduct rigid teaching that confuses students, fail to explain the material and only assign tasks, rely solely on materials available on the learning management system (LMS), deliver incomplete explanations, limit teaching to PowerPoint slides, rely on external literature to answer students' questions during class, do not explain the material, or rely solely on student presentations for content delivery.

In the teaching method criteria, lecturers are perceived positively if they act as facilitators for discussion, the material is complete on open learning platforms, students practice independently in class with guidance from the lecturer, explanations are easy to understand, varied video learning media are used, and additional illustrations are provided for project-based assignments. Furthermore, lecturers are perceived positively if they present the material enthusiastically in class (moving around, ice-breaking, facial expressions, and engaging communication patterns with students) and use interesting methods tailored to the material (e.g., singing, writing trigger questions, and problem-solving tasks); and create a relaxed atmosphere with humour. On the other hand, lecturers are perceived negatively if they ask students to do exercises without providing a discussion, the class feels monotonous, there is a lack of enthusiasm in teaching, the focus remains on teacher-centred methods, students' mistakes are recorded, there are too many assignments, not all groups present their tasks, perfectionism leads to high expectations for students, and the lecturer remains seated in one spot.

In the criteria of interaction with students, lecturers are perceived positively if they respond well to students, engage in active discussions during lectures, prompt questions during Q&A sessions, and explain material actively. On the other hand, lecturers are perceived negatively if the lecture is passive, the lecturer's responses are negative, and students actively engage in discussions. However, the lecturer does not reinforce explaining the material. Additionally, lecturers are perceived negatively if they only communicate with the class leader outside of lectures and if the lectures are less interactive because students do not understand the material being explained.

In the feedback criteria for students, lecturers are perceived positively if they provide feedback, offer analogies when students do not understand, assist

during practical classes, and give evaluations after discussions, especially to moderators guiding the discussion. Meanwhile, lecturers are perceived negatively if they provide negative responses, fail to give feedback on assignments, or if the learning evaluations restrict students. Additionally, lecturers are perceived negatively if they provide overly complete material in the LMS, leaving no questions for students to ask, only engaging in class discussions, and not thoroughly covering the problems.

In the learning media criteria, lecturers are perceived positively if they conduct learning activities by fulfilling all the features available in the Learning Management System, using Google Drive for assignment submissions, using video links as learning media to facilitate knowledge transfer, using printed books and e-books as primary references, using two learning media, PowerPoint (PPT) slides and Video, using speakers as learning media in class during listening sessions and using Google Meet for online lectures. Meanwhile, lecturers are perceived negatively if they conduct learning activities with incomplete materials on the LMS, students have to search for materials independently, the learning media used only involve PPTs from students, use overly thick books as references, and the learning media are monotonous and lack variety.

In the criteria of references and supporting materials, lecturers are perceived positively if they provide video links, PPTs, practice exercise files, material summaries, and practical videos created by the lecturers as supporting references to reinforce learning, all of which can be accessed anytime on the LMS. On the other hand, lecturers are perceived negatively if they do not provide references and only use PPTs from the students.

DISCUSSION

The first criterion of this study found that when lecturers explain the learning objectives and the course contract for the upcoming semester, the informants positively perceive it. This finding aligns with the findings of (19), who emphasize the importance of instructors preparing the lesson plan and curriculum before the course begins, which is considered one of the most important aspects of teaching. Additionally, the importance of lecturers being present in class according to the scheduled timetable and the preference for face-to-face teaching was valued by students. Therefore, developing a syllabus based on the curriculum and the programs offered to students is crucial. (20) revealed that the reliability of the course is high in dimensions that measure the reliability of higher education in providing services to students, with indicators such as (a) the lecturer's ability to deliver teaching methods as promised and (b) how accurately the lecturer provides the material. Lecturers also prepare lesson plans with appropriate durations in line with the class hours, which is supported by (21), who explains that clarity regarding the course plan for the semester, as well as explaining the material and course objectives, positively impacts the effectiveness of the course for the informants. However, suppose lecturers fail to communicate the learning objectives. In that case, if class hours do not align with the contract or less active students are selected to ask questions, these are seen as unfavourable (22).

The second criterion of this study found that informants mentioned that if lecturers master the learning material, it is considered positive because it allows for direct demonstrations in the classroom, such as providing relevant examples from the concepts being taught (21). Furthermore, lecturers reinforce the material by summarizing the lesson and involving students at the end of the

learning process (23), during which the lecturer also assesses the assignments. However, lecturers emphasize that students should not focus solely on grades but remain active in classroom learning (23). On the other hand, when lecturers' grading lacks objectivity, students perceive the evaluation as incomplete. This is due to the lecturer's rigid explanation and failure to clarify the material, instead merely assigning independent tasks for students to complete, which makes it difficult for students to understand the content (20).

The third criterion concerns teaching methods. Informants suggested that in delivering material, the lecture method can be employed with more varied styles in terms of delivery, appearance, voice intonation, and learning media, resulting in lectures that are engaging, positively valued, and well-received by students (24). The dimension of delivering concepts is relevant when linked to real-life examples (21). Additionally, lecturers often provide practical tutorials explained directly through videos, which enhances students' motivation toward assignments and projects in the coursework (Handican et al., 2023). However, some lecturers lack synchronous classes during online learning, which students perceive as unfavourable (19). Furthermore, (25) stated that delivering material in an overly serious manner and tense makes students feel uncomfortable. As a result, assignments are often given without further explanation, and the type of assignments varies from lecturer to lecturer (26).

The fourth criterion pertains to interactions with students. A lecturer's social abilities include expressing opinions, accepting criticism and others' viewpoints, getting to know students well, building rapport with students, staff, and colleagues, and tolerating student diversity (27). However, some lecturers do not engage in discussions or question-and-answer sessions with students in class, which causes students to feel sleepy or unfocused during learning. Since not all students can accept certain remarks, negative responses may lead to uncomfortable assessments. Some students have suggested that spontaneous behaviours should be improved (28). One factor indicating student satisfaction with lecturers' performance in student engagement is when lecturers facilitate interactions with their students, enhance student participation, and demonstrate openness to student input (23). Stimulating education fosters critical thinking and innovative ideas (29). Delivering more varied lectures in terms of style, appearance, voice intonation, and teaching media makes lectures more engaging for students and leads to optimal learning outcomes. No students ask questions when the lecturer explains the material or provides an opportunity for inquiries. Students lack the motivation to seek additional information or study the material already taught or scheduled to be taught. Students tend to passively accept the lecture's material rather than actively engage with it. According to the students interviewed, they are generally disinterested in exploring information or content to comprehend it fully. They primarily rely on the lessons and materials the lecturer provides (30). Research by (31) found that two-way interaction between educators and students significantly aids lecturers' teaching. This reciprocal interaction also positively impacts learning outcomes.

The fifth criterion for students is that lecturers are perceived positively if they provide feedback to students and offer analogies when students do not understand (21). (32) stated that through lecturers' reflections, several improvements in lectures had been observed: a) The implementation of PBI (Problem-Based Instruction) learning runs as planned with improvements made in each cycle, b) PBI learning activities have successfully increased students' independence in constructing their knowledge to achieve essential competencies,

c) student engagement has improved, and d) student learning mastery is achieved, demonstrated not only through learning outcomes but also through a learning process that is student-centred. Lecturers observed that during computer practice, students rarely asked questions. This might indicate that they understand the material or are merely following the flow. Only a few genuinely understand how to use a computer. The questions that arise are usually technical regarding practice. When lecturers provide opportunities to ask questions, no one does. Students lack the motivation to seek information independently and merely receive material from lecturers without curiosity. This is also evident from interviews, where students tend to be passive and merely follow lessons without trying to understand more deeply (33).

The sixth criterion, research indicates that students assess lecturers' knowledge/ professionalism in utilizing educational technology to enhance teaching and learning effectiveness (34). However, (35) stated that the lack of teaching materials affects the quality of teaching and learning. The study concluded that the scarcity of teaching materials is one of the main factors influencing the quality of teaching and learning. The study recommends that universities provide adequate teaching materials to create a conducive learning environment.

The seventh criterion highlights the importance of lecturers determining books students should read in class. The study by (36) found that students assess lecturers based on their knowledge, professional practices, and use of educational technology to enhance teaching and learning efficiency. Insufficient learning materials affect the quality of teaching and learning. Research findings indicate that students evaluate lecturers' knowledge, professional practices, and the application of educational technology to improve the quality of teaching and learning. Inadequate library resources impact the quality of teaching and learning (37).

CONCLUSION

The novelty of this research lies in its exploration of students' perceptions of SET through a qualitative approach, analysis of specific factors such as the clarity of learning objectives and lecturer-student interaction, development of more effective evaluation instruments, and application within a specific higher education context. This approach provides a more profound understanding of enhancing the quality of teaching and higher education in Indonesia.

The limitations of this study include the following: the research only involved students from specific study programs, which may not represent the entire student body at the university. Students' evaluations of lecturers are subjective and may be influenced by personal experiences. The study was conducted within a limited timeframe and location, which could affect the results. Students' methods of evaluating lecturers may vary depending on their understanding. The qualitative approach allows researchers to make differing interpretations. Other factors, such as university policies or students' social conditions, may not have been measured in this study. These limitations should be considered to understand the research findings better.

This study has several important implications. For lecturers, the findings can be utilized to improve the quality of teaching, interactions, communication, and teaching methods. The study helps educational institutions design faculty training programs and evaluate performance objectively and sustainably. For students, it encourages active participation in evaluations and provides

constructive feedback to enhance teaching quality. Furthermore, this research is a foundation for further in-depth studies on factors influencing teaching quality and learning experiences, employing broader methods and sample scopes. Thus, the findings are expected to contribute to the overall improvement of higher education quality.

REFERENCES

1. Prasetio T. Umpan Balik Pada Model Pembelajaran Hybrid Mata Kuliah Ekonomi di Masa Pandemi COVID-19. J Perspekt. 2022;20(1):90–8.
2. Patah Herwanto R. Mengoptimalkan Pembelajaran Online melalui AI: Peran dan Sikap Dosen dalam Meningkatkan Keterlibatan dan Kualitas Pembelajaran Mahasiswa. STMIK-IM. 2023;(7).
3. Ati S, Rohmiyati Y, Danny DE, Taufik A. Persepsi Mahasiswa Fib Undip terhadap Electronic Library Upt Perpustakaan Universitas Diponegoro. Humanika [Internet]. 2013;239–53. Available from: https://ejournal.undip.ac.id/index.php/humanika/article/view/5323%0Ahttps://ejournal.undip.ac.id/index.php/humanika/article/download/5323/4784
4. Khaola P, Thetsane R. The validity and reliability of student teaching evaluation at the National University of Lesotho. Int J African High Educ. 2021;8(1):139–57.
5. Knol MH, Dolan C V, Mellenbergh GJ, van der Maas HLJ. Measuring the quality of university lectures: development and validation of the instructional skills questionnaire (ISQ). PLoS One. 2016;11(2):e0149163.
6. Khong TL. The Validity and Reliability of the Student Evaluation of Teaching: A Case in a Private Higher Educational Institution in Malaysia. Int J Innov Educ Res. 2016;2(9):57–63.
7. Odukoya J, Atayero A, Alao A, Afolabi A. The Concurrent And Predictive Validity Of Covenant University Students'evaluation Of Lecturers'teaching Competence. In: EDULEARN14 Proceedings. IATED; 2014. p. 6316–23.
8. Montshiwa VT, Moroke ND. Assessment of the reliability and validity of student-lecturer evaluation questionnaire: A case of North West University. Mediterr J Soc Sci. 2014;5(14):352–64.
9. Mittal S, Gera R, Batra DK. Evaluating the validity of student evaluation of teaching effectiveness (SET) in India. Educ Train. 2015;57(6):623–38.
10. Lee K-H. A study on validity and reliability of students' evaluation. J Korean Data Inf Sci Soc. 2010;21(1):87–98.
11. Cook C, Jones J, Al-Twal A. Validity and fairness of utilizing student evaluation of teaching (SET) as a primary performance measure. J Furth High Educ. 2022;46(2):172–84.
12. Zhao J, Gallant DJ. Student evaluation of instruction in higher education: Exploring issues of validity and reliability. Assess Eval High Educ. 2012;37(2):227–35.
13. Alvarez RA, Miranda MO. Fiabilidad y validez en la evaluación docente universitaria. Rev Electrónica" Actual Investig en Educ. 2010;10(1):1–38.
14. Sonntag ME, Bassett JF, Snyder T. An empirical test of the validity of student evaluations of teaching made on RateMyProfessors. com. Assess Eval High

Educ. 2009;34(5):499–504.
15. Shevlin M, Banyard P, Davies M, Griffiths M. The validity of student evaluation of teaching in higher education: love me, love my lectures? Assess Eval High Educ. 2000;25(4):397–405.
16. Yimam W. Students Evaluations of Instructors' Performance in Higher Education Institutions: What Research Has to Say. Ethiop J High Educ. 2005;2(2):73–101.
17. Fox R. Validating lecturer effectiveness questionnaires in accounting. Account Educ. 1994;3(3):249–58.
18. Battle J, Fabick S. Validity of college students' evaluations of instructors' competence. Psychol Rep. 1975;37(3_suppl):1112–4.
19. Hsb RH, Berutu FR, Lestari D. Analisis Kepuasan Mahasiswa Terhadap Kinerja Mengajar Dosen UINSU. Madani J Ilm Multidisiplin. 2023;1(6).
20. Sukmanasa E, Novita L, Siti F. Analisis Kepuasan Mahasiswa Terhadap Kinerja Dosen Program Studi Pendidikan Guru Sekolah Dasar Universitas Pakuan. Pedago J Ilm Pendidik. 2017;1(2):91–9.
21. Neswardi S, Yoyet E, Yuanita I, Iwadiah I. Analisis Tingkat Kepuasan Mahasiswa terhadap Kinerja Dosen Program Studi Administrasi Bisnis Politeknik Negeri Padang. JIIP-Jurnal Ilm Ilmu Pendidik. 2022;5(3):845–51.
22. Amalia AR, Uswatun DA. Analisis Respon Mahasiswa dalam Penerapan Group Work Rules pada Metode Presentasi di Program Studi Pendidikan Guru Sekolah Dasar. J Holistika [Internet]. 2019;3(2):81–8. Available from: https://jurnal.umj.ac.id/index.php/holistika/article/view/5357
23. Dedeh. Analisis Tingkat Kepasan Mahasiswa Terhadap Layanan Akademik. J Wahana Pendidik. 2018;5(1):1–9.
24. Junaedi A, Sjafrizal T. Komunikasi dosen dengan mahasiswa dalam kegiatan pembelajaran melalui metode ceramah. J Ekon Sos Hum [Internet]. 2020;01(09):30–40. Available from: https://www.jurnalintelektiva.com/index.php/jurnal/article/view/116
25. Mutawakkil M, Nuraedah N. Gaya Komunikasi Dosen dalam Pembelajaran Mahasiswa. Commun J Ilmu Komun. 2019;3(2):135–52.
26. Yuliana Y, Aribowo EK, Setianingtyas AF. Persepsi Mahasiswa terhadap Profil Dosen Menggunakan Analisis Konjoin. Indones J Educ Sci. 2021;3(2):84–97.
27. Yohanita P. Persepsi mahasiswa terhadap kompetensi dosen di Fakultas Ekonomi Unika Soegijapranata. Ecodunamika. 2018;1(2):1–10.
28. Khusniati M, Fibriana F. Analisis Kepuasan Mahasiswa Prodi Pendidikan IPA terhadap Kinerja Dosen dalam Rangka Persiapan Akreditasi. In: Seminar Nasional MIPA 2016. 2017.
29. Halim A. Signifikansi dan Implementasi Berpikir Kritis dalam Proyeksi Dunia Pendidikan Abad 21 Pada Tingkat Sekolah Dasar. J Indones Sos Teknol. 2022;3(3):404–18.
30. Alisalman M, Berau S. DIKLUS: Jurnal Pendidikan Luar Sekolah Pembelajaran Partisipatif Sebagai Metode dalam Meningkatkan Hasil Belajar Mahasiswa. DIKLUS J Pendidik Luar Sekol [Internet]. 2022;1(6):2022–66. Available from: https://doi.org/10.21831/diklus.v6i1.48572
31. Siagian REF, Nurfitriyanti M. Metode Pembelajaran Inquiry dan Pengaruhnya terhadap Hasil Belajar Matematika ditinjau dari Kreativitas Belajar. Form J

Ilm Pendidik MIPA. 2015;2(1):35–44.
32. Telaumbanua A. Teori Belajar Behavioristik dalam Meningkatkan Kemampuan Merespon Materi Perkuliahan. DIDAKTIKOS: Jurnal Pendidikan Agama…, 3 (1), 49–59. J Pendidik Agama. 2020;
33. Febrilia BRA, Nissa IC, Pujilestari P, Setyawati DU. Analisis Keterlibatan Dan Respon Mahasiswa Dalam Pembelajaran Daring Menggunakan Google Classroom Di Masa Pandemi Covid-19. FIBONACCI J Pendidik Mat dan Mat. 2020;6(2):175.
34. Yana D, Adam A. Efektivitas Penggunaan Platform Lms Sebagai Media Pembelajaran Berbasis Blended Learning Terhadap Hasil Belajar Mahasiswa. J Dimens. 2019;8(1):1–12.
35. Muzaki H. Pengembangan Bahan Ajar BIPA Tingkat 3 Berbasis Budaya Lokal Malang. J Ilm Semant. 2021;2(02):1–9.
36. Nur Efendi, Muh Ibnu Sholeh. Manajemen Pendidikan Dalam Meningkatkan Mutu Pembelajaran. Acad J Teach Learn. 2023;2(2):68–85.
37. Titin TD. Hubungan Antara Sarana Prasarana, Kualitas Pelayanan dan Kepuasan Mahasiswa: Perspektif dan Implikasinya. J Bisnisman Ris Bisnis dan Manaj. 2023;4(3):92–100.