

## The Influence of Program Managers' Competence, the Quality of Mentoring, and Organizational Support on Student Satisfaction Through Student Engagement in the Jakarta Masa Depan Program

Rasidah Azidah<sup>1\*</sup>, Rita Yuni Mulyanti<sup>2</sup>, A.M Soma<sup>3</sup>

Program Studi Magister Manajemen, Universitas Teknologi Muhammadiyah Jakarta, Indonesia

**Corresponding Author:** Rasidah Azidah [rasidahazidah@gmail.com](mailto:rasidahazidah@gmail.com)

---

### ARTICLE INFO

*Keywords:* Program Manager Competence; Student Mentoring Quality; Perceived Organizational Support; Student Engagement; Student Satisfaction

*Received :* 27, July

*Revised :* 23, August

*Accepted:* 25, September

©2026 Azidah, Mulyanti, Soma: This is an open access article distributed under the terms of [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/).



### ABSTRACT

The Future of Jakarta (MDJ) Program is an educational assistance and student development program administered by BAZNAS (BAZIS) DKI Jakarta. This study analyzes the effects of Program Manager Competence, Student Mentoring Quality, and Perceived Organizational Support on Student Satisfaction, both directly and indirectly through Student Engagement as a mediating variable. The study employed an explanatory quantitative approach using a cross-sectional survey design on 237 active recipients of the MDJ Program in 2026, selected through purposive sampling from 242 submitted responses. Data were collected using a 47-item five-point Likert questionnaire and analyzed using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) with SmartPLS 4. The measurement model evaluation revealed that the research instrument failed to meet validity and reliability requirements: all outer loadings fell below 0.70 (0.266–0.575), all Average Variance Extracted values fell below 0.50 (0.163–0.224), all Cronbach's Alpha values fell below 0.70 (0.424–0.563), and all Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio values exceeded 1.00. The structural model, reported for completeness, yielded ten of ten statistically significant hypotheses, with  $R^2$  values of 0.516 for Student Engagement and 0.621 for Student Satisfaction. These results, however, cannot support substantive conclusions because the constructs tested were not demonstrably valid or reliable.

---

## **INTRODUCTION**

The Jakarta Future Program (MDJ) is an educational assistance program for students with active Jakarta ID cards, organized by the Jakarta National Azizah Agency (BAZNAS) (BAZIS). In 2026, the program served 3,016 students from 35 partner universities with an annual grant of Rp6,000,000 per student and a total allocation of Rp18.096 billion, and has reached 24,304 cumulative beneficiaries since its launch in 2019 (BAZNAS, 2026). In addition to financial assistance, the program provides academic mentoring, life skills training, leadership development, and other self-development activities, making MDJ an educational service ecosystem that demands professional management, quality mentoring, and consistent organizational support.

The urgency of educational assistance remains relevant even though DKI Jakarta is the national economic center; the Gross Enrollment Rate of DKI Jakarta universities in 2025 only reached 41.78% (BPS, 2025). However, the main problem of this research stems from the actual experiences of beneficiaries: a pre-survey of 30 MDJ recipient students showed that 63.3% of respondents stated that they were not satisfied, with the themes of complaints being suboptimal communication, limited intensity of mentoring, responses that were considered slow to students' needs, and unequal involvement in mentoring activities (Researcher Pre-survey, 2026). These initial findings became the basis for selecting research variables: complaints about communication and responses lead to Program Manager Competence; limited mentoring leads to Student Mentoring Quality; assessments of organizational attention and fairness lead to Perceived Organizational Support (POS); inequality of involvement leads to Student Engagement; and the level of dissatisfaction indicates the initial condition of Student Satisfaction.

Literature reviews of higher education services indicate that competence, responsiveness, empathy, and service quality are associated with student satisfaction (Darawong & Widayati, 2022; Seitova et al., 2024). Mentoring that provides guidance, access to consultation, and feedback has been shown to strengthen student engagement and satisfaction in higher education (Krause & Moore, 2022; Prananto et al., 2025). Perceived organizational support from students has the potential to increase engagement through attention, fairness, and resource provision (Ababneh et al., 2025; Li et al., 2025), while student engagement has been shown to mediate satisfaction in academic contexts (Assefa et al., 2025; Navio-Marco et al., 2024). However, most of this research has been conducted in the context of lectures or campus services, rather than on zakat-based social scholarship programs involving multiple universities, and the integration of these three organizational antecedents into a single model is still limited.

Based on these phenomena and gaps, this study aims to test and analyze the direct influence of Program Manager Competence, Student Mentoring Quality, and Perceived Organizational Support on Student Satisfaction, as well as its indirect influence through Student Engagement as a mediating variable, on active recipient students of the MDJ Program in 2026. The novelty of this research is contextual, namely testing the resources-engagement-satisfaction model in a

zakat-based social scholarship program with 3,016 active recipients from 35 partner universities, something that has not been widely found in the literature on student engagement and satisfaction which generally focuses on the context of formal learning.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

This research model is built on three layers of theory. The grand theory used is Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964), which explains that receiving benefits and positive treatment from an organization creates reciprocal obligations in the form of involvement and loyalty. The supporting theory is Organizational Support Theory (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Kurtessis et al., 2017), which emphasizes that perceived organizational support (POS) fosters a sense of appreciation and belonging. A complementary middle theory is Study Demands–Resources Theory (Bakker & Mostert, 2024), which views manager competence, mentoring quality, and POS as resources that increase student energy and engagement.

Program Manager Competence refers to Competency Theory (Boyatzis, 1982; Spencer & Spencer, 1993) and is measured by students' perceptions of the manager's understanding of the program, communication skills, problem-solving, professionalism, and responsiveness. Student Mentoring Quality refers to Mentoring Functions Theory (Arthur & Kram, 1985; Crisp & Cruz, 2009; Nabi et al., 2025) which includes access to consultation, progress monitoring, feedback, and self-development support. Perceived Organizational Support is adapted to the context of program beneficiaries, reflecting students' beliefs that the organizers value recipients, care about their well-being, and respond to their aspirations (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Student Engagement refers to behavioral, emotional, and cognitive dimensions (Fredricks et al., 2004; Kahu & Nelson, 2018) that are specifically directed at student involvement in MDJ Program activities. Student Satisfaction refers to the Expectancy–Disconfirmation Theory and the service quality perspective (Oliver, 1980; Parasuraman et al., 1988), namely the evaluation of the suitability between expectations and the service experience received.

Based on the theoretical framework, the structural model of the study is written as  $SE = \beta_1 KPP + \beta_2 KPM + \beta_3 POS + \varepsilon_1$ , and  $KM = \beta_4 KPP + \beta_5 KPM + \beta_6 POS + \beta_7 SE + \varepsilon_2$ , with indirect effects of  $\beta_1 \times \beta_7$ ,  $\beta_2 \times \beta_7$ , and  $\beta_3 \times \beta_7$ . Based on the model, ten research hypotheses are formulated: program manager competence (H1), student mentoring quality (H2), and perceived organizational support (H3) have a positive effect on student engagement; program manager competence (H4), student mentoring quality (H5), perceived organizational support (H6), and student engagement (H7) have a positive effect on student satisfaction; and student engagement mediates the influence of program manager competence (H8), quality of student mentoring (H9), and perceived organizational support (H10) on student satisfaction.

## METHODOLOGY

This study used a quantitative explanatory approach with a cross-sectional survey design to examine the structural relationships between variables (Sugiyono, 2023). The study location was the Jakarta Future Program managed by BAZNAS (BAZIS) DKI Jakarta, with recipients spread across 35 partner universities, so data collection was conducted online from February–June 2026. The study population was all 3,016 active MDJ student recipients in 2026. A sample of 237 respondents was determined from 242 responses received through a purposive sampling technique, with the criteria for respondents being active recipients who had participated in at least one coaching or mentoring activity. This sample size exceeded the minimum requirement of 85 respondents calculated through statistical power analysis (effect size 0.15;  $\alpha = 0.05$ ; power = 0.80) for the endogenous construct with the four most predictors (Hair et al., 2021).

Data were collected through a 47-item five-point Likert scale questionnaire measuring the five research constructs: Program Manager Competence (10 items), Student Mentoring Quality (10 items), Perceived Organizational Support (8 items), Student Engagement (9 items), and Student Satisfaction (10 items). Data analysis used Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) assisted by SmartPLS 4 software, because it is able to test direct and indirect relationships simultaneously in models with mediating variables (Hair et al., 2021). Evaluation of the measurement model (outer model) was carried out through convergent validity (outer loading > 0.70; AVE > 0.50), construct reliability (Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability > 0.70), and discriminant validity (Fornell-Larcker criterion and Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio/HTMT < 0.90). Evaluation of the structural model (inner model) was carried out through the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ), effect size ( $f^2$ ), predictive relevance ( $Q^2$ ), and collinearity examination (Variance Inflation Factor/VIF). Hypothesis testing was carried out through a bootstrapping procedure with 5,000 subsamples in a two-tailed test at a significance level of 5%, with the hypothesis criteria being supported if the p-value < 0.05, t-statistic > 1.96, and the 95% confidence interval does not include the zero value.

## RESEARCH RESULTS

### *Evaluation of Measurement Model (Outer Model)*

Convergent validity evaluation showed that none of the 47 indicators had an outer loading value above 0.70; all values ranged from 0.266 to 0.575, with the lowest value in the KPP3 indicator (0.266) and the highest in the SE2 indicator (0.575). A summary of the construct validity and reliability results is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of Convergent Validity and Construct Reliability

| Construct                        | Outer Loading Range | Cronbach's Alpha | Composite Reliability | AVE   |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------|
| Program Manager Competencies     | 0.266–0.513         | 0.424            | 0.654                 | 0.163 |
| Quality of Student Mentoring     | 0.348–0.507         | 0.504            | 0.689                 | 0.183 |
| Perceived Organizational Support | 0.372–0.532         | 0.473            | 0.683                 | 0.214 |
| Student Engagement               | 0.325–0.575         | 0.563            | 0.717                 | 0.224 |
| Student Satisfaction             | 0.337–0.503         | 0.540            | 0.708                 | 0.197 |

*Source: Results of primary data processing with PLS-SEM (2026).*

All AVE values were below 0.50 (range 0.163–0.224), all Cronbach's Alphas were below 0.70 (0.424–0.563), and all Composite Reliabilities were below 0.70 (0.654–0.717), with the average inter-item correlation within a construct only ranging from 0.067–0.122. The discriminant validity evaluation using the Fornell-Larcker criterion was also not met for any pair of constructs, because all inter-construct correlations (0.564–0.691) exceeded the square root of the AVE of each construct. Further testing using the Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT) showed that all values were above the threshold of 0.90, even exceeding 1.00 (range 1.196–1.883), with the highest value in the pair of Perceived Organizational Support and Student Satisfaction (1.883). Cross-loading examination also strengthened this conclusion: six of the 47 indicators (KPP1, KPP3, SE7, SE8, KM3, and KM4) even had the highest loading not on their own construct. Thus, the five research constructs could not be empirically distinguished based on the collected data, and all criteria of the measurement model – convergent validity, reliability, and discriminant validity – were not met.

#### ***Structural Model Evaluation (Inner Model)***

Although the measurement model did not meet the requirements, the structural model evaluation is still presented for completeness of reporting and is exploratory in nature. The  $R^2$  values of 0.516 for Student Engagement and 0.621 for Student Satisfaction are in the moderate category, but cannot be interpreted as true theoretical explanatory power because the latent variable scores are largely a weighted combination of measurement errors. All effect size ( $f^2$ ) values are in the small category (0.034–0.169), with the largest contributions from Student Mentoring Quality to Student Engagement ( $f^2 = 0.169$ ) and from Student Engagement to Student Satisfaction ( $f^2 = 0.118$ ). The predictive relevance ( $Q^2$ ) values of 0.097 for Student Engagement and 0.101 for Student Satisfaction are above zero but are relatively small. Collinearity checks show that all Inner VIF values are in the range of 1.732–2.245, below the threshold of 3, so there is no collinearity problem between predictors.

**Direct Effect Hypothesis Testing**

Bootstrapping tests with 5,000 subsamples show that all seven direct effect hypotheses (H1–H7) are statistically supported at the 5% level, as presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Results of Direct Effect Hypothesis Testing

| Hypothesis | Path Relationship                         | Coefficient | t-statistic | P-value | Decision  |
|------------|-------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|---------|-----------|
| H1         | KPP → Student Engagement                  | 0.238       | 3,022       | 0.003   | Supported |
| H2         | KPM → Student Engagement                  | 0.396       | 4,212       | <0.001  | Supported |
| H3         | POS → Student Engagement                  | 0.197       | 2,598       | 0.009   | Supported |
| H4         | KPP → Student Satisfaction                | 0.198       | 2,505       | 0.012   | Supported |
| H5         | KPM → Student Satisfaction                | 0.227       | 2,861       | 0.004   | Supported |
| H6         | POS → Student Satisfaction                | 0.207       | 2,541       | 0.011   | Supported |
| H7         | Student Engagement → Student Satisfaction | 0.304       | 4,345       | <0.001  | Supported |

Source: Results of primary data processing with PLS-SEM (2026).

The biggest influence on Student Engagement comes from the Quality of Student Mentoring ( $\beta = 0.396$ ), followed by Program Manager Competence ( $\beta = 0.238$ ) and Perceived Organizational Support ( $\beta = 0.197$ ). On Student Satisfaction, the biggest influence comes from Student Engagement ( $\beta = 0.304$ ), followed by the Quality of Student Mentoring ( $\beta = 0.227$ ), Perceived Organizational Support ( $\beta = 0.207$ ), and Program Manager Competence ( $\beta = 0.198$ ).

**Testing the Indirect and Mediation Effects of Student Engagement**

Testing of specific indirect effects shows that all three mediation paths (H8–H10) are statistically significant, as presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Results of Indirect Effect Testing

| Hypothesis | Mediation Path                  | Indirect Effect | t-statistic | p-value | Decision  |
|------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|---------|-----------|
| H8         | KPP → SE → Student Satisfaction | 0.072           | 2,577       | 0.010   | Supported |
| H9         | KPM → SE → Student Satisfaction | 0.120           | 3,115       | 0.002   | Supported |
| H10        | POS → SE → Student Satisfaction | 0.060           | 2,176       | 0.030   | Supported |

*Source: Results of primary data processing with PLS-SEM (2026).*

Because the direct and indirect paths in the three relationships are equally significant and unidirectional, the pattern formed is complementary partial mediation on all paths H8, H9, and H10. The largest indirect influence comes from the Quality of Student Mentoring on Student Satisfaction through Student Engagement (0.120), followed by Program Manager Competence (0.072) and Perceived Organizational Support (0.060), with the POS path being the relatively weakest mediation path because the lower limit of its confidence interval is closest to zero.

## DISCUSSION

In terms of relationship patterns, the results of this test are consistent with the direction predicted by Social Exchange Theory and Organizational Support Theory: students who perceive program managers as competent, mentoring as high-quality, and the organization as supportive tend to show higher engagement and satisfaction (Darawong & Widayati, 2022; Krause & Moore, 2022; Prananto et al., 2025; Ababneh et al., 2025). The role of Student Mentoring Quality as the strongest predictor of Student Engagement aligns with findings that student-to-student mentoring strengthens relationships and engagement in higher education (Krause & Moore, 2022; Li et al., 2025), while the role of Student Engagement as the strongest predictor of Student Satisfaction supports evidence that engagement is an explanatory pathway to satisfaction (Assefa et al., 2025; Navio-Marco et al., 2024).

However, this pattern of relationships should be read with one caveat in mind: the measurement model in this study does not meet any of the validity and reliability criteria. When a construct explains only about 16–22% of the variance in its own indicator and the average inter-item correlation within a construct is only 0.067–0.122—far below the 0.40–0.70 range typical for well-functioning attitude instruments—the latent variable scores used in the structural model cannot be guaranteed to represent the intended theoretical construct (Hair et al., 2021). Consistent with this guideline, all path coefficients,  $R^2$  values, and hypothesis conclusions in Tables 2 and 3 are positioned as data processing reports for completeness, not as empirical evidence regarding the relationship between manager competence, mentoring quality, organizational support, engagement, and student satisfaction in MDJ recipients.

Several possible causes for the instrument's poor quality can be put forward. First, the length of the 47-item questionnaire, completed online, potentially leads to respondent fatigue, leading to inadequate reading of answers. Second, the formulation of some items within a construct may be interpreted differently by respondents, preventing a consistent response pattern. Third, the distribution of responses heavily concentrated on scores 4 and 5 limits the variation available for establishing inter-item correlations. These three possibilities cannot be separated based on the available data and require separate instrument testing before substantive model testing can be repeated.

## **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The conceptual model of resources-engagement-satisfaction built from Social Exchange Theory, Organizational Support Theory, and Study Demands-Resources Theory obtained full statistical support at the structural model level: all ten hypotheses (H1-H10), both the direct influence of Program Manager Competence, Student Mentoring Quality, and Perceived Organizational Support on Student Engagement and Student Satisfaction, as well as their indirect influence through Student Engagement, were statistically significant with a complementary partial mediation pattern. However, the main and most important finding of this study is methodological: the evaluation of the measurement model showed that the 47-item instrument used did not meet the requirements of convergent validity, construct reliability, or discriminant validity. Therefore, this study cannot provide valid empirical answers to the problem formulation regarding the management of the Jakarta Future Program, and all significant path coefficients should be treated as data processing reports, not as substantive evidence of the relationship between variables.

The main recommendations of this study are to retest the model using an instrument that has undergone a pilot study and psychometric validation first, including reviewing the item formulation to make it more specific and easier for respondents to understand, simplifying the number of items to reduce the risk of respondent fatigue when completing the questionnaire online, and using a response format that encourages greater variation in answers. For MDJ Program managers, policy improvements should be postponed until a valid and reliable instrument is available, while for future researchers it is recommended to conduct exploratory factor analysis in the pilot stage before testing the full structural model.

## **ADVANCED RESEARCH**

This study has several limitations. First, the cross-sectional design and self-report data limit the interpretation of the results as structural relationships at a single point in time, rather than as longitudinal causal evidence. Second, the purposive sampling technique was not intended to produce a statistically representative sample of the population, so generalization of the findings requires caution. Third, and most fundamentally, the failure of the measurement model to meet validity and reliability criteria limits all findings to the data processing report level. Therefore, substantive conclusions regarding the

influence of program manager competence, mentoring quality, and organizational support on student satisfaction through student engagement cannot be established in this study.

## REFERENCES

- Ababneh, K. I., Ahmed, K., Ababneh, R., & Al-Waqfi, M. A. (2025). Key antecedents and consequences of study engagement among university business students in the UAE. *International Journal of Management Education*, 23(3), 101263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2025.101263>
- Arthur, M. B., & Kram, K. E. (1985). Mentoring at Work: Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30(3). Scott Foresman. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2392687>
- Assefa, Y., Tilwani, S. A., Moges, B. T., & Majeed, H. (2025). Unpacking student engagement and its mediating role in predicting the relationship between self-determination and academic satisfaction among undergraduate students in higher education. *Social Sciences and Humanities Open*, 12, 101797. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101797>
- Bakker, A. B., & Mostert, K. (2024). Study Demands–Resources Theory: Understanding Student Well-Being in Higher Education. *Educational Psychology Review*, 36(3), 92. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-024-09940-8>
- BAZNAS. (2026). Amanah ZIS Terus Berdampak, BAZNAS BAZIS Salurkan Rp24,64 Miliar kepada 44.842 Mustahik Sepanjang Juni 2026. BAZNAS. <https://donasi.baznasbazisdki.id/kabar/65/>
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. Wiley.
- Boyatzis, R. E. (1982). *The Competent Manager: A Model for Effective Performance*. Wiley.
- BPS. (2025). Angka Partisipasi Kasar (APK) Perguruan Tinggi (PT) Menurut Provinsi. Badan Pusat Statistik Indonesia. <https://www.bps.go.id/>
- Crisp, G., & Cruz, I. (2009). Mentoring college students: A critical review of the literature between 1990 and 2007. *Research in Higher Education*, 50(6), 525–545. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-009-9130-2>
- Darawong, C., & Widayati, A. (2022). Improving student satisfaction and learning outcomes with service quality of online courses: evidence from Thai and Indonesian higher education institutions. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 14(4), 1245–1259. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-02-2021-0074>
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500–507. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500>
- Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(1), 59–109. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059>
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., Sarstedt, M., Danks, N. P., & Ray, S. (2021). Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling. In *Handbook of Market Research*. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-57413-4\\_15](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-57413-4_15)

- Kahu, E. R., & Nelson, K. (2018). Student engagement in the educational interface: understanding the mechanisms of student success. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 37(1), 58–71. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2017.1344197>
- Krause, A. J., & Moore, S. Y. (2022). Creating an Online Peer-to-Peer Mentoring Program: Promoting Student Relationships, Engagement, and Satisfaction during the Era of COVID-19. *College Teaching*, 70(3), 296–308. <https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2021.1925624>
- Kurtessis, J. N., Eisenberger, R., Ford, M. T., Buffardi, L. C., Stewart, K. A., & Adis, C. S. (2017). Perceived Organizational Support: A Meta-Analytic Evaluation of Organizational Support Theory. *Journal of Management*, 43(6), 1854–1884. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315575554>
- Li, Y., Sueb, R., & Said Hashim, K. (2025). The relationship between parental autonomy support, teacher autonomy support, peer support, and university students' academic engagement: the mediating roles of basic psychological needs and autonomous motivation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16, 1503473. <https://doi.org/10.3389/FPSYG.2025.1503473>
- Nabi, G., Walmsley, A., Mir, M., & Osman, S. (2025). The impact of mentoring in higher education on student career development: a systematic review and research agenda. *Studies in Higher Education*, 50(4), 739–755. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2024.2354894>
- Navio-Marco, J., Mendieta-Aragón, A., Muñoz, V., & Bautista-Cerro, M.-J. (2024). Driving students' engagement and satisfaction in blended and online learning universities: Use of learner-generated media in business management subjects. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 22, 100963. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2024.100963>
- Oliver, R. L. (1980). A Cognitive Model of the Antecedents and Consequences of Satisfaction Decisions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17(4), 460–469. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378001700405>
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A Multiple-Item Scale for Measuring Consumer Perceptions of Service Quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12–40.
- Prananto, K., Cahyadi, S., Lubis, F. Y., & Hinduan, Z. R. (2025). Perceived teacher support and student engagement among higher education students - a systematic literature review. *BMC Psychology*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/S40359-025-02412-W>
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698–714. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.698>
- Seitova, M., Temirbekova, Z., Kazykhankyzy, L., Khalmatova, Z., & Çelik, H. E. (2024). Perceived service quality and student satisfaction: a case study at Khoja Akhmet Yassawi University, Kazakhstan. *Frontiers in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1492432>
- Spencer, L. M., & Spencer, S. M. (1993). *Competence at Work: Models for Superior Performance*. Wiley.
- Sugiyono, S. (2023). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R&D*.