

Conflicting Correlation Estimates Complicate Interpretation of Student Organizational Interest

Fransiska Novita Eni*, M.K.P. Abdi Keraf, Feronika Ratu

Universitas Nusa Cendana, Indonesia

Email: novitamarley@gmail.com, abd1ker4f1976@gmail.com,

feronika.ratu@staf.undana.ac.id

Keywords:

Correlation; Measurement
Reliability; Organizational
Interest; Student
Organizations; Student
Perceptions



This is an open access article
under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.
Copyright © 2026 by Author.
Published by
Al-Makki Publisher

Abstract

Objective: This correlational study examines the relationship between students' perceptions of student organizations and their interest in participating in such organizations in the Psychology Study Program, Faculty of Public Health, Nusa Cendana University, Kupang. **Method:** The manuscript reports a sample of 188 students from semesters II, IV, and VI, surveyed with Likert-type perception and organizational-interest scales and analyzed using SPSS. **Results:** The correlation table reports Spearman's $\rho = -0.334$ ($p = 0.01$), whereas the narrative separately reports a positive Pearson correlation ($r = 0.412$; p reported as 0.000). These results have opposite directions and cannot both be used to support the same directional conclusion without checking the underlying output and scoring. In addition, some category tables total 30 or 60 cases despite the stated sample of 188, and the combined 90-item reliability estimate is Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.584$. **Conclusion:** The manuscript suggests a statistically detectable association but does not provide internally consistent evidence of its direction or magnitude. The original analysis output, coding, analytical sample, item validity, and reliability must be verified before a directional conclusion or practice recommendation can be considered reliable.

INTRODUCTION

Students have a major role in determining the future of the nation, so that students carry such a big responsibility (Purwanto et al., 2022). As the nation's hope, students are expected to have good abilities, broad knowledge, and more advanced thinking. Improving knowledge, abilities, and character can be achieved through positive activities such as student organizations. Student organizations (ORMAWA) are a means or forum to develop knowledge, scientific attitudes, and strong character (Efendi, 2017). Student organizations help develop student capacity, such as the ability to convey positive and creative ideas, as well as various competencies that students have through the activities in them (Zuraida, 2023).

Organization is very important for every student to facilitate the improvement of adaptability to diverse societies and form an increasingly structured mindset. Interest in organizing has a significant impact on student activities when they are actively involved in an organization, and this interest can be seen from a person's participation in an organization (Ardiansyah, 2016). Perception is defined as the process when a person observes his environment through sensory tools, then realizes everything that exists in that environment (Asrori, 2020). Each individual has a different perception in interpreting something as good or bad, positive or negative, which in turn affects observable behavior. Therefore, perception of

an organization can be defined as an individual's direct response to an organization based on the experience experienced in understanding each process carried out by the organization. This process of giving responses is then interpreted through actions in the form of determining the individual's choice to follow or not to follow an organization.

According to Zuraida (2023), students' interest in organizing is influenced by their perception of the organization, namely how a person understands the elements that make up the organization, such as the people in it, the values adhered to, the goals, and the level of cooperation in it. If individuals have a positive view of the organization, they tend to be interested in taking a leadership role in it. Students who are interested in joining an organization show an incentive to actively participate in organizational activities, which can arise from internal factors, such as encouragement from within, as well as external factors, such as encouragement from the environment (Friyani et al., 2018).

Simple observations in the learning environment by the author found several things that caused a lack of interest in students to participate in student organizations in the Psychology Study Program, Faculty of Public Health (FKM), Nusa Cendana University (Undana). Based on academic data of FKM Undana in 2024, the number of active students in the Psychology Study Program reached 792 people with several internal campus organizations, such as the Faculty's Student Legislative Body (BLM), the Faculty's Student Executive Board (BEM), the Psychology Study Program Student Association (HMP Psychology), the Student Activity Unit (UKM), and the Campus Activity Unit (UKK). These observations show that the interest of students in the Psychology Study Program to join student organizations is quite good, but there are obstacles related to organizational opportunities due to the busy lecture schedule and accumulated tasks.

The initial interviews conducted by the researcher with students who are active in organizations, students who are not actively organized, and students who are interested in organizing but are constrained by the busy academic schedule received different responses. Students who are not actively organized argue that joining organizations can increase the burden of college assignments and disrupt the lecture process. On the other hand, students who are actively organized consider that joining organizations is good for increasing insight and self-development. Students who have not joined organizations stated that they have not found an organization that suits their interests. This phenomenon shows that students' perceptions of organizations vary and affect their interest in organizing.

A number of previous studies had relatively similar study themes. Zuraida (2023) used a quantitative method with correlative techniques and found a correlation between perception of organization and organizational interest in nursing students. Purwanto et al. (2022) found a relationship between perception of organization and social motives and interest in organizing. Ardi (2011) used a correlational approach to connect perception with interest in organizing in students of the Faculty of Psychology UIN Suska Riau using *the stratified proportional random sampling technique*. The three studies discussed perception of organization and its relationship with organizational interests, but differed in subject, location, type of organization, variables, and number of samples. These studies have not been conducted in the Psychology Study Program, FKM Undana Kupang. Therefore, this study aims to find out the relationship between perceptions of student organizations and organizational interest in students of the Psychology Study Program, Faculty of Public Health, Nusa Cendana Kupang University. The results of the

research are expected to enrich the treasures of organizational psychology and positive psychology, as well as become input materials for study programs, student organization administrators, and students in building positive perceptions and interest in organizing.

METHOD

This study uses a quantitative method with a correlative approach, namely looking for and determining the correlation between research variables (Zuraida, 2023). Variables are measured or observed characteristics that have different values between one object and another (Ulfa, 2019). The independent variable in this study is the perception of the organization, while the bound variable is the student's interest in organizing. The research was carried out at the Psychology Study Program of FKM Undana, Kupang, East Nusa Tenggara, for approximately one month, namely mid-November 2024 to mid-December 2024.

Student perception of the organization is defined operationally as an evaluation of the student organization that involves psychological factors from within the student and external factors in the form of stimuli from the environment, with indicators of selection, interpretation, and assessment (drawing conclusions and responses). This variable is measured on a 30-item Likert scale based on Sobur (2003) with a score of 1–5; the higher the score, the more positive the perception of the organization. Interest in organizing is defined as the interest of students to be actively involved in the organization, which is measured through six aspects based on the theory of Pintrich and Schunk (Schunk et al., 2012) modified by Ardi (2011) using a Likert scale of 60 items with a score of 1–5 (strongly disagree–strongly agree).

The research population is 366 active students of the FKM Undana Psychology Study Program in semesters 2, 4, and 6. The sample was determined by *probability sampling* technique using the Krejcie and Morgan formula as follows:

$$n = [\chi^2 \cdot N \cdot P(1 - P)] / [(N - 1) \cdot d^2 + \chi^2 \cdot P(1 - P)]$$

Remarks: n = sample size; N = population size; χ^2 = Chi Squared value (3.841); d = estimation error (0.05); P = population proportion (0.5). The calculation is as follows:

$$n = (3.841 \times 366 \times 0.25) / (366 \times 0.0025 + 3.841 \times 0.25)$$

$$n = (3.841 \times 92) / (0.92 + 0.96) = 353.3 / 1.88 = 188$$

Based on these calculations, the research sample amounted to 188 people.

Data were collected using a psychological scale developed based on the operational definition of variables, namely the *summated ratings* scale proposed by Rensis Likert. Each item was compiled in the form of statements that favored or rejected the object of attitude (Mawardi, 2019), with the choice of answers to be very agreeable, agreed, hesitant (neutral), disagreed, and strongly disagreed. *The blueprint of both scales is presented in Table 1 and Table 2.*

Table 1. Blue Print Scale of Perception of Organizations

Aspects	Favorable	Unfavorable	Total
Selection, the process of filtering or receiving information by sensory tools about the organization	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	6, 7, 8, 9, 10	10
Interpretation, assessment of the organization	11, 12, 13, 14, 15	16, 17, 18, 19, 20	10

Aspects	Favorable	Unfavorable	Total
Drawing conclusions and responses to the organization shown by behavior	21, 22, 23, 24, 25	26, 27, 28, 29, 30	10
Total	15	15	30

Source: Perception-scale blueprint described in the study, based on Sobur (2003).

Table 2. Blue Print Organizational Interest Scale

Aspects	Favorable	Unfavorable	Total
General attitude towards student organization activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	6, 7, 8, 9, 10	10
Specific awareness to enjoy or like activities in student organizations	11, 12, 13, 14, 15	16, 17, 18, 19, 20	10
Experience excitement about all things related to student organization activities	21, 22, 23, 24, 25	26, 27, 28, 29, 30	10
Involvement in student organization activities has significant significance for individuals	31, 32, 33, 34, 35	36, 37, 38, 39, 40	10
There is an intrinsic interest in the content of the organization's activities in the form of interesting things from the organization's activities	41, 42, 43, 44, 45	46, 47, 48, 49, 50	10
Actively participate in student organization activities	51, 52, 53, 54, 55	56, 57, 58, 59, 60	10
Total	30	30	60

Source: Organizational-interest scale adapted from Schunk et al. (2012) and Ardi (2011), as described in the study.

The validity test was carried out to see whether the measuring tool was valid (valid) or not, through questionnaire tests and *product moment correlation techniques* with the help of SPSS 29; items were declared valid if r counted $> r$ table (Sugiyono, 2020). Reliability tests were carried out to determine the consistency of the measuring tool when the measurement was repeated, using *Cronbach's alpha* in the SPSS application. Before the hypothesis test, an assumption test was carried out in the form of a normality test and a linearity test. The data was analyzed using a correlation technique with the help of SPSS, on the basis of decision-making: if the value of sig. < 0.05 , there is a relationship between independent and dependent variables, while if the value of sig. > 0.05 , then there is no relationship between the two variables.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The University of Nusa Cendana (Undana) was inaugurated on September 17, 1962 in the Meeting Room of the Dati I DPRD East Nusa Tenggara. The Faculty of Public Health Undana was established in 2001 against the background of the regional need for health workers who are able to solve public health problems in East Nusa Tenggara Province. The Psychology Study Program is the second study program at FKM Undana which was established on September 14, 2012, first accepted students in the odd semester of the 2014/2015 academic year, and has been accredited B since November 2022. Characteristics of respondents based on gender and semester are presented in Table 4 and Table 5.

Table 3. Characteristics of Respondents by Gender

No.	Gender	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	Male	73	39
2.	Female	115	61
Total		188	100

Source: Primary survey data processed by the authors (2025).

Table 3 shows that male respondents amounted to 73 people (39%) and female respondents amounted to 115 people (61%).

Table 4. Characteristics of Respondents by Semester

No.	Semester	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	II	43	23
2.	IV	64	34
3.	VI	81	43
Total		188	100

Source: Primary survey data processed by the authors (2025).

Based on Table 4, the respondents in semester 2 were 43 people (23%), semester 4 was 64 people (34%), and semester 6 was 81 people (43%).

Student perception is the process of how students receive, understand, and assess information about the organization, which is formed from experience, knowledge, and environment. Descriptive statistics and categorization of perception variables for student organizations are presented in Table 6 and Table 7.

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics of Perception Variables on Student Organizations

No.	Statistics	Value
1.	Number of Respondents (N)	188
2.	Minimum Score	147
3.	Maximum Score	218
4.	Mean	182,35
5.	Standard Deviation	8,85

Source: Primary survey data processed by the authors (2025).

Table 6. Categories of Student Perception of Organizations

No.	Perception Category	n	%
1.	High	14	47
2.	Medium	2	7
3.	Low	14	47
Total		30	100

Source: Primary survey data processed by the authors (2025).

Table 5 reports a mean organizational-perception score of 182.35, whereas a later discussion reports 202.39. Table 6 lists 30 categorized observations (14 high, 2 medium, and 14 low), not the 188 students described as the full study sample. The table totals are retained as reported, but the population to which these categories apply is unclear. Neither the descriptive mean nor the category proportions should be generalized to all 188 students until the original scoring sheet and analytical denominator are verified.

Student interest is the tendency or desire in students to pay attention, interest, and be involved in an activity, including organization, that arises due to internal or external motivations. Descriptive statistics and categorization of organizational interest variables are presented in Table 7 and Table 8.

Table 7. Descriptive Statistics of Organizational Interest Variables

No.	Statistics	Value
1.	Number of Respondents (N)	188
2.	Minimum Score	75
3.	Maximum Score	107
4.	Mean	90,70
5.	Standard Deviation	4,26

Source: Primary survey data processed by the authors (2025).

Table 8. Categories of Student Interest in Organizations

No.	Categories of Interest	n	%
1.	High	18	30
2.	Medium	24	40
3.	Low	18	30
Total		60	100

Source: Primary survey data processed by the authors (2025).

Table 8 presents categories totaling 60 observations (18 high, 24 medium, 18 low), whereas the main survey is described as involving 188 students. This inconsistency prevents generalization of those proportions to the main sample.

The validity test of the organizational perception scale used 30 test respondents so that the table r value was 0.361. The item was declared valid if r was calculated > 0.361 and invalid

if r was calculated < 0.361 . The results of the validity test of the organizational perception scale were presented in Table 10 and Table 11.

Table 9. Results of the Validity Test of the Organizational Perception Scale

No.	Aspects	Valid	Invalid	Total
1.	Selection	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10	3, 8	10
2.	Interpretation	11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20	13, 18	10
3.	Conclusion	21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30	23, 28	10
Total		24	6	30

Source: Instrument item-validity assessment reported in this study.

Table 10. Distribution of Validity Test Results of the Organizational Perception Scale

No.	Aspects	Valid (n)	Valid (%)	Invalid (n)	Invalid (%)
1.	Selection	8	80	2	20
2.	Interpretation	8	80	2	20
3.	Conclusion	8	80	2	20
Total		24	80	6	20

Source: Instrument item-validity assessment reported in this study.

Tables 9 and 10 identify 24 of the 30 organizational-perception items as meeting the reported item-validity threshold and six as not meeting it. This screening does not by itself establish construct validity, and the manuscript does not clearly show whether the six excluded items were removed before the correlation and scale-reliability analyses. The item-retention procedure and finalized scoring key must therefore be documented before interpreting the association.

The organizational interest scale consisted of 60 statements given to a research sample of 188 students. The results of the validity test are presented in Table 12 and Table 13.

Table 11. Results of the Validity Test of the Organizational Interest Scale

No.	Aspects	Valid	Invalid	Total
1.	General attitude towards student organization activities	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	6, 7, 8, 9, 10	10
2.	Specific awareness to enjoy or like activities in student organizations	11, 12, 13, 14, 15	16, 17, 18, 19, 20	10
3.	Experience excitement about all things related to student organization activities	21, 22, 23, 24, 25	26, 27, 28, 29, 30	10
4.	Involvement in student organization activities has significant significance for individuals	31, 32, 33, 34, 35	36, 37, 38, 39, 40	10
5.	There is an intrinsic interest in the content of the organization's activities	41, 42, 43, 44, 45	46, 47, 48, 49, 50	10

No.	Aspects	Valid	Invalid	Total
6.	Actively participate in student organization activities	51, 52, 53, 54, 55	56, 57, 58, 59, 60	10
Total		30	30	60

Source: Instrument item-validity assessment reported in this study.

Table 12. Distribution of Validity Test Results of the Organizational Interest Scale

No.	Aspects	Valid (n)	Valid (%)	Invalid (n)	Invalid (%)
1.	General attitude towards student organization activities	5	50	5	50
2.	Specific awareness of enjoying or liking the organization's activities	5	50	5	50
3.	Experience excitement for student organization activities	5	50	5	50
4.	Involvement in organizational activities has significance for individuals	5	50	5	50
5.	There is an intrinsic interest in the content of the organization's activities	5	50	5	50
6.	Actively participate in student organization activities	5	50	5	50
Total		30	50	30	50

Source: Instrument item-validity assessment reported in this study.

Tables 11 and 12 classify 30 of the 60 organizational-interest items as valid and 30 as invalid under the reported item–total screening rule. The manuscript does not establish whether the invalid items were reverse-coded, excluded, or retained in subsequent composite scores. These decisions matter because item direction can alter both internal consistency and the sign of a correlation. No claim that the retained scale is adequately validated can be made without confirming the scoring and recalculating reliability for the final items.

Reliability tests were performed using *Cronbach's alpha* through the SPSS program to ensure the internal consistency of the entire scale item. The results are presented in Table 13.

Table 13. Reliability Test Results (Reliability Statistics)

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
0,584	0,575	90

Source: Statistical analysis reported in this study.

Table 13 reports Cronbach's alpha = 0.584 for 90 items (standardized alpha = 0.575), indicating limited internal consistency for the combined item set. Reliability should be calculated separately for the finalized perception and interest scales, particularly after items are excluded. The current values do not justify describing the measurement as reliably established.

The basic assumption test in the form of a normality test was carried out on 90 items of the interest and perception scale of the organization using the Shapiro-Wilk test because the sample was less than 200 respondents. A summary of the results is presented in Table 14.

Table 14. Summary of Normality Test Results

Item Group	Item Range	Normal Item Quantity	Abnormal Number of Items
1	P1 – P10	9	1
2	P11 – P20	10	0
3	P21 – P30	8	2
4	P31 – P40	10	0
5	P41 – P50	9	1
6	P51 – P60	10	0
7	P61 – P70	8	2
8	P71 – P80	9	1
9	P81 – P90	10	0
Total	P1 – P90	83	7

Source: Statistical analysis reported in this study.

Table 14 reports 83 item-level distributions as normal and seven as non-normal. Item-by-item normality does not establish that the two composite scale scores, or their residuals, satisfy assumptions relevant to Pearson correlation. The appropriate association test should be chosen from verified composite-score distributions and the measurement scale, rather than inferred from the count of normally distributed questionnaire items.

Table 15. Summary of the Organizational Interest and Perception Scale Linearity Test (90 Items)

Item Group	Item Range	Sig. Linearity	Conclusion
1	P1 – P10	0,102	Linear
2	P11 – P20	0,087	Linear
3	P21 – P30	0,055	Linear
4	P31 – P40	0,091	Linear
5	P41 – P50	0,073	Linear
6	P51 – P60	0,068	Linear
7	P61 – P70	0,045	Linear
8	P71 – P80	0,082	Linear
9	P81 – P90	0,099	Linear

Source: Statistical analysis reported in this study.

Table 15 lists significance values for item groups rather than a transparent test of the relationship between the two composite study variables; one listed value is 0.045, while others exceed 0.05. The meaning of these values, the tested model, and whether they reflect linearity or deviation from linearity are not established by the table. Consequently, the manuscript

cannot claim that the relationship between perception and interest has been verified as linear or positive on this basis.

Table 16. Correlation Test Results

Spearman's Correlations	Spearman's rho	p-value
Interest – Perception of the Organization	-0,334**	0,01

Source: Statistical analysis reported in this study.

***.* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 16 reports a negative Spearman rank correlation between organizational interest and student perceptions ($\rho = -0.334$; $p = 0.01$). However, the later discussion reports a positive Pearson correlation ($r = 0.412$; p reported as 0.000). The underlying analyses or coding differ and require author verification; the direction and magnitude of the relationship cannot be established from the inconsistent manuscript.

The reported average organizational-perception score is inconsistent across the manuscript: Table 5 gives 182.35, whereas the discussion gives 202.39. The reported minimum and maximum in Table 5 also need to be checked against the stated item scale. These descriptive results cannot support a definitive classification until the scores, item count, and analysis sample are verified.

Perception theory provides a framework for explaining how students interpret organizational opportunities and constraints (Walgito, 2010). Positive assessments might motivate participation, whereas perceptions of academic overload might discourage it. However, these mechanisms are theoretical explanations and should not be attributed to the present data as demonstrated findings while the reported correlation coefficients point in opposite directions. Evidence from prior studies may inform hypotheses, but it cannot resolve the disagreement between Table 16 and the positive coefficient stated elsewhere in this manuscript.

Table 7 reports a mean organizational-interest score of 90.70, while Table 8 categorizes 60 observations (18 high, 24 medium, and 18 low). Because the overall sample is stated to comprise 188 students, the relationship between the categorized observations and the main analytical sample requires clarification. It is not yet defensible to characterize the interest of all surveyed students from these category percentages. Theoretical accounts of interest (Slameto, 2015) remain relevant to discussing possible motives for participation, but the descriptive inference must be limited to the verified denominator.

The discussion originally reports a positive Pearson correlation ($r = 0.412$; p reported as 0.000), whereas Table 16 reports a negative Spearman correlation ($\rho = -0.334$; $p = 0.01$). Both values are retained as originally reported, but their disagreement prevents a justified directional conclusion. Interpretation of whether organizational perceptions are positively or negatively associated with interest must be deferred pending validation of the original analysis, scoring key, and dataset.

Azwar's (2016) account of attitudes and the Theory of Planned Behavior can help frame hypotheses linking organizational beliefs, intention, and participation. A favorable perception may be one potential correlate of organizational interest, but this theoretical expectation is not an observed direction of association in the present dataset. The negative Spearman estimate in Table 16 and the separate positive Pearson estimate require reconciliation before any comparison with previous positive findings or any inference about practical significance.

Theoretical accounts of attitudes and planned behavior can explain why organizational perceptions may be linked to students' interest, but the present coefficients do not yet establish the direction of that association. Administrative initiatives such as improved information about student organizations remain reasonable considerations; they should not be presented as empirically demonstrated consequences of this inconsistent correlation analysis.

CONCLUSION

The study examines whether perceptions of student organizations are associated with students' interest in organizational participation. Although the manuscript reports statistical significance, the direction of the relationship remains unresolved: Table 16 reports Spearman's $\rho = -0.334$ ($p = 0.01$), while the discussion reports Pearson's $r = 0.412$ with a positive direction. These results should be reported as conflicting analyses, not combined into a claim that more positive perceptions necessarily produce greater interest. In addition, the descriptive tables use inconsistent denominators and the reported reliability coefficient for the combined items is 0.584.

Before substantive interpretation, the authors should verify the original statistical output, score coding and reverse-coded items, respondent counts in every table, the precise correlation test, and reliability for the finalized scales. Academic programs and student organizations may continue to offer accessible information and opportunities for participation, but any recommendation based on the direction or size of the reported association must await correction of the dataset and analysis.

FUNDING

All of this research is independently funded by the author. This research does not receive financial support in the form of funds, grants, or sponsorship from any external institution, organization, or party.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author expressly states that there are no conflicts of interest, whether personal, commercial, or financial, that can affect the objectivity and integrity of the findings in this study.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION

Each author makes a balanced and equal contribution to all stages of research, including the formulation of ideas and conceptual frameworks, data collection and analysis, and the preparation and editing of the final manuscript.

GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE USAGE STATEMENT

In writing this manuscript, the author uses artificial intelligence (AI) technology in a limited way, solely as a tool to check the accuracy of grammar and improve the style and quality of language. The author emphasizes that AI is not involved in data collection, substantive analysis, or the formulation of research conclusions.

REFERENCES

- Agus Sujanto. (1986). Psikologi umum. Aksara.
Alex, Sobur. (2003). Psikologi umum. Pustaka Setia.

- Ardi, M. (2011). Hubungan antara persepsi terhadap organisasi dengan minat berorganisasi [Skripsi tidak dipublikasikan]. Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau.
- Ardiansyah, A. (2016). Pengaruh Uang Kuliah Tunggal (UKT) terhadap minat berorganisasi mahasiswa di lingkungan Jurusan Pendidikan Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial (P.IPS) FKIP Universitas Lampung tahun 2015/2016 [Skripsi tidak dipublikasikan]. Universitas Lampung.
- Asrori. (2020). Psikologi pendidikan pendekatan multidisipliner. CV. Pena Persada.
- Bandura, A. (1977a). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191–215.
- Bandura, A. (1977b). Social learning theory. Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Prentice Hall.
- Baron, R. A., & Byrne, D. (2004). Psikologi sosial. Erlangga.
- Crow, L., & Crow, A. (1989). Psikologi pendidikan (Abror, Penerj.). Nur Cahaya.
- Dodi Sukma R.A., Hardianto, R., & Heleni Filtri. (2021). Analisa tingkat kepuasan mahasiswa terhadap perkuliahan daring pada era pandemi COVID-19. *ZONasi: Jurnal Sistem Informasi*, 3(2), 130–142.
- Efendi, H. (2017). Hubungan keaktifan berorganisasi dengan tingkat manajemen waktu dan indeks prestasi kumulatif pada mahasiswa angkatan tahun 2013 di Fakultas Kedokteran Universitas Lampung [Skripsi tidak dipublikasikan]. Universitas Lampung.
- Fausan. (2023). Perilaku organisasi. UIN KHAS Press.
- Fielman. (1999). Art as imega and idea. FSRD ISI.
- Friyani, V. S., Hakim, S. N., & Psi, S. (2018). Hubungan persepsi terhadap organisasi dengan minat mahasiswa kedokteran untuk berorganisasi [Skripsi tidak dipublikasikan]. Fakultas Psikologi Universitas Muhammadiyah.
- Haryono, E., Akhdinirwanto, W., & Ashari. (2014). Pengaruh keaktifan berorganisasi dan konsep diri terhadap indeks prestasi mahasiswa Program Studi Pendidikan Fisika Universitas Muhammadiyah Purworejo tahun akademik 2013/2014. *Radiasi*, 4(1), 77–80.
- Jayanti, F., & Arista, N. T. (2019). Persepsi mahasiswa terhadap pelayanan perpustakaan Universitas Trunojoyo Madura. *Competence: Journal of Management Studies*, 12(2), 205–223.
- KBBI. (2008). Kamus besar bahasa Indonesia. Balai Pustaka. <https://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id/>
- Lopez-Garrido, G. (2025). Self-efficacy: Bandura's theory of motivation in psychology. *Simply Psychology*.
- Mawardi. (2019). Rambu-rambu penyusunan skala sikap model Likert. *Scholaria: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan*, 9(3), 292–304.
- Muliadi, Syukri, Asyadi, T. M., & Salim, A. (2022). Analisa pengaruh ketidakseimbangan beban pada trafo distribusi penyulang Mibo Rayon Merduati. *Aceh Journal of Electrical Engineering and Technology*, 2(2), 7–12.
- Mulyati. (2004). Psikologi belajar. Andi Publisher.
- Pintrich, P. R., & Schunk, D. H. (1996). Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications. Prentice Hall.
- Pratiwi, S. S. (2017). Pengaruh keaktifan mahasiswa dalam organisasi dan motivasi belajar terhadap prestasi belajar mahasiswa Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Ekonomi*, 6(1), 54–64.

- Purwanto, A., Hidayati, I., & Qohar, A. (2022). Hubungan persepsi terhadap organisasi dan motif sosial dengan minat berorganisasi. *ANFUSINA: Journal of Psychology*, 5(1), 73–80. <https://doi.org/10.24042/ajp.v5i1.13987>
- Purwanto, D. M. N. (2010). Psikologi pendidikan. PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Purwanto, N. (2019). Variabel dalam penelitian pendidikan. *Jurnal Teknodik*, 6115, 196–215. <https://doi.org/10.32550/teknodik.v0i0.554>
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2015). Perilaku organisasi (Edisi 16). Salemba Empat.
- Schunk, D. H., Pintrich, P. R., & Meece, J. L. (2012). *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications*. Ohio, New Jersey.
- Sobur, A. (2003). Psikologi umum. Pustaka Setia.
- Sugihartono, dkk. (2007). Persepsi manusia, teori dan pengukurannya. Pustaka Pelajar.
- Sujanto. (2001). Membangkitkan minat siswa. Rineka Cipta.
- Supartha, W. G., & Sintaasih, D. K. (2017). Pengantar perilaku organisasi: Teori, kasus dan aplikasi penelitian. Universitas Udayana. https://simdos.unud.ac.id/uploads/file_pendidikan_1_dir/b9ca64feeb1d962d5d06f51ea4d7577b.pdf
- Surahman. (2020). Metode penelitian. Kementerian Kesehatan Republik Indonesia.
- Syah, L. Y. (2019). Perilaku organisasi. IN MEDIA.
- Tewal, B., Adolfini, Pandowo, M. H. C., & Tawas, H. N. (2017). Perilaku organisasi. CV. Patra Media Grafindo.
- Tim Penyusun Kamus Pusat Bahasa. (2007). Kamus besar bahasa Indonesia (Edisi Ketiga). Balai Pustaka. <https://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id/>
- Weir, K. (2025). Self-efficacy: The theory at the heart of human agency. American Psychological Association.
- Widyanti, R., & Basuki, M. S. (2021). Perilaku organisasi (teori dan konsep) jilid 1. Universitas Islam Kalimantan MAB.
- Zuraida. (2023). Persepsi terhadap organisasi ditinjau dari minat berorganisasi mahasiswa Jurusan Keperawatan Universitas Ratu Samban. *Jurnal Ilmiah PSYCHE*, 17(1), 1–10.