Scientia
Publica
Media

⊙ **Research Article**

Preservice Teacher Perceptions of School Field Introduction Program for Achieving Sustainability in Education: A Survey at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan

Fitria Ningsih[1]✉, Panji Hidayat[1] iD, Ega Asnatasia Maharani[2] iD, Satrianawati[3] iD

[1]Primary School Teacher Education Study Program, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Indonesia
[2]Department of Psychology, International Islamic University Malaysia, Malaysia
[3]School of Education, Harbin Normal University, China

Abstract
School field introduction program is intended to solidify academic and educational field competencies through various activities in schools. The aim of this research is to analyze the various responses of students in the Elementary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan towards the School Field Introduction Program (PLP) II, and to identify internal and external factors that can act as supports or obstacles for students in the implementation of the PLP II program in partner schools or laboratory schools for achieving sustainability in education. This research is quantitative with a descriptive approach and utilizes a survey method. The population of this research includes active odd-semester students in the Elementary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, class of 2016, totaling 324 students. The sample size was determined using the Slovin formula with a 5% margin of error, resulting in a sample size of 179 student respondents. Data collection was conducted online using a questionnaire. The collected data was analyzed descriptively and presented in percentages using SPSS. The results of this study show that the responses of students in the Elementary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan towards the PLP II program are categorized as very high, with a percentage of 42.5%. The research findings on internal and external factors are also categorized as very high, with percentages of 58.9% and 62.0%, respectively, indicating that internal and external factors can serve as support for the PLP II program. Thus, this research can serve as a benchmark for the success of students in implementing the PLP II program for achieving sustainability in education.

Keywords: Inhibiting Factors, Responses, School Field Introduction, Supporting Factors, Sustainability

1. INTRODUCTION

Education plays a crucial and strategic role in enhancing the quality of teachers as the frontline of educational implementation (Liston et al., 2008), contributing significantly to the improvement of educational quality in Indonesia, including at the primary school level. High-quality teachers greatly influence the effectiveness of education and, in turn, affect student achievement (Blömeke, 2016; Lee, 2018). Key components of education, such as students, educators, facilities and infrastructure, curriculum, and the environment, are determinants of the success of the national education system.

According to the National Education System as outlined in Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 20 of 2003, educational providers must adhere to several principles, including ensuring education that is organized fairly and non-discriminatorily, while upholding human rights, religious values, cultural values, and the diversity of the nation within a systemic bond through an open and meaningful system. Additionally, the process of fostering and empowering students should be continuous, providing role

models, building motivation, and developing creativity in students to enhance their learning and development. The goal is to empower society by ensuring all members have access to education and participation in the organization and quality control of educational services. Furthermore, Government Regulation No. 19 of 2005 on National Education Standards emphasizes that teachers must possess competencies in pedagogy, professionalism, personality, and social skills. These teacher competencies are comprehensive and interconnected.

Among these four competencies, the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan (FKIP UAD), as a Teacher Training Institution (LPTK), is bound by national education policies in the field of the new curriculum for LPTKs, which mandates that educational institutions must define graduate profiles. These profiles will determine the formulation of learning outcomes. The establishment of learning outcomes must refer to market signals, and the competency standards for graduates must align with Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 8 of 2012 on the Indonesian National Qualifications Framework (KKNI).

Based on these considerations, the learning outcomes of graduates from the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan will serve as the foundation for skill development according to professional skill strata, namely first-level teachers, junior teachers, intermediate teachers, and senior teachers. Law Number 14 of 2005 on Teachers and Lecturers, Article 1 Paragraph (1) states that teachers are professional educators with the primary duties of educating, teaching, assessing, and evaluating students in formal early childhood education, primary education, and secondary education. Article 8 further states that teachers must possess academic qualifications, competencies, teaching certificates, physical and mental health, and the ability to realize national education goals. Article 9 stipulates that academic qualifications, as mentioned in Article 8, are obtained through higher education at the bachelor's degree or diploma four program levels.

Teacher Training Institutions (LPTK), as referred to in Law Number 14 of 2005 on Teachers and Lecturers, Article 1 Paragraph (14), are higher education institutions assigned by the government to conduct teacher training programs for formal early childhood education, primary education, and/or secondary education, as well as to develop educational and non-educational sciences.

In line with Article 1 Paragraph (1) of Government Regulation No. 74/2008 on Teachers, it is stated that teachers are professional educators whose main duties include educating, teaching, guiding, directing, training, assessing, and evaluating students in formal early childhood education, formal education, primary education, and secondary education. Teachers must possess the academic qualifications and competencies outlined in the Minister of National Education Regulation No. 16 of 2007. The Minister of Research, Technology, and Higher Education Regulation (Permenristekdikti) Number 55 of 2017 on Teacher Education Standards (SN Dikgu) emphasizes that the preparation of professional teachers must begin at the academic level, both within the academic sphere at universities and through early field introduction in authentic settings in schools or other educational institutions. The School Field Introduction Program (PLP) meets this need in line with national education policies that have recommended the School Field Introduction Program (PLP) as part of the curriculum for Teacher Training Institutions (LPTK) in Indonesia. Consequently, the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan has also adapted. This program aims to foster student innovation and adaptation to ensure continuous school improvement.

The Faculty of Teacher Training and Education at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan has designed and implemented the PLP program as an integral part of the curriculum. PLP II is the second stage in the School Field Introduction Program for the Education Bachelor Program, conducted in the sixth semester as a continuation of PLP I. PLP II is intended to solidify academic and educational field competencies through various activities in schools. The PLP II program carries a weight of 3 credits and is carried out in school communities/madrasahs/educational institutions (referred to as partner schools/laboratory schools), with field supervisors (DPL) and mentor teachers at partner schools/laboratory schools who meet the specified requirements. The absence of prior research on PLP II is due to PLP II being a new policy or curriculum.

The PLP II program was implemented for the first time in the Elementary School Teacher Education Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan after previously implementing an internship program divided into three stages: basic internship, advanced internship, and applied internship. The PLP program is divided into

two stages: PLP I in the third semester and PLP II in the sixth semester. PLP II was carried out by 324 students from the 2016 cohort in the sixth semester. Based on the researcher's observations during the PLP II program, some students still experienced confusion in understanding task descriptions and how to act during their time at the partner elementary schools/laboratory schools. Furthermore, there has been no intensive evaluation of each activity level, particularly from the organizers. Therefore, students of the Elementary School Teacher Education Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, as the first implementers of the PLP II program in Muhammadiyah elementary schools in Yogyakarta, have their own opinions regarding its implementation. The implementation of PLP II also encountered various supporting and hindering factors for students. From the various forms of student feedback on the PLP II program after participating in PLP II as prospective teachers and receiving information from the surrounding environment of partner elementary schools/laboratory schools, it is possible to determine the success indicators of the PLP II program.

In light of this phenomenon, this study will discuss and examine the responses of students from the Elementary School Teacher Education Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan to the PLP II program, with the title "Responses of Students from the Elementary School Teacher Education Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan to the School Field Introduction Program (PLP) II." It is hoped that this research will provide new insights into the implementation of PLP II, improvements for the PLP II program, and address students' negative perceptions of the PLP II implementation. Thus, FKIP as the organizer of PLP II can enhance the quality of the PLP II program.

2. METHOD

2.1. Research Design

This study falls under the category of quantitative research with a descriptive approach and utilizes survey methods. Quantitative research is a type of research characterized by its systematic, planned, and highly structured nature, from the beginning to the end of the research design process (Sheard, 2017). According to Sugiyono (2013), quantitative research methods are based on positivism philosophy, used to study specific populations and samples, with data collection techniques generally conducted randomly. Data is collected using research instruments, and the analysis is quantitative/statistical, aimed at testing predefined hypotheses.

2.2. Time and Location of Research

This research was conducted in the Primary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, located at Campus V, Jl. Ki Ageng Pemanahan no. 18, Yogyakarta. The research was carried out from November 2019 to June 2020.

2.3. Population and Sample of Research

The population in this study consists of students from the Primary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, class of 2016, who are currently in an odd semester. The subjects have completed the PLP II program in the 6th semester in 2019. The sample was taken using a random sampling method, resulting in 179 respondents. The calculation of respondents was done using the Slovin formula as cited by Sugiyono (2013).

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N\,e^2}$$

where:
 = amount sample
N = amount all over population
e = error tolerance

2.4. Research Variables

Research variables are essentially anything determined by the researcher to be studied in order to obtain information about it, allowing for conclusions to be drawn (Sugiyono, 2016). The variable studied in this research is a single variable: the response of students from the Primary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan to the PLP II program. The single variable refers to the impressions left in the memory of these students after participating in the PLP II program.

2.5. Operational Definition

The data collection process in this research used a questionnaire that included students' statements and other aspects the researcher wanted to know about the PLP II program. The questionnaire was composed and adjusted to the research subject, which is the response of students from the Primary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan to the PLP II program. The questionnaire considered internal factors (psychological and physical) and external factors (supervising lecturers, mentor teachers, students, facilities, and the partner school environment).

2.6. Data Collection Techniques and Instruments

The data obtained were in the form of numbers, responses that revealed a certain reality. The data collection technique used in this research was a questionnaire. The questionnaire was used to obtain data on the responses of students from the Primary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan to the PLP II program online using Google Forms. The questionnaire used in this research was a closed-ended questionnaire, with predefined answers for respondents to choose from. The scale used to measure the responses was the Likert scale. According to Sugiyono (2017), the Likert scale is used by researchers to measure attitudes, opinions, and perceptions of respondents or groups towards social phenomena.

2.7. Validity and Reliability

An instrument can be considered valid if the measurement tool used to collect data (measure) is valid (Sugiyono, 2016: 173). In this study, the validity of the instrument measuring students' responses to the PLP II program was tested using construct validity through Pearson Product Moment Correlation. The reliability of the instrument in this research was tested using the Cronbach's Alpha formula. According to Sugiyono (2015: 365), the Cronbach's Alpha formula can be used to determine the reliability of an instrument with scores other than 0 and 1, such as questionnaires or non-essay tests. To test reliability, the researcher used the SPSS software version 18.0 with the Cronbach's Alpha reliability technique. The interpretation of the reliability coefficient was done using categories according to Sugiyono (2015).

2.8. Data Analysis

This study used descriptive data analysis methods, which were presented in percentages, according to Sudijono (2012: 43). The descriptive analysis used in this research included maximum value, minimum value, mean, standard deviation, median, and mode, which were then supplemented by frequency distribution tables. The frequency distribution tables aim to facilitate reading the raw and random research results, making them easier to process and understand. The data from the variable of students' responses to the PLP II program at the Primary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan were categorized using data tendency levels according to (Mardapi, 2008). After the data were grouped into each category, the percentage of each data category was calculated using the percentage formula by Sudijono (2012) as follows.

$$P = \frac{f}{N} \times 100\%$$

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study was conducted on active students from the 2016 cohort of the Elementary School Teacher Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan. The descriptive analysis results of the single variable—student responses from the Elementary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan towards the School Field Introduction Program (PLP) II and the underlying factors—are as follows:

3.1. Student Responses Towards the School Field Introduction Program (PLP) II

The research data on the responses of students from the Elementary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan towards the School Field Introduction Program (PLP) II was collected from 179 students of the 2016 cohort using random sampling techniques. The sample size was determined using Slovin's formula (1960). The research results revealed a maximum score of 146 and a minimum score of 76. The mean score was 118.47 with a standard deviation of 13.497. The mode was 120, and the median was 119.

$$Mi = \frac{1}{2}(\text{max score} + \text{min score})$$
$$= \frac{1}{2}(146 + 76)$$
$$= \frac{1}{2}(222)$$
$$= 111$$

From these calculations, it can be determined that the ideal Mean (Mi) for student responses in the Elementary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan towards the School Field Introduction Program (PLP) II is 111.

$$SDi = \frac{1}{6}(\text{max score} - \text{min score})$$
$$= \frac{1}{6}(146 - 76)$$
$$= \frac{1}{6}(70)$$
$$= 11.6$$

It can also be determined that the ideal Standard Deviation (SDi) for student responses in the Elementary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan towards the School Field Introduction Program (PLP) II is 11.6.

Based on the values of Mi and SDi, the categories of student responses in the Elementary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan towards the School Field Introduction Program (PLP) II can be calculated as follows:

Very high	$= X > Mi + 1.SDi$
	$= X > 111 + 11,6$
	$= X > 122,6$
High	$= Mi + 1.SDi > X > Mi$
	$= 111 + 11,6 > X > 111$
	$= 122,6 > X > 111$
Low	$= Mi > X > Mi - 1.SDi$
	$= 111 > X > 111 - 11,6$
	$= 111 > X\ 99,4$
Very Low	$= X < Mi - 1.SDi$
	$= X < 111 - 11,6$
	$= X < 99,4$

Based on the research data on student responses in the Elementary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan towards the School Field Introduction Program (PLP) II, a table categorizing the data trends can be arranged as follows:

Table 1. Categories of Student Responses

Class Intervals	Category	Frequency	Percentage
X > 122.6	Very high	76	42.5%
122.6 > X > 111	High	51	28.5%
111 > X > 99.4	Low	38	21.2%
X < 99.4	Very Low	14	7.8%
Amount		179	100.0%

In Table 1, it is explained that overall, the student responses from the Elementary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan towards the School Field Introduction Program (PLP) II can be broken down as follows: 76 students (42.5%) are in the very high category, 51 students (28.5%) are in the high category, 38 students (21.2%) are in the low category, and 14 students (7.8%) are in the very low category. Thus, it can be concluded that student responses from the Elementary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan towards the School Field Introduction Program (PLP) II are predominantly in the very high category, with the highest percentage of 42.50%. This indicates that the variable of student responses from the Elementary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan towards the School Field Introduction Program (PLP) II can be used as a benchmark for the success of students in the implementation of the PLP II program.

3.2. Student Responses Towards the School Field Introduction Program (PLP) II Based on Internal Factors

The research data on student responses from the Elementary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan towards the School Field Introduction Program (PLP) II based on internal factors revealed a maximum score of 60 and a minimum score of 18. The mean score was 46.64, with a standard deviation of 6.425. The mode was 50, and the median was 47.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Mi} &= \frac{1}{2}(\text{max score} + \text{min score}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(60 + 18) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(78) \\ &= 39 \end{aligned}$$

From these calculations, it can be determined that the ideal Mean (Mi) for student responses in the Elementary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan towards the School Field Introduction Program (PLP) II based on internal factors is 39.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SDi} &= \frac{1}{6}(\text{max score} - \text{min score}) \\ &= \frac{1}{6}(60 - 18) \\ &= \frac{1}{6}(42) \\ &= 7 \end{aligned}$$

It can also be determined that the ideal Standard Deviation (SDi) for student responses in the Elementary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan towards the School Field Introduction Program (PLP) II based on internal factors is 7.

Based on the values of Mi and SDi, the categories of student responses in the Elementary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan towards the School Field Introduction Program (PLP) II based on internal factors can be calculated as follows:

Very High $= X > Mi + 1.SDi$
$= X > 39 + 7$
$= X > 46$

High $= Mi + 1.SDi > X > Mi$
$= 39 + 7 > X > 39$
$= 46 > X > 39$

Low $= Mi > X > Mi - 1.SDi$
$= 39 > X > 39 - 7$
$= 39 > X\ 32$

Very Low $= X < Mi - 1.SDi$
$= X < 39 - 7$
$= X < 32$

Based on the research data on student responses in the Elementary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan towards the School Field Introduction Program (PLP) II based on internal factors, a table categorizing the data trends can be arranged as follows:

Table 2. Categories of Student Responses Based on Internal Factors

Class Intervals	Category	Frequency	Percentage
X > 46	Very high	107	59.8%
46 > X 39	High	52	29.1%
39 > X 32	Low	18	10.1%
X < 32	Very Low	2	1.1%
Amount		179	100.0%

In Table 2, it is explained that overall, the student responses from the Elementary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan towards the School Field Introduction Program (PLP) II based on internal factors can be broken down as follows: 107 students (59.8%) are in the very high category, 52 students (29.1%) are in the high category, 18 students (10.1%) are in the low category, and 2 students (1.1%) are in the very low category. Thus, it can be concluded that student responses from the Elementary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan towards the School Field Introduction Program (PLP) II based on internal factors are predominantly in the very high category, with the highest percentage of 59.80%.

Internal factors include physical conditions and psychological factors such as interest and special abilities or talents (Asmara & Haryanto, 2015; Šostar & Ristanović, 2022). This indicates that internal factors arising from within the individual can either support or hinder the implementation of PLP II. Therefore, it can be said that the better the physical health of students, the higher their interest and talent will support the implementation of the PLP II program. Conversely, a decline in students' physical health, lack of interest, and talent will hinder the implementation of the PLP II program.

3.3. Student Responses Towards the School Field Introduction Program (PLP) II Based on External Factors

The research data on student responses from the Elementary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan towards the School Field Introduction Program (PLP) II based on external factors revealed a maximum score of 88 and a minimum score of 37. The mean score was 71.83, with a standard deviation of 8.66. The mode was 71, and the median was 72.

$$Mi = \frac{1}{2}(\text{max score} + \text{min score})$$
$$= \frac{1}{2}(88 + 37)$$
$$= \frac{1}{2}(125)$$
$$= 62.5$$

From these calculations, it can be determined that the ideal Mean (Mi) for student responses in the Elementary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan towards the School Field Introduction Program (PLP) II based on external factors is 62.5.

$$SDi = \tfrac{1}{6}(\text{max score - min score})$$
$$= \tfrac{1}{6}(88 - 37)$$
$$= \tfrac{1}{6}(51)$$
$$= 8.5$$

It can also be determined that the ideal Standard Deviation (SDi) for student responses in the Elementary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan towards the School Field Introduction Program (PLP) II based on external factors is 8.5.

Based on the values of Mi and SDi, the categories of student responses in the Elementary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan towards the School Field Introduction Program (PLP) II based on external factors can be calculated as follows:

Very High	$= X > Mi + 1.SDi$
	$= X > 62,5 + 8,5$
	$= X > 71$
High	$= Mi + 1.SDi > X > Mi$
	$= 62,5 + 8,5 > X > 62,5$
	$= 71 > X > 62,5$
Low	$= Mi > X > Mi - 1.SDi$
	$= 62,5 > X > 62,5 - 8,5$
	$= 62,5 > X > 54$
Very Low	$= X < Mi - 1.SDi$
	$= X < 62,5 - 8,5$
	$= X < 54$

Based on the research data on student responses in the Elementary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan towards the School Field Introduction Program (PLP) II based on external factors, a table categorizing the data trends can be arranged as follows:

Table 3. Categories of Student Responses Based on External Factors

Interval Class	Category	Frequency	Percentage
X > 71	Very high	111	62.0%
71 > X > 62.5	Tall	40	22.3%
62.5 > X > 54	Low	25	14.0%
X < 54	Very Low	3	1.7%
Amount		179	100.0%

In Table 3, it is explained that overall, the student responses from the Elementary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan towards the School Field Introduction Program (PLP) II based on external factors can be broken down as follows: 111 students (62.0%) are in the very high category, 40 students (22.3%) are in the high category, 25 students (14.0%) are in the low category, and 3 students (1.7%) are in the very low category. Thus, it can be concluded that student responses from the Elementary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan towards the School Field Introduction Program (PLP) II based on external factors are predominantly in the very high category, with the highest percentage of 62.00%.

External factors include those arising from outside the PLP II participants, such as field supervisors (DPL), cooperating teachers, students at partner schools, facilities, and the environment of the partner schools. This shows that these external factors can either support or hinder the implementation of the PLP II program. In line with the components that influence the success of the internship program, as explained in the PLP II guidebook (2019: 7), the components contributing to the PLP II program include the PLP II program coordinator, PLP II program implementation team, field supervisors (DPL), partner school/laboratory school leaders, cooperating teachers, and PLP II student participants. All these program components influence the implementation of the PLP II program.

4. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the research results on student responses from the Elementary School Teacher Education Study Program at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan towards the School Field Introduction Program (PLP) II, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- Based on the research results, student responses to the PLP program are in the very high category, with a percentage of 42.5%. Thus, this research can serve as a benchmark for the success of students in implementing the PLP program.
- Student responses to the PLP II program based on internal factors are also in the very high category, with a percentage of 59.8%.
- Student responses to the PLP II program based on external factors are in the very high category, with a percentage of 62.0%.

Based on the research that has been conducted, the researcher offers several suggestions to the readers as follows:

- For Students:
  a. The learning process and experiences gained during the PLP II program, both in terms of material and practice, can serve as a platform for enhancing professionalism as prospective teachers.
  b. Make the most of the PLP II program by using it as an opportunity to seek as much information, insight, and experience as possible while engaging with partner schools.
- For the Primary School Teacher Education Program:
  a. The implementation of the PLP II program has been running well, but it can be further improved in the future.
  b. Encourage non-academic activities for students so that their knowledge and understanding as prospective teachers can be broadened.
- For Future Researchers:
  a. Future research is encouraged to explore a variety of research types, variables, and methods.

REFERENCES

Anas, S. (2012). *Pengantar Evaluasi Pendidikan*. PT Raja Grafindo Persada.

Asmara, A & Haryanto. (2015). Pengembangan Tes Minat dan Bakat dengan Metode Jaringan Syaraf Tiruan (JST) untuk Memprediksi Potensi Siswa Bidang Robotika. *Jurnal Vokasi, 5*(3), 273-286. http://dx.doi.org/10.21831/jpv.v5i3.6483

Blömeke, S., Olsen, R.V., Suhl, U. (2016). Relation of Student Achievement to the Quality of Their Teachers and Instructional Quality. In Nilsen, T., & Gustafsson, J. E. (eds) *Teacher Quality, Instructional Quality and Student Outcomes*. IEA Research for Education. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-41252-8_2

Lee, S. W. (2018). Pulling Back the Curtain: Revealing the Cumulative Importance of High-Performing, Highly Qualified Teachers on Students' Educational Outcome. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 40*(3). https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373718769379

Liston, D., Borko, H., & Whitcomb, J. (2008). The Teacher Educator's Role in Enhancing Teacher Quality. *Journal of Teacher Education, 59*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487108315581

Mardapi, D. (2008). *Teknik Penyusunan Instrumen Tes dan Non Tes*. Mitra Cendikia Press.

PPPK FKIP UAD. (2019). Buku Pedoman Pelaksanaan Program Pengenalan Lapangan Persekolahan II. Program Pengenalan Lapangan Persekolahan II. PPPK FKIP Universitas Ahmad Dahlan.

Sheard, J. (2017). *Quantitative data analysis. Research Methods* (2nd ed.), 429-452. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-102220-7.00018-2

Slovin, E. (1960). Slovin's Formula for Sampling Technique. Retrieved from https://prudencexd.weebly.com/

Šostar, M., & Ristanović, V. (2022). Assessment of Influencing Factors on Consumer Behavior Using the AHP Model. *Sustainability, 15*(13), 10341. https://doi.org/10.3390/su151310341

Sugiyono. (2013). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif R&D. CV* Alfa Beta.

Sugiyono. (2015). *Metode Penelitiann Pendidikan (Pendekatan Kuantitatif. Kualitatif dan R&D).* CV. Alfabeta.

Sugiyono. (2016). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitataif dan Kombinasi (Mixed Methods).* Alfabeta.

Sugiyono. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D.* Alfabeta CV.