JISIP (Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Pendidikan)
Vol. 10 No. 4 November 2026
e-ISSN : 2656-6753, p-ISSN: 2598-9944
DOI: *10.36312/jisip.v10i4.11116/http://ejournal.mandalanursa.org/index.php/JISIP/index*

Development and Validation of a Scholarship Management Instrument for Graduate Programs at Universitas Negeri Jakarta

Nurul Hadie[1], Siswadi[2], Riyan Arthur[3], Salma Maharani[4], Mevira Fairuz Azzahra[5], Puput Delia Indriani[6], Alifah Ayra Fauziah[7]
[1]Direktorat Keuangan Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia
[2, 3,4]Sekolah Pasacasarjana, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia
[4,5,6]Pendidikan Teknik Bangunan, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia

Article Info
Article history:
Received: 31 October 2026
Publish: 7 November 2026

Keywords:
Content Validity;
Evaluation Instrument;
Scholarship Policy;
Graduate;
Aiken's V.

Abstract
This study examines the content validity of a scholarship management evaluation instrument developed for the graduate programs at Universitas Negeri Jakarta. The instrument covers four dimensions: the scholarship selection process, recipients' academic performance, internal factors related to study, and external institutional support. This study employed a quantitative descriptive design using a content-validity approach. Three groups of validators, instrument experts, scholarship managers, and language experts, reviewed the 26 items using a five-point rating scale (1–5). Their assessments were analyzed using Aiken's V. The interpretation adopted in this study classifies scores of 0.80–1.00 as very high, 0.60–0.79 as high, 0.40–0.59 as moderate, 0.20–0.39 as low, and 0.00–0.19 as very low; scores of at least 0.60 were treated as meeting the study's content-validity criterion. The average Aiken's V scores were 0.878 for instrument experts, 0.788 for scholarship managers, and 0.983 for language experts. All 26 items therefore met the stated criterion in each validator group. The findings provide evidence that the items are relevant to the intended evaluation content, applicable to scholarship-management practice, and linguistically clear. Minor wording refinements were identified for several items, particularly those concerning transparency, motivation, time management, commitment to on-time graduation, and administrative implementation. The instrument is therefore considered content-valid and suitable for subsequent field testing; its reliability and effectiveness should be examined in further research.

This is an open access article under the Lisensi Creative Commons Atribusi-BerbagiSerupa 4.0 Internasional

Corresponding Author:
Mevira Fairuz Azzahra
Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia
Email Coressponden: mevira.fairuz.azzahra@mhs.unj.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

Scholarship programs constitute a strategic investment in education by expanding access to higher education, reducing socio-economic disparities, and promoting social mobility [1]. Financial assistance and performance-based scholarship schemes have been shown to enhance students' learning motivation, academic achievement, and overall academic performance [2]. To maximize these benefits, higher education institutions must implement scholarship programs through systematic and transparent governance mechanisms that ensure educational objectives are achieved effectively [3].

In Indonesia, scholarship programs represent an important educational investment intended to develop future leaders and highly qualified professionals who contribute to national development [4]. Many scholarship schemes are implemented through collaborative partnerships among universities, government agencies, and funding

institutions to strengthen higher education outcomes [5] Nevertheless, evaluations of scholarship implementation indicate persistent challenges, particularly delays in recipients' graduation, despite clearly established performance targets [6] These delays have encouraged policymakers to introduce stricter regulations and sanctions for recipients who fail to complete their studies within the prescribed period [7], [8]. Consequently, scholarship management requires rigorous and measurable selection procedures capable of identifying qualified candidates while ensuring continuous monitoring throughout the study period [9].

Recent studies have emphasized improving scholarship administration through the development of management information systems that facilitate application processing, scholarship distribution, activity monitoring, reporting, and decision support [9]. Such systems improve administrative efficiency by integrating applicant data, monitoring academic progress, and supporting scholarship management workflows. However, these developments primarily focus on information management rather than policy evaluation. Existing systems provide operational support but do not offer validated evaluation instruments capable of systematically assessing scholarship policy implementation, recipient performance, program effectiveness, or policy outcomes. Consequently, scholarship administrators continue to face difficulties in conducting objective, evidence-based evaluations to support accountability and continuous policy improvement.

At Universitas Negeri Jakarta (UNJ), the need for an evaluation instrument is especially relevant to the management of scholarships received by students enrolled in graduate programs. Evaluation in this setting needs to extend beyond the initial award or selection decision because scholarship management also concerns recipients' academic progress and the institutional conditions that support completion of study. The four areas addressed in this study, the selection process, academic performance, internal study-related factors, and external institutional support, provide a way to examine these connected aspects within one framework. The literature cited above identifies limitations in the evaluation of graduate scholarship selection, academic performance, and monitoring [10], [11], [12], [13], [14], [15], while higher-education quality assurance and information-quality research emphasizes systematic monitoring and evidence-informed institutional decisions [16], [17]. These sources establish the broader rationale for a structured instrument at UNJ. However, the present manuscript does not report institution-specific administrative statistics or a formal audit demonstrating the extent of an existing evaluation gap; therefore, the need is framed here as an institutional evaluation requirement rather than as a claim that UNJ's current scholarship management is ineffective.

This limitation is particularly evident in graduate scholarship programs. Previous studies remain largely descriptive and provide limited information regarding scholarship selection mechanisms, recipient characteristics according to funding sources, and graduate-award academic performance [10]. Existing monitoring practices predominantly rely on self-reported surveys measuring leadership development and broader social or economic contributions [12], [18]. Meanwhile, academic performance indicators, including research productivity, scientific publication, thesis completion, and challenges encountered during graduate study, have not been comprehensively evaluated [13]. As a result, higher education institutions lack standardized instruments capable of generating valid and reliable evidence for monitoring scholarship implementation, evaluating policy effectiveness, supervising program performance, and supporting institutional decision-making based on measurable data [6], [14].

Addressing these limitations requires the development of a comprehensive scholarship policy evaluation instrument capable of systematically measuring the effectiveness of scholarship governance from selection through study completion [15], [19]. The proposed instrument was developed through systematic analysis of scholarship policy

documents, administrative regulations, and selection criteria to evaluate applicants' academic profiles, achievements, funding characteristics, and subsequent academic performance [20]. Beyond supporting administrative processes, the instrument is intended to provide a standardized framework for monitoring scholarship recipients, evaluating policy implementation, supervising program performance, and strengthening institutional accountability. Furthermore, the instrument is expected to improve the credibility and consistency of scholarship evaluations by producing valid, objective, and comparable evidence that supports continuous quality improvement and evidence-based policymaking. This comprehensive evaluation framework is consistent with contemporary higher education quality assurance systems that emphasize continuous monitoring and systematic program evaluation [16], [21].

To ensure the content validity of the proposed instrument, expert judgments were analyzed using Aiken's V coefficient. Aiken's V was selected because it quantitatively measures the degree of agreement among experts regarding the relevance of each instrument item, thereby providing robust evidence of content validity before field implementation [22]. This validation approach also fulfills methodological requirements for decision-support systems, which require every evaluation criterion to demonstrate adequate validity before practical application [23]. Consequently, establishing content validity is a critical step in developing a reliable evaluation instrument capable of supporting accurate scholarship management and educational policy evaluation [17].

Unlike previous studies that have primarily examined scholarship administration, information systems, or isolated aspects of scholarship evaluation, this study develops and validates a comprehensive scholarship policy evaluation instrument integrating scholarship selection mechanisms, funding source characteristics, governance implementation, recipient monitoring, and Graduate-award academic performance within a single evaluation framework. Specifically, this study aims to evaluate the content validity of the proposed instrument using Aiken's V based on expert assessments. The validated instrument is expected to serve as a credible and standardized tool for monitoring, evaluation, supervision, and evidence-based decision-making in scholarship management, with particular emphasis on measuring graduation timeliness, reporting quality, and overall policy effectiveness in graduate scholarship programs at Universitas Negeri Jakarta.

2. RESEARCH METHODS

This study employed a quantitative descriptive design with a content-validity approach. The design was selected to examine whether the content of the scholarship management evaluation instrument was relevant and sufficiently clear for its intended purpose in the graduate programs at Universitas Negeri Jakarta. The instrument was intended to map the scholarship selection process, recipients' academic performance, internal factors related to study, and external institutional support.

The instrument was developed through a sequence of steps. First, a needs analysis was conducted through a review of relevant literature, scholarship policy documents, administrative regulations, and selection criteria, as described in the study's development process. This review was used to identify the aspects of scholarship management that required evaluation, including selection, recipients' academic progress, personal or study-related factors, and institutional support. Second, these aspects were organized into four dimensions: the scholarship selection process (8 items), academic performance (6 items), internal factors of study (6 items), and external factors of study (6 items). Together, the four dimensions yielded an instrument comprising 26 items, numbered 1–26 in Tables 3–6. Third, each item was formulated to represent an evaluable aspect within its corresponding dimension. The item wording was then reviewed by three validator groups:

instrument experts, scholarship managers, and language experts. The groups assessed the instrument from the perspectives of construction, relevance to scholarship-management practice, usability, readability, sentence clarity, and terminology. The validation sheets covered six assessment aspects for instrument experts, five for scholarship managers, and eight for language experts. Each validator rated the items on a five-point scale (1–5). The 26 items were retained because the reported Aiken's V results for every item were above the study's minimum criterion of 0.60 across the three validator groups. Validator comments were used to identify wording that required clarification; these editorial refinements did not change the four dimensions or the number of items. The validity of the content is analyzed using Aiken's V formula, $V = \frac{\sum s}{[\,n\,(c-1)]}$ with $s = r - L_o$.

With the following information:
V = Aiken index
S = the score score given by the assessor minus the lowest score in the category
r = score given by the assessor
Lo = lowest scoring score (1)
c = highest rating score (5)
n = number of validators (raters)

For this study, the Aiken's V values were interpreted using the categories presented in Table 1, adapted from [23]. Values of 0.60 or higher were considered to meet the minimum content-validity criterion. The five-point response scale (1–5) is the rating scale completed by validators; the Aiken's V categories are a separate interpretation of the coefficient and should not be confused with the original rating scale.

Table 1. Aiken's V Interpretation

Value V	Interpretation
0.80 – 1.00	Very high
0.60 – 0.79	High
0.40 – 0.59	Moderate
0.20 – 0.39	Low
0.00 – 0.19	Very low

Source: [24].

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1.Research Results and Discussion

All 26 items met the content-validity criterion in each of the three validation groups. Table 2 summarizes the number of validators, the number of instrument items assessed, and the average Aiken's V coefficient for each group. The value 26 in the "Number of Items Assessed" column refers to the 26 instrument items evaluated, it is not an accumulated rating score or the number of individual ratings.

Table 2. Summary of Aiken's V Content-Validity Results

Validation Group	Number of Validators	Number of Items Assessed	Mean Aiken's V
Instrument Validation	3	26	0.878
Scholarship Manager Validation	3	26	0.788
Language Validation	3	26	0.983

The results indicate that the instrument met the content-validity criterion in all three validation groups. Each of the 26 items obtained an Aiken's V value above 0.60 in the reported item-level results (Tables 3–6). The mean Aiken's V was 0.878 for instrument experts (very high), 0.788 for scholarship managers (high), and 0.983 for language experts

(very high). These findings provide content-validity evidence from three complementary perspectives: alignment with the intended instrument construct, relevance to scholarship-management practice, and clarity of language. The results support retaining the 26 items in the instrument, while the qualitative comments indicate that selected terms and formulations should be made more operational.

Table 3. s

No.	Item	Instrument Validation	Scholarship Manager Validation	Language Validation
Scholarship Selection Process Dimensions				
1	Dissemination of Scholarship Selection Requirements	0.927	0.800	0.979
2	Transparency of the Scholarship Selection Process	0.896	0.867	0.979
3	Clarity of Scholarship Selection Criteria	0.927	0.833	0.979
4	Academic Readiness of Scholarship Applicants	0.875	0.883	1.000
5	Study Motivation in the Selection Process	0.823	0.750	0.990
6	Objectivity of the Scholarship Selection Mechanism	0.927	0.867	1.000
7	Consistency of the Scholarship Selection Process	0.927	0.850	0.990
8	Effectiveness of Scholarship Selection Outcomes	0.823	0.800	1.000

In the dimension of the scholarship selection process, all items are declared valid. The Aiken's V score from instrument experts is in the range of 0.823 to 0.927, the value of scholarship managers is in the range of 0.750 to 0.883, and the value of linguists is in the range of 0.979 to 1.000. These results show that items regarding the socialization of requirements, transparency of the selection process, clarity of criteria, academic readiness of prospective recipients, study motivation, objectivity of the selection mechanism, regularity of the selection flow, and effectiveness of selection results have been considered relevant to evaluate the quality of scholarship selection [20]. This dimension is important because scholarship selection must be carried out in a measurable manner so that the selected recipients are in accordance with the program's objectives [7]. This is in line with emphasizing that the distribution of scholarships requires a clear selection and decision-making system so that the provision of assistance is on target [9].

The results of the validation on the dimension of the selection process also show that the instrument is able to answer the problem of transparency and objectivity which is an important part of scholarship governance. The items of socialization of selection requirements, clarity of criteria, objectivity of the selection mechanism, and regularity of the selection flow obtained a high score from instrument experts, namely 0.927. This value shows that experts consider these items to be very suitable to measure the quality of the selection process. However, the value of the scholarship manager on the study motivation item in the selection of 0.750 shows that the motivation aspect needs to be explained more operationally. Study motivation is not enough to be assessed as the desire to continue education, but needs to be associated with the reason for choosing a study program, academic readiness, suitability of study objectives, and contribution plan after obtaining a

scholarship. With this sharpening, the instrument can be more appropriately used to assess the quality of prospective recipients substantively.

Table 4. Results of the Academic Performance Dimension

No.	Item	Instrument Validation	Scholarship Manager Validation	Language Validation
Academic Performance Dimension				
9	Sustainability of Academic Achievement	0.927	0.800	0.990
10	Academic Discipline	0.938	0.800	1.000
11	Compliance with Study Progress Reporting	0.906	0.783	0.948
12	Achievement of Expected Academic Outcomes	0.906	0.883	0.990
13	Commitment to Study Completion	0.906	0.850	1.000
14	Contribution of the Scholarship to Academic Performance	0.875	0.767	1.000

In the academic performance dimension, all items also obtained valid scores. The Aiken's V score from instrument experts is in the range of 0.875 to 0.938, the value of scholarship managers is in the range of 0.767 to 0.883, and the value of linguists is in the range of 0.948 to 1.000. These results show that the instrument can be used to monitor the sustainability of academic achievement, academic discipline, compliance with study progress reporting, suitability of academic achievement, seriousness of completing studies, and the contribution of scholarships to academic performance. This dimension answers the problem in the background that scholarship evaluation does not quite stop at the selection stage, but must continue on the monitoring of the academic results of scholarship recipients. The recipient's academic discipline item received the highest score from the instrument expert of 0.938, while the suitability of the recipient's academic achievement received the highest score from the scholarship manager of 0.883. These findings show that the success of the scholarship program needs to be seen through the academic achievements of the recipients, not just administrative completeness during selection. One of the challenges in scholarship evaluation is the timeliness of the recipient's graduation [2]. Therefore, items regarding the reporting of study progress, seriousness of completing studies, and suitability of academic achievements are important because they can help institutions monitor whether scholarship recipients carry out their academic obligations consistently [5], [8]. It is also in line that the quality of higher education evaluation requires measurable data and information as a basis for decision-making [17].

Table 5. Results of the Internal Factors of the Study

No.	Item	Instrument Validation	Scholarship Manager Validation	Language Validation
Internal Factors of the Study				
15	Motivation for Study Completion	0.938	0.733	0.906
16	Time Management Skills	0.927	0.717	1.000
17	Academic Readiness	0.865	0.767	1.000

No.	Item	Instrument Validation	Scholarship Manager Validation	Language Validation
18	Discipline in Academic Responsibilities	0.938	0.767	0.990
19	Academic Resilience	0.938	0.767	1.000
20	Commitment to On-Time Graduation	0.938	0.683	1.000

In the internal factor dimension of the study, all items were declared valid, but there was a difference in assessment between instrument experts and scholarship managers. The value of instrument experts is in the range of 0.865 to 0.938, while the value of scholarship managers is in the range of 0.683 to 0.767. The linguist's score is in the range of 0.906 to 1,000. These results show that internal factors have been assessed as constructively and linguistically clear, but still require sharpening to better fit scholarship evaluation practices. This dimension is important because the success of the scholarship recipient's studies is not only influenced by the aid of costs, but also by the personal readiness of the student in managing his or her academic process.

The item of commitment to on time obtained the lowest score from the scholarship manager, which is 0.683. This value remains above the validity limit of 0.60, but it is an important finding because it shows that the item needs to be formulated more concretely. The commitment to graduating on time needs to be explained through observable indicators, such as the preparation of a study plan, completion targets for each semester, consistency in following guidance, completion of final projects, and reporting academic progress. These findings show that the timeliness of graduation is an important issue in the evaluation of scholarship programs [5]. Thus, internal factors need to be included in the instrument because study delays are not always caused by the system, but can also be influenced by the motivation, time management, discipline, and academic resilience of the scholarship recipient [13].

The item of ability to manage study time obtained a score of 0.717 and the motivation of the recipient to complete the study obtained a score of 0.733 from the scholarship manager. Both values are valid, but lower than the assessment of instrument experts. This shows that scholarship managers need indicators that are more direct and easy to observe. The ability to manage study time can be associated with time management between lectures, research, work, academic assignments, and guidance. Meanwhile, motivation to complete studies can be associated with consistency in participating in academic activities, seriousness in achieving study targets, and awareness of responsibilities as scholarship recipients [11]. With a more operational formulation, the instrument can generate more accurate data on the internal barriers of scholarship recipients [12].

Table 6. Results of the External Factors Dimension of the Study

No.	Item	Instrument Validation	Scholarship Manager Validation	Language Validation
External Factors Dimension of the Study				
21	Academic Advisor Support	0.938	0.750	1.000
22	Academic Facilities Support	0.865	0.767	0.906
23	Effectiveness of Scholarship Monitoring	0.927	0.767	1.000
24	Quality of Scholarship Administrative Services	0.865	0.750	0.917

No.	Item	Instrument Validation	Scholarship Manager Validation	Language Validation
25	Academic Environment Support	0.938	0.750	1.000
26	Scholarship Policy Support	0.938	0.750	0.990

In the external factor dimension of the study, all items were also declared valid. The Aiken's V score from instrument experts is in the range of 0.865 to 0.938, the value of the scholarship manager is in the range of 0.750 to 0.767, and the value of linguists is in the range of 0.906 to 1.000. These results show that academic supervisor support, academic facilities, scholarship monitoring, administrative services, academic environment, and scholarship policy are relevant aspects to evaluate the success of the scholarship recipient's studies. This dimension reinforces that scholarship evaluations should not only assess individual recipients, but should also assess the institutional support available.

The high scores of instrument experts on the items of academic advisor support, academic environment support, and scholarship policy support indicate that institutional factors are seen as important in the success of the study. This emphasizes the importance of monitoring higher education programs on an ongoing basis [16]. In addition, it was explained that the quality of data and information is needed in the management of higher education so that policies can be evaluated appropriately. In the context of graduate scholarships, monitoring, administrative services, academic facilities, and supervisor support are important because they can help scholarship recipients complete their studies on target [17].

Although all items of external factors are valid, the value of the scholarship manager is relatively lower than that of instrument experts and linguists. The items of academic supervisor support, the quality of scholarship administration services, academic environment support, and scholarship policy support received a score of 0.750 from the scholarship manager. This value indicates that external aspects are already relevant, but they still need to be explained more specifically. The support of academic advisors can be described through the intensity of guidance, clarity of direction, and assistance in overcoming academic obstacles [3]. The quality of administrative services can be explained through the speed of service, clarity of information, ease of procedure, and response to the needs of scholarship recipients. With this explanation, the instrument will be easier to use to identify external supports that actually affect the completion of the study [21].

When viewed by validator group, the highest results were found in language validation with an average of 0.983. This shows that the instrument has excellent sentence structure and readability. However, linguists' comments still point to the need to clarify some terms that are still common, such as "clear information", "transparent", "understand", "study motivation", "systematic", and "quality". The term needs to be operationalized so that respondents have the same understanding when filling out the instrument. For example, "transparent" can be described as the openness of procedures, assessment criteria, and the announcement of selection results. Meanwhile, "quality" can be directed to academic achievement, study readiness, research ability, and relevance of study objectives.

The instrument expert gave an average score of 0.878, which indicates that the dimensions and items of the instrument have been in accordance with the scholarship policy evaluation construct. This means that the structure of the instrument that includes the selection process, academic performance, internal factors, and external factors has

answered the needs of the evaluation formulated in the background. Meanwhile, the average score of the scholarship manager of 0.788 shows that the instrument is already relevant to management practices, but still requires editorial adjustments to be more applicable in the field. This difference is natural because scholarship managers assess instruments from the perspective of implementation, such as selection flows, documents, monitoring, services, and administrative policies [19].

Overall, the results of Aiken's V show that the scholarship policy evaluation instrument is suitable for use as an evaluation tool. This instrument answers the gap described in the background, namely the lack of comprehensive mapping of the selection process, academic performance, internal factors, and external factors of scholarship recipients. These four dimensions complement each other because the success of the scholarship program is not only determined by the accuracy of the selection, but also by the academic achievements of the recipients, the personal readiness of the students, and the support of the institution during the study period.

Thus, the main contribution of this research is to produce a scholarship policy evaluation instrument that is valid in terms of content and can be used to support data-driven decision-making. The necessary revisions are minor, especially in the sharpening of terms and the formulation of indicators to make them more operational. The improvement does not change the main construct of the instrument, but strengthens the clarity of the item so that the instrument can produce more accurate, measurable, and relevant evaluation data for scholarship management at the graduate programs at Universitas Negeri Jakarta.

4. CONCLUSION

This study concludes that the scholarship management evaluation instrument for the graduate programs at Universitas Negeri Jakarta demonstrated satisfactory content validity based on Aiken's V analysis. The mean coefficient was 0.878 for instrument experts, which falls in the very high category; 0.788 for scholarship managers, which falls in the high category; and 0.983 for language experts, which falls in the very high category. All 26 items exceeded the minimum criterion of 0.60 in the item-level assessments reported for the three validator groups. The results indicate that the instrument's content is considered appropriate in terms of construct representation, relevance to scholarship-management practice, and language clarity. The lower, although still acceptable, mean score from scholarship managers also indicates that some items may benefit from more operational wording to support their application in administrative and monitoring contexts. These findings establish evidence of content validity; they do not, by themselves, establish reliability or effectiveness in actual implementation. Further research should therefore examine the instrument's reliability and performance with its intended respondents.

5. BIBLIOGRAPHY

[1] A. Kosasih, N. E. Juniarfa, Y. Fadli, A. D. Nurlukman, and A. Basit, "The excellence scholarships program: Analysis of implementation aspects and societal impact," *Otoritas : Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 1–15, Apr. 2023, doi: 10.26618/ojip.v13i1.9152.

[2] G. A. Byantoro, D. T. W. Wardoyoe, Karwanto, A. Khamidi, and M. Nursalim, "The Impact of Scholarships on Student Achievement: A Mix Methods Study," *EDUKASIA: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran*, vol. 5, pp. 1371–1378, 2024, [Online]. Available: https://jurnaledukasia.org

[3] M. Oriza and M. Hanita, "Analisis Pengembangan Program Beasiswa Lembaga Pengelola Dana Pendidikan (LPDP) Dalam Meningkatkan Kualitas dan Ketahanan

Sumber Daya Manusia Guna Menghadapi Megatren Abad Ke 21," *Syntax Literate: Jurnal Ilmiah Indonesia*, vol. 7, no. 6, 2022.

[4] R. E. B. Gufron, M. Simanjuntak, and T. Novianti, "Program Beasiswa dan Peningkatan Kinerja Dampak Kepemimpinan, Kontribusi Sosial dan Ekonomi Alumni LPDP," *Jurnal Aplikasi Bisnis dan Manajemen*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 926–938, 2022, doi: 10.17358/jabm.8.3.926.

[5] F. Putra, A. Rahman, and A. Kasim, "Evaluation of the scholarship program by the education fund management institute in Indonesia," *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, vol. 13, no. 5, pp. 3321–3332, 2024, doi: 10.11591/ijere.v13i5.26195.

[6] H. Suluistiani and Y. T. Utami, "Penerapan Algoritma Klasifikasi Sebagai Pendukung Keputusan Pemberian Beasiswa Mahasiswa," *SNTI VI-2018*, no. October 2018, pp. 300–305, 2018.

[7] Supriyanta, Y. Sutanto, D. Susilo, H. A. Setyadi, and A. Syukron, "Multi-Criteria Decision Making Method for Developing Smart Indonesia Program Scholarship Recipient Candidate System," *International Journal on Informatics Visualization*, vol. 9, no. 6, pp. 2510–2518, 2025, doi: 10.62527/joiv.9.6.3706.

[8] T. Lintner, "Effects of performance-based financial incentives on higher education students: A meta-analysis using causal evidence," *Educ. Res. Rev.*, vol. 44, no. July, 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.edurev.2024.100621.

[9] Y. Orgianus, F. R. I. Lapalanti, H. Tarmizi, and H. Oemar, "Optimizing Scholarship Distribution: a Management Information System Approach," *Acta Logistica*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 197–209, 2024, doi: 10.22306/AL.V11I2.497.

[10] H. D. Hayati, M. Rahmawati, Hadiyanto, and Yahya, "Beasiswa LPDP sebagai Investasi Pendidikan: Evaluasi Aksesibilitas dan Kontribusi Alumni," *Jurnal Kepemimpinan dan Pengurusan Sekolah*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 462–472, 2025, [Online]. Available: https://ejurnal.stkip-pessel.ac.id/index.php/kp/article/view/554

[11] M. A. Rachman, "Scholarship for catching up? The Indonesia Endowment Fund for Education (LPDP) scholarship program as a pillar of economic development policy," *Int. J. Educ. Dev.*, vol. 96, pp. 0–29, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.ijedudev.2022.102701.

[12] M. A. A. M. Zamani, S. A. S. Ali, F. A. A. Shukri, M. R. M. Isa, and M. F. M. Amran, "Zakat Collection and Distribution Efficiency in the Federal Territory of Malaysia: A Two-Stage Data Envelopment Analysis," *International Journal on Informatics Visualization*, vol. 9, no. 6, pp. 2648–2655, 2025, doi: 10.62527/joiv.9.6.3924.

[13] H. A. R. R. Boli, "Investment Management at the Indonesia Endowment Fund for Education Agency (LPDP)," *Jurnal Ilmiah Administrasi Negara*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 1–14, 2025.

[14] O. Callista, "Evaluation of Accountability in Dana Publik Management in the LPDP Scholarship Program in Relation to Awardee Obligation Violations," *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 2026, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.6581859.

[15] A. Jumaidi, M. Mustanir, T. R. Yusuf, and S. Sanusi, "Political Study Analyses of Education Policy to Improve Education Quality," *Emerging Science Journal*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 1420–1439, 2024, doi: 10.28991/ESJ-2024-08-04-011.

[16] R. Hidayat, "A Systematic Literature Review of Prior Studies on the Indonesian Independent Campus Policy (2020–2023)," *Higher Education Forum*, vol. 22, pp. 69–97, 2025, doi: 10.15027/0002040521.

[17] H. Husain, F. Syafar, E. Sabara, and S. Syafar, "Data and information quality framework development: Proposed for Indonesia higher education," *Proceedings of the 33rd International Business Information Management Association Conference,*

IBIMA 2019: Education Excellence and Innovation Management through Vision 2020, pp. 7648–7653, 2019.

[18] M. A. Rachman, "Scholarship for catching up? The Indonesia Endowment Fund for Education (LPDP) scholarship program as a pillar of economic development policy," *Int. J. Educ. Dev.*, vol. 96, p. 102701, Jan. 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.ijedudev.2022.102701.

[19] K. S. Saling, "The valuable coordination of sponsored international education in a modern developmental state," *High. Educ. (Dordr).*, no. 0123456789, 2025, doi: 10.1007/s10734-025-01542-9.

[20] S. Syaridin, R. Yusuf, H. Ibrahim, H. Sofyan, B. Bahrun, and N. Muhammad, "Analysis of Social Aspects and Educational Values in Formulating Scholarship Policy: a Case Study in Aceh," *Jurnal Ilmiah Peuradeun*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 1439–1466, 2024, doi: 10.26811/peuradeun.v12i3.1512.

[21] V. Teeroovengadum, T. J. Kamalanabhan, and A. K. Seebaluck, "Measuring service quality in higher education," *Quality Assurance in Education*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 244–258, 2016, doi: 10.1108/qae-06-2014-0028.

[22] N. A. Ahmad, A. A. Mayouf, N. F. Elias, and H. Mohamed, "Learning management system instrument development based on Aiken's V technique," *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, vol. 13, no. 5, p. 3211, Oct. 2024, doi: 10.11591/ijere.v13i5.28925.

[23] N. I. I. Tajuddin *et al.*, "Content Validity Assessment Using Aiken's V: Knowledge Integration Model for Blockchain in Higher Learning Institutions," *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications*, vol. 16, no. 6, 2025, doi: 10.14569/IJACSA.2025.0160659.

[24] A. B. Tambunan and K. Sinulingga, "Jurnal Pengembangan dan Penelitian Pendidikan," *Jurnal Pengembangan dan Penelitian Pendidikan*, vol. 07, no. 2, pp. 161–175, 2025.