# The Influence of Infrastructure and Supervision Facilities on Employee Performance and Public Service Quality (Case Study of Bantaeng District)

**Nur Nengsih, Syahruddin, Mansur Azis**
Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi AMKOP Makassar, Indonesia
nur.nengsih@gmail.com, syahruddin@stieamkop.ac.id, mansur_asiz@stieamkop.ac.id

**Elyani**
Universitas Tjut Nyak Dhien, Medan, Indonesia
lilyelyani12@gmail.com

**T Enita Rosmika**
Management Study Program, Faculty of Bussines and Management
Universitas Amir Hamzah, North Sumatera, Indonesia.
shalihahilna@gmail.com

**Muhamad Abdul Jumali**
Universitas PGRI Adi Buana Surabaya
abduljumali@unipasby.ac.id

**Yusriadi Yusriadi**
Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Administrasi Puangrimaggalatung, Makassar, Indonesia
yusriadi.yusriadi@uqconnect.edu.au

## Abstract

This study aims: (1) to analyze the effect of infrastructure and supervision on employee performance and public service quality to examine the impact of employee performance on public services quality, and (2) to analyze the effect of infrastructure and supervision on the quality of public services through the implementation of employees in Bantaeng District, Bantaeng Regency. This research type is descriptive quantitative with a sample of 96 employees with data collection techniques through field research and literature. Data analysis used is path analysis (Path Analysis). The results of this study indicate that: (1) infrastructure and supervision have a positive and significant effect on the performance of the employees themselves in Bantaeng district, (2) facilities and infrastructure have a positive and significant impact on the quality of public services in the sub-district of Bantaeng district, (3) supervision has a positive but insignificant effect on the quality of public services in the Bantaeng district, (4) employee performance has a positive and significant impact on the quality of public services in Bantaeng district, and (5) infrastructure and supervision have a positive and significant effect on the quality of public services through the performance of employees in Bantaeng district.

**Keywords**:
Infrastructure, Supervision, Employee Performance, Public Service Quality

## 1. Introduction

Various types of developmental demands that must be faced by officials or employees who work in the field of government increasingly get the top priority by the government. This condition can be seen through various training

activities that are deliberately held to improve the quality of employee performance in general and the quality of service to the public (public service) as a servant of the state. Government officials or employees as the primary tool are very strategic and assertive. Therefore, every employee is a servant of the state who supports creating public services to fulfill the fundamental and civil rights of every citizen of goods, public services, and administrative services.

The quality of employee performance can be seen in knowledge derived from their intelligence and thinking power and skills and abilities, including loyalty, discipline, cooperation, and responsibility for their work. Simultaneously, the quality of public services will appear in the attitudes and actions provided by employees in handling complaints and resolving administrative requirements according to the community's demands. Human resources as employees are human elements in government as planners and implementers, and controllers who always have an active role in realizing government objectives. Human resources are agents who support goals, have thoughts, feelings, and desires that can influence behavior towards their responsibilities. Things that can affect human resources to improve the quality of work and the quality of public services are infrastructure and surveillance facilities.

The existence of infrastructure facilities in supporting activities and completing responsibilities for an employee's duties and supporting the quality of service will be the community's needs. In short, infrastructure facilities are facilities that support employees in completing their tasks or work and support to provide services to the community. Infrastructure facilities can be buildings, rooms, computers, prints, seating, and others. Furthermore, supervision is conducted through monitoring conducted by the head or head of the agency and inspections undertaken by related parties on the quality of employee work and the quality of public services provided and received by the public. Mangkunegara (2015), in his writings, argues that an employee's performance is the result of the quality and quantity of work achieved by an employee by carrying out the task that has been given to him. The quality of employee performance is based on human resources. If competent, then public services will run smoothly.

Furthermore, to support public services to the community, adequate infrastructure must be needed. Moenir (2015) states that infrastructure facilities are all types of equipment, work equipment, and facilities that serve as the primary tools/assistants in the implementation of work and the context of interests related to the organization of work. The village office is one of the local government's foundations that is very helpful to the community in the needs of letters or administrative issues such as business certificates and recommendations for identity cards and family cards. Besides, the village also assists in distributing foodstuffs or the task of resolving disputes that occur in the surrounding community. Therefore, the quality of human resources owned by the town must be competent and go hand in hand with the community's quality of public services. The realization requires infrastructure facilities that support and support and supervision in the form of monitoring and inspection to achieve the goals set.

Aspects of infrastructure, supervision, quality of work of employees, and public services each have a relationship. They are the main points and tasks/responsibilities commonly found in village offices' daily activities. They are the completeness of infrastructure facilities still inadequate, and completeness data of infrastructure facilities obtained. Yet lack of chairs and work desks, technological equipment such as computers/laptops and print media, and others can affect employees' work and the quality of public services to the public. This study will describe the infrastructure and supervision facilities needed by employees to support the quality of employee performance and the quality of public services to the community.

## 2. Literature Review

In the Regulation of the Minister (No.7: 2006) discussing the Standard of Facilities Infrastructure or Work facilities of the Local Government in article 1 also explains that office work facilities are facilities that directly have serves as a support for the implementation process of local government in achieving the specified facilities, including office space, work equipment, and official vehicles. Simultaneously, the workplace infrastructure is a facility that does not directly serve to support the implementation of a work process device in improving performance by its duties and responsibilities, such as office buildings, office buildings, and office houses. Infrastructure is needed in forever or permanently activities such as buildings, fields, hall buildings, and so on in an organization or company.

The dominant influence of available infrastructure facilities can support employees' performance from education and training (Mardiah, 2003; Nuraini et al., 2019; Umanailo, 2020, 2019). Previous research also stated that the work environment has a dominant effect on employee performance (Didi Hartono, 2014). Notwithstanding this, this research is based on these relationships. Hypotheses can be made as follows:

Supervision of the work carried out can affect work productivity (Widi Yuliani, 2015). The effect of control applied to the office or company on employees' or employees' performance is undeniable as in research that compares the influence of supervision and work experience on employee performance, showing the study results that supervisory variables have a more significant effect on employee performance (Situmeang, 2017; Mu'adi et al., 2020; Nawawi et al., 2020). Furthermore, based on the concept built from the previous research, hypotheses can be made as follows:

Infrastructures mean all equipment, work equipment, and facilities as the primary tool/assistant on the implementation of the work and in the context of interests related to the organization of work. The understanding explained by Moenir shows that facilities and infrastructure are various tools used in an activity. It includes providing services for those who need it, either as a support tool or, most notably / significantly. Still, both offer benefits to creating and achieving goals that want to be completed (Moenir, 2015). Research that has been conducted by taking variable infrastructure facilities on service performance does not show a significant influence (Friska and Rudi, 2017). This makes researchers interested in being proven by raising the hypothesis as follows:

Public service is a service provided by the government to the community. As a public service provider, the government must serve or meet the community's needs by their expectations because of good service and quality that will be used as a benchmark in determining the success of a government agency. A study that uses great motivation and supervision variables can positively and significantly influence the performance of services. (Anjani and Sugi, 2017). Based on this can be built hypotheses as follows:

Performance measures are seen in terms of specific amounts and qualities by the organization's standards or company. The form can be tangible (can be arranged by measuring instrument or standard) or intangible (cannot be determined by measuring instruments or means), depending on the form and process of successful implementation. Employees' performance in an institution is determined by several factors and conditions that come from within the employee or come from outside the employee. Excellent services should be provided to the broader community or the public. Previous research using employee performance variables based on individual competencies, organizational support, and management support affect public services quality (Bismawati, 2016). Based on this, hypotheses can be made as follows:

Public services conducted by the bureaucracy are one form of the state apparatuses functions as a public servant and a public servant. Public service is all service activities carried out by public service providers to meet general needs and implement statutory provisions.

The quality of public service will come at the satisfaction felt by those who need it. Previous studies have found that one factor in the quality of public services that affect satisfaction is physical or infrastructure evidence, namely physical facilities, equipment, and other physical infrastructure services. Indicators: (a) service support equipment; (b) location; (c) neatness and appearance of the apparatus; (d) proprietary information media. (Linda Nur Susila, 2010). Based on this, the following hypotheses can be created:

Public services aim to satisfy the community. To achieve that satisfaction, the demand for excellent service quality is transparency (open), accountability (responsibility), conditional (ability), participatory (community participation), equal rights, and obligations. Besides, excellent service can run smoothly if supported by good supervision from supervisors and direct leaders and employees' ability to carry out tasks. Previous research has shown that surveillance does not affect other words and insignificant to public services, while employees' ability to influence public assistance positively and significantly (Agusti Wulandari, 2016). Based on this, researchers are interested in proving it by proposing the following hypothesis:

## 3. Methods

This research uses a descriptive quantitative approach with path *analysis* techniques. This research was conducted with civil servants (civil servants) in the Bantaeng subdistrict. The research sample as many as 96 people who are civil servants (civil servants). Data collection techniques by conducting field research through observation and circulating questionnaires and literature research.

This study's variables were measured using a scale range of 1-5, meaning the number 1 (one) indicates strongly disagreed and a scale of 5 (five) indicates strongly agreeing with the questionnaire statement. The statements in the questionnaire are constructed from the following concepts:

Employee Work (Y1) is an activity carried out effectively and efficiently by employees according to their ability that can be assessed to meet qualitative requirements of the demands of their work to achieve the expected results. The indicators are Knowledge, Ability (skill), and Abilities (Matutina, 2013).

Public Service Quality (Y2) is a dynamic condition associated with services, people and processes, and environments in which quality assessment is determined at the time of public service. The indicators are attitude and action. (Gasperz (2011) and Zeitmall in Hardiansyah (2015).

Infrastructure facilities (X1) are physical and non-physical formations available and can be used by employees. The indicators are buildings, rooms, office equipment, health, and safety (Sri Mulyani (2012) and Hasibuan (2015) Supervision (X2) is the activity or act of observation/monitoring evaluating results that have been done. The indicators are determining work standards, measurement of work results, and corrective or corrective actions. (Handoko, 2015).

## 4. Results and Discussion

This study uses *path analysis* to test the path construct or not empirically. Ghozali (2013) states that path analysis is an extension of multiple linear analysis, or path analysis uses regression analysis to estimate causal relationships between predetermined variables (causal models) based on theory. This analysis is also done to find the direct and indirect effects of independent variables on dependent variables. The data in this study will be processed using the Statistics Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) program. Describing the relationship between variables using *path analysis,* they must design a path diagram (path *diagram)*. Wherein the chart of the path sub-structure, I (first) will describe the variables of infrastructure facilities ($X_1$) and variables supervision ($X_2$) to employee performance variables ($Y_1$). While the diagram of the substructure line II (second) will describe the variables of infrastructure facilities ($X_1$) and supervisory variables ($X_2$) against the variables of public service quality ($Y_2$), then the employee performance variable ($Y_1$) to the public service quality variable ($Y_2$). The test results of the path *diagram* using the help of the Statistical Package for Social *Sciences* (SPSS) program are presented as follows:

**Table 1**. Results of Analysis of Substructure Path I (first)

| Coefficients | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | | |
| Model | | B | Std. Error | Beta | t | Sig |
| 1 | (Constant) | 24.837 | 1.765 | | 14.074 | .000 |
| | X1 | .221 | .067 | .246 | 3.321 | .001 |
| | X2 | .509 | .060 | .628 | 8.486 | .000 |
| a. Dependent Dari Variable Y1 | | | | | | |

**Source:** Primary data processed 2019

**Table 2**. Result of Coefficient of Determination of Substructure Line I (first)

| Model Summary | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Model | R | R-Square | Adjusted R-Square | Std. An error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .709a | .503 | .492 | 2.539 |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), X2, X1 | | | | |

**Source:** Primary data processed data 2019

Based on the equation of the path of sub-structure I (first) above can be given an overview or described as follows:
$\rho1 = 0.246$, which explains that infrastructure facilities ($X_1$) influence and positively affect employees' performance ($Y_1$). If infrastructure facilities (X1) increase by 1 point, then employees' performance ($Y_1$) will increase by 0.246.

This means that the better the infrastructure, the better the understanding of employees; $\rho2 = 0.628$, which describes that supervision $(X_2)$ positively influences employee performance $(Y_1)$. If management $(X2)$ increases by 1 point, then employees' performance $(Y_1)$ will increase by 0.628. This means that the supervision of employees will also be better; The significance value of infrastructure facilities $(X_1)$ to employee performance $(Y_1)$ is 0.001, and the importance of supervisory significance $(X_2)$ to employee performance $(Y_1)$ is 0.000. This shows that infrastructure and supervision facilities significantly impact employee performance with a significant value of less than 0.050; $R\ square = 0.503$ is a coefficient of determination that describes that infrastructure facilities $(X_1)$ and supervision $(X_2)$ contributed 0.503 or 50.3% to employee performance $(Y_1)$, while the rest was influenced by other variables not studied or included in this study.

**Table 3.** Results of Analysis of Substructure Path II (second)

| Coefficients | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | | |
| Model | B | Std. Error | Beta | t | Sig |
| 1 (Constant) | 58.590 | 3.936 | | 14.888 | .000 |
| X1 | .226 | .089 | .252 | 2.549 | .012 |
| X2 | .185 | .101 | .229 | 1.840 | .069 |
| Y1 | .609 | .131 | .610 | 4.657 | .000 |
| a. Dependent Variable: Y2 | | | | | |

**Source:** Primary data processed in 2019

**Table 4.** Results of Analysis of Coefficient of Determination of Substructure Line II (second)

| Model Summary | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Model | R | R-Square | Adjusted R-Square | Std. An error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .463[a] | .214 | .189 | 3.200 |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), Y1, X1, X2 | | | | |

**Source:** Primary data processed in 2019

Based on the equation of the path of sub-structure II (second) above can be given an overview or described as follows: $\rho1 = 0.246$, which explains that infrastructure facilities $(X_1)$ positively affect public services quality $(Y_2)$. It can be said that the infrastructure will affect the quality of public services $(Y_2)$ by 0.252. This means that the better the infrastructure, the better the quality of public services provided; $\rho2 = 0.610$, which describes that employee performance $(Y_1)$ positively affects public services quality $(Y_2)$. If the performance of employees $(Y\ 1)$ increases by 1 point, then the quality of public services $(Y_2)$ will increase by 0.610. This means that the better the supervision, the better the quality of public services; $\rho3 = 0.229$, which describes that leadership $(X_2)$ positively affects public services quality $(Y_2)$. If supervision $(X2)$ increases by 1 point, then the quality of public services $(Y_2)$ will increase by 0.229. This means that the better the control, the better the quality of public services; The significance value of infrastructure facilities $(X_1)$ to the quality of public services $(Y_2)$ amounted to 0.012, the value of the importance of supervision $(X_2)$ to the quality of public services $(Y_2)$ amounted to 0.069. The value of the significance of employee performance $(Y\ 1)$ to the quality of public services $(Y_2)$ amounted to 0.000. This shows that infrastructure facilities and employee performance significantly impact employee performance with a significant value of less than 0.050. In comparison, supervision does not considerably influence public services' quality with a substantial value greater than 0.050; $R\ square = 0.214$ is a coefficient of determination that describes that infrastructure facilities $(X_1)$, supervision $(X_2)$, and employee performance $(Y_1)$ contributed 0.214 or 21.4% to the quality of public services $(Y_2)$. Simultaneously, the rest was influenced by other variables not studied or included in this study.

After presenting the data analysis results above, it is time to give a hypothesis test, including direct influence and indirect effect *in* this section. For more details, the hypothesis test can be seen in the following table:

**Table 5**. Hypothesis Test Results

| Hypothesis | Direct influence (*direct*) | Sig. | *Indirect* Influence | Info. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Substructure Path Equation I (first) | | | | |
| $X_1$ to $Y_1$ (H1) | 0,246 | 0,000 | | Accepted |
| $X_2$ to $Y_1$ (H2) | 0,628 | 0,001 | | Accepted |
| Substructure Path Equation II (second) | | | | |
| $X_1$ to $Y_2$ (H3) | 0,525 | 0,012 | | Accepted |
| $X_2$ to $Y_2$ (H4) | 0,229 | 0,069 | | Rejected |
| $Y_1$ to $Y_2$ (H5) | 0,610 | 0,000 | | Accepted |
| $X_1$ to $Y_2$ through $Y_1$ (H6) | | | (0,246 x 0,610) = 0,150 | Accepted |
| $X_2$ to $Y_2$ via $Y_1$ (H7) | | | (0,628 x 0,610) = 0,383 | Accepted |

**Source:** SPSS 16 output results processed in 2019

Based on the table above, it can be known that the hypothetical test results in this study are presented as follows:
The results of hypothesis 1 in the table showed that the direct influence for infrastructure variables ($X_1$) on employee performance ($Y_1$) was visible at 0.246 and was positive with a significance of 0.000. Thus, the infrastructure is positive and significant to employees' performance, so that the first hypothesis (H1) is accepted.

The results of hypothesis 2 of the table showed that the direct influence value for surveillance variables ($X_2$) on employee performance ($Y_1$) was 0.628 and was positive with a significance of 0.001. In other words, positive and significant supervision on employee performance so that the second hypothesis (H2) is accepted.

The results of hypothesis 3 in the table showed that the direct influence value for infrastructure variables ($X_1$) on the quality of public services ($Y_2$) was visible at 0.525 and was positive with a significance of 0.012. Thus, the infrastructure is positive and significant on the quality of public services so that the third hypothesis (H3) is accepted. The results of hypothesis 4 in the table showed that the direct influence value for surveillance variables ($X_2$) on the quality of public services ($Y_2$) was visible at 0.229 and was positive with a significance of 0.069. Thus, supervision has a positive but insignificant influence on public services quality, so the fourth hypothesis (H4) is rejected.

The results of hypothesis 5 in the table showed that the direct influence value for employee performance variables ($Y_1$) on the quality of public services ($Y_2$) was visible at 0.610 and was positive with a significance of 0.000. Thus, employees' performance is positive and significant on the quality of public services, so that the fifth hypothesis (H5) is accepted.

The hypothesis 6 results show that the influence of infrastructure facilities ($X_1$) on the quality of public services ($Y_2$) through employee performance ($Y_1$) obtained from the multiplication of the value of influence $X_1$ to $Y_1$ with the value of influence $Y_1$ to $Y_2$ produces an influence value of 0.150. Thus, the infrastructure is positive and significant on the quality of public services through employees' performance so that the sixth hypothesis (H6) is accepted.

The hypothesis 7 results showed that the influence of supervision ($X_2$) on quality of public services ($Y_2$) through employee performance ($Y_1$) obtained from multiplication between the value of influence $X_2$ to $Y_1$ with the value of influence $Y_1$ to $Y_2$ resulted in an influence value of 0.383. Thus, positive, and significant supervision on the quality of public services through employee performance so that the seventh hypothesis (H7) is accepted.

## 5. Conclusion
Based on these findings, researchers can conclude several things regarding employee performance and quality of public services. First, infrastructure and supervision facilities have a positive and significant effect on employee performance. Second, infrastructure has a positive and significant impact on the quality of public services, but the variable supervision does not positively affect public services quality. Third, the indirect influence provided by infrastructure and leadership through employee performance on public services' quality looks good. To maintain and improve the quality of public services, they must need infrastructure facilities, supervision, and employees' performance.

## References

Agusti Wulandari. 2016. Pengaruh Pengawasan Melekat Dan Kemampuan Pegawai Terhadap Kualitas Pelayanan Publik Pada Kantor Kecamatan Muara Ancalong Di Kabupaten Kutai Timur. Journal Pemerintahan Integratif, 2016, 4 (4) : 577-591

Bismawati. 2016. Pengaruh KInerja Pegawai terhadap kualitas pelayanan publik di Badan penanggulangan bencana daerah Kabupaten Mamuju. Jurnal katalogis, volume 4 nomor 3, maret 2016.

Didi Hartono. 2014. Pengaruh Sarana Prasarana Dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Dinas Pendidikan Kota Banjarbaru. Jurnal KINDAI Volume 10 Nomor 2, April – Juni 2014

Friska Manullang dan Rudy Pudjut Harianto, 2017. Pengaruh Disiplin, Tingkat Pendidikan, Sarana Prasarana, Dan Pemberian Kompensasi Terhadap Kinerja Pelayanan Dalam Penanganan E – Ktp Di Kecamatan Balikpapan Selatan. Jurnal akutansi manajemen madani Vol. 1, No. 1, Juni 2017.

Gaspersz, V. 2011. Total Quality Management. Bogor: Vinchristo Publication.

Handoko, T. Hani. 2015. Manajemen Personalia dan Sumber Daya Manusia. Yogyakarta: BPFE.

Hardiyansyah. 2015. Kualitas Pelayanan Publik. Yogyakarta: Gava Media.

Hasibuan, P. S. Malayu. 2015. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Jakarta: PT. Bumi Aksara

Linda Nur Susila. 2010. Analisis Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan Kantor Kelurahan Terhadap Kepuasan Masyarakat Kelurahan Jagalan Kecamatan Jebres Kota Surakarta. Journal of Rural and Development Volume 1 No. 1 Februari 2010

Luky Dewi Anjani dan Sugi Rahayu, 2017. Pengaruh Motivasi Berprestasi Dan Pengawasan Terhadap Kualitas Pelayanan Publik Badan Pertanahan Nasional (Bpn) Kota Yogyakarta. Jurnal. 9209-20693-1-SM.

Mangkunegara, A. Anwar Prabu. 2015. Sumber Daya Manusia Perusahaan. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya

Manullang. M. 2015. Dasar-dasar Manajemen. Yogyakarta: Universitas Gajah Mada Mardiah, Rita. 2003. Pengaruh Pendidikan dan Pelatihan, Sarana dan Prasarana Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai (Studi Kasus di Kabupaten Musi Rawas), Tesis Program Studi Magister Manajemen Fakultas Ekonomi. Palembang: Universitas Sriwijaya.

Matutina, 2013. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Jakarta: PT. Gramedia Widia Sarana Indonesia

Moenir, H.A.S. 2015. Manajemen Pelayanan Umum di Indonesia. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara,

Mu'adi, S., Maksum, A., Hakim, M. L., & Umanailo, M. C. B. (2020). Transfer of function agricultural land. Proceedings of the International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management, 0(March), 2568–2574.

Nawawi, M., Ali, A., Irawan, B., Ahmad, B., Mukramin, S., Marsuki, N. R., Umanailo, M. C. B., & Kaya, I. R. G. (2020). The village kalesang program as a poverty alleviation community. International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research, 9(3), 3103–3107.

Nuraini, N., Riadi, A., Umanailo, M. C. B., Rusdi, M., Badu, T. K., Suryani, S., Irsan, I., Ismail, I., Pulhehe, S., & Hentihu, V. R. (2019). Political Policy for the development of Education. International Journal Of Scientific & Technology Research, 8(10).

Pasolong, Harbani. 2015. Kepemimpinan Birokrasi cetakan ke empat. Bandung: CV. Alfabeta

Situmeang, Rosinta Romauli. 2017. Pengaruh pengawasan dan pengamalan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan pada PT. Mitra Karya Anugrah. Ajie – Asian Journal Of Innovation and entrepenuer. Vol. 02, No. 02, May 2017.

Sri Mulyani. 2012. Modul Memahami Prinsip-Prinsip Penyelenggaraan Administrasi Perkantoran. Erlangga. Jakarta.

Umanailo, M. C. B. (2019). Structure of Social Change in Industrial Society. Proceedings of the International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management Riyadh, 668–672.

Umanailo, M. C. B. (2020). The energy in the context of social. Proceedings of the International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management, 0(March), 2503–2508.

Widi Yuliani. 2015. Pengaruh Kualitas Kerja, Pengawasan Kerja Dan Kedisiplinan Kerja Terhadap Produktivitas Kerja Karyawan Pada PT. Pasar Raya Sri Ratu Semarang. Online. Eprints.dinus.ac.id/17178

## Biographies

**Nur Nengsih** is a student at Magister Program of Economic Science of STIE AMKOP, Indonesia. Her areas of interest and research include social science and economic. She has published some articles in national journals.

**Syahruddin** is a lecturer at Economics Department of STIE AMKOP, Indonesia. His areas of interest and research include economic, management, management human resource. He has published some books and many articles in national and international journals.

**Mansur Azis** is a lecturer at Economics Department of STIE AMKOP, Indonesia. His areas of interest and research include economic, management, management human resource. He has published some books and many articles in national and international journals.

**Elyani** is lecturer at the Faculty of Law, Department of Law, Universitas Tjut Nyak Dhien, Medan, Indonesia. His research fields and interests include social sciences, has published several scientific articles in national journals. Active in Participating in PERADI Advocate Professional Education. He is also involved in several organizations such as IKADIN (Indonesian Advocates Association), PDRI (Brotherhood Lecturer of the Republic of Indonesia) Medan Branch.

**T Enita Rosmika** Lecture of universitas Amir Hamzah since 1986. She completed her bachelor degree majoring in management from Universitas Sumatera Utara in 1985 and master degree majoring management from Universitas Sumatera Utara in 2005.

**Muhamad Abdul Jumali** has worked as a lecturer at the Industrial Engineering Program, Faculty of Engineering, PGRI Adi Buana University of Surabaya since 2013 until now in the University's academic activities. Has served as the head of Industrial Engineering Laboratory since 2014 and now has served the Vice Dean Faculty of Engineering since 2020 until now. Completed the bachelor program in the Industrial Engineering at Muhammadiyah University of Sidoarjo and completed the master program in the Industrial Engineering Study Program at Sepuluh Nopember Institute of Technology Surabaya

**Yusriadi Yusriadi** is a lecturer at Public Administration Department of Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Administrasi Puangrimaggalatung, Indonesia and chancellor on Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Hukum Pengayoman. His areas of interest and research include social science, political science, sociology, legal studies, and public administration. He has published some books and many articles in national and international journals. He is a reviewer and editor in some local and international journals.