

Influence of the Leadership Style on Information Transfer and Corporate Culture to Boost Employee Efficiency in Bantaeng Regency

Nur Nengsih

Student of Magister Program of Management, STIE AMKOP, Makassar, Indonesia
nurnengsih@gmail.com

Hasmin Tamsah, Umi Farida

STIE AMKOP, Makassar, Indonesia
hasmin@stieamkop.ac.id, farida.unm@gmail.com

Eli Retnowati

Universitas Sunan Giri, Surabaya, Indonesia
eli.retno1010@gmail.com

Yusriadi Yusriadi

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

Rudy Kurniawan

University of Sriwijaya, Palembang, Indonesia
rudykurniawan@fisip.unsri.ac.id

Ivana

STISIPOL Candradimuka, Palembang, Indonesia,
datasyaivana@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aims to analyse the impact of infrastructure and supervision on employee performance and the quality of public service and investigate the effect of employee performance on the quality of public services. Analyse the impact of infrastructure and supervision on public services quality through employees' performance in sub-districts in Bantaeng, Bantaeng Regency. This type of analysis is a descriptive quantitative study with a sample of 96 employees using field research and literature data collection techniques. The interpretation of the data used is route analysis (Path Analysis). This study's findings show that infrastructure and supervision have a positive and significant effect on the efficiency of employees themselves in the sub-district of Bantaeng. Bantaeng district, facilities, and infrastructure have a positive and significant impact on the quality of public services in the sub-district of Bantaeng district, Bantaeng Regency. Public services in the Bantaeng District Sub-district, Bantaeng District, staff performance has a positive and significant effect on the quality of public services in the Bantaeng District Sub-district. Facilities and monitoring have a positive and significant impact on the quality of public services through staff performance in the Bantaeng Sub-district.

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

1. Introduction

The government itself is gradually giving top priority to the different forms of growth demands that must be met by the apparatus or workers employed in the government sector. This situation can be seen through several practices in

the different training courses that are purposely performed to enhance employee efficiency in general and the quality of support to the society (public service) as public servants.

Government officers or staff are the critical weapons that are strategic and definitive. As a public official, any employee also promotes the delivery of public programs to conform with the fundamental and civil rights of a person of products, public services, and administrative services. The consistency of employees' success can be demonstrated in the expertise that emerges from their intellect and thinking capacity and their talents and abilities that involve commitment, professionalism, collaboration, and accountability for their jobs (Bin Tahir & Rinantanti, 2016). Meanwhile, public facilities' efficiency can be expressed in the behaviour and acts of staff in managing grievances and resolving administrative requirements in line with society's needs. Human resources as workers are human factors of government as managers and implementers, and controllers often have an essential part in achieving government objectives. Human resources are agents who facilitate goals, have opinions, emotions, and aspirations that may affect the actions against their obligations (A'yun et al., 2017). Matters that will affect human capital to help increase the standard of employment and public programs' quality are supervisory equipment and utilities.

The presence of facilities to sustain operations and perform the responsibilities of an employee and facilitate the standard of service would be a requirement for the city. In brief, the facilities are a building that allows workers to accomplish their duties or function and promote the offering of resources to the town. Infrastructure services may be in houses, rooms, machines, copying, seating, etc. Also, oversight shall be carried out by monitoring carried out by the director or head of the agency and by reviews carried out by the parties concerned concerning the nature of workers' function and the quality of the public services rendered and obtained by the public. Mangkunegara (2007) suggests in his writing that the employee's success is the product of the standard and quantity of work done by the employee in carrying out the duties assigned to him. The consistency of workers' job is fundamentally dependent on human capital, provided that the professional public facilities operate smoothly. Besides, sufficient facilities would be needed to sustain public programs in the city. Moenir (2010) notes that facilities and utilities are all forms of machinery, job equipment, and facilities that act as the essential tools/assistants to execute the work and the sense of work organization interests Nuraini et al., (2019). The office is one of the pillars of the municipal government. It is advantageous to the community in their letter requirements or administrative issues, such as company licenses and guidelines for identification cards and family cards. It often assists in delivering food or in settlement of conflicts that exist in the local region. The standard of the village's human capital must also be professional and would go hand in hand with the quality of the public services offered to the population. This needs support and support services and oversight in the context of surveillance and inspection to meet the specified objectives.

The aspects of infrastructure, supervision, quality of work of employees, and public services are related. They are vital points and the duties and responsibilities commonly identified in the village office's day-to-day activities or activities. The completeness of the infrastructure facilities available at each village office in the Bantaeng District is still incomplete, in compliance with the data on the researchers' complete infrastructure. The lack of working chairs and desks, technological equipment such as computers/laptops and print media, etc., can impact the work of employees and the quality of public services. This report would attempt to explain the equipment and supervision facilities required by workers to support the quality of employees' work and the quality of public services to the community.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Facilities and Infrastructure and Employee Performance

In Article 1 of the Ministerial Regulation (No. 7:2006) on Regular Facilities as well as on Utilities or Local Government Work Facilities, it is also clarified that Office Work Facilities are facilities that specifically assist the local government's implementation phase in accomplishing specified facilities, including office rooms, work equipment, and official vehicles. In the meantime, the organizational infrastructure is a facility that does not explicitly promote the introduction of job process technology to enhance efficiency in line with its roles and obligations, such as office houses, government buildings, and official homes. Infrastructure is required in ongoing or permanent operations, such as structures, fields, halls, institutions, or businesses.

The dominant impact of the accessible facilities will benefit employee success more than education and preparation (Mardiah, 2003). Previous research suggests that the working atmosphere has a dominant impact on employee

performance (Hartono, 2014). Apart from this, the analysis carried out is focused on these partnerships; the following inference can be made:

H1: Infrastructure facilities have a positive and significant effect on employee performance, the more adequate the infrastructure provided, the better employee performance

2.2 Supervision and Employee Performance

Supervision of work carried out can have an effect on efficiency at work (Yuliani, 2011). The impact of leadership extended to an organization or business on the performance of employees or employees cannot be ignored, as in a study that juxtaposes the effect of supervision and work experience on employees' performance. This demonstrates that the findings of the analysis indicate that the supervisory variable has a more significant influence on employees' performance (Situmeang, 2017).

H2: Supervision has a positive and significant effect on employee performance; the more intense the supervision is, the better its performance.

2.3 Facilities and Infrastructure and Quality of Public Services

Infrastructure means both types of machinery, work equipment, and services as the essential tools/assistants for the execution of work, even in the sense of work-related interests. Moenir (2010) defined the understanding that facilities and infrastructure are different resources utilized in operation, including providing services to those who require them, either as a support tool or, most notably/importantly. Yet, both offer benefits for the development and achievement of objectives to be done (Moenir, 2010).

The study carried out by bringing vector facilities and resources into service efficiency does not reveal a substantial impact (Manullang & Harianto, 2015). This is what allows researchers interested in proving themselves by raising the following hypothesis:

H3: Infrastructure has a positive and significant effect on the quality of public services, the more adequate the infrastructure provided, the better the quality of public services

2.4 Supervision and Quality of Public Services

Public programs are resources offered to society by the government. As a public sector provider, the government must be willing to fulfill or meet the people's demands according to their desires. Since excellent and reliable service be a measure to assess a government department. Research using success incentive and supervision factors may have a beneficial and essential influence on service performance (Putri, 2020). On this basis, the following theory may be constructed:

H4: Supervision has a positive and significant impact on the quality of public services; the more intense the supervision is carried out, the better the quality of public services

2.5 Employee Performance and Public Service Quality

Performance assessments taken in terms of quantities and consistency in compliance with the criteria established by the institution or corporation can be observable (can be set by measuring instruments or standards) or intangible (cannot be calculated by measuring instruments or means) based on the type and the experimental implementation phase. The success of workers in an organization is defined by various causes and circumstances that originate inside or beyond the employee.

Excellent service must be delivered to the broader society or the public, past analysis using staff evaluation factors focused on human expertise, operational support, and managerial support must affect public services' efficiency (Bismawati, 2016). On this basis, the following statement can be made:

H5: Employee performance is positive and significant for the quality of public services; the better the employee's performance, the better the quality of public services

2.6 Infrastructure, Employee Performance and Public Service Quality

Public services performed by the bureaucracy are a representation of the role of the state apparatus as public employees, in addition to becoming public servants. Public utilities are all program operations carried out by public service companies to address public demands and enforce regulatory mandates.

The consistency of public programs would come from the happiness expressed by people who use them. Previous surveys have found that one of the variables impacting satisfaction in delivering public services is tangible proof or amenities, including physical buildings, machinery, and other physical infrastructure services. Indicators: (a) operation support equipment; (b) location; (c) neatness and presence of the apparatus; (d) information media belonging to the apparatus; (Sulistyanto, 2015). On this basis, the following conclusions can be made:

H6: Infrastructure facilities have a positive and significant effect through employee performance on the quality of public services; the more adequate the infrastructure provided, the better the employee's performance to improve the quality of public services

2.7 Supervision, Employee Performance and Public Service Quality

The purpose of the civil sector is ultimate to serve society. To achieve this happiness, the demand for an excellent standard of service is honesty (openness), accountability (responsibility), conditionality (ability), participatory (community participation), adequate protection (not differentiated in terms of gender, nationality, faith, class, social status), the balance of rights and responsibilities. The exemplary operation will also operate if assisted by effective management by superiors and direct managers and workers' willingness to fulfill their duties.

Previous analysis has shown that the sign of supervision has little influence. In other words, it is not excellent and negligible for public services, whereas workers' capacity has a positive and vital impact on public assistance. (Augusti Wulandari, 2016). On this basis, the researcher is interested in demonstrating this by suggesting the following hypothesis:

H7: Supervision has a positive and significant effect through employee performance on the quality of public services, the more intense the supervision is carried out, the better the employee's performance will improve the quality of public services

3. Research Method

This research uses a descriptive quantitative approach using path analysis techniques (path analysis). This study was carried out on civil servants (PNS) in the Bantaeng district of Bantaeng Regency. The study sample comprises 96 individuals who are civil servants (PNS). The technique of data collection is through field research through observation and distribution of questionnaires and library research.

4. Result and Discussion

This study uses path analysis (path analysis) to test the path construct empirically or otherwise. Ghozali (2018) states that path analysis is an extension of multiple linear analysis, or path analysis uses regression analysis to estimate the causal relationship between variables (causal models) that have been theoretically predetermined. This analysis was also carried out to identify the direct and indirect effects of a set of independent variables on the dependent variable. The data in this study will be processed using the Social Sciences Statistical Package (SPSS) program. A path diagram design is required to describe the relationship between variables using path analysis, where the path diagram substructure I (first) conveys the infrastructure and infrastructure variables (X1) and the tracking variables (X2) for employee performance variables (Y1). At the same time, the path diagram of substructure II (second) will describe the infrastructure and infrastructure variables (X1) and the supervision variable (X2) for the quality variable of the public service (Y2), the employee performance variable (Y1) for the quality variable of the public service (Y2).

4.1. Path Analysis I

The results of the path diagram test using the Social Sciences Statistical Package (SPSS) program are presented as follows:

Table 1. Results of Sub-Structure Path Analysis I (first)

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	24.837	1.765		14.074	.000

	X1	.221	.067	.246	3.321	.001
	X2	.509	.060	.628	8.486	.000
Dependent of Variable Y1						

Table 2. Results of the Coefficient of Determination of Sub-Structure Path I (first)

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

Based on the I (first) sub-structure path equation above, it can be described or described as follows:

1. $\rho_1 = 0,246$, which describes that infrastructure (X1) has a positive and positive influence on employee performance (Y1). If the infrastructure (X1) increases by 1 point, the employee performance (Y1) will increase by 0.246. This means that the better the infrastructure, the better the employee's account will be.
2. $\rho_2 = 0.628$, which describes that supervision (X2) positively affects employee performance (Y1). If surveillance (X2) increases by 1 point, employee performance (Y1) will increase by 0.628. This means that with better management, employee performance will also get better.
3. The significance value of infrastructure (X1) on employee performance (Y1) is 0.001, and the significance value of supervision (X2) on employee performance (Y1) is 0.000. This shows that infrastructure and leadership significantly affect employee performance, with a significant value less than 0.050.
4. R square = 0.503 is the coefficient of determination, which describes that infrastructure (X1) and supervision (X2) contributed 0.503 or 50.3% to employee performance (Y1). Simultaneously, the rest was influenced by other variables not examined or included in this study.

4.2. Path Analysis II

Table 3. Results of Sub-Structure Path Analysis II (second)

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
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
Dependent Variable: Y2						

Table 4. Results of the Analysis of the Sub-Structure Path Determination Coefficient II (second)

Model Summary				
Model	R	R-Square	Adjusted R-Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.463 ^a	.214	.189	3.200
Predictors: (Constant), Y1, X1, X2				

Based on the equation of the sub-structure II (second) path above, it can be described or described as follows:

1. $\rho_1 = 0,246$, which describes that the infrastructure (X1) has a positive effect on public services quality (Y2). It can be said that the existence of infrastructure will affect the quality of public services (Y2) by 0.252. This means that the better the infrastructure, the better the quality of public services provided.

2. $\rho_2 = 0.610$, which describes that employee performance (Y1) positively affects the quality of public services (Y2). If the employee's performance (Y1) increases by 1 point, then the quality of public services (Y2) will increase by 0.610. This means that the better the supervision, the better the quality of public services
3. $\rho_3 = 0.229$, which describes that supervision (X2) positively affects the quality of public services (Y2). If management (X2) increases by 1 point, the quality of public services (Y2) will increase by 0.229. This means that the better the supervision, the better the quality of public services.
4. The significance value of infrastructure (X1) on the quality of public services (Y2) is 0.012, the significance value of supervision (X2) on the quality of public services (Y2) is 0.069, and the significance value of employee performance (Y1) on the quality of public services (Y2) is 0.000. This shows that infrastructure and employee performance significantly affect employee performance, with a substantial value less than 0.050. Meanwhile, supervision does not considerably affect public services quality, with a significant value greater than 0.050.
5. R square = 0.214 is the coefficient of determination, which describes that infrastructure (X1), supervision (X2), and employee performance (Y1) contribute 0.214 or 21.4% to the quality of public services (Y2). Simultaneously, the rest is influenced by other variables not researched or included in this study.

4.3. Hypothesis Results

Table 5. Hypothesis Test Results

Hypothesis	Direct Influence (direct)	Sig	Indirect Influence	Information
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
Sub structuring 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 to Y ₁ (H6)			(0,246 x 0,610) = 0,150	Accepted
X ₂ to Y ₂ to Y ₁ (H7)			(0,628 x 0,610) = 0,383	Accepted

Source: SPSS 16 output results processed in 2019

The results of hypothesis 1 in the table show that the value of the direct effect for the infrastructure variable (X1) on employee performance (Y1) appears to be 0.246 and is positive with a significance of 0.000. Thus, the infrastructure is positive and significant for employee performance, so that the first hypothesis (H1) is accepted.

The 2 table hypothesis results indicate that the value of the direct effect for the supervisory variable (X2) on employee performance (Y1) is 0.628 and is 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 show value of the direct effect for the infrastructure variable (X1) on the quality of public services (Y2) appears to be 0.525 and is 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 show a direct effect for the monitoring variable (X2) on the quality of public services (Y2) appears to be 0.229 and positive with a significance of 0.069. Thus, supervision has a positive but insignificant effect on the quality of public services, so that the fourth hypothesis (H4) is rejected.

The results of hypothesis 5 in the table show that the direct effect for the employee performance variable (Y1) on the quality of public services (Y2) appears to be 0.610 and positive with a significance of 0.000. Thus the employee performance is positive and significant on the quality of public services so that the fifth hypothesis (H5) is accepted.

The results of hypothesis 6 in the table show effect of infrastructure (X1) on the quality of public services (Y2) employee performance (Y1) is obtained from multiplying the effect value of X1 on Y1 with the effect value of Y1 on Y2, resulting in a practical matter of 0.150. Thus, infrastructure is positive and significant for the quality of public services through employee performance, so that the sixth hypothesis (H6) is accepted.

The results of hypothesis 7 in the table show effect of supervision (X2) on the quality of public services (Y2) employee performance (Y1) is obtained from the multiplication of the practical value of X2 on Y1 effect value of Y1 on Y2, resulting in a sufficient weight of 0.383. Thus, the positive and significant supervision on public services' quality through employee performance is that the seventh hypothesis (H7) is accepted.

5. Discussion

Infrastructure facilities have a significant effect on the performance of employees, the adequate infrastructure provided will be the better the performance of employees. Following the research conducted by researchers, dominant infrastructure facilities available can support employee performance rather than education and training (Mardiah, 2003). In addition, previous studies stated the work environment has a dominant effect over infrastructure facilities on employee performance (Hartono, 2014).

Supervision has a positional effect and has a significant impact on employee performance. The more intense management is carried out, the better the employee's performance. Supervision of the work carried out can affect work productivity (Yuliani, 2011). The influence of supervision applied to the office or company on the performance of employees or employees is undeniable as in research that compares the influence of supervision and work experience on employee performance that shows the results of research that supervisory variables have a greater influence on employee performance (Situmeang, 2017).

Infrastructure facilities have a positive and significant effect on the quality of public services. The more adequate the infrastructure provided will be, the better the quality of public services. Understanding described by Moenir (2010), there is a directive that facilities and infrastructure are various tools used in the activity, including providing services for those who need it. Either as a supporting tool or, most notably / importantly, both offer benefits to making and achieving the goals (Moenir, 2010). However, research that has been conducted by taking variable infrastructure facilities on service performance does not show a significant influence (Manullang & Harianto, 2015).

Supervision has a positive and significant influence on the quality of public services. The more intense the management is carried out, the better the quality of public services. As a public service provider, the government must be able to 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. Therefore, a study that uses variables of motivation to achieve and supervision can positively and significantly influence the performance of services (Putri, 2020).

The performance of employees is positive and significant to the quality of public services. The better the performance of employees will be, the better the quality of public services. Performance measures are seen in terms of specific amounts and rates by the standards set by the organization or company. The form can be tangible (can be arranged by measuring instrument or standard) or intangible (can not be determined by measuring instruments or standards), depending on the form and process of successful implementation. Excellent services should be provided to the public or the public. Previous research using employee performance variables based on individual competencies, organizational support, and management support affect public services quality (Bismawati, 2016).

Infrastructure facilities have a positive and significant effect on employees' performance to the quality of public services. The adequate infrastructure provided will improve the performance of employees to improve the quality of public services. Public services conducted by bureaucracy is one form of the function of the state apparatus as a public servant in addition to being a public servant. 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) information media owned (Sulistyanto, 2015).

Supervision has a positive and significant influence on the performance of employees on the quality of public services. The more intense supervision is carried out, the better the performance of employees to improve the quality of public services. In line with previous research, the study results also showed signs of supervision does not affect, in other words, is not positive and insignificant to public services, while the ability of employees to have a positive and significant influence on public assistance. (Agusti Wulandari, 2016).

6. Conclusion

Based on these results, it may infer various things for analysts about job morale and the efficiency of public services:

1. Facilities and supervision have a positive and significant influence on the success of workers.
2. The infrastructure has a favourable and vital influence on public services' efficiency, but the reporting variable has no positive impact on public services quality.
3. The indirect effects of facilities and management by workers' performance on the standard of public services look positive to sustain and enhance the quality of public services, infrastructure, oversight, and output of employees as a whole.

Reference

- A'yun, K., Suyono, Poedjiastoeti, S., & Bin-Tahir, S. Z. (2017, August). Reduction of cognitive conflict and learning style impact towards student-teacher's misconception load. In *AIP Conference Proceedings* (Vol. 1868, No. 1, p. 030004). AIP Publishing LLC.
- Bismawati, B. (2016). Pengaruh Kinerja Pegawai Terhadap Kualitas Pelayanan Publik Di Badan Penanggulangan Bencana Daerah Kabupaten Mamuju Utara. *Katalogis*. <https://doi.org/10.22487/j23022019,2016.v4.i3.6548>
- Bin-Tahir, S. Z., & Rinantanti, Y. (2016). Multilingual lecturers' competence in English teaching at the university of Iqra Buru, Indonesia. *Asian EFL Journal*, 5, 79-92.
- Ghozali. (2018). Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan IBM SPSS 25. Forum Ilmiah Pendidikan Akuntansi Universitas PGRI Madiun.
- Handoko, T. H. (2011). Manajemen Personalia dan Sumber Daya Manusia. Pengantar Manajemen.
- Hardiansyah. (2018). Kualitas Pelayanan Publik Konsep Dimensi Indikator dan Implementasinya. Gava Media.
- Hartono, D. (2014). Pengaruh Sarana Prasarana dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Dinas Pendidikan Kota Banjarbaru. *Jurnal Kindai*, 10(2), 142–155.
- Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2017). Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Bumi Aksara.
- Mangkunegara, A. P. (2007). Evaluasi Kinerja Sumber Daya Manusia, Cetakan ketiga. Penerbit PT Refika Adi Tama.
- Manullang, F., & Harianto, R. P. (2015). Pengaruh Disiplin, Tingkat Pendidikan, Sarana Prasarana, Dan Pemberian Kompensasi Terhadap Kinerja Pelayanan Dalam Penanganan E-Ktp Di Kecamatan Balikpapan Selatan. *Jurnal Akuntansi Manajemen Madani*, 1(1).
- Matutina, M. (2001). Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Gramedia Widia Sarana Indonesia.
- Moenir, H. A. S. (2010). Manajemen Pelayanan Umum di Indonesia. Manajemen Pelayanan Umum Di Indonesia.
- Mulyani, S. (2008). Modul Memahami Prinsip-Prinsip Penyelenggaraan Administrasi Perkantoran. Erlangga.
- Nuraini, N., Riadi, A., Umanailo, M. C. B., Rusdi, M., Badu, T. K., Suryani, S., ... Hentihu, V. R. (2019). Political Policy for the development of Education. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, 8(10).
- Putri, N. I. (2020). Pengaruh Objektivitas Dan Kompetensi Terhadap Kualitas Audit Apip Dengan Etika Auditor Sebagai Pemoderasi (Studi Kasus Kantor Inspektorat Provinsi Kalimantan Barat). *Jurnal Kajian Ilmiah Akuntansi Fakultas Ekonomi UNTAN (KIAFE)*.
- Situmeang, R. R. (2017). Pengaruh Pengawasan Dan Pengalaman Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada Pt. Mitra Karya Anugrah. *Ajie*.
- Sulistiyanto. (2015). Analisis Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan Terhadap Kepuasan Masyarakat (Studi Kantor Kelurahan Tempurejo Kecamatan Pesantren Kota Kediri). *Jurnal Revitalisasi*.
- Yuliani, W. (2011). Pengaruh kualitas kerja, pengawasan kerja dan kedisiplinan kerja terhadap produktivitas kerja karyawan pada PT. Pasar raya sri ratu semarang. *Jurnal Skripsi UDINUS*.

Bibliography

Nur Nengsih a student at Magister Program of Management of STIE AMKOP, Indonesia. Her areas of interest and research include social science and economic.

Hasmin Tamsah 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. He is a reviewer and editor in some local and international journals.

Umi Farida is a lecture at Economics Department of STIE AMKOP, Indonesia. Her areas of interest and research include social science, economic and management. She has published some articles in national and international journals.

Eli Retnowati is a lecture at Public Administration of Universitas Sunan Giri, Indonesia. His areas of interest and research include social science, economic and management. He has published some articles in national and international journals.

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.

Rudy Kurniawan is a lecturer and researcher at the Faculty of Social and Political Studies, University of Sriwijaya, Palembang, Indonesia. Some of his research is related to sociology and society empowerment. His research interests include corporate social responsibility, resolution of conflict, religion studies, and government studies.

Ivana is a lecturer and researcher at STISIPOL Candradimuka, Palembang, Indonesia. Some of her research is related to agricultural policy and food security policy. Her research interests include farmers' welfare, community empowerment, and public services.