

# THE INFLUENCE OF WORK CONFLICT, JOB STRESS AND WORK DISCIPLINE ON THE EMPLOYEES' PERFORMANCE OF PT. PELINDO II – IPC JAKARTA

**Ghafar Ibnu Tsalis<sup>1</sup>, Herry Krisnandi<sup>2</sup>, Kumba Digdowiseiso<sup>3\*</sup>**

Faculty of Economics, Universitas Nasional, Indonesia<sup>1,2,3</sup> Email:

ghafar.tsalis@yahoo.com<sup>1</sup>, hery\_krisnandi@yahoo.co.id<sup>2</sup>,

kumba.digdo@civitas.unas.ac.id<sup>3\*</sup>

---

## Abstract

This study aimed to analyze the effects of job stress work conflict and work discipline on the performance of employees of PT. Pelindo II-IPC Jakarta in 2016. The results of research using primary data in the form of a questionnaire to 100 respondents in PT. Pelindo II-IPC Jakarta in 2016 showed that there is influence between Conflict Work, Work Stress and Work Discipline on employee performance PT. Pelindo II-IPC Jakarta. This is evidenced by F count larger than F table and t greater than t table. The results of calculations based on t test obtained t for Conflict Work (X1) of 10.386 and thitung for Work Stress (X2) is 5,918 bigger than t table 1.660, meaning that the work conflict and work stress and significant positive effect on employee performance of PT Pelindo II. While thitung for Work Discipline (X3) of 1.178 is smaller than 1,660, which means ttable Discipline had no effect on employee performance of PT Pelindo II. While the regression model as follows  $Y = 0,571X1 + 0,383X2 + 0,080X3$  This suggests that the three independent variables X1, X2, and X3 affect the Y.

Keywords: Work Conflict, Job Stress, Work Discipline, Employee Performance

---

## INTRODUCTION

In a company, human resources are the main asset in every activity. Employees as human resources in the company have great potential to carry out company activities. The potential of every human resource in the company must be utilized as well as possible so that it is able to provide optimal work results in accordance with the company's goals.

PT Pelabuhan Indonesia II (Persero) or abbreviated as Pelindo II is State-owned enterprises (BUMN) which operates in the port services sector with a legal basis, namely Law No.19/2003 concerning state-owned enterprises, Law No.40/2007 concerning limited liability companies and Law No. 17/2008 concerning services and government regulation no. 61/2009.

---

How to cite:	Tsalis, et al. (2024). The Influence of Work Conflict, Job Stress and Work Discipline on The Employees' Performance of PT. Pelindo II – IPC Jakarta. (5)2. Doi:
E-ISSN:	<a href="https://doi.org/10.24127/jsss.v5i2.2721-5202">2721-5202</a>
Published by:	CV. Syntax Corporation Indonesia

---

PT Pelindo II considers conflict and work stress to be things that employees are prone to because of the many demands and the overtime hours that must be done. Likewise, work discipline can reduce employee performance due to not being punctual

According to Mangkunegara (2013:2) Human resource management is planning, organizing, coordinating, implementing and supervising the procurement, development, provision of services, integration, maintenance and separation of the workforce in order to achieve organizational goals.

Conflict is a conflict that occurs between what a person expects of himself, other people, and the organization and the reality of what is expected. Job stress is a feeling of pressure experienced by employees when facing work. This work stress can be seen from Simpton, including unstable emotions, feelings of unease, likes to be alone, difficulty sleeping, smoking excessively, unable to relax, anxiety, tension, nervousness, increased blood pressure, and experiencing digestive disorders.

According to Hasibuan (2011: 193) "Discipline is a person's awareness or willingness to obey all organizational and government agency regulations and applicable social norms. According to Mulyadi (2015:63) Performance is the work results achieved by employees in terms of quality and quantity in accordance with their duties and responsibilities.

The purpose of study is; (1) to find out and analyze the effect of work conflict on employee performance at PT Pelindo II, (2) to find out and analyze the effect of work stress on employee performance at PT Pelindo II, and (3) to find out and analyze the influence of work discipline on employee performance at PT Pelindo II

## RESEARCH METHOD

In this research, the object of research is employee performance which is influenced by work conflict, work stress and work discipline at PT Pelindo II. The data source in this research was obtained by distributing questionnaires, namely a data collection method by conducting or giving statements to respondents with a questionnaire guide containing statements based on the proposed indicators. The type of data used in this research is primary, namely data obtained by respondents from the results of the questionnaire.

The data collection technique will use a questionnaire which is a data collection technique through a containing list statement submitted to the respondent, namely an employee of PT Pelindo II. The scale used is a Likert scale. There are 5 answer categories according to Sugiyono (2010:132), namely

**Table 1. Likert Scale Measurement**

Answer Categories	Score
Strongly Disagree (STS)	1
Disagree (TS)	2
Doubtful (RR)	3
Agree (S)	4
Strongly Agree (SS)	5

Source: Sugiyono (2010:132)

## **Validity and Reliability Test**

### **Validity test**

Validity testing is needed to find out that the statements in the questionnaire are able to measure a variable. According to Sugiyono (2010:187): Testing the validity of each item uses item analysis, namely correlating the score of each item with the total score which is the sum of each item's scores with a minimum requirement of  $r = 0.3$ , then the statement item is said to be valid and can be measured." Validity test related to the accuracy or suitability of the measuring instrument to the concept being measured, so that the measuring instrument can actually measure what it should measure. In testing the validity of the instrument in this research, the SPSS 17.0 program was used.

### **Reliability Test**

Reliability is an instrument that is trustworthy enough to be used as a data collection tool because the instrument is good. A good instrument will not be tendentious or direct respondents to choose certain answers. Instruments that are trustworthy, reliable will produce reliable data. A reliable instrument means that the instrument must be good so that it can reveal reliable data. This Reliability Test was carried out using the Alpha Cronbach formula. The test criteria used to determine reliability are based on the results of a reliability coefficient or alpha of 0.7 as a benchmark.

## **Classical Assumption Testing**

### **Normality test**

The purpose of the normality test is to find out whether the data population is normally distributed or not. The normality test is needed to carry out tests on other variables by assuming that the residual values follow a normal distribution. The statistical test used to test normality in this research is the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test or sample. The results of this analysis are then compared with the crisis value. Guidelines for taking significance ( $\text{Sig} > \alpha = 0.05$ ) then the data is normally distributed, significance number ( $\text{Sig} < \alpha = 0.05$ ) then the data is not normally distributed.

### **Heteroscedasticity Test**

According to Imam Ghozali (2011, 139), the heteroscedasticity test aims to test whether the regression model has unequal variances from the residuals of one observation to another observation. If the variance of the residual from one observation to another is constant, it is called homoscedasticity and if it is different it is called heteroscedasticity.

### **Autocorrelation Test**

According to Ghozali (2011: 110), the autocorrelation test aims to test whether in the regression model there is a correlation between confounding errors in period  $t$  and confounding errors in period  $t-1$  (previously).

### **Multicollinearity Test**

The multicollinearity test aims to test whether the regression model found any correlation between independent variables. A good regression model should not have correlation between independent variables (Ghozali, 2011: 105).

## **Hypothesis test**

### **F-test**

According to Ghozali (2011: 98), the F statistical test basically shows whether all the independent variables or independent variables included in the model have a joint influence on the dependent variable or dependent variable.

**t-test**

To test the significance of the partial coefficient, it is calculated using the t test formula. To find out whether or not the role of each independent and dependent variable is real or not.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Validity test Table 2. Validity Test**

**Results of the Validity Test of the Work Conflict Variable Instrument**

Statement Items	R count	R table	Status
1	0.500	0.195	Valid
2	0.566	0.195	Valid
3	0.545	0.195	Valid
4	0.636	0.195	Valid
5	0.638	0.195	Valid
6	0.599	0.195	Valid
7	0.663	0.195	Valid
8	0.593	0.195	Valid

**Job Stress Variable Instrument Validity Test Results**

Statement Items	R count	R table	Status
1	0.567	0.195	Valid
2	0.575	0.195	Valid
3	0.533	0.195	Valid
4	0.589	0.195	Valid
5	0.724	0.195	Valid
6	0.696	0.195	Valid
7	0.660	0.195	Valid
8	0.695	0.195	Valid

**Results of the Validity Test of the Work Discipline Variable Instrument**

Statement Items	R count	R table	Status
1	0.513	0.195	Valid
2	0.455	0.195	Valid
3	0.643	0.195	Valid
4	0.572	0.195	Valid
5	0.607	0.195	Valid
6	0.607	0.195	Valid
7	0.630	0.195	Valid
8	0.560	0.195	Valid

**Result of Validity Test of Employee Performance Variable Instrument**

Statement Items	R count	R table	Status
1	0.489	0.195	Valid

2	0.513	0.195	Valid
3	0.521	0.195	Valid
4	0.659	0.195	Valid
5	0.564	0.195	Valid
6	0.642	0.195	Valid
7	0.641	0.195	Valid
8	0.617	0.195	Valid

Based on the results of the validity test in Table 2, it can be seen that the calculated r value is  $> 0.195$ , so it can be stated that the questionnaire items are valid.

### Reliability Test Table 3. Reliability Test

#### Reliability Test Results for Work Conflict Variables (X1)

##### Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,734	8

#### Job Stress Variable Reliability Test Results (X2)

##### Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,783	8

#### Work Discipline Variable Reliability Test Results (X3)

##### Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,708	8

#### Employee Performance Variable Reliability Test Results (Y)

##### Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,722	8

Table 3 shows that these four variables have a limit of 0.7, so it can be concluded that all variables in this study are reliable.

### Classic Assumption Test Results

#### Normality Test

#### Table 4. Normality Test Results

#### One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

Unstandardized Residuals

N		100
Normal Parameters,, b	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	1.79810943
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.071
	Positive	,053
	Negative	-.071
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		,707
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		,699
a. Test distribution is Normal.		
b. Calculated from data.		

From table 4 can be seen that the significance value (Asymp.Sig. 2-tailed) of 0.699. Because the significance value is more than 0.05, the residual value is normally distributed.

**Heteroscedasticity test Table 5. Heteroscedasticity Test Results Coefficientsa**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta			
1	(Constant)	1,881	1,294			1,453	,149
	Conflict	,014	,036	,042		,394	,695
	Stress	-.041	,043	-.122		-.957	,341
	Discipline	,002	,045	,006		,047	,963

a. Dependent Variable: Res\_2

Source: SPSS 17.0 processed data results

Based on the results of the heteroscedasticity test using the Glejser test in Table 5, the results obtained greater significance, namely for work conflict it is 0.695, work stress is 0.341 and work discipline is 0.963, so the significance value is greater than 0.05, so it can be said that the data does not have heteroscedasticity problems.

**Autocorrelation Test Table 6. Autocorrelation Test Results Model Summary b**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.848a	,719	,711	1,826	1,917

a. Predictors: (Constant), Discipline, Conflict, Stress

b. Dependent Variable: Performance

Source: SPSS 17.0 processed data results

Based on the results of the autocorrelation test in Table 6, the DW value is 1.917 compared to the DW table value using a significant 5% sample size of 100 (n) and the number of independent variables is 3 (k=3), then in the DW table the values obtained are  $dL=1.6131$  and  $dU= 1.7364$ . Because the DW value of 1.917 is greater than the upper limit (dU) of 1.7364 and less than  $4-1.7364=2.2636$  ( $4-dU$ ), this is in accordance with the performance criteria, namely  $dU < DW < 4-dU$  ( $1, 7364 < 1.917 < 2.2636$ ) then DW is located between dU and 4-dU, so it can be concluded that there is not a strong relationship between the data (autocorrelation).

**Multicollinearity Test Table 7. Multicollinearity Test Results Coefficientsa**

Model		Unstandardized Statistics		Standardized Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
		B	Std. Error					
1	(Constant)	-2,424	1,950		-1,243	,217		
	Work Conflict	,571	,055	,595	10,386	,000	,892	1,121
	Work stress	,383	,065	,402	5,918	,000	,633	1,579
	Work Discipline	,080	,068	,081	1,178	,242	,616	1,624

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Source: SPSS 17.0 processed data results

Based on Table 7, it can be seen that each variable has a VIF value  $> 1$ , so multicollinearity does not occur in this value.

### Results of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

**Table 8. Multiple Linear Regression Test Results Coefficientsa**

Model		Unstandardized Statistics		Standardized Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
		B	Std. Error					
1	(Constant)	-2,424	1,950		-1,243	,217		
	Work Conflict	,571	,055	,595	10,386	,000	,892	1,121
	Work stress	,383	,065	,402	5,918	,000	,633	1,579
	Work Discipline	,080	,068	,081	1,178	,242	,616	1,624

a. Dependent Variable: Performance

Based on Table 8 regarding the regression coefficients, it can be seen that the linear regression equation is as follows:

$$Y = -2.424 + 0.571 X_1 + 0.383 X_2 + 0.080 X_3$$

The above statement can be explained as follows:

- 1) The constant value (a) is -2.424, meaning that if all the independent variables, namely Work Conflict (X1), Work Stress (X2), and Work Discipline (X3) have a fixed or constant value, then the dependent variable, namely Employee Performance (Y), has a value of - 2,424
- 2) The regression coefficient value for the work conflict variable ( The coefficient is positive, there is a positive influence between work conflict and employee performance. This means that work conflict is estimated to improve performance.
- 3) The regression coefficient value for the Job Stress variable ( The coefficient is positive, there is a positive influence between Job Stress and employee performance. This means that Job Stress is estimated to improve performance.
- 4) The regression coefficient value for the Work Discipline variable ( The coefficient has a positive value, there is a positive influence between Work Discipline and employee performance. This means that Work Discipline is estimated to improve performance.

**Hypothesis test  
Partial Test**

**Table 9. Hypothesis Testing Results  
Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized		Standardized Coefficients		Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	
1	(Constant)	-2,424	1,950		-1,243	,217
	Work Conflict	,571	,055	,595	10,386	,000
	Work stress	,383	,065	,402	5,918	,000
	Work Discipline	,080	,068	,081	1,178	,242

a. Dependent Variable: Performance

Source: SPSS 17.0 processed data results

Based on Table 9, it can be concluded that the results of the t test are as follows:

1) Work Conflict (X1)

It can be seen that the tcount for Work Conflict (X1) is 10.386 with a significance level of 0.000, while the ttable value with a significance level of 5% is 1,660. Because tcount > ttable (10.386 > 1.660) then H0 is rejected, meaning that work conflict (X1) has a positive and significant effect on the performance of PT employees. Pelindo II – IPC Jakarta.

2) Work Stress (X2)

It can be explained from the results obtained that the tcount for Job Stress (X2) is 5.918 with a significance level of 0.000, while the ttable value with a significance level of 5% is 1.660. Because tcount > ttable (5.918 > 1.660) then H0 is rejected, meaning that Job Stress (X2) has a positive and significant effect on the performance of PT employees. Pelindo II - IPC Jakarta.

### 3) Work Discipline (X3)

It can be explained from the results obtained that the tcount for Work Discipline (X3) is 1.178 with a significance level of 0.242, while the ttable value with a significance level of 5% is 1.660. Because tcount < ttable (1.178 < 1.660) then H0 is accepted, meaning that Work Discipline (X3) has no effect on the performance of PT employees. Pelindo II - IPC Jakarta.

### Simultaneous Test

**Table 10. Model Feasibility Test Results (F Test)**

		ANOVA <sup>b</sup>				
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	820,663	3	273,554	82,044	,000a
	Residual	320,087	96	3,334		
	Total	1140,750	99			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Work Discipline, Work Conflict, Work Stress

b. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Source: SPSS 17.0 processed data results

Table 9, You can see the Fcount value amounting to 82,044 with a significance level of 0.000. The Ftable value is obtained from the degree of freedoms (df) Residual (remaining) is 97 as the denominator df and the Regression (treatment) df which is 3 as the numerator df with a significance level of 5%, so that the Ftable value ( $\alpha = 5\%$ ) is obtained, namely 2.70, because the value of Fcount is greater than Ftable ( $82.044 > 2.70$ ) with a significance level of  $0.000 < 0.05$ , it can be concluded that bahwa Work Conflict (X1), Work Stress (X2) and Work Discipline (X3) has a positive influence on Employee Performance (Y). The test results above explain that the model above can be declared feasible because Fcount is greater than Ftable, which means that the independent variable can explain the changes that occur in the dependent variable.

### Coefficient of Determination Results (Adjusted R2)

**Table 11. Coefficient of Determination Test Results (R2)**

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.848a	,719	,711	1,826

a. Predictors: (Constant), Work Discipline, Work Conflict, Work Stress

Source: SPSS 17.0 processed data results

In table 10 it is shown that the R square value is 0.719. Based on these values, it can be seen that 71.9% of the variation in the dependent variable is the performance of PT employees. Pelindo II – IPC Jakarta can be explained by a combination of independent variables, namely Work Conflict, Work Stress and Work Discipline. Meanwhile, the remaining 28.1% can be explained or explained by other factors not researched by the author.

## Discussion

From research conducted by the author on employees of PT Pelindo II, based on data obtained using determination analysis, it is known that the factors of work conflict, work stress and work discipline contribute 0.715 (71.5%) to employee performance at PT Pelindo II, while 28.5% is influenced by other unexplained factors.

Based on descriptive analysis, the results of the Work Conflict analysis (X1) mean a mean value of 30.47, meaning that Work Conflict in terms of the average value according to perception is 30.47 or has just reached  $(30.47 : 40) \times 100 = 76.17\%$  of the score ideally measures the level of strong achievement. The results of the work stress analysis (X2) have a mean value of 25.41, meaning that work stress in terms of the average value according to perception is 25.41 or has just reached  $(25.41 : 40) \times 100 = 63.52\%$  of the ideal score measured strong level of achievement. The results of the analysis of work discipline (X3) mean a value of 30.47, meaning that Work Discipline in terms of the average value according to perception is 30.47 or has just reached  $(28.18 : 40) \times 100 = 70.45\%$  of the ideal score measured strong level of achievement. The results of the Employee Performance analysis (Y) mean value of 26.95, meaning that employee performance is viewed from the average value according to perception of 26.95 or has just reached  $(26.95 : 40) \times 100 = 67.37\%$  of the ideal score measured by the level of achievement strong. From the regression results, the equation  $Y = -2.424 + 0.571 X1 + 0.383 X2 + 0.080 X3$

The tcount value for Work Conflict (X1) is 10.386 with a significance level of 0.000, while the ttable value with a significance level of 5% is 1.660. Because  $t_{count} > t_{table}$  ( $10.386 > 1.660$ ),  $H_0$  is rejected, meaning that work conflict (X1) has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. The tcount value for Work Stress (X2) is 5.918 with a significance level of 0.000, while the ttable value with a significance level of 5% is 1.660. Because  $t_{count} > t_{table}$  ( $5.918 > 1.660$ ),  $H_0$  is rejected, meaning that Job Stress (X2) has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. The tcount value for Work Discipline (X3) is 1.178 with a significance level of 0.242, while the ttable value with a significance level of 5% is 1.660. Because  $t_{count} < t_{table}$  ( $1.178 < 1.660$ ) then  $H_0$  is accepted, meaning that Work Discipline (X3) has no effect on employee performance.

Based on the F test results that Fcount value amounting to 41,001 with a significance level of 0.000. The Ftable value is obtained from the degree of freedoms (df) Residual (remaining) is 97 as the denominator df and the Regression (treatment) df which is 3 as the numerator df with a significance level of 5%, so that the Ftable value ( $\alpha = 5\%$ ) is obtained, namely 2.70, because the value of Fcount is greater than Ftable ( $41.001 > 2.70$ ) with a significance level of  $0.000 < 0.05$ , it can be concluded that bahwa Work Conflict (X1), Work Stress (X2) and Work Discipline (X3) has a positive influence on Employee Performance (Y).

Based on the research results, it can be said that efforts to improve performance are complex and influenced by many other factors. One of the factors is work conflict, work stress, and work discipline which encourage an employee to work better where an employee wants to get a better position. Therefore, to improve performance in a company is to also increase the quality or quantity of the application of work conflict, work stress and work discipline, so that this results in prosperity for the company or employees.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the results of research and discussion regarding the influence of work conflict, work stress and work discipline on PT employee performance. Pelindo II – IPC Jakarta, the research results can be concluded that; (1) there is an influence of work conflict on PT employee performance. Pelindo II - IPC Jakarta, (2) there is an influence of Job Stress on PT Employee Performance. Pelindo II - IPC Jakarta, and (3) there is an influence of Work Discipline on PT Employee Performance. Pelindo II - IPC Jakarta.

This article is a part of joint research and publication between Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Nasional, Jakarta and Faculty of Business, Economics, and Social Development, Universiti Malaysia Terengganu.

## REFERENCES

- Ahiruddin. 2011. Pengaruh Konflik dan Stress Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan CV. Bina Cipta Nusa Perkasa Bandar Lampung. *Jurnal Organisasi dan Manajemen*. 1 (1): 82-88.
- Fadiyiah, A. 2015. Pengaruh Stress Kerja dan Kepuasan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada PT. Kusuma Dinasasri Wisatjaya Batu Malang. *Jurnal JIBEKA*. 9 (1): 9-14
- Ghozali, I. 2011. Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program SPSS. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro. Semarang
- Giovanni, T.M., C. Kojo., dan V.P. Lengkong. 2015. Pengaruh Konflik Peran, Konflik Kerja dan Stress Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada PT. Air Manado. *Jurnal EMBA*. 3 (3): 90-98
- Harlie, M. 2012. Pengaruh Disiplin Kerja, Motivasi dan Pengembangan Karier Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Negeri Sipil pada Pemerintah Kabupaten Tabalong di Tanjung Kalimantan Selatan. *Jurnal Aplikasi Manajemen*. 10 (4).
- Hasibuan, S.P. 2011. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Cetakan 15. Bumi Aksara. Jakarta.
- Mangkunegara, A.P. 2013. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Perusahaan*. Cetakan 12. PT Remaja Rosdakarya. Bandung.
- Mauli, T. 2012. Pengaruh Stress Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Studi Kasus Pada Dosen Politeknik Negeri Bengkalis. *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa*. 1 (1): 10-18
- Mulyadi. 2015. *Manajemen sumber daya Manusia (MSDM)*. In Media. Bogor
- Nur, S. 2013. Konflik, Stress Kerja dan Kepuasan Kerja Pengaruhnya Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai pada Universitas Khairun Ternate. *Jurnal EMBA*. 1 (3): 739-749.
- Robbins, S.P. dan T.A. Judge. 2015. *Organizational Behavior*. 16<sup>th</sup> ed. Pearson Education. New Jersey. Terjemahan R. Saraswati, dan F. Sirait. 2015. *Perilaku Organisasi*. Edisi 16. Salemba Empat. Jakarta.
- Salihin, I. 2013. Stress dan Konflik Terhadap Kinerja. <http://www.academia.edu>. 25 oktober 2016. (14:00)
- Sugiono. 2010. *Metode Penelitian Bisnis*. Cetakan 15. ALFABET. Bandung
- Wahyudi. 2011. *Manajemen Konflik dalam Organisasi*. Edisi 2. ALFABETA. Bandung
- Journal of Social Science*, Vol. 05, No. 02, March 2024

---

**Copyright holder:**

Ghafar Ibnu Tsalis, Herry Krisnandi, Kumba Digdowiseiso (2024)

**First publication right:**

Journal of Social Science

**This article is licensed under:**

