

**THE INFLUENCE OF WORK ENVIRONMENT, WORK CULTURE ON  
THE QUALITY OF PUBLIC SERVICES AT *DPPKUM* CITY OF  
MAGELANG**

**Laras Tri Utami**

Universitas Tidar,

[larastritami6@gmail.com](mailto:larastritami6@gmail.com);

**Joko Tri Nugraha**

Universitas Tidar,

[jokotrinugraha@untidar.ac.id](mailto:jokotrinugraha@untidar.ac.id);

**Matheus Gratiano Mali**

Universitas Tidar,

[theogratiano@untidar.ac.id](mailto:theogratiano@untidar.ac.id);

**ABSTRACT**

This study aims to analyze the influence of the work environment and work culture on the quality of public services at the Department of Trade, Industry, Cooperatives and Micro Enterprises (*DPPKUM*) of Magelang City. The study used a quantitative explanatory research approach with a sample of 93 employees selected by proportional random sampling. Data were collected through Likert scale questionnaires and observations, then analyzed using multiple linear regression analysis. The results showed that the work environment had a significant negative effect on the quality of public services ( $B = -0.489$ ,  $t = -2.969$ ,  $p = 0.004$ ), the results of work culture did not have a significant effect ( $B = 0.115$ ;  $t = 0.584$ ;  $p = 0.561$ ). However, simultaneously both variables had a significant effect on the quality of public services ( $F = 4.623$ ;  $p = 0.012$ ;  $R^2 = 0.093$ ).

**Keywords:** *Work Environment, Work Culture, Quality of Public Services*

**A. INTRODUCTION**

Rising public expectations for the quality of public services in the era of bureaucratic reform require every government agency to provide services that are fast, transparent, and accountable. Meanwhile, in this era, the government is faced with limited resources and budget efficiency policies. This situation results in budget and resource constraints that can impact public service performance. In such a situation, public sector organizations are required not only to improve the technical aspects of service but also to strengthen internal factors such as the work environment and work culture, which directly influence employee motivation, performance, and service quality.

The quality of public services is a key indicator of the bureaucracy's success in carrying out government functions. According to Along (2020), the quality of public services can be defined as an organization's ability to provide satisfactory services from both technical and administrative aspects. This aligns with the findings of Rohaeni and Marwa (2018), who stated that service quality

significantly influences public satisfaction levels. Quality services are measured not only by procedures or service standards but also by the extent to which an organization is able to meet the expectations and needs of the public as service users (Adhythya, 2020). Therefore, organizational commitment is needed to build a culture of quality and increase awareness of human resources as an integral part of public service delivery (Rosidah, 2007).

The success of an organization can be judged by the quality of the services it provides. Normatively, good public service quality is defined as service delivery based on the principles of public service (Wiratno, 2020). The principles of public service delivery are regulated by the *Undang-Undang Nomor 25 Tahun 2009* concerning Public Services, which mandates that government agencies provide quality, fast, easy, affordable, and measurable services. However, the implementation of these principles is determined not only by formal written policies but also by how the internal conditions of the organization support the creation of excellent service oriented towards public satisfaction.

According to Hardiyansyah (2018), the quality of public services is significantly influenced by numerous factors, including internal organizational aspects such as the work environment and work culture. The work environment encompasses all conditions surrounding employees while they work, both physical, such as layout, air circulation, and lighting, and non-physical, such as employee relationships and the work climate (Sedarmayanti, 2017). A conducive work environment, both physically and socially, can boost employee morale and effectiveness (Wahyudi et al., 2022; Hazmi & Nugraha, 2021).

Meanwhile, work culture is a set of values, norms, and habits that guide employee behavior in carrying out their duties (Mangkunegara, 2019). A positive work culture shapes behaviors, values, and a work ethic that support employee professionalism and performance, reflecting service quality (Dewi et al., 2021; Ishak et al., 2022). Therefore, these two factors play a crucial role in ensuring optimal public service delivery.

The Department of Trade, Industry, Cooperatives, and Micro Enterprises (*DPPKUM*) of Magelang City is a regional government organization that plays a strategic role in providing public services in the regional economy. Based on initial observations, several aspects of the physical work environment, such as lighting, spatial planning, and air circulation, still need improvement. However, socially, relationships between employees and support from leaders indicate quite good conditions. This phenomenon illustrates that the quality of public services is not only influenced by the availability of facilities and infrastructure, but also by how the work atmosphere and organizational culture are built within the agency's internal environment. This condition is important considering that budget efficiency policies have the potential to limit the provision of physical facilities, so strengthening internal factors such as work culture and the work environment is strategic for maintaining service quality. Therefore, it is important to strengthen internal organizational factors, such as the work environment and work culture, so that resource limitations do not become obstacles to providing optimal service.

Several previous relevant studies have largely focused on public perception, specifically external parties to public services as service recipients. Studies of

internal organizational factors using the Internal Service Quality (INTQUAL) approach are still limited, particularly in local government agencies. Yet, understanding the internal conditions of an organization is key to the quality of service provided to the public.

The Internal Service Quality (INTQUAL) model is used in this study to differentiate it from other similar studies. The INTQUAL model was developed by Hallowell et al. (1996), and is used in this study to measure internal service quality from an employee perspective, with dimensions including tools, policies & procedures, teamwork, management support, goal alignment, effective training, communication, and reward & recognition. This approach is considered relevant to assess the extent to which the work environment and work culture influence the quality of public services through improving the internal quality of the organization.

Based on this background, this research aims to analyze the influence of the work environment and work culture on the quality of public services at *DPPKUM* Magelang City with the following problem formulation: Does the work environment have a significant influence on the quality of public services at the *DPPKUM* of Magelang City? Does work culture have a significant influence on the quality of public services at the *DPPKUM* of Magelang City? Do the work environment and work culture simultaneously have a significant influence on the quality of public services at the *DPPKUM* of Magelang City?

## **B. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Work environment**

The work environment is a condition that influences employees in carrying out their duties, both physical and non-physical. Sedarmayanti (2018) explains that the work environment includes all tools, materials, and work atmosphere that can influence individuals in carrying out their duties. Sunyoto (2016) defines the work environment as everything around employees and can influence the implementation of work, both directly and indirectly. The work environment has two main dimensions: the physical work environment and the non-physical work environment. According to Yuliani & Suprayoga (2022), the physical work environment includes the condition of the workspace, equipment layout, lighting, temperature, and noise levels, while the non-physical work environment is related to relationships between employees, the work climate, and communication patterns within the organization.

### **Work Culture**

Work culture is a set of values, norms, and habits that shape employee work behavior. Ndraha (2003) defines work culture as a mental program that can increase efficiency and cooperation within an organization. Sedarmayanti (2016) emphasizes that work culture is a way of life and shared values that serve as guidelines for action. Work culture is not formed instantly, but rather through a long process that occurs repeatedly and consistently in daily organizational activities (Nawawi, 2010). Ndraha (2003) states that work culture consists of three dimensions: habits, regulations, and values.

### Quality of Public Services

Service quality is related to compliance, the conformity of each public service provider organization to established service standards. According to Hardiyansyah (2011), quality public service occurs when public expectations align with what the service provider delivers. Therefore, public service quality is understood to be the alignment between the services provided and the applicable service standards and the expectations of the public as service recipients.

### C. RESEARCH METHODS

This research is a quantitative explanatory research. Explanatory research is a type of research used to explain the relationship between independent and dependent variables (Sugiyono, 2020). This research model was conducted to measure the influence between variables presented with numerical data. This approach model was chosen to determine the influence of the work environment and work culture on the quality of public services at the *DPPKUM* of Magelang City. To obtain the desired data, this study used a survey method, namely by distributing questionnaires containing statements with answer choices using a Likert scale scoring to respondents.

The population in this study were all *ASN* employees of the Department of Trade, Industry, Cooperatives and Micro Enterprises (*DPPKUM*) of Magelang City. The number of samples was calculated using the Slovin formula with a margin of error of 5%, resulting in a total sample of 93 respondents. Meanwhile, to distribute the samples to each field/*UPT*, this study used a proportional random sampling technique, where the number of samples in each unit was adjusted to the proportion of the number of employees in that unit. Furthermore, the data obtained through questionnaires by respondents were analyzed using SPSS 26 through simple regression testing, multiple linear regression with t-test, F-test, and coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ).

This study consists of two independent variables, namely the Work Environment ( $X_1$ ) and Work Culture ( $X_2$ ), and one dependent variable, namely the Quality of Public Services ( $Y$ ). The operational definitions of the variables are arranged in the form of dimensions and indicators which are then used as questionnaire statements.

**Table 1: Operational Definition**

Variables	Dimensions	Indicator
Work environment	1. Physical work environment	1. Availability of work facilities 2. Comfort of work space
	2. Non-physical work environment	1. Relationship between employees and superiors
Work culture	1. Habits	1. Work patterns carried out 2. Teamwork
	2. Regulations	1. Compliance with written rules 2. Implementation of work procedures

	3. Values	1. Prioritize obligations, namely work 2. Understanding the value of truth
Quality of public services	<i>Intqual (Internal Service Quality)</i>	1. Tools
		2. Policies and procedures
		3. Teamwork
		4. Management support
		5. Alignment of goals
		6. Effective training
		7. Communication
		8. Awards and recognition

Source: Processed data, 2025

Based on the theoretical basis and framework of thought that have been explained, the hypothesis in this study is as follows:

H1: The work environment has a positive and significant effect on the quality of public services at *DPPKUM* Magelang City.

H2: Work culture has a positive and significant effect on the quality of public services at *DPPKUM* Magelang City.

H3: The work environment and work culture together have a positive and significant effect on the quality of public services at *DPPKUM* Magelang City.

#### D. DISCUSSION

In this section, the research results will be explained for each variable used, namely work environment, work culture, and service quality.

##### Validity Test Results

**Table 2: Validity Test**

Variables	No Item	R Count	R Table	Sig.	P.Value	Information
Work Environment (X1)	1	0.688	0.202	0,000	0.05	Valid
	2	0.698	0.202	0,000	0.05	Valid
	3	0.865	0.202	0,000	0.05	Valid
	4	0.784	0.202	0,000	0.05	Valid
	5	0.862	0.202	0,000	0.05	Valid
	6	0.761	0.202	0,000	0.05	Valid
	7	0.861	0.202	0,000	0.05	Valid
	8	0.871	0.202	0,000	0.05	Valid
Work Culture (X2)	9	0.690	0.202	0,000	0.05	Valid
	10	0.760	0.202	0,000	0.05	Valid
	11	0.606	0.202	0,000	0.05	Valid
	12	0.690	0.202	0,000	0.05	Valid
	13	0.669	0.202	0,000	0.05	Valid

	14	0.657	0.202	0,000	0.05	Valid
	15	0.680	0.202	0,000	0.05	Valid
	16	0.733	0.202	0,000	0.05	Valid
	17	0.552	0.202	0,000	0.05	Valid
Service Quality (Y)	18	0.652	0.202	0,000	0.05	Valid
	19	0.695	0.202	0,000	0.05	Valid
	20	0.770	0.202	0,000	0.05	Valid
	21	0.791	0.202	0,000	0.05	Valid
	22	0.845	0.202	0,000	0.05	Valid
	23	0.696	0.202	0,000	0.05	Valid
	24	0.853	0.202	0,000	0.05	Valid
	25	0.805	0.202	0,000	0.05	Valid
	26	0.812	0.202	0,000	0.05	Valid
	27	0.854	0.202	0,000	0.05	Valid
	28	0.805	0.202	0,000	0.05	Valid
	29	0.734	0.202	0,000	0.05	Valid
	30	0.794	0.202	0,000	0.05	Valid

Source: Processed data, 2025

Based on the table, it is known that there are 30 statement items used as research instruments created to represent three variables, namely Work Environment (X1), Work Culture (X2), and Service Quality (Y). The research instrument is said to be valid if it has a calculated  $r$  value  $>$   $r$  table. From the results of the validity test above, it can be interpreted that all research instrument items are valid, because they have a calculated  $r$  value  $>$   $r$  table with a significance value  $<0.05$ . Thus, all statements on the variables of work environment, work culture, and service quality are declared valid and suitable for use in research.

#### Reliability Test

**Table 3: Reliability Test**

Variables	Reliability Value	Cronbach's Alpha	Information
Work Environment (X1)	0.919	0.60	Reliable
Work Culture (X2)	0.844	0.60	Reliable
Quality of Service	0.944	0.60	Reliable

Source: Processed data, 2025

Based on the reliability test results table above, it is known that all research variables are declared reliable. Research variables are considered reliable if they have a Cronbach's Alpha value  $>$  0.60. The reliability test results above indicate that all variables used in this study have a Cronbach's Alpha value  $>$  0.60, thus being declared reliable and can be used in the next stage of analysis.

**Prerequisite Analysis Test Results**  
**Normality Test**

**Table 4: Normality Test**

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test		
		Unstandardized Residual
N		93
Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Mean	.0000000
	Standard Deviation	10.28577333
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.059
	Positive	.059
	Negative	-.049
Test Statistics		.059
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.200 <sup>c,d</sup>
a. Test distribution is Normal.		
b. Calculated from data.		
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.		
d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.		

Source: Processed data, 2025

Based on the results of the normality test using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test above, it is known that significance value Sig. 0.200 >  $\alpha$ 0.050. So it can be concluded that the data is normally distributed.

**Multicollinearity Test**

**Table 5: Multicollinearity Test**

Independent Variables	Tolerance	VIF	Information
Work environment	0.999	1,001	No Multicollinearity Occurs
Work Culture	0.999	1,001	No Multicollinearity Occurs

Source: Processed data, 2025

Based on the results of the multicollinearity test in the table above, it is known that the work environment variable has a tolerance of 0.999 VIF value of 1.001 > 10. And the work culture variable with a tolerance of 0.999 VIF value of 1.001 > 10. Thus, it can be concluded that the equation model does not contain multicollinearity so that it meets the requirements for further analysis.

**Linearity Test**

**Table 6: Linearity Test X1**

ANOVA Table							
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Service Quality * Work Environment	Between Groups	(Combined)	1502.286	17	88,370	.742	.750
		Linearity	285,050	1	285,050	2,394	.126
		Deviation from Linearity	1217.236	16	76,077	.639	.842
	Within Groups		8930.639	75	119,075		
	Total		10432.925	92			

Source: Processed data, 2025

Based on the linearity test results for the work culture and service quality variables above, the significance value in the Deviation from Linearity section is  $0.842 > 0.05$ . Therefore, it can be concluded that the relationship between the work environment and service quality is linear and meets the requirements.

**Table 7: Linearity Test X2**

ANOVA Table							
			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Service Quality * Work Culture	Between Groups	(Combined)	2540.520	15	169,368	1,652	.079
		Linearity	699,050	1	699,050	6,820	.011
		Deviation from Linearity	1841,470	14	131,534	1,283	.237
	Within Groups		7892.405	77	102,499		
	Total		10432.925	92			

Source: Processed data, 2025

Based on the table of linearity test results for the work culture and service quality variables above, the significance value in the Deviation from Linearity section is  $0.237 > 0.05$ . Therefore, it can be concluded that the relationship between work culture and service quality is linear and meets the requirements.

**Heteroscedasticity Test**

**Table 8: Heteroscedasticity Test**

Independent Variables	Sig. (p-value)	Information
Work Environment (X1)	0.179	No Heteroscedasticity Occurs
Work Culture (X2)	0.474	No Heteroscedasticity Occurs

Source: Processed data, 2025

Based on the table of heteroscedasticity test results above, it is known that for the work environment variable, the Sig. value is  $0.179 > 0.05$  and the work culture variable has a Sig. value of  $0.474 > 0.05$ . Therefore, it is concluded that this regression model does not have symptoms of heteroscedasticity and thus meets the requirements.

**Multiple Regression Analysis**

**Table 9: Multiple Regression Analysis**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients	
	B	Std Error
(constant)	37,934	6,833
Work environment	-.489	.165
Work Culture	.115	.198

Source: Processed data, 2025

Based on the results of the multiple regression test in the table above, it is known that:

1. The work environment has a B value of  $-0.489$ , indicating that the work environment has a negative and significant effect on service quality at the *DPPKUM* in Magelang City. This means that if the work environment variable increases by 1%, the service quality variable will decrease by 0.489.
2. Work culture has a B value of  $0.115$ , which means that work culture has a positive influence on service quality at the *DPPKUM* in Magelang City. This means that if the work culture variable increases by 1%, the service quality variable will increase by 0.115.

**Hypothesis Testing**

**Table 10: T-Test**

Variables	B	t	Sig.
(Constant)	37,934	5,552	0,000
Work Environment (X1)	-0.489	-2,969	0.004
Work Culture (X2)	0.115	0.584	0.561

Source: Processed data, 2025

Based on the T-test results table above, it is known that partially it shows that:

1. Work Environment (X1) has a t count of  $2.969 > t$  table of 1.987 and a Sig. value of  $0.004 < \text{probability of } 0.05$  with a negative coefficient. So it is said that the work environment has a significant negative effect on the quality of public services at *DPPKUM* Magelang City.
2. Work Culture (X2) has a t count of  $0.584 < t$  table 1.987 and Sig. value  $0.561 < \text{probability } 0.05$ . So it is said that work culture does not have a significant effect on the quality of public services at *DPPKUM* Magelang City.

**F Test (Simultaneous)**

**Table 11: F Test**

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Information
Regression	690,099	2	345,050	4,623	0.012	Significant

Residual	6717,729	90	74,641		
Total	7407,828	92			

Source: Processed data, 2025

Based on the F test results table above, it is known that the calculated F value is  $4.623 > F$  table  $3.094$  with a significance value of  $0.012 <$  probability of  $0.05$ . So it is said that the work environment and work culture have a simultaneous effect on the quality of public services at *DPPKUM* Magelang City.

**R coefficient**

**Table 12: R Coefficient Test**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Standard Error of the Estimate
1	0.305	0.093	0.073	8,639

Source: Processed data, 2025

The coefficient of determination table above shows that the R-square value is  $0.093$  ( $9.3\%$ ). Therefore, the work environment and work culture variables simultaneously influence the service quality variable by  $9.3\%$ . The remaining  $90.7\%$  is explained by other variables outside this study.

**Discussion**

**The Influence of the Work Environment on the Quality of Public Services at the *DPPKUM* of Magelang City**

Based on the results of the t-test on the work environment variable, it shows that the work environment variable ( $X_1$ ) has a negative and significant effect on the quality of public services at the *DPPKUM* of Magelang City with a significance value of  $0.004 (<0.05)$ . Therefore,  $H_1$  in this study is declared accepted.

This study differs from Sofiyan's (2018) study, which stated that the work environment significantly influences service quality. The study explained that the most dominant influence lies in interpersonal relationships within the organization. However, this study aligns with the results of Mariska et al. (2024), which stated that the physical work environment had no effect on customer satisfaction. Furthermore, the study found that service facilities actually had a negative effect on customer satisfaction, where customer satisfaction is a crucial instrument determining service quality. Therefore, the results of this study can be used to strengthen the view that the work environment is not the sole determining factor in service quality.

**The Influence of Work Culture on the Quality of Public Services at the *DPPKUM* of Magelang City**

Based on the results of the t-test on the work environment variable, it shows that the work culture variable ( $X_2$ ) does not have a significant effect on the quality of public services at the *DPPKUM* of Magelang City with a significance value of  $0.561 (> 0.05)$ . Therefore,  $H_2$  in this study is rejected.

The results of this study differ from those of Dewi et al. (2021), which stated that work culture influences employee performance, reflecting service

quality. However, these results align with Marwiasri's (2013) study, which found that work culture had no effect on service quality, as this was due to the lack of full implementation of the culture.

### **The Influence of Work Environment and Work Culture on the Quality of Public Services at *DPPKUM* Magelang City**

Based on the results of the simultaneous test or F test on the variables of work environment and work culture on service quality, it shows that the calculated F value is  $4.623 > F \text{ table } 3.094$  with a significance value of  $0.012 < \text{probability } 0.05$ . So it is concluded that the work environment and work culture simultaneously influence the quality of public services at *DPPKUM* Magelang City. So H3 in this study is declared accepted.

Furthermore, the  $R^2$  coefficient test obtained an  $R^2$  value of 0.093, which means that the two independent variables simultaneously influence 9.3% of the quality of public services at the *DPPKUM* of Magelang City, while the remaining 90.7% is influenced by other factors not examined in this study. The results of this study confirm Hardiyansyah (2018) who stated that service quality is influenced by several factors including the work environment and work culture, although these two aspects are not the main factors.

### **E. CONCLUSION**

This study concluded that partially, through a t-test, the work environment has a significant negative effect on the quality of public services at the *DPPKUM* in Magelang City. Furthermore, work culture does not significantly influence the quality of public services at the *DPPKUM* in Magelang City. Then, simultaneously, through an F-test, the work environment and work culture simultaneously have a significant effect on the quality of public services at the *DPPKUM* in Magelang City.

Suggestions from this study for the *DPPKUM* of Magelang City include improving the quality of the physical work environment, particularly in terms of providing supporting facilities, comfortable spaces, and noise control, while maintaining social relationships among employees. Furthermore, the organization needs to provide guidance to strengthen teamwork and improve internal communication. The organization also needs to strengthen support such as relevant training, awards for high-performing employees, and involving employees in achieving organizational targets.

This study has limitations and shortcomings, so it is hoped that future researchers can expand the study by adding other variables that could potentially influence service quality, such as leadership, motivation, and the use of digital technology. Furthermore, using mixed research methods (quantitative and qualitative) and expanding the research sample to different institutions is also important for more comprehensive and representative results.

### **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Adhythya, N. (2020, April 15). KUALITAS PELAYANAN. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/vcswk>.

- Al Hazmi, C. R. V., & Nugraha, J. (2021). Pengaruh fasilitas kerja dan lingkungan kerja non fisik terhadap kinerja pegawai di PT Kawan Lama Sejahtera Surabaya. *Journal of Office Administration: Education and Practice*, 1(2), 282-297.
- Along, A. (2020). Kualitas layanan administrasi akademik di Politeknik Negeri Pontianak. *Jurnal Ilmiah Administrasi Publik*, 6(1), 94-99.
- Dewi, N. L., Gunawan, Y., Mangunsong, S., & Meiliana, Y. (2021). Pengaruh sistem pengendalian internal dan budaya organisasi terhadap kualitas pelayanan publik berkelanjutan. *Jurnal Manajemen Maranatha*, 20(2), 99-106.
- Hallowell, R.H., Schlesinger, L.A., & Zornitsky, J.J. (1996). *Internal Service Quality, Customer and Job Satisfaction: Linkages and Implications for Managers*.
- Hardiyansyah, H. (2018). *Kualitas Pelayanan Publik: Konsep, Dimensi, Indikator dan Implementasinya*. Gava Media.
- Ishak, W., Dama, H., & Asi, L. L. (2022). Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi Terhadap Kualitas Pelayanan Publik Pada Kantor Samsat Kabupaten Gorontalo. *JAMBURA: Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 5(2), 819-824.
- Marwiasri, A. (2013). Hubungan Disiplin Kerja dan Budaya Organisasi dengan Kualitas Pelayanan Karyawan. *Psikoborneo: Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi*, 1(2).
- Ndraha, T. (2003). *Teori Budaya Organisasi, Cetakan Kedua*. Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta.
- Rohaeni, H., & Marwa, N. (2018). Kualitas pelayanan terhadap kepuasan pelanggan. *Jurnal Ecodemica: Jurnal Ekonomi Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 2(2).
- Rosidah, R. (2007). Upaya Peningkatan Kualitas Pelayanan dalam Organisasi. *Efisiensi: Kajian Ilmu Administrasi*, 7(1).
- Sedarmayanti, H. J. (2018). *Tata Kerja dan Produktivitas Kerja*. Bandung: CV. Mandar Maju.
- Sugiyono, D. (2020). *Metode Penelitian Administrasi (Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D)*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Wahyudi, D., Marantika, A., & Yusup, Y. (2022). Pengaruh Kepemimpinan, Lingkungan Kerja, Dan Fasilitas Kantor Terhadap Kinerja Perangkat Desa Di Kecamatan Kampar. *Jesya (Jurnal Ekonomi dan Ekonomi Syariah)*, 5(1), 887-898.
- Wiratno, W. (2020). Implementasi Peningkatan Kualitas Pelayanan Publik Pemerintah Daerah Kabupaten Bone, Sulawesi Selatan. *Supremasi Hukum*, 16(02), 1-23.