

INTEGRITY INFLUENCE ON JOB SATISFACTION AND ITS IMPLICATIONS ON COMMISSIONERS' PERFORMANCE OF GENERAL ELECTION COMMISSION (KPU) IN WEST JAVA PROVINCE

by Wandy Zulkarnaen

Submission date: 24-Nov-2022 09:00AM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1962340831

File name: Jurnal_SCOPUS_Q2_USCM-wandy.doc (271.78K)

Word count: 3819

Character count: 22161

INTEGRITY INFLUENCE ON JOB SATISFACTION AND ITS IMPLICATIONS ON COMMISSIONERS' PERFORMANCE OF GENERAL ELECTION COMMISSION (KPU) IN WEST JAVA PROVINCE

Wandy Zulkarnaen^{1*}; Rully Indrawan²; Yusuf Arifin³
Universitas Muhammadiyah Bandung, Bandung, Indonesia^{1*};
ITL Trisakti, Jakarta, Indonesia²

Universitas Pasundan, Bandung, Indonesia³
Email : wandy.zulkarnaen@umbandung.ac.id^{1*}; rullyindrawan26@gmail.com²;
yusufarifin@unpas.ac.id³

ABSTRACT

The aim is to examine the effect of the Integrity on Job Satisfaction and their impact on Commissioner's Performance. Preliminary research shows the performance of Commissioner's Performance of the General Election Commission (KPU) of West Java Province, Indonesia. The survey was conducted on 101 respondents consist of commissioner of the General Elections Commission at the district/city level in West Java Province, Indonesia. Data were collected using a questionnaire and data analysis to test the t-test used. The analysis uses partial regression and hypothesis testing using a t-test. All analyzes use statistical tools using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS). The results show that the direction of effects of the Integrity (X) on Employee Competency (Y) is positive. Obtained p-value of 0,000 so that the p-value $< \alpha = 0.05$. That the total effect of Job Satisfaction (Y) on Commissioner's Performance (Z) is .691 or 69.1%. While the remaining 36.7% is the influence of other factors beyond Job Satisfaction. The results showed that the Integrity plays an important role in realizing Job Satisfaction and providing optimal Commissioner's Performance.

Keywords: Integrity; Job Satisfaction; Commissioner's Performance

I. INTRODUCTION

Indonesia through the 1945 Constitution expressly declares itself as a unitary state in the form of a republic with sovereignty in the hands of the people and implemented according to the Constitution. (Article 1 paragraph (1) and (2) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia). In order to carry out the mandate of the people's sovereignty, the 1945 Constitution then describes it in various state institutions that can represent the people. To be able to choose representatives who run the government, a mechanism is needed that guarantees the aspirations of the people without exception. The mechanism mandated by the 1945 Constitution to guarantee this is a general election.

As mandated by the 1945 Constitution, general elections in Indonesia aim to elect members of the People's Representative Council, Regional Representative Council, President and Vice President, and Regional People's Representative Council. It also stipulates that the ELECTION to elect members of the DPR and DPRD is a political party while the DPD is followed by individuals. To carry out general elections, the constitution mandates it to a general election commission that is national, permanent and independent. This is translated as the General Election Commission, which is abbreviated as KPU, (Article 22 E of the 1945 Amendment of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia).

The General Election Commission itself is the name given by the Law on General Elections to the ELECTION organizing agency. In Article 22E of the 1945 Constitution itself, the name of the organizer does not necessarily have to be the General Election Commission or KPU (Jimly

Assiddiqie, 2006). The post-reform election or rather the 1999 election was the second milestone after the 1955 election which was declared the most democratic election throughout Indonesia. Previously, in 1955, the ELECTION that took place could also be said to be democratic. Many political observers argue that the 1955 General Elections were held democratically by fulfilling the principles of LUBER (direct, public, free, and confidential) and Jurdil (honest and fair), while the New Order era elections could be said to be fictitious and less democratic because the winners of the General Elections were predictable. The result. The 1999 election was the second milestone in a more open democracy because of the freedom to party, which can be seen from the large number of parties participating in the election and many political observers who argued that the 1999 general election took place in a LUBER and Jurdil manner.

The performance quality of the General Elections Commission Institution is strongly influenced by the performance of its commissioners as leaders of the organization's wheels in achieving organizational goals. To make the performance of the commissioners as expected by the ELECTION Law, of course, it will be influenced by the quality of the satisfaction of the commissioners in their work. Meanwhile, to achieve job satisfaction, it must be supported by strong integrity in carrying out its duties.

The following is a preliminary survey of KPU commissioners in West Java Province, which shows the percentage of performance is not optimal, so it can be said that the integrity control, job satisfaction and performance of KPU commissioners are not optimal in Table 1.

Tabel 1: Preliminary Survey

	SB	B	KB	TB	STB	Total
Integrity						
Frequency	36	48	23	13	0	120
Score	180	192	69	26	0	467
Presentage	38.54	41.11	14.78	5.57	.00	100.00
Job Satisfaction						
Frequency	27	45	32	15	1	120
Score	135	180	96	30	1	442
Presentage	30.54	40.72	21.72	6.79	.23	100.00
Commissioner's Performance						
Frequency	35	55	39	21	0	150
Score	175	220	117	42	0	554
Presentage	31.59	39.71	21.12	7.58	.00	100.00

Source: Processed data 2021

Information: SB: Very Good, B: Good, KB: Less Good, TB: Not Good, STB: Very Unkind Data Processed from Questionnaire.

Previous studies relating to the Integrity on Job satisfaction. This study tried to find its impact on performance.

II. MATERIALS AND METHOD

Materials :
Integrity

According to Jamiah Manap et.al (2005) Integrity is knowledge, awareness, understanding and upholding values consistently accompanied by full commitment to these values in every word and action to achieve personal and organizational excellence. (Integrity is knowledge, awareness, understanding and holding fast to the values are consistently accompanied by a full commitment to those values in every word and action to achieve personal and organizational excellence).

Paul J. Meyer (2009) states that "integrity is real and affordable and includes traits such as: responsible, honest, true to words, and loyal. So, when talking about integrity, it is never separated from a person's personality and character, namely traits such as: trustworthy, commitment, responsibility, honesty, truth, and loyalty. Butler in Anggara Wisesa (2011:48) conceptualizes "integrity as a reputation, in the context of an organization someone can be trusted because of his honesty."

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is a general attitude towards a person's work that shows the difference between the number of awards workers receive and the amount they believe they should receive (Robbin, 2011:78). Luthans (2006:243) in his book Organizational Behavior cites Locke's opinion that job satisfaction is a positive emotional state of a person resulting from an appreciation for the work he has done. It is said further that job satisfaction is the result of a person's achievement of how well his job provides something useful for him. Locke (Luthans, 2006) provides a comprehensive definition of job satisfaction which includes reactions or cognitive, affective, and evaluative and states that job satisfaction is "a happy emotional state or positive emotion that comes from evaluating a person's job or work experience."

Commissioner's Performance

Mitchelle and Larson (2008) explain that employee performance shows an outcome of behavior that is assessed by several criteria or quality standards of work results. Quality issues are related to the good or bad results done by employees. If the employee's behavior provides work results that are in accordance with the standards or criteria set by the organization, the employee's performance is classified as good, and vice versa if the employee's behavior provides work results that are less or not in accordance with the standards set by the organization, then the employee's performance is not good. According to Furtwengler (2005) performance is seen from ha! speed, quality, service and value, meaning speed in work processes that have reliable quality and good service and have value in achieving good performance.



Fig. 1. Research Framework.

Methods:

This method uses analytical surveys and questionnaires as primary data collection tools. All respondents are commissioner of the General Elections Commission at the district/city level in West Java Province. List of questions shared to 101 respondents. These questions cover 13 dimensions, with 3 variables consist of 58 statements , namely: Integrity, Job Satisfaction and Commissioner's Performance. This study uses "perfect" and a "terrible" five-point scale to examine participants

respond to questionnaire questions. a list of questions testing to obtain validity and reliability. Analysis using partial regression and hypothesis testing using t test. All analyzes using statistical tools using Statistical Social Science Package (SPSS). Quantitative research methods require the formulation of narrow questions, numerical data collection, and the use of statistical analysis to determine the relationship between variables in an unbiased way) (Creswell in Zulkarnaen, W., et al. 2020:2475)

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Validity and Reliability Test:

Validity Recapitulation is shown in Table 2.

Tabel 2: Recapitulation Validity of Test Result

Corrected Item			
Variables/Items	Validity coefficient	r-critical	Explanation
INTEGRITY			
X1	.861	.300	Valid
X2	.945	.300	Valid
X3	.930	.300	Valid
X4	.932	.300	Valid
X5	.938	.300	Valid
X6	.933	.300	Valid
X7	.926	.300	Valid
X8	.937	.300	Valid
X9	.374	.300	Valid
X10	.848	.300	Valid
X11	.925	.300	Valid
X12	.800	.300	Valid
X13	.925	.300	Valid
X14	.836	.300	Valid
Job Satisfaction			
Y1	.534	.300	Valid
Y2	.837	.300	Valid
Y3	.387	.300	Valid
Y4	.394	.300	Valid
Y5	.551	.300	Valid
Y6	.654	.300	Valid
Y7	.628	.300	Valid
Y8	.414	.300	Valid
Y9	.535	.300	Valid
Y10	.553	.300	Valid
Y11	.515	.300	Valid
Y12	.689	.300	Valid
Y13	.338	.300	Valid
Y14	.617	.300	Valid
Y15	.615	.300	Valid
Y16	.610	.300	Valid
Y17	.325	.300	Valid
Commissioner's Performance			
Z1	.352	.300	Valid
Z2	.563	.300	Valid
Z3	.339	.300	Valid
Z4	.738	.300	Valid
Z5	.671	.300	Valid
Z6	.908	.300	Valid
Z7	.875	.300	Valid

Z8	.552	.300	Valid
Z9	.689	.300	Valid
Z10	.785	.300	Valid
Z11	.679	.300	Valid
Z12	.576	.300	Valid
Z13	.687	.300	Valid
Z14	.897	.300	Valid
Z15	.876	.300	Valid
Z16	.683	.300	Valid
Z17	.875	.300	Valid
Z18	.806	.300	Valid
Z19	.605	.300	Valid
Z20	.503	.300	Valid
Z21	.862	.300	Valid
Z22	.658	.300	Valid
Z23	.593	.300	Valid
Z24	.703	.300	Valid
Z25	.755	.300	Valid
Z26	.618	.300	Valid
Z27	.750	.300	Valid

Source: Processed data 2021

Tabel 3: Recapitulation Reliability of Test Result.

Variables	Validity coefficient	r-critical	Explanation
	Value		
INTEGRITY	.978	.700	Reliabel
Job Satisfaction	.805	.700	Reliabel
Commissioner's Performance	.963	.700	Reliabel

Source: Processed data 2021

Hypothesis Testing 1

The Integrity Questionnaire, which consists of 14 statements with four dimensions, is declared valid because the validity coefficient value is higher than the r-critical value of 0.300. The questionnaire on Job Satisfaction which consists of 17 statements with four dimensions is declared valid because its validity value is higher than the r-critical value of 0.300. The Commissioner's PERFORMANCE Survey which consists of 27 statements with five dimensions is declared valid because the value of the validity coefficient is higher than the r-critical value of 0.300.

The results of the research instrument reliability test can be seen in Table 3. Based on the reliability test results obtained, the reliability value for the reliability coefficient of the research instrument is more significant than 0.700, which means that all research variables are declared reliable or meet the requirements. Because the validity and reliability test states that all variables are valid and reliable, it means that the instrument (questionnaire) used is accurate and reliable.

H1: Integrity has a significant effect on Job Satisfaction. Based on Table 4, the effect of Integrity (X) on Job Satisfaction (Y) is positive. Obtained a p-value of 0.000 so that the p-value ≤ 0.05 . This means that there is a positive and significant effect of Integrity on Job Satisfaction.

Hypothesis testing 2

H2: There is a significant effect of Job Satisfaction on Commissioner's PERFORMANCE. Table 4 shows that the total effect of Job Satisfaction (Y) on Commissioner's Performance (Z) is 0.691 or 69.1%, while the remaining 30.9% is the influence of other factors outside of Job Satisfaction.

Integrity has a significant effect on Job Satisfaction:

From the results of factor analysis, Integrity has a strong effect on Job Satisfaction. Integrity shows a tendency to increase compliance with the Code of Ethics and Commitment to the organization. The Commissioners of the General Elections Commission need to understand this pattern of change. If the Commissioner's Job Satisfaction increases because he feels comfortable with his job/position in the organization, then the performance will increase in all levels of aspects of work activities.

Variables	Beta	t-Count	P-Value	Label
Integrity ---> Job Satisfaction	.233	3.096	.003	Significant
Job Satisfaction ---> Commissioner's Performance	.831	14.874	.000	Significant

Source: Processed data 2021

Integrity describes the behavior of elements involving employees and the success of fair dealings, honesty and reliability in the workplace (Integrity describes the behavior of elements involving employees and the success of fair dealings, honesty and reliability in the workplace) (Mehrabian, 2000).

Yukl (2010:71) defines integrity as a person's behavior consistent with the values attached to him, and the person is honest, ethical and trustworthy. Thus, to get better performance three conditions are needed where job satisfaction, integrity and motivation of health workers are priorities. (Integrity as a person's behavior is consistent with the values attached to them, and that person is honest, ethical and trustworthy. Thus, to get a better performance required three conditions where job satisfaction, integrity and motivation upon health personnel to be a priority)

In other words, Individuals are said to have high integrity when their actions are in accordance with the pure values they hold. (In accordance to that, Individuals are said to have a high integrity when their actions are aligned with the pure values they hold) (Jamiah Manap et.al, 2005).

Job Satisfaction has a significant effect on Commissioner's Performance:

In general, the normative measure used to determine the level of achievement of an organization or organization is by measuring the performance of the organization itself. Organizational performance is a representation of the performance of the commissioner. Organizations with good performance are significantly influenced by the performance of good commissioners.

Job satisfaction in any case is very important because of the tendency to improve employee performance in the organization cannot be achieved without employee job satisfaction. Where the organization must always pay attention to the job satisfaction of its employees because if the employees are satisfied then the organization itself will feel profit. And this is very influential on the goals of the organization. In addition, employees who are satisfied with their work will always have a positive attitude and always have high creativity.

The performance of the commissioner is strongly influenced by the satisfaction of the commissioner in carrying out the work he carries out. This is in accordance with the results of research conducted by Handoko (2010) which states "Employees who get job satisfaction usually have better performance than commissioners who do not get job satisfaction". Meanwhile, Organ (2006) in his research states "Job satisfaction affects performance. assuming that employees will give the best for the organization if they also get the best from the organization where they work.

The performance of the commissioner will increase if the job satisfaction of the commissioner is met. This is in line with the results of research conducted by Bacal, Robert (2011), namely job satisfaction has a direct effect on improving performance. Employee performance will increase if the satisfaction of the commissioner is met, this is in accordance with the results of research from Morrison (2004), namely employees will give their best if they also get the best from the organization. In research conducted by Robbins (2007), it was found that organizations with satisfied employees tend to be more effective than organizations with unsatisfied employees.

Job satisfaction affects performance (Schab & Cummings, in Johnson Dongoran, 2001). The influence is positive because individuals who are satisfied with their work will be happy to do the work and strive to continuously improve their abilities and skills so that they are more professional in carrying out tasks within the organization which ultimately lead to an increase in the performance in question and the overall performance of the organization.

Based on the results of the research described above, it indicates that increasing job satisfaction will affect the performance of the employee/commissioner in a positive direction, meaning that if the commissioner tends to experience job satisfaction, it is expected that the performance of the commissioner will increase.

IV. FUTURE SCOPE

This research explains the effect of Integrity variables on Job satisfaction and their impact on Commissioner's Performance. In future studies, it will be better if the X variable is developed, so that the research results will be more comprehensive.

V. CONCLUSION

This study aims to determine the effect of the Integrity on Job satisfaction and its impact on Commissioner's Performance at the General Election Commission of West Java Province, Indonesia. Hypothesis testing results indicate that the Integrity has an effect of significant on Job satisfaction and impacts Commissioner's Performance. This result can be interpreted that the Integrity plays an important role in realizing Job satisfaction so that Commissioner's Performance is getting more optimal.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank the Head and Staff of the General Election Commission of West Java Province, Indonesia.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest of any kind.

REFERENCES

- Adrian Gostick & Dana Telford. 2009. Keunggulan Integritas. Judul asli: *The Integrity Advantage*. Alih bahasa: Fahmi Ihsan. Jakarta: PT. Bhuana Ilmu Populer
- Allen, N.J., and J.P.Meyer. 2003. *Commitment in the Workplace (Theory Research and Application)*. London: Sage Publications.
- Ambar. 2009. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Graha Ilmu, Yogyakarta.
- Andrias Harefa. 2000. Menjadi manusia Pembelajar. Jakarta: PT. Kompas Media Nusantara.
- Anggara Wisesa .2011. Integritas Moral dalam Konteks Pengambilan Keputusan Etis, Vol.10, No 1. Jurnal Manajemen Teknologi, Sekolah Bisnis dan Manajemen Institut Teknologi Bandung.
- Anthony P. Morrison, Paul F, Lara W, Shon W. Lewis, Aoiffe K, Joanne G, Shophie P, Richard P. Bentall. 2004. Cognitive therapy for the prevention of psychosis in people at ultra-high risk. *The British Journal of Psychiatry* 185 (4) 291-297.
- As'ad. 2009. Seri Ilmu Sumber Daya Manusia: Psikologi Industri,. Edisi IV. Yogyakarta: Liberty

- Asshiddiqie. 2006. *Perkembangan dan Konsolidasi Lembaga Negara Pasca Reformasi*. Jakarta: Konstitusi Press.
- Bacal, Robert. 2011. *Performance Management*. Terjemahan Surya Dharma dan Yanuar Irawan, Gramedia Pustaka Jakarta
- Banuara Nadeak. 2017. *The Effect Of Locus Of Control, Integrity, And Interpersonal Communication On Public Servant' Job Satisfaction Of Department Of Education, Youth And Sports In Karawang District*. Jurnal Politikom Indonesiana, Vol.2 No.2:131. November 2017
- Barry Cushway. 2002. *Human Resource Management*. Jakarta: PT Elex Media Kumpitindo
- Bernardin, John H dan Joyce A. Russel. 2009. *Human Resource Management: An Experiential Approach*. Mc Graw-Hill.
- Dessler, Gerry. 2009. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: Indeks
- Dongoran. 2001. *Teori Komitmen, Keterbatasan Organisasi dan Pelaksanaan Strategi Organisasi*, Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis, Vol. V No.1 hal. 63-80
- Edratna. 2007 *Integritas, Dapatkah diukur dan diramalkan?*". Accessed on July 12, 2022, from Edratna.wordpress.com
- Fraser, T. M. 2002. *Stress dan Kepuasan Kerja*. Jakarta: PT Sapdodadi.
- Furtwengler. 2005. *Penilaian Kinerja: Menguasai Keahlian Yang Anda Perlukan Dalam 10 menit*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Andi.
- Gibson James L. John M. Ivancevich, James H. Donelly, Jr. 2009. *Organizations* .Terjemahan., Cetakan kesebelas. Jakarta: PT. Gelora Aksara Pratama.
- Gomes, Cardoso Faustino. 2013. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Yogyakarta: Andi.
- Greenberg. 2003. *Behavior in Organization International Edition*. New Jersey : Prentice Hall.
- Herzberg Frederick , A.H. Maslow dan David McClelland. 2005. *Job Satisfaction Theory*
- Handoko, T. Hani. 2010. *Manajemen Personalia dan sumber Daya Manusia*. Edisi Kedua. Yogyakarta: BPFE UGM.
- Hersey and Blanchard. 2006. *Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hal Inc.
- Jamiah Manap et. al. 2005. *Pemantapan Nilai Integriti Individu sebagai Teras Pembangunan Staf Berkualiti, Prosiding Seminar Kebangsaan Sumber Manusia 2005, anjuran Universiti Teknologi Malaysia*. 2- 3 Februari 2005. Hotel Sifitel, Senai, Johor Bahru
- Johns. 2006. *A Three Compenent Conceptualization of Organization Human Resources Management Review*, vol. No. 1, pp. 61-89
- Kaplan dan Norton. 2006. *Balanced Scorecard: Menerapkan Strategi Menjadi Aksi*. Alih Bahasa: Peter R. Yosi Pasla. 2000. Jakarta: Erlangga
- Kreitner dan Kinicki:2004. *Organizational Behavior 5th edition*, Boston: Mc Graw-Hill
- Luthans. 2006. *Perilaku Organisasi*. (Alih Bahasa V.A Yuwono, dkk), Edisi Bahasa Indonesia, Edisi Sepuluh. PT. Andi Offset: Yogyakarta
- Mangkunegara Anwar Prabu. 2013. *Evaluasi Kinerja Sumber Daya Manusia*. Bandung: Revika Aditama.
- _____. 2013. *Perilaku dan Budaya Organisasi*. Cetakan Pertama. Bandung: PT. Refika Aditama.
- Magnis-Suseno. 2000. *Persatuan Indonesia Pancasila, Paham Kebangsaan dan Integritas Nasional*. Jakarta: Pustaka Suara Harapan.
- Mahmudi. 2007. *Manajemen Kinerja Sektor Publik*. Yogyakarta: UPP AMP.
- Mahsun. 2016. *Pengukuran Kinerja Sektor Publik*. Edisi Pertama. Yogyakarta: BPFE.
- Mathis dan Jackson. 2008. *Perilaku Organisasi*. Yogyakarta: Andi Offset
- Mathis Robert L., Jackson John H. 2009. *Human Resources Management* .Terjemahan. Buku 1, Edisi Kesembilan, Jakarta: Penerbit Salemba Empat.
- Mc.Keena Eugene. 2002. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Andi.

- Mehrabian, A. 2000. *Beyond IQ: Broad-Based Measurement of Individual Success potential or "Emotional Intelligence"*. *Genetic, Social & General Psychology Monographs*, 126 (2), 133-239.
- Mitchelle dan Larson. 2008. *A Handbook of Human Resources Management*, Terjemahan, Jakarta: Elek Media Komputindo
- M. Fraser. 2002. Stres dan kepuasan kerja. Jakarta: PT Pustaka Binaman. Pressindo
- Organ, D. W., P. M. Podsakoff, S. B. MacKenzie. 2006. *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature, Antecedents, and Consequences*. USA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Pattison dan Edgar. 2011. *Integrity and the moral complexity of professional practice*.
- Paul J. Meyer. 2009. *Organisational commitment*", *International Review of Industrial Psychology*, 12, pp.175-227
- Pattison dan Edgar. 2011. *Integrity and the moral complexity of professional practice*
- Poznansky. 2000. "Using Structural Equation Modelling to Investigate the Causal Ordering of Job Satisfaction and Organization Commitment among Staff Accountants", *Behavioral Research in Accounting*, Vol. 22, No. 5, pp.551-568
- Pinder. 2014. *Work motivation: Theory, Issues And Applications* . Illinois : Scoff, Foresmen and Company
- Robbins, Stephen. P. & Judge. 2011. *Organizational Behaviour Human Behaviour at Work*. United States of Amerika: Mc graw-Hill Companies.
- Robbins, Stephen P. 2006. *Perilaku Organisasi*. Edisi kesepuluh. Jakarta: PT. Indeks Kelompok Gramedia
- Rogers. 1994. *Emphatic: Can Unappreciated Way of Being. The Counseling Psychologist*, Vol.5: 2-10
- Rowland dan Rowland. 2007. *Nursing Administration Handbook*. 4 thed. An Aspen Pub: Maryland.
- Sedarmayanti. 2011. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Reformasi Birokrasi dan Manajemen Pegawai Negeri Sipil*. Bandung: Refika Aditama.
- Simanjuntak. 2005. *Manajemen Dan Evaluasi Kinerja*. Jakarta: Fakultas Ekonomi
- Sondang P. Siagian. 2009. *Fungsi-fungsi Manajemen*. Jakarta: Penerbit Bumi. Aksara
- Strauss dan Sayless. 2006. *Manajemen Personalialia*. Jakarta: Penerbit IPPM dan PT. Pustaka Binaman Pressindo
- Sulistiyani, Ambar Teguh. 2009. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Sutermeister. 2009. *People and Productivity*. Toronto: Mc.Graw Hill Book
- Undang-undang dasar 1945 Pasal 1 ayat (1) dan ayat (2)
_____. (Amandemen) Pasal 22E
- Vecchio. 1995. *Organizational Behavior*. Florida: Harcourt Brace College Publishers
- Veithzal Rivai dan Basri, Ahmad Fauzi Moch. 2009. *Performance Appraisal*. Jakarta: PT. Grafindo Persada.
- Wexley, K.N. & Yukl, G.A. 2002. *Perilaku Organisasi Dan Psikologi Personalialia*. (cetakan kedua). Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Wibowo. 2009. *Manajemen Kinerja*. Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Yukl, Gary. 2010. *Kepemimpinan dalam Organisasi*, Edisi Kelima. Jakarta: PT. Indeks.
- Zulkarnaen, W., Bagianto, A., Sabar, & Heriansyah, D. (2020). Management accounting as an instrument of financial fraud mitigation. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, 24(3), 2471 – 2491. <https://doi.org/10.37200/IJPR/V24I3/PR201894>

INTEGRITY INFLUENCE ON JOB SATISFACTION AND ITS IMPLICATIONS ON COMMISSIONERS' PERFORMANCE OF GENERAL ELECTION COMMISSION (KPU) IN WEST JAVA PROVINCE

ORIGINALITY REPORT

12%

SIMILARITY INDEX

12%

INTERNET SOURCES

4%

PUBLICATIONS

5%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1

www.researchtrend.net

Internet Source

6%

2

discovery.researcher.life

Internet Source

1%

3

docplayer.net

Internet Source

1%

4

Submitted to Sim University

Student Paper

1%

5

www.scribd.com

Internet Source

1%

6

Submitted to Universitas Brawijaya

Student Paper

<1%

7

media.neliti.com

Internet Source

<1%

8

Submitted to International Islamic University
Malaysia

Student Paper

<1%

9

www.gssrr.org

Internet Source

<1 %

10

digilib.unila.ac.id

Internet Source

<1 %

11

journal.stiemb.ac.id

Internet Source

<1 %

12

Malicia Evendia, Armen Yasir, Yulia Neta, Ade Arif Firmansyah. "The Legal Politics of Recall Right of Political Parties Relevance with the System of Popular Sovereignty In Dynamics of the Constitution of Indonesia", Pattimura Law Journal, 2020

Publication

<1 %

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography On