



The Effect of Administrative Ethics on Service Quality

Abdul Latif¹

¹Faculty of Political and Social Sciences, University of Muhammadiyah Makassar, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: Abdul Latief

Article Info

Article History:

Received December 2, 2022

Revised December 13, 2022

Accepted: December 23, 2022

Keywords:

Ethics, Administration,
Service Quality.

Abstract

The study's objective is to glean participants' perspectives on administrative ethics' effect on service quality. This research combined quantitative and associative approaches. The technique used is called "saturated sampling," and it requires determining whether or not the sample can include every member of the community. The information utilized in this analysis was gathered using a combination of in-person interviews, online surveys, and direct observation. Simple linear regression analysis was employed to examine the data, and SPSS 24.0 was the software of choice for this task. Results from a test of the hypothesis that "administrative ethics (X) has a positive influence on service quality" are consistent with the research's result that ethics in administration has a positive effect on service quality (Y). This can be seen by comparing the values of tcount and ttable; tcount is greater by 10,696.

Introduction

The government develops agencies, which are made up of teams of personnel recruited in line with the rules that have been established, in order to carry out the commitments of the state and deliver great public services (French et al., 2020). For any government organization to be successful, it is vital that all of its owned and controlled human resources be used in an effective and efficient manner (Zhang et al., 2020). In order to assist the company in accomplishing its goals, the personnel resources must act at a professional level (Karatepe et al., 2019). This includes adhering to the requirements of administrative ethics and offering service of the highest possible quality (de Tran et al., 2020). It is one of the most important things that must be owned since administrative ethics in service quality is essential for those who will manage and develop new documents for the benefit of people who will carry out these services (Gallardo-Gallardo et al., 2020). There is still room for advancement in the field of administrative ethics, particularly with regard to the quality of services that are provided to the general public (Ramos-Morcillo et al., 2020). This is due to the fact that some organizations only make the barest of efforts to examine the impact that their policies and procedures have on members of the community (Greckhamer et al., 2018). Consequently, there is still room for advancement in the field of administrative ethics (Vallaster et al., 2019). Some managers have stated that service ethics still need to be strengthened, citing the persistence of individuals who are not community-oriented despite the fact that this may have a negative impact on the overall efficiency and effectiveness of the service industry as a whole (Feng et al., 2019). The managers

who made these statements cited the persistence of individuals who do not care about the community (Scott et al., 2020; Valencia et al., 2019) There are still some village officials who are insensitive to the community; consequently, it is essential to have strong ethics in regard to the quality of service in order to ensure that a variety of concerns faced by the community are not ignored and are not constrained by the provision of service (Madonsela et al., 2019). The purpose of this research is to accomplish the following objectives: (1) discover the degree to which administrative ethics impacts the quality of service;

(2) evaluate the quality of service itself; and (3) examine the effect that administrative ethics has on the quality of service.

Methods

For the purpose of this inquiry, quantitative research methodologies were used (Johnson et al., 2020). Researchers and statisticians that use this approach to carry out investigations make use of the methodology's mathematical base in addition to the suggested quantity theory. Quantitative research is conducted with the goal of illuminating the connections that exist between the many aspects of a population (Larkin et al., 2019). The fact that this kind of investigation generates measurable data by making use of questionnaires that are sent to the general public is the primary argument put out in support of using it.

Results and Discussion

Administrative Ethics

According to the information that was gathered from the questionnaire about the markers of equality, justice, loyalty, and accountability, the better the administrative ethics are, the more respondents there are who replied with a strong agreement (Bilan et al., 2020): (1) Equality, specifically equal treatment of services supplied; according to a poll about equality indicators, the greater the number of respondents who replied "strongly agree" to the issue, the greater the equality in administrative ethics:

Table 1. Equation X1 indicator

Respondents' Responses	Score (x)	Frequency (f)	F. X	Presentation (%)
Strongly disagree	1	0	0	0
Disagree	2	3	6	5
Disagree	3	6	18	10
Agree	4	27	96	45
Totally Agree	5	24	120	40
Total		60	240	100

Table 1. shows that, in terms of overall community satisfaction, 3 people (5%) disagree with

the statement "The results of interviews do not discriminate between people," while 6 people (10%) are less than enthusiastic, 27 people (45%) agree, and 40 people (40%) strongly agree. According to the average score, "Village authorities do not discriminate across communities" (X1) receives a 4, indicating that residents are generally pleased with the service they get from the municipality.

Table 2. Equation X2 indicator

Respondents' Responses	Score (x)	Frequency (f)	F.X	Presenta tion (%)
Strongly disagree	1	0	0	0
Disagree	2	3	6	5
Disagree	3	6	18	10
Agree	4	22	88	36,7
Totally Agree	5	29	145	48,3
Total (Σ)		60	257	100

Using the data in Table 2. we can infer that 5% of the community is not happy with how things stand in terms of the X2 indicator. A lower proportion of 6 (six) persons (10%) than the percentage of 22 (22) people (36.7%) who agree with the statement. With 29 (twenty- nine) persons giving a positive rating, the proportion of those who agree is 48.3. The average score of 4.2 suggests that there is a correlation between the degree of satisfaction in the community and the X2 indicator.

Table 3. Equation X3 indicator

Respondents' Responses	Score (x)	Freque n cy (f)	F. X	Presenta tion (%)
Strongly disagree	1	0	0	0
Disagree	2	2	4	3,3
Disagree	3	7	21	11,7
Agree	4	23	92	38,3
Totally Agree	5	28	140	46,7
Total (Σ)		60	257	100

According to Table 3. the satisfaction level is rated as disagreeable by 2 persons (3.3%), as

somewhat agreeable by 7 (11.7%), as agreeable by 23 (23.3%), as extremely agreeable by 28 (46.7%). The average score of 4.2 suggests that there is a correlation between the X3 indicator and the degree of community satisfaction.

Fairness

In a just society, equality is not sufficient. From responses to the justice indicators survey (Wolfensohn et al., 2018). Generally speaking, the greater the proportion of people who replied "strongly agree," the fairer the administration of ethics is (Lenoir et al., 2021). The frequency of the components making up the justice indicator are shown in the table below (Banzhaf et al., 2019).

Table 4. Fairness Indicator X4

Respondents' Responses	Score (x)	Frequency (f)	F.X	Presentation (%)
Strongly disagree	1	0	0	0
Disagree	2	0	0	0
Disagree	3	7	21	11,7
Agree	4	33	132	55
Totally Agree	5	20	100	33,3
Total (Σ)		60	253	100

According to Table 4. on the X4 indicator, "the degree of satisfaction of the community," 7 individuals (11.7%) disagree, 33 people (55.0%) agree, and 20 people (33.3%) highly agree. The average score of 4.2 indicates that the degree of community satisfaction with regards to the X4 indication is excellent.

Table 5. Fairness Indicator X5

Respondents' Responses	Score (x)	Frequency (f)	F.X	Presentation (%)
Strongly disagree	1	0	0	0
Disagree	2	4	8	6,7
Disagree	3	6	18	10
Agree	4	20	80	33,3
Totally Agree	5	30	150	50

Total (Σ)	60	256	100
--------------------	----	-----	-----

According to the data in Table 5. on the indicator X5 the level of community satisfaction is evaluated as disagreeing by 4 (four) people, with a percentage of 6.7%, as less agreeing by 6 (six) people, with a percentage of 10%, as agreeing by 20 (twenty) people, with a percentage of 33.3%, and as strongly agreeing by 30 (thirty) people, with a percentage of 50%. According to the average score, the overall level of community satisfaction with regards to the X5 indication is excellent, with a score of 4.2.

Table 6. Fairness Indicator X6

Respondents' Responses	Score (x)	Frequency (f)	F.X	Presenta tion (%)
Strongly disagree	1	0	0	0
Disagree	2	3	6	5
Disagree	3	6	18	10
Agree	4	29	116	48,3
Totally Agree	5	22	110	36,7
Total (Σ)		60	250	100

According to the data in Table 6. on indicator X6 the level of satisfaction in the community is rated as disagreeing by 3 (three) people, with a percentage of 5%, and as less agreeing by 6 (six) people, with a percentage of 10%, as agreeing by 29 (twenty-nine) people, with a percentage of 36.7%, and as very agreeing by 22 (twenty-two) people, with a percentage of 36.7%. When looking at the average score, a value of 6.0 indicates that the X6 indication is well-liked by the community.

Responsibility

According to a survey measuring markers of responsibility in administrative ethics, the greater the proportion of respondents who said "strongly agree" to the statement that "each officer must be accountable for whatever he does," the more responsible that officer is. The frequency of components making up each responsibility indication is shown in the table below (Realyvásquez-Vargas et al., 2018).

Table 7. Liability Indicator X10

Respondents' Responses	Score (x)	Frequen cy (f)	F.X	Presentat ion (%)
Strongly disagree	1	0	0	0
Disagree	2	2	4	3,4
Disagree	3	6	18	10
Agree	4	26	104	43,3
Totally Agree	5	26	130	43,3
Total (Σ)		60	256	100

Table 7. shows that of the individuals who provided feedback on the community satisfaction level indicator, 2 (two) people (or 3.4% of the sample) highly disagreed, 6 (six) people (10%) disagreed, 26 (twenty-six) people (43.3%) agreed, and 2 (two) people (or 3.4% of the sample) strongly agreed. According to the average score, the degree of community satisfaction with regards to the X10 indication is excellent, with a score of 4.2.

Table 8. Liability Indicator X11

Respondents' Responses	Score (x)	Frequen cy (f)	F.X	Presenta tion (%)
Strongly disagree	1	0	0	0
Disagree	2	0	0	0
Disagree	3	1	3	1,7
Agree	4	38	152	63,3
Totally Agree	5	21	105	35

According to Table 8. the proportion of people who disagree with the statement about the level of satisfaction in the community is 1.7%, the number of people who agree is 463.3%, and the percentage of people who strongly agree is 35%. Community satisfaction with respect to the X11 indication is excellent, as shown by the average score of 4.3 shown in the findings.

Table 9. Liability Indicator X12

Respondents' Responses	Score (x)	Frequency (f)	F.X	Presentation (%)
Strongly disagree	1	0	0	0
Disagree	2	3	6	5
Disagree	3	4	12	6,7
Agree	4	27	108	45
Totally Agree	5	26	130	43,3
Total (Σ)		60	256	100

According to Table 9. three individuals (5% of the total) disagree with the indicators, four people (6.7% of the total) agree somewhat with the indications, twenty-seven people (45% of the total) agree, and twenty-six people (43.3%) strongly agree with the indicators. The mean score of 4.2 suggests that overall community satisfaction with respect to the X12 indicator is above average.

Reliability

On a survey measuring reliability indicators, the higher the percentage of "strongly agree" responses, the more confident one may be in the quality of the services being provided (Lee et al., 2019). The frequency of elements making up dependability indicators are shown in the table below (FARKAS & ROMANIUK, 2020).

Table 10. Reliability Indicator Y4

Respondents' Responses	Score (x)	Frequency (f)	F.X	Presentation (%)
Strongly disagree	1	0	0	0
Disagree	2	3	6	5
Disagree	3	4	12	6,7
Agree	4	32	128	53,3
Totally Agree	5	21	105	35
Total (Σ)		60	251	100

Table 10. shows that 3 individuals (5% of the total) disagree with the indicators, 4 people (6.7% of the total) agree somewhat with the indications, 32 people (53.3%) agree with the indicators, and 21 people (35% of the total) strongly agree with the indicators. The average score of 4.1 suggests that the Y4 indication is well-liked by the community.

Table 11. Reliability Indicator Y5

Respondents' Responses	Score (x)	Frequenc y (f)	F.X	Presentat ion (%)
Strongly disagree	1	0	0	0
Disagree	2	0	0	0
Disagree	3	5	15	8,3
Agree	4	33	132	55
Totally Agree	5	22	110	36,7
Total (Σ)		60	257	100

Table 11. shows that 8.3% of respondents did not agree with statements about the Y5 indicator; 55% of respondents agreed; 36.7% strongly agreed; and 22.2% did not respond. An average score of 4.2 indicates that residents are generally pleased with the Y5 indication.

Table 12. Reliability Indicator Y6

Respondents' Responses	Score (x)	Frequen cy (f)	F.X	Presentat ion (%)
Strongly disagree	1	0	0	0
Disagree	2	0	0	0
Disagree	3	2	6	3,4
Agree	4	38	152	63,3
Totally Agree	5	20	100	33,3
Total (Σ)		60	258	100

Table 12. shows that of the persons who provided ratings for the Y6 indication, 2 (two) gave it a less agreeable rating, for a percentage of 3.4%; 38 (thirty-eight) gave it an agree rating, for a percentage of 63.3%; and 20 (twenty) gave it a highly agree rating, for a percentage of 33.3%. The average score of 4.3 indicates that Y6 indicator-related community satisfaction is above average.

Response

More respondents who replied "strongly agree" to a questionnaire on responsiveness indicators indicated higher levels of responsiveness in service quality, which is defined as the capacity to assist and offer services swiftly and correctly (Chyung et al., 2018). The response indicator items' frequencies are shown in the table below (Wardell et al., 2020).

Table 13. Y7 Responsiveness Indicator

Respondents' Responses	Score (x)	Frequency (f)	F.X	Percentage (%)
Strongly disagree	1	0	0	0
Disagree	2	0	0	0
Disagree	3	6	18	10
Agree	4	36	144	60
Totally Agree	5	18	90	30
Total (Σ)		60	252	100

Based on the data in Table 13. 6 (six) individuals (or 10%) rated the Y7 indicator as "less agree," 36 (thirty-six) people (or 60%) rated it as "agree," and 18 (eighteen) people (or 30%) rated it as "strongly agree." The average score of 4.2 indicates that the community's satisfaction with respect to the indicators is generally excellent.

Administrative Ethics towards Service

According to the responses of individuals who took part in the survey about the administrative ethics variable, it gives off the impression of being favorable (van der Voet, 2022). The fact that the average score is four, which puts it in the acceptable category, lends credence to this assertion (Pulido et al., 2020). According to the results, the quality of ethics in respect to the values that were embraced was proportionate to the amount of satisfaction that was felt by the community about ethics connected to disciplines that research values (Oluoch et al., 2020). This level of pleasure was related to the study of values. On the other hand, the amount of satisfaction experienced by the community is proportional to the quality of the values that were embraced by the group (Alaimo et al., 2020). along with the fact that it was absorbed into human civilization (Svrydenko & Stovpets, 2020). The value that is perceived by the

community as a consequence of adopting the ethics that are offered by the office is what gives birth to public perception (Duan et al., 2020). This value may be seen as a result of embracing the ethics that are supplied by the office (Haldorai et al., 2020). When the needs of the community are satisfied, the members of the community will have the perception that they are cared for and respected by those outside of the community (Lindauer & Hutter, 2020).

It earns good marks, as shown by the data obtained from the input that the respondents provided on the variable pertaining to the service quality (Shrestha, 2021). The fact that the average score is four, which puts it in the acceptable category, lends credence to this assertion (el Asnaoui & Chawki, 2020). The data revealed that the degree of satisfaction that was experienced by visitors was lower, the better the quality of service that was supplied, and the greater the level of satisfaction that was offered (Sánchez-Casado et al., 2019). The converse is also true, namely that a lower degree of satisfaction among guests is related with a lower quality of service (Rice et al., 2020). One of the factors that defines the level of a company's success is the quality of the services that are offered (Taouab & Issor, 2019). A successful company is one that is able to satisfy the requirements of its clientele as well as create positive feedback from those it serves (Rodríguez-Sánchez et al., 2020). The value that is provided to visitors as a direct consequence of the services provided by the firm is a direct contributor to the creation of the views that guests have towards the institution (Park et al., 2019). When we meet the needs of our visitors, they will get the impression that they are important to us and that we care about them (Battour et al., 2018).

This research makes use of two variables: the dependent variable, which is administrative ethics, and the independent variable, which is quality of service (Demuyakor, 2020). Both of these variables are examined in this study. According to the findings of many statistical tests (Erzen & Çikrikci, 2018). It is clear that adhering to ethical standards in administration has a beneficial impact on the quality of services provided (Camilleri, 2022). The influence of administrative ethics on service quality demonstrates that the factors of administrative ethics have a considerable effect on the variables of service quality (Pakurár et al., 2019).

Conclusion

The following are some of the conclusions that may be reached as a consequence of the findings of the data analysis and the conversations that have taken place: (1) According to the findings of the study, administrative ethics belongs to the category of good. (2) According to the findings of the study, the quality of service is considered to be in the "good" category. (3) The influence of administrative ethics factors on service quality may be determined by the direction the sign is facing, and these variables have a substantial impact on the overall quality of the service. The score for administrative ethics is much higher than 0.05, indicating that it moves in a constructive direction and has a considerable impact on the quality of services provided. This indicates that the study hypothesis has a chance of being accepted, which is necessary in order for the actualization of administrative ethics to achieve the level of service quality.

References

Alaimo, L. S., Fiore, M., & Galati, A. (2020). How the COVID-19 pandemic is changing online food shopping human behaviour in Italy. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *12*(22), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12229594>

Banzhaf, S., Ma, L., & Timmins, C. (2019). Environmental justice: The economics of race,

- place, and pollution. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 33(1), 185–208. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.33.1.185>
- Battour, M., Hakimian, F., Ismail, M., & Boğan, E. (2018). The perception of non-Muslim tourists towards halal tourism: Evidence from Turkey and Malaysia. *Journal of Islamic Marketing*, 9(4), 823–840. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIMA-07-2017-0072>
- Bilan, Y., Mishchuk, H., Samoliuk, N., & Mishchuk, V. (2020). Gender discrimination and its links with compensations and benefits practices in enterprises. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, 8(3), 189–204. <https://doi.org/10.15678/EBER.2020.080311>
- Camilleri, M. A. (2022). Strategic attributions of corporate social responsibility and environmental management: The business case for doing well by doing good! *Sustainable Development*, 30(3), 409–422. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2256>
- Chyung, S. Y. Y., Barkin, J. R., & Shamsy, J. A. (2018). Evidence-Based Survey Design: The Use of Negatively Worded Items in Surveys. *Performance Improvement*, 57(3), 16–25. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pfi.21749>
- de Tran, V., Dorofeeva, V. v., Loskutova, E. E., Lagutkina, T. P., Kosova, I. v., Gribkova, E. I., Galkina, G. A., Pak, T. v., Ibragimova, A. N., Le, M. H., & Cao, T. T. N. (2020). Elderly consumers' satisfaction with the quality of community pharmacy services in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam: a Q-methodology study. *Pharmacia*, 67(4), 303–309. <https://doi.org/10.3897/pharmacia.67.e56511>
- Demuyakor, J. (2020). Coronavirus (Covid-19) and online learning in higher institutions of education: A survey of the perceptions of ghanaiian international students in China. *Online Journal of Communication and Media Technologies*, 10(3). <https://doi.org/10.29333/ojcm/8286>
- Duan, T., Jiang, H., Deng, X., Zhang, Q., & Wang, F. (2020). Government intervention, risk perception, and the adoption of protective action recommendations: Evidence from the COVID-19 prevention and control experience of China. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(10). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17103387>
- el Asnaoui, K., & Chawki, Y. (2020). Using X-ray images and deep learning for automated detection of coronavirus disease. *Journal of Biomolecular Structure and Dynamics*, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07391102.2020.1767212>
- Erzen, E., & Çikrikci, Ö. (2018). The effect of loneliness on depression: A meta-analysis. In *International Journal of Social Psychiatry* (Vol. 64, Issue 5, pp. 427–435). SAGE Publications Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020764018776349>

- FARKAS, K. J., & ROMANIUK, J. R. (2020). SOCIAL WORK, ETHICS AND VULNERABLE GROUPS IN THE TIME OF CORONAVIRUS AND COVID-19. *Society Register*, 4(2), 67–82.
<https://doi.org/10.14746/sr.2020.4.2.05>
- Feng, T., Wang, D., Lawton, A., & Luo, B. N. (2019). Customer orientation and firm performance: The joint moderating effects of ethical leadership and competitive intensity. *Journal of Business Research*, 100, 111–121.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.03.021>
- French, J., Deshpande, S., Evans, W., & Obregon, R. (2020). Key guidelines in developing a pre-emptive COVID-19 vaccination uptake promotion strategy. In *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* (Vol. 17, Issue 16, pp. 1–14). MDPI AG.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17165893>
- Gallardo-Gallardo, E., Thunnissen, M., & Scullion, H. (2020). Talent management: context matters. In *International Journal of Human Resource Management* (Vol. 31, Issue 4, pp. 457–473). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2019.1642645>
- Greckhamer, T., Furnari, S., Fiss, P. C., & Aguilera, R. v. (2018). Studying configurations with qualitative comparative analysis: Best practices in strategy and organization research. *Strategic Organization*, 16(4), 482–495. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1476127018786487>
- Haldorai, K., Kim, W. G., Chang, H. (Sean), & Li, J. (Justin). (2020). Workplace spirituality as a mediator between ethical climate and workplace deviant behavior. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2019.102372>
- Johnson, J. L., Adkins, D., & Chauvin, S. (2020). A review of the quality indicators of rigor in qualitative research. In *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education* (Vol. 84, Issue 1, pp. 138–146). American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy.
<https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe7120>
- Karatepe, O. M., Ozturk, A., & Kim, T. T. (2019). The effects of nonwork and personal resources on frontline bank employees' work engagement and critical job outcomes. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 37(3), 858–879. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJBM-05-2018-0133>
- Larkin, M., Shaw, R., & Flowers, P. (2019). Multiperspectival designs and processes in interpretative phenomenological analysis research. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 16(2), 182–198. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2018.1540655>
- Lee, J., Song, H. D., & Hong, A. J. (2019). Exploring factors, and indicators for measuring students' sustainable engagement in e-learning. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 11(4).
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su11040985>
- Lenoir, A. L., Leconte, S., Cayn, M., Ketterer, F., Duchesnes, C., Fraipont, B., & Richelle, L.

- (2021). Exploring the diverse career trajectories of general practice graduates in the French-speaking part of Belgium: An interview study. *European Journal of General Practice*, 27(1), 111–118. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13814788.2021.1933938>
- Lindauer, M., & Hutter, F. (2020). Best Practices for Scientific Research on Neural Architecture Search. In *Journal of Machine Learning Research* (Vol. 21). http://automl.org/nas_checklist.pdf.
- Madonsela, B., Koop, S., van Leeuwen, K., & Carden, K. (2019). Evaluation of water governance processes required to transition towards Water Sensitive Urban Design-An indicator assessment approach for the City of Cape Town. *Water (Switzerland)*, 11(2). <https://doi.org/10.3390/w11020292>
- Oluoch, P. M., Odundo, P. A., & Mwangi, J. K. (2020). Context of Vignettes and Ethical Sensitivity in Decision-Making Among Undergraduate Business Studies Learners at University of Nairobi, Kenya. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 9(4), 151. <https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v9n4p151>
- Pakurár, M., Haddad, H., Nagy, J., Popp, J., & Oláh, J. (2019). The service quality dimensions that affect customer satisfaction in the Jordanian banking sector. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 11(4). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11041113>
- Park, E., Choi, B. K., & Lee, T. J. (2019). The role and dimensions of authenticity in heritage tourism. *Tourism Management*, 74, 99–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2019.03.001>
- Pulido, C. M., Villarejo-Carballido, B., Redondo-Sama, G., & Gómez, A. (2020). COVID-19 infodemic: More retweets for science-based information on coronavirus than for false information. *International Sociology*, 35(4), 377–392. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580920914755>
- Ramos-Morcillo, A. J., Leal-Costa, C., Moral-García, J. E., & Ruzafa-Martínez, M. (2020). Experiences of nursing students during the abrupt change from face-to-face to e-learning education during the first month of confinement due to COVID-19 in Spain. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(15), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17155519>
- Realyvásquez-Vargas, A., Arredondo-Soto, K. C., Carrillo-Gutiérrez, T., & Ravelo, G. (2018). Applying the Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) cycle to reduce the defects in the manufacturing industry. A case study. *Applied Sciences (Switzerland)*, 8(11). <https://doi.org/10.3390/app8112181>
- Rice, P., Law, T., & Casinillo, L. F. (2020). Econometric Modelling On Satisfaction In Rice Farming Under. 326 / *Journal of Research and Multidisciplinary*, 2. <http://journal.alhikam.net/index.php/jrm>
- Rodríguez-Sánchez, J. L., González-Torres, T., Montero-Navarro, A., & Gallego-Losada, R. (2020). Investing time and resources for work–life balance: the effect on talent retention. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(6). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17061920>
- Sánchez-Casado, N., Artal-Tur, A., & Tomaseti-Solano, E. (2019). Social media, customers' experience, and hotel loyalty programs. *Tourism Analysis*, 24(1),
- Copyright © 2023, *Journal Social Civilecial*, Under the license CC BY-SA 4.0
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.71435/610480>

27–41. <https://doi.org/10.3727/108354219X15458295631918>

- Scott, A., Squier, K., Alfredson, H., Bahr, R., Cook, J. L., Coombes, B., de Vos, R. J., Fu, S. N., Grimaldi, A., Lewis, J. S., Maffulli, N., Magnusson, S. P., Malliaras, P., Mc Auliffe, S., Oei, E. H. G., Purdam, C. R., Rees, J. D., Rio, E. K., Gravare Silbernagel, K., ... Zwerver, J. (2020). ICON 2019: International Scientific Tendinopathy Symposium Consensus: Clinical Terminology. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 54(5), 260–262. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2019-100885>
- Shrestha, N. (2021). Factor Analysis as a Tool for Survey Analysis. *American Journal of Applied Mathematics and Statistics*, 9(1), 4–11. <https://doi.org/10.12691/ajams-9-1-2>
- Svyrydenko, D., & Stovpets, O. (2020). Cultural and Economic Strategies of Modern China: In Search of the Cooperation Models across the Global World. *Future Human Image*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.29202/fhi/13/11>
- Taouab, O., & Issor, Z. (2019). Firm Performance: Definition and Measurement Models. *European Scientific Journal ESJ*, 15(1). <https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2019.v15n1p93>
- Valencia, S. C., Simon, D., Croese, S., Nordqvist, J., Oloko, M., Sharma, T., Taylor Buck, N., & Versace, I. (2019). Adapting the Sustainable Development Goals and the New Urban Agenda to the city level: Initial reflections from a comparative research project. *International Journal of Urban Sustainable Development*, 11(1), 4–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463138.2019.1573172>
- Vallaster, C., Kraus, S., Merigó Lindahl, J. M., & Nielsen, A. (2019). Ethics and entrepreneurship: A bibliometric study and literature review. *Journal of Business Research*, 99, 226–237. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.02.050>
- van der Voet, J. (2022). Policy preferences in response to negative economic prospects of COVID-19: A survey-experiment among local politicians in four European countries. *Public Administration*, 100(2), 356–374. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12729>
- Wardell, J. D., Kempe, T., Rapinda, K. K., Single, A., Bilevicius, E., Frohlich, J. R., Hendershot, C. S., & Keough, M. T. (2020). Drinking to Cope During COVID-19 Pandemic: The Role of External and Internal Factors in Coping Motive Pathways to Alcohol Use, Solitary Drinking, and Alcohol Problems. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*, 44(10), 2073–2083. <https://doi.org/10.1111/acer.14425>
- Wolfensohn, S., Shotton, J., Bowley, H., Davies, S., Thompson, S., & Justice, W. S. M. (2018). Assessment of welfare in zoo animals: Towards optimum quality of life. In *Animals* (Vol. 8, Issue 7). MDPI AG. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani8070110>
- Zhang, L., Li, H., & Chen, K. (2020). Effective risk communication for public health emergency: Reflection on the covid-19 (2019-ncov) outbreak in wuhan, china. *Healthcare (Switzerland)*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare8010064>