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Abstract. This research is a non-parametric statistical measurement form which use the Mann Whitney Test. The aim is to determine whether or not there are differences in the impact of the implementation of the PSBB as a result of Covid-19 pandemic in the Surabaya, Gresik and Sidoarjo areas through the distribution of questionnaires and interviews, a sample of 134 people who were distributed in the 3 regions obtained. From the results of repeated simulations, measurements and testing to answer existing hypotheses, it can be seen that there are 3 things that are the conclusions of this study. The first conclusion, that there is no difference in the impact of the PSBB implementation in the Sidoarjo and Surabaya areas, which use α = 5%, the value obtained $Z_{count} = -0.65745$ is higher than $Z_{table} = +/- 1.96$. It is in the receiving area which means $H_0$ or the hypothesis that there is no difference in the impact of the PSBB implementation between Sidoarjo and Surabaya areas cannot be rejected. The second conclusion, that there are differences in the impact of the PSBB implementation in the Surabaya and Gresik areas with the result that the value of $Z_{count} = -2.28792$ is lower than $Z_{table}$. The same thing happened in the third test, there was a significant difference in the impact of the PSBB implementation in Sidoarjo and Gresik areas. Furthermore, in the descriptive analysis, there are several factors were found which effect the three tests result, as follows: geographic, demographic, social, cultural and employment factors.
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1 Introduction

Development is a matter of concern for many individuals, groups, communities and nations in general (Catur Sugiyanto, 2019). If an economy wants to progress, the economy must invest (Rahardja and Manurung, 2008). At the end of 2019 and the beginning of 2020, Indonesia is optimistic about its economic development plans, poverty alleviation, employment, unemployment reduction, national output growth, investment realization, monetary stability, and all other macroeconomic indicators. The government also sets an economic growth rate of 5.3% in 2020. This is a realistic expectation given the previous achievements and Indonesia's macroeconomic conditions in 2019. The facts show different things. Before all those hopes and dreams came true, there was an epidemic. Coronavirus disease that was discovered in 2019, infectious disease caused by the corona virus. A new type of disease found in 2019. Globally, the corona virus disease pandemic has begun since the end of 2019 (Freddy Mutiara, Ambang Priyonggo, 2020). At first everyone thought that Covid-19 was common. Next, not slow but sure but, fast and sure, Covid-19 not only crippled public health but also crippled the people's economy. Finally, almost the whole world calls it the Covid-19 pandemic. This in turn gave rise to an economic pandemic.
Covid-19 has created an extraordinary negative multiplier effect for the Indonesian economy. An increase in the unemployment rate of 60,000 people in February 2020. Economic growth also declined in the first quarter of 2020, 2.97%. Exchange rate depreciation and rising inflation are macroeconomic indicators that worsened in February 2020 (BPS, 2020). Many countries have experienced recessions, many countries have revised their achievements, revised targets, and recalculated their financial capacity. Including Indonesia, in the middle of 2020 it must finally revise its economic growth target, from 0.4% to 2.3%. Whereas previously it was 5.3%. Like a match, there is a loss and there is also a win. Maybe in 2020 we will lose. With confidence, enthusiasm, hard work, and some adjustment policies, the government is optimistic that in 2021 growth can return to 4.5% - 5.5%. Our hopes and aspirations. All countries in the world are experiencing the Covid-19 pandemic. The Covid-19 pandemic has raised new problems for each region, including Indonesia. Several policy alternatives were made by the government as a solution to handling the Covid-19 pandemic. PSBB, this is the option chosen by the government in dealing with the Covid-19 pandemic. It was applied in almost all regions in Indonesia and had a tremendous impact on the people's economy. Not always at the same time, in each region can apply the PSBB to break the chain of spread of Covid-19 as needed and after obtaining approval from the central government. This situation also happened in East Java.

PSBB implementation in Greater Surabaya; Surabaya, Gresik, and Sidoarjo which always coincide in the coordination of the East Java Provincial Government. Taking into account the diversity of the population, population density, the amount of investment, geographical position, and the progress of regional development, these three cities can be considered as representations of cities in Indonesia in implementing the PSBB. This includes the consequences of implementing the PSBB. Observing this, the purpose of this study is to determine whether there are differences in the impact of the implementation of the PSBB in the three regions. Simulations, measurements, and analyzes were performed using the Mann Whitney Test. With several research samples in the three regions, comparisons were made to determine; a). whether there is a difference in the impact of the implementation of the PSBB between Sidoarjo and Surabaya, b). whether there is a difference in the impact of the implementation of the PSBB between Surabaya and Gresik, c). whether or not there is a difference in the impact of the implementation of the PSBB between Gresik and Sidoarjo. The existence of Covid-19 has created an extraordinary negative multiplier effect for the Indonesian economy (Bambang Budiarto, 2020b).

In general, impacts are the results felt by the community due to a change in an event or a change in circumstances. Meanwhile, what is meant by impact in this research is the economic condition felt by the people in Sidoarjo, Surabaya and Gresik due to the implementation of the PSBB. This is called an economic impact. The distribution of the questionnaire has 5 options for the impact felt by respondents on the implementation of PSBB; a). very affected, b). impacted, c). quite affected, d). not affected, and e). very unaffected. The statistics are divided in two; descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics are related to recording data, recapitulating data, and presenting data for the purpose of describing important things in a group of data. Inferent statistics are related to decision making from grouping data in these descriptive statistics.

Furthermore, in some cases, problems that cannot be solved with parametric statistics, such as the cases raised in this study, will be resolved with non-parametric statistics. In this study, the problem solving was solved based on non-parametric statistics, the mann whiney test. As has been done previously, the impact is divided into 5, but the analysis of the measurement results will only arrive at whether or not there is a difference in the impact of the...
PSBB application. Further research can be done if you want to get more analysis results. Based on this research, it can be continued by taking measurements on the basis of different measurement tools according to the desired objectives. Furthermore, in order to obtain good measurement results and analysis results, of course several concepts are needed to support this. Globalization has also brought cultural integration into a complex business environment by contributing to the development of a globally oriented consumer culture (Cleveland, Rojas, Laroche, Papadopoulus, 2016). In the current global era, the world is developing dynamically and will continue to change without anyone being able to regulate the pace (Octavia, Indra, Hery, Firman, 2019). Related economic growth, then, there are terms which are almost the same and which are often used together, economic development and economic growth. In simple terms, development is often understood as from nothing to being, which means creating or making something. If economic development, of course, means making something in the economic field. Furthermore, for growth, it simply means that there is a process of increasing capacity from one period to the next, with the same unit, namely percent. Growth measurements can be made with formulations,

\[
\frac{X_t - X_{t-1}}{X_{t-1}} \times 100\% = Y\%
\]

(1)

Economic growth, of course, is a process of increasing output capacity from one period to the next in percentage units. Output is the acquisition of the results of economic development, which means that it can be taken from income figures. It could be GDP, it could be GNP, or something else. Along with the development of measurement methods, there are now very various patterns of measuring economic growth. And what is certain is that at a theoretical level the value of this growth becomes very important along with the process of implementing economic development and the constraints it faces, because the value of this growth will later become one of the anatomical components of a region, whether it be a state or a region. An overview of Indonesia's economic growth can be seen in Table 1 and Table 2.

**Table 1: Indonesia’s Economic Growth in The Last Five Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Economic Growth (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BPS, several years of publication

**Table 2: Economic Growth in The Last 6 Quarters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Economic Growth (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>-5.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BPS, several years of publication
PSBB is a policy implemented by the government in an area in handling a problem. There is a legal basis that governs PSBB. There is Law which regulates Health Quarantine (UU No. 6/2018). In East Java, the provincial government issued which Large-Scale Social Restriction (Pergub Jatim No. 18/2020), as well as Government Regulation which concerning Large-Scale Social Restrictions in the context of Accelerating Handling of Corona Virus Disease 2019 (PP No. 21/2020). In addition there is also the Minister of Health which regulates the guidelines for implementing PSBB (Permenkes No. 9/2020). According to the Permenkes, it is explained that the PSBB is implemented during the longest incubation period of Covid-19, which is 14 days and can be extended if there is evidence of spread. Furthermore, for the city and district area, the Sidoarjo Regency Government has issued Regent Regulation (Perbup No. 31/2020). According to the regent's regulation, the PSBB was implemented for the first time in Sidoarjo on Tuesday, April 28, 2020. The community called it PSBB Volume I which was enforced for 14 days. Then continued Volume II for the next 14 days. In simple terms, it can be understood that the PSBB is carried out by local governments at both the provincial and district / city levels after obtaining approval from the Minister of Health through a Ministerial Decree that follows (Bambang Budiarto, 2020a). The implementation of the PSBB in East Java Province is coordinated by the East Java Provincial Government, therefore the PSBB adoption in Sidoarjo was finally carried out simultaneously with Surabaya and Gresik. Be with the name PSBB Surabaya Raya. Of course, quite a lot of changes and quite a lot of adjustments have been made along with the implementation of this PSBB. There are areas that are affected and there are areas that are not really affected. There are community groups that are affected and there are also groups in society that are not really affected. The impact is because everything is under restrictions. Driving is limited by the number of passengers, opening food stalls has limited operating hours, entertainment places have limited operating hours, etc. Everything is completely limited which ultimately hampers economic movement. At the macroeconomic level, the cessation of economic movements will of course impede public cash flow.

2 Method

Paying attention to several performance measurement tools, now there are several performance measurement tools (Bambang Budiarto, Firman Rosjadi, 2019). And, The Mann Whitney Test is one of them. This research with the aim of knowing whether or not there is a difference in the impact of the implementation of the PSBB in Sidoarjo Surabaya and Gresik uses data obtained through distributing questionnaires in the three regions. Of the 75 questionnaires distributed per region, 40 were returned to Sidoarjo. 59 returned questionnaires in Surabaya, and 35 returned questionnaires in Gresik. The recapitulation of data acquisition is shown in Table 3. Taking into account the research objectives with the acquisition of these data, a two-sample free test will be carried out using non-parametric statistics. It is said to be free because the existence of each sample is independent of one another. The test for the difference between two samples can actually be done with the t test in the parametric statistical method. This can be done provided that the data type is interval or ratio and follows a normal distribution or at least is considered normal. If one of these conditions is not fulfilled, for example data is of nominal or ordinal type, or for example data is of type interval or ratio but is not normally distributed, then the t test must be replaced with non-parametric statistics which are intended for two independent samples. And this is the case that is faced in this study, in the end we have to use non-parametric statistics, with the option of the Mann Whitney test.
The first step is done by compiling a hypothesis, $H_0$: the impact of implementing the PSBB is no different. $H_1$: the impact of implementing the PSBB is different. Furthermore, the basis for decision making is to compare the $Z_{count}$ value and $Z_{table}$ value. If $Z_{count} < Z_{table}$ then $H_0$ is accepted. If $Z_{count} > Z_{table}$ then $H_1$ is rejected. In statistics, there are several patterns of decision making, this too can be done by looking at the probability values. If probability $> 0.05$ then $H_0$ is accepted. If the probability $< 0.05$ then $H_1$ is rejected. The steps that must be done, of course, are measuring the $Z_{count}$ value and finding the $Z_{table}$ value. This research will be conducted with a confidence level of 95% and the test will be two-sided.

### 3 Result and Discussion

Obtaining data from preliminary research can be done by empowering primary data obtained through questionnaires and interviews with random samples of business actors in economic activity units in several areas where the activities of economic activity units are carried out in Sidoarjo Regency, East Java Province. The method or approach was chosen because this method can be done in the process of collecting primary data, using questionnaires, interviews, and so on (Suryani & Hendriyadi, 2015). There are 3 cities; Sidoarjo, Surabaya, and Gresik, where the impact of PSBB implementation will be seen or not. Therefore a simulation will be carried out by measuring and testing 3 times: a). Simulation 1: to determine whether there is a difference in the impact of the implementation of the PSBB in Sidoarjo and Surabaya. b). Simulation 2: to determine whether there are differences in the impact of the implementation of the PSBB in Surabaya and Gresik. c). Simulation 3: to determine whether there is a difference in the impact of the implementation of the PSBB in Gresik and in Sidoarjo. All of these measurements can be done quickly with the help of various statistical software, including SPSS. With the consideration in order to obtain a better known result in the order of execution, in this paper it is shown that manual calculations must be carried out on the 134 collected questionnaires. In the initial stage, the 134 collected questionnaires were divided into 3 parts as shown in Table 4, Table 5, and Table 6. Before taking further measurements, what needs to be done first is to formulate a hypothesis, $H_0$: there is no difference in the impact of the implementation of the PSBB in Sidoarjo and Surabaya. $H_1$: There are differences in the impact of the implementation of the PSBB in Sidoarjo and Surabaya. Furthermore, the basis for decision making is to compare the $Z_{count}$ value and the $Z_{table}$ value. If $Z_{count} < Z_{table}$ then $H_0$ is accepted and if $Z_{count} > Z_{table}$ then $H_0$ is rejected (Damodar Gujarati, 2016). The first step is to determine the ranking value. Simulation Rank 1 value can be obtained by way of all respondents arranged from the choice of impact.

### Table 3: Recapitulation of Distributing Questionnaires on the Impact of PSBB Implementation in Sidoarjo, Surabaya, and Gresik

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>The Types of Impact</th>
<th>Sidoarjo</th>
<th>Surabaya</th>
<th>Gresik</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>very unaffected</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>not affected</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>quite affected</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>affected</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>very affected</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** recapitulation of questionnaires

- Simulation 1: to determine whether there is a difference in the impact of the implementation of the PSBB in Sidoarjo and Surabaya.
- Simulation 2: to determine whether there are differences in the impact of the implementation of the PSBB in Surabaya and Gresik.
- Simulation 3: to determine whether there is a difference in the impact of the implementation of the PSBB in Gresik and in Sidoarjo.
From the smallest to the largest. From 1 to 5. After the respondents have grouped sequentially into the same impact choices, they are added up and then their average is calculated. In this case (Table 4), respondents 1 to 11 are respondents with the same impact, namely very unaffected, with a score of 1. So \((1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5 + 6 + 7 + 8 + 9 + 10 + 11) / 11 = 6\). This is the first ranking value. And so on until you find the next ranking values; 20.5; 37; 64.5; and 92. The next step is to classify the respondents by city, to then add up the ranking scores. Sidoarjo = 2899.5 and Surabaya = 2050.5. According to the basic concept of Mann Whitney, the next thing that must be calculated is the value of the \(U\) variable for the 2 cities, Sidoarjo and Surabaya. Measurement of Variable \(U\) can be done with the formulation \(U = n_1 n_2 + [(1 / 2 n_1 n_2 (n_x + 1)] - Rx\) (Inggih Santoso, 2004). With understanding; \(n_1\): the number of the first city variable, Sidoarjo = 59, and then \(n_2\): variable number of the second city, Surabaya = 40. Rx: total ranking in one city, Sidoarjo = 2,899.5 and Surabaya = 2,050.5.

There will be two values for the \(U\) variable, Sidoarjo and Surabaya. In the basic Mann Whitney concept, to measure the \(Z\) value, the small value of the \(U\) variable is used between the two values of the existing \(U\) variable.

**Table 4**: Recapitulation of Distributing Questionnaires on the Impact of PSBB Implementation in Sidoarjo and Surabaya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
34 Surabaya 3 37 84 Sidoarjo 4 64.5
35 Sidoarjo 3 37 85 Surabaya 5 92
36 Sidoarjo 3 37 86 Surabaya 5 92
37 Sidoarjo 3 37 87 Surabaya 5 92
38 Sidoarjo 3 37 88 Surabaya 5 92
39 Sidoarjo 3 37 89 Surabaya 5 92
40 Sidoarjo 3 37 90 Surabaya 5 92
41 Sidoarjo 3 37 91 Sidoarjo 5 92
42 Sidoarjo 3 37 92 Sidoarjo 5 92
43 Sidoarjo 3 37 93 Sidoarjo 5 92
44 Sidoarjo 3 37 94 Sidoarjo 5 92
45 Surabaya 4 64.5 95 Sidoarjo 5 92
46 Surabaya 4 64.5 96 Sidoarjo 5 92
47 Surabaya 4 64.5 97 Sidoarjo 5 92
48 Surabaya 4 64.5 98 Sidoarjo 5 92
49 Surabaya 4 64.5 99 Sidoarjo 5 92
50 Surabaya 4 64.5

Source: recapitulation of questionnaires
Description: 1 = very unaffected
2 = not affected
3 = moderately affected
4 = affected
5 = severely affected.

U-Surabaya = 1.129.5 and U-Sidoarjo = 1.230.5. Furthermore, the smallest U value is included in the Z value measurement formulation.

$$Z = \frac{U - \left(1/2 \cdot n_1 \cdot n_2\right)}{\sqrt{1/12 \cdot n_1 \cdot n_2 \cdot (n_1 + n_2 + 1)}} = \frac{1.129.5 - (1/2 \cdot 40.59)}{\sqrt{1/40.59 \cdot (40 + 59 + 1)}} = -0.65745$$

(2)

Table 5: Recapitulation of Questionnaires on the Impact of PSBB Implementation in Surabaya and Gresik

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gresik</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gresik</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Gresik</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Gresik</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Gresik</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Gresik</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19 Gresik 2 15.5 57 Gresik 4 52.5
20 Gresik 2 15.5 58 Gresik 4 52.5
21 Gresik 2 15.5 59 Gresik 4 52.5
22 Gresik 2 15.5 60 Gresik 4 52.5
23 Gresik 2 15.5 61 Gresik 4 52.5
24 Gresik 2 15.5 62 Gresik 4 52.5
25 Surabaya 3 31.5 63 Gresik 4 52.5
26 Surabaya 3 31.5 64 Gresik 4 52.5
27 Surabaya 3 31.5 65 Gresik 4 52.5
28 Surabaya 3 31.5 66 Gresik 4 52.5
29 Surabaya 3 31.5 67 Surabaya 5 71
30 Gresik 3 31.5 68 Surabaya 5 71
31 Gresik 3 31.5 69 Surabaya 5 71
32 Gresik 3 31.5 70 Surabaya 5 71
33 Gresik 3 31.5 71 Surabaya 5 71
34 Gresik 3 31.5 72 Surabaya 5 71
35 Gresik 3 31.5 73 Gresik 5 71
36 Gresik 3 31.5 74 Gresik 5 71
37 Gresik 3 31.5 75 Gresik 5 71
38 Gresik 3 31.5

Source: recapitulation of questionnaires

With the value of \(Z_{\text{count}} = -0.65745\), the next step is to find the value of the \(Z_{\text{table}}\) which is carried out at the 95% confidence level for the two-sided test where the value is ± 1.96.

\[ Z_{\text{table}} \text{ value at 95\% confidence interval} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
Z &= -0.65745 \\
-1.96 \leq Z_{\text{count}} &< +1.96 \\
\text{H}_0 \text{ rejected} \\
\text{H}_0 \text{ accepted} \\
\end{align*} \]

Sumber: adapted from nugroho (1996)

**Figure 1:** H0 Rejected and Accepted Area – The First Simulation

With the value of \(Z_{\text{count}} = -0.65745\), between the \(Z_{\text{table}}\) value ± 1.96, \(\text{H}_0\) is accepted. This means that the hypothesis that there is no difference in the impact of the implementation of the PSBB in Sidoarjo and Surabaya is acceptable. This is the result of Simulation 1 for Sidoarjo and Surabaya, which turns out to have the conclusion that there is no difference in the impact of the implementation of the PSBB between Sidoarjo and Surabaya. Furthermore, in the same way measurements can be made for Simulation 2, Surabaya and Gresik. Simulation 2 is carried out based on the recapitulation of the results of the distribution of the questionnaire on the impact of the PSBB implementation as shown in Table 5.

Starting with the preparation of a hypothesis, \(\text{H}_0\): There is no difference in the impact of the implementation of the PSBB in Surabaya and Gresik. \(\text{H}_1\): There are differences in the impact of the implementation of the PSBB in Surabaya and Gresik. Furthermore, the basis for decision making is to compare the \(Z_{\text{count}}\) value and the \(Z_{\text{table}}\) value. If \(Z_{\text{count}} < Z_{\text{table}}\) then \(\text{H}_0\) is
accepted and if $Z_{\text{count}} > Z_{\text{table}}$ then $H_0$ is rejected. With the same steps as the measurement in Simulation 1, the value of $Z_{\text{count}} = -2.28792$ is obtained. This value is obtained in the way as below.

$$Z = \frac{U - (1/2.n1.n2)}{\sqrt{1/12.n1.n2.(n1 + n2 + 1)}} = \frac{1.129.5 - (1/2.40.59)}{\sqrt{1/40.40.59.(40 + 59 + 1)}} = -2.28792$$

With the value of $Z_{\text{count}} = -0.65745$, the next step is to find the value of the $Z_{\text{table}}$ which is carried out at the 95% confidence level for the two-sided test where the value is $\pm 1.96$.

With the value of $Z_{\text{count}} = -2.28792 < Z_{\text{table}} \cdot 1.96$, $H_0$ is rejected. This means that the hypothesis that there is no difference in the impact of the implementation of the PSBB in Surabaya and Gresik cannot be accepted. This is the result of Simulation 2 for Surabaya and Gresik which turns out to have a conclusion that there are differences in the impact of the implementation of the PSBB between Surabaya and Gresik. Finally, in the same way, measurements can be made for Simulation 3, Gresik and Sidoarjo. Simulation 3 is carried out based on the recapitulation of the results of the distribution of the questionnaire on the impact of the PSBB implementation as shown in Table 6.

As in Simulation 1 and Simulation 2, it must be preceded by the preparation of a hypothesis such as the following, $H_0$: There is no difference in the impact of the implementation of the PSBB in Gresik and Sidoarjo. $H_1$: There are differences in the impact of the implementation of the PSBB in Gresik and Sidoarjo. Furthermore, the basis for decision making is to compare the $Z_{\text{count}}$ value and the $Z_{\text{table}}$ value. If $Z_{\text{count}} < Z_{\text{table}}$ then $H_0$ is accepted and if $Z_{\text{count}} > Z_{\text{table}}$ then $H_0$ is rejected. With the same steps as the measurements in Simulation 1 and Simulation 2, the value of $Z_{\text{count}} = -2.17645$ is obtained. This value is obtained in the way as below.

$$Z = \frac{U - (1/2.n1.n2)}{\sqrt{1/12.n1.n2.(n1 + n2 + 1)}} = \frac{1.129.5 - (1/2.40.59)}{\sqrt{1/40.40.59.(40 + 59 + 1)}} = -2.17645$$

With a value of $Z_{\text{count}} = -2.17645$, the next step is to compare with $Z_{\text{table}}$ at the 95% confidence level for the two-tailed test, $\pm 1.96$. 

![Image](image-url)

*Figure 2: Ho Rejected and Accepted Area – The Second Simulation*

With the value of $Z_{\text{count}} = -2.28792 < Z_{\text{table}} \cdot 1.96$, $H_0$ is rejected. This means that the hypothesis that there is no difference in the impact of the implementation of the PSBB in Surabaya and Gresik cannot be accepted. This is the result of Simulation 2 for Surabaya and Gresik which turns out to have a conclusion that there are differences in the impact of the implementation of the PSBB between Surabaya and Gresik. Finally, in the same way, measurements can be made for Simulation 3, Gresik and Sidoarjo. Simulation 3 is carried out based on the recapitulation of the results of the distribution of the questionnaire on the impact of the PSBB implementation as shown in Table 6.
**Table 6:** Recapitulation of Questionnaires on the Impact of PSBB Implementation in Gresik and Sidoarjo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gresik</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gresik</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gresik</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gresik</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Gresik</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Gresik</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Gresik</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Gresik</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Gresik</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Gresik</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Gresik</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Gresik</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sidoarjo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Gresik</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Gresik</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Gresik</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Gresik</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Gresik</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Gresik</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Gresik</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Gresik</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Figure 3: Ho Rejected and Accepted Area – The Third Simulation]

**Z_{table} value at 95% confidence interval**

$Z = -2.17645$

*Sumber: adapted from nugroho (1996)*
4 Conclusion

Observing several simulations carried out, several conclusions were obtained. First, there is no difference in the impact of the implementation of PSBB between Sidoarjo and Surabaya. At 95% confidence level, the value of $Z_{count} = -0.65745$ which turned out to be greater than $Z_{table} = -1.96$. There is in the receiving area which means $H_0$ or the hypothesis which states that there is no difference in the impact of implementing PSBB between Sidoarjo and Surabaya cannot be rejected. Second, with the value of $Z_{count} = -2.28792$ which turns out to be smaller than $Z_{table} = -1.96$ which means that there is a different impact on the application of PSBB in Surabaya and Gresik. The same thing happened in the third test for Sidoarjo and Gresik areas. With the value of $Z_{count} = -2.17645$, it means that it is smaller than $Z_{table} = -1.96$. This implies that there are different impacts on the application of PSBB in Sidoarjo and in Gresik. Furthermore, in the descriptive analysis, several factors were found that caused the three conclusions to occur; namely geographical, demographic, social, cultural and employment factors.

References


Editorial Team

Editor in Chief


Associated Editors

Sriyono Sriyono (https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0526-2387), Fakultas Bisnis, Hukum dan Ilmu Sosial, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo, Indonesia (Scopus (https://www.scopus.com/authid/detail.uri?authorId=57200559335)) (https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6373-1199)

Mochammad Tanzil Multazam, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo, Indonesia (Scopus (https://www.scopus.com/authid/detail.uri?authorId=57210818019))


ISSN

ISSN 2722-0672 (online) (http://u.lipi.go.id/1579075843)

Information
The Coronavirus or Covid 19 has hit almost all corners of the world. Many people died and economic conditions in affected countries decreased dramatically. Various efforts have been made by all countries in various sectors such as health, economic, social and others but the epidemic has not subsided and finished. Since, the Covid-19 is not over, there is a policy so called new normal or new reality where people are asked to adjust the situations by following the health protocols, such as always wearing masks, washing hands, and doing social distance. The goal is the economic conditions may be revived while the health condition can be maintained.

To eliminate Covid-19 and find solutions to its effects are endeavoured through research in various fields of sciences. Hopefully, the cure can be found and the new situation can be adapted.

On behalf of the Organizing Committee, we sincerely express our gratitude and appreciation to all those who have involved in enabling this conference achieving the desired aim or result: officials, resource persons, delegates and guests of Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo-Indonesia, Universitas Muhammadiyah Prof. DR. HAMKA-Indonesia, University Utara Malaysia-Malaysia, Cotabato City State Polytechnic College-Philippines, Khon Kaen University-Thailand, The Silk Road International University of Tourism-Uzbekistan, Universitas Pakuan Jakarta-Indonesia, Universitas Ronggolawe Tuban-Indonesia, STIKES Karya Husada Kediri-Indonesia, and all publication partners. Lastly, our heartfelt gratitude goes to honorable speakers and presenters who have shared knowledge and experiences in developing a robust discussion and transformative intellectual exchange. We wish all activities during the international conference will stimulate further relation, collaboration, and constructive engagement among those intellectuals in bringing their contributions for the betterment of the world.
Website: https://icigr.umsida.ac.id
Presentation material's of all participant's: https://zenodo.org/communities/icigr2020
(https://zenodo.org/communities/icigr2020)
Video presentation of all participant's: https://www.youtube.com
/playlist?list=PL2IflekPTT5A2KpQicBVAVoEl1tCw0X2
(https://www.youtube.com
/playlist?list=PL2IflekPTT5A2KpQicBVAVoEl1tCw0X2)
ISBN: 978-623-6833-07-0
DOI: https://doi.org/10.21070/pssh.v1i (https://doi.org/10.21070/pssh.v1i)
Published: 2021-03-25

Articles

Local Management Conflict Resolution Among Elementary Schools Principals In Maguindanao
(https://pssh.umsida.ac.id/index.php/pssh/article/view/63)
Sittie Maguid-Kusin, Zainodin M. Kusin
323-332


Integrated Validation System (IVS) Design for Proposal Submission of Student Activities at PPNS
Yesica Novrita Devi, Wibowo Arninputranto, Fitri Hardiyanti, M. Khoirul Hasin, Arie Indarto
300-332


A Level of Student Self-Discipline in E-Learning During Pandemic Covid-19
(https://pssh.umsida.ac.id/index.php/pssh/article/view/59)
Siti Nurajrina Binti Muksin, Mardzelah Binti Makhsin
278-283

PDF (https://pssh.umsida.ac.id/index.php/pssh/article/view/59/42)

Drivers of Women Entrepreneurship in the Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao
(https://pssh.umsida.ac.id/index.php/pssh/article/view/57)
Emraida C. Ali DBA, Noraida C. Ali DBM
263-277
Alcohol and Khamr on Fiqh Using Science Experiment Videos in Schools Affected by COVID-19
Rafika Dwi Rahmah MZ, Suyadi, Zahrul Mufrodi
284-299

Novice Teacher’s Needs in Starting Career as an Educator
Mohd Isha Awang, Abdull Sukor Shaari
255-262

Empowerment Based on Non Formal Education Through Local Potential in The Processing of Lampung Coffee
Lintang Markhamah Watianur Azizah
251-254

The Effect of Lecturer Competence in Online Learning Methods on Student College Satisfaction During the Pandemic
Asty Khairi Inayah Syahwani, Annisaa Soeyono
239-250

Survey Research on Lecturer Performance Profiles During Pandemic Covid-19
Dumiayati Dumiyati, Muhammad Yusuf
223-238
The Ecological Impact of the Covid-19 Pandemic Infodemic Discourse in Social Media: Ecolinguistic Perspectives

Khunusl Khotimah, Kisyanli Laksono, Suharto Suhartono, Udjang Pairin, Darni Darni
117-128

PDF

The Effectiveness of RADEC as a Distance Learning Model to Improve the Understanding of Class XI SHS Students on Dynamic Fluid Materials

Salsabila Indana Zulfia, Monica Widyaswari, Ulya Aziza Fitriya
223-228

PDF

Social Mapping of Cultural Production: Strategies in dealing with the decline in tourism due to the Covid-19 pandemic in Penglipuran Village, Bali

I Wayan Gede Lamopia, Riza Wulandari, Isma Illia Shara Yunianti
129-135

PDF

Tongling Performing Arts As The Identity Of The Wonomulyo Village - Genilangit

Evie Destiana, Rugaya Meis Andhiarini, Agus Salim
136-140

PDF

ICT and Economic Growth Nexus: Case of Central Asian Countries

Tursun Shodiev, Bakhodir Turayev, Kamoliddin Shodiiev
155-167

PDF

Ways To Develop Infrastructure of Tourism Destinations

Bakhodir Turayev, Ulugbek Atamurodov
Problems of employment in the Republic of Uzbekistan
Axtam Nizomov, Akmal Amirov, Xamrokul Ruziev
175-177

Development of The Tourism Industry Before and After The Covid Pandemic
Bakhodir Turayev, Anukrati Sharma
178-192

Application of Behavioral Architecture Concept on Space Order Natural Laboratory
Hana Rosilawati, Risma Andarini
206-214

English Language Training for Local Community in the Tourism Site of Karang Talun Mangrove Forest, Cilacap, Central Java
Betti Widianingsih, Dodi Satriawan, Fadhilla Hazrina, Novita Asma Ilahi, Riyani Prima Dewi, Devi Taufiq Nurrohman
215-222

Online CBT and ELIP Effectiveness Against The Degree of Post Partum Blues in Madura Urban
Elly Dwi Masita, Adenia Dwi Ristanti
148-154
Endang Sri Maruti
103-109

Prevalence Of Parasites In Freshwater Fishes In The Southern Part Of Ligawasan Marsh, Philippines (https://pssh.umsida.ac.id/index.php/pssh/article/view/26)
Sarip Tarita Ampatuan Ali
93-102
PDF (https://pssh.umsida.ac.id/index.php/pssh/article/view/26/20)

Ishanik Juni Fitriyah, Sugiyanto Sugiyonto, Erni Yulianti, Novida Pratiwi, Muhammad Fajar Marsuki, Siti Mualifah, Muhammad Adi Widodo
87-92
PDF (https://pssh.umsida.ac.id/index.php/pssh/article/view/24/19)

Measurement and Analysis of Differences in The Impact of The Implementation of Large-Scale Social Restrictions (PSBB) Based on The Mann Whitney Test (https://pssh.umsida.ac.id/index.php/pssh/article/view/23)
Bambang Budiarto
75-86

Siska Ayu Kartika
61-68
PDF (https://pssh.umsida.ac.id/index.php/pssh/article/view/21/16)

Tabitha Sri Harteti Wulandari
19-26


Brivian Florentis Yustanta, Layudha Ikhrima
11-18

PDF (https://pssh.umsida.ac.id/index.php/pssh/article/view/2/10)

Rokhmayanti Rokhmayanti, Sulistyawati Sulistyawati, Budi Aji, Siwi Pramatama Mars Wijayanti
27-36

PDF (https://pssh.umsida.ac.id/index.php/pssh/article/view/14/12)

Andilo Toham, Ernan Rustiadi, Bambang Juanda, Rilus Kinseng
49-56

PDF (https://pssh.umsida.ac.id/index.php/pssh/article/view/18/14)

Ro’fah Setyowati, Bagas Heradhyaksa
57-60

PDF (https://pssh.umsida.ac.id/index.php/pssh/article/view/19/15)

Siska Andriani, Kotim Subandi
69-74

PDF (https://pssh.umsida.ac.id/index.php/pssh/article/view/22/17)
The Feasibility of Developing Learning Devices Science Concept Based on Android for College Students in Elementary Teaching Program

Heny Sulistyaningrum, Sri Cacik, Anggun Winata, Mualifatul Munawaroh
37-48

Physiotherapy Management To Prevention Of Covid-19 By Improved Physical Activity In Elderly

Andung Maheswara Rakasiwi, Ade Irma Nahdiyyah
141-147

Business Information Technology Models for Women Farmer Group in Indonesia

Soehardjoepri, Muslichah Erma Widiana, Mahmudah Enny Widyaningrum
307-322

Risk Based Improvement Performance Strategy for Operation and Maintenance Activities of River and River Infrastructure (BBWS Ciliwung-Cisadane Authority)

Isni Septima Anindhita
110-116

The Relationship Between Empowerment And Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance in Majalengka Regency

Ratna Ratna, Dewi Maharani
193-197

Model of Application of Technology to Increase Income in Micro Business Clover Stick in The Face of Covid19 Pandemic Era
Analysis of The Influence of Pentagon Fraud in Detecting Financial Statement Fraud Using Method F-Score

Vina Yusniarti, Henny Mulyati, Amrizal Amrizal
40-56

PDF (https://pssh.umsida.ac.id/index.php/pssh/article/view/42/3)

The Influence of Strategic Environment, Public Trust, and Entrepreneurial Orientation on Competitive Advantage and Company Performance (Studies on Batik Companies in Tuban)

Yudi Supiyanto, Henny Sri Astuty, M. Yusuf
333-346

PDF (https://pssh.umsida.ac.id/index.php/pssh/article/view/65/47)