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ABSTRACT

Introduction: Quality is the suitability between the work carried out and the standards or requirements that have been set. As a quality guideline, hospitals in Indonesia use minimum service standards. Based on the operational report of Surabaya Hajj General Hospital in 2016, it shows that 62.09% of units are non-obedient in collecting minimum service standard reports and 23.66% of units have collected minimum service standard-reports within a time set, that means in 12 months during 2016 from 31 working units only four units are obedient in collecting minimum service standard reports. Methods: The research population is 31 heads of work units of minimum service standard reports in each work unit at Surabaya Hajj General Hospital. Sample calculation uses a simple random sampling technique with confidence interval 0.05 so that a large sample is obtained, 29 unit heads. Result: The results of the obedience influence test in collecting a minimum service standard reports use a logistical regression of five variables to indicate if, between location status (p=0.154), legitimacy of an authority figure (p=0.661), authority figure status (p=0.782), and proximity of authority figure (p=0.711) have no significant effect. Meanwhile, peer support (p=0.009) has a significant influence on officer obedience in collecting minimal service standards reports. Conclusion: the support of colleagues from each subunit needs to be improved and also by providing training on interpersonal communication to officers to more easily communicate with colleagues, as well as holding discussion forums between officers in work units attended by management to improve relations between employees.
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INTRODUCTION

The effectiveness of regional autonomy is the responsibility of the district/city government and plays a role in improving the public health level of the region. Each activity that aims to nurture and improve individual health is realized in the form of health efforts with preventive, promotive, curative, and rehabilitative approaches. As one of the health care facilities, it is expected that the hospital can provide quality services. The service provided must comply with the established standards, so that the service can reach the wider community.

In the implementation process, the hospital shall provide the minimum basic services following the Minister of Health’s Decree No. 129/Menkes/SK/II/2008 on the minimum hospital service standards (Ministry of Health, 2008).

In ensuring the availability of basic services for all citizens, there need to be instruments to control performance in the field of government, especially in public services, especially in the field of health, with minimum service standard (Ministry of Health, 2016). For hospitals, minimum service standard are used as quality guidelines (Wijaya, 2012).

As a government-owned hospital of East Java Province, the Regional Public Service Agency, Surabaya Hajj General Hospital must be able to manage professionally following the public's demands for the quality of service and increasingly intense competition. The
Surabaya Hajj General Hospital provides the minimum services that must be provided, including emergency, hospitalization, outpatient, surgery, childbirth, outpatient, and intensive care. In addition, there are also supporting services both medical and non-medical, there are as many as 31 units of work, each of which has indicators and standards that must be met and become a benchmark of service quality. Each person in charge of minimum service standard in the work unit has an obligation to make a minimum service standard report, collected before the 10th of each month (RSUD Haji Surabaya, 2017).

Quality is the level of obedience carrying out the work of the requirements and criteria that have been determined. Obedience is a fundamental element of the positive and negative aspects thoroughly carried out in social psychology (Passini and Morselli, 2010). A person's actions can be linked to psychological mechanisms, where for some people obedience is a behavior that has been ingrained in a person (Milgram, 1963).

Hospital minimum service standards as a decree that has been confirmed by the minister of health for hospitals so that the quality of service becomes guaranteed (Wijaya, 2012). According to the operational report of Surabaya Hajj General Hospital in 2016 it shows results of the average obedience of all work units for the frequency of collection of service standard reports in at least 12 months during 2016 is only 62.09% and the timeliness of collection of minimum service standard reports by all work units is only 23.66%.

The problem from the data obtained is low obedience (completeness and timeliness) in the collection of service standard reports from at least 31 service units at Surabaya Hajj General Hospital in 2016. This research aims to get an overview of the external factors of obedience that affect the collection of reports of minimum service standard in Surabaya Hajj General Hospital.

METHODS

This research was conducted using analytical methods with a cross-sectional research design. The research data were collected at a certain time to obtain a description of the factors that affect obedience in the collection of reports of minimum service standard at Surabaya Hajj General Hospital.

The research site was conducted at Surabaya Hajj General Hospital in December 2017. In this study, the data used is in the form of primary data obtained from questionnaire surveys and secondary data obtained from the minimum service standard report file and minimal service standard recap data at Surabaya Hajj General Hospital obtained in the medical services section, medical support section, and program planning and evaluation section.

This study used instruments in the form of questionnaires on the perception and assessment of respondents to research variables in the experiment conducted by Milgram’s factors that influence obedience such as location status, legitimacy of authority figures, the status of authority figures, support of co-workers, and proximity of authority figures (Milgram, 1963; 1974). In addition, the study also used a recap sheet of obedience data collection of minimum service standard reports.

The research population is 31 head of work unit or in charge of minimum service standard report in every working unit in Surabaya Hajj General Hospital with the number of sample calculations with simple random sampling technique with a confidence interval 0.05 so that a large sample of 29 unit heads / responsible for minimum service standard report. Respondents from the 29 units were examined based on recommendations from the head of the installation so that it could
be known the truth that the respondent was the one who created and collected the report.

The data is processed using the STATA program with descriptive analysis and influence analysis using binary logistics regression statistical tests. This test aims to analyze the factors that affect the obedience of officers in charge of minimum service standard in the collection of minimum service standard reports. Use ordinal or categorical data to represent research data. (The protocol in this study has passed through the ethics test with certificate number 647-KEPK).

RESULT

The minimum service standard of Surabaya Hajj General Hospital is one of the guidelines for each work unit to prepare a Standard Procedure Operation (SPO). SPO is based on hospital accreditation instruments, working culture groups, and minimum service standard. This minimum service standard is also used by hospitals to control the quality of hospital services. The minimum service standards are constructed based on the resources available in the hospital (i.e. human resources, advice and infrastructure, medical equipment, medicines, and medical equipment) and certain indicators that form the basis for the provision of products/services to the community. The minimum service standard has become one of the indicators of service quality and one of the foundations for the preparation of SPO.

Each unit records the data of each minimum service standard index and collects it in the fields of the "Medical Services" section to summarize them as a report. Monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of minimum service standards are carried out every month. Currently, the minimum service standard report is the responsibility of the three deputy directors and sub-coordination of each i.e. the Field of Medical Services, Medical Support Field, and Program Planning and Evaluation Section to be recapitulation and report, it is valid since semester 2 of 2017.

A person's obedience with the order following a set standard may be influenced by several factors such as the perception of location status, legitimacy of authority figures, the status of authority figures, co-worker support, and proximity of authority figures (Sarwono, 1993; Myers, 2014). Here are the external factors that affect respondents' obedience with distribution based on the respondents’ assessment as follows.

Table 1. Distribution of respondents' assessments in each variable in the collection of minimum service standard reports at Surabaya Hajj General Hospital in 2017.

| Variable                                    | Percentage |
|---------------------------------------------|------------|
| **Location status**                         |            |
| Very un-prestigious                         | 0%         |
| Not prestigious                             | 0%         |
| Prestigious                                 | 55%        |
| Very prestigious                            | 45%        |
| **The legitimacy of authority figures**     |            |
| Very unsuitable                             | 0%         |
| Not suitable                                | 0%         |
| Suitable                                    | 41%        |
| Very suitable                               | 59%        |
| **Status of authority figures**             |            |
| Very unsuitable                             | 0%         |
| Not suitable                                | 7%         |
| Suitable                                    | 66%        |
| Very suitable                               | 28%        |
| **Peer support**                            |            |
| Very unsupportive                           | 7%         |
| Does not support                            | 10%        |
| Support                                     | 52%        |
| Very supportive                             | 31%        |
| **The proximity of authority figures**      |            |
| Very less close                             | 3%         |
| Less close                                  | 10%        |
| Close enough                                | 48%        |
| Very close                                  | 38%        |
Location Status

Obedience in carrying out a procedure or activity may be influenced by the location or organization where it is implemented. The location or the state of the organization may affect the reputation of the organization. Prestige can be interpreted as a reputation or influence arising from success (Ulum and Wulandari, 2016).

The results of the study (Milgram, 1963) conducted by interviewing several prospective volunteers obtained the fact that prestige or the appearance of power in the eyes of others and the location of the person is a direct factor of obedience (Jeli, 2014). The conclusion that can be drawn is that the better an organization's reputation consists of achievements or successes that have been achieved, the position that the organization has achieved, or other attributes that indicate an achievement, then the obedience of its members to the rules of the organization is also better.

The research on location status in this study relates to respondents' feelings of pride in the quality of the hospital, the feeling of pride working in a regional hospital, pride in hospitals with good minimum service standard, the feeling of being comfortable doing tasks in the hospital, the feeling of wanting to do something useful for the hospital, and the feeling of working on reports outside of work time.

The Legitimacy of Authority Figures

Authority is generated by the power that is trusted, and the validity accepted by others, that is, the accepted power is valid (Andersen and Taylor, 2008).

A person will be able to obey the orders of others who already have the legal authority of the superior. This makes subordinates aware of and accepts the legal authority of their leaders so that they can comply with the orders and regulations of their decisions (Ulum and Wulandari, 2016).

In this study, the legitimacy of authority figures relates to the respondent's trust in the validity of the employer's position, trust in the duties and authority of the employer, willingness to receive orders, views, and reprimands from superiors, and willingness to accept superiors authorized by the hospital.

Status of Authority Figures

The position of authority figures is based on the position of authority figures in a specific field (Wirawan, 2007). A person's status will be able to influence obedience where the social status is the same when compared to the higher social status, then the level of obedience will be different where they will be more obedient to those with higher social status. A person who looks professional when he gives orders by using his professional status as a symbol, then someone he instructs will obey him more. Status is the use of symbols or symbols as a force that describes one's power in a society that can be realized in the form of behavior based on the level held in a group (Ulum and Wulandari, 2016).

The status of authority figures in this study relates to the respondent's belief in the suitability of the employer's education with the job, the belief that the boss has a good attitude, the belief that the boss is a professional worker, confidence in the authority of the boss in his position, confidence in the ability of the boss to carry out his duties, and confidence in the experience of the boss in his position.

Peer Support

An important factor that can affect obedience is social support in the form of emotional support from co-workers (Kammerer et al., 2007). Support can be interpersonal activities such as providing emotional attention, providing instrumental assistance, sharing information, and other help. It is believed that it can enable
individuals to obey with regulations to improve obedience (Taylor et al., 2009).

In this study, peer support relates to co-worker engagement, assessment of the suitability of colleagues to perform tasks according to standards, the willingness of coworkers to help work, cooperation with colleagues, the efficiency of work when done with colleagues, and support from colleagues.

The Proximity of Authority Figures

According to the results of the experiment (Milgram, 1963) obedience may be higher when an authority figure approaches and appears directly and gives instructions, instructions, and orders. The presence of the supervisor in overseeing the creation of a minimum service standard report can determine the obedience of the officer in making the report. The proximity of authority figures in this study relates to the presence of superiors to provide instructions, instructions from superiors to perform tasks, reprimands and input given by superiors, the role of superiors in improving duties, supervision by superiors, and the intensity of communicating between subordinates and superiors.

The Obedience of Responsible Officers in the Collection of Minimal Service Standards Reports

It can be seen from the completeness of the files and the timeliness of the collection of the minimum service standard report whether the Surabaya Hajj General Hospital complies with the minimum service standard report. The obedience collected from 29 units in the last 11 months of 2017 was classified according to the minimum service standard reporting obedience standard of Surabaya Hajj General Hospital, which was 88%. Obedience indicators in the value of the minimum number of service standard indicators per unit, frequency of completeness of files according to the minimum service standard indicator of each unit, completeness of files according to indicators, and frequency of collection of complete and timely reports. The unit obedience level in creating a minimum service standard report can be described in Table 2 as follows.

| Obedience | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Non-obedient | 17        | 59%        |
| Obedient | 12        | 41%        |
| Total | 29        | 100%       |

The entire unit has fully compiled the files according to the specified time. In Table 2 showing from 29 units in making a report on minimum service standard at Surabaya Hajj General Hospital in 2017, as many as 59% of units are non-obedient and 41% of units are obedient in making minimum service standard reports. When creating the minimum service standards report, the results were analyzed using cross-tabulations and logistic regression tests between variables and obedience personnel. Here is the effect of each variable on officer obedience in the collection of the minimum service standard report outlined in Table 3.
Table 3. The influence of each variable on the obedience of officers in the collection of reports of minimum service standard at Surabaya Hajj General Hospital

| Variable                     | Non-obedient | Obedient | Total | P-Value | Exp-B |
|------------------------------|--------------|----------|-------|---------|-------|
| Location status              |              |          |       |         |       |
| Very un-prestigious          | 0 0%         | 0 0%     | 0 0%  | 0.154   | 1.382 |
| Not prestigious              | 0 0%         | 0 0%     | 0 0%  |         |       |
| Prestigious                  | 10 66.7%     | 5 33.3%  | 15 100% |         |       |
| Very prestigious             | 7 50%        | 7 50%    | 14 100% |         |       |
| The legitimacy of authority figures |          |          |       |         |       |
| Very unsuitable              | 0 0%         | 0 0%     | 0 0%  | 0.661   | 1.138 |
| Not suitable                 | 0 0%         | 0 0%     | 0 0%  |         |       |
| Suitable                     | 8 66.7%      | 4 33.3%  | 12 100% |         |       |
| Very suitable                | 9 52.9%      | 8 47.1%  | 17 100% |         |       |
| Status of authority figures  |              |          |       |         |       |
| Very unsuitable              | 0 0%         | 0 0%     | 0 0%  | 0.782   | 0.944 |
| Not suitable                 | 0 0%         | 2 100%   | 2 100% |         |       |
| Suitable                     | 12 63.2%     | 7 36.8%  | 19 100% |         |       |
| Very suitable                | 5 62.5%      | 3 37.5%  | 8 100% |         |       |
| Peer support                 |              |          |       |         |       |
| Very unsupportive            | 5 83.3%      | 1 16.7%  | 6 100% | 0.009   | 1.484 |
| Does not support             | 8 88.9%      | 1 11.1%  | 9 100% |         |       |
| Support                      | 3 42.9%      | 4 57.1%  | 7 100% |         |       |
| Very supportive              | 1 14.3%      | 6 85.7%  | 7 100% |         |       |
| The proximity of authority figures |        |          |       |         |       |
| Very less close              | 0 0%         | 1 100%   | 1 100% |         |       |
| Less close                   | 2 66.7%      | 1 33.3%  | 3 100% | 0.711   | 0.956 |
| Close enough                 | 9 64.3%      | 5 35.7%  | 14 100% |         |       |
| Very close                   | 6 54.5%      | 5 45.5%  | 11 100% |         |       |

DISCUSSION

In Table 3, the results of the influence test using the logistical regression of the five variables indicate if the status of the location, the legitimacy of the authority figure, the status of the authority figure, and the proximity of the authority figure does not have a significant influence on the obedience of officers in collecting minimal service standard reports, while peer support has a significant influence on obedience with the collection of minimal service standard reports.

The Influence of Location Status on Officer Obedience in Collection of Minimal Service Standards Report

The status of location in Table 3 shows that respondents are quite proud of Surabaya Hajj General Hospital. A p-value of 0.154 (>0.05) indicates that there is no effect on officer obedience in the collection of minimum service standard reports. The increasing prestige of employees to the status of the hospital location does not necessarily affect the level of obedience. Other studies describing similar results show that officers in carrying out work according to
procedures are not affected by the prestige achieved by the organization in which he or she works. The prestige of the worker to the status of the organization's location may affect his obedience in performing the duties according to the procedure, this is due to the number of nurses who have prestige towards the hospital draw (Putri, 2018). Based on research conducted at Bridgeport with at Yale it was found that the arrangement could affect obedience, which is too high an estimate than Milgram interpretations in the past (Haslam, Loughnan and Perry, 2014).

Another supportive study is that there is no relationship between location status and obedience. This response is because the relatively homogeneous answer is quite prestigious, which is likely based on the success of the hospital so that it progresses and increases patient visits (Mahfudhoh and Rohmah, 2015).

The results in this study are different from those conducted by Sarafino and Smith that there is a positive relationship of prestige to an organization with a worker attachment in its organization. The greater the attachment between the worker and the organization, the better the performance will be. Good performance is a job performed by workers based on the standards of implementation and rules that have been determined and still apply on the instructions of the employer so that the workers become obedient (Sarafino and Smith, 2012).

If the worker believes that the organization has a valid status, and the prestige is the organization that organizes the program, then members of that organization will obey (Shaw, 1979). Milgram's experiments were conducted at Yale University's most famous and respected venue. A questionnaire was conducted after the discussion; the experiment and the interviewees indicated that if someone has a reputation for their institution or organization, obedience may increase (Myers, 2012).

In this study, most respondents were proud of the Surabaya Hajj General Hospital (55%), but the status of the site had no effect on the obedience of the person collecting the minimum service standard report. This may be because the development of Surabaya Hajj General Hospital and the trust of the community have caused officials to do more and more work. The rapid development of Surabaya Hajj General Hospital in Surabaya may not be offset by the supporting information system. The rapid development of the Surabaya Hajj General Hospital may not be offset by the supporting information system. If the information system is operating well, the minimum service standard data should be accessed in real-time through the hospital information system.

The Influence of Authority Figures on Officer Obedience in the Collection of Minimal Service Standards Reports

According to Table 3, data from legality authorities show that collecting minimum service standard reports (i.e., p-value 0.661 (> 0.05)) has no impact on officials' obedience. Subordinates will obey other people with the legal authority of the superior so that the subordinates will more obey the orders of the superior. However, if the subordinates obtain the legal authorization from the superior, the subordinates can be made to obey with the orders and the established rules. In this case, the authority figure is the management that manages the minimum service standard report.

In addition, the legitimacy of authority figures can be interpreted as how far the leadership's right to govern, make decisions, or make policies that are acceptable and recognized by the public (Wirawan, 2007).

Milgram's experiment stipulates that when an incoming phone is received by an
experimenter that requires him to leave the laboratory, at that time someone else who is given an order to become a scribe acts like someone who rules. As a result of the experiment, 80% of the participants were unwilling to obey their orders (Myers, 2012).

If members can accept it, power can be legalized (Andersen and Taylor, 2008). The idea of legitimate authority has a close relationship with the concept of power. Power is a superior power that can influence the behavior of its members. But other opposing studies suggest that if the authority is invalid then the level of obedience will be higher.

Unauthorized authorities are co-workers rather than researchers. This goes against the Milgram paradigm that states that more legitimate authority will result in greater obedience (Haslam, Loughnan and Perry, 2014). When the authority is present then the free will of the participants does not exist. They consider that obedience is not an interpretation of resignation from self-control. This may cause participants to become obedient to the authorities present (Reicher, Haslam and Miller, 2014).

Obedience with authority can also be encouraged by providing verbal advice or appreciation. Incentives can guide participants, make them feel satisfied and show full obedience. But when participants are encouraged by receiving a previous prize, it will be able to give rise to several perspectives that are receiving gratuities. So, it can strengthen or weaken adherence to authority, depending on the perspective adopted (Dolinski and Grzyb, 2019).

Other research supporting the absence of a link between the legitimacy of authority figures and officer obedience shows that the authority of hospital management increases following duties and functions (Mahfudhoh and Rohmah, 2015) and also with the recognition of the authority of the hospital director (Ernawaty et al., 2019).

In addition, research with similar results shows that authority figures are considered following the regulations set out in giving orders on the implementation of SPO does not impact subordinates to become obedient (Putri, 2018). Obedience may be beneficial, but officer resources allow for rejection. Empathy and creativity directly fulfill past expectations of authority (Bègue et al., 2017).

Other studies suggest a different relationship between the legitimacy of authority figures and the obedience of nurses in carrying out nursing care. Subordinates with a moderate perception of the legality of the head of his room as a legitimate superior can make subordinates more obedient in carrying out their duties (Ulum and Wulandari, 2016).

In addition, according to (Karakostas and Zizzo, 2016) states that obedience with the authority can occur if there is a clear boost or pressure from monetary gains. Employees will be consistent when establishing and implementing obedience regulations. That's when the authorities obeyed.

Another experiment Williams conducted showed that participants knew that the experiments were only set-ups, but when the experimenters had legitimate authority participants did not have the guts to disobey the orders of the experimenters (Russell, 2014).

In this study, most respondents rated the legitimacy of the authority figure as very appropriate at 59%, but the validity of the authority figures at Surabaya Hajj General Hospital did not affect the obedience of officers in collecting reports of minimum service standard possibly due to the status of staffing officers. This situation also occurred in research conducted in the Bridgeport industry, Connecticut was with a lower obedience
rate of 47.5%. In this context, a legitimately recognized authority that may be due to where it is exercised will behave toward the expectations of this authority. It's just that in this experiment the authority figure is physically present (Kosloff et al., 2017).

Surabaya Hajj General Hospital is one of the government-owned hospitals where the appointment and dismissal of employees cannot be carried out easily. In non-governmental institutions, the board of directors/management is in control of employee staffing status. Underperforming employees can be punished by their superiors.

The Influence of Authority Figure Status on Officer Obedience in Collection of Minimal Service Standards Report

Based on Table 3 status of authority figures with a p-value of 0.782 (>0.05) indicates if there is no influence of authority figure status on officer obedience in collecting minimum service standard reports. The results of the above statement do not correspond to experiments conducted by Milgram that a coat or laboratory suite is used by a person will make the person seen as someone who is important, professional and has the right to rule. But when someone who gives orders is a person who has no power, obedience decreases to 20% (Jeli, 2014).

The results of this study reinforce the results of previous studies if there is no significant influence between the status of authority figures and obedience. The effect of the status of authority figures on the obedience of officers in prescribing based on formulary can be caused by several things as the status of education, knowledge, and experience of the doctor. This is because most doctors do not necessarily have the same quantity and quality status (Mahfudhoh and Rohmah, 2015).

Other studies contrary to the results of this study show a significant relationship between the status of authority figures, and the obedience of officers in carrying out handwashing based on procedural measures. If nurses have the perception that the boss is a professional, knowledgeable and experienced person, then the obedience of the officer in carrying out handwashing based on procedures that conform to the standards can be affected (Putri, 2018).

A person's authority figure is not only due to having special abilities or experience, but that ability must also be recognized by his subordinates and subordinates feel that his superiors can provide direction and be able to complete his duties, and have the knowledge he or she mastered in earnest. Authority figures should be able to build strong trust and maintain a reputation for ability in their fields (Yulk and Gary, 2005).

A higher-status authority figure tends to be able to make subordinates obey his orders. Leaders with authority status have authority and involvement that greatly affects the obedience of a subordinate in doing so (Fattori et al., 2015; Ernawaty et al., 2019). Officers in charge of minimum service standard at Surabaya Hajj General Hospital mostly have the same education and longer work experience with minimum service standard management officers in the field of management. This may affect the obedience of the officer in charge of minimum service standard in the unit at Surabaya Hajj General Hospital.

The Influence of Peer Support on Officer Obedience in the Collection of Minimal Service Standards Reports

Table 3 shows peer support is a p-value of 0.009 (<0.05) which means that peer support affects obedience with
minimum service standard report collection. The value of \( \text{Exp-B} \) shows that the impact of peer support in Surabaya Hajj General Hospital is 1484 times that of the minimum service standard report collection requirement.

This is following the principle of social validation, a person who is consistent in doing a job then others will be easier to trust him and willing to follow what he commands. A person decides to behave and think the same as the person he is in to suggest that he is behaving properly. Following directions or commands from a preferred relative or person will be easier to do than fulfilling a request from someone who is not close to him or even he hates them. One will be more adaptable to his social environment (Cialdini and Martin, 2004).

Fernald states that the environment can affect a person's obedience. A person who is in an obedient social environment will also obey, and vice versa even if obedience is important (Fernald, 2007). One's obedience can be influenced by the social support of our environment, when a person is in a disobedient environment in carrying out orders it will be able to make one disobey (Natasi and Kurniawati, 2014). In addition, peer support can increase obedience when co-workers are recruited into authority roles (Haslam, Loughnan and Perry, 2014).

In addition, other research shows a low relationship between social peer group support and regulatory obedience. Colleagues who are able to install infusions in accordance with the SPO then other co-workers tend to follow it so that it gets better. Similarly, co-workers who install infusions are not in accordance with the SPO, other co-workers will also follow it even though it can result in something fatal (Kusumadewi, Hardjajani and Priyatama, 2012).

Research conducted on workers at PT. X shows similar results that there is a relationship between peer support and obedience with the use of personal protective equipment. Coworkers can also influence a person's behavior to obey. Communication between workers to remind each other also affects workers to obey with the applicable orders or rules because a coworker is a close friend in the work environment which can be an example in performing work tasks. In addition, based on the theory presented by Green if external reinforcement factors in influencing a person's behavior are peer influence received from friends in the environment in which he or she works (Puji, Kurniawan and Jayanti, 2017).

If there is a link between peer support and obedience, other studies have cited similar results. If there is support from colleagues, it indicates that the statement is highly obedient (Mahfudhoh and Rohmah, 2015).

**The Influence of the Proximity of Authority Figures to Officer Obedience in the Collection of Minimal Service Standards Reports**

The proximity of the authority figures in Table 3 indicates a p-value of 0.711 (>0.05) indicating if there is no influence between the proximity of authority figures to obedience with the collection of minimum service standard report at Surabaya Hajj General Hospital. A boss who comes to give briefings and feedback is part of the supervision. The good relationship between the leader and the good member will be easier to obey his orders, followed by his direction and listened to his advice by his subordinates.

Other research suggests that there is a significant relationship between the proximity of authority figures to obedience. The closer the subordinate relationship with the boss, the higher the level of obedience in carrying out procedures in accordance with the standards (Putri, 2018). In addition, research from Milgram states that subordinate obedience rates will be higher.
if subordinates have a close relationship with superiors (Griggs, 2016).

Other research results that also contradict this study are research conducted (Mahfudhoh and Rohmah, 2015) stating that the proximity of authority figures has a strong relationship with the obedience of officers in writing prescriptions based on formulary categorized moderately and in the same direction. The increasing proximity of authority figures will improve officers’ obedience in writing prescriptions in accordance with established standards.

Other different studies suggest that obedience can be influenced by good relationships with authority figures. The closer the relationship with authority figures, the higher the obedience (Ulum and Wulandari, 2016).

Experiments conducted by Milgram show that if direct surveillance by an authority figure will make a person obedient, but when an authority figure is not present and does not give instructions directly or simply directs over the phone, then subordinate obedience will decrease (Atkinson, 1983). A person will have higher obedience if it is close to the authority figure, but one will be easy to resist the command of the authority figure if it does not have closeness. The image of the authorities is directly presented to the supervision and direct guidance of the action procedures to be carried out can make people obey.

In this study, obedience of officers in charge of minimum service standard is likely to be influenced by supervision from direct supervisors as well as management. Before the management policy of minimum service standard tailored to the deputy director who led, all reports of service standards from at least 31 units in Surabaya Hajj General Hospital were managed by the field of medical services. Communication between management and the person in charge of reports from each unit can also be the cause.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results and discussion in this study can be concluded that there is no significant influence between the status of the location, the legitimacy of the authority figure, the status of the authority figure, and the proximity of the authority figure. The variable support of colleagues shows a significant influence on the obedience of officers in the collection of reports on the achievement of minimum service standard at Surabaya Hajj General Hospital. These variables are one of the hallmarks of the behavior of officers in government organizations. In addition, too few sample numbers are likely to cause the influence of some of these variables to be invisible.

Advice for Surabaya Hajj General Hospital in improving obedience with the collection of minimum service standard report is to increase the support of colleagues from each subunit to be able to collect data more time so that the person in charge can create and collect minimum service standard reports on time. In addition, it can also be by providing training on interpersonal communication to officers to more easily communicate with colleagues, as well as holding discussion forums between officers in work units attended by management to improve relations between employees.
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