The Influence of Socio-Economic Welfare on Stress Levels and Work Commitment of Personnel at the 1st Fleet Command of the Navy

Sigit Dandung Utomo[1], Ermaya Suradinata[2], Sampara Lukman[3], Ika Sartika[4]
[1,2,3,4]*Institut Pemerintahan Dalam Negeri (IPDN), Indonesia*
Email: sigitutomo1979@gmail.com

Abstract

The Indonesian Navy is part of the TNI military organization which has the high discipline and work commitment. However, it is not uncommon to find so many obstacles to personnel performance caused by mental stress or stress. The influence of social and economic welfare is one of the main factors causing increased stress which also affects the work commitment of Indonesian Navy personnel, *Mako Koarmada I*. This study aims to analyze the effect of socio-economic welfare on stress levels and work for commitment of *Mako Koarmada I TNI AL* personnel. This research uses quantitative methods. The quantitative approach itself uses the estimation technique of Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) and a literature review to explain the quantitative findings of this study. The results showed that the Social Welfare economy does not have a significant effect in reducing stress levels and increasing the work commitment of Indonesian Navy personnel at the 1st Fleet Command of the Navy.

Keywords: Socio-Economic Welfare, Level of Stress, Work Commitment, Indonesian Navy

――――――――― ◆ ―――――――――

A. INTRODUCTION

Job stress has become an important topic today; the UN report states that work stress is a disease of the 20th century. Behr & Newman in (Wijono, 2014), define work stress as a condition that arises in the interaction between humans and work. Work stress can also be defined as feedback on employees physiologically and psychologically to the wishes or demands of the organization, which can be factors that can put pressure on productivity and the work environment and can disturb the individual (Wijono, 2014).

Stress is widely associated with negative mental health areas such as depression, anxiety, physical symptoms, and even death in certain extreme cases (Folkman & Moscowitz, 2000). The problem of stress stems from not meeting psychological and physical needs, including social relationships. Fulfilment of psychological needs, in particular, is closely related to a person's psychological well-being, where the more one's psychological needs are met, the more psychological well-being is (Ryan & Deci, 2001). Psychological well-being is theoretically a conception of positive mental health criteria as part of the characteristics of a person who has psychological well-being (Feldman et al., 2009).

Human resources are an essential element in running the organization because organizational success is primarily determined by the human element

(Ardana et al., 2012). Therefore, the human resource factor seen from the performance of personnel in the organization is demanded to continue to increase (Lee et al., 2006). Job satisfaction is a pleasant or unpleasant emotional state when personnel view their work (Handoko, 2012). Research by Ho et al. (2009), suggests that the vision of organizations will increase their job satisfaction and encourage them to be willing to stay in employee jobs and be committed to the organization. Job satisfaction is an individual thing because each individual has a different level of satisfaction with the value system that applies to him (Priyono, 2012). The ability to deal with stress alone is not the same for everyone. Some people have a high-stress resistance and therefore can cope with the stress themselves.

On the other hand, not a few people have low endurance and ability to deal with stress. Unresolved stress can result in what is known as "burnout", which is a mental and emotional condition as well as physical exhaustion due to ongoing and insurmountable stress (Salem, 2015). The impact of job satisfaction decreases because stress at work will interfere with the implementation of the work process and subordinates lose the ability to control it, so they are unable to make decisions, and behaviour becomes erratic and ultimately subordinates experience disturbances, both physically and mentally (Ajayi & Abimbola, 2013).

Fleet I Command (hereinafter known as Koarmada I) is the Main Command for Guidance and Operations which is directly under the Chief of Naval Staff in the field of development and combat readiness of his unit command and is directly under the TNI Commander in the field of operations. The main tasks of Koarmada I are fostering the capability of an integrated fleet weapon system, fostering maritime potential to become a marine security defence force, carrying out daily marine operations and sea combat operations for sea control and projecting power to land by sea in the context of enforcing the rule of law in the sea.

Throughout 2015 to 2019, there has been a gradual increase in the number of Indonesian Navy personnel as a whole, who are stationed in different locations. During 2015 to 2019, the average increase in the number of Indonesian Navy personnel assigned to Koarmada, I reached 4.3%. This shows a high enough interest for the community to join the Indonesian Navy.

However, in line with the increase in the number of personnel in the Navy, especially those assigned to Koarmada I, it turns out that since 2015 there has been a significant increase in sufferers of mental stress. On average, the ratio of mental stress sufferers to total personnel annually reached 5.19% during the 2015 to 2019 period. This very significant increase was a result of several factors such as internal family problems, economic problems, difficulty in adaptation, and leadership problems in the unit. Felt less accommodating the aspirations of the personnel concerned.

In several periods where there was a decrease in the number or ratio of mental stress sufferers, according to the results of interviews with the Indonesian Navy Health Center, it was stated that this was the success of the efforts to cure mental stress sufferers that had been carried out in previous years. However, what is

unfortunate is that there has been a significant increase since then. This shows that the aspects of human resource management and organizational governance still need to be optimized. Based on the results of the trend processing data below, it appears that there is an increasing trend between the number of personnel and the ratio of mental stress sufferers. Every 1% increase in the number of Indonesian Navy personnel will encourage an increase in the number of people suffering from mental pressure for Indonesian Navy personnel by 0.1%. This indicates that the mental unpreparedness of personnel against the pressure that occurs both from within (internal, family, and socio-economic) and from outside (work environment and leadership) is something that needs to be considered more seriously.

In this study, there is a significant gap which indicates that there is a mismatch between field experience of human resource management in the Indonesian Navy and the theory that explains the optimization of the quality of human resources. The basis of the approach used in human resource management within the Indonesian Navy is always oriented towards high discipline, and TNI Navy personnel are urgently required to prepare for even the worst conditions. In shipping duties, the personnel must also be prepared not to meet with their families for a relatively long period. This then became one of the triggers for stress on Indonesian Navy soldiers. In a study conducted by Kartono & Gulo (1987), it is stated that stress is a tense condition, in which the form is mental stress and conflict. In detail, some of the primary triggers for stress are as follows.

1. The condition that creates a human psychological or physiological power capacity.
2. Frustration, which is a condition in which the direction of activities to achieve goals experiences a very significant distraction, thus increasing feelings of anxiety in the process of achieving goals.
3. There is physical contact that involves disturbing the physical aspects of the human object.
4. A condition of physical and psychological tension that causes excessive anxiety.

Based on the results of the explanation from the above background, the author tries to compile a study on the effect of social welfare on stress levels and work commitment of Indonesian Navy personnel at Mako Koarmada I. This study will analyze the magnitude of the influence of social welfare on reducing stress levels and work commitment of this personnel.

B.   METHOD

This study focuses on analyzing and identifying the main problems that are factors in the occurrence of mental stress or stress on Indonesian Navy personnel. Thus, this study will use a quantitative approach with a focus on the causal relationship between several factors on the performance of the TNI AL military personnel. The data used as a source of analysis is primary data obtained through a questionnaire or survey instrument.

This data collection is the first step in the analysis process of this research. In research based on the study of human resources, the factors used cannot be measured directly, because they are closely related to perception. Factors that cannot be measured directly are referred to as latent factors. Thus, each factor analyzed must have a benchmark or indicator that can be measured through the use of a scale that represents the respondent (Sugiyono, 2016).

The object of this research is the military personnel of the Navy of the Tamtama class/rank with 324 respondents. The data collection technique (sampling) used random sampling with a population that included personnel of the Indonesian Armed Forces I TNI AL Strata Tamtama.

C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The initial stage of the discussion section in this study is to describe all the variables used. As explained in the previous section, this study uses socio-economic variables), stress levels and work commitment. The data used in this study were obtained from the distribution of questionnaires to respondents who were members of the Indonesian Navy who served in Koarmada I of the Navy as many as 324 respondents. Information from each variable used in this study will be presented in full through descriptive statistics with information coverage of the number of observations, the variable mean (mean), standard deviation, maximum value, and minimum value for each variable.

1. Testing Data Analysis Requirements

An empirical analysis, the processed data must meet several requirements before being processed through a test. The purpose of this test is to ensure that each construct used can represent the latent variables used in this study. Fulfilment of this requirement is essential to ensure that the results of the analysis used in this study are not biased. Therefore, a pre-test was conducted on 30 respondents consisting of a validity test and a reliability test. The basis for using 30 respondents is the standard assumption for the minimum number of samples so that data can be normally distributed. Validity and reliability tests were carried out using SPSS software by calculating the component matrix for each variable. The results are presented below.

a. Validity Test

The validity test is used to measure the extent of the correlation between each construct and its latency. A construct is valid because the value of the component matrix is above or equal to 0.5. The validity test was carried out on all latent variables used in this study.

Table 1 Validity Test of Socio-Economic Variable
Component Matrix

	Component		
	1	**2**	**3**
E1	.625	.598	.106
E2	.511	.624	.149
E3	.602	.577	.195
E4	.669	.461	.189
E5	.579	.457	.115
E6	.710	.283	-.460
E7	.641	.299	-.520
E8	.718	.307	-.394
E9	.748	.137	-.307
E10	.704	-.416	-.083
E11	.676	-.477	-.075
E12	.750	-.412	-.022
E13	.721	-.403	.003
E14	.699	-.423	-.061
E15	.712	-.525	-.092
E16	.758	-.403	-.121
E17	.607	.089	.584
E18	.600	-.177	.561
E19	.522	-.169	.676

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 3 components extracted.

Source: Author's Data Processed (2020)

Table 2 Validity Test of Stress Level Variables
Component Matrix

	Component	
	1	2
S1	.641	.526
S2	.646	.526
S3	.595	.582
S4	.842	.254
S5	.699	.580
S6	.677	.573
S7	.792	-.189
S8	.875	-.140
S9	.874	-.356

S10	.665	.115
S11	.720	-.208
S12	.881	-.319
S13	.871	-.395
S14	.817	-.439
S15	.829	-.469

Extraction Method: Principal
Component Analysis.

Two components extracted.
Source: Author's Data Processed (2020)

Table 3 Validity Test of Work Commitment Variables
Component Matrix

	Component	
	1	2
P1	.729	.050
P2	.819	-.152
P3	.819	-.152
P4	.771	.100
P5	.861	-.235
P6	.906	-.120
P7	.861	-.092
P8	.906	-.120
P9	**.348**	**.848**
P10	**.419**	**.808**

Extraction Method: Principal
Component Analysis.
a. 2 components extracted.
Source: Author's Data Processed (2020)

Based on the results of data processing in the pre-test for validity testing, there are two construct variables derived from the work commitment variable because the component matrix values are 0.348 for P9 and 0.419 for P10, respectively. Therefore, in further data processing, questions P9 and P10 will not be used from the work commitment variable.

b. Reliability Test

The reliability test is intended to identify the consistency of the empirical capital used in producing output for causal analysis. In this study, the reliability test used the Cronbach's Alpha value, where a variable is said to be reliable if the Cronbach's Alpha value is equal to or more than 0.6.

Table 4 Reliability Test of Socio-Economic Variables
Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.928	19

Source: Author's Data Processed (2020)

Table 5 Stress Level Variable Reliability Test
Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.949	15

Source: Author's Data Processed (2020)

Table 6Reliability Test of Work Commitment Variables
Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.918	10

Source: Author's Data Processed (2020)

Based on the test results in the table above, it was found that each Cronbach's Alpha value was 0.966 for the leadership variable, then 0.928 for the socio-economic variable, then 0.949 for the stress level variable, and 0.918 for the work commitment variable.

c. Normality Test

The normality test is intended to measure the extent to which the data used on all variables can be normally distributed. Therefore, a normality test must be carried out to ensure that the conditions for normally distributed data are then met. In this study, the Kolomogorov-Smirnov test was used to measure the level of normality of the data used on the variables of this study using SPSS software.

Table 7 Normality test
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Unstandardized Residual
N		324
Normal Parameters [a,b]	Mean	0E-7
	Std. Deviation	.46716499
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.111
	Positive	.111
	Negative	-.084
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.996
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.201

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.
Source: Author's Data Processed (2020)

Based on the test results using the Kolmogorov Smirnov test, it can be concluded that the data in this study have been normally distributed, as shown by the Asymp value. Sig. (2-tailed), which is greater than the significance value used in this study of 5%.

2. Evaluation of Empirical Models

a. Standardized Loading Factor

After testing the validity and reliability aspects as the basis for initial testing, then testing the evaluation of the model is carried out as explained in the previous chapter, that this study uses the estimation technique of Structural Equation Modeling (SEM). Therefore, it is necessary to evaluate the model to ensure that all constructs that use all samples can be representations/indicators of all the latent variables used in this study. To evaluate the model carried out, namely, the load factor test or construct validity. The validity test is carried out by calculating the t-value with a significance level of 5% (the benchmark p-value is less than 5%, or the calculated t-value is more significant than 1.96). A construct can be said to be valid if its SLF (Standardized Loading Factor) value is more than 0.5.

Based on the results of the loading factor test, it was found that all the standardized loading factor (SLF) values in the construct above were above 0.5. This means that all of the constructs used are all valid, which means that the latent variables used in this study have been represented/indicated by valid constructs.

b. Construct Reliability Test

After testing the load factor (standardized loading factor) or better known as construct validity testing, the next step is to test the construct reliability. In this research, the techniques used are constructed reliability and variance extracted.

c. Determination Coefficient Test (R²)

As explained in the methodology section, the coefficient of determination test aims to identify how much the model can explain the variation in changes in the dependent variable. For Socio-Economic Welfare, the value of the Leadership coefficient is 0.035. Then for the level of stress, the value of the coefficient of leadership is -0.19, and the value of the coefficient of socio-economic welfare is -0.053.

3. The Effect of Socio-Economic Welfare on Stress Levels

Based on the results of primary data processing using the Structural Equation Modeling estimation technique, the t-count value of the Socio-Economic Welfare variable is -1.34, where the result is smaller than the t-table value (with an alpha value of 5%) of 1.96. . This indicates that the influence of Socio-Economic Welfare on Stress Level is not significant. On the other hand, the value of the coefficient of the Socio-Economic Welfare variable is -0.19. Therefore, it can be concluded that a 1 unit increase in socio-economic welfare will reduce the potential for stress by 0.19, but this impact is not significant.

The results of data analysis in this study are relevant to several previous studies, especially those discussing how social and economic welfare can reduce stress levels, and vice versa. It's just that in this study, the impact of reducing stress levels due to an increase in social welfare is not significant. The relevance of finding the direction of the coefficient in this study is one of the studies conducted by Baum, Garofalo, and Yali (1999), which analyzed the impact of socio-economic well-being and stress levels. Socio-economic status (SES) is an essential predictor of various health and disease outcomes. Research seeking to identify the extent to which these frequently reported effects are due to the protective benefits of high SES or from toxic elements of low social status have not yielded consistent or conclusive findings (Steptoe el al., 2003). A relatively recent hypothesis is that these effects are due to the chronic stress associated with SES; Low SES is associated with several necessary social and environmental conditions that contribute to the burden of chronic stress, including crowds, crime, noise pollution, discrimination, and other hazards or stressors. In other words, chronic stress can include a great deal of variance in health and the social consequences associated with harmful aspects of low social status (Chandola & Marmot, 2010). Low SES is generally associated with adversity, the prevalence of mental health problems, and with health-damaging behaviours also associated with stress. Research targeting this hypothesis is needed to determine the extent of stress as a pathway linking SES and health. The results suggest that many of the conditions associated with low SES may contribute directly to background stress, suggesting that low SES is associated with high chronic stress. Chronic stress appears to be more generous in those in lower social status positions, and responses to stressors differ from those of people at higher social status (Kunz-Ebrecht et al., 2004).

Apart from that, other studies have also identified an inverse relationship between the level of welfare / social status and the potential for a decrease in stress levels. One of them is done by Dohrenwend (1973), who analyzed a person's social status and the level of stress they experience in an organization in Puerto Rico. It is hypothesized that (a) people of low social status are disproportionately exposed to stressful life events and (b) this exposure explains the relationship between low social status and individual psychological distress. The hypothesis is applied to social class, sexuality, and racial status. Based on the results of previous research, stressful life events are measured by the rate of life change (Lin et al., 1979).

On the other hand, blacks and Puerto Ricans did not experience a disproportionate change in life when compared to people of other higher status. Evidence shows in each case that instability is a factor that stresses the individual relatively high on individuals of low social status. The results of the study indicate that ethnicity does not have the burden of life change more than that given to the low social class. This confirms that welfare and social status have severe implications for the potential for stress, which in this study found insignificant impacts.

4. The Effect of Socio-Economic Welfare on Work Commitment

Based on the results of primary data processing using the Structural Equation Modeling estimation technique, the t-count value of the Socio-Economic Welfare variable was -0.87, where the results were smaller than the t-table value (with an alpha value of 5%) of. This indicates that the effect of Socio-Economic Welfare on Work Commitment is insignificant. On the other hand, the value of the coefficient of the Socio-Economic Welfare variable is -0.34. Therefore it can be concluded that an increase of 1 unit in socio-economic welfare will reduce the potential for a work commitment, with the assumption that an increase in socio-economic welfare will gradually reduce the dependence of personnel to continue working as Navy soldiers, especially for those who serve in Koarmada I of the Indonesian Armed Forces. The sea, however, this impact is not significant.

The research in this study is unique because the results of the coefficient are not relevant to most studies which state that an increase in the level of welfare will increase a person's work commitment. One of them is research conducted by Frogner, Skillman, Patterson, and Snyder (2016), on socio-economic welfare and its implications for work commitment in the United States. As the health system in the United States seeks to reduce costs, employers are finding new and creative ways to use individuals in lower-middle-level skills that are less costly to employ (Liebenberg, 2010). Questions arise about the quality of these positions, especially in conditions that rely heavily on jobs with lower-middle skills, such as long-term care. There are concerns about whether the country is building a health system on a weak workforce foundation. A recent report found that despite the high demand for long-term nursing workers, the rate of individuals dropping out of long-term care is very high to become unemployed or even unemployed; besides, these individuals have high rates of disability and poverty (Linnansaari-Rajalin et al., 2015). There is a

growing understanding among researchers that increased reliance on a low skilled workforce without adequate wages can result in high turnover, which can interfere with continued care and contribute to a lower quality of care. This high turnover is an indication of low work commitment due to low levels of socio-economic welfare (Pugh, 2000).

One thing that is very interesting from this research is that leadership has a very central position in the military context, especially in the Indonesian Navy. In this study, it is empirically proven that increasing the quality of leadership will significantly reduce the level of stress, significantly increase work commitment, and also significantly increase socio-economic welfare (Pluta, 1979).

D. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of primary data processing using the Structural Equation Modeling estimation technique, the t-count value of the Socio-Economic Welfare variable is -1.34, where the result is smaller than the t-table value (with an alpha value of 5%) of 1.96. This indicates that the influence of Socio-Economic Welfare on Stress Level is not significant. On the other hand, the value of the coefficient of the Socio-Economic Welfare variable is -0.19. Therefore, it can be concluded that a 1 unit increase in socio-economic welfare will reduce the potential for stress by 0.19, but this impact is not significant.

Based on the results of primary data processing using the Structural Equation Modeling estimation technique, the t-count value of the Socio-Economic Welfare variable was -0.87, where the results were smaller than the t-table value (with an alpha value of 5%) of. This indicates that the effect of Socio-Economic Welfare on Work Commitment is insignificant. On the other hand, the value of the coefficient of the Socio-Economic Welfare variable is -0.34. Therefore it can be concluded that an increase of 1 unit in socio-economic welfare will reduce the potential for a work commitment, with the assumption that an increase in socio-economic welfare will gradually reduce the dependence of personnel to continue working as Navy soldiers, especially for those who serve in Koarmada I of the Indonesian Armed Forces. The sea, however, this impact is not significant.

REFERENCES

1. Allan, B. A., Autin, K. L., & Duffy, R. D. (2016). *Self-determination and Meaningful Work: Exploring Socio-Economic Constraints*. Frontiers in Psychology, 7, 71.

2. Ardana, I. K., Mujiati, N. W., & Utama, I. W. M. (2012). *Manajemen sumber daya manusia.* Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.

3. Baum, A., Garofalo, J., & Yali, A. (1999). Socio-economic Status and Chronic Stress: Does Stress Account for SES Effects on Health?. *Annals Of The New York Academy Of Sciences,* 896(1), 131-144.

4. Beaumier, C.M., Ford, J.D. (2010). Food insecurity among Inuit women exacerbated by socio-economic stresses and climate change. *Canadian Journal of Public Health* 101(3), 196-201.

5. Dohrenwend, B. (1973). Social Status and Stressful Life Events. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 28(2), 225-235.

6. Feldman, P. O., Papalia, D. E., & Olds, S. (2009). *Human development*. Jakarta: Salemba Humanika.

7. Folkman, S., & Moskowitz, J. T. (2000). Stress, positive emotion, and coping. *Current directions in psychological science*, 9(4), 115-118.

8. Frogner, B. K., Skillman, S. M., Patterson, D. G., & Snyder, C. R. (2016). C*omparing the Socio-economic Well-Being of Workers Across Health care Occupations. Seattle, WA: Center for Health Workforce Studies,* University of Washington.

9. Handoko, T. H. (2012). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia, Second Edition*. Yogyakarta: BPEF.

10. Ho, W. H., Chang, C. S., Shih, Y. L., & Liang, R. D. (2009). Effects of Job Rotation and Role Stress Among Nurses on Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment. *BMC health services research*, 9(1), 8.

11. Kartono, K., & Gulö, D. (1987). *Kamus psikologi*. Jakarta; Pionir Jaya.

12. Lee, P. M., Khong, P., Ghista, D. N., & Rad, A. M. M. (2006). The Impact of Organizational Culture on The Successful Implementation of Total Quality Management. The TQM Magazine.

13. Li, W. D., Arvey, R. D., & Song, Z. (2011). *The Influence of General Mental Ability, Self-Esteem and Family Socio-Economic Status on Leadership Role Occupancy and Leader Advancement: The Moderating Role of Gender*. The Leadership Quarterly, 22(3), 520-534.

14. Payne, D. E. (1972). S*ocio-economic Status and leadership selection in the Mormon Missionary System*. Review of Religious Research, 118-125.

15. Priyono, F. M. A. (2012). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja Dan Komitmen Manajemen Pada Laboratorium Mawar. *Journal of Business and Banking*, 2(1), 113-122.

16. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual review of psychology*, 52(1), 141-166.

17. Salem, I. E. B. (2015). Transformational leadership: Relationship to job stress and job burnout in five-star hotels. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 15(4), 240-253.

18. Sugiyono. 2016. *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan, Pendekatan kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta

19. Wijono, S. (2014). *Psikologi Industri dan Organisasi Edisi Revisi*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.

20. Ajayi, M. P., & Abimbola, O. H. (2013). Job Satisfaction, Organizational Stress and Employee Performance: A study of NAPIMS. *Ife PsychologIA: An International Journal*, 21(2), 75-82.

21. Steptoe, A., Kunz-Ebrecht, S., Owen, N., Feldman, P. J., Willemsen, G., Kirschbaum, C., & Marmot, M. (2003). Socioeconomic Status and Stress-Related Biological Responses Over The Working Day. *Psychosomatic medicine*, 65(3), 461-470.

22. Kunz-Ebrecht, S. R., Kirschbaum, C., & Steptoe, A. (2004). Work Stress, Socioeconomic Status and Neuroendocrine Activation Over The Working Day. *Social science & medicine*, *58*(8), 1523-1530.

23. Lin, N., Ensel, W. M., Simeone, R. S., & Kuo, W. (1979). Social support, stressful life events, and illness: A model and an empirical test. *Journal of health and Social Behavior*, 108-119.

24. Liebenberg, S. (2010). *Socio-economic Rights: Adjudication Under a Transformative Constitution*. Juta and Company Ltd.

25. Pugh, C. (2000). Squatter settlements: their sustainability, architectural contributions, and socio-economic roles. *Cities*, *17*(5), 325-337.

26. Pluta, J. (1979). The Performance of South American Civilian and Military Governments from a Socio-Economic Perspective. *Development and Change*, *10*(3), 461-483.