

Public Satisfaction Index Measurement Of Local Government Public Service Quality

Syamsiah Badruddin, Paisal Halim

Abstract: The purpose of the research is to find out and then conduct an analysis of the quality of local government services to the public by using a public satisfaction index measurement based on Decree of the Minister of Administrative Reform No. 25/2004 concerning the General Guidelines for the Compilation of Public Satisfaction Indexes. The number of respondents used in the study was 150 people who were people who used public services. Indicators used in measuring public satisfaction following the guidelines issued by the ministry are 14 indicators in the form of Service Procedures, Service Requirements, Clarity of Officers, Staff Discipline, Officer Responsibilities, Officer Capability, Speed of Service, Justice Getting, Courtesy and Hospitality, Certainty Service Schedule, Environmental Comfort, Service Security, Fairness of Service Fees, Certainty of Service Costs. From the results of the study show that with the method of the percentage of Public Satisfaction Index of public services held by the District Office is 51.80%, this means that the quality of public services produced is in quite a good category than for an average public satisfaction index of 66.42 with service criteria B is excellent, which means that the general service conditions in Majene Regency are good. However, some indicators are still quite low which needs to be improved so that the services performed will be more optimal.

Index Terms: Government Organization, Government Bureaucracy, Service Provider, Service Procedures.

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the activities carried out by an organization is providing services both to units of activity within the organization or government and to parties outside the organization [1]. Service activities are very influential in the achievement of quality and smoothness of organizational activities and affect the achievement of overall organizational goals. The services provided are not just assisting with customer needs, but also provide excellent service to customers [2]. Public organizations in providing competent services are required to be able to act quickly and accurately. This is an obligation that must do. For public organizations, excellent service reflected in every effectiveness and efficiency of the activities carried out smoothly. The faster and more accurate the services provided, the better the quality of service [3]. As a government organization that functions as a public service provider in the field of transportation, Public Services are also demanded to be able to provide excellent services and always improve service performance to match what is expected by service users [4]. Service results can be said to be good if many get a positive response by the public and service users are satisfied with the services provided, namely between the reality or the results obtained by service users following the expectations they want, for example, people's desires for polite service, fast, safe, and comfortable seems to have become an ideal category in general [5]. Society needs services to meet various kinds of needs that cannot be fulfilled by themselves, even in the extreme, it can be said that services cannot be separated from human life. Public services often needed in the form of public goods and public services. Examples of services in the form of public goods include roads, clean water, electricity, while examples of services in the form of public services include administration, health, education and transportation services [6]. The government, as a public service provider, is responsible and continues to strive to provide the best service to the community [7]. The low quality of public services provided by government officials is a bad image of the government in the community. Some people who have dealt

with bureaucracy always complain and are disappointed with the services they provide. There are some people until now still underestimate the performance of the bureaucracy. As a result, many service users or the community take shortcuts to use the services of brokers to take care of their needs related to government bureaucracy [8]. The services provided, in general, have not satisfied the community [9]. The services provided are too complicated for a variety of reasons that are less acceptable to the community, so the services provided tend to be ineffective and inefficient. Such conditions make the public as users of public services insatiable. All of this results in the community being reluctant to deal with everything directly related to the government bureaucracy [10]. The primary purpose of public service is community satisfaction. This satisfaction can be realized if the services provided are following established service standards or better than the service standards [11]. The problem that is still often complained by some people is service time. The processing time for the community to around two weeks considered to be too long for the community, even though the length of service has been under the provisions on the standard time for public services stipulated in law number 25 of 2009 concerning public services. Public satisfaction is an essential factor and determines the success of a business entity because the community is a consumer of the products it produces. This supported by the statement of Hoffman and Beteson [12], that is, without customers, the service firm has no reason to exist. The definition of community satisfaction according to Mowen [13], is that Customers satisfaction is defined as the overall attitudes regarding goods or services after its acquisition and uses. Therefore, business entities must be able to meet the needs and desires of the community to achieve community satisfaction, and community loyalty can be achieved in the future. Because, if it cannot meet the needs and satisfaction of the community, causing community dissatisfaction results in community loyalty to a product that will fade and turn to products or services provided by other business entities [14]. The Public Satisfaction Index compiled from one Government Service Unit to another is structured to provide benefits to both the community and the government agency itself. According to the Decree of the Minister of Administrative Reform No. 25/2004 concerning General Guidelines for the Compilation of Public Satisfaction Indexes, with periodic availability of Public

- Syamsiah Badruddin, Professor, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Nasional, E-mail: chiah_jurnal2006@yahoo.com.
- Paisal Halim, Professor, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Nasional, E-mail: paisalhalim@gmail.com.

Satisfaction Index data. Considering that the types of services are very diverse with different characteristics and characteristics, in order to facilitate the preparation of the Public Satisfaction Index in-service units a general guideline is needed that is used as a reference for agencies, Central Government, Provincial and Regency/City Governments to find out the level of performance of service units in the respective agency environment. The existence of an evaluation of public services in government agencies is inseparable from the existence of elements of the assessment or assessment standards that have set. These assessment elements are formulated or determined so that the valuation is given. One of the evaluations of service quality based on recognition or assessment from customers or parties who receive service [15]. Service quality indicators are client satisfaction and perceptions, for example, indicated by the presence or absence of complaints from service users. The results of quality measurements will be the basis for making overall quality improvement policies. In order to improve the quality of public services (both at the central and regional levels), the Central Government has issued a Decree of the Minister of Administrative Reform on General Guidelines for the Preparation of Public Satisfaction Indexes of Government Institution Service Units. This regulation then becomes a guideline for measuring the community satisfaction index to assess the level of service quality. The community satisfaction index data then serves as a means of evaluating service elements as well as being a driving force for each service provider unit to improve the quality of its public services. Given the urgency of measuring the community satisfaction index, it is necessary to measure the types of public services, both those that include essential services and administrative services. Based on the principle of service as stipulated in the Decree of the Minister of Administrative Reform on General Guidelines for the Implementation of Public Services, which then developed into 14 elements that are relevant, valid and reliable, as a minimum element that must exist for the basis of measuring the Public Satisfaction Index, can be mentioned as follows:

1. Service procedures, namely the ease of the stages of service provided to the community in terms of simplicity of service flow;
2. Service Requirements, namely technical and administrative requirements needed to obtain services following the type of service;
3. Clarity of service officers, namely the existence and certainty of the officers who provide services (name, position and authority and responsibilities);
4. The discipline of service officers, namely the sincerity of officers in providing services, especially on the consistency of working time by applicable regulations;
5. Responsibilities of service officers, namely clarity of authority and responsibilities of officers in the administration and completion of services;
6. The ability of service officers, namely the level of expertise and skills possessed by officers in providing/completing services to the community;
7. Speed of service, i.e., target service time can be completed within the time determined by the service delivery unit;
8. Justice receives services, namely the implementation of services by not distinguishing the groups/status of the community served;

9. Courtesy and friendliness of officers, namely attitudes and behavior of officers in providing services to the community in a polite and friendly manner as well as mutual respect and respect;
10. Fairness of service costs, i.e., affordability of the community to the number of costs set by the service unit;
11. The certainty of service costs, i.e., conformity between costs paid and costs that have determined;
12. Certainty in the service schedule, namely the implementation of service time, following established conditions;
13. Environmental comfort, which is the condition of service facilities and infrastructure that are clean, neat, and orderly so that it can provide comfort to the recipient of the service;
14. Service Security, i.e., the guaranteed level of security of the environment of the service provider unit or the means used, so that the public feels calm to obtain services against the risks resulting from the implementation of the service.

The public satisfaction index is data and information about the level of community satisfaction obtained from quantitative and qualitative measurement results, on the opinion of the community in obtaining services from public service providers and comparing their expectations and needs. Where the measurement objectives include structuring the system, mechanism, and service procedures; therefore, the service can be carried out more quality, efficient and effective [15]. The policy on the utilization of the state apparatus in the effort to improve the quality of services must be carried out consistently by taking into account the needs and expectations of the public, so that government services to the community can always be provided quickly, precisely, cheaply, openly, and efficiently implemented and not discriminatory [16]. Therefore, efforts to improve the quality of services to the community are activities that are carried out continuously and continuously by all levels of the state apparatus at all levels of service, to achieve the expected quality [17], [18].

2. RESEARCH METHOD

2.1 Research Approach

The research model used in the study based on the level of exploration is descriptive research because it has done to find out the value of the independent variable, which is to find out the level of community satisfaction measured by calculating the Public Satisfaction Index. The research method uses survey methods because it will be carried out on the population by taking samples, and according to the type of data and analysts in this study will be obtained in the form of numerical data from the results of filling out the questionnaire by the respondents who gave the answer scores of each question assessed by amicable numbers (4), friendly (3), less friendly (2), and not friendly (1). The data will be analyzed to calculate the Community Satisfaction Index under the Decree of the Minister of Administrative Reform No. 25/2004 concerning General Guidelines for the Preparation of Community Satisfaction Indexes for Government Institution Service Units.

2.2 Population and Sample

The population in this study were all users of Majene Regency services in the Population and Civil Registry Office, District Offices within the Majene Regency Government, District

Offices within the Majene Regency Government. For the determination of the sample will be guided by the Decree of the Minister of Administrative Reform Number 25 of 2004 concerning General Guidelines for the Preparation of Community Satisfaction Indexes in Government Institution Service Units, namely to meet the accuracy of the results of index preparation, selected respondents are set at least 150 people from the total population of service recipients, on the basis $(\text{Number of elements} + 1) \times 10 = \text{number of respondents}$ $(14 + 1) \times 10 = 150$ respondents. Based on the determination of the number of samples in these provisions, the sampling technique in this study is to use a quota sampling technique, which is a technique to determine samples from populations that have specific characteristics to the desired amount (quota) [19]. This error tolerance limit expressed as a percentage. The smaller the fault tolerance, the more accurately the sample describes the population. Research with an error limit of 5% means it has an accuracy rate of 95%. To avoid bias, the selection of respondents is those who did or who received services during the survey reference period [20], [21]. Respondents who will record in the Community Satisfaction Survey activities in 2019 are the people who have received services at the Civil, Population, and Registration Office in the Majene Regency Government.

Table 1. Demographics of Respondents

Variables	Indicator	Percentage
Gender	Male	42.00%
	Female	58.00%
Age	< 20 years	14.00%
	20 - 30 years	20.00%
	30 - 40 years	43.33%
	> 40 years	22.67%
Educational Background	Primary school	7.33%
	Junior high school	23.33%
	Senior High School	48.67%
	College	20.67%
Employment	Government employees	11.33%
	Private employees	15.33%
	Student	7.33%
	Housewife	30.00%
	Entrepreneurship	14.67%
	Other Work	21.33%

2.3 Data Collection and Analysis Techniques

In order to dig up information about public satisfaction with public services in each Majene Regency Government service unit, data collection will carry out using a questionnaire/questionnaire method. This method used to obtain information about the opinion of each respondent/sample of the elements of service. The preparation of the questionnaire will be arranged following the form of the questionnaire in the attachment to the Decree of the Minister of Administrative Reform on General Guidelines for the Preparation of Community Satisfaction Indexes for Government Institution Service Units. In this study, data analysis techniques, namely by calculating the value of the Community Satisfaction Index for each service unit in Majene Regency, West Sulawesi Province. Guided by the Decree of the Minister of Administrative Reform on General Guidelines

for the Preparation of Public Satisfaction Indexes of Government Institution Service Units. The Public Satisfaction Index Value is calculated using the "weighted average value" of each service element. In calculating the community satisfaction index for each service element studied, each service element has the same weighting as the following formula:

$$\text{Weighted Average Value} = \frac{\text{Total Weight}}{\text{Total Element}} = 0,071 \quad (1)$$

Then to obtain the value of the Public Satisfaction Index (PSI) service units used a weighted average value approach with the following formula:

$$\text{PSI} = \frac{\text{Total of Perception Element}}{\text{Weighing the Total Elements}} \times \text{Weighing Value} \quad (2)$$

Furthermore, to facilitate the interpretation of the PSI assessment, which is between 25-100, the results of the above assessment are converted to a base value of 25, with the following formula:

$$\text{Weighing Unit PSI Value} \times 25 \quad (3)$$

PSI value divided into four criteria, from dissatisfied to very satisfied. As we know that the category of service quality based on the Decree of the Minister of Administrative Reform No. 25/2004 is in the following table:

Table 2. Criteria for Public Satisfaction Index

Perception Value	Interval Value	Conversion Interval Value	Service Performance
1	1,00 - 1,75	25,00 – 43,75	Not good (D)
2	1,76 - 2,50	43,76 – 62,50	Good enough (C)
3	2,51 - 3,20	62,51 – 81,25	Good (B)
4	3,26 - 4,00	81,26 – 100	Very Good (A)

Evaluation of public services involves all aspects, including systems, procedures, and methods in fulfilling public rights, both as providers and users of public services. The quality of public services is said to be good if the public service provider can provide services following applicable regulations and the needs of the community as users of public services to create public satisfaction with the implementation of public services.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Based on data collected in the field, the results of the study were analyzed using 2 (two) methods, namely the percentage value method for each indicator of public satisfaction and the method of analysis of public satisfaction calculated using the weighted average value of each service element. Both of these analysis techniques used so that the results of this study truly illustrate the true and valid value of the Community Satisfaction Index. The percentage analysis used guided by the method proposed by [22], were to understand whether or not the implementation of activity refers to the following categories:

- 0% - 39% = Not good
- 40% - 55% = Good Enough
- 56% - 75% = Good
- 76% - 100% = Very Good

Meanwhile, the Public Satisfaction Index (PSI) analysis,

which calculated using the weighted average value of each service element, has a category in Table 2. This percentage analysis based on the results of the data presented that have described in the previous section. From the calculation of the percentage value per indicator, the following recapitulation obtained:

Table 3. Percentage of Public Satisfaction Index Indicators

No.	Service Elements	Performance
1	Service Procedure	65.33%
2	Service Requirements	54.00%
3	Clarity of Officers	58.67%
4	Staff Discipline	43.67%
5	Officer Responsibilities	48.33%
6	Officer Capability	52.00%
7	Speed of Service	44.67%
8	Justice Getting	45.33%
9	Courtesy and Hospitality	47.00%
10	Certainty Service Schedule	43.67%
11	Environmental Comfort	41.33%
12	Service Security	67.33%
13	Fairness of Service Fees	58.00%
14	Certainty of Service Costs	56.00%

Based on the table above, it can see that the lowest percentage value is an indicator of environmental comfort that is 41.33%, and the highest is an indicator of service safety, which is 67.33%. However, overall, the Community Satisfaction Index of Public Services performed at the District Office was 51.81%. This means that the implementation of public services in the District Office is included in the quite good category because it can provide satisfaction to the community by 51.81%. The still low quality of service is directly related to the role of civil servants who are servants of the community. Not optimal services provided by government employees provide an unfavorable image for the government indirectly. Serving the community well is a responsibility for all government agencies [23]. Therefore, each employee in a government agency must serve the community and learn how to improve their skills to serve. In service skills, this also includes mastery of the knowledge of the services provided, because this will show the public that the employee in the government agency is a professional in the field of Public Service Management [24]. In the world of public service, it should master the needs of the community and know how to satisfy and meet the needs of the community, so that public complaints about the services of government agencies will disappear along with the increasing professionalism of the work of employees in government agencies to serve the community as well as possible.

Table 4. Service Performance Public Satisfaction Index.

No.	Service Elements	Conversion Value	Service Performance
1	Service Procedure	65.63	Good
2	Service Requirements	67.40	Good
3	Clarity of Officers	66.55	Good
4	Staff Discipline	62.63	Good

No.	Service Elements	Conversion Value	Service Performance
5	Officer Responsibilities	63.23	Good
6	Officer Capability	67.17	Good
7	Speed of Service	68.33	Good
8	Justice Getting	64.30	Good
9	Courtesy and Hospitality	71.53	Good
10	Certainty Service Schedule	67.33	Good
11	Environmental Comfort	53.65	Good
12	Service Security	73.56	Good
13	Fairness of Service Fees	69.17	Good
14	Certainty of Service Costs	69.43	Good

The results of these calculations when referring to the Decree of the Minister of Administrative Reform Number 25 of 2004 concerning the General Guidelines for the Preparation of Community Satisfaction Indexes in Government Institution Service Units, then the value of the Public Satisfaction Index is in the category B (Good). Thus, based on an analysis of the weighted average value, the value of the Community Satisfaction Index of public services organized by the District Office is excellent. Alternatively, in other words, that the results of this study generally put the value of perception and quality of public services organized by the District Office included in the category (Grade) B or good. Public services carried out by the District Office have had a significant impact on satisfaction, fairness and quality of services provided to the community. This success is inseparable from the supporting factors that make a real contribution to the success in the delivery of public services, both human resource factors that have competence, the existence of general and operational references in providing services in the form of laws and regulations, as well as awareness factors, both owned by all apparatus in the District Office and awareness of the community. Meanwhile, the inhibiting factors, both service facilities and infrastructure, as well as the service process, must be a severe concern for immediate improvement so that the quality of public services provided to the public can further increase. Besides, to overcome these inhibiting factors, it is necessary to reform the current system. Urgent reforms are to give broader authority to the District Government, especially in the issuance of identity cards, so that they are no longer concentrated in the Office of Population and Civil Registry as is currently happening. This needs to do so that the process of services provided to the community can be faster. Public service organizations have a characteristic of public accountability, in which every citizen has the right to evaluate the quality of the service they receive [25]. It is complicated to judge the quality of service without considering the role of the community as the recipient of the service and the apparatuses implementing the service. Evaluations originating from service users are the first element in the analysis of the quality of public services. The second element in analysis is the ease with which a service is recognized either before the process or after the service has provided [26]. Service efforts undertaken in order to create public satisfaction are generally carried out by determining the public services that provided, what are their kinds, treating service users, as customers, trying to satisfy service users, following what they want, looking for the best way to deliver services and quality [27]. These efforts depart from the issue of public satisfaction with what is given by the servants in this case. Namely, public administration is the government itself

with what they want, that is to say, the extent to which the public hopes for what they ultimately receive the presence of a public organization is a tool to meet needs and create public satisfaction [28]. The performance of public services can be said to be successful if it can realize what the main tasks and functions of the organization concerned are [29]. For this reason, organizations and employees who carry out activity must always be oriented and concentrate on what is their job. Public services are prioritizing the public interest, facilitate public affairs, shorten the implementation of public affairs and provide satisfaction to the public (community) [30]. The condition of the implementation of public services carried out by government officials in various service joints, including those concerning the fulfillment of civil rights and the basic needs of the population, is still not felt as expected by the community. This can be seen in part from the number of complaints, complaints from the public. On the other hand, the community, as the main element served, has not provided adequate control to become an encouraging element in efforts to improve the quality of public services. Therefore, efforts are needed to improve public services through comprehensive reforms covering institutional aspects, staffing, and human resources, management, and accountability, so that is expected to produce excellent public services, namely services that are fast, precise, cheap, safe, fair, and accountable [26]. In terms of aspects of human resource development, more education and training need to be done in order to improve employee knowledge and skills to be able to provide better public services [27]. The quality of public services is the result of interaction from various aspects, namely the service system, human resources service providers, strategies, and customers [31]. Crosby [32], define service quality as an adjustment to details where this quality sees as the degree of excellence that is to be achieved — performing continuous control in achieving these advantages in order to meet the needs of service users. Service quality substantially defined as a quick form, which obtained by comparing customer perceptions of the services they receive with the services they expect. If the reality is more excellent than expected, then the service can be said to be quality whereas if the reality is less than expected, the service is not qualified, and if the reality is the same as the expectation, the service is called excellent and satisfying. Thus, the quality of service can be defined in how far the difference between reality and the expectations of customers for the service they receive [33]. The improvement of the factors that affect the quality of services, especially the improvement and improvement in the aspects of ability and skills will linearly increase the quality of public services [34]. One of the most fundamental elements of quality public service management is continuous employee development through education and training Competency-based human resource development can help organizations to have competent and reliable human resources at work [35]. Through various development and training activities, human resource competency will be more optimal and lead to an increase in organizational performance through the translation and operationalization of its vision and mission.

CONCLUSION

Public services provided by the Government, in general, are quite good and the services provided based on democratic values. Democratic values here interpreted as services

oriented to the interests of the community because the community as citizens has full rights to get the attention of the government and all its apparatus because the community is the real owner of this country. If democratic values like these used as a reference for all government officials, then it is not difficult for this country to achieve its goal of creating a just, prosperous, and prosperous society. However, there are still several factors that need to consider for improvements, such as the provision of representative service facilities and infrastructure and building more intensive communication with the public so that the whole community will understand the procedures and service requirements. Besides that, the community as service users should be more responsive in understanding all service processes so that they contribute reciprocally to improving service quality. In other words, the improvement and improvement of service quality is not only the responsibility of the government as a public service operator, but community participation is also needed so that the existing obstacles can get a solution well.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Bergman and B. Klefsjö, Quality from customer needs to customer satisfaction. Studentlitteratur AB, 2010.
- [2] G. Boyne, P. Day, and R. Walker, "The evaluation of public service inspection: A theoretical framework," *Urban Stud.*, vol. 39, no. 7, pp. 1197–1212, 2002.
- [3] H. Oh, "Service quality, customer satisfaction, and customer value: A holistic perspective," *Int. J. Hosp. Manag.*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 67–82, 1999.
- [4] B. K. Kahn, D. M. Strong, and R. Y. Wang, "Information quality benchmarks: product and service performance," *Commun. ACM*, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 184–192, 2002.
- [5] J. Mattsson, "A service quality model based on an ideal value standard," *Int. J. Serv. Ind. Manag.*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 18–33, 1992.
- [6] A. Hidayat, B. Tola, S. Sutanto, P. H. Halim, and S. Badruddin, "Productivity Lecturer in the Era of the Industrial Revolution 4.0: Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)," *Helix*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 5102–5107, 2019.
- [7] T. Redman and B. P. Mathews, "Service quality and human resource management: A review and research agenda," *Pers. Rev.*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 57–77, 1998.
- [8] J. Niskanen, *Bureaucracy and representative government*. Routledge, 2017.
- [9] Darhamsyah, "Environmental Governance Urban: Public Participation and Sustainable Development," *Int. J. Environ. Eng. Educ.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 17–24, 2019.
- [10] P. Halim, Natsir, S. Badruddin, A. Hidayat, and T. Maulamin, "Competence and Commitment: Two Factors that Impact Performance in Organizations," *Helix*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 5096–5101, 2019.
- [11] S. Van de Walle and G. Bouckaert, "Public service performance and trust in government: the problem of causality," *Int. J. Public Adm.*, vol. 26, no. 8–9, pp. 891–913, 2003.
- [12] K. D. Hoffman and J. E. G. Bateson, *Essentials of services marketing: Concepts, strategies and cases*. South-Western Pub, 2001.
- [13] J. C. Mowen and M. Minor, "Customer Behavior." Prentice Hall Inc, New Jersey, United State, 1995.
- [14] N. B. S. Wangi, P. Halim, S. Badruddin, and T. Maulamin, "Gamification framework and achievement motivation in digital era: Concept and effectiveness," *Int. J. Eng.*

- Technol, vol. 7, no. 3.6, pp. 429–431, 2018.
- [15] L. Eboli and G. Mazzulla, "A new customer satisfaction index for evaluating transit service quality," *J. Public Transp.*, vol. 12, no. 3, p. 2, 2009.
- [16] M. Milakovich, *Improving service quality: achieving high performance in the public and private sectors*. CRC Press, 1995.
- [17] E. Löffler, "Improving the quality of public services: putting the citizens at the centre of administrative action," *SIGMA*, 2009.
- [18] W. Van Dooren, N. Thijs, and G. Bouckaert, "Quality management and the management of quality in European public administrations," in *Improving the quality of East and West European public services*, Routledge, 2017, pp. 91–106.
- [19] H. Lune and B. L. Berg, *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Pearson Higher Ed, 2016.
- [20] J. W. Creswell, *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Method Approaches*, 4th ed. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2014.
- [21] L. J. Moleong, *Qualitative Research Methodology*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya, 2007.
- [22] J. F. Hair, W. C. Black, B. J. Babin, and R. E. Anderson, *Multivariate Data Analysis*, 7th ed. Harlow, England: Pearson New International Edition, 2014.
- [23] S. Ilcan and T. Basok, "Community government: voluntary agencies, social justice, and the responsabilization of citizens," *Citizensh. Stud.*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 129–144, 2004.
- [24] C. Needham, *Personalising public services: Understanding the personalisation narrative*. Policy Press, 2011.
- [25] J. Stewart and M. Clarke, "The public service orientation: issues and dilemmas," *Public Adm.*, vol. 65, no. 2, pp. 161–177, 1987.
- [26] S. Paul, "Accountability in public services: exit, voice and control," *World Dev.*, vol. 20, no. 7, pp. 1047–1060, 1992.
- [27] L. Bright, "Does public service motivation really make a difference on the job satisfaction and turnover intentions of public employees?," *Am. Rev. Public Adm.*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 149–166, 2008.
- [28] R. Common, N. Flynn, and E. Mellon, *Managing public services: Competition and decentralization*. Elsevier, 2016.
- [29] M. I. Setiawan et al., "Airport, passenger and aircraft supporting to regional growth," in *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management*, 2019, pp. 1759–1761.
- [30] C. Pollitt, *New perspectives on public services: place and technology*. Oxford University Press, 2012.
- [31] J. Buckley, "E-service quality and the public sector," *Manag. Serv. Qual. An Int. J.*, vol. 13, no. 6, pp. 453–462, 2003.
- [32] P. B. Crosby, *Quality is free: The art of making quality certain*, vol. 94. McGraw-hill New York, 1979.
- [33] P. Halim and I. Sriwahyuni, "Patient Satisfaction Level at Local General Hospital in Mamuju Regency, Indonesia," *Int. J. Sci. Res.*, vol. 6, no. 9, pp. 1817–1821, 2017.
- [34] S. Badruddin and W. Husain, "Level of Satisfaction of Public Service in Takalar Regency, Indonesia," *Int. J. Sci. Res.*, vol. 6, no. 9, pp. 1831–1835, 2017.
- [35] M. Eraut, *Developing professional knowledge and competence*. Routledge, 2002.