

Service Quality of Government Institution and Its Influence on Public Satisfaction (Study in Regency/City Government of North Sulawesi)

Hendrik Gamaliel¹, Lintje Kalangi², Jessy Warongan³
Universitas Sam Ratulangi^{1,2,3}
Kampus Unsrat Manado, Indonesia
Correspondence Email: hendrik_gamaliel@unsrat.ac.id
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7398-8409>

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Publication Information

Research Article

HOW TO CITE

Gamaliel, H., Kalangi, L., & Warongan, J. (2022). Service Quality of Government Institution and Its Influence on Public Satisfaction (Study in Regency/City Government of North Sulawesi). *International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality in Asia Pasific*, 5(1), 1-12.

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.32535/ijthap.v5i1.1397>

Copyright@ year owned by Author(s).
Published by IJTHAP



This is an open-access article.
License: Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike (CC BY-NC-SA)

Received: DATE,MONTH,YEAR
Accepted: DATE,MONTH,YEAR
Published: DATE,MONTH,YEAR

ABSTRACT

This study aims to empirically examine the influences of the service quality of government institutions on public satisfaction and the degree of influences of service quality among regencies/cities in the North Sulawesi Province. This study focuses on the performance measurement of One-Stop Integrated Service and Investment Service. Respondents of this research are a community in four regencies/cities in the province of North Sulawesi that is Manado City, Bitung City, Bolaang Mongondow Regency, and Kotamobagu City. The respondents are those who have experienced the services provided by One-Stop Integrated Service and Investment Service institutions in those regencies/cities. This study uses a survey method that distributes questionnaires to each region. The data analysis method uses multiple linear regression analyses. The results show that of the 6 (six) hypotheses, 5 (five) hypotheses were supported and 1 (one) hypothesis was not supported. Supported hypotheses are 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 hypotheses. Meanwhile, the 6 hypotheses are not supported.

Keywords: North Sulawesi Province , One-Stop Integrated Service and Investment Service Institution, Performance Measurement, Public Satisfaction, Service Quality

JEL Classification: M00, L80, L89

INTRODUCTION

The demands of improvement of public service from the orientation and quality of service of government agencies is a common phenomenon today. This is because the government organization with all its activities is not immune from the pressures to continuously improve and increase the quality of community service (Donnelly, Wisniewski, Dalrymple, & Curry, 1995). According to Zen, Barlow, and Gondowarsito (2006), public services provided by the Government are not fully in favor of the interests of the community yet. Three reasons are underlying the statement. First, public services organized by government agencies are not yet fully qualified to the interests of the community. Secondly, community service organizers are still less aware of their role as servants. Thirdly, there is a lot of community service agencies providing services that do not prioritize the principles of accountability and transparency. Increased public awareness of the implementation of the public administration triggered the onset of turmoil rooted in dissatisfaction. The higher demands are continually posed by the public to the government. Lack of effort from the government especially local governments, in involving the public in the process of evaluating service quality can result in the absence of control services provided.

Service quality assessment through public satisfaction is one of the important elements in the process of measuring the performance of government service agencies. As a user of government services, the community satisfaction factor should be a top priority in the process of measuring the performance of government service agencies. It is awkward when the quality of service provided does not satisfy the public, but the performance of the service agency is said to be good. The performance of government service agencies is now gaining a lot of spotlights, as the community begins to question the quality and benefits it acquired for the services provided by government institutions. The phenomenon of the condition encourages the researchers to examine the service quality provided by institutions relating to government services. In particular, the service institution provided by One-Stop Integrated Service and Investment Service in 4 (four) regencies/cities in the regional government area of North Sulawesi province.

The first research question is how the influence of service quality is provided by One-Stop Integrated Service and Investment Service institution which includes tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy for the public satisfaction in the North Sulawesi Province. Meanwhile, the second research question is whether there is a difference in the service quality provided by One-Stop Integrated Service and Investment Service institutions between regencies/cities in the province of North Sulawesi.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Service Quality

There is some definition of service quality by experts. Zeithaml and Bitner (1996) defined service quality as a level of incompatibility between expectations or desires from customers and customer feedback. They argued that the quality of service is an important part of success in all organizations and the quality of service should be defined solely based on the criteria of the customer. Bolton and Drew (1991) stated that the concept of service quality is described as a form of attitude relating to satisfaction but not equivalently. Service quality is said to be the result of a comparison between expectations and performance. They also state that the definition of service quality differs from one industry to another. Mwita (2000) suggested that service quality management is described as the process of minimizing the performance gaps between the real state of the services provided and customer expectations. To improve the quality of service,

managers should be able to adopt customer-oriented techniques because the services provided are directly aimed at customer needs.

The service quality is abstract which is difficult to understand the construct. This is due to the characteristic factors inherent in service as well as the understanding of quality that cannot be reviewed from one dimension only but must be of many dimensions (Ghobadian, Speller, & Jones, 1994). These factors make the process of grading and measuring service quality based on some dimensions in principle, as well as the description of service quality. According to Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1988), there are five dimensions in principle as well as the description of service quality. Those dimensions are 1) Tangibles, which are defined as physical appearances of facilities, equipment, personnel, and communication materials. 2) Reliability, which is defined as the ability to perform accurate and reliable service appointments. 3) Responsiveness, which is defined as a willingness to assist the consumer and deliver the service quickly and timely. 4) Assurance, is defined as the knowledge, friendliness, and ability of the employees of the organization to instill a sense of confidence and trust in the consumer. 5) Empathy, is defined as the caring attitude of the organization by giving individual attention to the consumer.

Customer Satisfaction

Satisfaction is the fulfillment of something desired. It is also Satisfaction is the level of someone's feeling after comparing performance with expectations (Tendur, Hutabarat, & Tumbelaka, 2021). If connected with the service, satisfaction is the fulfillment of the desired service. The focus of satisfaction is on personal, emotional reaction to service (Hernon, Nitecki, & Altman, 1999). Bitner dan Hubbert (1994) suggested that satisfaction consists of service encounter satisfaction, the consumer's dissatisfaction with discrete service encounter, and overall service satisfaction, the consumer's overall dissatisfaction with the organization based on all encounters and experiences with that particular organization. Kotler (2006) argued that satisfaction is the level of a person's perception after comparing the performance or results he perceived compared to his expectations. Satisfaction is the level of consumer perception gained after consumers do something.

The government is organizations engaged in service. Customers of government organizations are public as service users. As a service user is the right of the public to obtain satisfaction from the services provided by the Government. The successful measure of service is determined by receiver satisfaction level. Service receiver satisfaction is achieved if the recipient of the service obtains services as required and expected. To obtain such information, the government in measuring organizational performance needs to involve the public to obtain information about the satisfaction of the services provided. Swindell and Kelly (2005) stated that Governments need to see the value of research on community satisfaction as a tool for measuring outcomes services and providing an appreciation for these values for regional level planning.

Tangible

Tangible is the ability of the organization of service providers that are seen from the characteristics of the physical appearance of facilities and infrastructure owned. Characteristic of physical appearance is such as the quality of office building used to provide services, equipment used, and the level of sophistication of the technology used. This dimension emphasizes the perception of service users on the organization of service providers in relation to advice and infrastructure that can physically support the service delivery activities. Some of the research gives empirical evidence that tangibles positively affect the satisfaction of the user of the service. Agus et al. (2007) conducted using the samples of the department managers and the public obtained evidence that tangibles positively influence public satisfaction. The existence of characteristics of the

physical appearance of services that are well regarded by the public can help and support the service delivery process. Rosen and Karwan (1994) state that tangibles positively affect the satisfaction of service users who obtain services that seldom relate directly to the service provider, such as in education services. Philip and Stewart (1999) argued that Tangibles had a positive effect on the satisfaction of users of cancer information services in America. Based on the empirical evidence, the relationship between tangibles and public satisfaction in this study is hypothesized:

H₁: Tangibles positively influence the public satisfaction

Reliability

Reliability is the ability of the organization of service providers to fulfill promises that services will be provided accurately and reliably. This dimension emphasizes the perception of service users of service providers organizations relating to existing service standards, service time, system and service procedures, employee commitment, and the reporting system on the results of services that have been provided. Several studies conducted provide empirical evidence that reliability has a positive effect on service user satisfaction. Curry and Herbert (1998) conducted a study on psychological service for children in Scotland. The sample chosen was principals at the primary school level and parents. Empirical evidence obtained states that reliability has a positive effect on satisfaction. Agus et al. (2007) state that reliability has a positive effect on service users of public sector organizations in Malaysia. Rosen and Karwan (1994) state that reliability has a positive effect on the satisfaction of users of hospital, restaurant and bookstore services. The same thing was proven by Stafford, Stafford, and Wells (1998), which stated that reliability had a positive effect on the satisfaction of vehicle insurance service users at four insurance companies in the United States. Based on the empirical evidence, the relationship between reliability and community satisfaction in this study was hypothesized:

H₂: Reliability has a positive effect on public satisfaction

Responsiveness

Responsiveness is the willingness of all elements of the organization to help and provide services quickly. This dimension emphasizes the perceptions of service users of service provider organizations relating to the provision of correct service information and the speed and readiness of employees in providing services. Several studies conducted provide empirical evidence that responsiveness has a positive effect on service user satisfaction. Agus et al. (2007) based on research on public satisfaction of users of public sector services in Malaysia stated that responsiveness has a positive effect on community satisfaction. The attitude of the employees plays an important role in increasing the satisfaction of the service user community. While Rosen and Karwan (1994) state that responsiveness has a positive effect on service user satisfaction in the fields of education, restaurants, and bookstores. Lee et al. (2000) state that responsiveness has a positive effect on the satisfaction of parking service users and investment consulting services. Based on the empirical evidence, the relationship between responsiveness and community satisfaction in this study was hypothesized:

H₃: Responsiveness has a positive effect on public satisfaction

Assurance

Assurance is knowledge and friendly attitudes as well as the ability of service provider employees to create trust and a sense of security that is also comfortable with service users in service delivery activities. This dimension emphasizes the perceptions of service users towards service provider organizations related to the belief in the capabilities of the organization's employees, the feeling of security and comfort when using services, the friendly and polite attitude shown, and the support of the organization to employees. Several studies conducted provide empirical evidence that assurance has a positive

effect on service user satisfaction. Rusherlistyani (2004) researched the level of consumer service at the office of the State Land Agency (BPN) in the Yogyakarta Province. The sample taken is the BPN service user community. The results obtained empirical evidence that assurance has a significant positive effect on community satisfaction. Stafford et al., (1998) conducted a study of customer satisfaction from four car insurance companies in America. The results obtained provide empirical evidence that assurance has a positive effect on customer satisfaction. Rosen and Karwan (1994) state that assurance has a positive effect on the satisfaction of users of educational services, hospitals, restaurants, and bookstores. Based on the empirical evidence, the relationship between assurance and community satisfaction in this study was hypothesized:

H₄: Assurance positively affects the public satisfaction

Empathy

Empathy is the caring attitude of the organization by giving individual attention to consumers. This dimension emphasizes the perception of service users on the organization of service providers concerning individual service policies, attention, and adequate handling of individual consumer needs and service delivery patiently. Some research is giving empirical evidence that empathy affects positively the satisfaction of the user of the service. O'connor and Shewchuk (1990) conducted research to test the effect of service quality on hospital patient satisfaction. The samples used were patients in two hospitals. The results have proved that empathy has a positive effect on patient satisfaction. The same result is also stated by Stafford et al. (1998) and Rusherlistyani (2004) using samples that are consumers in four car insurance companies and users of the BPN service services in Yogyakarta. Based on the empirical evidence, the relationship between the assurance and the satisfaction of the community in this study was hypothesized:

H₅: Empathy has a positive effect on community satisfaction

Service Quality and Public Satisfaction Between Region

The difference in the level of public satisfaction for the quality of service provided by the Government in each region is a phenomenon that is often encountered. This phenomenon arises in addition to the differences in strategy and policies applied because there are factors that differentiate between one region and another. Factors such as political, economic, social, demographic, and resource factors.

Swindell and Kelly (2005) researched 141 types of services including police services, fire extinguisher services, parking services, city Waste Management services, road maintenance services, and postal services. These services are Given by 17 local governments in the United States. The results of the study concluded that socio-economic and demographic factors such as income level, social status, ethnic, and residential environment. Play an important role in explaining the difference in the level of community satisfaction in a city. In the results of the research is also stated, that there is a difference in public satisfaction caused by the absence of a balance of distribution patterns in the provision of public services.

Rusherlistyani (2004) obtained empirical evidence about the quality of service perceived by the public to the services provided by the National Land Agency (BPN) in the district/municipality in the province of Yogyakarta. By comparing the quality of service and satisfaction of the users of the services of BPN between the districts/cities in Yogyakarta Province, the results of the differences in vision, mission, and problems are adjusted to the circumstances Areas resulted in differences in efforts to improve the quality of service. This has an impact on the different levels of community satisfaction in each district/city in the province of Yogyakarta. Another factor that can affect public

service quality is the large budget for Public service financing (public expenditure). Horton and Smith (1983) conducted a testing relationship between financing and service within the period of 1972-1982. The results proved that there was a positive relationship between financing and service. They stated that the decision to raise or lower financing would be very related to changes in the quality of services provided to the public. Based on the descriptions and some empirical evidence expressed, the following hypotheses are stated:

H₆: There are differences in service quality influence in each district/city in the relation between tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, and public satisfaction

RESEARCH METHOD

The type of data used in this study is primary data. Data collection using the survey method through the distribution of the questionnaire to each respondent. The process of dissemination and collection of the questionnaire is done directly with the assistance of the authorities in each of the One-Stop Integrated Service and Investment Service Institutions in each district/city. The overall sample of this study amounted to 200 respondents. The number is divided into 50 respondents for each city and district. Sampling process using a random sampling method.

Hypothesis testing in the study used multiple linear regression analysis tools and multiple linear regression with a dummy. Multiple linear regression analyses are used to test H₁, H₂, H₃, H₄, and H₅ hypotheses. Meanwhile, multiple linear regression analyses with the addition of dummy variables are used to test the H₆ hypothesis. The regression equations used are as follows:

Test the hypotheses H₁, H₂, H₃, H₄, dan H₅

$$Y = \alpha + \beta_1.X_1 + \beta_2.X_2 + \beta_3.X_3 + \beta_4.X_4 + \beta_5.X_5 + \varepsilon \dots\dots\dots(\text{Equation 1})$$

Test the hypothesis H₆

$$Y = \alpha + \beta_1.X_1 + \beta_2.X_2 + \beta_3.X_3 + \beta_4.X_4 + \beta_5.X_5 + D_0Z_0 + D_1Z_1 + D_2Z_2 + D_3Z_3 + \varepsilon \dots\dots\dots(\text{Equation 2})$$

Description:

- Y = Public Satisfaction
- X₁ = Tangibles
- X₂ = Reliability
- X₃ = Responsiveness
- X₄ = Assurance
- X₅ = Empathy
- β₁- β₅ = Regression Coefficient
- D₀- D₃ = Dummy coefficient for District/City category
- Z₀ = Dummy variable Manado City
- Z₁ = Dummy variable Bolaang Mongondow District
- Z₂ = Dummy variable Kotamobagu City
- Z₃ = Dummy variable Bitung City
- α = Constant
- ε = *Error*

RESULTS

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

Variable	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Dev
Public Satisfaction	169	2.25	5.00	3.97	0.448
Tangibles	169	2.20	4.80	3.94	0.410
Reliability	169	2.00	5.00	3.98	0.477
Responsiveness	169	2.25	4.75	3.97	0.430
Assurance	169	2.20	5.00	3.99	0.472
Empathy	169	2.17	4.83	3.99	0.442

Table 1. reports univariate statistics that include the minimum, maximum, mean, and standard deviation. The minimum value of public satisfaction, tangible, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy are 2.25, 2.20, 2.00, 2.25, 2.20, and 2.17 respectively. Meanwhile, the maximum value of public satisfaction, tangible, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy are 5.00, 4.80, 5.00, 4.75, 5.00, and 4.83 respectively.

The results at these minimum and maximum values can be used to indicate the range value. Based on the values shown in Table 4.2 It appears that range values range in numbers 2 and 3. The highest range value in the reliability variable and the lowest value of the responsiveness variable is 2.5. These results indicate that the data variability level for the responsiveness variable is the lowest and best in comparison with the other variables.

The mean values of public satisfaction, tangible, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy are 3.97, 3.94, 3.98, 3.97, 3.99, and 3.99 respectively. The mean values indicate that the spread of data for all the variables leads to the agreed answer. This is because the interval values for answers agree and strongly agree on the numbers 4 and 5. As a result, the standard deviation values of public satisfaction, tangible, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy are 0.448, 0.410, 0.477, 0.430, 0.472, and 0.442 respectively. These values indicate that the level of data spread for all variables is not too large. In other words, almost overall data are close to the mean value.

Service Quality and Public Satisfaction

Table 2. Regression Analysis Service Quality Dimension and Its Influence on Public Satisfaction

Variables	Regression Coefficient	Regression Coefficient Value	t-Test Value	Level of Significance
Constanta	α	-0,127	-0,686	0,494
Tangibles	β_1	0,241	3,725	0,000***
Reliability	β_2	0,203	2,841	0,005***
Responsiveness	β_3	0,146	2,684	0,008***
Assurance	β_4	0,145	1,975	0,050**
Empathy	β_5	0,302	4,654	0,000***
F-test Value	105,318***			

Probability	0,000
R^2	0,764
Adjusted R^2	0,756
n =	169

*** Level of significance 1%, ** Level of significance 5%,

The results in Table 2 show an F-test is 105.318 with a probability of 0.000. The F-test value is significant at a 1% level. That means that this model of linear regression of research can be used to explain the effects of independent variables, namely tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy against the dependent variable is public satisfaction.

The regression results also show an R^2 value of 0.764 and an R^2 adjusted value of 0.756. This results in the sense that some independent variables consisting of tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and Empathy can explain the changes or variations that occur dependent variables that are community satisfaction of 76.4 %. Meanwhile, 23.6% is explained by other factors outside this research model.

Table 2 (presented at the end of this article) indicates that the tangible variable generates a coefficient value of 0.241 and a t-test value of 3.725 with a level of significance of 0.000. This means that the tangible variable is positively influencing public satisfaction at a 1% level. The results supported the first hypothesis (H1).

Testing for the reliability shows the coefficient value of 0.203 and the t-test value of 2.841 with the level of significance of 0.005. This means that the reliability variable has a positive influence on public satisfaction at a 1% level. The results obtained support the second hypothesis (H2) of this research. Meanwhile, testing for the responsiveness variable generates a coefficient value of 0.146 and a T-test value of 2.684 with a significant rate of 0.008. This means that the responsiveness variable has a positive influence on the satisfaction of the community at the level of 1%. The results obtained support the third hypothesis (H3) of this research.

For the assurance variable, the test results in Table 2 present a coefficient value of 0.145 and a T-test value of 1.975 with a significant rate of 0.050. This means that the assurance variable has a positive influence on the satisfaction of the public at the level of 5%. The results support the fourth hypothesis (H4) of this research.

The final test is for the empathy variable. The test result of this variable results in a coefficient value of 0.302 and a T-test value of 4.654 with a significant rate of 0.000. This result means that Empathy variables have a significant positive influence on community satisfaction at the level of 1%. The results gained support this fifth hypothesis (H5) research.

Overall the test results showed that the 1-5 hypothesis was all supported. As for, the test results can be expressed in the following equation:

$$\text{Public Satisfaction} = -0.127 + 0.241 \text{ tangible} + 0.203 \text{ reliability} + 0.146 \text{ responsiveness} + 0.145 \text{ Assurance} + 0.302 \text{ empathy} + \epsilon$$

The next step is the comparative testing of the influence of the quality of service elements on the public satisfaction of the interregional that became the object of this research. The goal is to test the difference in service quality felt by the Interprovincial and city communities in the province of North Sulawesi. The hypothesis tested is the sixth hypothesis (H6). The proposed H6 is a difference in the quality of service in every district and city to tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, and public

satisfaction. This hypothesis test was conducted using multiple linear regression analyses by adding dummy variables. In conducting tests with dummy variables, this study should determine one area as the benchmark. The area that is used as a benchmark for comparison with other areas is the city of Manado. This means that to determine the level of public satisfaction with the quality of services provided by the One-Stop Integrated Service and Investment Service Institution in the province of North Sulawesi, every district and city in the study will be compared to Manado City.

Table 3. Regression Analysis with the Addition of Dummy Variables

Variables & Regency/City	Regression Coefficient Dummy	Regression Coefficient Value and Dummy	t-Test Value	P value
Constant	α	-0,121	-0,640	0,523
Tangibles	β_1	0,237	3,581	0,000***
Reliability	β_2	0,195	2,627	0,009***
Responsiveness	β_3	0,151	2,706	0,008***
Assurance	β_4	0,148	1,983	0,049***
Empathy	β_5	0,302	4,296	0,000***
Bolaang Mongondow	D ₁	0,040	0,778	0,438
Kotamobagu	D ₂	-0,005	-0,089	0,929
Bitung	D ₃	0,015	0,265	0,729
F test value	65,098***			
Probability	0,000			
R ²	0,765			
Adjusted R ²	0,753			
n = 169				

*** level of significance 1%, ** level of significance 5%,

The results in table 3 indicate that when added dummy variables in the test process do not result in changes in the direction of the coefficient and the level of significance between service quality variables and public satisfaction. The resulting F-test value is 65.098 with a significance level of 1% level. R² value of 0.765 or 76.5% and R² adjusted value of 0.753 or 75.3%.

DISCUSSION

Regression test results by adding dummy variables indicate that the value of the dummy coefficient of Bolaang Mongondow District (D₁) amounted to 0.040 and a T-test value of 0.778 with a significance of 0.438. These results proved that there was no significant difference in the influence of service quality that consists of tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and Empathy to the satisfaction of the public between the districts of Bolaang Mongondow and Manado City. However, the value of the coefficient of 0.040 means that the perception of the level of satisfaction in the quality of service in Bolaang Mongondow District is higher in comparison with the level of satisfaction over the quality of service in the city of Manado. Meanwhile, the test results showed that the value of dummy coefficients for Kotamobagu City (D₂) was -0.005 and the T-Test value of -0.089 with a significance of 0.929. These results proved that there is no significant difference in the influence of quality of service consisting of tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy to the public satisfaction between users of service services in the city Kotamobagu and Manado City. Meanwhile, the value of the

coefficient of -0.005 is meaning that the perception of the level of satisfaction on the quality of service in Kotamobagu is lower in its comparison with the level of satisfaction over the quality of service in the city of Manado.

The next test is the dummy of Bitung City. The test results showed that the value of dummy coefficients for the city of Bitung amounted to 0.015 and a T-test value of 0.265 with a significance of 0.729. These results indicate that there is no significant difference in the influence of service quality that consists of tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy to the public satisfaction between users of service services in the Bitung City and Manado City. All of the results of the tests show that the proposed sixth hypothesis (H6) is not supported. As a result, test results can be expressed in the following equations:

$$\text{Public Satisfaction} = -0,121 + 0,237 \text{ tangible} + 0,195 \text{ reliability} + 0,151 \text{ responsiveness} + 0,148 \text{ assurance} + 0,302 \text{ empathy} + 0,040 \text{ Bolaang Mongondow} - 0,005 \text{ Kotamobagu} + 0,015 \text{ Bitung} + \varepsilon$$

The results showed that some proposed hypotheses were supported even though some were not supported. Some supported hypotheses are perceptions of the public regarding the quality of service provided by One-Stop Integrated Service and Investment Service Institution. The perception of the judgment given by the community can be a mirror for the relevant Institution/Department in terms of improving the quality of service. The results of the test comparison of public satisfaction of the services provided by the Capital investment service and one door service showed no significant differences. This can be said that the provision of service quality provided by the capital investment office and one door service in each district and city of North Sulawesi province is not quite significant. Although there is no significant difference, the results of the research test provide evidence that the highest level of satisfaction is felt by the community in Bolaang Mongondow County. Furthermore, it is followed by Bitung City and Manado City. Meanwhile, the lowest level of satisfaction in Kotamobagu City.

CONCLUSION

This research aims to empirically examine the quality of service provided by the Regency/city government agencies in the province of North Sulawesi in the region of public satisfaction. The quality of the tested service is reviewed from 5 (five) dimensions, namely tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy. In addition, this research also tests the differences in the influence of the five dimensions of service quality on the satisfaction of people between districts/cities. The results provide empirical evidence that improved service quality with the dimensions of tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy can increase the level of public satisfaction of the services provided by the One-Stop Integrated Service and Investment Service Institution in several districts/cities in North Sulawesi Province. Furthermore, other research results show that there is no significant difference in the level of satisfaction for the quality of service provided by the One-Stop Integrated Service and Investment Service Institution between districts/cities in provincial areas North Sulawesi. However, there is no significant difference but the results of the research test provide evidence that the highest level of satisfaction felt by the public in Bolaang Mongondow regency. Furthermore, it is followed by Bitung City and Manado City. Meanwhile, the lowest level of satisfaction in Kotamobagu City.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

N/A

DECLARATION OF CONFLICTING INTERESTS

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

REFERENCES

- Agus, A., Barker, S., & Kandampully, J. (2007). An exploratory study of service quality in the Malaysian public service sector. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*, 24(2), 177-190.
- Bolton, R. N., & Drew, J. H. (1991). A longitudinal analysis of impact of service change on customer attitude. *Journal of Marketing*, 55, 1-9.
- Curry, A., & Herbert, D. (1998). Continuous improvement in public service – a way forward. *Journal of Managing Service Quality*, 8(5), 339-349.
- Donnelly, M., Wisniewski, M., Dalrymple, J., & Curry, A. (1995). Measuring service quality in local government: The Servqual approach. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 8, 15-20.
- Ghobadian, A., Speller, S., & Jones, M. (1994). Service quality: Concepts and models. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*, 11(9), 43-66.
- Hernon, P., Nitecki, D. A., & Altman, E. (1999). Service quality and customer satisfaction: An assessment and future direction. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 25(1), 9-17.
- Horton, R. D., & Smith, J. P. (1983). *Expenditure and Service*. NY: New York University Press.
- Kotler, P. (2006). *Marketing management* (12th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall International, Inc.
- Lee, H., Lee, Y., & Yoo, D. (2000). The determinant of perceived service quality and its relationship with satisfaction. *Journal of Service Marketing*, 14(3), 217-231.
- Mwita, J. I. (2000). Performance management model: A system-based approach to public service quality. *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 13(1), 19-37.
- O'Connor, S. J., & Shewchuk, R. (2003). Commentary–patient satisfaction: What is the point?. *Health Care Management Review*, 28(1), 21-24.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). Servqual: A multiple-item scale for measuring customer perception of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12-40.
- Philip, G., & Steward, J. (1999). Assessment of the service quality of a cancer information service using a new P-C-P attributes model. *Journal of Managing Service Quality*, 9(3), 167-179.
- Rosen, D. L., & Karwan, K. R. (1994). Prioritizing the dimensions of service quality: An empirical investigation and strategic assessment. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 5(4), 39-52.
- Rusherlistyani. (2004). *Analisis tingkat layanan konsumen studi empiris pada badan pertanahan nasional propinsi Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta* (Doctoral Dissertation). Universitas Gajah Mada, Yogyakarta.
- Stafford, M. R., Stafford, T. F., & Wells, B. P. (1998). Determinants of service quality and satisfaction in auto casualty claim process. *The Journal of Service Marketing*, 12(6), 426-440.
- Swindell, D., & Kelly, J. (2005). Performance measurement versus city service satisfaction: Intra-City variations in quality. *Social Science Quarterly*, 86(3).
- Tendur, S. T. E., Hutabarat, V. V., & Tumbelaka, S. S. X. (2021). Price perception, service quality and customer satisfaction (Empirical study on cafes at Tondano City). *International Journal of Tourism & Hospitality in Asia Pacific*, 4(3), 19-31.

- Zeithaml, V. A., & Bitner, M. J. (1996). *Service marketing international*. NY: McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Zen, Z., Barlow, C., & Gondowarsito, R. (2006). Oil palm in Indonesian socio-economic improvement: A review of options. *Industry Economic Journal*, 6, 18 – 29.