Service Quality, Public Satisfaction in the District Beji, Depok City, West Java Indonesia

Bando Amin C. Kader[1]

[1]*Lecturer University Dehasen Bengkulu Indonesia. E-mail: baminc01@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research is to determine and analyze the quality of service to the satisfaction of the people in the District of Beji, Depok, West Java, Indonesia. Public Satisfaction priority in the services provided, from research conducted found that the high level of service quality and satisfaction of the public, the difference in quality of service from the aspect of hope and the reality experienced by respondents, there is a relationship of service quality to the satisfaction of the public, the dominant factor service quality affect public satisfaction of the results of this study concluded that the quality of services provided can improve the satisfaction of the public. A quality service into the expectations of public is as to meet every need of public.

Keyword: Quality, Service, Public Satisfaction.

1. INTRODUCTION

Service quality is a priority in any institution or organization. The service provided the image or the benchmark of capabilities, performance of an institution or organization. According to Selnes (1993) image can be strengthened when the consumers get high quality services and it will decrease if consumers get lower quality. Beji District Office is a government agency in the depok city that public service to the community. The government as a provider of public services is needed by the public responsibility and continually strives to provide the best service for the improvement of public services. State and government systems become the foundation and citizens of the service in obtaining guarantees of their rights therefore service quality improvement (quality of services) will be important (Zauhar, 2001, Prasojo, Pradana and Hiqmah, 2006).

The public service is very important because it is always associating with the greater community or the general public who have a diversity of interests and goals. Empirically, the positive service and quality will create satisfaction to society, Thoha (1998) revealed the public service is one indicator of quality assessment of public administration in performing its duties and functions. The public administration or the government was seen how far the public service in accordance with the demands, needs and expectations of society.

In the provision of services, public service organizations have not been able to provide fast service, high quality, and equally to the citizens who receive these services (Effendi, 1985). The low service could provide the complexity of administration and regulations, making it difficult for the public in obtaining optimum service. Ritonga, (1999) says that if people need something prepared by the relevant agencies to deal with convoluted bureaucracy and services that uncertain time. This is one indicator of the low quality of service in government agencies, the community is reluctant in taking care of any document when dealing with government agencies.

Afrial (2009) in his research said that although districts have been legally and officially shifted to local government institutions, the quality of public service performance index still not optimal. This is indicated by index lower performance and importance index to the respondents, in other words there is a gap between respondents' perceptions and expectations of toward on the public services quality.

Saleh (2004), the failure of public services, are : 1) the lack of free management, as well as the excessive political interference in the management of public services. 2) a dual role in the public service between commercial and social objectives. 3) The executive power is an incompetent and unprofessional in service delivery.

Public service is the most important element in improving the quality of social life in any society (Saragih, 2006). Fulfillment of customer expectations is the task of the agency in providing the best products in the service from. That service quality is the ratio between the reality of the care it received by the expectation of service you wish to receive (Brady and Conin, 2001). The public service will effective if the community as customers get service easly the with short procedures, rapid, precise and satisfactory. Excellent service quality reflected in the principles of public service based on the Ministry of Administrative Reform Number (PAN Decree) 63 in 2003, namely: Transparency, accountability, conditional, participatory, equal rights, as well as the balance of rights and obligations.

The philosophy of public service puts people as subjects in governance (Rachmadi, 2008). Satisfaction of the people is important for the service provider to determine the quality of public services. Hoffman and Beteson (1997), said without customers, the service firm doses not has a reason to exist. According Mowen (1995) is defined as the overall attitudes regarding goods or services after its acquisition and uses.

Service is the best served at any time, quickly and satisfactorily, polite, friendly and helpful, as well as professional (Rachmadi 2008). Zeithaml and Bitner (2000), states that customer satisfaction is influenced by the quality of service, product quality, price, situational factors and personal factors customers.

Customer satisfaction defined as an effective response to the experience of doing specific consumption or an evaluation of the suitability or unsuitability perceived between prior expectations and actual performance of the product after use (Oliver on Birgelen, Ruyter and Wetzels, 2000). According to Selnes (1993) there are three levels of community satisfaction,these are the level of overall satisfaction (overall satisfaction), the suitability of service to community expectations and the level of satisfaction of the people for a relationship with the agency (experience).

Fornell et. al. (1996) stated that high customer satisfaction will perceived the value beyond customer expectations. Customer satisfaction will be achieved when the expectations correspond was reality taken. according to Yi (1990), there are two factors of customer satisfaction, namely. The expectations and experience perceived factors. An increasing service quality can give satisfaction to the public, in an effort to achieve satisfaction of the people, the government agencies are required to improve the quality of public service duties and obligations as a government agency. The purpose of this research is to determine and analyze the quality of service in order to public satisfaction, the special purpose in this study are 1) to know the level of quality of service and satisfaction of the people; 2) comparison of the quality of service from the aspect of hope and the reality experienced by the respondents; 3) the relationship of service quality to people's satisfaction; 4) The dominant factor was affecting the service quality of people's satisfaction.

2. RESEARCH METHODS

The method used in this research is a quantitative method. Sugiyono (2012) said that quantitative research method can be interpreted as a method of research that is based on the philosophy of positivism it, is used to examine the population or a particular sample. Quantitative methods in this research are using descriptive and inferential analysis.

The population in this study is a society that the service users at the district office Beji Depok City, who is a citizen of the local society at the district office Beji Depok City. The sampling technique used in this study is random sampling techniques. The sample used in the study sample amounted to 220 people, this is in accordance with the opinion of Arikunto (2008) which says the study population is the determination of sample, if it less than 100, it will better taken all. If it have large number of subject, it can be can be taken between 10-15% or 20-25% or more depending on: 1). The ability of researchers views of time, energy and funds 2). Narrow the vast area of observations from each subject, because it involves a lot of lack of funds. 3). The size of the risk borne by researchers for researchers is risky, of course if sample of the results will be better. Data are collected by questionnaire. Questionnaire is a technique of data collection it is done by giving a set of questions or a written statement to the respondent to answer Sugiyono (2008).

Data collection in this study the analyzed by used descriptive and inferential analysis with Pearson correlation, multiple regression, and t test analysis. Interpretation of descriptive analysis as expressed by Nunally (1978), namely: Mean score 1:01 to 2:00 (low); 2.01- 3.00 (a simple, low); 3:01 to 4:00 (simple high); 4:01 to 5:00 (high). The aim of correlation is detecting study the extent of variations on a factor that related to variations in one or more other factors based on the correlation coefficient (Suryabrata, 1992). According to Cohen (1988), correlation values between +0.1 to +0.29 showed little relationship, the value of + 0.30 to + 0.49 is simple, while +0.50 to +1 indicates a great relationship. Multiple linear regression analysis is used to analyze the influence of several independent variables (X) to the dependent variable (Y) together.

Before being research, testing instrument isused by measurement instrument. Measurement of this instrument is used validity and reliability, validity test performed with SPSS item by looking at the correlation between each item with the total score based on the total correlation greater than or equal to 0.41 (Santoso, 2000). this study using SPSS, where a construct or a variable value will be reliable if the Cronbach Alpha (α) > 0.6 (Nunnally, 1967; Ghozali, 2001).

The instrument used was changed and adapted to the research, instrument service quality by Zeithaml, Berry and Parasuraman (1985), which identifies five dimensions of quality, namely: 1) direct evidence (tangibles), including physical facilities, equipment, personnel and means of communication. 2) Reliability

(reliability), the ability to provide the promised services promptly and satisfactorily. 3) Responsiveness (responsiveness), namely the desire of the staff to help customers and provide service with a response. 4) Security (assurance), including the ability, courtesy, and trustworthiness owned by the staff; free from danger, risk or hesitation. 5) Empathy (emphty), including ease in the relationship, good communication, and understanding the needs of its customers.

According to selnes (1993), the research instrument of comunity satisfaction includes three levels, namely: namely the level of overall satisfaction (overall satisfaction), the suitability of service to community expectations (expectation), and the level of satisfaction of the people for a relationship with the agency (experience).

3. RESEARCH RESULT

3.1. Determine the Level of Service Quality and Public Satisfaction

To determine the level of service quality and Public Satisfaction in this research uses descriptive analysis. The results of descriptive analysis can be seen in table 1.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics Service Quality and Public Satisfaction

No	Variable	Dimention	Mean	Standar Deviation	Interpretation
1	Service Quality	Tangibles	20.10	3.674	High
		Reliability	19.46	3.775	
		Responsiveness	18.75	4.101	
		Assurance	19.58	4.086	
		Empathy	19.23	4.507	
2	Public Satisfaction	Overall satisfaction	33.36	6.407	High
		Expectation	33.14	5.985	
		Experience	33.48	6.314	

From Table 1 it can be seen that the quality of service and community satisfaction levels have high value, it has been seen from the dimensions of the two variables. Tangibles dimension values (mean = 20.10, SD = 3.674), the dimension of reliability values (mean = 19.46, SD = 3.775), the dimensions of responsiveness has a value (mean = 18.75, SD = 4.101), the assurance dimension values (mean = 19.58, SD = 4.086), the dimension empathy values (mean = 19.23, SD = 4.507), the data showed the whole dimension of the service quality has a high value.

The overall of satisfaction dimension values (mean = 33.36, SD = 6.407), the dimension of expectation values (mean = 33.14, SD = 5.985), the dimensions of experience has a value (mean = 33.48, SD = 63.14). The data showed that the whole dimension of people's satisfaction has a high value.

Through the analysis of description can be seen that the quality of service and satisfaction of the people according to the respondents is very good, the quality of service provide to the community government agencies has improved, so that people have the satisfaction. The services provided to the community institutions have a high quality this also shows the community has acknowledged the services provided by government agencies it has been very good and qualified.

3.2. Comparison of Quality of Service based on Expectations and Reality Aspects Suffered Respondents

To compare the quality of service from the aspect of hope and reality uses the t test analysis. Quality of services provided government agencies viewed from the aspect of hope and the reality experienced by the respondents can be seen from Table 2.

Table 2
T Test analysis of quality service based on From Expectations
and Reality Aspects views of respondents

| Variable | Views of Respondents | | | | T Value | Sig. |
| | Hope | | Reality | | | |
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D		
Service quality	99.50	9.791	96.26	15.156	2.668	.008
Tangibles	20.82	3.349	20.10	3.674	2.143	.033
Reliability	19.52	3.632	19.46	3.775	.167	.867
Responsiveness	19.96	3.958	18.75	4.101	3.147	.002
Assurance	18.80	4.066	19.58	4.086	-2.024	.044
Empathy	20.40	3.841	19.23	4.507	2.937	.003

From Table 2, it can be seen that the value of the service quality variable on tangible dimension (t = 2.143; Sig = 0.033) is lower than the sig. 0.05, it is known that there are differences in quality of service according to the respondents through the desired expectations with the reality of the matter the average overall dimensions value of tangibles to expectations (mean = 20.82, SD = 3.349), the value of tangibles dimension to reality (mean = 20.10, SD = 3.674), it is proved that the average value of tangibles dimension expectations are higher than the average value of tangibles reality.

Reliability dimension has a value (t = 0.167; Sig = 0.867), it is higher than sig. 0.05, it is known that there is no any difference in quality of service according to the respondents through the desired expectations with the reality of the matter, the value of the average overall reliability dimension to expectations (mean = 19.52, SD = 3.632), the value of reliability dimension to reality (mean = 19.46, SD = 3.775), it is proved that the average value of dimensional reliability expectations are higher than the average value of tangibles reality.

Dimensions responsiveness has a value (t = 3.147; Sig = 0.002), it is lower than sig. 0.05, it is known that there are differences in quality of service according to the respondents through the desired expectations with the reality of the matter, the value of the average overall dimensions of responsiveness to the expectations (mean = 19.96, SD = 3.958), the dimensions of responsiveness to reality (mean = 18.75, SD = 4.101), it is shown that the value of the average dimensions of responsiveness expectations are higher than the average value of responsiveness reality.

Assurance dimension value (t = -2.024; Sig = 0.044), is lower than the sig. 0.05, it is known that there are differences in quality of service according to the respondents through the desired expectations with the reality of the matter, the value of the average overall dimension of assurance for the expectation (mean = 18.80, SD = 4.066), the value of the assurance dimension to reality (mean = 19.58, SD = 4.086), it is shown that the average value of the assurance dimension expectancy lower than the average value assurance reality.

Dimensions empathy value (t = 2.937; Sig. = 0.003), is lower than the sig. 0.05, it is known that there are differences in quality of service according to the respondents through the desired expectations with the reality of the matter, value of the average overall dimensions empathy to expectations (mean = 20.40, SD = 3.841), the value of dimension empathy to reality (mean = 19.23, SD = 4.507), it is proved that the average value dimension empathy expectations are higher than the average value empathy reality.

From these results it can be seen that there is a difference between expectations and reality on the quality of service perceived by the respondents, the quality of service perceived and received by the respondents is lower than expectations of a chill, although the reliability dimension shows different things, so that there is not any difference between expectations and the fact on the respondents perceived.

3.3. The relationship between of Service Quality and Public Satisfaction

To determine the relationship of service quality toward people's satisfaction in uses Pearson correlation analysis. The analysis relation of service quality and people's satisfaction can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3
Relationship Between Service Quality and Public Satisfaction

Service Quality / Public Satisfaction	Overall satisfaction	Expectation	Experience	Public Satisfaction
Tangibles	.065	.130	.062	.114
Reliability	.090	.085	.115	.131
Responsiveness	.233**	.225**	.244**	.315**
Assurance	.215**	.074	.163*	.205**
Empathy	.326**	.317**	.479**	.504**
Service Quality	.320**	.284**	.370**	.438**

*significant at the level of P <0.05
** significant at the level of P <0.01

From Table 3 above can be seen that the service quality toward the people's satisfaction have a simple relationship with the correlation value (r = 0.438). Relations between the two variables can be seen on the relationship between each dimension. Dimensions of responsiveness have a relationship with overall satisfaction (r = 0.233), and dimensions of expectation (r = 0.225), dimension of experience (r = 0.244), the dimensions of the public satisfaction (r = 0.315).

Dimensions assurance have a relationship with overall dimensions of satisfaction (r = 0.215), dimension of experience (r = 0.163), the dimension of public satisfaction (r = 0.205). Dimensions empathy have a relationship with overall dimensions of satisfaction (r = 0.326), dimensions of expectation (r = 0.317), dimension of experience (r = 0.479) and dimensions the public satisfaction (r = 0.504), and for variable quality of service has a relationship with overall dimension of satisfaction (r = 0.320), the expectation (r = 0.284), dimension of experience (r = 0.370), and has a relationship with the public satisfaction (r = 0.438).

From these results it can be seen that the quality of service has a simple relation to public satisfaction, it is also indicated by the dimensions of responsiveness, assurance and empathy, a great relationship only indicated by the dimensions empathy to the public satisfaction, and the other dimensions has a weak relationship.

3.4. The Dominant Factor Affecting Service Quality and Public Satisfaction Variable

To analyze the dominant factor affecting the quality of service, and public satisfaction in this study uses stepwise multiple regression analysis. To analyze the multivariate regression used stepwise method, which performed by a correlation analysis as table 4.

Table 4
Correlation between Quality of Service and Public Satisfaction

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.504a	.254	.250	12.042
2	.537b	.288	.282	11.789

a. *Predictors:* (Constant), Empathy

b. *Predictors:* (Constant), Empathy, Responsiveness

From Table 4 it is found that the correlation value of variable quality of service through the dimension empathy is 0.504, with correlation value of determination 0.254, this means that approximately 25.4% factor of public satisfaction can be explained by the dimensions empathy, value the correlation value of responsiveness dimension is 0.537 with correlation of determination is 0.288, it shows that 28.8%, factors of the affecting the service quality can be explained by the dimensions empathy and responsiveness, this suggests that the improvement of public satisfaction could be done by repairing and improving the service quality base on the dimension of empathy and responsiveness, while the tray will be explained by other variables. Multiple regression calculation of variable data used stepwise method, can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5
Multivariate Regression Using Stepwise Method

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	70.073	3.566		19.653	.000
	Empathy	1.555	.181	.504	8.613	.000
2	(Constant)	60.946	4.491		13.570	.000
	Empathy	1.394	.184	.452	7.591	.000
	Responsivenes	.652	.202	.192	3.230	.001

a. *Dependent Variable:* public satisfaction

From Table 5 above can be seen that the calculation of multivariate regression using stepwise on the first model 1.555 to the dimensions empathy with a constant value 70.073, the second model 1.394 to the dimensions empathy, and 0652 for the dimensions of responsiveness to the constant value of 60.946, the average multivariate regression these variables can be described by the regression equation $\hat{Y} = 60.946 + 1.394X_5 + 0.652X_3$. Before going to the purposes of divination, this regression equation regression testing should be performed by interests. To determine the degree of interest of a multiple regression equation, F test and the results are presented in Table 6 as follows:

Table 6
Variant Analysis of Multiple Linear Regression Ŷ = 60.946 + 1.394X₅ + 0.652X₃

	Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Regression	10757.253	1	10757.253	74.189	.000a
1	Residual	31609.633	218	144.998		
	Total	42366.886	219			
	Regression	12207.286	2	6103.643	43.916	.000b
2	Residual	30159.600	217	138.984		
	Total	42366.886	219			

a. Predictors: (Constant), empathy

b. Predictors: (Constant), empathy, Responsiveness

c. Dependent Variable: public satisfaction

Based on the analysis of variance regression in Table 6 above is known that the first model with dimensions X_5 (empathy) value of count 74.189 and sig = 0.000, the second model with dimensions X_5 (empathy) and X_3 (responsiveness) value of count 43.916 and sig = 0.000, it can be concluded that regression $\hat{Y} = 60.946 + 1.394X + 0.652X$, is very significant. These findings prove that the dominant factor of affecting the public quality service that are satisfaction of empathy and responsiveness, the refinement and improvement of public satisfaction can be carried out jointly between the dimensions empathy and responsiveness.

4. DISCUSSION

The results showed that the increasing of community satisfaction can be done to improve the quality of services provided, quality of service and satisfaction of the people, it means that a high current condition is going to be in good shape, people as customers in government agencies, especially at the District Office Beji, Depok City, requires excellent service quality that related to all existing service activity at the district office.

This study is consistent with a study conducted by Auh (2005) found that the quality of the relationship between a service provider with customers (soft) affects the quality of superior performance (hard). While McDougal (2000) warned that the service quality is still not good, it will have an impact on the level of satisfaction. Thus it can be said that satisfaction is received in good condition indicates the quality of service is in good shape anyway.

Based on the results of the research, it is found that which there is difference between expectations and reality on the quality of service perceived by the respondents, as the people in the District Office Beji, Depok City, the public has a different quality of service expected by fact or accepted. The public have high expectations on the quality of services, when its compared with the reality of the matter. Kotler (1997) said that the level of satisfaction is a function of the difference between the perceived performances with expectations. Juran (1998) stated that customer satisfaction will be seen if the quality of service rendered to meet customer needs.

This research also found that the quality of service has a simple relation to the people satisfaction, which is visible from service quality dimensions, namely; responsiveness, assurance, empathy, to the satisfaction of the people as well as the dimension tangibles, and reliability it has little relationship to the satisfaction of the people. Based on the results of this study it can be said that the dimensions of responsiveness, assurance, empathy, are the effecting factor of the affects the community satisfaction. Repairing and improvement of service quality and improvements focused on improving responsiveness, assurance, empathy on service quality, the overall of people satisfaction will be enhanced by the quality and service excellence from a government agency.

According to academics, customer satisfaction is a construct that stands alone and have influenced by the quality of service (Oliver, 1980). Fullerton and Taylor (2002) also proved that there is a close relationship between the quality of service and satisfaction. There is Affects of service quality toward public satisfaction, public will not get satisfaction when the services are not qualified. It is as expressed by Kotler and Armstrong (1996) quality products and services have an important role to establish customer satisfaction.

Dimensions empathy and responsiveness become a dominant factor in affecting people's satisfaction, the community is hoping for a high quality of empathy and responsiveness, this could be caused by empathy, the activities related to the ease in the relationship, good communication, and understanding of customers need, as well as responsiveness associated with the desire of the staff to help and provide service to customer with a response, it relates directly to the public in the activities of the services provided. Their human resources in Beji district office with high performance are capable to handling any community service activity causing contentment in the community as service users District office. Kashmir (2006) said that the main factor that affecting the service is human resources. The role of man (employee) who service the community is a major factor because only human customers can communicate directly and openly. This study was supported by research studies of Atmawa and Wahyuddin (2004), which shows that independent variables consist of physical evidence, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy and a positive are significant impact on customer satisfaction.

5. CONCLUSION

Getting satisfaction in using the services rendered is one indicator in assessing the performance of an organization, including government agencies, Beji district office is one of the government offices that serve the society needs. Today, the public's service provide is in good condition, people have satisfaction in receiving services from the district office. Beji District Office as required governmental institution in providing quality service, so that the requiring improvement and development in a culture of performance and internal environment District office is obtaining a higher quality of service. The provision of a quality service is a priority and always be done as a form of professionalism in their work and produce a quality performance as well. Their professionalism and high performance the district office can improve the quality of service provided to the community as the customers.

Satisfaction of the people are affected by the level of quality of services provided, the District Office Beji, as a government agency in charge of providing public services is always required working optimally to serve the community. The maximum service is a right for all the people. The government is obliged to provide services as a form of public service, and be able to improve the quality of public service, it takes a variety of appropriate measures to overcome the obstacles a quality service, one of the efforts in overcoming various obstacles quality service can be performed by improving service system, as well as the professionalism of employees, as well as the establishment of policies required treatment with both leaders.

References

Afrial R.J., (2009) Quality Public Services Sub-district after the Change Position and function as the Head of the Region. *Business & Bureaucracy, Administration and Organization Science Journal, May-August 2009, 87-95*

Arikunto, S. (2008). *Research Procedure A Practice Approach.* Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Atmawati, Rustika dan M. Wahyuddin. (2004). *Influence Analysis Service Quality Customer Satisfaction At Matahari Department Store in Solo Grand Mall. Surakarta: Surakarta Muhammadiyah University Graduate Program.*

Auh, Seingyoung. (2005), The Effects Of Soft And Hard Service Attributes On Loyalty: The Nediating Role Of Trust, *Journal of services Marketting,* 19, 2, 81-92.

Birgelen, Marcel van, Ko de Ruyter dan Martin Wetzels (2000) The Impact of Incomplete Information on the Use of Marketing Research Intelligence in International Service Settings. *Journal of Service Research,* Vol. 2, No. 4.

Brady, Michael K. Brady and J. Joseph Cronin Jr. (2001). Some New Thoughts on Conceptualizing Perceived Service Qual ity: A Hierarchical Approach. *Journal of Marketing,* Vol. 65, No. 3 (July).

Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

Effendi, Onong Uchjana (1985). *Science Communication Theory and Practice.* Bandung : Remaja Rosdakarya.

Fornell, Claes, Michael D. Johnson, Eugene W. Anderson, Jaesung Cha, and Barbara Everitt Bryant (1996), The American Customer Satisfaction Index: Nature, Purpose, and Findings. *Journal of Marketing,* 60 (October), 7-18.

Fullerton, G., & Taylor, S. (2002). Mediating, Interactive, and Non-Linear Effects in Service Quality and Satisfaction with Services Research. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 19.

Ghozali, Imam, (2001), *Applications Multivariate Analysis With SPSS Program.* Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

Hoffman, K. Douglas, dan John E.G. Bateson. (1997). *Essentials of ServiceMarketing.* Florida: The Dryden Press.

Juran, J. M., dan Godfrey, A. B., (1998), *Juran's Quality Handbook.,* Amerika Serikat: McGraw-Hill,

Kasmir. (2006). *Banking Management,* Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.

Kotler P. & Amstrong, G. (1996). *Fundamentals of Marketing. volume 1.* Alih Bahasa Alexander Sindoro dan Benyamin Molan. Jakarta: Prenhalindo.

Kotler, P. (1997). *Marketing management: analysis, planning, implementation, and control. (9th ed.).* New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

McDougall Gordon H.G, Terrence Levesque, (2000) "Customer satisfaction with services: putting perceived value into the equation", *Journal of Services Marketing,* Vol. 14 Iss: 5, pp.392 - 410

Minister for Administrative Reform Decree No. 63 /KEP/M.PAN/7/2003 on General Guidelines for Public Services.

Mowen, J. C. (1995), *Consumer Behavior 4th edition.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Oliver, R.L. (1980). A Cognitive Model of The Antecedents and Consequences of Satisfaction Decisions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17.

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A., & Berry, L.L. (1985). A Conceptual Model of Service Quality and Its Implications for Future Research. *The Journal of Marketing,* 49.

Prasojo Eko, Perdana Aditya dan Hiqmah Nor., (2006). *Performance Public Service, Public Perception to Performance, Engagement and Public Participation in the Ministry of Education, Health and Population.*Jakarta: YAPPIKA.

Rachmadi, (2008). Influence of Service Quality Satisfaction Inpatient Hospital Class III In Karimun, *Thesis*. Jakarta: Graduate - Open University Public Administration

Saleh, Syafiuddin. (2004). The recent Public Service and Service Improvement Efforts And Employee Morale / public official. *Philosophy of Science* / PPS 702

Santoso, S. (2000). *Exercise Book SPSS Statistics Parametric.* Jakarta: PT Elek Media. Komputindo.

Saragih, Ferdinand D. (2006). M Prima creates Public Services Through Practical Benchmarking Method. *Journal of Administrative Sciences and Organizations, Business & Bureaucracy,* vol.14, No.3 (September)

Selnes, Fred. (1993) An Examination of the Effect of Product Performance on Brand Reputation, Satisfaction and Loyalty. *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 27 Iss: 9, pp.19 - 35

Sugiyono, (2008). *Qualitative and Quantitative Research Methods R & D.* Bandung: Alfabeta

Sugiyono. (2012). *Business Research Methods.* Bandung: Alfabeta.

Suryabrata, S. (1992). *Research Methodology.* Jakarta: CV. Rajawali.

Thoha Miftah. (1998). *Organizational behavior.* Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.

Yi, Y., (1990). A Critical Review of Customer Satisfaction, in Zeithaml V. A (Ed), Review of Marketing, *American Marketing Association.* Chicago IL,p.68-123.

Zauhar, Soesilo, (2001). *Public Services Administration, an early conversations: Balancing Customer Perception and Expectations.* New York: The Free Press.

Zeithaml, Valarie A and Mary Jo Bitner. (2000). *Service Marketing.* Singapore: Mc Graw-Hill Companies Inc.