

Empirical Study of Public Satisfaction Based on Public Trust and Service Quality at Sekupang Police Station

Doni Permana¹⁾ & Mulyana²⁾

¹⁾Faculty of Economic, Universitas Islam Sultan Agung (UNISSULA) Semarang, Indonesia, E-mail: Donipermana@std.unissula.ac.id

²⁾Faculty of Economic, Universitas Islam Sultan Agung (UNISSULA) Semarang, Indonesia, E-mail: Mulyana@unissula.ac.id

Abstract. *This study aims to develop a model for increasing public satisfaction at the Sekupang Police by analyzing the influence of service quality and public trust on public satisfaction. The type of research used is explanatory research with a quantitative approach. The population in this study was all users of the Sekupang Police services, with 100 respondents selected using a non-probability sampling technique through the convenience sampling method. Data collection was carried out through a closed questionnaire with a Likert scale of 1–5. Data analysis used the Partial Least Square (PLS) method. The results of the study showed that: (1) service quality has a positive and significant effect on public satisfaction; (2) service quality also has a positive and significant effect on public trust; and (3) public trust has a positive and significant effect on public satisfaction. These findings reinforce the importance of increasing the professionalism of the apparatus, transparency of information, and the public service system as a strategy in building public trust and satisfaction with police services.*

Keywords: *Community; Quality; Satisfaction; Service; Trust.*

1. Introduction

The police institution is one of the main pillars in the public service system tasked with maintaining security, order, and providing legal protection for the community. As public servants, the police provide various important services that include law enforcement through criminal case investigations, arrests of criminals, and providing justice to victims. In addition, the police play a role in maintaining public security and order (Kamtibmas) through routine patrols, crowd control, and mediation of social conflicts to create a safe and orderly environment. The police serve the needs of the community such as issuing Police Record Certificates (SKCK), managing crowd permits, and making reports of lost goods. The police are

also at the forefront in handling emergencies, including responding to traffic accidents, natural disasters, and incidents that threaten public safety. In addition, the police traffic unit handles vehicle flow regulation, traffic violations, and the issuance of Driving Licenses (SIM) to ensure smooth and safe traffic. As part of preventive efforts, the police often provide education and counseling to the community regarding the dangers of drugs, cybercrime, and other relevant issues to increase public awareness.

Special protection services are also provided to vulnerable groups such as children, women, and victims of violence through special units such as the Women and Children's Service Unit (UPPA). With these various services, the police not only carry out law enforcement functions but also build public trust and provide a sense of security through a professional, transparent, and integrity-based approach. Public satisfaction is one of the main indicators in assessing the performance of public services, including in the police sector. The police have a strategic responsibility to provide a sense of security, enforce the law, and serve the community with integrity. In this context, the Sekupang Police, as a task force unit of the Republic of Indonesia Police, is faced with the demand to provide quality services that can meet the expectations of the community.

Customer satisfaction can be called a post-consumption evaluation of service quality which is a mental state that arises after encountering a service and contrasts with previously held experiences.(Hermawan et al., 2016). Community satisfaction is positively related to performance perceptions.(Sahuri, 2009). Along with managerial measures, satisfaction is also used as a standard of service performance.(Salim et al., 2018). Service satisfaction is defined as the degree of quality of the services produced by the company, where service satisfaction is developed internally, meaning that the development of service quality is determined by the company.(Rahmawati et al., 2022). Public satisfaction is also the result of public opinion and assessment of the performance of services provided to public service providers.(Herliani Putri Ratnaningsih et al., 2023). Furthermore, the quality of service provided by the police is also a key factor in determining the level of public satisfaction. Service quality is a crucial factor that determines the level of public satisfaction. Dimensions of service quality, such as reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, and tangible evidence, are benchmarks for the public in evaluating their interactions with the Polsek. Services that do not meet public expectations can have an impact on decreasing satisfaction and worsening the image of the police institution.

The success of the police institution is highly dependent on the aspect of public trust, which is the main foundation in building harmonious relations with the community. The success of the Polsek in providing services does not only depend on the technical aspects, but also on the ability to build public trust. Public trust is an important element that underlies the

relationship between the police and the community. When public trust in the police institution is high, the community tends to feel satisfied and support the various programs and policies implemented. Conversely, low public trust can hinder the effectiveness of services and create negative perceptions of the police institution. The increasing criticality of the public in supervising the implementation of public services must be anticipated by improving public service standards. Therefore, every public service organization is required to improve public service standards. Low compliance with service standards for the public results in low quality of service. Sooner or later it will erode public trust in government officials. Declining public trust is directly correlated with the hampered growth of investment (DahyarDaraba, 2021).

2. Research Methods

The type of research that used This research is an associative type of explanatory research, which aims to determine the relationship between two or more variables (Sugiyono, 2018). This study aims to explain hypothesis testing with the intention of justifying or strengthening the hypothesis with the hope that it can ultimately strengthen the theory used as a basis. In this case, it is to test the influence of service quality, public satisfaction and public trust.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Community Satisfaction

Satisfaction is the level of similarity a person has after comparing the perceived performance (results) with their expectations. (Edi Kurniawan et al., 2022). Then, public satisfaction is the result of public opinion and assessment of the service performance provided by public service providers (Decree of the Minister of PAN Number 251 of 2004).

Service is any activity that is beneficial to a group/unit, and offers satisfaction even though the results are not tied to a physical product. (Ratnaningsih et al., 2023). Furthermore, public services are everything provided by the government or collectively in order to fulfill the social welfare of the entire community. (Dwiyanto, 2008). Meanwhile, the definition of public service according to Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Service is an activity or series of activities in order to fulfill service needs in accordance with laws and regulations for every citizen and resident for goods, services, and/or administrative services provided by public service providers.

Satisfaction can be interpreted as an effort to fulfill something or make something adequate. (Dwiyanto, 2008). Public satisfaction is the main factor that must be considered by public service providers, because public satisfaction will determine the success of the

government in providing public services, the definition of public satisfaction is often equated with the definition of customer satisfaction or consumer satisfaction, this is only distinguished by who the provider is and what the motive is for providing the service (Embi & Widyasari, 2013).

Public satisfaction is a person's feeling of pleasure or disappointment resulting from comparing the performance or results felt by a product or service with expectations. (Larono, 2020). Public satisfaction is a feeling or response to a good or service that meets public expectations (Akbar & Sundoyo, 2021).

In service delivery, public satisfaction is measured by the level of satisfaction based on the overall experience with a company or agency. Public satisfaction can be used as a benchmark to assess the level of quality of service provided to the public by government agencies. (Listyanto, 2012).

The Public Satisfaction Index (PSI) is data and information about the level of public satisfaction obtained from quantitative and qualitative measurements of public opinion in obtaining services from public service providers by comparing their expectations and needs. (Sarasvananda et al., 2021). The measure of success of service delivery is determined by the level of satisfaction of service recipients. Satisfaction of service recipients is achieved when service recipients receive services according to what is needed and expected.

So it is concluded that public satisfaction is the result of public opinion and assessment of the performance of services provided to public service providers. The indicators used to measure the level of public satisfaction with the quality of service are based on the Decree of the Minister of State Apparatus Empowerment No. 14 of 2017 concerning Guidelines for the Preparation of IKM for Government Agency Service Units which consist of clarity of service requirements, simplicity of service procedures, certainty of service costs, timeliness of service and the ability of service officers (Decree of the Minister of State Apparatus Empowerment No. 14 of 2017).

Table 3.1 Estimation Results of Loading Values of Indicator Factors for Public Satisfaction Variables (Y2)

Code	Indicator	Outer loading
Y21	Clarity of service requirements	0.792
Y22	Simplicity of service procedures	0.882

Y23	Certainty of service costs	0.860
Y24	Timeliness of service	0.772
Y25	Service officer capabilities	0.909

The table above shows the magnitude of the loading factor for each indicator for the Public Satisfaction variable (Y2) is above 0.700. Based on these results, it can be stated that the Public Satisfaction variable (Y2) can be explained well or convergently can be called valid by the indicators Clarity of service requirements, Simplicity of service procedures, Certainty of service costs, Timeliness of service, and Ability of service officers.

Based on the results of the convergent validity test on each variable, it can be said that all indicators used in this research model are declared valid, so they can be used as a measure for the variables used in this study.

3.2. Public Trust

Trust is the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other party will perform certain actions that are important to the trustor.(Buck et al., 2021). Trust is a psychological state consisting of an intention to accept vulnerability based on positive expectations of another person's intentions or behavior.(Kmieciak, 2020).

Trust is key to understanding the dynamics of social relationships, as it is often seen as the glue that holds societies together (Kmieciak, 2020). Trust is the willingness of an entity (i.e., the trustor) to be vulnerable to another entity (i.e., the trustee). This suggests that trust broadly refers to a person's willingness to be vulnerable to another actor (Schilke et al., 2021).

Trust can be concluded as the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other party will perform a particular action that is important to the trustor.

The three concepts of trust outlined below generally encompass these characteristics. These are (a) fiduciary trust, which is notable for its asymmetrical relationships and attendant opportunities for malfeasance; (b) mutual trust, which develops among individuals who interact with each other repeatedly; and (c) social trust, which is embedded in institutions that we all know and take for granted (Schilke et al., 2021).

Four trust factors are Competence, transparency, public interest, honesty (Johnson, 1999). "Competence" measures respondents' assessment of whether an institution has the knowledge and skills to evaluate information accurately and take appropriate action. "Transparency" measures the perception of an institution's openness of communication. "Public interest" measures the extent to which respondents perceive an institution to act without bias when faced with conflicting social norms. "Honesty" measures the extent to which an institution is honest about risks.

Table 3.2 Estimation Results of Loading Values of Indicator Factors for Public Trust Variables (Y1)

Code	Indicator	Outer loading
Y11	<i>Competence</i>	0.917
Y12	<i>Transparency</i>	0.867
Y13	<i>Public interest</i>	0.899
Y14	<i>Honesty</i>	0.886

The data presented above shows that all indicators of the Public Trust variable (Y1) have a factor loading value above 0.700. Based on these results, it can be stated that the Public Trust variable (Y1) can be explained well or convergently can be called valid by the Competence, Transparency, Public interest, and Honesty indicators.

3.2.1. The Influence of Public Trust on Public Satisfaction

Public trust has been proven to have a positive and significant influence on public satisfaction. These results support previous research which states that trust has a strong relationship in increasing public satisfaction.(Herliani Putri Ratnaningsih et al., 2023).

The measurement of the Public Trust variable in this study is a reflection of four indicators, namely the Competence, Transparency, Public Interest, and Honesty indicators. Meanwhile, the measurement of the Public Satisfaction variable in this study is measured from the reflection of five indicators, namely the indicators Clarity of service requirements, Simplicity of service procedures, Certainty of service costs, Timeliness of service, and Ability of service personnel.

Based on the measurement results, the indicator with the highest outer model value in the public trust variable is competence, while in the public satisfaction variable, the most prominent indicator is the ability of service officers. This finding indicates that the higher the level of competence possessed by the institution or individual providing the service, the higher the ability of the officer in providing quality service. This means that public trust will increase along with the increase in skills, expertise, and knowledge possessed by service officers, because the public considers competence as an important foundation in forming satisfaction with the services received.

Meanwhile, the indicator with the lowest outer model value on the public trust variable is transparency, and on the public satisfaction variable is the timeliness of service. This shows that the level of information openness and accountability in the service process is still a weak aspect. This study shows that increasing transparency will have a positive impact on increasing the timeliness of public services. This means that when the service process is carried out openly, clearly, and accountably, the bureaucratic process becomes more efficient, the public's waiting time becomes shorter, and satisfaction with the speed of service increases.

3.3. Quality of Service

Service performance is the process of measuring and evaluating how well human resources in a company serve consumers.(Karpen et al., 2015). Consumer impressions arise when consumers interact with the company through the services provided by HR until they decide to make repeat purchases or not.(Hameed et al., 2021).

Excellent service is an action or effort carried out by a particular company or organization to provide maximum service with the aim that customers or the public can get satisfaction from the service provided.(Karpen et al., 2015). In general, the aim of excellent service is to provide services that can meet and satisfy customers so that the company can gain maximum profit.(Ratna Sari et al., 2021).

Service performance analysis is the process of identifying that a process is running according to specifications (Liu & Lin, 2019). Service performance is the process of ensuring that functional requirements in providing services to customers are met (Cusumano et al., 2008; Sharma & Patterson, 1999). Service performance can be concluded as a company's efforts to meet consumer needs as the basis for consumer assessment of purchase satisfaction.

E-service quality is a service provided to internet network consumers as an extension of a site's ability to facilitate hospital activities, purchasing and distribution effectively and efficiently.(Sihotang et al., 2022). E-Service Quality is a combination of internet-based service

quality consisting of efficiency, fulfillment, system availability, privacy (Fauzan Saputra & Antonio, 2021). Online service performance increases the likelihood that customers will feel more efficient in making transactions in terms of time and cost, as well as the availability of information.(Sihotang et al., 2022).

Parasuraman (Valarie A Zeithaml et al., 2000) developed a scale called SERVQUAL which is the most famous scale for measuring Service Quality. The SERVQUAL model represents service quality as the discrepancy between customer expectations of service offerings and customer perceptions of the service received (Altuntas & Kansu, 2020). The five dimensions of service quality are tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy(Zeithaml et al., 2002). Here are the dimensions:

1. *Tangibles*(measurable evidence), describing physical facilities, equipment, and the appearance of personnel and the presence of users.
2. *Reliability*(reliability), refers to the ability to provide the promised service accurately and dependably.
3. *Responsiveness*(responsiveness), namely the willingness to help customers and provide appropriate attention.
4. *Assurance*(assurance), is a polite and knowledgeable employee who provides a sense of trust and confidence.
5. *Empathy*(empathy), includes caring and individual attention to users.

Every employee needs to serve customers very well for the overall good service culture of the organization/institution. Therefore, individual service attitudes need to be considered for service management and innovation. The MyServEx six dimensions proposed and tested in this paper include related dimensions and TQM items. The TQM items are rewritten to fit the service setting. The MyServEx six dimensions include the following aspects: customer/self, competitor, coordination, performance, long-term, and service orientation.(Ho Voon et al., 2021).The ability of human resources in providing services to consumers can also be measured by the concept of excellent service which is based on the 3A concept, namely; attitude, attention, and action.(Karpen et al., 2012). E-Service Quality is realized by smooth transactions, the availability of appropriate system facilities and guarantees of customer data confidentiality (Fauzan Saputra & Antonio, 2021).

The government through its institutions and all its apparatus is tasked with providing and organizing services to the community. The activities carried out by government apparatus consist of various forms. In the Decree of the Minister of State Apparatus Empowerment No. 63 of 2003, public services are divided into 3 groups, namely:

1. Administrative Service Group, namely a form of service that produces various official documents needed by the community or public. For example, citizenship status, ownership, and others. These documents include KTP.

2. Goods Service Group, namely services that produce various forms/types of goods used by the public. For example, the provision of electricity, clean water, and others.

3. Service Group, namely services that produce various forms of services needed by the public. For example, education, health services, transportation services, and others.

Based on the Decree of the Minister of State Apparatus Empowerment No. 63 of 2003 concerning general guidelines for the provision of public services, service standards at least include:

1. Standardized service procedures for service providers and recipients including complaints.
2. The completion time is determined from the time of submission of the application until completion including complaints.
3. Service fees/rates including details are set out in the service provision process.
4. The service results that will be received are in accordance with the provisions that have been set.
5. Provision of adequate service facilities and infrastructure by public service providers.
6. The competence of service providers must be determined appropriately based on the knowledge, expertise, skills, attitudes and behavior required.

Service Performance Indicators are based on several existing regulations from various institutions as follows:

1. Transparency (Decree of the Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform of the Republic of Indonesia No. 58/2002). This indicator is further divided into 3 sub-indicators, namely transparency of service procedures, transparency of service requirements, and transparency of service costs.

2. Convenience (Ministerial Decree of PAN, namely Ministerial Decree of PAN No. 63/2003 and Ministerial Decree of PAN RI No. 25/2004) related to the ease of service flow. In addition, it is also included in servqual for citizen (NPS). The combined results produce 3 sub-indicators, namely ease of service flow, ease of obtaining services and ease of accessing service locations.

3. Certainty (Decree of the Minister of PAN RI and also servqual and servqual for citizens). The combined results of the three Decrees of the Minister of PAN and servqual produced 4 sub-

indicators, namely certainty of service costs, certainty of service time, timeliness of completion according to standards and certainty (clarity) of units/officers providing services.

4. Justice (Decree of the Minister of PAN No. 25/2004). In addition, it is also found in servqual for citizen (NPS). This variable is only related to one thing, namely fairness or equal treatment when receiving services.

5. Officer Professionalism. This indicator is found in three (Decree of the Minister of PAN, namely Decree of the Minister of PAN No. 58/2002, Decree of the Minister of PAN No. 63/2003 and Decree of the Minister of PAN No. 25/2004). In addition, it is also found in servqual Zeithml, et al and servqual for citizen (NPS). The combined results of servqual and the Decree of the Minister of PAN for this dimension produce 6 sub-indicators, namely officer discipline, officer responsibility, officer ability, speed of service, politeness and friendliness of officers and officer honesty (no extortion).

6. Facilities and Amenities. (Ministerial Decree of PAN, namely Ministerial Decree of PAN No. 58/2002, Ministerial Decree of PAN No. 63/2003 and Ministerial Decree of PAN No. 25/2004). In addition, it is also found in servqual from Zeithaml, et al. The combined results of servqual and the Ministerial Decree of PAN produce 3 sub-indicators, namely the availability of facilities and amenities, perceived comfort and the availability of supporting facilities.

7. Security (Ministerial Decree of PAN, namely Ministerial Decree of PAN No. 63/2003 and Ministerial Decree of PAN No. 25/2004). In addition, it is also included in servqual for citizen (NPS). The combined results produce 2 sub-indicators, namely environmental and facility security and a sense of security in service.

8. Compensation (servqual and Kepmen PAN). This indicator is only found in the measurement of public services in the United States when President Clinton was in power. This indicator is developed into 2 sub-indicators, namely the availability of compensation and perceived satisfaction.

9. Complaint Handling System. This indicator is not found in servqual. This indicator is found in the Decree of the Minister of PAN No. 63/2003. This indicator is further developed into 2 sub-indicators, namely the availability of a complaint handling system and perceived satisfaction.

Table 3.3 Estimation Results of Loading Values of Indicator Factors for Service Quality Variables (X1)

Code	Indicator	<i>Outer loading</i>
X11	Service Policy	0.790
X12	Human Resources Professionalism	0.881
X13	Infrastructure	0.846
X14	Public Service Information System	0.760
X15	Consultation and Complaints	0.855
X16	Innovation	0.804

The data presentation above shows that all indicators of the Service Quality variable (X1) have a loading factor value above 0.700. Based on these results, it can be stated that the Service Quality variable (X1) can be explained well or convergently can be called valid by the indicators of Service Policy, Human Resource Professionalism, Facilities and Infrastructure, Public Service Information Systems, Consultation and Complaints, and Innovation.

3.3.1. The Influence of Service Quality on Public Satisfaction

This study proves that service quality has a positive and significant effect on public satisfaction. This result strengthens previous findings which show that service quality has a strong relationship in increasing public satisfaction.(Herliani Putri Ratnaningsih et al., 2023).

The measurement of the variable of Service Quality in this study is a reflection of six indicators, namely the indicators of Service Policy, Human Resource Professionalism, Facilities and Infrastructure, Public Service Information System, Consultation and Complaints, and Innovation. While the measurement of the variable of Public Satisfaction in this study is measured from the reflection of five indicators, namely the indicator Clarity of service requirements, Simplicity of service procedures, Certainty of service costs, Timeliness of service, and Ability of service personnel.

The measurement results of the service quality variable show that the indicator with the highest outer model value is human resource professionalism, which indicates that this aspect is the strongest representation of respondents' perceptions of the quality of service provided. Meanwhile, in the public satisfaction variable, the indicators with the highest outer model values include quantity, timeliness, and ability of service officers. This finding indicates that the higher the level of professionalism of officers in carrying out their duties, the greater the volume of services that can be provided effectively to the public. This means that human resource professionalism not only increases work efficiency, but also contributes directly to increasing the number and quality of services felt by the public.

On the other hand, the measurement results show that the indicator with the lowest outer model value in the service quality variable is the public service information system, while in the public satisfaction variable, the lowest indicator is the timeliness of service. This shows that weaknesses in the public service information system are still an obstacle in realizing fast and timely services. Therefore, the better the public service information system that is available and implemented, the more the timeliness in delivering services to the public will increase. This means that strengthening infrastructure and information technology is an important factor in supporting public services that are more efficient, transparent, and responsive to the needs of the community.

3.3.2. The Influence of Service Quality on Public Trust

Service quality has been proven to have a positive and significant influence on public trust. These results support research showing that trust has a direct positive and significant influence on satisfaction (Kurniawan & Purwanti Alwie, 2022).

The measurement of the Service Quality variable in this study is a reflection of six indicators, namely the Service Policy indicator, Human Resource Professionalism, Facilities and Infrastructure, Public Service Information System, Consultation and Complaints, and Innovation. While the measurement of the Public Trust variable in this study is a reflection of four indicators, namely the Competence, Transparency, Public interest, and Honesty indicators.

The results of the analysis of the service quality variable show that the indicator with the highest contribution is human resource professionalism. Meanwhile, in the public trust variable, the indicator with the highest value is competence. This finding indicates that increasing professionalism in the apparatus or public service officers directly contributes to increasing public perception of institutional competence. This means that when human resources are able to demonstrate a professional attitude, work reliably, and demonstrate

high work ethics, the public will increasingly believe that the institution has the capacity and expertise to carry out its functions effectively.

On the other hand, the measurement results also revealed that the indicator with the lowest value on the service quality variable is the public service information system, and on the public trust variable is transparency. This reflects that improving the quality of information systems, such as accessibility, clarity of procedures, and openness of public information, has great potential in encouraging increased transparency of institutions in the eyes of the public. This means that the more optimal the public service information system is run with the support of easily accessible and informative information technology, the greater the public's perception of transparency or openness of institutions in providing services.

4. Conclusion

This study proves that service quality has a positive and significant effect on public satisfaction. Service quality is proven to have a positive and significant effect on public trust. Public trust is proven to have a positive and significant effect on public satisfaction.

5. References

Journals:

- Alfaruki, D., Apep Mustofa, M., Faroji, R., & Hidayatullah, S. (2023). Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan Terhadap Kepercayaan Muzakki dengan Kepuasan Sebagai Intervening Variabel. In *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Profetik* (Vol. 1, Issue 1).
- Alghfeli, A. H., Khalifa, G. S. A., Alareefi, N. A., Alkathiri, M. S., Alsaadi, T. A., & Alneadi, K. M. (2020). *The influence of Service Quality and Trust in Consultant on PMC performance in Public Sector* (Vol. 2, Issue 2).
- Altuntas, S., & Kansu, S. (2020). An innovative and integrated approach based on SERVQUAL, QFD and FMEA for service quality improvement: A case study. *Kybernetes*, 49(10), 2419–2453. <https://doi.org/10.1108/K-04-2019-0269>
- Buck, C., Olenberger, C., Schweizer, A., Völter, F., & Eymann, T. (2021). Never trust, always verify: A multivocal literature review on current knowledge and research gaps of zero-trust. *Computers and Security*, 110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cose.2021.102436>
- Cusumano, M. A., Kahl, S. j., & Suarez, F. F. (2008). Services, industry evolution, and the copetitive strategies of product firms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(2), 315–334. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj>

- Edi Kurniawan, Zulkarnain, & Purwanti Alwie, A. (2022). Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan Elektronik (E-Servqual) Terhadap Kepercayaan dan Kepuasan Masyarakat Pada Media. *Jurnal Daya Saing*, 8(3), 350–359.
- Ho Voon, B., C Voon, J. E., & Kiat Teo, A. (2021). Individual Service Excellence for Better Performance: Evidences from MUET Students. *Journal of Creative Practices in Language Learning and Teaching (CPLT)*, 9(2), 126–139.
- Johnson, B. B. (1999). Exploring dimensionality in the origins of hazard-related trust. *Journal of Risk Research*, 2(4), 325–354. <https://doi.org/10.1080/136698799376763>
- Karpen, I. O., Bove, L. L., & Lukas, B. A. (2012). Linking Service-Dominant Logic and Strategic Business Practice: A Conceptual Model of a Service-Dominant Orientation. In *Journal of Service Research* (Vol. 15, Issue 1, p. 21–38). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670511425697>
- Karpen, I. O., Bove, L. L., Lukas, B. A., & Zyphur, M. J. (2015). Service-dominant orientation: Measurement and impact on performance outcomes. *Journal of Retailing*, 91(1), 89–108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2014.10.002>
- Kasinem. (2020). Pengaruh Kepercayaan dan Kualitas Pelayanan Terhadap Kepuasan Konsumen Pada Hotel Bukit Serelo Lahat. *Jurnal Media Wahana Ekonomika*, 17(4), 329–340.
- Kmieciak, R. (2020b). Trust, knowledge sharing, and innovative work behavior: empirical evidence from Poland. *European Journal of Innovation Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-04-2020-0134>
- Kurniawan, E., & Purwanti Alwie, A. (2022). Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan Elektronik (E-Servqual) Terhadap Kepercayaan dan Kepuasan Masyarakat Pada Media. *Jurnal Daya Saing*, 8(3), 350–359.
- Ratna Sari, D., Kartikasari, D., & Herya Ulfah, N. (2021). Impact of Effective Communication on the Quality of Excellent Service and Patient Satisfaction in the Outpatient Department. *KnE Life Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kls.v0i0.8883>
- Salim, M., Bachri, S., & Febliansa, M. R. (2018). Customer Satisfaction (Public Satisfaction) on Services in Administrative Village Office. *Asia Pacific Management and Business Application*, 007(01), 17–30. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.apmba.2018.007.01.2>
- Sany Ayu Citra, B., Setiono, B., Haposan Pangaribuan, C., & Francisca Lies Ambarwati, M. (2021). The Influence of Service Quality on Public Satisfaction and Public Trust: A Study on Jakarta Public Health Services during COVID-19 Pandemic. In *Management, and Social Studies* (Vol. 1, Issue 1).

Valarie A Zeithaml, A Parasuraman, & Leonard L Berry. (2000). Measuring the quality of relationship in customer service: An empirical study. . *Journal of Marketing* .

Zeithaml, V. A., Parasuraman, A., & Malhotra, A. (2002). Service quality delivery through web sites: A critical review of extant knowledge. In *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* (Vol. 30, Issue 4, p. 362–375). <https://doi.org/10.1177/009207002236911>

Books:

Dwiyanto, A. (2008). *Mewujudkan Good Governance melalui Pelayanan Publik*. Gadjah Mada University Press.

Ghozali. (2018). *Metode penelitian*. 35–47.

Hair, J. F. (1995). *MultiVariate Data Analysis*. Jakarta:Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Sahuri, C. (2009). *Membangun Kepercayaan Publik melalui Pelayanan Publik yang Berkualitas*.

Sugiyono. (2018). *Metode Penelitian*, 22–34.