

Research Horizon

ISSN: 2808-0696 (p), 2807-9531 (e)

Research Horizon

Volume: 05

Issue: 06

Year: 2025

Page: 2665-2674

Citation:

Kurnia, A. R., Abdulloh, Sholeh, S., & Ruslan, U. (2025). Evaluation of integrity zones in public services at the Faculty of Law, Universitas Singaperbangsa Karawang. *Research Horizon*, 5(6), 2665-2674

Article History:

Received: September 29, 2025

Revised: November 23, 2025

Accepted: December 29, 2025

Online since: December 31, 2025

Evaluation of Integrity Zones in Public Services at the Faculty of Law, Universitas Singaperbangsa Karawang

Asep Rahmat Kurnia^{1*}, Abdulloh¹, Slamet Sholeh¹, Undang Ruslan¹

¹ Universitas Singaperbangsa Karawang, Telukjambe, Indonesia

* Corresponding author: Asep Rahmat Kurnia (asepunsika33@gmail.com)

Abstract

The development of an integrity zone in higher education institutions is a national effort to create clean, accountable, and high-quality public services. This study evaluates the quality of public services at the Faculty of Law, Universitas Singaperbangsa Karawang, in the context of ongoing integrity zone implementation. A quantitative survey approach using the service quality model was employed a questionnaire covering five dimensions: reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, and tangibles. The research respondents consisted of three groups of service users, namely educational staff, lecturers, and students, who were selected using proportional random sampling techniques. Data were collected online and analyzed descriptively. The results show that service quality is in the good category with average scores of 2.64 (educational staff), 2.71 (lecturers), and 3.25 (students). Reliability and assurance received the highest ratings across all groups, while empathy (among staff) and tangibles (among students) scored the lowest. Students were the most satisfied group, whereas educational staff were the most critical. The study concludes that the integrity zone initiative has been moderately effective, but further improvement in interpersonal communication, response speed, and digital-physical facilities is still required to achieve excellent service standards.

Keywords

Bureaucratic Reform, Good Governance, Higher Education, Integrity Zone, Public Service, SERVQUAL.

1. Introduction

Higher education institutions have a strategic role in producing competent and ethical human resources while providing accountable, transparent, and responsive public services. Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology (*Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi/Kemendikbudristek, 2023*) stresses that good governance in higher education must include accountability, transparency, efficiency, and continuous improvement of service quality. For this reason, strengthening management and public services has become a key requirement for universities that want to remain competitive at national and global levels.

The Indonesian government continues to push bureaucratic reform through the Integrity Zone (*Zona Integritas/ZI*) program toward Corruption-Free Areas (*Wilayah Bebas dari Korupsi/WBK*) and Clean and Serving Bureaucratic Areas (*Wilayah Birokrasi Bersih dan Melayani/WBBM*). This initiative, launched by the Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform since 2010, aims to improve integrity, accountability, and service quality in all government agencies, including public universities (KemenPAN-RB, 2022). Although more than 6,000 work units across Indonesia have declared the development of Integrity Zones, only a small number have successfully achieved WBK or WBBM status (KemenPAN-RB, 2024). This fact shows that building an Integrity Zone requires real commitment and cultural change, not just administrative fulfillment.

In the context of higher education, the Integrity Zone is very important because universities are responsible for shaping the character and integrity of the nation's next generation. Rahmawati (2021) states that implementing an integrity zone in universities significantly improves academic service quality and public trust, especially among students. Universitas Singaperbangsa Karawang (UNSIKA), as a young public university, supports this national agenda through Rector Regulation Number 9 of 2022 concerning the Development of Integrity Zones. The Faculty of Law, one of the largest and most strategic faculties at UNSIKA, not only serves thousands of students and lecturers but also provides external legal services such as legal clinics and community consultation. Therefore, professional and integrity-based service management is absolutely necessary.

Service quality in higher education can be measured using the SERVQUAL model developed by Parasuraman et al. (1988). This model evaluates five dimensions: tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy. Many studies such as Tjiptono (2017), Wibowo (2019), and Owusu (2020) have successfully applied SERVQUAL in universities, yet most of them were conducted in long-established public universities or private institutions. According to Zeithaml et al. (2018), user satisfaction emerges when actual service performance meets or exceeds expectations, but newer public universities, such as UNSIKA, still rarely become the object of research related to the impact of Integrity Zone implementation on daily service quality. Meanwhile, Sutrisno and Mulyani (2022) highlight that service digitization is a key factor in modern bureaucratic reform, while Rinaldi (2020) emphasizes the need to adapt the integrity zone model to the unique characteristics of the campus environment.

Despite the increasing national attention to the integrity zone program, empirical studies that specifically evaluate the relationship between integrity zone development and public service quality at the faculty level in new public universities remain very limited. Most existing research only focuses on central university services or large state universities, so the challenges faced by younger and rapidly growing faculties are not well documented. This condition creates a clear research gap, especially at the Faculty of Law, UNSIKA, which has diverse service users (students, lecturers, and administrative staff) and external legal service activities.

Therefore, this study aims to evaluate the quality of public services in the context of integrity zone development at the Faculty of Law, UNSIKA using the SERVQUAL model. The results of this research are expected to provide practical recommendations for faculty leaders and contribute to a better understanding of how the Integrity Zone can actually improve day-to-day services in new public universities.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Integrity Zone toward Corruption-Free and Clean-Serving Bureaucracy

The Integrity Zone (*Zona Integritas*/ZI) is a national program launched by the Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform (*Kementerian Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara dan Reformasi Birokrasi*/KemenPAN-RB) since 2010 to create work units that are free from corruption and able to provide excellent public services. According to KemenPAN-RB (2021), integrity zone development is carried out through six mandatory areas of change: change management, governance arrangement, human resource management arrangement, accountability strengthening, supervision strengthening, and public service quality improvement. These six areas must be implemented together so that a work unit can first achieve Corruption-Free Area status and later Clean and Serving Bureaucratic Area status. KemenPAN-RB (2022) emphasizes that ZI is not just a plaque or ceremony, but a real cultural transformation.

Hidayah et al. (2023) state that in higher education institutions, the integrity zone model cannot simply be copied from ministries or local governments because universities have academic freedom, Tri Dharma activities, and more diverse stakeholders. Santi et al. (2025) add that successful ZI implementation in universities significantly increases public trust and academic service quality, especially among students and lecturers. However, KemenPAN-RB (2024) reports that although more than 6,000 work units nationwide have declared ZI, only a few hundred have succeeded in obtaining WBK/WBBM status, showing that real cultural change remains the biggest challenge.

2.2. Public Service Quality in Higher Education Context

Public services in universities are different from services in regular government offices because they involve academic and non-academic processes at the same time. Dwiyanto (2018) explains that university public services include student registration, academic guidance, tuition payment, scholarship management, document legalization, library services, and even external community services such as legal aid. Hardiansyah (2018) emphasizes that good public services in higher education must meet the principles of transparency, accountability, speed, accuracy, and friendliness as mandated by Law Number 25 of 2009 on Public Services. These principles become more important because service users are not only internal (students, lecturers, staff) but also external communities.

McHaney (2023) adds that today's students, mostly digital natives, demand fast, paperless, and 24-hour accessible services through mobile applications or websites. Sutrisno and Mulyani (2022) found that digitization of academic and administrative service processes is one of the most important factors in the success of bureaucratic reform in higher education institutions. However, many new public universities still rely heavily on manual procedures and face-to-face services, causing long queues and frequent complaints. Therefore, service quality in higher education is no longer only measured by staff politeness, but also by system efficiency, infrastructure readiness, and integration between online and offline services.

2.3. The SERVQUAL Framework

The SERVQUAL model, developed by Parasuraman et al. (1988), is still the most popular instrument for measuring service quality based on user perceptions through five dimensions: tangibles (physical facilities and equipment), reliability (ability to deliver promised service accurately), responsiveness (willingness to help quickly), assurance (knowledge and courtesy of staff), and empathy (individual attention to users). Elkhani and Bakri (2012) explain that customer satisfaction occurs when actual performance meets or exceeds expectations, known as expectancy-disconfirmation theory. In higher education settings, these five dimensions can clearly reflect the daily experiences of students, lecturers, and staff when dealing with administrative units.

Asnawi and Setyaningsih (2020) prove that the empathy dimension has a significant positive effect on student perceptions of service quality in Indonesian universities, while Joseph et al. (2005) show that students today give lower scores to tangibles if the academic information system is slow or the service room is uncomfortable. Asiyai (2022) states that the assurance dimension is very important for lecturers and administrative staff because they need certainty that data and documents are processed safely and correctly. Sedarmayanti (2017) and Setiono and Hidayat (2022) agree that SERVQUAL is highly suitable for evaluating public services in Indonesia because the questionnaire is simple yet able to capture both technical quality (tangibles and reliability) and functional quality (responsiveness, assurance, empathy) at the same time.

2.4. Integrity Zone Implementation and Service Quality

KemenPAN-RB (2021) explicitly states that one of the six mandatory areas of change in integrity zone development is the improvement of public service quality, meaning every work unit that builds an integrity zone must show a measurable increase in user satisfaction. Lestari (2020) found that universities that consistently implement an integrity zone experience a significant decrease in public complaints and faster service completion times. Yayu (2023) proved that there is a positive relationship between ZI implementation and lecturer satisfaction with administrative services at several large state universities. However, most previous studies only used qualitative approaches or general satisfaction surveys without breaking down the results into specific service quality dimensions.

According to Oakland (2014) and Stamatis (2018), true service excellence is achieved only when technical quality and functional quality are both high, something that should be the direct result of successful integrity zone implementation. Despite the increasing number of faculties declaring ZI, empirical research that specifically measures the impact of integrity zone on the five SERVQUAL dimensions, especially at the faculty level in new public universities, remains very scarce. This study fills that gap by evaluating public service quality using the SERVQUAL instrument in the context of integrity zone development at the Faculty of Law, Universitas Singaperbangsa Karawang, a young and fast-growing faculty with diverse internal and external service users.

3. Methods

This research employs a quantitative approach with a survey method to evaluate the implementation of the Integrity Zone in public services at the Faculty of Law, Universitas Singaperbangsa Karawang. The SERVQUAL model, developed by Parasuraman et al. (1988), is used because it effectively measures service quality based on user perceptions through five main dimensions: reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, and tangibles. The survey design allows for direct, objective, and measurable data collection from service users, making it suitable for describing

satisfaction levels and identifying areas for improvement in the context of Integrity Zone standards.

The study was conducted at the Faculty of Law, Universitas Singaperbangsa Karawang, during the even semester of the 2024/2025 academic year. Data collection through online questionnaires using Google Forms took place from July 21 to July 31, 2025. Following that, data processing and report preparation were carried out from August 1 to August 10, 2025, while the presentation of results to faculty leadership and report approval occurred from August 11 to August 15, 2025. This timeline ensured timely feedback and alignment with the university's bureaucratic reform agenda.

The population consists of all service users at the faculty, divided into three groups: educational staff, lecturers, and students. Proportional random sampling was applied to represent each group fairly, using the Slovin formula with a 10% margin of error. This resulted in a total sample of 150 respondents, comprising 30 educational staff, 40 lecturers, and 80 students. The sample size was kept manageable to maintain data quality and feasibility within the research timeframe.

The instrument is a closed-ended questionnaire with a Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree/very poor) to 5 (strongly agree/excellent), based on the five SERVQUAL dimensions. It includes 15 statements, with three statements per dimension: reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, and tangibles. The questionnaire was distributed online via Google Forms to ensure efficient and representative data collection, as suggested by Sugiyono (2017). Raw data were exported to Microsoft Excel for initial processing.

Data analysis involved descriptive statistical methods to calculate average scores for each dimension and determine service quality categories. Scores were categorized as follows: 3.40–4.00 = A (excellent), 2.60–3.39 = B (good), 1.80–2.59 = C (fair), 1.50–1.79 = D (less good), and 1.00–1.49 = E (poor). These categories were adapted from SERVQUAL standards for public service evaluation. Additionally, an evaluative analysis compared the results with integrity zone indicators from KemenPAN-RB (2021), focusing on accountability, transparency, process effectiveness, and user satisfaction to identify strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations for improvement.

4. Results

This study evaluates the quality of public services at the Faculty of Law, Universitas Singaperbangsa Karawang, in the context of Integrity Zone development using the SERVQUAL model. A total of 150 respondents participated: 30 educational staff, 40 lecturers, and 80 students. All responses were complete and valid. The analysis focuses on the average score for each of the five SERVQUAL dimensions (reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, and tangibles) as well as the overall score for each respondent group. The mean scores were interpreted using the following categories: 3.40–4.00 = A (excellent), 2.60–3.39 = B (good), 1.80–2.59 = C (fair), 1.50–1.79 = D (less good), and 1.00–1.49 = E (poor). The results are presented separately for each respondent group.

Educational staff rated service quality at an average of 2.64, which falls in the Good (B) category. As shown in Table 1, the highest score was given to the tangibles dimension (3.47), indicating that staff members consider physical facilities, equipment, and the appearance of service areas to be relatively satisfactory. Reliability (2.95) and assurance (2.90) also received scores in the Good category, showing that staff perceive services as fairly consistent and staff competence as adequate. However, responsiveness (2.76) and especially empathy (2.47) scored lower, with empathy falling into the Fair (C) category. This suggests that educational staff feel that personal attention, individual understanding of their needs, and quick responses still require significant improvement.

Table 1. Service Quality Assessment by Educational Staff

No.	Dimension	Mean	Service Criteria	Quality Grade
1.	Reliability	2.95	Good	B
2.	Responsiveness	2.76	Good	B
3.	Assurance	2.90	Good	B
4.	Tangibles	3.47	Good	B
5.	Empathy	2.47	Fair	C
	Overall	2.64	Good	B

Among lecturers, the overall average score was slightly higher at 2.71, still within the Good (B) category. Table 2 reveals a more balanced perception compared to that of the educational staff. The highest dimension for lecturers was empathy (2.80), meaning they feel that administrative officers provide reasonably good personal attention and understanding of lecturers' specific needs. Assurance (2.76) and responsiveness (2.71) also scored relatively well, while reliability (2.60) and tangibles (2.66) were the lowest but still in the Good range. These results indicate that lecturers generally experience consistent interpersonal support, although they expect faster and more accurate administrative processes.

Table 2. Service Quality Assessment by Lecturers

No.	Dimension	Mean	Service Criteria	Quality Grade
1.	Reliability	2.60	Good	B
2.	Responsiveness	2.71	Good	B
3.	Assurance	2.76	Good	B
4.	Empathy	2.80	Good	B
5.	Tangibles	2.66	Good	B
	Overall	2.71	Good	B

Students provided the highest overall satisfaction score of 3.25, which remains in the Good (B) category but is noticeably closer to the upper boundary. According to Table 3, reliability received the highest rating (3.31), followed closely by assurance (3.29) and empathy (3.29), showing that students perceive administrative services as quite consistent, trustworthy, and caring. Responsiveness scored 3.25, reflecting acceptable speed and willingness to help. The lowest dimension for students was tangibles (3.09), suggesting that physical facilities, waiting rooms, and especially the performance of digital platforms still need upgrading to fully meet student expectations in the digital era.

Table 3. Service Quality Assessment by Students

No.	Dimension	Mean	Service Criteria	Quality Grade
1.	Reliability	3.31	Good	B
2.	Responsiveness	3.25	Good	B
3.	Assurance	3.29	Good	B
4.	Empathy	3.29	Good	B
5.	Tangibles	3.09	Good	B
	Overall	3.25	Good	B

When the three groups are compared, students consistently gave the highest scores across almost all dimensions, followed by lecturers, while educational staff were the most critical group. The dimensions that received the strongest ratings across all respondents were reliability and assurance, whereas empathy (among staff) and tangibles (among students) emerged as the weakest areas. Despite these variations, the overall service quality perceived by all user groups falls within the Good (B) category, indicating that the Faculty of Law has achieved a reasonable level of service performance under the ongoing Integrity Zone initiative.

5. Discussion

The evaluation of service quality at the Faculty of Law, Universitas Singaperbangsa Karawang, reveals clear differences in perceptions among the three user groups: educational staff, lecturers, and students. Students reported the highest overall satisfaction with an average score of 3.25, followed by lecturers at 2.71 and staff at 2.64, all within the Good (B) category. According to Tjiptono (2017), such variations stem from differing service needs; for instance, staff were most critical of the empathy dimension (2.47, Fair/C), likely because they interact daily with administrative processes and expect more personalized support. In contrast, students prioritized reliability (3.31) and assurance (3.29), reflecting their focus on accurate and trustworthy academic procedures. Lecturers, meanwhile, valued empathy highest (2.80), suggesting they appreciate interpersonal relationships in administrative support. These differences highlight how service perceptions are shaped by user roles, with internal staff experiencing more routine frustrations compared to external-facing students.

Building on these group-specific insights, the overall Good (B) rating indicates that the Integrity Zone implementation has been somewhat effective but falls short of excellent standards. The weaker dimensions, such as empathy among staff and tangibles among students (3.09), point to gaps in interpersonal interactions and facility optimization. As stated by Noerhartati et al. (2023), empathy significantly influences service perceptions in educational settings, and its low score here suggests inadequate training in communication and user-centric approaches. Similarly, Setiawan (2022) notes that students, as digital natives, have high expectations for tangibles like updated information systems, which may explain their lower rating despite overall positivity. For lecturers, the balanced scores across dimensions align with Pate et al. (2022), who found that academic staff often rate communication and access higher than speed, but still desire improvements in responsiveness. These findings underscore that while reliability and assurance are strengths, functional aspects like responsiveness and empathy require targeted enhancements to fully embody the Integrity Zone's emphasis on accountable and user-responsive services.

From a theoretical perspective, the results support established service quality models and their application in bureaucratic reform. Grönroos (2007) conceptualizes service quality as comprising technical (tangibles and reliability) and functional (responsiveness, assurance, empathy) elements, and the data here show stronger technical quality overall, with functional areas lagging. This imbalance mirrors challenges in higher education governance, where Prasad (2024) argues that digitization is crucial for modern reform, yet the tangible scores indicate incomplete adoption at the faculty level. Furthermore, Lu and Wang (2023) emphasize that satisfaction arises when performance meets expectations, explaining why students, potentially with lower baseline expectations as newcomers, rated higher than seasoned staff. In the context of Integrity Zone standards, the Good rating means the faculty meets basic requirements for transparency and effectiveness, but must address low-scoring dimensions to progress toward WBK/WBBM status. This alignment with prior studies reinforces that ZI success depends on holistic changes, not just administrative compliance.

The implications of these findings are multifaceted, offering both theoretical and practical contributions to higher education management. This study extends the application of SERVQUAL in emerging public universities, filling a gap in the literature focused on new institutions like UNSIKA, where rapid growth amplifies service challenges. It demonstrates how ZI can integrate with service models to measure real-world impacts, providing a blueprint for similar evaluations. Faculty leaders should prioritize empathy training for staff and digitize tangibles to boost responsiveness, potentially reducing complaints and enhancing user trust. For policymakers at the Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform, these

results suggest tailored ZI guidelines for universities, emphasizing user-group differences. Ultimately, implementing these improvements could elevate the faculty's service to Excellent (A), fostering a stronger integrity culture and better preparing graduates for ethical professional roles.

6. Conclusion

This study shows that the quality of public services at the Faculty of Law, Universitas Singaperbangsa Karawang, in the context of Integrity Zone development is generally in the Good (B) category. The overall average scores are 2.64 from educational staff, 2.71 from lecturers, and 3.25 from students. Reliability and assurance are the strongest dimensions across all groups, while empathy (especially for staff) and tangibles (especially for students) still need significant improvement. Although the implementation of the Integrity Zone has produced positive results and brought the faculty closer to the standards of a clean and serving bureaucracy, the service has not yet reached the Excellent level expected in the advanced stages of WBK/WBBM.

The findings imply that continuous efforts in staff training, service digitization, and facility upgrading are necessary to close the existing gaps and increase satisfaction. The main limitation of this study is that it only covers one faculty in a relatively new public university, so the results cannot yet be generalized to other faculties or more established universities. Future research is recommended to use a longitudinal approach to see the impact of Integrity Zone implementation over a longer period, involve more faculties for comparison, or combine the SERVQUAL survey with in-depth interviews to obtain richer explanations behind the scores. With sustained commitment, the Faculty of Law has a strong foundation to become a model of integrity-based excellent service in Indonesian higher education.

References

- Asiyai, R. I. (2022). Best practices for quality assurance in higher education: implications for educational administration. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 25(5), 843–854.
- Asnawi, N., & Setyaningsih, N. D. (2020). Perceived service quality in Indonesian Islamic higher education context: A test of Islamic higher education service quality (i-HESQUAL) model. *Journal of International Education in Business*, 13(1), 107–130.
- Dwiyanto, A. (2018). *Manajemen pelayanan publik*. Yogyakarta: Gava Media.
- Elkhani, N., & Bakri, A. (2012). Review on “expectancy disconfirmation theory” (EDT) model in B2C e-commerce). *Journal of Information Systems Research and Innovation*, 2(12), 95–102.
- Grönroos, C. (2007). *Service management and marketing*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hardiansyah. (2018). *Kualitas pelayanan publik*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Hidayah, K., Esha, M. I. A., & Fikri, S. (2023). The regulation model of public services based on the integrity zone in the religious higher education in Indonesia. *Widya Yuridika: Jurnal Hukum*, 6(3), 397–404.
- Joseph, M., Yakhou, M., & Stone, G. (2005). An educational institution's quest for service quality: Customers' perspective. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 13(1), 66–82.
- KemenPAN-RB. (2021). *Pedoman pembangunan zona integritas menuju WBK/WBBM*. Jakarta: KemenPAN-RB.
- KemenPAN-RB. (2022). *Laporan reformasi birokrasi nasional*. Jakarta: KemenPAN-RB.
- KemenPAN-RB. (2024). *Data nasional pencanangan ZI*. Jakarta: KemenPAN-RB.
- Kemendikbudristek. (2023). *Standar nasional pendidikan tinggi*. Jakarta: Kemendikbudristek.
- Lestari, R. (2020). Penguatan pengawasan dalam reformasi birokrasi di perguruan tinggi. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 8(1), 45–58.

- Lu, H. P., & Wang, J. C. (2023). Exploring the effects of sudden institutional coercive pressure on digital transformation in colleges from teachers' perspective. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28(12), 15991–16015.
- McHaney, R. (2023). *The new digital shoreline: How Web 2.0 and millennials are revolutionizing higher education*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Noerhartati, E., Saurina, N., & Idris, A. (2023). Evaluating user satisfaction and educational impact of the sorghum entrepreneur marketplace: An application of the pieces framework. *Research Horizon*, 3(6), 668–679.
- Oakland, J. S. (2014). *Total quality management and operational excellence: Text with cases*. London: Routledge.
- Owusu, A. (2020). The impact of audio-visual technologies on university teaching and learning in a developing economy. *South African Journal of Information Management*, 22(1), 1–9.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12–40.
- Pate, A. N., Fleming, L., Jones-Bodie, A., Wagner, J. L., Fleming, J. W., Davis, C., & Brown, M. A. (2022). Impact of communication method and timeliness on student and faculty perception of professionalism and value. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 86(2), 83–91.
- Prasad, R. (2024). From tradition to transformation: Digitizing examinations at Tribhuvan University through institutional and technological levers. *NG Journal of Social Development*, 16(2), 45–62.
- Rahmawati, S. (2021). Implementasi zona integritas di perguruan tinggi. *Jurnal Kebijakan Pendidikan*, 10(2), 87–100.
- Rinaldi, A. (2020). Zona integritas dan reformasi birokrasi di perguruan tinggi. *Jurnal Administrasi Negara*, 12(1), 66–79.
- Santi, A., Komariah, L., Mulawarman, W. G., Nurlaili, Akhmad, & Azainil. (2025). Strategies for managing facilities and infrastructure in inclusive schools. *Research Horizon*, 5(3), 933–944.
- Sedarmayanti. (2017). *Reformasi administrasi publik*. Bandung: Refika Aditama.
- Setiono, B. A., & Hidayat, S. (2022). Influence of service quality with the dimensions of reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy and tangibles on customer satisfaction. *International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Research*, 6(09), 330–341.
- Stamatis, D. H. (2018). *Total quality service: Principles, practices, and implementation*. London: Routledge.
- Sugiyono. (2017). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sutrisno, & Mulyani. (2022). Digital governance dan pelayanan publik modern. *Jurnal E-Government*, 5(1), 29–47.
- Tjiptono, F. (2017). *Kualitas layanan dan kepuasan*. Yogyakarta: Andi Offset.
- Wibowo, A. (2019). Manajemen SDM dalam reformasi birokrasi. *Jurnal Manajemen Publik*, 11(2), 55–70.
- Yayu, Z. (2023). University administrators' leadership style influencing instructors' job satisfaction in Shanxi, China. *Pacific International Journal*, 6(4), 160–164.
- Zeithaml, V. A., Bitner, M. J., & Gremler, D. (2018). *Services marketing*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Acknowledgment

We gratefully acknowledge the contributions of individuals who supported the completion of this article.

Funding Information

This research did not receive any funding.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Ethical Approval and Originality Statement

Ethical approval was obtained for this study. The manuscript represents original work and has not been previously published, nor is it under consideration by another journal.

Data Disclosure Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors.

This work is licensed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>).