

Effect of Service Standards and Infrastructure on User Satisfaction at the Ministry of Home Affairs Administrative Service UnitMayang Angelica P Wibowo¹, Irwin Ananta Vidada², Rina Lestari³^{1,2,3} Management Study Program, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Bina Sarana Informatika, Indonesia**Article History**

Received : 26 August 2026
Revised : 28 August 2026
Accepted : 21 September 2026
Published : 22 September 2026

Corresponding author*:

Mayang Angelica P Wibowo

Contact:angelicamayang08@gmail.com**Cite This Article:**

Wibowo, M. A. P., Vidada, I. A., & Lestari, R. (2026). Effect of Service Standards and Infrastructure on User Satisfaction at the Ministry of Home Affairs Administrative Service Unit. *Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin*, 5(05), 26–33.

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.56127/jukim.v5i05.3099>

Abstract: Administrative service users may encounter waiting times, inadequate facilities, and unclear procedures, which can reduce satisfaction and service effectiveness. Previous studies report inconsistent effects of service standards and infrastructure on satisfaction, particularly in ministerial administrative services. **Objective:** This study aimed to analyze the effects of service standards and infrastructure on user satisfaction at the Administrative Service Unit of the Ministry of Home Affairs. **Method:** A quantitative associative survey involved 288 respondents from a population of 1,025 service users selected through purposive sampling. Data were collected using a five-point Likert questionnaire and analyzed using descriptive statistics, validity and reliability tests, classical assumption tests, multiple linear regression, t-tests, F-test, and coefficient of determination. **Findings:** Service standards significantly affected satisfaction ($B = 0.435$; $\beta = 0.473$; $t = 10.915$; $p < 0.001$), as did infrastructure ($B = 0.372$; $\beta = 0.481$; $t = 11.090$; $p < 0.001$). Both variables were simultaneously significant ($F = 123.950$; $p < 0.001$) and explained 46.1% of satisfaction variance. **Implications:** Integrated improvements in service implementation and facilities may enhance user satisfaction. **Originality:** The study jointly examines both factors in a ministerial administrative service context.

Keywords: administrative services; infrastructure; public services; service standards; user satisfaction

INTRODUCTION

Public service is a core governmental function through which citizens and other service users directly interact with public institutions. Service performance is reflected not only in the completion of administrative needs but also in procedural clarity, timeliness, staff responsiveness, access to information, and adequate supporting facilities. User satisfaction is therefore an important indicator of whether actual service experiences meet expectations (Fathurrahman, Abidin, & Utami, 2021; Lamsal & Gupta, 2022; Zhang, Chen, & Petrovsky, 2022). At the Administrative Service Unit of the Ministry of Home Affairs, preliminary observations identified relatively long waiting times, limited waiting-room facilities, suboptimal service completion, and service-flow information that was not fully understood by users. These conditions indicate the need to examine both service implementation and infrastructure as determinants of user satisfaction.

Previous studies have documented relationships among service quality, service standards, facilities, and public satisfaction, although their findings are not uniform. Zailani and Astuti (2023) reported an effect of service standards on public satisfaction, while Syafri, Firman, and Badaruddin (2023), Akbar, Kartini, and Barokah (2023), Dani, Sawihin, Sakti, Aprianty, and Purnawan (2023), Kurniawan and Aricon (2023), Ardiasih and Cahyadi (2024), and Heriyanto and Oktarina (2025) similarly emphasized the relevance of service performance and/or facilities to satisfaction. Idris and Salju (2023) and Kristiawan, Koton, and Kadir (2023) also found infrastructure to be associated with satisfaction. Conversely, Malinta, Wolok, and Abdussamad (2024) reported a nonsignificant partial effect of service quality in their setting, while Cahyani, Rahmat, and Chaniago (2024) found that infrastructure did not have a significant partial effect on satisfaction. These differences suggest that the relationship is context dependent.

The literature therefore presents both an empirical and a contextual gap. Empirically, prior findings are inconsistent regarding the partial contribution of service-related factors and infrastructure to satisfaction (Cahyani et al., 2024; Malinta et al., 2024). Contextually, much of the existing evidence comes from health

care, education, local government, population administration, transportation, hospitality, and other service settings, whereas evidence from a ministerial administrative service unit remains limited. Fahri (2022) showed that infrastructure and user experience can generate context-specific dimensions of satisfaction, while Ningrum and Wicaksana (2024) emphasized the importance of public service quality across diverse service settings. The originality of this study lies in simultaneously examining service standards and infrastructure as predictors of user satisfaction in the specific context of the Administrative Service Unit of the Ministry of Home Affairs.

Accordingly, this study aimed to analyze the partial and simultaneous effects of Service Standards and Infrastructure on User Satisfaction at the Administrative Service Unit of the Ministry of Home Affairs. Specifically, it tested whether Service Standards significantly affect User Satisfaction (H1), whether Infrastructure significantly affects User Satisfaction (H2), and whether both variables simultaneously have a significant effect on User Satisfaction (H3). The findings are expected to contribute to public-service management literature and provide practical evidence for improving procedural clarity, service consistency, responsiveness, information accessibility, facility adequacy, and the overall user experience.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employed a quantitative associative design to examine the statistical relationships between Service Standards, Infrastructure, and User Satisfaction at the Administrative Service Unit of the Ministry of Home Affairs. Primary data were obtained directly from service users through a structured questionnaire. Because the study used a nonexperimental survey design, the findings are interpreted as statistical associations within the observed sample rather than as evidence of experimental causality (Sugiyono, 2023).

The population comprised 1,025 service users. A total of 288 respondents were included. The initial sample-size reference was calculated using the Slovin formula, $n = N/[1 + N(e^2)]$, with $N = 1,025$ and $e = 0.05$, yielding 287.72 and rounded to 288 respondents. Respondents were selected using nonprobability purposive sampling. Eligibility required respondents to have directly received administrative services at the unit and to complete the questionnaire. Accordingly, the Slovin calculation served only as a sample-size reference; respondent selection remained purposive, and the findings should not be interpreted as probability-based population estimates.

The research instrument was a closed-ended questionnaire using a five-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Service Standards (X1) comprised 15 items covering tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy as dimensions of users' perceived implementation of service standards. Infrastructure (X2) comprised nine items covering facility completeness, condition, and ease of use. User Satisfaction (Y) comprised 12 items covering expectation congruence, perceived service performance, expectation-reality comparison, and confirmation/disconfirmation. The instrument therefore contained 36 items.

Instrument quality was assessed through validity and reliability testing. Item validity was evaluated using corrected item-total correlations against the study's critical r value, while internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's alpha, with values above 0.60 treated as acceptable (Ghozali, 2021). Prior to regression interpretation, the model was assessed for residual normality using the one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, multicollinearity using tolerance and variance inflation factor (VIF), heteroscedasticity using the Glejser test, and linearity using significance of deviation from linearity.

Data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics version 26. The analytical sequence comprised descriptive statistics, validity and reliability testing, classical assumption testing, multiple linear regression, partial t -tests, simultaneous F -test, and the coefficient of determination. The regression model was $Y = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \varepsilon$. Statistical significance was evaluated at $\alpha = 0.05$, and Adjusted R Square was used to describe the proportion of variation in User Satisfaction explained by the predictors.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Statistics

Data were obtained from 288 users of the Administrative Service Unit of the Ministry of Home Affairs. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the distribution of responses for Service Standards (X1), Infrastructure (X2), and User Satisfaction (Y).

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

Variable	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Service Standards (X1)	288	2.87	5.00	4.0729	0.42878
Facilities and Infrastructure (X2)	288	2.44	5.00	3.9417	0.50955
User Satisfaction Service (Y)	288	2.92	5.00	4.0286	0.39478
Valid N (listwise)	288				

Source: Research data processed, 2026.

As shown in Table 1, Service Standards had the highest mean ($M = 4.0729$, $SD = 0.42878$), followed by User Satisfaction ($M = 4.0286$, $SD = 0.39478$) and Infrastructure ($M = 3.9417$, $SD = 0.50955$). All means were close to 4 on the five-point scale, indicating generally positive respondent assessments. Infrastructure had the lowest mean and the largest standard deviation, indicating greater variation in respondents' perceptions of supporting facilities.

Validity and Reliability Tests

Validity testing assessed whether each questionnaire item adequately represented its intended construct. With 288 respondents, the study used a critical r value of 0.116. Items were considered valid when the corrected item-total correlation exceeded this value.

$$df = N - 2$$

$$df = 288 - 2 = 286$$

At the 5% significance level, the critical r value was 0.116. An item was considered valid when its corrected item-total correlation exceeded 0.116.

Table 2. Validity Test Results

Variable	Item	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	r Table	Description
Service Standards (X1)	X1.1	0.524	0.116	Valid
	X1.2	0.522	0.116	Valid
	X1.3	0.530	0.116	Valid
	X1.4	0.532	0.116	Valid
	X1.5	0.577	0.116	Valid
	X1.6	0.586	0.116	Valid
	X1.7	0.533	0.116	Valid
	X1.8	0.549	0.116	Valid
	X1.9	0.564	0.116	Valid
	X1.10	0.559	0.116	Valid
	X1.11	0.598	0.116	Valid
	X1.12	0.565	0.116	Valid
	X1.13	0.501	0.116	Valid
	X1.14	0.549	0.116	Valid
	X1.15	0.483	0.116	Valid
Infrastructure (X2)	X2.1	0.559	0.116	Valid
	X2.2	0.604	0.116	Valid
	X2.3	0.574	0.116	Valid
	X2.4	0.561	0.116	Valid
	X2.5	0.610	0.116	Valid
	X2.6	0.604	0.116	Valid
	X2.7	0.585	0.116	Valid
	X2.8	0.597	0.116	Valid
	X2.9	0.560	0.116	Valid
User Satisfaction (Y)	Y.1	0.554	0.116	Valid
	Y.2	0.429	0.116	Valid
	Y.3	0.505	0.116	Valid
	Y.4	0.564	0.116	Valid
	Y.5	0.516	0.116	Valid
	Y.6	0.530	0.116	Valid
	Y.7	0.492	0.116	Valid
	Y.8	0.502	0.116	Valid

Y.9	0.536	0.116	Valid
Y.10	0.498	0.116	Valid
Y.11	0.491	0.116	Valid
Y.12	0.456	0.116	Valid

Source: Research data processed using IBM SPSS Statistics 26, 2026.

All 36 questionnaire items had corrected item-total correlations greater than 0.116. The values ranged from 0.483 to 0.598 for Service Standards, 0.559 to 0.610 for Infrastructure, and 0.429 to 0.564 for User Satisfaction. Thus, all items met the validity criterion used in this study.

Table 3. Reliability Test Results

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Items	Reliability Threshold	Description
Service Standards (X1)	0.885	15	0.60	Reliable
Infrastructure (X2)	0.859	9	0.60	Reliable
User Satisfaction (Y)	0.842	12	0.60	Reliable

Source: Research data processed using IBM SPSS Statistics 26, 2026.

Cronbach's alpha values were 0.885 for Service Standards, 0.859 for Infrastructure, and 0.842 for User Satisfaction. All values exceeded the 0.60 criterion, indicating adequate internal consistency.

Classical Assumption Tests

Classical assumption testing included residual normality, heteroscedasticity, multicollinearity, and linearity assessments.

Table 4. Normality Test

Description	Value
N	288
Test Statistic	0.056
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.030
Monte Carlo Sig. (2-tailed)	0.031

Source: Research data processed using IBM SPSS Statistics 26, 2026.

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test produced an Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) value of 0.030 and a Monte Carlo Sig. (2-tailed) value of 0.031. Because both values were below 0.05, the residuals showed a statistically detectable departure from normality under this test. This result is reported as a limitation of the model assumption and should not be described as evidence of normality.

Table 5. Heteroscedasticity Test

Variable	B	t	Sig.	Description
Service Standards (X1)	-0.093	-1.198	0.256	No heteroskedasticity
Infrastructure (X2)	-0.112	-1.736	0.149	No heteroskedasticity

Source: Research data processed using IBM SPSS Statistics 26, 2026.

The significance values were 0.256 for Service Standards and 0.149 for Infrastructure, both above 0.05. Based on the Glejser test, no evidence of heteroscedasticity was detected.

Table 6. Multicollinearity Test

Variable	Tolerance	VIF	Description
Service Standards (X1)	0.999	1.001	No multicollinearity
Infrastructure (X2)	0.999	1.001	No multicollinearity

Source: Research data processed using IBM SPSS Statistics 26, 2026.

Both predictors had a tolerance value of 0.999 and a VIF of 1.001. These values indicate no evidence of multicollinearity between Service Standards and Infrastructure.

Table 7. Linearity Test

Variable Relationship	F Deviation from Linearity	Sig. Deviation from Linearity	Description
Service Standards (X1) terhadap User Satisfaction (Y)	1.241	0.191	Linear
Infrastructure (X2) terhadap User Satisfaction (Y)	1.118	0.329	Linear

Source: Research data processed using IBM SPSS Statistics 26, 2026.

The significance of deviation from linearity was 0.191 for Service Standards and 0.329 for Infrastructure, both above 0.05. Thus, the relationships of both predictors with User Satisfaction met the linearity criterion used in this study.

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Multiple linear regression was used to estimate the direction and magnitude of the relationships between Service Standards (X1), Infrastructure (X2), and User Satisfaction (Y).

Table 8. Multiple Linear Regression Results

Variable	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Constant	0.788	0.208	-	3.789	<0,001
Service Standards (X1)	0.435	0.040	0.473	10.915	<0,001
Infrastructure (X2)	0.372	0.034	0.481	11.090	<0,001

Source: Research data processed using IBM SPSS Statistics 26, 2026.

The estimated regression equation was:

$$Y = 0.788 + 0.435X1 + 0.372X2 + \varepsilon$$

The unstandardized coefficient for Service Standards was 0.435, while the coefficient for Infrastructure was 0.372. Both coefficients were positive, indicating that higher scores on each predictor were associated with higher User Satisfaction when the other predictor was held constant.

Service Standards had $t = 10.915$, $\beta = 0.473$, and $p < 0.001$, while Infrastructure had $t = 11.090$, $\beta = 0.481$, and $p < 0.001$. Thus, H1 and H2 were supported within the estimated model.

Simultaneous Test and Coefficient of Determination

Table 9. Simultaneous F-Test Results

Model	F	F Table	Sig.	Description
Regression	123.950	3.03	<0,001	Significant

Source: Research data processed using IBM SPSS Statistics 26, 2026.

The model produced $F = 123.950$ with $p < 0.001$, indicating that Service Standards and Infrastructure jointly contributed significantly to the prediction of User Satisfaction. Accordingly, H3 was supported.

Table 10. Coefficient of Determination

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.682	0.465	0.461	0.289715

Source: Research data processed using IBM SPSS Statistics 26, 2026.

The model yielded $R = 0.682$, $R \text{ Square} = 0.465$, and $\text{Adjusted } R \text{ Square} = 0.461$. Thus, Service Standards and Infrastructure explained 46.1% of the adjusted variation in User Satisfaction, while 53.9% remained unexplained by the model.

Discussion

Effect of Service Standards on User Satisfaction

Service Standards showed a positive and statistically significant relationship with User Satisfaction ($B = 0.435$; $\beta = 0.473$; $t = 10.915$; $p < 0.001$). This finding indicates that clearer and more consistently implemented service processes are associated with better user evaluations of administrative services.

Users assess not only the final administrative outcome but also the process through which the service is delivered. Reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, and the tangible aspects of service implementation can shape perceptions of procedural certainty, timeliness, and staff professionalism. The descriptive results reinforce this interpretation: Service Standards had the highest mean (4.0729), although the minimum score of 2.87 indicates that user experiences were not entirely uniform. Maintaining consistency across service encounters therefore remains important.

The result is consistent with Zailani and Astuti (2023), Syafri et al. (2023), Kristiawan et al. (2023), and Akbar et al. (2023), which emphasize the role of service performance in satisfaction. Differences from Malinta et al. (2024) and Idris and Salju (2023) indicate that the magnitude and significance of service effects may vary across institutional and service contexts.

Practically, the Administrative Service Unit should maintain procedural clarity, timely responses, consistent information, and professional staff interaction. These measures can reduce uncertainty during service delivery and strengthen users' overall service experience.

Effect of Infrastructure on User Satisfaction

Infrastructure also had a positive and statistically significant relationship with User Satisfaction ($B = 0.372$; $\beta = 0.481$; $t = 11.090$; $p < 0.001$). This indicates that adequate and usable facilities are associated with higher satisfaction among administrative service users.

Infrastructure supports each stage of the service process, including waiting, obtaining information, submitting or verifying documents, and communicating with service personnel. Facility completeness, physical condition, accessibility, and ease of use can therefore affect convenience and perceived service efficiency.

Infrastructure had the lowest mean (3.9417) and the highest standard deviation (0.50955) among the three variables. This suggests that respondents' experiences with facilities were more varied than their assessments of service standards and satisfaction.

The result is consistent with Idris and Salju (2023), Kristiawan et al. (2023), Kurniawan and Arieon (2023), and Heriyanto and Oktarina (2025). However, Cahyani et al. (2024) reported a nonsignificant partial effect of infrastructure in a different setting, underscoring the importance of organizational and service context. For ministerial administrative services, routine evaluation of waiting areas, information facilities, service equipment, internet connectivity, and other supporting facilities is therefore relevant to improving the user experience.

Simultaneous Effect of Service Standards and Infrastructure on User Satisfaction

The simultaneous test showed $F = 123.950$ with $p < 0.001$, demonstrating that Service Standards and Infrastructure jointly contributed significantly to User Satisfaction. Their standardized beta coefficients were similar (0.473 and 0.481), indicating that both dimensions were relevant within the model.

The Adjusted R Square of 0.461 indicates that 46.1% of the variation in User Satisfaction was explained by the two predictors. The remaining 53.9% may relate to factors outside the model, such as service completion speed, access to information, digital service systems, queue management, staff competence, staff communication, and user characteristics.

These findings support an integrated service-improvement approach. Procedural consistency and staff responsiveness should be developed alongside adequate, functional, and accessible facilities. Such integration addresses both the interactional and physical components of users' administrative service experiences.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that Service Standards and Infrastructure are positively and significantly associated with User Satisfaction at the Administrative Service Unit of the Ministry of Home Affairs. Service Standards showed $B = 0.435$, $\beta = 0.473$, $t = 10.915$, and $p < 0.001$, while Infrastructure showed $B = 0.372$, $\beta = 0.481$, $t = 11.090$, and $p < 0.001$. Simultaneously, both predictors were significant ($F = 123.950$; $p < 0.001$). The Adjusted R Square of 0.461 indicates that the model explained 46.1% of the variation in User Satisfaction.

The findings imply that improvements should integrate consistent service implementation with adequate supporting facilities. The study is limited to one administrative service unit, uses purposive sampling, and includes only two predictors; therefore, generalization should be cautious. Future studies should consider probability sampling where feasible, broader service settings, and additional variables such as service completion speed, information accessibility, digital service systems, queue management, staff competence, and staff communication.

REFERENCES

- Akbar, M. H., Kartini, E., & Barokah, R. A. (2023). Pengaruh kualitas pelayanan terhadap kepuasan masyarakat di Kecamatan Mandalajati Kota Bandung. *Professional: Jurnal Komunikasi dan Administrasi Publik*, 10(2), 871–880. doi:10.37676/professional.v10i2.4059
- Ardiasih, A. P., & Cahyoadi, B. (2024). Meningkatkan kepuasan pengguna layanan publik melalui fasilitas dengan kualitas layanan sebagai variabel intervening. *Jurnal Pendidikan Ekonomi Undiksha*, 16(2), 394–402. doi:10.23887/jjpe.v16i2.78723
- Cahyani, H. N., Rahmat, I., & Chaniago, A. (2024). Pengaruh sarana prasarana dan kualitas pelayanan terhadap kepuasan santri Pondok Pesantren Modern Sahid Bogor. *Alamiah: Jurnal Muamalah dan Ekonomi Syariah*, 5(2), 32–45.
- Dani, R., Sawihin, S., Sakti, B., Aprianty, H., & Purnawan, H. (2023). Kualitas pelayanan publik terhadap kepuasan masyarakat pembuatan KTP-e di Dinas Kependudukan dan Pencatatan Sipil Kabupaten Seluma. *Professional: Jurnal Komunikasi dan Administrasi Publik*, 10(2), 697–706. doi:10.37676/professional.v10i2.3931
- Fahri, J. (2022). Exploring citizen's satisfaction with the infrastructure of services at a local seaport in Ternate, North Maluku. *Journal of Indonesian Economy and Business*, 37(2), 103–135. doi:10.22146/jieb.v37i2.3449
- Fathurrahman, R., Abidin, Z., & Utami, A. D. (2021). Public service satisfaction on Hajj-related services in Indonesia: Demographic analysis. *Al-Muzara'ah*, 9(1), 99–107. doi:10.29244/jam.9.1.99-107
- Ghozali, I. (2021). Aplikasi analisis multivariate dengan program IBM SPSS 26 (10th ed.). Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
- Heriyanto, Y., & Oktarina, N. (2025). Pengaruh kualitas pelayanan, kinerja pegawai, dan sarana prasarana terhadap kepuasan masyarakat Desa Rejosari Barat. *Business and Accounting Education Journal*, 6(1).
- Idris, F., & Salju. (2023). Pengaruh budaya kerja, kualitas pelayanan, sarana dan prasarana terhadap kepuasan masyarakat. *Kelola: Journal of Islamic Education Management*, 8(1), 71–78. doi:10.24256/kelola.v8i1.3731
- Kristiawan, Y., Koton, Y. P., & Kadir, L. (2023). Pengaruh kualitas pelayanan dan sarana prasarana terhadap kepuasan pasien rawat jalan di Rumah Sakit Umum Daerah Kabupaten Bolaang Mongondow Utara. *Innovative: Journal of Social Science Research*, 3(6), 1893–1903.
- Kurniawan, R., & Arieon, R. (2023). Pengaruh kualitas pelayanan dan sarana prasarana terhadap kepuasan masyarakat di RS Lampung Eye Center. *Jurnal Manajemen Mandiri Saburai*, 7(4).
- Lamsal, B. P., & Gupta, A. K. (2022). Citizen satisfaction with public service: What factors drive? *Policy & Governance Review*, 6(1). doi:10.30589/pgr.v6i1.470
- Lestari, A. P. D., & Sukmana, H. (2023). Revealing public service quality: Assessing satisfaction levels and performance in a local administrative unit. *Indonesian Journal of Public Policy Review*, 23. doi:10.21070/ijppr.v23i0.1320
- Malinta, A., Wolok, T., & Abdussamad, Z. K. (2024). Pengaruh kualitas pelayanan dan fasilitas fisik terhadap kepuasan konsumen Hotel Grand Q di Kota Gorontalo. *JAMBURA: Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 7(1), 138–142. doi:10.37479/jimb.v7i1.25063
- Ningrum, A. P., & Wicaksana, R. A. (2024). The effect of public service quality on community satisfaction in the analysis of systematic literature review. *DIA: Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 22(2), 187–198. doi:10.30996/dia.v22i02.9975
- Sugiyono. (2023). Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D (2nd ed.). Alfabeta.

- Syafri, S., Firman, A., & Badaruddin, B. (2023). Pengaruh fasilitas pelabuhan, kualitas pelayanan, dan kinerja pelayanan terhadap kepuasan pengguna jasa pada PT Pelindo Terminal Petikemas Bitung. *Ezenza Journal*, 2(2), 168–182.
- Zailani, R., & Astuti, J. T. (2023). Pengaruh standar pelayanan terhadap kepuasan masyarakat: Kualitas pelayanan sebagai variabel mediasi. *Trending: Jurnal Manajemen dan Ekonomi*, 1(2), 202–214. doi:10.30640/trending.v1i2.895
- Zhang, J., Chen, W., & Petrovsky, N. (2022). The expectancy-disconfirmation model and citizen satisfaction with public services: A meta-analysis and an agenda for best practice. *Public Administration Review*, 82(1), 147–159. doi:10.1111/puar.13368