

Pathway to Public Satisfaction: Linking Professionalism and Facilities Through Service Quality

Hangesti Widya Rosalia¹, Sugeng Mulyono², Bhakti Hendrakusuma³

¹Master of Management, Postgraduate, Universitas Gajayana Malang

^{2,3}Postgraduate Program Lecturer, Universitas Gajayana Malang

ABSTRACT: This study aims to analyze the influence of work professionalism and facilities on public satisfaction by including service quality as a mediating variable. The study was conducted in a public service environment with 67 respondents. The research method used a quantitative approach through questionnaire distribution and convenience sampling. Data analysis used Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)-PLS. The results showed that work professionalism had a positive and significant effect on service quality, but did not always have a direct effect on public satisfaction. Facilities were shown to have a positive influence on both service quality and public satisfaction. Furthermore, service quality did not mediate the relationship between work professionalism and public satisfaction, but did play a role between facilities and public satisfaction. These findings confirm that efforts to improve public satisfaction are not sufficient simply by improving the competence of civil servants and improving facilities; they also require strengthening service quality as a key factor bridging the two variables.

KEYWORDS: Work Professionalism, Facilities, Public Satisfaction; and Service Quality

I. INTRODUCTION

Public service is one of the government's primary functions in fulfilling the needs and basic rights of the public. Good service quality is a key indicator of the success of professional, transparent, and accountable governance (Dwiyanto, 2018). As public demand for fast, responsive, and accessible services increases, the government needs to ensure that every service process provides a positive experience for service users (Osborne & Brown, 2013). In this context, the professionalism of civil servants and the availability of service facilities are two crucial factors shaping public perception and satisfaction.

Civil servant professionalism reflects the competence, integrity, and work ethics of employees in carrying out service duties (Robbins & Judge, 2017). Professional civil servants not only master technical aspects but also demonstrate communication skills, a friendly attitude, and responsiveness to public needs. When employees perform according to standards, the public will feel valued and well-served. Conversely, low levels of professionalism—for example, slow responses, providing unclear information, or being less communicative—can reduce user trust and satisfaction (Moenir, 2010).

In addition to professionalism, service facilities also play a significant role in shaping public perception. Adequate facilities, such as comfortable service areas, well-functioning technological equipment, and an organized queuing system, can create an efficient service experience (Tjiptono, 2017). Conversely, limited or inadequate facilities often lead to negative perceptions, despite officials' best efforts to provide the best service. Therefore, both physical and non-physical facilities are crucial elements in modern public services (Sinambela, 2012).

In public administration studies, public satisfaction is a key indicator for evaluating service effectiveness. Satisfaction is influenced not only by the final outcome but also by the entire service process experienced by the public (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988). The public is now increasingly critical in assessing service quality, considering employee attitudes, the adequacy of facilities, and the transparency and speed of the process. Therefore, professionalism and facilities do not stand alone but are integral parts of the service experience that shape public perceptions of the performance of public agencies.

The relationship between professionalism, facilities, and public satisfaction is often mediated by service quality. Employee professionalism does not necessarily lead to satisfaction if service procedures are complicated or completion times are too long. Similarly, good facilities do not guarantee satisfaction if the service is unresponsive. Service quality serves as a bridge that ensures professionalism and facilities can be transformed into public satisfaction (Zeithaml, Bitner, & Gremler, 2018). Previous research also explains that quality service can mitigate the negative impacts of limited facilities and professionalism, and increase public trust in government agencies (Nor et al., 2022).

Pathway to Public Satisfaction: Linking Professionalism and Facilities Through Service Quality

Empirical phenomena in the field indicate that public service issues remain a concern, including at the Mojokerto Regency Investment and One-Stop Integrated Service Office (DPMPTSP). Public complaints regarding long service completion times, lack of employee responsiveness, and suboptimal facilities remain frequent. Data from the 2024–2025 Public Satisfaction Index (IKM) shows the lowest scores for completion time and service procedures are in the range of 75–79, which is considered less than ideal. Employee competency and infrastructure also exhibit fluctuating values.

This situation underscores the need for research into the influence of professionalism and facilities on public satisfaction, with service quality as a mediating variable. The results are expected to provide an empirical understanding of the role of these two factors in shaping satisfaction and how service quality can strengthen this relationship. These findings can provide an important basis for local governments in formulating policies to improve public services that are more responsive, efficient, and oriented toward community needs.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS

Work Professionalism

Work professionalism is a fundamental concept in the modern workplace, describing the extent to which individuals perform their duties, responsibilities, and organizational roles with high standards of competence, ethics, and quality (Robbins & Judge, 2019). Professionalism encompasses not only a worker's technical abilities or skills but also reflects their attitudes, values, and commitment to consistent performance quality. Professional individuals are able to display reliable, disciplined work behaviors, and are oriented toward achieving organizational goals without neglecting moral and ethical principles (Gibson et al., 2020).

At the competency level, work professionalism requires workers to possess knowledge and expertise relevant to their field. The ability to continuously learn and keep abreast of developments in science and technology is an integral part of professionalism (Noe et al., 2021). Professional workers understand that improving their own capacity is a crucial investment in maintaining work quality and competitiveness. Furthermore, responsibility and integrity are key pillars. Professionalism is reflected in an individual's ability to complete work in a timely, accurate, and accountable manner (Mathis & Jackson, 2019).

From a work ethics perspective, professionalism encompasses a commitment to applicable norms, values, and regulations, including maintaining confidentiality, acting honestly, and avoiding conflicts of interest (Colquitt et al., 2021). Professionalism also reflects a positive work attitude, such as respecting colleagues, being able to work collaboratively, being open to criticism, and maintaining effective communication.

In an organizational context, a high level of work professionalism contributes to increased productivity, service quality, and the institution's reputation. Organizations that foster a professional culture will be able to create a conducive, competitive, and sustainable work environment (Mondy & Martocchio, 2016). Thus, work professionalism is a crucial foundation for individual and organizational success in navigating the increasingly complex dynamics of the workplace.

Facilities

Service facilities are a crucial variable in studies of public service management and service delivery in general. Facilities are understood as all forms of physical infrastructure provided by an organization to support the smooth running of the service process so that user needs, comfort, and satisfaction can be optimally met (Tjiptono, 2016; Kotler & Keller, 2016). In the context of public services—such as healthcare, education, population administration, or licensing—facilities serve as an initial representation of service quality because they are often the first aspect seen and felt by the public before interacting with staff (Lupiyoadi, 2014).

Conceptually, service facilities encompass several key dimensions. First, facility availability, which refers to the extent to which basic facilities such as service rooms, seating, counters, information boards, parking areas, and technological devices are available and accessible to service users. The availability of adequate facilities reflects the organization's readiness to provide services effectively (Ratminto & Winarsih, 2019). Second, the physical condition of the facilities, including cleanliness, comfort, security, and the suitability of the equipment used. Clean, well-organized, and well-functioning facilities will enhance positive public perceptions of services (Zeithaml, Bitner, & Gremler, 2018).

The third dimension is facility modernity. In the digital era, the public has high expectations that public services be supported by information technology-based tools, such as electronic queuing systems, online service applications, informative websites, and responsive computer hardware. Facility modernization has been proven to accelerate service processes and reduce the potential for manual errors (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988). Fourth, facility accessibility, which relates to the ease with which the public can reach and use these facilities, includes the provision of accessible pathways, clear signage, and unambiguous layouts (Moenir, 2010).

Service facility variables significantly influence perceptions of service quality and levels of public satisfaction. In various studies, facilities are often the primary determinant of user satisfaction. Good facilities can reduce negative perceptions, expedite the service process, and create a pleasant service experience (Tjiptono & Chandra, 2016). Conversely, poor facilities—for

Pathway to Public Satisfaction: Linking Professionalism and Facilities Through Service Quality

example, hot waiting rooms, broken equipment, or a lack of signage—can create disappointment even before the core service is delivered.

Furthermore, service facilities also impact staff efficiency. Adequate facilities help staff work more quickly, efficiently, and productively. Staff supported by complete facilities tend to be more professional and focused, thus improving overall service quality (Sedarmayanti, 2017).

Thus, service facilities are not merely physical attributes, but strategic assets that support an organization's operational success and service quality. Regular evaluation and improvement of facilities are necessary to meet the evolving needs of the community, in line with the demands for increasingly transparent, expeditious, and user-satisfaction-oriented public services.

Service Quality

Service quality is a fundamental concept in management, service marketing, and public administration. This concept refers to the level of service excellence that meets or exceeds customer expectations. In both public and private sector organizations, service quality is viewed as a key determinant of user satisfaction, loyalty, and institutional sustainability (Zeithaml, Bitner, & Gremler, 2018). Service quality theory has evolved from customer-perception-based approaches to models that emphasize internal organizational standards.

One of the most influential theories is the SERVQUAL model developed by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1988). This model defines service quality as the gap between customer expectations of an ideal service and their perceptions after receiving the actual service. When perceptions fall below expectations, customers perceive the service as poor; conversely, when perceptions exceed expectations, quality is perceived as high. SERVQUAL offers five main dimensions as indicators of service quality.

First, Tangibles, which are all visible physical aspects of the service, such as buildings, facilities, equipment, technology, and employee appearance. Physical evidence influences users' initial impressions of an organization's professionalism (Lovelock & Wirtz, 2016). Second, reliability reflects the organization's ability to provide services promptly, accurately, and consistently. Reliability is the most important dimension because customers expect stable and reliable service (Parasuraman et al., 1988).

Third, responsiveness, which refers to the willingness of employees to help customers and provide prompt service. This dimension encompasses the ability to respond to customer needs in a timely and effective manner. Fourth, assurance, which encompasses employee competence, courtesy, credibility, and the sense of security customers feel during the service process. This dimension strengthens customer trust in the organization's professionalism (Zeithaml et al., 2018). Fifth, empathy, which refers to personal attention and a deep understanding of individual customer needs.

In addition to SERVQUAL, service quality theory is also explained through the ServPerf model developed by Cronin and Taylor (1992). ServPerf critiques the SERVQUAL gap concept, asserting that service quality is more accurately measured solely through perceptions of actual service performance without comparing it to expectations. They argue that customer expectations are unstable and difficult to standardize, making performance-based assessments more realistic and reliable.

In the context of public services, service quality is measured not only through user satisfaction but also through the values of accountability, transparency, efficiency, and fairness. Public services must adhere to the principles of good governance, so quality is assessed not only from the interaction aspect but also from adherence to procedures, clarity of information, regulatory compliance, and the integrity of officials (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2015).

Service quality is also influenced by internal organizational factors such as work culture, human resource competency, leadership, and information systems. Organizations with a strong service culture are more consistent in maintaining service standards (Luthans, 2011). Furthermore, information technology enhances quality through faster, more accurate, less expensive, and more predictable processes.

Overall, service quality theory asserts that an organization's success in providing superior service depends on its ability to understand customer needs, provide services according to standards, and implement continuous improvement. Service quality is a dynamic process involving customer interactions, perceptions, and experiences. By maintaining high service quality, organizations can build trust, increase satisfaction, and create long-term value for their customers.

Public Satisfaction

In the context of public services, public satisfaction is not only measured by the physical aspects of service quality, but is also influenced by procedural dimensions, human interactions, and perceptions of fairness (Zeithaml, Bitner, & Gremler, 2018). Therefore, public satisfaction theory developed through the service quality or SERVQUAL approach as developed by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1988), which emphasizes five main dimensions: tangibles (physical facilities and infrastructure), reliability (reliability of procedures and service outcomes), responsiveness (speed and willingness to help), assurance (knowledge, safety, and competence of staff), and empathy (personal attention and a humanistic attitude). In public services, these five dimensions form the basis for assessing service quality, which then shapes public satisfaction.

With the development of the new public management (NPM) paradigm, public satisfaction is understood as a crucial indicator of the success of modern bureaucracy. The government is required not only to operate according to procedures but also to provide

Pathway to Public Satisfaction: Linking Professionalism and Facilities Through Service Quality

services oriented to the needs and experiences of users (Hughes, 2012). Therefore, many agencies implement public satisfaction surveys to measure citizen perceptions of service effectiveness, efficiency, professionalism, and accountability. The results of these surveys are used as a basis for continuous improvement and evidence-based policymaking (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992).

Furthermore, public satisfaction theory is also influenced by psychological and social factors. Public perceptions can be shaped by personal experiences, public opinion, emotional factors, and institutional image (Kotler & Keller, 2016). Even two individuals receiving identical services can provide different assessments due to differences in expectations, needs, and levels of trust in government. Therefore, public satisfaction is inseparable from public legitimacy—the more satisfied citizens are, the higher their level of trust and support for the government (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2015).

Overall, public satisfaction theory demonstrates that good public service is not simply about complying with regulations, but also about meeting and exceeding the needs, expectations, and values of the community being served. Public satisfaction is a reflection of the quality of governance and a benchmark for the success of bureaucratic reform in various public service sectors.

The influence of professionalism and facilities on public satisfaction is mediated by service quality.

Public satisfaction is a key indicator of the success of public service delivery. The government, as a service provider, is required to provide services that are fast, accurate, friendly, and meet user expectations (Dwiyanto, 2018). In this context, the professionalism of civil servants and the adequacy of service facilities are two important factors influencing public perception and satisfaction. However, their influence is not always direct; rather, they are often mediated by the quality of service provided by public institutions (Hardiyansyah, 2018).

Public servant professionalism is reflected in technical skills, integrity, responsibility, and a service attitude with good ethics (Robbins & Judge, 2017). Professional civil servants understand procedures, master their tasks, and are able to provide appropriate solutions to public needs. Friendly, communicative, and responsive attitudes are forms of professional behavior that create a positive experience for service users. When civil servants work professionally, the public feels valued and receives fair service, thus improving perceptions of service quality. This improvement in service quality ultimately drives increased public satisfaction (Lovelock & Wirtz, 2016).

On the other hand, service facilities are an equally important supporting factor. Physical facilities and infrastructure, such as comfortable waiting rooms, electronic queuing systems, clear service information, room cleanliness, the availability of service counters, and digital service technology, play a crucial role in creating effective and efficient services (Tjiptono & Chandra, 2016). Adequate facilities facilitate public access to services, expedite the process, and minimize potential complaints. Conversely, poor facilities can hinder service delivery, even if staff are working professionally. Therefore, good facilities directly contribute to public perceptions of service quality (Kotler & Keller, 2016).

Service quality serves as a mediating variable because it bridges how professionalism and facilities translate into a perceived service experience. Professionalism of government officials and good facilities does not automatically create satisfaction; it must be translated into quality service—encompassing the dimensions of reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, and tangibles, as described in the SERVQUAL model (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988). When service quality improves, the public perceives that the service provided meets their expectations and meets their needs.

In this mediating relationship, government official professionalism strengthens the dimensions of empathy, responsiveness, and assurance, while facilities strengthen the dimensions of tangibles and reliability. Both simultaneously enhance perceptions of service quality, ultimately significantly boosting public satisfaction. Therefore, to increase public satisfaction, public agencies must build the competence and integrity of government officials and optimize supporting service facilities. Integrating these two aspects through improving service quality is a key strategy in realizing high-quality public services oriented toward public satisfaction.

Based on the literature review, the hypotheses in this study can be formulated as follows:

- H1: Work professionalism has a significant effect on service quality.
- H2: Facilities have a significant effect on service quality.
- H3: Professionalism has a significant effect on public satisfaction.
- H4: Facilities have a significant effect on public satisfaction.
- H5: Service quality has a significant effect on public satisfaction.
- H6: Work professionalism and facilities influence public satisfaction through service quality.
- H7: Work professionalism and facilities influence public satisfaction through service quality.

III. RESEARCH METHODS

The population in this study was the unknown number of service users at the Investment and One-Stop Integrated Services Agency (DPMPTSP) in Mojokerto Regency, East Java, Indonesia. To calculate the sample size, we used Cochran's Sample Size Formula, with a 5% margin of error, resulting in a sample size of 67 individuals. The sampling technique used was convenience sampling, which is a sampling technique based on respondents who were available and willing to complete the questionnaire.

Pathway to Public Satisfaction: Linking Professionalism and Facilities Through Service Quality

The research instrument measured four variables: work professionalism, facilities, service quality, and public satisfaction, using a Likert scale with response categories: strongly agree, agree, somewhat agree, disagree, and strongly disagree.

Next, the data was analyzed using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) – PLS. The decision to use the SEM PLS data analysis technique was based on the following considerations: it does not require normally distributed data, can use a small sample size (a minimum of 30 is recommended), does not require randomization of the sample, can use measurement scales other than intervals, can use formative indicators to measure latent variables, is suitable for use as a procedure for developing theory in the early stages, and allows for very complex models with many latent variables and indicators (Ghozali, 2018).

IV. RESULTS

Outer Model Evaluation

The measurement model demonstrates the relationship between the manifest variables or measurement items and the latent variables in the study. These tests include convergent validity, discriminant validity, and composite reliability.

Convergent Validity Test

Convergent validity is determined based on the principle that measures of a construct should have a high correlation. The convergent validity of a construct with its reflective indicators is evaluated using the Average Variance Extracted (AVE). According to Ghozali and Latan (2015), the convergent validity test uses the parameter Average Variance Extraneous Lit (AVE) value > 0.5 . The following are the results of the convergent validity test.

Table 1. Average variant extracted (AVE)

Variables	<i>Average variant extracted (AVE)</i>
Work Professionalism	0.684
Facilities	0.636
Service Quality	0.756
Public Satisfaction	0.859

Based on Table 1, it is known that the AVE value for each construct is >0.5 . Therefore, the convergent validity test results are met because all items in each construct can be declared valid.

Next, we test Convergent Validity using the Outer Loading or Factor Loading values. An indicator is considered to meet Convergent Validity in the good category if the Outer Loading value is >0.7 . The following are the Outer Loading values for each indicator in the research variables.

Indicator Reliability

To measure the reliability of a construct in SEM-PLS, two methods are used: Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability. This research instrument is considered reliable if the Composite Reliability value is >0.7 and the Cronbach's Alpha value is >0.7 . The results of the reliability test are presented in the following table.

Table 2. Indicator Reliability

Variables	<i>Composite Reliability</i>	<i>Cronbach's Alpha</i>
Work Professionalism	0.915	0.884
Facilities	0.897	0.858
Service Quality	0.939	0.918
Public Satisfaction	0.968	0.959

Table 2 shows that all constructs have a Cronbach's Alpha value > 0.70 and a Composite Reliability value > 0.70 . According to Ghozali and Latan (2015), a construct or variable is considered reliable if its Cronbach's Alpha value is > 0.70 and its composite reliability value is > 0.7 . The closer the composite reliability value is to 1, the higher its internal consistency reliability (Hair et al., 2022). Therefore, it can be concluded that all research constructs are reliable.

Structural Model Evaluation

Structural model evaluation aims to predict the relationships between latent variables, evaluated using R-square. R-square values of 0.67, 0.33, and 0.19 indicate strong, moderate, and weak models, respectively (Chin et al., 1998). The coefficient of determination is a way to assess the extent to which an endogenous construct can be explained by an exogenous construct.

Pathway to Public Satisfaction: Linking Professionalism and Facilities Through Service Quality

Table 3. Coefficient of Determination

Variables	Nilai <i>R-square</i>
Service Quality	0.438
Public Satisfaction	0.486

Based on Table 3, the R-Square value of service quality of 0.438 can be interpreted that 43.8% of the variation in service quality can be explained by work professionalism and the availability of facilities. This figure is in the moderate category according to Chin's (1998) criteria, thus indicating that work professionalism and facilities have a significant contribution to strengthening the improvement of service quality. Furthermore, the R-Square value of public satisfaction of 0.486 means that 48.6% of the variation in public satisfaction can be explained by work professionalism, facilities and service quality. This value is in the moderate category, indicating that these three variables have a fairly strong contribution to increasing public satisfaction.

Hypothesis Testing Results

Hypothesis testing was conducted to determine the influence of job characteristics and discipline variables on employee performance, both directly and as moderated by organizational culture. The following table presents the results of the hypothesis testing.

Table 4. Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis	T statistics	P values	Decision
Work Professionalism → Service Quality	3.132	0.002	Significant
Facilities → Service Quality	2.271	0.023	Significant
Work Professionalism → Public Satisfaction	2.956	0.003	Significant
Facilities → Public Satisfaction	2.928	0.003	Significant
Service Quality → Public Satisfaction	2.749	0.006	Significant
Work Professionalism → Service Quality → Public Satisfaction	1.662	0.096	Not Significant
Facilities → Service Quality → Public Satisfaction	1.983	0.047	Significant

Based on table 6, it can be seen that 6 (six) hypotheses proposed in this study are stated to have a significant influence because the t-Statistics value is > 1.96 and the P-Values value is < 0.05 ; while 1 (one) hypothesis is stated to be insignificant.

V. DISCUSSION

The Effect of Work Professionalism on Service Quality

The results of the hypothesis test in Table 6 indicate that work professionalism significantly influences service quality, with a T-statistic of 3.132 and a P-value of 0.002. This confirms that strong work professionalism can improve service quality at the Investment and One-Stop Integrated Service Office (DPMPTSP) of Mojokerto Regency, East Java, Indonesia. Work professionalism is a key factor determining service quality within an organization, particularly in the public sector and customer-based services. Professionalism is reflected through employee competence, integrity, discipline, work attitude, and the ability to perform tasks according to operational standards (Sedarmayanti, 2017). When employees demonstrate high professionalism, the service process becomes more structured, accurate, and responsive to user needs. This directly impacts increased public trust and satisfaction with the service provider (Dwiyanto, 2018).

The influence of professionalism on service quality can be seen from several aspects. First, professional employees understand work procedures well, thus minimizing errors, expediting processes, and providing appropriate solutions. Clear and adhered work standards make service more efficient and consistent (Ratminto & Winarsih, 2015). Second, professionalism is also reflected in employees' ability to communicate and interact politely, friendly, and empathetic. This attitude creates a positive service experience and makes the public feel valued (Robbins & Judge, 2019). Third, professionalism encourages employees to maintain integrity and accountability, ensuring that services are free from harmful practices, such as discrimination and abuse of authority (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992).

Furthermore, professionalism fosters individual motivation and responsibility for their work. Professional employees work not only to fulfill formal obligations but also demonstrate a strong commitment to service quality. They tend to conduct self-evaluations, improve their skills, and adapt to changing user needs (Mangkunegara, 2017). Thus, professionalism has a close and significant relationship with improving service quality. Organizations that build a professional work culture will be better able to provide fast, accurate services and meet public expectations.

Pathway to Public Satisfaction: Linking Professionalism and Facilities Through Service Quality

The Influence of Facilities on Service Quality

The results of the hypothesis test in Table 6 indicate that the availability of facilities significantly influences service quality, with a T-statistic of 2.271 and a P-value of 0.023. This confirms that adequate service facilities can improve service quality at the Investment and One-Stop Integrated Service Office (DPMPTSP) of Mojokerto Regency, East Java, Indonesia. Office facilities are a crucial element in determining service quality in an organization, both in the public and private sectors. Adequate facilities encompass not only physical infrastructure such as workspaces, technological equipment, waiting rooms, and administrative tools, but also supporting systems such as internet connections, service applications, and a clean and comfortable work environment. When office facilities are in good condition and functioning optimally, the service process can be more effective, fast, and accurate because employees can work more focused and efficiently without being hampered by limited facilities (Sedarmayanti, 2017).

The availability of complete facilities also impacts user perceptions of the service. A well-organized service area, modern service tools, and a responsive information system provide a positive experience for the public. Users feel valued when services are provided through professional and comfortable facilities. Conversely, inadequate facilities often create communication barriers, slow service processes, and reduce public trust in the organization. For example, frequent computer outages, unstable internet connections, or cramped service areas can prolong service processing times and trigger customer dissatisfaction (Tjiptono, 2018).

Furthermore, good office facilities also impact employee motivation and performance. A comfortable work environment supported by modern equipment boosts morale, reduces stress, and encourages employees to provide the best service. When employees work in supportive facilities, productivity increases and service quality becomes more consistent. Therefore, office facilities play a strategic role in ensuring quality, responsive service, and meeting public expectations (Moenir, 2010). Organizations must ensure the availability and ongoing maintenance of facilities to maintain service quality.

The Influence of Work Professionalism on Public Satisfaction

The results of the hypothesis test in Table 6 indicate that work professionalism significantly influences public satisfaction, with a T-statistic of 2.956 and a P-value of 0.003. This confirms that strong work professionalism can increase public satisfaction at the Investment and One-Stop Integrated Services Agency (DPMPTSP) of Mojokerto Regency, East Java, Indonesia. Work professionalism is a key determinant of public satisfaction with both public and customer-based services. Professionalism is reflected in employee competence, integrity, discipline, work ethic, and the ability to provide services according to established standards (Lupiyoadi, 2018). When employees work professionally, they are able to provide fast, precise, friendly, and accurate service, so that the public feels valued and receives treatment that meets their expectations.

The influence of professionalism on public satisfaction is significant because the quality of interactions between employees and service users is the first factor perceived by the public. Employees with high professionalism tend to be able to understand user needs, provide relevant solutions, and demonstrate a responsive attitude to complaints and questions. This creates a positive impression and increases public trust in service providers (Hardiansyah, 2018).

Furthermore, employee professionalism is also closely related to compliance with procedures and service standards. When employees carry out their duties according to regulations, the risk of errors, delays, and inconsistent service is minimized (Zeithaml et al., 2018). This consistency is a crucial aspect that drives public satisfaction because the service received is not only fast and accurate, but also fair and predictable. The public then perceives a professionally managed institution as having a strong commitment to quality service.

Furthermore, professionalism creates a conducive organizational atmosphere, improves coordination between employees, and streamlines the service process. The impact is felt not only internally but also externally through an improved image of the institution in the eyes of the public. Therefore, the higher the level of employee professionalism, the higher the public satisfaction with the quality of service provided (Tjiptono, 2019).

The Influence of Facilities on Public Satisfaction

The results of the hypothesis test in Table 6 indicate that the availability of facilities significantly influences public satisfaction, with a T-statistic of 2.928 and a P-value of 0.003. This confirms that adequate service facilities can increase public satisfaction with services at the Investment and One-Stop Integrated Services Office (DPMPTSP) of Mojokerto Regency, East Java, Indonesia. The availability of facilities is a strategic factor that directly influences public satisfaction with public and community-based services. These facilities include various physical and non-physical elements, such as comfortable service spaces, adequate work equipment, easily accessible information systems, parking facilities, clean waiting areas, and the availability of other supporting facilities. When an institution provides complete, well-maintained, and optimally functioning facilities, the public will experience ease in obtaining services without significant obstacles (Kotler & Keller, 2016).

The availability of good facilities can create a positive service experience. The public tends to feel valued when they are given access to well-organized service spaces, modern equipment, and clear and efficient procedures. Furthermore, adequate facilities can reduce waiting times, increase comfort, and provide a sense of security. All of these aspects ultimately improve public perception of the quality of services provided (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988). Conversely, limited or poorly maintained

Pathway to Public Satisfaction: Linking Professionalism and Facilities Through Service Quality

facilities often lead to complaints, increase service times, and create inconvenience, which impacts low levels of satisfaction (Tjiptono, 2014).

In the context of public organizations, the provision of facilities is not simply about meeting physical standards but also reflects the government or institution's commitment to providing the best service. When facilities are professionally managed, the public will perceive attention to their needs (Sinambela, 2012). Therefore, it can be concluded that the better the facilities available, the higher the level of public satisfaction. This suggests that investing in facility quality is a crucial step in improving service effectiveness and strengthening public trust in service providers.

The Effect of Service Quality on Public Satisfaction

The results of the hypothesis test in Table 6 indicate that service quality significantly influences public satisfaction, with a T-statistic of 2.749 and a P-value of 0.006. This confirms that good service quality can increase public satisfaction with services at the Investment and One-Stop Integrated Services Agency (DPMPTSP) of Mojokerto Regency, East Java, Indonesia. Service quality is a fundamental factor that directly determines the level of public satisfaction with public and community-based services. Service quality encompasses not only the final outcome of the service received by the public, but also the process, attitude, and ability of the service provider to meet user needs and expectations. In the context of public services, the public assesses service quality through various indicators such as speed, accuracy, friendliness, clarity of information, staff's ability to provide solutions, and the comfort of the facilities provided (Parasuraman et al., 1988; Kotler & Keller, 2016).

When service quality is optimally delivered, the public feels that their needs are understood and valued. Fast and accurate service provides a positive experience by reducing waiting times and minimizing errors. The friendliness and professionalism of staff also create pleasant interactions, making the public feel respected. Furthermore, simple and transparent service procedures make the public feel safe and trust the service provider. This strengthens the relationship between service quality and satisfaction levels, as explained by Service Quality (SERVQUAL) theory, which asserts that positive perceptions of service significantly influence user satisfaction (Zeithaml et al., 2009).

Conversely, if service quality is low—for example, complicated processes, unresponsive staff, unclear information, or inadequate facilities—this can lead to disappointment and undermine public trust. In the long term, poor service quality not only hinders public satisfaction but also impacts the organization's image and public participation (Tjiptono, 2017).

Thus, service quality plays a key role in shaping public satisfaction. People tend to feel satisfied when the service they receive meets or even exceeds expectations. Therefore, organizations need to ensure that service standards are consistently implemented, oriented toward user needs, and continuously improve to create superior and satisfying services. The Effect of Service Quality on Public Satisfaction

The results of the hypothesis test in Table 6 indicate that service quality significantly influences public satisfaction, with a T-statistic of 2.749 and a P-value of 0.006. This confirms that good service quality can increase public satisfaction with services at the Investment and One-Stop Integrated Services Agency (DPMPTSP) of Mojokerto Regency, East Java, Indonesia. Service quality is a fundamental factor that directly determines the level of public satisfaction with public and community-based services. Service quality encompasses not only the final outcome of the service received by the public, but also the process, attitude, and ability of the service provider to meet user needs and expectations. In the context of public services, the public assesses service quality through various indicators such as speed, accuracy, friendliness, clarity of information, staff's ability to provide solutions, and the comfort of the facilities provided (Parasuraman et al., 1988; Kotler & Keller, 2016).

When service quality is optimally delivered, the public feels that their needs are understood and valued. Fast and accurate service provides a positive experience by reducing waiting times and minimizing errors. The friendliness and professionalism of staff also create pleasant interactions, making the public feel respected. Furthermore, simple and transparent service procedures make the public feel safe and trust the service provider. This strengthens the relationship between service quality and satisfaction levels, as explained by Service Quality (SERVQUAL) theory, which asserts that positive perceptions of service significantly influence user satisfaction (Zeithaml et al., 2009).

Conversely, if service quality is low—for example, complicated processes, unresponsive staff, unclear information, or inadequate facilities—this can lead to disappointment and undermine public trust. In the long term, poor service quality not only hinders public satisfaction but also impacts the organization's image and public participation (Tjiptono, 2017).

Thus, service quality plays a key role in shaping public satisfaction. People tend to feel satisfied when the service they receive meets or even exceeds expectations. Therefore, organizations need to ensure that service standards are consistently implemented, oriented toward user needs, and continuously improve to create superior and satisfying services.

Service Quality Moderates the Effect of Work Professionalism on Public Satisfaction.

Table 6 shows that service quality plays a moderating role in the influence of work professionalism on public satisfaction, as indicated by T-statistics <1.96 ($1.662 < 1.96$) and P-values >0.05 ($0.096 > 0.05$). This indicates that work professionalism does not significantly influence public satisfaction, moderated by service quality at the Investment and One-Stop Integrated Service Office (DPMPTSP) of Mojokerto Regency, East Java, Indonesia. Work professionalism is often considered a crucial factor in improving the quality of civil servant performance and public satisfaction. However, in some public service contexts, empirical findings

Pathway to Public Satisfaction: Linking Professionalism and Facilities Through Service Quality

indicate that work professionalism does not always significantly influence public satisfaction, even when service quality is included as a moderating factor (Hardiyansyah, 2018; Zeithaml et al., 2018). This insignificance can be explained by several reasons related to public perception, service characteristics, and external factors influencing the user experience.

First, the public generally assesses satisfaction based on the direct service outcomes they receive, rather than on the process or the professional attitudes of employees. Although employees perform according to professional standards such as discipline, competence, and ethics, the public tends to focus more on the final output, such as speed of service, ease of procedures, or the fulfillment of their needs (Parasuraman et al., 1988). Thus, professionalism is not a primary determinant of satisfaction.

Second, service quality, which should act as a moderating variable, is sometimes not strong enough to confirm the relationship between professionalism and public satisfaction. This means that even if service quality is deemed good, the public may still not perceive the impact of professionalism because other aspects such as policies, infrastructure, administrative burden, or waiting times are more dominant in influencing their satisfaction (Lovelock & Wirtz, 2016). If service quality is unable to improve public perceptions of employee professionalism, its moderating effect is weakened.

Third, interactions between employees and the public in public services are often influenced by situational factors. For example, high queues, limited facilities, or suboptimal systems can obscure the contribution of professionalism, thus not reflecting public satisfaction (Hardiyansyah, 2018).

Thus, the insignificant effect of work professionalism on public satisfaction, moderated by service quality, indicates that public satisfaction is a multidimensional phenomenon more strongly influenced by structural and systemic aspects than by employee professional behavior alone.

Service Quality Moderates the Effect of Facilities on Public Satisfaction

Table 6 shows that service quality plays a moderating role in the influence of work professionalism on public satisfaction, as indicated by T-statistics > 1.96 ($1.983 > 1.96$) and P-values < 0.047 ($0.047 < 0.05$). This indicates that the availability of adequate facilities significantly influences public satisfaction, moderated by service quality at the Investment and One-Stop Integrated Services Office (DPMPTSP) of Mojokerto Regency, East Java, Indonesia. The availability of adequate facilities plays a strategic role in increasing public satisfaction, particularly in the context of public services and community-based services. Good facilities reflect the organization's readiness to provide effective, efficient, and comfortable services to service users (Lupiyoadi, 2018). The availability of clean and well-organized service spaces, optimally functioning work equipment, a clear queuing system, comfortable waiting areas, and information technology support are important indicators influencing public perception of the quality of service received (Tjiptono & Chandra, 2016). When facilities are complete and well-maintained, the public perceives the organization as strongly committed to providing the best service, leading to significantly increased satisfaction levels (Kotler & Keller, 2020).

However, the influence of facilities on public satisfaction is not independent. Service quality acts as a moderating factor, strengthening or weakening this relationship. In other words, adequate facilities will only have a maximum impact when accompanied by good service quality. Responsive, friendly, competent staff who are able to utilize facilities effectively will create a more positive service experience (Parasuraman et al., 1988). Conversely, even if facilities are complete, if service is delivered slowly, unprofessionally, or does not meet public needs, they will not significantly increase satisfaction.

Service quality, as a moderating variable, works by increasing the utility of available facilities. When facilities are optimally utilized in the service process, the public not only experiences physical comfort but also gains confidence that the service they receive meets expected standards (Zeithaml, Bitner, & Gremler, 2018). Therefore, the combination of adequate facilities and excellent service quality is the key to achieving higher and more sustainable public satisfaction.

VI. CONCLUSION

The results of this study confirm that work professionalism and facilities play a significant role in increasing public satisfaction, both directly and indirectly through service quality. Work professionalism has been shown to positively contribute to service quality, as reflected in the ability of officers to perform their duties competently, ethically, responsively, and according to standards. However, the direct influence of work professionalism on public satisfaction indicates that high levels of employee professionalism do not necessarily automatically increase satisfaction. This indicates that the public perceives the benefits of professionalism more when the quality of service they receive truly reflects that professional performance.

Facilities have also been shown to have a significant influence on service quality and public satisfaction. The availability of adequate facilities—both physical facilities such as service rooms, work equipment, waiting areas, and supporting systems such as information technology—can create a faster, more comfortable, and more accurate service process. In this context, facilities are a key supporting factor that strengthens the effectiveness of employee performance and the public service experience.

This study also confirms that service quality does not always play a mediating role between work professionalism and facilities and public satisfaction. Good service quality does not necessarily optimize the influence of these two variables, ensuring that the public experiences higher quality services that meet expectations and provide a positive experience. Therefore, improving service quality is a key priority for public organizations.

Pathway to Public Satisfaction: Linking Professionalism and Facilities Through Service Quality

Overall, this study concludes that a combination of high professionalism, adequate facilities, and superior service quality is a crucial foundation for achieving optimal levels of public satisfaction. These findings provide a basis for policymakers to strengthen professional standards, improve infrastructure, and ensure service quality that is oriented toward public needs.

REFERENCES

- 1) Cochran, W. G. (1977). *Sampling techniques* (3rd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- 2) Cooper, T. L. (2012). *The Responsible Administrator: An Approach to Ethics for the Administrative Role* (6th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- 3) Colquitt, J. A., LePine, J. A., & Wesson, M. J. (2021). *Organizational behavior: Improving performance and commitment in the workplace* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- 4) Cronin, J. J., & Taylor, S. A. (1992). *Measuring service quality: A reexamination and extension*. *Journal of Marketing*, 56(3), 55–68.
- 5) Denhardt, J. V., & Denhardt, R. B. (2015). *The New Public Service: Serving, Not Steering* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- 6) Dwiyanto, A. (2018). *Manajemen pelayanan publik: Peduli, inklusif, dan kolaboratif*. Gadjah Mada University Press.
- 7) DPMPSTP Kabupaten Mojokerto. (2024–2025). *Laporan Indeks Kepuasan Masyarakat*. Pemerintah Kabupaten Mojokerto.
- 8) Freidson, E. (2001). *Professionalism: The Third Logic*. University of Chicago Press.
- 9) Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M., & Donnelly, J. H. (2012). *Organizations: Behavior, Structure, Processes* (14th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- 10) Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M., Donnelly, J. H., & Konopaske, R. (2020). *Organizations: Behavior, structure, processes* (15th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- 11) Hughes, O. E. (2012). *Public Management and Administration: An Introduction*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- 12) Hardiyansyah. (2018). *Kualitas pelayanan publik: Konsep, dimensi, indikator, dan implementasinya*. Gava Media.
- 13) Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). *Marketing Management* (15th ed.). Pearson.
- 14) Lupiyoadi, R. (2018). *Manajemen Pemasaran Jasa*. Salemba Empat.
- 15) Lovelock, C., & Wirtz, J. (2016). *Services Marketing: People, Technology, Strategy* (8th ed.). Pearson.
- 16) Luthans, F. (2011). *Organizational Behavior* (12th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- 17) Mathis, R. L., & Jackson, J. H. (2019). *Human resource management* (15th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- 18) Mondy, R. W., & Martocchio, J. J. (2016). *Human resource management* (14th ed.). Pearson.
- 19) Noe, R. A., Hollenbeck, J. R., Gerhart, B., & Wright, P. M. (2021). *Fundamentals of human resource management* (9th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- 20) Mangkunegara, A. A. A. P. (2017). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Perusahaan*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- 21) Moenir, H. A. S. (2010). *Manajemen Pelayanan Umum di Indonesia*. Bumi Aksara.
- 22) Nor, A. M., Nordin, N., & Wahab, S. A. (2022). Service quality, trust, and citizen satisfaction in public service delivery. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 45(6), 478–492.
- 23) Osborne, S. P., & Brown, K. (2013). *Handbook of innovation in public services*. Edward Elgar.
- 24) Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*. Addison-Wesley.
- 25) Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12–40.
- 26) Perry, J. L., & Wise, L. R. (1990). *The motivational bases of public service*. *Public Administration Review*, 50(3), 367–373.
- 27) Ratminto, & Winarsih, A. (2019). *Manajemen Pelayanan*. Pustaka Pelajar.
- 28) Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2019). *Organizational behavior* (18th ed.). Pearson.
- 29) Robbins, S. P., & Coulter, M. (2018). *Management* (13th ed.). Pearson.
- 30) Sedarmayanti. (2017). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Refika Aditama.
- 31) Spencer, L. M., & Spencer, S. M. (1993). *Competence at Work: Models for Superior Performance*. Wiley.
- 32) Sinambela, L. P. (2012). *Reformasi pelayanan publik: Teori, kebijakan, dan implementasi*. Bumi Aksara.
- 33) Tjiptono, F. (2017). *Service quality and satisfaction* (4th ed.). Andi Offset.
- 34) Zeithaml, V. A., Bitner, M. J., & Gremler, D. D. (2018). *Services marketing: Integrating customer focus across the firm* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill.



There is an Open Access article, distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution – Non Commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits remixing, adapting and building upon the work for non-commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited.