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ABSTRACT

This research establishes a relationship between the quality of hospital services and the satisfaction of BPJS Outpatient patients at the Assisted Hospital in Lawang District, Malang Regency, East Java. Quantitative methods were used in this research, with an analytical survey approach. Data was collected from 126 respondents selected using purposive sampling based on inclusion criteria. The results of univariate analysis show that the majority of respondents have a high school education level and most tend to be dissatisfied with hospital services. Bivariate analysis found a significant relationship between factors such as fitness, responsiveness, empathy, appearance, and service assurance with patient satisfaction.

INTRODUCTION

Quality healthcare is at the core of a proactive approach to meeting patient needs while maintaining ethical and medical standards. Currently, the health care industry, especially hospitals, is experiencing significant development. The increase in the number of both government-owned and private hospitals in various parts of Indonesia has created increasingly fierce competition in this sector.

The importance of hospital service quality cannot be ignored in the health service structure. Hospitals are expected to provide superior services to support health development goals within the National Health System (SKN) and contribute to improving public health. As a service company, hospitals are required to excel in providing quality services.

The government is committed to realizing equitable access to health services by creating a social security system through the National Health Insurance (JKN) program run by the Social Security Organizing Agency (BPJS). However, the implementation of JKN and BPJS Kesehatan is still faced with various obstacles, including low perceptions related to service quality and complaints related to limited choices of health facilities.

The increasing number of BPJS Kesehatan participants poses its own challenges in ensuring equitable services regardless of participant status. The quality of service in hospitals is crucial in supporting the BPJS Health program, where patient satisfaction is considered as an indicator of the success of this program.
Various dimensions of service quality such as reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, and direct evidence are important factors that affect patient satisfaction. Maintaining high standards of service quality, including providing qualified healthcare workers, is the key to success in maintaining patient trust and satisfaction.

Hospitals, as one of the partners in BPJS Health services, have an important role in providing comprehensive services, ranging from outpatient services to emergency departments. Service standards set by the government are a reference in ensuring the quality of services provided by hospitals.

Research on the effect of service quality on patient satisfaction at the Lawang Sub-District Assistance Hospital, Malang Regency, East Java, is an important step in evaluating hospital performance and finding ways to improve service to patients. With a focus on the quality of doctor services, this study aims to get a clearer picture of the factors that affect the satisfaction of BPJS Outpatient patients at the hospital. Through a deeper understanding of the interaction between service quality and patient satisfaction, it is hoped that solutions or recommendations can be found that can help improve the quality of service at the Lawang Sub-District Assistance Hospital.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research method carries a quantitative approach with a focus on analytical surveys. This approach relies on the philosophy of positivism and uses statistical analysis to examine the relationship between service quality and patient satisfaction of BPJS Outpatient at the Relief Hospital Malang District, Malang District, East Java Province in 2023. With a cross-sectional design, the study aims to explain in depth the impact of service quality on perceptions of patient satisfaction.

The research location focused on the Outpatient Polyclinic of Lawang Sub-District Assistance Hospital, Malang Regency, East Java Province. Site selection is based on significant patient visit data, especially in surgical patient care, as well as position as the largest contributor to revenue among other polyclinics. The research period covers August to October 2023, including the initial survey stages, data collection, data analysis, report preparation, and presentation of results in seminars.

The population in this study was all patients who sought treatment at the General Poly of Lawang Sub-District Assistance Hospital, Malang Regency, East Java Province during October 2022, with the number of patients that month reaching 512 people. Of the population, 126 people were selected as samples using the slovin formula. Sampling is carried out by purposive sampling method, considering inclusion criteria such as the number of patient visits and the patient’s ability to understand and answer questionnaires.

RESEARCH RESULTS

Univariate Analysis

Identitas Responden

Respondents’ identities include age, gender, education and occupation. The distribution of respondents’ identities is seen below.

1. Age Respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Umur Responden</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Children (5-11 years old)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Early adolescence (12-16 years)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Late adolescence (17-25 years)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Early Adult (26-35 years)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Late adult (36-45 years)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Early elderly (46-55 years)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Late elderly (56-65 years old)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Manula (&gt;65 years old)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Respondent's Gender

Table 2. Gender of Respondents at the Relief Hospital of Lawang District, Malang Regency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>58,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Respondent's Education

Table 3 Education of Respondents at the Assistance Hospital of Lawang District, Malang Regency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SMP</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SMA</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>55,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Akademi/S1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Respondent's Occupation

Table 4 Respondents' Work at the Relief Hospital in Lawang District, Malang Regency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Private Officers</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wiraswasta</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PNS</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Not Working</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality of Outpatient BPJS Patient Service at the Assistance Hospital Kec. Lawang Kab. Malang

Table 5 Distribution of Respondents by Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Very Not Good</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hospital service flow (patient registration)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14,3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The doctor's ability to explain the disease</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14,3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The doctor's ability to explain the treatment plan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11,1</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The ability of the doctor to explain the action / drug given</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12,7</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nurse skills in performing nursing actions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47,6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The ability of laboratory personnel to perform blood sampling actions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>48,4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Suitability of food to the patient's condition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12,7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Janitor skills</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15,1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6 Distribution of Respondents by Reliability Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number (People)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>73,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sum</strong></td>
<td><strong>126</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7 Distribution of Respondents by Responsiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Very Not Good</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Registration waiting time</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11,1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22,2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The ability of doctors to respond to patient complaints</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34,1</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The nurse’s ability to respond to patient complaints</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27,0</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dexterity of laboratory personnel in conducting examinations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24,6</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The deft nutritionist about the timing of the diet</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7,1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27,8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The strangulation of the hospital janitor in handling hospital hygiene</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15,1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22,2</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8 Distribution of respondents by category Responsiveness (Responsiveness)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number (People)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sum</strong></td>
<td><strong>126</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100,0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9 Distribution of Respondents Based on Empathy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Very Not Good</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Friendliness of registration officers in providing services at the hospital</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11,9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22,2</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Attention of doctors in providing services in hospitals</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9,6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13,5</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nurses’ attention in providing services in hospitals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19,8</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Patience of laboratory staff in providing services in hospitals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17,5</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Friendliness of nutritionists in providing services at the hospital</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4,8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13,5</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Janitor friendliness</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15,1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10,3</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10 Distribution of Respondents by Empathy Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number (People)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sum</strong></td>
<td><strong>126</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100,0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 Distribution of Respondents by Tangible (Appearance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Very Not Good</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ease of access to the hospital</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hospital waiting room</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hospital bathroom (toilet)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fittings of hospital beds, pillows and mattresses</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Neatness of the doctor's clothes in conducting examinations and treatment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Completeness of hospital information instructions, such as; Brochures, Promotions, Hospital Signage</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Electricity, clean water, temperature, ventilation, and noise in hospitals</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Availability of drugs needed in pharmacies</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Food menu for patients</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 Distribution of Respondents by Tangible Category (Appearance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number (People)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13. Distribution of Respondents Based on Patient Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Not Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Registration services</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The clothing of the hospital registry officer</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The flow of hospital services by registration officers in serving patients</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The registration waiting time is given by the registration officer in serving patients</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The friendliness of registration officers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Neatness of the clothes of specialist doctors in hospitals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Explanation by the doctor of the disease in serving patients</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Doctor's explanation of the treatment plan</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Doctors respond to patient complaints</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Attention of doctors to patients</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communication of doctors with patients 3 2.4 32 25.3 69 54.8 22 17.5 126 100.0
Change of doctor if the main doctor is unavailable Nurse Services 5 4.0 29 23.0 68 54.0 24 19.0 126 100.0
Neatness of nurses' clothes in the hospital 0 0.0 52 41.3 51 40.5 23 18.2 126 100.0
Explanation given by the nurse about the action / drug in serving patients 0 0.0 25 19.9 75 59.5 26 20.6 126 100.0
Nurse skills in infusing 0 0.0 49 38.9 48 38.1 29 23.0 126 100.0
Nurse's response to complaints 0 0.0 27 21.4 70 55.6 29 23.0 126 100.0
Nurse's attention to patients 0 0.0 29 23.0 62 49.2 35 27.8 126 100.0
Nurse to patient communication 0 0.0 30 23.8 61 48.4 35 27.8 126 100.0
Nurse guard shift change Medical Support Services (Laboratory/Radiology) 0 0.0 34 27.0 35 27.8 57 45.2 126 100.0
Explanation of the actions given by laboratory personnel 7 5.6 54 42.9 30 23.7 35 27.8 126 100.0
Patience of laboratory personnel 8 6.3 52 41.3 30 23.8 36 28.6 126 100.0
Communication of laboratory personnel 8 6.3 53 42.1 30 23.8 35 27.8 126 100.0
Notification of inspection results Nutrition Services 5 4.0 56 44.4 30 23.8 35 27.8 126 100.0
Neatness of nutritionist clothes 3 2.4 51 40.5 22 17.4 50 39.7 126 100.0
Cutlery fittings 2 1.6 38 30.2 33 26.2 53 42.1 126 100.0
Suitability of food to the patient's condition 2 1.6 42 33.3 22 17.5 60 47.6 126 100.0
The timing of feeding the diet 0 0.0 34 27.0 30 23.8 62 49.2 126 100.0
Friendliness of nutritionists 0 0.0 34 27.0 28 22.2 64 50.8 126 100.0
Food flavor 1 0.8 32 25.4 28 22.2 65 51.6 126 100.0
Cutlery collection two hours after food delivery 2 1.6 25 19.8 36 28.6 63 50.0 126 100.0
Hygiene
Room cleanliness 2 1.6 28 22.2 36 28.6 60 47.6 126 100.0
Cleaning officer skills 1 0.8 28 22.2 35 27.8 62 49.2 126 100.0
When to respond to hygiene complaints 1 0.8 30 23.8 32 25.4 63 50.0 126 100.0
Janitor friendliness 1 0.8 30 23.8 33 26.2 62 49.2 126 100.0
Waiting room cleanliness 0 0.0 27 21.4 35 27.8 64 50.8 126 100.0
Schedule of cleaning frequency of officers 0 0.0 51 40.5 13 10.3 62 49.2 126 100.0
Ease of access reaches RS 0 0.0 54 42.9 20 15.9 52 41.2 126 100.0
Room comfort 0 0.0 30 23.8 48 38.1 48 38.1 126 100.0
Availability of supporting facilities such as canteens, ATMs, parking lots, minimarkets 0 0.0 32 25.4 36 28.6 58 46.0 126 100.0

Table 14. Distribution of Respondents by Patient Satisfaction Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Univariate analysis of the data presented includes respondents’ identities, such as age, gender, education, and occupation. From the age distribution table of respondents, the majority of respondents are in the age range of early elderly to elderly (>65 years) with the highest percentage of 24.6%. Overall, respondents who are women are more than men with a ratio of 58.7% and 41.8%. In terms of education, the majority of respondents...
have a high school education background with a percentage of 55.6%. The majority of respondents' jobs consist of self-employed (34.1%) and private employees (19.8%). In addition, from tables that display the distribution of respondents based on categories of reliability, responsiveness, empathy, appearance, and patient satisfaction, it can be seen that the majority of respondents rated aspects of patient satisfaction in general tended to be dissatisfied with a percentage of 51.6%, while only 48.4% of respondents were satisfied with the services provided.

Bivariate Analysis

Reliability Relationship (Reliability) with Patient Satisfaction

Table 15 Reliability Relationship (Reliability) with Outpatient BPJS Patient Satisfaction at Kec. Lawang Relief Hospital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keandalan (Reliability)</th>
<th>Patient Satisfaction</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Not Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Relationship between Responsiveness and Patient Satisfaction

Table 16. The Relationship between Responsiveness and Outpatient BPJS Patient Satisfaction at the Lawang District Assistance Hospital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsiveness</th>
<th>Patient Satisfaction</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Not Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Relationship of Empathy with Patient Satisfaction

Table 17 The Relationship between Empathy and Outpatient BPJS Patient Satisfaction at the Lawang District Assistance Hospital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empati (Empathy)</th>
<th>Patient Satisfaction</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Not Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Relationship of Appearance (Tangible) with Patient Satisfaction

Table 18. Relationship between Appearance (Tangible) and Outpatient BPJS Patient Satisfaction at Kec. Lawang Relief Hospital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appearance (Tangible)</th>
<th>Patient Satisfaction</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Not Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Warranty Relationship (Assurance) with Patient Satisfaction

Table 19 Relationship between Assurance and Outpatient BPJS Patient Satisfaction at Lawang District Assistance Hospital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appearance (Tangible)</th>
<th>Patient Satisfaction</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Not Satisfied</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bivariate analysis showed a relationship between several factors and patient satisfaction. Reliability, responsiveness, empathy, tangible, and assurance factors show a significant association with patient satisfaction. Good reliability, responsiveness, empathy, appearance, and service assurance were positively correlated with higher levels of patient satisfaction. This can be seen from the significant p-value (p-value ≤ 0.05) in the tables that compare these factors with patient satisfaction.

DISCUSSION

In this study, the effect of service quality on outpatient BPJS patient satisfaction at Kec. Lawang Assistance Hospital, Malang Regency, was examined through variables such as reliability, responsiveness, empathy, appearance, and assurance.

In the reliability dimension, optimal service that takes into account speed and accuracy is still a major shortcoming. Most patients complain about the flow of service, the ability of doctors to explain conditions, treatment plans, and the need for drug counseling. This provides input for hospital management to improve service flow and improve communication with patients, especially for elderly groups and with higher education levels.

Responsiveness is also a focus. The responsiveness of health workers who are still less than optimal, such as waiting times for registration and dexterity in responding to patient complaints, is a cause of dissatisfaction. The elderly group also highlighted the unresponsiveness of officers in providing health services. Improving the responsiveness of health workers and the speed of service are important recommendations.

Empathy, which includes the patient, friendly, and caring attitude of officers, is also a concern. The large number of patients who feel they lack empathy from health workers, especially in direct interactions, shows the importance of improving communication skills and attention of staff to individual needs.

Tangibles or the physical appearance of hospital facilities are also an issue. Accessibility issues, room cleanliness, officer appearance, and completeness of facilities are still the main complaints that affect patient satisfaction. Improving physical appearance and availability of facilities can increase patients' positive perception of services.

Assurance, which is related to ease of communication, the taste of food, and the cleanliness of the room, also affects patient satisfaction. Poor communication between doctors and nurses with patients and lack of facilities are major issues. Improving communication and facility fulfillment can increase patient satisfaction. The results of this study provide a deep understanding of the relationship between service quality and outpatient BPJS patient satisfaction at the hospital. The recommendations of this study include improved communication, increased responsiveness of health workers, increased empathy, improved physical appearance of facilities, and better fulfillment of facilities to ensure patient satisfaction.

CONCLUSION

The conclusion of the results of this study is that factors such as reliability, responsiveness, empathy, physical appearance, and service assurance have a significant relationship with outpatient BPJS patient satisfaction at the Kec. Lawang Assistance Hospital, Malang Regency. Data shows that the majority of patients tend to be dissatisfied especially related to the flow of service, responsiveness of health workers, lack of empathy in interactions, physical appearance of facilities, and lack of service assurance. Recommendations from this study include improving service flow, increasing officer responsiveness and empathy, improving the physical appearance of facilities, and better fulfillment of facilities to increase overall patient satisfaction.
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