

Bishnu Prasad Lamsal

Management Services Department, Nepal Administrative Staff College, Jawalakhel, Lalitpur, Nepal.

Anil Kumar Gupta

Public Service Training Department, Nepal Administrative Staff College, Jawalakhel, Lalitpur, Nepal
(Corresponding Author, email: cdps10gupta@gmail.com)

Submitted: 22 August 2021, Revised: 19 December 2021, Accepted: 30 December 2021

Bishnu Prasad Lamsal is a Deputy Executive Director at Nepal Administrative Staff College (NASC). Before joining NASC, he served as a Secretary in various ministries and commissions including the Ministry of Defense, Office of the Prime Minister and Council of Ministers, National Planning Commission of the Government of Nepal. He has a Master of Public Administration from Tribhuvan University.

Anil Kumar Gupta is a Deputy Director of Studies at Nepal Administrative Staff College. He obtained M.Phil. in Development Studies from the Kathmandu University School of Education, Nepal in 2018. He also holds Master of Arts in Population Studies, and Master of Education in Population Education from Tribhuvan University, Nepal. He has research and writing interests in the field of development governance.

Citizen Satisfaction with Public Service: What Factors Drive?

Abstract

Understanding citizens' satisfaction with public service is crucial for effective and efficient governance. In this milieu, this paper intended to examine the factors that drive citizen satisfaction with public service. Data on this topic were taken from the Nepal National Governance Survey 2017/18, and analyzed using a logistic regression model. The findings revealed that compliance with the rule, responsiveness, prompt service delivery, receiving service own self, and hassle-free service have a positive effect on citizen satisfaction, whereas paid/asked bribes and service attempts have a negative effect. Hence, cautious intervention in these factors is pivotal to ensure higher citizen satisfaction with public service.

Keywords:

Citizen, satisfaction, public service, performance, quality

Introduction

Citizen satisfaction with public service has emerged as a topic of interest for academics and managers studying governance and public administration (Chatterjee & Suy, 2019; Nguyen et al., 2016). Scholars of public administration have been interested in explaining citizen satisfaction and studying the consequences of high or low satisfaction (Van de Walle, 2018). With the increasing recognition of citizens as the focal point of public service, the emphasis on

ensuring citizen satisfaction with public services has increased. Citizen satisfaction is the ultimate goal of government with public service, which is an indicator of successful governance (Paudel & Gupta, 2019a; Gupta & Shrestha, 2021). Today, public service institutions face an ever-increasing demand for providing the finest and efficient services compared to the past (Hailu & Shifare, 2019). Public service institutions have a duty for providing high-quality services to citizens in accordance with

their expectations and demands. Public service institutions are expected to deliver quality service in a fair, transparent, reliable, and responsive manner for citizen satisfaction. Although citizens' demand for improved public service is increasing, governments are not always able to respond effectively. Failure to meet citizens' expectations leads to dissatisfaction with public services. Improved institutional performance leads to citizen satisfaction; for which, citizens provide a higher rating in government (Ariely, 2013). Increasing citizen satisfaction with public services is the basis for public sector governance.

The Government of Nepal has been attempting to provide high-quality services as per the needs and demands of citizens for ensuring higher citizen satisfaction with public services. However, evidence suggests that many citizens are not satisfied with public services. Nepal National Governance Survey 2017/18 found that only 15 percent of citizens are fully satisfied with the service they receive, while 65 percent are partially satisfied. Although there are more partially satisfied citizens, the proportion of fully satisfied citizens is very low. This clearly indicates that the public service provided by state institutions is not up to citizens' expectations. To meet citizens' expectations of public service, the Constitution of Nepal (2015) has envisioned for making public administration fair, competent, impartial, transparent, free of corruption, accountable, and participatory (Government of Nepal, 2015, p.30). Similarly, Nepal's 15th development plan (2019/20-2023/24) has focused on developing result-oriented and people-serving public administration (National Planning Commission, 2020, p. 406). The Constitution of Nepal and the 15th development plan have attempted to ensure higher citizen satisfaction with public service through policy reform in public administration. Ensuring higher citizen satisfaction with public service is complex because several factors are associated with it. In this backdrop, this study

intended to examine the factors that drive citizens' satisfaction with public services, using Nepal National Governance Survey 2017/18 data set. The results of this paper will help overcome a gap in the existing literature on determinants of citizen satisfaction in public service.

The article is divided into four sections. It starts with an introduction to the issues and research purpose. The following section demonstrates, citizen satisfaction, and theoretical explanation. The third section focuses on research methods. The final section focuses on the study's findings, discussion and conclusion.

Literature Review

Citizen's Satisfaction: An Overview

Citizen satisfaction is defined and perceived in a variety of ways in the literature. Satisfaction is a complex phenomenon that combines expectations, experiences, and previous attitudes (Van de Walle, 2018). Citizen satisfaction with public services depends on an assessment of public service encounters (Bradford et al., 2009; Brown, 2007; Cohen, 2006). Oliver (1997) argued that satisfaction is a judgment based on a comparison of pre-service provision with post-service provision evaluation of the product or service experience. Satisfaction is the outcome of a comparison of expectations and actual service experience. Indeed, it is an assessment of post-service delivery. It's a mental condition that occurs after interacting with service and comparing it to previous experiences (Oliver, 1980). Citizens compare prior service expectations to actual service experience and decide whether he/she is satisfied or not. Satisfaction is thus, a result of differences between expected and perceived service (Parasuraman et al., 1985). In general, citizens are satisfied if their expectations are met by the quality of public service. The quality of public services has a greater impact on citizen satisfaction. Citizens are more likely to be satisfied if they receive high-quality public

services. That may be the reason, Oliver (2010) argued that satisfaction is a function of quality. Satisfaction increases as service quality surges. Satisfaction is generally high as long as quality service delivery is maintained (Engdaw, 2020). High-quality public service not only leads to satisfaction, but also fosters citizen confidence and trust. Therefore, public sector institutions should deliver high-quality services to citizens to meet their expectations.

Citizens Satisfaction: A Theoretical Explanation

There are several models that illustrate the relationship between quality service and customer satisfaction. The expectation disconfirmation, service quality, and performance model are notable ones.

Expectation Disconfirmation Model

Expectancy disconfirmation is a psychological theory that is widely used in marketing, especially in consumer behaviour, to decide whether or not a customer is satisfied after post-purchase (Chatterjee & Suy, 2019). Initially, this model was commonly applied in customer satisfaction from private sector services (Jayanti & Jakson, 1991), but it is increasingly being applied in public sector service (Van Ryzin, 2004, 2006; Roch & Poister 2006; James, 2009; Morgeson, 2012) and has become one of the dominant approaches in explaining citizen satisfaction with public services (Zhang et al., 2021). The expectancy disconfirmation model posits that disconfirmation affects citizen satisfaction.

The idea of expectation disconfirmation is primarily based on the concept of customer expectations. Customer expectation represents the customer hope of service performance, and is an important determinant of satisfaction (James, 2009; Van Ryzin, 2013). Satisfaction judgment is decided not only by-product or service performance, but also by a process in which customers equate performance to

prior expectations of that service (Van Ryzin, 2004; Grimmelikhuijsen & Porumbescu, 2017). Expectancy disconfirmation is a gap between customers' expectations and actual results (Erevelles & Leavitt, 1992; Oliver, 1997). The greater the disconfirmation value, the greater is the gap between performance and expectation (Zhang et al., 2021).

Citizen (dis)satisfaction with public services is primarily decided by the (dis)confirmation of past expectations (Van Ryzin, 2006). Citizens compare and evaluate service performance with their service expectations, and decide their satisfaction level. Citizens are satisfied with public services when the service performance positively meets or exceeds their prior expectations (Grimmelikhuijsen & Porumbescu, 2017; Zhang et al., 2021). Disconfirmation may be positive or negative depending on the service performance and expectations. A customer's expectation is positively disconfirmed when a service performs above expectations, and negatively disconfirmed when a service performs under expectations (Alizadeh & Kianfar, 2013; Chatterjee & Suy, 2019). Positive disconfirmation increases with higher performance and decreases with higher expectations (Grimmelikhuijsen & Porumbescu, 2017). Positive disconfirmation results in greater satisfaction, whereas negative disconfirmation results in less satisfaction. Citizen satisfaction, therefore, is a function of expectations, service performance and disconfirmation. Expectations change over time, and can vary between different segments of the population (Van de Walle, 2018).

SERVQUAL Model

The SERVQUAL model, introduced in the 1980s by Zeithaml, Parasuraman, and Bery, is another model for explaining citizen satisfaction based on the concept of disconfirmation (Parasuraman et al., 1988). This model originally suggested 10 factors of quality service (reliability, communication, credibility, access, courtesy, responsiveness,

competence, security, understanding/ knowing the customer and tangibles). However, in the early 1990s, the model was refined with five dimensions, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1.

Dimension of service quality

Dimension	Descriptions
Reliability	Ability to deliver the promised service dependably and accuracy
Assurance	Knowledge and courtesy of employee and their ability to inspire trust/ confidence
Tangibles	Appearance of personnel, physical facilities and equipment
Empathy	Caring, individualization and attention closeness
Responsiveness	Willing to support customers and deliver prompt service

Source: Parasuraman et al., 1988, p. 23

These five dimensions have an impact on consumer satisfaction, and are used to assess the quality of public services. Service quality is described by Parasuraman et al., (1988) as an organization's ability to meet or exceed customer expectations. Services quality is influenced by customer expectation and actual service performance. Customer expectation is a customer's beliefs about a service (Parasuraman et al., 1988), and is shaped by four factors: word-of-mouth communications, personal needs, past experience, and external communications (Parasuraman et al., 1985). Service performance, whereas, refers to the actual service delivered by institutions. If the service performance meets the citizen expectations, the citizen is satisfied with public service. Citizen (dis)satisfaction, therefore, is heavily reliant on citizen expectations and actual service performance.

Performance Model

The performance model is another model for describing citizen satisfaction with public services. Citizen satisfaction, according to this model, is a determinant of the kind of judgment people make on how the government

is performing in comparison to how government should work (Masiya et al., 2019). Citizens are highly calculative about what they have paid for, and their expectations rise accordingly (Acharya, 2010). Citizens do not express their satisfaction with public service until the service's performance is calculated. Citizens calculate public service performance and, if they find positive gain, they express satisfaction. Citizen satisfaction may decline when the expectation of service performance is not met adequately by actual performance. Citizen satisfaction with public services is indeed a product of institutional performance. Citizens are dissatisfied with institutions that perform poorly. Citizens expect higher performance from public service institutions, and failure to fulfil expectations lead to dissatisfaction (Gupta, 2021). Public service institutions should, therefore, perform their task effectively and efficiently to hoard a higher level of citizens' satisfaction.

Methods

The data for our analysis came from the Nepal National Governance Survey 2017/18. It is a national level citizen perception survey on state governance carried out by the Nepal Administrative Staff College (NASC) with technical assistance from the Central Bureau of Statistics, Nepal. This survey selected 12920 individual respondents (18 years and older) from 43 districts out of 77 districts, representing all seven provinces and three ecological zones using a four-stage multiple cluster sampling design. Out of 12920 individual respondents, 12872 (response rate 99.6%) were successfully interviewed by trained enumerators between December 2017 and March 2018. The survey collected data on three broad parameters of governance, namely foundations of governance, the infrastructure of governance and service delivery. Among the three dimensions of governance, this paper focuses on service delivery.

Study Variables: Outcome and Predictor

As previously stated, the study intended to examine the factors that influence citizen satisfaction with public services. Therefore, the outcome variable for the study is citizen satisfaction with public service. The Nepal National Governance Survey 2017/18 measured citizen satisfaction by asking ‘To what extent are you satisfied with the government service you received?’. The respondents were asked to rate their level of satisfaction on the following scales: fully satisfied (1), satisfied to some extent (2) dissatisfied to some extent (3) fully dissatisfied (4) not accessed services (5), don’t know/can’t say (99). The highest level of satisfaction is fully satisfied. This study removes not accessed services and the don’t know/can’t say option since it is not in line with the research objectives. Out of 12872 respondents, 242 were not accessed public services and 160 were reported can’t say/ don’t know. After removing this, the sample size for this study become 12470. In the study, compliance, responsiveness, service on time, receive service without third party assistance (hereafter referred to as receive service own self), hassle-free service, paid/asked bribe, and service attempts were used as predictor variables. These predictor

variables were used to examine the propensity of satisfaction with public service.

Data Management and Analysis

In this study, binary logistic regression was used to examine the effect of predictor variables on the outcome variable. For this analysis, the outcome variable ‘citizen satisfaction’ was split into two groups ‘1’=satisfaction and ‘0’=dissatisfaction, as required by binary logistic regression. Similarly, all predictor variables were classified and coded in the same way as the outcome variable, as shown in Table 2.

The binary logistic regression model is presented as:

$$\ln \left\{ \frac{P}{1-P} \right\} = b_0 + b_1 \dots b_n \quad \text{-----}(1)$$

Where, \ln = the natural logarithm, P is the probability for satisfying with public service; $(1-P)$ is the probability of not satisfying with public service; b_n is the predictor variables.

The data processing and statistical analysis were carried out using the SPSS software 26 version, and the information was organized, tabulated, presented, and described using appropriate literature on citizen satisfaction and public service.

Table 2.
Coding of study variables

Variable	Survey options	Categorizing and coding
Citizen satisfaction	Fully satisfied, satisfied to some extent, dissatisfied to some extent, fully dissatisfied, not accessed service, don’t know/can’t say.	Fully satisfied and satisfied to some extent was merged and labelled as ‘satisfaction’ coded as ‘1’ while fully dissatisfied and dissatisfied to some extent merged and labelled as ‘dissatisfaction’ coded as ‘0’. Not accessed services and don’t know/can’t say were omitted.
Compliance, responsiveness, timely delivery, receive services own self, receive and hassle-free service	Strongly agree, agree to some extent, disagree to some extent, strongly disagree, don’t know/can’t say.	Strongly agree and agree to some extent were merged and labelled as ‘yes’ coded as ‘1’ while disagree to some extent and strongly disagree merged and labelled as ‘no’ coded as ‘0’. don’t know/can’t say was omitted.
Paid/asked bribe	Yes, no, did not receive any public service, don’t know/can’t say.	Paid/asked bribe is labelled as ‘yes’ coded as ‘1’ while not paid/asked bribe is labelled as ‘no’ coded as ‘0’.
Service attempts number of attempts	Service attempt was group into ‘single attempt’ coded as ‘0’, ‘2-3 attempts’ coded as ‘1’ and ‘4 and more attempts’ coded as ‘3’.

Results

The results of binary logistic regression are shown in Table 3. Several noteworthy results have been found. Compliance has a significant positive impact on citizen satisfaction (OR = 2.435, $p < .001$). Citizens who perceive the government officials follow the rules are 2.435 times more likely to be satisfied. Responsiveness appears to be a significant predictor as well. The value of OR is 1.686 for responsiveness, which is significant at $p < .001$. This suggests that citizen who perceives that government officials are responsible are 1.686 times more likely to be satisfied. This implies that government officials, who listen, inform and respond to citizen concerns when providing service are more satisfied than those who do not. Timely service delivery seems to have a significant positive relationship with citizen satisfaction (OR = 1.254, $p < .05$). The citizen who perceives the government officials offer timely services are 1.254 times more likely to be satisfied. A significantly positive association is also detected between receiving services own self (without third party assistance) and citizen satisfaction (OR = 1.543, $p < .001$). This infers that the citizens who receive service themselves (without third party assistance) are 1.543 times more likely to be satisfied. Hassle-free service has massive effect on citizen satisfaction (OR = 2.013, $p < .001$). The citizens who receive services without any hassle are 2.013 times more likely to be satisfied. A hassle-free service contributes positively to citizen satisfaction. This scenario, however, is entirely different for paid/asked bribes and service attempts. The impact of paid/asked bribes and service attempts on citizen satisfaction appears to be negative. Citizens who paid/asked for a bribe are .487 times less likely to be satisfied than those who do not (OR = .487, $p < .001$). It indicates that paying/asking for a bribe in public service reduces citizen satisfaction. Service attempts, like paid/asked bribes, are negatively associated with citizen satisfaction. The

probability of citizen satisfaction is decreasing as the number of service attempts increases. As compared to single attempts, citizens who receive services 2-3 times (OR = .853, $p < .001$) and 4 or more times (OR = .446, $p > .05$) are .853 and .446 times less likely to be satisfied, respectively. To sum up, the predictor variables explained 24.5% variation in the outcome variable in the model.

Table 3.
Coefficients of Logistic Regression for
Citizens Satisfaction with Public Service

Predictor Variables	B	S.E.	Exp(B)	Sig.
Compliance	.890	.087	2.435	.000
Responsiveness	.522	.100	1.686	.000
Timely delivery	.227	.098	1.254	.021
Receive services own Self (Without third party assistance)	.434	.072	1.543	.000
Receive hassle free service	.700	.092	2.013	.000
Paid/asked bribe	-.719	.091	.487	.000
Single attempt (ref.)				
2-3 attempts	-.159	.084	.853	.060
4 and More Attempts	-.808	.122	.446	.000

Nagelkerke R Square=.245

Discussion

Citizen satisfaction is a symbol of the quality of public services and is recognized as a primary goal of all governments. Public service providing institutions strive to deliver quality services to citizens for confirming a higher level of satisfaction. Citizens are satisfied when the quality of public is delivered as per citizens' expectations, needs and demands. Citizens' satisfaction with public services is influenced by many factors, which are discussed below:

Compliance

Compliance denotes adhering to rules and existing standards that should be followed to ensure citizen satisfaction. Compliance has a positive impact on citizen satisfaction, as confirmed by this study. The enforcement of predefined rules, regulations, and guidelines during the delivery of public services positively contributes to citizen satisfaction. Public service institutions have certain

predefined rules, regulations and regulations which should be enforced (Paudel & Gupta, 2019b). Service providers (bureaucrats), according to Weber (1968), should exercise authority delegated to them in accordance with formal and predefined laws. The service provider (bureaucrats) largely follow rules, regulations, and procedures in the performance of their responsibilities (Gupta et al., 2019). A large number of citizens are satisfied with public services when moral principles and standards are codified into legal enforcement (Nguyen et al., 2016). Citizens are satisfied, and good governance is improved, when service providers deliver the service as per rules and regulations. Following predefined rules and regulations to perform duties is a prerequisite for ensuring citizen satisfaction. Shakya (2009), however, argued that government agencies are found to be involved in violations of the rule of law. Violation of predefined rules in public services delivery creates a conducive atmosphere for a bribe, which reduces citizen satisfaction significantly. Service providers should, therefore, provide public services as per predefined rules, regulations and procedures for a higher level of citizen satisfaction.

Responsiveness

The demand for responsive public service has increased over the past year. Citizens expect public officials/institutions to be more responsive. Citizens have a legal right to responsive service, and service providers have a legal duty to provide it. Responsive services satisfy citizen needs and expectations (Gupta, 2018). Responsiveness in public service means meeting citizens' legitimate needs and putting a human face on governance systems, processes, and practices, thus reducing the gulf between the state and the people (Pokharel et al., 2018). Responsiveness has a positive impact on citizen satisfaction with public service, as the study confirms. Citizen satisfaction rises with increasing responsiveness in public service. Citizens may be dissatisfied when they feel the service provider

is careless with them (Wang, 2010), because responsiveness entails active listening, supporting and responding to citizens needs empathetically (Pokharel et al., 2018). Citizens report lower satisfaction with public services when service providers do not respond to their demands, concerns, and needs. Therefore, the service provider should respond and resolve citizens' problems and behave in such a way to meet the expectations, desires, and aspirations of citizens. Fulfilling citizens' expectations, desires, and aspirations in public service is a hallmark of responsive governance, which assures citizen satisfaction. Therefore, service providers should inform, listen, and respond to citizens' concerns empathically to increase citizen satisfaction with public services.

Time

Timely delivery service is a notable influencing factor for citizen satisfaction, and it positively contributes to ensuring citizen satisfaction, as confirmed by this study. Time has a positive impact on citizen satisfaction (Dang & Hanh, 2018). Citizens are dissatisfied if they have to wait too long or results are not delivered as promised (Nguyen et al., 2016). The inability to offer service on time has a negative impact on citizen satisfaction. The propensity to postpone and take longer to provide public services has a negative impact on citizen satisfaction. Citizens have the legal right to receive public service on time, but evidence reveals that this right is not being met. According to the Nepal National Governance Survey 2017/18, forty-four percentage of people reported that government employees do not provide service on time (NASC, 2018). Acharya (2010) argued that the efficiency of an organization is heavily reliant on the timely delivery of services, which helps to maintain the institutions' goodwill. Furthermore, she argued that the rapid growth of communication media assists citizens in receiving services on time, and that in some cases, if service providers are unable

to deliver services on time, the citizen should be notified of the reason for the delay, resulting in a positive and strong citizen perception on public institutions. The Good Governance (Management and Operation) Act 2008 mandated for the timely and cost-effective public services delivery and states that an official who fails to perform the work within a given timeframe with nasty intent to circumvent duty or fails to meet work performance indicators, he/she may be reprimanded by the senior authority. There is a legal provision that citizens pay no additional money for public service unless required by law. However, some service providers purposefully delay and take a longer time to compel citizens to pay extra fees (Pokharel et al., 2018). In this case, citizens should pay to obtain timely service because the state has a monopoly in public services, and uses it as a weapon to gain an unfair advantage. Citizens sometimes offer extra money voluntary basis to service providers to complete work quickly. Sometimes citizens also seek the help of intermediaries to receive hassle-free services on time. These factors have a negative effect on the quality of public services, resulting in a decline in citizen satisfaction. Service providers, therefore, should offer services on time, which leads to a higher level of citizen satisfaction.

Receive Service Own Self

A citizen may receive public services own self or with the assistance of a third party. Receiving public service without the assistance of a third party is a sign of accessibility in public service. The issue is that not all citizens can obtain public services own self, and should seek assistance from a third party. Pokharel et al., (2018) argued that receiving public services own self depends on the nature of service and other conditions in which the citizens live, and is also affected by the citizen's confidence in service providers. Furthermore, they argued that if citizens do not believe they can receive service

independently, they seek assistance from a third party. According to the Nepal National Governance Survey 2017/18, more than half of citizens (55%) reported they receive service own self, while 45 percent needed third-party assistance. Among those who take the assistance of a third party, one-third of citizens (36.4%) seek the help of family members/relative/neighbour/friend followed by a government employee (6.4%), intermediaries (3%), political party member (1%), social worker (0.7%), community leader and others (0.5%) (NASC, 2018). Receiving public service own self and citizen satisfaction are positively associated. Citizens who obtain public service own self are more satisfied than citizens who sought help from a third party, because it imposes an additional financial burden on citizens. Citizens generally pursue third-party assistance when they have lack information about administrative processes, lack self-confidence, lack of convenient atmosphere, the involvement of intermediaries, and so on. All of these have a negative impact on citizen satisfaction with public services.

Hassle-Free Service

Receiving hassle-free public service is a legal right of citizens and is positively related to citizen satisfaction. Citizen satisfaction increases as the services are becoming more hassle-free, as confirmed by the study. Public service should be made hassle-free and as simple as possible. However, citizens have complained about long procedures, queues, poor service delivery, and inconvenient physical facilities (Mohammed et al., 2010, as cited in Hailu & Shifare, 2019). According to the Nepal National Governance Survey 2017/18, only forty-six percentage of citizens reported that they received hassle-free service from government offices. It suggests that citizens face difficulty in receiving public services. Citizen-friendly public services reduce the hassle and surge citizen satisfaction. Therefore, public service should be delivered as conveniently

and simply as possible. Sometimes citizens feel the hassle to follow predefined rules to receive service, whereas sometimes service provider creates the hassle intentionally by showing multifarious and plethora procedures to get additional benefits. In this situation, citizens have to pay extra money to receive hassle-free service on time. Citizens sometimes also establish personnel connections with the service provider to get hassle-free service on time. Citizens who establish personnel contact with service providers can receive services on time and without hassle. Citizens confidence in receiving hassle-free public services declines when they have no personal contact with service providers. Citizens having personal contact with service providers reduce the number of regulations and simplifies the administrative process, allowing service providers to become more responsive and deliver services in the most efficient, scalable, and timely manner as possible. Citizens should receive hassle-free public service even if they do not have personal contact with the service provider. This is the bedrock of citizen satisfaction with public services.

Corruption

Citizens may be dissatisfied if they believe there is widespread corruption among individuals who govern the country (Wang, 2010). The influence of corruption on citizen satisfaction is immense, and is negatively associated. The higher the level of corruption in public service, the lower the level of citizen satisfaction. Citizens who ask/pay bribes in exchange for public services rate the service poorly, and are dissatisfied. Bribing is a negative prophet of satisfaction, showing that bribing is not a feasible choice for people seeking to simplify the service acquisition process (Pokharel et al., 2018). Some service providers are inclined to accept bribes by stalling and stretching public services delivery. As per Nepal National Governance Survey 2017/18, sixty-three percentage of citizens reported that proper documentation is not enough to get work

done in government offices; bribing is necessary (NASC, 2018). This figure indicates that corruption is prevalent in the public sector. Citizens' perception of bribery is needed as serious impairments to good governance (Pokharel et al., 2018). Corruption has prevailed, although the government of Nepal has taken several efforts to make Nepal a corruption-free country (Gupta et al., 2018). Mentioning 'I will not be corrupt, I will not allow corruption, I will work honestly for the country and the people' with high priority in the policy and program of the Government of Nepal 2077/78 indicates the evidence of corruption in public service. Asking or paying bribes before service undermines and deters the quality of public service and reduces citizen satisfaction. Hence, corruption should be significantly reduced by taking concrete steps at all levels to surge a higher level of citizen satisfaction with public services.

Service Attempts

Receiving public services in a single attempt is an indication of citizen-friendly service delivery and citizen satisfaction. Citizens have the right to get public services in a single attempt, but for a variety of reasons, they receive services in multiple attempts. As per Nepal National Governance Survey 2017/18, almost three-quarters of citizens (73.7%) received the public service in single attempts followed by 2-3 attempts (20.2%) and 4 and more attempts (6.1%). Receipt of service in multiple attempts was because of incomplete documentation (39.6%), followed by an absence of staff (18.2%), insufficient time-unable to complete during office hour (18.1%), the unwillingness of service provider (17.8%), crowding of service receiver (14.5%) inadequate information (10.6%), lengthy process (9.8%), insufficient money to pay (2.8%), missing record in office (2.6%), lack of utilities (2.1%) and other (1.4%) (NASC, 2018). Whatever the reason for multiple attempts, the impact of multiple attempts is negative on citizen satisfaction. As citizens make more attempts to obtain services, their level of satisfaction rapidly

drops (Pokharel et al., 2018). Citizens who receive services on their first attempt are more satisfied than those who receive services on multiple attempts. This is because multiple efforts pose additional cost and time burdens to citizens. Citizens face difficulties when the number of service attempts increases, and often negatively assess service quality. Therefore, efforts should be made to deliver public service in single attempts to confirm a higher level of citizen satisfaction. To do this, all relevant information and service procedures should be proactively communicated to citizens.

Conclusion

Citizen satisfaction with public services is the yardstick of government performance. Ensuring citizen satisfaction through improved public service has become the ultimate goal today. Citizen satisfaction with public service, in general, is associated with service performance. Citizens are more satisfied when public service performance meets or outstrip their expectations. Although public service institutions pledge to satisfy citizens via improved service performance, yet many citizens complain that public services do not fully meet their expectations. Meeting the citizen expectation for satisfaction is a big challenge, because citizen satisfaction is influenced by several factors. Factors such as compliance, responsiveness, service on time, receive service own self and hassle-free service have a positive impact on citizen satisfaction, while, paid/asked bribes and service attempts have a negative impact. Therefore, intense care on these factors should be given to ensure higher citizen satisfaction with public service.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank Nepal Administrative Staff College for providing Nepal national governance survey 2017/18 data sheet for the publication of this paper.

References

- Acharya, S. (2010). *Implementation of citizen's charter and improving municipal services in Nepal: Myth or reality?* [Unpublished MPhil dissertation]. University of Bergen, Norway. <https://bit.ly/3wEtHKT>
- Alizadeh, A., & Kianfar, F. (2013). Developing a model for citizens 'satisfaction with public sector services based on rough sets theory: A case study of Tehran municipality. *Technical Gazette*, 20(5), 795-802. <https://bit.ly/3oPvJVN>
- Ariely, G. (2013). Public administration and citizen satisfaction with democracy: Cross-national evidence. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 79(4), 747-766. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852313501432>
- Bradford, B., Jackson, J., & Stanko, E. A. (2009). Contact and confidence: Revisiting the impact of public encounters with the police. *Policing & Society*, 19(1), 20-46. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439460802457594>
- Brown, T. (2007). Coercion versus choice: Citizen evaluations of public service quality across methods of consumption. *Public Administration Review*, 67(3), 559-572. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.2007.67.issue-3>
- Chatterjee, R., & Suy, R. (2019). An overview of citizen satisfaction with public service: Based on the model of expectancy disconfirmation. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(4), 243-258. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2019.74019>
- Cohen, J. E. (2006). Citizen satisfaction with contacting government on the internet. *Information Polity*, 11(1), 51-65. <https://doi.org/10.3233/IP-2006-0083>
- Dang, V. M., & Hanh, N. T. T. (2018). Evaluating satisfaction of citizens on quality of public administration services in the central highlands of Vietnam. *Advances in Economics and Business*, 6(5), 308-314. <https://doi.org/10.13189/aeb.2018.060504>

- Engdaw, B. D. (2020). The impact of quality public service delivery on customer satisfaction in Bahir Dar city administration: The case of Ginbot 20 sub-city. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 43(7), 644-654. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2019.1644520>
- Erevelles, S., & Leavitt, C. (1992). A comparison of current models of consumer satisfaction/dissatisfaction. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 5(10), 104-114.
- Government of Nepal.(2015). *The constitution of Nepal 2015*. Government of Nepal. <https://bit.ly/3GZTAKj>
- Government of Nepal (2020). *Annual policy and programme 2020/21*. Government of Nepal. <https://bit.ly/3h0kKEh>
- Government of Nepal. (2008). *Good governance (management and operation) act 2008*. Government of Nepal. <https://bit.ly/3vp1V4M>
- Grimmelikhuijsen, S., & Porumbescu, G. A. (2017). Reconsidering the expectancy disconfirmation model. Three experimental replications. *Public Management Review*, 19(9), 1272-1292. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2017.1282000>
- Gupta, A. K. (2018). *Accountability and performance of Nepali bureaucracy: A survey of the ministry of education* [Unpublished MPhil dissertation]. Kathmandu University School of Education. <https://bit.ly/3kXaWxc>
- Gupta, A. K. (2020). *Citizen's trust in public and political institutions in Nepal*. Nepal Administrative Staff College. <https://bit.ly/2XHwQxw>
- Gupta, A. K., & Shrestha, G. L. (2021). Citizen charter in Nepali public sector organizations: Does it really work?. *Policy & Governance Review*, 5(1), 18-32. <https://doi.org/10.30589/pgr.v5i1.368>
- Gupta, A. K., Adhikari, S. H., & Shrestha, G. L. (2018). Corruption in Nepal: Level, pattern and trend analysis. *Journal of Management and Development Studies*, 28, 36-52. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jmds.v28i0.24957>
- Gupta, A. K., Poudyal, T., & Shrestha, S. (2019). Politicians and bureaucrats' relation in local governance of Nepal. *Local Government Quarterly (April – June)*, 5-24. <https://bit.ly/34xgac5>
- Hailu, A. G., & Shifare, H. G. (2019). Service delivery and customer satisfaction in the public service sector: An Ethiopian experience. *Public Policy and Administration Research*, 9 (9), 24-37. <https://doi.org/10.7176/PPAR>
- James, O. (2009). Evaluating the expectations disconfirmation and expectations anchoring approaches to citizen satisfaction with local public services. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 19(1), 107-123. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum034>
- Jayanti, R., & Jackson, A. (1991). *Service satisfaction: An exploratory investigation of three models*. ACR North American Advances.
- Masiya, T., Davids, Y. D., & Mangai, M. S. (2019). Assessing service delivery: Public perception of municipal service delivery in South Africa. *Theoretical and Empirical Researches in Urban Management*, 14 (2), 20-40. <https://bit.ly/3yCjCQa>
- Morgeson, F. V. (2012). Expectations, disconfirmation, and citizen satisfaction with the US federal government: Testing and expanding the model. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 23(2), 289-305. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mus012>
- National Planning Commission. (2019). *15th development plan (2019/20-2023/24)*. Government of Nepal. <https://bit.ly/3shceck>
- Nepal Administrative Staff College. (2018). *Nepal national governance survey 2017/18*. Nepal Administrative Staff College. <https://bit.ly/2K8LFCb>
- Nguyen, M. P., Van Hoang, H., & Van Nguyen, D. (2016). Factors influencing citizens'

- satisfaction with public administrative services at the grassroots level case study of Tay Ho district. *VNU Journal of Science: Economics and Business*, 32 (5), 90-101. <https://bit.ly/3un6tao>
- Oliver, R. L. (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17(4), 460-469. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378001700405>
- Oliver, R. L. (1997). *Satisfaction: A behavioral perspective on the consumer*. McGraw Hill.
- Oliver, R. L. (2010). *Satisfaction: A behavioral perspective on the consumer*. M.E. Sharpe. <https://bit.ly/3nuHHUv>
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing*, 49(4), 41-50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224298504900403>
- Parsuraman A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). A multiple item scale for measuring consumer perception of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12-40. <https://bit.ly/3fdMs10>
- Paudel, R. C., & Gupta, A. K. (2019a). Performance in Nepali bureaucracy: What determines?. *Research Journal of Economics*, 3(1), 1-6. <https://bit.ly/3fMp9v8>
- Paudel, R. C., & Gupta, A. K. (2019b). Determinants of accountability in the bureaucracy: The case of Nepal. *Modern Economy*, 10(9), 2085-2109. <https://doi.org/10.4236/me.2019.109131>
- Pokharel, T., Subedi, B. P., Adhikari S. H., Adhikari, R., & Gupta, A. K. (2018). *Quality of public service in Nepal: Nepal national governance survey 2017/18 thematic paper*. Nepal Administrative Staff College. <https://bit.ly/34juNQ1>
- Roch, C. H., & Poister, T. H. (2006). Citizens, accountability, and service satisfaction: The influence of expectations. *Urban Affairs Review*, 41(3), 292-308. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1078087405281124>
- Shakya, U. R. (2009). Ethics in Nepalese civil services sector: How does it matter? *Administration and Management Review*, 21(2), 88-107. <https://bit.ly/3fQ79Qv>
- Van de Walle, S. (2018). Explaining citizen satisfaction and dissatisfaction with public services. In E. Onagri & S. Van Thiel (Eds.). *The Palgrave handbook of public administration and management in Europe* (pp.227-241). https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-55269-3_11
- Van Ryzin, G. G. (2004). Expectations, performance, and citizen satisfaction with urban services. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 23(3), 433-448. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.20020>
- Van Ryzin, G. G. (2006). Testing the expectancy disconfirmation model of citizen satisfaction with local government. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 16(4), 599-611. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mui058>
- Van Ryzin, G. G. (2013). An experimental test of the expectancy-disconfirmation theory of citizen satisfaction. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 32(3), 597-614. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.21702>
- Wang, Z. (2010). Citizens' satisfaction with government performance in six Asian-Pacific giants. *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, 11(1), 51. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1468109909990132>
- Weber, M. (1968). *Economy and society*. Bedminster.
- Zhang, J., Chen, W., Petrovsky, N., & Walker, R. M. (2021). The expectancy-disconfirmation model and citizen satisfaction with public services: A meta-analysis and an agenda for best practice. *Public Administration Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13368>