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Abstract:  
This article examines people’s satisfaction of the quality of public administrative services mainly based on the research in Lien Hoa Commune, Lac Thuy District, Hoa Binh Province, Vietnam. Its objective is aimed at finding out the current situation of people’s satisfaction of the quality of public administrative services as well as factors affecting the quality of public administrative services. To do so, both quantitative and qualitative analysis methods are used to identify factors affecting the quality of public administrative services. Data includes both primary and secondary data sources. Secondary data are collected through published books, newspapers, reports, and research documents. Primary data are collected through a survey of 150 people at different demographic criteria who were provided with public services in Lien Hoa commune, Lac Thuy district, Hoa Binh province via Google Drive tool. With the method of linear regression analysis and exploratory factor analysis (EFA), the authors have pointed out 4 factors that have significant influence on satisfaction of the quality of public administrative services including (1) material facilities; (2) staff competency; (3) administrative procedure; (4) customer trust in the area. Based on the research results, the authors have proposed several solutions to improve the quality of public administrative services in Lien Hoa Commune in particular and the country in general to aim at boosting people’s satisfaction.
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1. Introduction  
Along with the trend of globalization and international economic integration, the improvement of public administrative services is one of the urgent tasks for developing a people-centered, democratic, transparent, clean and professional administration. Accordingly, many new guidelines, mechanisms and policies have been concretized to create favorable legal corridors for investors, businesses and people such as the Overall Program of State Administrative reform in 2011 - 2020. However, the public administrative service in the country in general as well as in Lien Hoa commune in particular has not yet ensured the quality and efficiency; the administrative procedures are still cumbersome, overlapping and rigid; the solving way is still authoritarian, powerful, delayed; many intermediate steps are annoying individuals and organizations; ineffective application of information technology in the management of administrative quality has not yet significantly affected the settlement of people’s affairs that reduces people’s trust in the State and the administrative apparatus. In addition, people’s satisfaction of the quality of an administrative service of an agency is the driving force and foundation for the public sector to carry out its regular activities, improve the effectiveness and operation of the State apparatus. Therefore, this article aims to measure people's satisfaction of public administrative services, accordingly imply to stakeholders how to improve the quality of public administrative services that is considered as one of effective methods to improve operational efficiency for public organizations, ensure to provide the best administrative services to the people, speed up the process of reforming administrative procedures, administrative system and modernizing the State apparatus, maintaining the development and stability of the society.

2. Literature review  
National Academy of Public Administration (2009), Administration are activities regarding organization, management and administration performed on the basis of compulsory and imperative rules (power - obedience) set by the state or other entities in order to achieve defined common interest.

Nguyen Hai Thap et al. (2018), Public services are activities to serve the basic and essential needs of people for common interest of the society, the State is responsible to the society (directly undertake or authorize and facilitate the private sector to implement) in order to ensure efficiency, stability and social justice; including administrative services, career services and public welfare. In particular, public administrative services are activities of state administrative agencies to deal with the affairs of organizations and citizens within their competence; usually including services related
to law enforcement activities, non-profit purposes, granted to organizations by competent state management agencies and individuals in the form of legally valuable papers in those areas managed by that State agency. Each public administrative service is associated with an administrative procedure to complete a specific activity involving an organization or individual.

Service quality is a large category and there are many different views on defining the concept of service quality depending on the type of service. According to Zeithaml (1987), service quality is a customer's evaluation of the overall effectiveness of an entity. It is the result of a comparison between what is expected and a perception of what is received. Lehinen (1982) believes that service quality must be assessed on two aspects: Service provision process and service outcome. Gronroos (1984) also mentions two aspects of service quality including technical quality and functional quality. The technical quality refers to what is served and the functional quality refers to how it is served (Nguyen Dinh Tho et al., 2003).

Despite of different views of the service quality, the service quality generally is characterized by superiority, specificity, supply, demand satisfaction and value creation. According to Kotler & Keller (2006), satisfaction is the degree to which a person's sensory state originates from comparing their perception of products to their expectation. Zeithaml & Bitner (2000), customer satisfaction is the customer's assessment of the product or service whether the product or service meets his demand and expectation or not. Kotler (2003), satisfaction is the feeling of pleasure or frustration of a person derives from a comparison of perception and expectation about the quality of a product or service. Kotler believes that satisfaction is a person's emotional status when comparing their perception of a product to their expectations. Satisfaction specifically has three levels: if the customer's perception is smaller than expected, the customer feels dissatisfied; if perceived by expectation, customers feel satisfied; if the perception is greater than expected, the customer feels very satisfied or excited.

Tony Bovaird & Elike Loffler (1996) argues that for the public sector: high quality public administration not only increases customer satisfaction of public services but also forms honesty in public management via transparent process, accountability and democratic dialogue. Evaluation of the public sector in the area of provision of public administrative services must be understood via responsibility and civil society through the activities of citizens and other interest groups. In relation to service quality or people's satisfaction level, it requires administrative agencies to shorten the gap between people's expectation and administrative agency's real capacity.

2.1. Theories of Satisfaction of Service Quality

2.1.1. Five-Gap Model of Service Quality

To evaluate and measure service quality, Parasauaraman et al. (1985) have proposed Five-gap model of service quality as follows:

- The first gap is the difference between the customer's expectations of the service and manager's awareness of the expectations. This is the most unrecognizable gap.
- The second gaps is knowledge of the manager about the expectations of customers with the detailed characteristics, standards and service quality specifications of the company.
- The third gap is the difference between detailed characteristics, standards and service quality specifications of the company and actual service provided for customer.
- The fourth gap is the difference between service provided for customers in reality and what communicated and advertised by the company (beyond control).
- The fifth gap is the difference between services expected by customers and service received by them in reality. This difference has the greatest impact. Goal of all providers is to ensure that actually received service is equal to or more than service expected by customers. Parasauaraman and his colleagues think that at the time of the zero gap, the quality of service is perfect.

2.1.2. Measurement of Service Quality Using SERVQUAL Scale

Measurement of the service quality shows an overall picture of the service quality. To measure it, Parasauaraman and colleagues built a scale including five following criteria:

- Reliability: Ability to provide service as promised/committed in an accurate manner. Any service is trusted if it is performed at the beginning.
- Assurance: Qualities of employees bring trust to customers include politeness, communication ability, professionalism...
- Response: Employees are willing to help customers, answer their questions
- Empathy: Employees care about customers and give them a sense of trust
- Tangibility: Appearance, clothes of employees, facilities, equipment...

Parasauaraman et al. (1991) stated that: "SERVQUAL is a complete, reliable and valuable scale of service quality that can be applied to different fields. Each field has its own characteristics, so when applying SERVQUAL in assessing the quality of public administrative services, it is necessary to study and verify the model carefully because the scale includes some changeable variables."
2.2.3. Studies on the Quality of Public Administrative Services in Vietnam

Research by Vo Nguyen Khanh (2011) on satisfaction of public administrative services in People's Committee of District 1, Ho Chi Minh City shows that people's satisfaction of public administrative services is affected by four important factors: administrative procedure, ability to serve, reliability, facilities.

Nguyen Thanh Man (2014) conducted a research on people's satisfaction of public administrative services in People's Committee of Dak Ha District, Kon Tum Province in which he pointed out 6 factors affecting people's satisfaction of services including reliability, administrative procedure, civil servants, cost and time, facilities, care about and support for people.

Le Ngoc Suong (2011) conducted a survey to assess people's satisfaction of the quality of public administrative services at People's Committee of Cu Chi District, Ho Chi Minh City and pointed out 6 factors positively affecting people's satisfaction of service quality including trust, serving attitude, empathy, service delivery environment, service capacity, facilities.

Do Huu Nghiem (2010) surveyed the level of satisfaction of taxpayers for the quality of public services at the Tax Department in Binh Duong province, which identified five factors affecting the quality of public services: trust, dependability, level of response, service capacity, empathy, tangible means. The test results show that all 5 factors are homologous with the satisfaction of the payers; it means that when these five factors are improved, the taxpayers' satisfaction will increase and vice versa.

To study factors affecting the people's satisfaction of inter-agency one-stop mechanism in Thot Not District, Can Tho City, Nguyen Quoc Nghiand Quang Minh Nhut (2015) used Cronbach's Alpha testing method, EFA analysis and multivariate linear regression with sample size n = 130. The research result pointed out 3 factors affecting the people's satisfaction of inter-agency one-stop mechanism including tangible reflection and means; staff and procedure. In particular, the quality of human resources is the factor that has the strongest impact on people's satisfaction. In particular, quality of human resources is the factor having the strongest impact on people's satisfaction.

Meanwhile, evaluation of people's satisfaction of the quality of public administrative services at the People's Committee of Di An Town, Binh Duong Province and the result of Ngo Hong Lan Thao's (2016) research model points out 6 factors affecting people's satisfaction of the quality of public administrative services including facilities, reliability, staff capacity, serving attitude, empathy, procedures. Such test results have helped leaders of People's Committee in Di An Town clearly understand which factor and level of each factor affecting people's satisfaction of the quality of public administrative services at the People's Committee of Di An Town, accordingly propose feasible solutions to improve people's satisfaction.

Vo Thanh Tuan (2016) used exploratory factor analysis (EFA), multifactor linear regression analysis to evaluate taxpayer's satisfaction of quality of support and propaganda at the Tax Department of Hau Giang province. The results of the research model show seven factors affecting taxpayer's satisfaction including facilities, transparency, service capacity, responsiveness, reliability, democratic equity and empathy in which reliability has the strongest impact on taxpayer's satisfaction.

Le Dan (2011) proposed the plan of "Assessing satisfaction of citizens and organizations with public administrative services ." The author used theoretical base and real status of administrative procedures in recent years to develop a model to assess satisfaction of people and organizations with administrative services including seven factors: (1) civil servants; (2) facilities; (3) public service; (4) workflow procedures; (5) working time; (6) fees and charges; and (7) monitoring and commenting mechanisms. However, the model has not been formally studied and tested in reality because the author only proposed the plan. The model is relatively suitable for studying the level of satisfaction of the types of public administrative services, so it can be selected for use in the official study.

As a result, there have been many studies on people's satisfaction of quality of public administrative service in different areas with different socio-economic development, understanding and culture. All results focus on some factors affecting people's satisfaction of public administrative service but at different influence levels according to the study area. Lien Hoa commune in Lac Thuy District, HoaBinh Province is a midland district with wavy mountainous terrain, many limestone mountains; diverse ethnic groups (Muong, Dao, Kinh), poor education, so public service will be more complicated, research is needed to improve the quality of administrative services, promote effective operation of administrative apparatus of the country.

3. Research Methodology

The research uses both secondary data and primary data. The secondary data was collected from books, newspapers, studies, and published reports while the primary data was collected from 150 people who came to enjoy public administrative services at Receiving and Notifying Department of Lien Hoa Commune People's Committee, Lac Thuy District and HoaBinh Province. According to Nguyen Dinh Tho (2011), number of observations is (at least) 5 times greater than number of variables, preferably 10 times greater than number of variables. This study includes 23 observation variables; accordingly, number of samples must be 5-10 times greater, 115-230 samples will be needed. Each citizen coming to receive the public service will fill in a survey form directly in their smartphone with internet connection. The survey form is created using Google tools. Collected data is saved to Google Drive, then processed and analyzed. The author used Likert scale of 5 degrees (from degree 1: completely disagree to degree 5: totally agree). To ensure reliability of the scales, the author used two tools including Cronbach’s Alpha reliability coefficient and EFA. Cronbach’s Alpha is used to eliminate unsuitable variables while surveying 150 people (Tab.1) enjoying the service and analyzing scale with SPSS software 20.
### Table 1: Structure of Research Sample by Some Demographic Criteria

| Criterion              | Number (person) | Percentage (%) |
|------------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Gender                 | Male            | 73             | 48.7           |
|                        | Female          | 77             | 51.3           |
| Age                    | Under 20 years old | 9              | 6.0            |
|                        | From 21 to 30 years old | 57           | 38.0           |
|                        | From 31 to 40 years old | 64          | 42.7           |
|                        | Above 40 years old | 20             | 13.3           |
| Educational level      | Below high school education | 47         | 31.3           |
|                        | High school     | 49             | 32.7           |
|                        | College         | 27             | 18.0           |
|                        | University      | 26             | 17.3           |
| Occupation             | Student         | 27             | 18.0           |
|                        | Employees       | 89             | 59.3           |
|                        | Housewife       | 20             | 13.3           |
|                        | Other           | 14             | 9.4            |
| Administrative services for use | Business registration | 97         | 64.7           |
|                        | Duplication, authentication | 15      | 10.0           |
|                        | Land            | 23             | 15.3           |
|                        | Measurement     | 11             | 7.3            |
|                        | Construction    | 4              | 2.7            |
|                        | Other           | 0              | 0              |
| Total                  | 150             | 100            |

*Table 1: Structure of Research Sample by Some Demographic Criteria
Source: Collected from the Survey of the Authors, 2018*

The dependent variable is "People's satisfaction" Independent variables include: (1) Facilities; (2) Staff's competency; (3) Staff's attitude; (4) administrative procedures; (5) People's trust. Moderating variables are demographic variables including age, gender, marital status.

### Table 2: Description of Variables in the Model

*Source: Synthesis of the Authors from Theoretical and Related Studies*

| Factor                      | Observation Factor                  |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| **Facilities**              |                                     |
| CSVC1                       | Arrangement of places to receive records is reasonable and convenient to communicate and contact officials |
| CSVC2                       | Receiving and Notifying Department is relatively modern |
| CSVC3                       | Receiving and Notifying Department is wide and fresh |
| CSVC4                       | Receiving and Notifying Department is fully furnished (seats, electric fans, ...) |
| CSVC5                       | Instructions, forms and procedures are listed, fully affixed and convenient for searching |
| **Staff's competency**      |                                     |
| NLNV1                       | Staffs are friendly and easy to communicate |
| NLNV2                       | Staffs are professional and skilled |
| NLNV3                       | Staffs have knowledge and skills to solve problems |
| NLNV4                       | Staffs provide right instructions for citizens |
| **Staff's attitude**        |                                     |
| TDPV1                       | Staffs are polite when receiving records |
| TDPV2                       | Staffs are friendly when answering questions of citizens |
| TDPV3                       | Staffs are enthusiastically answer questions of people |
| TDPV4                       | Staffs have a fair attitude towards all people |
| TDPV5                       | Staffs are responsible to citizen’s records |
| TDPV6                       | Staffs don’t make any difficulty or harassment while receiving citizen’s records |
| **Procedure**               |                                     |
| QTTT1                       | Staffs have reasonable requests |
| QTTT2                       | Processing time is reasonable |
| QTTT3                       | Procedure’s steps are reasonable |
| QTTT4                       | Regulations on public administrative procedures are appropriate |
| **People’s trust**         |                                     |
| STC1                        | Records are resolved on time |
| STC2                        | Records are not defective or lost |
| STC3                        | Service is publicly and transparently provided |
| STC4                        | It doesn’t take citizens too much time to come so many times |
| **Satisfaction**           |                                     |
| SHL1                        | Satisfied with public administrative services |
| SHL2                        | Satisfied with attitude of officials and civil servants |
| SHL3                        | Satisfied when using public administrative services |

*Table 2: Description of Variables in the Model
Source: Synthesis of the Authors from Theoretical and Related Studies*

### 3.1. Research Model and Hypothesis

The theoretical framework to study the factors affecting people’s satisfaction of the quality of public administrative services is generalized in Figure 1 as follows:
coefficients are used in next analyses (Tab. 4).

Besides, Alpha coefficient if item deleted of variables is less than Cronbach's Alpha coefficient, so these component measurement coefficients are used in next analyses (Tab. 3).

4. Research results

4.1. Scale Test with Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient

Firstly, “facilities” have Cronbach's Alpha coefficient 0.644 > 0.6 which is meaningful and used in next analyses. However, Corrected Item - Total Correlation of CSVC1 (Arrangement of places to receive records is reasonable and convenient to communicate and contact officials) as 0.202 < 0.3. It is required to eliminate this coefficient to re-calculate the Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient.

When CSVC1 is eliminated, the “facilities” component has Cronbach's Alpha coefficient as 0.670 (> 0.6) which is meaningful and used in next analyses. Corrected Item - Total Correlation of the measurement variables is more than 0.3. Besides, Alpha coefficient if item deleted of variables is less than Cronbach's Alpha coefficient, so these component measurement coefficients are used in next analyses (Tab. 3).

| Component variable | Average Scale If Item Deleted | Variance Item deleted | Corrected Item - Total Correlation | Cronbach's Alpha if item deleted |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| CSVC2              | 12.08                         | 3.510                 | 0.455                             | 0.600                           |
| CSVC3              | 12.11                         | 3.814                 | 0.381                             | 0.647                           |
| CSVC4              | 12.11                         | 3.121                 | 0.540                             | 0.538                           |
| CSVC5              | 12.12                         | 3.569                 | 0.430                             | 0.617                           |
| Cronbach’s Alpha   |                               |                       | 0.670                             |                                 |

Table 3: Cronbach’s Alpha Scale “Facilities” Second Time
Source: SPSS Analysis Results

Secondly, “Staff’s competency” has Cronbach's Alpha coefficient as 0.748 (> 0.6) which is meaningful and used in next analyses. Corrected Item - Total Correlation of the component measurement variables is more than 0.3. Besides, Alpha coefficient if item deleted of variables is less than Cronbach's Alpha coefficient, so these component measurement coefficients are used in next analyses (Tab. 4).

| Component Variable | Average Scale If Item Deleted | Variance Item Deleted | Corrected Item - Total Correlation | Cronbach’s Alpha if item deleted |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| NLNV1              | 11.54                         | 3.566                 | 0.519                             | 0.704                           |
| NLNV2              | 11.57                         | 3.764                 | 0.543                             | 0.690                           |
| NLNV3              | 11.64                         | 3.588                 | 0.536                             | 0.693                           |
| NLNV4              | 11.57                         | 3.602                 | 0.574                             | 0.672                           |
| Cronbach’s Alpha   |                               |                       | 0.748                             |                                 |

Table 4: Cronbach’s Alphascale “Staff’s competency”
Source: SPSS analysis results

Thirdly, “Staff’s attitude” has Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient as 0.762 (> 0.6) which is meaningful and used in next analyses. Corrected Item - Total Correlation of the component measurement variables is more than 0.3. Besides, Alpha coefficients are used in next analyses (Tab. 4).
coefficient if item deleted of variables is less than Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient, so these component measurement coefficients are used in next analyses (Tab. 5).

| Component Variable | Average Scale if Item Deleted | Variance Item Deleted | Corrected Item - Total Correlation | Cronbach’s Alpha if item deleted |
|---------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| TDPV1               | 19.46                         | 7.794                 | 0.565                              | 0.711                           |
| TDPV2               | 19.37                         | 7.994                 | 0.479                              | 0.733                           |
| TDPV3               | 19.50                         | 7.540                 | 0.553                              | 0.713                           |
| TDPV4               | 19.55                         | 8.290                 | 0.422                              | 0.748                           |
| TDPV5               | 19.46                         | 8.398                 | 0.509                              | 0.727                           |
| TDPV6               | 19.39                         | 7.797                 | 0.501                              | 0.728                           |
| Cronbach’s Alpha    |                              |                       |                                    | 0.762                           |

Table 5: Cronbach’s Alphascale “Staff’s attitude”
Source: SPSS Analysis Results

Fourthly, “Procedure” has Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients 0.722 (> 0.6) which is meaningful and used in next analyses. Corrected Item - Total Correlation of the component measurement variables is more than 0.3 (more than allowable value as 0.3). Besides, Alpha coefficient if item deleted of variables is less than Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient, so these component measurement coefficients are used in next analyses (Tab. 6).

| Component variable | Average scale if item deleted | Variance item deleted | Corrected Item - Total Correlation | Cronbach’s Alpha if item deleted |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| QTTT1              | 11.93                         | 3.338                 | 0.456                              | 0.692                           |
| QTTT2              | 11.91                         | 3.288                 | 0.501                              | 0.665                           |
| QTTT3              | 11.91                         | 3.073                 | 0.574                              | 0.620                           |
| QTTT4              | 11.92                         | 3.376                 | 0.511                              | 0.660                           |
| Cronbach’s Alpha   |                              |                       |                                    | 0.722                           |

Table 6: Cronbach’s Alphascale “Administrative Procedure”
Source: SPSS Analysis Results

Fifthly, “Trust” has Cronbach’s Alpha as 0.631 (> 0.6) which is meaningful and used in next analyses. Corrected Item - Total Correlation of STC4 variable (It doesn’t take citizens too much time to come so many times) is 0.284 <0.3. Therefore, it is needed to delete this variable to re-calculate Cronbach’s Alpha.

In case STC4 is deleted, Cronbach’s Alpha of “Trust” element is 0.665 (>0.6) which is meaningful and used in next analyses. Corrected Item - Total Correlation of the component measurement variables is more than 0.3 (more than allowable value as 0.3). Alpha coefficient if item deleted of variables is less than Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient, so these component measurement coefficients are used in next analyses (Tab. 7).

| Component Variable | Average Scale If Item Deleted | Variance Item Deleted | Corrected Item - Total Correlation | Cronbach’s Alpha if item deleted |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| STC1               | 7.95                          | 1.642                 | 0.481                              | 0.562                           |
| STC2               | 7.77                          | 1.630                 | 0.469                              | 0.579                           |
| STC3               | 7.88                          | 1.744                 | 0.479                              | 0.566                           |
| Cronbach’s Alpha   |                              |                       |                                    | 0.665                           |

Table 7: Cronbach’s Alphascale “Trust” Second Time
Source: SPSS analysis results

Sixthly, Cronbach’s Alpha of the dependent variable “Satisfaction” is 0.781 (>0.6) which is meaningful and used in next analyses. Corrected Item - Total Correlation of the component measurement variables is more than 0.3 (more than allowable value as 0.3). Alpha coefficient if item deleted of variables is less than Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient, so these component measurement coefficients are used in next analyses (Tab. 8).

| Component variable | Average scale if item deleted | Variance if item deleted | Corrected Item - Total Correlation | Cronbach’s Alpha if item deleted |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| SHL1               | 6.02                          | 4.451                   | 0.581                              | 0.773                           |
| SHL2               | 6.36                          | 3.118                   | 0.569                              | 0.718                           |
| SHL3               | 6.05                          | 4.239                   | 0.579                              | 0.763                           |
| Cronbach’s Alpha   |                              |                         |                                    | 0.781                           |

Table 8: Cronbach’s Alphascale “Satisfaction”
Source: SPSS Analysis Results
4.2. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

The analysis result of “Trust” coefficient shows that Cronbach’s Alpha of variable groups is more than 0.6, Corrected Item – Total Correlation is more than 0.3, only CSVC1 and STC4 variables are less than 0.3, so it is deleted. Therefore, CSVC1 and STC4 variables will be removed during factor analysis which is done using Principal Component Analysis and Varimax rotation.

| KMO Coefficient | 0.776       |
|------------------|-------------|
| Bartlett’s Test  | Cumulative of Variance 65.587% |
|                  | Eigenvalues value 1.658 |
|                  | Significance (Sig.) 0.000 |

Table 9: KMO Results with Independent Variables
Source: SPSS Analysis Results

- In Table 8, KMO = 0.776 meet the condition 0.5 < KMO < 1, so Exploratory factor analysis suitable for real data.
- Bartlett’s Test provides statistical significance Sig. = 0.000 < 0.05 so the observed variables are linearly correlated with the representative factor

| Component variable | Factor |
|--------------------|--------|
|                    | 1      | 2      | 3      | 4      |
| TDPV2              | 0.741  |
| TDPV4              | 0.670  |
| TDPV5              | 0.630  |
| TDPV3              | 0.547  |
| NLNV3              | 0.527  |
| TDPV6              | 0.693  |
| NLPV2              | 0.628  |
| QTTT2              | 0.519  |
| QTTT4              | 0.532  |
| QTTT3              | 0.681  |
| QTTT1              | 0.625  |
| STC2               | 0.547  |
| STC1               | 0.519  |
| STC3               | 0.693  |
| CSVC5              | 0.599  |
| CSVC4              | 0.699  |
| CSVC2              | 0.604  |
| CSVC3              | 0.832  |

Table 10: EFA Result
Source: SPSS analysis results

Scale adjusting model through Cronbach’s Alpha test and exploratory factor analysis (EFA)

| No. | Scale   | Featured Variable                  | Explanation of scale |
|-----|---------|------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 1   | KNPV(F1)| TDPV2, NLPV2, TDPV6, TDPV4, TDPV5, TDPV3, NLNV3 | Serving capacity     |
| 2   | QTTT(F2)| QTTT2, QTTT4, QTTT3, QTTT1          | Administrative procedure |
| 3   | STC(F3) | STC2, STC1, STC3                    | Trust                |
| 4   | CSVC(F4)| CSVC1, CSVC2, CSVC3, CSVC4         | Facilities           |
| 5   | SHL     | SHL                                | Satisfaction         |

Table 11: Scale Adjusting Table
Source: SPSS Analysis Results

| KMO coefficient | 0.713       |
|------------------|-------------|
| Bartlett’s Test  | Cumulative of Variance 74.696% |
|                  | Eigenvalues value 2.241 |
|                  | Significance (Sig.) 0.000 |

Table 12: KMO Results with Dependent Variables
Source: SPSS Analysis Results
Table 13: Results of Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) as for Dependent Factors
Source: SPSS Analysis Results

The analysis results show a mutual relation between variables (sig = 0.000 < 0.05), KMO = 0.713.

4.3. Regression Analysis
Research models and hypotheses are tested by regression analysis. This method aims at defining important role of each factor in the assessment, the relationship between customer’s satisfaction when using the service and the service evaluation factors (reliability, serving capacity, procedures and facilities).

To know whether the model is suitable or not, the researchers used the determination coefficient R² to evaluate the suitability of the model, R² is proved to be a function which is not decreased by number of independent variables included in the model, but it is not true that more variables equation has, more suitable with data it is, R² tends to be an optimistic element of the model’s suitability for data when there is one variable explained in the model. Therefore, adjusted R² is usually used in multiple linear regressions to evaluate the suitability of the model because it does not inflate the suitability of the model. Moreover, it is required to test to ensure that no multi-collinear phenomenon by variance inflation factor VIF (VIF < 10). The higher the standardized Beta coefficient of one variable is, the greater the impact of that variable on customer satisfaction is (Hoang Trong & Mong Ngoc, 2008).

In order to identify factors affecting people’s satisfaction of the quality of public administrative services at the People’s Committee of Lien Hoa commune, the regression model is like:

\[ SLH = f(F_1, F_2, F_3, F_4) \]

In which:
- \( SLH \) is a dependent variable
- \( F_1, F_2, F_3, F_4 \) are independent variables respectively KNPV, QTNT, STC, CSVC

Therefore, factors from \( F_1 \) to \( F_4 \) are considered to determine which factor significantly affects people’s satisfaction by linear regression equation:

\[ SLH = \beta_0 + \beta_1 F_1 + \beta_2 F_2 + \beta_3 F_3 + \beta_4 F_4 \]

**Table 14: Regression Analysis Results**
Source: SPSS Analysis Results

Comparison of \( R^2 \) and adjusted \( R^2 \) shows that adjusted \( R^2 \) is less than \( R^2 \) that evaluates the model’s suitability. It will be better because it doesn’t inflate the suitability of evaluation model and research model.

The results of the regression analysis showed that all four independent factors had a positive effect (\( \beta > 0 \)) on people’s satisfaction, with a significance level (Sig. = 0.000) at all variables and constants are statistically significant and have a coefficient \( \beta = -1.356 \). Comparing the value (strength) of standardized \( \beta \) shows that; Serving capacity is the biggest factor affecting people’s satisfaction (\( \beta_1 = 0.402 \)), followed by procedure (\( \beta_2 = 0.291 \)), trust (\( \beta_3 = 0.244 \)) and facilities (\( \beta_4 = 0.204 \)).

Thus, after performing regression run, and testing statistical assumptions, we have regression model with variables with non-standardized coefficients as follows:

\[ SLH = -1.356 + 0.402 * F_1 + 0.291 * F_2 + 0.244 * F_3 + 0.204 * F_4 \]

\( (Satisfaction = -1.356 + 0.402 * Serving \ capacity + 0.291 * Procedure + 0.244 * Trust + 0.204 * Facilities) \)
5. Conclusion and Recommendation

The actual survey and analysis of exploratory factor analysis (EFA) shows four factors affecting people’s satisfaction of the quality of public administrative services: serve capacity, manual process, procedures, reliability, and facilities. The results of the study showed that serving capacity ($β_1 = 0.402$) has the strongest impact on the quality of public administrative services, followed by procedure ($β_2 = 0.291$), trust ($β_3 = 0.244$), facilities ($β_4 = 0.204$). Accordingly, to improve the quality of public administrative services to boosting people’s satisfaction in the context of difficult socio-economic conditions in the area with low education, contributing to promote the transparency and effectiveness of the public administration sector, stakeholders should:

5.1. Firstly, Improve the Service Capacity of Officials and Civil Servants

Improving the service capacity of officials and civil servants is the first and important factor affecting the service quality, so the officials and civil servants need friendly and gently communicate with citizens, sincerely instruct citizens to finish procedures at the Commune People’s Committee. In addition, officials and civil servants need to have knowledge and skills to professionally handle jobs, and give full advice while working with citizens. To do that, it is required to:

- Train and improve knowledge and skills of officials and civil servants so that they can clearly explain and instruct citizens.
- Improve communicative skills for officials such as skill to negotiate, skill to persuade, skill to quickly solve problems in order to make correct decisions for administrative procedures.

Develop the professional capacity of administrative human resources that must originate from two sides: One is policies of agency; the other is the officials and civil servants themselves. Therefore, in addition to completion of policy to directly improve professional qualifications, the Commune also needs to have incentive policies to ensure benefits for the officials and civil servants so that they are highly motivated to learn and improve their knowledge and skills. It is also necessary to improve professional skills to solve issue for the officials; make short-term and long-term training plans for the officials that help them update new laws, timely provide them with missing or weak skills.

In addition, it is necessary to flexibly and creatively use modern and advanced working tools and means to meet the requirements of information technology development and international integration. The People’s Committee can organize exchanges for the officials and civil servants learned from local improvement experiences. These are important and direct solutions for improving qualifications of officials and civil servants.

5.2. Secondly, Improve and Make Administrative Procedures to Become Compact, Transparent and Really “One-Stop”

The reform of administrative procedures under the “one-stop” mechanism is one of the important tasks in order to improve performance, create breakthroughs for economy, culture and society, and shorten procedures in many fields that create practical effect and satisfaction for people.

The People’s Committee should review and simplify administrative procedures, strictly control the promulgation, organization and receipt of recommendations from organizations and individuals; also promulgate a number of documents on reforming administrative procedures, strengthening officials and civil servants of the “one-stop” division. Additional notice/requirement on the result returning date should be avoided because it makes citizens uncomfortable. To do it, it is required to clearly defining duration of processing stages and then applies to all administrative procedures. Moreover, administrative procedures, work process, fees and charges shall be publicly and transparently performed at Receiving and Notifying Department. The administrative procedures shall be posted on the portal with hotline numbers so that individuals and organizations timely give their ideas if required.

5.3. Thirdly, Improve Official and Civil Servant’s Attitude to Citizens

Improve communicative skill of the officials and civil servants to organizations and citizens; strengthen rules and administrative discipline, professional ethics of the officials and civil servants.

Improve responsibility, spirit, attitude and ethics of each official and civil servant, say "Sorry" to citizens for wrong process or procedure or advices, delayed result return to citizens. This will raise awareness and responsibility for officials and civil servants in guiding people while handing records.

The commune People’s Committee should organize refresher courses on political and moral theory for officials, develop a system for collecting people’s feedback, make schedule for working with citizen or hotline of leaders.

5.4. Fourthly, Improve Facilities

Fully provide facilities, electronic and modern equipment, apply software to computerize all transactions between individuals, organizations and State agency in publicly guiding and receiving records, returning results to citizen. Therefore, it is specially focused on developing Receiving and Notifying Department, additionally equip working tools for the officials such as camera, printer, photocopier, computer with internet, electronic board to look up information, promote the use of software as prescribed.

Receiving and Notifying Department should be additionally provided with computers on which administrative procedures will be publicized so that people may see procedures, legal documents, forms and declaration. Moreover, it is better if the space is arranged so that citizen may read news; access freely internet and print documents while waiting for their record settlement. At the same time, it is recommended to create a comfortable space, reasonable layout, friendly environment with instruction and consultancy stall that facilitates communication between officials and citizen.
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