

The Association of Dental Health Services Quality with Patient Satisfaction Level in Indonesia

Fuad Husain Akbar, Luthfiah Humairah Akhmad

Department Dental Public Health, Faculty of Dentistry, Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: fuadgi2@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to determine the association of dental health services quality factors with patient satisfaction level in urban and rural areas of Bone Regency, Indonesia. This study using a pilot pathfinder survey was conducted on February 25th - March 1st, 2019. The questionnaire was designed using a five-point Likert scale to assess patient satisfaction. Data were collected from 442 subjects consisting in two locations that represent urban and rural areas to determine the association of oral health services quality factors with patient satisfaction level in urban and rural areas of Bone Regency. Chi square test for statistical analysis was used. In the urban area, the highest mean of the treatment dimension was 3.70 and the lowest mean was 3.66. In the rural area, facility and treatment dimension was the highest mean was 3.63 and the lowest was appointment dimension was 3.36. Based on chi square test, marital status, occupation, and income significantly associated with patient satisfaction. There are association dental health services quality factors with patient satisfaction level. Good service quality provides the highest level of satisfaction. The medium level of satisfaction was on the appointment dimension. Subjects felt difficult, uncomfortable, and the appointment option was not appropriate.

Keywords: Patient Satisfaction, Service Quality, Health Services, Indonesia.

Correspondence:

Fuad Husain Akbar

Department Dental Public Health, Faculty of Dentistry, Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: fuadgi2@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Based on Regulation of The Health Minister of The Republic of Indonesia about Hospital Obligations states that each hospital is obliged to provide safe, quality, anti-discriminatory and effective health services by prioritizing patient importance in accordance to Hospital service standards. To provide effective services, it is important to improve the quality of healthcare to a major concern for patients and also important for hospitals.^{1,2,3}

Service quality is the most important element regarding service providers to gain excellence, so it must be improved and measured properly. At present, due to the higher expectations and patients' desires. Quality is achieved when services can fulfill the needs and expectations of patients.⁴⁻⁷

Oral diseases are one of the public health problems in Indonesia. Based on Indonesia Basic Health Research 2013, the national prevalence of oral problems is 25.9 %. When the patient's oral health changes, it is the responsibility of the dental health provider to restore the patient's oral health to a better level to satisfy them. Health services cannot be given as high quality levels without measuring patient satisfaction. Therefore, measuring patient satisfaction is considered a dynamic aspect in measuring the quality of overall health services.⁸⁻¹²

Factors that influence patient satisfaction with health services can be classified into two major categories related to providers and related to patients. Today, health services are transformed from a service-centered approach to a patient-centered approach where satisfaction with patient needs is part of the definition of quality. Therefore, the commitment to provide high quality services and to achieve patient satisfaction is important to healthcare providers.¹³⁻¹⁵

According to satisfaction in low and middle income countries, study in Brazil showed the higher satisfaction is associated with hospitality, sufficient duration for treatment, and instruction that fulfill patient needs. Other studies in Pakistan found that patient feedback regarding their level of satisfaction with the quality of health treatment was the standard for assessing services. The majority of patients were satisfied with the doctor-patient interaction, technical ability, administrative competence and hospital environment.^{16,17}

The population of Bone Regency based on 2017 population projections was 751,026 people. Bone Regency has 4 hospitals, 38 public health centers. Besides supported by the facility, there were 21 dentists with dentists-populations ratio is 1: 35.763, while according to the WHO ideal Dentist-population ratio is 1:7500 so there was an imbalance between the demand and number of dentists.^{18,19}

There are various studies on the satisfaction of dental health services, but there is no previous research on the quality of dental health services with patient satisfaction in Bone Regency. This survey aims to determine the association of dental health services quality factors with patient satisfaction level in urban dan rural areas of Bone Regency.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Survey design

This study is observational analytic and used pilot pathfinder survey.

Sample

The target population of this survey were people in West Tanete Riattang Subdistrict and Uluweng Subdistrict aged \geq 18 years who have done dental treatment both in the public

health center and hospitals in Bone. Willing to answer all questionnaires. Total subjects were 442 people, consisting of 223 people in urban areas and 219 people in rural areas.

Data collection

In this study, questionnaire that contained the characteristics of the subject was used to measure service quality using a questionnaire developed by Albalhaddad A, Alshammari A, Alqadi A, Nazir MA. which consists of three dimensions including appointment (4) items, facilities (5) items, and treatments (8) items. This questionnaire consists of 17 questions. To measure satisfaction on service quality using 5 alternative answers which used Likert scale (1 = very dissatisfied, 2 = dissatisfied, 3 = neutral, 4 = satisfied, 5 = very satisfied). The survey outcome were divided into 2 major answers.¹² For very satisfied and satisfied answers were classified to satisfied answer categories, while for neutral, dissatisfied, and very dissatisfied into dissatisfied answers category. Determination is useful for avoiding data that is not normally distributed. A maximum score of 85 and a minimum score of 17. Scores ≤ 51 are categorized as dissatisfied, score >51 is categorized as satisfied. The mean value in each dimension is classified into categories: Low: 1-2.33, Medium: 2.34-3.66, High: 3.67-5.00.²⁵ Data were analyzed by SPSS 25.0 statistics and using chi-square test.

RESULTS

Table 1 showing the subject characteristics. The most subject was female (65.4%), 18-24 years old (31.0%), Bugis ethnic (98.2%), Muslims (99.3%), Married (55.7%), graduate from senior high school (28.7%), unemployment (56.6%), has income 0 – 150.000 IDR (56.1%), 0-5 km to the health service centre (79.4%), and insurance coverage (73.3%).

Table 2 shows the questionnaire results of 17 questions with 3 dimensions of dental health services quality in urban and rural areas. In the urban area, most of the subjects answered "satisfied of each dimension for "satisfied about appointment coordination" (3.74), "Hospital location was easy to access" (3.76), "Professional dentist" (3.78). In rural areas most of the subjects answered satisfied for "easy to make convenient appointments" (3.52), "The waiting room was clean and neat" (3.80), "satisfied with dental treatment results" (3.81). From the three dimensions assessed regarding the quality of health service, in the urban area, the dimension which gained the highest average value on the treatment dimension was 3.70 (high category) and the lowest average on the facilities dimension was 3.66 (medium category). In the rural area, the dimension which gained the highest average value on the treatment and facilities dimension was 3.63 (medium category) and the lowest average on the appointment dimension was 3.36 (medium category).

Table 3. Association of subject characteristics with dimensions of service quality (satisfaction of appointment) in urban and rural areas. There is a significant association between marital status with appointment satisfaction in urban areas ($p=0.044$) and rural ($p=0.012$).

Table 4 Showing a significant association between occupation with facility satisfaction in urban area ($p=0.017$)

Table 5 showing a significant association between occupation with treatment satisfaction in urban area ($p=0.050$) and monthly income in rural area ($p=0.022$)

DISCUSSION

In this survey, subject satisfaction was assessed with three dimensions which are appointment, facility, and treatment. Table 2 regarding the dimension of appointment in urban areas, the item included in the medium category was appointment options suited on schedule. service organizing dimension as the lowest satisfaction because many patients came and service was delayed so that appointment was rescheduled.^{20-21,31} While in rural areas, all items belonged to the medium category. The items on the appointment dimension are easy to make the first appointment, comfortable, and scheduled on schedule. Similar studies in India showed 31.9 % subjects had problems with scheduling appointment.³² The main reasons for failure in appointment to the dental services were busy with other activities, long waiting time, and long distances.^{33,34,35}

The satisfaction of facilities in urban and rural areas belonging to the medium category are toilet clean, the equipment and materials used are clean, the room temperature is comfortable, and the location of the hospital is easily accessible. Opposite with study in India, patients are satisfied that toilets and equipment are clean. Hospitals that are far from their home contribute to failures during appointment. This may be a result of additional time and costs needed to access healthcare facilities.^{30,32,33,35,36}

The satisfaction of treatment in urban areas belonging to the medium category are sufficient waiting time and treatment time. That waiting time obtained the lowest satisfaction level. The waiting time until the beginning of treatment was significantly associated with overall patient satisfaction. Possible reasons for dissatisfaction with waiting time for treatment and duration of treatment can include the complexity of dental procedures and lack of time management skills and lack of experience in handling patients effectively.^{30,37,38} Whereas in rural, three items with medium category are sufficient waiting time, the dentist explains alternative treatment plans, and patient questions can be answered by the dentist. The most unsatisfactory problem about waiting time.^{37,22-25} That 90.5% obtained an explanation of alternative treatment plans and obtained the highest agreement regarding dentists answering all patient questions (97.3%).^{39,26-29} Miscommunication might caused unsatisfactory response of the patient even with optimal treatment quality.^{30,40,41}

There was association between marital status and appointment satisfaction. That unmarried patients had significantly less satisfaction levels compared to married patients or patients who had separated. Marital status can also be associated with satisfaction, because married individuals are usually happier and have greater life satisfaction than unmarried individuals.^{42,43}

There was a significant association between occupation with patient satisfaction. Lower satisfaction of health services is

associated with patients who have jobs compared to unemployments. One of explanation of it was working patients can have better access to visit dental health services and more flexible.^{16,44}

There was a significant association between income and treatment satisfaction. Patients with low monthly income were more satisfied with health care facilities compared to patients who had high income levels. Patients with low income have fewer expectations and show more satisfaction with health care providers.^{42,45,46-52}

CONCLUSION

This study reported that there is an association of dental health services quality with patient satisfaction level. Good service quality provides a high level of satisfaction. The highest level of satisfaction is in the treatment dimension in urban areas. Medium satisfaction level with the lowest mean is on appointment dimension in rural areas. Subjects felt difficult, uncomfortable, and the appointment option was not appropriate so they were not satisfied with the appointment that were not well scheduled.

REFERENCES

- Ministry of Health of the Republic of Indonesia. (2009). Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 36 of 2009 concerning Health.
- Ministry of Health of the Republic of Indonesia. (2018). Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 4 of 2018 concerning Obligations of Hospitals and Obligations of Patients. Indonesia.
- Maqsood, M., Maqsood, H., Kousar, R., Jabeen, C., Waqas, A., & Gillani, S. A. (2017). Effects of hospital service quality on patients' satisfaction and behavioural intention of doctors and nurses. *Saudi Journal of Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences*, 3, 556-567. <https://doi.org/10.21276/sjmps>
- Aghamolaei, T., Eftekhaari, T. E., Rafati, S., Kahnouji, K., Ahangari, S., Shahrzad, M. E., ... & Hoseini, S. H. (2014). Service quality assessment of a referral hospital in Southern Iran with SERVQUAL technique: patients' perspective. *BMC health services research*, 14(1), 322. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-14-322>
- Fatima, T., Malik, S. A., & Shabbir, A. (2018). Hospital healthcare service quality, patient satisfaction and loyalty. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJQRM-02-2017-0031>
- Fattahian, R., Bagheri, S. R., & Sadeghi, M. (2018). Development of posttraumatic hydrocephalus requiring ventriculoperitoneal shunt after decompressive craniectomy for traumatic brain injury: a systematic review and meta-analysis of retrospective studies. *Medical Archives*, 72(3), 214. <https://dx.doi.org/10.5455%2Fmedarh.2018.72.214-219>
- Arisandy W. (2015). Strategy of the health office in improving the quality of health services through the citizen report card (crc) method in the city of surabaya. *Public Policy and Management*. 3 (2): 12-23.
- Veiga, N., & Coelho, I. (2015). The Importance of Epidemiology in Dental Medicine. *of*, 4, 1983-84.
- National Institute of Health Research and Development. (2013). Basic Health Research.
- Porter, J., Ntouva, A., Read, A., Murdoch, M., Ola, D., & Tsakos, G. (2015). The impact of oral health on the quality of life of nursing home residents. *Health and quality of life outcomes*, 13(1), 102. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12955-015-0300-y>
- Patel, J. Y. (2014). A study on evaluation of patient satisfaction with dental health care services. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 4(8), 1-4.
- Ali, D. A. (2016). Patient satisfaction in dental healthcare centers. *European journal of dentistry*, 10(3), 309. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4103%2F1305-7456.184147>
- Balkaran, R. L., Osoba, T., & Rafeek, R. (2014). A Cross-sectional Study of Patients' Satisfaction with Dental Care Facilities: A Survey of Adult Treatment at the University of the West Indies, School of Dentistry. *The West Indian medical journal*, 63(5), 490. <https://dx.doi.org/10.7727%2Fwimj.2013.197>
- Adhikary, G., Shawon, M. S. R., Ali, M. W., Shamsuzzaman, M., Ahmed, S., Shackelford, K. A., ... & Gakidou, E. (2018). Factors influencing patients' satisfaction at different levels of health facilities in Bangladesh: Results from patient exit interviews. *PloS one*, 13(5), e0196643. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0196643>
- Ahmady, A. E., Pakkhesal, M., Zafarmand, A. H., & Lando, H. A. (2015). Patient satisfaction surveys in dental school clinics: a review and comparison. *Journal of dental education*, 79(4), 388-393. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.0022-0337.2015.79.4.tb05895.x>
- Aldosari, M. A., Tavares, M. A., Matta-Machado, A. T. G., & Abreu, M. H. N. G. (2017). Factors associated with patients' satisfaction in Brazilian dental primary health care. *PloS one*, 12(11), e0187993. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0187993>
- Iqbal W, Farooq F, Bari YA, Nazir SF. (2018). Evaluation of dental care through patient satisfaction feedback – a cross sectional study at Dental Institute of OJHA Hospital , Karachi , Pakistan. *Adv Dent Oral Heal*. 8(4):1-9. <https://doi.org/10.19080/ADOH.2018.08.555743>
- Bone Regency in Figures. (2018). Statistics of Bone Regency. 50,77,95.
- Sankalp, Y., & Gautam, R. (2016). The current status of dental graduates in India. *The Pan African Medical Journal*, 23. <https://doi.org/10.11604/pamj.2016.23.22.7381>
- Al-Abri, R., & Al-Balushi, A. (2014). Patient satisfaction survey as a tool towards quality improvement. *Oman medical journal*, 29(1), 3. <https://dx.doi.org/10.5001%2Fomj.2014.02>
- Kim, C. E., Shin, J. S., Lee, J., Lee, Y. J., Kim, M. R., Choi, A., ... & Ha, I. H. (2017). Quality of medical service, patient satisfaction and loyalty with a focus on interpersonal-based medical service encounters and treatment effectiveness: a cross-sectional multicenter study of complementary and alternative medicine

- (CAM) hospitals. *BMC complementary and alternative medicine*, 17(1), 174. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12906-017-1691-6>
22. Mosadeghrad, A. M. (2013). Healthcare service quality: towards a broad definition. *International journal of health care quality assurance*, 26(3):203–19. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09526861311311409>
 23. Ghahramanian, A., Rezaei, T., Abdullahzadeh, F., Sheikhalipour, Z., & Dianat, I. (2017). Quality of healthcare services and its relationship with patient safety culture and nurse-physician professional communication. *Health promotion perspectives*, 7(3), 168. <https://dx.doi.org/10.15171%2Fhpp.2017.30>
 24. Parasuraman AP, Zeithaml VA, Berry LL. (1988). SERVQUAL: a multiple- item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *J Retail*. 664(1):12–40. [https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(99\)00084-3](https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(99)00084-3)
 25. Al-Damen, R. (2017). Health care service quality and its impact on patient satisfaction “case of Al-Bashir Hospital”. 12(9):136–52.
 26. Habibi, M. R. M., Abadi, F. M., Tabesh, H., Vakili-Arki, H., Abu-Hanna, A., & Eslami, S. (2018). Evaluation of patient satisfaction of the status of appointment scheduling systems in outpatient clinics: Identifying patients’ needs. *Journal of advanced pharmaceutical technology & research*, 9(2), 51. https://dx.doi.org/10.4103%2Fjaptr.JAPTR_134_18
 27. Akbar, F. H., & Jaya, M. T. (2017). Relationship between service quality on public health center and patient satisfaction. *Glob J Health Sci*, 9(7), 96-102. <https://doi.org/10.5539/gjhs.v9n7p96>
 28. Lee, K. T., Chen, C. M., Huang, S. T., Wu, Y. M., Lee, H. E., Hsu, K. J., ... & Wu, J. H. (2013). Patient satisfaction with the quality of dental treatment provided by interns. *Journal of Dental Sciences*, 8(2), 177-183. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jds.2012.05.015>
 29. World Health Organization. (2013). Oral health surveys basic methods fifth edition. WHO Libr Cat Data Oral. 651:43–56.
 30. Balhaddad, A. A., Alshammari, A., AlqADi, A., & Nazir, M. A. (2018). Patient Satisfaction with Dental Services and Associated Factors in a Saudi Dental Institution. *Journal of Clinical & Diagnostic Research*, 12(12). <http://dx.doi.org/10.7860/JCDR/2018/38358.12399>
 31. Akbar, F. H., Pasiga, B., Samad, R., Pratiwi, R., Anwar, A. I., Djamaluddin, N., & Ulfa, L. (2018). Evaluation of Expectations and Perceptions on Quality of Dental Services in Bantaeng District, South Sulawesi, Indonesia, 2018. *Journal of International Dental and Medical Research*, 11(3), 938-944.
 32. Nagappan, N., & John, J. (2014). Patient satisfaction with the dental services offered by a dental Hospital in India. *Journal of Indian Association of Public Health Dentistry*, 12(4), 297. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4103/2319-5932.147669>
 33. Onyejaka, N. K., Emele, I. E., & Eboh, O. F. (2018). Appointment Failure among Dental Patients Attending a Government Dental Centre in Enugu, Nigeria. *Pesquisa Brasileira em Odontopediatria e Clinica Integrada*, 18(1), 4004. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4034/PBOCI.2018.181.56>
 34. Ibrahim, O. M., Gabre, A. A., Sallam, S. F., El-Alameey, I. R., Sabry, R. N., Galal, E. M., ... & Ramadan, A. (2017). Influence of interleukin-6 (174G/C) gene polymorphism on obesity in Egyptian children. *Open access Macedonian journal of medical sciences*, 5(7), 831. <https://dx.doi.org/10.3889%2Ffoamjms.2017.175>
 35. Akbar, F. H., Pasinringi, S., & Awang, A. H. (2019). Factors Affecting Dental Center Service Quality in Indonesia. *Pesquisa Brasileira em Odontopediatria e Clinica Integrada*, 19, (1):1–11. <https://doi.org/10.4034/pboci.2019.191.53>
 36. Akbar, F. H., & Ayuandyka, U. (2018). Gender and age differences in patient satisfaction with dental care in the urban and rural areas of Indonesia: Pilot pathfinder survey. *Pesquisa Brasileira em Odontopediatria e Clinica Integrada*, 18(1), 4093. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4034/PBOCI.2018.181.80>
 37. Sur, H., Hayran, O., Yildirim, C., & Mumcu, G. (2004). Patient satisfaction in dental outpatient clinics in Turkey. *Croatian medical journal*, 45(5), 651-654.
 38. Lyros, I., Pavi, E., Tsolakis, A. I., Makou, M., & Kyriopoulos, J. (2019). Satisfaction with Orthodontic Care Provided in a University Orthodontic Clinic. *The Open Dentistry Journal*, 13(1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.2174/1874210601913010067>
 39. Tashkandi FS, Hejazi LO, Lingawi HS. (2017). Patients’ satisfaction with dental care services provided by educational dental hospital. *Int J Heal Sci Res*. 7(6):135–42.
 40. Akbar, F. H., & Pasiga, B. (2017, August). Patient satisfaction level with health care quality at Dental Hospital of Hasanuddin University. In *8th International Conference of Asian Association of Indigenous and Cultural Psychology (ICAAIP 2017)*. Atlantis Press. <https://dx.doi.org/10.2991/icaaip-17.2018.59>
 41. Akbar, F. H., & Pratiwi, R. (2016). Patient satisfaction against the quality of dental health services at dental polyclinic of Tenriawaru General Hospital in Bone Regency. *J dentomaxillofac sci*, 1(3), 352-60. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15562/jdmfs.v1i3.313>
 42. Afzal, M., Rizvi, F., Azad, A. H., Rajput, A. M., Khan, A., & Tariq, N. (2014). Effect of demographic characteristics on patient’s satisfaction with health care facility. *Journal of Postgraduate Medical Institute (Peshawar-Pakistan)*, 28(2).
 43. Lazaridou, D., Tsiantou, D., Coolidge, T., Arapostathis, K. N., & Kotsanos, N. (2015). Predictors of Dental Patients’ Satisfaction in a Greek Sample. *Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research*, 470-480. <https://doi.org/10.9734/BJMMR/2015/15984>
 44. Akbar, F. H., Pratiwi, R., & Cendikiawan, R. (2017). Relationship between oral health status with knowledge, attitude, and behavior of elementary school children. *Journal of International Dental and Medical Research*, 10(3), 921-926.
 45. Husain, F. A., & Tatengkeng, F. (2017). Oral health-related quality of life appraised by OHIP-14 between urban and rural areas in Kutai Kartanegara Regency, Indonesia: Pilot pathfinder survey. *The Open Dentistry*

-
- Journal*, 11, 557. <https://dx.doi.org/10.2174%2F1874210601711010557>
46. Akbar, F. H., Pratiwi, R., Samad, R., & Fanissa, F. (2017, October). Patient satisfaction on health service center in urban and rural area. In *Health Science International Conference (HSIC 2017)*. Atlantis Press. <https://dx.doi.org/10.2991/hsic-17.2017.14>
 47. Akbar, F. H., Pasiga, B. D., & Montho, R. (2017). Association between service health quality and patient satisfaction—a case study of people in north mamuju, indonesia 2017. *International Journal of Management (IJM)*, 8(1).
 48. Akbar, F. H., Pasinringi, S., & Awang, A. H. (2020). Assessment of Patient Satisfaction Level to Dental Health Care Services in Indonesia. *Pesquisa Brasileira em Odontopediatria e Clínica Integrada*, 20, 4825. <https://doi.org/10.1590/pboci.2020.077>
 49. Akbar, F. H., Pasinringi, S., & Awang, A. H. (2019). Relationship between health service access to dental conditions in urban and rural areas in Indonesia. *Pesquisa Brasileira em Odontopediatria e Clínica Integrada*, 19. <https://doi.org/10.4034/pboci.2019.191.83>
 50. Akbar, F. H., Rivai, F., Abdullah, A. Z., Awang, A. H., & Maretta, Y. A. (2020). Dental tourism: New strategies for the health care in Indonesia. *International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research*. 9(2), 1432–1433.
 51. Akbar, F. H., Alfian, A. A., & Maretta, Y. A. (2020). Relation of patient satisfaction level with oral health status on health insurance user in Indonesia 2018. *International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research*. 9(1), 3351–3357.
 52. Akbar, F. H., Ulfah, & Maretta, Y. A. (2020). The effect of health services quality on satisfaction and loyalty in West Sulawesi Province, Indonesia. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*. 29(5), 3763–3777.

Table 1. Distribution of Subjects According to Demographic Characteristics

| Characteristics | | Location | | | | Total | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------|------|-------|------|-------|------|
| | | Urban | | Rural | | | |
| | | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| Gender | Male | 62 | 27.8 | 91 | 41.6 | 153 | 34.6 |
| | Female | 161 | 72.2 | 128 | 58.4 | 298 | 65.4 |
| Ages (years) | 18 - 24 | 36 | 16.1 | 101 | 46.1 | 137 | 31.0 |
| | 25 – 34 | 31 | 13.9 | 26 | 11.9 | 57 | 12.9 |
| | 35 - 44 | 40 | 17.9 | 36 | 16.4 | 76 | 17.2 |
| | 45 - 55 | 58 | 26 | 41 | 18.7 | 99 | 22.4 |
| | 56 – 70 | 58 | 26 | 15 | 6.8 | 73 | 16.5 |
| Ethnics | Bugis | 220 | 98.7 | 215 | 98.2 | 435 | 98.4 |
| | Makassar | 3 | 1.3 | 2 | 0.9 | 5 | 1.1 |
| | Mandar | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0.9 | 2 | 0.5 |
| Religions | Muslim | 222 | 99.6 | 217 | 99.1 | 439 | 99.3 |
| | Buddha | 1 | 0.4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.2 |
| | Christian | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0.9 | 2 | 0.5 |
| Marital status | Unmarried | 40 | 17.9 | 115 | 52.5 | 155 | 35.1 |
| | Married | 154 | 69.1 | 92 | 42 | 246 | 55.7 |
| | Widow | 24 | 10.8 | 12 | 5.5 | 36 | 8.1 |
| | Widower | 5 | 2.2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1.1 |
| Educational | No school | 39 | 17.5 | 7 | 3.2 | 46 | 10.4 |
| | Elementary | 61 | 27.4 | 44 | 20.1 | 105 | 23.8 |
| | Junior high school | 23 | 10.3 | 45 | 20.5 | 68 | 1.4 |
| | Senior high school | 50 | 22.4 | 77 | 35.2 | 127 | 28.7 |
| | Bachelor degree | 50 | 22.4 | 46 | 21 | 96 | 21.7 |
| Occupation | Unemployment | 127 | 57 | 123 | 56.2 | 250 | 56.6 |
| | Farmer | 22 | 9.9 | 19 | 8.7 | 41 | 9.3 |
| | Labor | 5 | 2.2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1.1 |
| | Entrepreneur | 21 | 9.4 | 31 | 14.2 | 52 | 11.8 |
| | Private employees | 8 | 3.6 | 6 | 2.7 | 14 | 3.2 |
| | Government employees | 39 | 17.5 | 33 | 15.1 | 72 | 16.3 |
| | Others | 1 | 0.4 | 7 | 3.2 | 8 | 1.8 |
| Monthly income | 0 – 150000 IDR | 133 | 59.6 | 115 | 52.5 | 248 | 56.1 |
| | 150000 – 500000 IDR | 17 | 7.6 | 31 | 14.2 | 48 | 10.9 |
| | 500000 – 1000000 IDR | 16 | 7.2 | 16 | 7.3 | 32 | 7.2 |
| | 1000000 – 2000000 IDR | 17 | 7.6 | 25 | 11.4 | 42 | 9.5 |
| | > 2000000 IDR | 40 | 17.9 | 32 | 14.6 | 72 | 16.3 |
| Distance to the health service center | 0 - 5 km | 182 | 81.6 | 169 | 77.2 | 351 | 79.4 |
| | 6 - 10 km | 31 | 13.9 | 36 | 16.4 | 67 | 15.2 |
| | > 10 km | 10 | 4.5 | 14 | 6.4 | 24 | 5.4 |
| Health insurance status | Yes | 177 | 79.4 | 147 | 67.1 | 324 | 73.3 |
| | No | 46 | 20.6 | 72 | 32.9 | 118 | 26.7 |
| Total | | 223 | 100 | 219 | 100 | 442 | 100 |

Table 2. Average Distribution of Satisfaction with Health Services Quality

| Quality dimensions | Items | Urban | | | Rural | | |
|--------------------|---|-------|------|----------|-------|------|----------|
| | | Mean | SD | Category | Mean | SD | Category |
| Appointment | It was easy to make my first appointment | 3.67 | 0.63 | High | 3.46 | 0.85 | Medium |
| | It was easy to make my convenient appointment | 3.70 | 0.73 | High | 3.52 | 0.88 | Medium |
| | I'm satisfied about appointment coordination | 3.74 | 0.74 | High | 3.14 | 1.02 | Medium |
| | Appointment options suited my schedule | 3.63 | 0.76 | Medium | 3.32 | 0.96 | Medium |
| | Overall satisfaction with appointments | 3.69 | 0.51 | High | 3.36 | 0.68 | Medium |
| Facilities | Hospital location was easy to access | 3.76 | 0.80 | High | 3,56 | 0.90 | Medium |
| | The waiting room was clean and neat | 3.70 | 0.88 | High | 3,80 | 0.73 | High |
| | Enough and clean toilets are available | 3.62 | 0.98 | Medium | 3,79 | 0.83 | High |
| | Materials and equipment were clean | 3.55 | 1.04 | Medium | 3,40 | 0.98 | Medium |
| | The temperature was comfortable | 3.66 | 0.95 | Medium | 3,61 | 0.96 | Medium |
| Treatment | Overall satisfaction with facilities | 3.66 | 0.67 | Medium | 3.63 | 0.64 | Medium |
| | The waiting time was suitable and acceptable | 3.65 | 0.88 | Medium | 3.45 | 0.91 | Medium |
| | The Dentist was professional | 3.78 | 0.85 | High | 3.72 | 0.86 | High |
| | The dentist showed his concern | 3.75 | 0.79 | High | 3.74 | 0.77 | High |
| | The dentist clearly explained my treatment plan | 3.68 | 0.86 | High | 3.69 | 0.82 | High |
| | The dentist explained an alternative treatment plan | 3.68 | 0.83 | High | 3.49 | 0.90 | Medium |
| | My questions had been answered | 3.69 | 0.81 | High | 3.47 | 0.93 | Medium |
| | The treatment time was suitable and acceptable | 3.65 | 0.83 | Medium | 3.68 | 0.79 | High |
| | I am satisfied with my dental treatment results | 3.74 | 0.88 | High | 3.81 | 0.86 | High |
| | Overall satisfaction with treatment | 3.70 | 0.51 | High | 3.63 | 0.66 | Medium |

*Low: 1-2.33, Medium: 2.33-3.66, High: 3.67-5.00

Source : Primary Data

Table 3. Association of Subject Characteristics with Dimension of Service Quality (Satisfaction of Appointment) in Urban and Rural Areas

| Characteristics | Urban | | p-value | Rural | | p-value |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|----------|-----------------------------|--------------|---------|
| | Satisfaction of appointment | | | Satisfaction of appointment | | |
| | Satisfied | Dissatisfied | | Satisfied | Dissatisfied | |
| | n(%) | n(%) | | n(%) | n(%) | |
| Gender | | | 0.307 | | | 0.169 |
| Male | 54(87.1) | 8(12.9) | | 52(57,1) | 39(42,9) | |
| Female | 129(80.1) | 32(19.9) | | 86(67.2) | 42(32.8) | |
| Ages (years) | | | 0.673 | | | 0.051 |
| 18 – 24 | 30(83.3) | 6(16.7) | | 53(52.5) | 48(47.5) | |
| 25 – 34 | 25(80.6) | 6(19.4) | | 18(69.2) | 8(30.8) | |
| 35 – 44 | 32(80.0) | 8(20.0) | | 26(72.2) | 10(27.8) | |
| 45 – 55 | 45(77.6) | 13(22.4) | | 31(75.6) | 10(24.4) | |
| 56 – 70 | 51(87.9) | 7(12.1) | | 10(66.7) | 5(33.3) | |
| Marital status | | | | 0.044* | | |
| Unmarried | 36(90.0) | 4(10.0) | 62(53.9) | | 53(46.1) | |
| Married | 128 (83.1) | 26(16.9) | 68(73.9) | | 24(26.1) | |
| Widow | 15 (62.5) | 9(37.5) | 8(66.7) | | 4(33.3) | |
| Widower | 4 (80.0) | 1(20.0) | 0(0.0) | | 0(0.0) | |
| Education | | | 0.700 | | | 0.111 |
| No school | 33(84.6) | 6(15.4) | | 6(85.7) | 1(14.3) | |
| Elementary | 52(85.2) | 9(14.8) | | 31(70.5) | 13(29.5) | |
| Junior high school | 18(78.3) | 5(21.7) | | 23(51.1) | 22(48.9) | |
| Senior high school | 38(76.0) | 12(24.0) | | 45(58.4) | 32(41.6) | |
| Bachelor degree | 42(84.0) | 8(16.0) | | 33(71.7) | 13(28.3) | |
| Occupation | | | 0.208 | | | 0.342 |
| Unemployment | 107(84.3) | 20(15.7) | | 73(59.3) | 50(40.7) | |
| Farmer | 17(77.3) | 5(22.7) | | 11(57.9) | 8(42.1) | |
| Labor | 3(60.0) | 2(40.0) | | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | |
| Entrepreneur | 16(76.2) | 5(23.8) | | 19(61.3) | 12(38.7) | |
| Private employees | 6(75.0) | 2(25.0) | | 5(83.3) | 1(16.7) | |
| Government employees | 34(87.2) | 5(12.8) | | 26(78.8) | 7(21.2) | |
| Others | 0(0.0) | 1(100.0) | | 4(57.1) | 3(42.9) | |
| Monthly income | | | 0.842 | | | 0.226 |
| 0 – 150000 IDR | 108(81.2) | 25(18.8) | | 69(60.0) | 46(40.0) | |
| 150000 – 500000 IDR | 14(82.4) | 3(17.6) | | 18(58.1) | 13(41.9) | |
| 500000 – 1000000 IDR | 12(75.0) | 4(25.0) | | 9(56.3) | 7(43.8) | |
| 1000000 – 2000000 IDR | 14(82.4) | 3(17.6) | | 1 (64.0) | 9(36.0) | |
| > 2000000 IDR | 35(87.5) | 5(12.5) | | 26(81.3) | 6(18.8) | |

Chi square test. *Significant p<0.05

Table 4. Association of Subject Characteristics with Dimension of Service Quality (Satisfaction of Facilities) in Urban and Rural Areas

| Characteristics | Urban | | p-value | Rural | | p-value |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------------|----------|----------------------------|--------------|---------|
| | Satisfaction of facilities | | | Satisfaction of facilities | | |
| | Satisfied | Dissatisfied | | Satisfied | Dissatisfied | |
| | n(%) | n(%) | | n(%) | n(%) | |
| Gender | | | 0.054 | | | 0.928 |
| Male | 57(91.9) | 5(8.1) | | 71(78.0) | 20(22.0) | |
| Female | 129(80.1) | 32(19.9) | | 98(76.6) | 30(23.4) | |
| Ages (years) | | | 0.075 | | | 0.852 |
| 18 – 24 | 33(91.7) | 3(8.3) | | 79(78.2) | 22(21.8) | |
| 25 – 34 | 23(74.2) | 8(25.8) | | 18(69.2) | 8(30.8) | |
| 35 – 44 | 37(92.5) | 3(7.5) | | 29(80.6) | 7(19.4) | |
| 45 – 55 | 49(84.5) | 9(15.5) | | 31(75.6) | 10(24.4) | |
| 56 – 70 | 44(75.9) | 14(24.1) | | 12(80.0) | 3(20.0) | |
| Marital status | | | | 0.778 | | |
| Unmarried | 35(87.5) | 5(12.5) | 90(78.3) | | 25(21.7) | |
| Married | 126(81, 8) | 28(18.2) | 70(76.1) | | 22(23.9) | |
| Widow | 21(87.5) | 3(12.5) | 9(75.0) | | 3(25.0) | |
| Widower | 4(80.0) | 1(20.0) | 0(0.0) | | 0(0.0) | |
| Education | | | 0.335 | | | 0.143 |
| No school | 29(74.4) | 10(25.6) | | 6(85.7) | 1(14.3) | |
| Elementary | 51(83.6) | 10(16.4) | | 33(77.0) | 11(25.0) | |
| Junior high school | 18(78.3) | 5(21.7) | | 29(64.4) | 16(35.6) | |
| Senior high school | 43(86.0) | 7(14.0) | | 65(84.4) | 12(15.6) | |
| Bachelor degree | 45(90.0) | 5(10.0) | | 36(78.3) | 10(21.7) | |
| Occupation | | | 0.017* | | | 0.298 |
| Unemployment | 102(80.3) | 25(19.7) | | 90(73.2) | 33(26.8) | |
| Farmer | 22(100.0) | 0(0.0) | | 13(68.4) | 6(31.6) | |
| Labor | 3(60.0) | 2(40.0) | | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | |
| Entrepreneur | 16(76.2) | 5(23.8) | | 27(87.1) | 4(12.9) | |
| Private employees | 7(87.5) | 1(12.5) | | 5 (83.3) | 1(16.7) | |
| Government employees | 36(92.3) | 3(7.7) | | 29(87.9(| 4(12.1) | |
| Others | 0(0.0) | 1(100.0) | | 5(71.4) | 2(28.6) | |
| Monthly income | | | 0.197 | | | 0.315 |
| 0 – 150000 IDR | 106(79.7) | 27(20.3) | | 85(73.9) | 30(26.1) | |
| 150000 – 500000 IDR | 17(100.0) | 0(0.0) | | 24(77.4) | 7(22.6) | |
| 500000 – 1000000 IDR | 13(81.3) | 3 18.8) | | 11(68.8) | 5(31.3) | |
| 1000000 – 2000000 IDR | 14(82.4) | 3(17.6) | | 20(80.0) | 5(20.0) | |
| > 2000000 IDR | 36(90.0) | 410.0) | | 29(90.6) | 3(9.4) | |

Chi square test. *Significant p<0.05

Table 5. Association of Subject Characteristics with Dimension of Service Quality (Satisfaction of Treatment) in Urban and Rural Areas

| Characteristics | Urban | | p-value | Rural | | p-value |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|--------------|----------|---------------------------|--------------|---------|
| | Satisfaction of treatment | | | Satisfaction of treatment | | |
| | Satisfied | Dissatisfied | | Satisfied | Dissatisfied | |
| | n(%) | n(%) | | n(%) | n(%) | |
| Gender | | | 1.000 | | | 0.162 |
| Male | 53(85.5) | 9(14.5) | | 65(71.4) | 26(28.6) | |
| Female | 138(85.7) | 23(14.3) | | 103(80.5) | 25(19.5) | |
| Ages (years) | | | 0.654 | | | 0.320 |
| 18 – 24 | 32(88.9) | 4(11.1) | | 81(80.2) | 20(19.8) | |
| 25 – 34 | 27(87.1) | 4(12.9) | | 17(65.4) | 9(34.6) | |
| 35 – 44 | 33(82.5) | 7(17.5) | | 26(72.2) | 10(27.8) | |
| 45 – 55 | 52(89.7) | 6(10.3) | | 34(82.9) | 7(17.1) | |
| 56 – 70 | 47(81.0) | 11(19.0) | | 10(66.7) | 5(33.3) | |
| Marital status | | | | 0.950 | | |
| Unmarried | 35(87.5) | 5(12.5) | 89(77.4) | | 26(22.6) | |
| Married | 131(85.1) | 23(14.9) | 71(77.2) | | 21(22.8) | |
| Widow | 21(87.5) | 3(12.5) | 8(66.7) | | 4(33.3) | |
| Widower | 4(80.0) | 1(20.0) | 0(0.0) | | 0(0.0) | |
| Education | | | 0.350 | | | 0.488 |
| No school | 33(84.6) | 6(15.4) | | 4(57.1) | 3(42.9) | |
| Elementary | 53(86.9) | 8(13.1) | | 34(77.3) | 10(22.7) | |
| Junior high school | 17(73.9) | 6(26.1) | | 32(71.1) | 13(28.9) | |
| Senior high school | 42(84.0) | 8(16.0) | | 63(81.8) | 14(18.2) | |
| Bachelor degree | 46(92.0) | 4(8.0) | | 35(76.1) | 11(23.9) | |
| Occupation | | | 0.050* | | | 0.899 |
| Unemployment | 105(82.7) | 22(17.3) | | 94(76.4) | 29(23.6) | |
| Farmer | 19(86.4) | 3(13.6) | | 14(73.7) | 5(26.3) | |
| Labor | 4(80.0) | 1(20.0) | | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | |
| Entrepreneur | 19(90.5) | 2(9.5) | | 22(71.0) | 9(29.0) | |
| Private employees | 6(75.0) | 2(25.0) | | 5(83.3) | 1(16.7) | |
| Government employees | 38 (97.4) | 1(20.0) | | 27(81.8) | 6(18.2) | |
| Others | 0(0.0) | 1(100.0) | | 6(85.7) | 1(14.3) | |
| Monthly income | | | 0.090 | | | 0.022* |
| 0 – 150000 IDR | 108(81.2) | 25(18.8) | | 90(78.3) | 2 (21.7) | |
| 150000 – 500000 IDR | 16(94.1) | 1(5.9) | | 23(74.2) | 8(25.8) | |
| 500000 – 1000000 IDR | 13(81.3) | 3(18.8) | | 9(56.3) | 7(43.8) | |
| 1000000 – 2000000 IDR | 15(88.2) | 2(11.8) | | 16(64) | 9(36.0) | |
| > 2000000 IDR | 39 (97.5) | 1(2.5) | | 30(93.8) | 2(6.2) | |

Chi square test. *Significant p<0.05