



# CLIENT SATISFACTION FOR A NATIONAL GOVERNMENT AGENCY IN RELATION TO R.A. 11032 (EASE OF DOING BUSINESS AND EFFICIENT GOVERNMENT SERVICE DELIVERY ACT OF 2018)

**Michael A. Castillo**

*Master in Public Administration, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Sta. Cruz, Laguna, Philippines*

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra21991>  
DOI No: 10.36713/epra21991

## ABSTRACT

Within the competent and effective public service framework which focuses on delivering quality services to citizens, this study evaluated client satisfaction for a national government agency, particularly the Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) Regional Office IV-A in relation to R.A. 11032 (Ease of Doing Business and Efficient Government Service Delivery Act of 2018). The demographic analysis revealed that most respondents are from CALABARZON and within the 21-25 age group, with a predominantly female sample and a majority holding undergraduate degrees belonging to the Business, Education, and Social Work cluster of professions. The primary type of transaction involved records requests with significant challenges related to facility and workplace conditions, environmental conduciveness and employee responsiveness. Despite these challenges, client satisfaction with PRC IV-A services received high ratings, particularly in efficiency and reliability of personnel, and transparency of services, as well as in equity and accountability which reflect fair and consistent service delivery. Statistical analysis revealed no significant differences in perceived challenges based on the demographic profile of the respondents. However, client satisfaction varied significantly by age in aspects of efficiency, competency, equity, and accountability, while reliability and transparency showed no significant differences. The study highlighted the need for improving office facilities, ensuring adherence to health and safety protocols, and enhancing employee responsiveness to address client concerns effectively.

**KEYWORDS:** Client Satisfaction, Government Service Delivery, National Government Agency

## INTRODUCTION

RA 11032 also known as the Ease of Doing Business and Efficient Government Service Delivery Act of 2018 is seen as significant step toward reforming public sectors in the Philippines. Its successful implementation is expected to create a more business-friendly environment, reduce corruption, and improve the overall quality of government services. As stated in the declaration of policy, the promotion of high level of integrity, accountability, and proper management of public affairs as well as the public property is the utmost focus of the government. The efficient delivery of government services through the adoption of basic requirements and procedures are being set in place to reduce red tape and promote transparency in every government agency, of which the Professional Regulation Commission is one of the national government agencies which upholds its mandate to serve and adapted the Citizen's Charter in its offices with the aim of promoting transparency in every transaction and eliminating the bureaucratic red tape. To implement this directive, there are frontliners assigned to assist the services needed by transacting individuals. Thus, the service quality of the frontliners is nearly satisfying clients who want to spend the least amount of time possible on every transaction at the PRC.

## MATERIALS AND METHOD

The researcher used descriptive quantitative approach which is ideal for measuring client satisfaction since it allows for the measurement of subjective experiences using standardized instruments like Likert-scale surveys (López-Miguens et al., 2019). According to Kumar and Sunder (2020), this quantitative technique provides a precise overview of consumer impressions, allowing firms to discover opportunities for improvement. Inferential research focuses on several critical components, including the population and sample, hypothesis testing, and statistical significance.

The respondents of this study were two hundred (200) clientele of Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) Regional Office IV-A with ages ranging from 21 to 66 years old and above who are from CALABARZON and nearby provinces.

A researcher-made questionnaire to determine the rationale of the client satisfaction for a National Government Agency – Professional Regulation Commission Regional Office IV – A in relation to RA 11032 (Ease of Doing Business and Efficient Government Service Delivery Act of 2018).



**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Demographic Profile of Respondents in Terms of Age**

The demographic profile of the respondents according to age shows that 38% for the 21-25 years old, 26% for 26-30 age bracket, 6% for 31-35 years old, 7.50% for 36-40, % for 41-45 years old, 7% for 46-50 years old, 1.50% for 51-55 years old, 4% 56-60 years old, and 0.50% for 66 years old and above.

**Demographic Profile of Respondents in Terms of Sex**

In terms of gender, majority are female with 75.50% and 24.50% are male. The transactions at PRC Region IV-A are dominated by female clients.

**Demographic Profile of Respondents in Terms of Educational Attainment**

Concerning the educational attainment of the respondents, 64% is comprised of undergraduate degree (college) holders, 32.50% are graduate degree (masters) holders, and 3.50% are post graduate degree (doctorate) holders.

**Part II. Challenges that the Clients Experienced**

**Table 1. Level of the Challenges Encountered by the Clients in Terms of Condition of the Facilities**

| <i>Indicator</i>  | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>Interpretation</i> |
|---|----------|-----------|-----------------------|
| 1. The overall cleanliness of the office.                   | 4.63     | 0.58      | VH                    |
| 2. The condition of office furniture (desks, chairs).       | 4.51     | 0.68      | VH                    |
| 3. The quality of restroom facilities.                      | 4.33     | 0.82      | VH                    |
| 4. Adequate parking available at the office.                | 4.33     | 0.88      | VH                    |
| 5. The temperature control (heating, cooling, ventilation). | 4.40     | 0.80      | VH                    |
| Overall Mean  | 4.44     |           | VH                    |

A sample of 200 respondents (N=200) served as the basis for the data. A certain rating system is used to understand the mean scores. A mean score between 4.21 and 5.00 is deemed "Very High" (VH), and a score between 3.41 and 4.20 is deemed "High" (H). "Moderately High" (MH) is the category for scores between 2.61 and 3.40. "Low" (L) scores fall between 1.81 and 2.60, while "Very Low" (VL) scores fall between 1.00 and 1.80.

Table 1 presents the level of challenges encountered by clients concerning the condition of the facilities. The overall mean score of 4.44 indicate that clients perceive significant challenges related to facility conditions.

The result underscore the need for improvements in facility conditions to enhance the overall client experience and

**Demographic Profile of Respondents in Terms of Cluster of Profession**

The cluster of profession is composed of Business, Education, and Social Work with 59%, Health with 32.50%, Engineering with 7%, and Technology with 1.50%. The result shares that the transacting clients are mostly licensed professional teachers, certified public accountants, and registered social workers or those who seeks to become licensed or registered professionals.

**Demographic Profile of Respondents in Terms of Place of Origin**

The transacting clients of PRC Region IV-A are mostly coming from CALABARZON with 86.50%, MIMAROPA with 7%, Bicol with 3%, NCR shares 5%, and 1% are coming from other nearby provinces. CALABARZON got the most number of responses simply because the government agency accessible to the people especially to those living near its office.

**Demographic Profile of Respondents in Terms of Type of Transaction**

With regards to the type of transaction, the transaction on records got 41%, regulation got 32%, registration got 20%, and application got 7%.

satisfaction. The studies of Santos and Lim (2022) found that overcrowding in PRC offices, especially in urban areas like Metro Manila, negatively impacts the client experience. Pangilinan (2021) assessed the challenges faced by the PRC Regional Office IV-A in complying with RA 11032 which noted that lack of infrastructure, including internet connectivity issues and limited access to digital tools, hindered the full realization of the law's goals in certain areas of CALABARZON. It also emphasized the need for capacity-building programs for both clients and staff, particularly in areas where technology adoption was still limited. In addition, some clients in rural areas still preferred traditional methods, creating a barrier to the full transition to digital services.



**Table 2. Level of Challenges Encountered by Clients in Terms of Workplace Situation**

|              | <i>Indicator</i>  | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>Interpretation</i> |
|--------------|---|----------|-----------|-----------------------|
| 1.           | Health and safety protocols in the office.                            | 4.59     | 0.59      | VH                    |
| 2.           | The cleanliness and hygiene of shared spaces.                         | 4.59     | 0.63      | VH                    |
| 3.           | The office's overall safety (e.g., fire exits, emergency procedures). | 4.52     | 0.66      | VH                    |
| 4.           | The availability and cleanliness of communal areas (lounge, lobby).   | 4.46     | 0.74      | VH                    |
| 5.           | Wi-Fi or internet connectivity reliable.                              | 4.03     | 1.10      | VH                    |
| Overall Mean |   | 4.44     |           | VH                    |

A sample of 200 respondents (N=200) served as the basis for the data. A certain rating system is used to understand the mean scores. A mean score between 4.21 and 5.00 is deemed "Very High" (VH), and a score between 3.41 and 4.20 is deemed "High" (H). "Moderately High" (MH) is the category for scores between 2.61 and 3.40. "Low" (L) scores fall between 1.81 and 2.60, while "Very Low" (VL) scores fall between 1.00 and 1.80.

Table 2 presents the level of challenges encountered by clients in terms of workplace situation with an overall mean of 4.44 with a verbal interpretation of very high level of challenges which indicates that clients perceive significant challenges related to workplace situation.

Ferdinand and Miralles (2022), emphasized that customer satisfaction in government services hinges on the perceived value of services and trust in the institutions and have found that timely service delivery and employee responsiveness are essential in enhancing satisfaction. Pangilinan (2021) argued that there are a significant number of PRC facilities do not fully comply with accessibility standards for people with disabilities, making it challenging for these clients to navigate the premises and PRC offices need better infrastructure to accommodate people with special needs and make their processes more inclusive.

**Table 3. Level of the Challenges Encountered by Clients in Terms of Conduciveness of the Environment**

|              | <i>Indicator</i>   | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>Interpretation</i> |
|--------------|--|----------|-----------|-----------------------|
| 1.           | The office environment is conducive to focus and productivity. | 4.61     | 0.59      | VH                    |
| 2.           | Noise disruptions in the office.                               | 4.43     | 0.82      | VH                    |
| 3.           | The lighting in the office.                                    | 4.49     | 0.73      | VH                    |
| 4.           | The comfortability of the furniture in the waiting area.       | 4.45     | 0.69      | VH                    |
| 5.           | The general aesthetic of the office space.                     | 4.41     | 0.72      | VH                    |
| Overall Mean |  | 4.48     |           | VH                    |

A sample of 200 respondents (N=200) served as the basis for the data. A certain rating system is used to understand the mean scores. A mean score between 4.21 and 5.00 is deemed "Very High" (VH), and a score between 3.41 and 4.20 is deemed "High" (H). "Moderately High" (MH) is the category for scores between 2.61 and 3.40. "Low" (L) scores fall between 1.81 and 2.60, while "Very Low" (VL) scores fall between 1.00 and 1.80.

Table 3 presents the level of challenges encountered by clients in terms of conduciveness of the environment with an overall mean of 4.48 with a verbal interpretation of very high level of challenges which indicates that clients perceive significant challenges related to conduciveness of the environment.

The findings is supported by Ferdous (2021) wherein the Citizen's Charter is a document in which an institution commits to its clients about the standard of facilities, information, selection and discussion, nondiscrimination and availability, complaint resolution, courteousness, and value for money. Santos and Lim (2022) found that overcrowding in PRC offices, especially in urban areas like Metro Manila, negatively impacts the client experience. The lack of adequate seating, air conditioning, and general cleanliness detracts from the professionalism of the organization and creates discomfort for clients. These issues were particularly prevalent in the main office of the PRC, where clients often had to wait for extended periods under inadequate conditions.



**Table 4. Level of the Challenges Encountered by the Clients in Terms of Responsiveness of the Personnel**

| <i>Indicator</i>  | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>Interpretation</i> |
|---|----------|-----------|-----------------------|
| 1. Personnel address client concerns or issues in a timely manner.  | 4.69     | 0.58      | VH                    |
| 2. Personnel communicate with clients when providing updates on transactions.                                   | 4.64     | 0.58      | VH                    |
| 3. The professionalism of the personnel in client interactions (e.g., tone, clarity, politeness).               | 4.67     | 0.57      | VH                    |
| 4. The communication style of the personnel to meet the needs of different clients (e.g., formal vs. informal). | 4.68     | 0.55      | VH                    |
| 5. The accuracy and completeness of the information provided by the personnel.                                  | 4.68     | 0.58      | VH                    |
| Overall Mean  | 4.67     |           | VH                    |

A sample of 200 respondents (N=200) served as the basis for the data. A certain rating system is used to understand the mean scores. A mean score between 4.21 and 5.00 is deemed "Very High" (VH), and a score between 3.41 and 4.20 is deemed "High" (H). "Moderately High" (MH) is the category for scores between 2.61 and 3.40. "Low" (L) scores fall between 1.81 and 2.60, while "Very Low" (VL) scores fall between 1.00 and 1.80.

Table 4 presents the level of challenges encountered by the clients experienced in terms of the responsiveness of the personnel with an overall mean of 4.67 with a verbal interpretation of very high level of challenges which indicates that the clients found concerns on the personnel responsiveness to their transactions.

De Guzman et al. (2021) suggested that the PRC Regional Office IV-A could further enhance its service delivery by integrating Artificial Intelligence (AI) and machine learning tools to handle more routine transactions, such as license renewals and CPD processing. This would allow staff to focus on more complex tasks, improving overall efficiency and customer experience. Manalo (2023) discovered that ineffectiveness and a failure to respond to client demands were frequently caused by low worker morale and motivation. In order to foster a positive work atmosphere where employees are more involved and proactive in providing client service, employee happiness is essential.

**Part III. Satisfaction Level of Clients**

**Table 5. Level of the Satisfaction of Respondents on PRC Services Transactions on Operations in Terms of Efficiency**

| <i>Indicator</i>   | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>Interpretation</i> |
|--|----------|-----------|-----------------------|
| 1. The personnel's responsiveness to your inquiries or requests. | 4.71     | 0.55      | VH                    |
| 2. The personnel provide accurate and timely information.        | 4.67     | 0.59      | VH                    |
| 3. The personnel understand your needs.                          | 4.72     | 0.59      | VH                    |
| 4. The personnel keep you informed throughout the process.       | 4.69     | 0.59      | VH                    |
| 5. The personnel resolve your issues or address your concerns.   | 4.70     | 0.60      | VH                    |
| Overall Mean   | 4.70     |           | VH                    |

A sample of 200 respondents (N=200) served as the basis for the data. A certain rating system is used to understand the mean scores. A mean score between 4.21 and 5.00 is deemed "Very High" (VH), and a score between 3.41 and 4.20 is deemed "High" (H). "Moderately High" (MH) is the category for scores between 2.61 and 3.40. "Low" (L) scores fall between 1.81 and 2.60, while "Very Low" (VL) scores fall between 1.00 and 1.80.

Table 5 presents the level of respondent satisfaction with the efficiency of PRC service transactions with an overall mean of 4.70 with a verbal interpretation of very high level of challenges which indicates that clients are highly satisfied with the efficiency of PRC personnel in handling service transactions. Respondents

strongly agree that PRC staff demonstrate a very high level of awareness and attentiveness to their concerns.

Santos and Lim (2022) also explored the impact of RA 11032 in enhancing the efficiency of public sector services, with a focus on the PRC's Regional Office IV-A with emphasis on automated queuing systems and online platforms which were integral in complying with the requirements of RA 11032. However, they also noted that certain challenges persisted, particularly in rural parts of CALABARZON, where internet access and technological infrastructure were limited. Despite these challenges, the overall perception of the law's effects on service



efficiency in PRC Regional Office IV-A was largely positive, with clients reporting.

**Table 6. Level of the Satisfaction of Respondents on PRC Services Transactions on Operations in Terms of Reliability**

| <i>Indicator</i>  | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>Interpretation</i> |
|---|----------|-----------|-----------------------|
| 1. Personnel have the skills required to perform their duties as service providers. | 4.73     | 0.55      | VS                    |
| 2. Personnel are knowledgeable and competent about their specific job.              | 4.72     | 0.54      | VS                    |
| 3. Personnel are able to perform transaction promptly and dependably.               | 4.66     | 0.53      | VS                    |
| 4. Personnel accurately handle records of client's transactions                     | 4.68     | 0.53      | VS                    |
| 5. Personnel show a sincere attention on error free records.                        | 4.68     | 0.54      | VS                    |
| Overall Mean  | 4.69     |           | VS                    |

A sample of 200 respondents (N=200) served as the basis for the data. A certain rating system is used to understand the mean scores. A mean score between 4.21 and 5.00 is deemed "Very Satisfied" (VS), and a score between 3.41 and 4.20 is deemed "Satisfied" (S). "Mostly Satisfied" (MS) is the category for scores between 2.61 and 3.40. "Less Satisfied" (LS) scores fall between 1.81 and 2.60, while "Not Satisfied" (NS) scores fall between 1.00 and 1.80.

Table 6 presents the level of respondent satisfaction on PRC services transactions on operations in terms of reliability with an overall mean of 4.69 with a verbal interpretation of very satisfied

level of satisfaction which indicates that clients expressed a high level of satisfaction with PRC services transactions operations in terms of reliability.

According to Singh & Tiwari, (2020) reliability is a crucial factor in citizen satisfaction with government services, with frequent delays or errors leading to dissatisfaction and decreased public trust. Likewise, Chang and Lee (2022) discussed the role of reliability in the public sector, particularly in emergency response services, where consistent and reliable performance is directly linked to public confidence.

**Table 7. Level of the Satisfaction of Respondents on PRC Services Transactions on Operations in Terms of Competency**

| <i>Indicator</i>   | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>Interpretation</i> |
|--|----------|-----------|-----------------------|
| 1. The personnel was knowledgeable about the product, service, or process.     | 4.73     | 0.50      | VS                    |
| 2. The personnel apply expertise to address your needs or solve your problem.  | 4.67     | 0.55      | VS                    |
| 3. The personnel appear confident when providing solutions or guidance.        | 4.68     | 0.55      | VS                    |
| 4. The personnel demonstrate problem-solving skills during the interaction.    | 4.64     | 0.58      | VS                    |
| 5. The personnel effectively communicate technical or specialized information. | 4.67     | 0.55      | VS                    |
| Overall Mean   | 4.68     |           | VS                    |

A sample of 200 respondents (N=200) served as the basis for the data. A certain rating system is used to understand the mean scores. A mean score between 4.21 and 5.00 is deemed "Very Satisfied" (VS), and a score between 3.41 and 4.20 is deemed "Satisfied" (S). "Mostly Satisfied" (MS) is the category for scores between 2.61 and 3.40. "Less Satisfied" (LS) scores fall between 1.81 and 2.60, while "Not Satisfied" (NS) scores fall between 1.00 and 1.80.

Table 7 presents the level of respondent satisfaction on PRC services transactions on operations in terms of competency with an overall mean of 4.68 which speaks about the commitment of PRC in relation to competency which reflects its commitment to serve. The respondents were very satisfied with which the personnel are knowledgeable about the product, service, and process.



The finding is supported by Kim and Lee, (2021) wherein that government employees' competence is directly tied to effective service delivery and public perception of governmental efficiency, with poorly trained staff leading to inefficiencies and

negative perceptions. Tan and Zhu, (2020) explored the importance of professional competence in the public sector, noting that adequate training and employee qualifications lead to improved service quality and satisfaction.

**Table 8. Level of the Satisfaction of Respondents on PRC Services Transactions on Operations in Terms of Transparency**

| <i>Indicator</i>  | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>Interpretation</i> |
|---|----------|-----------|-----------------------|
| 1. The personnel clearly explain the services, processes, or solutions.                     | 4.63     | 0.60      | VH                    |
| 2. The personnel is honest about potential limitations or challenges in meeting your needs. | 4.65     | 0.58      | VH                    |
| 3. The personnel provide complete and accurate information.                                 | 4.63     | 0.59      | VH                    |
| 4. The personnel communicate changes, delays, or unexpected issues.                         | 4.61     | 0.60      | VH                    |
| 5. The personnel openly address your questions or concerns without avoiding details.        | 4.64     | 0.59      | VH                    |
| Overall Mean  | 4.63     |           | VH                    |

A sample of 200 respondents (N=200) served as the basis for the data. A certain rating system is used to understand the mean scores. A mean score between 4.21 and 5.00 is deemed "Very High" (VH), and a score between 3.41 and 4.20 is deemed "High" (H). "Moderately High" (MH) is the category for scores between 2.61 and 3.40. "Low" (L) scores fall between 1.81 and 2.60, while "Very Low" (VL) scores fall between 1.00 and 1.80.

Table 8 presents the level of respondent satisfaction on PRC services transactions on operations in terms of transparency with an overall mean of 4.63 with a verbal interpretation of very high level of satisfaction which indicated that the respondents were very satisfied on how the personnel gives thorough and correct information and at the same time convey changes, delays, and unanticipated concerns in a manner that they handled queries or concerns directly.

This manner of handling of queries or concerns with the provision of complete details of which Hakala (2016) and Rawlins (2008) emphasized that transparency is a purposeful effort to make available all legally releasable information—whether good or negative nature—in a way that is factual, timely, balanced, and unmistakable, for the purpose of improving public reasoning skills and hold organizations accountable for their activities, rules, and procedures. According to Becker & Wallis (2022) the impact of transparency on public trust in government services, concluding that clear communication and openness in decision-making are key to maintaining citizen trust. Moreover, Vargas and Palomares (2023) investigated transparency in public procurement systems, finding that increasing transparency significantly improved the perception of fairness in service delivery. Meyer and Shaffer (2019) explored the relationship between service quality and client satisfaction in governmental services, concluding that satisfaction is closely linked to the transparency and quality of communication from the agency.

**Table 9. Level of the Satisfaction of Respondents on PRC Services Transactions on Operations in Terms of Equity**

| <i>Indicator</i>  | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>Interpretation</i> |
|---|----------|-----------|-----------------------|
| 1. The personnel treat you fairly and without bias.   | 4.67     | 0.61      | VH                    |
| 2. The personnel show respect for your individual needs and preferences.  | 4.71     | 0.54      | VH                    |
| 3. The personnel made an effort to ensure you have equal access to services or information.                                 | 4.72     | 0.53      | VH                    |
| 4. The personnel demonstrate understanding and respect for diversity (e.g., cultural, linguistic, or personal differences). | 4.70     | 0.55      | VH                    |
| 5. The personnel is consistent in his/her behavior and communication throughout the interaction.                            | 4.68     | 0.56      | VH                    |
| Overall Mean  | 4.69     |           | VH                    |



A sample of 200 respondents (N=200) served as the basis for the data. A certain rating system is used to understand the mean scores. A mean score between 4.21 and 5.00 is deemed "Very High" (VH), and a score between 3.41 and 4.20 is deemed "High" (H). "Moderately High" (MH) is the category for scores between 2.61 and 3.40. "Low" (L) scores fall between 1.81 and 2.60, while "Very Low" (VL) scores fall between 1.00 and 1.80.

Table 9 presents the level of respondent satisfaction on PRC services transactions on operations in terms of equity with an overall mean of 4.69 which implies that the respondents were very satisfied of which Lee (2021) discussed that in a government agency, equity is building trust when citizens think that

government services are fair and accessible, their trust in government institutions grows.

According to Cepiku & Mastrodascio (2021) and Kuehn (2021) Public service is crucial for fulfilling basic human needs related to survival and growth. These services, which include education, healthcare, employment, and social benefits, play a vital role in the public welfare system administered by local governments. Wang and Liu (2020) analyzed equity in public services, emphasizing that equitable access to government services reduces disparities and enhances overall satisfaction among citizens while Hernandez and Martinez, (2021) reviewed equity in government agencies, finding that ensuring equal service provision for marginalized groups enhances public trust and satisfaction.

**Table 10. Level of the Satisfaction of Respondents on PRC Services Transactions on Operations in Terms of Accountability**

| Indicator  | M    | SD   | Interpretation |
|--|------|------|----------------|
| 1. The personnel do not refuse to accept and process transactions.                         | 4.70 | 0.59 | VH             |
| 2. The personnel do not impose requirements or fees not listed in the Citizen's Charter.   | 4.69 | 0.60 | VH             |
| 3. The personnel do not collude with fixers.   | 4.69 | 0.55 | VH             |
| 4. The personnel do not miss set standard process cycle time.                              | 4.68 | 0.64 | VH             |
| 5. The personnel introduced the Citizen's Charter outlining government processes and fees. | 4.62 | 0.61 | VH             |
| Overall Mean   | 4.67 |      | VH             |

A sample of 200 respondents (N=200) served as the basis for the data. A certain rating system is used to understand the mean scores. A mean score between 4.21 and 5.00 is deemed "Very High" (VH), and a score between 3.41 and 4.20 is deemed "High" (H). "Moderately High" (MH) is the category for scores between 2.61 and 3.40. "Low" (L) scores fall between 1.81 and 2.60, while "Very Low" (VL) scores fall between 1.00 and 1.80.

Table 10 presents the level of satisfaction with PRC services transactions operations in terms of accountability with an overall mean of 4.67 which indicates that that respondent expressed a high level of satisfaction with PRC services transactions operations.

Service quality is assessed based on its alignment with client expectations, as noted by Ramya (2019). To improve their offerings, service business operators regularly evaluate service quality to identify issues promptly and better assess client satisfaction. Honnon (2023) emphasizes that ongoing oversight of government operations enhances accountability, enabling citizens to hold public servants accountable. The implementation of robust accountability systems, such as digital signatures and audit trails, ensures traceability within decision-making processes, fostering transparency in governance.

**Table 11. Significant Difference in the Challenges Encountered on Region IV-A Services When Grouped According to Age**

| Age                         | $\chi^2$ | p-value | Decision on Ho    | Interpretation  |
|-----------------------------|----------|---------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Condition of the facilities | 9.250    | .415    | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
| 21-25 years old             |          |         |                   |                 |
| 26-30 years old             |          |         |                   |                 |
| 31-35 years old             |          |         |                   |                 |
| 36-40 years old             |          |         |                   |                 |
| 41-45 years old             |          |         |                   |                 |
| 46-50 years old             |          |         |                   |                 |
| 51-55 years old             |          |         |                   |                 |
| 56-60 years old             |          |         |                   |                 |
| 61-65 years old             |          |         |                   |                 |
| 66 years old and above      |          |         |                   |                 |



|                                  |                        |        |      |                   |                 |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|--------|------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Workplace Situation              | 21-25 years old        | 7.833  | .551 | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
|                                  | 26-30 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                                  | 31-35 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                                  | 36-40 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                                  | 41-45 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                                  | 46-50 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                                  | 51-55 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                                  | 56-60 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                                  | 61-65 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                                  | 66 years old and above |        |      |                   |                 |
| Conduciveness of the environment | 21-25 years old        | 14.832 | .096 | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
|                                  | 26-30 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                                  | 31-35 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                                  | 36-40 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                                  | 41-45 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                                  | 46-50 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                                  | 51-55 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                                  | 56-60 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                                  | 61-65 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                                  | 66 years old and above |        |      |                   |                 |
| Responsiveness of the personnel  | 21-25 years old        | 21.790 | .010 | Reject Ho         | Significant     |
|                                  | 26-30 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                                  | 31-35 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                                  | 36-40 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                                  | 41-45 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                                  | 46-50 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                                  | 51-55 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                                  | 56-60 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                                  | 61-65 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                                  | 66 years old and above |        |      |                   |                 |

Note: *p-value* < .05 is significant. Kruskal Wallis H test was used since there is not enough observation for each group

Table 11 presents the results of the Kruskal-Wallis H test analyzing whether there is a significant difference in the challenges encountered in Region IV-A services when grouped according to age. The results indicate that age does not significantly influence perceptions of the condition of facilities,

workplace station, or conduciveness of the environment. However, differences do exist in how various age groups perceive the responsiveness of employees, emphasizing the need for further exploration of factors that may contribute to these differing perceptions.

**Table 12. Significant Difference in the Challenges Encountered on Region IV-A Services When Grouped According to Sex**

|                                  | Sex    | Mann-Whitney U statistic | p-value | Decision on Ho    | Interpretation  |
|----------------------------------|--------|--------------------------|---------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Condition of the facilities      | Male   | 3446.000                 | .450    | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
|                                  | Female |                          |         |                   |                 |
| Workplace Situation              | Male   | 3479.000                 | .515    | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
|                                  | Female |                          |         |                   |                 |
| Conduciveness of the environment | Male   | 3452.500                 | .457    | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
|                                  | Female |                          |         |                   |                 |
| Responsiveness of the personnel  | Male   | 3774.000                 | .805    | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
|                                  | Female |                          |         |                   |                 |

Note: *p-value* < .05 is significant



Table 12 shows the results of the Mann-Whitney U test indicate that there is no significant difference in the challenges encountered in Region IV-A services when grouped according to sex. Specifically, the p-values for all four categories such as condition of the facilities, workplace situation, conduciveness of the environment, and responsiveness of employees are all greater than the .05 significance level. This means that males and females experience similar challenges across these areas. The lack of significant differences may indicate that the challenges in Region IV-A services are systemic rather than gender-specific.

Magno and Esguerra (2020) found that clients in fields such as engineering, law, and medicine, which require frequent renewals

and continuing professional development (CPD), were more likely to report dissatisfaction with the renewal and CPD accreditation process. These professionals often found the procedures cumbersome, especially when the PRC required them to submit a variety of documents that were redundant or outdated. On the other hand, teachers and less regulation-heavy professions reported higher satisfaction due to simpler processes. According to a UK study by O'Neill and Lee (2021) on public sector satisfaction across various professions, healthcare workers—who regularly deal with regulatory agencies—were frequently unhappier because they felt that licensing issues were not being handled quickly enough.

**Table 13. Significant Difference in the Challenges Encountered on Region IV-A Services When Grouped According to Educational Attainment**

|                                  | <i>Educational Attainment</i>   | $\chi^2$ | <i>p-value</i> | <i>Decision on Ho</i> | <i>Interpretation</i> |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Condition of the facilities      | Undergraduate Degree (College)  | 2.252    | .324           | Fail to reject Ho     | Not Significant       |
|                                  | Graduate Degree (Masters)       |          |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | Postgraduate Degree (Doctorate) |          |                |                       |                       |
| Workplace Situation              | Undergraduate Degree (College)  | 3.697    | .157           | Fail to reject Ho     | Not Significant       |
|                                  | Graduate Degree (Masters)       |          |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | Postgraduate Degree (Doctorate) |          |                |                       |                       |
| Conduciveness of the environment | Undergraduate Degree (College)  | 1.317    | .518           | Fail to reject Ho     | Not Significant       |
|                                  | Graduate Degree (Masters)       |          |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | Postgraduate Degree (Doctorate) |          |                |                       |                       |
| Responsiveness of the personnel  | Undergraduate Degree (College)  | 0.876    | .645           | Fail to reject Ho     | Not Significant       |
|                                  | Graduate Degree (Masters)       |          |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | Postgraduate Degree (Doctorate) |          |                |                       |                       |

*Note: p-value < .05 is significant. Kruskal Wallis H test was used since there is not enough observation for each group.*



Table 13 presents the results of the Kruskal-Wallis H test analyzing whether there is a significant difference in the challenges encountered in Region IV-A services when grouped according to educational attainment with the results indicate that educational attainment does not significantly influence perceptions of the condition of facilities, workplace station, or conduciveness of the environment.

Santos and Lim (2022), cited that clients with higher levels of education (college graduates and postgraduates) expressed more discontent with the PRC's bureaucracy and complexity as well as the condition of the facilities, workplace situations, and conduciveness of the working environment.

**Table 14. Significant Difference in the Challenges Encountered on Region IV-A Services When Grouped According to Cluster of Profession**

|                                  | <i>Cluster of Profession</i>     | <i>x<sup>2</sup></i> | <i>p-value</i> | <i>Decision on Ho</i> | <i>Interpretation</i> |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Condition of the facilities      | Business, Education, Social Work | 4.731                | .193           | Fail to reject Ho     | Not Significant       |
|                                  | Engineering                      |                      |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | Health                           |                      |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | Technology                       |                      |                |                       |                       |
| Workplace Situation              | Business, Education, Social Work | 3.533                | .316           | Fail to reject Ho     | Not Significant       |
|                                  | Engineering                      |                      |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | Health                           |                      |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | Technology                       |                      |                |                       |                       |
| Conduciveness of the environment | Business, Education, Social Work | 4.005                | .261           | Fail to reject Ho     | Not Significant       |
|                                  | Engineering                      |                      |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | Health                           |                      |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | Technology                       |                      |                |                       |                       |
| Responsiveness of the personnel  | Business, Education, Social Work | 2.254                | .521           | Fail to reject Ho     | Not Significant       |
|                                  | Engineering                      |                      |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | Health                           |                      |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | Technology                       |                      |                |                       |                       |

*Note: p-value < .05 is significant. Kruskal Wallis H test was used since there is not enough observation for each group.*

Table 14 presents the results of the Kruskal-Wallis H test analyzing whether there is a significant difference in the challenges encountered in Region IV-A services when grouped according to cluster of profession. The results indicate that profession does not significantly influence perceptions of the condition of facilities, workplace station, or conduciveness of the environment.

A study by O'Neill and Lee (2021) in the UK focused on public sector satisfaction among different professions and found that healthcare professionals, who frequently interact with regulatory bodies, were often more dissatisfied due to what they perceived as slow and inadequate response times in addressing licensing issues. In contrast, individuals in less regulated professions, such as IT professionals, tended to express higher satisfaction due to streamlined processes and greater emphasis on digital services.



**Table 15. Significant Difference in the Challenges Encountered on Region IV-A Services When Grouped According to Place of Origin**

|                                  | <i>Place of Origin</i> | $x^2$ | <i>p-value</i> | <i>Decision on Ho</i> | <i>Interpretation</i> |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|-------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Condition of the facilities      | Bicol                  | 2.096 | .718           | Fail to reject Ho     | Not Significant       |
|                                  | CALABARZON             |       |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | MIMAROPA               |       |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | NCR                    |       |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | Others                 |       |                |                       |                       |
| Workplace Situation              | Bicol                  | 5.348 | .253           | Fail to reject Ho     | Not Significant       |
|                                  | CALABARZON             |       |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | MIMAROPA               |       |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | NCR                    |       |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | Others                 |       |                |                       |                       |
| Conduciveness of the environment | Bicol                  | 4.544 | .337           | Fail to reject Ho     | Not Significant       |
|                                  | CALABARZON             |       |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | MIMAROPA               |       |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | NCR                    |       |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | Others                 |       |                |                       |                       |
| Responsiveness of the personnel  | Bicol                  | 1.874 | .759           | Fail to reject Ho     | Not Significant       |
|                                  | CALABARZON             |       |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | MIMAROPA               |       |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | NCR                    |       |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | Others                 |       |                |                       |                       |

*Note: p-value < .05 is significant. Kruskal Wallis H test was used since there is not enough observation for each group.*

Table 15 presents the results of the Kruskal-Wallis H test analyzing whether there is a significant difference in the challenges encountered in Region IV-A services when grouped according to place of origin. The results indicate that point of origin does not significantly influence perceptions of the condition of facilities, workplace station, or conduciveness of the environment. The lack of significant differences may indicate that the challenges in Region IV-A services are consistent.

Due to the challenge of reaching PRC offices, especially in less developed provinces, clients from rural areas expressed lower levels of satisfaction, according to a survey by Pangilinan (2021). In addition to their aggravation with long lines and service delays, rural clients frequently had to travel great distances. On the other hand, the convenience of PRC's main office and online services was generally rated higher by clients from Metro Manila and metropolitan areas.



**Table 16. Significant Difference in the Challenges Encountered on Region IV-A Services When Grouped According to Type of Transaction**

|                                  | <i>Type of Transaction</i> | $\chi^2$ | <i>p-value</i> | <i>Decision on Ho</i> | <i>Interpretation</i> |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|----------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Condition of the facilities      | Application                | 3.544    | .315           | Fail to reject Ho     | Not Significant       |
|                                  | Registration               |          |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | Regulation                 |          |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | Records                    |          |                |                       |                       |
| Workplace Situation              | Application:               | 1.890    | .596           | Fail to reject Ho     | Not Significant       |
|                                  | Registration               |          |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | Regulation                 |          |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | Records                    |          |                |                       |                       |
| Conduciveness of the environment | Application:               | 4.188    | .242           | Fail to reject Ho     | Not Significant       |
|                                  | Registration               |          |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | Regulation                 |          |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | Records                    |          |                |                       |                       |
| Responsiveness of the personnel  | Application:               | 1.459    | .692           | Fail to reject Ho     | Not Significant       |
|                                  | Registration               |          |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | Regulation                 |          |                |                       |                       |
|                                  | Records                    |          |                |                       |                       |

*Note: p-value < .05 is significant. Kruskal Wallis H test was used since there is not enough observation for each group.*

Table 16 presents the results of the Kruskal-Wallis H test analyzing whether there is a significant difference in the challenges encountered in Region IV-A services when grouped according to types of transaction. The results indicate that

profession does not significantly influence perceptions of the condition of facilities, workplace station, or conduciveness of the environment.

**Table 17. Significant Difference in Client Satisfaction on PRC Region IV-A Services When Grouped According to Age**

|                   | <i>Age</i>      | $\chi^2$ | <i>p-value</i> | <i>Decision on Ho</i> | <i>Interpretation</i> |
|-------------------|-----------------|----------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <b>Efficiency</b> | 21-25 years old | 20.762   | .014           | Reject Ho             | Significant           |
|                   | 26-30 years old |          |                |                       |                       |
|                   | 31-35 years old |          |                |                       |                       |
|                   | 36-40 years old |          |                |                       |                       |



|                     |                        |        |      |                   |                 |
|---------------------|------------------------|--------|------|-------------------|-----------------|
|                     | 41-45 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                     | 46-50 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                     | 51-55 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                     | 56-60 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                     | 61-65 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                     | 66 years old and above |        |      |                   |                 |
| <b>Reliability</b>  | 21-25 years old        | 15.646 | .075 | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
|                     | 26-30 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                     | 31-35 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                     | 36-40 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                     | 41-45 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                     | 46-50 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                     | 51-55 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                     | 56-60 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                     | 61-65 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                     | 66 years old and above |        |      |                   |                 |
| <b>Competency</b>   | 21-25 years old        | 19.748 | .020 | Reject Ho         | Significant     |
|                     | 26-30 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                     | 31-35 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                     | 36-40 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                     | 41-45 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                     | 46-50 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                     | 51-55 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                     | 56-60 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                     | 61-65 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                     | 66 years old and above |        |      |                   |                 |
| <b>Transparency</b> | 21-25 years old        | 7.807  | .554 | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
|                     | 26-30 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                     | 31-35 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                     | 36-40 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                     | 41-45 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |
|                     | 46-50 years old        |        |      |                   |                 |



|                       |                        |        |      |           |             |
|-----------------------|------------------------|--------|------|-----------|-------------|
|                       | 51-55 years old        |        |      |           |             |
|                       | 56-60 years old        |        |      |           |             |
|                       | 61-65 years old        |        |      |           |             |
|                       | 66 years old and above |        |      |           |             |
| <b>Equity</b>         | 21-25 years old        | 18.577 | .029 | Reject Ho | Significant |
|                       | 26-30 years old        |        |      |           |             |
|                       | 31-35 years old        |        |      |           |             |
|                       | 36-40 years old        |        |      |           |             |
|                       | 41-45 years old        |        |      |           |             |
|                       | 46-50 years old        |        |      |           |             |
|                       | 51-55 years old        |        |      |           |             |
|                       | 56-60 years old        |        |      |           |             |
|                       | 61-65 years old        |        |      |           |             |
|                       | 66 years old and above |        |      |           |             |
| <b>Accountability</b> | 21-25 years old        | 21.266 | .012 | Reject Ho | Significant |
|                       | 26-30 years old        |        |      |           |             |
|                       | 31-35 years old        |        |      |           |             |
|                       | 36-40 years old        |        |      |           |             |
|                       | 41-45 years old        |        |      |           |             |
|                       | 46-50 years old        |        |      |           |             |
|                       | 51-55 years old        |        |      |           |             |
|                       | 56-60 years old        |        |      |           |             |
|                       | 61-65 years old        |        |      |           |             |
|                       | 66 years old and above |        |      |           |             |

*Note: p-value < .05 is significant. Kruskal Wallis H test was used since there is not enough observation for each group.*

Table 17 presents the results of the Kruskal-Wallis H test reveal that there are significant differences in client satisfaction with PRC Region IV-A services when grouped according to age in certain aspects. Age can significantly influence how clients perceive the quality of services they receive. Older clients may prioritize efficiency and personalized service, while younger clients may focus on digital accessibility and speed.

A study by Cajayon et al. (2021) found that younger PRC clients, particularly those in the early stages of their careers, expressed

higher satisfaction with the online transaction system. The study noted that younger clients preferred the convenience of digital platforms over physical office visits. In contrast, older clients (aged 40 and above) reported challenges in navigating online systems and expressed a preference for face-to-face interactions. This demographic was less satisfied with the shift toward digitalization, highlighting the importance of catering to different age groups' needs.



**Table 18. Significant Difference in Client Satisfaction on PRC Region IV-A Services When Grouped According to Sex**

|                | Sex    | Mann-Whitney U statistic | P-value | Decision on Ho    | Interpretation  |
|----------------|--------|--------------------------|---------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Efficiency     | Male   | 3590.000                 | .713    | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
|                | Female |                          |         |                   |                 |
| Reliability    | Male   | 3488.000                 | .490    | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
|                | Female |                          |         |                   |                 |
| Competency     | Male   | 3853.000                 | .610    | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
|                | Female |                          |         |                   |                 |
| Transparency   | Male   | 3431.000                 | .396    | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
|                | Female |                          |         |                   |                 |
| Equity         | Male   | 3649.500                 | .868    | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
|                | Female |                          |         |                   |                 |
| Accountability | Male   | 3764.500                 | .832    | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
|                | Female |                          |         |                   |                 |

Note: *p-value* < .05 is significant. *Kruskal Wallis H test* was used since there is not enough observation for each group.

Table 18 presents the test of difference in client satisfaction on PRC region IV-A services when grouped according to sex. The results revealed that there is no significant difference between male and female when it comes in satisfaction on PRC region IV-A services. Sex can also influence client satisfaction in public services. Studies suggest that women and men may experience public services differently, potentially due to social roles, expectations, or service delivery biases. Magno & Esguerra (2020) observed that women were more likely to voice displeasure with waiting times and office amenities, but they did

not find a significant gender difference in overall satisfaction with PRC services.

Longer wait times were observed in areas with heavy foot traffic when there was a shortage of physical space. Women were more outspoken about the need for a faster, more effective service system because they frequently juggled several responsibilities. According to Kim et al. (2021) study on public sector satisfaction in South Korea, women were generally less happy with service staff's perceived empathy and fairness.

**Table 19. Significant Difference in Client Satisfaction on PRC Region IV-A Services When Grouped According to Educational Attainment**

|             | Educational Attainment          | $\chi^2$ | p-value | Decision on Ho    | Interpretation  |
|-------------|---------------------------------|----------|---------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Efficiency  | Undergraduate Degree (College)  | 0.891    | .641    | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
|             | Graduate Degree (Masters)       |          |         |                   |                 |
|             | Postgraduate Degree (Doctorate) |          |         |                   |                 |
| Reliability | Undergraduate Degree (College)  | 0.229    | .861    | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
|             | Graduate Degree (Masters)       |          |         |                   |                 |
|             | Postgraduate Degree (Doctorate) |          |         |                   |                 |



|                |                                 |       |      |                   |                 |
|----------------|---------------------------------|-------|------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Competency     | Undergraduate Degree (College)  | 0.912 | .634 | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
|                | Graduate Degree (Masters)       |       |      |                   |                 |
|                | Postgraduate Degree (Doctorate) |       |      |                   |                 |
| Transparency   | Undergraduate Degree (College)  | 0.794 | .672 | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
|                | Graduate Degree (Masters)       |       |      |                   |                 |
|                | Postgraduate Degree (Doctorate) |       |      |                   |                 |
| Equity         | Undergraduate Degree (College)  | 0.297 | .862 | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
|                | Graduate Degree (Masters)       |       |      |                   |                 |
|                | Postgraduate Degree (Doctorate) |       |      |                   |                 |
| Accountability | Undergraduate Degree (College)  | 1.104 | .576 | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
|                | Graduate Degree (Masters)       |       |      |                   |                 |
|                | Postgraduate Degree (Doctorate) |       |      |                   |                 |

*Note: p-value < .05 is significant. Kruskal Wallis H test was used since there is not enough observation for each group.*

Table 19 presents test of difference in client satisfaction on PRC region IV-A services when group according to educational attainment. The results revealed that there is no significant difference in client's level of satisfaction on PRC region IV-A services among the groups of educational attainment, since the *p*-value obtained are all greater than .05 alpha level of significance thus, failed to reject null hypothesis.

Educational attainment often correlates with expectations and perceptions of service quality. Highly educated clients might have higher expectations for professionalism and efficiency in public service delivery. Santos and Lim (2022) found that clients with higher educational attainment (i.e., college graduates and postgraduates) reported greater dissatisfaction with the bureaucracy and the complexity of the PRC's processes.

**Table 20. Significant Difference in Client Satisfaction on PRC Region IV-A Services When Grouped According to Cluster of Profession**

|             | <i>Profession</i>                | $x^2$ | <i>p-value</i> | <i>Decision on Ho</i> | <i>Interpretation</i> |
|-------------|----------------------------------|-------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Efficiency  | Business, Education, Social Work | 2.531 | .470           | Fail to reject Ho     | Not Significant       |
|             | Engineering                      |       |                |                       |                       |
|             | Health                           |       |                |                       |                       |
|             | Technology                       |       |                |                       |                       |
| Reliability | Business, Education, Social Work | 0.706 | .872           | Fail to reject Ho     | Not Significant       |
|             | Engineering                      |       |                |                       |                       |
|             | Health                           |       |                |                       |                       |
|             | Technology                       |       |                |                       |                       |



|                |  |       |      |                      |                 |
|----------------|--|-------|------|----------------------|-----------------|
| Competency     | Business, Education,<br>Social Work<br>Engineering<br>Health<br>Technology | 0.726 | .867 | Fail to reject<br>Ho | Not Significant |
| Transparency   | Business, Education,<br>Social Work<br>Engineering<br>Health<br>Technology | 2.321 | .508 | Fail to reject<br>Ho | Not Significant |
| Equity         | Business, Education,<br>Social Work<br>Engineering<br>Health<br>Technology | 3.063 | .382 | Fail to reject<br>Ho | Not Significant |
| Accountability | Business, Education,<br>Social Work<br>Engineering<br>Health<br>Technology | 1.906 | .592 | Fail to reject<br>Ho | Not Significant |

**Note:** *p-value < .05 is significant. Kruskal Wallis H test was used since there is not enough observation for each group.*

Table 20 presents test of difference in client satisfaction on PRC region IV-A services when group according to cluster of profession. The results revealed that there is no significant difference in client's level of satisfaction on PRC region IV-A services among the groups of profession, since the *p*-value obtained are all greater than .05 alpha level of significance thus, failed to reject null hypothesis.

Magno and Esguerra (2020) found that clients in fields such as engineering, law, and medicine, which require frequent renewals and continuing professional development (CPD), were more

likely to report dissatisfaction with the renewal and CPD accreditation process. These professionals often found the procedures cumbersome, especially when the PRC required them to submit a variety of documents that were redundant or outdated. On the other hand, teachers and less regulation-heavy professions reported higher satisfaction due to simpler processes. According to a UK study by O'Neill and Lee (2021) on public sector satisfaction across various professions, healthcare workers—who regularly deal with regulatory agencies—were frequently unhappier because they felt that licensing issues were not being handled quickly enough.

**Table 21. Significant Difference in Client Satisfaction on PRC Region IV-A Services When Grouped According to Place of Origin**

|             | Place of Origin                                  | $\chi^2$ | p-value | Decision on Ho    | Interpretation  |
|-------------|--|----------|---------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Efficiency  | Bicol<br>CALABARZON<br>MIMAROPA<br>NCR<br>Others | 1.123    | .891    | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
| Reliability | Bicol<br>CALABARZON<br>MIMAROPA<br>NCR<br>Others | 2.875    | .579    | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
| Competency  | Bicol<br>CALABARZON                              | 3.159    | .532    | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |



|                |            |       |      |                   |                 |
|----------------|------------|-------|------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Transparency   | MIMAROPA   | 6.816 | .146 | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
|                | NCR        |       |      |                   |                 |
|                | Others     |       |      |                   |                 |
|                | Bicol      |       |      |                   |                 |
| Equity         | CALABARZON | 1.418 | .841 | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
|                | MIMAROPA   |       |      |                   |                 |
|                | NCR        |       |      |                   |                 |
|                | Others     |       |      |                   |                 |
| Accountability | Bicol      | 0.986 | .912 | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
|                | CALABARZON |       |      |                   |                 |
|                | MIMAROPA   |       |      |                   |                 |
|                | NCR        |       |      |                   |                 |
|                | Others     |       |      |                   |                 |

Note: *p-value* < .05 is significant. Kruskal Wallis H test was used since there is not enough observation for each group.

Table 21 presents test of difference in client satisfaction on PRC region IV-A services when group according to place of origin. The results revealed that there is no significant difference in client's level of satisfaction on PRC region IV-A services when

grouped according to place of origin, since the *p-value* obtained are all greater than .05 alpha level of significance thus, failed to reject null hypothesis.

**Table 22. Significant Difference in Client Satisfaction on PRC Region IV-A Services When Grouped According to Type of Transaction**

|              | Type of Transaction | $\chi^2$ | <i>p-value</i> | Decision on Ho    | Interpretation  |
|--------------|---------------------|----------|----------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Efficiency   | Application         | 1.555    | .670           | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
|              | Registration        |          |                |                   |                 |
|              | Regulation          |          |                |                   |                 |
|              | Records             |          |                |                   |                 |
| Reliability  | Application         | 0.892    | .827           | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
|              | Registration        |          |                |                   |                 |
|              | Regulation          |          |                |                   |                 |
|              | Records             |          |                |                   |                 |
| Competency   | Application         | 1.557    | .669           | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
|              | Registration        |          |                |                   |                 |
|              | Regulation          |          |                |                   |                 |
|              | Records             |          |                |                   |                 |
| Transparency | Application         | 1.040    | .792           | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
|              | Registration        |          |                |                   |                 |
|              | Regulation          |          |                |                   |                 |
|              | Records             |          |                |                   |                 |
| Equity       | Application         | 0.687    | .876           | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
|              | Registration        |          |                |                   |                 |
|              | Regulation          |          |                |                   |                 |
|              | Records             |          |                |                   |                 |



|                |              |       |      |                   |                 |
|----------------|--------------|-------|------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Accountability | Application  | 1.899 | .594 | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
|                | Registration |       |      |                   |                 |
|                | Regulation   |       |      |                   |                 |
|                | Records      |       |      |                   |                 |

Note: *p-value < .05 is significant. Kruskal Wallis H test was used since there is not enough observation for each group.*

Table 22 presents test of difference in client satisfaction on PRC region IV-A services when grouped according to types of transaction. The results revealed that there is no significant difference in client's level of satisfaction on PRC region IV-A services when grouped according to the types of transaction, since the *p-value* obtained are all greater than .05 alpha level of significance thus, failed to reject null hypothesis.

This aligns with research suggesting that the nature of the transaction does not significantly influence customer satisfaction particularly a study by Alrubaiee and Alkaa'ida (2011) reported no significant differences in customer satisfaction across various service types in internet banking.

**Table 23. Significant Difference in the Challenges Encountered on Region IV-A Services When Grouped According to Cluster of Profession**

|                | <i>Cluster of Profession</i>     | <i>x<sup>2</sup></i> | <i>p-value</i> | <i>Decision on Ho</i> | <i>Interpretation</i> |
|----------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Efficiency     | Business, Education, Social Work | 2.531                | .470           | Fail to reject Ho     | Not Significant       |
|                | Engineering                      |                      |                |                       |                       |
|                | Health                           |                      |                |                       |                       |
|                | Technology                       |                      |                |                       |                       |
| Reliability    | Business, Education, Social Work | 0.706                | .872           | Fail to reject Ho     | Not Significant       |
|                | Engineering                      |                      |                |                       |                       |
|                | Health                           |                      |                |                       |                       |
|                | Technology                       |                      |                |                       |                       |
| Competency     | Business, Education, Social Work | 0.726                | .867           | Fail to reject Ho     | Not Significant       |
|                | Engineering                      |                      |                |                       |                       |
|                | Health                           |                      |                |                       |                       |
|                | Technology                       |                      |                |                       |                       |
| Transparency   | Business, Education, Social Work | 2.321                | .508           | Fail to reject Ho     | Not Significant       |
|                | Engineering                      |                      |                |                       |                       |
|                | Health                           |                      |                |                       |                       |
|                | Technology                       |                      |                |                       |                       |
| Equity         | Business, Education, Social Work | 3.063                | .382           | Fail to reject Ho     | Not Significant       |
|                | Engineering                      |                      |                |                       |                       |
|                | Health                           |                      |                |                       |                       |
|                | Technology                       |                      |                |                       |                       |
| Accountability | Business, Education, Social Work | 1.906                | .592           | Fail to reject Ho     | Not Significant       |
|                | Engineering                      |                      |                |                       |                       |
|                | Health                           |                      |                |                       |                       |
|                | Technology                       |                      |                |                       |                       |

Note: *p-value < .05 is significant. Kruskal Wallis H test was used since there is not enough observation for each group.*



Table 23 presents test of difference in client satisfaction on PRC region IV-A services when grouped according to cluster of profession. The results revealed that there is no significant difference in client's level of satisfaction on PRC region IV-A services when clients are grouped according to cluster of profession, since the  $p$ -value obtained are all greater than .05 alpha level of significance thus, failed to reject null hypothesis.

This finding is supported by research showing that professional background does not significantly impact the challenges faced in service utilization explicitly a study by Ozturk and Demirkaya (2017) found no significant differences in job satisfaction and managerial satisfaction across various educational statuses.

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

### Conclusion

Based on the results and summary of findings, the following conclusions were drawn – There is no significant difference on the level of challenges encountered on region IV-A services when grouped according to age, sex, educational attainment, cluster of profession, place of origin and type of transaction. Thus, the hypothesis is *accepted*. There is no significant difference in the level of satisfaction and challenges encountered on PRC Regional Office IV-A services when the respondents are grouped into demographic profiles is accepted. All profiles are not significant except the only variable of age with regard to the responsiveness of the personnel is significant. There is no significant difference in the level of satisfaction on PRC Regional Office IV-A services when the respondents are grouped into the four clusters of professions is accepted. All profiles are not significant except the variable of age in terms of reliability and transparency are deemed significant.

### Recommendation

The following recommendations were drawn from the conclusions presented. An improvement of the facility conditions pertaining to the cleanliness of the office, indicating concerns about maintaining a hygienic and well-kept environment, provide health and safety protocols in the office, come up with stable wifi or internet connection, make provisions on the office's overall safety like fire exits, emergency procedures, conduct seminars for the improvement of the personnel responsiveness, promote clear communication, set goals, and actively listen to team members, while also encouraging input and responding to changing needs, and conduct periodic evaluation of the office site and of personnel to solve the existing challenges of clients with regard to the to the service delivery rendered.

## REFERENCES

1. Alonderiene, R., & Majauskaite, M. (2016). *Leadership Style And Job Satisfaction In Higher Education Institutions. International Journal of Educational Management*, 30(1), 140-164. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-08-2014-0106>
2. Alrubaiee, L., & Alkaa'ida, F. (2011). *Service Quality Dimensions And Customers' Satisfaction: A Study in the*

*Jordanian Context. International Journal Of Marketing Studies*, 3(1), 130-144.

<https://doi.org/10.5539/ijms.v3n1p130>

3. Aydogdu, S., & Asikgil, B. (2011). *An Empirical Study Of The Relationship Among Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, And Turnover Intention. International Review Of Management And Marketing*, 1(3), 43-53.
4. Bhattacharya, Soumendu & Dash, Manoj. (2013). *Measurement Of Customer Satisfaction On Demographic Variables Of Banking Sector In National Capital Region - An Empirical Analysis. Prestige International Journal of Management & IT- Sanchayan*. 02. 78-107. [10.37922/PIJMIT.2013.V02i02.008](https://doi.org/10.37922/PIJMIT.2013.V02i02.008).
5. Becker, L., & Wallis, E. (2022). *The Impact Of Transparency On Public Trust In Government Services. Journal of Public Administration*, 59(3), 209-225.
6. Bender, K. A., Donohue, S. M., & Heywood, J. S. (2005). *Job Satisfaction And Gender Segregation. Oxford Economic Papers*, 57(3), 479-496. <https://doi.org/10.1093/Oep/Gpi015>
7. Bustos, J. M., & Toledo, M. (2020). *Digital Transformation And The PRC: Enhancing Licensing Efficiency. Journal of Government Services*, 32(4), 111-126.
8. Cabalida, M. T. (2022). *Service Quality Perception In The Government Service Insurance System (GSIS): The Case Of Pagadian Branch. Journal Of Public Administration And Governance*, 12(2), 87-103.
9. Cahiles-Magkilat, B. (2022). *Competency Management in Government. The Manila Bulletin*.
10. Cajayon, D. M., Fajardo, M. A., & Roces, J. S. (2021). *The impact of RA 11032 on government service efficiency: A case study of the Professional Regulation Commission. Philippine Journal of Public Administration*, 65(2), 145-162.
11. Cepiku, Denita & Mastrodascio, Marco. (2021). *Equity in Public Services: A Systematic Literature Review. Public Administration Review*. 81. [10.1111/puar.13402](https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13402).
12. Chang, S., & Lee, K. (2022). *Reliability in Public Sector Emergency Services: A Case Study. Public Administration Review*, 80(6), 752-765.
13. Chavez, P., & Gomez, F. (2021). *Efficiency in Public Service Delivery In Developing Nations: A Digital Revolution. Government Performance Journal*, 45(2), 50-65.
14. Choi, Y., Lee, J., & Kim, S. (2022). *Geographical Disparity in Client Satisfaction with Public Services: Evidence from South Korea. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 32(3), 500-514.
15. De Guzman, D. M., Esteban, P. C., & Garcia, R. S. (2021). *Barriers to Licensure Processing: A Study on The Delays Faced by Clients of The Professional Regulation Commission. Journal of Philippine Public Affairs*, 38(4), 50-65.
16. De Guzman, D. M., Esteban, P. C., & Garcia, R. S. (2021). *Client Satisfaction with PRC's Examination and Licensing Processes. Philippine Journal of Public Policy*, 38(4), 50-65.
17. De Guzman, D. M., Esteban, P. C., & Garcia, R. S. (2021). *Enhancing Public Sector Efficiency Under RA 11032: An Evaluation of PRC Regional Office IVA. Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 38(4), 50-65.



18. Del Mundo, R., & Sarmiento, G. (2023). *Reforms and Challenges in The Professional Regulation Commission*. *Philippine Public Policy Review*, 38(1), 77-89.
19. Desmal, A.J., Othman, M.K., Hamid, S. (2020). *Evaluation of Government Service Quality from Perspective of Reliability*. Pp. 6-7.
20. DeVellis, R.F. (2016). *Scale Development: Theory and Applications*. Vol. 26, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.
21. Estrella, D., Mendoza, F.D., Merilles, L., Estioco, M.C., Abante, M., Vigonte, F. (2024), *Assessing the Competency-Based Recruitment and Qualification Standards and Competency-Based Learning and Development Program for Government Workforce*. Pp. 2-3.
22. Ferdinand, N., & Miralles, M. L. (2022). *Factors Influencing Client Satisfaction in Government Services*. *Public Service Management*, 47(1), 34-50.
23. Gonzales, R. F., & Tan, V. J. (2020). *The Impact of Digital Services on Client Responsiveness in The Philippine Government: A Focus on PRC's Online Systems During The COVID-19 Pandemic*. *Philippine Journal of e-Governance*, 18(1), 30-40.
24. Hakala, N. (2016). *Transparency Ideal in Strategic Communication. A Discussion between Theory and Practice*. Masters Thesis. Copenhagen Business School.
25. Hernandez, J., & Martinez, G. (2021). *Equity in Government Service Delivery*. *Journal of Social Policy*, 58(5), 467-480.
26. Honnon, J. M., (2023). *The Impact of Digitalization on Government Services: A Case Study of Benin*. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*. 8(10), 1559-1560.
27. Joint Council's Executive Monthly Report. (2022). *Institute for Citizen-Centered Service*.
28. Joshi, A., (2022). *What Makes "Difficult" Settings Difficult? Contextual Challenges for Accountability*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dpr.12681>
29. Kim, J., & Lee, K. (2021). *Competence in Public Sector Employees: The Key to Improving Government Services*. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 45(3), 301-314.
30. Kovach, J.V., Obanua, F., And Hutchins, H.M., (2022). *Pilot Testing a Series of Value-Based Care Training Courses*. *Advances in Medical Education and Practice*, 13:319-322. doi: 10.2147/amep.s360027
31. Kuehn BM. *Centering Equity in Cardiovascular Care*. *Circulation*. 2021 Dec 21;144(25):2035-2037. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.121.058471. Epub 2021 Dec 20. PMID: 34928707.
32. Kumar, V., & Sunder, A. (2020). *Using Surveys for Client Satisfaction Analysis in Service Industries*. *Journal of Service Marketing*, 34(2), 125-135.
33. Kumbhar, V. M. (2011). *Service Quality Perception And Customers' Satisfaction In Internet Banking Service: A Case Study Of Public And Private Sector Banks*. MPRA Paper 36959, University Library Of Munich, Germany.
34. Kwok, See Ying; JUSOH, Ahmad; Khalifah, Zainab. *The influence of service quality on satisfaction: Does gender really matter?*. *Intangible Capital*, [S.l.], v. 12, n. 2, p. 444-461, mar. 2016. ISSN 1697-9818. Available at: <<https://www.intangiblecapital.org/index.php/ic/article/view/673/516>>. Date accessed: 26 mar. 2025.
35. Lardizabal, Cathyrine and Mapa, Jo-Ann and Taguinod, Gloria and Vigonte, Florinda and Abante, Marmelo V., *Analyzing Client Satisfaction with Government Office Services: A Study of Demographic Data and Empirical Findings - IMRAD* (October 1, 2023). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4616372> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4616372>.
36. Lee, Yunsoo. (2021). *Government for Leaving No One Behind: Social Equity in Public Administration and Trust in Government*. *SAGE Open*. 11. 215824402110292. 10.1177/2158244021102927.
37. Li, Y., Shang, H. (2020). *Service Quality, Perceived Value, and Citizens' Continuous-use Intention Regarding E-Government: Empirical Evidence from China*. 57 (3), 3.
38. Licsandru, T., Meliou, E., Steccolini, I., Chang, SM. (2025). *Citizens' Inclusion in Public Services: A Systematic Review of the Public Administration Literature and Reflection on Future Research Avenues*.
39. Liu, Z., & Wang, P. (2019). *Improving Transaction Efficiency in Government Agencies: A Policy Analysis*. *Public Management Review*, 21(2), 123-137.
40. Lohr, T., Stroth, M. (2023). *Improving Equity in Government Programs and Services*.
41. López-Miguens, M. J., Santos-Vijande, M. L., & García-Morales, V. J. (2019). *The Role Of Client Satisfaction In Organizational Performance: Implications For Managers*. *Journal of Business Research*, 102, 105-113.
42. Magno, M. A., & Esguerra, J. R. (2020). *Analyzing The Procedural Complexities In The Professional Regulation Commission's Licensure Process*. *Asian Journal of Public Administration*, 40(1), 73-85.
43. Magno, M. A., & Esguerra, J. R. (2020). *Client Satisfaction and RA 11032: Evaluating the Professional Regulation Commission's Regional Office Services*. *Asian Journal of Public Administration*, 40(1), 73-85.
44. Magno, M. A., & Esguerra, J. R. (2020). *Educational Attainment and Client Satisfaction: Analyzing Professional Regulatory Processes in The Philippines*. *Asian Journal of Public Administration*, 40(1), 73-85.
45. Manalo, C. R. (2023). *Employee Well-Being and Service Efficiency at The Professional Regulation Commission*. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*, 12(3), 175-188.
46. Meyer, M., & Shaffer, E. (2019). *Public Sector Client Satisfaction and Service Quality: A Comparative Study*. *International Journal of Public Services*, 33(4), 229-240.
47. Menet, G., & Szarucki, M. (2020). *Impact Of Value Co-Creation On International Customer Satisfaction In The Airsoft Industry: Does Country Of Origin Matter?* *Journal Of Risk And Financial Management*, 13(10), 223. <https://doi.org/10.3390/Jrfm13100223>
48. Moshi, E. (2023). *Characteristics of Public Administration*. Pp. 1-2.
49. Mukherjee, A. (2022). *Accountability and Transparency in Governance*. Pp. 2-3.
50. Myers, K., Mitchell K., Pandit, A., Kelkar, M. (2021). *Inclusive, Equity-centered Government*. Pp. 1.



51. Nguyen, P., & Hoang, C. (2021). *Empathy in Government Service Delivery: Improving Citizen Satisfaction*. *Journal of Public Sector Innovation*, 29(2), 88-102.
52. Nguyen, L. T., Le, T. T., & Phan, P. T. (2018). *Impact of Accessibility On Customer Experience And Satisfaction In Urban Commercial Areas*. *International Journal Of Urban Planning*, 12(3), 201-219.
53. Nguyen, L. T., Tran, T. H., & Hoang, P. T. (2020). *The Effect of Education on Satisfaction with Public Sector Services in Vietnam*. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 33(2), 107-122.
54. O'Neill, T., & Lee, K. (2021). *Professional Satisfaction and Government Service Delivery: Insights from Healthcare Professionals*. *Journal of Public Services Management*, 29(1), 50-64.
55. Ozturk, R., & Demirkaya, H. (2017). *The Relationship Between Managerial Satisfaction and Job Turnover Intention: The Mediating Role Of Job Satisfaction*. *International Journal Of Academic Research In Business And Social Sciences*, 7(9), 72-85.  
<https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/V7-I9/3316>
56. Pangilinan, L. F. (2021). *Accessibility and Satisfaction with PRC Services: A Rural-Urban Comparison*. *Disability and Society Review*, 11(2), 120-134.
57. Pangilinan, L. F. (2021). *Accessibility of Public Facilities for Persons with Disabilities: A Case Study of The Professional Regulation Commission's Offices*. *Disability and Society Review*, 11(2), 120-134.
58. Pangilinan, L. F. (2021). *Challenges in Implementing RA 11032 In Rural Areas: A Case Study of The Professional Regulation Commission's Offices*. *Disability and Society Review*, 11(2), 120-134.
59. Perez, E. J., & Tan, A. S. (2021). *Improving Government Transaction Processing: A Case Study of The Philippines*. *Asian Journal of Public Administration*, 38(3).
60. Philippine Statistics Authority. *Client Satisfaction Measurement*  
<https://rso10.psa.gov.ph/special-release/node/55363>
61. Pizam, A., & Tasci, A. D. A. (2019). *Customer Satisfaction And Service Quality In The Hospitality Industry*. Routledge.
62. Professional Regulation Commission (PRC). (2021). *Annual Report on The Implementation of RA 11032 In the Professional Regulation Commission*.
63. Professional Regulation Commission (PRC). (2020). *Annual Report 2020: Regional Office IV-A Statistics*. Retrieved from [PRC.gov.ph](http://PRC.gov.ph)
64. Professional Regulation Commission (PRC). (2021). *Annual Report 2021: Licensure Examination Statistics*. Retrieved from [PRC.gov.ph](http://PRC.gov.ph)
65. Professional Regulation Commission (PRC). (2022). *Licensure Exam Statistics and Demographics Report for Region IV-A*. Retrieved from [PRC.gov.ph](http://PRC.gov.ph)
66. Ramsurrin, A., (2023). *Accountability and Transparency Are Treated as Major Building Pillars for Governing Democratic Nations in Recent Years*. Pp. 1-2.
67. Santos, R. P., & Lim, J. K. (2022). *Client Perceptions of Public Service Facilities: A Case Study of The Professional Regulation Commission*. *Philippine Journal of Public Policy*, 29(1), 80-92.
68. Santos, R. P., & Lim, J. K. (2022). *E-Government Services Under RA 11032: Streamlining Services in PRC Regional Office IV-A*. *Philippine Journal of Public Policy*, 29(1), 80-92.
69. Shittu, O. S., Ademuson, A., & Àkànl, O., (2020). *Contemporary Issues in Social Research*, Ibadan: Ibadan University Press. Pp. 105-114.
70. Singh, A. (2018). *Study of Customer Satisfaction With Respect to Age of Customers in Mobile Industry*. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention (IJBMI)*, vol.07, no. 02, 2018, pp. 85-88.
71. Teddlie, C., & Yu, F. (2020). *Mixed Methods Sampling: A Typology with Examples*. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 14(1), 1-23.
72. Tolme, M. & Moreno, F. (2019). *Civil Registry Service Delivery System: A Client Satisfaction Survey in Zamboanga Peninsula*.  
doi: 10.13140/RG.2.2.11928.65284
73. Uniri Repository (2023). *Tourist Accommodation In Households - Perception Of Service Quality*. Repository Of Faculty Of Tourism And Hospitality Management, University Of Rijeka.
74. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. <https://www.unodc.org/e4j/en/anti-corruption/module-2/key-issues/what-is-good-governance>.
75. Vischer, J. C. (2008). *Towards An Environmental Psychology Of Workspace: How People Are Affected By Environments For Work*. *Architectural Science Review*, 51(2), 97-108.  
<https://doi.org/10.3763/Asre.2008.5114>
76. Zamora, A. J., Lim, T. H., & Reyes, M. P. (2022). *Public Sector Challenges in Complying with RA 11032: A Case Study of PRC Regional Office IVA*. *Journal of Public Sector Management*, 10(3), 112-124.