

Perception of Academicians towards Quality of Public Service Marketing in Pokhara

Amin Palikhe

Lecturer, Prithvi Narayan Multiple Campus, Pokhara

DOI:

Abstract

This study mainly focuses on understanding user perception and experiences towards quality of public service marketing on delivery by using the five service delivery dimensions: accessibility, cost, time, barrier and behavior. The research methodology comprises descriptive research design followed by stratified simple random sampling for permanent academic faculty members under multi stage sampling from one constitute and four affiliated college. The primary sources of data were collected through semi structure questionnaire method. Reliability and validity were tested. The study reveals that overall qualities of public service delivery dimension are moderate. The academicians were satisfied with the quality of public service delivery in Pokhara but perception was not as expected. However, the qualitative result depicted that there were major challenges in service delivery such as problem from staff, risk after payment of fees and extra efforts for completing lengthy service. In addition, environmental situation, employees' attitude, intermediaries, and Afno Manche (known person), salary level and political interventions cause changes in behavior during public service delivery. So, public service institutions should give due attention to such issues to improve quality of service delivery. Even though there is no specific model to measure the quality of public service delivery in Nepalese context therefore, a CAT-Behavior model is recommended for measuring the quality of public service delivery in

Corresponding Author

Amin Palikhe, Email: mp77amin@cdpa.edu.np

Nepalese context and it could be beneficial from different perspective.

Keywords: *Academician, Marketing, Perception, Public Service Delivery, Quality of Service*

Introduction

Socialists, liberals, and politicians have all expressed different perspectives on the public sector. Economic and political factors such as democracy, government structure, and accessible resources influence people's opinions. In the area of marketing, this is a relatively new concept. Marketing can greatly assist public sector organizations to perform better than ever before and respond better to public interests; despite of this they offer public provisions rather than the production of product and services. Marketing principle is essential for improving public service delivery, but the important thing is to let people know that you are doing the right thing. Marketing is much more than just advertising, more about knowing your competitors, customers and partners, segmenting, targeting, innovation, launching new services and programs, developing effective delivery channels, forming strategic alliance and partnership, performance management, pricing and cost recovery. As a result, marketing as an ideal planning platform for public organization seeking to meet citizens' requirement and offering superior value satisfaction (Giovanni& Sofia, 2019). Thus, the concept of marketing may be defined, from the public sector point of view, as "the activity, set of institutions, and processes - always interconnected and interdependent - meant to identify, anticipate, create, communicate, deliver and exchange valuable offerings that satisfy clients, audiences, partners, and society at large" (Serrat, 2010).

The relevance and the changing role of the marketing in the public service sectors is always debatable topic. Public service organizations are increasingly conceptualizing the public sector as a marketing context as management than just as administration. Therefore, the distinctive aspects of the public sector utilize and address marketing principles by examining relevant structural and process characteristics. The structural characteristics include the nature of the product(service, constraints/duties/facilities, and public goods), the organization(politically accountable managerialism and not-for-profit mission), and the market factors (consumer as citizens, competition and nature of demand) and the process characteristics are concerned with the procedures and systems (new product development process, payment receipt, delivery, internal market operation, evaluation of outputs and outcomes) that govern activity, and their implications. Public sector marketing is guided in the first instance by the general principles of

marketing; thinking and practice then that is adapted to the particular sector; and finally applied to specific marketing situations (Butler & Collins, 1995).

Recognizing the need to properly manage public service marketing efforts, the public sector began focusing and learning to improve the capabilities of marketing strategies for effective use in public service. In the academic area, the actuation of marketing in the public sector is a novel practice with a variety of translations as governmental marketing is an entire process based on public demand and employed to satisfy the public by using various marketing tools (Li & Ge, 2002). One of the hindrances to using marketing in the public sector is a lack of understanding of the different types of marketing. There are four basic types of marketing in the public sector, according to Madill (1998). Marketing of Goods and Services (the public sector provides its goods and services for free or for a fee), social marketing (the design, implementation, and management of initiatives aimed at influencing the agreeability of social thoughts, encompassing product, planning, price, communication, distribution, and marketing research), policy marketing (to persuade specific segments of society to accept policy or new legislation) and de-marketing: “Try not to Use Our Programs” or refers to influence targeted audiences not to use programs that were previously available to clients (Zaheer, & Rashid, 2016).

Under the public sector organization, government agencies duty is to offer proficient and efficient services to the citizens (Farquhar & Robson, 2017). Citizens’ wants and expectations are addressed through public services. The fundamental responsibility of government institutions is to fulfill public promises in the form of public services. Public service delivery provides the service via the government to people (Engdaw, 2019). Public services are the core functions of the government. Such services can be tangible or intangible, direct or indirect, and immediate or long-term. There are always debates about the quality of such services. It claims that individuals measure the quality of government by the services they receive from the government (Pokharel et al., 2018). The nature and quality of public services are always a source of contention. It is always a source of public concern (Pokharel et al., 2017). As a result, the quality measurement could be contextual. Although the state is in charge of planning, delivering, and regulating public services, numerous delivery modalities may exist. The government may provide services directly or through the use of private or non-government organizations and networks. Whatever the method, it is the government’s job to guarantee that provisions are in place to ensure that public services are delivered efficiently. There have been numerous difficulties in the delivery of public services. Inefficiency, ineffectiveness, unresponsiveness, inaccessibility and unreliability are

just a few of the issues but there is no single solution and way out. Improving public service delivery necessitates holding policymakers, public employees, and service providers accountable to citizens, as well as encouraging citizen participation and faith in government institutions. The interconnections between institutions, service delivery, and people's confidence and engagement are all important factors in providing high-quality public services (Engdaw, 2019).

Citizens have a right to services that the state has agreed to provide under the planned specifications. The traditional definition of the state-people relationship is the social compact, which states that individuals accept the state's authority to preserve their rights in exchange for certain rights (Rousseau, 2008). As a result, the quality of the services may determine the relationship's strength. Nepal's governance is the primary provider of public services. People rely on the government to fulfill their obligations. The government is primarily responsible for the design, delivery, monitoring, and assessment of public services. In Nepal, public service is bound by the government's basic definition of public service and is dependent on government processes and functions. The majority of public services are defined by the providers (Pokharel et al., 2017). The receivers have had limited possibilities to specify quality and processes. The public's perception of public service is extremely important (McCourt, 2007). Furthermore, quality public participation is critical to the delivery of high-quality public services. Integrity, citizen centric notion, need responsibility are the essentials of service delivery. Greater transparency promotion, quality assessment of people, effectiveness and efficiency of basic services and their expression should be focused (Ringgold et al., 2012). It is difficult to assess the quality that has been produced by producer besides consumer may be looking for different things. Therefore, perception of consumer regarding to quality is changed and judged differently. The service quality that was accepted in past may not be accepted in future. The acceptable level of service for one person may not be suited so for another. For these reasons, the assessment of the quality conformity is likely to be difficult. Different approaches have been used to assess the quality-of-service delivery.

The SERVQUAL is widely used instrument for assessing service quality. It is developed by Parasuraman et al., in the 1980s. It was originally designed to assess ten dimensions of service quality. That are relating to dependability, communication, access, responsiveness, competence, courtesy, credibility, security, customer understanding or knowledge, and tangible. Later, it used just five dimensions: reliability, assurance, tangible, empathy and responsiveness in the early 1990s (Van der Wal et al., 2002). There are popularly used two schools of thought on service quality from a theoretical perspective: European school of

thought and US school of thought. The first European school of thought measures customers' perception of the quality of service on two broad aspects: (1) the service delivery process (the way the services are performed) and (2) the service outcomes (the end results of the services). The second thought is US school of thought. It uses five SERVQUAL dimensions namely: tangible, reliability, responsiveness, assurance and empathy. These schools of thought argued that the perception of quality of service of customer can be measured by using SERVQUAL model. Nevertheless, the measurement of service quality is varying in terms of method and techniques of how customer is satisfied. Moreover, there are a number of theories that shows the relationship between quality service and customer satisfaction. The services quality is measured based on the level of service condition that meets the customers' perceptions and expectations in terms of need, interest, extent, nature of service, and so on. However, customers' perception is very powerful components of customer satisfaction to measure service quality in the public sector (Leisen & Vance, 2001).

The significance of public service marketing in bridging the gap between society and government cannot be overemphasized. There exists an intricate link between public service marketing and social perception, however, service delivery within the quality of public service marketing and its relationship to perception has rarely been analyzed. However, measurement of service quality is always a complicated task. It is because of nonexistence of a universal definition of quality services measurement indicators. It is different in terms of definition, need, conflicts of interests, constraints of finance, arguments about policy, and legal requirements must be necessarily taken into account in decisions about the extent, nature, and focus of services to and for the public. Therefore, any discussion of quality and its improvements must be within this context. In a competitive market, quality of the product or service can exceed its perceived value. Therefore, this study is different in terms of theoretical perspective; the marketing perspective examines the quality of public service delivery by combining two thoughts namely: European and American schools of thought for studying quality service delivery in public service marketing. Besides that, all research had been focused on the citizen's perspective but this study has been focused on a particular assessment of the perception of academician (college lecturers) regarding the situation of quality-of-service delivery in Pokhara Metropolitan City. This research work can play important role in developing a public service delivery system that will be benefited the government as well as service receivers. Therefore, by using quality service delivery dimensions, this study explores an assessment of perception of academicians towards the quality of public service marketing on service delivery in Pokhara Metropolitan City.

Method

The basic philosophical aspects of this study have been discussed about ontology, epistemology, and methodology. The ontology is concerned with the reality about the perception of academicians towards quality service marketing. This aspect tries to know the reality either objectivism or constructivism way. Moreover, epistemology focuses on the research question and methods that the study has been find out the reality about the research questions, collect data and interpret data. Therefore, the deductive reasoning approach was used to measure the objective by applying quantitative methodological approach that reflects the positivist paradigm. It focused on primarily quantitative data. The reason behind the selection of quantitative method was ontological position of objectivism and epistemological position of positivism and the research approach which was deductive approach. However, the study has employed quantitative descriptive research designs to measures the perception of academicians towards quality public service delivery dimensions and satisfaction. The population of this study consists of the total permanent teaching faculties of T.U constitute and affiliated public campus in the Pokhara Metropolitan City. The total population size of the Constituent Campus (PNC) is 269 faculty members and the affiliated campus (JMC, KCP, GMMC, KMC) is 56 faculty members. Therefore 115 samples have been taken. A stratified simple random sample has been used as a sampling technique and the sampling frame for the study is the list of lecturers of the selected sampled colleges. The selected sample is knowledgeable, understands all the situation and environment and as well they can provide real problem solutions for the service delivery system for the improvement and reform of the service delivery. The structured questionnaire was containing 26 questions, and was developed in the Nepali version and converted into the English language for analysis purposes. The questionnaire started to distribute on 12, Bhadra, 2079, and was collected till 09 Ashoj 2079. Perception-related measurement has used a five-point Likert scale, which ranges from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5) as a survey instrument. The objectivity-related variable has been measured in a descriptive way as a nominal scale. The SPSS version 20 was used to analyze the quantitative data. The researcher has, made considerably content, constructs, criteria validity by reviewing the literature; consulting experts, and academician and measures Cronbach Alpha for testing validates the reliability of data, made an ethical clearance, properly cited and acknowledgment of the work, quality control and follow guidelines prescribed by the research department and supervisor of the CDPA, faculty of management, Tribhuvan University. Where independent variables were taken as accessibility, cost, time, behavior, barrier and dependent

variable was quality of public service marketing on service delivery.

Results

The background characteristics are explored to investigate the variations in service quality and experiences, as background characteristics, college type, sex, caste or ethnicity, age, occupation level, and education level are presented. Service quality may be impacted by the characteristics of service users. The study particularly based on the study of academicians concerning to Tribhuvan University related lecturer of constitutes and affiliated college in Pokhara therefore 65.2% respondents were taken from the constitute college and rest of respondents from affiliated college comprises Janapriya Multiple Campus, Kanya Campus, Gupteshwer Mahadeve Multiple Campus and Kalika Multiple Campus. All faculties were covered by this survey and maximum humanities faculties followed by management, science, education and law. Almost 85% of respondents were Lecturer followed by Reader and Professors has been taken. The survey covered that 82.6% Lecturers had master level education followed by M. Phil, and Ph.D. During the survey, there were more male lecturers than female lecturers in the both constitute and affiliated college. All respondents were married. Maximum Lecturers, Associate Professor and Professors were Brahmin, followed by Chhetri and Janajati ethnic group. More than 53% of respondents were above the age of 50 and mean age of them is 48.77 years of age.

Analysis of Quality of Public Service Delivery Dimension

Table 1: Percentages of Academicians that are Recently Visited Public Service Institution within Past Two Year

Types of Service Institutions	Percentage
Land administration	10.7
Municipal office	20.9
Health institution	16.0
District administration office	9.0
Revenue office	9.8
Transport office	32.4
Others	1.2
Total	100.0

Sources: Field survey, 2022

This part of the analyses contains the descriptive statistics of the various perception of quality of public service delivery dimensions

Table 1 shows that over the course of the last two years, about 99% of the lecturers have visited at least one of the six public institutions (district administration office, municipal office, land revenue office, transportation office, tax office and health office). About 32.4% of academicians received services from transportation office, while 20.9% went to municipal offices for assistance and so on.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Accessibility Condition Items

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Lack of awareness by me	115	2.00	.982
Insufficient time available	115	3.23	.958
Lack of information available for access	115	2.77	1.052
Poor handling skill	115	3.72	.987
Lack of user education	115	2.70	.975
Lack of sufficient fund	115	2.65	.908
Unfavorable environment	115	3.37	1.004
Poor attitude of staff	115	3.50	1.095
Equipment breakdown	115	3.29	1.041
Documentation problem	115	3.03	.968
Convenient	115	3.01	.987
Overall accessibility	115	3.02	0.459

Sources: Field survey, 2022

In this result, unfavorable environment, poor attitude of staff, and equipment breakdown had greater than one standard deviation; therefore, there were greater spread of data from mean. But in overall, there is less deviation from the mean. All items mean are above the level 3.0 expect lack of awareness by me, lack of user education, lack of information available for access, and lack of sufficient fund for creating accessing problem for the lecturers of both type of colleges. Overall accessibility mean is 3.0245. It means that overall accessibility condition neither easy nor hard to the respondents. The descriptive statistics with minimum and maximum means values ($M=2.00$, $SD=0.982$ and $M=3.72$, $SD=0.987$) shows moderate level of accessibility of public services.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for Cost related Condition Items (N=115)

Items	Mean	Std. Deviation
-------	------	----------------

I have to spend huge amount of service fee for accessing this service	3.10	1.026
I must spend a lot of amount on the transportation, launch, lodge etc. for accessing service	2.62	.942
I pay anything else than stated fee for accessing	2.85	.976
I pay for intermediary to access service	2.80	1.036
There is always associated a risk of uncertainty even a spent cost for services.	3.22	.925
I use a lot of effort for accessing the services	3.36	.919
Overall cost condition	2.9899	.65311

Sources: Field survey, 2022

Overall mean value is around 3. Whereas, I must spend a lot of amount on the transportation, launch, lodge etc. for accessing service, I pay anything else than stated fee for accessing and I pay for intermediary to access service have less than 3.00. Item first and second has maximum variability from mean. Therefore, there are 1.026 and 1.036 standard deviation. The descriptive statistics with minimum and maximum means values ($M=2.62, SD=0.942$ and $M=3.36, SD=0.919$) shows moderate level of cost of public services that they pay for either government, intermediary, employee or other than accessing fees.

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics for Time Related Condition Items (N=115)

Items	Mean	Std. Deviation
Serviced delivery organization is far distance from your current residence	2.72	1.056
It takes hours to reach service organization from your current residence	2.26	.889
I need to use vehicles to reach from my current residence	3.78	.835
I take a walk to reach the service organization	2.55	1.078
It takes more than usual time to access for the service	3.72	1.005
Service delivery takes comparably long time	3.99	.832
Overall time	3.171	.56302

Sources: Field survey, 2022

From the table 4, overall mean value 3.1710. Standard deviations are far from the mean value of item first, fourth and fifth. But overall standard deviation of time is less than one (0.56302). The descriptive statistics with minimum and maximum

means values ($M=2.26$, $SD=0.889$ and $M=3.99$, $SD=0.832$) shows moderate higher level of time taken for accessing of public services.

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics for Factors Creating Barrier for Accessing Public Services (N=115)

Items	Mean	Std. Deviation
Language	2.21	.987
Gender discrimination	2.25	.926
Caste/ethnicity	2.24	.923
Service providers' attitude	3.68	.843
Presence of intermediary service for access	3.68	.969
Not having <i>Afno Manche</i> (known person)	3.54	.967
Environment/receive service with hassle	4.06	.741
Commitment of staff	3.27	1.054
Customer document and data	3.12	.975
Overall barrier condition	3.12	0.492

Sources: Field survey, 2022

From table 5, it shows that mean value is 3.1169. First three items have less than average and data variation from means is commitment of staff. That is 1.054 deviations. The descriptive statistics with minimum and maximum means values ($M=2.21$, $SD=0.9872$ and $M=4.06$, $SD=0.741$) shows moderate to higher level of barrier that was created during accessibility of public services like lack of efficiency of employee, limited of time, physical and service facilities (toilet, breakfast,) employee training in office hours, unnecessary documentation, *Afno Manche* (know person) (Pokharel, et al. (2018).

Table 6 below shows behavior of service provider for public service provider. Overall means and standard deviation are 2.7273 and 0.48029 respectively. Last two items have more than one standard deviation. It means data set far from the mean of individual items. Table also shows that which has less than three mean indicates that average responses is disagree and medium point is between disagree and neutral level of response. The descriptive statistics with minimum and maximum means values ($M=2.17$, $SD=0.764$ and $M=3.72$, $SD=1.048$) shows moderate level of behavior of service provider in during accessibility of public services. Therefore, employees need to change their behavior drastically to improve the public service delivery in Nepal.

Tables 6: Descriptive Statistics for Behavior of Service Provider for Public

Services (N=115)

Items	Mean	Std. Deviation
The government employees follow the rules.	2.58	.964
The government employees properly listen to and understand concerns of service recipients.	2.28	.801
The government employees provide clear information about the service.	2.53	.862
The government employees use polite language	2.55	.840
The government employees behave in a friendly/cordial manner	2.41	.815
The government employees provide service in time	2.17	.764
The government employees do not create any hassles/problems	2.34	.815
Employees asked for bribe for receiving service	2.81	.857
Employee perceives that relationship matters in receiving public service	3.07	.925
Sufficient Salary and facilities of public employees play important role in their behavior	3.54	1.011
Change in behavior of employees due to political interventions are aimed at personal benefits	3.72	1.048
Overall behavior condition	2.72	0.480

Sources: Field survey, 2022

Perception and Satisfaction of Public Services Delivery

The difference between expectations and actual experiences can be used to calculate perceived service quality. A person's satisfaction with a given service is influenced by a variety of elements, including the service's content, the provider's behavior, the service process, the facilities, and the individual's expectations. The level of satisfaction with the services they receive can be used to measure the quality of public services.

Table 7 shows the perception of quality of public service delivery in Pokhara. 43.5% of the respondents had bad perception about service delivery followed by neutral and good perception.

Table 7: Level of Perception on Quality of Public Service Delivery

Degree of Perception	Percent
----------------------	---------

Highly Disperceive	7.0
Disperceive	43.5
Neutral	30.4
Perceive	17.4
Highly Perceive	1.7
Total	100.0

Sources: Field survey, 2022

Table 8 reveals that perception of public service delivery was not good. 43.5% of academicians had negative perception on public service quality.

Table 8: Perception on the basis of Level of Designation of Academicians

Perception on service Delivery	Level of Designation of Academicians						Total	
	Lecturer		Assoc. Professor		Professor		N	%
	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Highly negative perception	6	6.2	0	0	2	22.2	8	7.0
Negative perception	42	43.3	4	44.4	4	44.4	50	43.5
Neutral	39	30.9	3	33.3	2	22.2	35	30.4
Positive Perception	17	17.5	2	22.2	1	11.1	20	17.4
Highly positive perception	2	2.1		.0	0	.0	2	1.7
Total	97	100	9	100	9	100	115	100

Sources: Field survey, 2022

Table 9: Level of Satisfaction of Quality of Public Service Delivery

Level of Satisfaction	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	5.2
Disagree	27.0
Neutral	34.8
Agree	32.2
Strongly Agree	.9
Total	100.0

Sources: Field survey, 2022

Table 9 shows the level of satisfaction of the academicians from the constitute and affiliated college in Pokahra. The 32.2 percent of the lecturers are satisfied followed by neutral, and disagree with the service provided by different public services

offices in Pokhara.

Table 10: Satisfaction on the basis of Level of Designation of Academicians

Satisfaction Level on Public Service Delivery	Level of Designation of Academicians						Total	
	Lecturer		Assoc. Professor		Professor		N	%
	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Strongly Disagree	6	6.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	5.2
Disagree	23	23.7	4	44.4	4	44.4	31	27.0
Neutral	34	31.5	2	22.2	4	44.4	40	34.8
Agree	33	34.0	3	33.3	1	11.1	37	32.2
Strongly agree	1	1.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.9
Total	97	100	9	100	9	100	115	100.0

Sources: Field survey, 2022

Table 10 reveals that 34% of lecturer are satisfied with the public service delivery given by public organization. The overall satisfaction of quality of public service delivery process given by different public organization in Pokhara is 32.2 %

Table 11: Descriptive Statistics for Satisfaction for Public Services (N=115)

Items	Mean	Std. Deviation
Convenient service	2.80	.871
Service as expected	2.62	.823
Good behavior of staff	2.44	.786
Systematic service	2.30	.703
Low cost	2.50	.842
Service in less time	2.05	.619
Process of service	2.60	.825
Willingness to pay more for service	2.33	.953
Service organization	2.73	.820
Making loyalty myself	3.70	.772
Possibility of revisit for service	3.69	.831
Satisfaction level	2.97	.917
Overall satisfaction	2.727	0.4161

Sources: Field survey, 2022

Table 11 shows the satisfaction of public service delivery. Overall means and standard deviation are 2.727 and 0.41613 respectively. This table also shows that nine items has less than three mean that indicates moderate responses and medium point is in between disagree and neutral level of response. The descriptive statistics with minimum and maximum means values ($M=2.05$, $SD=0.619$ and $M=3.70$, $SD=0.772$) shows moderate level of satisfaction of public service.

Significant Issues in Perception of Quality-of-Service Delivery Process in Public Service Organization

The qualitative analysis had been done to explore the major issues in perception of quality-of-service delivery process in public service organization. The open-ended responses had been taken from the respondents' feedback. The biggest issues with service delivery administration as reported by respondents are given here. From the qualitative analysis shows that the problem of quality of public service delivery are : time consuming process, human resource management problem, political environment, lack of technology, service mentality, training and development, government plan and policy, cost, lack of convenience service, bureaucracy and red tapes, monitoring and evaluation of public service delivery, crowded, lack of resource management, corruption and bribery, lack of co-ordination, lack of one window policy, information and awareness, requirement of relation with employee, lack of commercialization and lack good governance.

Discussion

The study had been used quality of public service delivery dimensions such as accessibility, cost, time, barrier, and behavior for the study. The research contents and construct are similar to Pokharel et al., (2018) and Pokharel et al., (2017). However, the research constructs and concept were different to Parasuraman et al., (1985). However, this study explores those extended quality service dimension was reconstructed and used in Nepalese context for analysis. The major five quality of public service delivery dimension: accessibility, cost, time, barrier and behavior are equivalent to empathy (accessibility), communication (barrier and cost), reliability (time) and assurance (behavior) respectively.

Regarding to access, they visited maximum in transportation office for taking public services. Most of the University teachers take renewal service from the transportation office. The sources of information were an experience about the public service but the role of citizen charter cannot be ignored (20%). Citizen charter is given less priority for sources of information by university teacher or government re-think about the effectiveness of the citizen charter but Good

Governance (Management and Operation) Act, (2008) had made mandatory for information of public service delivery. This result is also different from the Pokharel et al., (2017). The Good Governance (Management and Operation) Act, (2008) makes assured for fast and speed delivery of services. The result is similar with Pokharel et al., (2018). This result is dissimilar with Pokharel et al., (2018) and Pokharel et al., (2017). This difference reveals that general public has no proper education and knowledge about the preparation of proper document for service than teachers or lecturers. Feeling and perception regarding the accessing service were time consuming process and lack of responsibility and accountability of service agency towards the service receiver. This result is totally difference with Pokharel et al., (2017). Overall accessibility of public service delivery is moderate. It shows by mean value 3.0245. The level of satisfaction regarding to accessibility in municipality service delivery in South Africa was written by Masiya et al., (2019).

There is the problem of accessing the public service is the poor attitude of staff. They create problem in accessing of public service delivery. The findings also support by SEVOTTAM: Quality Management System where service delivery accessibility and satisfaction brings by improving employees attitudes by Ramkrishnan, (2014). The results also show that the moderate level of cost pay for receiving public service in Pokhara. There is always associated a risk of uncertainty even a spent cost for services because the service process is complex, time consuming, overcrowded client and so on. Besides that, university teachers do maximum effort for accessing services because they have to manage time cost, intermediary cost, and internal cost alike. This overall result is similar to the Pokharel et al., (2017). The study was revealed that moderate level of cost for service, in addition cost like travel cost, lodging, food, intermediary cost, cover additional payment for service. The original SEVEQUAL theory also support this finding that quality of service delivery is determined by how much service will cost, tradeoff between service and cost, and efforts that handled by client of Parasuraman et al., (1985). The Nepal civil service act 2015 explained the punctuality, regularity, and present of civil servants and officials in their job or organization. It shows that average university teachers took considerable time for getting services.

This result is similar to the findings of the Pokharel et al., (2017). The study revealed that times taken for service are moderate level. Similarly, Good Governance (Management and Operation) Act, (2008) explained about decision making by officials in the situation to fail to perform and no improvement in the conduct of public service delivery by prevailing laws. Departmental action shall be taken for improvement of public service delivery. Obviously, this study reveals that

service delivery time is long. Therefore, this finding is supported by prevailing laws to take considerable action for incompetency of employees for providing services. The result is similar to the findings of Pokharel et al., (2018). Public perceive that service providers take considerably long time or did not manage properly. The time factor is expiated as reliability dimension in the service quality dimensions model of Parasuraman et al., (1985). Every people have right to equitable access to service but different factors are influenced the barrier in public service delivery. Social factor like language, caste and ethnicity, gender, employee, environment, relationship with employee and intermediary, documents etc. creates the barriers.

The construct barrier is explained as communication problem in public service delivery by Parasuraman et al., (1985) in a conceptual model of service quality. Similarly, a conference paper presented in 31st SKOCH Summit 2013 by Ramakrishnan explained about the poor face more barrier in accessing public service delivery focusing, language, corruption, service providers' attitude etc. This study reveals environment, service provider attitude, intermediary role, *Afno Manche* are main barrier for public service delivery. It is quite similar to finding of Pokharel et al., (2018) in the sense of *Afno Manche* but dissimilar to finding regarding to language, caste and ethnicity and gender discrimination can create the barrier. It is supported by The National Population Census, (2021); Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS), (2014); and Ministry of General Administration (MoGA), 2013. These laws explain more than hundreds mother tongue, and speaking Nepali mother tongue therefore, the results is similar to explain by laws. Language may not be barrier for public service delivery. The study result is different with the barrier of service delivery mention by Qureshi et al., (2021) in an article in mental health. This study is explained inappropriate human resources, lack of culturally appropriate tools, interventions and integrating service health system. Service providers' behavior determines the integrity, honesty, accountability, readiness to perform their job in better ways to satisfy the public.

Different laws and policies state the behavior of service provider. Behavior of service provider plays an important role in providing quality public service delivery. Ensuring good behavior of service provider is the overall good governance system of the country. Therefore, good behavior can be achieved through applying good governance in the public administration (Good Governance (Management and Operation) Act, 2008). This act specifies the good behavior of serviced provider by laws. This study reveals the behavior of provider is moderate level. Different factors determine the change in behavior of service provider like political intervention, sufficient salary and facilities are most reason for change behavior of service provider for quality of public service delivery in Pokhara but university

teacher are not believed that government employee properly listen and understand concerns of service recipients and provide service in time. University teacher have different perception towards the behavior of service provider. The study is similar to variable identify by Pokharel et al., (2018). They specify the behavior affects the public service delivery and they study the behavior of service provider in four different construct like compliance, responsiveness, work simplification and timely delivery. Similarly, the construct variable behavior was the assurance construct used in a conceptual model of service quality model specify by Parasuraman et al., (1985). Similarly, Neumanna, & Schott, (2021) explains the behavior effect of public service motivation among the citizens. They focus on public servant and citizens' engagement for digital co-production and attitudinal and behavior outcomes for job performance, commitment and job satisfaction. Overall perception of quality-of-service delivery is not good. Academicians have bad perception regarding service delivery in Pokhara.

Their perception depends upon the type of service organization that they rendered the service. This study shows the different perception regarding to good or bad views, negative because of lack of competitive pressure to improve their service and react quickly to request from the public. Bekerom et al., (2020) concluded same citizens' perception regarding to private and public organization with bad performance. A study found service quality in Umea University, ICA Alidhem, and Forex Bank by Agbor (2011). Perception regarding to service quality was agreeable. The quality of public service delivery is measured by the satisfaction of public that they received service. In precise way, the difference between expectation and perception of service is satisfaction by Parasuraman et al., (1985). However, the people expectation and experience are different and complex to measure it. This study reveals that satisfaction level is moderate level. Average university teachers are satisfied with the quality of public service delivery. The result was same as by Pokharel et al., (2017), and Mengste et al., (2020). A study found customer satisfaction in Umea University, ICA Alidhem, and Forex Bank by Agbor, (2011). The customer satisfaction was highly satisfied. The results suggested to improvement of service quality is necessary. The major problem is the staff in accessibility of service. Cost regarding risk after payment of fees and extra efforts for completing service was cost related influencing factor.

The service time was so long. Likewise, environmental situations, employees' attitudes, intermedator, and *Afno Manche* makes are the barrier to service delivery. The salary level and political interventions cause changes in behavior in during public service delivery. This finding is likely to study by Pokharel et al., 2017; National Planning Commission [NPC], 2007; Upreti, 2010). It revealed that

process, cost, time, and citizen orientation are the major topics that structure criticisms. In terms of procedure, it is criticized for red tape, bureaucratic headaches, and complications.

Conclusion

The objective of this survey was to explore the assessment of perception of academicians towards the quality of public service marketing on service delivery in Pokhara. The majority of the public and private organizations have worked with the implementation SERVQUAL, a universal model of assessing the quality of service delivery dimension but the research model contained accessibility, cost, time, barrier, and behavior and analyzed the relationship with perception of service quality and satisfaction. The design of CAT-Behavior model (Communication (Cost and Barrier, Accessibility, Time, and Behavior) model is useful for measuring the quality of public service delivery in the Nepalese context by replacing the SERVQUAL model. The survey concluded that the service delivery and general level of satisfaction of quantitative results were moderate because of inconvenience service, bad behavior of staff, lack of systematic process, high cost, long waiting time, and so many other factors. As a result, respondents are dissatisfied with their services. Therefore, higher officials should place proper emphasis on and work on the service delivery dimensions to attain the highest degree of satisfaction.

The public administrator of organizations should work harder to raise satisfaction levels by creating public service representative units that are tasked with carrying out periodic satisfaction surveys, determining whether services are provided under the standards established, handling public complaints, analyzing suggestions and opinions, and ultimately coming up with alternative solutions; by empowering employees through the arrangement of various training programs on customer handling, code of conduct, and technical skills even though there is a client information officer. These results indicated that, when those factors are resolved, respondents will be happy and satisfied. The results also show that the mean score values are modest across all service delivery dimensions, perception, and satisfaction, with perception having the lowest value. Because of this, the top administrative and organizational officer must pay close attention to the service delivery process. Each public organization must set up a client-handling unit that makes it easier for clients to receive services under the requirements of clients with particular care. So, this, perception of the client shall be positively increased. To improve each firm's customer satisfaction, the authorities of the organization should concentrate and work hard on the attributes of these service delivery

dimensions. The public service administration should work to address the primary service delivery bottlenecks found by assigning qualitative studies, particularly issues relating to staffing, qualified people, process, time, intermediary/agent, system management, corruption and bribery, the behavior of employees, and so on.

To reduce the occurrence, of corruption and rent-seeking practices, unethical behavior, to improve service mentality, the public service administration should develop and implement human resource development programs like short- and middle-term training programs, rewarding systems, strengthened code of conduct implementation, anti-corruption and rent-seeking alleviation strategies, and more. The public service administration should develop and implement a deliberate, team-based strategy to coordinate and direct all service delivery systems to solve societal issues by creating a shared understanding, developing innovative, communicative solutions, and fostering lasting change. The present research has different implications. No doubt that this study covers the educational group and their experience regarding the government's service towards the general public so people like college faculty can contribute significantly to their experience in policy formulation and theory building process. The analysis of service quality could benefit from the theoretical, managerial, and methodological contributions that this study could bring.

References

- Agbor, J.M. (2011). *The Relationship between Customer Satisfaction and Service Quality: a study of three Service sectors in Umeå* (Unpublished Masters Dissertation). Umea University (Umeå School of Business), Sweden.
- Bekerom, P. V., Voet, J. V., & Christensen, J. (2021). Are citizens more negative about failing service delivery by public Than Private Organizations? Evidence from a large-scale survey experiment. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 128-149, doi:10.1093/jopart/muaa027
- Butler, P, & Collins, N. (1995) Marketing public sector services: Concepts and characteristics. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 11, 83-96.
- Central Bureau of Statistics [CBS]. (2014). Population Monography of Nepal Volume II: Social Demography. Kathmandu: CBS.
- Engdaw, B. D. (2019). The Impact of Quality Public Service Delivery on Customer Satisfaction in Bahir Dar City Administration: The Case of Ginbot

20 Sub-city. *International Journal of Public Administration*,
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9070-7629> DOI:
10.1080/01900692.2019.1644520

- Farquhar, J. D., & Robson, J. (2017). Selective de-marketing: When customers destroy value. *Marketing Theory* 17 (2), 165-182.
- Giovanni G., & Sofia A. (2019): Public sector marketing practices and service delivery in government agencies in Romania. *Journal of Marketing and Communication*, 12(2) pp. 41-51.
- Kuo, Y.F. (2003). A study on Service Quality of Virtual Community Websites. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 14(4), 461-473.
- Li D. and, Ge W. (2002). *Comment on government marketing- take Ningbo as an example*. The Newspaper of Ningbo party school, p.64 (in Chinese).
- Leisen, B., & Vance, C. (2001). Cross-national assessment of service quality in the telecommunication industry. *Journal Service Quality*, 11(5), 7-717.
- Madill, J. (1998) Marketing in government. *Optimum* 28(4):9-18. Google Scholar
- Masiya T., Davids Y. D., Mangai M. S. (2019). Assessing service delivery: public perception of municipal service delivery in South Africa. *Theoretical and Empirical Researches in Urban Management*, 14, (2), Research Center in Public Administration and Public Services, pp. 20-40. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/26633007>
- McCourt, W. (2007). *Efficiency, integrity, and capacity: An expanded agenda for public management?* In A. Shah (Ed.), Performance accountability and combating corruption (pp. 33-55). Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Mengste, M., Teshome, Z., Belete, B., Gizaw, G. & Mulugeta, A.(2020). Assessment of customers' perception towards service delivery among public Service organizations in Dire Dawa Administration. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 10, (5). p. 946-954.
- Ministry of General Administration [MoGA]. (2013). *Inclusion in Civil Service: Issues and Initiatives*. Kathmandu: Project to Prepare Public Administration for State Reform (PREPARE), UNDP & MoGA. <http://saruwa.moga.gov.np/mogawebsite/images/pdf/Inclusion%20in%20Civil%20Service%20> -

%20Issues%20and%20Initiatives.pdf, Retrieved October 24, 2022.

- Mukherji, P. & Albon, D. (2015). *Research Methods in Early Childhood. An introductory guide* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- National Planning Commission [NPC]. (2007). *Three Year Interim Plan 2007/08-2009/10*. Kathmandu: National Planning Commission, Government of Nepal.
- Neumann, O., & Schott, C. (2021) Behavioral effects of public service motivation among citizens: testing the case of digital co-production. *International Public Management Journal*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10967494.2021.1937413>
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing*, *49(4)*, 41-50. doi:10.2307/1251430
- Pokharel, T., Dahal, A. & Adhikari, R. (2017). *Public services in Nepal: Citizen's experiences*. Lalitpur, Nepal: Nepal Administrative Staff College.
- Pokharel, T., Subedi, B.P., Adhikari S.H., Adhikari, R., & Gupta, A.K. (2018). *Quality of public service in Nepal: Nepal National Governance Survey 2017/18 Thematic Paper*. Lalitpur: Nepal Administrative Staff College.
- Qureshi, O., Endale, T., Ryan, G. *et al.* (2021). Barriers and drivers to service delivery in global mental health projects. *International Journal of Mental Health System*, *15(14)* <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13033-020-00427-x>
- Ramakrishnan, R. (2014). Delivery of Public Services-The way Forward, Conference Paper on 31st SKOCH Summit 2013, Rethinking Governance, 25th & 26th March, New Delhi India · November 2014, DOI: 10.13140/2.1.3753.1846
- Ringgold, D., Alaka, H., Koziol, M., & Srinivasan, S. (2012). *Citizens and service delivery: Assessing the use of social accountability; approaches in human development*. Washington, DC: International Bank for reconstruction and development.
- Rousseau, J.-J. (2008). *The Social Contract*. (G. H. Cole, Trans.) New York: Cosimo, Inc.
- Serrat, O. (2010). *Marketing in the public sector*. [Online] available at [www.adb.org/ documents/information/knowledge-solutions/marketing-in-the-public-sector.pdf](http://www.adb.org/documents/information/knowledge-solutions/marketing-in-the-public-sector.pdf), accessed on August 22, 2010.

- Upreti, B. C. (2010). *Nepal: Transition to Democratic Republican State*. Kathmandu: Gyan Publishing House.
- Van der Wal, R.W.E., Pampallis, A, & Bond, C. (2002). Service quality in a cellular telecommunications company: A South African experience. *Journal of Service Theory and Practice* 12(5):323-335. DOI:10.1108/09604520210442119
- Van de Walle, S. 2016. When public services fail: a research agenda on public service failure. *Journal of Service Management*, 27 (5). 831-846.
- Zaheer, A. N. & Rashid, A. (2016). Analyzing the role of public sector marketing in the empowering social effectiveness: a case study from Anhui Province, China, *Springer*, 14(1), 57-71. DOI 10.1007/s12208-016-0162-y