

REFERENCES

- Akhavan, S. (2012). Midwives' views on factors that contribute to health care inequalities among immigrants in Sweden: a qualitative study. *International journal for Equity in Health*, 11(1), 1-10.
- Annas, G. J., & Grodin, M. A. (1996). Medicine and human rights: reflections on the fiftieth anniversary of the doctors' trial. *Health and human rights*, 6-21.
- Attanapola, C. T. (2013). Migration and Health: A literature review of the health of immigrant populations in Norway.
- Aydin, S. (2018). Factors Affecting Patient Satisfaction with Healthcare System of Turkey.
- Braveman, P., & Gruskin, S. (2003). Defining equity in health. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, 57(4), 254-258.
- Brown, S. W., Nelson, A. M., Bronkesh, S. J., & Wood, S. D. (1993). Patient satisfaction pays: Quality service for practice success. Jones & Bartlett Learning.
- Carballo, M., & Mboup, M. (2005). International migration and health. Paper submitted to the Global Commission on International Migration.
- China, 2011. In *BMC public health* (Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 1-10). BioMed Central.
- COVENANT, P. (1966). 2. International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.
- Czapka, E. A., & Sagbakken, M. (2016). "Where to find those doctors?" A qualitative study on barriers and facilitators in access to and utilization of health care services by Polish migrants in Norway. *BMC health services research*, 16(1), 1-14.

- DECLARATION, O. (1948). Universal Declaration of Human Rights.
- Donabedian, A. (1988). The quality of care: how can it be assessed? *Jama*, 260(12), 1743-1748.
- European Commission. Directorate-General for Employment, & Equal Opportunities. (2006). *The Demographic Future of Europe--from Challenge to Opportunity*. Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Farmer, P. (1999). Pathologies of power: rethinking health and human rights. *American journal of public health*, 89(10), 1486-1496.
- Galanis, P., Sourtzi, P., Bellali, T., Theodorou, M., Karamitri, I., Siskou, O., ... & Kaitelidou, D. (2013). Public health services knowledge and utilization among immigrants in Greece: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Health Services Research*, 13(1), 1-8.
- Grodin, M., Tarantola, D., Annas, G., & Gruskin, S. (2013). *Health and human rights in a changing world*. Routledge.
- Gulliford, M., Figueroa-Munoz, J., Morgan, M., Hughes, D., Gibson, B., Beech, R., & Hudson, M. (2002). What does 'access to health care' mean?. *Journal of health services research & policy*, 7(3), 186-188.
- Håkonsen, H., Lees, K., & Toverud, E. L. (2014). Cultural barriers encountered by Norwegian community pharmacists in providing service to non-Western immigrant patients. *International journal of clinical pharmacy*, 36(6), 1144-1151.
- Harpelund, L., Nielsen, S. S., & Krasnik, A. (2012). Self-perceived need for interpreter among immigrants in Denmark. *Scandinavian journal of public health*, 40(5), 457-465.

Hutabarat, A. (2020). Indonesian Political Policy in Overcoming Illegal Immigrant Problems in Indonesia. *International Journal on Social Science, Economics and Art*, 10(2), 96-103.

International Migration, Health and Human Rights. IOM, WHO and UN HumanRights:https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/Migration/WHO_OM_UNOHCHRPublication.pdf Last accessed: 16/10/2018.

International Organization for Migration (IOM). *Migration Health Report*. Geneva: IOM; 2004

Jakobsson, L., & Holmberg, L. (2012). Quality from the patient's perspective: a one-year trial. *International journal of health care quality assurance*.

Kolter, P. and Clarke, R. (1987) *Marketing for Health Care Organisation*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs.

Larsson, E. C., Fried, S., Essén, B., & Klingberg-Allvin, M. (2016). Equitable abortion care—A challenge for health care providers. Experiences from abortion care encounters with immigrant women in Stockholm, Sweden. *Sexual & Reproductive Healthcare*, 10, 14-18.

Leary, V. A. (1994). The right to health in international human rights law. *Health and human rights*, 24-56.

Li, Z., Hou, J., Lu, L., Tang, S., & Ma, J. (2012, June). On residents' satisfaction with community health services after health care system reform in Shanghai,

Lindkvist, P., Johansson, E., & Hylander, I. (2015). Fogging the issue of HIV-Barriers for HIV testing in a migrated population from Ethiopia and Eritrea. *BMC Public Health*, 15(1), 1-12.

- Mahmoud, I., & Hou, X. Y. (2012). Immigrants and the utilization of hospital emergency departments. *World journal of emergency medicine*, 3(4), 245.
- Manzoor, F., Wei, L., Hussain, A., Asif, M., & Shah, S. (2019). Patient Satisfaction with Health Care Services; An Application of Physician's Behavior as a Moderator. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 16(18), 3318. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16183318>
- Mohd, A., & Chakravarty, A. (2014). Patient satisfaction with services of the outpatient department. *Medical Journal Armed Forces India*, 70(3), 237-242.
- Nations, U. (2015). Department of Economic and Social Affairs, population division. *International migration report*.
- Nie, Y., Mao, X., Cui, H., He, S., Li, J., & Zhang, M. (2013). Hospital survey on patient safety culture in China. *BMC health services research*, 13(1), 1-11.
- Norredam, M. (2011). Migrants' access to healthcare. *Dan Med Bull*, 58(10), B4339.
- Norredam, M. (2011). Migrants' access to healthcare. *Dan Med Bull*, 58(10), B4339.
- Oliver, A., & Mossialos, E. (2004). Equity of access to health care: outlining the foundations for action. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, 58(8), 655-658.
- Oliver, A., & Mossialos, E. (2004). Equity of access to health care: outlining the foundations for action. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, 58(8), 655-658.

- Penchansky, R., & Thomas, J. W. (1981). The concept of access: definition and relationship to consumer satisfaction. *Medical care*, 127-140.
- Poot, F. (2004). How to be a happy dermatologist. *DERMATOLOGY AND PSYCHOSOMATICS*, 5, 112-113.
- Pottie, K. et al., 2014. Improving delivery of primary care for vulnerable migrants
- Prakash B. (2010). Patient satisfaction. *Journal of cutaneous and aesthetic surgery*, 3(3), 151–155. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0974-2077.74491>.
- Rogers, A., Flowers, J., & Pencheon, D. (1999). Improving access needs a whole systems approach: and will be important in averting crises in the millennium winter.
- Rudenim Makassar, Total Imigran di Rudenim dan di Luar Rudenim Makassar, periode 8 Februari 2019
- Schutt, R. K., & Mejía, C. (2017). Health care satisfaction: effects of immigration, acculturation, language. *Journal of immigrant and minority health*, 19(6), 1372-1378.
- Sironi, A., Bauloz, C., & Emmanuel, M. (2019). International migration law no. 34: Glossary on migration.
- Småland Goth, U. G., & Berg, J. E. (2011). Migrant participation in Norwegian health care. A qualitative study using key informants. *The European journal of general practice*, 17(1), 28-33.
- Suphanchaimat, R., Kantamaturapoj, K., Putthasri, W., & Prakongsai, P. (2015). Challenges in the provision of healthcare services for migrants: a systematic review through providers' lens. *BMC health services research*, 15(1), 1-14.

United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. International migration report 2017. New York: United Nations; 2017.

United Nations. Universal Declaration of Human Rights, New York City, 1948, article 25. Available from: <http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/>

Vozikis, A., & Siganou, M. (2015). Immigrants' satisfaction from the national health system in Greece: In the quest of the contributing factors. *Health*, 7(11), 1430.

Whitehead, M. (2000). *The concepts and principles of equity and health*. Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe.

WHO. *Improving Performance. The World Health Report 2000, Health Systems*: WHO

World Health Organization. (1998). *The World health report: 1998: Life in the 21st century: a vision for all: executive summary* (No. WHO/WHR/98.1). World Health Organization.

World Health Organization. (2002). *25 questions and answers on health and human rights*. World Health Organization.

Yucelt, U. (1994) *An Investigation of Causes of Patient Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction with Physician Services*. *Health Marketing Quarterly*, 12, 11-28. http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J026v12n02_03

LAYOUT HASIL ANALISIS
Analisis Univariat
Frequency Table

RELIABILITY_SOAL1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	3	5,7	5,7	5,7
	2	4	7,5	7,5	13,2
	3	16	30,2	30,2	43,4
	4	15	28,3	28,3	71,7
	5	15	28,3	28,3	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

RELIABILITY_SOAL2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	2	3,8	3,8	3,8
	2	7	13,2	13,2	17,0
	3	14	26,4	26,4	43,4
	4	20	37,7	37,7	81,1
	5	10	18,9	18,9	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

RELIABILITY_SOAL3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	3	5,7	5,7	5,7
	2	5	9,4	9,4	15,1
	3	13	24,5	24,5	39,6
	4	21	39,6	39,6	79,2
	5	11	20,8	20,8	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

RELIABILITY_SOAL4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	5	9,4	9,4	9,4
	2	3	5,7	5,7	15,1
	3	15	28,3	28,3	43,4
	4	17	32,1	32,1	75,5
	5	13	24,5	24,5	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

RELIABILITY_SOAL5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	6	11,3	11,3	11,3
	2	4	7,5	7,5	18,9
	3	15	28,3	28,3	47,2
	4	11	20,8	20,8	67,9
	5	17	32,1	32,1	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

RESPONSIVE_SOAL1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2	7	13,2	13,2	13,2
	3	12	22,6	22,6	35,8
	4	14	26,4	26,4	62,3
	5	20	37,7	37,7	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

RESPONSIVE_SOAL2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	2	3,8	3,8	3,8
	2	4	7,5	7,5	11,3
	3	16	30,2	30,2	41,5
	4	19	35,8	35,8	77,4
	5	12	22,6	22,6	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

RESPONSIVE_SOAL3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	1	1,9	1,9	1,9
	2	7	13,2	13,2	15,1
	3	13	24,5	24,5	39,6
	4	17	32,1	32,1	71,7
	5	15	28,3	28,3	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

RESPONSIVE_SOAL4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2	4	7,5	7,5	7,5
	3	14	26,4	26,4	34,0
	4	20	37,7	37,7	71,7
	5	15	28,3	28,3	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

ASSURANCE_SOAL1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	1	1,9	1,9	1,9
	2	6	11,3	11,3	13,2
	3	10	18,9	18,9	32,1
	4	21	39,6	39,6	71,7
	5	15	28,3	28,3	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

ASSURANCE_SOAL2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	2	3,8	3,8	3,8
	2	7	13,2	13,2	17,0
	3	16	30,2	30,2	47,2
	4	15	28,3	28,3	75,5
	5	13	24,5	24,5	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

ASSURANCE_SOAL3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2	4	7,5	7,5	7,5
	3	17	32,1	32,1	39,6
	4	23	43,4	43,4	83,0
	5	9	17,0	17,0	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

ASSURANCE_SOAL4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	2	3,8	3,8	3,8
	2	4	7,5	7,5	11,3
	3	16	30,2	30,2	41,5
	4	19	35,8	35,8	77,4
	5	12	22,6	22,6	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

ASSURANCE_SOALS5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	1	1,9	1,9	1,9
	2	8	15,1	15,1	17,0
	3	17	32,1	32,1	49,1
	4	14	26,4	26,4	75,5
	5	13	24,5	24,5	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

ASSURANCE_SOAL6

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	3	5,7	5,7	5,7
	2	8	15,1	15,1	20,8
	3	17	32,1	32,1	52,8
	4	16	30,2	30,2	83,0
	5	9	17,0	17,0	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

EMPATHY_SOAL1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	1	1,9	1,9	1,9
	2	5	9,4	9,4	11,3
	3	12	22,6	22,6	34,0
	4	18	34,0	34,0	67,9
	5	17	32,1	32,1	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

EMPATHY_SOAL2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	2	3,8	3,8	3,8
	2	8	15,1	15,1	18,9
	3	13	24,5	24,5	43,4
	4	18	34,0	34,0	77,4
	5	12	22,6	22,6	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

EMPATHY_SOAL3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	1	1,9	1,9	1,9
	2	7	13,2	13,2	15,1
	3	10	18,9	18,9	34,0
	4	20	37,7	37,7	71,7
	5	15	28,3	28,3	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

EMPATHY_SOAL4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2	5	9,4	9,4	9,4
	3	20	37,7	37,7	47,2
	4	15	28,3	28,3	75,5
	5	13	24,5	24,5	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

EMPATHY_SOAL5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	1	1,9	1,9	1,9
	2	9	17,0	17,0	18,9
	3	14	26,4	26,4	45,3
	4	20	37,7	37,7	83,0
	5	9	17,0	17,0	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

TANGIBLE_SOAL1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	1	1,9	1,9	1,9
	2	5	9,4	9,4	11,3
	3	12	22,6	22,6	34,0
	4	18	34,0	34,0	67,9
	5	17	32,1	32,1	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

TANGIBLE_SOAL2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2	3	5,7	5,7	5,7
	3	20	37,7	37,7	43,4
	4	19	35,8	35,8	79,2
	5	11	20,8	20,8	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

TANGIBLE_SOAL3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	3	5,7	5,7	5,7
	2	4	7,5	7,5	13,2
	3	15	28,3	28,3	41,5
	4	15	28,3	28,3	69,8
	5	16	30,2	30,2	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

TANGIBLE_SOAL4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	2	3,8	3,8	3,8
	2	4	7,5	7,5	11,3
	3	21	39,6	39,6	50,9
	4	16	30,2	30,2	81,1
	5	10	18,9	18,9	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

PERSEPTION_SOAL1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3	15	28,3	28,3	28,3
	4	29	54,7	54,7	83,0
	5	9	17,0	17,0	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

PERSEPTION_SOAL2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2	2	3,8	3,8	3,8
	3	18	34,0	34,0	37,7
	4	22	41,5	41,5	79,2
	5	11	20,8	20,8	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

PERSEPTION_SOAL3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2	3	5,7	5,7	5,7
	3	23	43,4	43,4	49,1
	4	20	37,7	37,7	86,8
	5	7	13,2	13,2	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

PERSEPTION_SOAL4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2	4	7,5	7,5	7,5
	3	21	39,6	39,6	47,2
	4	21	39,6	39,6	86,8
	5	7	13,2	13,2	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

RELIABILITY

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	KURANG BAIK	14	26,4	26,4	26,4
	BAIK	39	73,6	73,6	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

RESPONSIVE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	KURANG BAIK	11	20,8	20,8	20,8
	BAIK	42	79,2	79,2	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

ASSURANCE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	KURANG BAIK	11	20,8	20,8	20,8
	BAIK	42	79,2	79,2	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

EMPATHY

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	KURANG BAIK	14	26,4	26,4	26,4
	BAIK	39	73,6	73,6	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

TANGIBLE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	KURANG BAIK	14	26,4	26,4	26,4
	BAIK	39	73,6	73,6	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

PERSEPTION

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	KURANG BAIK	10	18,9	18,9	18,9
	BAIK	43	81,1	81,1	100,0
	Total	53	100,0	100,0	

Analisis Bivariat Crosstabs

RELIABILITY * SATISFACION

Crosstab

			PERSEPTION		Total
			KURANG BAIK	BAIK	
RELIABILITY	KURANG BAIK	Count	8	6	14
		% within RELIABILITY	57,1%	42,9%	100,0%
		% within PERSEPTION	80,0%	14,0%	26,4%
	BAIK	Count	2	37	39
		% within RELIABILITY	5,1%	94,9%	100,0%
		% within PERSEPTION	20,0%	86,0%	73,6%
Total	Count	10	43	53	
	% within RELIABILITY	18,9%	81,1%	100,0%	
	% within PERSEPTION	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18,208 ^a	1	,000		
Continuity Correction ^b	14,968	1	,000		
Likelihood Ratio	16,437	1	,000		
Fisher's Exact Test				,000	,000
Linear-by-Linear Association	17,864	1	,000		
N of Valid Cases	53				

a. 1 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2,64.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

RESPONSIVE * SATISFACION

Crosstab

			PERSEPTION		Total
			KURANG BAIK	BAIK	
RESPONSIVE	KURANG BAIK	Count	6	5	11
		% within RESPONSIVE	54,5%	45,5%	100,0%
		% within PERSEPTION	60,0%	11,6%	20,8%
	BAIK	Count	4	38	42
		% within RESPONSIVE	9,5%	90,5%	100,0%
		% within PERSEPTION	40,0%	88,4%	79,2%
Total	Count	10	43	53	
	% within RESPONSIVE	18,9%	81,1%	100,0%	
	% within PERSEPTION	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11,542 ^a	1	,001		
Continuity Correction ^b	8,789	1	,003		
Likelihood Ratio	9,760	1	,002		
Fisher's Exact Test				,003	,003
Linear-by-Linear Association	11,325	1	,001		
N of Valid Cases	53				

a. 1 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2,08.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

ASSURANCE * SATISFACION

Crosstab

			PERSEPTION		Total
			KURANG BAIK	BAIK	
ASSURANCE	KURANG BAIK	Count	7	4	11
		% within ASSURANCE	63,6%	36,4%	100,0%
		% within PERSEPTION	70,0%	9,3%	20,8%
	BAIK	Count	3	39	42
		% within ASSURANCE	7,1%	92,9%	100,0%
		% within PERSEPTION	30,0%	90,7%	79,2%
Total	Count	10	43	53	
	% within ASSURANCE	18,9%	81,1%	100,0%	
	% within PERSEPTION	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18,174 ^a	1	,000		
Continuity Correction ^b	14,671	1	,000		
Likelihood Ratio	15,301	1	,000		
Fisher's Exact Test				,000	,000
Linear-by-Linear Association	17,831	1	,000		
N of Valid Cases	53				

a. 1 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2,08.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

EMPATHY * SATISFACION

Crosstab

			PERSEPTION		Total
			KURANG BAIK	BAIK	
EMPATHY	KURANG BAIK	Count	7	7	14
		% within EMPATHY	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		% within PERSEPTION	70,0%	16,3%	26,4%
	BAIK	Count	3	36	39
		% within EMPATHY	7,7%	92,3%	100,0%
		% within PERSEPTION	30,0%	83,7%	73,6%
Total	Count	10	43	53	
	% within EMPATHY	18,9%	81,1%	100,0%	
	% within PERSEPTION	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12,046 ^a	1	,001		
Continuity Correction ^b	9,441	1	,002		
Likelihood Ratio	10,775	1	,001		
Fisher's Exact Test				,002	,002
Linear-by-Linear Association	11,819	1	,001		
N of Valid Cases	53				

a. 1 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2,64.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

TANGIBLE * SATISFACION

Crosstab

			PERSEPTION		Total
			KURANG BAIK	BAIK	
TANGIBLE	KURANG BAIK	Count	9	5	14
		% within TANGIBLE	64,3%	35,7%	100,0%
		% within PERSEPTION	90,0%	11,6%	26,4%
	BAIK	Count	1	38	39
		% within TANGIBLE	2,6%	97,4%	100,0%
		% within PERSEPTION	10,0%	88,4%	73,6%
Total		Count	10	43	53
		% within TANGIBLE	18,9%	81,1%	100,0%
		% within PERSEPTION	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	25,637 ^a	1	,000		
Continuity Correction ^b	21,764	1	,000		
Likelihood Ratio	23,786	1	,000		
Fisher's Exact Test				,000	,000
Linear-by-Linear Association	25,154	1	,000		
N of Valid Cases	53				

a. 1 cells (25,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2,64.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Analisis Multivariat Logistic Regression

Case Processing Summary

Unweighted Cases ^a		N	Percent
Selected Cases	Included in Analysis	53	100,0
	Missing Cases	0	,0
	Total	53	100,0
Unselected Cases	Total	0	,0
	Total	53	100,0

a. If weight is in effect, see classification table for the total number of cases.

Dependent Variable Encoding

Original Value	Internal Value
KURANG BAIK	0
BAIK	1

Block 0: Beginning Block

Classification Table^{a,b}

Observed			Predicted		Percentage Correct
			PERSEPTION		
			KURANG BAIK	BAIK	
Step 0	PERSEPTION	KURANG BAIK	0	10	,0
		BAIK	0	43	100,0
Overall Percentage					81,1

a. Constant is included in the model.

b. The cut value is ,500

Variables in the Equation

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 0 Constant	1,459	,351	17,261	1	,000	4,300

Variables not in the Equation

			Score	df	Sig.
Step 0	Variables	RELIABILITY	18,208	1	,000
		RESPONSIVE	11,542	1	,001
		ASSURANCE	18,174	1	,000
		EMPATHY	12,046	1	,001
		TANGIBLE	25,637	1	,000
	Overall Statistics		31,621	5	,000

Block 1: Method = Backward Stepwise (Wald)

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

		Chi-square	Df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	30,588	5	,000
	Block	30,588	5	,000
	Model	30,588	5	,000
Step 2 ^a	Step	-5,487	1	,019
	Block	25,101	4	,000
	Model	25,101	4	,000
Step 3 ^a	Step	,000	1	,991
	Block	25,100	3	,000
	Model	25,100	3	,000
Step 4 ^a	Step	-,213	1	,645
	Block	24,888	2	,000
	Model	24,888	2	,000
Step 5 ^a	Step	-1,102	1	,294
	Block	23,786	1	,000
	Model	23,786	1	,000

a. A negative Chi-squares value indicates that the Chi-squares value has decreased from the previous step.

Model Summary

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	20,748 ^a	,438	,707
2	26,235 ^b	,377	,608
3	26,236 ^b	,377	,608
4	26,448 ^b	,375	,604
5	27,550 ^b	,362	,583

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 20 because maximum iterations has been reached. Final solution cannot be found.

b. Estimation terminated at iteration number 6 because parameter estimates changed by less than ,001.

Classification Table^a

Observed			Predicted		
			PERSEPTION		Percentage Correct
			KURANG BAIK	BAIK	
Step 1	PERSEPTION	KURANG BAIK	8	2	80,0
		BAIK	4	39	90,7
		Overall Percentage			88,7
Step 2	PERSEPTION	KURANG BAIK	7	3	70,0
		BAIK	4	39	90,7
		Overall Percentage			86,8
Step 3	PERSEPTION	KURANG BAIK	7	3	70,0
		BAIK	4	39	90,7
		Overall Percentage			86,8
Step 4	PERSEPTION	KURANG BAIK	7	3	70,0
		BAIK	4	39	90,7
		Overall Percentage			86,8
Step 5	PERSEPTION	KURANG BAIK	9	1	90,0
		BAIK	5	38	88,4
		Overall Percentage			88,7

a. The cut value is ,500

Variables in the Equation

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)		
							Lower	Upper	
Step 1 ^a	RELIABILITY	3,099	1,844	2,823	1	,093	22,182	,597	824,202
	RESPONSIVE	-23,012	20917,274	,000	1	,999	,000	,000	.
	ASSURANCE	-,821	1,855	,196	1	,658	,440	,012	16,699
	EMPATHY	-1,649	1,908	,747	1	,388	,192	,005	8,094
	TANGIBLE	26,525	20917,275	,000	1	,999	3,307E11	,000	.
	Constant	-4,213	1,998	4,444	1	,035	,015		
Step 2 ^a	RELIABILITY	1,435	1,278	1,260	1	,262	4,199	,343	51,428
	ASSURANCE	-,019	1,719	,000	1	,991	,981	,034	28,478
	EMPATHY	-,623	1,678	,138	1	,710	,536	,020	14,361
	TANGIBLE	3,757	1,725	4,745	1	,029	42,826	1,458	1258,357
	Constant	-5,341	1,816	8,654	1	,003	,005		
Step 3 ^a	RELIABILITY	1,435	1,278	1,260	1	,262	4,199	,343	51,430
	EMPATHY	-,633	1,420	,199	1	,656	,531	,033	8,589
	TANGIBLE	3,749	1,565	5,740	1	,017	42,478	1,978	912,232
	Constant	-5,345	1,794	8,873	1	,003	,005		
Step 4 ^a	RELIABILITY	1,263	1,188	1,131	1	,288	3,536	,345	36,252
	TANGIBLE	3,428	1,339	6,553	1	,010	30,808	2,233	425,104
	Constant	-5,574	1,744	10,213	1	,001	,004		
Step 5 ^a	TANGIBLE	4,225	1,156	13,349	1	,000	68,400	7,090	659,852
	Constant	-4,813	1,507	10,202	1	,001	,008		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: RELIABILITY, RESPONSIVE, ASSURANCE, EMPATHY, TANGIBLE.

Variables not in the Equation

			Score	df	Sig.
Step 2 ^a	Variables	RESPONSIVE	3,682	1	,055
		Overall Statistics	3,682	1	,055
Step 3 ^b	Variables	RESPONSIVE	3,550	1	,060
		ASSURANCE	,000	1	,991
		Overall Statistics	3,684	2	,159
Step 4 ^c	Variables	RESPONSIVE	2,767	1	,096
		ASSURANCE	,064	1	,801
		EMPATHY	,202	1	,653
		Overall Statistics	3,900	3	,272
Step 5 ^d	Variables	RELIABILITY	1,188	1	,276
		RESPONSIVE	2,121	1	,145
		ASSURANCE	,009	1	,923
		EMPATHY	,036	1	,849
		Overall Statistics	4,873	4	,301

a. Variable(s) removed on step 2: RESPONSIVE.

b. Variable(s) removed on step 3: ASSURANCE.

c. Variable(s) removed on step 4: EMPATHY.

d. Variable(s) removed on step 5: RELIABILITY.

Lembar kuesioner:

No	Statement	Totally agree	Agree	Less agree	Disagree	Totally disagree
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Reliability					
	1. Health workers always give greetings and smiles when they meet 2. Health workers pay attention to complaints that you feel 3. Health workers provide information about available facilities 4. Health workers are meticulous and skilled in carrying out nursing actions 5. Health workers arrive on time in the room when needed.					
2	Responsiveness					
	1) Health workers are willing to offer assistance to you when you experience difficulties even without being asked. 2) Health workers immediately handle you when they arrive. 3) The health worker helps you in obtaining medicine and explains the procedures for consuming the drug to you 4) Health workers help you in carrying out physical examinations.					
3	Assurance (jaminan)					
	1) Health workers are competent and can be trusted. 2) Health workers can guarantee you are free from danger. 3) Health workers provide satisfying health services. 4) Health workers are clear in providing information about health.					

	5) Health workers do not hesitate in taking action.					
4	Empathy (empati)					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Health workers provide information about all actions that will be carried out 2) Health workers are easy to meet and contact when you need it. 3) Health workers often look and check your general condition 4) Health workers treat you with patience 5) The services provided by health workers do not look at rank / status but based on your condition 					
5	Tangibles (Bukti fisik)					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Health workers always maintain the cleanliness and tidiness of the room you occupy. 2) Health workers maintain the hygiene of health equipment used on you. 3) Health workers always give greetings and smiles when giving actions to you. 4) Health workers always maintain the neatness and appearance. 					