# Responsiveness of the Investment Office and One-Stop Integrated Services of East Luwu Regency in the Service of Trade Business Licenses

**Joyakin Damanik[1*], Sangkala[2], Agus Santosa[3]**
Universitas Terbuka, Indonesia [1,3]
Universitas Hasanuddin, Indonesia[2]
Email: Joydamanik66@gmail.com[1*], Sangkalarewa@gmail.com[2], agusto@ecampus.ut.ac.id[3]
*Correspondence

## ABSTRACT

The responsiveness of the Trading Business License (SIUP) licensing service provider is very important to create a pleasant and excellent licensing service system. Simplification of the number and types of licensing and non-licensing has been carried out, from 142 types to 34 types. Through the online system, it is easier for applicants to register and monitor the flow of permits and can speed up the licensing process time, one day service. The Department of Investment and One Stop Integrated Services (DPMPTSP) has made various efforts to increase the responsiveness of SIUP services, but based on preliminary research conducted by researchers, it shows that the level of responsiveness of the East Luwu Regency DPMPTSP is still not optimal, being in the "sufficient" category. This research aims to analyze the level of responsiveness and factors that hinder the responsiveness of SIUP services in DPMPTSP East Luwu Regency. The research used a descriptive quantitative approach, with a questionnaire instrument to collect data from 100 respondents from a population of 1,342 people. The sample taker used a simple random sampling technique. Data processing using SPSS version 22, was then analyzed using Weight Means Score (WMS). The level of responsiveness of DPMDPTSP East Luwu Regency in SIUP services, an average of 3.41 (fair) indicates that responsiveness is not optimal, especially in terms of speed of service, timeliness of service, and response to every applicant's complaint as stated by Zeithaml et al (1990) that Responsiveness is the willingness and readiness to help provide immediate service, such as punctuality of service, responding to every applicant, service quickly, precisely and carefully.

## Introduction

The responsiveness of the government as a service provider is very important in administrative services such as trade business licenses. This permit is urgently needed by the community as proof of the legalization of a trading business from the government which must be owned by people or entities that have small-scale to large-scale trading businesses. (Hilson, 2020).

The responsiveness needed and expected by the service recipient is as stated by (Anandita & Rahmawati, 2024) Responsiveness, willingness, and promptness to help serve immediately such as the timeliness of service, responding to each requester, fast, precise, meticulous service, right time, and all customer complaints are responded to by the officer.

Business license services are the affairs of the Regional Government that issue permit documents based on Regional Regulations or other regulations that state the legality of business or activities. (Erdiawati, 2023; Yıldız & Kural, 2020).

The responsiveness of service providers is currently still not optimal, as can be seen from the complaints of service recipients, regarding the length of completion and service, and the absence of follow-up to the complaints of service recipients.

Low bureaucratic responsiveness is indicated by the number of complaints from service users about the implementation of public services the indication of low responsiveness is seen from the many complaints of service users against the implementation of public services. (Arfan, Mayarni, & Nasution, 2021; Datutusta, Rochmah, & Amin, 2020).

**Table 1**
**Number of SIUP and TDP Services in 2016 -2018**

| Year | Sum | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|
| 2016 | 507 | 38% |
| 2017 | 474 | 35% |
| 2018 (as of July 31) | 361 | 27% |
| Total | 1342 | 100% |

The number and types of permits and non-permits have been simplified, to 34 types from the previous 142. Implementing an online application to make it easier for applicants to manage permits. Applicants are made easier to register and monitor their licensing flow and can speed up the licensing process time given, one-day services, simplified permits, SIUP requirements, and Company Registration Certificate (TDP) are equalized.

The results of the initial research conducted by researchers on the community in Nuha, Towuti, and Wasuponda sub-districts that take care of SIUP, showed:

**Table 2 The results of the initial research**

| Indicator | Score | Criterion |
|---|---|---|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Officers' readiness to help the community | 2,87 | Enough |
| Responding to any complaints | 2,67 | Enough |
| Ease of licensing requirements | 3,00 | Enough |
| Speed, alertness, in serving | 2,93 | Enough |
| Service meticulousness | 2,73 | Enough |
| Timeliness of SIUP completion | 2,83 | Enough |

SIUP services show that they are not optimal in terms of increasing responsiveness.

(Sharma, Metri, Dwivedi, & Rana, 2021) Stated that to provide services to the community that are successful and effective, they are faced with various problems, including aspects of government apparatus, society, laws and regulations, procedural mechanisms, facilities and infrastructure, and funds.

According to (Sondakh, Sambiran, & Kumayas, 2020) The low responsiveness of business license services is caused by the lack of competence of bureaucrats in listening to and meeting customer needs. To improve responsiveness, customer listening skills such as surveys, customer follow-ups, community surveys, customer contacts, customer contact reports, customer councils, focus groups, customer interviews, and customer service training (Zingmark & Kylén, 2023) Are needed.

## Research Methods

The study used a descriptive quantitative approach with a questionnaire as an instrument to collect data from 100 respondents from 1,342 populations. The sample was taken using a simple random sampling technique. The data was processed with SPSS version 22 and analyzed using Weight mean score (WMS). The data used consisted of primary and secondary data.

The number of samples is determined using the Slovin formula as follows:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + (N \ x \ e^2)}$$

Information:

n=Sample size/number of respondents

N=Population size

e= error tolerance limit (0.1)

Known

N = 1342 people

So the number of research samples obtained is as follows:

$$So \ \ n = \frac{1342}{1 + (1342 \ x \ 0.1^2)} = 93{,}06$$

The result was 93.06, rounded to 93, to facilitate data processing, the number of samples was rounded up to 100 people.

**Table 3 Responsiveness Measurement**

| Score | Category |
|---|---|
| Response with a score of 1 | Strongly disagree |
| Response with a score of 2 | Disagree |
| Response with a score of 3 | Simply Agree |
| Response with a score of 4 | Agree |
| Response with a score of 5 | Strongly Agree |

Sumber: Sugiyono (2016:93) Skala Likert

Based on the table above, score categories range from 1 to 5, with an interval of 0.8 between each criterion, by subtracting the highest score (5) from the lowest score (1), then dividing by the number of criteria (there are 5). The calculation method uses the Weight *Means Score* (WMS) formula, by (Apriliani, Salbiah, & Wulandari, 2023).

**Table 4 Interpretation Criteria based on the *Weight Means Score* (WMS) Formula**

| Assessment Criteria | Interpretation number interval |
|---|---|
| Very Bad | 1,00 – 1,80 |
| Bad | 1,81 - 2,61 |
| Enough | 2,62 – 3,42 |
| Good | 3,43 – 4,23 |
| Excellent | 4,24 - 5,00 |

Source: (Sugiyono, 2016)

According to (Apriliani et al., 2023) In the journal data obtained from the field and then processed based on respondents' answers through a questionnaire using the Weight *means score* (WMS) formula:

$$M = \sum f(x)/n$$

Information:

M Acquisition of interpretation criteria

f= Answer frequency

x= Weighting of the value scale (score)

∑= Summing

n = sum of all respondents' answers

## Results and Discussion

**Table 5 Validity and Reliability Test of Responsivitas Instrument statement item number 1-25**

| Item | r calculate | r table | Information |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 0,550 | 0,195 | Valid |

| Item | r calculate | r table | Information |
|------|-------------|---------|-------------|
| 2 | 0,531 | 0,195 | Valid |
| 3 | 0,609 | 0,195 | Valid |
| 4 | 0,522 | 0,195 | Valid |
| 5 | 0,635 | 0,195 | Valid |
| 6 | 0,756 | 0,195 | Valid |
| 7 | 0,831 | 0,195 | Valid |
| 8 | 0,688 | 0,195 | Valid |
| 9 | 0,511 | 0,195 | Valid |
| 10 | 0,734 | 0,195 | Valid |
| 11 | 0,791 | 0,195 | Valid |
| 12 | 0,846 | 0,195 | Valid |
| 13 | 0,819 | 0,195 | Valid |
| 14 | 0,747 | 0,195 | Valid |
| 15 | 0,842 | 0,195 | Valid |
| 16 | 0,800 | 0,195 | Valid |
| 17 | 0,776 | 0,195 | Valid |
| 18 | 0,748 | 0,195 | Valid |
| 19 | 0,862 | 0,195 | Valid |
| 20 | 0,516 | 0,195 | Valid |
| 21 | 0,322 | 0,195 | Valid |
| 22 | 0,523 | 0,195 | Valid |
| 23 | 0,320 | 0,195 | Valid |
| 24 | 0,616 | 0,195 | Valid |
| 25 | 0,436 | 0,195 | Valid |

**Table 6 Reliability Test Results**

| Variable | Cronbach's Alpha | Alpha | Information |
|----------|------------------|-------|-------------|
| Responsiveness | 0,892 | 0,600 | Reliable |

The above result shows that all items are valid, because r count is greater than r table. The results of the value of the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of all variables showed the value of the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient> 0.600. This indicates that each of these research instruments has a good level of reliability.

**Table 7 Validity Test Results Factors that Hinder Responsiveness**

| Item | r calculate | r table | Information |
|------|-------------|---------|-------------|
| 1 | 0,411 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 2 | 0,708 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 3 | 0,645 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 4 | 0,549 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 5 | 0,504 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 6 | 0,411 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 7 | 0,375 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 8 | 0,495 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 9 | 0,354 | 0,361 | Invalid |
| 10 | 0,487 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 11 | 0,438 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 12 | 0,418 | 0,361 | Valid |

| Item | r calculate | r table | Information |
|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | 0,525 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 14 | 0,405 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 15 | 0,368 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 16 | 0,371 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 17 | 0,519 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 18 | 0,517 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 19 | 0,360 | 0,361 | Invalid |
| 20 | 0,465 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 21 | 0,439 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 22 | 0,571 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 23 | 0,480 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 24 | 0,400 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 25 | 0,442 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 26 | 0,385 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 27 | 0,418 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 28 | 0,445 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 29 | 0,378 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 30 | 0,331 | 0,361 | Invalid |
| 31 | 0,369 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 32 | 0,394 | 0,361 | Valid |
| 33 | 0,394 | 0,361 | Valid |

The above result shows that all items are valid, because r count is greater than r table. Items number 9, 19, and 30 are invalid because the value of the r count is smaller than the r of the table (0.361). The three items are not used in the subsequent calculations.

**Table 8 Reliability Test Results**

| Variable | Cronbach's Alpha | Alpha | Information |
|---|---|---|---|
| Factors that can hinder responsiveness | 0,901 | 0,600 | Reliable |

The results of the value of the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of all variables showed the value of the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient> 0.600. This indicates that each of these research instruments has a good level of reliability.

**Responsiveness variables and inhibiting factors**

**Table 9  Recapitulation of Responsiveness Variables (n = 100)**

| Indicator | Score | Criterion |
|---|---|---|
| Responding well to applicants | 3,45 | Good |
| Assisting applicants | 3,46 | Good |
| Informing | 3,56 | Good |
| Staff friendliness | 3,58 | Good |
| Courtesy of the officer | 3,55 | Good |
| **Dimension Responding to each applicant** | 17,60/3 | |
| =∑ scores/number of indicators | **3,52** | **Good** |
| **Fast Service** | | |
| Speed of processing applications | 3,32 | Enough |
| Officers do not delay service | 3,40 | Enough |
| Ease of Procedure Licensing requirements | 3,55 | Good |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Service Dimensions at a Time** | 10,27/3 | |
| =∑ scores/number of indicators | **3, 42** | **Enough** |
| **Proper Service** | | |
| Service to the applicant's expectations | 3,38 | Enough |
| Meet the needs of the applicant | 3,40 | Enough |
| Meet the wishes of the applicant | 3,42 | Enough |
| No service errors | 3,58 | Good |
| Conformity with the procedure | 3,42 | Enough |
| **Precise Service Dimensions** | 17,20/5 | |
| =∑ scores/number of indicators | **3,44** | **Good** |
| **Careful Service** | | |
| Focus on providing services | 3,52 | Good |
| Officers' seriousness | 3,53 | Good |
| Officers' thoroughness | 3,55 | Good |
| **Careful Service Dimensions** | 10,60 | |
| =∑ scores/number of indicators | **3,53** | **Good** |
| **Timeliness** | | |
| Punctuality of serving | 3,47 | Good |
| Certainty of the time to complete the permit | 3,52 | Good |
| Timeliness of licensing completion | 3,09 | Enough |
| **Dimension of Timekeeping** | 10,08/3 | |
| =∑ scores/number of indicators | **3,36** | **Enough** |
| **Responding to any complaints** | | |
| Officers respond to the applicant's complaint | 3,40 | Enough |
| The ability of officers to respond quickly to complaints | 3,25 | Enough |
| Give a deadline for resolving complaints | 2,79 | Enough |
| The best solution to complaints | 2,83 | Enough |
| Complaint management mechanism in place | 3,58 | Good |
| Availability of compliant media | 3,60 | Good |
| **Dimension Responding to every complaint** | 19,45/6 | |
| =∑ scores/number of indicators | **3,24** | **Enough** |
| =∑ score/sum of all indicators | 85,20/25 | |
| **Average score of interpretation numbers** | **3,41** | **Enough** |

**Table 10 Recapitulation of Factors Hindering the Responsiveness of Government Apparatus**

| Indicator | Score | Criterion |
|---|---|---|
| Consistency and consequences (leader - subordinate) | 3,43 | Good |
| Employee discipline | 3,46 | Good |
| Professionalism | 3,42 | Enough |
| The welfare of government apparatus in the form of income is still below standard | 3,43 | Good |
| Work motivation | 3,45 | Good |
| Disclosure of information | 3,52 | Good |
| **Dimension of Government Apparatus** | 20,71/6 | |
| =∑ scores/number of indicators | **3,45** | **Good** |
| **Applicant Society** | | |
| Community values, supporting service improvement | 3,43 | Good |
| Applicant's openness to service improvement | 3,45 | Good |
| Heterogeneous levels of education support improved services | 3,43 | Good |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Community discipline and social responsibility | 3,44 | Good |
| People's income is inadequate so high service costs are still felt | 3,43 | Good |
| Public legal awareness | 3,44 | Good |
| **Dimension of the Applicant's Society** | 20,62 /6 | |
| =∑ scores/number of indicators | **3,44** | **Good** |
| **Laws and Regulations** | | |
| SIUP regulations are good not overlapping | 3,40 | Enough |
| Implementation of regulations that guarantee the career of the system | 3,35 | Enough |
| **Dimension of Laws and Regulations** | 6,75/2 | |
| =∑ scores/number of indicators | **3,38** | **Enough** |
| **Mechanism of Procedure** | | |
| Availability of Implementation and technical instructions | 3,55 | Good |
| Adequate information system | 3,56 | Good |
| There are differences in interests in service objectives | 3,51 | Good |
| Direct supervisor supervision | 3,47 | Good |
| **Dimension of Procedure Mechanism** | 14,09/4 | |
| =∑ scores/number of indicators | **3,52** | **Good** |
| **Facilities and Infrastructure** | | |
| Adequate workplace | 3,48 | Good |
| Adequate equipment quantitatively and qualitatively | 3,45 | Good |
| Adequate service facilities | 3,43 | Good |
| **Dimensions of Facilities and Infrastructure** | 10,36/3 | |
| =∑ scores/number of indicators | **3,45** | **Good** |
| **Funds** | | |
| Availability of funds | 3,62 | Good |
| Efficiency of funds | 3,60 | Good |
| **Fund Dimensions** | 7,22/2 | |
| =∑ scores/number of indicators | **3,61** | **Good** |
| **Hearing Ability** | | |
| Applicant satisfaction surveys are conducted periodically | 3,52 | Good |
| The complainant's complaint/complaint is followed up, setting a deadline for responding. | 2,89 | Enough |
| Effectiveness of advice media, complaint service number | 3,04 | Enough |
| Management of complaint follow-up records/reports | 3,39 | Enough |
| A focus group discussion was held | 3,15 | Enough |
| Interview the applicant to find out the complaint | 3,46 | Good |
| Competence of officers to respond to complaints | 3,41 | Enough |
| **Hearing Dimension** | 22,86/7 | |
| =∑ scores/number of indicators | **3,27** | **Enough** |
| =∑ score/sum of all indicators | 102,61/30 | |
| **Average score of interpretation numbers** | **3,42** | **Enough** |

**Responding to Each Applicant**

Responding to each applicant according to (Anggrini, Hafni, Rahman, Bakar, & Fazil, 2024) Is related to the attitude of the officers/apparatus in providing services seen from politeness and friendliness, and includes a good communication attitude.

The results of observation and analysis showed that the communication between the officers and the applicant was good, directing to the front desk, and helping to fill out manual and online forms. The average score of "responding to each applicant" is 3.52 (good category). The service is polite, friendly, and informative.

**Fast Service**

The speed of service, according to (Suadi, Nurlinah, & Syamsu, 2024) Is the promptness and sincerity of officers in answering questions or requests from the community, quickly and easily. Fast service is the speed of processing the applicant's application, not delaying the service, and the ease of the licensing requirements procedure. The results of the analysis of "service quickly" have an average score of 3.42 (adequate). This shows that the speed of serving SIUP licensing services is not optimal and needs to be improved to be more responsive.

**Proper service**

Appropriate services according to the needs, expectations, and desires of the community, with correct and error-free procedures. So that no one feels disadvantaged, and service products are received correctly, appropriately, and legally. The analysis shows that the accuracy of SIUP services is good, with an average score of 3.44 (good). However, the service has not been to the expectations of the community.

**Meticulous service**

Meticulousness in serving, according to (Batalden & Foster, 2021) Careful service is always focused and earnest in providing services to the community. Meticulousness in serving is the ability of officers to always focus and earnestly, thoroughly, and meticulousness in serving is also seen from the accuracy of service by standard operating procedures (SOPs). The results of the "Careful" analysis have an average score of 3.53 (good), the officers are careful, earnest, focused, and meticulous in providing SIUP services.

**Service at the right time**

Punctuality of service, service at the right time according to (Tijsma et al., 2020) This means that the implementation of community services will be completed within a predetermined period. By the licensing time standards, it can provide certainty of service time to the applicant.

The results of the "punctuality" analysis have an average score of 3.36 (adequate), the timeliness of SIUP services is still not optimal. The completion of the permit exceeds the deadline specified in the SOP. Needs to be improved.

**Responding to all complaints**

Each leader of a public service delivery unit is obliged to complete every complaint report, or public complaint regarding dissatisfaction in providing services according to his authority. (Marumahoko, 2023). Service providers must respond to each applicant's complaint, set a deadline for resolution, and provide the best solution.

The results of the analysis showed that "responding to every complaint" SIUP applicant had an average score of 3.24 (adequate), meaning that it was not optimal to respond to all complaints, because the deadline for resolving complaints had not been determined with the lowest score of 2.79 (sufficient). The solutions provided in meeting the needs and expectations of applicants with a score of 2.83 (adequate) still need to be improved.

**Factors that hinder responsiveness**

**Government Apparatus (service provider)**

Apparatus is an employee who carries out service duties that have discipline professionalism, and disclosure of service information. The results of the analysis "Government apparatus" have an average score of 3.45 (good), meaning that SIUP services are good, and employees who carry out service tasks have discipline professionalism, and information disclosure.

**Community (Applicant)**

The value system that applies in the community is needed through involvement and openness, discipline, and social responsibility in receiving services, providing input, submitting complaints, and obeying the obligation to have a SIUP as proof of the legality of the business owned.

The results of the analysis of "applicant community" have an average score of 3.44 (good) which shows that increasing the responsiveness of SIUP services has been good, meaning that the community culture supports services, including in terms of submitting complaints, the level of discipline and responsibility for receiving services and compliance with laws and regulations. The community has legal awareness of taking care of SIUP as an obligation.

**Legal Rules**

SIUP laws and regulations that do not overlap and the implementation of regulations that guarantee the career of the system. Regulations are socialized to the public so that they are understood by the public, as a reference and basis in managing permits.

The results of the analysis of "laws and regulations" have an average score of 3.38 (sufficient) which illustrates that the laws and regulations to improve the responsiveness of SIUP services are not optimal, there is an overlap between SIUP regulations and regulations that guarantee the system's career is not optimal, therefore, it is necessary to carry out socialization and increase the implementation of these regulations.

**Mechanism and Procedure**

Task mechanisms and procedures, implementation, and technical instructions have been provided, the information system supports licensing services properly. Supervisor supervision is carried out. The results of the "Procedural Mechanism" analysis showed an average score of 3.52 (good). This means that the information system is adequate to support the service, the implementation and technical instructions are complete, and the supervisor supervises well.

## Conclusion

Based on the results of the research on the level of responsiveness and the factors that inhibit the responsiveness of the East Luwu Regency Investment and One-Stop Integrated Service Office (DPMDPTSP) in SIUP services, it can be concluded that the level of service responsiveness is still not optimal, especially in terms of service speed, timeliness, and response to each applicant's complaint. Several factors hinder responsiveness, including the existence of overlapping SIUP regulations and the implementation of regulations that ensure a system career that is not optimal. In addition, competence in listening to meet the needs of applicants to improve the responsiveness of SIUP services also needs to be improved.

## Bibliography

Anandita, Tasya Ulfa, & Rahmawati, Imelda Dian. (2024). Responsivitas Penyelenggaraan Pelayanan Kesehatan Di Puskesmas Krian Kabupaten Sidoarjo. *Jurnal Media Akademik (JMA)*, *2*(7).

Anggrini, Hutri Tria, Hafni, Nur, Rahman, Dahlan Ar, Bakar, Muhammad Bin Abu, & Fazil, Muhammad. (2024). Analysis The Implementation of Service Standards for Producing Electronic Population Cards (E-KTP) in The East Aceh District Population and Civil Registration Service. *Malikussaleh Governance and Policy Reviews*, *1*(2).

Apriliani, Afmi, Salbiah, Euis, & Wulandari, Siti. (2023). Employee Work Discipline in Caringin District, Bogor Regency. *Proceeding Djuanda International Conference*, 153–158.

Arfan, Surya, Mayarni, Mayarni, & Nasution, Mimin Sundari. (2021). Responsivity of Public Services in Indonesia during the Covid-19 Pandemic. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*, *4*(1), 552–562.

Batalden, Paul, & Foster, Tina. (2021). From assurance to coproduction: a century of improving the quality of health-care service. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, *33*(Supplement_2), ii10–ii14.

Datutusta, I. Nyoman Gede Prajanata, Rochmah, Siti, & Amin, Fadilah. (2020). Quality of Functional Services for Private University Lecturers (Studies at the Office of LLDIKTI Region VIII). *HOLISTICA–Journal of Business and Public Administration*, *11*(2), 52–62.

Erdiawati, Naditya Kusumaningrum. (2023). Implementation of Risk-Based Business Licensing in Providing Investment Ease for Business Players. *International Journal of Business, Economics and Law*, *30*(1), 112–118.

Hilson, Gavin. (2020). 'Formalization bubbles': a blueprint for sustainable artisanal and small-scale mining (ASM) in sub-Saharan Africa. *The Extractive Industries and Society*, *7*(4), 1624–1638.

Marumahoko, Sylvester. (2023). Urban local government service delivery in post-Mugabe Zimbabwe. In *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance* (pp. 13123–13130). Springer.

Sharma, Sujeet Kumar, Metri, Bhimaraya, Dwivedi, Yogesh K., & Rana, Nripendra P. (2021). Challenges common service centers (CSCs) face in delivering e-government services in rural India. *Government Information Quarterly*, *38*(2), 101573.

Sondakh, Erlangga Y., Sambiran, Sarah, & Kumayas, Neni. (2020). Kualitas Pelayanan Ijin Mendirikan Bangunan Di Dinas Penanaman Modal Dan Pelayanan Terpadu Satu Pintu Di Kota Manado. *JURNAL EKSEKUTIF*, *2*(5).

Suadi, Nur Afifah, Nurlinah, Nurlinah, & Syamsu, Suhardiman. (2024). Responsivity of

Village Government in Community Empowerment at Bababulo Village Office,
Majene Regency, West Sulawesi Province. *Proceedings of the World Conference
on Governance and Social Sciences (WCGSS 2023)*, 448. Springer Nature.

Sugiyono, Sugiyono. (2016). Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, R&D. *Bandung:
Alfabeta*.

Tijsma, Geertje, Hilverda, Femke, Scheffelaar, Aukelien, Alders, Sven, Schoonmade,
Linda, Blignaut, Nadine, & Zweekhorst, Marjolein. (2020). Becoming productive
21st-century citizens: A systematic review uncovering design principles for
integrating community service learning into higher education courses.
*Educational Research*, *62*(4), 390–413.

Yıldız, Taşkın Deniz, & Kural, Orhan. (2020). The effects of the mining operation
activities permit process on the mining sector in Turkey. *Resources Policy*, *69*,
101868.

Zingmark, Magnus, & Kylén, Maya. (2023). Feasibility of a reablement program in a
Swedish municipality. *Scandinavian Journal of Occupational Therapy*, *30*(1), 53–
64.