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Abstract
The article develops and tests a comprehensive background explaining the decision to measure public service performance by conducting citizen surveys. Citizen surveys frequently measure service use in terms of quality or satisfaction. However, little attention has been paid to the relationship between public service use/satisfaction and service space in geographic-urban and social dimensions. Using data from Lithuanian cities Vilnius, Kaunas and Klaipeda we examine relationship between city space factors and perceived public service performance for provision on the basic urban service.
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Introduction
Local authorities in Europe and around the globe use citizen surveys as a performance measurement and management tool. The performance measurement continues to be one of the pressing innovations in municipal administration today (Bouckaert, Halligan, 2008; James, 2011; Kuhlmann, 2010; Charbonneau, Van Ryzin, 2010). The aim of creating value through efficiency is not only a rational thing, but politically acceptable for voters. Citizen surveys often measure service use as well as the perceived performance of services. Normally it is done in the form of satisfaction rating. But little attention has been paid to the basic problems about the relationship between perceived performance and public service use (Charbonneau, Van Ryzin, 2010; Van de Walle, Van Ryzin, 2011; Van de Walle, Van Ryzin, 2011). How do the service performance assessments vary from frequent to infrequent users? Does the form of the relationship differ across the diversity of service delivered by local governments? And does the service expectancy and satisfaction depend on the administrative, geographical, social city space (Pollitt, 2012).

When analysing service satisfaction data, academics and practitioners often tend to interpret the data as given and do not reflect on context factors. Such interpretations have a negative side because the ranks of satisfaction depend on factors that have in fact little to do with the performance of the service (Van de Walle, Van Ryzin, 2011; Dalehite, 2008). Citizens’ of cities surveys focus on the relationship between city space factors and the perceived public service performance for provision on basic urban services.

The aim of the article is to develop and test a framework for explanations or urban/city space factors (in a case of Lithuanian cities) in citizen surveys.

The objectives of research: 1) to develop the theoretical framework for analysis urban/city factors in public service performance measurement; 2) to analyse the relationship between the dissatisfaction in municipal services and the urban/city space factors within Lithuanian cities.

The methods of research are quantitative, comparative and systemic analysis.

Theoretical Framework of the Research
A range of theories has contributed to clarifying the role of performance measures into service provision (Van de Walle, Van Ryzin, 2011; Van Ryzin, 2004). The perspective of implementing performance measures for their value in rational decision making process has usually been linked to the agency aspect, since performance measures in government often seek to move the focus of budgeting management and accountability away from inputs towards results. New public management doctrine has made an important impact on the increase of the usage of public service evaluations (Ariely, 2011; Gudelis, 2007). On the other hand, this instrument became popular in the 1960s with the expansion of government services in the USA. Public performance measure in the form of service use and satisfaction is in the post management toolbox (Dalehite, 2008).

Citizen surveys are considered to be the instruments for good service and infrastructure planning, increasing citizens’ participation, setting...
budget priorities, holding government accountable for results and obtaining information on citizens’ priorities and perceptions. Surveys indicate that 43.1 percent of cities and counties measured citizen satisfaction in the USA twenty years ago (Dalehite, 2008). This instrument is obligatory for Swedish, British municipalities as one of the instruments in performance evaluation models (i.e. ‘Best Value’, Comparative Municipal Quality Networks systems) (Kuhlmann, 2010). They are non-mandatory, but prevalent as an innovative instrument in other European municipalities (Torres, Pina, Martí, 2012).

Recent research shows that surveys are conducted by Lithuanian local authorities either sporadically or for very specific purposes, i.e. mostly for the strategic planning, infrastructure development projects, implementation of service quality systems and for political and symbolic interest (Gudelis, 2007; Marcinkevičiute, Petrauskiene, 2007; Petu-kiene, 2011). It seems that data-collecting process is oriented to political-administrative legitimacy and professional image which is contrary to rational decision making reasons. It is necessary to point out that all municipalities do some office surveys by analysing citizen satisfaction with the first line office services. These users’ satisfaction examinations are required by law (Zin., 2007, No. 94-3779). The research shows that evaluation of service user attitudes is done in some municipalities very superficially, casually. Civil servants rarely are using service gap, ‘on the exit’ or other methods and models (Civinskas, Dvorak, 2011). Taking this into account, reported practices of adoption of surveys could be described as inadequate. However, little in-depth, systematic research has been done to explain context of application of citizen surveys as well as their content and form.

Despite ongoing interest in the use of citizen surveys for measuring government performance, there is some scepticism from practitioners about reliability of this instrument. This position has some rational grounds. Empirical studies indicate that in some cases there is now correlation between subjective (external, i.e. satisfaction surveys) and objective (internal dative, service provision data taken from government records) (Kelly, Swindell, 2002). The research on the factors of citizen satisfaction with municipal services generally reflected such factors as respondents’ social-demographic characteristics, their trust in government and political attitudes as well as personal contact with local government (Van Rynzin, 2004; Van de Walle, Van Rynzin, 2011).

Three decades ago these critical interpretations of performance measures in the form of citizens’ surveys started a search of new objective measures starting from new, more objective survey methods and finishing with multidimensional performance evaluation models. The academic studies linked the drivers of city satisfaction to the specific features of a city or neighbourhood (such as public goods, recreational and cultural facilities), the emotional experiences of the city, interpersonal involvements with service provider and attitudes towards local government, investigating how such features and experiences affect residents’ satisfaction (Swindell, Kelly, 2005). An inclusive model of these three satisfaction drivers (neighbourhood characteristic, contact with service provider and attitudes to local government) suggests that the more governments invested in citizen, the greater their satisfaction with services, regardless of individual and neighbourhood characteristics (Kelly, Swindell, 2002, Van de Walle, Van Rynzin, 2011).

There is also another conceptual and methodological approach to the neighbourhood aspect in satisfaction surveys. Some researchers see advantage in a smaller unit analysis. D. Swindell and J. Kelly argued that more aggregated data (neighbourhood units or similar) would be more appropriate than city wide collected data (2005). Empirical research shows that satisfaction with the service varies within cities. In other words, citizens’ satisfaction surveys demonstrate essentially different level of satisfaction with services across neighbourhoods. There are several strong arguments that ground neighbourhood as an appropriate unit for analysis. Firstly, geographic grouping is reasonable because it captures the level of services. Secondly, such research can show data differences in service which can vary across urban residences. Indeed, there is a considerable support for models in research of patterns in urban service distribution (Kelly, Swindell, 2005). The studies show the effectiveness of citizens’ satisfaction surveys for explanation of public service quality within city neighbourhoods.

This methodological approach correlates with new perspective on public services research. In his book New Perspectives on Public Services: Place and Technology the Place and Face of Public Services (2012) Christopher Pollitt examines which public services shape places and how places shape public services. He premises his argument that policymaking and public administration have to focus on broad approach, the one which embraces both place and technological change. Geographical urban places retain importance for urban service delivery despite application of numerous technological innovations. Indeed, numerous studies show that the centralised management-by-targets and performance regimes have on occasion prevailed in the western public
administration institutions (Pollitt, 2012; Bevan, Hood, 2006; Pollitt, Op de Beeck, 2010; Pollitt, Bouckaert, 2011). In fact, neighbourhood as a traditional space for service provision has many positive effects. At the same time it does not easily fit with the cost-saving, target-achieving focus of some contemporary public-management systems.

Research Methodology

The data to test the theoretical approach comes from the research project “Social Exclusion in Lithuanian Cities: Spatial Segregation and Polarisation Forms” managed by the Social Research Centre at Vytautas Magnus University. The research project was financed by the Research Council of Lithuania in the programme for research groups (Reg. No. MIP-11306). The research was based on survey data. This article uses the part of the data which is related to the estimation of public services in different types of neighbourhoods.

The first section of the questionnaire contained a survey with questions to collect data for such variables as age, gender, employment and others. The research instrument further contained questions about local services provided by the municipality, security in public places, social-economic problems of neighbourhood and other variables. The questionnaire was created by social science scholars from the Social Research Centre at Vytautas Magnus University.

The survey sample was created according to a geographical cluster sampling technique. All respondents were taken from Vilnius, Kaunas or Klaipeda cities or their suburbs. Two key criteria were used in selecting the study sample. Firstly, the residential areas of the cities (neighbourhoods or the smallest administrative units ‘seniunijos’) were divided into four zones: old town, ‘working class’, soviet blocks of flat houses and suburbs. This sampling was based on a traditional concentric zone model (also known as the Burgess model), one of the earliest theoretical models to explain urban social structures. The soviet blocks of flat houses type of neighbourhood is an important segment for the research of post-soviet urban societies. Finally, the sample selection (see Table 1) criteria were defined after discussions with local government officials and other experts. Quota sampling method was used for selecting survey participants according to their sex and age in the prefigured geographical clusters. It was sought that the indicators of the socio-demographic structure of the sample according to sex and age data would correspond to national statistics data of 2011 provided by the Statistics Department of Lithuania. The survey was conducted in the summer of 2012. The overall geographical cluster pooled sample numbered 1890 respondents: 617 in Vilnius, 633 in Kaunas, and 640 in Klaipeda.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating neighbourhoods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre of the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Working class’ near city centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soviet blocks of flat houses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interviews were conducted by employing the face-to-face data collection method in respondents’ households. In order to ensure the highest quality of data collection, 15 per cent of all interviews were checked by telephone calls. The survey was conducted according to all social research quality standards and WAPOR (World Association for Public Opinion Research) rules.

We chose to use descriptive statistical analysis in SPSS 14 for simplicity of presentation and interpretation. The chi-square statistics was calculated for each type of neighbourhood.

Research Results

The first set of data presented citizens’ satisfaction with the provision of police, public transport, primary and secondary education and primary health services. The responses to this rating scale constitute subjective measure of service quality. The answers were arranged in the scale from very
satisfied/excellent to very dissatisfied/poor. The respondents who did not provide an answer were not included in the analysis. Only negative (very dissatisfied/poor and dissatisfied/only fair) answers are analysed in this article (see Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Neighbourhood type</th>
<th>Police services</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Public transport</th>
<th>Primary health services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vilnius</td>
<td>In total:</td>
<td>16.1 %</td>
<td>15.0 %</td>
<td>7.9 %</td>
<td>17.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centre of the city</td>
<td>7.5 %</td>
<td>3.6 %</td>
<td>1.2 %</td>
<td>1.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Working class’</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>2.6 %</td>
<td>11.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soviet type block of flat houses</td>
<td>15.9 %</td>
<td>5.8 %</td>
<td>1.4 %</td>
<td>31.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>17.2 %</td>
<td>33.0 %</td>
<td>27.4 %</td>
<td>29.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaunas</td>
<td>In total:</td>
<td>13.7 %</td>
<td>10.8 %</td>
<td>13.0 %</td>
<td>11.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centre of the city</td>
<td>9.5 %</td>
<td>8.9 %</td>
<td>0.5 %</td>
<td>4.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Working class’</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9.6 %</td>
<td>10.8 %</td>
<td>15.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soviet type block of flat houses</td>
<td>19.1 %</td>
<td>11.1 %</td>
<td>2.0 %</td>
<td>4.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>10.7 %</td>
<td>13.8 %</td>
<td>43.0 %</td>
<td>23.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klaipeda</td>
<td>In total:</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centre of the city</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Working class’</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soviet type block of flat houses</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square Test p value</td>
<td>p=0.000, except Klaipeda (p=0.236)</td>
<td>p=0.000</td>
<td>p=0.000</td>
<td>p=0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first question we cover is whether citizens’ dissatisfaction with municipal services is of general character, or does it differentiate among various services. Table 1 shows that respondents from the cities in Lithuania do not tend to differentiate their dissatisfaction much, even though there are some differences among public services. The data presented in Table 1 support the general finding that there is considerable dissatisfaction with some public services among citizens from different neighbourhoods. Citizens’ dissatisfaction with municipal services depends on the limited accessibility (respondents from suburbs are dissatisfied with public transport and education services) and local problems (safety problems in some neighbourhoods). The results provide considerable support for the theoretical model, which states that satisfaction level in public services essentially differs across the neighbourhoods of cities.

*Police services.* Results from evaluation of police services found to be statistically significant among different cities suburbs (p=0.000), except Klaipeda (p=0.236). Thus, dissatisfaction rating varies among Klaipeda neighbourhoods less than 2.5%. On the contrary, respondents’ ratings are significant from different types of neighbourhoods in Vilnius and Kaunas. The respondents from ‘working class’ neighbourhoods (25%) are mostly dissatisfied with police services. If we look at the overall dissatisfaction data, little difference is found among the police services in this respect. However, the marked differences exist concerning the factors of dissatisfaction. They are mainly determined by the urban (degeneration of the urban space) and social (feeling unsafe as the effect of living in the area of a low socioeconomic status) factors.

*Education services.* Results from evaluation of quality of education services found to be statistically significant among different cities suburbs (p=0.000). The results about this service show considerable variations across the areas in all cities. The respondents from suburbs of Vilnius (33.0 % very dissatisfied and dissatisfied), Kaunas (13.8 %), and Klaipeda (13.8%) expressed dissatisfaction with education services provided in their neighbourhoods (see Table 2). In contrast, other respondents’ preferences were more positive in services provided by schools and preschools. It is an evident that the citizens from centre neighbourhoods in all the cities tend to rank education service most positively. With
regard to satisfaction with schooling institutions, the data showing the strongest dissatisfaction could be related to the limited accessibility to the services. Furthermore, it could be determined by lower quality of the services provided by the institutions in city outskirts and in some socially and economically disadvantaged urban areas (Pauriene, 2011). The respondents from Kaunas had lowest dissatisfaction (10.8%) with education services in comparison to the respondents from Vilnius (15.0%) and Klaipeda (13.8%).

Public transport is the third service analysed. Previous analyses presented that education and police services played an important role in citizens’ evaluations of their community. The survey data shows a similar trend in evaluation of public transport. The respondents from the suburbs of Vilnius (27.4% very dissatisfied and dissatisfied), Kaunas (43.0%), Klaipeda (24.6%) expressed dissatisfaction with public transport services provided in their communities (see Table 2). Public transport quality questions were consistently related low in citizens’ satisfaction surveys according some studies (Kelly, Swindell, 2002; Fellesson, Friman, 2008). In our case, dissatisfaction with transport services comes only from respondents living in the peripheries of a city. Contrary to possible assumptions, the respondents from other neighbourhoods (particularly, from city centre neighbourhoods) were satisfied with services. The findings extend the scope of evidence about urban patterns and the factor of service accessibility effects the citizens’ satisfaction with public services.

The citizen dissatisfaction with access to primary health care services depends not only on urban patterns. The respondents from Vilnius soviet block of flat houses neighbourhoods were extremely dissatisfied with the health care services (31.5 % very dissatisfied and dissatisfied). In comparison, dissatisfaction with this service was noticeably lower in other respondents’ rankings. These results show that citizen satisfaction with services could be explained not only by the limited accessibility to service provider from outskirts of the town. Quality factors (suitability, timely/waiting time for service, references from family doctor to a specialist, etc.) play an important role for expectations and satisfaction according to the studies carried in Klaipeda and Kaunas (Rastenyte et al., 2011; Keliauskaite et al., 2012).

Conclusions and Discussion

The present findings indicate that citizens’ dissatisfaction with public services varies depending on the nature of the services and on geographical/urban factors. The dissatisfaction level with services was found to be high when accessibility of services was limited. Overall, we found less we found less relation between urban geographical and citizen dissatisfaction, except services provided in suburbs. Variations in dissatisfaction among the different cities neighborhoods (except suburbs) are relatively small, but dissatisfaction is highest in primary health care services (Vilnius soviet block of flat houses neighbourhoods). Differences in levels of dissatisfaction can be explained more by social-economic than by social geographical/urban factors. Bearing this in mind, it is possible to analyze smaller variations in the dissatisfaction level with public services across cities social space.

Service quality and satisfaction are not the only criteria citizens use to evaluate government. Performance, trust in government and political factors are also important in formation of generally positive attitude. It should be emphasized that there is no one-factor explanation for variations in dissatisfaction in public institutions. One implication of this study is that the causal relations are contested, composite and multifaceted. Dissatisfaction in public services is a complex mix of expectations, political preconceptions, the actual performance of public services, social-economic factors and urban space variables. To gain a better understanding of the variation in citizens’ dissatisfaction with public services, one need to take a more comparative approach, focusing on fluctuations over time and urban space.

These findings should encourage local politicians and administrators to see the importance of citizens’ satisfaction surveys as a tool for measurement of service gaps and appreciate their value for more careful planning at the intra-city level. They can also essentially be used in combination with more objective performance measures starting form inputs and finishing with outputs. Such tools can advance to a more holistic system for measurement of how local government officials, politicians and administrators are doing in providing the quality of life desired by citizens.

Local government officials may also have to change their plans according to the nature of services involved. In this perspective, the concept of ‘neighbourhood oriented’ management (or ‘neighbourhood oriented governance’) can improve interaction with citizens, through various arrangements. These neighbourhood arrangements were rediscovered by many Dutch cities several years ago and have been successfully implemented since then (Hendriks, Tops, 2003). It is worth to mention that interaction with citizens embraces satisfaction surveys as one of the instruments. Therefore this managerial instrument is combined with others governance like
mechanisms which extend and increase efficiency of interaction between local government and citizens. Lastly, ‘neighbourhood oriented’ management is primarily a model for organisation in terms of municipal service delivery.

‘Neighbourhood oriented’ management can trace its roots back to NPM times when internationally famous ‘Tilburg’ model was implemented by many Dutch local governments (Hendriks, Tops, 1999). It is worth to remember that municipality of Tilburg city rearranged responsibilities at the organisational level and adopted decentralised ‘holding-structure’. Reformers created the Suburb Department for management of specific neighbourhood affairs that incorporated both policy and operational levels. The citizens’ need in services was one of the main reasons in this reorganisation. The Dutch cities reform case could be evaluated as a good practise example for public service provisions. Modernisation of Lithuanian cities’ service has dynamic contextual reasons (rapid demographical decline in Kaunas and Klaipeda, inner migration to outskirts of city) and political-administrative factors (inefficiency in public service delivery in Vilnius city in 2012 and others). Most challenging is the development of public services (especially public transport and education) in suburbs due to enormous service quality gaps. Therefore, a logical step in this line of problem solving is to cooperate with a group of cities and establish meaningful spatial areas within each of their city limits, then compare citizen service satisfaction with more objective measures of service performance data. The answers might provide politicians, officials and administrators with new way to respond to information they receive from multiply measures of service performance.
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**Piliečių apklausos Lietuvos vietos savivaldoje: viešųjų paslaugų vystymo vertinimas**

**Santrauka**


miestų atveju policijos darbą palankiausia vertina centro mikrorajonų respondentai.

Respondentų buvo prašoma įvertinti mokyklų ir darželio teikiamų paslaugų kokybę (toliau – švietimo paslaugų). Šis vertinimas statistiškai reikšmingai skiriasi tarp visų trijų miestų mikrorajonų tipų (p = 0,000). Vilniuje mokyklų ar darželių teikiamų paslaugų kokybę blogai dažniausiai vertina priemiesčio zonos gyventojai (33,0 proc.), o centro respondentai šių paslaugų kokybę vertina palankiau (3,6 proc.). Tik senosios darbininkiskos miesto dalies (17,1 proc.) gyventojai švietimo paslaugų vertinimas yra arti visų skirtingų tipo mikrorajonų vidurkio (15,0 proc.). Akivaizdu, kad norint subalansuoti, pagerinti švietimo paslaugų kokybę, vietos valdžia kaip prioritetinę turėtų išskirti priemiesčio zoną.

Analizuojant švietimo paslaugų kokybę Kauno skirtingų tipų mikrorajonuose, nustatyta, kad priemiesčio zonos respondentai ją įvertino prasčiausiai (13,8 proc.), o centro – geriausiai (8,9 proc.). Šie rezultatai nėra itin nulotų nuo visų kitų skirtingų tipo mikrorajonų gyventojų vertinimo rodiklio (10,8 proc.). Klaipėdoje mokyklų ir darželio teikiamų paslaugų kokybę įvertina centro respondentai (31,6 proc.), o tai daugiau nei penkis kartus didesninė vertinimas nei centro gyventojų (5,9 proc.). Tiek centro, tiek priemiesčio zonos respondentų vertinimas yra similarus nuo bendro vertinimo rodiklio (13,8 proc.).

Apibendrinant trių didmiestių švietimo paslaugų kokybės vertinimo rezultatus, matyti akivaizdi tendencija: priemiesčio zonos respondentai į vertinimo paslaugų kokybę vertina kraštiniai, o centro – palankiausiai. Lyginant miestų rezultatus tarpusavio, atsižvelgiant į geografinį paieškomą dienos, Vilniuje respondentai įvertino gyventojų vertinimą (10,8 proc.).

Susisiekimo ir viešosios transporto paslaugų vertimą įvertino, kad Vilniaus respondentų vertinimą supranta daugiau nei 43,0 proc. respondentų. Susisiekimo ir viešosios transporto paslaugų vertinimo rodiklis yra aukščiausias (11,8 proc.), senosios darbininkų miesto dalies respondentų vertinimo rodiklis yra arčiausias (10,8 proc.).

Apibendrinant Vilniaus, Kauno ir Klaipėdos susisiekimo ir viešosios transporto paslaugų vertimą, matyti, kad Vilniuje susisiekimo ir viešosios transporto paslaugų vertinimą supranta daugiau nei 43,0 proc. respondentų, kurių dauguma įvertina susisiekimo ir viešosios transporto paslaugų kokybę visuotinai. Senosios darbininkų miesto dalies respondentų vertinimą vertina aukščiausias (11,8 proc.), o centro – arčiausias (11,8 proc.).

Apibendrinant tris didmiesčių susisiekimo ir viešosios transporto paslaugų vertimą, matyti, kad Vilniuje susisiekimo ir viešosios transporto paslaugų vertinimas yra aukščiausias (11,8 proc.), o centro – arčiausias (11,8 proc.).

Nepasitenkinimas viešosiomis paslaugomis priklauso nuo paslaugų pobūdžio ir geografinių-urbanistinių miesto veiksnių. Lietuvos didmiesčių gyventojai nepasitenkinimą viešosiomis paslaugomis lemia ribotas prieinamumo. Tačiau tikėtinius sąlyginius darbą prieinamumą, kuriuos respondentai įvertina aukščiausius (11,8 proc.), senosios darbininkų miesto dalies respondentų vertinimas yra aukščiausias (11,8 proc.), o centro – arčiausias (11,8 proc.).

Išvados. Nepasitenkinimas viešosiomis paslaugomis priklauso nuo paslaugų pobūdžio ir geografinių-urbanistinių miesto veiksnių. Lietuvos didmiesčių gyventojai nepasitenkinimą viešosiomis paslaugomis lemia ribotas prieinamumą. Tačiau tikėtinius sąlyginius darbą prieinamumą, kuriuos respondentai įvertina aukščiausius, senosios darbininkų miesto dalies respondentų vertinimas yra aukščiausias (11,8 proc.), o centro – arčiausias (11,8 proc.).
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