

HİTİT SOSYAL BİLİMLER DERGİSİ

Hitit Journal of Social Sciences

e-ISSN: 2757-7949

Cilt | Volume: 18 • Sayı | Number: 2

Ağustos | August 2025

A Study on Citizens' Satisfaction of Local Public Services: The Case of Ankara and Paris

Yerel Kamu Hizmetlerinde Vatandaş Memnuniyeti Üzerine Bir Çalışma: Ankara ve Paris Örneği

İsmail Safa AYDIN

Corresponding Author | Sorumlu Yazar

Dr. | Lecturer

Karabük Üniversitesi, Safranbolu Şefik Yılmaz Dizdar Meslek Yüksekokulu, Yönetim ve Organizasyon Bölümü, Karabük, Türkiye

Karabük University, Safranbolu Şefik Yılmaz Dizdar Vocational School, Department of Management and Organization, Karabük, Türkiye

ismailsafaaydin@karabuk.edu.tr

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4716-8586>

<https://ror.org/04wy7gp54>

Kemal YAMAN

Doç. Dr. | Assoc. Prof.

Karabük Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü, Karabük, Türkiye

Karabük University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Karabük, Türkiye

kyaman@karabuk.edu.tr

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9844-4264>

<https://ror.org/04wy7gp54>

Makale Bilgisi | Article Information

Makale Türü | Article Type: Araştırma Makalesi | Research Article

Geliş Tarihi | Received: 08.01.2025

Kabul Tarihi | Accepted: 19.06.2025

Yayın Tarihi | Published: 31.08.2025

Atıf | Cite As

Aydın, İ. S., & Yaman, K. (2025). A study on citizens' satisfaction of local public services: the case of Ankara and Paris. *Hitit Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 18(2), 330-352. <https://doi.org/10.17218/hititsbd.1616082>

Yazar Katkıları: %60-%40

Değerlendirme: Bu makalenin ön incelemesi iki iç hakem (editörler-yayın kurulu üyeleri) içerik incelemesi ise iki dış hakem tarafından çift taraflı kör hakemlik modeliyle incelendi. Benzerlik taraması yapılarak (Turnitin) intihal içermediği teyit edildi.

Etik Beyan: Bu çalışmanın hazırlanma sürecinde bilimsel ve etik ilkelere uyulduğu ve yararlanılan tüm çalışmaların kaynakçada belirtildiği beyan olunur.

Etik Bildirim: husbededitor@hitit.edu.tr
<https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/hititsbd>

Çıkar Çatışması: Çıkar çatışması beyan edilmemiştir.

Finansman: Bu araştırmayı desteklemek için dış fon kullanılmamıştır.

Telif Hakkı & Lisans: Yazarlar dergide yayınlanan çalışmalarının telif hakkına sahiptirler ve çalışmalarını CC BY-NC 4.0 lisansı altında yayımlanmaktadır.

Author Contributions: 60%-40%

Review: Single anonymized-Two Internal (Editorial board members) and Double anonymized - Two External Double-blind Peer Review. It was confirmed that it did not contain plagiarism by similarity scanning (Turnitin).

Ethical Statement: It is declared that scientific and ethical principles have been followed while conducting and writing this study and that all the sources used have been properly cited.

Complaints: husbededitor@hitit.edu.tr
<https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/hititsbd>

Conflicts of Interest: The author(s) has no conflict of interest to declare.

Grant Support: The author(s) acknowledge that they received no external funding to support this research.

Copyright & License: Authors publishing with the journal retain the copyright to their work licensed under the CC BY-NC 4.0.

A Study on Citizens' Satisfaction of Local Public Services: The Case of Ankara and Paris^{1*}

Abstract

Providing public services effectively and efficiently is one of the most important issues that governments have focused on from the past to the present. Local public services provided by different units are affecting the daily lives of citizens. Given the significance of these services, numerous variables influence their delivery. In the literature, there are various domestic and foreign studies measuring satisfaction with public services. There are many studies that compare the satisfaction of people living in different cities in a country. However, there is no study comparing the satisfaction with local public services that are living in a city in Turkey and a city in another country. This study aims to understand how citizens' satisfaction with local public services and to compare this with different geographical and cultural contexts. In this respect, it is important to compare a city in Türkiye with a city in France, a country that has influenced Türkiye throughout history. This study focuses on local public services provided in metropolitan areas. The aim of the study is to measure and compare the satisfaction levels of the services provided in Ankara and Paris metropolitan areas. This study was conducted by using the survey technique as the primary data collection method. Demographic information is included at the beginning of the survey form and then local public services were listed. 5-point Likert scale was used for the research. Local public services are services for citizens living in a limited area and the survey measured these services. These services are generally provided by local governments, but there are also various services provided by the central government and the private sector. According to the research findings, there are significant differences in the perception of satisfaction with environmental, economic, urban and transportation services between respondents in Ankara and Paris. However, no significant difference was observed in terms of communication, social municipalism and innovation services. According to these results, it is seen that participants in Paris have higher satisfaction perceptions than those in Ankara in all service types.

Keywords: Public Service, Local Public Services, Service Satisfaction, Ankara, Paris

Yerel Kamu Hizmetlerinde Vatandaş Memnuniyeti Üzerine Bir Çalışma: Ankara ve Paris Örneği^{2**}

Öz

Kamu hizmetlerinin etkili ve verimli bir şekilde sunulması, hükümetlerin geçmişten günümüze odaklandığı en önemli konulardan biridir. Farklı birimler tarafından sağlanan yerel kamu hizmetleri, vatandaşların günlük yaşamlarını etkilemektedir. Bu hizmetlerin önemi ile birlikte, bu hizmetlerin sunumunu etkileyen birçok değişken bulunmaktadır. Literatürde kamu hizmetlerinden memnuniyeti ölçen çeşitli yerli ve yabancı çalışmalar bulunmaktadır. Bir ülkenin farklı şehirlerinde yaşayan insanların memnuniyetini karşılaştıran birçok çalışma bulunmaktadır. Ancak, Türkiye'deki bir şehirde ve başka bir ülkedeki bir şehirde yaşayan insanların yerel kamu hizmetlerinden memnuniyetini karşılaştıran bir çalışma bulunmamaktadır. Bu çalışma, vatandaşların yerel kamu hizmetlerinden memnuniyetinin nasıl olduğunu anlamayı ve bunu farklı coğrafi ve kültürel bağlamlarla karşılaştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu açıdan tarih boyunca Türkiye'yi etkileyen bir ülke olan Fransa'daki bir kent ile Türkiye'deki bir kentin karşılaştırılması önemlidir. Bu çalışma, metropol alanlarda sağlanan yerel kamu hizmetlerine odaklanmaktadır. Çalışmanın amacı, Ankara ve Paris metropol alanlarında sağlanan hizmetlerden memnuniyet düzeylerini ölçmek ve karşılaştırmaktır. Bu çalışma, birincil veri toplama yöntemi olarak anket tekniği kullanılarak yürütülmüştür. Anket formunun başında demografik bilgiler yer almış ve ardından yerel kamu hizmetleri listelenmiştir. Araştırma için 5'li Likert ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Yerel kamu hizmetleri sınırlı bir alanda yaşayan vatandaşlara yönelik hizmetlerdir ve anket bu hizmetleri ölçmüştür.

¹ This study is derived from the doctoral dissertation titled Citizen Satisfaction in Local Public Services: The Case of Ankara and Paris.

* The questionnaire prepared for this study was approved by the Social and Human Sciences Research Ethics Committee of Karabük University with the decision dated 18 January 2022.

² Bu çalışma, Yerel Kamu Hizmetlerinde Vatandaş Memnuniyeti Üzerine Bir Çalışma: Ankara ve Paris Örneği başlıklı doktora tezinden üretilmiştir.

** Bu çalışma kapsamında kullanılan anket formu, Karabük Üniversitesi Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Araştırma Etik Kurulu'nun 18.01.2022 tarihli kararı ile onaylanmıştır.

Bu hizmetler genellikle yerel yönetimler tarafından sağlanmakla birlikte, merkezi hükümet ve özel sektör tarafından sağlanan çeşitli hizmetler de bulunmaktadır. Araştırma bulgularına göre, Ankara ve Paris'teki katılımcılar arasında çevresel, ekonomik, kentsel ve ulaşım hizmetlerine ilişkin memnuniyet algısında önemli farklılıklar bulunmaktadır. Ancak iletişim, sosyal belediyeçilik ve yenilik hizmetleri açısından önemli bir fark gözlenmemiştir. Bu sonuçlara göre, Paris'teki katılımcıların tüm hizmet türlerinde Ankara'daki katılımcılardan daha yüksek memnuniyet algılarına sahip olduğu görülmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kamu Hizmeti, Yerel Kamu Hizmeti, Hizmet Memnuniyeti, Ankara, Paris

Introduction

In today's world, the effective and efficient delivery of public services are critical factor in determining the well-being of societies. Local public services have significant impact on the daily lives of citizens. In this context, the quality of services provided by local governments and citizen satisfaction has become a complex subject involving various variables. The impact of citizen's satisfaction with local public services plays a critical role in the social, economic, and cultural development of modern societies.

Through comparative studies on satisfaction with local public services across various cities and countries, it becomes possible to evaluate the social welfare levels in these nations. In addition to that, these studies are also important in terms of evaluating social policies and local government systems in these cities. The results of these studies can guide the development of more effective urban policies by identifying which services are performing better than others. These studies also help to understand the best services and practices between countries. This makes it possible to apply these services and practices to other cities and regions. Measuring satisfaction with local public services contributes to determining the level of public participation in services.

Ankara and Paris are two prominent capitals that stand out for their strategic geographical locations, rich cultural heritage, and distinctive administrative structures. These cities are leading centers for Turkish and French local governments. The Turkish and French administration systems exhibit similarities and differences in various aspects. First, both states are shaped by a unitary state structure. Secondly, throughout the history, these two states have been under the influence of centralism. Thirdly, French influence is quite dominant in Turkish public administration since the Ottoman Empire era. The impact of this influence can be observed in the formation, structure and functioning of local governments too. This study aims to contribute to the understanding of the differences and similarities in citizen's satisfaction with local public services in French and Turkish cities.

Furthermore, Paris and Ankara represent contrasting socio-economic and urban profiles within a common framework of metropolitan challenges, including urbanization, population density, and public service demands. Beyond their institutional roles, Paris and Ankara also share key social and cultural traits as national capitals. Both attract internal migrants and international visitors. And this leading to diverse multi-ethnic populations. Both cities host a vibrant arts scene, nurture leading institutions, and play a central role in shaping national identity and values. Paris, as a global metropolis within a highly developed country, and Ankara, as a major Turkish city with rapid growth, face similar public service issues but approach them with different administrative tools and resources. By analyzing satisfaction levels in these two cities, this study not only provides insights into citizen expectations across diverse settings but also highlights best practices that can be adapted to enhance policies in similar urban contexts.

This study contributes to a deep understanding of the delivery of local public services and the alternative delivery options of local governments. In addition, comparing examples from different geographical and cultural contexts will provide a general perspective. It will help to understand more broadly the concept of universality or locality of local public services.

1. Literature Review

There are many studies made in Turkish and international literature on local public service satisfaction. Most of the studies focus on measuring, comparing, and determining what needs to be done to improve the satisfaction with the services provided by municipalities. Bernhard et al. (2018) examined the relationship between the degree of e-government in Swedish municipalities and citizens' satisfaction in their study. In their study, Çolak et al. (2018) measured the expectations of young people from the services provided by metropolitan municipalities and their satisfaction with these services. Karagianni and Theriou (2018) examined citizen satisfaction with the services provided by the Kavala Transport and Communication Department of Greece. Akçakaya and Ecer (2020) conducted research on those living within the borders of Kars Municipality to measure satisfaction with local services. Söylemez and Şahin (2018) conducted a study on the example of Mamak Municipality to measure citizens' perception of municipal services and their expectations of municipal services. Lakovic (2020) conducted research that evaluated the performance of urban services according to citizen satisfaction using structural equation modeling. Türkmen and Zengin (2020) measured the satisfaction level of citizens with the services provided by public institutions in the example of Niğde province. Wesemann (2020) measured the impact of the services provided by local governments on the quality of life of citizens. Cömertler and Çundur (2021) investigated the relationship between demographic features and the level of satisfaction with public services. Islam and Ahsan (2021) examined the relationship between the perception of the quality of local public services and citizens' satisfaction in Bangladesh. Kayar (2021) conducted a study on the example of Ordu, Tekirdağ, Manisa and Mardin Metropolitan Municipalities to measure satisfaction with local public services. In his study, Korkut (2021) compared the satisfaction levels with the services provided by municipalities. Berdibek (2022) conducted a survey in the TRB-1 region to examine municipal service quality and determine the dimensions of service quality that affect citizen satisfaction. Dağ (2023) measured the expectations and perceptions of Generation Z with local public services in the example of Ankara Metropolitan Municipality. Manaf et al. (2023) examined the perceptions of citizens and local public officials in Malaysia regarding local public service delivery. Sözen (2023) examined satisfaction with the public services provided for disabled people in metropolitan cities.

2. Public Services Delivery and Citizen's Satisfaction

Public services are services that everyone living in that country can benefit from. Governments determine what are public services. Governments also decide how and by whom public services will be delivered. The aim of public services is public interest rather than profit making. Definitions regarding the concept of public services are generally made in terms of public interest. Collins Dictionary defines public services as; "... something such as health care, transport or the removal of waste which is organized by the government or an official body in order to benefit all the people in a particular society or community". Ozer (2019) defines public service as; "services that the state and other public legal entities perform directly or outsource to private persons under their supervision and control in order

to meet the general and common needs of the society". Jackson (2020) also defines it as "... is composite of activities needed by the general public but cannot be availed in the open market unless through resource allocation provided by the government".

Public services are executed to meet various needs resulting from people living together. These, constantly changing, services must be provided impartially. Public services must be delivered without any interruption and without charging a fee. These services are delivered on a regular basis because of the importance of ensuring the satisfaction of citizens. Due to the importance of the service deliverance, public services can be defined as the reason for the existence of the state (Sezer, 2008). Therefore, the delivery of public services affects the trust of the state by citizens and the trust of the international community and the appearance of the state.

2.1. The Concept of Local Public Services

Public services can be categorised based on criteria such as the structure of the service offered, its subject matter, and the geographical area in which it is provided. Some services are delivered in certain local areas while others are delivered to everyone in the country. Local public services and national public services associate the service with the area where the services are delivered. According to Banazili (2018), public services that are delivered at the whole country level, such as security, justice, education, and health are classified as national public services. Services which are delivered at the local level, such as urban transportation, sewage, pavement, water and garbage collection services, are classified as local public services.

The number of people living in cities is constantly increasing because of globalization, information and communication technology developments and population growth. This increase also forces states, institutions and organizations which are delivering services in cities, to make changes in the way that they serve those services. The high speed of these developments also affects local services and demands. Today, the structure of public administration has transformed. Citizens demand more efficient, transparent, accountable, fast and democratic services. To meet these demands, different structures participate in the delivery of local services. Local governments, non-governmental organizations and private organizations, as well as the state takes part in it.

Local public services can be delivered by the central government through provincial organizations and local governments. It also can be delivered by private sector organizations, under the control of the state. The increase of the population in cities increases the type of urban services and the importance given to urban services. Local public services are closely related to the citizens living in a certain area. The dominant political structure, the country's level of democracy, the relations of the central government with local units and the service areas of local units also affect local public services.

2.2. Satisfaction with Local Public Services

To ensure satisfaction with public services, it is necessary to measure how these services are perceived. Measuring satisfaction with local public services is important for local government organizations for many reasons. First, they are the closest service deliverers to the citizens. Secondly, they deliver services that are affecting the daily life of the citizens. So, citizens can directly see and experience local services. Thirdly, their decision-making bodies are elected. Public service providers who are concerned about being re-elected pay more attention to

citizens' satisfaction or dissatisfaction with services. Even with all this importance the citizens can be dissatisfied with these services. The reasons for citizens' dissatisfaction with public services may consist of differences between citizens' expectations and the performance of public institutions and various economic, political, administrative and cultural dimensions (Turan et al., 2017).

Various notions that affect the satisfaction or dissatisfaction of citizens with the delivery of local public services. It is possible to list these notions as locality, effectiveness, centralization, participation in management and change.

Locality is an important factor in the delivery of effectiveness of public services. While distributing the authority and duty in service delivery, the geographical proximity of the unit that will provide the service and those who will receive the service are considered. A local government organization that does not have sufficient economic capacity can cooperate with a unit close to it to satisfy the citizens in the area it serves. These services are undertaken by a higher unit or central management.

Efficiency is also an important notion for local public services. Small local government units can't deliver some services within their own financial, administrative and technical means. Even if they provide these services, it costs more. Delivering local services to more or less than the most appropriate areas will make units less efficient. Citizens will not be satisfied with the services produced by these units.

The concept of centralization has negative meanings in public service delivery. Various methods are also applied to reduce the negative effects of centralization. Decentralization is the opposite of centralization. With decentralization, various powers, duties and resources owned by the center are transferred to local units. Thus, the delivery of local public services is carried out by the closest and most responsible unit. It is very important to ensure the participation of citizens in local units. Because the decisions which are taken for services are affecting their daily lives. It's very clear that centralism needs to be reduced. And that helps to ensure legitimacy and increase the degree of participation in decisions. Thus, by ensuring the participation of the public and non-governmental organizations in local government, local administrators can become more auditable.

Change can be mentioned as the last notion that affects local public services. The concept of change contains the idea of transformation from traditional public service to the new public service. It also contains the mental transformation that occurs in citizens and public service deliverers. Public services need to be delivered to citizens in a different way than before.

2.3. Urban Rights and Local Public Services

As the urban population has grown, so have discussions about cities and the issues faced by urban residents. Access to and quality of local services, and democratic participation rights, are among the main topics of discussion. The right to the city is a key concept in the provision of local public services. This concept emerged from Henri Lefebvre's 1968 work *Le Droit à la ville* (Dinçer, 2016). Influenced by debates about capitalism at the time, Lefebvre viewed the right to the city as a form of resistance against the commodification of urban areas. He emphasises that the city should not be shaped by capital owners, but rather be made liveable for everyone, in line with the needs of city residents (Özdemir Metlioğlu, 2021). Therefore,

Lefebvre's work can be seen as evaluating the city and the right to the city from a Marxist perspective.

The right to the city is often confused with urban rights. Lefebvre defines the right to the city as being broader than urban rights. While urban rights address the needs of individuals within the confines of the existing system, the right to the city transcends these limitations and encompasses objectives such as the city's social and cultural development and democratisation (Özdemir Metlioğlu, 2021). Lefebvre (1996) describes the right to city as "superior form of rights: right to freedom, to individualization in socialization, to habitat and to inhabitat". Similarly, Lefebvre (1996) states that the right to the city is realised through participation in decision-making processes concerning the city, as well as through equal access to urban resources. In this context, local public services can be considered a fundamental tool for realising the right to the city. These services directly affect citizens' daily lives and are where social justice and social inclusion are put into practice. The democratic, fair and participatory provision of these services is critical for moving the right to the city from theory to practice (Purcell, 2002).

Various documents have been prepared to regulate urban rights. The most prominent of these is the European Urban Charter, which was approved by the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe. It is widely considered one of the most important sources on urban rights. In addition to the 1992 charter, the European Urban Charter II: Manifesto for a New Urbanity, was adopted in 2008 (Pektaş and Akın, 2010). Urban rights described and explained in these documents as: security, an unpolluted and healthy environment, employment, housing, mobility, health, sport and leisure, culture, multicultural integration, good quality architecture and physical surroundings, harmonisation of functions, participation, economic development, sustained development, services and goods, natural wealth and resources, personal fulfilment, inter-municipal collaboration, financial mechanisms and structures and equality (Council of Europe, 2009).

3. Ankara and Paris Municipalities

In Türkiye, local government organizations are municipalities, special provincial administrations and villages. Special provincial administrations are serving local public services in the provincial areas. Villages are the smallest local public service providers. Municipalities are the most important local authorities with their features such as being close to the public, having the ability to deliver fastly and providing services that affect the daily life of citizens. And 93.4% of Türkiye's population lives within the municipal borders (TUIK, 2022).

The special form of government called metropolitan municipality stands out among other municipalities. Metropolitan municipalities differ from other municipalities in terms of their duties, powers, areas of responsibility, resources and the population they serve. Ankara is the capital of Türkiye and it's one of the 30 metropolitan municipalities of Türkiye. Ankara and its surroundings have had a strategic location throughout history. This city, which has hosted different states and cultures in the past, is also very important economically as it is located on trade and transportation routes.

The bodies of Ankara Metropolitan Municipality are the Metropolitan Municipality Council, the Metropolitan Municipality Board and the Metropolitan Municipality Mayor. Ankara Metropolitan Municipality Council serves as the decision-making body. Ankara Metropolitan

Municipality Board serves as the executive and advisory body of the metropolitan municipality. The executive body of Ankara Metropolitan Municipality is the president. As the highest authority of the municipal organization, he is responsible for the municipal administration. The personnel in the municipal organization are appointed by the metropolitan mayor.

Ankara Metropolitan Municipality is governed by the "Metropolitan Municipality Law" numbered 5216 in 2004. Until today the most significant changes were made in this law with the numbered 6360, enacted in 2012. Thus, Ankara Metropolitan Municipality started to provide services on a provincial scale. While Ankara started to be governed as a single central district, today it has reached 25 districts.

In France, in the 72nd article of the V. Republic constitution, local governments are listed as municipalities, provinces, regions, administrations with special status and overseas administrations. Municipalities, based on settlement areas created by the church in the period between the 10th and 12th centuries, are still quite common today as the oldest administrative structures in France (Arslan, 2019).

The Île de France region, where Paris is located, is among the best regions in the world in terms of prosperity. The regional administration does not have any hierarchical power over the Paris Municipality and there is constant competition between these two administrations (Ekici, 2019). The Paris metropolitan area administration consists of 12 regions, and it's called the Greater Paris Metropolis. The Greater Paris Metropolitan Municipality is governed by the president, the Metropolitan Office (Bureau Métropolitain) and the Metropolitan Assembly (Conseil Métropolitain). There are 20 district municipalities in Paris, and they do not have a separate legal personality from the city of Paris (Erol, 2021). Districts have district councils, and a president is elected from this council. These councils provide advisory services rather than decision-making authority. The districts carry out the duties transferred to them from the Paris municipality.

4. Research Method

4.1. Subject, Scope and Limitations of the Research

The subject of the research is to compare local public services in Ankara and Paris and identify differences in services. The research was conducted on people living in Ankara Metropolitan Municipality and Paris Metropolitan Area. Research is limited to local public services included in the survey form.

4.2. Purpose and Importance of the Research and Research Problem

The research aims to compare the satisfaction of local public services in Ankara and Paris and to determine in which city which services are more satisfied. The research measures the satisfaction of residents with local public services of two cities in two different countries. Although there are many studies examining Turkey and France, there is no study comparing Ankara and Paris in terms of local public services. The research problem is "What is the difference between the satisfaction level of local public services of citizens living in Ankara and Paris?".

4.3. Research Model

The questions created in this direction were grouped under 7 factors. These factors are environmental services, transportation services, urban services, social municipal services,

economy services, communication services and innovation services. There are 11 hypotheses of the research. These hypotheses were created for both Ankara and Paris, and the last hypothesis is to compare them.

Hypotheses of the research:

H1: The perception of satisfaction with local public services among individuals living in Ankara varies according to their genders.

H2: The perception of satisfaction with local public services among individuals living in Ankara varies according to their ages.

H3: The perception of satisfaction with local public services among individuals living in Ankara varies according to their educational backgrounds.

H4: The perception of satisfaction with local public services among individuals living in Ankara varies according to their professions.

H5: The perception of satisfaction with local public services among individuals living in Ankara varies according to the districts they reside in.

H6: The perception of satisfaction with local public services among individuals living in Paris varies according to their genders.

H7: The perception of satisfaction with local public services among individuals living in Paris varies according to their ages.

H8: The perception of satisfaction with local public services among individuals living in Paris varies according to their educational backgrounds.

H9: The perception of satisfaction with local public services among individuals living in Paris varies according to their professions.

H10: The perception of satisfaction with local public services among individuals living in Paris varies according to the districts they reside in.

H11: There is a significant difference between the satisfaction perceptions with local public services of individuals living in Paris and Ankara according to service types.

4.4. Population and Sample

This study was conducted with citizens who benefit from the services delivered in the area with the responsibility of Ankara Metropolitan Municipality and Paris Metropolitan Area. While the population of Ankara Metropolitan Municipality is 5 million 663 thousand people, 11 million 142 thousand people live in the Paris Metropolitan Area. The total universe is 16 million and 805 thousand. The share of Paris in this universe is calculated as 66% and the share of Ankara is 34%. Accordingly, the formula $n = \frac{N \cdot t^2 \cdot p \cdot q}{(d^2 \cdot (N-1) + t^2 \cdot pq)}$ was used to determine the number of samples. In the formula meanings are;

N: Number of individuals in the target audience

n: Number of individuals to be sampled

p: Frequency (probability) of the event examined

q: Frequency of occurrence of the examined event (probability of not occurring)

t: The theoretical value in the t table at a certain level of significance and the level of error determined

d: the sampling error is accepted according to the frequency of occurrence of the event.

Using this formula, $N=16,805,000$, taking $p=0.5$ for $\alpha=0.05$ significance level and $d=0.05$ margin of error, and applying the data from these two metropolises to the formula, the sample size was found to be 384 (Altunışık et al., 2012). For this purpose, it was aimed to distribute 450 surveys, assuming that there might be surveys that were not returned or were incorrect. However, considering the population ratios of Paris and Ankara within the total population, it was deemed appropriate to limit the sample to 442 surveys. In this case, it was aimed to complete 292 (66%) surveys in Paris and 150 (34%) surveys in Ankara. A random sampling method was used to select the people who were surveyed.

4.5. Data Collection

The survey technique was used as the primary data collection method in the research. The survey form has been approved by the decision of Karabük University Social and Humanities Research Ethics Committee dated 18.01.2022. Two methods were followed to collect data. First, surveys were conducted by the researcher in Paris between May 4, 2022, and May 6, 2022. Between these dates, a team of 4 people and the researcher visited parks, cafes, etc. in Paris to fill out face-to-face survey forms. 107 survey forms were given to individuals consisting of volunteers in the places. By excluding the incorrect and incomplete survey forms, 97 of them were used in the research. Secondly, a survey form was created via Google Forms and the link to the survey form was distributed via social media. This virtual survey form was stopped when it reached 185. As a result of examining the online survey forms, 19 survey forms that did not contain sufficient data were removed and 166 forms were evaluated. Thus, a total of 263 surveys in Paris were used in the analysis. In Ankara, 150 online survey returns were received and 5 of them that were incorrect were removed and 145 were evaluated, thus, a total of 408 surveys were analyzed.

4.6. Data Analysis

The collected data were processed through the SPSS program with the help of an expert. Arithmetic mean, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis coefficient tests were used in the analysis of the data. In the study, Skewness and Kurtosis values were examined to determine whether the groups showed normal distribution. These values are considered to be normal distributions when they are between -1.5 and +1.5 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). In the study, Skewness values were observed between -0.449 and 0.121, and Kurtosis values were observed between 0.901 and 0.241. Therefore, the data shows a normal distribution. In this regard, two groups of T-Test and ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) tests, independent of parametric tests, were applied. LSD method, one of the Post-Hoc multiple comparison tests, was applied to determine the ones with significant differences in the ANOVA test.

5. Results

In this part of the study, the data obtained by examining the satisfaction levels of the people in Ankara and Paris with local public services are presented within the framework of statistical analysis. First, the demographic characteristic of the research is explained. Next, a comparison of satisfaction in Ankara and Paris has been made depending on participants' gender, age, education, profession, and district they live in. Finally, hypothesis results are given.

5.1. Findings Regarding Demographic Characteristics

In Ankara, 65.5% of the participants were women and 34.5% were men. In Paris, the gender data of the participants are similar, with women at 51.7% and men at 48.3%. In Ankara, 31.72% of the participants are people between the ages of 26-35, 29.65% are people aged 25 and under, 20.68% are people between the ages of 36-45, and 11.72% are people aged 46-45. In Paris, 39.16% are from people aged 26-35, 23.59% are from people aged 36-45, 20.91% are from people aged 25 and under, and 12.16% are from people aged 46-45. According to this distribution, many of the participants in both cities consist of people between the ages of 26-35.

63.44% of the participants in Ankara are university graduates, 23.44% are high school graduates, 10.34% are postgraduate graduates, 2.06% are secondary school graduates and 0.68% are primary school graduates. 59.31% of the participants in Paris are university graduates, 26.99% are high school graduates, 9.88% are postgraduate graduates, 2.6% are secondary school graduates and 1.14% are primary school graduates. Participants in the research in both cities mainly consist of university graduates.

24.82% of the participants in Ankara are civil servants, 24.13% are students, 14.48% are members of other professions, 13.1% are laborers, 7.58% are tradesmen/employers, 4.82% are housewives, 4.13% are teachers/academics, 3.44% are retirees and 3.44% are unemployed. 28.51% of the participants in Paris are from other professions, 16.34% are tradesmen/employers, 12.16% are civil servants, 11.78% are students, 8.36% are unemployed people, 7.6% are laborers, 6.46% are teachers/academics, 4.56% are retirees and 4.18% are housewives. Approximately half of the population in Ankara consists of civil servants and students. In Paris, approximately half of the participants consist of other professionals, tradesmen/employers and civil servants.

37.24% of the participants in Ankara live in Çankaya, 15.17% in Yenimahalle, 13.1% in Keçiören, 9.65% in Etimesgut and the rest live in other districts. 13.68% of participants in Paris reside in 19ème, 12.92% in 18ème, 10.26% in 17ème, 9.5% in 16ème and the rest in other districts. Many participants of Ankara reside in Çankaya. The district where the participants mostly reside in Paris is 19ème. Table 1 shows the socio-demographic characteristics of the participants in the study.

Table 1. Socio-Demographical Characteristics of the Participants

Demographic Features	Options	Ankara		Paris	
		N	%	N	%
Gender	Woman	95	65.50	136	51.70
	Male	50	34.50	127	48.30
Age	25 and below	43	29.65	55	20.91
	26-35	46	31.72	103	39.16
	36-45	30	20.68	62	23.59
	46-55	17	11.72	32	12.16
	56 and older	9	6.20	11	4.18
Educational Status	Primary Education	1	0.68	3	1.14
	Secondary Education	3	2.06	7	2.66
	High School	34	23.44	71	26.99
	University	92	63.44	156	59.31
Profession	Graduate	15	10.34	26	9.88
	Officer	36	24.82	32	12.16
	Tradesman/Emp.	11	7.58	43	16.34
	Laborer	19	13.10	20	7.60
	Teacher/Academic.	6	4.13	17	6.46

Table 1. Socio-Demographical Characteristics of the Participants (cont'd)

Retired	5	3.44	12	4.56
Housewife	7	4.82	11	4.18
Student	35	24.13	31	11.78
Unemployed	5	3.44	22	8.36
Other	21	14.48	75	28.51

5.2. Comparison of Satisfaction in Ankara and Paris by Gender

There is no significant difference between men and women in satisfaction with all services in Ankara and Paris ($p>0.05$). In Ankara, men's satisfaction perceptions ($\bar{X}=3.113$) are higher than women's satisfaction perceptions ($\bar{X}=3.107$). In Paris, women's satisfaction perceptions ($\bar{X}=3.378$) are higher than men's satisfaction perceptions ($\bar{X}=3.252$). The T-test comparison results of the satisfaction of the participants in Ankara and Paris according to their gender are given in Table 2. It shows that there is no significant difference according to the gender of the participants in Ankara in their satisfaction with the environment, urban, transportation, social municipality, economy, communication, and innovation services ($p>0.05$).

Table 2. T-test results by gender in service types

Service Variables	Residence	n	Gender		t	p
			Woman	Man		
Environment	Ankara	145	3.223	3.152	0.461	0.646
	Paris	263	3.417	3.286	1.695	0.091
Urban	Ankara	145	3.089	3.050	0.243	0.809
	Paris	263	3.462	3.292	0.226	0.027*
Transportation	Ankara	145	2.970	3.063	-0.628	0.531
	Paris	263	3.411	3.397	0.160	0.873
Social Municipal	Ankara	145	3.198	3.161	0.215	0.830
	Paris	263	3.384	3.254	1.767	0.078
Economy	Ankara	145	2.856	2.726	0.685	0.494
	Paris	263	3.122	3.005	1.277	0.203
Communication	Ankara	145	3.151	3.280	-0.680	0.497
	Paris	263	3.358	3.225	1.586	0.114
Innovation	Ankara	145	2.968	3.220	-1.215	0.226
	Paris	263	3.098	2.968	1.401	0.162
All Services	Ankara	145	3.107	3.113	-0.038	0.970
	Paris	263	3.378	3.252	1.192	0.056

Note: *Significant difference ($p<0.05$)

In Paris, there is no significant difference in the gender of the participants and their satisfaction with the environment, transportation, social municipality, economy, communication, and innovation services ($p>0.05$). There is a significant difference in terms of gender among participants in Paris in terms of satisfaction with urban services ($p<0.05$).

5.3. Comparison of Satisfaction in Ankara and Paris by Gender

There is no significant difference in the satisfaction perception of the participants from all services in Ankara according to age groups ($p>0.05$). In Paris, a significant difference was found in the participants' perception of satisfaction with all services according to age groups ($p<0.05$). In Paris, the satisfaction perception of the 25 and underage group ($\bar{X}=3.158$) is higher than others in all services. ANOVA test results of the satisfaction of the participants in Ankara and Paris according to their gender are given in Table 3. To ensure that the ANOVA test results in Table 3 are accurate, 9 people aged 56 and over living in Ankara and 11 people aged 56 and over living in Paris were included in the age group of 46 and over.

According to the ANOVA test results, there is no significant difference in the satisfaction of environmental, urban, transportation, communication, and innovation services according to the ages of the participants in Ankara ($p>0.05$). There is a significant difference in the satisfaction of the participants with social, municipal and economic services in Ankara

according to their age ($p < 0.05$). LSD test, one of the Post-Hoc multiple comparison tests, was applied to determine between which age groups have significant differences. It has been determined that there is a significant difference in social municipal services between the participants whose ages are 25 and under and those between the ages of 26-35, and between those ages 25 and under and those ages 46 and over. In Ankara ($\bar{X}=3.144$), the age range of the participants with the highest level of satisfaction perception in economic services is 26-35, while the lowest level of satisfaction perception belongs to the participants in the 25 and under age group.

Table 3. ANOVA test results according to ages in service types

Service Variables	Residence	Age				F	p	Post Hoc (LSD)
		25 and above ¹	26-35 ²	36-45 ³	46 and over ⁴			
Environment	Ankara	2.941	3.423	3.287	3.125	2.450	0.066	
	Paris	3.565	3.276	3.284	3.369	2.935	0.034	
	Ankara	2.9678	3.319	3.041	2.863	1.854	0.140	
Urban	Paris	3.597	3.290	3.394	3.298	3.264	0.022*	1-2* 1-4*
	Ankara	2.945	3.126	2.916	2.974	0.502	0.682	
Transpor.	Paris	3.657	3.318	3.362	3.348	3.041	0.030*	1-2* 1-3* 1-4*
	Ankara	2.942	3.515	3.251	2.926	3.558	0.016*	1-2* 2-4*
Social Municipal	Paris	3.494	3.281	3.244	3.308	2.064	0.105	
	Ankara	2.503	3.144	2.955	2.564	3.426	0.019*	1-2* 2-4*
Economy	Paris	3.315	3.035	3.059	2.829	3.660	0.013*	1-2* 1-4*
	Ankara	3.055	3.417	3.233	2.992	1.215	0.307	
Communication	Paris	3.432	3.182	3.409	3.218	2.468	0.063	
	Ankara	2.899	3.347	3.133	2.705	2.018	0.114	
Innovation	Paris	3.200	2.957	3.075	2.953	1.484	0.219	
	Ankara	2.935	3.360	3.140	2.919	2.346	0.075	
All Services	Paris	3.518	3.244	3.300	3.260	3.532	0.015*	1-2* 1-3* 1-4*

Note: *Significant difference ($p < 0.05$)

In Paris, there is no significant difference in the participants' perception of satisfaction with the environment, social municipality, communication and innovation services according to their age ($p > 0.05$). There is a significant difference in urban, transportation and economic services ($p < 0.05$). Among the age groups with significant differences in urban services ($\bar{X}=3.597$), transportation services ($\bar{X}=3.657$) and economic services ($\bar{X}=3.315$), the highest satisfaction perception was found in the age group of 25 years and under.

5.4. Comparison of Satisfaction in Ankara and Paris by the Education Level

There is no significant difference in satisfaction with all services in Ankara and Paris according to education level ($p > 0.05$). While participants with a high school diploma in Ankara ($\bar{X}=3.125$) have the highest perception of satisfaction with all services, the lowest perception of satisfaction is seen in participants with a graduate education level ($\bar{X}=3.089$). Participants with a bachelor's degree in Paris ($\bar{X}=3.059$) have a high perception of satisfaction. The lowest

satisfaction perception was found in participants at the postgraduate education level ($\bar{X}=2.923$).

Table 4. ANOVA test results according to education level in service types

Service Variables	Residence	Education			F-stat	p-value	Post Hoc (LSD)
		High School ¹	Undergraduate ²	Postgraduate ³			
Environment	Ankara	3.207	3.206	3.133	0.046	0.955	
	Paris	3.316	3.366	3.399	0.240	0.786	
Urban	Ankara	3.153	3.076	2.871	0.524	0.593	
	Paris	3.340	3.402	3.375	0.266	0.767	
Public Transport	Ankara	3.092	3.003	2.871	0.792	0.455	
	Paris	3.411	3.432	3.217	1.019	0.363	
Social Municipality	Ankara	3.117	3.202	3.254	0.146	0.864	
	Paris	3.273	3.350	3.297	0.467	0.628	
Economy	Ankara	2.587	2.844	3.177	1.741	0.179	
	Paris	2.876	3.136	3.230	4.048	0.019*	1-2* 1-3*
Comm.	Ankara	3.284	3.130	3.373	0.496	0.610	
	Paris	3.249	3.341	3.153	1.086	0.339	
Innovation	Ankara	3.114	2.985	3.333	0.614	0.543	
	Paris	3.024	3.059	2.923	0.380	0.684	
All Services	Ankara	3.125	3.106	3.089	0.011	0.989	
	Paris	3.024	3.059	2.923	0.380	0.684	

Note: *Significant difference ($p<0.05$)

In Table 4, for the ANOVA results to be accurate, 1 primary school graduate and 3 secondary school graduates from the participants living in Ankara, and 3 primary school graduates and 7 secondary school graduates from the participants living in Paris were included in the high school groups. According to the ANOVA test results, there is no significant difference in the perception of satisfaction with the environment, urban, transportation, social municipality, economy, communication and innovation services according to the education levels of the participants in Ankara ($p>0.05$). The group with the highest perception of satisfaction in the social municipality ($\bar{X}=3.254$), economy ($\bar{X}=3.177$), communication ($\bar{X}=3.373$) and innovation services ($\bar{X}=3.333$) are the participants who are in postgraduate education level.

In Paris, there is no significant difference in satisfaction with the environment, urban, transportation, social municipality, communication, and innovation services of the participants depending on their education level ($p>0.05$). There is a significant difference in satisfaction with economic services depending on education level ($p<0.05$). The highest perception of satisfaction was found in participants with postgraduate education ($\bar{X}=3.230$). The lowest satisfaction was found in participants who are high school graduates ($\bar{X}=2.876$).

5.5. Satisfaction Comparison in Ankara and Paris by Profession

According to the ANOVA test results in Table 5, there is no significant difference in the satisfaction of the participants with any service variables in Ankara according to the participants' professions ($p>0.05$). In Ankara, laborers have the highest perception of satisfaction in environmental, economic and social municipal services, retirees in urban services, other professionals in transportation services, civil servants in communication services, and teachers/academics in innovation services.

In Paris, there is no significant difference in the participants' perception of satisfaction with the environment, urban, transportation, economy, and communication services according to their profession ($p>0.05$). In Paris, there is a significant difference in the satisfaction of the participants with social municipality and innovation services according to their profession ($p<0.05$). The satisfaction perception ($\bar{X}=3.647$) of teachers/academician profession members in social municipal services is higher than others. The satisfaction perceptions of teachers/academician professionals in innovation services ($\bar{X}=3.274$) are higher than others.

When satisfaction with all services in Ankara and Paris is examined, there is no significant difference according to professions ($p>0.05$). In Ankara, laborers have the highest perception of satisfaction from all services ($\bar{X}=3.237$), and housewives have the lowest perception of satisfaction ($\bar{X}=2.694$). While the highest perception of satisfaction with all services in Paris is found in retirees ($\bar{X}=3.583$), the lowest perception of satisfaction is seen in workers ($\bar{X}=3.189$). Table 5 shows ANOVA test results according to participants' professions.

Table 5. ANOVA test results according to professions in service types*

Service	R.	Profession									F	p	Post Hoc (LSD)
		P. S. ¹	T./E. ²	L. ³	T./A. ⁴	Re. ⁵	Hw. ⁶	St. ⁷	Un. ⁸	Other ⁹			
Environment	A	3.333	3.250	3.342	3.187	3.050	2.803	3.064	2.925	3.273	0.533	0.830	
	P	3.218	3.311	3.306	3.713	3.677	3.363	3.483	3.204	3.305	1.735	0.091	
Urban	A.	3.057	3.118	3.230	3.051	3.246	2.626	3.105	2.907	3.051	0.332	0.792	
	P.	3.387	3.377	3.246	3.633	3.673	3.251	3.583	3.136	3.317	1.822	0.266	
Transportation	A.	2.935	2.893	3.105	3.083	3.166	2.666	3.047	2.500	3.174	0.581	0.953	
	P.	3.364	3.317	3.391	3.402	3.888	3.348	3.596	3.234	3.377	1.257	0.073	
Social Municipality	A.	3.305	3.305	3.306	3.242	2.945	2.766	3.077	2.927	3.229	0.426	0.904	
	P.	3.173	3.215	3.109	3.647	3.666	3.206	3.451	3.338	3.332	2.186	0.029*	4-1** 4-2** 4-3** 4-9**
Economy	A.	2.963	2.757	3.263	3.055	2.333	2.666	2.542	2.200	2.857	1.172	0.320	
	P.	3.093	3.046	3.100	3.156	3.250	3.000	3.365	2.924	2.933	1.177	0.313	
Communication	A.	3.438	3.163	3.210	3.366	2.720	2.571	3.177	2.800	3.181	0.739	0.657	
	P.	3.368	3.316	3.220	3.482	3.250	3.163	3.393	3.336	3.200	0.561	0.809	

Table 5. ANOVA test results according to professions in service types* (cont'd)

Innovation	A.	3.055	3.181	3.017	3.611	2.533	2.666	3.076	2.800	3.142	0.428	0.903	6-2** 6-4** 6-7** 6-9**
	P.	2.812	3.225	2.683	3.274	2.916	2.545	3.268	2.939	3.066	2.784	0.006*	
All Services	A.	3.181	3.143	3.237	3.193	2.980	2.694	3.061	2.816	3.150	0.383	0.928	
	P.	3.255	3.294	3.189	3.556	3.583	3.196	3.488	3.204	3.276	1.690	0.101	

*R.=Residence, A.=Ankara, P.=Paris, P.S.= Public Servant, T./E.=Tradesman/Employers, L.=Laborer, T./A.=Teacher/Academician, Re.=Retired, Hw. = Housewife, St.=Student, Un.= Unemployed; **Significant difference (p<0.05)

5.6. Comparison of Satisfaction in Ankara and Paris by District of Residence

The results of comparing the service satisfaction of the participants in Paris according to the districts they live in by ANOVA test are given in Table 6. To perform the ANOVA analysis properly, 2 participants living in Altındağ and 5 participants living in Pursaklar included to Keçiören, 2 participants living in Polatlı included to Yenimahalle, 1 participant living in Beypazarı and 1 participant living in Kızılcahamam included to Sincan. According to the ANOVA test results, there is no significant difference in the perception of satisfaction with transportation, communication and innovation services according to the participants' place of residence in Ankara (p>0.05). There is a significant difference in satisfaction with environmental, urban, social, municipal, and economic services depending on the place of residence (p<0.05).

Table 6. ANOVA test results for service types according to the district of residence in Ankara

Service Variables	Residence						F	p	Post Hoc (LSD)
	Çankaya ¹	Etimesgut ²	Keçiören ³	Mamak ⁴	Sincan ⁵	Yenimahalle ⁶			
Env.	3.233	3.544	2.971	2.807	3.741	3.062	2.618	0.027*	5-3* 5-4* 5-6* 5-1*
Urban	3.126	3.500	2.880	2.692	3.659	2.788	3.261	0.008*	5-3* 5-4* 5-6*
Transp.	3.061	3.095	2.891	2.653	3.238	2.986	0.830	0.530	
Social M.	3.245	3.753	2.947	2.664	3.694	2.962	3.386	0.006*	2-3* 2-4* 2-6* 4-1*
Economy	2.919	3.119	2.641	2.000	3.4286	2.652	3.178	0.010*	4-2* 4-5*
Com.	3.188	3.700	2.984	3.169	3.428	3.025	1.067	0.382	
Inno.	3.216	3.523	2.846	2.564	3.381	2.722	1.886	0.101	
All Services	3.165	3.521	2.910	2.701	3.572	2.9108	2,731	0.022*	2-3* 2-4* 2-6*

Note: *Significant difference (p<0.05)

In terms of environmental services, there is a significant difference between the participants in the Sincan district and the participants in Keçiören, Mamak and Yenimahalle, and the

perceptions of the participants in Sincan ($\bar{X}=3.741$) with environmental services are higher than the others.

In terms of urban services, there is a significant difference between the participants in Sincan and the participants in Çankaya, Keçiören, Mamak and Yenimahalle ($p<0.05$), and the satisfaction perception of the participants in Sincan with the transportation service ($\bar{X}=3.659$) is higher than the others.

There is a significant difference between the participants in Etimesgut and the participants in Keçiören, Mamak and Yenimahalle in terms of social municipal services, and the satisfaction perception of the participants in Etimesgut with social municipal services ($\bar{X}=3.753$) is higher than the others. In terms of economic services, there is a significant difference between the participants in Mamak and the participants in Çankaya, Etimesgut and Sincan ($p<0.05$), and the perceptions of the participants in Sincan with economic services ($\bar{X}=3.428$) are higher than the others. In terms of services other than communication services, the perception levels of participants in Mamak are at the lowest level compared to other districts. The results of comparing the service satisfaction of the participants in Paris according to the districts they live in by ANOVA test are given in Table 7.

Table 7. ANOVA test results for service types according to the district of residence in Paris

Ser. Var.	Residence							F	p	Post Hoc (LSD)
	5ème ¹	7ème ²	9ème ³	10ème ⁴	12ème ⁵	13ème ⁶	14ème ⁷			
Envi.	3.276	3.516	3.409	3.357	3.611	3.163	3.694	1.836	0.043*	7-6* 7-11* 7-12* 7-13*
Urban	3.241	3.497	3.545	3.571	3.473	3.165	3.594	0.904	0.543	
Trans.	3.214	3.655	3.212	3.642	3.675	3.448	3.601	1.007	0.443	
So. M.	3.220	3.387	3.272	3.428	3.069	3.560	3.272	0.802	0.649	
Eco.	3.095	3.133	2.848	3.166	3.228	3.000	3.166	0.576	0.861	
Com.	3.471	3.386	3.090	3.414	3.452	3.092	3.433	1.192	0.289	
Inno.	3.214	3.288	3.030	3.166	3.017	2.641	3.296	1.016	0.435	
All Serv.	3.252	3.448	3.303	3.450	3.473	3.126	3.543	1.040	0.413	

Ser. Var.	Residence						F	p	Post Hoc (LSD)
	15ème ⁸	16ème ⁹	17ème ¹⁰	18ème ¹¹	19ème ¹²	20ème ¹³			
Envi.	3.302	3.320	3.578	3.143	3.218	3.201	1.836	0.043*	7-6* 7-11* 7-12* 7-13*
Urban	3.275	3.307	3.507	3.334	3.267	3.205	0.904	0.543	
Trans.	3.429	3.320	3.395	3.264	3.380	3.268	1.007	0.443	
So. M.	3.272	3.181	3.367	3.254	3.328	3.373	0.802	0.649	
Eco.	3.052	2.933	3.209	3.147	2.963	2.851	0.576	0.861	
Com.	3.094	3.224	3.414	3.370	3.044	3.433	1.192	0.289	
Inno.	2.877	2.880	3.098	2.990	2.944	3.185	1.016	0.435	
All Serv.	3.241	3.224	3.423	3.250	3.222	3.283	1.040	0.413	

Note: *Significant difference ($p<0.05$)

In Table 7, to perform the ANOVA analysis properly, 4 participants living in 1er and 5 participants living in 3ème included to 5ème, 6 participants in 8ème included to 9ème, 6

participants in 6ème included to 7ème and 9 participants living in 11ème included to 20ème. According to the ANOVA test results, there is no significant difference in the perception of satisfaction with urban, transportation, social municipality, economy, communication and innovation services in Paris according to the participants' place of residence ($p > 0.05$). There is a significant difference in the perception of satisfaction with environmental services according to place of residence ($p < 0.05$).

The perception of satisfaction with environmental services of those living in 14ème ($\bar{X}=3.694$) is higher than others. The lowest perception of satisfaction with environmental services ($\bar{X}=3.143$) is seen in participants residing in 18ème.

5.7. Hypothesis Results

In this section, the results of the research's hypotheses tests are given, and which hypotheses are accepted and rejected for which service types are explained. In Table 8 hypotheses results are given. The parts expressed with (A) represent the hypotheses for Ankara, and the parts expressed with (P) represent the hypotheses for Paris. The part in the form of (A-P) is used to shorten the hypotheses comparing Ankara and Paris.

H1, H3 and H4 are rejected for all service variables. This shows that there is no significant difference with participants in Ankara with all service variables depending on their gender, education, and professions. H2 accepted for social municipalism and economy services. There is a significant difference between the participants in Ankara with social municipalism and economy services depending on their age. H5 is accepted for transportation, communication, and innovation services. There is a significant difference between the participants in Ankara with transportation, communication, and innovation services depending on the district they live. H6 is accepted for urban services. This shows that there is a significant difference between the participants in Paris with urban services depending on their gender. H7 is accepted for urban, transportation and economy services. There is significant difference with participants in Paris with urban, transportation and economy services depending on their age. H8 is accepted for economy services. There is a significant difference between the participants in Paris with economy services depending on their education. H9 is accepted for social municipalism and innovation services. There is a significant difference between the participants in Paris with social municipalism and innovation services depending on their professions. H10 is accepted for environmental services. H11 is accepted for economy, urban and transportation services. There is significant difference with participants in Paris with economy, urban and transportation services depending on the district they live.

Table 8 shows that for all service variables, participants' gender, education, and professions have no significant difference for Ankara. But for the participants who live in Paris, genders have a significant difference on urban services. Educations have a significant difference on economy services and professions have significant differences in social municipalism and innovation services.

Table 8. Hypothesis Results

Hypotheses	Explanation	Result
H1=Gender(A)	All service variables	Rejected
H2=Age(A)	Social municipalism and economy services	Accepted
	Environment services	Rejected
H3=Education(A)	All service variables	Rejected
H4=Profession(A)	All service variables	Rejected
H5=District(A)	Transportation, communication, and innovation services	Accepted
	Other service variables	Rejected
H6=Gender(P)	Urban services	Accepted
	Other service variables	Rejected
H7=Age(P)	Urban, transportation and economy services	Accepted
	Other service variables	Rejected
H8=Education(P)	Economic services	Accepted
	Other service variables	Rejected
H9=Profession(P)	Social municipalism and innovation services	Accepted
	Other service variables	Rejected
H10=District(P)	Environment services	Accepted
	Other service variables	Rejected
H11=ServiceVariables(A-P)	Economy, urban and transportation services	Accepted
	Other service variables	Rejected

Conclusion

The comparison between Paris and Ankara highlights key differences in local governance and public service delivery. By choosing two cities from different countries, it is possible to compare satisfaction with the services provided by different methods. This also answers the question of "how to deliver better quality services in the future?". In this regard, the fact that the participants in Paris are generally more satisfied. And it gives an idea to Turkey on several points. The transformation experienced by France in localization as a unitary state also affects local service delivery. The existence of various institutions and rules from the past are preserved in Paris. The fact that the district municipalities in Paris do not have a separate legal personality and that these municipalities fulfill mostly advisory duties enables integrated action throughout the city. The involvement of regional organizations in local public services also contributes positively. These units, which focuses on the development of the region, have an impact on local public service delivery as they take part in the coordination of investments made in local governments. Regional organizations, such as local government organizations, also take part in the delivery of urban and economic services. This situation ensures competition in service delivery in the metropolitan area. In addition, it provides support for urban policies and urban transformation.

In environmental services, it is important to act integrated with garbage collection, waste recycling, separation of solid waste at the source and segregation and collection of garbage, covering the entire metropolitan area. Keeping the design of garbage collection trucks and the shape and colors of garbage containers the same in all metropolitan areas will affect the perception of citizens about waste and contribute to their awareness.

In social municipal services, the existence of opportunities for citizens to spend their free time, the number of sports fields and the diversity of social and cultural services in the city affect the satisfaction of citizens. In these services, municipalities, which are the closest unit to the citizens and know their needs best, are the most important. Citizens who do not have sufficient income need to be supported by local government organizations. In addition to economic or food aid provided to these people, facilities that create various job opportunities should also exist. There should be transparency and no discrimination in delivering this aid to those in need.

The existence of public transportation services and alternative transportation services is extremely important in transportation services in metropolises. It is necessary to ensure satisfaction with these services that citizens use every day. Managing these services from a single source, covering the entire region and every transportation method can have a positive impact on the satisfaction of citizens. It is important to make future plans in accordance with urban planning and to provide transportation services by combining the metro and tram network with buses when necessary.

Urban planning must be done in a way that calculates the current and future population density of the city. In the management of metropolitan areas, planning should be made considering neighboring cities and regions and expansion into these parts. The existence of a local unit that provides services for the maintenance, repair and renovation of buildings in the city is important. This unit will provide expert services as an alternative to the private sector. Citizens will be able to receive services such as stopping gas and water leaks in their homes and repairing electrical problems. In addition, it is important that the regulations for the exterior of the buildings are subject to inspection and permission by the local government unit.

It is necessary to create an economic structure suitable for those who live and will live in the future in the metropolitan area. In this regard, it is necessary to act based on statistical data regarding the economic situation of the people living in this area. Thus, it is possible to determine the important sectors. Also, the professions that are needed for the short and long term in this urban area will be known. Then, training and courses supported by the central government and local government units can be organized for these sectors.

To ensure satisfaction in communication services, there must be an appropriate level of communication and internet infrastructure. Ensuring affordable prices and performance in the delivery of internet service, providing free internet in various parts of cities and correct management of infrastructure investments are important for local government units.

In innovation services, the existence of citizens' tools to participate in management is important. The existence of various assemblies established in this direction may please the citizens. It makes a difference if the proposals presented by this assembly are taken into consideration by metropolitan administrations. This council will not be an alternative to the decision-making councils in local governments. It aims to ensure that a few issues deemed important for citizens are brought to the agenda of the decision-making assembly once or twice a year. In addition, the local government ombudsman application used in resolving disputes arising between citizens and the municipality can be useful in various aspects. The ombudsman institution is used to resolve issues with services without going to court. It also responds to applicants who have experienced negative outcomes regarding their

applications. This ensures that citizens receive equal and fair treatment. Additionally, the institution's free application process saves time and costs by avoiding court proceedings.

Comparison of satisfaction with local public services in Ankara and Paris shows that Parisians are more satisfied. Examining differences in satisfaction with services reveals that, beyond regional organisations, Turkey's lack of specialised metropolitan municipalities contrasts with the French system. The unique administrative structure of Paris, which differs from other cities due to its special status, influences the provision of local public services and the satisfaction of residents. While debates continue about whether cities such as Ankara, Istanbul and Izmir should have different governance models from other metropolitan areas, Paris serves as a compelling example. Just as the capital, Paris, operates under a different administrative framework than other French cities, Ankara could benefit from a similar approach.

References

- Akçakaya, O., & E. Zeylin Ceylin (2020). Vatandaşların yerel hizmetlere yönelik memnuniyet algıları üzerine bir araştırma: Kars belediyesi örneği. *Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 16(27), 516-543. <https://doi.org/10.26466/opus.676976>
- Altunışık, R., Coşkun, R., Bayraktaroğlu, S., & Yıldırım, E. (2012). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma Yöntemleri*. Sakarya: Sakarya Yayıncılık.
- Arslan, E. (2019). Fransa'da ve Türkiye'de yerelleşme politikaları: İl özel idareleri ve büyükşehir Belediyeleri üzerinden karşılaştırmalı bir değerlendirme. *Çağdaş Yerel Yönetimler Dergisi*, 28(3), 43-71. Erişim adresi: <https://avesis.cumhuriyet.edu.tr/yayin/406c0a87-f920-4202-bba5-263874e0a1ad/fransada-ve-turkiyede-yerellesme-politikalari-il-ozel-idareleri-ve-buyuksehir-belediyeleri-uzerinden-karsilastirmali-bir-degerlendirme>
- Banazili, A. M. (2018). Yerel kamu hizmeti sunumunda "yeniden belediyeleştirme (remunicipalisation)": OECD Ülkeleri ve Türkiye'den uygulama örnekleri. *Medeniyet Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 3(6), 111-132. Erişim adresi: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/612818>
- Berdibek, U. (2022). *Yerel yönetimlerde hizmet kalitesi algısının vatandaş memnuniyeti üzerinde etkisi: TRB-1 bölgesinde bir uygulama* (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi). Bingöl Üniversitesi, Bingöl.
- Bernhard, I. Norström, L. Snis, U. L. Grasjö, U., & Gellestedt, M. (2018). Degree of digitalization and citizen satisfaction: a study of the role of local e-government in Sweden. *The Electronic Journal of e-Government*, 16(1). Erişim adresi: <https://academic-publishing.org/index.php/ejeg/article/view/651/614>
- Collins Dictionary. Erişim adresi: <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/public-service#:~:text=A%20public%20service%20is%20something,a%20particular%20society%20or%20community>
- Council of Europe. (2009). Manifesto for a new urbanity, <https://rm.coe.int/urban-charter-ii-manifesto-for-a-new-urbanity-publication-a5-58-pages-/168095e1d5/>
- Cömertler, N., & Çondur, F. (2021). Türkiye'de kamu hizmetlerinden memnuniyet. *Aydın Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8(2), 255-275. <https://doi.org/10.30803/adusobed.1024482>
- Çolak, M. Yapıcı, İ. Çolak, N., & Çetin, T. (2018). Gençlerin büyükşehir belediye hizmet algısı ve beklentileri (örnek bir uygulama). *Opus Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 8(8), 299-317. <https://doi.org/10.26466/opus.393544>
- Dağ, B. (2023). *The expectations and perceptions of generation z toward local public services: case of Ankara metropolitan municipality* (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi). İstanbul Medeniyet Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Dinger, Ö. (2016). Sürdürülebilir kentleşme tartışmaları ve kent hakkı. *Ufuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 5(10), 73-84. Erişim adresi: <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/1359156>
- Ekici, B. (2019). *Karşılaştırmalı Büyükşehir Yönetimi: Londra, New York, Tokyo, Paris, İstanbul*. İstanbul, Marmara Belediyeler Birliği Kültür Yayınları.
- Islam, MD. S., & Ahsan, A. H. M. (2021). Citizens' satisfaction with local government service delivery performance in bangladesh: does citizens' confidence matter?, *Social Science Review*, 38(2), 117-133. <https://doi.org/10.3329/ssr.v38i2.64464>
- Jackson, E. A. (2020). Importance of the public service in achieving the UN SDGS. In: Leal Filho, W., Azul, A., Brandli, L., Lange Salvia, A., Wall, T. (eds) Decent Work and Economic Growth. *Encyclopedia of the UN Sustainable Development Goals*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-71058-7_20-2
- Karagianni, T., & Theriou, G. (2018). Service quality in local government and its effect on citizen satisfaction: the case of the division of transportation and communications of the regional unit of kavala in the region of Eastern Macedonia and Thrace, Greece. *International Journal of Business and Economic Sciences Applied Research*, 11(2), 8-16. Erişim adresi: <https://www.econstor.eu/handle/10419/242187>
- Kayar, I. (2021). *Büyükşehirlerde tüzel kişilikleri kaldırılan belde belediyelerinin yerel hizmet sunumuna ilişkin memnuniyet algısı: Ordu, Tekirdağ, Manisa ve Mardin örnekleri* (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi). Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi, Çanakkale. <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>

- Korkut, H. (2021). Türkiye'de belediye hizmetlerinden memnuniyet düzeyi: iller arası karşılaştırma. *Yönetim ve Ekonomi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 19(2), 279-298. <https://doi.org/10.11611/yead.911522>
- Lakovic, V. (2020). Crisis management of municipality performance on citizen satisfaction with urban services by structural equation modeling. *Quality & Quantity*, 765-773. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-020-01026-1>
- Lefebvre, H. (1996). *Writing on cities*. (Trans. ve Ed. E. Kofman ve E. Lebas), Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Manaf, H. A. Mohamed, A.M., & Harvey, W. S. (2023). Citizen perceptions and public servant accountability of local government service delivery in Malaysia. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 46(12), 823-832. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2015.1035788>
- Ozer, M. A. (2019). Kamu hizmeti anlayışında değişim ve yeni sağ politikaları. *Hak-İş Uluslararası Emek ve Toplum Dergisi*, 8(20), 10-42. <https://doi.org/10.31199/hakisderg.508783>
- Özdemir Metlioğlu, S. (2021). Kentte insan hakları ve kent hakkı. *OPUS International Journal of Society Researches*, 18(40), 2731-2743. Erişim adresi: <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/1484237>
- Pektaş, E. K., & Akin, F. (2010). Avrupa kentsel şartları perspektifinde bir kentli olarak "katılım hakkı" ve Türkiye. *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi İ.İ.B.F Dergisi*, 12(2), 23-49. Erişim adresi: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/18931>
- Purcell, M. (2002). Excavating Lefebvre: The right to the city and its urban politics of the inhabitant. *GeoJournal*, 58(2-3), 99-108. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:GEJO.0000010829.62237.8f>
- Sezer, Ö. (2008). Kamu hizmetlerinde müşteri vatandaş odaklılık: Türkiye'de kamu hizmeti anlayışı açısından bir değerlendirme. *Uluslararası Yönetim İktisat ve İşletme Dergisi*, 4(8), 147-172. Erişim adresi: <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/1123507>
- Söylemez A., & Şahin A. (2018). Vatandaşların yerel hizmetin sunumuna yönelik algı ve beklentilerinin değerlendirilmesi (Mamak belediyesi örneği). *Türk İdare Dergisi*, 90(487), 671-708. Erişim adresi: [http://www.tid.gov.tr/kurumlar/tid.gov.tr/tum-sayilar\(2\)/2001-2025/2018/arama/9_Vatandaslarin-Yerel-Hizmetin-Sunumuna-Yonelik.pdf](http://www.tid.gov.tr/kurumlar/tid.gov.tr/tum-sayilar(2)/2001-2025/2018/arama/9_Vatandaslarin-Yerel-Hizmetin-Sunumuna-Yonelik.pdf)
- Sözen, H. (2023). *Büyükşehir belediyelerinde engelli vatandaşlara sunulan hizmetlerin karşılaştırmalı bir analizi* (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi). Selçuk Üniversitesi, Konya, <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using Multivariate Statistics*, Boston, Pearson.
- TUIK, (2022). Adrese Dayalı Nüfus Kayıt Sistemleri Sonuçları, 6 Şubat 2023, Sayı 49685.
- Turan, E. Çevik, S., & Aktepe, E. (2017). Türkiye'de yaşam memnuniyetinin boyutları ve yerel kamu hizmetlerinden tatmin arasındaki ilişki. *Belediyelerin Geleceği ve Yeni Yaklaşımlar*, 183-196. Erişim adresi: https://www.academia.edu/35653489/T%C3%99CRK%C4%B0YEDE_YA%C5%9EAM_MEMNUN%C4%B0YET%C4%B0N%C4%B0N_BOYUTLARI_VE_YEREL_KAMU_H%C4%B0ZMETLER%C4%B0NDEN_TATM%C4%B0N_ARASINDAK%C4%B0_%C4%B0L%C4%B0C%C5%9EK%C4%B0
- Türkmen, H. H., & Zengin, E. Ç. (2020). Vatandaşların kamu hizmetlerinden memnuniyet düzeyleri üzerine bir araştırma: Niğde İli örneği. *Ömer Halisdemir Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 13(1), 9-23. <https://doi.org/10.25287/ohuiibf.554126>
- Wesemann, A. (2020). Why public services matter: linking citizen quality of life to local government services. *Journal of Public Administration and Policy Research*. 12(1), 8-16. <https://doi.org/10.5897/JPAPR2020.0476>