

Public Report- Tunisia

English Version

The total number of received questionnaires was 970, and the missing data is less than the 5% margin. The male exceeded the percentage of the females with a limited percentage. The age ranged between 19 and 88 years of age, with a mean of 35.5 year/old. In addition, more than half the participants had regular jobs (Table 1). Results show that approximately half of the participants in this study reported that the father is the main source of income for the family, and only 5.9% described their income as high.

Table1: The demographic characteristics of the participants (n=970)

Factor		n	%	Missing Data
Sex	Male	548	56.5	15 (1.5%)
	Female	407	42.0	
Age (Mean= 35.5 Y/O, SD= 9.5 Years, Range 21-57 years)	< 30	434	45	6 (.6%)
	31-40	249	25.9	
	41-50	167	17.2	
	>50	134	11.7	
Academic degree	School	317	32.7	42 (4.3%)
	Diploma	190	19.6	
	Baccalaureate	329	33.9	
	Master	33	3.4	
	PhD	5	.5	
	Technical School	54	5.6	
Family income	Low	263	27.1	14 (1.4%)
	Medium	636	65.6	
	High	57	5.9	
Source of income	Father	472	48.7	43 (4.4%)
	Mother	60	6.2	
	Father and Mother	278	28.7	
	Other*	117	12.1	
Do you have a regular job/work?	I work	540	55.7	67 (6.9%)
	I don't	363	37.4	

*The participants referred to income from different other sources

The study questionnaire studied three main themes (i.e., public satisfaction (17 items); service delivery efficiency (11 items); and fund opportunity (13 items)) that were explained by 41 items. The values of the internal consistency show that the whole questionnaire (α .967) and its themes have achieved high reliability values. **These results show that this questionnaire as a research measure has well-structured, homogenous items (when the value is greater than .60 and closer to 1.00), and therefore achieved high internal consistency values. Internal consistency means that the questionnaire has both measured the theme adequately and that the items of the questionnaire are homogenous and relate to each other (not measuring something else not related to the study theme).**

The response on the scale items has a value of 0 (which means never), 1 (rarely), 2 (sometimes), 3 (often), or 4 (always). The range of the concepts was: public satisfaction 0-68; service delivery efficiency 0-44; and fund opportunity 0-52. **This range is calculated by summing up the scores that reflect the responses of the participants in this study. Of course, the higher the score, the better the view of the participant to the item. For instance, when asking about public view of the quality of service and we achieve two responses; the first response score is 2 out of 4 and the second is 3 out of 4. This means that the individual who scored 3 view the quality of services better than the other one, and so on.**

The first subscale, publicsatisfaction, achieved an internal consistency value of .832. However, the mean score for the scale is low, which indicates the presence of dissatisfaction among the general population from the municipality services (Table 2). The lowest item on the subscale is “I influence the decision at the municipality by participating in the budget meetings” and the highest item is “I know the role of the municipality”.

Table 2: Public responses on the items of the satisfaction subscale

Factor/items	Mean	SD
Public satisfaction 17 items, $\alpha = .832$	23.01	11.43
1 I know the role of the municipality	2.06	1.22
2 Employees receive with respect	2.00	1.23
3 Employees communicate openly	1.81	1.16
4 Employees are not biased when it comes to providing services	1.39	1.37
5 The time I spent to finish my work is acceptable	1.52	1.24
6 My suggestions are taken by the municipality seriously	1.16	1.31
7 I can talk directly to the key person when making any suggestion/complaint	1.20	1.42
8 I contribute in making the general policies of the municipality	1.02	1.15
9 I know how to follow my suggestion within the municipality	1.12	1.36
10 I know whom to address to finish my job at the municipality	1.45	1.34
11 I can reach the key person to make my complaint easily	1.22	1.23
12 The department of concern follows my suggestion/complaint seriously	1.10	1.16
13 I receive a response from the municipality to complaint within a reasonable period of time	1.08	1.09
14 I influence the decision at the municipality through electing my representative	1.86	1.57
15 I influence the decision at the municipality through becoming a candidate, myself	.93	1.79
16 I influence the decision at the municipality through the civil NGOs	1.38	1.44
17 I influence the decision at the municipality by participating in the budget meetings	.87	1.21

The second subscale measured service delivery efficiency as perceived by the public attending the municipality. The internal consistency for this subscale is .751, and the mean is 18.02, indicating that the public believe that efficiency in delivering the services provided at the municipality is below the acceptable standards (Table 3). The lowest item mean score reported by the public is “Employees perform similarly”, and the highest mean score is for the item “I can read the signage easily to finish my work at the municipality”.

Table 3: Public responses on the items of the service delivery efficiency subscale

Factor	Mean	SD
Service delivery efficiency 11 items, $\alpha = .751$	18.02	7.29
1 Employees finish task/job on time	1.41	1.04
2 Employees perform similarly	1.28	1.08

3	Employees are helpful when it comes to service delivery	1.67	1.12
4	Employees are collaborative	1.73	1.14
5	The number of employees to provide service is adequate	1.49	1.25
6	Employees know the steps of their work	1.87	1.21
7	Distance between my house and the municipality influence the quality of services	1.30	1.27
8	Distance between my house and the municipality influence the time of service delivery	1.35	1.30
9	I can read the signage easily to finish my work at the municipality	2.09	1.47
10	Signage at the municipality are adequate	1.85	1.41
11	Signage at the municipality are self-directing and read easily	1.89	1.40

Public knowledge and awareness of the funding opportunity available at the municipality has measured using the third component of the questionnaire. The internal consistency value is .877, and the mean score is 11.70 (Table 4). By examining the range and the reported scores, this mean measured on this subscale is very low, which might necessarily indicate limited knowledge about funding and funding opportunity supporting the municipality running or planned projects that serve the community. The lowest achieving mean score is the item “I know about the municipality achievements and work through periodic bulletin”, and highest is “External fund to projects at the municipality is both legal and helpful”. Although the public perceived funding positively, the amount of information transferred to them might not adequate to understand exactly the role of this fund.

Table 4: Public responses on the items of the employee Fund opportunity subscale

Factor	Mean	SD
Fund Opportunity ($\alpha = .877$)	11.70	9.58
1 I know the funding bodies supporting the municipality	.93	1.19
2 I know about a funded project called MINARET	.71	1.23
3 I know about the externally funded projects at the municipality	.76	1.13
4 I receive updates about funded projects from the municipality newsletter	.68	1.05
5 I receive updates about funded projects from the advertisements	.76	1.08
6 I receive updates about funded projects when meeting with the council members or municipality managers	.78	1.24
7 I receive information about projects (new and current) on time	.78	1.11

8	External fund to projects at the municipality is both legal and helpful	1.83	1.52
9	The municipality informs the public about the recent achievement and projects frequently	.80	1.16
10	I know about the municipality achievements and work through periodic bulletin	.56	1.01
11	I know about the municipality achievements and work through meeting with the mayor and council members	.75	1.12
12	I know about the municipality achievements and work through municipality webpage	1.00	1.35
13	I know about the municipality achievements and work through the social media	1.67	1.47

Communicating municipality plans, project and achievements is perceived by the participants in this study as ineffective and insufficient. This issue is reflected by the low mean scores of each single item and the three main concepts presented in this report.

Conclusions

The public reported that they were not satisfied by not participating in the decision-making process within the municipality. Although this point could be related to the policy being set by the state, it is possible to make the public part of the decisions concerning many parts of the processes within the municipality. This point could also be surpassed once the public becomes aware of the mandates of the law and where they can engage actively in the decisions of the municipality. Another point of concern was related to the process of making and following suggestions aiming at improving the services at the municipality.

The lowest scoring items, which show very low satisfactory among the participants, were as follows: “I influence the decision at the municipality by participating in the budget meetings” (.87 out of 4); “I influence the decision at the municipality through becoming a candidate, myself” (.93 out of 4); “I contribute in making the general policies of the municipality” (1.02 out of 4); “I know how to follow my suggestion within the municipality” (1.12 out of 4); “I know how to follow my suggestion within the municipality” (1.12 out of 4); and “My suggestions are taken by the municipality seriously” (1.16 out of 4).

The public rate low their ability to follow the suggestions which makes the process of providing these suggestions and making them become real inputs to the municipality a major challenge. A rare point raised in this study is the bias of the employee when providing a service. It is not clear at this stage what makes the public report this issue. This point needs further attention in future studies.

The public responses on the service delivery efficiency rated the adequacy of the number of employees and that employees perform similarly very low. This result could also imply that the public perceives the time required to finish any job as more than what is really needed. Similar to reports from Jordan, the distance is another challenge to receiving the service in a timely and high-quality manner. The lowest achieving scores on the scale were the following items: “Employees perform similarly” (1.28 out of 4); “Distance between my house and the municipality influence the quality of services” (1.30 out of 4); and “Employees finish task/job on time” (1.41 out of 4). The later is another serious point, which requires attention and action. Interestingly, the majority of scores in this theme were below the midpoint. The midpoint is where the individual feels ambivalent toward a particular issue. In this case, as the scores were below this point, the public is reporting having negative feelings toward the quality of services provided by the municipality, whether inside the building or in the community.

The knowledge and experience of the public concerning funding opportunities are extremely limited. This is reflected by the low scores achieved on the third theme, fund opportunity. Similar to findings in the Lebanese study, the Tunisian also reported having limited experience when it comes to external funds and not knowing much about the MINARET project. The relatively promising point in this report is that although the public has not acknowledged funded projects, they still believe that these external funds are positive and good promote better

achievements and improve the services of the municipality. Scores in this theme are way below the midpoint, and this is a very serious issue, which raises questions about the transparency of the municipality when dealing with the public. This point is a very concerning one, and should then be taken seriously to improve, public knowledge of any external source of support that often aims to enrich the experience of the municipality to provide better quality services to the public.