

SOCIALLY SIGNIFICANT SERVICES: PUBLIC MONITORING METHODOLOGY

Botagoz Rakisheva¹, Gulimzhan Suleimenova²,
Kuralay Mukhambetova³, Ainur Ibraeva⁴

Received:
November 14, 2022

Revised:
January 12, 2023
February 9, 2023

Accepted:
February 24, 2023

DOI:
10.56289/ijcsrp.191

ABSTRACT

This article is based on the “Methodological guide for the preparation, organisation, and conduct of public monitoring of socially significant service quality assessment” project, completed by order of the Astana Civil Service Hub and published with its permission. The paper presents a methodology for monitoring the quality of socially significant services provided in Kazakhstan. The methodology was developed by analysing public monitoring experiences from recent decades and considering the specific nature of socially significant services. This methodology is primarily based on surveys of service recipients. During the development process, three main methodological approaches to conducting public monitoring were established: a direct survey of service recipients, an expert survey, and a participatory survey. Their tools include stakeholder surveys, Community Score Cards, Citizen Report Cards, Community-Based Monitoring, Participatory Outputs Tracking, and Social Audits. All these tools utilise both quantitative and qualitative approaches to data collection.

Keywords: Public services, Measurement, Socially significant services, Public opinion, Public monitoring, Methodology, Service recipient, Service provider.

INTRODUCTION

There are numerous public services, yet among them exist those critical for fulfilling the basic needs of citizens in areas such as health, education, social security, safety, and access to information and justice. Their availability and quality directly impact people's living conditions, especially those of vulnerable groups.

Some states identify a group of such services and categorise them as “socially significant services”, variously referred to as “public services of general interest”,⁵ “critical public services”,⁶ or “essential services”.⁷ By providing these, the state ensures a minimum standard of living, supports the implementation of social justice and equality principles, promotes citizen welfare, and maintains social system stability. These services are a state priority.

In providing such services, the state implements feedback mechanisms to understand how citizens perceive public services, identify existing problems, and determine areas needing

¹ Correspondent-author, Ph.D, Director of the Public Opinion Research Institute, Acting Associate Professor of the National School of Public Policy, Academy of Public Administration under the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9856-5805>. E-mail: brakisheva@gmail.com.

² Doctor of Economics, Associate Professor, Astana Civil Service Hub, Astana, Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7332-504X>. E-mail: gulimjan_n@mail.ru.

³ Ph.D, Head of the Department of Sociology, Lev Gumilyov Eurasian National University, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1093-5032>. E-mail: k.mukhambetova74@gmail.com.

⁴ MSS in Sociology, Deputy Director of the Public Opinion Research Institute, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-7701-5470>. E-mail: ainur.mazhitova@gmail.com.

⁵ https://commission.europa.eu/topics/single-market/services-general-interest_en

⁶ <https://www.adaptingtorisingtides.org/portfolio/community-land-use-facilities-and-services/>

⁷ <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/essential-services>

improvement. This is primarily achieved through public monitoring. Data from public monitoring allows government agencies to correct errors, enhance operations, and increase citizen satisfaction. Furthermore, the public monitoring process itself helps ensure transparency in public fund spending, preventing corruption and abuse within the state apparatus.

In 2023, Kazakhstan officially defined a list of socially significant services, which consequently created a need for their dedicated monitoring. The Agency of the Republic of Kazakhstan for Civil Service Affairs, which generally oversees all public services, was appointed as the government body responsible for this monitoring. Given this, the task arose to develop a scientifically sound and practically implementable methodology for public monitoring. Consequently, the Astana Civil Service Hub launched a project aimed at developing this methodological framework for public monitoring, the results of which will be presented in this article.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The last few decades have witnessed an intensive re-evaluation of the state's purpose and role (de Mooij, 2012; Vyas-Doorgapersad and Aktan, 2017; Kuz'mina, 2019). Consequently, the "service state" concept emerged in the 1980s (Falina 2012), defining the state as a producer and provider of services. The state's main objective became ensuring the proper and high-quality satisfaction of societal needs (Iskakov, 2013). This concept's advent spurred a surge in research exploring the nature of public services, their classification, accessibility and equity, effectiveness, and the public's perception of their quality (Xu, 2013; Menezes et al., 2022; Cepik and Mastrodascio, 2021; Petkovšek et al., 2021).

A careful study of scientific works in this area reveals that the objective need to review the state's role and the emergence of the service state concept stem from societal demands. Society has formed a strong internal demand for transparency, accountability, and a citizen-oriented public administration. This shift is also linked to the necessity of improving the state apparatus's efficiency concerning the speed, quality, and convenience of public service provision. This approach is particularly characteristic of Western countries, where changes often resulted from bottom-up initiatives.

In post-Soviet countries the re-evaluation of the state's role resulted from the restoration of independence and the initiation of the so-called Washington Consensus reform package. Here, reform initiatives primarily came from the top down. Regarding public services, there were extensive discussions about their precise definition, the distinction between a public function and a public service, and how to ensure their accessibility, openness, and transparency.

While administrative reforms began in the early 1900s, laws establishing a clear definition of public service were adopted later. Georgia was among the first to pass a public services law in 2004. In Georgia, active development began in 2004 with the adoption of the Law on Public Services. This positioned Georgia as a leader in the post-Soviet space for implementing effective public and online service delivery systems. Armenia followed suit, adopting its Law on Public Services in 2007, marking a significant step toward improving the quality and accessibility of these services.

Belarus, in 2010, saw an important advancement in 2008 with Presidential Decree No. 60 "On the procedure for the provision of public services," which regulates service provision at the executive authority level. Legislation concerning public services in Russia developed actively after 2000. Federal Law No. 210-FZ "On State and Municipal Services," adopted in 2010,

became the foundational document for establishing and improving the system of public service provision. Ukraine undertook reforms with the adoption of the Law of Ukraine “On Administrative Services” in 2012, which served as the basis for transforming the public services sector. Further improvements were made with the Law of Ukraine “On the Provision of Administrative Services” in 2016. Kazakhstan introduced such legislation in 2013.

In the Law on Public Services of the Republic of Kazakhstan, a public service is defined as “one of the forms of implementation of individual state functions or their totality, carried out at the request or without the request of service recipients and aimed at implementing their rights, freedoms and legitimate interests, providing them with appropriate material or non-material benefits.” This definition effectively concludes prior discussions regarding the distinctions between a public service and a state function, clearly indicating that public services represent a specific mode of executing individual state functions. Crucially, the law also specifies the roles of both the service provider and the service recipient, a vital aspect for establishing clear subject-subject relationships.

In this Law, a public service is understood as “one of the forms of implementation of individual state functions or their totality, carried out at the request or without the request of service recipients and aimed at implementing their rights, freedoms and legitimate interests, providing them with appropriate material or non-material benefits”. This definition concludes the discussion regarding the differences between a public service and a state function, indicating that public services are one of the forms of implementation of individual state functions. The law also defines who is the service provider and who is the service recipient, which is important for subject-subject relations.

In 2023, a new term, Socially Significant Services (SSS), was added to this law. These services are provided continuously and are vital for every citizen of the Republic of Kazakhstan.⁸ The introduction of this term was a logical step in defining what should be included in the list of services guaranteed by the state.

It is worth noting that Kazakhstan previously had a category of socially significant services. These services aimed to ensure the socio-economic rights of individuals and/or legal entities. Their distinguishing qualitative criterion was their provision in one of the following areas: social security, population service and protection, employment, healthcare, education, housing, and entrepreneurship. There was also a quantitative criterion: 350,000 or more requests for individuals, and 10,000 or more requests for legal entities. These rules were in effect for only a little over a year and a half, specifically from 2011 to 2013.⁹

An important aspect of improving the quality of SSS is regular public monitoring, which appeals to the opinion of the population. This monitoring aims to determine the level of public satisfaction with the quality of SSS provision, identify problematic issues, and develop recommendations for improvement.

Based on a study of literary sources, we identified three methodological approaches to conducting public monitoring. The first, or traditional approach, defines monitoring as the collection of information on studied parameters through surveys, in-depth interviews, questionnaires completed by recipients of public services and facilitating agencies, and the

⁸ Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan dated April 15, 2013, No. 88-V “On public services”.

⁹ On approval of criteria for socially significant services. Resolution of the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan dated November 14, 2011, No. 1334. Repealed by Resolution of the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan dated August 6, 2013, No. 799.

conducting of 'test purchases', followed by generalisation. A specific set of methods is determined based on the specifics of the public service (Styrin and Plaksin, 2012).

The second approach is the expert approach, where selected external experts measure the quality and performance of service providers based on a predetermined set of indicators.

The third approach is participatory (or joint) monitoring. This approach aims to involve members of the public not only in providing feedback but also in actively participating in the planning and implementation of the assessment. The goal is to build the capacity of citizens to analyse, reflect, and take action (PG Exchange).

PG Exchange identifies six collaborative monitoring tools: stakeholder surveys, Community Score Cards, Citizen Report Cards, Community-Based Monitoring, Participatory Outputs Tracking, and Social Audits. All of these tools rely on the use of both quantitative and qualitative methods for collecting information.

RESEARCH METHODS

To develop the methodology for public monitoring of socially significant services, we employed several methods. We began with consultations with employees of the Agency of the Republic of Kazakhstan for Civil Service Affairs. This step was crucial for clearly understanding the essence of SSS and their expectations regarding the methods and tools for assessing service quality. Next, we researched global and domestic experiences in conducting public monitoring of SSS. Based on this research, we prepared a methodology for a survey designed to measure public satisfaction with SSS quality. To ensure the quality of our tools, we conducted a pilot survey involving 500 respondents from the Akmola region of Kazakhstan. This assessment covered 33 socially significant services provided by 32 government agencies. The object of this pilot public monitoring was the population of the Akmola region over 18 years old, with the subject of the survey being the level of public satisfaction with the quality of SSS. Information was collected through in-person, face-to-face interviews conducted as part of a mass survey at respondents' places of residence. The survey was administered in both state and Russian languages. In total, 255 urban and 245 rural respondents participated in the pilot survey.

RESULTS

1. Current practice of public monitoring of public services

Kazakhstan currently employs a traditional approach to public monitoring of quality of public services, primarily through surveys of service recipients. Two main types of monitoring can be distinguished, both grounded in fundamental principles such as: legality, objectivity, impartiality, reliability, comprehensiveness, transparency, and competence.

The first type of monitoring is conducted within the framework of research projects focused on assessing the performance of individual government agencies. For instance, since 2007, the Association of Taxpayers of Kazakhstan has been monitoring tax and customs public services through sociological surveys. These surveys engage various stakeholders, including the general population, legal entities, individual entrepreneurs, and tax officials.¹⁰

¹⁰ Assessment of the quality of work of tax authorities of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Agency for Social and Marketing Research "Public Opinion Research Centre (CIOM)", ALE "Association of Taxpayers of Kazakhstan (ATK)", 2007; Monitoring the quality of services of tax authorities. Survey of entrepreneurs, population and employees, SANGE Research Centre, commissioned by the Association of Taxpayers of Kazakhstan, Astana, 2009, etc. <https://www.kgd.gov.kz/ru> .

The second type of monitoring is conducted regularly by the Agency of the Republic of Kazakhstan for Civil Service Affairs¹¹ (the Agency), often with the involvement of third-party organisations selected through public procurement procedures.

In 2014, the first public monitoring of public service provision was commissioned by the Agency. This comprehensive survey included individuals, individual entrepreneurs, and legal entities. The sample was formed based on the prevalence of each service. A total of 8,533 respondents were surveyed to assess 33 services provided by 17 government agencies. The project also incorporated 291 in-depth interviews, 4 focus groups, and 99 'mystery shopper' observations. The survey itself was conducted by the SANGE Research Centre.

In 2015, the second public monitoring was carried out by the 'Public Opinion' Research Institute. The methodology of the previous survey served as a basis, with certain modifications and additions. During this survey, 8,327 respondents were interviewed to assess 39 services provided by 17 government agencies, alongside interviews with 20 experts. Following the main survey, and as per the established methodology, 10 in-depth interviews were conducted focusing on services that received low ratings from service providers.¹²

Consequently, for the past 11 years, various sociological organisations have conducted annual public monitoring to assess the quality of public services. These have consistently used population surveys based on a uniform methodology (Table 1).

The primary purpose of public monitoring is to assess the level of satisfaction among service recipients regarding the quality, accessibility, and procedures of public service provision by service providers. This process also aims to identify issues and formulate recommendations for enhancing public service quality.

Regular, annual surveys of service recipients enable the observation of dynamic changes in the quality of public services provided to the population, thereby facilitating improvements in the operations of government agencies.

International practice suggests that public monitoring is not consistently regular. Monitoring can become an effective tool if its theoretical framework is rigorously tested over a period of three years, followed by the implementation of the refined, final version of the monitoring methodology.

Scientists have identified three primary reasons for the discontinuation of monitoring efforts. The first is disappointment with initial reports that failed to address all pertinent questions. The second reason cited is a change in political leadership. The third factor is the absence or inadequacy of financial resources required to conduct the monitoring (Michalski and Kopec, 2021).

Returning to the methodology, it is important to note that if the specific public services being measured, or the total number of services offered by a government agency, vary annually, then a direct comparison with previous year's results becomes problematic. Furthermore, assessments of individual services by government agencies do not necessarily reflect an overall evaluation of the entire agency's performance.

¹¹ Agency of the Republic of Kazakhstan for Civil Service Affairs.

<https://www.gov.kz/memleket/entities/qyzmet/activities/11?lang=ru>

¹² Results of public monitoring of the quality of public services, UNDP, Agency of the Republic of Kazakhstan for Civil Service Affairs, Research Institute "Public Opinion", 2015. <https://www.kgd.gov.kz/ru>

Table 1. Methods of sociological surveys for assessing the quality of public services

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Number of services	33	39	57	55	60	65	70	75	47	50	70
Population survey (number of respondents)	8,533	8,327	9,082	9,517	10,000	14,219	9,211	12,095	9,810	9,789	12,507
In-depth interview (number of respondents)	291	10	-	-	28	52	-	30	40	40	65
Focus groups	4	-	-	55	60	29	5	25	10	10	10
Mystery Shopper	99	-	-	32	25	20	20	20	20	20	20
Expert survey	-	20	-	-	-	-	30	-	-	-	-
Source: Results of public monitoring of the quality of public services. https://nationalbank.kz/ru/news/rezultaty-obshchestvennogo-monitoringa-kachestva-okazaniya-gosudarstvennyh-uslug and https://www.gov.kz/memleket/entities/qyzmet/documents/details/788198?lang=ru&ysclid=m6hgae44kv894867099											

A survey is conducted using lists of service recipients from the previous year or the initial period of the current study year.

The quality of public services provided by service providers is assessed using a 5-point Likert scale. Respondents answer questions, and their responses are measured on this 5-point scale; refusals to answer are also recorded (Table 2). For instance, the results of public monitoring in 2024¹³ revealed that, under the "accessibility and convenience" criterion for services provided in both paper and electronic formats, the average score was 4.81 points, indicating an 88.9% satisfaction level (Appendix 1).

Table 2. Rating scale.

The quality of public services provided by service providers is assessed on a 5-point scale	Interpretation of the 5-point rating scale
"5" - "Fully satisfied", "Strongly agree", "Excellent"	5 points - "Excellent", the service was provided on time, without any complaints, costs, or barriers
"4" - "Mostly satisfied", "Agree", "Good"	4 points – "Good", the service was provided with only minor complaints and/or minimal costs, and/or there were negligible barriers
"3" - "Rather dissatisfied", "Rather disagree", "Average"	3 points – "Satisfactory", the service involved several complaints, notable additional costs, and/or discernible barriers.
"2" - "Mostly dissatisfied", "Disagree", "Poor"	2 points – "Unsatisfactory", the service was provided with numerous violations, or significant issues such as corruption or other substantial barriers were encountered
"1" - "Fully dissatisfied", "Strongly disagree", "Very poor"	1 point – "No work", the service was not provided due to insurmountable barriers, or costs

When discussing the reliability of data derived from customer experience (i.e., the experience of receiving a specific public service), a degree of 'skew' or bias is always present. Therefore, it is recommended to employ multiple data collection methods simultaneously. Respondents themselves can exhibit various attitudes – being loyal, critical, passive, or silent – which, consequently, also influences survey results.¹⁴

Service quality assessments frequently depend on the most recent experience, which can unduly overshadow more general experiences. Whether this most recent interaction was positive or negative can significantly influence the perception and overall assessment of the entire service. This phenomenon is known as the "last experience effect" or the "recency effect."

While the aforementioned aspects are difficult to eliminate in surveys, they must be acknowledged.

¹³ Results of public monitoring of the quality of public services, UNDP, Agency of the Republic of Kazakhstan for Civil Service Affairs, East Kazakhstan Youth Information and Analytical Agency, 2024.

<https://www.gov.kz/memleket/entities/qyzmet/documents/details/788198?directionId=11&lang=ru>

¹⁴ How to Measure Reliable Customer Experience Indicators with Surveys and Emotion Recognition <https://911.prolan.ru/articles/kak-ehffektivno-izmeryat-klientskij-opyt-s-pomoshchyu-oprosov-i-raspoznavaniya-ehmocij.html>

Having analysed current methods of public monitoring for the quality of public services, we developed a comprehensive methodology for the public monitoring of SSS.

2. Methodological approach to public monitoring of the SSS

Since a socially significant service (SSS) is a public service, its public monitoring must be conducted in accordance with the principles stipulated in the Law "On Public Services." The key principles of public monitoring include: 1. Legality; 2. Objectivity; 3. Impartiality; 4. Reliability; 5. Comprehensiveness; and 6. Transparency. Public monitoring is carried out as a periodic sociological study, aiming to determine the dynamics of satisfaction levels over time.

The purpose of public monitoring is to assess the level of satisfaction among the population of Kazakhstan with the implementation of government policies and strategic documents issued by central government bodies. This includes policies and documents derived from the functions and services provided by local executive bodies and other relevant stakeholders.

In this context, public monitoring is designed to fulfil three key tasks:

- 1) To obtain information on the level of public satisfaction with the quality of SSS.
- 2) To identify problematic issues as they arise during service provision.
- 3) To develop recommendations for improving the quality of primary health care delivery.

The object of this public monitoring is the population of the Republic of Kazakhstan aged 18 years and older. The subject of the monitoring is the level of public satisfaction with the quality of SSS. The survey's geographical scope should encompass all regions and cities of national significance.

Primary data is collected through face-to-face surveys of respondents aged 18 and older at their places of residence. It should be noted that this survey serves as the main source of information for determining the level of satisfaction with the quality of SSS.

Conducting public monitoring should comprise four stages. The **first stage** is preparatory. Within this stage, a study plan and schedule must be developed, clearly indicating implementation timelines and responsible parties. If necessary, additions or adjustments should be made to the public monitoring methodology and/or tools.

The sample for the survey is drawn based on official population statistics.

At this stage, desk research should also be conducted to refine the list of SSS. The designated performers are responsible for collecting, studying, systematising, and analysing secondary sociological information related to SSS provision. This information is typically sourced from processed data found in official reports, periodicals, economic publications, statistical handbooks, internal company reports, and similar available resources.

The **second stage** involves the collection of empirical material. This phase focuses on gathering primary sociological data by applying the research methods selected during the first stage, all within the established sample. As previously noted, the main research method is a mass survey. Questionnaires can be administered on paper or through another suitable data collection option. Respondents are given the choice to complete the survey in either Kazakh or Russian.

The **third stage** is the processing and analysis of results. In this crucial phase, the primary data obtained from the survey results are processed, analysed, and generalised.

The **final fourth stage** is the preparation of an analytical report. The findings from the sociological research on public monitoring are presented in an analytical report, which includes information on how the study's goal was achieved, and all research tasks were addressed.

3. Criteria for determining the list of socially significant services

The main principles for selecting socially significant services (SSS) for monitoring are:

- Social significance: The service must be vital for every citizen of the Republic of Kazakhstan.
- Continuous implementation: The service must be provided on an ongoing basis.
- Societal benefit: The service must aim to satisfy the legitimate interests of society.

The list of SSS was approved by analysing the functions of government bodies, as outlined in their respective regulations, to identify those aligning with the basic selection principles mentioned above. Matches found through this process were classified as SSS. This approach revealed that each state body provides SSS relevant to its specific profile of activities.

Upon completing this stage, 33 types of SSS provided by 32 central government bodies and agencies of the Republic of Kazakhstan were identified. These services will be assessed using questions designed to gauge satisfaction with SSS quality.

It's important to note that this is not an exhaustive list of SSS. The types and number of SSS are subject to annual revision due to potential changes in the structure and activities of the Central Civil Defence and other agencies of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

4. Determining the level of satisfaction with the quality of SSS

The level of satisfaction with SSS quality is determined by calculating the percentage of respondents who provided "Fully satisfied" (5 points) to "Fully dissatisfied" (1 point) ratings on a 5-point Likert scale across all SSS criteria (Table 3).

Table 3. Determining the satisfaction level with the quality of SSS on a 5-point scale (example).

SSS name	Fully dissatisfied "1"	"2"	"3"	"4"	Fully satisfied "5"	Total	Average SSS score
SSS	5.2%	8.5%	18.7%	39.6%	28.0%	100.0%	3.77
SSS	5.7%	11.8%	30.5%	36.7%	15.0%	100.0%	3.43

As an example, we'll provide questionnaires for three types of SSS, specifically within the spheres of public health protection, social security, and labour relations. For social protection services, we've included six questions, while labour relations and health service provision each feature four questions (Tables 4-6).

Table 4. Socially significant services in the sphere of social security.

Social protection, "5" fully satisfied, "1" fully dissatisfied							
1.	Please rate the quality of social services in your locality (<i>pensions, social benefits, social support, etc.</i>)	1	2	3	4	5	99
2.	Please rate the quality of specialised social services provided (<i>provision of health resort treatment, prosthetic and orthopaedic care, rehabilitation, etc.</i>)	1	2	3	4	5	99
3.	Please evaluate the conditions provided for people with limited mobility (<i>elderly people, people with disabilities, and those using strollers or wheelchairs</i>) in public places (<i>ramps or lifting devices, accessible parking, etc.</i>)	1	2	3	4	5	99
4.	Please evaluate the terms and procedure for receiving pension payments	1	2	3	4	5	99
5.	Please rate the timeliness of social benefits	1	2	3	4	5	99
6.	Are you satisfied with the amount of social benefits assigned?	1	2	3	4	5	99

Table 5. Socially significant services in the sphere of labour relations.

Labour relations, "5" fully satisfied, "1" fully dissatisfied							
1.	Are you satisfied with the working conditions in your locality (<i>timely annual leave, compliance with the work and rest schedule, payment of wages and other payments, sick leave, etc.</i>)?	1	2	3	4	5	99
2.	Please evaluate the measures taken to ensure safety (<i>availability of personal and collective protective equipment, training, instructions, etc. in order to prevent incidents, deaths, injuries</i>)	1	2	3	4	5	99
3.	Please rate the provision of equal opportunities in the exercise of labour rights and freedoms (<i>no discrimination in appointments and promotions, equal pay for equal work, etc.</i>)	1	2	3	4	5	99
4.	How satisfied are you with the legal regulation of labour relations?	1	2	3	4	5	99

Table 6. Socially significant services in the sphere of public health.

Health services, "5" fully satisfied, "1" fully dissatisfied							
1.	Please rate the quality of health services provided in your locality (<i>including medical care</i>)	1	2	3	4	5	99
2.	Are you satisfied with the work of the emergency health services?	1	2	3	4	5	99
3.	Are you satisfied with the provision of medicines?	1	2	3	4	5	99
4.	Are you satisfied with the guaranteed volume of free medical care?	1	2	3	4	5	99

The pilot survey revealed that respondents generally hold positive views regarding the assessment of specific socially significant services. The refusal rate stood at 20%, which is

notably low compared to the surveys conducted in 2023. The Likert scale proved effective in measuring the level of satisfaction with the quality of socially significant services. The pilot survey and the overall project culminated in the preparation of the "Methodological Guide for Conducting Public Monitoring to Measure the Level of Satisfaction of the Population with the Quality of Socially Significant Services."

CONCLUSION

In this article, we describe the methodology for public monitoring of socially significant services (SSS), which was developed as part of a project commissioned by the Astana Civil Service Hub. This methodology primarily involves direct surveys of the population to gather feedback on the quality of these vital services.

The public monitoring process comprises four distinct stages. It is crucial that qualified specialists conduct this monitoring, as the collection of reliable data and its accurate interpretation are of critical importance to service providers, particularly government agencies.

To minimise data bias, it would be advisable to employ multiple data collection tools simultaneously, although this approach inherently increases monitoring costs.

Looking ahead, it would be beneficial to explore the introduction of new monitoring approaches that leverage digital technologies.

REFERENCES

- Cepiku, D. and Mastrodascio, M. (2021). Equity in public services: A systematic literature review. *Public Administration Review*, 81(6), 1019–1032.
- De Mooij R.A. (2012). Introduction: Rethinking the role of state. *International Tax and Public Finance*, Volume 19, pages 463–467. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10797-012-9243-y>
- Isakov A.R. (2013). Public services and their classification. *Vestnik Saratovskoj gosudarstvennoj yuridicheskoy akademii*, № 6 (95), pages-91-96. Translation from Russian.
- Falina, A. S. (2012). *Servisnoe gosudarstvo: istoki teorii, elementy praktiki*. *Sociologiya vlasti*, (1), 132-140. Translation from Russian.
- Kuzmina A.L (2019) Evolution of an Economic Role of the State and its Reflection in Economic Theories. *Ekonomicheskij zhurnal*, (1 (53)), pages 92-106 Translation from Russian. <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/evolyutsiya-ekonomicheskoi-rol-i-gosudarstva-i-ee-otrazhenie-v-teoreticheskikh-kontseptsiyah>
- Menezes, Vítor G. de, Glauco V. Pedrosa, Marcos P. P. da Silva, and Rejane M. da C. Figueiredo (2022). Evaluation of Public Services Considering the Expectations of Users – A Systematic Literature Review. *Information* (13), pages 162. <https://doi.org/10.3390/info13040162>
- Michalski, T. and Kopeć K. (2021) Implementation of monitoring of the quality of public services at the local level as a tool for reforming public administration – the Polish experience, *Public Administration Issues* [online], 6 (Special Issue II, electronic edition), pages 128–145. <https://doi.org/10.17323/1999-5431-2021-0-6-128-145>
- Veronika Petkovešek, Nevenka Hrovatin, Primož Pevcin (2021). Local Public Services Delivery Mechanisms: A Literature Review. *Lex localis - Journal of Local Self-Government*. 19. 39-64. <https://doi.org/10.4335/19.1.39-64>

- Paul Spicker (2009). The nature of a public service. *International Journal of Public Administration* 32(11) pp 970-991.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265865101_The_Nature_of_a_Public_Service
- Styrin E., Plaksin S. (2012). Features of the Diptychs of the quality of state and municipal services in Russia in the twentieth world experience.
https://www.hse.ru/data/2012/05/29/1252473230/%D1%81%D1%82%D0%B0%D1%82%D1%8C%D1%8F_%D0%A1%D1%82%D1%8B%D1%80%D0%B8%D0%BD_%D0%9F%D0%BB%D0%B0%D0%BA%D1%81%D0%B8%D0%BD_%D0%A1%D0%9F%D0%B1_11_11_2011.doc Translation from Russian.
- Vyas-Doorgapersad, S., Coskun Can Aktan (2017). Changing World and Changing State: Rethinking the Roles Of The State. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Studies*, N9. <https://hdl.handle.net/10210/250779>
- Xu G. (2013). Development through Empowerment: Delivering Effective Public Services – a Literature Review. *Asian Development Bank*. N. 382. 36p.
<https://www.adb.org/publications/development-through-empowerment-delivering-effective-public-services-literature-review>

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors express their sincere gratitude to UNDP, the Astana Civil Service Hub, and the Agency of the Republic of Kazakhstan for Civil Service Affairs for the invaluable opportunity to participate in this significant project to develop a methodology for the public monitoring of socially significant services.

APPENDIX 1

Assessment of accessibility and convenience in the provision of services
in paper and electronic form (2024)

Evaluation criteria	Assessment of the quality of the service provided in paper form	Average score		Satisfaction level		
ACCESSIBILITY AND CONVENIENCE	Paper form					
	The service provider's building has convenient location	4.83	4.81	83.3%	88.9%	
	Convenient work hours	4.88		96.6%		
	Enough parking spaces	4.82		80.3%		
	Access to the building was easy (e.g., there were no barriers to physically entering and staying in the building)	4.73		90.6%		
	There were necessary waiting areas that were comfortable	4.83		87.3%		
	The service was provided on a fair and equitable basis	4.76		95.4%		
	Electronic form					
	Ease of registration on the portal for receiving an electronic service	4.65	4.61	70.0%	70.7%	
	Ease of obtaining EDS	4.45		69.1%		
	Ease of use of EDS	4.61		68.2%		
	Evaluation of the appearance (design) and structural organisation of the portal (online platform) where the service was received	4.74		75.4%		
	AVERAGE SCORE			4.71		79.8%
	Source: Results of public monitoring of the quality of public services, 2024. https://www.gov.kz/memleket/entities/qyzmet/documents/details/788198?directionId=11&lang=ru					