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ABSTRACT

One of the key elements of public sector reforms in the world is the decentralization of power, resources and functions from central government to LGAs. Since the 1990s, Tanzania’s government through LGRP adopted D-by-D for strengthening good governance. This study explores the determinants of effective implementation of decentralization reforms in Tanzania’s LGAs, specifically at SMC. It focuses on the implementation process of decentralization reforms, the effectiveness of implementation of decentralization reforms, the factors for effective execution of the reforms and finally the factors hindering effective execution of reforms in LGAs in Tanzania. A sample size of 50 respondents were purposively and randomly selected and used in the study. The study used case study design and mixed data collection methods. Data collected were qualitatively and quantitatively analyzed. The study has discovered that the process of implementation of decentralization reforms in Tanzania’s LGAs was activated by the creation of decentralized institutions like LGAs, enactment and amendments of numerous pieces of legislation and through devolving limited fiscal, administrative and political power/functions to LGAs. It was further discovered that the effectiveness of decentralization in LGAs in Tanzania is rather mixed and not guaranteed because LGAs have not yet given autonomy over the entire governance of local affairs. However, the study observed some good practice in government responsiveness to the needs of the people. The study confirmed further that for effective implementation of the reforms in Tanzania’s LGAs, political will and commitment from government, institutional capacity of LGAs, policy coherence and strong legal framework are vital. It further revealed that, LGAs have neither institutional capacities nor the political will and commitment to effective implement decentralization reforms. It is recommended that, more political will and commitment from the central government and instant reviewing of existing legal framework is vital for safeguarding local autonomy over local governance matters. Adoption of decentralization policy is crucial, if Tanzania is to advantage from decentralization reforms as advocated by the NPM model.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of a Research

Decentralization is perceived as a significant component of New Public Management Reforms (NPM) for redefining and restructuring the government as well as bringing power closer to the people both in developed and developing states worldwide (Smoke, 2015; Mooketsane, Bodilenyane & Motshekga, 2017). Since the 1980s, decentralization reforms started to be implemented in several countries across the world as a strategy for achieving good governance and remedying pathologies in governance affairs (Ozmen, 2014; Mohammed, North & Ashton, 2016; Kalufya, Michael & Chalu, 2018). This era of reforms was associated with the paradigm shift from centralized to decentralized public governance as advocated by NPM model. The era was dominated by devolving of authority, responsibilities and resources from the state government to the grassroots authorities for enhancing strong democratic entities governed by locally elected body (Mbate, 2017; Obosi, 2019).

The World Bank indicates that by the end of 2000s, 95% of the democratic state in the world had elected local authorities and administrative, fiscal and political powers have been given to sub-national government at grassroots (Karlstrom, 2015; Makara, 2018). Globally, decentralization reforms has been highly implemented in developed countries such as Germany, United Kingdom, United States of America (USA) and Canada but partially implemented in developing counties like Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania, South Africa, Botswana, Nigeria and Ghana (Wagana, Iravo & Nzulwa, 2015; Zaidi et al, 2019). Therefore across the world, reforms have been seen as a strategy against the concentration and discretionary exercise of power by the central government.

Since the 1990s, decentralization reform was recognized as crucial political reform agenda by many African countries than anywhere else in the world. Over the past thirty years, African countries started to transfer resources and activities to the local
government authorities (LGAs) like county, municipalities and cities (Dickovick & Wunsch, 2014). In the African context, the reform is executed by a good number of countries as a strategy for achieving African agenda 2030 and 2063, bringing decision making power and autonomy closer to the people and remediying bureaucratic pathologies in public services delivery (Slavova & Ekwechime, 2016).

Awortwi (2011) observed that, in 2010 almost two-thirds (2/3) of countries from sub-Saharan region has executed more than one form of decentralization purposely to bring the government where the people live. Likewise, World Bank (2011) as cited in Mbate (2017) suggests that, more than 50% of African countries have devolved power, resources and functions from the centre to the grassroots. Mbate (2017) argued that, successfully execution of the reforms in Kenya is the results of participatory governance, institutional and bureaucratic capacities and political competitions at the grassroots level. However, the execution of the reform in many African countries is still contentious with mixed outcome because LGAs are featured by political sluggishness and institutional incapacity.

Around the 1980s and 1990s, International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank (WB) prompted African countries to decentralize governance power, resources and functions to local authorities (Zaidi et al, 2019). In early of the 1990s, several countries started to enshrine decentralization reforms either in a national constitution or in other legislation. By 2009, 40% of African countries have enshrined decentralization matters in their constitution (United Cities and Local Government of Africa, 2015). Likewise, Commonwealth African Countries such as Zambia, Nigeria, Tanzania, Kenya, Uganda, Ghana and Botswana, have enshrined decentralization matters in their constitution and other legislations (Sutcliffe, 2014).

Kundishora (2009) asserts that, many governments from Africa countries have enacted comprehensive constitutions with specific provisions which support the execution of decentralization reform whilst strengthening decentralized local authorities. However, the plethora of legislations with some sort of ambiguities complicates the process of implementation of the reforms in most of third world countries. In Tanzania, the
decentralization reform was meant to overturn the bureaucratic public administration featured by inefficient and ineffective to decentralized governance system which is perceived to be efficient (Mbate, 2017).

In 1972 the government of Tanzania adopted decentralization reform purposely to deal with inter-regional development gap and ensuring equitability of public services between urban and rural areas. Through regional planning committee, central government coordinated all devolved activities at the grassroots level instead of LGAs. With time, the committee failed to attain the preferences of the populace at the grassroots areas. Following these failures, in 1982 the government re-instituted LGAs for effective execution of decentralized activities in the country (URT, 1998).

Anosisye (2016), Mseti and Mwakasangula (2019) observe that, within the broader context of public sector reforms in 1996, Tanzania’s government adopted Local Government Act No. 7, 8 & 9 of 1982 and local government reform agenda to strengthen central-local government relations. This was adopted to enhance public sector performance, participatory planning and ensuring efficiency in delivery of public services through the use of D-by-D as the guiding policy. The execution of decentralization reform principally addressed the challenges of public service delivery at grassroots and aimed at empowering LGAs to respond more efficiently and effectively to the local preferences (Lufunyo, 2013).

In line with Tanzania Development Vision (TDV) 2025, decentralization also aimed to empower local authorities in deciding their own issues affecting their lives (Frumence, Nyamhanga, Mwangu &Hurtig, 2013). However, despite the recognized significance offered by the reform, its implementation remains to be defective. Mpambije (2016) and Economic Commission for Africa (2017) declared that limited local autonomy over human and fiscal resources, institutional incapacities and misuse of public fund characterize the context of decentralized LGAs in Tanzania.
Der Visser (2005) as cited by Mpambije (2016) asserted that, if LGAs are characterized with insufficient power and institutional capacity cannot afford to act according to the desires of the local populace they are empowered to serve. Similarly, Soucat and Scheffler (2013) as cited by Slavova and Okwechime (2016) observed that, the decentralized public services delivery in Africa are worse and featured by poor facilities, under-resourced, incompetent and underpaid public officials resulting to deteriorated public services delivery. Tanzania in particular, most of the decentralized public services such as education and health services are still plagued with centralized directives, weak institutional capacities and centralization of power to the central government officials who regularly interferes local council affairs.

1.2. Statement of the Problem
Since the 1990s, the government of Tanzania embarked on the implementation of decentralization reform. The reform not only aimed to restructure local institutions but also strengthening good governance, democracy and poverty reduction at the grassroots (Mutahaba & Pastory, 2015; Kigume & Maluka, 2018; 2019). The adoption of the Decentralization Policy Paper of 1998, the enactment of Local Government Laws (Miscellaneous Amendments) Act in 1999, initiation of LGRP in 2000, legislation of Local Government Regulations in 2000, the amendment of District Authorities Act No.7 and No. 8 of 1982 by Act No. 13 of 2006 respectively reveals the commitment and efforts taken by Tanzania’s government to decentralize power and functions to decentralized entities (Lufunyo & Pallangyo, 2017).

Despite the efforts of the government to attain full devolvement of power, resources and functions to the grassroots entities, the actual process of devolvement depicts the state of sluggishness (Kessy, 2018). Njunwa (2017; 2018) argued that, decentralized programs are slowly and ineffectively implemented in most of LGAs. Lameck (2017) citing Cabral (2011) observed that, more than 50% of African countries are identified by ineffective execution of decentralization reforms. Arguably, three decades of execution of D-by-D reform in Tanzania, LGAs are governed by centralized principles featured by centralization of power at the center, financial dependency for over 90% from CG,
limited autonomy over its local affairs as well as pervasive poverty since 64% of people are poor whereas 31.3% of those poor are living under extreme poverty (Mutahaba & Pastory, 2015; Mdee & Thorley, 2016; ECA, 2017).

Moreover, Sutcliffe (2014) citing Helmsing (2005) reveals that in 19 out of 27 Sub-Saharan African countries (SSA) studied, Central Government (CG) possess legal power to abolish LGAs. Likewise, in 14 of the 27 countries surveyed CG can dissolve the councils as happened in Dar-es Salaam-Tanzania in 2002 and Nairobi-Kenya where locally elected authorities were abandoned and replaced by central commissions to run the cities. Helmsing’s study found that in 18 of the 27 countries, LGAs do have limited power to set local tax rate but subject to CG approval. Only in 3 countries, LGAs have full autonomy to set local tax rate (Karanja, 2005 as cited in Awoertwi, 2011). The overall implementation process of decentralization reforms in developing countries and Tanzania in particular has mostly remained in paper or theory featured by a sluggish or ineffective implementation. This study therefore seeks to explore the determinants of effective implementation of decentralization reforms in Singida Municipality, Tanzania.

1.3. Objectives of the Study
1.3.1. General Objective
The main objective of the study was to explore the determinants of effective implementation of decentralization reform in local government authorities in Tanzania.

1.3.2. Specific Objectives
i. To determine the process of decentralization reforms in Singida Municipality

ii. To determine the effectiveness of implementation of decentralization reforms in Singida Municipal Council.

iii. To determine factors that enhances effective implementation of decentralization reforms in Singida Municipal Council.

iv. To determine factors that impedes effective implementation of decentralization reforms in Singida Municipal Council.
1.4. Research Questions
i. How was the process of decentralization implemented in Singida Municipality?

ii. To what extent is decentralization implemented in Singida Municipality?

iii. What are the factors that enhance effective implementation of decentralization reform in Singida Municipality?

iv. What are the factors that impede effective implementation of decentralization reforms in Singida Municipal Council?

1.5. Significance of the Study
The findings of the study are significant to policy makers, development partners and implementers of the reforms both at local and central government in several ways. Firstly, the results of the investigation bring essential information to the government concerning effective implementation of numerous public policies and reforms. Secondly, the results of the research will also be imperative to development partners inspired in motivating effective implementation of decentralization reforms. The findings of the research also add knowledge to the available literature on decentralization reforms by providing new perspectives on the determinants of effective execution of decentralization reforms in decentralized entities in Tanzania.

Moreover, the study is expected to encourage public sector employees to present their knowledgeable views on how best can the councils effectively implement decentralization reforms or policies in order to stimulate development and good governance practices at the grassroots. Lastly, the study raises consciousness to the entire population in the country about the decentralization reforms and therefore being able to participate in governance affairs of their councils.

1.6. Scope of the Study
The study concentrated on exploring the determinants of effective implementation of decentralization reforms in local government authorities (LGAs) in Tanzania, a case of
Singida Municipal Council. Public servants at the headquarters of the council formed the target population from which the sample size was obtained. Public servants involved in the sample size were those from managerial ranks, supervisory positions, councilors and all employees from the lower ranks in the council.

1.7. Limitations of the Study
Numerous constraints inhibited a researcher in the process of data collection. Some participants were reluctant to provide required information on time during the study, others failed to fill and return questionnaire on time and hesitant to be recorded during interview fearing newly enacted law on statistics. Likely, some employees especially Municipal Director, Heads of Departments and Councilors always have other duties during working hours and often travel for official duties hence it was difficult to be contacted for an interview on time.

1.8. Delimitations
To guarantee that all respondents fill questionnaires as it was scheduled, the questionnaires were timely distributed to the respondents so as to give them enough time to fill it. This allowed all participants to fill and return the questionnaires on time even though they had other official responsibilities. Moreover, the appointments to conduct an interview with key informants were made in-advance so as to enable respondents to schedule their timetable.

1.9. Chapter Summary
The study is organized into five chapters. Chapter one consists of the background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, research questions, significance of the study, scope of the study, limitation and delimitation of the study. The chapter explores the determinants of effective execution of decentralization reform in local government authorities in Tanzania using Singida Municipal Council as a case study.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter reviews numerous literatures from different scholars relating to the implementation of decentralization reforms. The chapter presents both the theoretical and empirical literature reviews concerning the study. Additionally, the chapter provides a research gap, definitions of key terms, theoretical insights as well as conceptual framework used in the study.

2.1. Definitions of Key Research Concepts (Terms)

2.1.1. Government
The term government has been conceptualized in various ways. As the concept government has been described as an apparatus of the state through which people in a given political system are governed and state authority or power is exercised (Acharya, 2018b). Government therefore is made up by a small group of people with legitimacy power to govern the entire population either through election or appointment. This group is entrusted by the whole population in the country for the purpose of leading them to socio-economic and political development.

2.1.2. Local Government
Local government entails local administration such as village, town, district, municipal or city that is constitutionally created to uphold law, order, peace and stability, provide basic services as well as enhancing participation of local populace in attainment of their social welfare (Fatile & Ejalonibu, 2015; Acharya, 2018a,b). For this study, local government is therefore defined as the segment of central government with power to sue or be sued, created by statute, exercising its power and authority at grassroots level, governed by legislative body known as council assisted by executive body called committees and administrative organ namely local government services organ.
2.1.3. Local Government Authorities

Local government authorities (LGAs) entails the rural and urban institutions which are statutorily established, functioning within a defined political system at local level and exercising their power through a democratically elected body known as a councils (Mbegu & Komba, 2017; Jesse & Bengesi, 2018). In the case of Tanzania, LGAs exist under the Local Government Act No. 7 & 8 of 1982 as amended by Act No. 13 of 2006 which describes the presence of Rural and Urban Authorities (URT 1982 as cited in Lufunyo & Parangyo 2017). Local government authority therefore is described as legally created body governed by locally elected representatives that ensure peace and harmony and availing public services such as health care, sanitation, education and water in their area of jurisdiction.

2.1.4. Decentralization

Houdret and Harnisch (2017) defines decentralization as the process of redefining and restructuring the structures, powers and governance practice by devolving national power and responsibilities from the central government to the sub national levels of government for the sake of bringing government closer to the people in line with the principle of subsidiarity. Obosi (2019) state that, in this era of modern state, decentralization entails the process of devolving political, administrative and fiscal authority such as decision making and management of public affairs from national government to either provisional institutions, LGAs, semi autonomous public entities or voluntary associations outside the ambit of the central administration.

2.1.5. Decentralization reforms

The decentralization reforms entail changing the centre of power and authority from central government to the local authorities at the grassroots level for the sake of enhancing public accountability, bringing government closer to the people whilst improving public service provision to the people (McCollum, Theobald, Otiso & Martineau, 2018; Obosi, 2019). Principally, failure of the centralized system to bring better and affordable public services to the people spearhead the adoption of
decentralization reforms as the alternative to improve the quality of public services to the citizens in less and affordable cost.

2.2. Theoretical Literature Review

2.2.1. Rationale or Motives of Decentralization Reforms

Many countries from various regions have adopted and implemented decentralization reforms for numerous reasons. In Western countries, decentralization has been executed as the most appropriate management system for poverty eradication and improving public services to the people (Chardchawarn, 2010). For liberals the execution of the reforms in countries from Latin America in the early of the 1980s, aimed to transform from an authoritarian regime to democratic system and improving participation of people in local governance affairs for nurturing socio-economic and political development (Norman, 2018).

Moreover, in South Africa, Sri Lanka, Yugoslavia and Indonesia the reforms were the reaction to ethnic, racial and regional conflicts that prevailed in their political system. Thus, decentralization was perceived as the solution to ever-ending conflicts in different countries in the world (Sutiyo, 2014; Martinez-Vazquez, et al, 2015). Similarly, in East Asia, Central Europe and Soviet Union, decentralization was considered as part of economic reforms geared towards transforming centralized public administration to decentralized government focusing on market economies (Cheema & Rondinelli, 2007 as cited in Sutiyo, 2014; European Union, 2016).

Based on decentralization theorem as advanced by Oates 1972 it is perceived that, the pathologies of centralized administration such as corruption and patronage can only be solved through devolution of power to LGAs, since devolved authorities respond easily to local problems (Martinez-Vazquez, Lago-Peñas & Sacchi, 2015; Wagana et al 2015; Nadeem, 2016, Richardson, Durose & Dean, 2018). Likewise, more than 80% of developing countries including the Philippines, Indonesia and Tanzania adopted decentralization reform as an alternative for improving economic efficiency, economic stability and public sector performance (Chardchawarn, 2010; Kessy 2013; Sutiyo, 2014; Archarya, 2018a). Though, it is almost three decades now since the inception of the
reforms but poverty and central governance is still prevalent in Tanzania’s public administration.

Grounded on Neo-Liberal Perspectives and Institutional Theory, Dickovick (2014), Karlstrom (2015) and Zaidi et al (2019) established that since the 1980, IMF, WB and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) pressurized state under centralized public administration in SSA to adopt the decentralization reforms. These institutions sought that, the reforms is essential for enhancing good governance, poverty alleviation, building social stability and removing disparities between urban and rural areas (Houdret & Harnisch, 2017; Gaynor, 2018). Therefore, it is worth noting that SSA reformed their public sector to fulfill the conditions of IMF and WB but not solving socio-economic problems of the grassroots population.

It can therefore be concluded that, the theoretical focus of decentralization reforms in developing and transition economies is to strengthen good governance, improved public services delivery, enhance political stability, peace building and poverty reduction through transferring power, resources and activities to the LGAs. Though it is worth noting that, in many African countries, the adoption of decentralization reform was geared towards meeting the conditions imposed by WB and IMF but not solving societal problems at grassroots since majority of local populace are still starved and faced with poor services delivery.

On the other hand, the opponents of decentralization by devolution reforms, opines that reforms has increased inequalities and regional disparities in the provision of basic public services at the grassroots areas. Similarly, the reform has resulted to the increase of corruption, culture of patronage and elite capture behaviors to local government politicians and bureaucrats. In the case of South Asia, it is estimated that between 30 and 40% of development funds are stolen by local government politicians and junior bureaucrats (Nadeem, 2016; Kalufya, et al, 2018).Moreover, the reform has enhanced management complexity and rapid growing administrative areas which results to
ineffective execution of public policies hence miserable services delivery to the people (Green, 2013 cited in Mensah, Adamtey & Mohammed, 2015).

Over the years, decentralization has been used as an instrument of domination and entrenching power of the ruling party at the grassroots level. Local authorities initially established to strengthen democracy and to enhance popular participation today is significantly used as patronage network to create and sustain electoral privilege of few elite at both national and local level (Jane & Englebert, 2019). Evidence from the governments of Kenya, Democratic Republic of Congo, Uganda, Zimbabwe, Nigeria, Cote d’Ivoire, South Africa and Tanzania indicates that all countries have used decentralized political system to consolidate the power of the ruling party at both national and local level.

2.2.2. The Nature and Characteristics of Decentralization Reform.
Decentralized governance system is featured by (a) statutory bringing decision-making power and resources to the grassroots entity (b) empowering people at the grassroots to decide their own ways of governance and (c) it is associated with a large number of societal actors (government, the private entity, and civil society organizations) involved in public services delivery (Mnyasenga & Mushi, 2015). Likewise, Ozmen (2014) maintained that, decentralization is characterized by the combination of both political, fiscal, administrative power and market functions. However, it should be noted that decentralization is not associated with the transfer of authority to non-state actors like private sectors as well as not adopted as an alternative to centralization or to weaken centralized public administration.

The United State Agency for International Development (2009) summarized the characteristics of decentralization into four categories including; Local Authority, which entails power of LGAs to carry out its assigned activities in favor of local people at their areas of jurisdiction, Local autonomy, which empower LGAs to undertake its functions freely without inducement from central government. Capacity in-terms of resources, which enable national government to render public services to the local populace at the
grassroots level effectively. *Local Accountability*, which empowers voters to hold bureaucratic and politicians accountable for their actions if they do not effectively respond to local needs (USAID, 2009, Acharya, 2018a, b).

Based on the sequential theory of decentralization as advanced by Fallet in 2004 and the principle of residuality as used in unitary countries, it is concluded that the practice of decentralization in many developing countries has been featured by de-concentration which entails the retention of authority, resources and power at the center of the government. As the weakest form of decentralization, de-concentration is highly preferred by central government leaders and bureaucrats since it disperses only implementation roles to LGAs as opposed to political decentralization which seeks to transfer full power and resources from the centre to the local authorities.

### 2.2.3. Typologies and forms of Decentralization

Literally there are different typologies of decentralization which are practiced by several countries in the world. These typologies are political, administrative, fiscal, and market decentralization (Eldal, 2018).

Chardchawarn, (2010) considers *political decentralization* as the constitutional dispersal of considerable decision making powers, resources and responsibilities from higher government to the democratically elected authorities at the lower levels. In this type, LGAs at grassroots levels are autonomous from central government authorities (Beshara, Downing, Holbreich & Singh, 2014). Therefore, this dimension deals with the pursuit of the participatory democracy, empowering citizens and local institutions that have been democratically elected by their electorate.

Wagana et al, (2015) define *administrative decentralization* as the incomplete transfer of certain decision making power, activities and public servants from higher government to grassroots authorities. It is the most preferred type of decentralization by many governments since political power and resources over lower authorities are contained at the center (Mohammed et al, 2016). *Fiscal decentralization* implies the series of policies
designed to enhance the process of devolving decision making power and autonomy on financial matters from state government to the local authorities (Ozmen, 2014) citing Fallet,2004; Wagana et al, 2015). Thereby, shifting fiscal powers from the state government to the autonomous organization at the grassroots institution is necessary for other variants of decentralization to flourish.

Based on privatization and alternative service model, market decentralization entails the dispersing of responsibilities from the government to private entity which operate outside the public realm for quality improvement of public services (Kigume & Maluka, 2018). This is the result of the involvement of non-state actors in the provision of public services to the grassroots people (Ibid). In Tanzania, market decentralization is carried out through outsourcing, contracting out and privatization and Public Private Partnerships arrangements. Wagana et al (2015) differentiate several forms of decentralization. These forms are devolution, de-concentration and delegation. Devolution which entails a set of statutorily reforms designed to diffuse political authority and responsibility to the democratically elected LGAs.

Devolution requires constitutional reforms, strong legislatures and functioning political units at local levels (Akudugu, 2013; Ozmen, 2014; Mbate, 2017). The goal of this form is to confer more decision making power to elected authorities and empowering local populace in local governance at the grassroots. De-concentration referring to the shifting of administrative responsibility from central government to lower levels without granting them required power or autonomous status (Wagana et al, 2015; ECA, 2017). Therefore, this form of decentralization is unlikely to bring the expected benefits of decentralization to the local populace since is regarded as the weakest form of decentralization and regularly used in unitary states like Tanzania.

Delegation, refers to more comprehensive form of decentralization through which central government disperse specific administrative functions for decision-making and planning to quasi-autonomous institutions or public entities that are not regularly controlled by the delegating office but held accountable by it (Wagana et al, 2015; Mohammed et al, 2016;
Mbate, 2017). In the case of Tanzania, the creation of agencies or special projects implementation units like Big Results Now (BRN) units and Tanzania Building Agency (TBA) fostered the government to delegate some of its responsibilities and functions to reduce burden at the centre.
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**Source:** Karmel, E (2017).

### 2.2.4. The Overviews of Decentralization Reforms Worldwide

Chardchawarn (2010) contends that, the implementation of decentralization reform across the world can be categorized into three waves. During the 1950s, government from many countries started to undertake decentralization process as an integrated governance effort
to enhance public participation in decision-making and responding to the society desire for public services. However, this epoch failed in many regions of Asia and Africa as it was characterized by limited participation of people in local governance since the center contained power in their hands (Chardchawarn, 2010). By the mid 1970s and 1980s, the world observed the triumph of the second wave of decentralization in large number of developing countries such as Mexico, Brazil, China and Russia (Beshara et al, 2014). This era of decentralization was featured by the continuation of concentration of powers and resources at the centre hence undermining the power of elected local government at the grassroots.

From 1980s, to present entail the third phase of decentralization reform. This era witnessed various countries worldwide decentralized their governance system, define and restructure the roles of the central government to cater the ever-increasing demands for good governance and the blowing wind of change as advocated by neo-liberal philosophy (Chardchawarn, 2010). Since the 1980s the majority of developing countries initiated the process of decentralization reform in its all variants to increase power sharing deal between central and local government. Over the past three decades, it was approximated that 50% of the member state of European Union and 80% of developing and transition countries across the world have implemented some form of decentralization reform respectively whereas 76% of countries globally had opted political decentralization (Kimengsi & Gwan, 2017).

2.2.5. The Process of Implementation of Decentralization Reform in Tanzania

The decentralization process in Tanzania has been evolving since pre-colonial era. The presence of chieftom system and native authorities in different regions in Tanzania is a concrete evidence of the evolvement of decentralization system in the country. Kessy (2018) prove this by arguing that; decentralization is coupled with local government systems and native authorities that have been existed in Tanzania since independence. Moreover, Ng’eni and Chalam (2016) and Kessy (2018) maintained that, the documented process of decentralization reform in Tanzania is aged more than four decades now since its adoption. Therefore, this section delineates the processes of decentralization in
Tanzania immediately after independence with the focus on the D-by-D which commenced since 1997 to present.

From the 1961 to mid 1971, the government of Tanzania adopted decentralization strategy to improve public services delivery to the grassroots populations (Kigume, Maluka & Kamuzora, 2018). The national building agenda in Tanzania and nationalization policy of the 1962 abolished traditional chiefdom system and colonial native authorities and engaged on the consolidation of democratically elected local authorities (Kigume, et al, 2018). In this period, democratic local authorities were established purposely to enhance the process of devolving power, resources and functions from central government to LGAs (Flumence, et al, 2013). It should be noted that this epoch was affected by the concentration of power and resources at the centre, weak legal framework and lack of decentralization policy.

By the early of the 1972 to 1982, a second wave of decentralization was started. This era was the result of the failure of established LGAs in achieving the anticipated goals such as increasing public service delivery to the citizen, lessening poverty and enhancing involvement of citizen in grassroots governance (Flumence, et al, 2013). Following the failure of LGAs to provide basic social service at the grassroots, in 1972 the government of Tanzania strengthened the capacity of regional and district level committee for the management of dispersed resources and activities from central government (Kundishora, 2009). Therefore, between 1972 and 1982 central government through region and district committee took the responsibilities of managing all local government affairs. The government enacted Decentralization of the Government Administration (Interim Provisions) Act of 1972 to officiate regions and districts offices to take charge of LGAs functions (Mnyaenga & Mushi, 2015).

The 1972 Act, legalized de-concentration system of decentralization as well as the abolition of local government authorities but empowered Regional Development Committees (RDC), District Development Councils (DDC) and Ward Development Committees (WDC) to take over all responsibilities that were performed by LGAs to the
hands of the central government (Likwelile & Assey, 2018). Though, weak institutional incapacity and economic crisis of the early 1970s resulted to the poor public services delivery hence paved the way to the failure of de-concentrated governance system at the grassroots level (Ibid).

The failure of de-concentration system from the 1982-1996, marked the beginning of the third phase of decentralization reform in Tanzania. This failure spearheaded the re-establishment of LGAs with an element of political and administrative decentralization in the country (Kigume et al, 2018). The enactment of the Local Government Authorities Act No. 7 and 8 of 1982 and Local Government Services Act No.10 of 1982 as revised in 2006 initiated the re-institutions of local authorities in Tanzania (Likwelile & Assey, 2018). The amendment of the Constitution of the United Republic of Tanzania of 1977 through Act No. 15 of 1984 legalized the re-instituted LGAs in Tanzania and any intention of abolishing it cannot thrive without the amendments of the statute that legalize its existence (Mnyasenga & Mushi, 2015).

Despite the re-institution of LGAs in Tanzania-mainland in 1984, centralized (top-down) management approach was used to govern local affairs. This perpetuated the dominance of bureaucratic procedures in all central government offices hence local government remained under central government control and domination. With huge bureaucratic power, central government controlled social-economic and political agenda of LGAs at the grassroots level and people’s expectations were not real achieved (Mnyasenga & Mushi, 2015; Kigume et al, 2018).

Comprehensive Local Government Reform Programme (LGRP) of 1996 marked the beginning of the fourth phase of decentralization in the country. Due to the failure of LGAs to execute its constitutional functions, the questions for decentralization become an issue to the majority of Tanzanian. Rugeiyamu, Masanyiwa and Nziku (2018) established that, in 1995 during political rally and campaign, the ruling party (CCM) promised Tanzanians to strengthen local governance system if re-elected with the overall aims of enhancing quality public services.
After the massive victory in October, 1995 the policy paper on LGRP was prepared and published in 1998. The execution processes of decentralization reforms in Tanzania were eventually revived by the Local Government Reform Agenda of 1996-2000 and the Policy Paper on Local Government Reform of 1998. These reforms initiated a Policy of D-by-D with the aim of enhancing local governance, finance, human resources as well as legal status of local authorities (Lufunyo & Pallangyo, 2017; Likwelile & Assey, 2018).

One of the reform’s objectives as stated previous is to improve local governance for the sake of limiting interference from central government over local affairs. Local governance therefore implies a process through which LGAs is granted with substantial power and autonomy of making decisions without undue influence from national government. Principally, local governance is vital for enhancing accountability of the locally elected leaders to their citizens, community representation and participation in decision-making process, bringing government closer to the people as well as enhancing responsiveness of local authorities in the provision and management of quality and affordable public services to local people (Ndreu, 2016; Likwelile & Assey, 2018).

Likewise, enhancing financial autonomy to the established local authorities was an agenda of Policy Paper on Local Government Reform of 1998. Mutahaba and Pastory (2015) noted that, authority to use collected resources based on local preferences is imperative for decentralized entities to render required public services to the populace. Fiscal autonomy therefore seeks to increase the autonomy of LGAs to set their own tax rate, collect revenue and determine their areas of expenditure, improve revue compliance and enhancing financial management without interference as stated in the policy paper that “LGA locally generated and centrally disbursed financial resources enhanced and managed efficiently”(Ng’eni & Chalam, 2016).

In similar vein, Ridder, Emans, Hulst and Tollenaar (2015) argues that, human resources management as part of administrative decentralization is the cornerstone of D-by-D and Policy Paper of 1998. The broad objective of LGRP was to have LGAs with autonomy over local employees in their areas of jurisdiction. Likewise, decentralized human
resources management intended to change the accountability status of local employees from their former parent ministries to locally elected council. Similarly, the reforms aimed at granting appointment and human resources management power and autonomy to LGAs (Kalufya et al, 2018).

The reform also aimed at granting LGAs with legal status for effective execution of decentralization reform. Numerous legislations were enacted and amended in order to give LGAs a legal backing. The Local Government Acts No. 7, 8 & 9 of 1982 (Revised in 2006), the enactment of Act No.6 of 1999, the Local Government Regulations (Councilors and Staff Code of Conduct) both of 2000 acted as the vehicles for effective execution of the reforms in local authorities (Mnyasenga & Mushi, 2015; Lufunyo & Pallangyo, 2017). Likewise, The Local Government Laws (Miscellaneous Amendments) Act, No. 6 of 1999 enhanced the creation of legal and autonomous institutions needed for improving central-local government relations in the management of local affairs (Mbwambo, 2015; Ng’eni & Chalam, 2016).

Therefore, despite the rhetoric of D-by-D, it is undisputable fact that the ambiguities in laws governing central-local government relations (such as Act No.6 of 1999 and Act No 13 of 2006) create a loop-hole to the central government and minister responsible for local government to exert their control and influence over LGA’s affairs (Mnyasenga & Mushi, 2015; Kessy & Mushi, 2018; Pazi, 2018). Moreover, the re-centralization of property tax since 2016 grabbed the power of LGAs over resources collection hence weakening its fiscal autonomy and creating an environment for local government dependence on grants from central government.

Ridder, et al, (2015) opines that, centralized human resources management approach undermines local autonomy over personnel management for almost 95% hence unsuccessful decentralized human resources management system (Ibid). Public Servant Recruitment Secretariat (PSRS) as created by Public Service Act of 2002 (amended by Act No. 18 of 2007) is mandated to recruit professionals’ employees whilst common cadres are within the domain of LGAs (Ridder, et al 2015). Because of the plethora of
laws and appointment authorities, LGAs comprises of staff from various appointing institutions hence accountability problems (Lameck, 2015; Mutahaba & Pastory, 2015; Mbwambo, 2015).

Concerning local governance, Norman and Massoi (2009) as cited in Ng’eni and Chalam (2016), Mwakasangula and Tufurukwa (2018) reveals that, governance process in grassroots institutions such as village, ward council level and district or municipal council is featured by limited participation of local populace in governance affairs and poor accountability mechanisms (Mmari & Katera, 2018). Therefore, it is undisputable fact that the government of Tanzania attained only the theoretical part of instituting decentralized structures at the grassroots though on ground failed to improve public services provisions and good governance values at the grassroots institution hence the crisis of local governance.

In Tanzania, D-by-D is prescribed in conformity with the presence of LGAs. Article 145 (1) and 146 (1) of the constitution insist the element of “people power” and emphasizing bringing government closer to the people. Article 145(1) states that, “there shall be established local government authorities in each region, district, urban areas and the village” whereas Article 146 (1) provides that, “the purpose of having local government authorities is to devolve power and authority in the hands of people at the grassroots level” (CURT, 1977). Likewise, sub-article (2) of Article 146 declares that, “A local government authority shall ensure enforcement of laws and public safety of the people and consolidate democracy within its area to speed up development of the people” without specifying power, functions and demarcation of each authority (Ibid).

The Local Government Act No. 7 & 8 of 1982 recognizes the presence of decentralized authorities such as, village, district, township, municipal and city council deliberately to strengthen local governance, popular participation and poverty eradication at the grassroots. Section 8(1) of the Local Government (Urban Authorities) Act No. 8 of 1982 (as amended in 2006) empowers urban authorities to make by-laws subject to ministerial approval. Likewise, section 6 (1) (a)-(u) of the Local Government Finance Act No.9 of
1982 (and its amendments) provides sources of revenue of urban council to raise their own revenues. Public Services Act No. 8 of 2002 as well authorize LGAs to hire, promote, discipline and fire employees accordingly. Finally, LGAs are granted power to conduct local government elections by The Local Authorities Elections Act, No. 4 of 1979.

2.2.6. The Effectiveness of the Implementation of Decentralization Reforms

Effectiveness entails the degree of the capacity of achieving the intended objectives in relation to the appropriateness of the programs under implementation (Fye, 2015). However, in this study, effectiveness is related to the attainment of the stated objectives of decentralization reforms. There are different theories accessible in the literature that facilitates the assessment of the effectiveness of decentralization initiatives in several countries. These theories among others are Stigler’s menu of 1957 and Oates decentralization theorem advanced by Oates in 1972 (Kessy, 2018).

The theories identifies that (i) the government work better when it is closer to the people and (ii) local populace must have the right to demand the type of public services they desire and (iii) public services should be delivered by authorities having autonomy over small jurisdiction for internalizing costs and benefits of such delivery (Dickovick, 2014, Kessy, 2018). The theorems therefore suggest that decision making autonomy, resources and functions for public services delivery should be relinquished from the centre to the grassroots institutions for obtaining maximal efficiency in resources allocations and ensuring sufficient and quality public services delivery.

Based on normative theory Smoke (2003) as cited by Smoke (2015), Kwach, Adam and Shangazi (2016) opined that, decentralization is believed to improve public services provisions to the people as well as increasing autonomy to sub-national government. However, there is mixed results and limited research that has been carried out to prove whether the reform has increased the deliverance of public services to the people and autonomy to LGAs. Differently, Mbate (2017) perceives that in various countries the
reforms has effectively implemented and increased decision making autonomy to grassroots institutions and improved public service delivery to the local populace.

Fatile and Ejalonibu (2015) opines that, the effectiveness of decentralization is accomplished through increasing fiscal, administrative and political autonomy to LGAs and providing people with quality and affordable public services provided by competent and non partisan public bureaucrats. Smoke (2015) and Fye (2015) noted that, since its inception, the reforms failed to increase government responsiveness to the desires of populace as well as improving public services provision to the citizen. The experiences and empirical evidence on the ground indicate that the reform has failed to achieve its stated theoretical objectives of empowering LGAs since the reforms is vulnerable to unwillingness of central government to devolve resources and power to sub-national government at the grassroots (Smoke, 2015; ECA, 2017).

Therefore based on the above theories, the effectiveness of decentralization reforms in LGAs in Tanzania is assessed through three dimensions; these are: (i) local autonomy over financial, human resources, and decision making matters (ii) public services delivery; (iii) accountability of government officials to the needs of the people and (iv) the responsiveness of the government to the people. These indicators of assessment of the effectiveness of decentralization program are grounded on the wide literature of local governance and decentralization (Dickovick, 2014; Fye, 2015; Kessy, 2018).

2.2.7. Factors for Effective Implementation of Decentralization Reforms

The implementation of various forms of decentralization should be guided by the principle of subsidiarity. The principle is grounded on the idea that any function that need to be performed at the grassroots level of the government should not to be performed by the national government (Bannink & Ossewaarde, 2012). Moreover, the principle requires that, public services delivery to reflect the demands and preferences of the citizens at the grassroots level. According to the principle, effective execution of the reforms will be attained only if fiscal, administrative and political functions, resources
and powers are devolved and exercised by grassroots level with minimal control and supervision from central government in case arise (Chhetri, 2013).

Guided by soufflé-theory of decentralization as advocated by Parker in 1995, Sutiyo (2014) argued that strong political will and commitment from both political and bureaucratic leaders, clear legal and institutional framework, involvement of populace in governance process and the level of accountability in the specific country are vital for effective execution of the reforms. According to Parker’s theory having good design of decentralization did not guarantee its execution rather willingness of public officials and leaders from central government to disperse power, resources and functions to LGAs (Cheema & Rondinelli, 2007 as cited by Sutiyo, 2014). It is undisputable fact that, political and bureaucratic commitment to engage in power sharing deal with LGAs is likely to enhance effective execution of reforms.

Kimengsi and Gwan (2017) and Ochieng (2017) relying on resources dependency theory argued that, institutional capacity in terms of human and financial resources are required for decentralized government to effectively provide public services within their area of jurisdiction. Thereby, it can be cemented that for effective execution of decentralization reform, LGAs should have adequate resources both financial and competent human resources to facilitate the execution process of decentralization reform for effective and efficient delivery of public services.

Olum (2014) citing Litvack, Bird and Ahmed (1998) asserted that, functioning constitutional and institutional mechanism is essential for successful execution of decentralization reforms. The enactment and enforcement of laws create space for citizen input in local governance and avoid rent-seeking habits of political leaders or technocrats for private gain (Olum, 2014). Thus, the devolvement of political, fiscal and administrative power to LGAs requires parliamentary legislation to coordinate the entire process of creating decision-making institutions for undertaking the decentralized functions efficiently and effectively at the grassroots level. Depending on the context of the country, Cabral (2011) citing Jutting et al (2005) summarized the ingredients for
effective implementation of decentralization into three basic categories that is political, fiscal and administrative factors.

Given the available literature, Cabral (2011), Sutio (2014), Olum (2014), Kimengsi and Gwan (2017) and Ochieng (2017) the critical factors for effective implementation of decentralization reforms in most developing countries, Tanzania in particular are; the presence of strong political will and commitment from the central government officials to support the reform and the strength of the legal framework and policy coherence that define the powers and responsibilities of each level of government. Likewise, the institutions capacity and autonomy in-terms of financial and human resources, citizen’s participation in local affairs and the presence of accountability mechanisms are also crucial for effective execution of the reform.

2.2.8. Factors Impeding Effective Implementation of Decentralization Reform
Ringo and Mollal (2014) opined that, in some countries, the implementation of decentralization reform indicates the signs of success but in several cases the effectiveness of the reform are difficult to be materialized. Olowu (2003) and Duncan (2004) as cited in Ochieng (2017) added that, decentralization reforms is complex process and regularly fail to bring its expected potentialities due to a sequence of impediments that tends to interrupt the implementation.

Based on sequential theory of decentralization, Fissha (2017), Kessy and Mushi (2018); Jane and Englebert (2019) argues that, lack of local government capacity to undertake newly assigned functions and reluctance from central government authorities to facilitate the process of dispersing power and resources to LGAs affects the execution of the reforms. Politically, conservative party in many countries control over local government candidate choice, limit the scope of political decentralization hence the chosen local candidate may not respond accordingly to the local concerns rather to the needs of national clients (Kessy & Mushi, 2018). This is because politicians and bureaucrats from central government perceive that by implementing decentralization reform they will lose
governance power and control over resources hence acting as stumbling block towards the execution of the reform.

Sutiyo (2014) based on soufflé-theory of decentralization agreed with USAID (2009) by arguing that the inadequate revenue collections in local institutions weaken the execution of decentralization reforms. Mooketsane et al (2017) citing Dipholo and Gumede (2013) note that, financial dependence from higher government inhibits local authorities to undertake its functions autonomously. Despite the fact that central government transfers some amount of resources required to grassroots institutions, LGAs are still plagued with insufficient resources to accomplish its devolved or delegated functions accordingly. Arguably, the habit of depending financial / human resources from national government or donor countries limit the effectiveness of LGAs in the execution of its decentralized public services programs.

Mooketsane et al (2017) added that hostile relationship between the central government and LGAs bureaucrats’ result to the dysfunctional local governance hence enables central governance dominance over local affairs. It was further argued that lack of political commitment, erroneous policies and laws and lack of human resources leads to inefficiencies in governance of decentralized authorities (Gaynor, 2018). Using bureaucratic theory, Gaynor(2018) argued that the continuation of hierarchical and bureaucratic culture at both national and local level public entities and frequently central government interference over local power, limit the autonomy of lower level authorities which subsequently affect the execution of the reform.

Moreover, grounded by the Principal-Agent Model as advanced by Jensen and Meckling in 1976, Putnam (1993) as cited by Sutiyo (2014) and Richardson et al (2018) argues that, local government work by adhering to the instructions and directives from central government hence local authorities are faced with limited power, resources and weak accountability mechanism which impede effective implementation of decentralization reform or policy. Therefore based on Agency and Stakeholder Theory, it can be cemented
that, failure of government to consider the wishes of local leaders and other stakeholder’s interests affects the implementation of decentralization reform in a political entity.

Therefore, this study is alignment with Fye (2015) and Kessy (2018) who reveals that resistance from central government to devolve power and resources to LGAs impedes effective execution of the reform. The experience shows that central government in Tanzania has a vested concern of upholding domination over local authorities through re-centralization of council’s own sources of revenue. They further argue that, weak institutional capacity, weak legal framework and lack of decentralization policy also affects the implementation of decentralization reform. Finally, weak accountability mechanisms and limited citizen’s participation in local governance are also central factors for ineffective execution of decentralization in Tanzania (Kessy, 2018).

2.2.9. Theoretical Framework of the Study
This study was anchored by the “Principal-Agency Theory” constructed based on different assumptions. The justification for selecting this theory stem on the fact that it show the relationship which persists between different parties engaged in services delivery to the populace.

The theory was propounded by Jensen and Meckling in 1976. It is one of the leading theories for studying public sector management reforms. The theory is based on the idea that, the principal is too busy, incompetent and un-willing to perform certain work and thus delegates or hires an agent to carry out his activities. The theory is guided by agency relationship, information flows and power positions between principals and agents. Thus, the theory intends to attain three relational objectives. Firstly, to ensure the objectives of the principal and the agent is similar. Secondly, to resolve differences between principal and agent and thirdly, to ensure there is no information asymmetric between parties. The theory view that, for agent to pursue the principal’s interest, the principal must select the best agent and creating incentive mechanisms of inspiring agents to behave in the principal’s preferences and performs as agreed (Masanyiwa, Niehof & Termeer, 2012 cited in Wagana et al, 2015).
Based on this theory local government are agents, undertaking responsibilities on behalf of the principal (central government) and on the other hand both central and local government’s politicians are agents and citizens are principal whereas local government bureaucrats’ in charge for public services delivery are agents of locally elected politicians. Therefore agents are responsible for revenue generation and services provision to the principal. The existing agency problem is that local authorities are faced with limited political, fiscal and administrative power, autonomy and resources to undertake its functions accordingly. Likewise, both central and local governments (agents) are not accountable for their actions to the citizens (principal) and fail to deliver basic public services to the citizens.

The principal-agency theory is significant to this study as it grants good basis for understanding the relationship which persists between different parties in services delivery in which one party (the principal) delegates responsibilities or functions to another (the agent), who performs the delegated responsibilities on behalf of the principal (Hiskey, 2010 in Masanyiwa, 2014). The theory is essential for addressing and solving the principal-agent problems like monopolization of power and resources, rent seeking behaviors, lack of commitment, absence of citizen’s participation in decision making, lack of accountability and poor service delivery. However, the main challenge of this theory is how to get agents who will work according to the principal’s interests as opposed to personal interests (Eisenhardt, 2009).

2.3. Empirical Literature Review

This segment of the study discusses the empirical literature review on the implementation of decentralization reforms. Several studies have been carried out on the execution of the reform in different countries in the world. These studies include the study conducted in countries from Asia and Africa, Tanzania in particular.

Asian Development Bank Institute (2017) commissioned a study titled; Central and Local Government Relations in Asia; Achieving Fiscal Sustainability. The study
concentrated on assessing the level of financial and administrative autonomy in local authorities. The findings of the study revealed that, even though Asian countries differ in the implementation of decentralization policy but in most cases local authorities in Asian economies lack fiscal autonomy. It was further observed that local authorities carry out their government operation under the legal arrangement framed by state government of respective country. Furthermore, the study observed that the principle of local authorities to act as a self governing organization is violated in Asian countries due to the centralization of power at the centre and incomplete implementation of laws concerning local government.

Murthy and Mahin (2015) conducted a study on, *Examining the Constitutional Impediments to Decentralization in the World’s Largest Federal Country with evidence from India*. The study observed that the commitment on decentralization reforms in India was driven by the 74th constitutional amendment Act of 1992. Similarly, the study perceived that by dispersing power closer to the people at the grassroots level, government officials will be highly accountable and responsible to the grassroots’ preferences. Moreover, the study observed that, the decentralization reform has only been partially implemented in India since some of the sections of amended constitution act as an obstacle towards effective execution of reforms in the polity (Murthy & Mahin, 2015). Finally the study discovered that the presence of top-down governance approach associated with lack of administrative capacity at grassroots institutions weakened local authorities hence jeopardizing its strength towards effective execution of decentralization reforms (Ibid).

The study conducted by Jagero, Kwandayi and Longwe (2014) titled, *The challenges of decentralization in Malawi*. The study used qualitative approach and discovered that the decentralization reforms in Malawi are guided by strong legal and regulatory framework but delaying in the amendment of some sections of the local government Act of 1998 is retarding the speed of implementing the decentralization reforms in the country. They further observes that, central government hesitate to decentralize their power and functions to the local authorities as required by the decentralization policy (Ibid). This
study reveals the reality of what is happening in other African countries, where government agencies and departments still retain power at the centre. Therefore, these findings on the weakness of the decentralized institutions in Malawi will be employed as an insight into the determinants and strategies for the effective implementation of decentralization reform in Tanzania.

Another study was conducted in Ethiopia by Moshago, Negash and Asfaw (2015), titled, *A Critical Assessment of Decentralized Public Governance Features and Challenges in Ethiopia: Insights from Self-Governance in Guraghe Zone Districts*. The study used both qualitative and quantitative data. It was observed that, the government of Ethiopia is devolving power and responsibilities to local authorities though local government elites retain more power than the common citizens at the grassroots. The study further indicated that LGAs lack autonomy, controlled and organized by centrally established government institutions. Likewise, the study observed that in Ethiopia the decentralization reform is well designed but the problem is its implementation. Furthermore, the research found that LGAs are affected by massive political interference from the higher tier of the state hence weakening the autonomy of local authorities.

The findings of this study provide the picture concerning ineffective implementation of decentralization reforms in many African countries, Tanzania in particular. The challenge of the government of Tanzania therefore is to ensure effective implementation of well designed and formulated policies or adopted reforms which are either not well implemented or totally abandoned and stored in the office shelves.

Kim, Smith, Sommers and Varela (2015) in collaboration with The International Republican Institute (IRI) carried out a field study on; *Power to the people: A comprehensive Analysis of Decentralization in the East African Community; Kenya being a case study*. The researchers used semi-structured interview with 34 respondents from both government and CSOs. The study declares that the 2010 constitutional change enhanced the separation of powers and responsibilities between national and the county
government which activated the implementation of decentralization reform in the country.

Additionally, the study revealed that local government election of 2013 spearheaded local people to feel that they are in improved local governance where they can hold local employee accountable as the results of execution of devolution policy (Kim et al., 2015). Equally, the study results indicate that the continuation of divided politics and absence of political commitment from sub-national public leaders and employees act as a hindrance to effective execution of decentralization reforms.

Anosisye (2017) did a study on; Decentralization by Devolution: Perception of Councilors on Their Exercise of Fiscal Decision-making Authority in Local Government Authorities in Tanzania using Tarime Township Council as a case study. The study used qualitative approach and included 20 respondents. The study found that local authority had reasonable fiscal autonomy related to planning local tax and resources generation respectively. Likewise, the study found that councilors were empowered to spend the small amount or percentage of their own source revenue and discretionary grants from central government. Based on Anyosisye’s study, it can be argued that the currently LGAs in Tanzania have limited authority and discretionary power to use what they have collected from own sources.

Fjeldstad and Katera (2017) conducted a study titled, Theory and Practice of Decentralization by Devolution: Lessons from a Research Programme in Tanzania (2002-13). The study which employed the use of both qualitative and quantitative methods focused on key three issues namely (1) governance, people’s participation and local autonomy, (2) financial management and local resources generation and (3) public services provisions. The study found that citizen’s views were ignored and not given priority in the council plans whereas 50% were not happy with the quality of public services provided by LGAs at the grassroots. Likewise, the study indicated that, elected leaders lack power to terminate employment contracts of corrupt and sluggish council technocrats. Lastly, it was observed that local authority’s financial autonomy in both rural
and urban councils have been curtailed by central government as the results only few urban authorities can afford to finance large developmental projects by using revenue generated from their own sources.

2.4. Research Gap
Several researches have so far been carried out on the implementation of decentralization reform in Tanzania and other countries around the globe but unbelievably little has been done to determine factors for effective or ineffective implementation of decentralization reform in LGAs in Tanzania particularly at Singida Municipal Council. Evidence from the reviewed literature has indicated more rhetoric than reality on the execution of decentralization reform since incomplete decentralization and the dominance of centralized management system characterized numerous developing countries (Bannink & Ossewaarde, 2012; Akudugu, 2013). This study therefore seeks to bridge the existing gap in the literature of decentralization reform by exploring the factors for effective and ineffective implementation of decentralization reforms in local government authorities in Tanzania, using SMC as a case study.

2.5. Conceptual Framework of the Study.
The conceptual framework of this study is formulated to demonstrate the existing relationships between variables. These variables are dependent and independent variables. Effective implementations of decentralization reforms in local authorities show dependency over several independent variables such as political, administrative and financial capacity/autonomy of grassroots entities. Diagrammatically the relationships between research variables are as shown below:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political capacity / autonomy</td>
<td>Decentralization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative or managerial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capacity/ autonomy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial capacity / autonomy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2.2: Conceptual Framework on the Determinants of Effective Implementation of Decentralization Reforms


From the conceptual framework above it can therefore be argued that, effective execution of decentralization reforms can either be enhanced or impeded by political, administrative and financial capacity or autonomy of decentralized institutions.

2.6 Chapter Summary.
This chapter is an appraisal of the most appropriate literature, which is deemed obligatory in helping to comprehend the research topic under study. The chapter presents theoretical and empirical literature reviews, research gap, the conceptual framework and definition of key concepts as used in the study.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction
This chapter presents research methodologies used in the study of the determinants of effective implementation of decentralization reforms in local government authorities in Tanzania. The chapter covers, area of the study, research design, research approaches, population of the study, sample size and sampling techniques, data collection methods and instruments, validity and reliability of collected data, ethical considerations and data analysis.
3.2. Area of the Study
The study was conducted in Municipal Council of Tanzania Mainland, namely Singida which is situated in Singida region. The selection of this case was due to the fact that, SMC was among of 52 councils which embarked on the execution of decentralization reform phase II since the 2000s. Likewise, SMC was used as a case study due to; massive complaints from the local populace concerning poor service delivery, yet no records to indicate a study that was previously undertaken to explore the practice of decentralization reform in the area. Thus, the selected place for the study helped the researcher to obtain research data from employees who apart from theorizing do engage directly in the execution of decentralization reforms by providing services to the local grassroots people.

3.3. Research Design
This study employed a case study design in exploring the determinants of effective implementation of decentralization reform in LGAs in Tanzania. Puch (2005) as cited by Jesse and Bengesi (2018) argued that, case study design permits the researcher to have careful and in-depth exploration and understanding of phenomenon in its contextual environment. The design allowed individuals within the organization to be studied comprehensively by a researcher. Likewise, the use of case study design was suitable in this study because it is impossible for the researcher to study all organization which implements decentralization reform in Tanzania due to the limited financial resources and time. The researcher used Singida Municipal Council as a case study.

3.4. Research Approaches
Qualitative and quantitative methods were both used in data gathering. The use of mixed approach allowed the researcher to collect first-hand information and understanding of the phenomenon under study and presents the findings statistically using tables and percentages. The application of multiple sources of data collections provided a researcher with comprehensive data and increases the validity and credibility of results. Likely, mixed approach was used since the researcher intentionally wanted to gather intensive data concerning the implementation of decentralization reform in local authorities. Qualitative approach has been deployed to portray phenomena, as they appear whilst
quantitative approach has been deployed to solicit the extent to which numerous factors influence effective implementation of decentralization reforms in Tanzania LGAs.

3.5. The Population of the Study
The target population of this study involved all employees serving at SMC (Headquarters) Office and its ward offices that are involved in the implementation of decentralization reforms and perceived to have appropriate information concerning the study. The target population of the study therefore involved 148 employees including one (1) Municipal Director, sixteen (16) Heads of Departments and Units, twenty six (26) Councilors and one hundred and five (105) lower cadre employees.

The sections / units involved in the study are; Planning, Statistics and Evaluation, Community Development and Social Welfare, Administration and Human Resources, Secondary Education, Environmental Conservation and Solid Waste Governance sections as well as Procurement, Legal, Finance and Trade units.

3.6. Sample Size
The sample size of the study involved 50 respondents which is equivalent to 30% of the total employees (148) serving at the council headquarters; selected from the managerial positions and councilors who were purposively selected and those from middle and lower ranks cadres who were randomly drawn to represent the entire population of the council. Salum (2017) citing Cooper and Schinder (2011) reveal that, in social science studies a sample size with range of 10% to 30% is good for credibility and reliability of data.

3.7. Sampling Technique (Methods)
This study employed both probability and non-probability sampling techniques. Thereby, purposive and simple random sampling procedures were used to decide on the respondents manageable in the study.
3.7.1. Purposive or Judgmental Sampling

Purposive sampling method was used to select the key informants to be involved in the study. Purposive sampling technique was used to get fourteen (14) resourceful respondents who were believed to possess information concerning the study including Municipal Director, Assistant Administrative Secretaries, Elected Councilors, Heads of Departments, Heads of Units, Divisional Officers and Ward Executive Officers. These respondents were purposively involved in the study by virtue of their positions, knowledge or information they possess concerning decentralization reform. Similarly, SMC was purposively selected as a case study since it was among of 52 Councils which embarked on the execution of LGRP phase II hence the council is extremely far away than other councils outside Singida.

3.7.2. Simple Random Sampling

Simple random sampling technique was deployed to pick other respondents apart from those picked purposively. The lottery method was used to get thirty six (36) respondents to be involved in the study. This method involved putting 36 labeled items on the distinct piece of paper of the same size and color. The piece of paper was folded and mixed up in a box. Labeled piece of paper was picked randomly without replacement by the employees. The employees who picked the piece of paper that had labeled were involved in the study. The practice of picking pieces of paper was carried out until the respondents from lower position were obtained. This method gave all employees an equal opportunity of being included in the study.

3.8. Data Collection Methods

This study involved the collection of both qualitative and quantitative data. To avoid the distortion of the general picture that the study wishes to explore, both primary and secondary sources of data were used in gathering information. Primary data were gathered through interview whereas documentary review was used to attain secondary data. Creswell (2014) as cited in Salum (2017) argue that, no single method is adequate in collecting reliable and accurate data. Arguably, each method checks and supplements the other (Cohen, West & Aiken, 2013 in Salum, 2017).
3.8.1. Primary Data
The study collected primary data in the field through standardized questionnaire and interview methods by relying on selected respondents from the council. Primary data entail first-hand information collected directly from field to bring more reliable information concerning real picture of the phenomenon under study.

3.8.1.1. Interview Method
Interviews were among the methods used to collect primary data relating to the study. Accordingly, the interviews were governed by a list of detailed and well-prepared questions asked to the respondents. In-depth interview was conducted to key informants who have experience and knowledge concerning decentralization matters. Interview methods were used to collect supplementary information since it is easy for a researcher to acquire information that could not be acquired by using the questionnaires and provides chance to respondent who lack time to fill questionnaire but can orally articulate themselves well.

3.8.1.2. Observation Method
Non-participant observation method was used in the entire process of data collection exercise. The methods helped the researcher to collect empirical data concerning the topic under investigation directly from the field. The method was partly applied to depict and see the actual conditions of public services provision in SMC in relation to physical working conditions, readiness of employees to serve, responsiveness of local officials and the availability of facilities in the office.

3.8.2. Secondary Data
The study also employed secondary sources of data. Secondary data entails the second-hand information gathered from either unpublished or published materials. Therefore, secondary data appears in the form of documentaries, journal, books, government publications, articles and the Internet sources. Thus, documentary review was used to obtain appropriate information relevant to the studied phenomenon.
3.8.2.1. Documentary Review

The researcher reviewed numerous published and unpublished documents which sought relevant to the study. Such reviewed documents and publications include the Constitution of the United Republic of Tanzania of 1977 (as amended), Appropriate Acts such as Local Government Acts No. 7, 8 and 9 of 1982 as revised in 2006, Local Government Policy Paper on decentralization of 1998 and other relevant materials available in the council. The method assisted the researcher to obtain background information of the phenomenon under study.

3.9. Data Collection Instruments

The study used questionnaires as a principal instrument of acquiring data from forty (40) respondents. The application of questionnaires with pre-determined and standardized questions was desired as it is free from personal prejudice, quick, less expensive to construct and easy to manage. Moreover, the instrument assisted a researcher to collect correct and reliable data from respondent while provided respondents with reasonable time to reply to questions asked.

3.10. Data Analysis

Data collected in the field was cleaned, edited and qualitatively and quantitatively analyzed. Qualitative data collected through interviews were analyzed by using content analysis whereby the recorded interviews carried out by using “swahili” language were interpreted and translated into English language and were systematically documented. Quantitative data collected through questionnaires were analyzed with the help of statistical analysis software program. Analyzed data was then; organized and presented in frequency tables and percentages in chapter four.

3.11. Ethical Considerations in Research

Throughout the study ethical issues were adhered. Thus, the study was carried out after the researcher has been granted a research permit from the proper authorities and informed consents from participants. The principle of anonymity to all respondents during data gathering and presentation stage was adhered by not mentioning participant’s
names but only using department names. The respondents were assured of their confidentiality after been informed that, all information and data obtained in the study was for the academic purpose.

3.12. Validity and Reliability of Data

3.12.1. Validity of Data

In order to ensure validity and reliability a researcher constructed an interview and questionnaire questions consonant to the objectives of the study by using unambiguous language to participants. Likewise, the researcher relied on the use of multiple sources of data such as observation, interview and documentary review. Data gathering instruments were polished through remarks from the research advisor and questionnaire was personally administered by a researcher.

3.12.2. Reliability of Data

To warrant the reliability of data a researcher used the same data collection instruments to the entire respondents. Furthermore, pilot study was conducted before actual data gathering activities to check if the instruments to be applied were unambiguous to respondents. The responses from the pilot exercise enabled the researcher to revise various research instruments for the sake of minimizing ambiguities and make them suitable for gathering reliable and valid data.

3.13. Chapter Summary

This chapter constitutes the research methodologies which the researcher applied in the study. Thereby, the chapter comprises area of the study, research design which helped investigators to plan and conduct exploratory studies. Likewise, the chapter delineates research approach, target population, sampling design and sample size, data collection methods and instruments, data analysis, reliability and validity of data and ethical considerations.
CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

4.1. Introduction
This chapter presents the research findings concerning the determinants of effective implementation of decentralization reforms in LGAs in Tanzania. The chapter is divided into four sections. Section 4.2 presents questionnaire return rate. Section 4.3 discusses socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents. Section 4.4 presents the process of decentralization implemented in Singida Municipality. Section 4.5 presents the effectiveness of implementation of decentralization reforms in SMC. Section 4.6 is on the factors that enhance effective implementation of the decentralization reform in SMC. Section 4.7 presents the factors that impede effective implementation of decentralization reform in SMC and last section 4.8 presents chapter summary.

4.2. Socio-Demographic Information/Characteristics of Respondents
The socio-demographic information or characteristics of respondents examined in this research included sex, age category, education level, working experience and nature of their employment (Table 4.1). The findings indicate that, 62.2 % of respondents were male whilst 37.8 % were female. This reveals that commonly there were more males participants in the research than females. Though, the findings indicate fair representation of each gender in this study.
Table 4.1: Socio-Demographic Information/Characteristics of Respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Respondents</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>No. of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>No. of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest level of Education</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>No. of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor degree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years Worked in the Organization</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>No. of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Respondents</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>No. of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managerial positions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle positions,</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary/lower cadre</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of the employment</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>No. of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent and Pensionable</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Findings, 2019.

More than half (56.8%) were in the age category of 29-39 years whereas the group between 18-28 years had 13.5%, followed by 40-49 years (24.3%) and 5.4% were aged between 50-59 years old. This indicates that, different positions in SMC are occupied by youth’s employees who are likely to serve the council for a long time before retirement. More than two thirds (78.4%) of employees had bachelor degree while 10.8% had diploma and masters education respectively. Also, working category of respondents was investigated to determine their involvements in policy making and execution. From the
findings, 21.6% were from managerial positions, 45.9% were from middle positions, 18.9% were from lower ranks and 10.8% were councilors. Moreover, overall 48.6% of the respondents had served the council between 6 and 10 years, another 27.0% had served the council for 5 years and below whereas 13.5% have served the council 11 to 15 and 13.5% served the council for 16-20 years while the remaining 2.7% of the respondents worked in the council for a period between 21 to 25 years. This is an indication that cumulative 75.6% of employees served 6 to 25 years in public service. These employees were likely to have enormous knowledge and experiences on several issues including the implementation of decentralization reforms. Largely, 94.6% of the employees had employed on a permanent basis whereas 5.4% of participants are engaged on a temporary basis.

Therefore, the study findings demonstrate that the majority of employees at SMC were largely represented by males compared to females. The findings also depict that majority of the respondents were middle-aged employees. Further, it indicates that all respondents had formal education as they all have diploma, bachelor degree and master education respectively. This meant that, public employees are capable as well as competent to participate fully in the implementation of decentralization reform. Moreover, it was revealed that employees involved in the study have enormous experience and knowledge about the execution of decentralization reforms in SMC.

4.3. The Process of Decentralization Implementation in LGAs in Tanzania.

The first research objective was to determine the process of decentralization reform in local government authorities in Tanzania. It analyzes the implementation process of decentralization reforms in Singida Municipality. Some of the issues that the researcher thought relevant to determine in this aspect were the following; Whether respondents have idea about decentralization and its implementation process, whether respondents know laws/policies guiding the implementation process; whether laws and policies facilitated the process of implementation of decentralization reforms; whether the creation of decentralized institutions facilitated the implementation process of the reforms and the extent to which public employees are satisfied with the organizational set up.
between central and local governments in the process of implementing decentralization reforms.

### Table 4.2: The Process of Implementation of Decentralization Reforms in Tanzania’s LGAs (N.37).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements or Questions</th>
<th>Response statements</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you have any idea about decentralization and its process?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have any idea about decentralization and its process?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you know any laws or policies which were used as a guideline in the process of implementation of decentralization reform?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you know any laws or policies which were used as a guideline in the process of implementation of decentralization reform?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you know any laws or policies which were used as a guideline in the process of implementation of decentralization reform?</td>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think the existing laws and policies facilitated the process of decentralization implementation in your council?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think the existing laws and policies facilitated the process of decentralization implementation in your council?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent laws and policies of decentralization enabled the process of implementation of decentralization reforms in Singida Municipality.</td>
<td>Great extent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent laws and policies of decentralization enabled the process of implementation of decentralization reforms in Singida Municipality.</td>
<td>Moderate extent</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent laws and policies of decentralization enabled the process of implementation of decentralization reforms in Singida Municipality.</td>
<td>Limited extent</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent laws and policies of decentralization enabled the process of implementation of decentralization reforms in Singida Municipality.</td>
<td>Very limited extent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent laws and policies of decentralization enabled the process of implementation of decentralization reforms in Singida Municipality.</td>
<td>Non responses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent the creation of decentralized institutions facilitated the process of implementation of decentralization reforms in Singida Municipality?</td>
<td>Great extent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent the creation of decentralized institutions facilitated the process of implementation of decentralization reforms in Singida Municipality?</td>
<td>Moderate extent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent the creation of decentralized institutions facilitated the process of implementation of decentralization reforms in Singida Municipality?</td>
<td>Limited extent</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent the creation of decentralized institutions facilitated the process of implementation of decentralization reforms in Singida Municipality?</td>
<td>Very limited extent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you satisfied with the organizational arrangement between central and local governments in the process of implementation of decentralization reform?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you satisfied with the organizational arrangement between central and local governments in the process of implementation of decentralization reform?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Findings, 2019.

As indicated in Table 4.2 most employees (83.8%) have ideas concerning the decentralization and its implementation process whilst 16.2% of the respondents were not aware with the doctrine of decentralization. Likewise, during interviews one of the interviewees reported that:

*“Decentralization is a process of bringing government where the people live. Narrated further that, the process of implementation of decentralization reforms was prevalent since independence in 1961 but was pronounced in 1998 following*
the initiation of policy paper on decentralization and widespread in 2000 as the results of financial support and influences from IMF, WB and JICA (Interview, 19 March, 2019 & 3 April, 2019)."

Table 4.2 shows the majority of the respondents (59.5%) know policies and laws guiding the execution of the reforms, 16.2% were neutral. The rest 24.3% were not aware of any laws and policies guiding the execution of the reforms. These were those elected leaders (councilors), and other officers from both lower and middle cadre like (wards executive officers, accountants, engineers and education officers) in the council who often do not participate in the council meeting.

Moreover, Constitution of URT of 1977 as amended from time to time, Local Government (District) Authorities Act Cap 287, Local Government (Urban) Authorities Act Cap 288 of 1982, The Local Government Act, Cap 290, Environmental Management Act of 2004, Decentralization Policy Paper of 1998 and Municipal Strategic Plan 2016/2017-2020/2021 were among the documents mentioned by the respondents in the questionnaires and were reviewed by the researcher during the study.

From Table 4.2 above, 37.8% acknowledged that the existing laws and policies enhanced the execution of the reforms in LGAs. The majority of the respondents 62.2% opined that laws and policies impeded the process of execution of the reforms. These laws and policies failed to create demarcation and define clearly power of each tire of the government hence decentralized institutions acted as an agent of central government. However, one of the interviewed respondents at SMC had different opinion and reported that:

"Existing laws and policies have contributed to the process of implementation of reforms because these pieces of laws confer several powers and authority to LGAs to decide on range of local matters within their area of jurisdiction. Also, said that through Public Services Act No. 8 of 2002 and its regulations of 2003,
LGAs has full mandate to recruits some lower cadres staff like drivers and personal secretaries). (Interview, 21, March, 2019).

In case of the extent to which laws and policies enabled the process of implementation of the reforms at SMC, the research findings in Table 4.2 indicates that, 43.2% said at limited extent, 29.7% at moderate extent and 8.1% said that at very limited extent whereas 10.8% of the respondents said at great extent whereas 8.1% were undecided. Also documentary review indicates that the constitution does not warrant the execution of the reforms because the statute has granted more power to central government. For example, Article 145 (2) and 146(2) empowers parliament to ratify laws regarding instituting LGAs and their composition and provides general functions of LGAs without specifying clearly their relationships with central government.

On top of that, 10.8% said that the created institutions greatly enhanced the execution process of the reforms whilst 21.6% and 64.9% opined that the institution moderately and slightly enabled the process whereas 2.7% opined that limited extent the created institutions enabled the execution of the reforms. Furthermore, as revealed in Table 4.2, 43.2% of employees were satisfied with existing organizational set up between tiers of government whilst 56.8% were discontent with the existing structure. However, one of the interviewed respondents confirmed that:-

“The organizational arrangement between central and local government is well structured but the problem is the implementation of the reforms itself since local government authorities centrally interfered in terms of sources of revenue, central directives and orders hence weaken the capacity of the council to exercise their devolved political, financial and administrative powers with full autonomy as embraced by local government reform programmes as well as in decentralization policy paper of 1998. (Interview, 21, March, 2019)”.

Documentary review indicates that the implementation process of decentralization reforms was done through the creation of decentralized authorities (LGAs) as indicated in
section 5 of the Local Government Act No.7&8 of 1982. These Acts also enhanced participation of people in local affairs through public hearing and participatory planning and budgeting process. Likewise, empowerment of LGAs to make-by laws subjected to ministerial approval as indicated in section 54(1) and 80(1) of the Act No.7 & 8 of 1982 also added value to the execution of the reforms.

Moreover, the reviewed documents revealed that the executions of the reforms were facilitated by decentralizing revenue collection and human resource management power and autonomy to LGAs like SMC. Through decentralized revenue collection LGAs are empowered to set tax rate, find sources of revenue, collect own revenue, spend the collected revenue according to local priorities. These powers are provided by section 6(1) (a)-(u) of the Local Government Finance Act No.9 of 1982 as amended in 2006. In case of decentralized human resources management the council is granted with recruitment of lower cadre position, promotion, training, disciplining and terminating of employee contract power as stipulated in Public Services Act No.8 of 2002 as amended in 2007 and its regulation of 2003 respectively.

Documentary review also indicated that the reform was implemented through repealing several legislations. The repealed laws are, Constitutional Amendment by Act No.15 of 1984 which re-instituted LGAs, Local Government Act No. 7, 8 & 9, 1982 as revised in 2002 and further repealed by Act No.6 of 1999 and by the Local Government Laws (Miscellaneous Amendments) Act No.13 of 2006. These amendments were purposely intended to devolve fiscal, administrative and political power and autonomy to re-instituted LGAs.

Based on the above study findings, it is noticeable that the majority of the employees understood what the decentralization entails. Through documentary review it was discovered the execution of decentralization reforms started after independence as depicted clearly in chapter two. The creation of decentralized authorities, decentralized revenue collection, human resources management and legislative power to LGAs were perceived as a means for enhancing the execution of the reforms. Enactment of pieces of
laws also enhanced the implemented of the reforms. Though, the existing laws and institutional setup empowers central government to exert control over LGAs affairs hence ignoring the preferences of local populace.

4.4. The Effectiveness of Decentralization Reform in LGAs in Tanzania.

The second research objective was to determine the effectiveness of decentralization reforms in Tanzania’s LGAs. Some of the key issues that the investigator found pertinent to determine in this section were the following, the extent to which decentralization by devolution (D by D) was effectively implemented in local level by the central government and the extent to which the implementation of decentralization reforms brought changes on public services delivery in LGAs. The study findings are indicated in Table 4.3 below.

Table 4.3: The extent to which decentralization reforms is effectively implemented by central government and brought changes in public services delivery (N.37).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions</th>
<th>Response statements</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do decentralization reforms are effectively implemented in local level by the central government?</td>
<td>Great extent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate extent</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited extent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does the implementation of decentralization reform brought changes on public services delivery in your council?</td>
<td>Great extent</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate extent</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited extent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Findings, 2019.

As shown in Table 4.3, 13.5% of the respondents opined that the reform was greatly implemented in LGAs by central government where as a total of 86.5% of the respondents reported that the reforms have been implemented moderately and slightly. The discrepancy of results implies that central government still retains power and resources over staff recruitment, transfer, promotion and budget allocation at the centre and not willing to engage in power sharing deal with LGAs. Responses from one of the interviewed respondents from the council reported that:-
“Decentralization by Devolution is not effectively implemented in local government authorities by central government since LGAs have little autonomy and discretionary authority over governance process, human and financial resources and worse enough relies on financial resources from government transfer for over 95% (Interview, 18, March, 2019)”.

Furthermore, the reviewed document indicates that in 2003 the government through the President Office-Public Services Management (PO-PSM) authorized public services regulation based on Public Services Act No. 8 of 2002 to lead human resources management in LGAs. These Acts and its regulations limit local autonomy over personnel management since LGAs cannot recruit any council employee of their choice without central government (PO-PSM) approval (URT, 2003). Additionally, document establishes that the local authorities lack financial autonomy because of the weaknesses of Local Government Finance Acts of 1982 and its amendments of 2006. The Acts empowers central government to regulate, abolish and re-centralized the revenue sources of LGAs. For example the re-centralization of property tax in 2017. In reality central government remains in charge of the resources allocation and deployment for basic public services like water, education and health services.

As well the researcher assessed whether the execution of decentralization reform brought changes on public services delivery in LGAs. The results in Table 4.3 summarize that the minority of employees 27.0% opined that the reform greatly brought changes on the delivery of public services to the people. The totality of employees (73.0%) felt that, the decentralization reforms brought moderate and slight changes since vast of local populace lack access to public services like (water and health services) and are faced with severe poverty.

In order to measure the effectiveness of decentralization reform in relation with public services delivery at SMC, different statements were provided to the respondents. Then, respondents were inquired to provide out their opinions through likert scales format from
5-Strongly agree, 4-Agree, 3- Neutral, 2-Disagree and 1-Strongly disagree. The results are shown in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4: The Status of Effectiveness of Decentralization Reforms in Tanzania’s LGAs (N.37).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studied Variables</th>
<th>Response statements</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public services facilities (e.g. offices, health, water and sanitation services) are available and autonomously managed by LGAs</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After decentralization Public services facilities has equipped with sufficient equipment such as (offices equipments)</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public services offered by the council are affordable and citizens have the ability to pay for such services.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public employees in your council are adequate, competent and well trained to provide public services professionally</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public employees and leaders in your council are committed, motivated, accountable and ready to serve the local populace.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public services delivered by Local authorities to the community are of high quality and satisfies the needs of the people</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public services such as (e.g. health Services) are responsively provided by public officials without corruption, favoritism and patronage</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Findings, 2019.

Table 4.4 indicates that 56.7% of respondents disagreed and 5.4% strongly disagreed that there is enough public facilities in LGAs whereas 21.6% agreed and 2.7% strongly disagreed with the statement. Through the reviewed reports the study established that the
council had eighteen (18) wards with only one health center namely Sokoine Health Centre located at Misuna ward. This implies those local populaces are still faced with scarcity of public facilities such as health services.

Furthermore, on the statement whether the execution of decentralization reforms resulted to the increase of equipment in public facilities like offices and health centers, the study findings in Table 4.4 reveals that 45.9% disagreed and 5.4% strongly disagreed while 5.4% agreed and 18.9% strongly agreed. Also, it was observed that public services centers are faced with shortage of working facilities such as motor vehicles, computers and offices. One head of department, said that:-

“Centralized procurement procedures such as purchasing permit are the root cause of insufficient facilities like motor vehicles in LGAs facilities. (Interview, 18, March, 2019)”.

Furthermore, whether public services rendered by local government after the reforms are affordable, the findings in Table 4.4 above indicate that, 51.4% disagreed, 10.8% strongly disagreed and 8.1% agreed with the statement. This implies that local populace especially from Singida Municipality cannot afford the costs of public services such as health services. Also, whether “after the reforms the council has adequate and competent employees to render public services to the populace” the findings in Table 4.4 indicate that, 51.4% of employees disagreed and 13.5% strongly disagreed, whereas 24.3% agreed with the statement. Through reviewed documents which were made available to the researcher, it was found that the council has a deficit of 987 out of 2516 competent employees’ required hence affecting public services delivery (SMC, 2019).

Also, as to the statement whether public employees in LGAs are committed, motivated and ready to serve the grassroots populace, the study results in Table 4.4 indicate that the majority 45.9% disagreed and 8.1% strongly disagreed. Of those remaining 27.0 % agreed and 2.7% strongly agreed on the statement. One of key informants from the council said that:-
“There is lack of employee’s morale to commit themselves on daily activities hence most of them are not ready and willing to serve the community. (Interview, 21, March, 2019)”. Moreover, the study assessed whether after the reforms, the public services rendered by LGAs are of high quality and meet the expectations of local populace. The study findings analyzed in Table 4.4 illustrates that 54.0% disagreed, 32.4 % agreed and 2.7% strongly agreed with the statement. One of the interviewed respondents reported that:-

“Public services provision does not satisfy the expectations of local populace because public services delivered by local authorities are measured in terms of quantity and not quality....that why it is possible for example to have majority of pupils from primary school who are unable to write and read after seven years of schooling. (Interview, 21, March, 2019).”

Finally, the level of responsiveness of government employees to render public services without corruption was determined. Results in Table 4.4 reveal that 37.8% agreed and 2.7% strongly agree whilst 10.8% were neutral. The rest, 40.5% disagreed and 8.1% strongly disagreed. Moreover, when interviewed one respondents from SMC said that:-

“Public services are responsively provided by government employees but political interference and patronage systems are pervasive since politicians interferes normal services delivery procedures as they want their relatives or citizens from his / her ward to be favored. (Interview, 19, March, 2019)”.

Basically through questionnaires respondents were able to mentions other factors apart from decentralization reforms which enhance public services delivery at local authorities. 40.5% mentioned that seriousness and commitment of the government in power to eliminate waste in public sectors, as well as improving integrity in management of public affairs enhance services delivery to LGAs. The involvement of private sectors in the provision of public services like health, education and sanitation services was mentioned by 35.1% whilst  24.3% of the respondents recognized the use of information and
communication technology (ICT) as a key factor for improving public services delivery in LGAs.

**Table 4.5: Other factors enhancing provisions of public services apart from decentralization reforms (N.37).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Frequency(n)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seriousness of the government and commitment of the government in power to eliminate all waste like corruption in public sector</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The involvement of private sectors in the provision of public services</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The use of information and communication technology (ICT) in public services provision</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Research findings, 2019.*

The implementation of decentralization reforms as stated in LGRP of 2000s was aimed to improve local governance and enhancing the LGAs capacity through empowering locally elected bodies at the grassroots. Therefore, the findings in Table 4.4 above imply that even after the execution of the reforms the LGAs capacity to render public services to the populace was denied by limited public services facilities and its equipment like offices and motor vehicles, unmotivated employees to serve the populace and shortage of public employees to cater the demands of the council. However, the study findings indicate improvement of government responsiveness to the needs of citizens though corruption and patronage system in public service delivery are still pervasive.


This section deals with the third objective of the study which sought to determine factors likely to enhance effective implementation of decentralization reforms in Tanzania’s LGAs. The section therefore attempted to answer a question about “What are the factors that fuel effective implementation of the decentralization reform in Singida Municipality? The participants were provided with sub-variables to be answered by the use of Likert scale as indicated in Table 4.6. The purpose was to determine exactly what sub-variables enhance effective implementation of decentralization reforms in Tanzania’s LGAs.
Table 4.6: Factors Enhancing Effective Implementation of Decentralization Reforms in LGAs in Tanzania (N.37).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studied Variables</th>
<th>Response statements</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political willingness and commitment from both the central and sub-national government leaders to undertake decentralization reforms.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local governments fiscal autonomy to set tax rate, collect resources and utilize the resources at local level depending on their plans</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government autonomy or power to manage its human resources</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong legal framework which clearly define the responsibilities/ functions and power of each tier of the government</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen’s participation in local decision making and planning process</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presence of accountability mechanisms to hold local bureaucrats accountable to elected leaders and to the citizens as well.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Findings, 2019.

As analyzed in Table 4.5 above most of the respondents 59.5% agreed and 21.6% strongly agreed. The remaining 5.4% disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively with the statement that political commitment and willingness of government leaders from both local and central government enhance the implementation of the reforms. This was further complimented by one respondent in SMC who replied that:

“The central government commitment and readiness to devolve power, resources and functions to the council is important for successful execution of the reforms, though the problem is only functions are devolved whilst resources and power remain at the centre. (Interview, 18, March, 2019)”.
Likewise, as to the statement whether LGAs fiscal autonomy to set tax rate, collect and use resources without interference from central government can enhance the execution of decentralization reforms in Tanzania’s LGAs, the study findings in Table 4.5 maintain that, 40.5% and 32.4% agree and strongly agree respectively. The remaining few respondents 5.4% opined that autonomy is nothing to do with successful execution of reforms. Moreover, one of the key informants in the council when interviewed said that:

“Autonomy in setting tax rates, collection and spending is a backbone for the survival of the council unless otherwise the council will fail to provide basic services to the people and run other administrative issues like conducting statutory meeting which consumes a lot of taxpayers’ money. (Interview, 22, March, 2019)”.

Whether local government autonomy to manage its human resources is an ingredient for effective execution of decentralization reforms in Tanzania’s LGAs, the findings in Table 4.5 establish that the majority of respondents, 56.8% agreed and 18.9% strongly agreed that for effective execution of decentralization reforms human resources autonomy to LGAs is essential. The rest 8.1% disagreed with the statement. Likewise, one of the senior council leaders during interview had this to say:

“Decentralized human resources management is important for effective implementation of the reforms since it devolve human resources management power and autonomy (hiring, training, promotion and disciplining staff) form the core closer to the people at the grassroots level (Interview, 22, March, 2019)”.

Also, in a statement as to whether strong legal framework which clearly defines the powers and the responsibilities of each tier of the government enhance effective implementation of decentralization reforms, the study findings in Table 4.5 above demonstrate that 18.9% of respondents strongly agreed and 37.8% agreed. Of the rests 5.4% and 2.7% of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. The findings also supported by one of the respondents during interview who confirmed that:
“Basically, with strong and sound legal framework, powers, autonomy and responsibilities of each tier of government will be clearly defined and constitutionally exercised without disturbing each tier of the government (Interview, 22, March, 2019).”

Furthermore, on the statement as to whether the participation of local populace in local governance affairs is vital for effective implementation of decentralization reforms, the study findings in Table 4.5 opined that out of 37 respondents, 37.8% and 29.7% of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed respectively. Of the rest 16.2% disagreed. These results were also supported by one head of department from SMC who commented that:-

“Community participation is important for effective implementation of any programs introduced in LGAs including decentralization initiatives. Also emphasized that, the community has been involved in the implementation of decentralization reforms through Opportunity and Obstacle to Development but the problem is since its inception in the 2000s, O&OD is not clearly understood by the populace at the grassroots. (Interview, 22, March, 2019).”

Through the review of Policy Paper on Local Government Reforms of 1998 it was found that participation of people in decision making and governance process at grassroots level is vital for strategy implementation. The paper stipulates that, “The reform should focus on aiding the roles of people in deciding issues distressing their socio-economic lives as well as participation in planning and executing development initiatives” (URT, 1998).

Finally, the study assessed if accountability mechanisms in-place is obligatory for effective implementation of decentralization reforms in Tanzania’s LGAs. Research results in Table 4.5 above indicate that, 56.7% and 5.4% of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed respectively that accountability mechanism is vital for effective execution of reforms. The remaining few, 2.7% of respondents disagreed. The results were supported by SMC official who claimed that:-
“The issue of accountability mechanisms to both councilors and bureaucrats is important for ensuring effective execution of the reforms and other council programs since leaders and employees fears to be held to account by the government as well as by the people through election and public meeting and without accountability mechanism, reforms objective and council performance cannot be realized. (Interview, March, 19, 2019)

The discussion in the consideration of the study findings concludes that, political commitment and willingness from central government, institutional capacities of LGAs, strong and sound legal framework which clearly define the powers and responsibilities of each tier of government, citizen participation in local affairs and the presence of accountability mechanism to hold government leaders and officials accountable for their actions are the bases for the effective execution of the reforms in Tanzania’s LGAs.


This section deals with the last specific objective of the study. In this segment the researcher sought to determine the factors constraining effective implementation of decentralization reforms in Tanzania’s local government authorities as well as answering the question, “what are the factors that impede effective implementation of decentralization reform in Singida Municipal Council.

Table 4.7: Factors Impeding Effective Implementation of Decentralization Reform in Tanzania’s LGAs (N.37).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studied Variables</th>
<th>Response statements</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The process of devolving central government power, resources and functions to local authorities so far is smooth, efficient and effective</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral,</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The central government is willing and committed to ensure the decentralization process is effectively implemented.</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral,</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studied Variables</td>
<td>Response statements</td>
<td>Frequency (n)</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is an adequate financial resource for public services delivery which matches with the degree of decentralized functions.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are insufficient and incompetent human resources for successfully execution of decentralized functions and responsibilities.</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is weak legal framework or policies to provides clearly the functions of each level of government and to ensure local autonomy</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local elite or leaders (councilors and local chief if any) are not willing and committed to engage in effective implementation of the reform</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non responses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Findings, 2019.

The study findings presented in Table 4.6 establish that 29.7% and 40.5% of the respondents strongly disagreed and disagreed with statement. Of the remaining 5.4% agreed and strongly agreed that devolvement of power and resources to LGAs are effectively implemented. During the interview, one of the heads of departments from SMC reported that:-

“Though the central government has managed to transfer some of its power, authority, functions and resources to LGAs, still much power or authority is concentrated at the centre”. He further elaborated that the sector-ministries as well as minister responsible for regional administration and local government for example has power over council governance since most LGAs decisions are subject to the minister’s approval. (Interview, 21, March, 2019)”.
Further, on the statement whether central government is fully willing and committed to decentralize power and resources to LGAs, the study findings analyzed in Table 4.6 above indicate that, a sum of 45.9% disagreed and 24.3% strongly disagreed contrary to 16.2% and 2.7% who agreed and strongly agreed respectively. Moreover, one of the interviewed respondents said that:-

“In my view the disempowerment of LGAs through re-centralization of human resources, water and infrastructure services from the council to the ministry or authority concerned as well as taking over all reliable sources of revenues like property, billboards and parking tax from LGAs to Tanzania Revenue Authority, shows how central government is not committed to effectively execute decentralization reform instead making LGAs as implementers of centrally imposed policies. (Interview, 3, April, 2019)”.

Furthermore, on the statement as to whether LGAs have adequate financial resources to undertake its decentralized public activities in their jurisdictions, the research results in Table 4.6 above indicate that, 67.5% of the respondents disagreed and 21.6% strongly disagreed in respect to the statement whereas 2.7% of respondents were undecided. The remaining 8.1% of the respondents agreed with the statement. Through review of CAG report of 2017, which were made available during the study, the research found that following different directives and orders from central government (executive and parliament) to LGAs, the council overdependence rate for financial resources from central government transfer was over 91% and 90% for fiscal year 2015/2016 and 2017/2018 respectively.

This finding was supported by the interview responses from one heads of departments from SMC who said that:-

“Greatly, guidelines, directives, regulations, circulars, laws and statements imposed by the national (central) government obstruct LGAs’ initiatives in revenue collection. For instance, recent the central government issued a
statement that those entrepreneurs with business identity cards are not supposed to be taxed by the councils. (Interview, 19, March, 2019)"

Also, another when interviewed accentuated that:-

“It is the re-centralization of all reliable sources of revenue which are enormous and effortless to collect such (property tax, billboard tax, parking fee) whilst leaving the council with sources which are difficult to be generated affect the financial autonomy of LGAs. Narrated further that, after the abolition and recentralization of some sources of revenue the collection rate of the council has declined tremendously. (Interview, 3, April, 2019)”.

In respect to human resources, the researcher interest was to explore the institutional capacity of LGAs to undertake its decentralized activities. The study results in Table 4.6 above maintain that, 21.6% of the respondents disagreed, 5.4% strongly disagreed. Large group of the respondents 40.5% and 21.6% of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed respectively that councils are faced with shortage of competent staff. Likewise, through documentary review it was discovered that the council has a deficit of 987 out of 2516 employees required (SMC, 2019). During the interview one heads of department from SMC said that:-

“The centralization of human resources management featured by bureaucratic procedures such as seeking employment permit from central government had resulted not only to the delays in recruiting council’s employees but also limited administrative autonomy of the council hence shortage of competent public servants. (Interview, 18, March, 2019)"

Furthermore, one of the elected councilor reported that:-

“…..Singida Municipal Council like other councils in Tanzania has been denied power to employ local government employees to occupy managerial positions which remained vacant for a long period but only given autonomy to recruit
common cadres’ employees. Also added that the council lacks power to hold president’s or minister’s appointed public servants accountable. (Interview, 18, March, 2019)”.

Additionally, one member of the council management team emphasized that:

“Regardless of the goodwill of the government, the re-centralization of recruitment system in 2009 under PSRS following the amendment of Public Service Act, No 8 of 2002 by Section, No 29 of the Act No.18 of 2007, grabbed administrative power of the council in terms of determining the requirements, number of establishments, recruitments and appointments of higher rank positions hence stated to experience delays in filling vacant posts and resulting to the shortage of staff in the council. (Interview, 22, March, 2019)”.

Weak legal framework and absence of decentralization policy to define clearly the functions of each level of government and to ensure local autonomy, was identified in the study as an obstacle towards effective execution of decentralization reforms. The findings in Table 4.6 above establish that, 13.5% of the respondents disagreed and 8.1% strongly disagreed. Of the remaining 62.1% agreed and 10.8 % strongly agreed that, weak legal frameworks and absence of decentralization policy affect local autonomy and fail to define clearly powers of each tier of government accordingly.

Likewise, through review documents it was found that the minister responsible for local government enjoys vast powers over LGAs as stipulated in Local Government Act No.7, 8&9 of 1982 and its amendments. All these legislations grants enormous power to the minister to supervise and control functions, powers and resources of LGAs through its approval power, regulations, directives and direct interventions over local affairs on appointment and transfer of LGAs staff. However, one of the key informants from the legal affairs units when interviewed had this to say:-
“To some degree the central government has succeeded to uphold the responsibilities and functions of the semi-autonomous or sub-national government through the prevailing system of laws including the country constitution and legislations, but the setback is that, these Parliamentary Acts, statutes and laws have vested enormous authority and power in the hands of the minister in charge for local governments. (Interview, 21, March, 2019)”.

Moreover, the researcher sought to assess whether local leaders such as councilors are not willing and committed to engage in the implementation of decentralization reforms in their localities. The results in Table 4.6 above validate that, 18.9% and 8.1% of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively whereas 43.2% and 5.4% of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed respectively. Moreover, this result was supported by one head of departments at the council who emphasized that:-

“Local councilors to some extent are not willing to engage on execution of council’s deliberations which seems to jeopardize their self interests and that of their wards. Principally most resolution agreed at the council are in favour of the local elite and their client (Interview, 19, March, 2019)”.

Basically, through questionnaire methods respondents were able to provide other factors impeding effective execution of decentralization reforms apart from what they were asked. 37.8% mentioned inadequate knowledge and awareness of local elites and community on decentralization reforms as a key factor impeding execution of the reforms. Corruption was also identified by 13.5% as one of the obstacles for effective execution of the reforms whereas 40.5% and 8.1% opined that overlapping roles and powers and hostile relations between central and local government officials as well as local government bureaucrats and councilors being an obstacles towards effective execution of the reforms in LGAs respectively. Table 4.8 summarizes the results.

Table 4.8: Other factors impeding implementation of decentralization reforms in LGAs in Tanzania (N.37).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Inadequate knowledge and awareness of local leaders and community on decentralization reform. | 14 | 37.8  
Corruption. | 5 | 13.5  
Overlapping roles and powers and hostile relations between central and local government officials. | 15 | 40.5  
Hostile relationship between local government bureaucrats and councilors. | 3 | 8.1  

Source: Research Findings, 2019.

4.7. Chapter Summary

This chapter focused on presenting and discussing the research findings on several research questions. The discussion therefore in the deliberation of the study findings concludes that, the creation of decentralized institutions, legislation of various pieces of laws, decentralization of different power and activities to LGAs activated the implementation process of the reforms. Likewise, the study establishes that decentralization reforms were moderately implemented since central government resources, power and autonomy was partially devolved to LGAs.

The study also observed the implementation of decentralization reforms were impeded by lack of political commitment and willingness from government officials, limited local government autonomy over local affairs and weak legal framework which fails to define clearly powers and responsibilities of each tier of government. Arguably, lack of knowledge and awareness among councilors and the entire community on decentralization reform and hostile relationship and overlapping roles and powers between the central and local governments impede the effectiveness of decentralization reforms in LGAs in Tanzania. Furthermore, the finding establishes that strong policies and legal framework, political will/commitment from the central government and institutional capacity are vital for effective execution of the reforms.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION OF THE RESEARCH FINDINGS

5.0. Introduction
This chapter presents a discussion of the research findings covered in chapter four based on specific objectives. These specific objectives were set out to determine the process of implementation of decentralization reforms in Tanzanian’s local government authorities, the effectiveness of implementation of decentralization reforms in local government authorities in Tanzania, factors for effective implementation of decentralization reforms in Tanzanian’s LGAs and the factors impeding effective implementation of decentralization reforms in LGAs in Tanzania.

5.1. The Process of Implementation of Decentralization Reforms in Tanzanian’s LGAs.
This specific objective of the study deliberately intended to determine the process of implementation of decentralization reforms in Tanzanian’s LGAs with reference to SMC. Issues discussed under this specific objective includes, the respondent’s understandings of decentralization concepts, laws and policies guiding the implementation process of decentralization reforms, employee satisfaction with the existing institutional framework and the influence of created decentralized institutions on the implementation of decentralization reforms in LGAs in Tanzania.

The findings indicate that the majority of employees at SMC understand the doctrine of decentralization and how it was implemented. Respondents see decentralization as the process of bringing power and authority closer to the people and indicated that the creation of decentralized institutions and legislation of various laws governing local affairs enhanced the execution of the reforms. These findings are similar to those by Shaningwa (2012) who observed that, respondents from rural and urban areas in Namibia have wide knowledge of the decentralization reforms. However, the results contradict
with Malinga, Moyo, Sikhosana and Moyo (2015) who found that public employees in Zimbabwe did not know what decentralization entails. Moreover, the study findings found that available laws and policies were not very supportive of the process of the implementation of decentralization reforms in LGAs, Singida Municipality in particular. This concurs with Pazi (2018) who observed that Tanzania’s constitution has failed to define central-local government relationship but empowers the central government to enact laws and policies which dictate local government affairs. Mnyasenga and Mushi (2015) also argues that despite the government efforts to amend the local government laws through LGRP of 1998-2014, still Minister responsible with LGAs enjoy the overwhelming powers and control over local government affairs. This meant the existing laws and policies approved by central government jeopardize the autonomy of LGAs to make its own decision on financial and human resources affairs without central government interference.

Moreover, the findings of the study revealed that the existing institutional setup between central and local government affects the process of implementation of the reforms because the majority of employees were dissatisfied with the existing setup. These findings are similar to those by Lufunyo and Pallangyo (2017) and Acharya (2018) who established that decentralized structure of government is blurred hence obstruct the efforts towards effective execution of decentralization reforms for improved public services delivery. This meant that, the existing organization set up between central and local government act as an impediment to the process of implementation of decentralization reform in LGAs in Tanzania.

5.2. The Effectiveness of Implementation of Decentralization Reforms in LGAs in Tanzania.
In this specific objective, the researcher was interested to establish the effectiveness of implementation of decentralization reforms in Tanzanian’s LGAs based on several indicators. These indicators were; local autonomy over financial, human resources, and decision making matters, public services delivery, accountability of government officials to the needs of the people and government responsiveness to the people. The focus was
on assessing whether decentralization reforms have achieved its stated objectives of relinquishing autonomy for local governance to LGAs.

The research findings demonstrate that, the reforms have been moderately implemented by central government since the government still retains decision making, human and financial resources power at the centre. Likewise, the study confirmed that, the level of public accountability to the local populace is low since local officials remain accountable to their appointing authority. This agrees with Fye (2015) who argues that the effectiveness of decentralization in Gambia is not guaranteed. This may be due to the lack of enthusiasm of central government to relinquish power to the citizens, inadequate internal and external sources of revenues to the local authorities and lack of autonomy to make decisions about human and financial resources for delivering public services among the LGAs (Fye, 2015).

Similarly, Kessy (2018) revealed that for more than four decades, the effectiveness of decentralization in Tanzania is yet to be materialized. It was further argued that, LGAs execute central government priorities and policies. This can be justified through the limited power of decentralized authorities over financial and personnel management (recruitment, promotion and discipline) autonomy. The appointment of local government accounting officers by the President instead of Minister responsible for local government undermines the essence of D-by-D as stated in the Policy Paper on LGRP. Though, this shift enhances upward accountability but lessen downward accountability level of local officials to the elected representatives of the people.

Additionally, the study found that the reforms brought minimal changes in the provision of public services to the people in terms of availability, quality and affordability of public services. These findings are similar to those by Smoke (2015) who noted that, since its inception, the implementation of decentralization reforms failed to improve public services provisions to the people. Also, the findings are in line with Kwach et al (2016) who discovered the majority of Ukonga residents in Ilala Municipality are faced with poor access of safe and piped water services from Dar es Salaam Water and Sewage Corporation (DAWASCO) and largely depend on water services from private vendors.
Therefore to the greater extent LGAs are considered as the implementers of central government broad policies, directives and resources for public services delivery to the people.

Kwach et al, (2016) further argues that people in Ilala Municipality was dissatisfied with the cost of decentralized public services delivery particularly water services. The cost of connection, the price of piped water and the cost of water infrastructure maintenance are both unaffordable to the people (Kwach, et al, 2016). This implies that, the reforms had minimal effects on the drive to reduce the cost of public services since large numbers of people are still in the womb of poverty and fails to afford the costs of basic public services. However, the findings contradict those by Lufunyo (2013) who revealed that, decentralization reforms improved the accessibility of public facilities like schools and water services to the people at the grassroots.

Furthermore, the study discovered that public services delivery at the grassroots level is associated with corruption, favoritism and patronage. These results are similar to the findings by Lufunyo (2013) who revealed that corruption and favoritism is still pervasive in public services delivery in Tanzania. Also these study observation correlate with Moshago et al (2017) who claim that in Ethiopian public services are provided on the basis of political patronage with low government responsiveness to the needs of the people. Though, the government of Tanzania has taken several measures to fight against corruption but still some elements of corruption, patronage and favoritism persist in public services delivery in the country.

From the above discussion it is worth to conclude that, the execution of decentralization reforms in Tanzania’s LGAs, Singida Municipality in particular is ineffective and fail to meet people’s expectation in terms of improved public services delivery. However, the findings from some of reviewed literature provide different results concerning the execution of decentralization reforms in LGAs. For example some had indicated that, the reforms enhanced availability and accessibility of public facilities with sufficient equipment required for public services delivery in decentralized authorities. Differently,
Shaningwa (2012) revealed that delay in provision of public services to the grassroots people reveals the ineffectiveness of decentralization reforms in Namibia.


This specific objective sought to determine factors that can enhance effective execution of decentralization reforms in Tanzanian’s LGAs. Both questionnaires and interviews were employed by a researcher to collect reliable information pertaining to the objective. The results from both questionnaires and interviews explored political willingness and commitment from central and local government leaders to decentralize, local government fiscal autonomy, administrative autonomy, legal and institutional framework, citizen’s participation in decision making and presence of accountability mechanisms in governance arena as critical factors for effective implementation of decentralization reforms in Tanzania’s LGAs.

Majority of the respondents said that, political willingness and commitment of central and local government leaders to devolve and share power, resources and functions with LGAs are imperative for effective implementation of decentralization reforms. This view concur with those by Karmel (2017) and Saunders (2018) who published that for effective execution of the reforms national government bureaucrats should be committed and willing to devolve and share power, resources and functions with LGAs. In the Philippines, Bolivia, South Africa and India the triumph of decentralization reforms greatly attributed by the willingness and commitment of their leaders to empower LGAs through devolvement power, resources and responsibilities (Cabral, 2011).

The study also discovered that for effective implementation of decentralization reforms in Tanzania’s LGAs, human resources management autonomy (recruit, promote and discipline employees) as well as adequate fiscal autonomy (set tax rate, collect and use collected resources) according to local priorities is highly demanded. Likewise, the study discovered that strong legal and regulatory framework and participation of people in local governance processes are essentially desired for effective execution of the reforms. These findings coincided with those by Ochieng (2017) who established that adequacy financial
resources derived from fiscal autonomy to set tax rates and collect revenue are imperative for execution of decentralized activities.

The study also discovered that for effective implementation of decentralization reforms in Tanzania’s LGAs, adequate financial resources and fiscal autonomy to set tax rate, collect and use collected resources according to local priorities is highly demanded. Also, to the study done by Olum (2014); Kimengsi and Gwan (2017) and Richardson (2018) argued that, competent and adequate employees, institutionalized legal and constitution framework which clearly specifies powers, roles and the relationship between tiers of government is essential for effective execution of the reforms. Finally Mbwambo (2015) indicated that citizen’s involvement in the governance of local affairs is crucial for successful execution of reforms because community influence LGAs to deliver public services in accordance with their preferences. This implies that strong legal framework and participation of people in governance process fortifies the authenticity of reforms and provides policy coherence and direction for effective execution of reforms.

Generally, the study findings are similar to those found in literature that institutional capacity in terms of human and financial resources, strong legal and policy framework and political willingness and commitment from central government as well as participation of people in local governance are essential ingredients for effective implementation of decentralization reforms in LGAs in many developing countries, Tanzania in particular.


The fourth specific objective of the study sought to explore factors inhibiting effective implementation of decentralization reforms at SMC. The study findings explored that, the hesitation of national government to devolve resources and power to LGAs, lack of commitment and willingness from central and local government elites to execute the reforms, limited financial autonomy hence insufficient financial resources and limited administrative autonomy hence inadequate human resources, weak legal and institutional
framework are factors impeding successful execution of decentralization reforms in Tanzania’s LGAs essentially at SMC.

The study findings indicate that, the unwillingness of national government to devolve and share resources and functions with LGAs inhibits effective implementation of decentralization reforms. These findings are comparable to those by Ringo et al (2014), Kim et al (2015) and Gaynor, (2018) who established that, the devolvement of power and resources to LGAs in Tanzania are curtailed by resistance and unwillingness of central government leaders who exert their control over local affairs such as revising council’s budgets before approval. Arguably, central governments resists to engage in power sharing deal with LGAs due to fearing of losing power affect the process of dispersing power and resources to LGAs at lower level.

Moreover, the research discovered that lack of political will and commitment on reforms from central government leaders and officials affect the execution of reforms. Similarly, Mooketsane et al (2017), Zon et al (2017 and Archarya, 2018b) discovered that political harassment of public servants, persistence of centralized governance system in personnel management and revenue generation as well as continuous political interference and state intervention over local autonomy challenges the devotion and readiness of national government to decentralize power and resources to autonomous institutions. Based on Weberian theory therefore, it is undisputable fact that central government bureaucrats still enjoy state powers and resources through existing centralized governance system.

Likewise, the study revealed that SMC faces acute shortage of competent human resources to undertake decentralized activities. The findings are similar to that of Mohammed et al (2016) and Zon et al (2017) who contended that, LGAs have limited autonomy over recruitment of competent employees since civil servants are centrally recruited. Furthermore, the study found that SMC lack fiscal autonomy to set tax rate, collect and spend revenue free from central government interference. ADBI (2017) established the same results that, LGAs fiscal autonomy have been curtailed by central government as the results only few LGAs can afford to finance large projects using
revenue from their own sources. This meant LGAs lack human and financial resources for undertaking decentralized activities like health delivery to the people.

Another reported obstacle was weak legal framework which fails to define power and functions of each tier of the government. Similar findings were observed by Murthy and Mahin, (2015) that the ambiguities of the amended sections in the constitution of India act as an obstacle towards effective execution of the reforms. Also, the study by Mnyasenga and Mushi (2015) and Gaynor (2018) confirmed that, local government autonomy is affected by the plethora of legislations and directives from central government. The existing legislations are weak and fail to define power, roles and demarcation of each tier of the government. This implies that central government enactment of ambiguous laws weakens the power and autonomy of LGAs hence jeopardizing the execution of decentralization reforms.

Resistance from local councilors were reported as another factors inhibiting effective execution of decentralization reforms at Singida Municipality. These results are similar to Moshago et al, (2015) who found that local elites are after nurturing their self interest and patronage networks for misappropriating public power and resources for person gain but not engaging in execution of decentralization reforms. This implies that local elite are not willing and uncommitted to effectively participate in effective implementation of decentralization reforms.

5.5. Chapter Summary
The chapter discusses the research findings covered in chapter four in relation with the literature reviewed concerning the phenomenon under investigation. Therefore, it can be concluded that the process of execution of the reforms is not uniform all over the world it differ depending on the design, institutional strength of a country and the willingness and commitment of national government to devolve power and resources to LGAs. Likewise, the findings from numerous literature reviewed correlate to the findings of the study. The reviewed literature for example establish that in most cases the reforms is moderately
implemented since national government hesitate to relinquish and share resources and power with sub-national government.

CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.0. Introduction
This chapter presents a summary of key findings in relation to the specific objectives of the study, followed by a conclusions and overall recommendations for strengthening effective execution of decentralization reforms in Tanzania’s LGAs. The section also suggests the contribution of the study to the existing knowledge as well as areas for further study in respect of execution of decentralization reforms.

6.1. Summary of Findings
The study sought to explore the determinants of effective implementation of decentralization of reforms in LGAs in Tanzania. The specific objectives of the research were; to determine the process of implementation of decentralization reforms in Singida Municipality; to determine the effectiveness of implementation of decentralization reforms in SMC; soliciting factors for effective implementation of decentralization reforms in SMC and to explore factors impeding effective implementation of decentralization reforms in LGAs in Tanzania.

The researcher used a case study research design and mixed research approaches. Data were gathered from 50 employees working in the headquarters of SMC. Basically, documentary review, interviews, observation and questionnaires were deployed in data gathering. Collected data were guided by content analysis, descriptively analyzed and then presented in table and percentage for clarification.

In the study it was observed that the implementation process of the reforms in LGAs in Tanzania was through the creation of decentralized institutions, enactment and amendments of numerous pieces of legislation such as Local Government Act No.7,8&9
of 1892 (Revised in 2006) and through decentralizing fiscal, administrative and political power/functions to LGAs. It was further discovered that decentralization reforms were moderately implemented at Singida Municipality because the reforms brought mixed results in Tanzania’s LGAs. However, the study observed some improvement in government employees’ responsiveness to the needs of the people.

The study further confirmed that for effective implementation of the reforms in Tanzania’s LGAs, political will and commitment from government, institutional capacity of LGAs and strong legal framework are vital. It further revealed that, effective execution of decentralization reform is complicated by weak institutional capacities of LGAs, unwillingness and lack of political commitment from national government as well as absence of national decentralization policy in the country.

The findings are related to studies by Zon et al (2017) who published that central government willingness and commitment to devolve administrative, financial and political authority and autonomy to grassroots institutions, making policies and legislative changes in governance process was the apparatus that determine effective implementation of decentralization reforms in SSA countries.

The findings also corroborates with those by Jagero et al (2014) that the unwillingness of higher tier government to devolve resources and authority to decentralized entities as well as LGAs reluctance to transfer power to local populace, institutional incapacities coupled with limited financial and human resources and lack of clear demarcation of power and roles among levels of government has implicated the implementation of decentralization reforms as planned in Malawi.


The study also sought to determine the process of implementation of decentralization reforms in LGAs in Tanzania, with evidence from SMC. It was evidenced that, the process of execution of decentralization reforms in Tanzania commenced immediately
after the attainment of political sovereignty in 1961. In 1972 marked the abolition of LGAs and replaced by centrally coordinated committees. The failure of these committees marked the re-institution of LGAs in 1982 by the Local Government Authorities Act No.7 and 8 of 1982 as revised in 2006 as well as the amendment of the Constitution of the United Republic of Tanzania of 1977 through Act No. 15 of 1984. The weakness of the re-instituted LGAs spearheaded the government to adopt comprehensive LGRP in 1998 to make LGAs more efficient under the framework of D-by-D.

The findings indicate that the majority of employees have idea about decentralization reforms and were familiar with laws and policies guiding the execution of the reforms. Moreover, it was noted that the government of Tanzania executed the reform within the domain of multifaceted organizational structure. Also, the study revealed that legal framework and policies complicated the process of implementation of the reforms. Furthermore, the study found that created institutions such as village and LGAs at the grassroots level impeded the process of execution of the reforms. Finally, it was found that institutional structure complicated the process of effective completion of decentralization reforms.

6.1.2. The Effectiveness of Implementation of Decentralization Reforms in Tanzania’s LGAs.

The findings of the study indicated that, the reforms have been unsuccessfully implemented as well as brought minimal changes on the delivery of public services contrary to the objectives of LGRP of 2000. This is because LGAs have not yet given autonomy over the governance of local affairs. Specifically the study established that, even after the execution of the reforms local populaces are faced with insufficient public services facilities like health, water, education and sanitation services.

However, the study observed that after the execution of the reforms government responsiveness to the needs of the people has somehow improved though downward public accountability is diminishing. Largely, it was observed that SMC is plagued by the scarcity of competent, trained and accountable employees required for execution of
decentralized activities. Moreover, the investigation revealed that the majority of people at grassroots level cannot afford the cost of services provided by LGAs since corruption and patronage system in public services provision is still ubiquitous.

Lastly, the study identified other factors for effective public services delivery apart from decentralization reforms. The factors identified include (a) the commitment of the government in power to eliminate waste and ensuring integrity in governance of public resources (b) the involvement of private sectors in the provision of public services and (c) the use of information and communication technology (ICT) in public service delivery at the grassroots.

The researcher’s opinion concerning the discussion of the results of the second specific objective is that, if decentralized institutions like village councils and LGAs are empowered and capacitated with all necessary resources, effectively monitored and supervised greatly may warrant improved public services delivery to the populace.

6.1.3. Factors for Effective Implementation of Decentralization Reforms in Tanzania’s LGAs.

The study findings established that, large number of the respondents believed that commitment and willingness from higher government leaders to decentralize power and resources to LGAs is significant for effective execution of the reforms in the council. Similarly, the findings revealed that local autonomy over human resources management is vital for successful execution of the reforms. The study further acknowledges that local government fiscal autonomy to set tax rate, collect and use revenue according to their wishes enhances effective execution of reforms in SMC.

Moreover, many respondents mentioned that participation of people in governance process and accountability mechanisms were appraised as imperative for successful execution of decentralization reforms in local authorities. Subsequently, a large percentage of employees indicated that strong legal framework which defines and specifies clearly powers and responsibilities of each tier of government are required for effective implementation of decentralization reforms.
The researcher’s observation about the discussion of the results of the third specific objective is that political commitment and willingness from higher government leaders and bureaucrats to decentralize, institutional and financial autonomy to LGAs, strong legal framework, involvement of the community in governance affairs and accountability mechanism are imperative for effective implementation of reforms in Tanzania’s LGAs.

### 6.1.4. Factors Inhibiting Effective Implementation of Decentralization Reforms in Tanzania’s LGAs.

The fourth specific objective aimed to determine factors inhibiting effective implementation of decentralization reforms in Tanzania’s LGAs with evidence from SMC. Through interview and documentary review it was revealed that the failure of SMC to act independently in all matters concerning local governance as visualized by the LGRP of 2000 is fostered by the idea of the unitary system of government. Such an idea is attached with the ideology that central government exercise power and control over the entire LGAs hence monopolize all power and resources at the center through central government organs.

The study findings established that lack of commitment and political will from political leaders and central government bureaucrats obstruct the practice of relinquishing power, resources and functions from central government to LGAs. Moreover, employees’ exposed that lack of fiscal autonomy inhibit effective execution of decentralized activities. Furthermore, the study indicates that, the shortage of competent human resources account for ineffective execution of the reforms in the council. Besides, majority of employees opined that restrictive legal framework and absence of decentralization policy obscure LGAs to execute their decentralized functions.

### 6.2. Conclusions

Decentralization reforms have been perceived as imperative strategy for enhancing the preferences of local populace through democratically elected leaders at the grassroots level. This study has indicated that effective implementation of decentralization reform is
influenced by numerous factors. These factors include strong legal, policies and regulatory framework which clearly defines the powers and the roles of each government, central commitment and willingness to devolve power, resources and functions to LGAs, participation of people in governance and accountability mechanisms. These findings concur with Principal-Agency Model and Participatory-Democratic Theory. These theories commonly prove that presence of accountability mechanisms and participation of local populace in governance process is required for effective execution of decentralization reform,

However, the study found that weak legal and regulatory framework and absence of decentralization policy complicate the implementation process of the reforms. Through literature review and the study findings it was discovered that the government launched LGRP in 2000 for the implementation of decentralization reforms in LGAs and enhancing public’s participation in local governance process but remained to be poorly implemented. This was validated by the study that, the reforms had minimal contribution on improvement of public services provision in grassroots authorities in Tanzania. This was for the reason that the implementation of decentralization reforms are still plagued with several impediments as extensively discussed in chapter five of this study.

6.3. Contributions of the Study to the Body of Knowledge
The study adds knowledge to the existing literature that absence of decentralization policy and presence of weak legal framework, regulatory system and institutional set ups intricate the devolution of power, resources and responsibilities from central government to LGAs. This is because decentralization policy, strong regulatory and legal bases or constitution and well established institutional set ups, clearly define power and responsibilities of each tier of the government as well as harmonizing the central-local government relationship.

Furthermore, the study added that most of elected leaders (councilors) have vast power without knowledge but are the ones responsible for policies, decision making and issuing guidelines for implementation of council’s functions. On the other hand, bureaucrats who
are professionals are required to adhere to the directives and order from politicians (councilors) as well as responsible for policies and projects implementation. From principal-agent theory and Adversarial model this kind of relationship between elected councilors (politicians) and bureaucrats (appointed) public officials will always be a source of endless and unresolved differences nurtured by lack of trust, self interests and rent seeking behaviors.

6.4. Policy Implications

Decentralized authorities are statutory creature empowered to provide public services to the local populace within their area of jurisdiction. Therefore, continuation of top-down management approach based on Weberian theory characterized by partial devolvement of power, resources and functions to locally elected bodies (Council) has several implications over enhancing good governance at the grassroots level. It is an institution through which laws and order are maintained, efficient and effective in the use of public resources are ensured and proper public services are provided to the citizens in their localities (Mbegu & Komba, 2017; Jesse & Bengesi, 2018). Therefore, partial or incomplete devolvement of power, resources and autonomy from central government to local government as clarified by NPM model weaken the capability of local government to fulfill the expectations of citizens. Thus, weak LGAs imply poor public services delivery, poor local governance and lack of accountability, mismanagement of public resources, political interference to local affairs and poor execution of the reforms.

In practice, ad-hoc policies, directives, guidelines and plethora of laws from central parent ministries bring confusion and unwarranted influence towards implementation of decentralization reforms in local authorities hence the council’s management should know how to deal with it so that the execution of reforms continue as adopted. Therefore, it can be argued that alterations of government legislation, policies and priorities affect negatively the process of execution of decentralization reforms in Tanzania’s LGAs. For example, the changing from decentralized to recentralized property tax collection in 2017 and decentralized to recentralized recruitment system in 2009 respectively have impacted the level of fiscal and administrative autonomy of LGAs in a way that the council
depends on grants from central government for over 90% hence ineffective execution of the reforms.

**6.5. Recommendations of the Study**

Decentralization reforms are of great significance to the empowerment of local authorities and enhancing the struggle for poverty eradication and strengthening good governance at the grassroots. Based on the study findings and the overview of the process of implementation of decentralization and its effectiveness on public services provision to the people at the grassroots, the study offers the following recommendations; -

Firstly, the study found that some employees lack understanding on the practice of decentralization. It is therefore recommended that continuous capacity building on decentralization issues is essential to council’s employees as well as nurturing a culture of accepting changes to its employees and mould them to have optimistic attitudes towards changes. The best practice is to involve all employees in initiation of the reforms which will make even easier during its implementation and exposing employees especially councilors to the real world.

Secondly, the study established that current there is no decentralization policy and there is weak legal framework. Therefore, it is suggested that instant action to be taken by the government to formulate decentralization policy and to review current legal framework so as to address the problems of decentralized governance, central-government relations and overlapping of roles of each level of governments as well as enshrining power and autonomy of devolved system in the constitution.

Thirdly, since the study found that there is a lack of political will and commitment to decentralize, it is recommended that more political will and commitment from local and central government leaders and bureaucrats is needed for effective execution of decentralization reforms for public services delivery in LGAs.

Fourthly, the study indicated that there are enormous variations between rhetoric and reality. Such variation has piloted to less local government autonomy over all matters
concerned local governance such as financial and human resources management as well as poor public services delivery. Therefore it is recommended that, LGAs should be given power, resources and autonomy to make their own decisions without inducement from central government. Thus, LGAs should be constitutionally empowered to make decisions, mobilize resources and use it wisely.

Further, due to the ad-hoc policies, directives and orders from central government like re-centralization/abolition of some sources of revenue, LGAs should prepare for impromptu directives, orders and policies so as to contain such ad-hoc plans without jeopardizing council’s strategies. Therefore, participatory decision making approach between tiers of government is desirable practice for avoiding ad-hoc plans which affects LGAs strategies.

Besides, central government should ensure resources required for implementation of reforms including financial, human and physical facilities are disbursed as arranged so as to avoid ineffective implementation process. Furthermore, there is the need of reducing the number of statutory meeting in the council which consumes huge amount of taxpayer’s money for sitting allowance. The best practice is by encouraging enterprising culture to the members of the council.

Finally, LGAs requires effective monitoring and evaluation mechanism which will be capable to map out progress in the implementation of devolved activities and transferred resources against public services provided so as to identify any gaps which need instant actions. Interference to local affairs is undesirable.

6.6. Suggestions for Further Areas of study
The study explored the determinants of effective implementation of decentralization reforms in Tanzania’s LGAs. It is also worth investigating the roles of elected politicians (leaders) in enhancing effective implementation of decentralization by devolution in Tanzania’s LGAs. This is because elected politicians are the ones who develop and authorize laws and policies to be adhered in attaining the mission and vision of the
country. Likewise, other studies can be carried out to investigate the influence of central-local government relationships in the implementation of decentralization reforms in Tanzania’s LGAs.
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APPENDICES

Questionnaires for Respondents

Introduction

Dear respondent, I am a bona fide student of Mzumbe University pursuing a Master Degree in Public Administration. As part of my degree program, I am conducting a research on The Determinants of effective implementation of decentralization reform in local government authorities at Singida Municipal Council. Thus, I humbly appeal to you to spare some of your time and fill this questionnaire as honest as possible in order to obtain valid and reliable information for better results of the study. The information that will be provided will be analyzed with highest level of confidentiality and solely be used for the purpose of the study.

SECTION A: RESPONDENT’S BACKGROUND INFORMATION

(Tick where appropriate)

1. How old are you?
   (a) 18-28 [ ] (b) 29-39 [ ] (c) 39-49 [ ] (d) 50-60 [ ]
   (b) 60- and above [ ]

2. Gender
   (a) Male [ ] (b) Female [ ]

3. Highest level of Education
   a) Doctor of Philosophy [ ] (b) Master degree [ ]
   c) Bachelor degree [ ] (d) Diploma [ ]
   e) Any other (Specify)………………………………

4. What is your job designation? …………………
5. How long have you been working with the council?
   (a) 1-5 years [ ] (b) 6-10 years [ ]
   (c) 11-15 years [ ] (d) 16-20 years [ ]
   (e) 21-25 years (f) Any other (Specify)
6 Nature of the employment
   a) Temporary [     ]   (b) Contractual bases [     ]
   c) Permanent and Pensionable [ ] (d) Any other (Specify)……

SECTION B: THE PROCESS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF
DECENTRALIZATION IN LGAs IN TANZANIA.

7. Do you have any idea about decentralization and its implementation process?
   (a) Yes [     ]   (b) No [     ]
   If the yes, please state……………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………

8. (a) Do you know any laws and policy guiding the process of implementation of
decentralization reform in your council?
   (a) Yes [     ] (b) No [     ] (c) I don’t know [     ]
   If the answer is yes, please mention them……………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   (b). Do you think laws and policies mentioned in Q.8) have contributed to the process of implementation of decentralization reforms in your council?
   a) Yes [     ]   (b) No [     ]

9. To what extent does laws and policies mentioned in (Q. 8) enabled the process of
decentralization implementation in your council?
   a) Great extent [     ]   c) Limited extent [     ]
   b) Moderate extent [     ]   d) Very limited extent [     ]

10. To what extent the creation of decentralized institutions at lower levels enabled the
    process of implementation of decentralization in your council?
    a) Great extent [     ]   b) Moderate extent [     ]
    c) Limited extent [     ]   d) Very limited extent [     ]
11. In your opinion are you satisfied with the organizational arrangement between central and local governments in the process of implementing decentralization reform?
   (a) Yes [ ]  
   (b) No [ ]

SECTION C: THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DECENTRALIZATION REFORM IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT AUTHORITIES.

12. To what extent does decentralization reforms is effectively implemented in local level by the central government?
   a) Great extent [ ]  
   b) Moderate extent [ ]  
   c) Limited extent [ ]  
   d) Vey limited [ ]

13. To what extent does the implementation of decentralization reform brought changes on public services delivery in your council?
   a) Great extent [ ]  
   b) Moderate extent [ ]  
   c) Limited extent [ ]  
   d) Very limited [ ]

14. The following are some of statements concerning the effectiveness of decentralization reform in terms of public services delivery to the local government level. Please indicate the extent do you agree or disagree with the statement. Use, 5-Strongly agree, 4- Agree, 3-Neutral, 2- Disagree, and 1-Strongly disagree. (Put exactly scale besides the statement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public services facilities (e.g. offices, health, water and sanitation services) are available and autonomously managed by LGAs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After decentralization Public services facilities has equipped with sufficient equipments such as (buildings and offices equipments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public services offered by the council are affordable and citizens have ability to pay for such services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public employees (public servants ) in your council are adequate, competent, and well trained to provide public services professionally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public employees in your council are committed, motivated, accountable and ready to serve the local populace.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public services (e.g. education, health, and water) delivered by Local authorities to the community are of high standard and quality

Public services are timely and promptly provided devoid of unnecessary delays.

Public services such as (such as health Services) are responsively provided by local government officials without corruption, patronage and favoritisms.

(b) Apart from decentralization reform, please provide other factors for effective public services delivery in Singida Municipal Council?

SECTION D: FACTORS ENHANCING EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF DECENTRALIZATION REFORMS IN LGAs IN SMC.

15. The following are some of the ingredients for effective implementation of decentralization reform in local government authorities in Tanzania. Kindly indicate the extent do you agree or disagree with the statement; Use the scale of 1-5. 1- Strongly agree, 2, agree, 3 neutral, 4 disagree, 5 strongly disagree (Put exactly scale besides the statement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political willingness and commitment of leaders from both the central and sub-national government to undertake decentralization reforms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local governments fiscal autonomy to set tax rate, collect resources and utilize the resources at local level depending on their plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government autonomy or power to manage its human resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong legal and institutional framework which clearly define the responsibilities/ functions and power of each tier of the government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens participation in local decision-making and planning process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presence of accountability mechanisms to hold local bureaucrats accountable to elected representatives and elected leaders accountable to the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Provide other factors that you think can enhance effective implementation of decentralization reform? (Mention as many as you can)

………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………

SECTION, E; FACTORS THAT INHIBIT EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF DECENTRALIZATION REFORM IN LGAs IN SMC..

17. The following are some of the statements concerning the factors inhibiting effective implementation of decentralization reform to the local government level. Please indicate the extent do you agree or disagree with the statement. Use, 5-Strongly agree, 4- Agree, 3-Neutral, 2- Disagree, and 1-Strongly disagree. (Put a tick below scale given)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The process of devolving central government power, resources and function to local authorities so far is smooth, efficient and effective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The central government is fully willing and committed to ensure the process of decentralization is effectively implemented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is an adequate financial resource for public services delivery which matches with the degree of decentralized functions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are insufficient and incompetent human resources needed for successfully execution of decentralized functions and responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is weak legal framework and absence of decentralization policy to ensure local autonomy and to provide clearly the functions of each level of government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local elite or leaders (councilors and local chief if any) are not willing and committed to engage in effective implementation of the reform

18. Provides other factors that you think are likely to impede the implementation of decentralization reform in Singida Municipality? (List as many factors as you can)

………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………

19. Please provide suggestions which should be taken to enhance and enable effective implementation of decentralization reforms in SMC.

………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………

THANK YOU FOR USING YOUR TIME IN THIS EXERCISE
APPENDIX. B:
Interview Guide Questions for Respondents.

1. What do you understand about decentralization? And how is it implemented?
2. Do you know any laws and policies guiding the process of implementation decentralization reform? Which are they?
3. Do legal and institutional frameworks enable the process of implementation of decentralization reforms in your council?
4. Does the central government and sub-national government leaders are politically willing and committed to the decentralized power, resources and function to LGAs?
5. Do participation of people in decision making influence effective implementation of decentralization reforms?
6. Do you think that holding local government official and elected leaders are accountable enhance implementation of decentralization reforms?
7. Does SMC have full autonomy, power and authority to collect tax, manage human resources and to make decisions without interference from central government?
8. Does the execution of D-by-D reform brought changes on public services delivery in your council in terms of accessibility, affordability, and quality, timely and competent employee?
9. Apart from decentralization reforms, what other factors that can enhance effective public services delivery in your council?
10. What do you think can enhance effective implementation of decentralization reform in your council?
11. What do you think can inhibit effective implementation of decentralization reforms in your council?
12. What should be done to enhance effective implementation of decentralization reform in your council?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.