

Evaluating the performance of Public Service Delivery Organizations (PSDOs) in Uganda and Tanzania

Benon C. Basheka

Department of Governance, Kabale University-Uganda
bbasheka@kab.ac.ug

John S. Kihamba

Dar es Salaam University College of Education (DUCE)-Tanzania



AJoGPL
ISSN: 2789-2298

Vol 2. Issue 1.
pp. 7 - 19, Sept 2023
<https://ajogpl.kab.ac.ug>

Abstract

There is a plethora of academic literature on the nature of public sector organizations. Generally, all public sector institutions exist to deliver certain services to the population. An assessment of their performance thus serves a primary purpose of checking how these institutions stand on their legal mandates. Undeniably, the public service institutions have since 1980s been candidates for a myriad of reforms and these reforms have been intended to make the public service organizations work better. This paper is about such efforts in Uganda and Tanzania. In both countries, governments have implemented a myriad of public service reform programmes to increase efficiency and effectiveness of the public sector. The extent to which these efforts have yielded substantive results is hardly examined. This paper through a comparative approach examines the performance of public service organizations in delivery of public services in both Uganda and Tanzania. Data for this assessment was obtained through an evaluation undertaking which relied on both secondary and primary sources. The findings overall suggest that there are some areas where public service organisations have performed well due to the reforms. The evaluation points out of an unfinished business as there remains a number of public service areas where performance has been doubted.

Key words: Civil Service, Public Service, Public Service Reform and Service Delivery, Uganda, Tanzania

Introduction

Debates on the exact role of the state has tended to focus on assessing the efficiency and usefulness of public sector activities (Afonso, Schuknecht, & Tanzi, 2005, Basheka, 2018). This debate has scaled up to a growing dissatisfaction and mistrust by citizens of government services (Peters, 2004; Ngowi, 2007). Some scholars however even question what should constitute organizational performance or effectiveness (Selden and Sowa, 2004). The entry of other providers in service delivery like the private sector and the non-state actors generally has sometimes led to a questioning of the role of the state. The question is whom should the citizens hold accountable for the lapses in service delivery-government or the non-state actors? Basheka (2018:2) intimates that the debate on whether public services should be provided by the government or the private sector became a battle ground of scholarly and policy arguments at the time when governments were being accused of inefficiency by the 'old public administration' philosophies.

Public management relates to public sector organizations unlike private management whose domain is the private sector. The two are differentiated based on the degree to which direct state intervention in the delivery of services is involved. From a democratic perspective, government is an agent of the state and is charged with the responsibility of delivering public services through tax payer's money. Public sector reforms have tended to favour private sector involvement in the delivery of public goods and services. Rosenbloom, Kravchuk and Clerkin (2009:9) have guided that the government obligation to promote the public interest distinguishes public administration from private management.

Performance management in government has received increasing interest since the late 1980s and early 1990s when the role of the state in service delivery was under attack (Basheka, 2018). Most reforms were supported and implemented as a result of the 're-inventing government' agenda (Osbourne and Gabler 1992, Hood, 1991, Hughes, 2003) that prioritised the use entrepreneurial models in delivery of public services. With this debate came an idea of shared public service delivery between state and non-state actors. Of particular importance was the responsibility between government and the private sector as far as delivery of public services was concerned (Basheka, 2018, Hughes, 2003). It is clear from the literature that most developing countries emerged from independence with government playing a major role in society and economy (Hughes, 2003:220) but towards the 1980s this role was seriously questioned (Basheka, 2018).

The most important argument in favour of government role in service delivery has been efficient nature of organization which relies on Weber's ideal type of bureaucracy (Breton & Wintrobe, (1982: 33). Weber's model emphasizes rigidity yet, one of the inherent characteristics of public sector organizations is their innate ability to undergo reforms in order to respond to the internal and external dynamics and demands that evolve in countries overtime (United Republic of Tanzania, 2013:36). This attribute enables public sector organizations to undertake innovations that lead to adoption of new systems, processes, tools and structures for carrying out their mandates responsively, effectively and efficiently (URT, *ibid*:36). Public service organizations are dynamic, adaptive, responsive and transformational entities and are always striving to imbue with necessary values, additional strictures, management, tools, skills, among others (Olaopa, 2010: 110).

This paper reports on a study whose purpose was to:

- i. Examine and analyse the performance of public service organizations in Uganda and Tanzania using both secondary and empirical data to understand the state of reform interventions success or failure
- ii. Examine the possible explanatory factors for the performance of public sector organizations in both Uganda and Tanzania
- iii. Examine the most likely critical success factors needed for public sector organizations to achieve their intended objectives

Theoretical and Conceptual issues

New Public Management theory

Theoretically, the new public management theory offers an appropriate theoretical frame for a discussion on the performance of the public sector. This theoretical stance compares the role of government in service delivery *visa vis* other non-state actors. This theoretical perspective dubbed the 'New Public

Management Perspective' (NPM) is associated with the idea of reinventing government, re-engineering, revitalization and re-energizing of the public sector. This argument is scaled to the need for organizational transformation, applying certain private sector driven models like total quality management, entrepreneurship, empowerment, result oriented processes, downsizing/rightsizing, lean and mean management, contracting out, steering rather rowing, empowering rather than serving and earning rather spending (Osborne and Gaebler, 1992, Hughes, 2003).

NPM focuses on decentralizing management and disaggregating the public sector. NPM theory focuses on improving efficiency, horizontally specialization in the public service organizations, marketization, adoption of private sector management style, explicit performance standards and output/outcome control (Christensen, 2012). NPM theory guided public sector reforms in Uganda and Tanzania and the reforms tended to be driven by the 'one-size fits all' prescription.

Public Service Reforms: Meaning and Purpose.

Reforms in public service organizations have been inevitable but this calls that such reforms need to be consciously planned and effectively managed in order to achieve their intended results (URT 2013:36). The imperfectness of human arrangements and the nature of human beings to continuously search for performance improvement make reforms a characteristic feature of organizations, hence an inescapable routine (Bana and Ngware, 2006:205). Public Service Reform Programme (PSRPs) envisions fundamental changes in the way Government implement its planned activities to enhance efficiency and effectiveness overtime. Introducing reform programmes in the public service is however a complex process requiring support at the highest levels and great internal management confidence and skill (Corkery, *et al.*, 1998:1). Public service reforms basically have two official aims: (i) to adjust the functions and roles of the state in society to fit current government visions-issues of "what to do", (ii) to improve the efficiency, effectiveness, legitimacy and accountability of the state in carrying out those functions-issues "how to do it" (Kiragu and Mukandala, 2005).

Public service reforms are undertaken in order to restore the public to a path from which it had derailed, while at some other times public service reforms are borne out of the need to restructure it to handle challenges that may arise in the nearest future (Olaopa, *ibid*: 108). The concept of public service/civil service means the administrative machine that is established to assist those who exercise supreme political authority within a given state (Ademolekun, 2005:17). Public service is the main instrument of governments charged with the responsibility of translating national development policies and strategies into action. By virtue of its unique role as the engine for growth (Kikwete, 2008: i), it enlivens and keeps the machinery of government running effectively (Bentil, 2004: xiii). Thus, a functioning public service makes government of the day implements its plans smoothly, thus fulfilling what it promised to its citizens (Kikwete, 2008: i). However, the public service in any country is never static (Kuye, 2005:175), denoting "induced" systematic permanent improvement in the structure, process and management in order to attain efficiency and effectiveness.

The research problem is a both a conceptual and a theoretical one. Whereas governments in Africa have implemented reforms since the 1980s with a view of improving the performance of the public sector, limited knowledge remains on how the sector has performed. There is a general lack of studies intended to assess the performance of the public sector and offer useful lessons on what has worked and what has not worked. This scenario creates not only a knowledge gap in the area of practice but also scholars are denied

a chance to share experiences in the academic fora. Moreover, attempts which have been made to address this challenge do so only from a single country perspective. Comparative studies are limited and this has led to lack of understanding the differences and similarities in the state of public sector performance. This study used a comparative approach to address this challenge.

Methodology

This paper builds on both primary and secondary sources. Primary data is used for the case of Uganda while the study on Tanzania relies on the secondary data. In Uganda's case, the findings are derived from several evaluation studies regarding the performance of various public sector organisations. The studies were intended to examine the efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability of public sector organizations. The assessment evaluated the existing reports from agencies of government like Auditor General as well as findings obtained from a self-administered questionnaire for the case of Uganda. The emerging findings were analysed alongside the thematic areas aligned to the evaluation criteria.

The findings from the studies are synthesized along the secondary report findings to identify a general state of evaluative performance of the PSOs in the country. The study used a deductive approach to review the literature and identify the main issues associated with performance or underperformance of PSOs in Uganda and Tanzania. In each country an attempt was made to map out in detail the nature of the reform interventions and the how the process was undertaken. We then use selected reforms to undertake an evaluation of the successes and failures. We describe, analyse and outline major success stories and sad stories in regard to the performance of the public sector in the two countries. We also examine some similarities and differences of reform interventions in these selected countries. Each of the countries has different classifications of PSOs and the assessment use a sample from the different classification categories.

Public Service Reforms in Uganda and Tanzania: The nature of the Reforms.

The Public Sector Reforms (PSRs) in Africa often have similar aims and contain surprisingly similar components (Therkildsen, 2006). In Uganda and Tanzania in particular, there is little heterogeneity of public service reforms in terms of plans, designs, contents, periodization and implementation modalities. In both countries, the reforms can structurally be traced to the work of the Public Sector Review and Re-organization Commission (PSRRCs) of early 1990's. The adopted reform interventions were in the framework of the Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) and many of the operational tools and processes, approaches and systems were externally generated (Corkery, *et al.*, 1998).

The major thrust of the reform interventions in both countries was cost containment through downsizing and rightsizing the public service delivery organizations whereby 153,000 and 91,000 employees were retrenched from Uganda and Tanzania public service organizations (Moti and Vambe, 2009; Mutahaba, *et al.* 2017, Mukandala, 2008). The reform interventions also focused on decentralizing government functions to Local authorities and streamlining and rationalizing ministerial structures and functions in both countries (Issa, 2019; Moti and Vambe, 2009; Mukandala, 2008:71) and addressed the issue of low pay, and capacity issues for improved service delivery (Mukandala, 2008:71). A number of reform initiatives were implemented and their outcomes largely depended on the support from donors and top political leadership of Uganda and Tanzania.

In the early 1990s, the presidents of Uganda and Tanzania declared themselves to be committed to transforming the administrative and raise performance of the public sector organizations. In Tanzania for example, from 1995 to 2005 the pace of restructuring, retrenchment and pay reform were among the focus of the then political leadership (Kiragu and Mukandala 2005). The reform also; (iii) contained uncontrolled growth of size of the size of the public service by monitoring new hiring and wage bill expenditure using a fully integrated Human Resources Management and Payroll System (Mutahaba, *et al.*, 2017; URT, 2013:39; Mukandala, 2008:71). And (iv) enhanced salary levels in the public service in real terms and made the pay structure more transparent, and consolidated.

Pay Reforms: the Politics on Payment of Living Wages in Uganda and Tanzania.

By its nature, public services pay is inherently complex and political due to the fact it is determined and constrained by political leaderships (Mukandala, 2008). Political leaderships determine and approve how much governments should pay staff salaries without affecting other obligations. Public servants need to be adequately compensated to raise their morale and meet their living and other obligations (Basheka and Tshombe, 2018). However, wages need to be kept low, but not to the extent of endangering the survival and production of the labor force. Pay is a crucial to sustaining motivation, performance and integrity of public servants (Kiragu and Mukandala, 2005).

Across African countries evidence show that government employees either cut back their productivity or hours of work when salaries are low and the reduction in production is greater as the compensation diminishes (Kiragu and Mukandala, *ibid*). Government in Africa do not pay minimum living wage to their employees, remuneration is so low as to lead to “institutionalized corruption”, laxity and general lack of discipline (Kigundu, as cited by Kiragu and Mukandala, 2005). In addition, the public service pays levels in Sub-Saharan African were too low and uncompetitive which led to depletion of scarce motivational capital in the public service giving rise to: demotivation of civil servants at all levels; reduced work efforts; declining levels in performance; weakening of accountability and control mechanism and reduced commitment to the public service (Mutahaba, 2005).

In order to address these deficiencies associated with demotivated employees, governments in Africa and in particular Uganda and Tanzania introduce pay reforms as one among the public service reform interventions. The pay reform intervention aimed at increasing pay levels of the public servants a motivation for them to improve performance in service delivery. Before reform of 1990s public service salaries were extremely low in Uganda and Tanzania (Robinson, 1990; Mukandala, 2008). The public service delivery organizations in Uganda and Tanzania soon after independences in 1960s to 70s were lean, efficient, well-paid and highly motivated and served to the expectation of political leadership and citizens (Lumbanga, 1995). However, in the late 1980s and early 1990s, it was revealed that the public service delivery employees were extremely demotivated with abysmally low salaries and wages (Mukandala, 2008). The reform initiatives aimed enhancing pay level as a critical component of increasing employee morale and improve performance in service delivery.

The reform intervention enhanced salary levels in the public service in real terms and made the pay structure more transparent, and consolidated the pay structure by reducing 196 grades and 36 allowances to, respectively 45 grades and 7 allowances; (v) Launched the decentralization programme, created executive agencies, contracted out non-core activities such as security, cleaning, etc to the private sector, and instituted measures to re-engineer service delivery by the “quick wins scheme; (v) enhanced the

government capacity by injection of needed competencies and expertise through contract recruitment and ‘crash’ training programmes, which enhanced government capacity to implement reforms; (vii) improved policy and legislative environment for sustaining reforms (URT, 2013:39). The public service delivery organizations in both countries aimed at paying living wages to their employees as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: PSO salaries for the Year 1993 and 1997 for Uganda and Tanzania.

	Uganda	Tanzania	Uganda	Tanzania	Uganda	Tanzania
Categories of Public servants	Monthly pay in 1993 US \$	Monthly pay in 1993 US \$	Monthly pay in 1997 US \$	Monthly pay in 1997 US \$	Percentage Increase US\$ (%)	
Primary Teacher	7.41	25	68.90	91.52	930	366.08
Nurse	7.41	22	87.05	76.27	1,175	346.68
Policeman/woman	6.61	20	66.39	76.27	1,004	381.35

Source: Kyarimpa, 2009; Kiragu and Mukandala, 2005; Lukumai, 2006.

The data above shows the first phase of public service reforms of Uganda and Tanzania where the two countries made some increase in pay levels as compared to the situation before reforms. The successes recorded from this reform intervention were short-lived in both countries since no minimum living wage (MLW) was achieved despite the pay rise in nominal terms. Service delivery did not therefore improve and in some cases, it was followed by reversals (Mukandala, 2018). At the end of 1990s CSRPs did not substantively achieve what it was expected particularly improved public service delivery (URT, 2013: 39). Accordingly, the reform initiatives did not improve performance in service delivery as it largely focused on cost containment than strengthening institutional capacity of the civil service (Mukandala, 2018:9).

In 2000 the Government of Tanzania launched the PSRP whose strategic drivers, included (i) a strong focus on service delivery improvements; (ii) institutional pluralism in public service delivery; (iii) shifting primary implementation responsibility to ministries, departments and agencies; (iv) a strong monitoring and evaluation mechanism; (v) strengthening links with other public sector reforms; and (vi) improving staff incentive framework under severe budgetary constraint. The scope of the programme was broader, wider and comprehensive, aimed at total transformation of the public service into a vibrant/robust, efficient, and effective and outcome-based institution (Mutahaba, *et al*, 2017). PSRP I involved two major thrusts: (i) the installation of Performance Management Systems in MDAs, involving adoption of strategic planning and programme budgeting methodologies, carrying out service delivery surveys, and client service charters; and (ii) modernization of the management of public service personnel (URT, 2013; Mutahaba, 2017). It had also seven interdependent components, namely (i) Performance Improvement Systems; (ii) Restructuring and Re-engineering; (iii) Human Capital Management; (iv) Leadership, Management and Staff Development; (v) Integrity and Diversity in the Public Service; (vi) Information Technology and Systems; (vii) Policy development, programme coordination, monitoring and evaluation (Mutahaba, 2017).

Performance of Public Service Organizations in Uganda and Tanzania: An Evaluation.

Uganda

Findings from the literature and primary sources suggest that Uganda’s public service organizations have achieved some notable positive results. For example, a number of the public sector organisations have

developed evidence-based policies, have improved the use of performance management systems and have improved management of public service through Human Capital Management (Kihamba, 2018). Through the public sector transformation evaluation, Uganda has identified the missing gap as being implementation of the policies. The same is reported in the case of Tanzania. Despite the positive results reported in some areas of the public sector, a crisis of under performance in other public service delivery organizations has been reported. The under performance is attributed to incompetency, poor accountability and declining service standards have continued to bedevil Uganda's public service and Tanzania (ESID, 2016; Issa, 2019). Poor Policy implementation, weaknesses in coordination of government, incompetence and uncommitted leadership, corruption, political patronage, and general lack of accountability from citizens.

Uganda Vision 2040 and NDP 2010/11-2014/15 cite weak public sector management and administration as the most binding constraint to economic growth and a key challenge to Uganda's development. According to the National Service Delivery Survey Report (2016), the general performance of civil servants was ranked as good by only 35.3% of the respondents. This shows the concern of the respondents on the performance gaps. The report notes that only 32% of the respondents ranked the attitude of public servants as good. When respondents were asked to rank government on utilisation of government resources, 88% of respondents believed that government buildings were for example appropriately utilised and 61.6% believed that government vehicles were appropriately utilised. There were reports of corruption where 17% of households had recorded incidences of corruption tendencies.

According to the Policy Paper on the Transformation of the Uganda Public Service (2013), the public service was characterised by inflexible procedures, long and manual processes, weak strategic linkages in planning and implementation of government intervention poor performance management practices, inflexibility in management, manual public management systems, inadequate funding and inadequate public service pay, poor work attitudes, insufficient leadership capacity, inadequate application of modern methods, a feeling of apathy, general lack of ethical values, ineffective complaints handling mechanisms amongst several. Within this environment, the reforms targeting the coordination function in the public sector which have been among the most recent in Uganda have been affected. In 2003, cabinet approved a coordination framework under the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM) to ensure that all government programmes were monitored and evaluated in a rational manner. In practice, however, this role has remained shared among three other institutions: The Office of the President; the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (MoFPED) and the National Planning Authority (NPA). This has created a state of 'uncoordinated coordination' that is functional to the members of the ruling inner circle.

The existing performance appraisal methods in PSOs have not adequately linked individual staff or departmental performance with performance of the PSOs. Instead, the appraisal methods have intended to evaluate personal traits and attributes rather than performance of tasks of the individual and the department. As a result, the extent to which outcomes of performance appraisal have been applied in decision making as a human resource practice has remained questionable. The performance of public sector organisations is also affected by poor oversight by the respective Boards. Moreover, the appointment of the board members of almost all the PSOs has remained a key governance area of concern as those who fail in elections and are aligned to the ruling establishment tend to be the candidates for appointment to such boards. Their competences and exposure in corporate governance are hardly considered.

The implication of this is that most of such PSOs fail to align their objectives with the new development agenda of the country (Vision 2040).

The Leadership question of the PSOs remains a key matter affecting the performance of these organisations (Basheka,2018). Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) of Public Sector Organizations tend to lack mastery of the environmental factors and context in which their PSOs operate. This is demonstrated by their inability to mobilise diverse resources for implementing planned activities. A tendency to rely on state financing of most activities has been characteristic of most public sector organisations in Uganda.

A diagnostic review of the efficiency and effectiveness of public service organisations (PSOs) in Uganda conducted in 2009 found that there was lack of a comprehensive and coordinated monitoring and evaluation system for the PSOs in the country. PSOs then were not included in the National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (NIMES) under the Office of the Prime Minister and Government lacked a central data bank of information about PSO performance and how they contributed to the overall national social-economic performance. The study found several issues including the governance challenges which hindered promotion of efficiency and effectiveness. Out of 119 PSOs assessed, the study found that only 19 (22.6%) had Board Audit Sub-committees although 68 PSOs (80%) were found to have an operational internal audit function. These are key governance structures for efficiently managing public resources. Only 66 (78.5%) had then submitted audited accounts for up to 2006, 14 up to 2005, 13 up to 2004, and 6 up to 2003.

Regarding staffing, PSO sector establishment had total of 21,539 approved posts, whereas the actual number of persons employed was 24,149, indicating that there was 2,610 persons occupying unapproved posts. At the same time there were 3,081 vacancies against the approved positions, this implied that some PSOs were understaffed. The total annual wage bill was shillings 230 billion. The average gross expenditure on personnel was 30% (Shillings 409 billion) of the average annual budget (Shillings 1, 620 billion). There were questions of continued sustainability of PSOs. Out of one hundred nineteen PSOs, nine depend on donor support for over 60% of their annual budgets and thirty financed their annual budgets by over 70% from internally raised revenues.

Tanzania

Tanzania has been recording encouraging economic growth during the last 17 years. For instance, from 2001 to date Tanzania has sustained an average annual growth rate of 6.7 to 7% as compared with 3.0% in the preceding decade (Mukandala, 2018). In addition, public service organizations in Tanzania have made improvements in policy making by making evidence-based policies using the standard guidelines; improved use of performance management systems by MDAs and their linkages to service delivery, (Kariuki,2017 as cited by Mukandala, 2018).

In addition, the performance of the public service organizations such as executive agencies and local government authorities and the education sector is on the lower side (Kihamba, 2018;2014; URT, 2012; Kihamba and Kamugisha, 2016; URT, 2018; 2019; Mutahaba, *et al.*, 2017). The reasons for this state affairs associated to: failure to internalize public service reform initiatives, shortage of financial resources, poor coordination of activities and low level of capacity of staff to undertake their core function as well as low morale and corruption (Mutahaba, *et al.*, 2017). On the education sector, poor performance was attributed to absenteeism of public servants or present at workstation while performing un-related works

(Mukandala, 2018). For example, the 2015 and 2016 TWaweza studies revealed that, 31 percent teachers were absent from workstations while 34 percent were present but not teaching and only 35 percent were teaching (Mukandala, 2018). The World Bank report also shows students received roughly 39 percent of the scheduled teaching time, which is equivalent to 2 hours and 46 minutes per day instead of official 5 hours and 56 minutes (WB, 2015).

The underperformance of the public service organizations was contrary to the expectation of the political leadership and the public at large in Tanzania since the government adopted the Malaysian's Performance Management Delivery Unit model branded the Big Results Now (BRN) in 2013. The BRN was expected to be strong and effective system that the government could use to oversee, monitor and evaluate the implementation of national development plans and programmes (The Commonwealth Secretariat, 2016:25). BRN reform initiative aimed at transforming Tanzania's public service delivery systems in six key ministries and it was wholly financed by donors (Mukandala, 2018). However, this reform initiative (BRN) was expensive, unpopular outside the six selected areas, attempted to short-circuit the formal civil service, and was abandoned by the fifth phase government leadership (Mukandala, 2018). The fifth phase government focused more on achieving results and curbing inefficiency and corruption within the public service (Issa, 2019). As a result performance of the public service organization to some extent improved. For example, in the sectors of health, water supply, electricity, and education service delivery were relatively improved (Issa, 2019). Accordingly, petty corruption and bribes were reduced and public service performance in service delivery rose from 49% to 58% (Issa, *ibid*). However, these notable improvements are not attributed to institutionalized performance culture with the public service organizations rather on a created fear of being terminated from the public service by the political leadership. The failure to institutionalize performance culture within public service undermines sustainability of the achieved performance records. Public service employees have remained demotivated due to inadequate/no salary increase for six years from 2016 to 2021 which affect their morale and commitment to public service delivery.

Critical Success Factors (CSFs) for public service organizations performance.

From the primary and secondary sources, a synthesis of the critical success factors for performance of public sector organisations is discernible. Public service organizations need to have clear vision, mission and values which describe their existences and where they intend to go or be. In order to achieve these, all public service organizations need to have highly motivated, accountable and professional staff, adequate number of staff and financial resources. Almost all of the public service organizations are operating with shortage of staff, demotivated due to low salaries and other benefits. The presence of these is a critical requirement for accelerated performance. The need for high level of political commitment and civic competence among the citizens are a critical requirement for improved public sector. Dwindling accountability and corruption which are common in public service organizations (Mutahaba, *et al.*, 2017) need to be addressed for substantial progress to be made.

The other factors that could account for the performance of public service organizations include; quality of services, accountability of public officials, increased access to public services, increased pay levels and reduced incidents of corruption among others. A number of reform interventions were implemented and to a great extent, they have strengthened institutional capacity and legal frameworks, increased access to social services such as; health facilities, water facilities, education, and increased public awareness of corruption and its consequences (Mutahaba *et al.*, 2017).

Conclusion and Policy Implications.

A well-functioning public service in any country is one that perform better and deliver quality public services consistent with citizen expectations. Public service organizations exist to deliver services to the populace and assessment of their performance serves a purpose of assuring various stakeholders how these institutions stand on their legal mandates. The results of evaluation suggests that Uganda and Tanzania public service organizations have achieved some notable positive results in terms of formulation of evidence-based policies and the use of performance management systems across MDAs. However, in many areas of their operations, the performance has not improved as was expected due to the incompetency of public service's staff, poor accountability and declining service standards. Many of the public service organizations have variously been accused of unsatisfactory performance and often demonstrating dysfunctional governance and management systems devoid of promoting the ideals of an efficient and effective public administration. Some have exhibited inefficient systems, poor behavioural attitudes and weak accountability structures as well as lack of an institutionalized performance culture. To deal with these concerns, public service organizations have to improve the working condition, improve salary levels and provide more opportunities for employees to increase their level of competences. In order to improve performance in service delivery, public service organizations need to have clear vision, mission and values which set direction. In addition, all public service organizations have to motivate their employees, raise their morale and commitments as well as enhance integrity.

The failure of the public service to effectively realize their performance from the early post-independence period to date are in most cases attributed to inadequate adherence to public service code ethics among the employees and inadequate capacity in terms of both financial and human resources which always affect performance of the public service. In addition, public service organizations performance has been affected by donor dependence syndrome in terms of planning and designing of implementation modalities, which in many cases lack local ownership and content.

References

- Afonso, A., Schuknecht, L., & Tanzi, V. 2005. Public sector efficiency: an International comparison. *Public Choice*, 123, 321–347.
- Bana, B. A., & Ngware, S. 2006. *Reforming the Public Service: The Tanzanian Experience*, in Kiragu and Mutahaba (Eds.) *Public Service Reform in Eastern and Southern Africa: Issues and Challenges*. Dar es Salaam: Mukuku na Nyota.
- Basheka, B. C. 2018. Public Sector Management: An Introduction, in Benon C Basheka and Lukamba-Muhiya Tshombe (Eds.), *New Public Management in Africa*. Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, New York.
- Behn, Robert D. 1995. The Big Questions of Public Management. *Public Administration Review*, vol. 55, No. 4, pp. 313-324.
- Bentil, M. 2004. *50 Years of Civil Service Reform Experience in Anglophone Africa. Reflections on the Past. To Guide Future Efficiency in Governance*. Accra: Design Solutions.
- Breton, A., & Wintrobe, R. 1982. *The Logic of Bureaucratic Conduct: An Economic Analysis of Competition, Exchange, and Efficiency in Private and Public Organizations*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cameron, K., & Whetten, D. A. 1983. Models of the Organizational Life Cycle: Applications to Higher Education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 6(4).
- Christensen, T. 2012. Post-NPM and changing public governance. *Meiji Journal of Political Science and Economics*, 1(1), pp. 1-11.

- Corkery, J., Daddah, T. O., Nuallain, C. O., & Land, T. 1998. (Eds.). *Management of Public Service Reform: A comparative review of experiences in the management of programmes of reform of the administrative arm of central Government*. Ohmsha. IOS Press.
- Dixit, A. 2002. Incentives and Organizations in the Public Sector: An Interpretive Review. *Journal of Human Resources*, 37(4), 696-727.
- ESID 2016. *Public Sector Reform in Uganda: behind the façade*. ESID Briefing No.23 available at www.effective-states.org
- Epstein, P. D. 1992. *Measuring the performance of Public Service*, in M. Holzer (ed), *Public Productivity Handbook*. Marcel Dekker, 161-193.
- Giordano, R., Tommasino, P., & Casiraghi, M. 2008. *Behind public sector efficiency: the role of culture and institutions*. <http://www.siepweb.it/siep/oldDoc/2009/200990.pdf>
- Gore, Al. 1993. *Creating a government that works better and cost less. The report of National Performance Review*. New York: Plume.
- Goodman, P. S., & Pennings, J. M. 1977. Perspectives and issues: An Introduction, in P.S. Goodman, and J.M. Pennings, (Ed) *New perspectives on organizational effectiveness*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Grindle, M. S. 2002. *Good enough governance: Poverty reduction and reform in developing countries*. Paper Prepared for the Poverty Reduction Group of the World Bank.
- Hood, C. 1991. A Public Management for all Seasons? *Public Administration*, Vol 69, pp. 3- 19.
- Hughes, O.E. 2003. *Public Management and Administration: An Introduction*. Third Edition. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Issa, F. H. H. 2019. Leadership Effectiveness and Democratic Processes: The Tanzania Experience. *Journal of Power, Politics & Governance*, Vol. No.2, pp. 1-14.
- John Alford and Janine O'Flynn. 2012. *Re-thinking Public Service Delivery: Managing with external providers*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kiggundu, M. N. 1998. Civil Service Reform: Limping into the Twenty-first Century, in Minogue, M. *et al.* (eds). *Beyond the New Public Management*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Kihamba, J. S. 2018. E-Public Staff Management and Performance in Service Delivery: Trends, Issues, and Challenges in Tanzania. *International Journal Technology and Management*, Vol. 3(1).
- Kihamba, J. S. 2014. *Administrative Governance and Executive Agencies' Service Delivery in Tanzania* (Unpublished PhD Thesis), University of Dar es Salaam.
- Kihamba, J. S., & Kamugisha, D. 2016. Public Budgeting and Service Delivery in Tanzania, in Peter Fusein Haruna and Shikha Vya-Doorgapersad (Eds) (2016), *Public Budgeting in African Nations: Fiscal Analysis in Development*. Routledge, Taylor and Francis. New York.
- Kikwete, J. M. 2008. *Inaugural Speech of the Second Public Service Reform Programme*. Dar es Salaam: President's Office.
- Kiragu, K., & Mutahaba, G. 2006. Public Service Reform in Eastern and Southern Africa, in Kiragu, K., & Mutahaba, G. (Eds.) *Public Service Reform in Eastern and Southern Africa: Issues and Challenges*. Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota.
- Kiragu, K., & Mukadala, S.R. 2005. *Politics and tactics in public sector reforms: the dynamics of public service pay in Africa*. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania: Dar es Salaam University Press Ltd.
- Kirlin, J.J. 2001. Big questions for a significant public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 61(2), pp. 140-143.
- Kuye, J. O. 2006. Designing and Implementation of Public Service Reforms: Lessons of Experience from South Africa, in Kiragu, K., & Mutahaba, G. (Eds.) *Public Service Reform in Eastern and Southern Africa: Issues and Challenges*. Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota.
- Kyarimpa, G. E. 2009. *Comparative Administrative Reform: the Rhetoric and Reality of the Civil Service Reform Programs in Uganda and Tanzania*. Florida International University.
- Ladipo, A. 2005. (Ed.). *Public Administration in Africa; Main Issues and Selected Country*. *Public Administration in Africa: Main issues and selected country studies*, Westview press, Oxford.
- Lukumai, C. E. 2006. *The implementation of Civil Service Reforms in Tanzania, 1991-2000*. MA Thesis, University of Bergen, Norway.
- Lumbanga, M. 1995. *Report on the Joint donors and government meeting on the civil service reform programme*, Dar es Salaam. President's Office- State House.

- Mallya, E.T. 2006. Civil Society and the Land Question in Tanzania, in Kiondo A. and Nyang'olo J (Eds.) *Civil Society and Development in Tanzania*. Harare, MWENGO.
- Ministry of Public Service 2013. *Uganda Public Service Transformation Policy Paper; Management in Africa, in the African Association of Public Administration*. Government of Uganda.
- Moti, U. G., & Vambe, J.T. 2009. A comparative Analysis of Public Sector Reforms in Ghana and Uganda. *International Affairs Quarterly; An inter-disciplinary Journal of Global Issues*, Vol.1 No. 2.
- Mukandala, R.S. 2008. *The Challenges of Ensuring Effective Leadership and an Enabling Political Environment for Public Sector Reform in Tanzania. A Paper presented to the National Convention on Public sector reforms: 17-18 June 2008. PO-PSM. "Achieving Rapid Results in Public Sector Reforms."*
- Mukandala, R.S. 2018. *The Civil Service and Economic Development in Tanzania-Tanzania Institutional Diagnostic. Economic Development & Institutions. WP18/TID04.*
- Mutahaba, G., Bana, B., & Mallya, E. 2017. *Reforming Tanzania's Public Sector: Assessment and Future Direction*. Mkuki na Nyota. Dar es Salaam.
- Mutahaba, G.R. 2005. *Pay reform and Corruption in Tanzania's Public Service. A paper Presented at the Seminar on Potential for Public Service Pay Reform to Eradicate Corruption among Civil Servants in Tanzania, 25th May 2005; ESRF Conference Hall, Dar es Salaam.*
- Ngowi, H.P. 2007. *Privatization and Agentification of Public Service Delivery in Africa: extent and managerial leadership implications in Tanzania*. Paper presented at 29 AAPAM Annual Roundtable Conference at Mbabane, Swaziland, 3 - 7 September 21007.
- Ntukamazina, D. 1998. *Civil Service Reform in Tanzania: A Strategic Perspective, in Severine Rugumamu (Ed.) Civil Service Reform in Tanzania: Proceedings of the National Symposium*. Dar es Salaam: Dar es Salaam University Consultancy Bureau.
- Olaopa, T. 2011. *Managing complex reforms: A public sector perspective*. Ibadan: Book Craftafrica.
- Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. 1992. *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming Government*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Peters, G.B. 2004. Governance and Public Bureaucracy: New Forms of Democracy or New Forms of Control? *The Asia Pacific Journal of Public Administration*, VOL 26, NO 1, pp. 3-15.
- Pollit, C., & Bouckaert, G. 2000. *Public Management Reform: A comparative Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rainey, Hal, G. 2003. *Understanding and Management Public Organizations*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.
- Robinson, M. 2007. The Politics of Successful Governance Reforms: Lessons of Design and Implementation. *Commonwealth and Comparative Politics*, vol. 45, No. 4, pp. 521-48.
- Rosenbloom, Kravchuk, & Clerkin. 2009. *Public administration: Understanding Management, Politics, and Law in the Public sector*, Seventh Edition. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Selden, S.C., & Sowa, J.E. 2004. *Testing a Multi-Dimensional Model of Organizational Performance: Prospects and Problems*. Presented at the 7th National Public Management Research Conference, Washington, DC, October 9-11, 2003.
- Sokoine, E.M. 1983. *The changing ecology of public administration and management in Africa; in the African Association of Public Administration and Management (AAPAM), the Ecology of Public Administration & Management in Africa*. Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.
- Ștefănescu, Aurelia, Daniela Artemisa Calu, Eugeniu Țurlea, Florina Nicolae. 2010. Approaches of the role of performance into the public sector entities from Romania. Tibiscus, Annals. *Economic Science Series (XVI/2010)*.
- Therkildsen, O. 2006. In Therkildsen, (2008). *Public Sector Reforms and Development of productive capacities in LDCs. The Least developed Countries Report of 2009: the state and development Governance*. Background Paper. UNCTAD.
- URT 2008. *Final Report on Assessment of PMS Tools Utilization in 18 MDAs*. Public Service Dar es Salaam: President's Office - State House.
- URT 2013. *Reforming Tanzania's Public Sector: An assessment and Future Direction*. Dar es Salaam: President's Office - State House.
- URT 2019. *Annual General Audit Report on the Audit of the Local Government Authorities for 2017/18 financial year*. Dar es Salaam: National Audit Office. Government Printers.
- URT 2018. *Annual General Audit Report on the Audit of the Local Government Authorities*. Dar es Salaam: National Audit Office. Government Printers.

- URT 2012. Strategic Plan 2012/13 to 2016/17. *President Office Public Service Management*. Dar es salaam, Tanzania: Government Printers.
- URT 2007. *The Second-Generation Financial Sector Reforms (II): Background Paper to the Implementation Plan*. Bank of Tanzania (BOT) Dar es Salaam.
- URT 2004. *Impact Assessment of Executive Agencies in Tanzania; Part I*. Dar es Salaam. Available at: www.estabs.go.tz (accessed 21 July 2020).
- World Bank 2015. *Tanzania 2014 Service Delivery Indicators: Health Technical Report*. Washington, DC.
- Yang, K., & Holzer, M. 2006. The Performance–Trust Link: Implications for Performance Measurement. *Public Administration Review*, Volume 66, Issue 1, 114-126.
- Zhonghua, C., & Ye, W. 2012. Research frontiers in public sector performance measurement. *Physics Procedia*, 25, pp. 793-799.