

# Devolution and Public Service Delivery: Evidence from Masvingo City, Zimbabwe

BEATRICE HICKONICKO<sup>1</sup>

---

## Abstract

Devolution in Zimbabwe has always been a contested subject. Devolution is the transfer of powers and responsibilities from the central government to subnational authorities. Its objective is to give powers of local governance to the people and enhance participation in making decisions thus improving service delivery. The purpose of the study was to determine the effects of devolution on public service delivery in Masvingo. Despite it being constitutionalised, devolution still appears to be on paper rather than practical, hence the investigation to assess whether there has been any improvement in terms of service delivery. The study adopted a mixed methods research approach and used purposive sampling. Data were collected using interviews and questionnaires. Thematic data analysis was used in the study. The main findings of the study indicate that devolution can improve service delivery by increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of operations by minimizing bureaucracy. The study highlighted that the devolution funds led to improved service delivery. The council has constructed schools, bought motorised graders and drilled solar-powered boreholes to improve water supply amongst other devolution-funded projects. However, results indicate that there is still a lack of proper citizen participation to ensure meaningful development. The study recommends that there be improved transparency and accountability to coordinate and support the implementation of devolution-funded projects that improve service delivery.

**Keywords:** *participation, devolution, decentralisation, service delivery*

---

<sup>1</sup> Department of Rural and Urban Development, Great Zimbabwe University, Zimbabwe

## INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Many African countries have been undergoing structural reforms intending to promote effective and efficient service delivery. One of the reforms is decentralisation. Decentralisation programmes became more pronounced following recommendations from the World Bank for developing countries to devolve political and administrative powers to local and autonomous levels. The recommendations were made after realising that centralised systems that were common in developing countries were characterised by corruption, clientelism and political alienation that led to poor service delivery thus undermining development. Decentralisation through its various forms like devolution was argued to quicken the decision-making process and increase participation by local people (Faguet, 2000). Improving service delivery through increased accountability and good governance has been the main reason behind the trend toward devolution in many developing countries. Many countries in sub-Saharan Africa have adopted devolution as it enhances citizen participation in the development process.

The attainment of independence by Zimbabwe in 1980 ushered in a new government with a development ideology that was premised on the need to guarantee grassroots socio-economic development. However, upon noticing that there was too much government intervention in the activities of the decentralised entities coupled with the lack of fiscal autonomy and limited citizen participation in the affairs of local authorities, there were calls for the adoption of devolution as the new development trajectory for Zimbabwe. According to Moyo and Ncube (2014), the introduction of devolution of powers as a governance model in Zimbabwe has led to a more democratic, citizen-centred, participatory, transparent, accountable and locally relevant development-focused governance system. Zinyama and Chimanikire (2019) posit that from a regional perspective, devolution presents an opportunity to correct historical injustices and entrench equity in the distribution of resources and other development benefits. The quest for devolution identifies a history of poor performance of local authorities such as poor governance, poor budgeting, inadequate government financial support and unfunded mandates, lack of local participation and civic responsibility and skewed priorities that are biased against service delivery (Government of Zimbabwe, 2020).

Devolution seeks to strengthen and reduce existing regional disparities in public service delivery. It seeks to ensure that services are managed more effectively. If adequate resources are availed through devolution funds, devolution is expected to enable improvements in coverage and quality of services delivered (Chigumira, 2019). Devolution also seeks to provide more opportunities for citizens at the grassroots level to have a say in how resources are allocated. It enables bottom-up accountability on how those resources are used which ultimately leads to improved and sustainable service delivery (Muchadenyika, 2013).

### **CONCEPTUALISING DEVOLUTION AND PUBLIC SERVICES DELIVERY**

Devolution implies the transfer of powers, functions and responsibilities to the subnational levels of government. Berris (2008) defines devolution as a situation where the central government transfers executive, legislative, administrative and financial decision-making power to local governments that have distinct and legally recognized jurisdiction in that they provide services to constituents to whom they are accountable. Devolution is accompanied by the creation of provincial and local tiers of government and reinforced by legislative, revenue and resource mobilisation, policy formulation and implementation powers. According to Chigumira (2019), devolution is the statutory delegation of powers from the central government of a sovereign state to govern at a subnational level such as a regional or local level. Devolution is aimed at improving the responsiveness of governments. It is important because it ensures that decisions are made locally and closer to the people.

Service delivery is a phrase used to describe the distribution of basic resources citizens depend on, such as water, sanitation, municipal roads and transport-related infrastructure, housing-related infrastructure and low-cost housing, refuse removal, street lighting, municipal health care, and primary education. It is often said that such services are the ‘most tangible interactions citizens have with their government’ (Dudley *et al.*, 2015). Public service delivery can be defined as any contact that the public administration has with customers, citizens and residents in handling the affairs of the latter. Ricket (2001) defines service delivery as the provision

of a product or service, by a government or government body to a community that it was promised to or which is expected by that community. Public service delivery is the mechanism through which public services are delivered to the public by local governments. Public services include water and sanitation provision, waste management, housing, primary health provision, public education, street cleaning and lighting. Good public service delivery requires that the local government understands the need to promote citizen-oriented administration and accessible public service delivery in an effective, efficient, friendly, reliable, predictable and accountable manner.

Local governments' proximity to citizens assists in reducing corruption through improved transparency and accountability relative to more centralised systems (Smoke, 2015) thus leading to improved service delivery. One of the reasons behind poor service delivery is the looting of resources and corruption. Transparency allows detection and reduces the likelihood of corrupt behaviours because it lowers the information barriers allowing for scrutiny and monitoring (Kelmor, 2016). The fact that resources are distributed to local communities makes it easier for them to manage them in an accountable and transparent manner. Any form of abuse of resources can easily be traced and exposed (Nhede, 2013). Promotion of transparency is one of the objectives of devolution and it manifests through measures that ensure public access to information through active participation of citizens. Access to information increases transparency and thereby improves accountability systems. According to Kessy (2020), transparency is an essential tool of local governance that enables local citizens to hold local institutions accountable for their performance, foster trust in government, minimize corruption and improve local service delivery.

In local government, there are several types of transparency and these include downward, upward and horizontal transparency. Devolved systems focus more on downward accountability, especially through elections. However, for transparency to properly work, it needs effective structures of implementation, management and adequate resources, and must be supported by strong internal organizing capacity (Ingrams,

2016). Other mechanisms that may foster transparency include citizen engagement with local governments through participatory planning and budgeting and freedom of information. Participatory budgeting is a form of citizen participation in that citizens are involved in the process of deciding how public money is spent (Shah, 2007). Local people are often given a role in the scrutiny and monitoring of the process following the allocation of budgets but for participatory budgeting to work, it has to be inclusive and active. If it is non-inclusive, it is unlikely to bring about significant improvements in the quality of services provided by local authorities. It is also worth noting that the use of transparency and accountability mechanisms requires awareness, capacity and interest on the part of citizens. According to Smoke (2015), participatory forums may be available but people may be unaware of them, may not know how to access them or may be unable to use them due to lack of knowledge.

Devolution makes possible faster and more responsive public services attuned to local and individual needs. It enhances efficiency through reduced bureaucracy (Polit *et al.*, 1998). Bureaucratic procedures are reduced through the devolution of powers since decisions can be made within the shortest possible time. The discretionary powers that will be invested in local authorities would result in a reduction of the consultative process and as a result important decisions can be made expeditiously. According to Nhede (2013), centralised governance is bureaucratic and has limitations when it comes to efficiency, accountability and transparency hence the people of Zimbabwe across the different provinces advocated for the transfer of power, authority and responsibilities to local authorities. Bureaucratic systems often cause unnecessary and long delays as people become more focused on following rules than increasing productivity. According to Mitchinson (2003), the central government needs to “resist the temptation to over-supervise, and intervene only sparingly.” Through devolution, public service delivery is enhanced because of the reduction in bureaucracy.

## **DEVOLUTION AND SERVICE DELIVERY IN KENYA**

The history of governance in Kenya has been characterised by high levels of centralisation (World Bank, 2012). The centralisation entails that

citizens could not take part in decisions that affect them at the local level. Concerns were raised by citizens reflecting an aspiration of the citizens to govern themselves. This resulted in the adoption of a devolved government which was divided into national and county governments. In light of this, the Kenyan administration managed to devolve powers and functions to 47 county governments (The Kenyan Section of the International Commission of Jurists, 2013). In Kenya, the contribution of devolution to service delivery is mixed, but there are promising signs. The picture is mixed because some sectors show positive trends but others do not. There has been an improvement in local service delivery and infrastructure development. In addition, the citizens are now participating in the crafting of budgets and development policies that are peculiar to their needs as a community. According to Muwonge *et al.* (2022) counties in Kenya have invested substantially in infrastructure for service delivery, for example, rural water supply schemes and agriculture infrastructure such as irrigation, markets and rural roads. Urban investments have focused on drainage, street lighting and solid waste management following renewed reform efforts to re-establish municipalities. Through devolution, Kenya has also invested in human resources by recruiting staff to deliver services.

Despite the aforementioned achievements, staffing shortages continue to be an issue, compounded by high rates of absenteeism and sometimes low staff morale and misallocation (Muwonge *et al.*, 2022). Corruption, nepotism and general mismanagement of funds have also posed challenges to improving service delivery through devolution leading to disparities in accessing resources, especially among minority groups (World Bank, 2018). Nevertheless, efforts and strides taken by Kenya in devolving the government are noteworthy.

## **DEVOLUTION AND SERVICE DELIVERY IN UGANDA**

The Ugandan government is involved in one of the most radical devolution initiatives which are actively supported by a substantial part of the donor community (Mitchinson, 2003). The prime responsibility of implementing the devolution program lies with the Ministry of Local Governance with the responsibility of ensuring that local governance

functions effectively and efficiently. The services to be delivered include education, health services, public and environmental health, water and sanitation. A striking characteristic is the high degree of autonomy given to local authorities with the freedom to provide services as they deem fit. There is a pronounced minimum interference by the central government in budgetary processes and local authorities are free to come up with their own budgets as long as they are balanced and take into account the Local Government's 3-year development plan (Jesper *et al.*, 2001). A local authority is not obliged to obtain government approval for its development budget which is not the case in other countries that require central approval.

In Uganda, devolution has been argued to improve service delivery through the reduction of bureaucracy. According to Mitchinson (2003), service delivery is enhanced by empowering people to provide the services that they judge necessary and to decide their own local priorities in the allocation of resources. The provision, management and maintenance of primary healthcare, primary education, roads and basic urban services were decentralised to districts (Ssewankambo, 2004). The provision of primary education serves as a good example in that participation of the people in the delivery of services is exhibited. Parents and the local population provide labour for the construction of classrooms while the government provides funding for corrugated iron sheets and other capital inputs (Muriisa, 2008). This clearly shows the improvement in service delivery although some challenges are inevitable. There are gaps between the transfer of functions and the transfer of staff and resources together with difficulties in the recruitment and retention of suitably qualified local government staff.

## **DEVOLUTION AND SERVICE DELIVERY IN ZIMBABWE**

Devolution in Zimbabwe is an integral part of a major constitutional reform. The framework for devolution is provided for in Section 264 of the Constitution of Zimbabwe Amendment (No. 20) Act 2013. As enshrined in the Constitution, there must be devolution of power and responsibilities to lower tiers of government in Zimbabwe for development to take place. The objectives of devolution include giving

powers of local governance to the people and enhancing their participation in the exercise of powers of the State and in making decisions affecting them; promoting democratic, effective, transparent, accountable and coherent government in Zimbabwe as a whole, recognizing the right of communities to manage their own affairs and to further their development (Constitution of Zimbabwe, 2013).

In addition, section 265 of the Constitution spells out that local authorities should ensure good governance by being effective, transparent, accountable and institutionally coherent; secure public welfare and ensure the fair and equitable representation of people within their areas of jurisdiction. According to Chigumira (2019), proponents of devolution argue that it facilitates greater transparency and accountability that lead to increases in the efficiency and effectiveness of government services by bringing governance mechanisms closer to the people. The idea behind devolution is to strengthen democracy and empower citizens to make locally-based choices to improve the delivery of public services (Chigwata, 2019). According to the Government of Zimbabwe (2018), through devolution, local authorities will be empowered to make decisions that previously required authorisation at ministry head offices. Devolving decision-making thus enables local authorities to respond to local issues faster.

## **PUBLIC SERVICE DELIVERY IN URBAN AREAS IN ZIMBABWE SINCE 1980**

Service delivery is the main function of local government. Urban Zimbabwe has been marred with a plethora of challenges in service provision since independence with marginal improvements along the way. This has been attributed to massive central government intervention. The governance discourse after independence was based on centralisation and bureaucratisation of government. Central government-controlled resources and decision making rested on a few individuals who were usually unaware of the plight of those at the grassroots. The services provided by local authorities in Zimbabwe include sanitation, waste management, road construction and maintenance and provision of primary health care, yet many local authorities have failed to provide these



services. The failure of service delivery in urban areas can be seen from infrequent water provision, burst water and sewer pipes, faecal contamination of the major water source, deterioration of road networks, non-functioning traffic lights and non-collection of refuse, uncompleted capital projects as well as service delivery protests among others (Marumahoko *et al.*, 2012).

The issue of inadequate service delivery became topical in the year 2019. Over the years, Residents' Associations have also become a crucial feature of urban councils facilitating accountability in service delivery (Musekiwa and Chatiza 2015). This necessitated the birth of the devolution agenda through its enactment in 2013. As the country embraced 2013 there was great expectation that adoption of a new Constitution would bring back urban service delivery from the brink. This has led to an improvement in service delivery as the country has adopted measures that ensure public participation.

Further devolution has led to improved service delivery through financing from devolution funds. Financial resources influence the delivery of devolved services (Karama and Muia, 2019). There is a positive relationship between the availability of financial resources and service delivery. Funds allocated for devolution projects in Zimbabwe go a long way in supporting service delivery. Devolution funds in Zimbabwe have been used to finance infrastructural development and other public service provisions. The dedication of funds by the Government of Zimbabwe has seen positive strides in service provision. In the absence of funding, it becomes difficult for any meaningful provision of services. Having financial resources enable local authorities to allocate resources where they are needed and ultimately improves service delivery.

## **METHODS**

The study adopted a mixed methods research approach. A combination of two approaches, that is, desktop research to identify the ability of devolution to enhance service delivery and key informant interviews and questionnaires from purposefully selected respondents to get their view on the impact of devolution on service delivery was used. The key informant interviewees were selected from the Masvingo City Council, Masvingo

United Residents and Ratepayers Alliance (MURRA) and academia involved in devolution and service delivery. Thematic data analysis was adopted as it sought to understand experiences and views about the impact of devolution on service delivery.

## RESULTS

### EVIDENCE FROM MASVINGO CITY

It is the mandate of local authorities to provide services to their citizens. The researcher sought to examine the impact of devolution on service delivery in Masvingo. Masvingo has made major strides in health, education, infrastructure and water and sanitation service provision.

Research revealed that through devolution funds, the city has been able to complete the superstructure for Rujeko Secondary school.

“We have already completed the superstructure, targeting to complete the whole project by 31 December 2022 in preparation for 2023 form one enrolment.

Currently, there are four form-one classrooms that are complete,” said one key informant from Masvingo City Council.

Rujeko is the first school to be managed by Masvingo City Council. Construction of the school has bridged the infrastructure gap that was occasioned by the absence of a secondary school in the high-density suburb of Rujeko. One resident said that,

“Rujeko as a suburb did not have a secondary school thereby pushing students to neighbouring suburbs where they risked accidents by crossing busy roads. The school has eased the problem of high transport costs”.

To show that the construction of the school was long overdue, the school received 200 applicants on the first day it opened. This shows the positive results that emerge from devolution funds.

The city of Masvingo has been grappling with the issue of sewer problems as the city has been expanding.

The Mucheke trunk sewer line is now 78% complete. Out of the 7km at least 5km has been completed using devolution funds,” said one key informant from Masvingo City Council.

The construction of the Mucheke trunk sewer which commenced in 2011 and was suspended in 2015 when funding ran out is set to improve on the current situation and ease sewer blockages. This has led to the council resorting to devolution funds for financing the much-needed project. However, residents have complained about delays in the completion of the project. 'Late disbursement of devolution funds has been identified as one of the reasons behind this,' said one interviewee. Still under water and sanitation, at least 6 boreholes were drilled in wards 3, 4,5 and 6 of the urban constituency. One resident from Mucheke applauded the council for drilling boreholes as the move helped curb the issue of water shortages. Water supply has been a countrywide issue, with Masvingo not being spared.

'The drilling of boreholes has assisted in reducing the effects of water shortages like cholera', said the respondent.

The research revealed that the Masvingo City Council has also been able to service stands in Pangolin and Oliver Street in response to housing shortages in the city. At the local level, people expect to be allocated serviced stands to enable them to build decent housing. The provision of serviced stands in these areas has led to improved housing service delivery by local authorities as previously they would blame lack of funds for their inability to provide adequate housing. However, residents raised concerns over the location of the stands in a wetland in the Pangolin residential area.

It is the mandate of local authorities to provide primary health care. The Masvingo City Council has constructed the Runyararo North West clinic as part of devolution projects. This has gone a long way in improving the accessibility of health care services in the residential area. A key informant from the Masvingo City Council said,

"The clinic is part of the council's infrastructural renewal projects and will cater for primary health care. The City of Masvingo channelled \$3 million of its first share of devolution funds towards the completion of the Runyararo North West clinic, a project that had been stalled due to lack of funding."

Before its construction residents had to walk long distances to access the nearest clinic. Devolution brings services closer to the people. One

resident highlighted that the completion of the project gives Runyararo residents an option closer home and will reduce congestion at other council clinics. This is a positive stride towards development.

One of the respondents indicated that through devolution funds, the council has resealed three roads that are Mharapara, Dikwindi and Glendor street in Clovelly. Good service delivery entails that councils ensure that roads are accessible, resurfaced and pot holes are sealed. In addition, the city managed to repair 18 tower lights. The majority of the respondents argued that the availability of devolution funds is a positive development toward improved service delivery.

Devolution fosters participation in local government thereby improving service delivery. In terms of participation, the study sought to measure the extent to which residents are involved in making decisions that affect service delivery. Research showed that residents are not fully involved in decision-making. Participants raised concern over the lack of participation and transparency on the way devolution was being rolled out. They highlighted that they have only read about devolution projects instead of them being part of the decision-making process. One member of the MURRA also indicated that the council has not been consulting residents on the identification of devolution projects. Residents accused their local authority of misuse of devolution funds and failure to consult stakeholders on priority projects.

“The council did not conduct consultative meetings before using funds thus hindering participation,” said one respondent.

The council’s argument was that participation took shape through representation by councillors and participatory budgeting meetings that the residents are not so keen to attend.

The study also revealed that devolution leads to increased accountability and transparency hence improved service delivery. However, 60% of the respondents highlighted that the council lacks transparency in its operations. MURRA spokesperson raised concerns arguing that residents are not given the platform to scrutinise the key projects under devolution.

“We are not happy with the way devolution funds are being handled. Residents and other key stakeholders are not given the chance to input in various key projects being funded through devolution. We are not sure why council and District Development Coordinators (DDC) do not consult residents on the selection of projects since they are the ones who know what they need. “When devolution money comes, we are only told of the amount and the projects they will be channelling such funds towards without our input,” said the spokesperson.

Onyinkwa (2014) suggested that openness and accountability contribute to increased responsiveness on the part of providers; enhanced access and quality of services; and, as a result, enhanced service delivery. Although devolution is taking shape, the council has failed to make maximum use of the distribution of funds, primarily due to corruption and lack of transparency and this has been adversely affecting the quality of services. Residents showed disgruntlement over the lack of transparency and accountability and blamed the council for misusing devolution funds.

The study also revealed that there are some challenges faced in service provision through devolution. One of the challenges raised was the issue of late disbursement of devolution funds amidst high inflation. Masvingo City Council, which has been battling to complete its dumpsite and sewer projects, has attributed its failure to meet targets to late disbursements of devolution funds.

“Our main source of funding for these key projects has been devolution funds and we are facing a serious challenge when it comes to disbursement.” said an official from the Masvingo City Council.

“So far, we have only received 50 million out of 250 million Zimbabwe dollars that we were allocated this year. We are looking forward to sourcing external funds so that we speed up the process and complete these projects.”

The same sentiments were also echoed by one councillor for Ward 10 who said the local authority was facing serious financial challenges when it came to these projects due to inflation.

“We haven’t received our full devolution allocation, so you would find that the council will pay workers stage by stage according to the availability of resources. Our budget has been greatly affected by inflation and it’s a tricky

situation for us because what we budgeted for is no longer sufficient,” said the councillor.

Over-reliance on devolution funds as the main source of funding for development projects was also revealed to be a challenge during the study. Poor revenue collection from residents has also been referred to as one of the setbacks as the devolution funds lack augmentation from other sources of funding. MURRA spokesperson encouraged local authorities to explore other revenue collection avenues instead of over-reliance on devolution funds.

Another challenge noted during the research includes interference by the central government in devolution funds. The permanent secretary in the Local Government and Public Works ministry sometime in July 2022 advised that government will procure fire tenders on behalf of local authorities utilizing the 2022 devolution fund allocations. The City of Masvingo would get two fire tenders at 169 968 936 Zimbabwe dollars each. The 2022 devolution allocation was \$253 107 300 and the council was advised to re-prioritise the devolution funds to accommodate the cost of the fire tenders. The council officials highlighted that the fire tenders were not a priority to the City of Masvingo.

“The City of Masvingo requires refuse trucks, tipper trucks, graders and ambulances, not fire tenders,” said the official.

The fire tender issue torched a storm after the Local Government and Public Works ministry wrote to all city, town and rural district councils indicating that it was procuring fire tenders from Belarus on behalf of all local authorities with the money being deducted from their devolution fund allocations over 12 months.

“The directive by the central government was unconstitutional since the funds are from devolution funds where they have to consult residents on how to use the money,” said the Mayor of Masvingo.

## **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The study sought to investigate the impact of devolution on service delivery. The study concluded that devolution leads to improved service

delivery. Despite the good intentions of devolution, its implementation is marred by some challenges like poor financing and lack of accountability. Improving local funding sources and creating mechanisms through which public officials are held more accountable would lead to improved service delivery. Devolution also increases accountability to local citizens thus leading to more visible goods and services.

The study establishes that residents are not directly involved in the selection of devolution projects that would otherwise lead to improved service delivery. The lack of consultation of the local community derails the objectives of devolution that encourage citizen participation in decision-making on matters that affect them.

Devolution promotes the efficient allocation of resources. Efficiency measures the extent to which output is maximised using minimum resource inputs. Devolution funds facilitate access to resources by local government for better service delivery. Infrastructural development, primary health care, road rehabilitation, improvement of water and sanitation have been facilitated by the availability of funds allocated for devolution projects. However, the late disbursement of funds poses a challenge to the successful completion of the project within set timelines.

Using the conclusions above, the study recommends the following:

- ☐ A multi-stakeholder involvement approach that ensures that all residents participate in decisions on devolution projects to be undertaken.
- ☐ A timeous disbursement of devolution funds to ensure that they are not eroded by the high rate of inflation.
- ☐ A search for new sources of revenue to avoid over-reliance on devolution funds.

## REFERENCES

- Beris, T. (2008). *Principles of Local Government*. London: Gollancz.
- Chigumira, T. (2019). Exploring the Success Factors in Implementing Devolution in Zimbabwe. Zimbabwe Economic Policy Analysis and Research Unit. Harare.

- Chigwata, T. C. (2019). Devolution demystified: Emerging debates and prospects for devolution in Zimbabwe, viewed 16 July 2018, from <https://zimlil.org/content/devolutiondemystified-emerging-debates-and-prospects-devolution-zimbabwediscussionpaper>.
- Constitution of Zimbabwe Amendment (No.20) Act. (2013). [Zimbabwe], 22 May 2013, available at: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/51ed090f4.html>.
- Dudley E, Yi, Lin D, Mancini M and J Ng. (2015). “Implementing a Citizen-Centric Approach to Delivering Government Services”, pp. 1-20. (Available at <https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/public-sector/our-insights/implementing-a-citizen-centric-approach-to-delivering-government-services>).
- Faguet, J. P. (2012). *Decentralisation and Popular Democracy: Governance from Below in Bolivia*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Finch, C. and Omolo, A. (2015). Building Public Participation in Kenya’s Devolved Government. © World Bank Group, Washington, DC. <http://hdl.handle.net/10986/21663> License.
- Government of Zimbabwe. (2018). Zimbabwe Transitional Stabilisation Programme Reforms Agenda October 2018–December 2020. Harare: Ministry of Finance and Economic Development.
- Government of Zimbabwe. (2020). *Devolution and Decentralisation Policy*. Harare: Printflow Private Limited.
- Ingrams, A. (2016). Transparency. In Farazmand, A. (ed.). *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Jesper, S., Ssewankambo, E. and Van Land Gerhard. (2001). Local Level Service Delivery, Decentralisation and Governance: A Comparative Study of Uganda, Kenya and Tanzania Education, Health and Agriculture Sectors. Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA). Japan.
- Karama, F.B. and Muia, J.M. (2019). Effect of Financial Resources on the Delivery of Devolved Services in Selected Counties in Kenya. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 11 (18), 153-160.
- Kelmor, K. (2016). Legal Formulations of a Human Right to Information: Defining a Global Consensus. *Journal of Information Ethics*, 25 (1), 101-113.



- Kessy, A. (2020). Transparency in Local Government Finance and Service Delivery: The Case of Mwanza City and Moshi District Councils in Tanzania. *Inkanyiso Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences* 12(2),194-211.
- Marumahoko, S. (2012). Service Delivery in the City of Mutare: A Perspective from Local Residents. *Theoretical and Empirical Researchers in Urban Management*. 15 (3), 81-95.
- Mitchison, R. (2003). Devolution in Uganda: An Experiment in Local Service Delivery. *Public Administration and Development*, 23 (3), 241-248.
- Moyo, P. and Ncube, C. (2014). Devolution of Power in Zimbabwe's New Constitutional Order: Opportunities and Potential Constraints. *Law Democracy & Development*, 18, 289-304.
- Muchadenyika, D. (2013). The Inevitable: Devolution in Zimbabwe's Constitution Making Process, In: J. de Visser, N. Steyler, D. Powell and E. Durojaye (Eds.), *Constitution-Building in Africa*, Community Law Centre. University of the Western Cape. South Africa. 26, 104-134.
- Muriisa, R.K. (2008). Decentralisation in Uganda: Prospects for Improved Service Delivery. *Africa Development XXXIII* (4), 83–95.
- Musekiwa, N. and Chatiza, K. (2015). Rise in Resident Associational Life in Response to Service Delivery Decline by Urban Councils in Zimbabwe. *Commonwealth Journal of Local Governance*, 16, 120-136.
- Muwonge, A., Williamson, T.S., Owuor, C. and Muratha, K. (2022). Making Devolution Work for Service Delivery in Kenya. International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank 1818 H Street NW, Washington, DC 20433.
- Nhede, N.T. (2013). Devolution of Power and Effective Governance: The Zimbabwean Constitutional Debate, *African Journal of Public Affairs*, 6 (4), 32-42.
- Onyinkwa, J. (2014). Factors Influencing Compliance to Procurement Regulations in Public Secondary Schools in Kenya: A Case of Nyamache District, Kisii County, *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 5 (1), 561—592.

- Polit D.F., Beck C.T. & Hungler. B.P. (2001). *Essentials of Nursing Research: Methods, Appraisal and Utilization*. 5th Edition. Philadelphia: Williams & Wilkins.
- Rusare, P. (2021). Building Zim through Devolution. The Patriot. Celebrating being Zimbabwean.
- Shah, A. (2007). Corruption and Decentralised Public Governance. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3824. Washington, D.C: World Bank.
- Smoke, P. (2015). Accountability and Service Delivery in Decentralising Environments: Understanding Context and Strategically Advancing Reform. In: A. Whaites, E. Gonzalez, S. Fyson, and G. Teskey, (Eds.). *A Governance Practitioner's Notebook: Alternative Ideas and Approaches*. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. 219-232.
- Ssewankambo, E. (2004). A Comparative Analysis of Decentralisation in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda, Country Report Uganda, August 2004, The World Bank.
- The Kenyan Section of the International Commission of Jurists. (2013). *Handbook on Devolution*. Nairobi: ICJ Kenya.
- World Bank. (2012). Devolution without disruption: pathways to a successful new Kenya, Nairobi, Kenya.
- World Bank. (2015). Kenya devolution. Building Public Participation in Kenya's Devolved Government. Working Paper-Summary Overview, Kenya School of Government, Working Paper Series, Nairobi.
- World Bank. (2018). Kenya Accountable Devolution Program (KADP) Annual Report. The World Bank, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Zinyama, T. and Chimanikire, D.P. (2019). The Nuts and Bolts of Devolution in Zimbabwe: Designing the Provincial and Metropolitan Councils. *African Journal of Public Affairs*, 11(2), 148-176.