

**Fatores que afetam a responsabilidade social nos setores prestadores de serviços:
explorando as perspectivas dos beneficiários na zona de Jimma**

**Factors Affecting Social Accountability in Service Providing Public Sectors: Exploring
Beneficiaries' Perspectives in Jimma Zone**

**Factores que afectan la responsabilidad social en la prestación de servicios a sectores
públicos: exploración de las perspectivas de los beneficiarios en la zona de Jimma**

Recebido: 29/08/2019 | Revisado: 31/08/2019 | Aceito: 25/09/2019 | Publicado: 27/09/2019

Hunde Doja

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1559-6252>

Jimma University, Ethiopia

E-mail: jitudoja@gmail.com

Tadele Duressa

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8663-1027>

Jimma University, Ethiopia

E-mail: taaddee2011@gmail.com

Resumo

Este estudo foi realizado para identificar os fatores que afetam a responsabilidade social no fornecimento de serviços às organizações do setor público a partir das perspectivas dos beneficiários na Jimma Zone. Fatores que dificultam a responsabilidade social, os mecanismos de responsabilidade social implementados nos setores públicos e o papel da responsabilidade social foram os objetivos avaliados neste estudo. A abordagem de pesquisa qualitativa foi empregada. Os beneficiários de quatro setores públicos (saúde, educação, agricultura e água) foram selecionados propositadamente, porque esse é o foco principal do Programa de Responsabilidade Social Etíope (ESAP2). Duas cidades administrativas (Jimma e Agaro) e duas cidades woreda / kebele (distritos de Limu Kosa e Gera) foram propositadamente selecionadas para este estudo. Foram realizadas oito discussões em grupo focal, dezesseis entrevistas em profundidade e quatro entrevistas com informantes-chave. As principais conclusões do estudo revelaram que os fatores que dificultam a responsabilização social são a baixa conscientização dos direitos dos cidadãos e as barreiras socioculturais que limitam a divulgação, a falta de acesso à informação garante renda e despesa do governo, porque os beneficiários não têm a conscientização correta até o momento. e a relutância do

provedor de serviços em compartilhar informações. Os cartões de pontuação da comunidade e os prestadores de serviços em reuniões presenciais são os dois mecanismos de responsabilidade social comumente implementados, respectivamente. Com base nas descobertas, os pesquisadores recomendaram que reformas institucionais de longo prazo para tornar os setores públicos mais responsáveis perante os cidadãos, devoluções aos níveis do governo local ou responsabilidade e prestação de contas pela prestação de serviços, a participação da comunidade e da sociedade civil deva ser incentivada pelo governo.

Palavras-chave: Prestação de Contas; Fatores; Mecanismos; Beneficiários e Jimma.

Abstract

This study was undertaken to identify the factors affecting social accountability in service providing public sector organizations from beneficiary perspectives in Jimma Zone. Factors hindering social accountability, social accountability mechanisms implemented in public sectors and the role of social accountability were the objectives assessed in this study. Qualitative research approach was employed. Beneficiaries of four public sectors (health, education, agriculture and water) were selected purposively because these are the main focus of the Ethiopian Social Accountability Program (ESAP2). Two administrative towns (Jimma and Agaro) and two woreda/kebele towns (Limu Kosa and Gera districts) were purposively selected for this study. Eight Focus group discussion, sixteen in-depth interviews and four key informant interviews were conducted. The main findings of the study revealed that factors hindering social accountability are the low citizens' rights awareness and the socio cultural barriers that limit speaking out, absence of access to information guarantees rendering government income and expenditure because beneficiaries lack of their right awareness up to this and service provider's unwillingness to share information. Community score cards and service providers in face to face meetings are the two commonly implemented social accountability mechanisms respectively. Based on the findings the researchers recommended that long- term institutional reforms to make the public sectors more accountable to citizens, devolutions to local government levels or responsibility and accountability for service provision, community and civil society participation should have to be encouraged by the government.

Key Words: Accountability; Factors; Mechanisms; Beneficiaries and Jimma.

Resumen

Este estudio se realizó para identificar los factores que afectan la responsabilidad social en la prestación de servicios a las organizaciones del sector público desde la perspectiva de los beneficiarios en la Zona Jimma. Los factores evaluados en este estudio fueron los factores que obstaculizan la responsabilidad social, los mecanismos de responsabilidad social implementados en los sectores públicos y el papel de la responsabilidad social. Se empleó un enfoque de investigación cualitativa. Los beneficiarios de cuatro sectores públicos (salud, educación, agricultura y agua) fueron seleccionados deliberadamente porque estos son el foco principal del Programa de Responsabilidad Social de Etiopía (ESAP2). Dos ciudades administrativas (Jimma y Agaro) y dos ciudades *woreda* / *kebele* (distritos de Limu Kosa y Gera) fueron seleccionadas deliberadamente para este estudio. Se llevaron a cabo ocho grupos de discusión, dieciséis entrevistas en profundidad y cuatro entrevistas a informantes clave. Los principales hallazgos del estudio revelaron que los factores que obstaculizan la responsabilidad social son la baja conciencia de los derechos de los ciudadanos y las barreras socioculturales que limitan la expresión oral, la ausencia de acceso a la información garantiza que los ingresos y gastos del gobierno rindan debido a que los beneficiarios carecen de la conciencia adecuada para esto. y la falta de voluntad del proveedor de servicios para compartir información. Las tarjetas de puntuación de la comunidad y los proveedores de servicios en las reuniones cara a cara son los dos mecanismos de responsabilidad social comúnmente implementados, respectivamente. Con base en los hallazgos, los investigadores recomendaron que las reformas institucionales a largo plazo para hacer que los sectores públicos sean más responsables ante los ciudadanos, las devoluciones a los niveles del gobierno local o la responsabilidad y la rendición de cuentas por la provisión de servicios, la participación de la comunidad y la sociedad civil deberían ser alentadas por el gobierno.

Palabras clave: responsabilidad; Factores Mecanismos; Beneficiarios y Jimma

I. Background and Justification

Social accountability relates to community-based initiatives intended to improve transparency and access to information by holding the state and its agents accountable (Gaventa & McGee 2010). Malena et al. (2004) discuss this concept in the context of demand for good governance; it is referred as strengthening the voice and building the citizens' capacity to call for greater accountability and responsiveness of authorities and public service providers. Social accountability is also closely linked with the concept of citizen-led accountability. Social accountability is a demand-side effort of good governance and explains

as to how the communities can best interact with local governments, service providers and state actors for demanding better service delivery in, for example, education and health (Agarwal et al. 2009).

The effectiveness of social accountability tools is highly dependent on the way in which they are initiated and exercised. National Institute of Administrative Research (NIAR), in its study, relates the effectiveness and success of social accountability mechanisms with their institutionalization. Indirectly, social accountability mechanisms try to improve the efficiency and performance of government officials and politicians (Bukenya et al. 2012).

Social accountability is a new buzzword for the development partners around the world in order to understand the state and society's synergy that can be helpful for better provision of public services (King 2014). In the long-term, the major advantages of social accountability are that it has the potential to lead to poverty reduction, enhanced service delivery, people-centric policies, empowerment of citizens and thus strengthening the democratic processes (IDS 2006). Social accountability is also closely related to the general concept of voice and accountability.

Affiliated Network for Social Accountability (ANSA) provides a compact framework for social accountability. According to ANSA the four pillars needed across the world to social accountability includes organized and capable public groups, responsible government, access to information, and sensitivity to culture and context. In order to achieve the smooth and well-functioning demand side mechanisms and functions, civic engagement is of high importance. Different social accountability tools used all around the world include (Khadka & Bhattarai 2012): citizen's charter, checklist of entitlements, participatory budgeting, budget tracking, Right to Information (RTI), awareness of relevant laws, civic education, community score card (CSC), citizens report Card (CRC), participatory planning and community led procurements.

In the past decade, strengthening social accountability has emerged as a key strategy for improving public services and making progress towards attaining the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) (World Bank, 2004; Deverajan and Widlund, 2007). Increasingly, debates about strengthening accountability have focused on two types of initiatives: increasing government transparency (bringing previously opaque information or

processes into the public domain) and social accountability (citizen-led action for demanding accountability from providers).

In an attempt to support Ethiopia's progress towards reaching the MDGs, the Government of Ethiopia along with international development partners had established the protection of basic services-Ethiopian Social Accountability Program (PBS-ESAP) having four basic components in June 2006. Among these, the fourth component, i.e. "the Social Accountability (SA)" is an approach by which citizens and their organizations participate directly or indirectly in exacting accountability using mechanisms such as Citizens' Report Cards, Community Score Cards, Independent Budget Analysis, Participatory Budgeting, etc.

For public sector organizations, the Ethiopia government implemented public sector reform in a number of ways, for example accruals accounting and performance assessment focusing on key performance indicators since 2013(Base Line Survey,2013). These techniques were aimed at improving operational systems and enhancing accountability in the public sector.

Inadequately developed social sectors, weak Institutions and marked social inequalities make the implementation of social accountability difficult (Kapiriri and Martin, 2007). Reasons to weak social accountability in public sector confirms due to the following reasons: There is a lack of credible information. This lack of information and transparency is often due to a lack of periodic evaluations of key components in the public strategy. In general, there is a lack of communication between different levels of government and community. There are also inadequate and inaccurate data from the local level, as well as a lack of planning for evaluating social accountability (Boex, 2008).

Despite the emphasis on decentralized service delivery in the public sector, an intergovernmental analysis of public expenditures carried out by Baseline survey Report (2013) reveals that social accountability and public-service delivery in Ethiopia is not as decentralized as it could be.

In general, the central problems with social accountability initiatives in the area of public sector tend to be lack of both institutionalization and inclusiveness. The reason for this is unequal power structure. When it comes to getting the voice of the community heard in the public sectors, community priorities are often in competition with other stakeholders'

priorities, for example, from the private sector, NGOs or religious institutions. Institutional mechanisms often do not function well and thus do not ensure accountability.

The poor management service providers and both participation and institutionalization of social accountability initiatives considered as a threat to some organizations. Therefore, a mechanism needed, which are more institutionalized and grounded in broad-based participation in order for the social accountability system as a whole to flourish.

To sum up, most of the literatures also reviewed are only focuses on specific aspects of social accountability, often as part of a wider analysis. Much of the literature is theoretical in nature, and well-grounded empirical studies of social accountability are still not conducted in this area. Therefore, this study is focused to explore factors affecting social accountability, mechanism and roles of social accountability in public sector organizations of Jimma Zone.

More specifically, the study answered the following research questions:

- What are the factors affecting implementation of effective social accountability in public sector organizations of selected woredas or districts in Jimma Zone?
- What are the tools/mechanisms in place to provide feedback information on how social accountability inputs have been addressed in the public sector organizations of selected woredas?
- What are the roles of social accountability practices in improving public practices and services in public sector organizations?

II. Objectives of the Study

General Objective

The general objective of the study is to investigate factors affecting social accountability in service providing public sector organization of Jimma Zone selected woredas or districts.

Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of the study were:

- To identify factors hindering social accountability in public sectors of Jimma zone selected woredas
- To assess social accountability mechanisms/tools implemented in the public sectors of selected areas.
- To assess the role of social accountability practices in improvement of public policies and services in public sector organizations of Jimma zone.

III. Research Methods

The study was conducted in Jimma Zone, specifically on two woredas and two administrative towns. The two urban and local administrations (Jimma and Agaro) and two woreda (Gera

and Limmu Kosa) were the study areas. The objective of this study is to investigate the factors affecting social accountability, mechanisms/ tools used in the sectors and role of practicing social accountability in public sectors. This research is conducted before Dr. Abiy Ahmed come to power. Therefore, this finding does not include the current reform that Ethiopian government is conducting. With Qualitative approach was used to investigate the subjective assessment of feelings and opinions about factors affecting social accountability in public sectors from beneficiary's perspectives. To collect the primary data, interview and focus group discussion were used with the study participants. Key informant interview was also conducted with the selected sector's officials.

Beneficiaries of education, health, agriculture and water supply and sanitation sectors were selected because Ethiopian Social Accountability Program (ESAP2), which was established by the Government of Ethiopia (GoE) and international development partners in June 2006 as a new mechanism to support Ethiopia's progress toward Millennium Development Goal (MDG) targets on education, health, agriculture and water supply and sanitation including rural road. Both convenience and purposive sampling techniques were used to select woredas and public sectors selected. The nature of this study permits the researchers more to collect data from readily available beneficiaries. Rather, the research focused to approaching to beneficiaries. Finally, purposive sampling technique was also employed in order to collect data using interviews and focus group discussion. Therefore, in this study eight FGD and sixteen in-depth interview and four key informant interviews were employed.

Qualitative methods of data analysis were employed in this study. The analysis was carried out by narrating and quoting the data collected, which is applicable for in depth interviews and open ended responses. This was conducted by documenting and grouping similar responses together. A thematic analysis was used to analyze interviews and FGD responses. This involves a critical assessment of each response and examining in accordance with the objective of the study. Before moving to the field for data collection, ethical clearance was obtained from College of Social Sciences and Humanities, Research and Postgraduate Coordinating office of Jimma University. Consent was sought from study participant to confirm willingness to participate in the study. Privacy and confidentiality was ensured throughout the process of the study. All the names used in quotations were pseudo names or not their real names.

IV. Result and Discussions

This section presents both the result and discussion parts. In the result all the objectives, such as hindering factors, social accountability mechanisms and roles were presented. In line with the main findings, the discussion was made through associating with the previous empirical findings and international reports about social accountability.

Result

a) Constraining Factors Affecting Social Accountability in Selected Public Sectors

In this study different hindering factors affecting social accountability were raised by the beneficiaries of these public sectors (health, education, agriculture and water). The low citizens awareness about their right and socio cultural barriers that limit speaking out, absence of access to information guarantees rendering government income and expenditure because beneficiaries lack of their right awareness up to this and service provider's unwillingness to share information were the factors raised by the respondents. Very little training seems to have been given to citizens on how to approach service providers with regard to service provision was commented as a potential behind this problem. Again a weak civil society due to poor working environment in relation to regulation and lack of fund for social accountability were another hindering factors identified by respondents. In line with this one of the interviewee stated his feeling as follows:

My name is Ahmed. I'm 48 years old. I go to these sectors for several reasons. I observed the way services given to us at a different time. Some of the service providers provide the service only based on their free will. What lead them is not structure, rule and regulation of the organization rather simply their interest. These kinds of individuals are not accountable for the job. They did not understand what social accountability means by themselves. There is a discrepancy of understanding their duties and responsibilities among the workers.

In principle where effective social accountability and transparency exists among service providers, beneficiaries can talk/ speak out in different ways about constraining factors they have observed in different public sectors. In this study the participants pointed that since social accountability mechanisms implemented in organizations are limited, beneficiaries

speak out rarely about constraining factors of social accountability from lack of awareness. In contrast some participants commented about the possibilities of uttering their feelings. However, the way community participates limited to meetings as to the data gathered through both FGD and interviews.

The other interviewee explained the hindering factors of effective social accountability as follow:

My name is Musa. I'm 52 years old. There are varies hindering factors of the implementation of social accountability to my knowledge. We are a cultural society. We don't need to rush to complain and enforce the service providers because we perceive that the service providers are educated and should have to be respected but service providers not accountable as such as we expect many things from them. For instance, when you ask me something I may not to speak out the limitations. Our cultural orientation in which we have grown up in also affected us. Here and there in their office what they post says *customer is king* but you couldn't find the reality on the ground. Therefore, continuous awareness and trainings needed for both service providers and beneficiaries as well.

The FGD participants also stated that the risk of lack social accountability among service providers is a result of different hindering factors. The awareness of the community is limited only to attending public meetings invited by kebele and woreda officials where such issues are imparted as an awareness creation component. Besides, these are lack of sustainability or institutionalization, failure to result in service improvements, superficial level of citizen involvement, lack of inclusiveness and raised citizen expectations are major of them. The FGD participants also suggested that in order to produce better insights into the effectiveness of the development of social accountability tools and mechanisms in these selected public sectors, it would be necessary to have comprehensive and precise baseline awareness about the effects of an intervention and the implementation of effective service delivery. This finding has also revealed that there is a marginal improvements related to the capacities of local administration for social accountability. The weak structural features in giving chance for beneficiaries in combination with service provision can in some instances lead to the danger of government and civil society in public sectors. Therefore, beneficiary have reminded that awareness needed on the concept and forms, tools and mechanisms of social accountability practices, as well as technical and organizational skills, but service providers capacity to act as agents of social accountability remained limited. One of the key

informant interviewee also stated that *‘When resources and appropriate person not appropriately assigned across all sectors or organizations, the public sectors lack the capacity to provide appropriate service delivery’*.

This finding also revealed that the expansion of corruption at different levels is the other hindering factor. The FGD discussants revealed that the community members are at different level in social class or economically. Those who have money give corruption to get service and those who don't have cannot afford for service providers. This kind of practice created dependency on service providers. As one of the participant stated during in-depth interview:

I'm Abdi and 39 years old. I have observed the services given in public organizations. Some workers give you the services genuinely. The others were not as such happy to the service seekers. If you are intimate to the service providers, all the ways that you pass through are smooth or you have to give money or materials in kind for the service providers in order to get a good service. A kind of tit for tat or reciprocity principle is highly affecting the effectiveness of social accountability in the organizations. Unless, you will be suffered a lot because being accountable for their own job is not their concern since I have not seen any one who is punished or fired up because of wrong doings.

b) Social Accountability Tools/mechanisms

In this section participants were requested about the social accountability tools or mechanisms they have been experienced in the selected public sectors. Accordingly, the study participants gave their response through FGD and interview. In principle social accountability tools or mechanisms are important where civil society itself takes on attributes of the state in supervising the performance of state agencies. After the service given to the customer the service providers request them to write their comment or feeling towards the service provided to them. Besides, public meetings were rarely used with the community. According to the data gathered through FGD, the other social accountability tools or mechanisms such as public forum, public revenue monitoring, and participatory public expenditure tracking were not implemented to evaluate the performance of providers from beneficiary perspectives. One of the interviewee stated his feeling during in depth interview as follow:

My name is Jibril. I'm 38 years old. I went to all public organizations existing in our woreda. I got different services. It is difficult to say there are tools or mechanisms in place to ensure social accountability. After getting service you might be requested to write comment or put it what you have written in a box. This is infrequent or not consistent. In case when there is a public meeting with the community, people cannot talk their real feelings because we don't trust each other. There is no transparency too. Except this, I didn't see the other mechanisms the organizations are using to ensure social accountability. If you talk negative things towards the organizations you will be requested after back as soon as the meeting finished. There is a networking called *tokko-shane* (one to five). These groupings of five households in one group across all kebeles or woredas were used for political purpose. If you talk negative things about the ruling government you will be exposed, up to prison and physical and psychological torture. Therefore, simply accepting and using reaction formation mechanism became our tradition with this government.

The finding gained from the FGD participants also supported the above case. When social accountability tools or mechanisms used appropriately, the relationship between provider and user, perceptions of service quality and working towards solutions through collective discussion and debate will be advanced more. However, beneficiaries responded that they express their opinions through writing on documents prepared after they got service. This became a pseudo practices because is not to improve the quality of service from the side of providers as per feedbacks of the beneficiaries rather to show the documents when the higher officials come for supervision. Participatory public expenditure tracking and public revenue monitoring are inexperienced mechanisms in the public sectors and the others were underutilized too. Intervention of local community in expenditure and revenue of a certain sector is limited because the beneficiaries still considering as if it is secret. Besides, the participants also commented that the organizations were not using the comments positively because the services are remained inadequate.

c) Role of Social accountability

Using FGD and interview participants also suggested that social accountability mechanisms can contribute to improved governance, increase development effectiveness through better service delivery, and empowerment. However, what is problem in the organizations was not performing accordingly on the ground. While the range of social

accountability mechanisms is wide and diverse, key common building blocks include obtaining, analyzing and disseminating information, mobilizing public support and advocating and negotiating change needs were not utilized effectively according to participants view. One of the key informant interviewee shared his view as follow:

I'm Jibat and 41 years old. I worked for last ten years in different government public sectors. The issue of good governance and social accountability raised at least as one agenda whenever there is a meeting whether with staffs or community at a large. In principle the service providers recognizes the role of social accountability as a key element for effective quality service delivery but you couldn't find it at ground.

The data gained through FGD also supports the above case in that critical factors of success including, access to and effective use of information, civil society and government capacities and synergy between the two are still rarely implemented. These participants also suggested that social accountability mechanisms to be effective on the long run need to be institutionalized and linked to existing governance structures and service delivery system. Besides, FGD discussants and interview participants were asked to forward more suggestions on how to better include citizens and community priority needs in service delivery to ensure social accountability. Some of these were interrelated and complementary to each other. Some were more technical like increasing the number of skilled staff. Others, more relevant to SA, were suggested. The suggestion that was forwarded by participants was highly the need for citizen participation in planning and budgeting followed by training/ awareness creation of stakeholders on SA mechanisms, identification of priority needs of community and implementing them, close supervision of service providers and implementing community and government cooperation/good governance.

Discussions

This study was focused on the factors affecting social accountability, tools or mechanisms and roles of social accountability. In line with the findings and the previous empirical studies or reports the discussion was made. Strengthening Social Accountability has emerged as a key strategy for improving public services and making progress towards attaining the millennium development goals (MDGs) through increasing transparency (World Bank, 2004; Deverajan and Widlund, 2007). In contrast to this, there were factors which are hindering not to attain this objective. These hindering factors includes, lack of awareness from beneficiary perspectives, reluctance of the service providers, lack of supervision,

absence of access to information, lack of transparency and the overlook of bottom-up approach.

As Eshetu presented on 2011 of United Nations conference held in New York, there are a number of Social Accountability mechanisms that citizens, community groups, and CSOs can use to hold service providers and government officials accountable. These mechanisms mainly include, Citizens Report Card, Community Score Cards, Citizen Participation in public policy making, participatory planning and budgeting, public budget tracking citizen monitoring of public service delivery, lobbying, campaigning and advocacy, etc. however, paradoxically this finding revealed that except infrequent public meeting and beneficiaries report on the document prepared by the service providers, the other mechanisms were not utilized in the study areas. The citizen-led accountability tactics were not as the culture of these organizations. This finding is similar with study conducted by Tamsin A., Ghazia A., & Rasmus S., (2017). According to these authors, social accountability mechanisms are rarely appearing as a wider approach to ensure good governance.

Support for social accountability mechanisms in rural Sub-Saharan Africa has increased over the past decade and is becoming firmly anchored in government policies and donor and NGO strategies (Esbern F., 2014). In contrast to this, social accountability in the sectors selected showed progress rarely.

According to the Social Development Note No. 75, Social accountability can play an important role in the creation of more transparent and representative governments and aid public institutions in meeting the expectations of the population. It allows civil society and government to interact in a manner that acknowledges the limitations each sector faces while recognizing that collaboration is necessary for effective and sustainable development. Against to this, the finding revealed that the key role of social accountability in selected public organizations was not enhancing service delivery and rarely holds the service providers accountable. Social accountability relies upon collective actors. Non-governmental organizations, CBOs and Associations and Medias were not effectively used their voice to make the failures public.

Social Accountability mainly is important for two major reasons among other things: on the one hand to hold service providing agencies accountable to citizens by providing accessible, affordable and quality services, and on the other end to empower citizens and ultimately to enable them demand about their rights. Thus, it contributes to improved governance, increased development effectiveness through better service delivery and empowerment (Eshetu, 2011). In Contrary to this, according to this study there were

discrepancies across political or administration woredas and sectors have created challenges in consolidating and verifying information on the key services such as education, health, agriculture and water supply.

V. Conclusion and Recommendations

Conclusion

This study focused on public sector organizations in Jimma zone, specifically targeted on education, health, agriculture and water supply and sanitation while at the same time deepening local accountability and transparency in basic service delivery. Because the Ethiopian Social Accountability Program (ESAP2) is part of the Protection of Basic Services (PBS) Project, which was established by the Government of Ethiopia (GoE) and international development partners in June 2006 as a new mechanism to support Ethiopia's progress toward Millennium Development Goal (MDG) targets on education, health, agriculture and water supply and sanitation including rural road. In line with this the objective of this study was to investigate the constraining factors, tools or mechanisms and roles of social accountability.

The understanding of the term social accountability was not entirely uniform however participants enumerated several facets that in turn contribute to social accountability. Whereas, there was no sufficient evidence of the practice of social accountability in the public sectors, there is need to increase awareness and promote a deliberate strategy for social accountability. The assessment of accountability cannot be separated from the vision one has about what constitutes adequate democratic control, sufficient checks and balances, or good enough governance. However, the study participants agreed that these were rarely practiced in the public sectors selected. Therefore, the government need to be encouraged to directly stimulate the participation of society and to institutionalize mechanisms of state-society relations through effective quality provisions.

Recommendations

Based on the findings the following recommendations were forwarded by the researchers:

- This study revealed little evidence practically that investing social accountability is contributing to good governance in the areas researched. All parties (citizens, service providers, SAIPs and local government officials) must be trained in SA tools to get them equipped better with the ability to work as a team to improve the quality of basic services. Citizens shall be made aware of their rights to demand and contribute to the improvement in quality of basic services and be able to hold service providers accountable for poor performance.

- Beneficiaries should have access to adequate information on woreda/kebele development plan, budget allocation and expenditure. They should be consulted on improving basic services and be allowed to have much stronger participation in planning basic services. They should also be effectively reported to, with regard to plan implementation and the challenges faced.
- Strengthening the capacity of SAIPs in using SA tools while dealing with their beneficiaries requires strengthening of their institutional capacity at woreda and kebele level. This should be implemented as much as possible.
- Any future attempts to promote social accountability and to increase the proactive engagement of citizens should take a more diversified approach to citizens and explore the various potentials and limitations of social groups in relation to their structural positions, interests and capability to engage in various types of actions.

Acknowledgement: First and for most, we want to confirm our appreciation to Jimma University for providing us noteworthy financial support to conduct this study. We would like to express our cordial gratitude to all the study participants for their willingness to participate in this study. We are also thankful to the leaders of the sectors for their facilitation to get the beneficiaries. Last but not the least, we express our gratitude to everyone who supported us directly and indirectly throughout the study.

References

Andersson, K. and van Laerhoven, F. 2007. From Local Strongman to Facilitator: Institutional Incentives for Participatory Municipal Governance in Latin America. *Comparative Political Studies*, 40, 1085-1111.

Baseline Survey report, 2013. Ethiopia Protection of Basic Services Social Accountability programs.

Boex (2008). *Rethinking Democratic Accountability*. Washington: Brookings Institute. DFID, July 2009, 'Eliminating World Poverty: Making Governance work for the poor', Government White Paper, London.

Esbern Friis (2014). Social Accountability and Public Service Delivery in Rural Africa.

Eshetu Bekele, 2011. *Social Accountability Mechanisms in Enhancing Good Governance*, New York.

Fox, Jonathon. 2014. "Social accountability: What does the evidence really say?" GPSA Working Paper 1. Global Partnership for Social Accountability.

Gaventa, John and Anne Marie Goetz. 2001. *Bringing Citizen Voice and Client Focus Service Delivery*. IDS Working Paper No. 138. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.

Goetz, Ann Marie, and John Gaventa. 2001. "Bringing Citizen Voice and Client Focus to Service Delivery."

Holland, Jeremy, Allyson Thirkell, Emmanuel Trepanier, and Lucy Earle. 2009. "Measuring Change and Results in Voice and Accountability Work," Working Paper 34. London: Department for International Development.

Hyden, G. 1992. *Governance and the Study of Politics*, in G. Hyden and M. Bratton, eds. *Governance and Politics in Africa*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Kapiriri, L. and Martin, D. K. 2007. Bedside Rationing by Health Practitioners: A Case Study in Ugandan Hospital. *Medical Decision Making*, 27, 44-52.

Leinster S: Evaluation and assessment of social accountability in medical schools. *Medical Teacher* 2011, 3(8):673–676.

Malena, C. 2010. *Evidence of Impacts of Social Accountability/Demand for Good Governance (DFGG) Initiatives: An Overview*. Partnership for Transparency Fund.

McGee, Rosemary, and John Gaventa. 2011. "Synthesis report: Review of Impact and Effectiveness of Transparency and Accountability Initiatives," Prepared for the Transparency and Accountability Initiative Workshop, October 14 – 15, 2010. London

OPDC (2009) *Background information*, www.opdc.go.th, accessed 15 July 2009.

OPDC (2003) *The Instructional Book: The Good Governance Royal Decree*, Bangkok: OPDC

Ringold, Dena, Alaka Holla, Margaret Koziol, and Santhosh Srinivasan. 2012. "Citizens and Service Delivery: Assessing the Use of Social Accountability Approaches in Human Development," *Direction in Development: human Development*. Washington DC: The World Bank.

Singh, R. and Vutukuru, V. (2010) 'Enhancing Accountability in Public Service Delivery through Social Audits: A Case Study of Andhra Pradesh', *Accountability Initiative*, New Delhi: Centre for Policy Research.

Social Accountability Study-The Not-for-Profit CCRC Profile, 2010.

Social Accountability in the Public Sector. 2005: A Conceptual Discussion." *Social Development Paper 82*, World Bank, Washington, DC.

Tamsin Aylie, Ghazia Aslam & Rasmus Schjødt, (2017). *Social Accountability in the Delivery of Social Protection*, Fina Research report, United Kingdom.

World Bank. 2003. "Case Study 1—Peru: Towards a System of Social Accountability." *Social Development Note 83*, Participation and Civic Engagement Group, World Bank, Washington, DC.

World Bank 2010. *World Development Report 2004: Making Services Work for Poor People* Washington: World Bank.

World Bank 2005. *The Effectiveness of World Bank Support for Community-Based and-Driven Development: An OED Evaluation*. Washington: World Bank.

World Bank (2004a) for a discussion of the weaknesses of elections as a mechanism of Accountability.

Porcentagem de contribuição de cada autor no manuscrito

Hunde Doja – 50%

Tadele Duressa – 50%