

Impact of Accountability on Public Service Delivery Efficiency.

Fauzia Rana¹, Arfan Ali^{*2}, Waqas Riaz³, Asmara Irfan⁴

^{1,2,3}Department of Public Administration, GC University Faisalabad, Pakistan

⁴Azman Hashim International Business School, University Teknologi Malaysia, Malaysia

* Corresponding author: arfan_ali64@yahoo.com

Abstract

Accountability in public organization is necessary to ensure efficient public service delivery which ultimately strengthens the democracy. Lack of accountability in public organization undermines public confidence. If there is no check and balance on public organization then it will threaten the very fabric of our society and ultimately to democracy. This study took waste management associations of two big cities of Punjab and collect data from their officials. Statistical analysis of the data revealed that there is a strong and positive relationship exist between accountability and public service delivery. Government should ensure the accountability in public organization to enhance the efficiency level of public service delivery.

Keywords: Accountability, Public Service Delivery, Public Organization

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Received: 12 December 2018

Revised: 25 February 2019

Accepted: 10 April 2019

DOI: 10.31580/jpvai.v2i1.480

© Readers Insight Publication

INTRODUCTION

The main purpose of public service organizations of any country is to deliver services to the people to promote a better living standard. Democratic governments want to deliver their promises but there is a threat that corruption and lack of accountability will jeopardise their commitment because to achieve the excellence in service delivery, there is a need of corruption free public institutions that should be accountable to government and public. Citizens are increasingly asking for workable solutions to everyday problems. Their common concern is about governance discourses: ensuring accountability and preventing corruption in the public sector. The quest for efficient public service delivery inside the structure of New Public Administration (NPM) is a topic of awesome enthusiasm for the field of open organization (Andrews 2010; Andrews and Van De Walle 2013; Pollit and Bouckaert 2004). New Public Management is a dream, and belief system or a heap of specific administration methodologies and strategies (Sami et al. 2018). The idea of new open administration was entered in principle and practice in 1982. A few associations supported the acts of new open administration as a structure. The NPM has turned into an umbrella covering an arrangement of open area changes. New Public Management has been driven by mix of four elements that is social monetary political and innovative components. The new open administration require accountability of public service for efficient public service delivery.

Accountability frequently connected with political procedures which link with NPM. Additionally, accountability itself is an exceptionally expansive idea that has been characterized by various researchers in different ways. Here, we take after Falleti (2005: 328), who depict decentralization as a procedure or change comprising of various open strategies that exchange obligation, assets, or power from a higher to a least level of government. Generally there are numerous courses in which obligation, assets, and power might be dispersed. Designation change obligation and power to semi-self-sufficient organizations, more often than not with sheets of executives tending to isolate corporate interests (work, business, government). Devolution exchange obligation and power. We could likewise

inspect decentralization against execution in different parts or execution in advancing vote based systems and practices. In any case, we could here endeavoring to analyze the part of decentralization in general society division from the focal workplaces of the Miniso isolate regulatory structures still inside general society organization (e.g. areas, zone, districts). Privatization makes a legally binding connection.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Accountability focuses on the demand side of good governance. It aims at strengthen the voice of citizens to demand greater accountability and responsiveness directly from public officials and service providers. Accountability is defined as being answerable for our actions or taking responsibility for our action. The concept of New Public Management has ushered in a new era of accountability for government agencies. Government employees have traditionally been required "to do the right thing" in accordance with due process. Currently, they are being held accountable for performance and citizen satisfaction under the banners of public choice and managerialism (Aucoin, 1995). The main mechanism of public accountability is increasingly becoming the annual report, accounting the dominant language and ends means.

Accountability is a critical imperative of good administration. It contends the associations or organizations are liable to all those who are influenced by their choices & deeds. According to Kettani et al., (2009) the responsibility is connected with straightforwardness and the standard of law. It is forcefully required by open area and additionally private division. Government bodies are considered responsible and responsible to the general public.

First, the quality of public service delivery is explicitly modeled. The quality of public service is becoming increasingly important for the general public and consequently for policy-makers. This is in line with the expectation that with rising living standards, demand will tend to shift towards higher quality services rather than larger quantities of low quality services (e.g., parents expect to receive a better education

for their children, rather than expecting to ‘park’ them inschool for longer hours).

The act of governance by government through various ministries, departments and agencies (MDAs) is tending towards efficient and effective service delivery (Ali et al. 2018a). But there seems to be many variables militating against the delivery of efficient and effective infrastructural, social and welfare services by various governments’ ministries, departments and agencies. Few amongst the variables militating against efficient delivery of services in the public sector are corruption, accountability, probity, prudence, insufficient funding, government policies, government instability, leadership quality, etc.

Reforms in the public sector aimed at improving service delivery have received considerable focus during the last decade. Customer awareness Citizens today are more aware of their rights, have better access to information on public services and consequently have higher expectations of service levels (Ali et al. 2018b). Because they have become accustomed to capable private sector organizations providing high levels of customization and other benefits, they are not prepared to accept that public sector organizations are incapable of improving their own service delivery.

Methodology

Population of this study consist of two associations that are Faisalabad waste administration association and Gujrnwala Waste Management association of Punjab. The sample size of 60 has been chosen from every association. An exploration overview instrument has been used for the information. The aggregate sample size of 120 was chosen from the waste administration association. The noteworthy respondents were the representatives of the waste administration association who had been working in the association. Data was collected by the questionnaire and then analyse by SPSS.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Respondants

Demographic	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	106	88
Female	14	12
Total	120	100
Age		
20-25	12	10
26-30	48	40
31-35	48	40
36-40	12	10
Total	120	100
Education		
Graduate	51	42
Post Graduate	69	58
Total	180	100

Table 1 explain the demographic Characteristics of Respondants. It shows the frequency and percentage of male and female staff. The proportion and frequency of male staff are 88% and 106 respectively. The female staff percentage and frequency were 12% and 14 correspondingly. This table shows a greater proportion of male staff as compare to the female staff. This table also shown that the age dissemination of respondents. It demonstrates a more percentage number of respondents lie between 26 to 30 years and 31 to 35 years . The respondents lie between the ages of 26 to 30 years and 31 to 35 are 40 % (48). While following them 10% (12) in between 21 to 25 years and 36 to 40 years old. This table also figure out the frequency division of education of the individuals. It shows 42% (51) individuals having graduate degree while 58% of employee that are 69 are post gradutae degree holders.

Table 2: Regression Analysis

Table 2. Model Summary
Accountability act as independent
Public Public Service Delivery efficiency act as the dependent

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.300 ^a	.090	.082	.96158

a. Predictors: (Constant), Accountability

Model summary is mentioned in Table 2. It shows that independent variable accountability explain the variance of 90.% in the dependent variable Public Public Service Delivery efficiency by indicating the value of R² .90. it conclude that in Pakistan, accountability play a vital role in Public Service Delivery.

Table 3: Anova Table

ANOVA^a

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	10.817	1	10.817	11.699	.001 ^b
Residual	109.107	118	.925		
Total	119.924	119			

a. Dependent Variable: Public_service_delivery_efficiency
 b. Predictors: (Constant), Accountability

ANOVA statistics represent the arithmetical impact of the model. In this table, the significance is shown as 0.001 in the model. P= 0.001 which is clearly less than α (0.05). It showing that the model is significantly predict the outcome. F= 11.699 it directly shows the significance of the relationship among the needy and the independent variable. P-value of “F” static is less than α . It indicates that model is fine for conducting regression analysis and Fit is good.

Table 4: Coefficient

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig
	B	Std. Error			
1 (Constant)	1.653	.406		4.068	.000
Accountability	.447	.131	.300	3.420	.001

a. Dependent Variable: Public_service_delivery_efficiency

H₀: Accountability does not significantly impact on public Public Service Delivery efficiency.

H₁: Accountability has significantly impact on Public Public Service Delivery efficiency.

Table of coefficient indicates that P-value is less than α . Null hypothesis automatically will be rejected. If $P \leq \alpha$, unusual hypothesis will be accepted. Above mentioned table indicate that it can be done that accountability has significant constructive impact on public Public Service Delivery efficiency.

$$\text{Public Public Service Delivery efficiency} = 4.068 + \text{Accountability} (.300)$$

This step has been conducted to evaluate impact of accountability on public Public Service Delivery efficiency and the results show significant positive impact of accountability on public Public Service Delivery efficiency in public sector organizations of Pakistan.

Conclusion

The basic purpose of this research is to examine the impact accountability on Public Service Delivery efficiency of Pakistan’s waste management companies . This study focused on accountability to enhance Public Service Delivery efficiency in waste management



company's agencies to implement the new public management reforms.

This study explored the relationship between accountability and Public Service Delivery efficiency.. The research study was supported by the prior studies on the mentioned variables and the hypothesis of this research model.

The results showed a positive and strong relationship between accountability as an independent variable and Public Service Delivery efficiency as dependent variable. So, it can be concluded that accountability has significant positive effect on public Public Service Delivery efficiency.

Limitations and Implications

Once of the limitations of this study was that the information was collected at a single time. Therefore the participants' attitude could not be examined at different times. Shortage of financial resources and shortage of time were other limitations. The research study was conducted at Punjab level in public sector waste management organization only. So, the scope can be increased and the study may be conducted in other public sectors at national level also. Regression Analysis was used to evaluate and investigate the results. Other statistical methods and large number of samples should be used for improved outcomes. Furthermore, qualitative methods (like interviews) for data collection may also be used for more comprehensive results.

Future Research Recommendations

This research provide a brief description of accountability and its impact on Public Service Delivery efficiency but there is always a room for improvement. Future research may be focused on the following points.

1. How to enhance new public management reforms in waste management organizations by utilization of public participation.
2. A comparison can be conducted between different waste management organizations under this research model.
3. How new public management reform can further improve efficiency of public service delivery.
4. Future research may explore a great number of variables and their effect on efficiency.
5. In public organizations collective terminologies may be presented to avoid the confusion.
6. Organizations may use this research to check the results of their reforms.
7. The current study is limited to Faisalabad and Gujrnwala organizations, other capital may be included so as to confirm the reliability and validity of research

References:

Ali, A., Bashir, M., Munib, M., Saqib, S & Sami, A. (2018a). Assessing the Efficiency of Water and Sanitation Agencies of Punjab, Pakistan: A Benchmarking Approach. *Journal of Managerial Sciences*, XI (3), 245-254

Ali, A., Saleem, S., Bashir, M., Riaz, W., & Sami, A. (2018b). Mediating Role of Citizens' Participation between Public Service Motivation, Political Interference and Local Government Performance: A Case Study of Municipalities of Punjab. *Abasyn Journal of Social Sciences-Special Issue: AIC 2017*, 250-26

Andrews, R. (2010). New Public Management and the Search for Efficiency. In T. Christensen & P. Lægreid (Eds.), *Ashgate Research Companion to the New Public Management*. Aldershot:

Andrews, R., Boyne, G.A., Law, J. & Walker, R.M. (2011). *Strategic Management and Public Service Performance*. Houndmills: Palgrave.

Araujo JFFE De (2001). Improving Public Service Delivery: Then Crossroads between NPM and Traditional Bureaucracy, *Public Adm*.79:4.

Arora RK (2003). New Public Management: Emerging Concerns, *Prashasnikha*, Volume30:2.

Aucoin, P. 1995. *The New Public Management: Canada in comparative perspective*. Montreal: Institute for Research on Public Policy.

Balk WL (1996). *Managerial Reform and Professional Empowerment in the*

Public Service. Quorum Books, Westport, CT. Barberis, P., 1998. The new public management and a new accountability. *Public Admin*, 76: 451-470.

Barzelay M (1992). *Breaking Through Bureaucracy: A New Vision for Managing in Government* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Boyne, G.A. (2003). Sources of Public Service Improvement: A Critical Review and Research Agenda. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 13:367-94.

Caiden GE (2001). *Administrative Reform, Handbook of Comparative and Development Public Administration*, New York: Marcel Dekker, pp. 655-688.

Diaz, L.F., Savage, G.M. and Eggerth, L.L. (2005), "Alternatives for the treatment and disposal of healthcare wastes in developing countries", *Waste Management*, Vol. 25 No. 6, pp. 626-37.

Ebrahim, Alnoor (2003). "Making Sense of Accountability: Conceptual Perspectives for Northern and Southern Nonprofits." *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 14 (2), pp. 191-212.

Falleti, T. (2005) *A Sequential Theory of Decentralization: Latin American Cases in Comparative Perspective*.

Kettani, D., Gurstein, M., & El Mahdi, A. (2009). Good governance and e-government: applying a formal outcome analysis methodology in a developing world context. *International Journal of Electronic Governance*, 2(1), 22-54.

Polidono C (1999). "The new public management in developing countries" Institute for Development Policy and Management, University of Manchester Precinct Centre, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9GH, UK.

Pollitt, C. & Dan, S. (2011). *The impacts of the new public management in Europe: A Meta analysis*. COCOPS working paper no. 3.

Pollitt, C. & Bouckaert, G. (2004). *Public Management Reform: An International Comparison*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rosenbloom, D. (1983). Public Administration Theory and the Separation of Powers. *Public Administration Review*, 43(3):219-222.

Sami, A., Jusoh, A., Md. Nor, K., Irfan, I., & Qureshi, M. I. (2018). Systematic Review of Public Value. *Journal of Public Value and Administration Insights*, 1(1), 1-6.

Seabright, P.n.d., Accountability and decentralisation in government: An incomplete contracts model, *European Economic Review* 40(1), 61-89.

Van de Walle, S. & Bouckaert, G. (2003). Public service performance and trust in government: The problem of causality. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 29(8-9):891-913.

