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ABSTRACT

The increasing importance to improve efficiency in Public sector in Uganda allowed the innovative shared service model to operate with a view of lowering costs, improving efficiency and service delivery.

This thesis aims to explore whether application of the model resulted into service satisfaction and service quality in Kampala Capital City Authority (KCCA). The theoretical propositions underlying shared services are the transformation of service delivery which leads to improvement and the current researcher has sought the answer to this question by examining the cost, quality and social welfare (CQS) dimensions in KCCA, Uganda. In addition the social welfare, cost, economies of scale, efficiency, effectiveness equity, quality and quantity (SCEEQQ) has also been examined as a measurement instrument.

A cross sectional study used a questionnaire as an instrument involving 573 employees, former employees and residents of KCCA as respondents. In addition interviews were carried out as another source of data to support in discovering the in-depth model of sharing. Cluster sampling was used were clusters are parishes and strata are the divisions. The data has been analyzed using a Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS Version 16) and NVIVO where analysis for reliability i.e., factor analysis, correlation, regressions and hierarchical regression have been performed.

Results further indicate that, sharing solid waste management has improved service delivery, reduced costs, improved efficiency and effectiveness, service satisfaction, social welfare and service quality though far from optimal level and there was no documented evidence to show that costs and economies of scale reduced although quantitative data supports. Further, qualitative findings indicate that the model was initiated two years
ago, all the five divisions of KCCA are involved in the sharing, a mixed model i.e., formal and informal is being applied, they share transport, heavy equipments, landfill and human resources, the major reasons for sharing are economic driven i.e., lack of resources.

This study offers recommendations for theory, research and policy. Overall KCCA is effective and efficient in delivering solid waste services using a sharing model and the model’s success was also dependent on the informal approach of its implementation process and a clear understanding of the risks and benefits.

This research bridged the gap in the literature through empirical evidence and novel insights on the impact of shared services on service quality and service satisfaction in public-public sector in Ugandan context. The findings of this research may enable policy makers to consider shared services as a preferred model of service delivery.
ABSTRAK

Kepentingan yang semakin mendesak untuk meningkatkan kecekapan dalam sektor awam di Uganda telah mempengaruhi model perkongsian perkhidmatan awam yang berinovatif untuk beroperasi dengan tujuan mengurangkan kos, meningkatkan efisiensi dan kecekapan penyampaian perkhidmatan. (delivery of service)

Tesis ini bertujuan untuk meneroka sama ada aplikasi model perkongsian perkhidmatan yang mengakibatkan peningkatan kepuasan perkhidmatan dan kualiti perkhidmatan awam dalam persekitaran Kampala Capital City Authority. Usul teori asas perkhidmatan perkongsian adalah transformasi penyampaian perkhidmatan yang membawa kepada peningkatan dan penyelidik telah mencari jawapan kepada soalan ini dengan mengkaji dimensi cost quality social welfare (CQS) dalam Kampala Capital City Authority (KCCA), Uganda. Di samping itu Social welfare, cost, economies of scale, efficiency, effectiveness, equity, quality and quantity (SCEEEEQQ) juga telah diselidiki sebagai instrumen pengukuran.

Satu kajian irisan lintang menggunakan soal selidik sebagai instrumen yang melibatkan 573 kakitangan awam, bekas kakitangan dan penduduk KCCA sebagai responden. Temu bual telah digunakan sebagai satu lagi sumber tambahan data untuk menyokong dalam mencari model yang perkongsian perkhidmatan yang lebih mendalam. Persampelan kelompok telah digunakan dimana kelompok adalah dan strata adalah bahagian. Data telah dianalisis dengan menggunakan Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS Versi 16) dan NVIVO di mana analisis untuk kebolehpercayaan iaitu analisis faktor, korelasi, dan regresi hierarki telah dijalankan.

Keputusan kajian menunjukkan bahawa, perkongsian pengurusan sisa pepejal telah mengakibatkan penyampaian perkhidmatan yang lebih baik, pengurangan kos,
peningkatan kecekapan dan keberkesanan, kepuasan perkhidmatan, kebajikan sosial dan kualiti perkhidmatan, walaupun jauh dari tahap yang optimum dan tidak ada bukti didokumen untuk menunjukkan bahawa kos dan skala ekonomi berkurangan walaupun terdapat sokongan data kuantitatif. Lagi pun, penemuan kualitatif menunjukkan bahawa model yang telah dimulakan dua tahun lalu, mempamerkan bahawa semua lima divisi KCCA terlibat dalam perkongsian, iaitu model yang bercampur-campur, formal dan tidak formal adalah yang digunakan, mereka berkongsi dalam aspek pengangkutan, peralatan berat, tapak pelupusan dan sumber manusia, sementara sebab utama perkongsian adalah didorong oleh faktor ekonomi iaitu kekurangan sumber.

Kajian ini menawarkan cadangan untuk teori, penyelidikan dan dasar. Keseluruhan KCCA yang berkesan dan cekap dalam menyampaikan perkhidmatan sisa pepejal dengan menggunakan model perkongsian dan kejayaan model itu juga bergantung kepada pendekatan proses pelaksanaan tidak formal dan kefahaman yang jelas tentang risiko dan manfaat.

Kajian ini mengurangkan lagi jurang dalam kesusasteraan melalui bukti empirikal dan pandangan baru mengenai kesan perkhidmatan perkongsian pada kualiti perkhidmatan dan kepuasan perkhidmatan dalam sektor awam-awam dalam konteks Uganda. Hasil kajian ini membolehkan penggubal dasar untuk mempertimbangkan perkhidmatan perkongsian sebagai model pilihan dalam penyampaian perkhidmatan kepada masyarakat.
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