

# Management of Local Authorities in Zimbabwe. What needs to be done to improve the Situation?

Langton Mutoya

*Africa University of Zimbabwe College of Peace, Leadership and Governance.*

E-mail: [mutoyal@africau.edu](mailto:mutoyal@africau.edu) or [mutoya2007@yahoo.com](mailto:mutoya2007@yahoo.com)

---

**ABSTRACT:** Management of Local Authority is a crucial facet and tier of governance in any country and, as such, sufficient investment has to be made into this level to ensure sustainable development, sound service delivery and accountable governance strengthened by active citizen participation in decision-making processes. This study analysed the management of local authorities in Zimbabwe and prescribed what needs to be done to improve the current situation. The research was a qualitative case study of the Local Authorities in Zimbabwe and is informed by secondary data. The author reviewed the Regional Town and Country Planning Act (1976); Provincial Councils and Administration Act (1985); The Rural District Councils Act (1988); The Urban Councils

Act (1993); The Traditional Leaders Act (2000); and Constitution of Zimbabwe Amendment (No. 20) Act of 2013.] and other municipal by-laws that govern local authorities. Three models were used, that is, the Agency Theory, Partnership Model, and Corporate Governance Model to evaluate the performance of the Local Authorities. Major finding was the crisis in management of Local Authorities' manifest into poor service delivery. The study recommends realignment of statutes that govern Local Authorities in Zimbabwe to the supreme law of the land, full implementation of the devolution and setting up of functional structures of Local Governance.

**KEY WORDS:** Local Governance, Urban Councils Act, Rural Councils Act, Service Delivery, Development

---

## I. INTRODUCTION

Zimbabwe is a constitutional democracy and is a unitary state. The unitary form resembles a Centralised concept of Local Governance. Subnational governments exercised powers delegated to them under various Acts of Parliament. It is therefore appropriate to claim that the three pillars of state, namely the Executive, the Judiciary and the Legislature derive their existence and authority from the Constitution of Zimbabwe. For the proper functioning of government, the afore-mentioned pillars of state, though respecting the principle of separation of powers by maintaining their independence from one another, coordinate and complement the roles prescribed by the national governance. As a unitary state, Zimbabwe currently observes a central government structure which regulates the general policy of development of the country. Provincial and Local Governance in Zimbabwe is enshrined in the Constitution of Zimbabwe [Chapter 14 of the Constitution of Zimbabwe Amendment (No. 20) Act, 2013]. Part Three of the Constitution Sections 274-279 provides the guidance on Local Governance. This study focus on the management of Local Authorities in Zimbabwe and therefore reviewed among other complementing statutes of local government management the following sections of the supreme law of the land

[ Constitution of Zimbabwe Amendment (No. 20) Act, 2013]: -

- Section 274 (Urban Local Authorities)
- Section 275 (Local Authorities for rural)
- Section 276 (Functions of Local Authority)
- Section 279 (Procedure of Local Authority).

**Definition of Local Authority:** Local Authority is a segment of the government that manages local affairs through elected officials and technocrats appointed based on their expertise (Mapuva, 2014). Local Authority is based on fiscal governance, legislative and executive authority over an area corresponding to the territorial limit and a certain group of people. (OECD Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development). Local Authority is also defined as a legal entity that provides public services to its people within the territory where it exercises jurisdiction and it is a democratic institution which from the decision making point of view, is governed by a council with representatives elected by the

People who are accountable to their constituents (Tindal, 1977; 2). This study adopts the definition that local government is the kind of governance in a legal institution or organization such that it ensures the generality of population within a given territory act collectively to ensure their welfare. Furthermore, the study analysed the management of local authorities in Zimbabwe and prescribed what needs to be done to improve the current situation based on the definitions discussed and the complimentary regulating statutes and by-laws.

## **II. BACKGROUND**

Zimbabwe is a former British colony and its Local Governance model naturally reflects the colonial legacy. The Institute for a Democratic Alternative for Zimbabwe (IDAZIM) (2010:17) states that, after attaining independence in 1980, Zimbabwe inherited a racially based model of governance that served the interests of white Europeans and segregated white from black Africans. Chigwata (2010:24) states that Government in Zimbabwe was principally based on the principle of 'separate development' of races, notably whites and blacks, with the former benefiting more than the latter. To serve the purpose of 'separate! development', local government was similarly divided on the basis of race, that is, the Urban and Rural Councils. Urban Councils, in various forms, were elected by the whites, enjoyed sound autonomy, and provided reasonable services to the white community. The urban and rural Councils were administered to the advantage of the white colonialists while the blacks were relegated to the status of second class citizens and confined in terms of living to what was called Tribal Trust Lands (Reserves) or Native Lands, African Council (later changed to District Councils). Local governance from that colonial background, is that level of governance that is closest to the people, as it relates to structures, institutions and processes of local government, which happen at a local level within the geographical locality of residents. In theory, citizens are, thus, able to effectively influence local governance more effectively than national governance because this is a level where their voices can be heard and development processes directly influenced. Ideally, the elected or identified local leader should be accessible because he or she is domiciled in that area.

The responsibilities that are formally accorded to Local Authorities in Zimbabwe since attainment of independence are much broader than those accorded in other countries across sub-Saharan Africa region (Wekwete, 1998). The management of Local Authorities in Zimbabwe however, is more inclined to public service delivery. Local Authorities in the 20<sup>th</sup> century have been experiencing multitude of challenges that culminated into deterioration of service delivery across the areas of responsibilities. Admittedly, there are a number of inherent challenges that need to be addressed and opportunities that need to be explored within the management of Local Authorities, that is, if the Republic of Zimbabwe is to enjoy a healthy local governance framework designed through citizenry participation and responsive local institutions to foster good service delivery, accountability and transparency. In Zimbabwe, the past decade, there has been widespread complaints over municipal and local governance decay in service delivery. There has been a notable general decline in municipal service delivery and capital development in local authority governed areas. Local authorities are hypothetically involved mainly in the management of provision of education, health, road maintenance, refuse collection, water and sanitation.

**History of Local Government in Zimbabwe:** The history of Local Governance in Zimbabwe is traceable as far back as 1890. The first set up was the Salisbury Sanitary Board of 1891. A few legal instruments were observed then. The first formally established Local Authority [LA] was the Salisbury Sanitary Board in 1891 (Jordan, 1984; Wekwete, 2006). The necessary legal instrument (Ordinance 2) was, however, only enacted in 1894 and followed by the first Municipal Law of 1897 which granted municipal status to Salisbury (now Harare) and Bulawayo with wholly elected councils. Hlatshwayo (1986) interprets the time lag or delay between setting up the Salisbury Sanitary Board (SSB) and Ordinance 2 as an indication that local government was established. The urban local government which was developing excluded Africans from urban governance. In rural areas, the creation of the Gwayi and Shangani reserves under the Matabeleland Order in Council of 1894 signified the beginning of colonial local Governance (Hammar, 2003). These reserves were established to manage the black locals who posed a threat to the then white colonial rule. Subsequent orders, legislations and Commissions entrenched white expropriation of African land until the 1930 Land Apportionment Act and the African Council Act of 1957. Large-scale commercial farms, mines and small urban centres were administered by Roads Councils which were later transformed into Rural Councils through the 1966 Rural Councils Act. These were under European control. This process shaped the development of Local Governance (Chakaipa, 2010). During the Unilateral Declaration of Independence (UDI) period from 1965 to 1979, administration of black rural areas became increasingly centralised and authoritarian, dominated by centrally appointed Commissioners with dictatorial powers. The Urban Councils Act was enacted in 1973, providing for the control of African townships by the white colonialists.

Zimbabwe inherited a colonial style of Local Government. In 1980, the Government of Zimbabwe formed one Ministry responsible for Local Government. Tribal Trust Lands were renamed Communal lands. Two hundred and twenty African Councils were amalgamated into fifty-five District Councils. Town Management Boards [TMBs] managed by the white capitalists also emerged. These changes especially in the Urban areas were institutionalised in order to solidify white minority rule and guard against blacks to ensure that African labour continued to be at colonialists' disposal. However, the post-independence era witnessed the Prime Minister's declaration of 1984 which gave birth to decentralised structures especially in rural areas. The main aim was to enhance participation of people in local governance. Amongst the structures, were the Village Development Committees [VIDCO] and the Ward Development Committees [WADCO] or Area Committees in Urban areas. The declaration further observed Provincial Councils and Administration, thus, the post of Provincial Governors then and Resident Minister currently. Initially, these committees proved to be effective. Young people and elders together with the traditional and elected leadership came together and discussed the issues that affected them developmentally. Action plans were born from these platforms, some of which were auctioned locally and some forwarded as recommendations to be used by the respective Local Authorities in annual development plans or even forwarded to the parent Ministry. Joint action was witnessed especially in farming where Non-Governmental Organisation [NGOs] came forward and partnered the local community in establishing community gardens. These benefited the communities. Forty-five Rural Councils were further amalgamated through the enactment of the Rural District Councils [RDC] Act of 1988. However, this only came into being in 1993. To avoid confusion and conflict of interest, the Government passed the Traditional Leaders Act of 2000, giving clearly defined roles for the traditional leaders in the discharge of their duties.

It is also imperative to note that, Zimbabwe Local Government is a result of statute [Act of Parliament]. What this ordinarily argues is that, Local Government was excluded in the Country's supreme law or Lancaster House driven Constitution. The new Constitution of Zimbabwe Amendment (No.20) Act of 2013, recognises two types of local government (urban and rural local authorities) which ironically existed in Zimbabwe prior to its adoption. Urban local authorities enjoy greater autonomy and status than rural local authorities both in law and practice. Within the urban and rural forms of local government, several categories of local authorities can be established. Currently, there are three legally recognised classifications of urban local authorities. These are, municipal councils (including cities), town councils and local boards. Among the host of effects, the Government do not directly fund Local Authorities through treasury like other line ministries. The Government of Zimbabwe takes the assumption that, Local Authorities can function on their own through the funds they get from the services they provide. Furthermore, the committees established, that is, VIDCO, WADCO and Area Committees proved not to be effective because the Government seem to have agreed in establishing the committees but however, failed to come up with sustainable strategies and funding mechanisms to keep them in the existence. Subsequently, the general population fell victim to abject poverty.

Most RDCs are constantly crafting supplementary budgets or applying for loans from the parent Ministry. However, NGOs have historically played a significant role in coming up with joint action plans, building partnerships among Local Governments, the Communities and Civil Society. This has witnessed a significant improvement in areas of good governance and Human Rights but still lacking when it comes to Local Government Administration and Financial Management vis-à-vis community development and poverty alleviation. Most Local Authorities have not yet come up to the age of being able to craft sustainable pro-poor budgets neither have they been able to improve Local Economic Development so as to curb unemployment. Effectively, the Zimbabwe's current system of local government was effectively established in 1993. This is when the first local assembly elections were held for the Rural District Councils [RDCs] under the newly unified system of rural territorial administration [Schou, 2000, 125]. The RDC Act was revised a number of times since 1988. The Act governs sixty rural councils. The remaining thirty-one are Urban Councils [UCs] which are governed under the Urban Councils Act [UC Act]. The UC Act was promulgated in 1995. Generally, Local authorities in Zimbabwe hold a considerable degree of formal authority, which can be argued to provide a strong basis for a decentralized local system (Bland, 2011; Smoke, 2003). Administratively, the RDCA and UCA engage in services that range from providing potable water and health clinics to protecting the environment and public security.

**Statement of the Problem:** There are frequent public complains through both electronic and print media of no water supplies, poor road network, no refuse collection and a decaying health system within the Local Authorities [The Herald, 22 November, 2005:1 a major example]. At some extent, the Minister of Local Government, Public Works and National Housing [MLGPWNH] dismissed some head of councils, head of administration, or senior officials of council, or even all of them. This has been reportedly necessitated by allegations centred around poor service delivery, maladministration,

Abuse of public funds, abuse of authority or office, fraudulent dealings and corrupt tendencies. Thus, the poor state of service delivery and Local Authorities governance in Zimbabwe's motivated this study to examine the management of local authorities in Zimbabwe and prescribed what needs to be done to improve the situation to the desired standards.

### III. METHODOLOGY

The study was cross sectional and reviewed the Local Authorities statutes, corporate governance pillars against the three identified models [ Agency Model, Partnership Model and Corporate Governance framework]. This assisted in the examination of the state of management of Local Authorities in Zimbabwe and prescription of what needs to be done to improve the situation. Published journals, articles and google scholar were used to examine the current state of Local Authorities and the desired expectation by the general population. The collected literature was the basis for evaluation. Descriptive and qualitative analysis were employed on this secondary data to understand the operations within the Local Authorities. The rationale of this approach was to put into context the understanding of the current state of management against the desired state by generality. The analysis was guided by the following study research questions.

#### Research Questions

- i. What is the expected role of Local Authority Governance?
- ii. Are there existing functional structures of Local Authority Governance?
- iii. To what extent is management of Local Authorities contributing to service delivery status in Zimbabwe?
- iv. What need to be done to improve the Local Governance situation in Zimbabwe?

#### Hypothesis

In line with the above research questions and objectives the following hypothesis were formulated as guidelines around which this study conclusion was derived:

*H<sub>0</sub>*: Crisis in management of local authorities does not manifest into poor service delivery

#### Objectives

- i. To examine the expected role of Local Authority Governance
- ii. To examine existing functional structures of Local Authority Governance
- iii. To explore the management attitudes towards desired service delivery within the Local Authorities in Zimbabwe
- iv. To prescribe what need to be done to improve the Local Governance situation in Zimbabwe

**Theoretical Framework:** Corporate Governance in this study is described as the process of decision making and the process by which decisions are implemented in Local Authorities. This study was guided by the theories of Corporate Governance as the basis in which the examination of management of local authorities in Zimbabwe was hinged on. These theories of Corporate Governance used in the context of Local Authorities are as follows: -

- |   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><input type="checkbox"/> Agency Theory</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Stewardship Theory</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Resource Dependency Theory</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder Theory</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Transaction Cost Theory</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Political Theory</li></ul> |
|---|

**Agency Theory:** The theory was first proposed by Stephen Ross and Barry Mitnick, independently and concurrently in 1973. Ross is responsible for the origin of the economic theory of agency, and Mitnick for the institutional theory of agency. Basically, the concepts underlying these approaches are similar.

The approaches can be seen as complementary in their uses of similar concepts under different assumptions. Ross introduced the study of agency in terms of problems of compensation contracting; agency was seen, in essence, as an incentives problem. Agency theory was fully developed by Jensen and Meckling (1976). They suggested a theory of how the governance of a company is based on the conflicts of interest between the company's owners. Jensen and Meckling defined the agency relationship as a form of contract between a company's owners and its managers, where the owners (as principal) appoint an agent (the managers) to manage the company on their behalf. As a part of this arrangement, the owners must delegate decision-making authority to the management. According to this theory, the principals of the company hire the agents to perform work. The principals delegate the work of running the business to the directors or managers, who are agents of shareholders. The shareholders expect the agents to act and make decisions in the best interest of principal. On the contrary, it is not necessary that agent make decisions in the best interests of the principals. The agent may be succumbed to self-interest, opportunistic behaviour and fall short of expectations of the principal. The key feature of agency theory is separation of ownership and control. The theory prescribes that people or employees are held accountable in their tasks and responsibilities. Rewards and Punishments can be used to correct the priorities of agents. In this study, the principal becomes the Central Government and the shareholders becomes the stakeholders (general public). Agents therefore from the narrative, should be accountable to their principal for their decisions and actions. Accountability in this context, means, having to report back to the principal and give an account of what has been achieved; having to answer questions from the principal about performance and achievements; and the principal having power to reward or punish an agent for good or bad performance. This study therefore used the agency theory to examine the management style of Local Authorities and their institutional structures and performance.

**Stewardship Theory:** The steward theory states that a steward protects and maximises shareholders' prosperity through organisational performance. Stewards are company executive management working for the shareholders to protect their investments and make profits for them. The stewards are satisfied and motivated when organizational success is accomplished. It stresses on the position of employees or executives to act more autonomously so that the shareholders' returns and interests are maximized and satisfied respectively. The employees who subscribe to the steward theory take ownership of their jobs and work at them applying due diligence. Stewardship theories argue that the management of organisations are stewards of the owners, and both groups share common goals (Davis, Schoorman, & Donaldson, 1997). Contrary to the Agency theory, stewardship theory advocate that the principal should not be too controlling, as agency. Ideally, the principal should provide a supportive role by empowering executives and, in turn, increase the potential for higher performance (Hendry, 2002; Shen, 2003). Stewardship theories further advocate that for sound relationships between principal and executives, there must be some training, mentoring, and shared values (Shen, 2003; Sundaramurthy & Lewis, 2003). In the context of this study, the Local Authorities management are taken as the stewards and the government taken as the principal and the general population given the position of the shareholders or stakeholders for evaluation purposes.

**Stakeholder Theory:** Stakeholder theory assumes that shareholders are not the only group with a stake in a company or a corporation. This theory fuses the accountability of management to a broad range of stakeholders. The theory focuses on decision making by the management and their balanced interest with all stakeholders. Stakeholder theories argue that clients or customers, suppliers, and the surrounding communities also have a stake in a corporation. The theory further state that, managers have fiduciary duties to ensure that all stakeholders and shareholders receive a fair return from their stake in the company (Donaldson & Preston, 1995). Jones, Freeman, & Wicks, 2002 reiterated that, managers have a duty to operate in ethical ways. In that context, management broadly have a guardianship responsibility of the interests of all stakeholders by ensuring that corporate or organizational practices consider the principles of sustainability and service provisions for surrounding communities. In the context of this study, the Local Authorities management are taken as the guardians of responsibilities and the government taken as the shareholder and the general population the stakeholders given the existing relationship.

**Resource Dependency Theory:** The Resource Dependency Theory focuses on the role of principals in providing access to resources needed by the firms. It states that, principals should play pivotal role in providing adequate resources for the organization to satisfy their mandate and reason to survive. Resource-dependence theories argue that a principal exists as providers of resources to management in order to help them achieve set goals (Hillman & Daziel, 2003). Resource-dependence theories recommend interventions by the principals while promoting for strong financial, human, and intangible supports to management. Resource-dependence theories further praise that most of the decisions passed by management should be approved by the principals. Resources improves organizational sound functionality.

Within private sector setup, the management provide resources to the firm, such as information, skills, access to key constituents such as suppliers, buyers, public policy makers, social groups as well as legitimacy. In the context of this Local Authorities management study, local authority is presumed as the management and the government taken as the principal.

**Transaction Cost Theory:** Transaction cost theory states that, an organisation has number of trade agreements within themselves or the generality of its services through which it creates value. In business environment, there is cost associated with each trade agreement with external party; such cost is called transaction cost. If transaction cost of using the market is higher, the company would undertake that transaction itself. In this context, Local Authorities should be seen to be creating the value to its communities.

**Political Theory:** Political theory brings the approach of developing demographic processes. It highlights the delegation of corporate power, and privileges are determined the political affiliation. Zimbabwe has a different type of democracy. Elections in the Zimbabwean context are an accountability tool. If one does not perform will be voted out

#### IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The following answers the research questions and addresses the objectives of the study.

##### **What is the expected role of Local Authority Governance?**

Local governance is that level of governance that is closest to the people, as it relates to structures, institutions and processes of local government, which happen at a local level within the geographical vicinity of residents. The expectation is that, citizens are, thus, able to effectively influence local governance more effectively than national governance because this is a level where their voices can be heard and development processes influenced. Moreso, the local elected leader is accessible because he or she is domiciled within the local community or ward. Ward according to the Zimbabwe local governance structure means the smallest units of governance. The study found that, there are a number of challenges that need to be addressed if Zimbabwe is to enjoy a robust local governance framework epitomised by citizen participation, responsive local institutions, good service delivery, accountability and transparency. Local Authorities are generally expected to ensure on a non-discriminatory basis accessible, acceptable, and affordable good quality basic services. Examples of expected services include but not limited to, refuse collection, repairing of bursting sewers, constant clean water supplies, roads maintenance and provision of health and education facilities within their perimeters.

##### **Are there existing functional structures of Local Authority Governance?**

In terms of the legal framework, the following Acts define the functional structure of the local government system in Zimbabwe:

- i. Constitution of Zimbabwe Amendment (No. 20) Act of 2013).
- ii. The Traditional Leaders Act (2000);
- iii. The Urban Councils Act (1993); The Rural District Councils Act (1988);
- iv. Provincial Councils and Administration Act (1985);  
and
- v. The Regional Town and Country Planning Act (1976);

The above legal instruments were enacted and some of them are supported by amendments to carry out the local governance mandate (Machingauta, 2010). This study considered that, these six legislations are at the core of local government in Zimbabwe in terms of defining functions, powers, structures and procedures. Local authorities are envisioned to bring communities closer to the decision-making process towards sustainable development initiatives. Given the pieces of legislation discussed above, the study found that there are existing functional structures of Local Authority Governance in Zimbabwe.

##### **To what extent is management of Local Authorities contributing to service delivery status in Zimbabwe?**

Local Authorities management is a crucial facet and tier of governance in any country and, as such, sufficient investment has to be made into this level of governance to ensure sustainable development, sound service delivery and accountable governance is underpinned by active citizen participation in decision-making processes. The study found that, the management of Local Authorities in Zimbabwe operates in a delegated capacity,

Performing functions conferred upon it by the central government. The functions, although enshrined in laws are still controlled by central government. The central governance institute the variations and reassignment to other statutory instruments (Zimbabwe Institute, 2005). The study found that, local government system mainly rural authorities, is defined by three facets. One face comprises of democratically elected local government leadership, the other comprising appointed leadership and other officials imposed by the central government. Therefore, currently there exist two forces of power running parallel to each other in local authority management in Zimbabwe. The forces identified in this study are, one which is defined as democratic and the other category of those appointed. It is however noted that there is evidence of existence of formal linkages between the two pronounced through the governing statutes and by-laws. Local Authorities are managed through committee systems which are provided for in relevant legislations. These include among others; - finance, human resources, planning, audit, housing, health, roads/works, environment and social/community services. Each committee consists of a number of councillors and relevant executive staff. One of the councillors is elected as chairperson. Committee resolutions design the service to be delivered. The study identified what it considered as the critical issues that need to be addressed in order to ensure that management of Local Authorities attain good and expected service delivery status in Zimbabwe. These include, but are not limited to, centralisation of power, corrupt tendencies by management, dual governance structures, narrow revenue bases, politicisation of development structures, securitisation of local governance, and questionable qualifications & capacity of elected leadership.

### **What need to be done to improve the Local Governance situation in Zimbabwe?**

Zimbabwe subscribes to different form of democracy. Elections in Zimbabwe are deemed an accountability framework. If one who is voted in does not perform, they will be voted out. The following prescribe what needs to be done to improve management of Local Authorities in Zimbabwe: -

- i. **Devolution of power:** Local authorities continue to suffer interference from central government, particularly in issues of budget ratification and appointment of key officials. There is an urgent need for the country to move towards a devolved system of government envisaged in Chapter 14 of the Constitution.
- ii. **Sustainable revenue bases:** Most local authorities, both rural and urban, have very narrow revenue bases resulting in limited budgets, which culminate in poor service delivery. Local authorities have over-relied on rates and levies charged on residents for years, but in a country where the bulk of the populace in unemployed, this has seen the authorities at loggerheads with residents. Local authorities have to broaden their revenue bases by creating a framework for sustainable local economic development (LED). Currently, there is insufficient revenue power to match the desired service by the general population.
- iii. **Address Conflicting Roles:** At district level, rural district councils are headed by chief executive officers (CEOs), who are appointed by the councils, while there also district administrators. District administrators (DAs), who were inherited from the colonial governance system to preside over the affairs of natives, remain a subject of contention, as there are numerous clashes between DAs and CEOs. Most of the time, the respective personalities play a moderating role in minimising or maximising conflicts due to an apparent dualisation of power. The DA presides over the district development committee, co-ordinates activities of various line ministries, and supervises/works with traditional leaders, while the CEO heads the local authority's secretariat. These two offices overlap and, thus, there is need to resolve this anomaly. One solution is to totally scrap the office of the DA. There is need to realign statutes to the supreme law of the land and review the functional structure of Local Authorities. Other fundamental area is the conflicting roles of traditional and elected leaders and the size of wards. These are also issues that affect local governance and service delivery. In the same context, corruption, misplaced priorities, poor quality of councillors and an inadequate policy and legislative framework are issues that need to be reviewed and refocused toward development.
- iv. **Revive the Dysfunctional Development Structures:** Zimbabwe has a brilliant development framework for rural development, but, unfortunately, the frame died a natural death. Development, as envisaged by the Traditional Leaders Act and the Rural District Councils Act, begins at village level through village development committees (VIDCOs), which are supposed to develop village plans. These plans then cascade upwards to ward development committees chaired by councillors and then the ward assembly chaired by a headman or headwoman. Unfortunately, most of these development structures are dysfunctional and fail to develop village and ward plans. Subsequently, top-down decision-making prevails. There is need to depoliticise these structures and to enhance their planning capacities so that they can deliver their mandate of facilitating development.
- v. **Promote Linkages:** the study identified that there are poor government linkages for example between or among Local Authorities, Zimbabwe National Road Authority [ZINARA], Zimbabwe National Water Authority [ZINWA].

- vi. The study is of the view that the ZINARA and ZINWA should be revenue bases for Local Authorities and or ensure the two are accountable to the Local Authorities.
- vii. **Local Authority Strengthening:** There is need for strengthening of Local Authority governance structure such as socio-political and economic systems. Furthermore, implementation of performance-based contracts for the executive management of the Local Authorities. Non-performing Chief Executive Officers and or those implicated in corrupt tendencies should be relieved off their duties.

## V. CONCLUSION

The study concluded that, the crisis in management of local authorities' manifest into service delivery. In most cases the outcome of poor management in these public institutions is poor service delivery and malfunctioning system. Therefore, the study disagrees with the hypothesis that, the crisis in management of local authorities does not manifest into poor service delivery

## REFERENCES

1. Africa Community Publishing and Development Trust (ACPDT). (2002). Local Governance and Participation. ACPDT and ACDT: Harare.
2. Chatiza, K. (2008). „Opportunities and Challenges in Institutionalizing Participatory Development: The Case of Rural Zimbabwe“, Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Swansea University: UK.
3. Chatiza, K. (2010). „Can Local Government Steer Socio-Economic Transformation in Zimbabwe? Analysing Historical Trends and Gazing into the Future“, Community Law Center: University of the Western Cape. South Africa.
4. De Valk, P and Wekwete, K.H. (1990). „Challenges for Local Government in Zimbabwe“, in Decentralising for Participatory Planning: Comparing the Experiences of Zimbabwe and Other Anglophone Countries in East and Southern Africa. Aldershot, UK: Gower Publishing Company.
5. Government of Southern Rhodesia. (1953). „Letter to the Director of Native Administration for the Salisbury Municipality“. National Affairs Discussion Group, April 29, Salisbury.
6. Government of Zimbabwe (2013). Constitution of Zimbabwe Amendment (No.20) Act 2013, Government Printer, Harare.
7. Hlatshwayo, B. (1998). Local Government in Zimbabwe, in J. Stewart (ed.) Grounding Good Governance and Democracy in Communities: An Exploration of Some Zimbabwean Experiences. Vienna: Austrian North-South Institute, and Graz: Institute of International Law and International Relations, University of Graz: Austria.
8. Jordan, J.D. (1984). Local Government in Zimbabwe: An Overview. Mambo Press: Harare.
9. Machingauta, N. (2010). Supervision of Local Government in J. de Visser; Steytler, N, and N. Machingauta (eds.). Local Government Reform in Zimbabwe. Community Law Centre: University of the Western Cape.
10. MapuvaJephias, *The Controversies of Devolution in Zimbabwe*, International Journal of Political Science and Development, Vol. 3(5), pp. 183-192, May 2015
11. Weinrich, A. H. K. (1971). Chiefs and Councils in Rhodesia: Transition from Patriarchal to Bureaucratic Power. University of South Carolina Press: Columbia.
12. Wekwete, K. (2006). Urban Local Government Finance in Zimbabwe: The Case of Harare City Council, Public Administration and Development, 12 (1): 97-110.
13. Zimbabwe Institute (2005). Thirteen Principles to Guide the Decentralisation Process in Zimbabwe. Local Government Policy Review. Harare: Zimbabwe Institute.
14. Constitution of Zimbabwe Amendment (No. 20) Act of 2013 Section 264.
15. Bland G. 2011. Considering local democratic transition in Latin America. Journal of Latin American Politics 3(1): 65–98.
16. Bratton M, Masunungure E. 2011. The Anatomy of Political Predation: Leaders, Elites, and Coalitions in Zimbabwe, 1980–2010. Development
17. Leadership Program: Canberra. Available at: [www.dlprog.org](http://www.dlprog.org).
18. Brinkerhoff DW. 2005. Rebuilding governance in failed state and post-conflict societies: core concepts and cross-cutting themes. Public
19. Administration and Development 25(1): 3–14.
20. Chikumbu HR, Mika J, Manikai GI. 2006. Municipal service delivery improvement: the case of sewage disposal by Kadoma City Council.
21. In Enhancing Local Government Capacity for Effective Service Delivery and Poverty Reduction in Africa: Challenges and Opportunities,

22. Mumvuma T, Kombe JW, Ndubiwa M (eds). *Municipal Development Partnership-Eastern and Southern Africa*: Harare; 83–115.
23. Jackson RH, Rosberg CG. 1984. Personal rule: theory and practice in Africa. *Comparative Politics* 16(4): 421–442.
24. Kamete AY. 2006. The return of the jettisoned: ZANU-PF's crack at 're-urbanising' in Harare. *Journal of Southern African Studies* 32(2): 255–271.
25. Local Government Laws Amendment Bill. 2007, H.B. 15. kubatana.net Web site, [http://www.kubatana.net/docs/legisl/loc\\_gov\\_laws\\_and\\_bill\\_071221.doc](http://www.kubatana.net/docs/legisl/loc_gov_laws_and_bill_071221.doc) [accessed May 26, 2010].
26. Olowu D. 2003. Local institutional and political structures and processes: recent experience in Africa. *Public Administration and Development* 23: 41–52.
27. Ribot JC. 2003. Democratic decentralisation of natural resources: institutional choice and discretionary power transfers in sub-Saharan Africa. *Public Administration and Development* 23: 53–65.
28. Richards, T, Majiwa, M, Sauramba, J. 2009a. *Rapid Appraisal of Water Supply and Sanitation Services in Masvingo City Council: Final Report*.
29. GTZ Water and Sanitation, Zimbabwe: Harare, Zimbabwe (June 2009a).
30. Richards T, Majiwa M, Sauramba J. June 2009b. *Rapid Appraisal of Water Supply and Sanitation Services in Zvishavane Town Council: Final Report*. GTZ Water and Sanitation: Harare, Zimbabwe.
31. Sachikonye LS, Chawatama S, Mangongera C, Musekiwa N, Ndoro C. 2007. *Consolidating democratic governance in Southern Africa*: Zimbabwe. EISA Research Report No. 30. EISA: Johannesburg.
32. Schelder A (ed.). 2006. *Electoral Authoritarianism: The Dynamics of Unfree Competition*. Lynne Rienner Publishers: Boulder.
33. Schou A. 2000. Democratic local government and responsiveness: lessons from Zimbabwe and Tanzania. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 43: 1121–1146.
34. Shall A. 2007. *Sub-Saharan Africa's Experience with Participatory Budgeting*. In *Participatory Budgeting*, Shah A (ed.). World Bank: Washington, DC.
35. Smoke P. 2003. Decentralisation in Africa: goals, dimensions, myths and challenges. *Public Administration and Development* 23: 7–16.
36. Wekwete K. 1992. Urban local government finance in Zimbabwe: the case of Harare City Council. *Public Administration and Development* 12: 97–110.
37. Zvidzai S. 2009. Deputy Minister of Local Government speech on the state of service delivery in Zimbabwe to a retreat of the Democratic Councils Forum. Harare, Zimbabwe (June 4).