



The Role of Leadership Collaboration in City Management: Evidence from Kampala and Kigali Cities

Frank W. Asiimwe

Uganda Technology and Management University, Uganda
Email: asfrawinter@yahoo.com

IJOTM
ISSN 2518-8623

Volume 1, Issue 1
pp. 1- 10, June 2016
email: ijotm@utam.ac.ug
<http://ijotm.utamu.ac.ug>

Abstract

The heavy responsibilities placed on cities in Africa and the need to conform to international performance standards, have motivated them to adopt city management structures that ensure efficient service delivery. This paper explores how leadership collaboration has influenced the management of Kampala and Kigali, East African cities that use similar city management structures. The results provide important lessons on the contribution of leadership collaboration to effective city management. The findings from a combined sample of 144 key political and administrative stakeholders from Kampala and Kigali cities revealed that collaboration between the city council and city management in Kigali had led to shared values, goals and team work. This enhanced the quality of city management which resulted into efficient and effective utilisation of resources. Effective collaboration among city leaders enabled City management in Kigali to be more solid and put service delivery and the needs of stakeholders ahead of every other consideration. In Kampala, there was lack of effective communication, coordination, coalition and willingness to share power between city administrators and the city council, due to unclear lines of responsibility, partisan politics and unnecessary central government interference. This resulted into tension amongst workers and confusion between the leaders relating to powers and roles. This scenario has negatively affected the achievement of the city's core service goals. Lack of collaboration among city management agencies can hinder sustainable development of cities by preventing them from implementing solutions that can bring about improved quality of life and sustainable development among city stakeholders. Leadership collaboration is an indispensable ingredient in the process of building effective city management. It creates shared leadership and teamwork which result into organisational effectiveness. Hence, cities need leadership collaboration structures that create city managements united by the motivation to develop the city and improve service delivery.

Keywords: Leadership Collaboration, Power Sharing, Coalition, Coordination, Effective City Management

Introduction

Poor city management has been one of the major stumbling blocks to efficient service delivery in African cities (Ndayisaba, 2013). Continuing the legacy of their former colonial masters, most cities in Africa have been under total management of the central government. Governments made policies, fully funded city operations and recruited bureaucrats to manage departments that delivered services to the city (Goodfellow, 2011). This centralised form of city management subsequently proved to be costly in supervision and funding, which resulted into inefficiencies in services delivery.

Efficient city management is vital to effective service delivery by the city. It enables the best possible use of resources for the good of stakeholders. Harpham and Boateng (1997) contrast city management with governance when they define city management as the implementation of a set of objectives pursued by a city

on the basis of established governance structures. Hence, city managers are the implementers of policy and service delivery targets set by the city governors (Goodfellow, 2011). City management ensures that there is efficiency in performance and quality of operations. City management is more action-oriented and relates to the function of the city management organs (Blanco, 2013). Therefore, the quality of city management is highly dependent on collaboration between the city's governing agencies.

In order to improve services delivery and to conform to international city performance standards more fully, most cities in Africa have adopted devolved forms of city management (Kanyehamba, 2012). Devolved city management is one based on separation of powers and control (Elander, 2002). In this form of city management, city management is decentralised and given to a management agency that is supervised by city governing agency (City council). Partnerships are also made with city division governments and private agencies in managing the city (Karyeija & Kyohairwe, 2014). Local level agencies and partners play an active role in the management processes of their areas. Stakeholders play a significant in decision making and accountability for outcomes to local areas. Blair (2000) affirms that effective city management in devolved structures is dependent on the existence of management infrastructures that facilitate the operation of devolved management; effective coalition and co-ordination of activities at different spatial levels within this infrastructure and the willingness of governing agencies to grant freedom and flexibility with effective performance oversight and accountability measures.

With the adoption of decentralisation, most cities in East African countries became autonomous or local government units. The central government became a mere stakeholder that needed to take into account the interests of other stakeholders. The rules on which cities were governed were now made by the city council and implemented by city management (Blanco, 2013). The central government's influence in city management was through a government ministry that made policies, to ensure commitment from the governing agencies to service delivery in cities (North et al., 2007).

Background and Context

The change in the powers and control of city governance due to decentralisation and the practices advocated by New Public Management led to the adoption of management structures in which city management was done by an agency supervised by the city council in East African countries. This move resulted from a growing realisation that cities need management that is separate from leadership to run city affairs effectively and in the right direction (Adams, 2002). It was realised that cities would achieve their service delivery goals if they were run by professional managers who are supervised by the city council. This form of city management is sometimes referred to as corporate management (Monks & Minow, 2004). Hence, corporate management has been solidified in city management in East Africa, because it is viewed as a strategy for promoting performance of cities by preventing poor management from taking root. Monks and Minow (2004) add that the worldwide concern for transparency and accountability in all types of human endeavour has also increased the popularity of corporate management in city management in East Africa. Currently, corporate management is being seen as a management structure to enable cities in East Africa to achieve their objectives and meet stakeholder expectations (Clarke, 2007).

The Kampala City Development Plan (2015) and Kigali City Development Plan (2013) indicate that the two cities have adopted corporate management structures, Kigali in 2007 and Kampala in 2010. Kampala and Kigali use a council-manager type of government (Goodfellow, 2011). In this type of government, the elected governing body, called the city council, forms the political section of the government and oversees the general administration of the city, makes policy and sets budgets (DeSantis and Tari, 2002). The council appoints a professional city manager to carry out day-to-day administrative operations. The city manager serves as the Chief Executive Officer and his/ her staff constitutes the administrative (management) section of the city government. Authority is vested in the legislative council that sometimes delegates authority to the city manager, who is accountable to the council (Kanyehamba, 2012).

The administrative section is supposed to provide the best and safest services at the most efficient cost, with clear accountability to the city council (Rwandan Association of Local Governments, 2010). Through performance measurements by the city council, the city administrators deliver service delivery goals set by the city council, thus enabling the council to be more accountable to stakeholders (Kampala Capital city Authority [KCCA] Act,

2010).

The Problem

Despite using related city management structures, Kigali seems to be benefitting more from her city management than Kampala. The KCCA Annual Report (2013) reports significant inefficiency in city management, manifested by poor services delivery and accountability, payments for undelivered services, mismanagement of revenue collection, procurement fraught with inefficiencies as well as poor contract management (KCCA Annual Report, 2013). Kashaka (2014) observes that Kampala city mismanagement has resulted into poor living conditions. In most parts of the city, housing space is limited, resulting in high rents and crowded conditions. Currently, the majority of city dwellers live in poor health and sanitary conditions (Kashaka, 2014). The city has had poor sanitation related disease epidemics such as Typhoid and cholera (Karyeija & Kyohairwe, 2014). Other life amenities such as water, electricity and the internet are unreliable and expensive (Kanyamanza, 2014).

On the other hand, Kigali city management has been able to resolve city challenges (Kigali City Development Plan, 2013). City management is effectively directing city development, and has improved housing as well as the provision of utility services. Goodfellow (2011) indicates that the road network, health facilities, power and water supply in Kigali are among the best in East Africa. The International Growth Centre (2014) shows, that Kigali is currently the fourth best city in Africa. Hence the key questions for this study were:

- What differences may exist in collaboration among city leaders that have led to differences in the management results of Kampala and Kigali?
- What could be the root cause of these differences?
- What aspects of collaboration strongly enhance city management?

Purpose and Objectives

This paper examined the role of leadership collaboration in city management. Specifically, the paper explored how communication among leaders, willingness to share power, coordination and coalition has caused differences in the management and subsequently in the performance of Kampala and Kigali. The paper finally drew important lessons on the role of collaboration in the management of cities. The paper bridged the knowledge gap due to lack of recent empirical studies on the issues and provided important information that could guide policy decision-making.

Literature

City management structures in decentralised environments are based on the principal-agent theory. According to Jensen and Meckling (1976), cities have owners (called principals) and then managers (called agents). This theory advocates having management structures that separate governance of cities from management. The theory urges that cities should have a management agency run by professional managers to manage the city on behalf of stakeholders (Kiel & Nicholson, 2003). The agency theory also advocates for the setting up of a collaborative relationship between city governing and management agencies in form of management rules and incentives to align the behaviour of managers to the desires of stakeholders (Hawley & Williams, 1996). The management rules and incentives motivate city managers to perform to the expectations of the principals (city council).

Following the principal-agent theory, Kampala and Kigali cities adopted a council-manager government, where an elected governing body (city council) oversees the general administration of the city, makes policy and sets budgets (DeSantis & Tari, 2002). The cities also have a professional city manager to carry out day-to-day administrative operations. The city manager performs his/her roles through specified Directorates of: Administration and Human Resources, Engineering and Technical Services, Treasury Services, Public Health and environment, education and social services, Legal affairs, Revenue collection, Gender, Community services and production, Internal audit and Physical planning (KCCA Act, 2010, Law n°10/2006, 2006). These directorates are responsible for city planning and policy implementation. The city manager also serves as the Chief Executive Officer. All authority is vested in the legislative council that sometimes delegates it to the city manager. This form of city management requires collaboration for it to be effective.

Leadership collaboration is a growing topic within city management (Morse, 2010). Salamon (2002, p.2) states that 'leadership collaboration exists in public institutions, when crucial elements of public authority are shared with and among categories of governmental actors and non-governmental actors'. According to Morse (2010 p. 69), 'public governance requires complex interconnections in which take-charge leaders are no longer effective'. Morse (2010) defines leadership collaboration as networked relationships between two or more governmental administrative agencies to form mutual comprehension of a greater or singular goal of collaborative action. In the case of Kampala and Kigali, governmental administrative agencies mean the city council and city management. Leadership collaboration is exhibited by effective communication among leaders of governmental administrative agencies, willingness to share power, coalition (alliance) and coordination (harmonisation) of city operations (Horwath & Morrison, 2007).

Coalition allows everyone in the city management agencies to take part in decision-making and problem-solving. The sense of ownership builds commitment to the common purpose and promotes more involvement in implementation (Horwath & Morrison, 2007). Coordination in collaborative leadership involves harmony among leadership agencies of the city (Cameron, 2005). Coordination involves more formalised joint working among leadership agencies. This includes unity of purpose and action among the city council, city management and city divisions or districts. In coordination, the mayor is normally given a favoured position, which enables him or her to bring together elected officials, city managers and community leaders (Chester, 2011). Therefore, leadership collaboration exists in a public institution when there is cooperation among leaders to achieve common goals and working across boundaries in multi-sector relationships.

Leadership collaboration is being promoted as a significant contributor to effective city management (Morse, 2010). It has been observed that relationships between the political and administrative agency of the city improve working across boundaries in multi-sector relationships, which results in the achievement of common goals (Horwath & Morrison, 2007). Collaboration also promotes effective decision-making and allows power-sharing among city governing agencies. According to Chester (2011), collaboration is exhibited by open communication, willingness to share power, coalition and coordination among city governing agencies.

Morrison (2007) argues that open communication and information-sharing is the cornerstone of leadership collaboration. Therefore, successful collaboration between agencies should be based on effective communication, where individuals from different city governance departments talk together. This promotes accurate understanding of city operations and employee roles (Agranoff & McGuire, 2003; Pierre, 2005). Institutional performance results from getting everyone to possess good knowledge of institutional performance goals. This can be achieved through regular departmental and manager- employee meetings. This leads to the development and implementation of more creative approaches to problem-solving. Open information-sharing, resulting from free communication, also nurtures collaborative problem-solving and decision-making (Morse, 2010).

When collaborative problem-solving exists, it is the group that considers the problem, decides what to do, and counts on the leader to help them focus their effort. In this case leaders do not just start with their goals in mind and steer the group in that direction. Chester (2011) asserts that collaborative leadership means that the end result is worked out among all the participants. Effective communication promoted by city leaders promotes employees' access to more and better information and ideas. Morse (2010) adds that when all those involved in an issue are party to addressing it, they bring with them a wealth of information as well as a variety of perspectives. As a result, the solutions they arrive at are likely to be better than those developed in a vacuum, or by only a small number of people.

Free power-sharing is another aspect of collaborative leadership that can significantly influence city management. Studies that were conducted in Soweto, South Africa (Blair, 2000) indicated that collaboration among city leaders led to the recognition that power is greatest in a collective team. Hence, city leaders who encourage equal participation across all levels of employees promote employee commitment and autonomy. This guaranteed autonomy and effective employee participation in leadership results in higher work performance (Agranoff & McGuire, 2003). As a result, effective solutions to city problems are developed from the best ideas deriving from a team approach to problem-solving. This subsequently leads to effective and efficient service delivery by cities.

Studies reveal that coalition is crucial to the quality of service delivery by cities. Salamon (2002), states that coalition involves some agencies sacrificing some autonomy and integrating to create a new joint identity. A study by Pierre (2005) reveals that coalition has turned Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, into one of the best cities to live in East Africa. He goes on to show that partnerships among various city agencies reduce role conflicts and promote cordial relationships. Trust develops and teams to accomplish city operations are formed. This increases the efficiency of the city. The teams are given more responsibility for their work. This enables issues that arise to be dealt with swiftly. Co-creation of strategies and joint problem-solving subsequently result in better city performance.

Therefore, experts in city management indicate that coalition among leadership groups developed by good collaboration enables city management to root out causes of conflict as they arise and implement solutions promptly to keep work moving forward. This results in open-process operations, which encourages discussion and dialogue. This eventually promotes efficiency and effectiveness among employees and subsequently enables cities to achieve core service objectives (Salamon, 2002).

Morrison (2007) affirms that coalition also ensures that everyone in the management structures is part of the decision-making and problem-solving process. This makes what people are doing theirs, rather than something imposed on them by someone else. The sense of ownership of the institution developed among all categories of employees builds commitment to the common purpose and promotes more involvement in implementation. Employees are willing to take responsibility for implementing the group's action plan, because they were part of developing it. This creates better opportunity for substantive results (Horwath & Morrison, 2007).

Coordination in collaborative leadership involves harmony among governing agencies of the city (Cameron, 2005). Coordination involves more formalised joint working among leadership agencies. According to Morse (2010), coordination includes unity of purpose and action among the city council, city management and city divisions or districts. Blair (2000) states that effective coordination should be coordination that is inclusive. Effective coordination includes stakeholders in city governance. The inclusion of all stakeholders – anyone with an interest or involvement in an issue or organisation – in problem-solving and decision-making leads to people taking more responsibility and caring more about what they do (Morrison, 2007). It leads to better functioning and planning in every sphere. Better planning yields quality service delivery.

When there is good coordination among city governing agencies, the mayor has a favoured position, which enables him to tap into various communication networks among elected officials, governmental staff and community leaders (Salamon, 2002). The mayor is able to transmit messages on service delivery issues better than anyone else in the government because of the breadth of knowledge and range of contacts he is likely to have. In so doing, the mayor has a unique potential to expand the level of understanding and improve coordination among participants in the governmental process (Salamon, 2002). In addition, the existence of leadership collaboration gives the mayor the opportunity to provide guidance in the initiation and execution of policy, which may be done through the coordinative dimension.

Cameron (2005) points out significant limitations in the collaborative effort among leaders of African cities. Most of the time, the intended outcomes of the actual collaboration have either underperformed or have not been realised (Morrison, 1996). In order for collaboration to positively influence city performance, it has to be done without partisan intentions. Horwath and Morrison (2007) however, note that collaborations developed out of political mandates tend to fail. Collaborations produced from legislated partnerships must overcome a series of hurdles to successfully function and achieve the purpose of the organisational relationship. This is due to the involuntary nature of the motivation to work collectively (Luke, 1998).

Salamon (2002) also argues that for leadership collaboration to be effective, leaders have to adopt new public management. New public management emphasises the centrality of public problem-solving and collaborative approaches among public administration agencies instead of authority. Agranoff and McGuire (2003) add that new public management (a trend in public administration) is centred upon collaboration, with increased focus on the networks and partnerships through which collaborative efforts arise. City governing agencies have to be ready to make a paradigm shift from strictly hierarchical leadership to greater reliance on networking and collaboration across multiple agencies (Morse, 2007).

Methodology

Respondents in this study were city managers at centre and division levels and city council members. The sample included top city managers, senior personnel from among city management staff and some representatives on the city council. A total of 60 city management staff were randomly selected from three divisions of Kampala and 56 from the three districts of Kigali. With regard to top city managers, three were purposively selected from Kampala and two from Kigali. As far as council members are concerned, 12 were purposively selected from Kampala and 11 from Kigali. This brought the grand total of respondents to 144. A structured questionnaire was used to collect data from city management staff while a structured interview guide was used to collect data from top city managers and council members. A variety of analyses were conducted to explore the questions postulated above. First, frequency analysis was conducted to explore differences in the implementation of collaboration across the two cities. Then, interviews were carried out to ascertain the origin of any perceived differences in collaboration and the effect of the differences on city management.

Results and Discussion

Descriptive findings

Using a frequency table, the implementation of collaboration between Kampala and Kigali was explored. Respondents' indicated the extent to which they strongly disagreed to strongly agree to each of the six statements that measured leadership collaboration. The mean response was calculated and the rating based on the mean response value indicated the level of implementation of a particular aspect of collaboration. The findings are presented in the table below.

Table 1: Differences in the implementation of collaboration (N=116)

Aspect	Kampala(n=60)			Kigali (N=56)		
	Mean response	Sd	Rating	Mean response	Sd	Rating
Leaders in our city have maintained effective communication to promote services delivery	2.04	1.55	D	4.3	1.1	A
There is free power-sharing among leaders in our city to promote efficient service delivery	1.1	.82	SD	1.98	2.1	D
There is joint working on a case-by-case basis on all city management issues	1.93	1.01	SD	4.2	1.5	A
Formalised joint working among various categories of leaders in our city exists	2.92	1.3	UD	4.3	.78	A
City agencies even sacrifice some autonomy in order to have a well managed city	2.82	1.1	UD	1.89	1.3	D

Source: Primary data

Key: SD = strongly disagree, D=Disagree, NS = Not sure, A = Agree, SA = strongly agree

The findings in the table above show that Kampala still had the problem of reluctance of governing agencies of the city to permit the sharing of power and responsibility for the sake of promoting effective management. With regard to leaders of the city maintaining effective communication, the respondents in Kampala disagreed (mean response = 2.02, SD = 1.55) while those in Kigali agreed (mean response = 4.3, SD= 1.1). As far as free power-sharing among leaders to promote service delivery was concerned, the respondents in Kampala strongly disagreed (mean response = 1.1, SD = .82) while those in Kigali agreed (mean response = 1.98, SD = 2.1).

In relation to there being joint working on a case-by-case basis on all city management issues, the respondents in Kampala strongly agreed (mean response = 1.93, SD = 1.01) and those in Kigali agreed (mean response = 4.2, SD = 1.5). As far as the existence of formalised joint working among various categories of leaders in city was concerned, the respondents in Kampala were undecided (mean response = 2.92, SD = 1.3) while those in Kigali agreed (mean response = 4.3, SD = .78). With regard to city agencies sacrificing some autonomy

in order to have a well managed city, the respondents in Kampala were undecided (mean response = 2.82, SD = 1.1) while those in Kigali disagreed (mean response = 1.89, SD = 1.3). As far as city agencies having been merged to create new joint working operations in the city was concerned, the respondents in Kampala disagreed (mean response = 1.98, SD = .84) while those in Kigali agreed (mean response = 4.4, SD = 1.4). The findings above show that Kigali had stronger collaboration among leaders than Kampala. In Kigali, there was more effective communication among leaders, joint working and willingness to share power to create better working operations compared to Kampala.

Interview responses on leadership collaboration across the two cities

The views of city managers and council members were explored on the level, challenges being faced and effects of leadership collaboration on city management in the two cities. The findings revealed lack of effective communication, willingness to share power, trust and cooperation among leaders of Kampala city compared to Kigali. The council member from Nakawa division in Kampala said that role conflicts between the lord mayor and the Executive Director resulted in 'non-cordial relations'. This led to the development of mistrust among these two leaders yet they headed the two important organs of the city authority. The deputy mayor of Rubaga division in Kampala added that 'mistrust among city leaders reduced the speed at which [...] city problems were addressed'. There was less team work among leaders and employees and the two governing agencies pursued their own agendas.

Slow implementation of development plans had definitely kept the work of the city from moving forward. Subsequently, the deputy lord mayor added that 'open process operations which encourage discussion and dialogue were eliminated when the city council suspended the lord mayor'. Given the fact that the lord mayor is responsible for ensuring the performance of employees from the administrative wing of the city, his absence bred inefficiency among employees. This has subsequently slowed down the achievement of the city's core service objectives.

The mayor of Kawempe division intimated that there had been 'poor information sharing among leaders' of KCCA. The city divisions were almost operating on their own with limited information on the overall city development objectives. This had reduced collaborative problem-solving and decision-making. A councilor from Makindye division, stated that the 'Executive director(ED) [set] her own service goals and steer[ed] KCCA in that direction'. This implies that generally the residents and city politicians were left out in the process of working out solutions to city problems.

The key informants further revealed that in Kampala city, the willingness of the leaders of the city governing agencies to work together in order to solve common problems was diminished. There are divisions along partisan lines in the council. Council members from the ruling party ran the affairs of the authority in a parallel manner. The Lord mayor and ED in Kampala had persistent conflicts, each of them claiming equal and overlapping power over control of the capital city. This indeed had paralysed the authority's activities, with the political wing working towards sabotaging the bureaucratic efforts.

In contrast to Kampala, Kigali had good indicators of collaboration among city leaders. The Executive secretary (ES) of Kigali stated that 'city leaders recognise[d] that power is greatest in a collective team'. He remarked that there was 'equal participation in problem-solving and decision-making by residents, politicians, employees and city managers'. The Executive Secretary of Gasabo district added that good collaboration among leaders in Kigali had 'resulted in effective solutions to city problems'. A council member from Kichukiro district added that 'collaboration had enabled city management to come up with practical avenues to effective service delivery'. These comments from key informants indicate that there was strong commitment among leaders and employees of the political and administrative wings of Kigali city to share power and to work together to achieve the city's core service goals. The ES, Nyarugenge district intimated that effective coalition had enabled employees from the administrative wing to feel that their service to the city was 'whole souled and what they [were] doing [was] theirs, rather than something imposed on them by someone else'. The key informants also revealed that Kigali city employees had a sense of ownership of the institution, which had boosted commitment to the common purpose. The head of corporate services of Kigali stated that '[e]mployees [were] willing to take responsibility for implementing the group's action plan, because they were part of developing it'. This

had given the city better opportunity to achieve substantive results. These comments from key informants thus confirmed that in Kigali power and legitimacy were distributed among different actors in the city.

Conclusion

Significant differences existed in leadership collaboration and its effect on the quality of city management in Kampala and Kigali. There was better collaboration between the city council and city management in Kigali than in Kampala. This made Kigali city management more effective. Kigali had more effective communication among leaders; and there was more and better joint working between the political and administrative sections of the city. It was also evident that each of the sections was willing to sacrifice its authority at the service of better service delivery. Hence Kigali strove to achieve the true intentions of leadership collaboration, which is interaction, interconnection and partnership among governing agencies, to conduct business more effectively.

However, in Kampala, the ability and willingness of city leaders to work together in order to solve common problems were much diminished. Leaders in Kampala did not allow coherence and coordination. Hodson et al (2012) argue that an effective city management framework should allow an institution to pursue its goals, objectives and policies in a coherent and coordinated manner. However, this was not possible in Kampala because the political and administrative heads of city government ran the affairs of the authority in a parallel manner, with each of them claiming equal and overlapping power over the control of the capital city. Hence there was very minimal willingness to share power, coalition and coordination among the political and administrative sections of city government. This caused differences in the accomplishments of the two city managements.

The accomplishments of city management in Kampala city was poorer than that of Kigali partly because mistrust among city leaders reduced the speed at which city problems were addressed. The political wing of Kampala city was not functional and so was unable to direct the operations of the city bureaucrats. Horwath and Morrison (2007), state that weaknesses in the controlling section of city governance slow down the implementation of development plans by the city. Such weaknesses kept the work of the city from moving forward in Kampala. According to Morse (2010), lack of open-process operations that encourage discussion and dialogue that was evident in Kampala made it difficult for employees in the administrative wing of the city to be more efficient. There was limited accountability by employees and this bred inefficiency among employees, which resulted in low achievement of the city's core service objectives. Hence, poor collaboration among city leaders in Kampala had paralysed the city's activities, with the political wing working towards sabotaging bureaucratic efforts.

The council in Kigali had complete control over city management. This was due to the fact that the Executive Secretary was hired by and fully reported to the council. Hence the council was able to effectively supervise the operations of the Executive Secretary. It is evident that city management in Kigali had adopted the true spirit of corporate management. The culture of collaboration was stronger in Kigali than in Kampala. Kigali city management cherished and strove to have considerable power over policy implementation and administration of services. Hence it raised and effectively spent revenues from local taxes and fees, within some basic 'ground rules' prescribed by the state. This empowerment of local governments was generally one of the strengths of Kigali.

In contrast, KCCA was still used to 'centralisation' and hence the behaviour and mindset of city leaders were in conflict with the 'collaboration culture required by the management structures that the city had adopted. Though the central government was merely a stakeholder, the council allowed the central government's unrelenting interference in council operations. The interference by the central government in the council's activities was motivated by both political interests and self-interest instead of genuine attempts to improve service delivery and the lives of the urban poor. The council did not have the opportunity to perform its strategic management function of ensuring that city managers run the affairs of the city well. Practically, the Executive Director had more power and control than the council. Hence, as indicated by Monks and Minow (2004), this allowed poor management to take root, resulting from the stifling of transparency and accountability among city management staff. In Kampala, the two leaders of the capital city tended to run the affairs of the authority in a parallel manner, with each of them claiming equal and overlapping power over the control of the capital city. In line with Clarke and dela Rama (2008), in Kampala, control systems that enhance effective city management were not allowed to work owing to central government interference and partisan politics. The city management

had no intention and commitment to achieve the vision and mission of the city. The inclination to prioritise service delivery was also absent among city management.

Policy Implications

The study has revealed that Lack of collaboration among city management agencies can hinder sustainable development of cities by preventing them from implementing solutions that can bring about improved quality of life and sustainable development among city stakeholders. City management challenges created by poor collaboration negatively impact on service delivery. Therefore, leadership collaboration is a critical component of effective city management. City leaders are thus expected to enact collaborative leadership in their governance. A significant challenge to this is that the need for collaboration has not been clearly embedded into the governance frameworks of Kampala and Kigali cities.

Policies on city governance are quite silent on how governing agencies are supposed to work together to achieve service delivery targets. While Kigali city strove to promote collaboration among city leaders for the sake of meeting stakeholder needs, Kampala was not able to do so owing to its predominantly partisan politics. The use of collaboration in city governments is relatively new and, understandably, has left the practice of collaboration with gaps to be filled in by both those who are forced into it and those who actively seek out collaborative experiences. Kigali has been able to mitigate this challenge, but Kampala still has a long way to go. Partisan politics, unnecessary central government interference and lack of a collaboration culture can lower the effectiveness of city management and subsequently exacerbate the quality of service delivery. Hence, having political and administrative cultures that favour valuable leadership collaboration is important in the effectiveness of city management.

Limitations

The cross-sectional nature of the study could have limited the study from collecting all information that would exhaustively explain research questions. A longitudinal study could have been more appropriate since it collects data over a longer time period. However, the findings in this study make a good case for more elaborate investigations in the future. The study did not adequately consider differences in the political, economic, technological and cultural environments yet they could have had an effect on the meaning and in interpretation of the findings. Hence, there is a need to consider these conditions in future studies.

References

- Agranoff, R., & McGuire, M. (2003). *Collaborative public management: new strategies for Local Governments*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Blair, H. (2000). Participation and accountability at the periphery: democratic local management in six countries. *World Development*, 28, (1), 21–39.
- Blanko, I. (2013) Analysing Urban Governance Networks: Bringing Regime Theory Back in. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 31, 276 – 291. doi: 10.1068/c11174
- City of Kigali (2006). *Determining the structure, organization and the functioning of the city of Kigali*. Retrieved from <http://lip.alfa-xp.com/lip/AmategekoDB.aspx?Mode=r&pid=8406&iid=572>
- City of Kigali (2013). *The City of Kigali Development Plan (CKPD) 2012/13-2017/18 draft report*. Retrieved from www.kigalicity.gov.rw/IMG/.../Kigali_City_Development_Plan-2013-2018-Draft.pdf
- Clarke, T. & Rama, M. D. (eds.) (2008). *Fundamentals of corporate (Vols. I - IV)*. London and Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Colley, J., Stettinius, W., Dolye, J., & Logan G. (2003). *What is corporate governance?* New York: McGraw-Hill
- DiGaetano, A., & Strom, E. (2003). Comparative urban governance an integrated approach. *Urban affairs review*, 38(3), 356-395.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Agency theory: An assessment and review. *Academy of management review*, 14(1), 57-74
- Elander, I. (2002). Partnerships and urban governance. *International social science journal*, 54(172), 191-204.
- George, B. (1984). The Emergence of the Strong-Mayor, Council-Manager City: A Response to the Times. *Urban Resources*, 2, A1-A2.
- Harpham, T., & Boateng, K. A. (1997). Urban governance in relation to the operation of urban services in developing countries. *Habitat International*, 21(1), 65-77.
- Hodson, M., Marvin, S., Robinson, B., & Swilling, M. (2012). Reshaping urban infrastructure. *Journal of industrial ecology*, 16(6), 789-800.
- Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of financial economics*, 3(4), 305-360.
- Kampala Capital City Act 2010 (Uganda). Accessed from <http://www.ulii.org/ug/legislation/act/2015/1-8>
- Kampala City Council Authority Case, Uganda. *Journal of African & Asian Local Government Studies*, 1(4).
- Karyeija, G. K., & Kyohairwe, S. B. (2012). Organizational Puzzles of Agencification: A Kampala City Council Authority Case, Uganda. *Journal of African & Asian Local Government Studies*, 1(4).
- Kashaka, U. (2014, March 12th). *Kampala Capital City has been overstrained*. The New Vision, p.5
- KCCA (2013). *Annual report and financial statements FY 2011/12*. Retrieved from www.kcca.go.ug/uploads/Annual_Report_Final_Draft_2011-2012.pdf
- KCCA (2015). *KCCA strategic plan 2015/206 – 2018/2019*. Retrieved for www.kcca.go.ug/uploads/KCCA_STRATEGI_PLAN_2015-2016.pdf
- Mulili, B. M., & Wong, P. (2011). Corporate governance practices in developing countries: The case for Kenya. *International journal of business administration*, 2(1), 14.
- Newland, C. A. (1985). Council-manager governance: positive alternative to separation of powers. *Public Management*, 67(8).
- North, D., Syrett, S., & Etherington, D. (2007). Devolution and regional governance. Tackling the economic needs of deprived areas. Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York. pp119.
- Okpara, J. O. (2011). Corporate governance in a developing economy: barriers, issues, and implications for firms. *Corporate Governance: The international journal of business in society*, 11(2), 184-199.
- Pierre, J. (2005). Comparative Urban Governance Uncovering Complex Causalities. *Urban affairs review*, 40(4), 446-462.
- Salamon, L. M., & Elliott, O. V. (2002). *The tools of government: A guide to the new governance*. Oxford University Press.
- Scott, W. R. (1995). *Institutions and organizations. Foundations for organizational science*. London: A Sage Publication Series.
- Sparrow, G. (1984). The emerging chief executive: the San Diego experience. *Urban Resources*, 2, 3-8.
- Uganda Radio Network (2012 Jul 30th). *Councilors court justice Kanyeihamba's Opinion on KCCA Act*. Retrieved from <http://ugandaradionetwork.com/story/councilors-court-justice-kanyeihambas-opinion-on-kcca-act>