



# **ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**

**AN ASSESSMENT OF THE ROLES OF GRIEVANCE  
HEARING OFFICE ON THE PROMOTIONS OF GOOD  
GOVERNANCE: THE CASE OF *GUNA BEGEMIDIRWOREDA***

**BY**

***DESSALEGN TALEMA GUADE***

**ADVISOR**

***TEFERI MEKONNEN (PHD)***

**AUGUST, 2020**

**ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA**

# **ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSIT**

**Collage of Educational and Behavioral Sciences**

**Department of Civics and Ethical Studies**

**An assessment of the roles of grievance hearing office on the promotion of good governance: the case of *Guna Begemidir Wereda***

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of Civics and Ethical Education, College of Education and Behavioral Studies, Addis Ababa University, in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Masters of Education in Civics and Ethical studies**

**By**

***Dessalegn Talema Guade***

**Advisor**

***Teferi Mekonnen (PhD)***

**July, 2020**

**Addis Ababa, Ethiopia**

## **DECLARATION**

I, Dessalegn Talema, declare that this study is my own original work. The contents of this thesis are the results of my own study and findings then they have not been submitted for any similar degree or for any other university or high learning institutions for degree award.

.....

Regards

Dessalegn Talema

## Letter of Approval

This is to certify that the thesis prepared by *DessalegnTalemaGuade* entitled “An assessment of the roles of grievance hearing office on the promotions of good governance in Guna Begemidir *wereda*” and submitted to the partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in civics and ethical studies compliance with the regulation of the University and meets the accepted standard with respect to originality and quality.

### APPROVED BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS

Advisor’s Name

Signature

date

Tefferi Mekonnen (PhD)

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Internal Examiner’s Name

Signature

date

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

External Examiner’s Name

Signature

Date

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

First and for most, I would like to devote a few lines in praising the almighty God for all what he has bestowed on me throughout the journey of my life because words are so weak to express my internal feeling. Then I would like to express my deepest and heartfelt gratitude to my advisor Teferi Mekonnen (PhD) for his insightful and constructive comments and unreserved guidance to complete this study. His comments were valuable not only for this study in particular, but also in my entire future career in general. Moreover, I appreciate the time that he devoted by searching out the relevant materials for the quality and fulfillment of this study. I am particularly wants to thank my lovely wife Amarech Eshetu and my child Tefesihi Dessalegn for their continuous encouragement and support in all my educational life. My wife and my child have been a constant source of energy by helping me in my studies all the way through. Similarly, I am indebted to my parents, for constantly motivating me to become the best I could be and always believing in me. Finally, it should be noted that this study was done with the help of many of my friends. So, I would like to oblige my thanks to Destalem Werku, Animaw Sintayehu, Tesfaye Sintayehu and his wife Gebeyanesh Achenef and Andargie Alamrew. They have always been helpful and encouraging my endeavor to complete my studies.

<b>Tables of content</b>	<b>pages</b>
Acknowledgements-----	i
Table of contents-----	ii
List of tables-----	vi
Abbreviations and acronyms-----	vii
Abstract-----	viii

## **CHAPTER ONE; INTRODUCTION**

1.1 Back Ground of the Study -----	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem-----	5
1.3 Basic Research Question-----	9
1.4 Objective s of the Study-----	9
1.4.1 General Objective s of the Study-----	9
1.4.2 Specific Objective s of the Study-----	9
1.5 Significance of the Study-----	9
1.6 Scope and Limitation of the Study-----	10
1.7 Organization of the Paper-----	11
1.8Operational Definitions of Terms-----	11

## **CHAPTER TWO;REVIEW OF RELATED LETRATURE**

2.1 Theoretical Frameworks-----	13
2.1.1 Definition of Grievance-----	13
2.1.2 Definition of Complains-----	14
2.1.3 Definitions of Governance and Good Governance-----	14
2.1.4 Dimension of Grievance-----	15

2.1.5 Causes of Grievance-----	16
2.1.6 Objectives of Grievance Hearing Bodies-----	17
2.1.7 Responsibility of Grievance Hearing Offices-----	18
2.1.8 Grievance Redresses Mechanism-----	19
2.1.9 Ethiopian Institutions of ombudsman (EIO) -----	20
2.2 Types of Governance -----	20
2.3 Legality of Grievance Hearing Offices-----	21
2.4 Theories of Grievance-----	22

### **CHAPTER THREE; RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

3.1 Background of the Studying Area-----	25
3.2 maps of Guna Begemidir <i>wereda</i> -----	26
3.3 research design -----	27
3.4 research approach-----	27
3.5 Sampling Technique and Sampling Size-----	27
3.6 methods of data collection-----	30
3.6.1 Primary Sources of Data -----	30
3.6.2 Secondary Sources of Data-----	30
3.7 pilot study of instruments-----	31
3.7.1 Validity of instruments-----	31
3.7.2 Reliability of instruments-----	31
3.8 Methods of data Analysis and Interpretation -----	32

3.9 Ethical considerations -----32

**CHAPTER FOUR; DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

4.1 Introduction-----34

4.2Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents-----34

4.2.1 Sexes of the Respondents -----34

Table, 1 -----34

4.2.2 Work Experiences of the Respondents -----35

Table, 2 -----35

4.3 The roles of grievance hearing office-----37

4.3.1. Do You Know that There is Grievance Hearing Offices in Your

Organization? -----37

Table 3 ----- 37

4.3.2 Did You Bring Your Grievances to Any Grievance Hearing

Offices in Your Organization? -----38

Table 4 -----38

4.3.3 Grievance raised in their respective grievance hearing offices-----39

Table 5 -----39

4.3.4 The Response of Grievance Hearing Offices in their organizations-----40

Table 6 -----40

4.4 The Roles of Grievance Hearing Offices-----42

4.4.1 The Roles of Grievance Hearing Offices in Your Day Today Activities-----42

Table 7 -----42

4.4.2 The effectiveness of Grievance Hearing Office in Your organizations-----43

Table 8 -----43

4.4.3 For Whom You Should Approach in Case of Any Grievance Rose on You Specially to Promote Good Governance in Your Organization? -----	45
Table 9-----	45
4.4.4 Sources and Signs used to Discover Grievances in Your Organization? -----	46
Table 10 -----	46
4.4.5 The Main Objectives of Grievance Hearing Office in your Organization? -----	48
Table 11 -----	48
4.4.6 Are You Satisfied with the Grievance Settlement Process that Takes place in Your Organization? -----	50
Table 12-----	50
4.4.7 The Effects of Grievances on Employees' Performance? -----	51
Table 13-----	51
4.4.8 Do the Grievance Hearing Offices Resolve Your Grievances? -----	53
Table 14 -----	53
4.5 The Short comes of Grievance Hearing Offices -----	55
4.5.1 Do you agree that Grievance Hearing Offices Faced Any Short Comes when Resolving Grievances? -----	55
Table 15-----	55
4.5.2 The Main Factors Responsible for Grievance Hearing Offices not to Resolve Your Grievance -----	56
Table 16-----	56
4.5.3 The Cause of Grievance in Your Organization-----	58
Table 17-----	58
4.5.4 Do you agree that Grievance Hearing Offices can promote Good Governance in Your Organization? -----	60
Table 18-----	60
4.6 Actions to be Taken by the Grievance Hearing Offices in the Promotions of Good Governances -----	61
4.6.1 Is there any Action to be taken to strength the Roles of Grievance Hearing Offices in the Promotions of Good Governance? -----	61

Table 19-----	61
4.6.2 Advise for Grievance Hearing Offices to Make Their Mechanism more Effective and Productive? -----	62
Table 20 -----	62
4.7 Findings of the Study -----	64
4.7.1 The Role of Grievance Hearing Offices -----	64
4.7.2 The Short Comes of the Grievance Hearing Offices -----	68
4.7.3 Actions to be taken by the Grievance Hearing Offices-----	69
<b>CHAPTER FIVE; Summary, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION</b>	
5.1 summary -----	71
5.2 conclusions-----	72
5.3 Recommendations-----	73
References -----	75
<b>Appendices</b>	
Appendix A-----	79
Questioners -----	79
Appendix B -----	83
Translations of questioners -----	83
Appendix C -----	85
Interviews -----	85
<b>List of tables</b>	<b>pages</b>
Table 1-----	34
Table2-----	35
Table3-----	37
Table4-----	38
Table5-----	39
Table6-----	40

Table7-----	42
Table8-----	44
Table9-----	45
Table10-----	47
Table11-----	48
Table12-----	50
Table13-----	52
Table14-----	54
Table15-----	55
Table16-----	57
Table17-----	59
Table18-----	60
Table19-----	62
Table20-----	63

## **Abbreviations and acronyms**

ADB= Asian Development Bank

BPR= Business Processing Reengineering

EIO= Ethiopian Institutions of the Ombudsman

FDRE= Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia

GRM= Grievance Redress Mechanism

ILO= International Labour Organization

IMF= International Monetary Fund

PBS= Protection of the Basic Service

SPSS= Statistics Package for Social Scientists

UN= United Nation

UNDP= United Nation Development Program

USD = United States Dollar

WB = World Bank

## **Abstract**

This study assessed the roles of grievance hearing offices on the promotions of good governance in Guna Begemidir wereda. In this study a simple descriptive research design was employed. It was also done by using a mixed approach research methodology. The questionnaires and interviews were used as data collection instruments or techniques. The collected data were analyzed and interpreted by using the Statistical Package for the Social Scientists (SPSS) computer software. A total of 320 respondents from 1,583 total populations were included in the study. The study also investigated by using purposive sampling. The data were gathered through questionnaire, interview, and document analysis. Quantitative data were analyzed using percentage and Frequency whereas qualitative data were analyzed based on the quantitative data. The study revealed that the grievance hearing offices in general plays a great role on the promotions of good governance but in Guna Begemidir wereda this office could not act as such. This was because the offices were ineffective in resolving the grievances of customers. The major short comes of the grievance hearing offices not to resolve the grievances of the customers were the low salary of the grievance hearing officers and the dependency of the grievance hearing offices by the supervisors. Though this were the major obstacles, but the lack of implementations of the given law and the low educational levels of the grievance hearing officers could also recognized by this study as the short comes of the grievance hearing offices. There were no actions taken by the grievance hearing offices in this wereda to strength their role in resolving citizens' grievances, but there are deferent indications to be taken to strengthen the grievance hearing offices. These include; the government is expected to prepare successive training for grievance hearing officials, allocate the proper payment for the employees' in the grievance hearing offices, the grievance hearing offices are also expected to clarifying their performance to the citizens. In addition to this, they also expected to be simplicity and promptness in their actions. In the same way, in order to make the performance of grievance hearing offices more effective and productive, the grievance hearing offices are expected to conform to the existing legislation. At the end of the investigation, this study also recommended to which it concerns.

# CHAPTER ONE

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background of the Study

In a workplace; complaints, concerns, and issues arise from time to time and it is important that organizations have in a place an effective grievance handling mechanism to address such issues may by the employees. The existence of the complaint and grievance mechanisms at the global level, especially if made available to affected civil society and local communities, could rightly be heralded as a milestone in the organization of international affairs. This development is a sign of a gradual shift away from a purely intergovernmental approach to one premised upon broader notions of global regulation and administration (*French & Kirkham, 2009*).

As the impact and reach of such organizations increasingly transcend state boundaries and thus have the capacity to affect the lives and livelihoods of individuals, the call for greater accountability of such organizations was perhaps inevitable (*Bodansky, 1999*)

The significance of complaint and grievance mechanisms is that they can contribute to the promotion of a variety of constitutional values. Perhaps of most importance is their capacity to provide a realistic route by which grievances can be effectively pursued by those most immediately affected. But the value of complaint and grievance mechanisms can go further than securing redress. Complaint and grievance mechanisms can be utilized not only to call to account the actions of international organizations, but they can provide tangible evidence to the wider community that they are accountable and, at the same time, provide heightened incentives for international organizations to focus on the promotion of internal good governance (*French & Kirkham, 2009*).

Many of the complaint and grievance mechanisms in existence at the international level are reflective, perhaps even derivative, of processes and functions that already exist in the domestic sphere. The most prominent and wide-ranging form of alternative disputes resolution to have evolved at the national level is the office of the ombudsman, which is enshrined in many national, constitutional, administrative and private sectors (*Gregory & Giddings, 2000*).

In Africa, social and economic rights have not fared any better, with countries doing little to ensure their enjoyment. Thus, conditions such as poverty and social inequalities remain widespread, and have been exacerbated by the prevalence of corruption in most countries. Corruption often deprives the state of the resources it requires to provide its citizens with essential services such as health care, water and education. The African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights estimates that Africa loses around USD 148 billion a year to corruption. In addition, corruption creates discrimination in access to these services, thereby particularly undermining the social and economic rights of the poor, marginalized and disadvantaged groups. These conditions constitute sources of dissatisfaction, revolt and even terrorism (APRM, 2019).

Africa needs a unified strategy to address the continent's governance challenges and advance long-term peace and stability. Effective, inclusive, and accountable governance; visionary leadership; and solid democratic institutions are critical to ensuring Africa reaches its potential in ever challenging environments. Thus, restoring and strengthening governance in fragile and conflict affected contexts calls for a new social contract built on accountability and inclusiveness—of institutions, politics, economic growth, natural resource management, and the delivery of public services (*Mindzie M. Wachira G. and Dunderdale L.* 2014).

The concept of a grievance redress mechanism has been rooted in the culture and governance of Ethiopia since, at least, the latter part of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. During the era of absolute monarchy, there existed the notion, broadly embraced by the people, the nobility, and the monarchy, that justice flowed from the grace and wisdom of the ruler. Any citizen affected adversely by an action of an administrative unit could theoretically submit his or her grievance directly to the ruler, provided that an audience could be secured (*Randolph & Buli*, 2011).

With so many interactions occurring between the citizenry and the administrative state, there is a greater probability that the citizenry will be harmed by the commission of an administrative error and, in some cases, by governmental maladministration. Ethiopia has responded to the urging of its citizenry for a system to redress administrative errors, omissions, and maladministration with the creation of grievance redress mechanisms at the regional state and municipal levels(*ibid*).

During the period of Haile Selassie established an ad-hoc administrative court within the Imperial Court, as a part of his royal duties, to serve the purpose of receiving, listening to, and addressing grievances from citizens. The Dreg regime instituted a grievance redress mechanism for handling citizen complaints with the creation of the Office of the Procurator, fashioned on a Soviet model. This office received grievances from citizens and many would have to agree, however reluctantly, that it was effective in addressing grievances within the context of an otherwise repressive and odious governmental regime (*Ibid*)

After Derg, the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopian constitution (1995) has provided a broader framework for systematizing the grievance redress mechanism concept within a constitutional framework with its emphasis on respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, especially the right of access to justice, rule of law, and democratic governance. Beginning with the Transitional Government that was established after the overthrow of the Derg in 1991, the government has introduced a number of wide-ranging reforms, including the Civil Service Reform Program of 1996, which has influenced subsequent reform of the federal and regional state administrative systems (*Fekadu, 2013*).

The Civil Services Reform Program has great relevance to the present discussion since one of the initiatives in the “Service Delivery Sub-Program” was the promulgation in 2002 of a “Grievance Handling Directive” which provided the initial stimulus for the grievance redress mechanisms that are being devised, improvised and implemented in various jurisdictions, particularly in the regional states. Subsequently, the government pushed the grievance redress mechanism concept even further towards sustainability by making grievance redress a key goal of the business process reengineering (BPR) initiative (*Berhihu, 2009*).

The handling of citizens’ grievances was given an important place in the BPR package that was distributed to regional and municipal governments, and a draft grievance handling guideline was, accordingly, circulated as part of the BPR package. Thus, the BPR provided the impetus and the initial template for the birth of grievance redress mechanism in a number of regional states and municipalities (*Rondloph & Buli, 2011*).

The institution of ombudsman was established by proclamation number 210/2000 and 211/2000 on FDRE constitution article 55 sub article 15 in Ethiopia to promote the principle of

good governance and to receive complaints and grievances who dissatisfied by the service delivery public institutions (Federal negarit gazeta, 2000). According to FDRE Negarit Gazeta, Council of Ministers Regulations number 77/2002 any government office shall establish a committee that reviews the grievances of civil servants in accordance these Regulations (*Negarit gazeta*, 2011).

There are wide variations in the quality and availability of grievance handling procedures in the regional states of Ethiopia. For example, Amhara was the first state to pass legislation to authorize the creation and administration of a grievance handling procedure, locating its grievance handling procedure in the Office of the President. Tigray has followed suit with a draft regulation that it uses as the basis for administering its, grievance handling procedure but has opted to put its grievance handling procedure in office of Security and Administration (*Rondloph & Buli*, 2011).

Zikre- Hig of the Amhara National Regional State Council, regulation No.130/ 2015 establishes grievance hearing bodies in Amhara National Regional State. The first one is preliminary grievance hearing which organized in public offices at each and every hierarchy of the regional state. The second public grievance hearing bodies which have been conferred with a semiautonomous status, and organized starting from the office of the head of the National Regional State down to zonal, Woreda and kebele administration offices (*zikrehig*, 2015).

The grievance redress mechanism of an organization is its instrument to measure efficient and effectiveness as it provides important feedback on the working of that organization. Grievances, if they are not identified and redressed, may affect adversely the workers, managers and the organization. The adverse effects include on reduction of productivity, on employees reduction of commitment and punctuality, on managers increase discipline cases weak relation with employees (*Ibid*).

Thus, the researcher would assess on the roles of grievance hearing office in the promotion of good governance in Guna Begemidir woreda. The researcher wanted to assess this issue because there are a numbers of people who raised different grievances and complains on different offices and officials of this Wereda. And therefore, it needs investigation whether the

grievance hearing office can play an important role in the promotion of good governance in this area of study or not.

## **1.2 Statement of the Problem**

Complaint and grievance mechanisms at the international level are innovative both in their contribution to the operation of international organizations and as an alternative model vis-à-vis traditional dispute settlement procedures. Nevertheless, in truth it is the structural limitations of such mechanisms, as much as the opportunities they provide, which reveal a more complete analysis of the recurring tensions within global governance. Yet the inherent weaknesses of non-judicial complaints and grievance mechanisms are also a potential strength. Such “softer” forms of dispute resolution, which are able to bend more easily to the strictures of a system of law ultimately grounded in the sovereignty of States, rather than break when confronted directly against them, are arguably more amenable to the incorporation of ideals of legitimacy and governance than traditional dispute resolution regimes (*French & Kirkham, 2009*).

The significance of complaint and grievance mechanisms is that they can contribute to the promotion of a variety of constitutional values. Perhaps of most importance is their capacity to provide a realistic route by which grievances can be effectively pursued by those most immediately affected. Thus, the existence of such mechanisms compensates for the classic critique of the ability of judicial bodies to uphold the rule of law only when it falls within the narrow strictures of a particular factual matrix, as well as reflecting the almost universal truth that formal processes tend to be difficult to take advantage of and are prohibitively expensive and intimidating for the average litigant. With the work of international organizations increasingly impacting directly on the lives of individual citizens, these are important considerations if those same institutions are to obtain legitimacy. Moreover, the lack of a comprehensive judicial framework at the international level, particularly one which does not provide individuals with any meaningful role – other than in the case of the few human rights courts which permit individual claims against States – exacerbates both the general problem and highlights the need for alternative procedures (*ibid*).

Africa should introduce the concept of governance in reviewing the structures of its authority. Africa should reform the exercise of political power, work to enhance the legitimacy of its authority, and pursue policies aimed at preventing conflicts and promoting development. The biggest problems facing African nations in their efforts to improve governance are “informal” politics, arbitrary decision-making and administrative systems that are deliberately left uninstitutionalized (*Kataoka, 2004*).

Implementation also calls for strengthening the existing institutions that promote good governance, democracy, and human rights at the continental and national levels. These institutions must be empowered with clear mandates, adequate resources, and a conducive political environment to achieve their objectives. In so doing, regional actors should conduct capacity needs assessments in member states—especially those emerging from conflict—that may require technical support to rebuild effective, capable, and legitimate states. Follow-up mechanisms should monitor progress in socio economic development and economic integration. Best practices and initiatives in model countries of the region should be documented for possible replication and adaptation (*Mindzie M. Wachira G. and Dunderdale L. 2014*).

There are no formal and regularized grievance redress mechanisms at the federal level comports in Ethiopia with international best practices with a charter to hear and resolve citizen’s grievances involving maladministration. Most ministries have an employee grievance committee to hear ministry employee grievances and employee appeals of minor disciplinary actions taken by employers against employees. These committees are management-oriented and influenced and cannot make a final decision (*Randolph & Buli, 2011*).

The problem here is that there are no independent institutions which can take the responsibility to collect and give final decisions on complain and grievance rose by employees of different positions of the country. That was the first reason why the researcher is initiated to conduct this study.

The other problem here is that as the study on strengthening grievance redress mechanism for the protection of the basic services (PBS) program in Ethiopia 2011, indicated that a number of regional states (most notably Amhara and Tigray) had begun the process of creating grievance procedures approximating international standards which provide grievant in those states with a

forum to complain about governmental maladministration and seek redress for any harm done to the grievant. Amhara has grounded its grievance redress mechanism in legislation approved by the regional cabinet council (*Randolph and Buli* 2011).

Though these mechanisms were approved by the regional cabinet council, the major problem is that it was not functional for the people who worked in different parts of the Amhara Regional States. That was also why the researcher needed to investigate whether the grievance hearing office could play a role in the promotion of good governance in Guna Begemidir Woreda or not.

The Ombudsman institutions can also play an important role in protecting citizens by addressing grievances arising from maladministration such as unnecessary delay, failure to follow proper procedures, negligence and improper service by public officials. Also, the Institution of Ombudsman raises the awareness and grievance of citizens against public authority's mistakes and misdeeds with effective costs and times (*Dessie*, 2018).

Though this institution plays such role, however as the study conducted on perception and awareness of civil servants on ombudsman indicated that, civil servants had no clear awareness about FDRE ombudsman institution which in turn constraint their trust toward ombudsman institution. It also shows that many civil servants especially those in rural area have no awareness of ombudsman institution whatever civil servants are accessed media, different government workshops and conferences of the existence of ombudsman institution. The grievance hearing offices also need to handle grievances but it is not sure that those civil servants have a clear awareness about the role of those offices which need to study. Today absence of good governance is seen in different public administrations. Employees and customers of public services are experiencing a lack of good service which causes for the increasing of grievance and unable to satisfy in public services (*ibid*).

A research conducted by (*Dessie*, 2018), indicated that to handle grievance, EIO was not strong enough to reach each corner of the country. He also added that grievance handling office and nearby head office like for teachers' director office is preferable than EIO. However, there is a gap that he did not assess what roles can the grievance hearing offices play for the promotion of good governance.

Those studies were limited on awareness and perceptions of citizens about the grievance hearing institutions. Therefore, it needed more investigations than the awareness and perception of grievance hearing office including the institution of ombudsman. Since the grievance hearing offices existed in every corners of the Amhara National Regional State, it was necessary to conduct research on the roles of grievance hearing office for the promotion of good governance in different parts of the country.

In Guna Begemidir woreda there are also grievance hearing offices. However, the people of this woreda raised many complains about the lack of good governance in that area. Those studies by different investigator were basically dealt on the perception and awareness of employees on grievance hearing mechanism.

There are also no studies about the roles of grievance hearing office in Amhara National Regional State South Gondar Zone specifically in Guna Begemidir Wereda. The only studied concerned on awareness and perception of employees about the grievance hearing institutions in regional level at large did not include the roles played by grievance hearing office in the promotion of good governance.

Hence, this study would try to show these gaps especially what role could play those grievance hearing offices to promote good governance in Guna Begemidir woreda. Here, employees who are not satisfied in public services have access to complaining about the issue to the respective grievance hearing offices if its role is outlined.

Therefore, the role of Guna Begemidir preliminary grievance hearing offices in handling grievances in the promotion of good governance was a necessary issue that initiated the researcher to conduct this study. That was because the people of this wereda were raised complains on the grievance hearing offices itself. Those grievances hearing offices receive different Public servants grievances and complaints but still the people asked many questions and complained against the grievance hearing office by the lack of good governance. That is also why it needed investigation to find out whether it could handle those grievances and complains effectively and satisfied their customers or not.

## **1.3 Basic Research Questions**

After investigation, this research would answer the following questions:

1. What roles can grievance Hearing Office play in the promotion of good governance in Guna Begemidir woreda?
2. What are the short comes of grievance hearing office in Guna Begemidir woreda?
3. What are the actions to be taken by grievance Hearing Office in the promotion of good governance in Guna Begemidir woreda?

## **1.4 Objectives of the Study**

### **1.4.1 General Objective of the Study**

The general objective of this study was assessing on the roles of grievance hearing office in the promotion of good governance in Guna Begemidir Woreda, Amhara National Regional State.

To achieve this general objective, there were the following specific objectives.

### **1.4.2 Specific Objectives of the Study**

- Examining the roles of grievance hearing office on the promotion of good governance in Guna Begemidir Woreda.
- Describing the short comes of grievance hearing offices in Guna Begemidir Woreda.
- Evaluating actions to be taken by grievance hearing office to promote good governance in Guna Begemidir Woreda;

## **1.5 Significance of the Study**

After investigation, this study would give advantage to the people by indicating the major roles of grievance hearing office in the promotion of good governance in Guna Begemidir *woreda*. Currently, there are grievances which are raised by employees on the functions of the different offices. This research would answer such problems by searching out the short comes of grievance hearing offices and by indicating the way how they could give services to the community. It would also help to the government policy makers to considered policies related with grievance hearing and it would indicate the way to solved critical problems.

This study would help to the society by recognizing and assuring the rights of citizens and by indicating the ways how citizens could get efficient and effective services from their respective administrators so as to articulate their interests. In addition to these, this study also aimed to show the direction for further inquiry. It would also create eagerness for the academicians as well as for other researchers to conduct other researches related to this issue by taking the gaps of this study into account. Finally, it would have merits to the academic world by providing information and knowledge in all areas of study. It would also help to me to do more other studies as starting point and as a reference to other researchers.

## **1.6 Scope of the Study**

This study would focus on assessing the roles of grievance hearing office in the promotion of good governance in Guna Begemidir woreda. This study was done in Amhara National Regional State South Gondar Zone Guna Begemidir Woreda grievance hearing offices. Firstly, the area of this investigation was the center to get different services and the role of those offices was complained and grieved by different customers including the researcher. Secondly, it was because the researcher had closed relationship with employees in the grievance hearing office and that relation would help to collect the necessary data with a minimum cost. This study has been conducted on the roles of grievance hearing offices in the promotion of good governance in Guna Begemidir woreda selected offices.

## **1.7 limitations of the study**

There are also many offices which had different functions to promote good governance in Amhara National Regional State, in South Gondar Zone and in Guna Begemidir woreda. But this study would focus on selected public sectors. Particularly, it would focus on the grievance hearing offices in administrative pool and grievance hearing office in civil service pool and on the customers of the public grievance hearing offices in this woreda. The other grievance hearing offices would not include here. This was the fact that the selected area needed more investigation and the researcher also gave more emphasis for these offices to find out the problems and roles of these offices. The researcher would also become effective in time, transportation cost and other advantages of the study since the researcher worked in this woreda.

## 1.8 Organization of the Paper

This paper would contain five chapters. The first chapter would deal on the introduction part of the study. The second chapter is prepared by including reviews of literature. The third chapter would deal on research methodologies and also the descriptions of the study area. The fourth chapter would focus on the result analysis and discussions of the investigation. And finally chapter five would include the conclusions and recommendation parts of the investigation.

## 1.9 Operational Definitions of Terms

- **Compliant** is any kind of written request lodged by any client where he/she is dissatisfied with preliminary decisions rendered by any supervisor or officials.
- **Customers:** are persons or institutions that are engaging in some sort of interactions with the other persons or institutions.
- **Good governance** is the process whereby the level of goodness is high in governing processes.
- **Governance;** defined as the provision of the political, social and economic goods that a citizen has the right to expect from his or her state, and that a state has the responsibility to deliver it to its citizens.
- **Grievance** is a state of dissatisfaction, expressed or unexpressed, written or unwritten, justified or unjustified, having a connection with employment situation.
- **Grievance hearing office** is an office by which its authority is receiving, addressing, evaluating and resolving any grievances raised by the customers of the offices and employees of the offices.

- **Grievance Redress Mechanism** is a process for receiving, evaluating, and addressing grievances from affected communities or stakeholders at the level of the community or project, region, or country.
  
- **Office** is a position of responsibility of some authority within an organization.
  
- **Officials** are individuals or groups who holding public offices or having official duties especially a representative of the given people or a certain governmental institutions or offices.

# CHAPTER TWO

## Review of Related Literature

### 2.1 Theoretical Frameworks

#### 2.1.1 Definitions of Grievance

The course of action of raising dissatisfaction, either formal or informal, is called the grievance. The grievance is the term which refers to a process whereby a complaint is lodged and this is followed by a set procedure, which may either be included in a collective agreement or be part of workplace policies incorporated into a contract of employment (*Harold Arie, 2015*).

Grievance, according to Rose (2004) as cited in (*Mubezi, 2015*) defines as any dissatisfaction regarding work and workplace expressed by an employee in a formal way to his immediate supervisor. In addition, the author adds that employee grievance can be viewed as the process which involves an employee's attempt to show that she or he has suffered or been wronged, sometimes due to actions or decisions made by the manager acting on behalf of the organization.

According to ILO(international labor organization) as cited by (*Harold Arie, 2015*), grievance defines as a complaint of one or more workers with respect to wages and allowances, condition of work and interpretation of service, job assignment and termination of service. The National Commission on Labor noticed that “complaints” affecting one or more employees regardless of their salaries, overtime, leave, transfer, promotion, work assignment and discharge have the potential of constituting grievances. It is essential to separate grievance lodge by the individual from collective grievance. If the issues raised are concerned with individual employees, they should be dealt with through grievance channels. However, if the issues involved are about the general issues which deal with the implementation of the policy and include broad interest, it can become the subject of collective bargaining.

In an organization where individuals and group work together to meet a common objective, differences of opinion might occur. Sometime certain inconveniences may arise. These things lead to complaints. Complaints, which are not promptly attended to, leads to dissatisfaction. Dissatisfaction also occurs when certain expectations, real or perceived, are not

met in the job. Dissatisfaction is the cause of grievance. Complaint can be against a supervisor, about a machine, against the working environment, against canteen, against workload, etc. Grievances produce unhappiness, frustration, discontentment, inefficiency and low productivity (*Mubezi, 2015*).

According to the Revised Amhara National Regional State Proclamation No 171/2010, defines that Grievance means a complaint of a civil servant which could not be resolved through discussion between the compliant and his immediate supervisor or the concerned official and ought to be redressed through formal review mechanisms.

### **2.1.2 Definitions of Complains**

Compliantis according to (zikre- Hig of the Amhara National Regional State Council, 2015) defines as anykind of written request lodged by any client where he/she is dissatisfied with preliminary decisionsrendered by any supervisor or official thereof entrusted with a legal duty to look into thosegrievances of clients, to the grievance hearing department of the public offices so that the matermay be further investigated thereto.

### **2.1.3 Definitions of Governance and Good Governance**

Governance primarily comprises the essence of a political regime, its mechanisms for exercising authority in controlling the social and economic resources of a country, the degree of competence in public authorities' formulation and implementation of policy, and the ability of those authorities to fulfill their duties generally, called governance. Strengthening the functions of public authority—legislative, executive and judicial, establishing the rule of law, managing the public sector, cracking down on corruption, and curbing the rise in military expenditures are the key aspects of governance (*Mindzie M. Wachira G. and Dunderdale L. 2014*).

Governance has been defined as the provision of the political, social and economic goods that a citizen has the right to expect from his or her state, and that a state has the responsibility to deliver to its citizens. Good governance encompasses state-society relations that are democratic, including respect for human rights and the rule of law. They are developmental and allow for the management of the economy in a way that enables economic growth, structural change, and the judicious use of available resources in a sustainable manner.Embodied in effective governance

are the processes, mechanisms, and policies that deliver essential public goods and services that citizens have come to expect. These public goods and services range from safety and security to political participation, the rule of law, and human development, among others (*ibid*).

Dictionaries also define the term goodgovernance as cited by (*Kataoka, 2004*); the proper management of official duties, but the term encompasses concepts that are extremely complex. Defined in simplest terms, governance has to do with the manner in which a country is governed, the way politics should operate, and how authority is exercised. Organizations such as the IMF and World Bank define governance as the way in which social resources are controlled in order to exercise political power and promote social and economic development. This definition highlights the role played by governmental authorities in establishing a framework for economic activity and in deciding how the benefits of such activity are distributed. It also reveals the essence of relations between those who govern and those who are governed.

Literally goodgovernance means, according to (*Grindle, 2004*) as cited by (*Tefferi, 2017*), what is not bad governance or what is good enoughgovernance, or that the level of goodness is high in governing processes. In this way it issuggested that good governance should be characterized as reduced corruption, improvedaccountability, adequately decentralized, well managed public resources, introduced proper lawsand equality, and restructured civil services and so on.Good governance is about making sure the power and authority is not concentrated in thehands of a single individual or group. This requires checks and balances be put in place within anorganization that separates and balances power between different bodies and has clear linesofaccountability and transparency between them.

#### **2.1.4 Dimensions of Governance**

Governance is not government. Governance as a concept recognizes that powerexists inside and outside the formal authority and institutions of government. According to (UN-HABITAT, 2002), as cited by (*Tefferi, 2017*), governance recognizes thatdecisions are made based on complex relationships between many actors with different prioritiesGovernance is the exercise of political, economic and administrativeauthority in the management of countries affairs at all levels. It is a neutral conceptcomprisingthe complex mechanisms, processes,

relationships and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their rights and obligations and mediate their differences

Governance has been defined in different Aspects and dimensions based on point of view of different scholars and institutions. According to (ECA, 2001) as cited in (*Tefferi, 2017*), UNDP has identified four aspects of governance that could be considered as a set of complex mechanisms, processes, relationships and institutions. These aspects are: Economic Governance, Political Governance, Administrative Governance and Systems Governance (Processes and structures). All four aspects of governance are highly interdependent and interrelated that lack of one could seriously affect the other negatively and vice versa. It is mandatory to take into consideration all of the four aspects and efforts in trying to strengthen the overall governance atmosphere of a country need a holistic approach concentrating on all.

In another hand, governance in three dimensions which has been commonly understood by many scholars and institutions is, since the government doesn't only decide for all and doesn't covers the issues of governance, the civil society and the private sectors play vital role in the community (*ibid*).

### **2.1.5 Causes of Grievance**

Grievance is very much present in every workplace especially in today's era of globalization, if not tackled on time a minute grievance can become a conflict. A lack of interest has been found in the organization to handle the grievance and also to use the grievance handling as a tool to motivate the employees (*Garima, 2017*).

Grievance is a feeling of unfair treatment at work. It can result from the dissatisfaction of work. In this regard, cause of grievance can be anything that results in dissatisfaction or involving wage, working hours, or conditions of employment are the basis of grievance. Accordingly, grievance may occur due to a number of reasons. The first one is economic factors; employees may demand individual wage adjustments. They may feel that they are paid less than compared to others. The second work environment, it may be undesirable or unsatisfactory conditions of work, for example, light, space, heat, poor quality material, unfair rules and lack of recognition. Third personal traits, those personal traits may be the cause of grievance, for example, over-ambition, narrow attitudes, excessive self-esteem and mental tensions (*Chand, 2017*).

Grievance may occur due to a number reason. The first one is economic factors; employees may demand individual wage adjustments. They may feel that they are paid less than compared to others. The second work environment, it may be undesirable or unsatisfactory conditions of work, for example, light, space, heat, poor quality material, unfair rules and lack of recognition. Third personal traits, those personal traits may be the cause of grievance, for example, over-ambition, narrow attitudes, excessive self-esteem and mental tensions (*Ibid*)

According to (*Bhim, 2006*), the reason for grievance may vary according to the situation. Some of the important reasons are unfair management, poor communication, different interpretation, weak leadership, personality clash and culture of the organization. Public employees have certain expectations, assumptions; if the management or organization does not respect their expectations they become dissatisfied and may turn to the grievance of employees. Employees may be grievant due to the existing policy, rule work procedure or dissatisfaction due to the certain behavior.

Even though grievance occurs in different workplaces in different factors, the main thing here is that it should be resolved peacefully. To resolve grievances, it is important to provide the proper grievance hearing offices in different parts of the country. If grievances are not resolved as quickly as possible, it will reduce the productivity of employees and it is difficult for the existence of organization and institutions. Therefore, the grievance hearing offices are very important in this regard. As grievance occurs in many situations, those offices can play a role to resolve grievances and to increase the productivity of organizations and the satisfactions of employees as well as customers (*Garima, 2017*).

### **2.1.6 Objectives of Grievance Hearing Bodies**

According to (*Negarit Gazette, 2002*), the FDRE Council of Ministers Regulations No 77/2002, stated that objectives of the civil servants grievance procedure shall be to promote the smooth employment relations by providing: speedy redress to complaints, corrective measures to mistakes and weakness causing grievances, and fair and equal treatment to all civil servants. It also provides the right to petition any civil servants to the government office for redress if he has been aggrieved of being denied a right or unfairly treated.

The aim of a grievance procedure is to promote consistency, transparency and fairness in the handling of workplace problems and complaints. However, the employer should be allowed to seek an informal resolution where appropriate, but also more formal proceedings should the circumstances demand (*Harold Arie, 2015*).

According to Amhara Regional State public offices grievance directive , grievance handling mechanism shall have the principles; the grievance handling mechanisms should be easily known and understandable for customers; giving immediate response for grievance and complaints; give solution to grievances raised by customers on service delivery; reduce the load of judicial bodies and do based on loyalty and impartially; and serve as a source of information to improve public service delivery and promoting good governance.

### **2.1.7 Responsibilities of Grievance Hearing Offices**

Grievance is the dissatisfaction factor which an employee feels when working in a workplace. The grievances of the employees are related to the contract, work rule or regulation, policy or procedure, health and safety regulation, past practice, changing the cultural norms unilaterally, individual victimization, wage, bonus, etc. Grievance management is all about handling the grievance in more productive way. Conflict is the latent stage of grievance. Grievance, if not resolved on time, changes into conflict (*Garima, 2017*).

According to (The general laws, 2004), as cited by (*Abebe, 2018*) in any Amhara National Regional State's government, public offices have employed one permanent grievance hearing expert in each public service. However, a public office which has fewer customers can use one grievance hearing expert jointly. Different public office in zone and woreda level employed one preliminary grievance hearing offices served jointly. In municipal, hospital and courts have been employed one grievance office for each organization permanently. Those grievance hearing offices have responsibilities; to ensure grievances whether has given a solution or not in grievance hearing offices, convince the concerned bodies to agree with a possible solution which by the grievance hearing office, investigate solutions for grievances collected by the head of public sectors, plan for the grievance procedure enforcement and implementations and evaluate resolved grievances and raise solutions to improve public service delivery.

According to *Zikre- Hig* of Amhara National Regional State Council, revised regulation No.130/ 2015 establishes grievance hearing bodies in Amhara National Regional State. The first one is preliminary grievance hearing which organized in public offices at each and every hierarchy of the regional state. The second public grievance hearing bodies which have been conferred with a semiautonomous status, and organized starting from the office of the head of the National Regional State down to zonal, Nationality *Woreda* and city and *kebele* administration offices. The objective of it is to assist the prevalence of good governance by preventing maladministration done in public offices the regional state.

## **2.1.8 Grievance Redress Mechanisms**

Grievance redress mechanism can be defined as an after-the-fact review of a transaction between the government and a citizen who has been denied a governmental service or benefit where the citizen, as a matter administrative process or regulation, has a right to complain to an impartial third party about governmental actions or omissions in connection with the denial and, also, seek redress for any harm done and/or rectification for any wrongdoing (*Randolph and Buli, 2011*).

The Ethiopian Institution of the Ombudsman includes the meaning of maladministration as a decision reached or discretion exercised in a defective manner an act or failure to act or an omission, lack of care, judgment or honesty in the management of something. In other words Maladministration can also be defined as the technical term which describes the actions of a governmental body which can be seen as causing a prejudice or an injustice (*ibid*).

Grievance redress mechanisms (GRMs) are institutions, instruments, methods, and processes by which a resolution to a grievance is sought and provided (ADB, 2010). A grievance redress mechanism is a process for receiving, evaluating, and addressing project related queries and grievances from affected communities or stakeholders at the level of the community or project, region, or country (Ministry of Agriculture, 2018).

Grievance handling mechanism has various principles. All workers should be informed about the grievance mechanism, the procedure should be kept as simple and possible, avoiding unnecessary administrative stages, the process should ensure that a compliant dealt with

confidentially; the procedure should be designed so that employees that may feel particularly vulnerable are some principles of grievance handling mechanisms in institutions (*Bhim, 2006*).

The principles of grievance redress mechanisms in the institution of ombudsman are; Give solution to any complaints arise on public service delivery to ensure accountability, transparency and good governance; Serve as the source information to correct dissatisfaction customers in service delivery; Through assessing customer's dissatisfaction in services delivery give possible solutions; and create ethical public servant and ethical work environment to productivity (*Abrham, 2011*).

## **2.1.9 Ethiopian Institution of Ombudsman (EIO) for Good Governance**

The objective of the Ethiopian Institution of Ombudsman (EIO) as stated in Article 5 of the proclamation Number 211/2000 is ensuring the realization of an effective system of public administration rooted in the principles of rule of law and respect for the rights of individuals in the administration process. It envisages seeing good governance that is high quality, efficient and transparent and is based on the rule of law. Furthermore, EIO has the vision to strengthen good governance and ensuring efficient public service delivery, by investigating and redressing complaints of maladministration, raising the awareness of the public and the executive and overseeing the rules and administrative procedures of the executive (*Dessie, 2018*).

In the same manner, the objective of EIO for local governments is to deal with corruption and maladministration in local governments. Ombudsman can conduct investigation and enquiring in respect of any action involving corruption or maladministration or irregularities in the discharges of administrative functions by local self-government institution or by institutions transferred to such local self-government (*ibid*).

## **2.2 Types of Grievances**

According to (*Ngetich, 2016*), employee's dissatisfaction verbally addressed by one worker to another is a complaint and a complaint develops into a grievance when the management is made to perceive it. Grievances might be unvoiced or explicitly stated, written or oral, justifiable, genuine or untrue, may associate to the organizational work, a member of staff may perceive it as

a case of injustice, which may influence the performance outcome. Grievances might involve employment, working environments, alteration of service conditions, biased approach, and failure to apply principle of natural justice, occupation norms and work-loads. Grievances commonly results to various conditions such as unhappiness, insignificance, discontent, frustration, deprived morale, and poor competence that can result in change of attitude, insight and behavior.

According to *Locke* (2009) as cited by (*Ngetich, 2016*), grievance can be classified under three categories, which include management policies, at work conditions, and individual factors. Grievance ensuing from management policies consists of: rates of wages, Leave rule, Overtime, Absence of career planning, Role conflicts, Lack of respect for joint agreement and difference between workers' skills and job accountability. Various grievances that emanate from working conditions include: Inadequate safety and poor physical settings, lack of tools and suitable machinery, poor self-control and impractical targets. Grievances that rise from interpersonal features include: poor interactions between team members, autocratic leadership exercised by managers, poor relations with superior colleagues and disputes with associates and colleagues.

Grievances can also be categorized into visible grievances and hidden grievances as a worker may have a perception of infringement of his or her rights; in some cases, a grievance may exist in the minds of individual employee (*ibid*).

### **2.3 Legality of Grievance Hearing Offices**

Grievance is very much present in every workplace especially in today's era of globalization, if not tackled on time a minute grievance can become a conflict. A lack of interest has been found in the organization to handle the grievance and also to use the grievance handling as a tool to motivate the employees (*Garima, 2017*).

Consultants have researched that development of grievance redress mechanisms in developing countries, have tracked the history of the development of grievance redress mechanisms in Ethiopia beginning with Imperial grievance redress procedures and moving to a discussion of the stimulus provided by the Business Process Reengineering ("BPR") initiative which, in many respects, helped "birth" GRMs in Ethiopia. Consultants have thoroughly researched international best practices for grievance redress mechanisms with assistance of

exhaustive computer searches and have consulted with authorities on Ethiopian administrative law and legal culture in reaching the conclusion that Ethiopia should look to international best practices standard to evaluate the effectiveness of its grievance redress mechanism (*Randolph and Buli, 2011*).

Council of Ministers Regulations number 77/2002 any government office shall establishes a committee that reviews the grievances of civil servants in accordance with these Regulations. The objectives of the civil servants grievance procedure shall be to promote the maintenance of smooth employment relations by providing: speedy redress to complaints, corrective measures to mistakes and weakness causing grievances, and fair and equal treatment to all civil servants. It also provides the right to petition any civil servants to the government office for redress if he has been aggrieved of being denied a right or unfairly treated (*Negarit Gazette, 2002*).

According to (*Zikre- Hig, 2015*), Amhara National Regional State Council, regulation No.130/ 2015), establishes grievance hearing bodies in Amhara National Regional State. The first one is preliminary grievance hearing which organized in public offices at each and every hierarchy of the regional state. The second public grievance hearing bodies which have been conferred with a semiautonomous status, and organized starting from the office of the head of the National Regional State down to zonal, *Woreda*, city and *kebele* administration offices.

## **2.4 Theories of Grievance**

As a result of inquiry about the attitudes of employees, Herzberg (1959), as cited by (*Garima, 2017*), developed two distinct lists of factors. One set of factors caused happy feelings or a good attitude within the worker, and these factors, on the whole, were task related. The other grouping was primarily present when feelings of unhappiness or bad attitude were evident, and these factors, Herzberg claimed, were not directly related to the job itself, but to the conditions that surrounded doing that job.

Grievance can be related to any factor mentioned in the Herzberg's theory. In the absence of any factor of hygiene grievance can be there. And it is necessary to understand and handle these grievances on time to motivate the employees. Employees directly feel motivated if their grievances handled on time i.e. a direct relationship has been found between grievance resolution

and motivation. A grieved employee cannot work effectively in the organization, and effectiveness is necessary for an organization's success. If grievance is not resolved on time it converts into conflict and can harm the organization adversely (*ibid*).

Public projects around the world are failed due to disputes over land, water or labor issues and other related causes. The costs of ignoring such disputes or responding too late are high. A core characteristic of an effective grievance mechanism is the ability to identify minor community incidents before they escalate into unmanageable disputes (WB, 2013).

According to (*Ambrose & Arnould, 2005*), grievance procedures used by employees enable them to seek justice and fairness and also measures the fairness in which their grievances are handled for self interest and other fellow employees. The theory of equality promotes a concept of inclusion, which advocates that every employee in the work place must be afforded fair and equal opportunity to take part in the processes and procedures of the organization. Equity also requires effective remedies provided from the outcomes when rights are violated. Though resolutions differ, individuals in similar situations ought to face similar treatment (*Ngetich, 2016*).

The theory of grievance and conflict management also proposed a theory of dispute systems. There are three primary methods of dispute resolution. First, disputes might be handled and ultimately resolved through power-based methods, such as strikes, lockouts or other coercive sanctions. Second, they might be handled through rights-based methods, where the parties seek a resolution on the basis of rules or principles, such as those set down in collective agreements or in legislation concerning employment rights. Examples of this are provided by the operation of grievance procedures, mediation, and arbitration. Finally, disputes could be addressed on the basis of interest-based methods, where the parties seek to identify and accommodate their needs or 'interests' through joint problem solving and associated techniques (*Goldberg, 1989*).

To conclude, this study was done by taking the second theory of grievance and conflict management i.e. right based method. That is mainly because of the right based method emphasized on the rules and principles that all citizens are governed equally and fairly. This theory also involves the practices of mediation, facilitation, and joint problem-solving initiatives as a means of grievance handling procedures. That is why the researcher focused on this theory. In fact, everyone must obey the law of the country since law governs all citizens equally and fairly. This statement indicated that all citizens who work in different offices have to be treated as equal as others.

Finally, it should be noted that all the above review literatures are directly or indirectly linked to this study. The literature review is used to discuss the nature and the environment of the study for the purpose of helping the researcher to have detail knowledge and concept; as well as the study meeting the academic criteria. It is considered as a benchmark for theoretical and empirical grounds for the conceptualization of the study.

According to (*Creswell, 2009*), as cited by (*Tefferi, 2017*), literature review enables the researcher to familiarize with studies that are similar to the one being undertaken. It eventually allows connecting the research more specifically and concisely to the broader discussions on the subject matter, filling in gaps and referring to other studies upon which the provision of the study can be compared with other findings.

Therefore, this study would try to fill the gaps that the earlier studies were not seen what roles can play the grievance hearing office on the promotions of good governance. In spite of the broadness of the concepts and roles of grievance hearing offices played in different parts of the country, the researcher would focus only on assessing the roles of grievance hearing office on the promotions of good governance in Amhara National Regional State, South Gondar Zone, specifically in the case study of Guna Begemidir wereda. It will also contribute a lot for the next researchers to conduct research in these areas of studies by referring these review literatures as guidance to them..

## CHAPTER THREE

### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1 Area of the Study

This study was conducted in Amhara National Regional State, South Gondar Zone, particularly in the case study of Guna Begemidir Wereda grievance hearing offices.

Guna Begemidir wereda is a place that found in the northern parts of Ethiopia. It is about 712k.m far from Addis Ababa, the capital city of Ethiopia. It is also about 132k.m far from Bahirdar, the capital city of Amhara National Regional State. It is about 29k.m far from Debre Tabor, the capital city of South Gondar Zone. This wereda is geographically bounded by Ebinat woreda in the North, Estie wereda in the South, Gayinit wereda in the East and Farta wereda in the West. The well known mountain, the so called “Guna Mountain” is found in this Wereda (tourist attractive place in Ethiopia) which has a height of 4,231 meter above sea level (Administrative office of Guna Begemidir Wereda’s Plan Commission, 2020).

This Wereda is newly created in 2009 as Guna Begemidir Wereda seceded from Farta Wereda by the interest of the people. According to (the Administrative office of Guna Begemidir Wereda’s plan commission, 2020), it has the total population of 110,756 of whom 56,715 are men and 54,041 are women. From this total population, 5,202 men and 4,859 women are living in urban areas whereas, 51,513 men and 49,181 women are living in the country side of this Wereda. With regard to the religion of the people of this Wereda almost all residents are following the Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahido Christianity. Only few people practicing Islamic religion. To express in number, there are about 350 or 0.32% Muslims and the remaining 110,406 or 99.68% are Christians. There are about 1,538 public servants of whom 993 are men and 545 are women. All people speak Amharic language in that area. The economic source of the people of this Wereda is Agriculture (*ibid*).

The reason for the selection of this study area was firstly, because the researcher worked in this area and had better understanding and awareness about grievance hearing offices of this woreda. That also helped for the researcher together the necessary data with no more cost since the researcher worked in this Wereda. Secondly, the study area was selected because of the

current situation of the area. In Guna Begemidir Wereda, recently, there were many people who raised different grievances over the public sectors due to lack of good governance. Since this office was the center to serve different public services and the role of those offices was complained by many people, this study was needed to be conducted. Finally, according to the researcher, the study area was selected because the grievance hearing office was more crucial and necessary office to promote good governance in Guna Begemidir Wereda than the other offices.

### **3.3 Research Design**

According to (*Kothari, 2004*), there are several research designs and the researcher must decide in advance of collection and analysis of data as to which design would prove to be more appropriate for his research. He must give due weight to various points such as the type of universe and its nature, the objective of his study, the resource list or the sampling frame, desired standard of accuracy and the like when taking a decision in respect of the design for his research.

In this case, this study would be conducted by using simple descriptive research design. This type of research design was important to analyze and describe data that acquired from questionnaires and interviews about the roles of grievance hearing office in the promotion of good governance in Guna Begemidir woreda. In addition to this, the reason why simple descriptive research design was selected that it was because the nature of the study needed to describe and analyze the existing roles of grievance hearing offices and to redress more information about the study based on the existed or the available data.

### **3.4 Research Approach**

This research would be undertaken by using the mixed approach. Mixed approach is a research design which involved both the quantitative and qualitative approaches in a single study.

As (*Dornyei, 2007*) and (*Creswell, 2009*) explained that all methods have limitations and felt that biases inherent in a single method could neutralize or cancel the biases of other methods. By mixing the two approaches, quantitative and qualitative, the researcher would gain breadth and depth information through bypass the weakness of both approach and applying their strength. This approach was enabled the researcher to provide interpretive, exploratory and

explanatory methods to explore the roles of grievance hearing office in the promotion of good governance in Guna Begemidir *Wereda*.

### **3.5 Sampling Techniques and Sampling Size**

In order to collect the necessary information which had relations with the study, this research would use purposive sampling technique.

According to (Kothari, 2004), purposive sampling is a type of sampling that items for the sample will be selected deliberately by the researcher; his choice concerning the items remains supreme. In other words, under non-probability sampling the organizers of the inquiry purposively choose the particular units of the universe for constituting a sample on the basis that the small mass that they so select out of a huge one will be typical or representative of the whole.

The reason behind why the researcher employed purposive sampling or judgmental sampling was that it was a strategy in which particular individuals, groups or events could be taken consciously or deliberately in order to get important information which was not clear for other people. Purposive sampling or judgmental sampling was also selected for the purpose of time and cost effective.

The target populations of this study were the workers and employees of selected public sectors and customers of public grievance hearing offices in Guna Begemidir *woreda*. That was because they would have more information and understanding about the roles of grievance hearing office in the promotion of good governance in Guna Begemidir *Wereda*.

In this research, the researcher would take those people who were employed in selected public sectors and the customers of public grievance hearing offices in Guna Begemidir *Wereda* as a targeted population of this study. In Guna Begemidir *wereda*, public servants were grouped into four pools. These were civil service pool, agriculture pool, administrative pool and communication pool. From those employees, the researcher would purposely select the employees who work in the civil services pool and employees who work in the administrative pool and customers of public grievance hearing offices.

Based on the information taken from (the administrative office of Guna Begemidir *Wereda's* plan commission, 2020), there were about 1,008 public servants in civil service pool

and there were about 195 public servants in the administrative pool. There were also about 380 customers of public grievance hearing office of this Wereda. The total target populations would be 1,583. The researcher had taken these populations as the study target population. The reason why these populations would be taken as the study target population was due to that the researcher's high expectation that they would have better understanding and detail information about the roles of grievance hearing office in the promotions of good governance in Guna Begemidir Wereda. In addition to this, the costumers of the public grievance hearing office should also be the key actors of this study. Therefore, in this study, the researcher would select the correct sample size from the employees of the two pools and from customers in the public grievance hearing office of this Wereda. This was because public servants who employed in the selected sector could act as a backbone to provided different public services to the people and that was also very much important in the promotions of good governance in Guna Begemidir Wereda.

Since the total populations were known and fixed, then the researcher would select the correct sample size that could be available for this study. The researcher could not take the whole populations for this study because of many constraints like resources, time, budget, and the like.

To avoid such problems, the researcher would take the proper sample size by using Cochran's (1977), sample determination formula as cited by (Dessie, 2018) as follows;

$$n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2} \text{ Where:}$$

**N** = designated total numbers of population

**n** = Designated the sample size for the research

**e** = designated maximum variability or margins of error-5% (0.05)

Thus, in the case of this research since the numbers of the total population was known, 1,583, then the sample size would calculated as follows;  $n = \frac{1,583}{1+1,583(0.05)^2}$

$$n = \frac{1,583}{1+1,583(0.0025)}$$

$$n = \frac{1,583}{4.95} = 320$$

Therefore, from 1,583 total populations, the researcher would take 320 samples by using Cochran's formula. The researcher could also calculate proportionally to determine the specific sample of employees in the two pools of grievance hearing offices and from the customers of public grievance hearing office based on the numbers of its populations. Therefore, from the total employees of civil service pool 1,008, the researcher had taken 204 samples. From administrative pool total employees 195, the researcher had taken 39 samples. And from the total customers of the public grievance hearing office 380, the researcher had taken 77 samples. The researcher would select those respondents who were raised any grievance in their respective grievance hearing offices and who knew about grievance hearing offices in the study area. The questionnaires were distributed for 204 respondents from civil service pool, 39 respondents from administrative pool and 77 respondents from the customers of public grievance hearing office of Guna Begemidir Wereda.

The researcher would not limit only by questionnaires, but also there were individuals that the researcher was preparing to collect necessary information through interviews. Interviews were prepared for 16 head officers of different sectors to collect an insight authoritative data. These people were head officers of education, health, civil service, court, administrative, women's affair, justice, police, trade, small enterprise, transport, administrative house, and the four preliminary grievance hearing offices worker who were employed in the four pools.

### **3.6 Method of Data Collection**

In this study, the researcher would use primary data and secondary data sources.

#### **3.6.1 Primary Sources of Data**

The primary data for this research were collected by using different types of data gathering instruments such as questionnaire, interviews and observations. The questionnaires were distributed to and collected from selected public sector workers of Guna Begemidir woreda and customers of preliminary grievance hearing office in that woreda. The interview was prepared for the head of grievance hearing office of Guna Begemidir Wereda and for the heads of some public sectors that the researcher was purposively selected and for the customers of

public grievance hearing office of that Wereda. Finally, it should be noted that important information that obtained by observation would also included in this study.

### **3.6.2 Secondary Sources of Data**

The secondary data were collected from different written materials found in that area of study. These written materials could be included in review of literature and in all parts of the study gained from different sources such as; books, journals, articles, internets and the like. Not all books and journals would included there but the researcher was used materials which were closely related with the grievance, grievance hearing offices and the roles that the grievance hearing offices could played in the promotion of good governance and others were included in this study as a secondary sources of data.

### **3.7 Pilot study of instruments**

In order to conduct good research, the data collection instrument should be valid and reliable because validity assure the appropriateness, meaning fullness and usefulness of the specific inference made from the measures and reliability confirm the degree to which observed scores are free from errors of measurement, Therefore the process that under go from data collection to the conclusion needs certain logical test for judging the quality of the study (Dooley, 1995). From this point of view the researcher wanted to bring into play Reliability and validity as a criterion for judging the acceptability and quality of this study instruments.

#### **3.7.1 Validity of the instruments**

Validity refers, to the appropriateness, meaningfulness and usefulness of the specific inference made from the measures (Dooley, 1995). Before distributing the instrument of the participants, the researcher tried to cheek the validity of it by the advisor of the researcher and by senior individuals. Then it was checked by different individuals who are experienced in research in my own staff and they also gave me feedback. In line with this, (Best and khan, 2003) stated that research instrument can be validating using experts judgments and/or statistical procedures. Based on the feedback obtained from them, the researcher made modifications on the questionnaires.

### **3.7.2 Reliability of the instruments**

Reliability is concerned with whether data collection instruments can provide consistent results provided that the same data collection procedures and instruments are used (Bray man, 2008: Yin, 2003). After the instrument was developed under close guidance of the advisor, a pilot study was carried out to 10 known individuals in Guna Begemidir wereda which were not included in the actual sample of the study. The objectives of the pilot study was to check the practicality and appropriateness of the questionnaire and provide an induction whether the items need further refinement, obtain respondent suggestions and views on the item, and determine the level of difficulty of the items and to assess the reliability of the questionnaire (Yalew endawek, 1998). Based on the feedback obtained from the pilot test, certain modifications were made in the wording and sequence of the question items. The result of the pilot test was measured by Statically package for social scientists (SPSS) by using alpha Cronbach's which is mostly used by behavioral and social science researchers, the reliability coefficient of the instrument alpha were satisfactory (0.9683 or 96.833) and hence, was reliable. The instrument is found to be reliable as statically literature recommended a test result of 0.65 (65%) and above as reliable (Yalew endawoke, 1998) the result of Cronbach's alpha were satisfactory (between 0.692-0.989).

### **3.8 Methods of Data Analysis and interpretation**

Since this study would use quantitative and qualitative approaches of the study, it would analyze and interpret differently. The quantitative data would analyze and interpret by using descriptive analysis like; table, percentage and frequency with the help of SPSS (scientific package for social scientists). While the qualitative data would analyze and interpret by arranging the data that collected through different instruments in a way that help to detect patterns or problems, explore associations that existed in the data method.

Quantitative data would analyze firstly and then followed by qualitative data analysis. After interpreted differently, both quantitative and qualitative data were integrated together. Finally, at the end of the investigation, this research will be presented by the researcher.

### **3.9 Ethical Considerations**

According to the Belmont Report, as cited by (Vanderstoep and Johnston 2009), researchers must be concerned with three ethical issues:

**1. *Respect for Persons:*** Researchers must recognize research participants as autonomous agents, and those who have diminished autonomy (for example, the young, and the disabled) must be granted protection.

**2. *Beneficence:*** Researchers must secure the well being of participants by not harming them and, further, maximizing possible benefits and minimizing possible risk.

**3. *Justice:*** There must be fairness in the distribution of benefits and possible risks across all research participants.

Based on these ethical principles, in this research, the researcher was started the interviews and discussions based on the consents Of the participatory. Firstly, the objective of there search would outline to the participatory. Secondly, the researcher would tell for the participatory that individual's interviews and discussions would be confidential and not to bedisclosed for anyone. Finally, the names of participatory were not included in the question formats as well as in the report.

# CHAPTER FOUR

## DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION

### 4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter contains the analysis and discussions of respondents about an assessment of the roles of grievance hearing offices at Guna Begemidir *woreda*. The data was taken from 39 respondents in Guna Begemidir *woreda* government administrative pool grievance hearing office's customers who were employed in women's affair, trade, police, justice, court, administrative, small enterprise, transport and administrative house purposively. The major data of this research was collected from 204 respondents that were taken from the civil service pool grievance hearing office's customers who were employed in education, health and civil service offices purposively. The remaining data was collected from 77 respondents that were samples taken from the customers of the preliminary grievance hearing offices in Guna Begemidir *Wereda*. The data were described with simple descriptive research design by using percentages, tables and frequencies based on a statistical package for social scientists (SPSS). Additional explanations were provided by using the secondary sources of data like books and other written materials in the areas of this study.

### 4.2 Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

#### 4.2.1 Sexes of the respondents

**Table 1**

<b>Civil service pool</b>	Sex	Frequency	Percent
	Male	139	68.14
	Female	65	31.86
	Total	204	100
<b>Administrative pool</b>	Male	23	58.97
	Female	16	41.03

	Total	39	100
<b>Customers of the grievance hearing office</b>	Male	55	71.43
	Female	22	28.57
	Total	77	100
Total samples that were taken to the study	320	320	100

Sources; field study, 2020

As it is indicated in the above table, the questionnaire was distributed for Guna Begemidir wereda's civil service pool public servants, administrative pool public servants and for the customers of preliminary grievance hearing office of this wereda purposively. The questionnaire was included both sexes; male and female. The total numbers of respondents in this study were 320. Of whom, 217(67.8%) were male and 103(32.2%) were female. From these numbers of respondents there were about 139 (68.1%) male respondents and there were about 65 (31.9%) female respondents in Guna Begemidir civil service pool. From the administrative pool, there were about 23 (59%) male and there were about 16(41%) female respondents. Finally, from the customers of the preliminary grievance hearing office, there were about 55(71%) male and there were about 22(29%) female respondents.

From this, the researcher concluded that the participations of female were less than male. That was because in all sectors of this study the numbers of female were not as equal as male. But it did not negatively affect this study.

#### 4.2.2 Work experiences of the respondents

**Table 2**

<b>civil service pool</b>	1-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	16-20 years	Above 20 years	Total
Frequency	46	80	41	34	3	204
Percent	22.54	39.23	20.1	16.67	1.46	100
<b>administrative</b>	1-5 years	6-10	11-15	16-20	Above 20	Total

<b>pool</b>		year	years	years	years	
Frequency	16	12	5	4	2	39
Percent	41.04	30.77	12.8	10.26	5.13	100
<b>Customers of grievance hearing office</b>	Illiterate	Only writing and reading	<grade10	grade 10	>grade 10	Total
Frequency	7	16	38	6	10	77
Percent	9.09	21	49.4	7.8	12.71	100

Sources; field study 2020

As indicated in the above table, the majority of the respondents in the civil service pool of Guna Begemidir woreda had work experience from 6 to 10 years. It was around 80(39.23%). That was followed by respondents with the experience from one up to five years work experience about 46(22.54%). In this pool, the experiences of workers were decreased from eleven and above years. It was about 41(20.1%), 34(16.67%), 3(1.46%) from eleven up to fifteen, from sixteen up to twenty and from twenty and above respectively. In similar cases, the experiences of workers in Guna Begemidir wereda's administrative pool were decreased. The workers who had experience from one year up to five years were 16(41.04%). From six up to ten years were 12(30.77%). From eleven up to fifteen years were 5(12.8%). From sixteen up to twenty years were 4(10.26%). And workers who had the experience above twenty years of work were 2(5.13%). Finally, the respondents of the customers of the preliminary grievance hearing office were not employed in public sectors rather they were living by different means of life. Here, the majority of the respondents were educated up to grade ten. They were around 38(49.4%). The other respondents who were the customers of the grievance hearing office could have the ability only writing and reading. They were about 16(21%). The next customers were educated more than grade ten. They were about 10(12.71%). There were also respondents who were not educated. They were about 7(9.09%). Finally, the customers of the grievance hearing office included those individuals who were educated up to grade ten. They were about 6(7.8%).

To sum, as the researcher indicated in the description of the studying area, this wereda was newly created by the consent of the people. That was also why the majority of the

respondents were had the experiences less than ten years. The respondents were eager enough to give up the reliable information in the studying area. This study also included experienced individuals purposively to get more reliable and right information about the study.

### 4.3 The roles of grievance hearing offices

The questionnaires were started by asking the respondent's recognition about the existence of grievance hearing office in their respective organizations as presented in the following tables.

#### 4.3.1. Do you know that there is grievance hearing offices in your organization?

**Table 3**

Civil service pool	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	26	12.7	12.7	12.7
Valid Yes	178	87.3	87.3	100.0
Total	204	100.0	100.0	
Administrative pool	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	2	5.1	5.1	5.1
Valid Yes	37	94.9	94.9	100.0
Total	39	100.0	100.0	
Customers of grievance hearing office	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	22	28.6	28.6	28.6
Valid Yes	55	71.4	71.4	100.0
Total	77	100.0	100.0	

Sources, field study, 2020

Based on the above table, there were 178(87.3%) in civil service pool, 37(94.9%) in administrative pool and 55(71.4%) in the customers of the grievance hearing office had the recognition for the existence of grievance hearing office in their respective organizations. The remaining 26(12.7%) in civil service pool, 2(5.1%) in administrative pool and 22(28.6%) in the

customers of grievance hearing office had no the knowledge whether there was grievance hearing office in their organization or not.

This indicated that the majority of the respondents had the recognition about the existence of grievance hearing office in their organization. So, it was evidence that the respondents had clear understanding about their respective grievance hearing office and it was easy to them to give right and deep information for this study.

#### **4.3.2 Did you bring your grievances to any grievance hearing offices in your organization?**

**Table 4**

<b>Civil service pool</b>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	43	21.1	21.1	21.1
Valid Yes	161	78.9	78.9	100.0
Total	204	100.0	100.0	
<b>Administrative pool</b>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	13	33.3	33.3	33.3
Valid Yes	26	66.7	66.7	100.0
Total	39	100.0	100.0	
<b>Customers of grievance hearing office</b>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	19	24.7	24.7	24.7
Valid Yes	58	75.3	75.3	100.0
Total	77	100.0	100.0	

Sources, field study, 2020

As indicated in the above table, the majority of the respondents were brought their grievance for their grievance hearing office in their organization. To express in number, 161(78.9%) in civil service pool, 26(66.7%) in administrative pool and 58(75.3%) in the customers of the grievance

hearing office were brought their grievance to their grievance hearing office. Whereas 43(21.1%), 13(33.3%) and 19(24.7%) respondents in the civil service pool, administrative pool and in the customers of grievance hearing offices respectively responded as they did not take their grievances to the grievance hearing offices.

As a result, the study concluded that the majority of the respondents were taking their grievances in their respective offices. The researcher can therefore concluded that the respondents were experienced enough to give right information about the study.

#### 4.3.3 Grievance raised in their respective grievance hearing offices

**Table 5**

<b>Civil service pool</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Twice	35	17.2	17.2	17.2
three times	41	20.1	20.1	37.3
Valid many times	47	23.0	23.0	60.3
Once	81	39.7	39.7	100.0
Total	204	100.0	100.0	
<b>Administrative pool</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Once	1	2.6	2.6	2.6
Twice	2	5.1	5.1	7.7
Valid three times	35	89.7	89.7	97.4
many times	1	2.6	2.6	100.0
Total	39	100.0	100.0	
<b>Customers of grievance hearing office</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Twice	11	14.3	14.3	14.3
Once	18	23.4	23.4	37.7
Valid three times	20	26.0	26.0	63.6
many times	28	36.4	36.4	100.0
Total	77	100.0	100.0	

Sources, field study, 2020

Based on the table, 81(39.7%) respondents in Guna Begemidir woreda civil service pool raised their grievance one time; 35(17.2%) respondents raised two times, 41(20.1%) respondents raised three times and 47(23%) respondents raised grievance for their respective grievance

hearing offices. Similarly, in this woreda administrative pool, 1(2.6%) respondents raised their grievance once, 2(5.1%) respondents raised twice, 35(89.7%) respondents raised three times and 1(2.6%) respondents raised their grievance many times for their respective grievance hearing office. Finally, 18(14.3%) respondents from the customers of the grievance hearing office's of Guna Begemidir wereda raised their grievance one time, 11(14.3%) raised twice, 20(26%) raised three times and 28(36.4%) respondents raised their grievance many times for their respective grievance hearing offices.

As a result, the majority of the respondents in this wereda raised their grievance for their respective grievance hearing offices. This evidence indicated that there were correct respondents which help to achieve the objective of this investigation. No respondents who were not raised grievance in this regard. All respondents raised grievance from one up to many times; that was very important to understand the response of grievance hearing offices towards the respondents' grievance and to identify the role of grievance hearing office which could play in the study area.

#### 4.3.4 The response of grievance hearing office in their organization

**Table 6**

<b>Civil service pool</b>		Freque ncy	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumul ative Percent
Valid	state if any	21	10.3	10.3	10.3
	reject the grievance than giving responses	26	12.7	12.7	23.0
	look in to the matter for a long period of time	100	49.0	49.0	100.0
	immediately accept grievance and give responses	57	27.9	27.9	51
	Total	204	100.0	100.0	
<b>Administrative pool</b>		Freque ncy	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumul ative Percent
Valid	reject the grievance than giving responses	2	5.1	5.1	5.1
	immediately accept grievance and give responses	1	2.6	2.6	100
	state if any	11	28.2	28.2	97.4
	look in to the matter for a long period of time	25	64.1	64.1	69.2
	Total	39	100.0	100.0	
<b>Customers of grievance hearing offices</b>		Freque ncy	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumul ative Percent

Valid	state if any	22	28.6	28.6	61.0
	look in to the matter for a long period of time	16	20.8	20.8	32.5
	immediately accept grievance and give responses	9	11.7	11.7	11.7
	reject the grievance than giving responses	30	39.0	39.0	100.0
	Total	77	100.0	100.0	

Sources, field study, 2020

Based on the above table, in civil service pool, 57(27.9%) respondents answered that the grievance hearing offices accept their grievance immediately and tried to gave responses. 100(49%) respondents also responded that the grievance hearing offices look in to the matter for a long period of time. 26(12.7 %) respondents responded that the grievance hearing offices as rejected their grievance than gave responses. 21(10.3%) respondents were answered their different answers. In the administrative pool, 1(2.6%) respondents responded that the grievance hearing office immediately accept their grievance and gave responses. 25(64.1%) respondents answered that they look into the matter for a long period of time. 2(5.1%) respondents said the grievance hearing office reject their grievances than gave responses. Finally, 11(28.2%) respondents responded differently. In the customers of grievance hearing offices, 9(11.7%) respondents answered that the grievance hearing offices immediately accept and gave responses. 16(20.8%) respondents answered that they look the matter for a long period of time. 30(39%) respondents were responded that the grievance hearing offices reject their grievances than gave responses. The remaining 22(28.6%) of respondents were answered simply their feeling which were not related to the study. Generally, this indicated that the grievance hearing offices simply took the employees grievance without gave responses. Similarly, as most of the respondents showed that grievance hearing office hardly worked to accept the customers' grievances and to resolve it.

#### 4.4 The roles of grievance hearing office in the promotions of good governance

##### 4.4.1 The roles of grievance hearing office in your day today activities

**Table7**

Civilservicepool	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid cannot say	17	8.3	8.3	8.3
totally agree	44	21.6	21.6	29.9

	partially agree	63	30.9	30.9	60.8
	strongly agree	80	39.2	39.2	100.0
	Total	204	100.0	100.0	
<b>Administrative pool</b>		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	cannot say	1	2.6	2.6	2.6
	partially agree	3	7.7	7.7	10.3
Valid	totally agree	5	12.8	12.8	23.1
	strongly agree	30	76.9	76.9	100.0
	Total	39	100.0	100.0	
<b>Customers of grievance hearing offices</b>		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	totally agree	8	10.4	10.4	10.4
	cannot say	11	14.3	14.3	24.7
Valid	partially agree	13	16.9	16.9	41.6
	strongly agree	45	58.4	58.4	100.0
	Total	77	100.0	100.0	

Sources, field study, 2020

Based on the information gained from the above table, 80(39.2%) respondents in civil service pool, 30(76.9%) respondents in administrative pool and 45(58.4%) respondents in customers of grievances hearing office responded as they strongly agree with the crucial of grievances hearing offices for their day today activities. In the same case, 44(21.6%) respondents in civil service pool, 5(12.8%) respondents in administrative pool and 8(10.4%) respondents in the customers of grievance hearing office responded that they totally agree with the importance of grievance hearing office in their life. In other words, 63(30.9%) respondents in civil service pool, 3(7.7%) respondents in the administrative pool, and 13(16.9%) respondents in the customers of grievance hearing office responded as partially agree with its roles in the day today activities. The remaining 17(8.3%) respondents in civil service pool, 1(2.6%) respondents in the administrative pool and 11(14.3%) respondents in the customers of grievance hearing office had no any idea about the issues.

As the majority of the respondents responded in both pools and in the customers of grievance hearing office the roles of grievance hearing office was crucial in their day today activities. Therefore, the grievance hearing offices could play high contribution in day today activities of citizens.

#### 4.4.2 The effectiveness of the Grievance hearing office in your organization

**Table 8**

<b>Civil service pool</b>		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	102	50.0	50.0	100.0
	strongly agree	35	17.2	17.2	27.0
	totally agree	47	23.0	23.0	50.0
	partially agree	20	9.8	9.8	9.8
	Total	204	100.0	100.0	
<b>Administrative pool</b>		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	totally agree	4	10.3	10.3	10.3
	Disagree	22	56.4	56.4	100.0
	strongly agree	8	20.5	20.5	43.6
	partially agree	5	12.8	12.8	23.1
	Total	39	100.0	100.0	
<b>Customers of grievance hearing office</b>		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	28	36.4	36.4	100.0
	strongly agree	14	18.2	18.2	33.8
	totally agree	23	29.9	29.9	63.6
	partially agree	12	15.6	15.6	15.6
	Total	77	100.0	100.0	

Sources, field study, 2020

Based on the information gained from the above table, 35(17.2%) respondents in the civil service pool, 8(20.5%) respondents in the administrative pool and 14(18.2%) respondents in customers of the grievance hearing office were strongly agree with the effective functions of the grievance hearing offices. In the same way, 47(23%) respondents in the civil service pool,

4(10.3%) respondents in the administrative pool and 23(29.9%) respondents in the customers of grievance hearing office responded that they totally agree with the effective performance of the grievance hearing offices. Whereas, 20(9.8%) respondents in civil service pool, 5(12.8%) respondents in the administrative pool and 12(15.6%) respondents in the customers of the grievance hearing office responded that they partially agree with the effectiveness of the grievance hearing offices. The remaining respondents were responded as the grievance hearing offices were not effective in its activities. To indicate their responses in detail, 102(50%) respondents in the civil service pool, 22(56.4%) respondents in the administrative pool and 28(36.4%) respondents in the customers of the grievance hearing office were disagree with the effectiveness of grievance hearing offices.

As a result of the above description, the majorities of respondents were partially agreed and disagreed with the question asked for the effectiveness of grievance hearing offices. Therefore, all these indicated that the grievance hearing offices were ineffective in the process of resolving grievances of customers in their respective offices.

#### **4.4.3 For whom you should approach in the case of any grievance rose on you in your organization?**

**Table9**

<b>Civil service pool</b>		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	state if any	12	5.9	5.9	5.9
	Head of the Department	15	7.4	7.4	13.2
	Top Management	31	15.2	15.2	28.4
Valid	Grievance hearing offices	108	52.9	52.9	52.9
	Immediate supervisor	38	18.6	18.6	47.1
	Total	204	100.0	100.0	100.0
<b>Administrative pool</b>		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Head of the Department	3	7.7	7.7	7.7
Valid	Grievance hearing offices	18	46.2	46.2	100.0

Top Management	13	33.3	33.3	53.8
Immediate supervisor	5	12.8	12.8	20.5
Total	39	100.0	100.0	
<b>The customers of the grievance offices</b>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Head of the Department	2	2.6	2.6	2.6
Top Management	4	5.2	5.2	7.8
Grievance hearing offices	27	35.1	35.1	35.1
state if any	24	31.2	31.2	64.9
Immediate supervisor	20	26.0	26.0	33.8
Total	77	100.0	100.0	

Sources, field study, 2020

As indicated in the above table, 108(52.9%) respondents in the civil service pool, 18(46.2%) respondents in the administrative pool and 27(35.1%) respondents in the customers of grievance hearing office were responded that they directly approaching their grievance to the grievance hearing office. However, others took their grievance for different departments than grievance hearing offices. For example, 31(15.2%) respondents in civil service pool, 13(33.3%) respondents in the administrative pool and 4(5.2%) respondents in the customers of grievance hearing office took their grievance to the top managements in their organizations. On the other hand, 38(18.6%) respondents in the civil service pool, 5(12.8%) respondents in the administrative pool and 20(26%) respondents in the customers of grievance hearing office were take their grievance to the immediate supervisors in their organizations. 15(7.4%) respondents in the civil service pool, 3(7.7%) respondents in the administrative pool and 2(2.6%) respondents in the customers of grievance hearing office were raised their grievances to the head of the department. And the remaining 12(5.9%) respondents in the civil service pool and 24(31.2%) respondents in the customers of the grievance hearing offices stated different answers out of the given alternatives.

Generally, this implied that the majority of the respondents in this study were raised their grievance to their respective grievance hearing offices. Though different departments played a

role to handle grievances of respondents, but in this case the researcher concluded that grievance hearing offices are right and safe to resolve the customers' grievance.

#### 4.4.4 The sources and signs used to discover grievances in your organization

**Table10**

<b>Civil service pool</b>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
state if any	14	6.9	6.9	6.9
direct observation	44	21.6	21.6	28.4
Valid grievance procedure	84	41.2	41.2	41.2
open door policy	62	30.4	30.4	58.8
Total	204	100.0	100.0	
<b>Administrative pool</b>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
direct observation	7	17.9	17.9	17.9
Valid open door policy	15	38.5	38.5	56.4
grievance procedure	17	43.6	43.6	100.0
Total	39	100.0	100.0	
<b>customers of the grievance hearing offices</b>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
state if any	5	6.5	6.5	6.5
Valid grievance procedure	34	44.2	44.2	44.2
direct observation	25	32.5	32.5	55.8
open door policy	13	16.9	16.9	16.9
Total	77	100.0	100.0	

Sources, field study, 2020

Based on the above table, 44(21.6%) respondents in the civil service pool, 7(17.9%) respondents in the administrative pool and 25(32.5%) respondents in the customers of grievance

hearing office responded that they discover grievances through direct observation. On the other hand, 84(41.2%) respondents in the civil service pool, 17(43.6%) respondents in the administrative pool and 34(44.2%) respondents in the customers of grievance hearing discovered grievances through grievance procedure. The other 62(30.4%) respondents in the civil service pool, 15(38.5%) respondents in the administrative pool and 13(16.9%) respondents in the customers of grievance hearing offices were responded that they used open door policy as a source of discovering grievances. The others 14(6.9%) respondents in the civil service pool and 5(6.5%) respondents in the customers of grievance hearing office responded that was not related with the study.

As a result, the majorities of the respondents responded that grievance procedure is the major source and sign to discover grievance in all their organizations. Therefore, citizens' grievance could discover formally through grievance procedure and others are also used as an alternative way of identifying grievances' of citizens.

#### **4.4.5 The main objectives of Grievance hearing office in your organization**

**Table11**

<b>Civil service pool</b>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
state if any	10	4.9	4.9	4.9
To prevent dissatisfaction of employees	23	11.3	11.3	16.2
To improve mutual understanding between compliant and supervisor	33	16.2	16.2	32.4
To strengthen line management in the organization	61	29.9	29.9	62.3
to promote good governance	77	37.7	37.7	100.0
Total	204	100.0	100.0	

<b>Administrative pool</b>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
state if any	2	5.1	5.1	5.1
To improve mutual understanding between compliant and supervisor	3	7.7	7.7	12.8
Valid To prevent dissatisfaction of employees	5	12.8	12.8	25.6
to promote good governance	29	74.4	74.4	100.0
Total	39	100.0	100.0	
<b>Customers of grievance hearing office</b>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
To prevent dissatisfaction of employees	4	5.2	5.2	5.2
To improve mutual understanding between compliant and supervisor	8	10.4	10.4	15.6
Valid state if any	10	13.0	13.0	28.6
To strengthen line management in the organization	14	18.2	18.2	46.8
to promote good governance	41	53.2	53.2	100.0
Total	77	100.0	100.0	

Sources, field study, 2020

As showed in the above table, 77(37.7%) respondents in the civil service pool, 29(74.4%) respondents in the administrative pool, and 41(53.2%) in the customers of grievance hearing office responded that the main objective of grievance hearing offices in their respective organization is to promote good governance. The other 33(16.2%) in civil service pool, 3(7.7%) respondents in the administrative pool and 8(10.4%) respondents in the customers of grievance hearing offices were responded that the main objective of grievance hearing offices is to improve mutual understanding between compliant and supervisors. Others 61(29.9%), and 14(18.2%)

respondents in the civil service pool and in the customers of grievance hearing office respectively responded that the main objective of grievance hearing office is to strengthen the line management of their organizations. Similarly, 23(11.3%), 5(12.8%), and 4(5.2%) respondents in the civil service pool, in the administrative pool and in the customers of grievance hearing offices respectively responded that the main objective of grievance hearing offices is to prevent the dissatisfactions of citizens in their respective organizations. The remaining, 10(4.9%), 2(5.1%) and 10(13%) respondents in the civil service pool, in the administrative pool and in the customers of grievance hearing office respectively responded out of the given alternatives.

Generally, it indicated that the main objective of grievance hearing office according to the majorities of the respondents is to promote good governance in their respective organizations. Depending on the responses gained from the respondents, grievance hearing offices had other specific objectives to deal like; to improving mutual understanding between the complaints and supervisors, to strengthening the line management of their organization and also to prevent the dissatisfactions of citizens in their organizations.

#### **4.4.6 Are you Satisfied with the Grievance Settlement process that takes place in your organization?**

**Table12**

<b>Civil service pool</b>		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	91	44.6	44.6	44.6
	No	113	55.4	55.4	100.0
	Total	204	100.0	100.0	
<b>Administrative pool</b>		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	10	25.6	25.6	25.6
	No	29	74.4	74.4	100.0
	Total	39	100.0	100.0	

Customers of grievance hearing office	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	21	27.3	27.3	27.3
Valid No	56	72.7	72.7	100.0
Total	77	100.0	100.0	

Sources field study, 2020

Based on the information gained from the above table, 113(55.4%), 29(74.4%), and 56(72.7%) respondents in the civil service pool, in the administrative pool and in the customers of the grievance hearing offices respectively responded as they were not satisfied with their grievance settlement process in their organizations. The remaining, 91(44.6%) respondents in the civil service pool, 10(25.6%) respondents in the administrative pool and 21(27.3%) respondents in the customers of grievance hearing offices were satisfied in the grievance settlement process in their respective organizations.

This indicated that the grievance settlement process were not as much applicable in both pools and in the grievance hearing offices. Generally speaking, this implied that the grievance hearing offices hardly comfort to handle the grievance of citizens in this wereda.

#### 4.4.7 The effects of grievances on employees' performance

**Table13**

Civil service pool	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
state if any	5	2.5	2.5	2.5
Increased rate of absenteeism and turnover	22	10.8	10.8	13.2
Valid Reduced the levels of morality	34	16.7	16.7	29.9
Reduced the employees punctuality and commitment	57	27.9	27.9	57.8

All of the above can be occur	86	42.2	42.2	100.0
Total	204	100.0	100.0	
<b>Administrative pool</b>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Reduced the levels of morality	1	2.6	2.6	2.6
Reduced the employees punctuality and commitment	2	5.1	5.1	7.7
Valid State if any	3	7.7	7.7	15.4
All of the above can be occur	33	84.6	84.6	100.0
Total	39	100.0	100.0	
<b>Customers of the grievance hearing offices</b>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
All of the above can be occur	4	5.2	5.2	5.2
Reduced the employees punctuality and commitment	8	10.4	10.4	15.6
Valid state if any	10	13.0	13.0	28.6
Increased rate of absenteeism and turnover	14	18.2	18.2	46.8
Reduced the levels of morality	41	53.2	53.2	100.0
Total	77	100.0	100.0	

Sources, field study, 2020

Based on the information gained from the table above, 34(16.7%) respondents in the civil service pool, 1(2.6%) respondents in the administrative pool and 41(53.2%) respondents in the customers of grievance hearing office responded that if grievances were not identifying and

redressed well that would be reduced the levels of morality of citizens in their respective organization. The other, 57(27.9%), 2(5.1%) and 8(10.4%) respondents in civil service pool, in administrative pool and the customers of grievances hearing offices were respectively responded that it would reduced the employees punctuality and commitment on their day today activities. Others, 22(10.8%) respondents in the civil service pool and 14(18.2%) respondents in the customers of grievance hearing offices were responded that if grievances were not identified and redressed well it would increase the rate of absenteeism in work place and turnover. Similarly, 86(42.2%), 33(84.6) and 4(5.2%) respondents in civil service pool, in administrative pool and in the customers of grievance hearing offices were respectively responded that all of the above problems would happen if grievances were not settled well. Finally, 5(2.5%) respondents in civil service pool, 3(7.7%) respondents in the administrative pool and 10(13%) respondents in the customers of grievance hearing offices were responded that if grievances were not identified and redressed well there would be many problems in their respective organizations out of the alternatives given to them.

This implied that if grievances were not identified and redressed well there will happened many problems on the employees’ performance. The first problem is that the morality of workers will reduced on their work. The next problem is that it would reduce the employees’ punctuality and commitment on their day today activities. The other problem is that the employees’ absenteeism and turnover would increase. Depending on this information, the majority of the respondents responded that if grievances were not settled well there will be many problems that can occur. These problems in turn will affect the employees performance in their day today’s activities that also resulted for the reduction of the developments of the organizations.

**4.4.8 Do grievance hearing offices resolve your grievance in your organization?**

**Table14**

<b>Civil service pool</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
State if any	12	5.9	5.9	5.9
Valid it resolves my grievance	34	16.7	16.7	22.5
It resolves my grievance in some extent	73	35.8	35.8	58.3

It did not resolves my grievance at all	85	41.7	41.7	100.0
Total	204	100.0	100.0	
<b>Administrative pool</b>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
State if any	1	2.6	2.6	2.6
it resolves my grievance	4	10.3	10.3	12.8
Valid It did not resolves my grievance at all	9	23.1	23.1	35.9
It resolves my grievance in some extent	25	64.1	64.1	100.0
Total	39	100.0	100.0	
<b>Customers of grievance hearing offices</b>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
It did not resolves my grievance at all	8	10.4	10.4	10.4
it resolves my grievance	14	18.2	18.2	28.6
Valid It resolves my grievance in some extent	55	71.4	71.4	100.0
Total	77	100.0	100.0	

Sources, field study, 2020

As showed in the table, 34(16.7%) respondents in the civil service pool, 4(10.3%) respondents in the administrative pool and 14(18.2%) respondents in the customers of the grievance hearing offices were responded that the grievance hearing offices resolve their grievances well. The other, 73(35.8%), 25(64.1%) and 55(71.4%) respondents in the civil service pool, in the administrative pool and in the customers of the grievance hearing offices respectively responded that the grievance hearing offices resolve their grievances in some extent. On the other hand, 85(41.7%) respondents in the civil service pool, 9(23.1%) respondents in the administrative pool and 8(10.4%) respondents in the customers of the grievance hearing offices were responded that the grievance hearing offices did not resolve their grievances in their respective organizations. The remaining, 12(5.9%) and 1(2.6%) respondents in the civil service pool and in the administrative pool respectively answered differently which were not related with the question.

Generally speaking, this indicated that the majority of the respondents responded that the grievance hearing offices resolve their grievances in some extent but not fully resolve their

grievances. The next majority respondents responded that the grievance hearing offices did not resolve their grievances at all. This generalization is implied that the grievance hearing offices hardly resolves the grievances of the citizens in their respective organizations.

#### 4.5 The Short comes of Grievance Hearing Offices

##### 4.5.1 Do you agree that grievance hearing offices faced any short comes when resolving grievances in your organization?

**Table15**

<b>Civil service pool</b>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
did not agree	9	4.4	4.4	4.4
strongly agree	42	20.6	20.6	25.0
Valid Agree	69	33.8	33.8	58.8
partially agree	84	41.2	41.2	100.0
Total	204	100.0	100.0	
<b>Administrative pool</b>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
did not agree	3	7.7	7.7	7.7
Valid strongly agree	36	92.3	92.3	100.0
Total	39	100.0	100.0	
<b>Customers of grievance hearing offices</b>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
did not agree	2	2.6	2.6	2.6
partially agree	13	16.9	16.9	19.5
Valid Agree	19	24.7	24.7	44.2
strongly agree	43	55.8	55.8	100.0
Total	77	100.0	100.0	

Sources, field study, 2020

Based on the information, 42(20.6%), 36(92.3%) and 43(55.8%) respondents in the civil service pool, in the administrative pool and in the customers of the grievance hearing offices

respectively responded that they strongly agree that the grievance hearing offices faced many short comes when resolving grievances of customers. The next, 69(33.8%) respondents in the civil service pool and 19(24.7%) respondents in the customers of grievance hearing offices were responded as they agree that the grievance hearing offices faced many obstacles when resolving grievances of citizens. The other, 84(41.2%) and 13(16.9%) respondents in the civil service pool and in the customers of grievance hearing offices were respectively responded as partially agree that the grievance hearing offices faced many problems in resolving the grievances of citizens. The remaining, 9(4.4%), 3(7.7%) and 2(2.6%) respondents in the civil service pool, in the administrative pool and in the customers of grievance hearing offices were respectively responded as did not agree that the grievance hearing offices faced many short comes when resolving grievances of citizens in their organizations. According to the information gained the above table, there are only 14(4.4%) respondents responded that did not agree with the grievance hearing offices faced many obstacles in resolving grievances of citizens.

This implied that the majority of the respondents were responded as strongly agree, agree and partially agree that the grievance hearing offices faced different short comes when resolving the grievances of citizens.

**4.5.2 The main factors responsible for grievance hearing offices not to resolve your grievance in your organization**

**Table16**

Civil service pool	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
lack of implementation of the given law	15	7.4	7.4	7.4
Low educational level of grievance hearing officers	17	8.3	8.3	15.7
Valid Low salary of grievance hearing officers'	36	17.6	17.6	33.3
Dependency of the office by the supervisors	42	20.6	20.6	53.9
all can be the factors	94	46.1	46.1	100.0

Total	204	100.0	100.0	
<b>Administrative pool</b>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Dependency of the office by the supervisors	1	2.6	2.6	2.6
Valid Lack of the implementations of the given law	2	5.1	5.1	7.7
Low salary of grievance hearing officers'	36	92.3	92.3	100.0
Total	39	100.0	100.0	
<b>Customers of grievance hearing offices</b>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Lack of the implementations of the given law	7	9.1	9.1	9.1
Valid Low salary of grievance hearing officers'	12	15.6	15.6	24.7
all can be the factors	27	35.1	35.1	59.7
Dependency of the office by the supervisors	31	40.3	40.3	100.0
Total	77	100.0	100.0	

Sources, field study, 2020

Depending on the above information, 36(17.6%) 36(92.3%) and 12(15.6%) respondents civil service pool, in administrative pool and in the customers of the grievance hearing offices respectively responded that the main short comes of grievance hearing offices is a low salary of grievance hearing officers. The next, 42(20.6%) respondents in civil service pool, 1(2.6%) respondents in the administrative pool and 31(40.3%) respondents in the customers of grievance hearing offices were responded that the major problems of grievance hearing offices is the dependency of grievance hearing office by the supervisors of the respective organizations. Others only 17(8.3%) respondents in the civil service pool responded that the main short comes of the grievance hearing office is the low educational level of the grievance hearing officers in

the organizations. The others, 15(7.4%), 2(5.1%) and 7(9.1%) respondents in the civil service pool, in the administrative pool and in the customers of grievance hearing offices respectively responded that the major short comes that the grievance hearing offices faced is the lack of implementations of the given law. The remaining, 94(46.1%) and 27(35.1%) respondents respectively responded that all of the above alternatives can be the short comes that were faced to the grievance hearing offices in their respective organizations.

Therefore, as the majority of respondents responded that the major short comes of the grievance hearing offices is the low salary of the grievance hearing officers and the dependency of the grievance hearing offices by the supervisors respectively. Though this were the major obstacles, but the lack of implementations of the given law and the low educational levels of the grievance hearing officers could also recognized by respondents as a great short comes of the grievance hearing offices when resolving grievances in their organizations.

#### 4.5.3 The cause of grievance in your organization?

**Table17**

<b>Civil service pool</b>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
State if any other causes	11	5.4	5.4	5.4
cultures of the organization	52	25.5	25.5	30.9
Valid dissatisfaction in the salary	1	.5	.5	31.4
Lack of good governance	140	68.6	68.6	100.0
Total	204	100.0	100.0	
<b>Administrative pool</b>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
dissatisfaction in the salary	2	5.1	5.1	5.1
cultures of the organization	17	43.6	43.6	48.7
Valid Lack of good governance	20	51.3	51.3	100.0
Total	39	100.0	100.0	
<b>Customers of grievance hearing offices</b>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent

	dissatisfaction in the salary	6	7.8	7.8	7.8
	state if any	7	9.1	9.1	16.9
Valid	cultures of the organization	10	13.0	13.0	29.9
	Lack of good governance	54	70.1	70.1	100.0
	Total	77	100.0	100.0	

Sources, field study, 2020

Based on the above table, 140(68.6%), 20(51.3%) and 54(70.1%) respondents in the civil service pool, in the administrative pool and in the customers of grievance hearing offices respectively responded that the main cause of grievance in the organization is the lack of good governance. The next, 1(0.5%) respondents in the civil service pool, 2(5.1%) respondents in the administrative pool and 6(7.8%) respondents in the customers of grievance hearing offices were responded that the main cause of grievance in the organization is the dissatisfaction of employees in their salary. The other, 52(25.5%), 17(43.6%) and 10(13%) respondents in the civil service pool, in the administrative pool and in the customers of the grievance hearing offices respectively responded that the cultures of the organization by itself can be the main cause of grievance in the organizations. The remaining, 11(5.4%) respondents in the civil service pool and 7(9.1%) respondents in the customers of the grievance hearing offices were responded that is not related with the given alternatives.

To sum, the majority of the respondents were responded that the main cause of grievance in the organization is the lack of good governance. The cultures of the organization are also the other main cause for the emergence of grievances in the organization. Therefore, it implied that the lack of good governance can be the major cause of grievances in the study area.

#### **4.5.4 Do you agree that grievance hearing offices can promote good governance in your organization?**

**Table18**

<b>Civil service pool</b>		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Valid	did not agree	25	12.3	12.3	12.3
	Agree	45	22.1	22.1	34.3

partially agree	59	28.9	28.9	63.2
strongly agree	75	36.8	36.8	100.0
Total	204	100.0	100.0	
<b>Administrative pool</b>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
partially agree	2	5.1	5.1	5.1
Valid strongly agree	37	94.9	94.9	100.0
Total	39	100.0	100.0	
<b>Customers of the grievance hearing offices</b>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
did not agree	3	3.9	3.9	3.9
partially agree	6	7.8	7.8	11.7
Valid Agree	29	37.7	37.7	49.4
strongly agree	39	50.6	50.6	100.0
Total	77	100.0	100.0	

Sources, field study, 2020

As described on the above table, 75(36.8%), 37(94.9%) and 39(50.6%) respondents in the civil service pool, in the administrative pool and in the customers of the grievance hearing offices were respectively responded that the grievance hearing offices can promote good governance in their respective organizations. The next, 45(22.1%) respondents in the civil service pool and 29(37.7%) respondents in the customers of grievance hearing offices were responded as they agree with the promotion of good governance through grievance hearing offices in their organizations. The other, 59(28.9%), 2(5.1%) and 6(7.8%) respondents in the civil service pool, in the administrative pool and in the customers of the grievance hearing offices were respectively responded that they partially agree with the promotion of good governance through grievance hearing offices. And the remaining, 25(12.3%) respondents in the civil service pool and 3(3.9%) respondents in the customers of grievance hearing offices were responded as disagree with the promotion of good governance through grievance hearing offices in their respective organizations.

This also showed that the majority of respondents in this regard indicated that the promotion of good governance grievance can be approved through grievance hearing offices.

#### **4.6 Actions to be taken by the Grievance Hearing Offices on the promotions of good governances**

##### **4.6.1 Is there any action to be taken to strength the roles of grievance hearing offices in the promotion of good governance?**

**Table19**

<b>Civil service pool</b>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	86	42.2	42.2	42.2
Valid No	118	57.8	57.8	100.0
Total	204	100.0	100.0	
<b>Administrative pool</b>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	12	30.8	30.8	30.8
Valid No	27	69.2	69.2	100.0
Total	39	100.0	100.0	
<b>Customers of the grievance hearing offices</b>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	13	16.9	16.9	16.9
Valid No	64	83.1	83.1	100.0
Total	77	100.0	100.0	

Sources, field study, 2020

Depending on the information gained from the above table, 118(57.8 %), 27(69.2%) and 64(83.1%) respondents in the civil service pool, in the administrative pool and in the customers of the grievance hearing offices were respectively responded that there is no recognition about what actions should be taken to strength the roles of grievance hearing offices in the promotions

of good governance in their respective organizations. The remaining, 86(42.2%), 12(30.85) and 13(16.9%) respondents in the civil service pool, in the administrative pool and in the customers of the grievance hearing offices were respectively responded that there are recognitions about what actions should be taken to strength the roles of grievance hearing offices in the promotions of good governance in their respective organizations.

As the majority of the respondents responded that there are no actions to be taken by the grievance hearing offices in the promotions of good governances. Even though it is not enough, there are individuals who responded that there are open discussions by the employees in different organizations, there are also peer teaching between individuals, there are different training and evaluations of employees and the officials. Because of the actions are not strong enough and clear for the majorities of respondents, this implied that there are no actions taken to strength the roles of grievance hearing offices.

#### **4.6.2 Advise for grievance hearing offices to make their mechanism more effective and productive**

**Table20**

<b>Civil service pool</b>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
State if any	12	5.9	5.9	5.9
Clarifying their performance	26	12.7	12.7	18.6
Acceptability by the customers	38	18.6	18.6	37.3
Valid Simplicity and Promptness	57	27.9	27.9	65.2
Conformity with Existing Legislation	71	34.8	34.8	100.0
Total	204	100.0	100.0	
<b>Administrative pool</b>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
State if any	1	2.6	2.6	2.6
Valid Acceptability by the customers	4	10.3	10.3	12.8
Simplicity and Promptness	9	23.1	23.1	35.9

Conformity with Existing Legislation	11	28.2	28.2	64.1
Clarifying their performance	14	35.9	35.9	100.0
Total	39	100.0	100.0	
<b>Customers of grievance hearing office</b>	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Acceptability by the customers	16	20.8	20.8	20.8
Simplicity and Promptness	18	23.4	23.4	44.2
Clarifying their performance	20	26.0	26.0	70.1
Conformity with Existing Legislation	23	29.9	29.9	100.0
Total	77	100.0	100.0	

Sources, field study, 2020

According to the above table, there are advises to make the grievance hearing offices more effective and productive. From others, 26(12.7%), 14(35.9%) and 20(26%) respondents in civil service pool, in the administrative pool and in the customers of grievance hearing offices were respectively responded that to make their mechanism more effective and productive it is better to clarifying their performances. In the same way, 57(27.9%) respondents in civil service pool, 9(23.1%) respondents in the administrative pool and 18(23.4%) respondents in the customers of grievance hearing office responded that grievance hearing offices are expected to be simplicity and promptness in their activities. The other, 71(34.8%), 11(28.2%) and 23(29.9%) respondents in the civil service pool, in the administrative pool and in the customers of grievance hearing offices respectively responded that grievance hearing offices are expected to conform with the existing legislation. In the same way, 38(18.6%) respondents in the civil service pool, 4(10.3%) respondents in the administrative pool and 16(20.8%) respondents in the customers of grievance hearing office responded that grievance hearing offices should have the acceptability of customers in their respective organizations. The remaining, 12(5.9%) and 1(2.6%) respondents in the civil service pool and administrative pool respectively responded not only the given alternatives but also there are different actions that the grievance hearing offices are expected to do.

As a result, the respondents were advised to the grievance hearing offices as to clarifying their performance to the citizens. They also expected to be simplicity and promptness in their actions. In the same way, the majority of the respondents responded that in order to make the performance of grievance hearing offices more effective and productive, the grievance hearing offices are expected to conform to the existing legislation. Conforming to the existing legislation is very much important to the grievance hearing offices to make their performances more effective and productive in the process of handling grievances of citizens in their respective organizations.

## **4.7 Findings of the Study**

### **4.7.1 The Role of Grievance Hearing Offices**

Grievance is a feeling of unfair treatment at work. Grievance is very much present in every workplace especially in today's era of globalization, if not tackled on time a minute grievance can become a conflict. It should also be noted that employees' grievance is the sign of a lack of good governance in an organization. If grievance is handled by the concerned bodies, it would indicate for the prevalence of good governance.

In this study, citizens have varieties of grievances which are created by different bureaucratic administration of their organization. For that end, this study would try to find out that whether grievance hearing offices could handle citizens' grievance and could promote good governance in Guna Begemidir wereda or not.

Depending on the information gained from the above data analysis, people in the study area were tried to handle their grievances through grievance hearing offices. Accordingly, the majority of the respondents were brought their grievance for their respective grievance hearing office in their organizations. To indicate in number, there were about 74% of the respondents that brought their grievances to their respective grievance hearing offices and tried to resolve through it.

It was also found out that the majority of the respondents in both pools I.e. civil service pool and administrative pool and in the customers of grievance hearing offices indicated that the roles of grievance hearing offices were crucial in their day today's' activities. Therefore, the grievance hearing offices could play high contribution in day today activities of citizens in their respective organizations.

This study also found out that even though the grievance hearing offices could play a crucial role, but in this study area they were ineffective in the process of resolving grievances of customers in their respective offices. As the interview conducted to Guna Begemidir' grievance hearing office chairperson, the offices were ineffective because the offices were loaded and served too many customers. He also added that each office should have its own grievance hearing office as one department with qualified officers (chair person of Guna Begemidir wereda's grievance hearing office, 2020).

The majority of the respondents in this study were also raised their grievance to their respective grievance hearing offices than different departments. Though different departments played a role to handle grievances of customers, but in this case the respondents were concluded that grievance hearing offices as the right office and safe to resolve the customers' grievance.

In addition to this, this study indicated that the majorities of the respondents responded that grievance procedure is the major source and sign to discover grievance in all their organizations. Therefore, citizens' grievance could discover formally through grievance procedure and others are also used as an alternative way of identifying grievances' of citizens. These alternative ways include; direct observation, open door policy and the like.

As an interview conducted with the chairperson of Guna Begemidir wereda's education office indicated that; every civil servant can bring their grievance through variety means. These grievances first seen by the grievance hearing office and the office tried to solve the problems. After that, if the problem is not solved, it would be transferred to the heads of the public offices. Finally, if the grievances are not solved, then citizens or customers would go to the formal legal process of law or courts (Chairperson of Guna Begemidir wereda's education office, 2020).

The other finding of this study is that the main objective of grievance hearing office according to the majorities of the respondents is to promote good governance in their respective organizations. Depending on the responses gained from the respondents, grievance hearing offices had other specific objectives to deal with like; to improving mutual understanding between the complaints and supervisors, to strengthening the line management of their organization and also to prevent the dissatisfactions of citizens in their respective organizations.

In addition to this, respondents also added that the grievance settlement process were not as much applicable in both pools and in the customers of grievance hearing offices as well.

Generally, this implied that the grievance hearing offices hardly comfort to handle the grievances of citizens.

As the interview answered by the chairperson of Guna Begemidir wereda's civil service office, grievance hearing offices should have their own procedure to handle grievance for the promotion of good governance. Even though it is necessary to have their own procedure, but the grievance hearing offices in this wereda had little attention in their own procedure to resolve grievance for the promotion of good governance. It should start with creating awareness to reduce the possible cause of grievance before it comes in to practices. Grievance hearing offices tried to resolve customers' grievance but that much is not effective to build good governance in their respective organizations (chairpersons of Guna Begemidir wereda's civil service office, 2020).

The majority of the respondents responded that if grievances were not settled well, there will be many problems that can occur. These problems in turn will affect the employees performance in their day today's activities that also resulted for the creation of maladministration and reduction of the developments of the organizations.

In this study, the majority of the respondents responded that the grievance hearing offices resolve their grievances in some extent and others responded that the grievance hearing offices did not resolve their grievances at all. This generalization is implied that the grievance hearing offices hardly resolves the grievances of the citizens in their respective organizations.

The other information gained from the interview conducted with the chairperson of the administrative office indicated that if grievance hearing offices are effective in handling grievance it can play a major role on the development of democracy and good governance. However, this study found that the grievance hearing offices did not fully achieve their role on the promotion of good governance in Guna Begemidir wereda. Since the majority of the respondents and the interviewee indicated that the grievance hearing offices were ineffective in the process of resolving grievances of customers in their respective offices (chairperson of Guna Begemidir wereda's administrative office, 2020).

To recapitulate, in Guna Begemidir wereda, the role of grievance hearing office in the promotion of good governance is not very much effective. In this wereda's civil service pool grievance hearing offices, the administrative pool grievance hearing office and the grievance hearing office by itself played little role on the promotion of good governance. These are because

of as the study found that those grievance hearing offices have no strong framework to handle the grievances of customers. Similarly, it is suggested that the grievance hearing offices should follow up the principle of accessibility, accountability, transparency and simplicity to handle citizens' grievances and to satisfy customers by promoting good governance.

#### **4.7.2 The Shortcomings of the Grievance Hearing Offices**

A core characteristic of an effective grievance mechanism is the ability to identify minor community incidents before they escalate into unmanageable disputes. This study found that as the majority of the respondents were responded as strongly agree, agree and partially agree that the grievance hearing offices faced different short comes when they are trying to resolving the grievances of citizens in their respective organizations. The major cause of customers' grievances is lack of good governance in the respective organizations as well as different governmental and non governmental institutions.

As the interview conducted with the chairperson of the police office; grievances of customers would risen for many times because of different causes in their sector. For them some of the causes of grievances include; per time allowance for servants, work career structure, servants benefit distribution and the like when the servants think that there is unjust treatment with others. Therefore, the study found that when employees assumed that there is an unjust treatment of civil servants by the office then grievances would rise. This was also supported by the chairperson of Guna Begemidir wereda small enterprise and trade offices. According to these offices chairpersons interview, customers were raised their grievances by lack of fair treatment of civil servants in their respective offices (chairpersons of Guna Begemidir wereda's police, trade and small enterprises offices, 2020).

The study found that as the majority of respondents responded that the major short comes of grievance hearing offices is the low salary of the grievance hearing officers and the dependency of the grievance hearing offices by the supervisors respectively. Though this were the major obstacles, but the lack of implementations of the given law and the low educational levels of the grievance hearing officers could also recognized by respondents as a great short comes of the grievance hearing offices when resolving grievances in their organizations.

In addition to the above short comes of the grievance hearing office, the Zikrehig of the Amhara National Regional State regulation number 130/2015, article 19 sub article 2 indicates

that those grievance hearing offices had facilitating role to handle grievance by public officials but had no decision making ability.

Any head of the public office required in writing to provide with the necessary information or explanation in relation to his responsibilities on the part of any public grievance hearing bodies found at each administrative hierarchy of the Region shall have the duty to provide response signed by himself or his deputy or a person delegated by either of them within seven working days from the date of having been served with the letter of request for same (zikrehig, 2015).

However, article 19 sub articles 3, of this article states that the public officials would be accountable to any failures in grievance handling process. Any head of the public office including the administrators of each hierarchy who fails to co-operate or is defiant pursuant to Sub Arts. /1/ and /2/ of this Article hereof, hinders the implementation of decisions of public grievance hearing bodies or obstructs the efforts exerted to bring about good governance on the part of the Regional State shall, depending on the circumstance of the case, be liable in accordance with Art.416, Art.438, Art.440 Sub Art. /1/ “C” of the FDRE’s Criminal Code or other relevant provisions of the Criminal Law thereof (Ibid).

As the interview conducted with the chairpersons of health, court and justice offices, there are different challenges or short comes of grievance hearing offices in Guna Begemidir wereda. These short comes or challenges were similar with that of the respondents responded as the major short comes of the grievance hearing offices is the low salary of the grievance hearing officers and the dependency of the grievance hearing offices by the supervisors respectively. Even though this were the major obstacles, but the lack of implementations of the given law and the low educational levels of the grievance hearing officers could also recognized by the interviewees’ as a great short comes of the grievance hearing offices when resolving grievances in their respective organizations (chairpersons of Guna Begemidir wereda’s health, court and justice offices, 2020).

As the interview conducted with the chairpersons in the plan commission and sport offices, the challenges of grievance hearing offices are vary depending on the activities they delivered. Both offices indicated that one of the short comes of the grievance hearing offices is that there is no ground of laws to administer and enforce grievance and high dominance of grievance hearing

offices by its own officials (chair persons of Guna Begemidir wereda's plan commission and sport offices, 2020).

Generally speaking, the study shows that in Guna Begemidir wereda the grievance hearing offices have many obstacles to perform their task. Therefore, it is very much important to do that the grievance hearing offices should be organized independently as judicial bodies to be effective in resolving grievances. In addition to this, it is also vital to create the capacity building training for the employees in the grievance hearing offices concerning resolving the grievance. By doing these and other related measures, the grievance hearing offices can play an effective role on the promotions of good governance.

### **4.7.3 Actions to be taken by the Grievance Hearing Offices**

The study found that there are no actions to be taken to strength grievance hearing offices in Guna Begemidir wereda. As the majority of the respondents responded and as the interview conducted with the chairperson of the civil service office in Guna Begemidir wereda, that there are no actions to be taken by the grievance hearing offices in the promotions of good governances. Even though it is not enough, there are measures that the grievance hearing offices tried to take to strength its ability to perform its task. As civil service office responded that there are open discussions by the employees in different organizations, there are also peer teaching between individuals, there are different training and evaluations of employees and the officials. Because of the actions are not strong enough and clear for the majorities of respondents, this implied that there are no actions taken to strength the roles of grievance hearing offices (Guna Begemidir wereda's civil service office, 2020).

The study also found that the grievance hearing office in Guna Begemidir wereda civil service pool, administrative pool and the grievance hearing office by itself hardly take measures to strength the grievance hearing offices on the promotions of good governance. Though there are no actions taken by the offices, but there are indications that the respondents suggested different actions to be taken that strengthen the grievance hearing offices. As the interview answered by the chairperson of the administrative office, there are suggestions to strength grievance hearing offices. Primarily, the grievance hearing officials should be organized as an independent organ from federal up to woreda and kebele levels. This is because to strength grievance hearing offices and to promote good governance there must be strong legal ground to enhance the decision-making ability and responsibility of grievance hearing offices and to put

qualified and knowledgeable grievance hearing officials (Guna Begemidir wereda's administrative office, 2020).

In addition to this, he also added that the grievance hearing offices have to lead by skilled and matured officials especially that have work experiences in lawyer, justice, and related to law. Not only this but also, the grievance hearing offices should be organized and trained based on the principles of good governance (ibid).

. The study also found that to strength grievance hearing offices on the promotions of good governance, the respondents advise that the grievance hearing offices have to be committed on their performances and needs to be free from any political and other dominations. The study found that a strong legal guarantee is needed to be grievance hearing offices more effective. For that end, the government is expected to prepare successive training for grievance hearing officials and allocate the proper payment for the employees' in the grievance hearing offices elsewhere.

In addition to the above explanations, the study found that the grievance hearing offices are also expected to clarifying their performance to the citizens. They also expected to be simplicity and promptness in their actions. In the same way, the study found that as the majority of the respondents responded that in order to make the performance of grievance hearing offices more effective and productive, the grievance hearing offices are expected to conform to the existing legislation. Conforming to the existing legislation is very much important to the grievance hearing offices to make their performances more effective and productive in the process of handling grievances of citizens in their respective organizations. This conformity of legislation is also paves the way for the promotions of good governance in all aspects of human life.

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **5.1 Summary**

Citizens' grievances need to be handling effectively in any organizations. When the grievances of citizens handled effectively, then employees become satisfied and they can contribute a lot for the effectiveness and productivity of the organizations. To do this, there must be grievances hearing institutions and offices in any organizations. As a result, if the grievance hearing institutions identified and handled citizens' grievances effectively, then it would have an inevitable role to promote good governance. Therefore, it is very much important to understand that the roles of grievance hearing institutions on resolving grievance and promoting good governance is vital thing for any institutions.

As the majority of the respondents responded that the study shows, if grievances of citizens' were not settled well, then there will be many problems that can occur. These problems in return will affect the employees performance in their day today's activities that also resulted for the reduction of the developments of the organizations. These also indicated that democracy and good governance will not be practically implemented with the absence of effective grievance hearing offices in any organizations.

Hence, the study assessed that the roles of grievance hearing offices on the promotion of good governance in Guna Begemidir wereda by taking the samples for the study from the civil service pool, from the administrative pool and from the customers of grievances hearing office. In this wereda, almost all samples were raised grievances for their respective offices. Though they raised their grievance for their respective grievance hearing offices, but the offices were not effective in resolving the grievances of customers.

As the study shows the grievance hearing offices simply received the employees' grievance without gave responses as immediate as possible for them. Similarly, as most of the respondents showed that grievance hearing office hardly worked to accept the customers' grievances and tried to resolve it since the grievance hearing offices did not go far an expected distance. Even though the study shows that the grievance hearing offices are vital for the citizens in their day today activities, but their practice in Guna Begemidir wereda were not achieved well. So, it is

very much important to conclude that the grievance hearing offices in Guna Begemidir wereda were not as much effective in its contribution for the promotions of good governance.

The study also found that why the grievance hearing offices were not effective in Guna Begemidir wereda in its performances. The major short comes of the grievance hearing offices is low salary of the grievance hearing officers and the dependency of the grievance hearing offices by the supervisors. Though this were the major obstacles, but the lack of implementations of the given law and the low educational levels of the grievance hearing officers could also recognized by this study as the short comes of the grievance hearing offices when resolving grievances in their organizations. In addition to these, the study also indicated that those grievance hearing offices had facilitating role to handle grievance by public officials but had no decision making ability.

Finally, the study also found that there are no actions taken by the grievance hearing offices in this wereda, but there are deferent indications that the respondents suggested to be taken to strengthen the grievance hearing offices. Primarily, as the study shows, the government is expected to prepare successive training for grievance hearing officials and allocate the proper payment for the employees' in the grievance hearing offices. Secondly, the grievance hearing offices are also expected to clarifying their performance to the citizens.

This study would also contribute a lot for the performance of the grievance hearing office in this wereda. In addition to this, the study also showed that the grievance hearing offices as expected to be simplicity and promptness in their actions. In the same way, the study also indicated that in order to make the performance of grievance hearing offices more effective and productive, the grievance hearing offices are expected to conform to the existing legislation.

## **5.2 Conclusions**

Citizen's grievances and complains need to handle effectively in any ways of human life. This also resulted for the organizational effectiveness and productivity. Therefore, to handle such grievances, there is a need to grievance hearing institutions in the all governmental and nongovernmental organizations. If citizens' grievances are identified and handled effectively, it would have an inevitable role on the promotions of good governance. So it's essential to know the contribution of grievance hearing institutions on handling grievance and promoting good governance. The study assessed the roles of Guna Begemidir woreda grievance hearing offices in handling grievance and in the promotions of good governance.

The study shows that Guna Begemidir wereda civil services pool, administrative pool and preliminary grievance hearing offices, were served to hear grievance in their respective organizations. Citizens raised grievance through different ways however, the grievance hearing offices simply receive employee's grievances and did not go far an expected distance to handle employee's grievance to satisfy citizens. So that, it is possible to conclude as Guna Begemidir wereda civil services pool, administrative pool and preliminary grievance hearing offices were not effective in handling grievance and satisfying citizens. Hence, as it is less effective to handling grievances efficiently, it played insignificant role for the promotions of good governance in Guna Begemidir wereda.

The major short comes of the grievance hearing offices were low salary of the grievance hearing officers and the dependency of the grievance hearing offices by the supervisors. Furthermore, lack of implementations of the given law and the low educational levels of the grievance hearing officers could also recognized by this study as the short comes of the grievance hearing offices. The study also shows that the actions or measures to be taken to strengthen the grievance hearing offices were insignificant enough in Guna Begemidir *wereda*. However, it suggested different action to be taken by them to strength grievance hearing offices performances.

### **5.3 Recommendations**

Since the grievance hearing offices can play inevitable role in the promotions of good governance and as it is less effective in handling grievances in Guna Begemidir wereda, then it is important to recommend that;

- The grievance hearing offices in Guna Begemidir wereda are expected primarily to identify the causes of citizens' grievances and then they have to take lawful measures before it is going to high conflict.
- The grievance hearing officers who are employed in Guna Begemidir wereda's civil service pool, administrative pool and preliminary grievance hearing offices are also expected to handling the grievances of citizens in their respective organizations.
- The grievance hearing offices in this wereda are needed to strength its ability to make its own decisions regarding to grievance handling procedure but not be dependent on the political elites and different officials.

On the other hand, since the grievance hearing offices faced many short comes i.e. the lack of grounds of law and being dependent by different officials then it is very much important to recommend that;

- The political officials do not to interfere excessively and influence on the activities of grievance hearing offices.
- Since the grievance hearing offices can contribute a lot in the promotions of good governance, it is better for the government and for the government officials to give lawful freedom and liberty for the offices to do independently.
- Grievance hearing offices in Guna Begemidir wereda are expected to organize independently by each sector than organizing in many pools like; civil service pool, administrative pool, communication pool and agriculture pool.

As the study found no actions or majors could be taken, then it is better to recommend that;

- Each sector of the government may have its own grievance hearing mechanisms rather than making jointly one office in to more sectors to reduce the loads of grievance hearing offices.
- The government is also better to organize successive training to update the grievance hearing officials and pay a proper amount of payment to grievance hearing offices.
- The government is better to employ a computable and well-educated person to the grievance hearing offices.
- More studies may be conducted on handling employee's grievances, effectiveness, challenges and prospects in all sectors.

## References

- Abebe Sewmehon (2018), “*The roles of ombudsman institution on the creation of awareness and reductions of maladministration in dangla wereda public servants*” MA thesis submitted to Bahirdar University, (unpublished).
- Abrham, Y. (2011, July). *The ombudsman in Ethiopia; Ethiopian legal preif*  
Addis Ababa University, (2009), *introduction to research methods*; preparatory module for Addis Ababa University graduate programs
- Amhara National Regional State, (2020, February 25), *proclamations passed by the head of the government to all zones and City administrations on public grievance and administrative justice decision making*, office of the head of the government.
- APRM, (2019), *African governance report*; retrieved from [www.aprm-au.org/info@aprm-](http://www.aprm-au.org/info@aprm-)
- Berihu, A. G. (2009), *Business process re- engineering*, Addis Ababa: Brhanina selam pri press.
- Best, J. & J.VKahn, (2003), *Research Method in Education*; New Delhi: Prentice (Hall)
- Bhim, C. (2006, February 02). *Google* Retrieved from  
<https://www.wisenepali.com/.com/2006/02employees-grievance-reasoncauses.html?m=1>:  
<https://www.wisenepali.com/.com/2006/02employees-grievance-reasoncauses.html?m=1>
- Bodansky, D. (1999), *the legitimacy of international governance, American journal of international law*, Cambridge university press.
- BrayMan, A. (2008). *Social Research Methods* (3<sup>rd</sup>E.d). New York United States of America Oxford University Press
- Chair person of G. B. W, (2020, from April 1 up to 15), what are the causes of grievance in your organization? (Dessalegn interviewer).
- Chair person of G. B W, (2020, April, 17) what are the roles of grievance hearing office in your organization? (Dessalegn interviewer).
- Chair person of G. B. W, (2020, April, 20) how do you seen the performance of grievance hearing office in your organizations? (Dessalegn interviewer).

Chair persons of G. B. W, (2020 from April 24) what are the short comes of grievance hearing offices in your organization? (Dessaegn interviewer).

Chair person G. B, W (2020, April 25), is there any measures or actions taken by the grievance hearing offices to make their performance more effective? (Dessaegn interviewer).

*Chand, S.* (2017, March 09). *Google* Retrieved from [www.yourarticlelibrary.com/human-Resources/grievance-handling-definition-features-and-effects](http://www.yourarticlelibrary.com/human-Resources/grievance-handling-definition-features-and-effects)

*C.R Kothari,* (2004), *research methodology; methods and techniques*, 2<sup>nd</sup> revised edition.

*Dessie S.* (2018). *Ombudsman for Good Governances in Ethiopia: Assessing the Awareness and Perceptions of Civil Servants: Insight from South Wollo Zone Civil Servants*, *Journal of Political Sciences & Public Affairs*, Wollo University.

*Dooley D.* (1995), *Social Research Methods* (3<sup>rd</sup>E.d): University of California at Irvine Upper Saddle River, New Jersey

*Fekadu, N. D.* (2013), *the impact of integrated micro-credit programs and its linkage*. Addis Ababa: LAP Lambert.

*French, D. & kirkham, R.* (2009), *Complaint and grievance mechanisms in international law; one piece of the accountability jigaw*. *new zealand yearbook of international law*.

*Garima,* (2017), *grievance handling; motivational tool for employees*, international journal of Scientific research

*General laws, A. N* (2004), *General provisions*, Bahir Dar: st. Gebreal printing press.

*Goldberg, S. B.* (1989), *Grievance mediation; a successful alternative to labor arbitration*, Harvard: Harvard university press.

*Gregory R. & Giddings P.* (2000), *Right and wrong, the ombudsman in six continents*. Amsterdam: IOS Press.

- Guna Begemidir Wereda's plan commission (2020), "information, communication and Technology centre" Kimir dingay (un published).*
- Harold Arie, (2015), the role of an effective grievance procedure in creating tolerable environment.*
- Kataoka S. (2018), the plight of African states and good governance.*
- Mindzie M. Wachira G. and Dunderdale L. (2014), effective governance in challenging environments, international peace institute.*
- Ministry of Agriculture, G.B. (2019, September 11), Google Retrieved from [www.moaf.gov.bt](http://www.moaf.gov.bt):  
[http://:www.moaf.gov.bt](http://www.moaf.gov.bt)
- Mubezi S. (2015), Perceived effectiveness of employee grievance handling procedure on conflict management in Kenya; The Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management Jomo kennytta University.*
- Negarit Gazetta F. (2002), *Federal Civil servants disciplinary and grievance procedure; Councils of ministers, Addis Ababa.*
- Negarit Gazeta F. (2011), *the establishment of the institution of the ombudsman to promote the principle of good governance and to receive complaints and grievances in Ethiopia.*
- Ngetich P. K. (2016), perceived effect of grievance handling procedure on employee performance, Jemo Kenyatta foundation.*
- Rondloph, R. & Buli E. (2011), Study on strengthen grievance redress mechanism for the protection of basic services (PBS) in Ethiopia; World Bank and Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (KfW).*

Scott W. V and Deirdre D. J (2009) *Research Methods for Everyday Life*, blending qualitative and quantitative approach, published by Jossey-Bass

Teferi Zeleke, (2017), *an assessment of challenges of urban good governance*, the case of fiche town administration.

Wollo university, (2013), *research proposal, thesis and dissertation writing manual*, Wollo, Desie.

World Bank (2013, September), *the World Bank's Approach to*. Retrieved July 31, 2019, from

<https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/20119>:

<https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/20119>

Yin R. (2003), *Case Study Research Design and Methods* (4<sup>th</sup>E.d). Thousand Oaks, California: York: Wand worth Pub Com.

Zikrehig, (2015, April 10), *Google* Retrieved from <http://www.slpwa.gov.au>:

<http://www.slpwa.gov.au>

Zoltan Dornyei, (2007), *research methods in applied linguistics*; quantitative, qualitative and mixed methodologies, oxford university press.

ያለዉእንዳወቀ, (1998 ዓ.ም) የምርምርመሰረታዊምርሆኝእናአተገባበር:::(ሶስተኛ እትም) ባህርዳር ዩኒቨርሲቲ::

# **APENDICESS**

## **Appendix A**

### **Questionnaires**



## **ADDISS ABABA UNIVERSITY**

### **School of Social Science and Humanities**

### **Department of Civics and Ethical Studies**

### **Post Graduation Program**

### **Questionnaires**

First of all, I thank you all and I am MAgraduating student in civics and Ethical Studies at Addis Ababa University. To do so, I am preparing graduating thesis on “an assessment on the roles of grievance hearing offices in the promotion of good governance in Guna Begemidir woreda.” So, I kindly request you to share your best knowledge and experience by filling into the following questionnaires for the successful completion of this study. It should be also noted that all your responses are critical and valuable and only used for this research. So you have to be confidential that your answer should not be disclosed out of the academic purpose.

### **Instruction**

Here you are kindly request to put a sign of tick across the provided options which are representing your answer. When you write your answers, you are allowed to use any space which is available for you.

### **PART I Personal information**

1. Sex.....
2. Name of the organization.....

- 3. Years of Experience.....
- 4. Department.....

**Part II Questions about Grievance Hearing Offices**

- 1. Do you know that there is grievance hearing offices in your organization? (a) Yes (b) No
- 2. Did you bring your grievances to any grievance hearing offices in your organization? (a) Yes (b) no
- 3. How many times did you bring your grievance for your grievance hearing office?  
(a) Once (b) twice (c) three times (d) state if any.....
- 4. What was the response of grievance hearing offices when you and others raise grievance to those offices?  
a. Immediately accepts the grievance and give responses  
b. Look into the matter for a long period of time  
c. Rejects the grievance than giving responses  
d. State if any.....
- 5. Do you agree that the roles of grievance hearing office are crucial in your day today activities?  
(a) Strongly agree (b) totally agree (c) partially agree (d) I cannot say
- 6. Do you agree that the Grievance hearing office in your organization is effective in its functions?  
a. Strongly agree b. totally agree c. partially agree d. I cannot say
- 7. For whom you should approach in case of any grievance rose on you specially to promote good governance in your organization?  
a. Grievance hearing offices b. Top Management c. Immediate supervisor d. Head of the Department e. State if any.....
- 8. What sources and signs are used to discover grievances in your organization?  
a. Direct Observation b. Grievance Procedure c. Open door policy d. State if any.....
- 9. What do you think that the main objectives of Grievance hearing office in your organization?

- a. To promote good governance
- b. To improve mutual understanding between compliant and supervisor
- c. To strengthen line management in the organization
- d. To prevent dissatisfaction of employees
- e. State if any.....

10. Are you satisfied with the Grievance Settlement process that takes place in your organization? (a) Yes (b) No

11. What do you think that the effect of grievances on employees' performance, if grievances are not identified and Redressed in your organization well?

- a. Reduced the levels of morality b. Reduced the employees punctuality and commitment
- c. Increased rate of absenteeism and turnover d. All of the above can be occur
- e. State if any.....

12. What do you think that the grievance hearing offices can resolve your grievance in your organization?

- (a).it resolves my grievance well (b). It resolves my grievance in some extent
- (c). It did not resolves my grievance at all (d). State if any.....

13. Do you agree that grievance hearing offices faced any short comes when resolving grievances in your organization? (a) Strongly agree (b) agree (c) partially agree (d) did not agree

14. What are the main factors which are responsible for grievance hearing offices not to resolve your grievance in your organization? If any;

- a. Low salary of grievance hearing officers' b. Dependency of the office by the supervisors
- c. Low educational level of grievance hearing offices d. Lack of the implementations of the given law e. All can be the factors f. State if any.....

15. What do you think that the cause of grievance in your organization?

- a. Lack of good governance b. dissatisfaction in your salary c. cultures of the organization
- d. State if any other causes.....

16. Do you agree that grievance hearing offices can promote good governance in your organization? a. Strongly agree b. agree c. partially agree d. did not agree

17. Have you any recognition about what actions should be taken to strength the roles of grievance hearing offices in the promotion of good governance in your organization? (a) Yes (b) No. If your answer is yes, please explain in detail that what actions should be taken?  
.....

18. What do you advise for grievance hearing offices to make their mechanism more effective and productive?

a. Clarifying their performance b. Simplicity and Promptness c. Conformity with Existing Legislation d. Acceptability by the customers. e. State if any.....

**Thank you in advance for your cooperation and genuine information!!!**

# Appendix B

## Translations of the Questionnaires



### አዲስ አበባ ዩኒቨርሲቲ

### የማህበራዊ ሳይንስ እና ስነ- ሰብዕ ፋካልቲ

### የስነ-ዜጋና ስነ- ምግባር ፕናት ትምህርት ክፍል

### ድህረ - ምረቃ መርሀ ግብር

### መጠይቆች

ከሁሉ አስቀድሜ ስለትብብርዎ ከልብ እዎመሰግንኩኝ እኔ በአዲስ አበባ ዩኒቨርሲቲ የስነ-ዜጋና ስነ- ምግባር ፕናት ትምህርት ክፍል የምግባር ተማሪ የሁለተኛ ደረጃ የመመሪያ ጽሑፍ በመስራት ሳይ እገኛለሁ። በመሆኑም የመመሪያ ፅሑፍ ርዕስ የገና በገምድር ወረዳ የቅሬታ ሰሚ ፅ/ቤቶች ስመልካም አስተዳደር ግምባታ ያሳቸው ሚና የሚል ነው። ስለዚህ ቅጹን በቅንነት በመሙላት አስፈላጊውን ትብብር ሁሉ ታደርጉልኝ ዘንድ በአክብሮት እየጠየቅሁኝ፤ የሚያካፍሉኝ እውቀትና ልምድ ስጥናቱ መሳካት ታላቅ ሚና ይኖረዋል። በመሆኑም ዉድ እውቀትዎትንና ልምድዎትን በመጠይቅ መሰረት እንዲሞሉልኝ ስል በትህትና እጠይቃለሁ። የመጠይቅ ሁሉም መልሶች ደግሞ ስጥናቱ ዓላማ ብቻ የሚዉሉ ስለሆነ ምስጢራዊነቱን እንደምጠብቅ በፈጣሪ ስም ቃል እገባለሁ።

### መመሪያ፤

መልስዎን በትክክል ወይም በጥቅሱ ሚገልጽልዎን አማራጮች ሳይ አንድ ምልክት ያደርጉ። ተጨማሪ አስተያየት ካለዎ ወይም ከተዘረዘሩት አማራጮች የተለየ ሀሳብ ካለዎ ባለዉ ክፍት ቦታ ሳይ መፃፍ ይችላሉ።

### ክፍል I ግላዊ መረጃዎች

1. ፆታ.....
2. የመስሪያ ቤቱ ስም.....

3. የስራ ልምድ .....

4. ትምህርት ክፍል.....

**ክፍል II      ቅሬታ ሰሚ ተቋማትን የተመለከቱ ጥያቄዎች**

1. በመስሪያ ቤትም ወይም በሌላ ተቋም ሰሚ ተቋም መኖሩን ያውቃሉ? ሀ/ አወ ስ/ የሰም

2. በመስሪያ ቤትም ወይም በሌላ ተቋም ማንኛውንም አይነት ቅሬታ ሰቅሬታ ሰሚ ፅ/ቤት አቅርበዋል ያውቃሉ? ሀ/ አወ ስ/ የሰም

3. ቅሬታ አቅርበዋል የሚያወቁ ከሆነ ስምን ያህል ጊዜ አቅርበዋል ያውቃሉ? ሀ/ ስንድ ጊዜ ስ/ ስህስት ጊዜ ሐ/ ስህስት ጊዜ መ/ ሌላ ካለውት ቢገልጹልን .....

4. እርስዎም ሆኑ ሌሎች ቅሬታ አቅራቢዎች ቅሬታ ሲያቀርቡ ቅሬታቸው የሚያገኘው ምሳሽ እንዴት ነው ብለው ያስባሉ? ሀ/ ወዲያውኑ ተቀብሎ ተገቢውን ምሳሽ መስጠት ስ/ ጉዳዩን በማየት ማዘገዥት ሐ/ ቅሬታውን መቃወምና ምንም መልስ አስመስጠት መ/ሌላ ካለውት ቢገልጹልን.....

5. የቅሬታ ሰሚ ተቋማት ሚናቸው እስት ከእስት ስራዎቻችሁ ጋር ወሳኝ ነው በሚለው ይስማማሉ? ሀ/በጣም እስማማለሁ ስ/ እስማማለሁ ሐ/ በከፊል እስማማለሁ መ/ምንም ማለት አልፈልገም

6. በተቋምወት ወይም በሌላ ተቋም ሰሚዎች በሚሰሩት ስራ ውጤታማ ናቸው ብለው ያስባሉ? ሀ/በጣም እስማማለሁ ስ/ እስማማለሁ ሐ/ በከፊል እስማማለሁ መ/ምንም ማለት አልፈልገም

7. በተቋምወት ወይም በተለይም መልካም አስተዳደርን ለማስፈን በሚፈጠር ማንኛውም አይነት ቅሬታ ፈጥነው የሚያቀርቡት ሰማን ነው? ሀ/ ሰቅሬታ ሰሚ ፅ/ቤት ስ/ ስበሳይ አስተዳደሩ ሐ/ ሰቅርብ ተጠሪዎ መ/ ስስራ ክፍል ተጠሪዎ ስ/ ሌላ ካለውት ቢገልጹልን .....

8. በመስሪያ ቤትም ወይም በሌላ ተቋም ቅሬታዎችን ለመገለጽ የሚጠቀሙባቸው ምንጮችና ምልክቶች ምንድን ናቸው? ሀ/ በቀጥታ ምልክታ ስ/ በቅሬታ ስነስርዓት ሐ/ ክፍት በሆነ መመሪያ መ/ ሌላ ካለውት ቢገልጹልን .....

9. በመስሪያ ቤትም ወይም ያለው ቅሬታ ሰሚ ተቋም ዋና አላማው ምንድን ነው ብለው ያስባሉ? ሀ/መልካም አስተዳደርን ለማስፈን ስ/የአዛዥና ታዛዥ የሁለትዮሽ ተገባቦትን ለማሳደግ ሐ/ በተቋሙ ወይም ያለውን የአስተዳደር እርከን ለማጠናከር መ/በሰራተኞች ላይ ያለውን አስመርካት መከላከል ለ/ ሌላ ካለውት ቢገልጹልን

10. በመስሪያ ቤትም ዉስጥ በሚካሄዱ የቅራታ ስፈታት ሂደቶች እረክተዉ ያቃሉ? ሀ/ አዎ ስ/ የሰም
11. ቅራታዎች በአገባቡ ካልተሰዩና ካልተፈቱ በተቋሙ ሰራተኛች ዉጤታማነት ላይ የሚያሳድረዉ ተፅዕኖ ምንድን ነዉ ብሰዉ ያስባሉ? ሀ/የቅንነትና የታማኝነት ደረጃ መቀነስ ስ/ የሰራተኛች ስዓት አክባሪነትና ዝግጁነት መቀነስ ሐ/ የቀሪ መጠን መጨመርና የሰራተኛች መስዋወጥ መ/ ሁሉም ተፅዕኖወች ሲከሰቱ ይችላሉ ሠ/ ሌላ ካሰዎት ቢገልፁልን.....
12. የቅራታ ሰሚ ተቋማት ብቁና ዉጤታማ እንዲሆኑ ምን እይነት የአሰራር ዘዴ ቢጠቀሙ የተሻሰ ነዉ ብሰዉ ይመክራሉ? ሀ/አሰራራቸዉን ግልፅ ማድረግ ስ/ ቀላልና ፈጣን ማድረግ ሐ/ ህገን ተከትሎ መስራት መ/ በደምበኛች ዘንድ ተቀባይነት ያሰዉ አሰራር ሠ/ ሌላ ካሰዎት ቢገልፁልን
13. የቅራታ ሰሚ ተቋማት በተቋምዎ ዉስጥ ያሰዎትን ቅራታ ደፈታሉ ብሰዉ ያስባሉ? ሀ/ በሚገባ ደፈቱልኛል ስ/ በተወሰነ መልኩ ደፈቱልኛል ሐ/ ምንም አይደሉልኛም መ/ ሌላ ካሰዎት ቢገልፁልን
14. በመስሪያ ቤትም ዉስጥ የቅራታ ሰሚ ተቋማት ቅራታ በሚፈቱበት ጊዜ ተገዳሮቶች አጋጥመዉ ያዉቃሉ? ሀ/ በጣም አስማማሰሁ ስ/ አስማማሰሁ ሐ/ በከፊል አስማማሰሁ መ/ አልስማማም
15. በመስሪያ ቤትም ዉስጥ የቅራታ ሰሚ ተቋማት ቅራታወችን በአገባቡ እንዳይፈቱ ተፅዕኖ የሚያደርጉባቸዉ ችግሮች ካሉ ምን ምን ናቸዉ? ሀ/ የቅራታ ሰሚ ባለሙያወች የክፍያ ማነስ ስ/ የቅራታ ሰሚ ተቋሙ ሰህላሬወች ጥገኛ መሆን ሐ/ የቅራታ ሰሚ ባለሙያዎች የትምህርት ማነስ መ/መደበኛ ህጎችን ተግባራዊ ያስማድረግ ሠ/ ሁሉም ችግሮች ሲሆኑ ይችላሉ ረ/ ሌላ ካሰዎት ቢገልፁልን .....
16. በመስሪያ ቤትም ዉስጥ ሰሚነሱ ቅራታወች ምክንያታቸዉ ምንድን ነዉ ብሰዉ ያስበሉ? ሀ/ የመልካም አስተዳደር አጦት ስ/ በደሞዝ አስመርካት ሐ/ የተቋሙ ባህል መ/ ሌላ ካሰዎት ቢገልፁልን .....
17. በተቋምዎ ዉስጥ ቅራታ ሰሚ ተቋማት መልካም አስተዳደርን ሰማስፈን ይረዳሉ ብሰዉ ይስማማሉ? ሀ/ አስማማሰሁ ስ/ አስማማሰሁ ሐ/በከፊል አስማማሰሁ መ/ አልስማማም
18. በተቋምዎ ዉስጥ የቅራታ ሰሚ ተቋማት መልካም አስተዳደርን ሰማስፈን ያላቸዉን ሚና ሰማጠናከር ምን ምን ተግባራት እየተተገበሩ እንዳሉ እዉቅና አሰዎት? ሀ/ አዎ ስ/ የሰም እዉቅና አስኝ ካሉ ምን ምን ተግባራት ተከናወኑ? .....

ትክክለኛ መረጃ ስለሰጡኝ ከልብ አመሰግናለሁ፡፡

# Appendix C

## ቃስ- መጠይቅ (interview)

ይህ ቃስ- መጠይቅ (interview) በዋናነት የተዘጋጀው በገና በገምድር ወረዳ ውስጥ ሰሚገኝና ስተመረጡ የመንግስት መስሪያ ቤት ኅሳብዎችና ግለሰቦችነው።

ከሁሉ አስቀድሞ ስለትብብርዎ ከፍተኛ ያሉ ምስጋናዎን እያቀረብኩ እኔ በአዲስ አበባ ዩኒቨርሲቲ የሰነድ ዘጋና ስነ-ምግባር ጥናት ትምህርት ክፍል የሁለተኛ ደረጃ የመመሪያ ጽሑፍ በመስራት ላይ ስላሰሁ፤ መጠይቁን በቅንነት በመሙላት እዲተባበራኝ በአክብሮት እጠይቃለሁ። እርስዎ የሚሰጡኝ ምሳሌ ሰጥናታዊ ፅሁፊ መሳካት ገልጻለሁ ማለት ስላለው አስፈላጊ የሆኑ መረጃዎችን በመስጠት እንዲያጋሩኝ በትህትና እጠይቃለሁ ። የመመሪያ ፅሁፊ ርዕስም “የገና በገምድር ወረዳ የቅሬታ ሰሚ ፅ/ቤቶች ስመልካም አስተዳደር ግምባታ ያላቸውን ሚና ማጥናት” የሚል ሲሆን በርእሱ ዙሪያ ያለዎትን እውቀት እና ልምድ በመጠይቁ መሰረት እዲያካፍሉኝ በትህትና እጠይቃለሁ። ከመጠይቁ የማገኛቸው መልሶች በሙሉ ሰጥናቱ አላማ ብቻ የሚወጡ በመሆኑ በሚስጥር የሚያዝ እንደሚሆን ቃል እገባልዎታለሁ።

ክፍል 1: የመስሪያ ቤቱ ስም.....

2: ኅሳብዎን -----

ክፍል 2፤

- (1) እርስዎ ኃላፊ ከሆኑበት ጊዜ ጀምሮ በመስሪያ ቤትዎ ውስጥ ቅሬታዎች በምን በምን ምክንያት ሲነሱ ይችላሉ ብለው ያስባሉ? ቢዘረዝሩልኝ  
.....
- (2) በመስሪያ ቤትዎ ውስጥ አየሰሩ ያሉ የመንግስት ሰራተኞች ቅሬታዎች ሲኖሯቸው የሚያቀርቡት በምን አይነት መንገዶች እንደሆነ ቢገልጹልኝ?  
.....
- (3) በመስሪያ ቤትዎ ውስጥ ቅሬታዎች ለምን ያህል ጊዜ ቀርቦልዎት ያወቃል? የተሰጡት ምሳሌ ምን ይመስላሉ? በዝርዝር ቢገልጹልኝ  
.....
- (4) የሰራተኞች ቅሬታ በወቅቱ ካልተፈታ በሠራተኞች የእስት ክእስት የሥራ እንቅስቃሴና በወረዳው ውስጥ ባለው መልካም አስተዳደር ላይ ምን አይነት ተጽዕኖ ያስከትላል ብለው ያስባሉ?  
.....

- (5) በመስሪያ ቤት ውስጥ መልካም አስተዳደርን ለማስፈን የቅሬታ ሰሚ አካላት ሚና አላቸው? አላቸው ካሉ ሚናቸው ምን እንደሚመስል በዝርዝር ቢገልጹልኝ?  
.....
- (6) በመስሪያ ቤት ውስጥ ቅሬታን ለመቅረፍና መልካም አስተዳደርን ለማስፈን የመስሪያ ቤት ሰራተኞች ምን ምን ተግባራትን በማከናወን ላይ እንደሚገኙ በዝርዝር ቢገልጹልኝ?  
.....
- (7) ለአርሰዎም ደህን ስሌቶች ሰራተኞች ቅሬታንና መልካም አስተዳደርን በተመለከተ ስልጠናዎችን ወስደውና አስወስደው ያወቃሉ?  
.....
- (8) በመስሪያ ቤት ውስጥ የቅሬታ አቀራረብና አፈታት ምን እንደሚመስል ሰፊና ተንተን አድርገው ቢያብራሩልኝ?  
.....
- (9) በመስሪያ ቤት ውስጥ ቅሬታን ለመቅረፍ የአመራሩና የሰራተኛው ቀርጠኝነት ምን እንደሚመስል በዝርዝር ቢገልጹልኝ?  
.....
- (10) በመስሪያ ቤት ውስጥ የቅሬታ ሰሚ አካላት ቅሬታዎችን ተቀብለው ለማስተናገድ የማይችሉባቸው ችግሮችና ሁኔታዎች ካሉ ቢዘረዝሩልኝ?  
.....
- (11) የቅሬታ ሰሚ ተቋማት ያሉባቸውን ችግሮችና ተግዳሮቶች ለመፍታትና ለመቅረፍ እንዲሁም መልካም አስተዳደርን ለማስፈን በመስሪያ ቤት ውስጥ ምን ምን ስራዎች ተሰርተው ያወቃሉ በዝርዝር ቢያብራሩልኝ? .....
- (12) በመስሪያ ቤት ውስጥ ለወደፊቱ ቅሬታዎችን ለመፍታትና የቅሬታ ሰሚ ተቋማትን ሚና ከፍ ለማድረግ ምንምን ስራዎች ለመስራት ታቅዷል? በዝርዝር ቢገልጹልኝ .....
- በቃሰ መጠይቁ መሰረት ትክክለኛ መረጃ ስለሰጡኝ ከልብ አመሰግናለሁ!!!**